LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
00013395858

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
1800

CLARK'S

FOREIGN

THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

VOLUME XXI.

Olshausen's Biblical Commentary on St Paul's Epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians, and Thessalonians.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38, GEORGE STREET.
LONDON: J. GLADDING; WARD & CO.; JACKSON & WALFORD.
DUBLIN: JOHN ROBERTSON.

MDCCCLVI.

BIBLICAL COMMENTARY

ON

ST PAUL'S EPISTLES

TO THE

GALATIANS, EPHESIANS, COLOSSIANS,

AND

THESSALONIANS.

BY

HERMANN OLSHAUSEN, D.D.,
PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF ERLANGEN.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN, BY

A CLERGYMAN OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

SECOND EDITION.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38, GEORGE STREET.
LONDON: HAMILTON, ADAMS, & CO. DUBLIN: JOHN ROBERTSON.

MDCCCLVI.

BS2344
.O54
1856

MURRAY AND GIBB, PRINTERS, EDINBURGH.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

INTRODUCTION.

	Page
§ 1. Of the Province of Galatia, as also of the Time and Place of the Composition of the Epistle to the Galatians,	1
§ 2. Of the Occasion of the Epistle's being Written,	7
§ 3. Train of Ideas in the Epistle,	10
§ 4. List of Commentators on the Epistle,	13

EXPOSITION OF THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

PART FIRST.

§ 1. The Greeting	15
§ 2. St Paul's Call,	18
§ 3. St Paul at the Council of the Apostles,	28
§ 4. St Paul's Dispute with St Peter,	38

PART SECOND.

§ 5. Of the Curse of the Law,	47
§ 6. Of the Relation of the Law to the Gospel,	53
§ 7. Hagar and Sarah Types of the Law and the Gospel,	72
§ 8. Warning against Falling away from the Faith,	84

PART THIRD.

§ 9. Warning against the Abuse of Liberty,	91
§ 10. Conclusion,	99

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. The first readers of the Epistle,	105
§ 2. Of the genuineness of the Epistle,	111
§ 3. Time and place of the composition of the Epistle,	115
§ 4. Train of ideas in the Epistle,	119
§ 5. List of Commentators on the Epistle,	120

EXPOSITION OF THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

PART FIRST.

§ 1. Thanksgiving for Salvation in Christ,	121
§ 2. Thanksgiving for the Faith of the Readers,	138
§ 3. Of the Unity of the Believers in Christ,	165

PART SECOND.

§ 4. The Harmony of the Faith,	195
§ 5. Detached Moral Precepts,	219

P

Page
§ 6. Precepts for Matrimony and the Family, ... 242
§ 7. Of the Spiritual Combat, ... 258

THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. Of the Genuineness of the Epistle, ... 271
§ 2. Of the False Doctrines which were prevalent in Colossæ, . . 276
§ 3. Train of ideas in the Epistle, ... 282
§ 4. List of Commentators on the Epistle, ... 284

EXPOSITION OF THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

PART FIRST.

§ 1. Thanksgiving for the Faith of the Readers in salvation in Christ, 285
§ 2. Warning against false teachers, ... 309

PART SECOND.

§ 3. General Ethical precepts, ... 353
§ 4. Special Moral precepts, ... 362

THE EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. Of the occasion of the Epistles, ... 373
§ 2. Of the genuineness of the Epistles, ... 377
§ 3. Train of ideas in the Epistles, ... 379
§ 4. List of Commentators, ... 381

EXPOSITION OF THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

PART FIRST.

§ 1. Thanksgiving for the Faith of the Readers, ... 383
§ 2. Account of St Paul's labours in Thessalonica, ... 389
§ 3. Of St Paul's desire to see the Thessalonians, ... 397

PART SECOND.

§ 4. Exhortations to a holy life, ... 405
§ 5. Instructions as to Christ's advent, ... 411
§ 6. Concluding exhortations, ... 428

EXPOSITION OF THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

§ 1. Thanksgiving for the Faith of the Christians in Thessalonica, . 437
§ 2. Of the conditions of the happening of Christ's advent, . . 446
§ 3. Concluding exhortations 479

EXPOSITION

OF THE

EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

INTRODUCTION.

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

GALATIA, or Gallogræcia,[1] was a province of Asia Minor, bounded on the North by Paphlagonia, on the West by Phrygia, on the South by Lycaonia, and on the East by Pontus, and its most considerable cities were Pessinus, Tabium, Ancyra, and Gordium.

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

Living among tribes all speaking Greek, these Gauls soon made the Greek language their own, yet St Jerome found that they, even in *his* time, had preserved their German tongue along with the former; "they spoke a dialect," says that Father in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, "like that spoken in the vicinity of Treves."[2] In the year 188 A.C. Manlius conquered Galatia (Livy xxxviii. 12), and Augustus made it a Roman province, A.C. 26. (Dio Cassius liii. 26.) As early as in the time of Augustus there resided many Jews in Galatia, to whom

[1] See as to the Geography and History of Galatia, the treatises of Hoffmann de Galatiâ antiquâ. Lips. 1726. Wernsdorf de republicâ Galatarum. Norimb. 1734. Schulze de Galatis. Francof. 1756. As to the Geography alone, see further Sickler's Ancient Geography, vol. ii. p. 375, ss., and Böttger's Beiträge, pt. 1st.

[2] It may therefore be said that the Epistle to the Galatians is addressed to Germans, and it was the German Luther, who, in this Apostolical Epistle, again recognised and brought to light the substance of the Gospel.

that Emperor granted a letter of protection, which has been preserved, under the name of "monumentum Ancyrarum," in a brazen inscription, which was let into the wall of the temple of Augustus at Ancyra. Now, in this province of Asia Minor, in which no doubt the Jews had early made many proselytes, the Gospel was disseminated by the Apostle Paul in his second journey. (Acts xvi. 6.) But, very lately, the hypothesis has been set up, that it is not the inhabitants of Galatia proper who are to be taken for the Galatians to whom St Paul's Epistle was addressed, but those of Derbe and Lystra. That opinion was first maintained by Bishop Mynster of Copenhagen (in his smaller theological writings. Kopenhagen, 1825, p. 58 E. ss.), by C. W. Niemeyer de tempore quo epistola ad Galatas conscripta sit, Halæ 1827, and by Dr Paulus of Heidelberg, in his exposition of the Epistle to the Galatians, and afterwards within these few years learnedly and acutely defended, particularly by Ulrich in Stud. und Krit. for the year 1836, part 2, and Böttger in his Beiträge zur Einleitung in die Paulinischen Briefe, 1st and 3d parts. The hypothesis is not unimportant, so far as it affects the question of the date of the composition of the Epistle to the Galatians, as St Paul visited Lycaonia with the cities of Derbe and Lystra, before he arrived in Galatia proper. Accordingly, if the assumption that this Epistle was properly intended for Lycaonia, for the inhabitants of Derbe and Lystra, be correct, the composition of it can be put back to a period before the council of the apostles (Acts 15), which is not without weight for the explanation of the occurrences between St Paul and St Peter, Gal. ii. But Rückert, partly in his commentary on the Epistle of the Galatians, partly in an essay in his Magazine for the Exegesis and Theology of the New Testament, has so strikingly shown the unsatisfactoriness of that hypothesis, that we are at liberty to view it as completely refuted. The circumstances in favour of the notion that by the term *αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τῆς Γαλατίας* (Gal. i. 2; 1 Cor. xvi. 1), the churches of Lycaonia, and especially of Derbe and Lystra, are to be understood, are the following. According to the Roman division of provinces, all Asia Minor was divided into seven districts; Asia, in the more confined sense of the word, Phrygia, Bithynia, Galatia, Cappadocia, Pamphylia, and Pontus. By this division the Roman province of Galatia certainly comprised Lycaonia also, along with Derbe and Lystra; but, according to Pliny at least (Hist. Nat. v. 27), only *a part* of Lycaonia, while

another part of it seems to have belonged to Cilicia. (See Rückert, ubi suprà, Magazine for Exegesis, p. 103, sq.) Consequently it is, no doubt, *possible* that St Paul used the word Galatia in the sense the Romans did in their division of Asia Minor into provinces, in which case a part of Lycaonia would have to be reckoned in. But this assumption is not *probable*, and for this reason; such originally arbitrary divisions into provinces, which, besides, very often changed among the Romans, are not usually so easily recognised in every-day language. Rückert justly remarks that even now-a-days districts, although they have been otherwise divided by their rulers, preserve their old names for centuries, *e.g.*, Alsace and the Breisgau. But in the Acts Lycaonia is always particularly specified (see Acts xiv. 6), which could not have happened if the Roman division into provinces had been followed, according to which no province of Lycaonia existed.[1] If we consider, besides, how, in the passage Acts xvi. 6, in the report of St Paul's journey from Cilicia to Macedon all through Asia Minor, the names of the provinces are placed, as the words are: *διελθόντες δὲ τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν*, it is clear that Galatia proper, and not Lycaonia, must be meant there. For, in order to go from Cilicia to Phrygia, one was forced to pass through Lycaonia; the words ought, therefore, to have been placed in an inverted order, thus: *διὰ τὴν Γ. χώραν καὶ τὴν Φ.* It may be added that Derbe and Lystra had already been particularly mentioned, xvi. 1. In Acts xviii. 32 we read, it is true, *διερχόμενος τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν*, but those words admit of being so explained as to mean that St Paul, starting *from Antioch*, journeyed through Cilicia and Lycaonia (which are not named) first northwards to Galatia, then westwards to Phrygia.

Schwaben

The *other* circumstance which might seem to favour the extension of the meaning of the word Galatia is *this*. In the Acts copious details are given of the establishment of churches in Lycaonia. On the other hand, nothing is said of the labours of St Paul in Galatia; it is merely said, xvi. 6, xviii. 23, that St Paul had *passed through* Galatia. It may therefore seem more

[1] The passage 2 Tim. iv. 10, is also against the assumption that in the New Testament Galatia is used in the sense of the Roman division of their provinces, for in it Galatia is put along with Dalmatia. But this latter was likewise a Roman province, being but a district in the province of the Roman or barbarian Illyria. (See Sickler's anct. Geography, part i. p. 461.)

natural to allow the Epistle to the Galatians to have been directed to the well-known churches in Derbe and Lystra than to churches of whose origin and situation we know nothing at all in detail. But this argument is of no importance, for the Acts did not undertake to give accurate information as to what parts of the Roman empire St Paul founded churches in. Again, there is nowhere given any account of his journey to Crete, much less of the establishment of churches in that island. Therefore no conclusion can be drawn merely from the silence of the Acts as to the foundation of the Galatian churches. But, beyond that, there *is*, in Acts xvi. 6, an *indirect* allusion to St Paul's activity in teaching in Galatia. For, as it is only said of Asia that it was forbidden the apostle by the Holy Ghost to preach the word there, St Luke seems to have meant that St Paul had laboured in Phrygia and Galatia. We agree, therefore, with Rückert in finding no satisfactory reason for giving up Galatia proper, and consequently imagine the churches to which St Paul wrote to have been most probably in the above-named chief towns of Galatia, as the apostles were always in the habit of choosing those as the scenes of their labours.

Passing from this subject to the investigation of the time and place of the composition of this Epistle, we find the greatest variety in the views of the learned on this point. It is true that several of them run into such extremes that we may at once exclude them from consideration, without subjecting them to a closer investigation. To *that* class belongs the opinion of Köhler and Schrader (of which we have already spoken in our general Introduction to St Paul's Epistles, § 3), according to which the date of the Epistle to the Galatians is fixed at the very latest period of St Paul's life, his second captivity at Rome. The arguments for this assumption (as, *e.g.*, that in Gal. vi. 17, sufferings are mentioned which caused St Paul to expect death when he wrote to the Galatians) are so weak that they need no further refutation than they received above (ubi suprà).

The postscript ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ῥώμης also refers the Epistle to the Galatians to the latter part of St Paul's life, but still not exactly to the second Roman captivity. Besides, it is certainly generally admitted that the subscriptions are the work of later, often of grossly ignorant, copiers. Equally to be rejected with this view, which refers our Epistle to too late a time, is another attributing it to too early a date. Marcion assumed that it was the earliest of

all St Paul's Epistles. In later times Koppe and Keil, and, last of all, Böttger (ubi suprà), and Ulrich (Stud. 1836, part 2), favour the assumption that St Paul had written the Epistle to the Galatians the earliest of all. To make that probable, the above refuted hypothesis was used, viz., that the name Galatia in St Paul's Epistle included a part of Lycaonia; according to *that* one might fix the date of the establishment of the Galatian churches as early as the time alluded to in Acts xiv. 6, where stress is laid on the expression περίχωρος, which, however, cannot be referred to Lycaonia, but only to the cities of Derbe and Lystra; or else, in relation to Acts xi. 25, a journey of St Paul from Tarsus in Cilicia into the regions of Lycaonia and Galatia was quite arbitrarily assumed. This assumption could only be excused if there were in the Epistle itself evident signs of its having been composed so early as 51 A.D., to which year the latest defenders of that view refer it. But none such are found, and what are brought forward as such are quite untenable, as Rückert (in the Mag., p. 110, ss.) has well proved. For if it be said the passage Gal. ii. 13 presupposes that the Galatians knew Barnabas, and, as he, Barnabas, did not accompany the apostle on his second journey, there must have been an *earlier* journey, in which Barnabas *did* accompany him into Galatia—it is quite clear that the acquaintance with Barnabas need not have been a *personal* one, and, even if one chose to assume that it *was* so, why Barnabas might have gone into Galatia by himself at a time to us unknown. Further, it is inferred from Acts xv. 36, where the confirming the brethren is given as the object of the second journey, that St Paul must have been in Galatia *before*, otherwise it could not be said he would *confirm* the brethren there. But the confirming the brethren in the faith did not exclude the further extension of the Gospel in regions where it had not yet been preached. Why, on this very journey St Paul came first to Macedonia, where, however, it is certain there were *then* no churches which he could confirm. It is therefore most probable, as most of the modern critics admit, that St Paul wrote our Epistle about A.D. 57 or 58, and, it may be presumed, from Ephesus, while on his third missionary journey, shortly after his second sojourn in Galatia (Gal. i. 6, iv. 13), during which he had already found existing the germs of those errors which he reproves. For *earlier* the composition of the Epistle *cannot* be fixed, as Gal. iv. 13 presupposes that St Paul had been twice with the Galatians (see the exposition of that passage, whence it is evident

that it cannot be understood in any other way); *later* we cannot put it, as the Epistle gives the impression of having been written under the influence of a very near and immediate inspection of the condition of the Galatian churches. That impression prevents me from agreeing in Stein's notion, according to which (Röhr's Magazin für Prediger, B. x., St. 1) the Epistle was not written from Ephesus, but only later from Corinth, or even not until after his departure from Corinth through Macedonia to Jerusalem, so that the date of its composition would fall in the year 58 or the beginning of 59, A.D. Rückert (on Gal. i. 9, iv. 12, ss. v. 3-21) has clearly shown that the apostle, when he was in Galatia for the second time, found the germs of the corruptions there even *then* in existence. It is therefore improbable that he should let much time elapse before the writing of the Epistle, and on that ground it is to be presumed that the composition took place during the apostle's sojourn at Ephesus, which lasted more than two years. (Acts xix. 10.) The only circumstance which can excite any doubt as to this view, otherwise perfectly satisfactory, is that which has been put forward, especially by Ulrich, ubi suprà, viz., that no mention at all is made of the council of apostles and of its resolutions (Acts xv.), where one would expect it. (Gal. ii.) This gives rise to the wish to place the composition of the Epistle, if possible, *before* the council, by which means the advantage would be at the same time gained of being enabled more easily to interpret St Peter's behaviour. But difficulties and the removal of them can be no arguments, *per se*, for giving currency, in purely historical inquiries, to any other opinions than those which the arguments before us safely warrant; least of all, when those opinions can be established only by such violent means as the change of the number in Gal. ii. 1, which becomes requisite in the present question. For the fourteen years mentioned there bring us necessarily to the time after the meeting of the apostles, count them as you will; and the number itself is too firmly established on grounds of sound criticism to admit of any well founded suspicion. However, what may be said, if not to the complete *solution*, at least to the *smoothing down*, of these difficulties, will be given in the exposition of chap. ii.

§ 2. OF THE OCCASION OF THE EPISTLE.

We have already, in the Exposition of the Acts of the Apostles (see the remarks on x. 1, ss., xv. 1, ss., xxi. 17, ss.), considered the relation of the law of Moses to the power of the Gospel, which was continually making itself more and more felt, and we especially drew attention to the fact, that with respect to it various opinions developed themselves in the apostolical church.[1] The most contracted view was that represented by the quondam strict Pharisees; they demanded that the observance of the Law by the Jewish Christians not only *might* be kept up as a pious custom, but *must* be adhered to, saying that the Law was intended by God as an eternal ordinance, and salvation was annexed to its outward fulfilment. All the apostles rejected this view at their meeting (Acts xv.), and required of the Gentiles entering the Church of Christ only the observance of the commandments given to Noah; and even *that* not as means of salvation, but merely out of tenderness towards the Jews converted to Christianity, who could with difficulty wean themselves from certain observances, *e.g.* the prohibition to partake of blood, or of any animal killed by strangling. All the Jewish Christians, who stood upon the stricter requirements in regard to the observance of the Law, even after those resolutions of the apostles, now entered more and more into opposition to the truth, and saw themselves at length forced to assume quite a sectarian form. A milder view of the Law was propounded by those who maintained that, with respect to those born Gentiles, the resolutions of the apostles ought to meet with attention, but that those born Jews would do well to continue to observe the Law, as the pious custom of their fathers, but without looking on that observance as a necessary means of salvation. This view was defended by Bishop James of Jerusalem, in particular, and probably most of the apostles professed it. Perhaps those that maintained this view considered, though it might be only vaguely, that the Jewish Christians were called to form a peculiar, and rather more elevated circle in the church itself, which circle was surrounded

[1] The view of Baur, that there was a faction which had everywhere wanted to forbid Gentiles being received into the Christian Church, even if they took upon them the complete fulfilment of the law along with circumcision, entirely contradicts the testimonies of history. (See the details on that point in my Essay in the Stud. for 1838, pt. 4, p. 933.)

by the more extensive one of the Gentile Christians, standing at a greater distance from the centre, who might be compared to the proselytes of the Gate. The most liberal view, lastly, was that made current by St Paul. He very rightly perceived in the Gospel the tendency to abrogate generally the Law in its outward forms, so that not only was the burden of the Law *not* to be laid on the *Gentile* Christians, but even *Jewish* Christians must be freed from it. With this conviction, however, St Paul, in his wisdom, kept aloof from the extreme to which Marcion went; he by no means tried to snatch, in a violent manner, the Law from the Jewish Christians as soon as possible, as if it were a sin to observe it as the pious custom of their fathers, but left the task of liberating the Jewish converts from it to the natural development of Christianity. But with regard to *his own conduct* he went to work in the following way. When he lived among the *Gentiles*, he *abstained from* the observance of the Law, and lived freely, as *they* were wont to do; among *Jews*, on the contrary, he *kept* the Law, that he might not give them offence. (See 1 Cor. ix. 20, 21.) Now, certain as it is that this free posture of mind in the apostle himself was absolutely the right one, yet it is easily to be understood how this conduct of his might be misinterpreted by the one-sided factions among whom he moved. As the Jewish Christians, who followed him, also acted in a similar manner, the Judaïzing Christians maintained that he taught apostacy from the Law, and made the Jews themselves apostates, which was, however, in nowise the fact, as St Paul carefully avoided everything that might directly operate to the abrogation of the law of Moses among the Jews. On the other hand, St Paul went too slowly to work for those Gentile Christians who were disposed to violent measures, and who afterwards were represented by the Marcionites: they would gladly have seen the observance of the Law forbidden as a sin, as indeed the Church of Rome in later times touched upon such an extreme, when it forbade the observance of the Sabbath. St Paul, therefore, held with admirable wisdom the middle course between Gentile license and enmity to the Jews, and Jewish obstinancy and enmity to the Gentiles, and thus preserved the Church in the first great danger which grew up against her out of her own principles.[1]

[1] According to Gal. vi. 12, 13, it certainly seems as if the Judaïsts, who were so ac-

Now, it is the Epistle to the Galatians which affords us the opportunity of seeing how St Paul defends his principles against one party, the stiff Judaïzers. That party had sent out its emissaries to the communities of Galatia, and had not only led the believers in that country into uncertainty as to the way of salvation preached to them by St Paul, by requiring of them circumcision and the complete observance of the Law, as necessary to salvation; but also excited suspicion as to the apostolical character of St Paul altogether. (See i. 1, 6, 7. iv. 17. v. 10, vi. 12, 13.) The influence of those men was the more dangerous the more plausible they could make their assertions. As the Old Testament was received as an inspired volume by the Christian Church also, it could not but be easy for them to show by *literal* interpretation, that the Law must be kept to the end of the world. The practice of St James, and of other apostles, as also that of the church in Jerusalem, apparently coincided with that view, and the scarce-converted Galatians were naturally unable to perceive directly the more subtle difference between the apostolical doctrine and that of the bigoted Jewish Christians. Against St Paul himself they could, with a show of probability bring the charge, that he did not rightly know what Christ had really taught; for he had never lived in His company, and had not, until Christ's death, received the Gospel from others. St Paul, therefore, could not avoid declaring himself openly against these Judaïsts, and putting the Christians of Galatia in possession of the right point of view for judging of their intrigues. And the apostle carries out that purpose, in a masterly manner, in this our Epistle. It is therefore self-evident that this Epistle could only have been written, in the first place, to born Gentiles, who can at most be considered as proselytes of the Gate. Righteous proselytes (see Jahn's Antiquities), or even born Jews, may only be reckoned among the first readers, in so far as they had entirely abandoned the observance of the Law (which, however, will certainly have been the case with but very few), or at least laid no stress upon it for the attainment of salvation. The subject of the

tive in Galatia, were proselytes, who did not even keep the Law themselves, but only wanted to make the chiefs of the Judaïsts favourably inclined towards them by means of their zeal for the Law. However, that passage is surely more correctly understood, if one assumes that St Paul here rebukes the hypocrisy in which the Jewish Christians laid on others what they themselves did not touch with one of their fingers. (Matt. xxiii. 4.) But, at all events, the passage shows that the Judaïsts in Galatia were *dependents*.

Epistle to the Galatians is, therefore, closely connected with that of the Epistle to the Romans, but the two works differ in the essence of their contents, viz., the setting forth the relation between the Law and the Gospel, in this way: the Epistle to the Romans sets it forth quite *objectively*,[1] without any regard to the Judaïzing false teachers, the Epistle to the Galatians, on the contrary, quite *polemically* with regard to that dangerous party; both Epistles are, therefore, complements to one another, and by their conjunction give the first complete picture of St Paul's system of doctrine. But, as has already been remarked on the Epistle to the Romans (Introd. sec. 5), the Epistle to the Galatians also has naturally its perpetual significance, since, even at this day, the very same things, which St Paul in this Epistle says against the obstinate adherence to the Jewish law, apply to the Catholic ceremonial and the Rationalistic system of morality, and their relation to the Gospel. The law, in all imaginable forms, whether coarser or finer, is addressing itself continually with its demands to man, and his own unassisted power, whose weakness is unable to satisfy those forms; it can never, therefore, make *saints* of *honest* men, though it may *sinners;* of *dishonest*, or *blind* ones, it will make either hypocrites or presumptuous fools. Now, the operation of the Gospel is specifically different, for *that* demands nothing, but only *gives* and *beseeches* those to whom it is preached to receive with faith the gift of forgiveness of sins and of the new birth. These two spheres of existence, viz., of the Law and of faith, the Church must never allow to be mingled, and all attempts of that sort to mingle them will ever shatter themselves on the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians, as it were on indestructible bulwarks.

§ 3. THE TRAIN OF IDEAS IN THE EPISTLE.

The Epistle to the Galatians (the authenticity of which has *never* been doubted, on account of its been thoroughly impressed with the spirit of St Paul, and the original composition of which in Greek has only been impugned by the well-known, but quite untenable, hypothesis of Bolten and Bertholdt, that all the writings of the New Testament were originally written in the *Aramæic*

[1] Details on this point will be found in the above cited Dissertation. Stud. 1838, part 4.

tongue), naturally divides itself into three parts. The first part (chaps. i. and ii.) contains the relation of the history of St Paul. The second part (chap. iii. 1 to chap. v. 12) comprises an exposition of his doctrine. And the third and final one embraces practical observations (chap. v. 13 to chap. vi. 18). The first part again may be subdived into four paragraphs, of which the first contains the greeting (chap. i. 1–5); the second reproves the vacillation of the Galatians, and informs them how the apostle, without any teaching or vocation of men, had been set by the Lord Himself in the apostolical office; and from a persecutor of the Church had become her servant: it also touches upon his first travels, which show that he, in the first years after his conversion, was very little in company with the apostles (chap. i. 6–24). Afterwards in the third paragraph, the apostle relates his important journey to Jerusalem, to the Council of the Apostles, and shows how he there had occasion to maintain his principles in controversy with the Jewish Christians, and how he and the chief apostles came to a friendly arrangement, to the purport that *he* should labour among the Gentiles, and *they* among the Jews; only that he should not forget the poor in Jerusalem (chap. ii. 1–10).

Immediately on this follows, in the fourth paragraph, the remarkable account of what took place between him, Peter, and Barnabas, in Antioch; by which St Paul makes his readers observe, that he had dared, freely and openly, to avow his principles; yea, even to reprehend St Peter himself, on account of his wavering with regard to the connection of the Law with the Gospel; and that he therefore stood completely on a level with the twelve in apostolical dignity. At the same time St Paul announces the theme of his Epistle, viz., that in the Gospel man is not justified by the works of the Law, but by faith in Christ; that therefore the Law could not under the dominion of grace be again set up, without destroying the spirit of the Gospel; and that the Christian was, through the Law, dead to the Law, and had, as such, to live in the faith of the Son of God (chap. ii. 11–21). In the second part St Paul appeals, first of all, in the fifth paragraph, to the experience of the Galatians; and calls upon them to confess how they had received the Holy Spirit, *not* through the *Law*, but purely through the preaching of the *Gospel*. They should not, therefore, on any account, forget, that the Scripture already ascribed righteousness to all men who through faith are Abraham's children. The Law, as such, could only work the curse,

because it required absolute fulfilment, but Christ had redeemed us from the curse of the Law, to the end that we might receive, through faith, the promise of the Holy Spirit (chap. iii. 1–14). In the sixth paragraph St Paul further illustrates the relation between the Law and the Gospel by the metaphor of a man's testament. As a human testament cannot be annulled, much less can the promise of God, which was given to Abraham and his seed. The Law coming in between the promise and the fulfilment, cannot therefore destroy the latter, but can only be intended to have the effect of preparing for it. It is a schoolmaster unto Christ, in whom the opposition between the divine and the human, which is still prominent in the Law, through the union of both, seems to be adjusted. Therefore all that was separate, as well Jew as Christian, is in Christ combined into a higher unity, in which state also the true adoption, and, with it, the freedom of the adult, is alone given. (Chap. iii. 15 to chap. iv. 7.)

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

In the third part, St Paul adds to the exhortation, to maintain their freedom, the further admonition, not to abuse this freedom. He begs his Galatians, in the 9th paragraph, to walk in the Spirit, and not to fulfil the lusts of the flesh. The walk-

ing, however, in the Spirit, must bring forth the fruits of the Holy Ghost, and crucify the flesh with its appetites. This principle the apostle applies to the special circumstances which just then existed among the Galatians (chap. v. 13 to chap. vi. 10).

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

§ 4. BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTICE.

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

We have of Luther two works on our Epistle, a shorter one (Wittenberg, 1519), and a longer one (eod. loco, 1535). In him the polemical spirit against the Church of Rome is, as we might expect, decidedly paramount, as likewise in the works of Bullinger (Zurich, 1549), Beza (Cambridge, 1642), Brenz (Tübingen, 1588), upon our Epistle.

In later times, this Epistle was commentated on by Sebastian Schmid (Kiel, 1690), J. D. Michaelis (Goettingen, 1769), Zachariæ (Goettingen, 1770), Koppe in his Commentary on the New Testament (1st edition Goettingen, 1778, 3d edition, edited by Tychsen, Goettingen, 1823). Semler Periphrasis epist. ad Gal. (Halle, 1779), Morus acroases in epist. ad. Galatas edid., Eichstädt (Lips., 1795), Krause (Frankfort, 1788), Schilling (Lips., 1792), J. B. Carpzov (Helmstädt, 1794), Hensler (Leipzig, 1805), Borger (interpretatio epist. ad Galatas. Lugd. Bat., 1807), Winer (1st edition, 1821, 3d edition, 1829), Flatt (Tübingen, 1828), Paulus (Heidelberg, 1831), Rückert (Leipzig, 1833),

Usteri (Zurich, 1833), Matthies (Greifswald, 1833), Schott (Leipzig, 1834, (Zschocke, illustrative paraphrase (Halle, 1834). Further, the reader may compare Hermann's Essay on the three first chapters of our Epistle, in connection with Lücke's Review (in Ullman's and Umbreit's Stud., for 1833, part 2), and the observations on it by Rückert and Usteri, in their commentaries on our Epistle. Also Fritzsche's Comment. de nonnullis Pauli ad Galatas epistolæ locis. Rostochii, 1834, 4, which are included in opuscula Fritzschiorum, pag. 143, sqq.

EXPOSITION

OF THE

EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

I.

PART FIRST.

(I. 1–II. 21.)

§ 1. THE GREETING.

(I. 1–5.)

THE very beginning of the Epistle to the Galatians introduces us to the peculiar state of things which prevailed in their churches, and which, as we saw in our introduction, caused the apostle to compose it. The Judaïzing false teachers had impugned St Paul's apostolical authority, and represented him as subordinate to the twelve. This might really be done with a show of justice, as St Paul had not lived in the society of our Lord during His sojourn on earth, and stood alone beside the strictly defined body of the twelve. Therefore it was the more necessary to make the attempt completely to refute this assertion of his opponents which impaired his efficiency. He calls himself, therefore, here, at the very beginning of the Epistle: ἀπόστολος οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ δί ἀνθρώπου, ἀλλὰ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κ. τ. λ.,[1] and shows in detail in the first chapter, how *he* was just as independently called by the Lord as *the twelve were*, only for another purpose, namely, for the preaching among the Gentiles, while to the *former* the Jews were commended (chap. i. 15, 16, ii. 9, 10).

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 9, where St Paul, under the influence of the painful feeling of his former estrangement from God, writes: οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς καλεῖσθαι ἀπόστολος διότι ἐδίωξα τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, but also adds: χάριτι δὲ Θεοῦ, εἰμὶ ὅ εἰμὶ, forms a remarkable parallel to this. In the Epistle to the Corinthians, St Paul attributes to himself only personal worthiness, which, however, did not prevent God from choosing him for the office of apostle.

The name ἀπόστολος was, in the apostolical age, used not only of the twelve, but also of such teachers as were sent out by churches, or by single persons, as messengers; it only forms an antithesis with those teachers who did not travel about, who were permanently attached to a church, and, so far, is of similar meaning with the name εὐαγγελιστής (Cf. Acts xiv. 4–14; Rom. xvi. 7; 1 Cor. iv. 6–9, xii. 28, 29). Such a *human* authorization of his apostolical call St Paul emphatically denies; he says he received his office neither from men, nor *through* any specially distinguished man. *By* men the false apostles, the blind leaders, are called; every genuine call to the office of teacher in the Church proceeds, even yet, from the Lord, but in most cases by far this divine call takes place *through the medium* of a man, as *e.g.*, Timothy, Titus, and other excellent teachers, were called by the Lord through St Paul. But *this too* St Paul denies of *himself;* as *the twelve* were, so *he* too was called both by and through the Lord, without any human intervention. (Ἀπὸ denotes the source, the origin of the call, διὰ the intermediate agent, through which it is bestowed on the person chosen. Παρὰ might also have stood instead of ἀπὸ [cf. i. 12], or ὑπὸ; παρὰ, as also ὑπὸ, are even used of *persons* in preference to ἀπὸ, and that too, where they are thought of as immediately acting of themselves [cf. Bernhardy's Syntax, page 255; Winer's Gram. pp. 349 and 354]. This difference, however, between ἀπὸ and παρὰ is not always observed in the New Testament, as is directly shown in verse 3 by the formula of greeting, χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ, in which however, God and Christ are undoubtedly to be considered as immediately acting of themselves. In the following words St Paul apparently pictured to himself the relation in such a way that he meant to write διὰ Χριστοῦ and απὸ Θεοῦ, and put διὰ alone for the sake of shortness; for we find that the prepositions are usually so distinguished in reference to the Father and the Son [cf. the remarks on Rom. xi. 36]. Now Christ, as the Son of God, in conjunction with the Father, is put in opposition to every thing human, in which sentence there is contained an indirect proof of the divine nature of Christ. But, as the name of the Lord was in full Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς, and that of the Father Θεὸς ὁ Πατήρ, the omission of the articles (cf. ver. 3) is to be explained by the fusion of two ideas into one. Θεὸς Πατήρ, without article or genitive, is found also Phil. i. 3, ii. 10; 1 Peter i. 2; Ephes. vi. 23; 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Tim. i. 2; Titus i. 14. Winer (Gram. p. 115) has not discrimi-

nated from the above passages those in which the genitive is added. The New Testament does not contain the formulas Θεὸς υἱὸς, Θεὸς πνεῦμα, which came later into use. The reference to the resurrection of Christ is meant to exalt God's almighty power, of which St Paul's conversion is a shining proof. Matthiæ wishes to refer, but less appropriately, this addition to the exalted position of Christ, because there was no particular occasion to magnify exactly that. (As to the ἐγείρειν ἐκ νεκρῶν see the Comm., vol. 1, on Matt. xxii. 29, 30.)

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

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

περὶ, which, it is to be added, is found also Rom. viii. 3, and often elsewhere. [Cf. in Comm. vol. 1, on Matt. xx. 28.] The Son of God's giving himself up to death [Ephes. v. 11; Titus ii. 14] was, we may add, not extorted or commanded by the will of the Father, but was a voluntary act of his own [John x. 18], yet one answering to the will of God, and therefore κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ.—God is here called expressly πατὴρ ἡμῶν, inasmuch as he revealed himself as the Father of mankind in the mission of Christ as creating them anew in regeneration. Therefore also to Him belongs ultimately all the glory of the creation as of the redemption. [Cf. on the doxology at Rom. i. 25; 2 Cor. vi. 31.] The phrase ἐξαιρεῖσθαι ἐκ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος αἰῶνος πονηροῦ for denoting the object of Christ's work is found nowhere in the New Testament but here. The ἐξαιρεισθαι[1] [Acts vii. 10, xii. 11, xxiii. 27] = σώζειν, to withdraw from the influence of a destructive element. The meaning of the formula is therefore perfectly = σώζειν ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου. The ἐνεστῶς answers to the οὗτος [Rom. viii. 38; 1 Cor. iii. 22, vii. 26], whilst πονηρὸς is to be taken only epexegetically. [Cf. on αἰὼν οὗτος in Comm. vol. 1 on Matt. xii. 32.] Whilst, therefore, the δοῦναι ἑαυτὸν refers to the reconciliation, the ἐξαιρεῖσθαι refers to the redemption of those reconciled.)

§ 2. THE CALLING OF ST PAUL.

(I. 6–24.)

Without the least expression of love or sympathy, St Paul lets his excited feelings burst forth at once, and expresses his indignant wonder at the falling away of the Galatians. No doubt Rückert is completely right when he concludes from *that* that St Paul during his last visit must have already spoken to them of their backsliding, for, had nothing of the sort taken place, he would certainly, as is done in the first Epistle to the Corinthians, before rebuking them, have told them how he came into possession of the accounts of them. The οὕτω ταχέως, however, need by no means be referred to St Paul's last visit; it may rather be very aptly referred to their conversion, which ought to win over the man to the Christian element *permanently*. He therefore is still changed very quickly who relapses, even if after the course of several *years*. (Μετατίθεσθαι is "to change an opinion and

[1] The active form ἐξαιρεῖν is found Matt. v. 29, xviii. 9. The middle forms means also in the New Testament the same as ἐκλέγειν, Acts xxvi. 17.

tendency of mind," when the direction of the change is pointed out by εἰς. The present tense denotes the action as still continuing, as it were, only just arriving at completion. By that means the hope is excited of being able to stop the as yet incompleted action. The comparison of the word with גָּלַל, and an assumption of an allusion to the name Γάλαται, which St Jerome thinks is to be found here, is to be rejected as trifling.—The καλέσας is, of course, God only, not St Paul; the apostle certainly wished to convert no one to himself. The medium of the call is the χάρις Χριστοῦ;[1] therefore ἐν = διὰ, or stands for the dative only, without, however, exactly taking ἐν for the mark of the dative. [Cf. Winer's Gram., p. 195.])

Ver. 7. The ὅ οὐκ ἐστιν ἄλλο, εἰ μὴ κ. τ. λ. is not without difficulty. The reference of ὅ to ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον is clearly quite unsuitable, as the idea: "which, however, is no other," would represent the guilt of the opponents as less, whereas St Paul is in the act of depicting it as very gross. The reference of ὅ to εὐαγγέλιον alone, in the sense: "which can, and must be, no other than it is," *i.e.*, which one must not change arbitrarily, would require ἕτερον instead of ἄλλο, not to mention that it seems harsh, to separate εὐαγγέλιον from ἕτερον, and that the following εἰ μὴ does not suit *then;* for it is inadmissible to take it as = *sed* or *attamen*, for it only means *nisi*. (Cf. Winer's Gram., page 452. ss. Hartung's Partikellehre, vol. ii. page 118, ss.) The connecting εἰ μὴ, however, with θαυμάζω, which Schott has proposed, would be totally unallowable, because of the indicative, which cannot possibly mean: "I should wonder at your early apostacy, if I had not known that you were led astray." Besides, according to this interpretation, the difficulty of the ὅ οὐκ ἐστιν ἄλλο, which, according to it, must be enclosed in brackets, remains. Therefore the interpretation defended by Grotius, Winer, Rückert, alone recommends itself to us, according to which ὅ is referred to all that has preceded, and the words ὅ οὐκ ἐστιν ἄλλο, εἰ μὴ κ. τ. λ. are strictly connected in the sense: "which (your apostacy) is nothing else, or consists in nothing else, than that you have allowed yourselves to be led astray." By this addition, then, it is St Paul's intention to soften the guilt of the Galatians,

[1] The omission of Χριστοῦ, in accordance with F.G. and several, especially Latin, Fathers, would not be advisable. The coupling of this genitive with καλέσαντος is, however, clearly forbidden by the intervening ἐν χάριτι, as also by the fact that St Paul never refers the κλῆσις to Christ, but always to *the Father*.

and to point to their false teachers as the real culprits. (The article stands before the participle quite according to rule (as in the phrase εἰσιν οἱ λέγοντες), since the action is considered as one, which belongs only to definite persons, or by which the persons themselves are defined. [Cf. Matthiæ's Gram., vol. ii. page 552.] Winer's interpretation, as if the meaning were: εἰσι ταράσσοντες ὑμᾶς καὶ οὗτοι εἰσιν ὀλίγοι, introduces a thought into the meaning which is not contained in the words.—Ταράσσειν = σαλεύειν, 2 Thess. ii. 2. "To effect a change in one's settled principles of faith, and that by open violent attacks, not by secret and artful insinuations." As to the antagonists here pointed out, see further details at v. 10–12, and vi. 12, 13.—On μεταστρέφειν, cf. Acts ii. 20; James iv. 9. Θέλοντες has the stress on it, as it stands in opposition to the *unpremeditated* μεταστρεψαι, which took place among the Galatians, who knew not what they did, when they followed those false teachers.)

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

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

the matter quite hypothetically, the εἰ applies the remark to the actual case.

Ver. 10. The connection of verse 10 with the preceding is not quite clear. One would have expected, after verses 8 and 9, and the strong asseverations that whoever preached otherwise than he did was accursed, something like the following: "for what I teach is undoubtedly God's word;" or, "I know for certain that this alone is the truth."[1]

Instead of that, St Paul states that he seeks to please God and not man; but, if one takes this idea at its root, one recognizes that it contains exactly those ideas which, according to the context, one has a right to expect. For the very dictum, that he wishes to please God entirely, and not man—that he is entirely the servant of Christ, who is more than all men are—this very maxim is the pledge for his living union with God, and also for his illumination from above, which exalts his doctrines far above a mere subjective opinion. He gains, at the same time, by this turn of thought, the advantage of putting aside a charge that the Judaïsts raised against him, and of retorting it on them. They upbraided him on account of his accommodating spirit, that he became to the Gentiles a Gentile, to the Jews a Jew, as if the grasping at human approbation was the cause of it. The *fact* was exactly the reverse; this, no doubt, *was* the case with those Judaïstic false teachers, who sought, by the great number of their conversions, to gain fame, without caring about the means by which they effected them. (Cf. Gal. vi. 13). The ἄρτι, like the following ἔτι, can only be referred to the time since St Paul's conversion: with that event the old man, which in *him*, too, brought with it the desire of pleasing men, was in him forthwith so thrust back, that the holy fire from the divine altar alone glowed in him, and dissipated all other love. (Πείθω ἀνθρώπους, Θεὸν cannot, as Luther and Michaelis wanted, be taken: res humanas, res divinas, suadeo, nor can κατὰ be supplied; it is here rather equal to placare, tranquillum reddere, as it certainly means at 1 John iii. 9; Homer Il. a. 100; Eurip. Hipp. 1060. It is here = to ἀρέσκειν, which follows.)

Vers. 11–14. St Paul now endeavours, from here to chap. ii. 10, to trace historically this his *immediate* relation to God through Christ. He needed not to make any mention here of the great

[1] Rückert's supplement, "wonder not at this harsh speech. I can, in accordance with my divine call, say no otherwise," is clearly too harsh.

fact of the manifestation of the Lord, through which his conversion was effected, because he knew that this was sufficiently known to the Galatians; though he points, in verses 15, 16, to that event.

His only concern was to make it clear how he had in nowise been instructed by the apostles, and become, therefore, spiritually dependent upon them, so that their authority was above his own. It might be said St Paul *was baptized*, though by the Christians in Damascus, we may suppose by Ananias (Acts ix. 18); indeed, according to the parallel passage (Acts xxii. 10), the Lord commanded him to go to Damascus, there to learn what he was to be commissioned to do. He seems, therefore, not to have received the Holy Ghost immediately on Christ's manifestation, but only on Ananias laying hands on him, "when there fell from his eyes as it were scales" (both bodily and spiritually), and at his baptism. But that very point, that St Paul did not receive the Holy Ghost from an apostle through the laying on of hands, but independently of them, whereas, in other cases (according to Acts viii.), the apostles alone could impart the Holy Ghost, sets him free from *them* and their authority, and on a par with the body of the apostles. Added to this, St Paul, besides the first appearance at Damascus, saw the Lord repeatedly (cf. on Acts xxii. 17, xxiii. 11), and remained, as it were, in continued intercourse with Him, and received instructions from Him direct, 1 Cor. xi. 23. St Paul, therefore, could, with perfect justice, boast of the Gospel which he preached, as a something intrusted to him immediately by God, without any human intervention. (Ver. 11, γνωρίζω is used by profane writers as = γινώσκω, by the LXX. as = "to show or make known," [cf. Prov. xxii. 19; Ezek. xliv. 23, with 1 Cor. xii. 3, xv. 1.] Γὰρ is certainly to be preferred to δὲ, according to D. F. G., and other authorities: δὲ was surely substituted, merely because γὰρ stands five times in succession; but it often happens in St Paul that the same conjunction comes five times, and even oftener, in succession. [Cf. *e.g.* Rom. iv. 13, ss. v. 6, sq.] Κατ' ἄνθρωπον can only be taken, as in 1 Cor. ix. 8, as = ἀνθρώπινον, *human*, as to origin, essence, and object, in contrast to the *divine* character of the Gospel. Rückert's remark, that no one said that the Gospel was of *human* origin, and that, therefore, so taken, the apostolical dictum contains no antithesis against which it could be directed, is of no importance; for, even if the Judaïsts, whom St Paul contends with, did not say that *explicitly*, still it was to be inferred from their conduct; for they

made of it what they wished.—Ver. 12, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγὼ is to be taken: neque enim ego, *i.e.*, "I, as little as the other apostles," not: nam ne ego quidem, which would have been expressed by οὐδ' ἐγὼ γὰρ, or καὶ γὰρ οὐδ' ἐγώ.—Before ἐδιδάχθην many good MSS., especially A.D.F.G., read οὐδὲ for οὔτε, which last Griesbach preferred, as also Winer (ad h. l. and Gram. p. 456). Lachmann and Rückert, on the other hand, read οὐδέ. The decision depends on the distinction which one supposes between παρέλαβον and ἐδιδάχθην; Winer takes it as not specific, and cannot, therefore, be for the strongly disjunctive particle. But it is more correct to assume, with Lachmann and Rückert, a specific distinction, in which case οὐδὲ must be read. It is also especially in favour of that reading, that one cannot join παρὰ ἀνθρώπου also with ἐδιδάχθην, with which πρὸς is usually put, and thus διδάσκεσθαι forms an antithesis with ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι: the *former* denotes the gradual appropriation of a thing, through reflection and exercise of the intellect; the *latter* means intuitive perception, or instantaneous illumination of the reason. (Cf. Matt. xi. 25, ss.)—In the δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ scil. παρέλαβον, Christ is to be understood as the *author*, not as the *object*, of the Revelation; the *latter* is the Gospel. The revelation of Himself by Christ, stands here in opposition to the communication of Himself through man; the other side, according to which Christ is also the revealed, is brought prominently forward in ver. 15. Ver. 13, 14. In order to place the striking circumstances of his conversion in a clear light, St Paul reminds the Galatians first of his earlier relation to Christ, when he persecuted the church as a zealous Pharisee. He sets in opposition to the νῦν of his conversion the πότε of his life under the Law; the Galatians might have heard by report, or even through St Paul himself, what was necessary for them to know on that point. The form Ἰουδαϊσμός is often found in the Apocrypha. Cf. 2 Macc. ii. 21, xiv. 38; 4 Macc. iv. 26.—Καθ' ὑπερβολὴν = σφόδρα or περισσοτέρως, ver. 14; 1 Cor. xii. 31; 2 Cor. iv. 17. Πορθέω = πολιορκέω, Acts ix. 21.—Ver. 14, προκοπτειν is generally used intransitively; with ὑπὲρ it is "to surpass." [Luke ii. 52; 2 Tim. ii. 16, iii. 9.] —Συνηλικιώτης, aequalis, is found nowhere in the New Testament except here. Ζηλώτης, Acts xxi. 20.—The form πατρικὸς is found only here; πατρῷος often occurs, *e.g.* Acts xxii. 3, xxiv. 14. The παραδόσεις comprise the genuine books of Moses, along with the traditional Pharisaic dogmas; neither the *one* set nor the *other alone*).

Ver. 15. As the whole has its period, in which the fulfilment of the Divine promises happen (Gal. iv. 4), so also has each individual. When that holy moment arrived for St Paul (on his journey to Damascus), God caused His eternal decree of election to reach him *in time*, by means of a call, in order to use him as an instrument for the propagation of the Gospel. (The εὐδόκησεν ὁ Θεὸς answers to the רָצָה, cf. Ps. xl. 14.—Ἀφορίζειν = ἐκλέγειν. Cf. on Rom. ix. 1; Ephes. i. 4.—Ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου = מִבֶּטֶן אִמִּי. This phrase is, in meaning, exactly parallel to the πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου [Ephes. i. 4], *i.e.*, "from all eternity." The election by grace is, therefore, to be described as one in no wise earned by works. [Cf. on Rom. ix. 11.] The grace, therefore, refers as much to ἀφορίζειν as to καλεῖν.—Now, here the Revelation of Christ appears as the result and effect of grace; therefore, by the ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ is to be understood, not Christ's appearance as such, but the same in connection with the collective effects of grace, so far as Christ was thereby made manifest to St Paul inwardly in his heart, as the eternal Son of God. As to the vision which St Paul had at Damascus, we must refer the chief effects to the apostle's inner world; a mere *physical* seeing could not have produced such effects).[1]

Ver. 16. The aim of this manifestation was certainly for St Paul a *subjective* one also, viz., his salvation, though this vanishes in his eyes in comparison with the immense *objective* end, necessarily combined with it. Salvation was given to the whole believing Gentile world together with him (cf. Acts ix. 15). But it is Christ *Himself*, not something about Him, or merely the doctrine *concerning* Him, which is the object of genuine preaching, therefore it is said: ἵνα εὐαγγελίζωμαι αὐτόν. The connecting εὐθέως with the foregoing, for which Rückert and Neander decide, against all the MSS., in order to obtain the meaning that St Paul had already preached in Arabia, is entirely inadmissible; for St Paul cannot, according to the course of his ideas, have meant to say, that he was called in order to preach *immediately;* but only that he was called for the object of the ministry generally, and that

[1] It might appear striking, that St Paul does not mention Ananias, who certainly *baptized* him (Acts ix. 18), and of whom, therefore, one might at first have thought that he had also *instructed* him. But, as Christ and the apostles were baptized by John the Baptist, without having received any instruction from *him*, which did not *then* take place at baptism, St Paul might naturally omit mentioning *his baptism* too, and the rather, that baptism no where supposes a reason for the dependence of the baptized on the baptizer.

when he was aware of this he had given himself up forthwith to that object, without allowing himself to be decided by men. But it does not follow from *that*, that he fulfilled in the very first years the Divine intention in calling him; he must rather have experienced the want of first feeling his way in the new element into which he had entered. The assumption of an inversion, so that εὐθέως οὐ should be taken for οὐκ εὐθέως is still more unsuitable, for then it would follow that St Paul had *afterwards* asked counsel of men, whereas he means to deny *that* absolutely. But Schott thinks that εὐθέως cannot be joined with what follows without an ellipse, because that word by reason of its nature requires a positive proposition. It is best to supply προσέχων νοῦν, or the positive idea, which is directly after expressed negatively in what follows: "I treated not with flesh and blood," which must be restricted neither to St Paul himself, *i.e.*, to the questioning of his natural inclination, nor to the apostles, nor any other class of men, but is to be taken generally. "Obedient to God alone," St Paul means to say, "I excluded all human deliberation, as being subject to error." Προσανατίθημι = properly "to lay on in addition," as in Gal. ii. 6, in the phrase προσανατίθεσθαί τινι τι, or, as in Gal. ii. 2, ἀνατίθεσθαι, it means: "to lay before one, propose to one, something for deliberation or decision." So, often, in Diodorus and Lucian. Some inferior MSS. only read here προανεθέμην).

Ver. 17. But St Paul was especially concerned to show that he had always been without connection with the older apostles, because his Judaïstic adversaries represented him as dependent upon them; therefore St Paul makes it a prominent point that he had, after his conversion, gone first to Arabia, and had thence returned to Damascus, and had therefore no connection with the apostles in Jerusalem. (Instead of ἀνῆλθον B.D.E.F.G. and other critical authorities read ἀπῆλθον, which is no doubt to be preferred, and indeed Lachmann has received it into the text; since ἀνῆλθον was surely only put instead, because ἀπῆλθον follows again directly, and in ver. 18, ἀνῆλθον is used of the journey to Jerusalem, like the more usual ἀναβαίνειν = עָלָה.—The phrase οἱ πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἀπόστολοι points first to the earlier call of the twelve, but, second, sets St Paul also as an apostle, in the proper meaning of the term, by their side. Οὐδέ is to be taken as a strictly negative particle, because the idea has the emphatic meaning that he saw no apostle at all.—In the parallel passages (Acts ix. 22, xxvi. 22, xi. 17), the subject is not a journey into Arabia; it is more likely that

the first and second sojourns of St Paul in Damascus are there conjointly referred to. The words of our passage do not, however, permit us, as Usteri wishes, to assume that Damascus was reckoned in Arabia;[1] on the contrary, both plainly appear separate. The event, which is related 2 Cor. xi. 32, is, no doubt, to be referred to the time of the second sojourn at Damascus, for it assumes that St Paul had already preached the Gospel.

Ver. 18. How the three years are to be apportioned cannot be laid down with any approach to certainty.[2] To me it appears most probable that St Paul passed the longest time in Arabia, because there he contemplated not teaching, but his own inward development. (See section 1 of the general Introduction to St Paul's Epistles, and on Acts ix. 20, ss). The ἔπειτα can be reckoned only from the principal event, *i.e.*, from St Paul's conversion. The most important point in this passage, however, is, that St Paul declares the object of this his first journey to Jerusalem was, to become acquainted with St Peter. This declaration does not contradict the accounts in Acts ix. 26, ss., xxii. 17, ss. The only question is, what had St Paul in view in making this acquaintance? He probably wished to come to some understanding with St Peter as to their future labours, which, according to ii. 6, ss., was at a later period more completely effected. For, as he, in the beginning (see on Acts ix. 26, ss.) met with such great opposition in Jerusalem, he confined his stay to a few days, which fact he here brings forward as a proof that he could not have been instructed by the apostles. (Ἱστορεῖν means properly: "to become acquainted with by one's own perception, but it is, no doubt, usually applied to *things* only, seldom to *persons*. But Josephus too, B. J. vi. 1. 8. uses it of persons. It is not found again in the New Testament.— For Πέτρον A.B. and other MSS. read Κηφᾶν, as ii. 9. Lachmann receives it into the text; but the reading has surely no other foundation than that it was wished to turn aside the derogatory description which follows from St Peter, and to substitute some one else.— Whether ἐπέμεινα πρὸς points to a dwelling with St Peter, or not,

[1] As Damascus had not been named before, πάλιν ὑπέστρεψα εἰς Δαμασκὸν points unmistakeably to the fact that St Paul assumed it as known that his call took place on a journey to Damascus.

[2] Köhler's and Schrader's assumption that St Paul was but a few days in Arabia, is arbitrary; ἡμέρας τινὰς (Acts ix. 19) rather points to the short time that St Paul first passed in Damascus. It is true (Acts ix. 23), ἡμέραι ἱκαναὶ points to a longer sojourn, but still not to years. The longer stay of St Paul in Arabia, omitted by St Luke, is, we may suppose, that passed between the times thus alluded to.

must be left undecided. The phrase ἡμέραι δεκαπέντε, it remains to be said, answers to the French quinze jours, a fortnight.

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

that ἃ γράφω refers, it is true, to the *whole account*, but *especially* to the *last remark*.)

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

§ 3. ST PAUL AT THE COUNCIL OF APOSTLES.

(II. 1–10).

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

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

To begin with this last point, it is of no importance; for, that

[1] See, besides Schott's work (Elucidation of some important points in St Paul's life), also the Prolegomena to his Comm. on the Epistle to the Galatians, sec. 4.

[2] It is true that an appeal has been made to Eusebius's Chronicle, but here too the MSS. are altogether doubtful. See Schott in the Comm., p. 314, note 6.

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

[1] Hemsen's Life of St Paul, p. 68. The putting Barnabas first in Acts xi. 30, points in all probability to the fact that on that mission he was the chief person.

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

Were the meaning of these words as Schott gives it, the Galatians might say to St Paul, "Who knows how long you were with the apostles in the fourteen years, and how much you learnt of them?" The sinews of the whole series of proofs would thus have been cut. The διὰ here is no doubt to be taken in the sense of after, to which conclusion the ἔπειτα, too, decidedly leads. How it can have that sense Matthiæ shows in his Gram., vol. ii., pp. 13, 52. See Winer on this passage in the Comm., and in the Gram., p. 363, note. Here, therefore, we shall have no other resource than to say, St Paul must be looked upon as the first witness as to his own life; the question cannot be as to the object of a fraud *per se*, nor yet as to an error; it might rather be supposed, that there had been an oversight on the part of St Luke. But one need not necessarily assume even *that*. St Luke relates the journey, Acts xi. 30, so shortly, that it

might be thought St Paul was sent indeed with Barnabas to Jerusalem, but found himself prevented by illness or some other cause, from entering the city himself. It is true, Acts xii. 25 speaks again of the departure of St Paul from Jerusalem, which does not favour this assumption; at all events, we must imagine that St Luke in that case might not have been properly informed of this minor circumstance, that St Paul had not completely fulfilled the mission with Barnabas. In any case matters are so situated that we must, under all circumstances, here understand the journey to the apostolical council, though the way in which the accounts in the Acts can be reconciled with it must remain an open question.

Ver. 2. In order now to make the Galatian Christians observe that his movements were not arbitrary, but guided by a higher will, St Paul adds ἀνέβην δὲ κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν. According to Acts xv. 2, St Luke, it is true, says nothing of a revelation, but, of course, on such *inner* occurrences, St Paul himself could alone be accurately informed. That phrase Hermann (in the above cited essay, Leipz. 1832, p. 6) has erroneously proposed to explain explicationis causâ—*i.e.*, for the sake of discussion and explanation of the doctrine of the Gospels; he thinks, if it had been meant to relate to a divine revelation, τινα could not have been left out; but as, in the very first chapter, mention had been made of the manifestations which had been made to him, St Paul might, without any harshness write: κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν only. Besides ἀποκάλυψις has, in the dialect of the New Testament, the fixed signification—divine communication, revelation. But now St Paul names, as his peculiar task in this journey, the wish to lay before the apostles his method of preaching among the Gentiles, in order to obtain their approval of it. But the question of how the Gospel was to be spread among the Gentiles, was the very one which was to be decided at the council (Acts xv.); our Epistle, therefore, agrees entirely with the report that St Luke gives. (On ἀνεθέμην see at i. 16. The submitting of his opinions to the Council involves here, according to the context, the examination of those opinions. It is clear, from the foregoing, that αὐτοῖς can only designate the *apostles*, not all the Christians in Jerusalem.—The phrase εὐαγγέλιον ὃ κηρύσσω designates however, here, the method of propounding his doctrines, and the whole system of proceeding which the apostle had used, and still continued to use in the Gentile world.) But the last words of the verse are difficult. It is true the connecting δοκοῦσι

μήπως in the sense: "especially, however, to those who might perchance think that I ran in vain," will surely scarcely recommend itself to any one now, for, apart from every thing else, ver. 6 makes it clear enough that οἱ δοκοῦντες has here another meaning; the phrase is meant, no doubt, to single out the most distinguished among the apostles, and to restrict to them peculiarly the examination of the question propounded. In the κατ' ἰδίαν there is no occasion for anything local to be understood; it answers perfectly to our phrase "especially, preferably." But the connection of μήπως κ. τ. λ. is not without difficulty. One stumbles, that is to say, at the forms τρέχω and ἔδραμον, one expects the optative after μήπως. Fritzsche proposed, therefore, to take this sentence by itself, and as a question: Num frustra operam meam in evangelium insumo aut insumsi? But this interpretation has no recommendation at all, and was even afterwards retracted by the proposer himself. Τρέχω is rather to be taken as the conjunctive present, which is construed with μήπως in the New Testament, but ἔδραμον can be accounted for on the assumption that he subjoins his earlier labours oratione directa. (So Winer, correctly, in the Gram., p. 471). The opinion of Usteri and Schott that, on account of ἔδραμον, τρέχω must be the Indic. too, is erroneous; St Paul often combines different moods with the same particle, according to the change of idea. Thus, particularly 1 Thess. iii. 5. (The full phrase, δοκοῦντες εἶναί τι, is found ii. 6; vi. 3. Plato also (Apol. Socr. c. 33) uses it. It is not to be denied that it has a subordinate idea of blame, as Gal. vi. 3 clearly proves; but it is not here to be referred to the apostles themselves, but to the Judaïstic false teachers only, who abused the apostolical dignity for their own ends, inasmuch as they unjustifiably, and without the apostles' permission, sheltered themselves under their authority. The case is the same with the phrase οἱ ὑπὲρ λίαν ἀπόστολοι, 2 Cor. xi. 5. See the Comm. on that passage.)

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

even Titus, who yet appeared before them uncircumcised, was forced to submit to circumcision.")

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

St Paul would, in fact, have been quite faithless to his principles if he had yielded to the false brethren; it would have been totally improper *then* to say πρὸς ὥραν εἴξαμεν, for he would, according to that interpretation, have *altogether* given way to the false teachers. We must therefore, in any case, suppose an irregularity in the construction here, which is the less to be wondered at as sentences of that sort often occur in St Paul. The question now arises, how are we to account for the origin of the inaccurate construction? In verse 3, it is not said *expressly* that Titus was not circumcised *at all*, but only that he was not *forced* to it. One might therefore say, as Rückert has, that St Paul meant to proceed thus: "However, for the sake of the false brethren, he had indeed circumcised him, but voluntarily, without giving way to them." But here all depended on the matter of fact: if St Paul circumcised Titus in the presence of these men, he was obedient to their will. We must by all means suppose that Titus was not circumcised at all. But how, then, did St Paul come by the beginning: διὰ δὲ τοὺς κ.τ.λ.? I explain it thus: verse 3 has entirely the nature of a subordinate remark; the sentence might be separated parenthetically from verses 2 and 4. The δὲ is, therefore, to be brought into connection with the idea in ver. 2, and the following seems to have been the course of ideas in St Paul's mind.

"I went, it is true, to Jerusalem, in order to lay before the apostles my doctrine for examination; but on their account it was really by no means *necessary* for me to do so; Titus was not even so much as obliged to let himself be circumcised; but I saw myself moved to certain steps on account of the false brethren." St Paul, however, allows himself in the heat of composition to be led away from the construction he began with, and describes instead of it the disposition of the false teachers. To *that* view verses 6, ss. are also very well adapted, according to which St Paul again avers his relation to the apostles to be no inferior one. This hypothesis would be preferable to the mere supplying ἀνέβην or ἀνεθέμην, for which Zachariae, Storr, Rosenmüller, Borger, decided. But now, as to the description of the ψευδαδελφοί (2 Cor. xi. 26), St Paul calls them παρεισάκτους, because they had stolen (παρεισῆλθον) into the church with impure intention, *i.e.*, without having the self-denial to give up as was necessary their old Pharisaic bias. They wanted to burthen and domineer over the Christians in the church, with the yoke of their ordinances, just as they had previously done with the Jews; and thus to render suspected the Christian ἐλευθερία from the law, which belonged to all believers, as ὄντες ἐν Χριστῷ. (Κατασκοπεῖν to get information with a bad design in order to betray it as a spy.) St Paul speaks in a similar way of these false teachers in other passages; especially 2 Cor. xi. To these pretensions says St Paul, he had never for a moment given way (πρὸς ὥραν, John v. 35; 1 Thes. ii. 17; Phil. ver. 15), in order to preserve for his own, for whose guidance aright he bore the responsibility, the truth of the Gospel, *i.e.*, the Gospel in all its purity and genuineness. (Ver. 4. The form παρείσακτος is not found elsewhere, the *verb* occurs 2 Peter ii. 1.—For καταδουλώσωνται the active form is to be preferred with Lachmann, according to A.B. and other important authorities; it is probable the copyists put the middle form in the text as the to them more familiar one. The εἴξαμεν τῇ ὑποταγῇ Hermann has thus explained: "fratribus falsis ne horæ quidem spatium Jesu obsequio segnior fui;" but St Paul never uses ὑποταγή of the relation to Christ. Εἴξαμεν, as Winer has already justly observed, rather designates the action, as being performed but once; τῇ ὑποταγῇ, on the other hand, is an expression for the state of mind from which the action proceeds: "I did not give way to them, as one obedient, or in obedience to them.")

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

his favour. "The Spirit witnesseth that the Spirit is truth." 1 John v. 6.

Vers. 7–10. After this, St Paul subjoins the communication as to his position relative to the apostles, as it was settled at the council, by which the report of the Acts of the Apostles, chap. xv., is completed. The three chief apostles, James, Peter, and John, who are here represented as στύλοι τῆς ἐκκλησίας (the foundation of which expression is the figure according to which the church is compared to a temple, 1 Cor. iii. 16; Ephes. ii. 21; Rev. iii. 12) not only laid no burden on St Paul (as the Judaïsts wished and hoped), that is to say, in relation to his labours in making proselytes, therefore to have the converts circumcised—St Paul looks in charity on *their* burden as *his*),—but they even concluded among themselves a sort of convention, as to the limits of their respective labours. The apostles were moved to that by their conviction of the great and blessed efficiency of St Paul in the Gentile world, on which he and Barnabas gave in their report (Acts xv. 12), which would not have been possible without the assistance of Divine grace. They saw clearly that St Paul was intrusted by the Lord with a like commission among the Gentiles as among the Jews St Peter was (who, as the first, is named instead of *all* the apostles, just as St Paul is, instead of Barnabas and all those working with him). For the avoidance of all dispute and jealousy they now share the departments, with the condition, that they (St Paul and the Gentile apostles in general) should remember the poor. How carefully St Paul strove to maintain this condition, all his epistles show; see especially 1 Cor. xvi. 1; 2 Cor. viii. 9; the probable causes of which striking clause are treated of on 1 Cor. xvi. 1. What seems above all to explain the circumstance, that the sending of alms was imposed as a duty on the Gentile Christians, is, that it seems to have been looked on as a substitute for the Jewish Temple tax, and as the expression of their dependance on the mother church at Jerusalem. We may add that it lies in the very nature of this agreement that it is not to be considered as absolute; however scrupulously St Paul conformed to it (see on Rom. xv. 20; 2 Cor. x. 13), still he had no hesitation in his journeys through Palestine to Jerusalem to preach before Jews also. Nay, even in the Gentile world, St Paul, according to the Acts, always offered the Gospel to the Jews first; a circumstance in which no one, before Baur with his false criticism, was able to find a contradiction of this agreement, and a proof

of the Acts not being genuine. In later times as people became more and more convinced that the Jews in the mass rejected the Gospel, while the Gentiles embraced it, the agreement seems besides to have fallen tacitly into oblivion; at least we find that the apostles destined for the Jews, namely, St Peter and St John, leave Palestine towards the end of their lives, and devote *their* activity also entirely to the Gentiles. (On προσανατίθεσθαι, which is here to be taken in its original meaning, "to lay upon in addition," see at i. 16.) Ver. 7. On the well-known construction, πεπίστευμαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, see Winer's Gram., p. 205.—Ver. 8. St Paul often uses ενεργεῖν of the power of Divine grace, 1 Cor. xii. 6; Ephes. i. 11; Phil. ii. 15.—Ver. 9. The comparison of the apostles to pillars, has parallels in the Rabbinical language; thus Abraham is called עַמּוּד הָעוֹלָם, pillar of the world.—As to Cephas, see on John i. 42.—On the phrase δεξιὰς διδόναι, see 1 Macc. xi. 50, 62, xiii. 50.—At ἵνα ἡμεῖς we must supply εὐαγγελισώμεθα.—Ver. 10. On the repetition of αὐτὸ τοῦτο after ὅ, see Winer's Gram. p. 159).

§ 4. ST PAUL'S DISPUTE WITH ST PETER.

(II. 11–21.)

Ver. 11–13. So far now goes the communication as to the proceedings at the council of the apostles. There is subjoined to it, beginning at ver. 11, a remarkable report on a later occurrence, on which we have no information at all from any other source. St Paul reports here that St Peter (*when* remains uncertain) had come to Antioch, and had at first held communion with the Gentile Christians. Συνήσθιεν stands by synecdoche for "lived together with, cultivated intercourse generally with." See on Luke xv. 2; 1 Cor. v. 11; Acts x. 10, 11, iii. 15, 29.) But when certain persons came from St James, St Peter withdrew himself, out of fear of the strict Jewish Christians. The other Jews (*i.e.*, Jewish Christians) of the church at Antioch, who probably had also at first held with the Gentile Christians, had now also joined him (St Peter), and even Barnabas had been seduced from him (St Paul), through their influence. St Paul characterises his proceedings by the harsh expression ὑπόκρισις, by which he means, that their actions were not in harmony with their knowledge; they allowed themselves, through fear of the

hostility and accusations of heresy of the Judaïsts, to be driven to act against their better convictions. Now this communication makes a painful impression, and one which excites all kinds of doubts.[1] In the first infancy of Christ's church, one is inclined to imagine all in blessed peace, without dispute or quarrel; but according to this report, St James, who yet (Acts xv. 13, ss.) was for St Paul, seems to have worked against him. We picture the apostles to ourselves as holy, infallible men, on whose testimony the church reposes; here the rock St Peter and Barnabas, St Paul's faithful companion, appear quite wavering, and that too in so highly important a point, after a solemn decision of the council. What then remains of the doctrine of the *inspiration* of the apostles, and of their being filled with the Holy Ghost? One comprehends accordingly that endeavours were made to put the time of the composition of this Epistle *before* the council, in order to soften down the startling part of St Peter's proceedings; but we said in the Introduction that the historical facts do not admit of it, and then after all the gain is but small; in any case St Peter's behaviour certainly occurred after the pouring out of the Holy Ghost, which was to lead him to all truth. By careful interpretation, however, the one astounding point, viz., that St James seems to have worked against St Paul, admits of avoidance. For, if those Judaïstic emissaries are called in ver. 12, τινὲς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου, it is not asserted in those words that St James *himself* had sent them for the purpose of working against St Paul,[2] but only that they came from St James's church in Jerusalem, and appeared, though falsely, to have appealed to his authority. For, if the personal co-operation and design of St James were meant, ἀπὸ would not have been put, but ὑπὸ or παρά. (See Winer's Gram., p. 349.) But St Peter's and Barnabas's wavering conduct still remains; for, even if Κηφᾶς might be read instead of Πέτρος, still the assertion, to which some of the Fathers[3] had already had recourse, viz., that mention is here made not of the apostle of that name, but another Cephas, is totally inadmis-

[1] Cf. Weismann, "usus et abusus censurae Petri Paulinæ," Tübingne, 1745. Knapp, "de dispari formula, qua Paulus et Jacobus usi sunt;" in his "Script. varii. arg." Böckel adumbratio quæstionis de controversia inter Paulum et Petrum Antiochiae obortâ. Lips., 1817.

[2] On this point, see the remarks in the Comm. on Acts xv. 1, where the nearly related words, τινὲς ἐξ ἡμῶν (xv. 24), are compared with this phrase, and it is shown that the apostles in their Epistle do yet disavow those very τινές.

[3] To name *one*, Clemens Alexandrinus, according to the evidence of Eusebius Church History, i. 12.

sible. We must therefore try to find out the truth as to this relation from intrinsic reasons. The communication of the Holy Ghost to the apostles had not the object of making them morally perfect, but only to raise them in their doctrine to infallible organs of the truth.[1] There is no more reason to scruple to suppose of the apostles, than of the prophets of the Old Testament, that they could err; St Paul himself confesses that the old man was still alive in him, that he must die daily, and needed a thorn in the flesh. Examples of a behaviour not quite perfect are also found; see *e.g.* Acts xv. 36, ss., xxiii. 3, ss., and the remarks on those passages in the Comm. But now the difficulty in this case seems to be increased by the fact that the error of St Peter and Barnabas occurred in so important a point, which is intimately connected with the system of the Christian doctrine; and indeed St Paul in his rebuke of St Peter, ii. 14, ss., opposes that system to him, and developes the doctrine of *faith* in opposition to that of *works*. But the circumstance that St Paul designates the conduct of St Peter and Barnabas as dissimulation, removes this scruple, and it is just that harsh expression which affords us a considerable assistance to a milder interpretation of the passage as a whole. St Peter *taught* quite correctly, and had made no mistake in the resolutions of the council, he only *acted* weakly when he suffered himself to be intimidated. His error was therefore a purely personal one, by which his official character as an apostle is not in the least compromised. But it is a remarkable point with regard to his personal character, that he, the rock, could here be overcome by fear, as he was, formerly, in the denial of his Lord. (See on this point the remarks in the Comm. on John xviii. 15–18.)

It remains to be said, that the Antioch where this event took place is not that in Pisidia (Acts xiii. 14, xiv. 19), but the famous one in Cœle-Syria, on the Orontes, which in the beginning (until Rome became more so) was the central point of Gentile-Christian life. (Ver. 11, Winer pertinently translates κατὰ πρόςωπον præsens præsenti, face to face.—Καταγινώσκω, to judge one, and that, too, generally unfavourably, hence to blame, punish. The passive form has here often been taken as: reprehensione dignus, reprehendendus, which sense, however, is not couched in it. It is

[1] See Steudel's excellent development of the idea, that the infallibility of the apostles in their doctrine is to be viewed as quite independent of the degree of their personal perfection. Tübingen Zeitschrift for 1832, part 2d.

simpler to translate it: "for blame or a complaint had fallen upon him," no doubt on the part of the Gentile Christians whose society he had shunned.—Ver. 12. ὑποστέλλω, clam se subducere (to withdraw one's self secretly); the open consequence of which was ἀφορίζειν.—Ver. 13. συναπάγεσθαι, alicujus exemplo abripi, is found again (2 Pet. iii. 17).

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

Vers. 15, 16. Whilst Calvin, Beza, Semler, Koppe, would have had ver. 14 alone considered as the question addressed to St Peter, others extended it down to ver. 16, others again to ver. 17. It is surely most correct to consider the connection as continued down to ver. 21, but without being particular in looking on the words as spoken in that form. No doubt, however, in the beginning the special reference to St Peter stands out more prominently, and loses itself only by degrees in generalities. Thus the ἡμεῖς φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι κ.τ.λ. could not possibly have been said of the Galatians in general, since the majority of them were of Gentile origin. In these first words, besides, St Paul informs the Judaïsts that the Jews had some advantage over the Gentiles. But it has been

thought striking that St Paul admits the Jews are not ἁμαρτωλοί, as he in Rom. iii. 1 proves *they* too are under sin. It has been proposed to assume in these words an accommodation to the Jewish idea of the Gentiles, but St Paul would by that course have acted against his own interest, not to mention the intrinsic untruth, as he would have conceded them their principle. We must rather say that the οὐκ ἁμαρτωλοὶ is not meant to represent the Jews as without sin, but only as favoured above the Gentiles by the divine revelation which had been made them, and therefore, certainly, fallen into sin less grossly. The sinfulness of the Jews also is, certainly, set in a clear enough light by what follows, according to which faith in Christ can alone justify *them* also. A mistake was therefore altogether impossible. In the εἰδότες δὲ, St Paul appeals to the Christian conviction of St Peter, and all believers, that not ἔργα νόμου, but only πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ = εἰς Ἰησὸν Χριστὸν, Rom. iii. 22, can justify man; whence it follows that the scheme of the Judaïsts still as Christians to wish to win salvation by their observance of the law appears in all its perversity. For, continues St Paul, we received into us the faith in Christ for the very purpose of being justified through Him, and not by the works of the law, because none of them can be justified. Now, this representation completely answers both in substance and in form to the passage Rom. iii. 21, ss., to the explanation of which we refer, with regard both to specials and generals, as well here as for what follows. It is self-evident here too, especially, as there in Romans, that the law is to be understood not merely of the Jewish ceremonial law, to which it certainly, according to the historical connection, refers principally, but the same holds good of the law in every form; of the Roman Catholic sanctification as of the categorical imperative. The sinfulness of man's nature is, *per se*, incapable of complete fulfilment of the law, but such only is worth anything in the sight of the holy God. Christ the representative of the race has fulfilled it for all both by His life and death, and *His* work through faith becomes *our* work. (Ver. 15 φύσει denotes fleshly descent, as Rom. ii. 27.—Ver. 16, The δὲ is wanting in the text. rec., and thus ver. 15 can be joined with ver. 16 in one sentence, but B.C.D.E.G.I. have it, and the omission is clearly more easily explained than the addition of it, so ver. 15 must be taken as a sentence by itself.—The καὶ ἡμεῖς, "we too," is to be explained: "We Jews also, who, though we have the law, have believed in Christ, thus confess that the law,

as such, cannot justify." The concluding words, which are found also in Rom. iii. 20, διότι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, κ.τ.λ. seem to be formed on the model of Psalm cxliii. 2, to which supposition their colouring, so strongly Hebrew, also leads.)

Ver. 17. To this idea, that the Jews also need faith in Christ, the reproval of the conduct of St Peter and of the Jewish Christians, is now annexed. That it is contained in ver. 17 is clearly shown by ver. 18, with its following γάρ. But it is not quite clear *how* it is contained in ver. 17, for one might at first think one was obliged to take the words as if by them a warning was given against sinning after the experience of grace in Christ, in which sense one also usually takes the words, "to make Christ the minister of sin," *i.e.*, a promoter of sin by abusing the doctrine of grace and forgiveness of sins. But how would this reference to sinning after experience of grace agree with the context here? This mode of taking the passage is decidedly to be rejected, the rather as the καὶ αὐτοί, which answers to the καὶ ἡμεῖς in ver. 17, and to the ἡμεῖς φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι, is meaningless in it. The ζητεῖν δικαιωθῆναι ἐν Χριστῷ, itself, is rather to be taken as an intimation of being sinful; St Paul, that is to say, setting that down as the conclusion he draws from the conduct of St Peter and the Judaïsts. According to this view the sentence might be paraphrased thus: "If you, on the one hand, believe in Christ and teach others to believe in Him, but then, on the other hand, *act* as if we too, who desire nothing but to be justified in Christ, should be found sinners if we observe not the law—you certainly act contradictorily; you pull down what you have yourselves built up." In order to bring the absurdity of this conduct still more plainly home to the conscience of the Galatian Christians, he puts the question: ἄρα Χριστὸς ἁμαρτίας διάκονος; "Is, peradventure, Christ a promoter of sin? That cannot be!" For Christ, if the assertion of the Judaïsts were true, would be so far a promoter of sin, as He permitted the preaching of faith as a means of justification, whereas, in fact, justification must properly be sought for in the law, and Christ would thus point out a false way unto salvation. (In the ζητεῖν it is not an actual labouring and working which is signified, but only the striving to be and continue in the faith.—In the εὑρίσκεσθαι = נִמְצָא is included the being in a certain state, together with the being recognised in that state. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 8; Mal. ii. 6. The interrogative ἄρα is found again only at Luke xviii. 8, therefore one might be

tempted to read ἄρα without interrogation; but no critical authorities read so, and, besides, in St Paul μὴ γένοιτο = חָלִילָה is always found after a question. [Rom. iii. 6, 31, vi. 1, 15, vii. 7, 13, xi. 1, 11, 1 Cor. vi. 15, Gal. iii. 21.] But according to the context ἄρα is here not num, but nonne. See Hermann ad Viger, page 823.)

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

Vers. 19, 20. The following idea St Paul again connects by means of γὰρ with what precedes, in this sense: "the building up the destroyed law is very blameable, for the believer is in fact through the law dead to the law and lives now with Christ; if, therefore, he restores the law again that he might win salvation by it, that is as much as dying again in the new man in order to live in the old man." (See Gal. v. 4.) For it is no doubt true that the ἐγὼ denotes St Paul himself, not, however, in his individuality, but only as the representative of the faithful generally, as in Rom. vii. 9, ss. The ideas of living and dying (for which "being crucified with Christ" is but a stronger phrase,[1] in order to point to the painful and shameful character of that death) are easily explained, and are very frequent in St Paul. (See particularly on Rom. vi. 2, viii. 7, 9, ss.) In these words is described the process of being born again, the course of which is that the old sinful man dies, and the new one, who is created after God, becomes alive. Christ's death and life are the types of this inner life and death. The man who begins to live anew

[1] In Rom. vi. 4; Col. ii. 12, there stands the still stronger phrase, "to be buried with Christ."

in the new birth is not the old I (cf. on Rom. vii. 9, ss.), but Christ in us. Though he that is born again still lives ἐν σαρκὶ, in human weakness and unseemliness, yet it is no longer τῇ σαρκὶ as in the *old* man, but τῷ Θεῷ, for God, and Divine ends. But this is obscure, how St Paul could say he was dead to the law through the law (διὰ νόμου), whereas it seems that it ought to have been put, he had died to sin through *Christ* or through *faith*. But St Paul understands the relation of the law to sin in such a way, that the former by commanding and forbidding has a power of provoking *sinfulness* to actual *sin*. The law makes sin become more sinful, *i.e.*, makes it burst out in its whole nature and fearfulness, which are at first hidden from man himself. (See on Rom. v. 20, vii. 9, ss.) Therefore St Paul could well say νόμῳ ἀπέθανον, since he by the law understands it as some thing *outward* only; as the inner will of God—as the law written in the heart—it naturally continues to all eternity the normal law of man, but so that his will is in perfect concord with it. According to this acceptation we may also explain how St Paul can even say: διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον, for this idea only distinguishes the *negative* side from the *positive*, "through faith, through grace, I am dead to the law." For, as the law makes sin more and more sinful, it arouses in man the yearning after deliverance from it; sin becomes a burden to man, the feeling of sin excites the prayer: "wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me?" Rom. vii. 24, and with it enters the experience of deliverance itself. The further sin extends the nearer it approaches the moment of its destruction; through the law, by which it is heightened, it is also destroyed.

Thus the διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον admits of being paraphrased thus: "In consequence of the experience of the inadequateness of the law to lead to true righteousness, as it rather brings sin to its complete development, I (believing in Christ) have given up connection with the law." If others, on the contrary, as Luther, Erasmus, Calovius, Bengel, choose to understand νόμος of *faith*, because it is called, Rom. iii. 27, νόμος πίστεως, it must be designated as a complete misconception. Νόμος *alone* can never denote faith. Theodoret and others would have understood by νόμος the prophecies concerning Christ, which stood for Christ Himself. But *that* too is forced. According to the exposition, Rom. vii. 9, ss., one can have no doubt at all as to the meaning of the words. But next as regards the life of Christ in us, for which this is a leading passage in St Paul's epistles, the rationalist view,

viz., that there is nothing to be seen in it but an eastern figure, no longer requires refutation; St Paul, beyond all doubt—as the parallel expression of Christ's μένειν in the faithful, of his making his abode in their hearts (John xiv. 23) clearly show—wishes to assert a real indwelling of Christ in the soul, through the communication of His being. *That* too is now generally confessed; but, according to the Pantheistic tendency of the age, another extreme threatens us, viz., the opinion that St Paul asserts a vanishing of personality, an absorption into the universal ocean of deity, for which the οὐκέτι ἐγὼ might seem to vouch; an expression, however, which is only meant to designate the old man. That St Paul is far enough removed from such Pantheism, is shown by the exegetical addition: ἐν πίστει ζῶ τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ. But, besides this, he expressly designates Christ the Son of God, as the *historical Christ*, not as the mere *idea*, Christ, that is to say, as Him, who loved mankind (the aorist denotes the *reality* in the decree of redemption), and, under the influence of that love, gave himself up unto death as a sacrifice for the sin of the world. This personality[1] does not cease through Christ in us, nor even the life of faith (intuition belongs to the other world, 2 Cor. v. 7), but it is in that very abiding faith we receive Christ; if faith ceases, the indwelling of the Son of God ceases also. Faith, therefore, is *here again* taken as the spiritual receptivity for God and the divine workings of grace, not as the mere accepting certain doctrines as true, for that is merely a consequence of the living faith.

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

[1] It is said not only, "I in them," but also, "they in me." (John xiv. 23, xvii. 18; Rev. iii. 20.) Since, therefore, Christ and God, and the Spirit in and with Him, dwells in the faithful, and builds them up into His one Temple, they not only preserve their personality, but receive it again in a higher form.

II.

PART SECOND.

(III. 1–V. 12.)

§ 5. OF THE CURSE OF THE LAW.

(III. 1–14.)

Now, though the discourse from chap. ii. 14–21 is to be considered as addressed not merely to the apostle St Peter, but was so modified by St Paul, as to seem at the same time intended for the instruction of the Galatians (see the note on ii. 15); yet the epistle is not till now directed to its readers with a decided address. St Paul represents the rapid change of the Galatian Christians, considering the deep impression which they had received through his preaching of Christ, as an effect of enchantment, *i.e.*, as an inexplicable and destructive operation of hostile powers. (Βασκαίνω is the usual word for "to bewitch, enchant, especially by the evil eye." [Ælian. anim. i. 35. Pliny H. N. vii. 2. Gellii Noct. Att. ix. 4.] It is commonly construed with a dat., seldom with the accus., *e.g.*, Sirach xiv. 6.—For ἐβάσκανε there is also found the form ἐβάσκηνε, which is also pure Greek. [See Matthiæ Gramm. i. 328.] The words τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πείθεσθαι are wanting in A.B.D.F.G., and are doubtless to be struck out as inserted in the text from ver. 7.—The κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς προεγράφη is meant to denote the lively and graphic setting forth of Christ and His work in St Paul's preaching. It is without reason that Beza, Grotius, and others, lay a stress on the preposition, and translate priùs, antehâc depictus est. Jesus is described as the crucified one, because His death on the cross was the consummation of His work of redemption. It always, however, presupposes the resurrection which followed, as ἀνάστασις does the preceding death.—The ἐν ὑμῖν is not without obscurity: Ambrose, Luther, Brenz, Storr, take it as = ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, in a bad sense, *q.d.* "Christ, whom you have crucified in

you, who, therefore, is dead, and dwells no more in you," clearly very inaptly. The ἐν ὑμῖν is rather meant to represent the crucifixion of the Lord as having taken place *among them.* The omission of ὡς is to be accounted for by the heat of composition: We may add, that ἐν ὑμῖν is wanting in such important critical authorities, viz., A. B. C., that Lachmann has ejected it from the text. However, the obscurity of the words does not make it probable they were added.

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

Ver. 4. Like all newly-founded churches, the Galatians had

been forced to endure much, both from Gentiles and Jews, in the way of insult and persecution; St Paul reminds them of it, with the question of whether they intend to endure all that without aim and result? For, if they fell away altogether from the faith and lost Christ, then it *was* all in vain. Homberg's interpretation, to which Koppe, Flatt, and Winer adhere, and according to which πάσχειν, as vox media, is taken to mean "to receive good," is inadmissible for *this* reason, if for no other, that this use of the word is totally wanting in the New Testament. But St Paul adds further: εἴ γε καὶ εἰκῇ. This is taken by St Chrysostom and others, "if at least it is in vain, and you do not yet amend;" but in that case εἴπερ would be expected (see Hermann ad Viger. p. 834), and besides the καὶ does not suit well. Winer takes εἴ γε as = quandoquidem, siquidem, see on 2 Cor. v. 2, so that the former question would be replied to: siquidem frustra, *i.e.* puto equidem ista omnia vobis frustra contigisse." But even *so* the καὶ does not receive its full force, and it is clearly significant and completely warranted by criticism. It seems best with Rückert to take εἴ γε in the sense: "that is to say, if," as Ephes. iii. 2, iv. 21; Coloss. i. 23, and καὶ for "yet," and to oppose the merely *negative* loss to a *positive* greater damage, viz., to the loss of salvation, in the sense: "if namely you *have* yet but suffered in vain, and nothing worse befalls you!"

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

Vers. 7–9. The allusion to Abraham's faith then moves St

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

Ver. 10. From the blessing of faith St Paul is carried by the antithesis to the curse of the law, to which all are subject who stand on the ground of the law, and accordingly seek to attain righteousness by works. The requirement of the law is this: that *all* the commandments, without exception, be completely fulfilled, according to Deut. xxvii. 26: "he that transgresses but one is guilty of the whole law." Therefore blindness or hypocrisy alone can persuade itself that it has really fulfilled the law; the penitent man only perceives the more, the more earnestly he strives, how far he remains from the goal. This consciousness, without the grace of the forgiveness of sins, produces the feeling of the curse, of rejection by the holy and righteous God. The law, therefore, is holy, and the commandment holy, just, and good, Rom. vii. 12, but on account of the existence of sin, even *the good* works curse and death. The Epistle to the Romans also contains the same thoughts, but the expression κατάρα, used of the law, is peculiar

to this passage. (Κατάρα = קְלָלָה, Gen. xlvii. 12; מְאֵרָה, Mal. ii. 2.—Ὅτι is to be read after γέγραπται γὰρ according to A.B.C.D. E.F.G. The quotation is, on the whole, according to the LXX., only the latter reads πᾶς ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὅστις, and for γεγραμμένοις they have λόγοις. The phrase οὐκ ἐμμένειν ἐν is also found in just the same way, Hebrews viii. 9.) To this it might be objected, but still there were pious and just men under the old covenant! These, according to St Paul's dictum, must have all been under the curse! In regard to the law they were so, but they also knew of Christ and His advent. The sacrifices of the Old Testament prefigured faith in Him; *they* found *their* peace therefore by faith in the future work of Christ, as *we* find *ours* in the same already completed; their fidelity and *relative* fulfilment of the law could *alone* give them no peace.

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

Ver. 13. Christ freed us from the curse of the law by taking upon Him what belonged to our race; in that is couched the

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

Ver. 14. Finally, St Paul designates as the object of Christ's sacrifice, that by it the blessing of Abraham, of which mention

was made in ver. 8, might come upon all nations, and that they might receive through faith in Him the promise of the Holy Ghost, which could not be attained through the law. The ἔθνη are, of course, not merely the Gentiles without the Jews, but both. In the ἐπαγγελία πνεύματος the Spirit is to be understood as what was promised, so that in using the phrase passages like Joel iii. 1 were in the apostle's mind. The Holy Spirit, however, includes within Himself everything else worth wishing for. He is the author of the new birth, the creator of the new obedience, through which the believer can serve God in spirit and in truth, and essentially fulfil the law, which is impossible without faith. (See on Rom. viii. 3.)

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

(III. 15–IV. 7.)

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

Ver. 15. St Paul was perfectly aware that the comparison of the divine promise with a human testament was not accurate in *all* points; he only means to speak κατὰ ἄνθρωπον. He brings prominently forward only *this* point, that a formally executed and confirmed will can be by no power cancelled or altered. (As to the phrase κατὰ ἄνθρωπον, see on Rom. iii. 5; 1 Cor. ix. 8. Ὅμως is to be maintained in its original meaning, tamen, certè,

and will be best referred, with Rückert, to κατὰ ἄνθρωπον, which precedes, in this sense: "I mean to speak only as a man; one certainly cannot abrogate a *man's* testament; how much less, then, can the *divine* testament be altered!" Winer supposes an hyperbaton, so that ὅμως would be put too early, whereas it should stand before οὐδείς: "a will, though only that of a *man*, can still not be abrogated."—Διαθήκη is "every settlement, disposition, by will;" that of a dying person is considered the most decided, thence "a testament." That St Paul thought of a will in the peculiar sense one is led to suppose, first, by κεκυρωμένη, which is meant to denote the confirmation, the formal judicial sanction, of the will [Hesychius and Phavorinus explain κυρόω by βεβαιόω]; and also by the idea of an inheritance, which pervades the whole of the following deduction, and which, Gal. v. 21, is designated as the kingdom of God. (Matt. v. 5.) Διαθήκη is used in just the same way, Heb. ix. 16, 17, with reference to the Gospel; but *there* the death of the testator is also made a prominent feature, which point is not touched on *here*.—As to ἀθετέω see 1 Cor. i. 19.—Ἐπιδιατάσσεσθαι, insuper disponere, to make an ἐπιδιαθήκη, to annex codicils to the will. Frequent in Josephus. Here "to transform, change," in general.

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

[1] It is true the plural זְרָעִים occurs 1 Sam. viii. 15, but in the meaning "grains of wheat."

too, considered the argument very weak, but thought it was good enough for the stupid Galatians (iii. 1).

The less we can accede to such an assertion, the more carefully must we weigh the difficulties. If we first of all consider the passages of the Old Testament which relate to the subject, we shall find them as follows: ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς, Gen. xxii. 18; καὶ δώσω τῷ σπέρματί σου πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ταύτην, καὶ εὐλογηθήσονται ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς, xxvi. 4; finally: καὶ ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου, xxviii. 14. Immediately before (xxviii. 13), however, we read also: δώσω σοὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου. But, as the last passages refer to Isaac and Jacob, we have only xxii. 18 to think of particularly, though the later prophecies are at bottom but a resumption of those relating to Abraham, and therefore could be taken in conjunction with that one by St Paul without any impropriety. The passage, Rom. iv. 13, shows, besides, that St Paul does not understand the reference to those promises quite literally; *there* it is said: ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῷ Ἀβραὰμ ἢ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ. Now, according to the words of our passage, τῷ Ἀβραὰμ ἐρρήθησαν αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ, the promises are to be represented as subservient to the advantage of Abraham and his seed. But in the passages cited from Genesis, the other side stands out prominently, viz., that in and through Abraham's seed all nations shall be blessed. Now *this* seems to suit the reference to Christ's person better than the *former* one, which leads one to think more of the mass of the descendants of Abraham. However, if one reflects that the blessing, which came through Christ, must also be understood as His own blessing, then no great difficulty would exist in this interpretation. St Paul refers to the Old Testament freely, without citing with literal accuracy. But the stress that St Paul lays on the singular still contains something very obscure. True, it is only by a few interpreters that Χριστὸς is referred merely to the *person* of Jesus. If this *were* the case, then Ἰησοῦς would be put. In general Χριστὸς is rather understood of the faithful (1 Cor. xii. 12), the body of Christ as the true children of Abraham (Rom. iv. 11), and it is only left undecided, whether the faithful *alone* are to be understood by that word, or in conjunction with the person of the Saviour. But, of course, the *latter* only can be supposed; for the community of believers is called Christ, so far only as He lives in it, is its πλήρωμα and its

κεφαλή. In fact, ver. 28 decidedly favours this acceptation of Χριστὸς, for there the faithful are described as one in Christ, and therefore as Abraham's seed. Vers. 17–19 are against it only *in appearance*, for there Christ can also be properly understood of Jesus as the founder of the Church of the Faithful, and therefore as including them in Himself. But, suitable as this interpretation may seem to the context, and the usual train of St Paul's ideas, the emphasis which St Paul lays on the singular is not explained by it; on the contrary, that point seems by it to be made more difficult of explanation, for, according to it, Christ certainly signifies neither more nor less than a multitude, namely, Jesus with all believers in Him. This difficulty is only resolved by assuming that St Paul wishes to set Abraham's posterity, *in a certain sense*, in opposition to that posterity, *in another sense*, so that he speaks not of individuals, but of classes of individuals. As not all the children of Abraham's body were heirs of his blessing, but Isaac only, as is further developed (Gal. iv. 22, ss.), so also the merely *bodily* descendants of Abraham are not heirs of his promises, but only the Christ among them is that heir, whom the στοιχοῦντες τοῖς ἴχνεσι τῆς πίστεως Ἀβραάμ (Rom. iv. 12) form. This difference between the seed of Abraham according to the flesh and according to the spirit with respect to their relation to God's gracious promises, is what the stress laid on the singular is to point out. Now, if any one asks if that idea is purposely included in the singular σπέρμα by the author of Genesis, we shall certainly not be able to affirm it. But St Paul had, like all the writers in the New Testament, by the illumination of the Holy Ghost, full power to transcend the standing-point from which the writer consciously viewed the subject, and to unveil the innermost truth of the idea according to the meaning of Him that promises and prophesied.

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

Vers. 17, 18. From the metaphor of the Testament St Paul now deduces the following train of argument: the promise of

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

The εἰς Χριστὸν is to be taken: "To Christ," as the terminus ad quem. Καταργεῖν = ἀθετεῖν, ver. 15.—The ἐπαγγελία is considered as the inheritance set apart in the Testament for the seed of Abraham, which cannot be *demanded* in reliance on works of the law, but is a pure gift of grace, κεχάρισται ὁ Θεὸς τῷ Ἀβραὰμ δι' ἐπαγγελίας. Χαρίζεσθαι is to be taken transitively, "to show one's self gracious;" it often = ἀφιέναι, as 2 Cor. ii. 7–10.—The οὐκ ἔτι in ver. 18 is not equal to οὐκ, but is to be taken as non ampliùs.)

Ver. 19. But according to this exposition the opinion might force itself on the Jewish conscience, that the law seemed something superfluous, if everything depended on the promise and its

fulfilment merely; but the Jew was wont to view the law as God's most glorious institution. St Paul feels, therefore, the need of developing the significance of the law more fully in what follows, and in such a way too, that though he does full justice to the institution of the law of Moses, he yet, at the same time, points out how it always bore the character of a transitory institution, the object of which was to prepare for the fulfilment of the promise in Christ. He sets it prominently forward as the *first* characteristic feature of the law, that it was given τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν. The words might certainly mean, according to St Paul's mode of thinking and representation, "in order to call forth transgressions, to bring it about that the hidden nature of sin might make itself known in transgressions." (See on Rom. v. 20, vii. 10.) But this idea does not suit the context of our passage. St Paul merely wants to approach nearer to the ground taken up by the Jews, to resolve a difficulty in his previous exposition; but by that interpretation of the words he would add a new and greater difficulty to the previous one. The words are no doubt here meant to signify: "The law is to repress gross outward transgressions, through the fear which it excites;" in which is couched at the same time an antithesis to the New Testament, viz., that it was quite incapable of effecting an inward transformation in man (ver. 21). The reading of the text. rec., προσετέθη, is so satisfactorily vouched for, that we prefer it with Lachmann. In the πρὸς is very suitably expressed that the law was subsequently added to the promise, and thus its accessory nature is indicated. In Rom. v. 20, παρεισῆλθε is used in a similar way of the law. The *second* point is touched on in the words: ἄχρις οὗ ἔλθῃ κ. τ. λ., which need, by no means, be put in brackets, but are immediately connected with the tout ensemble of the ideas. For in them is expressed the transitoriness of the dispensation of the law, which has meaning only until Christ. Τὸ σπέρμα ᾧ ἐπήγγελται is, of course, Christ, but not, as was remarked on verse 17, the person of Jesus merely, but together with Him the church of believers, which forms His body; the meaning, therefore, is: until the newer and higher order of things introduced by Christ. (The reading ὅ for ᾧ has such slight authority for it, that it has no claim to be received.) *Thirdly*, St Paul calls the law διαταγεὶς δι' ἀγγέλων. That by this phrase we are to understand angels in the proper sense of the word, and not *e.g.* men like Moses, Aaron, and the prophets, need not be said. But now the Old

Testament says nothing of the presence and co-operation of the angels at the promulgation of the law. But in the passage, Deut. xxxiii. 2, the LXX. have already translated: ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ ἄγγελοι μετ' αὐτοῦ. In Rabbinical writings the same idea is often found. (See Jalkut Rubeni, p. 107, 3.) Josephus, too, is familiar with it (Ant. xv. 15, 3.), and the New Testament recognises it here, and Acts vii. 53, Hebrews ii. 2, as correct. Of course, however, the appearance of the angels does not exclude the appearance of Jehovah, the former only accompanies the latter. The reading ἀγγέλου, which C gives, proclaims itself at the first glance as a mere correction; probably the singular is meant to refer to the angel of the Covenant, of whom the Old Testament speaks, Mal. ii. 8; but, what makes the apostle here take note of that tradition of the ministry of the angels at the foundation of the dispensation of the Old Covenant? He means by it, on the one hand, to set forth the glory of the law, but also, on the other hand, the infinite pre-eminence of the New Testament, which was promulgated not by angels, but by the Son of God himself. *Fourthly*, and finally, the law was διαταγεὶς ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου, *i.e.* of Moses, as indeed some MSS. of no importance read. Elsewhere, Christ also is called so (see 1 Tim. ii. 5; Hebrews ix. 15, xii. 24), of whom, however, no interpreter will think again in this place. The name μεσίτης was bestowed on Moses in consequence of the events related in Exod. xix. 16; Deut. v. 5; for the people, under a sense of their unworthiness, besought Moses to approach to the divine appearance, in these words: "go *thou* near, *we* are afraid!" He therefore stood between God and the people, and he became in his person the means of conveying the law from God to man. The Rabbinical name for μεσίτης is סַרְסוּר. (See Buxtorf Lex. Talmud, et Rabb., page 1555. The passages relating to this point are collected by Schöttgen on this passage.) The object of this remark of St Paul's is now again to show how far the law stands below the New Testament; in the Old Testament, God and the people appear quite separated, Moses must act the mediator; in the New Testament the Godhead and manhood are united in an inseparable union in Christ. Accordingly, we cannot either, according to the context of the whole passage, here understand the Metatros by the μεσίτης, which view Schmieder recommends in his learned essay. (Naumburg, 1826, quarto.) For what is true in this idea of the Metatros (see on John i. 1, page 34, 3d edn.), may be reduced

to the doctrine of the λόγος; but we cannot suppose any allusion to that here, as the mention of his manifestation would set the promulgation of the law on an equality with the Gospel; whilst the contrary was in favour of the apostle's argument. (The ἐν χειρὶ answers to the בְּיַד. See Acts v. 12, vii. 35.)

Ver. 20. At this famous or notorious passage, it cannot of course be our task to reckon up all the different interpretations which, if we reckon all the shades of opinion on this point, amount to hundreds; for, first of all, most of them are of such a sort, that they proclaim themselves at the very first glance as capricious and forced (as, *e.g.*, that of Weigand in the work to be cited below, who for ἑνὸς wants to read ἔνος in the sense *annuus*, so that the meaning would be: "the yearly mediator is no more," whereas ἔνος is not *annuus*, yearly, *i.e.* recurring every year, but only *annotinus*, hornotinus, "this year's;") and, 2dly, it is not merely in separate excursus to the Comms. of Flatt, Winer, and others, that information is given on the various interpretations,[1] but they are also collected and criticised in separate dissertations. We therefore confine ourselves to first communicating our view of the passage; and, secondly, pointing out some leading interpretations, whether connected with ours or departing from it. First of all, however, it is to be observed that (what is a rarity in the case of important and difficult passages) not one various reading occurs in this verse in all the manuscripts and critical authorities; *that* is a proof that the copyists were very careful in copying the passage, and, on account of its unimportant dogmatical contents, had not the slightest interest on either side to alter anything in it. Lücke's view, that ver. 20 is a mere gloss, appears, after this result of the critical auxiliaries, quite inadmissible; as to what relates further to the connection of ver. 20 with the preceding and succeeding ones, it plainly forms a collateral remark (caused by the words ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου), which, as such, if one pleases, may be enclosed in brackets. For the following question: ὁ οὖν νόμος κατὰ τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ; takes up the question of ver. 19, τί οὖν ὁ νόμος; with a new turn, and carries

[1] Among them are Bonitius plurimorum de loco, Galat. iii. 20, sententiæ examinatæ novaque ejus interpretatio tentata. Lips. 1800. Keilii programmata de variis interpretum de loco, Galat. iii. 20, sententiis. Lips. 1800-1813. 7 Dissertations reprinted in Keilii Opusculis edid. Goldhorn. vol. 1.—Weigand ἑνὸς in nobilissimo Pauli effato (Galat. iii. 20), haud genitivo, sed nominativo, casu esse positum, examinatis aliorum 243 interpretum explicationibus, docere studuit. Erfordiæ, 1821. See, further, Schneckenburger's Beiträge, page 186, ss. Ullmann's Studien for 1833, part i., page 121, ss.

further the argument already begun. The meaning of the words, however, in ver. 20 itself cannot, *per se*, be difficult; indeed, the later interpreters, Winer, Hermann, Schleiermacher, Usteri, Matthies, Rückert, are quite unanimous in their acceptation of the separate words; they only vary in their determination of the connection those words have with the course of the argument. For ὁ μεσίτης denotes the idea of the Mediator, *every* Mediator, as such; the ἑνὸς οὐκ ἐστί expresses that a mediator necessarily presupposes *two; one* cannot be represented by a mediator. There is no sufficient reason to supply μέρους with ἑνὸς, it can be taken as masculine, which is to be preferred on account of the following εἷς. The second half of the verse: ὁ δὲ Θεὸς εἷς ἐστὶν, now explains further that God is only *one* party, and therefore the idea of a Mediator presupposes that there is yet a *second* party there, namely, the people; or, taken in a wider sense, mankind. According to this interpretation, the article needed not to be repeated before εἷς, it certainly *could* have stood there, but it was not necessary. It is wanting in Luke xvii. 34, just as here, in a connection completely parallel, although *there* an ὁ ἕτερος follows also. (Cf. Winer's Gram., p. 103.) Only one cannot translate: "God is the one party," but "God is one, or a single one," and consequently also only one party. The only *real* difficulty in this passage is then the question, what object St Paul has in making this remark. On account of the brevity of the words, and their merely subordinate position, we may be doubtful with regard to the answer to that question. To *me*, however, it is most probable that the idea in ver. 20 connects itself in St Paul's mind with the principal idea of his chain of argument thus: Ver. 19 was meant, it is true, to set forth the relative excellence of the law, but *so*, that its inferiority to the Gospel was also ever apparent. To make this inferiority observable is exactly St Paul's object in giving this elucidation of the idea of the Mediator. The mediation presupposes the being separate, *one* cannot be mediated for; since God is the *one* part, there must also have been *a second* too, mankind, who were separated from God. In the Gospel it is otherwise; in Christ, the representative of the church, all are one, all divisions and differences are in Him annihilated, as is developed in ver. 28. In opposition to that view, only this *one* argument might be adduced with any plausibility, viz., that St Paul does certainly, 1 Tim. ii. 5, call Christ himself "Mediator," and ascribes to Him in other passages also a media-

torial work, as Ephes. ii. 14. But here there is chosen only a different mode of contemplation and representation, without its being necessary for us to suppose that St Paul had changed his original idea of Christ. Here, that is to say, he contemplates the Redeemer merely as to His person, how God and man are united in Him; and thus all Mediators appear superfluous. On the other hand, in other places he (St Paul) considers not Christ *Himself*, but *His work*, and, in regard to *that*, Christ himself could be named Mediator, because He, through it, communicates by degrees to the faithful also the union with God already completed in His person. If we, after this, consider some other explanation of the passage, we must, first of all, reject all those, which, as Steudel, Flatt, and others, in vers. 19 and 20, whether in the whole or only a part of the verses, have chosen to find the words of a Judaïzing opponent. The various members of St Paul's argument are so closely knit together, that the slightest trace of foreign matter is no where to be discovered. Only the questions are naturally arranged with reference to the ground taken up by St Paul's Judaïzing opponents. In the same manner, we reject, at the outset, all explanations in which the simple meaning of the words is twisted, as, besides the already cited exposition of Weigand, is also the case with Bertholdt, who chooses to have ἑνὸς understood of Abraham (!), because he is called in Isaiah li. 2, הָאֶחָד; in the sense: "this Mediator (Moses) is, however, not Abraham's Mediator (but then τοῦ ἑνὸς must, at all events, have been put). But God is the same who gave the Law and the promise." A closer consideration, however, is required by Schleiermacher's and Usteri's interpretation, which the latter (Comm. p. 121) gives as follows: "The Law was given on account of transgressions, with the help of angels, through a mediator. But a mediator relates not to *one* party merely, but always presupposes *two* parties. (The contract is binding on both parties; now, since the Jewish people have transgressed the law, God cannot, in relation to the Law, fulfil His *promises*, but only His *threatenings*). But God is one; where He has acted, without a mediator, alone for Himself, as in his announcement to Abraham, there, too, the fulfilment is independent of another party (and therefore, for example, of the circumstance, whether the Jews should fulfil the Law); promise and fulfilment are both His free gift. Is then the law at variance with the promises? God forbid!" But I must assent to Winer's remarks against this acceptation of the

passage. In it the radical idea of ver. 15–18 is carried on to the deduction following from ver. 19 forward; but *that* is inadmissible for this reason, that here, beginning from ver. 19 forth, the peculiar glory of the Law, as an independent divine institution, is considered. Further, the idea of the μεσίτης is totally different from that of the maker of a contract, of a διαθήκη, or of a συνθήκη, as Winer very judiciously remarks. Usteri's defence against Winer (*ubi suprà*, p. 122) seems but little satisfactory. Only I can just as little assent to the independent explanation of Winer. For he expresses himself thus: non potest μεσίτης cogitari qui sit unius partis; Deus est una tantummodo pars; itaque quænam est altera? Gens Israelitica. Jam si hoc sponte efficitur, legem mosaicam pertinere etiam ad Judæos hosque legi isti observandæ adstrictos fuisse. But this remark seems quite idle, since neither Jews nor Christians doubted that the Jews were bound to the observance of the Law. We can, therefore, feel ourselves satisfied by the first proposed interpretation only, which allows their full force, as well to the separate words as to the context, by which we must *here* let ourselves be especially guided. For Hermann's exposition: interventor non est unius (*i.e.* ubi interventor est, ibi duos minimum esse oportet), Deus autem unus est—ergò apud Deum cogitari non potest interventor, will scarcely have the power to recommend itself to any one, as the conclusion is quite illogical, and the thought thoroughly unscriptural.

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

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

Ver. 23. Now the being concluded under sin is represented as a being kept and reserved until the time of the revealment of the dispensation of faith. But instead of the above ὑπὸ ἁμαρτίαν, ὑπὸ νόμον stands now. This change explains itself by the circumstance, that St Paul represents the Law as the power which brings hidden sin to light, and thereby (home) to the conscience. Sin and the Law are therefore, in his view, correlatives. But it is remarkable that in verse 22 the discourse was of *all* mankind, even Gentiles, while *the Law* was given to *the Jews only;* for, that νόμος means here especially the institution of the Law, as Moses gave it, is clear from verses 19 and 21. Certainly, the whole of the apostle's chain of argument also tends especially to represent the relation of the two dispensations of the Old and New Covenants. However, all that holds good of the Law of

Moses certainly also holds good, although in a less degree, of the natural law of the Gentile world (Rom. ii. 14, 15), and, according to the context, it must always be referred to this general human law along with the other. (As the πίστις is here described as one μέλλουσα ἀποκαλυφθῆναι, it must be understood of the faith revealed as an object, not of the subjective state of faith; for the latter was from all time in individuals, even before Christ, as iii. 6 shows.—On the collocation of the concluding words, see Rom. viii. 18.)

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

Ver. 26, 27. Believers, therefore, can no longer be under the Law, because they are υἱοὶ Θεοῦ, and *that* are they, because all those baptized have put on Christ. Baptism unto Christ is therefore here, according to its innermost idea, understood as the act of regeneration itself, in which the old man dies, the new man is born (Rom. vi. 3). The Χριστὸν ἐνδύσασθαι is a description of what happens in the new birth. This expression, borrowed from passages in the Old Testament (Isa. lxi. 10), denotes the most intimate appropriation of Christ, so that in Ephes. iv. 21, Col. iii. 10, to put on the new man is used as = ἀνακαινοῦσθαι; and 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54, ἀθανασίαν, ἀφθαρσίαν ἐνδύσασθαι denotes the change

of the mortal body into the immortal nature of corporeity. But with whomsoever Christ joins Himself, to *him*, He, the Son of God, also communicates the nature of a child of God. But St Paul names, in Rom. viii. 14, πνεύματι Θεοῦ ἄγεσθαι as the characteristic sign of the υἱὸς Θεοῦ. Whilst, therefore, the slavishly-disposed man under the Law strives to keep God's commands through fear alone, but in his heart loves sin, the child of God performs God's will through inward pleasure and joy, out of love to holiness. —In the conception υἱοὶ Θεοῦ (which name is substantially equivalent to τέκνα Θ., only that the former expresses the idea of one conscious, grown up, more than the latter), two extremes are to be avoided. First, the one according to which the idea is deprived of everything distinctive, and is lowered to a merely figurative expression, as if *every one* were by nature a child of God, and received through Christ only the *consciousness* of it. But, secondly, the other is just as much to be avoided, viz., as if all men became through the new birth sons of God in the sense in which Christ Himself is so. The truth lies in the middle. Christ really communicates His very nature to man in the new birth, changes them into Himself, imparts to them somewhat of His divine nature; but just because man receives this higher life *by communication* only, whilst Christ possesses it *originally and independently*, *man* is never called υἱὸς Θ. in the sense that *Christ* is, who is and remains ὁ μονογενής. (See in the Comm. on Luke i. 35.)

Ver. 28, 29. With this elevation into children of God all the distinctions also which, while out of Christ, have any significance in a religious or political point of view, are levelled unto the faithful in their religious relations; they form a great living unity in Christ, *i.e.* one which Christ fills with His Spirit and life. The participation in this one holy living fellowship, the true σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ, to whom the promises are given (ver. 15, 16), is also the only condition of participation in the divine inheritance. Thus the end is strictly connected with the beginning (ver. 15). But in this passage it is, first of all, surprising that we have πάντες εἷς ἐστε, as we expect ἕν, which is found, it is true, in F.G., but merely as a correction. We in fact find in the Gospels ἕν εἶναι always (John x. 30, xvii. 11, 21). But the masc. is surely chosen here with reference to ver. 16, where the one seed is called Christ, as 1 Cor. xii. 12; but it is not essentially different from ἕν, for a merging of individualities is by no means meant to be expressed by the masc. But, in the second place, it seems erroneous to

say that *all* distinctions *are abolished* by Christianity. True, the contrast of Jews and Gentiles is abolished as a *religious* distinction (and yet even *that* not *absolutely;* see the remarks on the parallel passage, Col. iii. 11), but not the general *human* one of man and wife (*i.e.*, of course, not in the *physical* but in the *ethical* relation, according to which the wife appears subordinate to the husband *after* as *before*), nor the *political* one of freedom and slavery. A revolutionary lust of liberty might think it had found in these words of the apostle a support of its frenzied projects. But the way in which St Paul himself in other places speaks on the subordination of the wife to the husband, of the servant to the master (1 Cor. xi. 7, ss.; Ephes. v. 22, ss.; Col. iii. 18; Ephes. vi. 5, ss.; Col. iii. 22, ss.), leaves not the slightest doubt but that St Paul, even in these contrasts, means the eye to rest on the religious-moral side of them only. It is only in the kingdom of God that *all* become *one* in Christ in *every* relation. (As to ἕνι, Col. iii. 11; James i. 17, which the elder grammarians, and even Fritzsche, look on as contracted from ἔνεστι, but Winer with Buttmann take for the apostrophized ἐν ἐνί—see Winer's Gramm. page 76.)

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

But as, in *outward* life, the heir, while a minor, is on a par with the servant, though he is the lord of all (of the whole inheritance), so it is also in the *spiritual;* it was requisite for mankind first to become ripe in spirit, before Christ could come. As the heir, while a minor, is subject to tutors, so mankind, while of immature age, are under the Law, as a παιδαγωγός. This idea is very remarkable, inasmuch as there is plainly expressed in it, that man, even *without* and *before* Christ, therefore while yet in sin, was, however, always the master of all; it is true he is in a state of humiliation, but for all that his nobility still shines through. In the κύριος πάντων, namely, there probably lies a reference to the dominion over the earth bestowed on man (Gen. i. 26; Ps. viii. 5), which in Christ came fully to completion, and in the kingdom of God will be exercised by all believers. (Ver. 2, ἐπί-

τροπος is a guardian [Xen. Mem. i. 2, 40; Œlian v. H. iii. 26, xiii. 44], who supplies the place of the dead or absent father. Οἰκόνομος, on the other hand, is the steward who has the management of the estate. Both expressions compose here the *combined* idea of conducting or leading by means of a power standing between God and man, namely, of a παιδαγωγὸς εἰς Χριστόν. To consider these teachers of the minor as having special reference to prophets or priests, is unsuitable; they merely represent the Law in general; we must not insist on the difference between the two expressions, nor on the plural's being used. The only meaning which might be claimed for the latter would be, that by it the Law of Moses, and the natural Law together, would be denoted.—Προθεσμία, tempus constitutum, a legal term, which occurs very often in the orators.)

Ver. 3, 4. The apostle has certainly now the *Jews* principally in his mind in this comparison, so that τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου mean the institution of the Law of Moses; but, in a more extended sense, the idea holds good also of the Gentile world, which showed itself even better prepared than the Jews; not because it had just as good preparative means, but because it used the inferior ones more honestly. The πληρωμα τοῦ χρόνου (answering to the προθεσμία τοῦ πατρὸς in the metaphor, and therefore to be taken as an attainment of one's full age) is an historical event of universal importance for the human race; it is indeed the turning-point of the old and new time, so that Christ forms the centre of the history of the world, in which all the *radii* meet, *to* which all *points before Him*, and *from* which all *proceeds after* Him. The choice of this time is certainly an act of the divine decree, but no arbitrary one, rather one determined by the course of the development of the human race. The expression πλήρωμα is to be explained by fancying or picturing to one's-self that a space of time is, as it were, filled up by the streaming in of time until the *terminus ad quem;* but then it is also at the same time intimated in it, that all the conditions which were necessary for the coming in of the event of Christ's mission, were brought to completion. (See on the phrase πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, Ezek. v. 2; Dan. x. 3; Ephes. i. 9. It can by no means be referred, as συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος, to the latter days, to the end of the world; for, though the writers of the New Testament look on the latter days as come in with Christ's advent (see 1 Cor. x. 11), the relation to them does not lie in the πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου or τῶν

καιρῶν. If this *were* the case, it would stand as in Tobit. xiv. 5; ἕως πληρωθῶσι καιροὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος.) But the ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, which answers to the ὑπὸ ἐπιτρόπους καὶ οἰκονόμους in the metaphor, is peculiar. For στοιχεῖον means *elementum*, in the twofold meaning of original matter (2 Peter iii. 10), and first principles (Hebrews v. 12). The Fathers adhered to the first meaning, and referred ἡμεῖς to the Gentiles, so that mention would be made of their worship of nature and the elements. "We served under the elements of the world," would mean "we were subject to the power of nature, which were embodied in the idols." But mention is not made here of the Gentiles *especially*, the ὑπὸ νόμον in verse 5, and the στοιχεῖα, to which the converted Gentiles fell back, according to verse 9, rather point plainly to the Law of Moses, to which also the phrase στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου in Col. ii. 8, 20, refers. Now, how the Old Testament in relation to the Gospel can be called στοιχεῖα, *elementa*, the first steps of religious life, is easily comprehended; but the addition κόσμου is puzzling. For the phrase has the collateral idea of the being fallen a prey to sin and corruption. (1 John ii. 16.) But how can that be said of the Old Testament, as it surely still remains a *divine* institution, even if it be a *subordinate* one? It might be thought the genitive is not meant to designate the character of the στοιχεῖα, but their destination for the education of the world; but in that case the dative, or εἰς, must necessarily have been used. Or again, it might be supposed allowable to assume, that St Paul by that name does not mean to designate the Old Testament *per se*, but only the Rabbinical variously perverted mode of interpreting it, the so-called δευτερώσεις of the Scribes, which went beyond the institutions of Moses. But, according to iv. 10, that is not the case. He designates the purely Mosaïcal institutions as ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα (ver. 9), just as in Heb. vii. 18 mention is made of something ἀσθενὲς καὶ ἀνωφελὲς in the Law. However, these epithets seem yet milder than the addition τοῦ κόσμου. For the ἀσθενὴς designates merely the character of the Law, according to which it imparts no higher power, and πτῶχος its restricted nature, compared with the riches of the Gospel. Both are so ordered by God. But the addition τοῦ κόσμου points to something sinful. This mode of expression can only be explained by distinguishing two modes of interpreting the Old Testament, the outward and the inward, the literal and the spiritual. The *inward* and *only true* one recognises in its rites and ordinances the outward and visible

signs of more profound ideas; *e.g.* in circumcision it sees the inward cleansing of the soul, the circumcision of the heart, etc.; if, therefore, it *does not* neglect the *outward*, yet it always takes it in connection with the *inner idea*. The *outward* mode, on the contrary, stops short at the actions as such, without taking into consideration the idea which lies in them; it was thus the Judaïzers interpreted it, and in this form the Old Testament appeared not merely as the beginning of the divine life, but as fallen a prey to the world, as more than poor and spiritless, viz., as incapable of amending and changing the heart. But we cannot consider it as a characteristic of the Old Testament itself that it contains the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, for, according to its inner idea, it is eternal, imperishable, and complete, as a work of the living God. (Matt. v. 17, 18.) Finding such expressions, one comprehends how so many could take offence at St Paul's labours!

Ver. 5. Now from this yoke Christ has redeemed man (iii. 13), that they through Him might receive the adoption of sons (iii. 26), *i.e.* forgiveness of sins, and strength unto a new life, iii. 14.—But in the description of Christ His earthly humility is (in the words γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικὸς (יְלוּד אִשָּׁה, Job. xiv. 1), γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον) contrasted with the majesty which is denoted in the name ὁ υἱὸς τ. Θ.

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

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

tion of this somewhat bold-looking conclusion, added first *one* word, then *another*.)

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

(IV. 8–V. 1.)

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

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

The interpretations *agniti a Deo*, or even *cognoscere facti*, *i.e.*

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

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

That is also intimated by παρατηρεῖσθαι, superstitiosè observare, a word that elsewhere in the New Testament, both in the active and middle forms, means "to lie in ambush." See Mark iii. 2; Luke vi. 7, xiv. 1, xx. 20. (Ver. 11. In the passage iii. 3, St

Paul represented the belief and the sufferings of the Galatians, and *here* his labours with them, as vain. In ver. 19 he declares that the labour must be begun anew.—The construction μήπως κεκοπίακα expresses that what he fears has already happened, and had not yet to happen. In the φοβοῦμαι ὑμᾶς the figure attraction is to be observed, as it is taken out of the following clause. [See Winer, Gram., p. 483, and in the Comm. on this passage.] However, there is still the harshness in the phrase, that the word taken up out of its own clause is not the subject of the subordinate clause, as it usually is in other similar cases, and as is the case in the examples brought forward by Winer, *ubi suprà.* But this interpretation, in spite of its harshness, is yet to be preferred to Rückert's opinion, who chooses to take φοβοῦμαι ὑμᾶς: "I am alarmed for you," which is quite inadmissible, and besides very much increases the difficulty of interpreting the following μήπως κ. τ. λ. The thought, "I fear for you," would have required the mention of the loss which *the Galatians themselves* suffered, not *St Paul.*

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

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

He now makes a somewhat similar claim on his hearers in

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

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

The chief question here is what is the ἀσθένεια τῆς σαρκὸς, and the πειρασμὸς ἐν τῇ σαρκί. To think of persecutions *alone* we are forbidden not merely by the reiteration of σάρξ,[1] but also by the circumstance, that surely persecutions could not well have occurred immediately on his appearance in Galatia; they usually began only when the Gospel spread. To me, with Rückert, it seems alone correct to suppose *bodily* infirmity, and trials arising therefrom, are meant, so that this passage is parallel with 2 Cor. xii. 7, ss. We must not figure to ourselves St Paul as of giant colossal frame, but rather as weakly. See Tholuck's remarks on this point in the Stud. for 1835, part ii. p. 364, ss. Next, the expression τὸ πρότερον,—from which it may be reasonably con-

[1] See the parallel passage 1 Thess. ii. 2, where, however, σάρξ is wanting, and we are certainly to think of persecutions alone.

cluded that St Paul, when he wrote these words, had been twice already in Galatia,—is here to be noticed. See on this point Rückert's remarks in the Magazine, p. 116, against Böttger's arbitrary expositions. See his Beiträge, 3d part, p. 9. (Ver. 13 the διὰ is to be taken in the sense: "whilst under the circumstances," as in διὰ νύκτα, διὰ χειμῶνα.—Verse 14. For πειρασμόν μου, A.B.D.F.G. read ὑμῶν, which Lachmann has received, but the ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου following does not permit us to receive this reading, which rests probably on the error of a copyist. Semler, Winer, and Rückert choose to have μου also struck out, and both pronouns considered as spurious additions.)

Ver. 15. Here the reading: τίς οὖν ἦν κ.τ.λ. gives no very good sense, unless τίς be taken in the sense of πόσος. But now A.B.C.F.G. read ποῦ for τίς, and in A.C. ἦν is also wanting, whilst F.G. have ἦ. The latter reading is to be preferred with the later critics, so that the meaning is: "where is then the blessedness in which ye *then* were?" (Μακαρισμὸς is found also Rom. iv. 6.) Only the ἦν excites some doubt, as, on the assumption that ποῦ was the original reading, it is difficult to explain how ἦν or ἦ could have come in. Now St Paul describes his grief hyperbolically (εἰ δυνατόν) when he says, that they would willingly have sacrificed to him what was dearest to them. (See Hor. Sat. ii. 5, 35. Terent. Adelph. iv. 5, 67.)

Ver. 16, 17. In order to represent to the Galatians their change of mind as deserving of entire reprobation, St Paul further compares *his* conduct to that of the Judaïsts, to whom they had given themselves up. In St Paul there was a sincere, pure zeal; he sought to win the souls of men for God; the *Judaïsts* too *were zealous*, but *they* sought to win the souls of men *for themselves*, in order to increase their party and acquire consideration. "Could I, therefore, have become your enemy (that is, hateful to you), because I work in truth, and (we must supply) can *those* be your *friends?*" *Zeal* St Paul certainly concedes to them, not a *pure* one, however (ζηλοῦσιν οὐ καλῶς) but a *selfish* one. (Ζηλοῦν τινά cannot here mean "to envy one," but "to busy one's-self about one, to seek zealously to win him over," 2 Cor. xi. 2; Ps. xxxvii. 1.) But what follows is not quite clear: ἀλλὰ (imo potius) ἐκκλεῖσαι ὑμᾶς θέλουσιν, for that ὑμᾶς is to be read, instead of the ἡμᾶς of the text. rec., all the later critics agree. But to what does the action of the ἐκκλεῖσαι refer? "From the church," "from the Christian community," or "from

me," might be supplied. But this all comes to the same thing in the end, for the true Christian community is only with the true apostles and their genuine doctrine. But that the separation from the person of St Paul is the more immediate reference is shown by the conclusion: ἵνα αὐτοὺς ζηλοῦτε, "instead of *me*, you shall join yourselves to *them*, make *them* the goal of your endeavours." But here the indicative after ἵνα, which is also found 1 Cor. iv. 6, raises a difficulty. Fritzsche (on Matt. p. 837) proposed, for that reason, to take ἵνα in these passages as = "where;" "quo in statu, *i.e.*, ubi à me estis abalienati, illos studiosè appetitis." But Winer justly rejects this as forced, and explains the unusual construction by the waning genius of the language, under the influence of which St Paul wrote, and which makes itself especially remarkable in a laxer use of the particles. (See Winer's Gram., p. 266.)

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

Ver. 19. Hereupon St Paul, in the overflow of his feeling, addresses the Galatians as his children, whom he has begotten as a father through the word of truth (James i. 18), and whom he (by giving another turn to the figure) bears on his heart as a mother, and brings to the birth with travail anew, until they entirely answer to their Christian character, *i.e.* until Christ has acquired a form in their hearts. It is self-evident that here the reference to the new man, Christ in us (Gal. ii. 20), is to be maintained; we are not to think of the mere communication of doctrine, of the completion of instruction; the only question is,

how the ἄχρις οὗ, according to that idea of regeneration, is to be taken. For regeneration seems to be an act, which either is or is not; but here a continuous activity of travail is represented, which attains its end (μορφή Χριστοῦ) by degrees only. We may suppose now that this state appeared in such a light to St Paul that the new life in man (the conception) *begins*, it is true, *suddenly*, but does not, except by degrees, form and fashion itself to a truly personal and conscious life; at first Christ works only in man by His power, but there proceeds from this energy a higher form of personality, the man lives also in Christ. St Paul here directs the Galatians, as to the aim of his labour in the Spirit, to this completion of the Christian life, which would secure them from such relapses as the one they threatened.

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

Ver. 21–23. After this more personal and affectionate lecture (ver. 12–20) St Paul returns to the form of demonstration, with a resumption of ver. 9, 10. "Ye who, as I said above, wish to be again under the Law, do ye not understand the Law? why, it speaketh *against you* and *for me!*" and now St Paul argues from the history of Abraham and of his sons. Ishmael was the son of Hagar, who was a slave; Isaac was the son of Sarah, the free, legitimate wife of Abraham; Ishmael was begotten according to natural inclination alone and in the usual way (κατὰ σάρκα, Gen. xxi. 9, xiv. 19): Isaac, on the contrary, was born of the barren Sarah when *she* was ninety, *Abraham* one hundred years old, in consequence of a divine promise (Gen. xv. 4, xvii. 16, xviii. 10) and by divine power (Rom. iv. 19, ss.). (Ver. 21, B.D.E.F.G. read ἀναγινώσκετε in lieu of ἀκούετε. But

that seems to be merely a correction by such copyists as translated ἀκούετε "hear ye not," and applied, we may suppose, the hearing to the reading in the congregation. But St Paul supposes the history to be known, for ἀκούετε is here meant as "do ye not then understand what the Old Testament relates?" after the analogy of שָׁמַע. Deut. xxviii. 49; Jer. v. 15.)

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

Suidas interprets ἀλληγορία ἡ μεταφορὰ, ἄλλο λέγον τὸ γράμμα καὶ ἄλλο τὸ νόημα. Hesychius: ἄλλο τι παρὰ τὸ ἀκουόμενον ὑποδεικνύουσα. In the Fathers the words προπολογία, θεωρία, ἀναγωγία, are also used in the same or a nearly-related sense;[1] but the result of the allegorical exposition is called ὑπόνοια, the underlying meaning. The two women, Hagar and Sarah, continues St Paul, are two covenants which God has set up with man. (Διαθήκη cannot here retain the meaning of "Testament, promise of an inheritance," because the latter is not applicable to the Law of Moses, it is here merely = בְּרִית).[2] Hagar, the slave, means the one of these covenants, the Law, which was promulgated on Mount Sinaï, and thence proceeded as from its centre. This law is now, according to the comparison with Hagar, represented as a mother who communicates her *status* to her children; the slave can bear slaves alone. This is denoted by the addition εἰς δουλείαν γεννῶσα,[3] sc. διαθήκη, and ver. 25 the δουλεύει μετὰ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς. Sarah, on the other hand, the free woman, who therefore bears free children, represents the other covenant. The New Testament is, therefore, called μήτηρ ἡμῶν, sc. πιστευόντων; all believers, therefore, bear likewise the character of the institution to which they belong. But, besides this parallel, St Paul further uses for denoting the two covenants the names: ἡ νῦν and ἡ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ. We are not to understand by

[1] See Tholuck's first Supplement to the Comm. on the Epistle to the Hebrews page 22. sq.

[2] See on διαθήκη, with the epithets παλαιὰ, πρώτη, καινὴ, διυτέρα, νέα, Matt. xxvi. 28; 2 Cor. iii. 6, 14; Heb. viii. 7, 8, ix. 15, xii. 24.

[3] On γυνᾶν, applied to women, see Luke i. 13, 57.

that expression an antithesis between the low-lying part of the city of Jerusalem and the higher citadel of Zion, or between the old Salem in the time of Melchisedec (Gen. xiv. 18) and the later Jerusalem, as all later interpreters acknowledge: but the *earthly* Jerusalem, as type of the institution of the Law of Moses, which had its centre in that city and the temple in it, is opposed to the *heavenly* Jerusalem, as type of the institution of the New Testament. The expressions νῦν and ἄνω = therefore γήϊνος and ἐπουράνιος, which last name occurs Heb. xii. 22, Apocal. xxi. 2. How far we are to understand this new Jerusalem as something *real* cannot be considered until we come to explain the Revelation, which gives a detailed description of the new or heavenly Jerusalem; it is here sufficient to think of it in general only as a type of the city of the Faithful, as the πολίτευμα ἐν οὐρανοῖς (Phil. iii. 20), therefore of the kingdom of God, *i.e.* of the Church of Christ and of the Spirit working in it. Had St Paul understood nothing *real* by it, no comparison between the constitution under the New Covenant and the heavenly Jerusalem could have occurred. The Rabbis, too, who often use this representation, no doubt in consequence of passages in the Old Testament, like Isaiah liv. 11, 12, lx. 18, lxii. 6; Ezek. xlviii., understood something *real* by the term heavenly Jerusalem. (See the passages in the well-known writings of Schöttgen, Lightfoot, Bertholdt, and Winer, in the Comm., page 113. The closer consideration of the Rabbinical conceptions we also defer to the exposition of the Apocalypse.) Thus, then, we have remaining in the interpretation of the details only the words (in verse 25) τὸ γὰρ Ἅλαρ Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ, συστοιχεῖ δὲ κ. τ. λ., which clearly bear on the face of them the nature of a subordinate remark, of a merely parenthetical clause. Certainly, if it were preferable to read τὸ γὰρ Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστίν, which Lachmann, on the authority of C.F.G., has put in the text, every difficulty would vanish; but the context will by no means permit the reception of that reading, not to mention that A.D.E. vouch for the common reading, and the supposition is but too probable, that the proposed reading was only adopted to avoid the difficulty in the common one. For the γὰρ imperatively requires that something, which lays a foundation in some way for verse 24, should be introduced; but the mere remark that Sinaï is a mountain of Arabia can prove nothing. According to the *common* reading, however, a sort of proof is couched in the

words: "the word Hagar (τὸ, not ἡ), namely, means in Arabia the mountain Sinaï." Now the word means in Arabic "a rock" (see Winer on this passage); Sinaï might, therefore, well be so called by the natives, though decided proofs of it are wanting.[1] But, at all events, we must not think of any names of cities or nations having affinity with it, since all is to be referred to *Mount Sinaï*. The proper etymology of the name הָגָר is, however, it is well known, totally different; for it is to be derived from the root "to flee." (See Gesenius in the Lex. on this word.) Finally, it is said of Hagar, in the sense pointed out, συστοιχεῖ τῇ νῦν Ἱερουσαλήμ. Συστοιχεῖν is not found again in the New Testament; it means "to go together with one another, to go in a row," then "to coincide with, to be in concord with, to answer to." The Old Testament, therefore, is brought into comparison with, firstly, Sinaï, and then Jerusalem; both correspond with one another, since both places may be considered as centres of the Old Testament life. (It remains to be said that the grammatical construction is not quite regular, for, after μία μὲν in verse 24, ἑτέρα δὲ ought to have followed in verse 26; but St Paul lets the figure drop, as being self-evident, and directly names the thing compared.) We may now, after this, consider more closely St Paul's conduct in the allegorical treatment of this passage of the Old Testament. The general observations on the mode of treating the Old Testament in the New one, as has been already remarked on 1 Cor. x. 1, we defer until the exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews, referring, by the way, to the already-cited first supplement of Tholuck to the said Epistle. For if, in this passage, there occurred merely a common typical application, such as we have often already found occasion to mention, it would require no further consideration; but it has peculiarities, that are not found elsewhere in the New Testament. True, the typical application of Mount Sinaï, as well as of the city of Jerusalem, has nothing extraordinary in any way; the places where the Law was promulgated, and where it found its abiding centre in the Temple, could be most fitly put for the institution of the Law itself. But the introduction of Sarah, and especially of Hagar, for such a purpose, seems surprising, because it appears as if *every* free woman and *every* bondwoman,

[1] The famous chief city of Idumea, Petra, "The Rock City," is in Arabic: Elhagar.

who have descendants by one man, might, with equal justice, be referred to in just the same manner.

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

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

But, even according to this milder turn, we can still see in the remark of St Paul, which is, besides, only cursorily introduced in a subordinate clause, merely an ingenious application of an accidental circumstance, which stands in no intimate connection

with the chief line of argument grounded in deeper, inner, truth. St Paul might, during his longer sojourn in Arabia (see on i. 17), have become acquainted with the Arabic name of Sinaï, and feels himself induced to impart this information here by the way, in order to offer to the reader a certain connection, though a very slight one, between the maid-servant Hagar and Mount Sinaï.

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

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

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

the innermost centre of life, and carries in his spirit all the radii united.

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

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

§ 8. WARNING AGAINST APOSTACY.

(V. 2–12.)

To the preceding exhortation there is now pertinently annexed an earnest warning, as St Paul points out whither falling back

to the Law leads; he declares this with his whole apostolical authority, and names himself, therefore, by name. "If you let yourselves be circumcised, Christ will profit you nothing." Now, it is self-evident again *here*, too, that *that* does not apply to the outward act of circumcision, but of circumcision, with the idea of, through it, winning salvation; else St Paul would not himself have allowed Timothy to be circumcised. (Acts xvi. 3.) The view of the Judaïsts had a totally different direction, as we find it expressed Acts xvi. 1: ἐάν μὴ περιτέμνησθε τῷ ἔθει Μωϋσέως, οὐ δύνασθε σωθῆναι. (The ἔδε = הֵנֵּה is accented by Fritzsche as paroxytone, by Griesbach as oxytone. This latter is the Attic pronunciation, according to the grammarians, but the former is, on that very account, to be preferred with Fritzsche, because, in the later Greek, much that is not Attic prevails, which the copyists were tempted to alter.)

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

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

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

Ver. 5, 6. The following verses set the *right* way (viz. to wait for righteousness from faith) in contrast to that erroneous

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

[1] Cf. on both these and hope the notes on 1 Cor. xiii. 13, and on Rom. iii. 21.

looks conversely to the effects, and rather presupposes their cause. (Verse 6, at ἰσχύει we may supply εἰς σωτηρίαν.)

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

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

Ver. 9, 10. The discourse proceeds from ver. 7 onwards without any connection by particles; wherefore the separate sentences have in them something of indeterminateness with regard to the context. The metaphor of the ζύμη is, of course, to be taken here in a bad sense for a principle of corruption. It is used otherwise, as is well known, Matt. xiii. 33; Luke xiii. 21. But whether the leaven is the doctrine or the persons of St Paul's adversaries, and the dough (φύραμα) the whole community or the disposition of individuals may seem questionable. If one considers, however, that the doctrine is closely connected with the persons who preach it, and that the community consists of individuals whose state of feeling defines that of the body, it seems best to let the sentence remain in the vague terms in which the apostle gives it, and to permit its application in every way that has been pointed out. But still the antithesis of great and small is to be adhered to. One idea can poison the whole inner man; one mis-leader can disturb a whole community. (For ζυμοῖ D.E. read δολοῖ, which Valkenaer would prefer. Ζυμοῖ might, in fact, have been taken from 1 Cor. v. 6. But δολοῖ may certainly rather be an interpretation of ζυμοῖ, which

gradually crept into the text.) Ver. 10, too, follows without any particle, "I have confidence in you in the Lord (*i.e.* so far as you are in Christ and rejoice in His help) that ye will be none otherwise minded." This idea might, *per se*, be just as well referred to something individual as generally; what follows, however, where the discourse is of the κρίμα of St Paul's adversaries, permits us to take the idea with greater propriety as a general one, in this wise: "I am certain ye will not give yourselves up to any errors of doctrine, and thus the punishment of apostacy will not fall on you; but," etc. The singular, ὁ ταράσσων, in connection with the ὅστις ἂν ᾖ, obliges us to imagine some *one* of the false teachers in Galatia was especially dangerous, for, according to i. 7, iv. 17, v. 12, there were several of them. (Κρίμα is put as the cause for the effect = "punishment," as it often is. See Acts xxiv. 25; Rom. ii. 2, 3, iii. 8, xiii. 2.)

Ver. 11. But now the transition from the punishment of his adversaries to his own preaching, and that, too, of circumcision, seems very obscure and arbitrary. "Why do I yet suffer persecution if I yet preach circumcision?" True, the first ἔτι before κηρύσσω is wanting in D.F.G., but it has certainly been omitted only because it seemed so difficult to explain. Had, then, St Paul *ever* preached circumcision (*i.e.* taught that circumcision must be undergone) that he could say εἰ περιτομὴν ἔτι κηρύσσω? we cannot refer it to his labours before his conversion, for κηρύσσω can never be used for *that;* and that St Paul should have required circumcision in the earlier time of his Christian labours is not to be supposed, because he appears firmly fixed in the same general views from the beginning. Therefore the passage can be only understood in such a manner that a reference is made in the περιτομὴν κηρύσσω to a charge on the part of his opponents, and that the ἔτι refers to the inferiority of these views as to circumcision, so that the meaning is this, "If I still stand on such a footing that I require circumcision, as some of my adversaries maintain, why, then, am I persecuted? In that case, every cause for it is surely wanting!" So it had been already explained by St Chrysostom and most of the better interpreters. But the Judaïsts might find plausible motives for such charges in St Paul's conduct, as he sometimes accommodated himself to the Jewish views, as, *e.g.*, by the circumcision of Timothy. But what connection has that with what preceded? The train of ideas I suppose to be this: the mention of the *divine* κρίμα (ver. 10) leads him to the *human*

judgment that is passed on him. He shows up that human judgment in its falsehood, and *that*, too, in such a way that he at the same time intimates how easily he might evade it, if he would sacrifice aught of divine truth; for it is only in that divine truth, in the offence, which the doctrine of the cross of Christ gives (σκάνδαλον σταυροῦ), *i.e.* the doctrine of salvation through faith alone in the atoning death of Christ, that the reason of the persecutions of him consists. (Cf. on σκάνδαλον σταυροῦ 1 Cor. i. 17, ss., 23; Phil. iii. 18, with Gal. vi. 12, 14. The ἄρα κατήργηται "is then ceased" supposes the εἰ περιτομὴν κηρύσσω to be taken as true. The sentence ἄρα κ.τ.λ. is not to be understood, with Knapp, as a question, but with Griesbach, Lachmann, Rückert, as a conclusion.

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

III.

PART THIRD.

(V. 13–VI. 18.)

§ 9. WARNING AGAINST THE ABUSE OF LIBERTY.

(V. 13–VI. 10.)

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

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

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

Ver. 14. Now St Paul establishes the absolute perfection of love, by representing it as the power which fulfils the Law, which idea was discussed suprâ, Matt. xix. 19; Rom. xiii. 9. But this verse is connected with the preceding one in this way, "the whole law is fulfilled in the one word, Love thy neighbour; if you, therefore, practise this love of your neighbour, you walk, in general, according to God's will. The love of *one's neighbour* is here named only in consequence of the context; the same, of course, holds good of the love of God, for love, in all its forms, is the same in its nature. (As to the putting ὁ πᾶς νόμος for πᾶς ὁ νόμος, see Winer's Gram., p. 111.—Acts xx. 18, xxvii. 37; 1 Tim. i. 16, the same collocation is found. For ἐν ἑνὶ λόγῳ, D.E.F.G. read ἐν ὀλίγῳ, and D.F.G. in what follows also omit ἐν τῷ. However, it is scarcely imaginable that St Paul should have called love ὀλίγον; no critic, therefore, has ventured to receive that reading into the text—Λόγος = דָּבָר, commandment. For πληροῦται Marcion already read πεπλήρωται, as do also A.B.C. and Lachmann: in fact, the change into πληροῦται is much more conceivable. For they took πληροῦσθαι, in the sense, "to fulfil, to keep," but it is here = ἀνακεφαλαιοῦσθαι, Rom. xiii. 9. The text. rec. reads ἑαυτὸν, not σεαυτὸν, but the MSS. are decidedly for σεαυτόν. However, in case no misunderstanding is to be apprehended, the pronoun of the third person can also stand where, taken strictly, that of the second would be required. See Winer's Gram. p. 143.)

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

Ver. 16, 17. The exhortations to practise love receive in what follows their psychological foundation; the discourse makes a transition from the outer conflict to the inner one, and here shows the root of the former, and the way to victory in it. St Paul describes, just as he did Rom. vii. 14, ss., the inward fight between flesh and spirit. This fight takes place not only in the awakened man but also in the regenerate one (see the remarks on the above passage), only that the *latter* is victorious, whilst the *former* continually succumbs. Now, this contrast between

flesh and spirit is, however, so strong, that it admits of no compromise. The Holy Scriptures know no emancipation of the flesh; on the contrary, the old man is to be crucified, v. 24, and die, but the new man of the Spirit is to live and rule. Now it is singular that St Paul, in this passage, speaks not merely of an ἐπιθυμεῖν of the flesh against the spirit, but also, *vice versâ*, of an ἐπιθυμεῖν of the spirit against the flesh. The soul arrives at the enjoyment of those holy aspirations of the spirit, of the blessed joy to serve God, even in the strictest self-denial, only when it has served God a considerable time, and, as it were, proved its fidelity. At first, one only feels the *bitterness* of the fight. (In ver. 16 there is couched in the ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκὸς οὐ μὴ τελέσητε the withholding the surrender of the will. The existence of the ἐπιθυμία man cannot destroy, but he can turn away from it in the will not to fulfil it: it is only the acquiescence of the will with the lust that is the actual sin which bringeth forth death [James i. 15]. It remains to be said, that here the spirit in which the Christian is to walk is not the *human spirit alone*, but *that spirit in its unity with the Divine Spirit*, which is poured out into the heart of the faithful.—In the ἵνα μὴ κ. τ. λ. the meaning of the thought as regards the purpose is expressed; the ultimate object of God in this fight is to withdraw man from slavery to his own will, and subject him to the requirements of the Divine Spirit.)

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

Ver. 19–21. In a long series, to which afterwards (ver. 22) the series of the fruits of the Spirit answers, the fruits of the flesh, which declare themselves as such unmistakeably, not merely outwardly, but also inwardly through the voice of conscience (even to *heathens*, who had none but *natural* religion), are now enumerated (Cf. on this point the analogous passages, Rom. i. 29, ss.; 2 Cor. xii. 20 ss.; Ephes. v. 3, ss.) Without inquiring too minutely into the particular members of the series, we can still distinguish three classes of ἔργα σαρκός; first, sins of lust; then evil works, proceeding from envy and hatred; lastly, forms of riot. Μοιχεία is wanting in A.B.C., and is, certainly, a later addi-

tion. Εἰδωλολατρεία is here to be reckoned among the sins of lust, inasmuch as idolatry was often connected with immoral rites. In the same way φαρμακεία cannot be taken as poison-mixing for murder, as further on φόνοι are also enumerated especially. The expression is rather to be understood in a special sense of love incantations. To take it, with Winer and others, as a form of idolatry seems to me inadmissible, because in the whole catalogue *carnal* transgressions only are named. The exhortation, it should be remembered, is addressed to Christians, as to whom a relapse into idolatry and its magical rites, was not to be feared. The rest of the words occur also in the passages quoted, at which compare more particular accounts as to their distinctions. As to ἐριθεία see at Rom. ii. 8.—Φθόνοι and φόνοι stand together in Rom. i. 29 as they do here; here the latter word is wanting only in B. and several Minuscules.—The concluding words, ἃ προλέγω ὑμῖν κ. τ. λ. comprise, in conclusion, the threat of punishment for those who give themselves up to such works of the flesh. What is *expressed negatively* only, viz., that they do not inherit the kingdom of God, is to be *taken positively* also, viz., that they fall into everlasting destruction, become heirs of the kingdom of Satan. (Ver. 21. Ἃ is not = ταῦτα, but the relative is derived by attraction out of the accus. of the object to πράσσοντες.—Προλέγω is found also 2 Cor. xiii. 2; 1 Thess. iii. 4. We must supply "before it comes to that." The προεῖπον refers to the past, that is to say, to the personal presence of St Paul in Galatia.—Here we see now that the object of the inheritance, of which mention was made so often in the preceding chapter, is the βασιλεία Θεοῦ. This expression is here to be restricted neither to the *outward* kingdom of God *alone* nor to the *inner* one *alone*, but is to be taken in the widest sense, as that order of things in which God's will shall reign. (See the development of the idea on Matt. iii. 2.)

Ver. 22, 23. Hereupon, to the works of the flesh St Paul opposes the outward signs of love as the fruit of the Spirit. The word καρπὸς points to the organic part of the development, which naturally and necessarily occasions these virtues to germinate from their root, the Spirit. Against these the Law is not, that is, it rather requires them; whoever, therefore, can exhibit them, is a δίκαιος. Whether one takes κατὰ τῶν τοιούτων as masculine or neuter, makes but little difference; but, as mention was not expressly made of persons in the foregoing, and the article is used, it seems fitter to take it as neuter. In any case,

the δὲ at the beginning of verse 24 is not to be taken as adversative, but as continuative. (Ver. 22, πίστις is "truth, fidelity." Matt. xxiii. 23; Rom. iii. 3; Tit. ii. 10.—Lachmann, after A.B.C., writes πρᾶΰτης.—At the end, D.E.F.G., add ἁγνεία, but this is, surely, added only in order to oppose the corresponding virtue to the above enumerated sins of lust.)

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

Now the sixth chapter ought to have begun here (which Rückert erroneously denies), for ver. 26 stands in strict connection with what follows down to vi. 5, and is separated from the foregoing by the exhortation making a transition from its entirely general character to the special. In the verses v. 26 down to vi. 5, the apostle had in view rather the *teachers*, in chap. vi. 6–10, rather the *lay persons*, in the Galatian Churches. But the whole section, from v. 26 to vi. 10, is addressed to those among the Galatians who had remained true to him, St Paul, and his form of doctrine. The exhortations to a milder judgment of the erring, the warnings against exalting themselves above others, attain to their full meaning on this supposition only. It was also in the very nature of the thing that St Paul approached the well-disposed especially, without distinguishing them, however, formally and openly from the others. In the second epistle to the Corinthians (see the Introd., sec. 4), a perfectly similar relation of its separate parts is found. It was in the nature of the thing that those who had remained faithful to him might easily be tempted to exalt themselves above those who had succumbed to

the temptation; St Paul, therefore, as a faithful shepherd of their souls, directs the attention of his disciples to this point, and calls upon them, as true πνευματικοί, rather to help up those fallen, and to be careful themselves not to fall into temptations.

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

Ver. 2. St Paul further exhorts them, exactly as at v. 13, 14, mutually to bear one another's necessities and burdens, so that each should consider himself as a member of the whole, and in that he sees the fulfilling of the law of Christ. He calls it νόμος Χριστοῦ, because the Redeemer especially recommends to them this indulgent love. The βάρη, which are here meant, are the ἀσθενήματα of the brethren (Rom. xv. 1), as Rückert correctly

remarks on this passage. (The reading ἀναπληρώσετε, which Lachmann has received into the text, and Rückert recommends, is surely only a correction of the copyists, to whom it seemed fit to represent the fulfilment of so difficult a task as a future one.)

Ver. 3–5. The best motive to indulgence towards others is the sense of our own weakness; he that thinks he is something, *i.e.* to be free, as regards himself, of all βάρος, deceives himself. Hence the exhortation to self-examination, which teaches humility, while it shows that each has enough to bear in his own burden. Thus, while all bear the burden of all, the whole body is held together by the bond of love. (Verse 3. φρεναπατάω is not found again in the New Testament; it denotes an ἀπατὴ ἐν φρεσί, self-deception.—The substantive, however, is found, Titus i. 10.—Verse 4. ἔργον ἑαυτοῦ here denotes the whole of the striving and working in the widest extent.—Καύχημα is the object of one's boasting, as Rom. iv. 2. In the εἰς ἑαυτόν μόνον καὶ οὐκ εἰς τὸν ἕτερον, the εἰς can only be taken as "in relation to, in comparison with," so that the sense is: "He will only have occasion to boast in looking at himself, he will restrain himself from looking at others." The καύχημα ἔχειν is, however, to be taken ironically, as ver. 5 shows. A radical self-examination makes one discover so much in one's own heart, that there can be no question of boasting anywhere; one sees that one has also one's own burden to bear, and judges, therefore, more indulgently the errors of others.)

Ver. 6. Hitherto St Paul seems to have thought especially of the *teachers*, or at least of these along with the lay-persons; he now addresses his discourse to the lay-persons alone, and calls upon them not to let the teachers starve, but to impart to them of all their earthly goods. This exhortation has, no doubt, its foundation in causes quite special, but which are not more intimately known to us. As to the duty of the lay-brethren to support in the body the dispensers of spiritual things, St Paul speaks in detail at 1 Cor. ix., on which the remarks in the Comm. may be compared. The reference of the ἀγαθὰ to spiritual treasures we can only reject as totally misunderstood.

Ver. 7, 8. Such avarice is very seriously rebuked, and threatened with divine judgment. He that despiseth God's servants despiseth God Himself (Luke x. 16; John xii. 48), and then the punishment fails not. The labour of man in this life is compared with the sowing of seed, the judgment with the harvest. He that soweth avarice and withholds their own from God's ser-

vants, sows unto the flesh, and can only reap from it what it is able to produce, corruption, *i.e.* (according to the antithesis of ζωὴ αἰώνιος), spiritual death. It remains to be said, that in the σπείρειν it is implied that the man's activity is directed to a purpose, and considered as to its result, which activity decides his fate according as it has for its object the corruptible or the incorruptible. For the πνεῦμα is to be taken here in opposition to σὰρξ, merely to denote the incorruptible; it is not meant here to be denied, that even the spirit itself can become evil, and that even in spiritual activity sin may be found. (Verse 7. St Paul often uses the phrase μὴ πλανᾶσθε, see 1 Cor. vi. 9, xv. 33, also James i. 16.—Μυκτηρίζειν is properly: suspensis naribus illudere. It is *often* found in the LXX., in the New Testament *here only*. We find the same metaphor of sowing in Prov. xxii. 8.)

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

§ 10. CONCLUSION.

(VI. 11–18.)

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

Ver. 12. Recapitulating once more the contents of the letter briefly, St Paul places the falseness of his Judaïstic adversaries in opposition to his pure endeavours. They preach circumcision out of fear of persecution, which was the lot of all those who based their salvation only on Christ's death on the cross, and seek to ingratiate themselves with their enemies by means of external compliances. (See on ii. 12, v. 11.) Of course this did not hold

good of *all*, any more than the hypocrisy rebuked in ver. 13; many of these Judaïsts were certainly also honest fanatics. We are here not to think of proselytes, who feared persecutions by the Jewish Christians (see the Introduc., sec. 2), but of Jews who held Christ for the Messiah, but at the same time pretended to observe the Law after the manner of the Pharisees. Only it may be doubtful whom we have to consider as the persecutors, whom those Judaïsts feared, who sought to seduce the Galatians to circumcision as a means of salvation. One might suppose that the Jews generally were meant; but the Jews as such, were also adversaries of the Judaïzing Christians; whoever held Jesus for the Messiah was to them an apostate, he might think of the Law what he would. We must here keep our point of view *within* the Church. The heads of the Judaïstic party are to be looked upon as those whose persecution the Galatian false teachers feared. It follows, then, from *that*, that the active persons in Galatia were not the *heads* of the party themselves, but only dependent persons. (Εὐπροσωπεῖν seems to be coined by the apostle himself, it is found nowhere else. However, Aristophanes has σεμνοπροσωπεῖν [Nub. v. 363], and Cicero φαινοπροσωπεῖν [ad Attic. vii. 20]. Our word means, first of all, "to be of handsome countenance," then "to recommend one's self by beauty," "to insinuate one's self." But those things by which the Judaïsts recommended themselves are mere externals, ἐν σαρκί. —The dative τῷ σταυρῷ is to be taken as the dat. instrumenti: "the cross, *i.e.* the doctrine of salvation through Christ's death on the cross alone, is the cause of the persecution." See on v. 11.)

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

Ver. 14. St Paul then opposes *his* pure endeavours to these dishonest proceedings: "I seek not glory in the sight of *men*, but find it only in the cross of *Christ*, *i.e.*, the dying Saviour is the only object of *my* boasting, *Him* alone do *I* make of any account, *men* are of *no* account with *me*." St Paul can say this, because

he knows that he (as to his sinful *old* man) is dead, that Christ, the pure, perfect *new* man, lives in him (ii. 20). Where this living event of regeneration has not taken place, St Paul means to say, *there* that hollowness is unavoidable. The dying of the old man, which at the same time always supposes the *birth* of the *new* one, is *here* again, according to the typical acceptation of the death of Christ (ii. 21), called a being crucified, and in the δι' οὗ, sc. σταυροῦ, is intimated, that the possibility of the regeneration is given by the death of Christ alone. The twofold turn of the idea ἐσταύρωται ἐμοὶ κόσμος κἀγὼ κόσμῳ, is merely to express the complete dissolution of the ties between the believer and the world: "the world is as good as dead to me, it no longer contains any living power of attraction for me; and *vice versâ*, I also am dead to it." (The ἐμοὶ μὴ γένοιτο answers to the חָלִילָה לִי מִן, Gen. xliv. 7; Jos. xxiv. 16.)

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

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

Jude ver. 1) *follows*, which also lies in the nature of the thing, since peace can only be the fruit of mercy. However, a design is scarcely to be sought in this collocation; St Paul meant, I suppose, at first to write εἰρήνη *only*, and then brought in the ἔλεος, which was hard by and familiar to him, to which is joined finally in ver. 18 the χάρις, which elsewhere is wont to be named first.

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

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

EXPOSITION

OF THE

EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. THE FIRST READERS OF THE EPISTLE.

ST PAUL came, for the first time, to Ephesus, the famous capital of proconsular Asia, as he, after a year and a half's sojourn in Corinth, was concluding his second missionary journey, and was travelling thence to Jerusalem. However, on this occasion, he only touched at Ephesus, and stayed but a few days there (Acts xviii. 19, 20). Nevertheless, he *even then* formed connections, and was besought to pass a longer time there; but a vow compelled him to haste; he therefore soon took leave, though with the promise of returning thither for a longer visit. This promise St Paul very soon performed; after ending his journey, he left Jerusalem once more for his *third* missionary journey, and went through Galatia and Phrygia directly to Ephesus. Now, he found here so favourable a soil for the Gospel, that he remained here two years and three months, and founded a prosperous church. (Acts xix. 8, 10.) St Paul would probably have stopped there still longer had not the goldsmith Demetrius obliged him by a tumult to leave the city. Meanwhile, the Church in Ephesus had been sufficiently established. Judaïsm and Gentilism threatened it no more, but interior schisms through false teachers were imminent. When, therefore, St Paul in his last journey to Jerusalem passed through Miletus, he sent thither for the presbyters of the Ephesian Church, and took leave of them in a moving speech. (Acts xx. 17–38.) At a later time St John chose for himself Ephesus as a centre for his comprehensive labours in Asia Minor. Its effects were so considerable that a few decennia later Pliny was already obliged to write to Trajan that paganism appeared to be almost entirely lost in Upper Asia. Plin. Ep. x. 97.)

Now, to this important Church in Ephesus the second of the shorter Epistles of St Paul is, according to its superscription and

title, addressed. But extrinsic and intrinsic reasons combine to excite doubt as to that destination of the Epistle. First, as to the *extrinsic* reasons; but little stress were to be laid on the fact, *per se*, that MSS. B. and 67 have not ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in the text (for the *former*, the Codex Vaticanus, has at least the words in the margin, and that too by the original hand, and in Codex 67 they are only wanting *ex emendatione*), but this want becomes important by its coincidence with other data. For Tertullian informs us in his controversy with Marcion (adv. Marc. v. 11): prætereo hic et de aliâ epistolâ, quam nos ad Ephesios præscriptum habemus, haeretici (Marcion cum suis) verò ad Laodicenos; with which chapter xvii. of the same work is to be connected, where the words run: ecclesiæ quidem veritate (*i.e.* according to mere ecclesiastical tradition) epistolam istam ad Ephesios habemus emissam, non ad Laodicenos; sed Marcion ei titulum aliquanto interpolare (*i.e.* according to Tertullian's usual language merely *corrumpere*, be it *addendo* or *delendo*) gestiit, quasi et in isto diligentissimus explorator. Nihil autem de titulis interest, quum ad omnes scripserit Apostolus, non ad quosdam. According to this, therefore, even in the time of Tertullian our Epistle was known as an Epistle to the Ephesians, only Marcion and his sect declared it to be addressed to the Laodiceans. Tertullian does not intimate what reading they found in the passage Ephes. i. 1, but it lies in the very nature of the thing that they could not have read ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, if they considered the Epistle as addressed to the Laodiceans. Now, true as might have been, on the whole, Tertullian's charge against Marcion, that he had altered the text of the Scriptures, so far as he received them, yet it is not easy to see what could *here* have influenced him to the alteration. Elsewhere, that is to say, they were *dogmatical* reasons which determined him in his alterations; but *those* could find no application *here*. However, this notice of the African Father upon the Marcionite dealing with the Epistle becomes important only through the more accurate communication, which we owe to Basil. (Basil. M. cont. Eunom. operum, vol. i. p. 254, edit. Garnier.) For this Father gives us express information as to the state of the MSS., and that too of the *old* MSS., in the passage Ephes. i. 1. He informs us the reading had been: τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσι καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, with the important addition: οὕτω γὰρ καὶ οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν παραδεδώκασι, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς τῶν ἀντιγράφων εὑρήκαμεν. Therefore Basil grounds on tradition and his own

inspection of old MSS. the conviction, that the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ were wanting in the exordium of our Epistle; the Father even uses this reading for a dogmatical argument, he finds in it that St Paul calls the Ephesians ὄντες, an intimation that they through the knowledge of faith were essentially united to Christ, the only real being. (Τοῖς Ἐφεσίοις ἐπιστέλλων ὡς γνησίως ἡνωμένοις τῷ ὄντι δι' ἐπιγνώσεως, ὄντας αὐτοὺς ἰδιαζόντως ὠνόμασεν.[1]) Through this accurate communication Tertullian's reports as to the nature of the Marcionite text, as also the state of some of our MSS., certainly become very important. To these *extrinsic* arguments, which are calculated to excite doubts whether our Epistle is addressed to the Ephesians, there now come *intrinsic* ones also, by which these doubts are very much confirmed. That is to say, one would expect from the position of St Paul towards the Ephesian Church, that divers personal allusions to it and its members would be prominent features in the Epistle.

But such are altogether wanting; it is true, a hearty cordiality pervades the Epistle, but *that* is based merely on the common consciousness of faith, not on personal acquaintance and friendship. The circumstance, that St Paul had commissioned Tychicus, the bearer of the Epistle, to relate of him by word of mouth (vi. 21, 22), certainly in some measure explains a total want of greetings and personal intelligence; but still it is hard to think in the case of an Epistle of St Paul to a church in which he lived longer than two years, that he should have so spoken of their faith, as if he had only heard of it by report (i. 15), and that he leaves in doubt whether the readers had heard of the grace of God which had been given to him (iii. 2). Therefore, even apart from the *extrinsic* reasons, the contents of our Epistle itself lead us to suppose a wider circle of readers, whose circumstances were not known to the apostle in the same degree as those of the Ephesians must have been; for, that St Paul means to address only those converted after his departure from Ephesus, who were therefore as yet unknown to him, is a totally inadmissible assumption, as no-

[1] In St Jerome's Comm. on Ephes. i. 1, we also read: Paulus Ephesius essentiæ vocabulo nuncupavit, but the Father himself finds fault with that interpretation; he remarks that: alii simpliciter vertunt, non ad eos qui sint, sed qui Ephesi sancti et fideles sint, scriptum arbitrantur. Böttger (Beit. part iii. p. 37) justly infers from the *arbitrantur*, that St Jerome also did not find the reading ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in MSS., he only knew it as a conjecture. But I cannot accede to Böttger's view (that originally there was *no* name of a town stood in the greeting, and therefore οὖσι is to be taken in a pregnant sense), for the reasons developed in what follows.

where is such a distinction among the Christians at Ephesus hinted at. One might think that this difficulty could only be resolved by assuming, that our Epistle is the one written to the Laodiceans, of which mention is made Col. iv. 16, as Grotius, Mill, Wetstein, and lately Holzhausen, have asserted. For St Paul did not know the Laodiceans personally, therefore the passages of our Epistle, which are surprising as addressed to the Ephesians, would seem quite well adapted to the Church in Laodicea. It was also obvious to seek in the similar assumption of the Marcionites an historical basis for this view, the rather that Marcion was of Asia Minor descent, and therefore we might suppose his manuscripts to contain the purest text. But there are decisive reasons against this assumption. Had St Paul written at the same time to the Christians in Colossæ and in Laodicea, he would not certainly have commissioned the Colossian Christians to make his greetings to the Laodiceans also (Col. iv. 15). Further, St Paul's wish, that the Laodiceans might read the Epistle to the Colossians, seems therefore to have but little motive, on the assumption, that the Epistle to the Ephesians is the one addressed to the Laodiceans, because this Epistle is of similar purport, in general, with that to the Colossians, and therefore the Laodiceans could have no particular interest, after the more detailed Epistle directed to *them*, in reading the *shorter one* also to the Colossians, which was calculated for particular circumstances. The Epistle mentioned Col. iv. 16 must rather be considered as lost, since, as will be immediately shown in detail, to the assumption of the Marcionites, that the Epistle to the Ephesians was intended for the Christians in Laodicea, no exclusive importance can be ascribed, since this circumstance admits of a simple explanation in another way, without supposing any corruption of the text. Accordingly, for the solution of the difficulty as to the destination of our Epistle only this *one* assumption can serve, viz. that the Epistle to the Ephesians was an *encyclical* one, *i.e.* that it was meant to circulate among *a number* of churches, and to be read out in their assemblies. For this supposition, which completely explains the character of the Epistle, the greater number, and the most eminent of the modern critics have accordingly decided. However, it is still a question, even supposing the correctness of this general view, how the Ephesians were exactly situated with regard to this number of churches, for whom this Epistle was intended, and how we are to establish the original reading in the salutation. That is to say, the Epistle to

the Ephesians can by no means be understood as an encyclical one in such a way; that in the number of the churches, for which it was especially intended, the Ephesian Church was not itself included; on the contrary, it must be regarded as the *first* church in that number, as the one to which the Epistle was given first of all by Tychicus, that they might forward it to the others (vi. 21, 22). *That* appears from the fact, that in all the Fathers, without exception, even in Basil, our Epistle is taken as an Epistle to the Ephesians. Marcion alone interpreted it as an Epistle to the Laodiceans, as we saw; but even in *him* it remained doubtful whether he read ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ in the salutation, or, as is more probable, had no name of a city at all in the text, just like Basil's MSS. That this variation of Marcion's does not express the general view of the ancient Church, is irrefragably established by the fact, that *before* Marcion, Ignatius, in his Epistle to the Ephesians, mentions our Epistle as one addressed to the Ephesian Church. (Ignat. ad Ephes. cap. xii. in the shorter recension of these Epistles, which, according to the latest investigations, is to be considered as genuine.) This universal concord would be completely inexplicable if the Epistle had not been especially addressed to the Church in Ephesus, much more if not at all to the same in conjunction with others. On the other hand, it is quite comprehensible (unless one chooses to suppose that it was merely Col. iv. 16 that was the cause of this supposition), that if our Epistle was not addressed, among others, to the Christians in Laodicea, along with others, it could be occasionally considered also as an Epistle to the Laodiceans (from which, however, the one mentioned Col. iv. 15 must still be supposed different), of which view a vestige seems to have remained among the Marcionites. Tertullian's charge of a designed corruption of the text is in this point clearly without any probable ground. Thus, then, there only remains further this one question, how the original text in Ephes. i. 1 may have stood. According to the above-cited passage of Basil, the oldest MSS. known to him seem to have left out the ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, so that τοῖς οὖσι καὶ πιστοῖς were closely united; for he deduces from this passage, as we already remarked, that he supposes the readers to have been thus called ὄντες, because they stood in connection with Christ, the only real being (τῷ ὄντι). But this interpretation, as similar ones attempted in later times by Schneckenburger, Matthies, and Meyer (see Harless p. xlvii.), cannot possibly be recommended. The analogy of the

exordia of St Paul's Epistles is in favour of the name of the city, or province, in which the readers of them are directly following the participle. But then, how shall the omission of the ἐν Ἐφέσῳ be explained, which took place in many old MSS.; and, on the other hand, if we uphold ἐν Ἐφέσῳ as the true reading, how could an encyclical Epistle be designated as addressed to the Ephesians merely, especially as our Epistle is addressed to *Gentile* Christians (ii. 11), whereas the Ephesian Church was composed of Gentile and Jewish Christians (Acts xix. 17, xx. 21). To the latter point, however, but little importance is to be ascribed, because all the churches founded by St Paul were predominantly Gentile-Christian, and could not be otherwise from the mission which he undertook (Gal. ii. 9); even if there were individual Jews among them, still St Paul might properly keep *the mass* especially in view, and remind them of their former idolatry. For it must be supposed, in the case of *all* the Epistles, and therefore *here* also, that St Paul wrote to whole churches, not to individuals of those churches, because he would, by the latter course, have himself dissolved their unity in faith and love. But there could scarcely have been any churches without some Jewish Christians. The two other arguments, however, the omission of the ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in *some*, and again the retention of those words in *other* MSS., can surely be only explained, considering the encyclical destination of the Epistle, by the assumption,[1] that either Tychicus was provided with several copies of the Epistle, and that in them the space for the proper city was left blank for filling up, or that copies of the Epistle were made in Ephesus for different places, and, as it was known to be an encyclical Epistle, the ἐν Ἐφέσῳ was put, not in *all*, but only in the copies intended for Ephesus and its neighbourhood; but as Ephesus was the chief city of Asia, most copies naturally went out from it, which, therefore, spread that reading. The objection has been made (see Harless, p. xlv.) to this hypothesis (as to which it is immaterial whether it be received so, or modified otherwise), "that it transfers the usages of *modern* times to the *ancient* world," *incorrectly*, as it appears to *me*. Copies must have been taken as much in olden time as in the present day, of an Epistle addressed to several churches, whether by the bearer himself, or by those to whom the Epistle came first; and that in these copies the name of the place

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

either was wanting at first, or was afterwards left out by the copyists, who knew the encyclical destination of the Epistle, seems also to be entirely analogous to the state of things at all times. This supposition, therefore, of Usher, Hug, and others, has ever seemed to me the most suitable solution of the difficulty, and, if we reject it, we see ourselves obliged to leave the difficulty unsolved.

§ 2. OF THE GENUINENESS OF THE EPISTLE.

Whereas our epistle maintained the character of an apostolical writing, as well *throughout the early* Church as in the *later* ages, without any dispute, the critics of our days have attempted to cast doubts on the correctness of this tradition. Schleiermacher expressed himself doubtful as to the origin of our Epistle, but his particular reasons have not as yet been published. De Wette also (Introd. p. 221, ss.) is just as doubtful, but confesses that the reasons did not as yet suffice for rejecting it. Meanwhile, one cannot apprehend that plausible reasons will fail the sharp-sighted hypercriticism of other theologians,[1] in order to reject *this* Epistle also, along with *other* ones, as not St Paul's. Let us examine cursorily, since the publication of those *reasons* for the non-genuineness of this Epistle has not yet followed, what may be considered as arousing suspicion. *Historical* arguments of this sort are entirely wanting, with the exception of the one, which (§ 1) was adduced as to its destination. But uncertainty as to the first readers of an Epistle can only *then* excite suspicion as to the declared author, if some other important points come in addition. *Such* the interior constitution of the Epistle is said to suggest. De Wette (ubi suprà, p. 229) expresses himself on those points in the following fashion: "In the Epistle to the Ephesians the style seems strange when compared with that of others of St Paul's Epistles, as it is *altogether too loose* (*that* sounds as if *looseness* were, in general, a characteristic of St Paul's mode of representation), overladen with parentheses and subordinate sentences, disjointed, rich in words, but poor in new ideas, and varying in particulars, a variation which may also be remarked in a great part of his conceptions, opinions, and mode of teaching. Certainly, these reasons are not

[1] According to Baur, in his work against Rothe, St Paul's Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians, are alone to be considered as decidedly genuine; all the others are not genuine, or else more or less suspicious.

sufficient for rejecting the Epistle, which contains so much which is worthy of St Paul, and scarcely to be expected of an imitator, and which Epistle antiquity has always acknowledged as genuine." The arguments here cited as arousing suspicion are, however, of such a description, that very little, if any, stress is to be laid on them. That is to say, as to the remarks, *first of all*, on *the form* of our Epistle, it is true that ἅπαξ λεγόμενα occur in it; but it has been long ago remarked that, considering the small *extent* of St Paul's Epistles all together, such *must* occur in each. The exposition in it is also very rich and full; but, when De Wette sees in it mere "*copia verborum*, without new ideas," *that* is, as Harless (Introd. sec. 3) has shown in detail, an entirely unfounded charge; the richness of style, the fulness of the sentences, is rather to be referred to the thronging ideas, which sought for expression at the same time in St Paul's mind. As to *the matter*, in the *second* place, many variations in "conceptions, opinions, and doctrine" are said to occur in the Epistle to the Ephesians. But *this* assertion *too* comes to nothing substantial. Thus De Wette remarks, among others, that the dæmonological conceptions in our Epistle are unusual, for which assertion the words ὁ ἄρχων τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος (ii. 2), τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις (vi. 12) are quoted. But, since the idea of evil spirits occurs in all St Paul's Epistles, it cannot possibly be said, with any reason, that there are *here* deviations from the genuine Pauline dæmonology, just because a subordinate trait is *here* brought out prominently, which we, accidentally, do not find *elsewhere*. Such are to be looked upon as mere ἅπαξ νοούμενα, and these have *per se* just as little force *of demonstration* in them as the ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, unless they appear in conjunction with decisive arguments.[1] The only thing now that might be looked upon as such is the relation of our Epistle to the Epistle to the Colossians; this requires, therefore, a nearer investigation.

That between the Epistle to the Ephesians and that to the Colossians a great affinity exists was known long ago, but the conviction was that the composition of both Epistles at the same time, and under like circumstances, was quite sufficient to ac-

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

count for it. But in later times it has been attempted to dispute *that*, because the affinity is so great that at bottom the Epistle to the Ephesians "appears only a copious amplification of the Epistle to the Colossians, and is wanting in everything distinctive as to aim and object." (See De Wette, ubi suprà, p. 223.) That is to say, the more decided character of the Epistle to the Colossians is taken to prove its originality at the expense of the Epistle to the Ephesians. (Ibid. p. 230, note A). Now, as an argument for this pretended quality of the Epistle to the Ephesians, De Wette gives us (p. 224–228) a comparison of the two Epistles (in which all those passages even which contain like words only are set down as parallel passages), careless whether the connection in which they occur is the same or a totally different one.[1] Harless (p. lxix.) has already shown in detail how very differently the comparison of the two Epistles appears, if one pays attention to the connection and tendency of them. With all the concord between them there still exists an independent character in them both. That is to say, whilst the Epistle to the Colossians has a very decided polemical reference, as an heretical party, which is characterized by peculiar features, is combated in it, such is totally wanting in the Epistle to the Ephesians. True, some passages are found which at first sight appear to have a polemical tendency (see iv. 3, 4, 14, 20, 21; v. 6); but, on a more accurate consideration, even in *these* passages all *properly* polemic allusion disappears, and the Epistle stands, as a warning, it is true, against possible errors, but, on the whole, as merely a lively effusion of the heart, full of faith and joy, by which the readers are meant to be strengthened in the faith, encouraged to the practice of love, and stirred up to patience in hope. Schneckenburger's assumption that (Introd. p. 135, ss.) our Epistle relates to the theosophic system, which had spread in Asia Minor, is, at all events, completely inadmissible. Why should that polemical reference be so veiled *here* when it is so openly expressed in the Epistle to the Colossians? The only thing in the Epistle to the Ephesians which must be considered as having a special regard to the circumstances of the first readers is the manner in which St Paul speaks of his knowledge of Christianity (iii. 4), and especially of the position of the Gentiles towards the Jews with reference to the Gospel (see ii. 2, ss., ii. 11–22, iii. 6, ss.), accord-

[1] The separate parallels will, in every case, meet with a closer examination in the exposition, and so we do not go into them more closely here.

ing to which our Epistle seems to have a greater affinity to those written to the Galatians and Romans, than to that written to the Colossians. If one compares with those copious and impressive representations as to the right of the Gentiles to an immediate entrance into the kingdom of God, the exhortations to concord which (iv. 1, ss.) are annexed to them, it surely cannot be denied that St Paul must have entertained the apprehension that Jewish Christians might at some future time distract the minds of the converts in the neighbourhood of Ephesus, just as had already happened in the neighbouring Galatia. That is to say, there is no certain trace in the Epistle to the Ephesians (see the Comm. on Ephes. iv. 14) that false teachers of this bias had already gained influence. St Paul's intention seems to have been merely to counteract betimes their possible and probable *future* influence. But the matter has quite another aspect in Colossæ, where the apostle's polemics combat with all their force a false doctrine which had already obtained circulation. However, when Mayerhoff (on Coloss. p. 143, ss.) finds *another* controversy in the Epistle to the Ephesians, he confounds a *positive* representation with a *negative*. True, every proposition contains also a reference to its opposite, but, if that opposite is nowhere openly prominent, there can be no question as to polemical tendency. Had St Paul in the Epistle to the Ephesians combated an actually existing error, he would have been obliged not merely to set forth the truth in addresses to the Gentile Christians, but also to describe their errors with a clear reference to the mistaken Jewish Christians; but of that not a trace is found. Even supposing, therefore, that in passages like Ephes. i. 20–23, just as in Col. i. 15, ss., there floated before St Paul's mind a reply to false teachers, who, like those of Colossæ, denied the divine dignity of Christ and put angel-princes on a level with Him, we should never be justified in supposing such a reply to exist in the Epistle to the Ephesians, except with a view to the possibility that such false teachers might come from the neighbouring Colossæ to Ephesus also, but not as if such views had already been disseminated there when St Paul wrote to Ephesus. St Paul's melancholy prophecies as to the false teachers to be expected in Ephesus (Acts xx. 29, ss.) were not realized until the time of the composition of the Epistles to Timothy and of the first Epistle of St John. But, besides this, the remaining entirely general contents of our Epistle are communicated so completely in St Paul's language and form of exposition, that, were the Epistle not genuine, it must

yet be supposed the author had not merely formed his style on St Paul's, but written out St Paul exactly word for word. But, had any one undertaken any thing of the sort, he would, in all probability, have imported into the Epistle above all *open* polemical tendencies, and not have obliterated those which are expressed in the Epistle to the Colossians, since the attempts at forgery were *usually* required to serve the purpose of adding apostolical authority to the *personal bias* that was to be rendered current. What we are to think of such hypotheses, derived from *intrinsic* reasons and set up without any support from *extrinsic* arguments, is especially shown in this case by the circumstance that Mayerhoff asserts the originality of the Epistle to the Ephesians and spuriousness of that to the Colossians with the same confidence and decision with which De Wette conversely maintains the originality of the Epistle to the Colossians, and the derivation therefrom of that to the Ephesians. (See Mayerhoff's work, "The Epistle to the Colossians examined, with especial regard to the three pastoral Epistles," Berlin 1838, p. 105, ss.) And, in fact, if this assertion of Mayerhoff's was not just as arbitrary, in the absence of all other decisive reasons, it would have, at least, this advantage over the totally untenable and *per se* empty one of De Wette's, that there would be a reasonable foundation for the fiction, viz. the insertion of the polemical element in the Epistle, whereas, according to De Wette's view, that element must have been even purposely left out, by which omission the work seems wholly aimless. Accordingly, we shall be justified in saying, that nothing at all can be discovered in our Epistle which could afford reasonable grounds for a suspicion of its genuineness.

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

This inquiry cannot be carried on with reference to the Epistle to the Ephesians alone, as St Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon, which are closely connected with one another, must necessarily be referred to the same time as our Epistle, on account of the near affinity of the former of them with our Epistle, and of the very similar circumstances under which they were composed. Nay, the very same thing holds good of the Epistle to the Philippians also, as Böttger (Beitr. part 2d, p. 60) has already correctly remarked: "It will ever be a fruitless labour to attempt to separate the Epistle to the Philippians by any considerable space of time from those to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Phile-

mon," which Schulz, Schott, De Wette, and Schneckenburger have attempted, more or less decidedly, to do. (See the passages in point in Böttger, ubi sup). Thus two questions arise for us to solve, first, when these four Epistles were composed, *i.e.* during what captivity, whether during the one at Rome, or that at Cæsarea (for these two alone can be named as the dates of their composition with any appearance of truth); and secondly, in what order do they stand with regard to each other?

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

Ephesians become an argument which would justify us in referring this Epistle to another time than the three others, as all arguments è silentio are of so precarious a nature.

But now, whether we shall decide for the captivity at Rome, as the date of the composition of these four Epistles of St Paul, or for that at Cæsarea, of which mention is made Acts xxiii. 23–26, 32, is certainly a difficult question, especially after Böttger (ubi. sup. p. 48, ss.) has tried to prove that the οἰκία Καίσαρος and the πραιτώριον (Phil. i. 13, iv. 22,) from which it was formerly thought that one could safely deduce the composition of the Epistles in Rome, can also be understood of the Palace of Herod in Cæsarea (Acts xxiii. 35), in which St Paul was a prisoner, and of the domestics in it.[1] Now it is true this view seems to me improbable, as St Paul would scarcely have called this Palace of the βασιλεὺς Herod οἰκία Καίσαρος; but let us pass over this argument, since we shall never be able to make out for certain which building St Paul means in the Epistle to the Philippians, because there were imperial palaces in many places. Now, among all which is brought forward by Böttger for Cæsarea on the one side, and on the other side by Graul[2] for Rome, we find so little that is really decisive, that it is difficult to declare one's self with full confidence for the one or the other view. Böttger's chief reason against Rome is, that St Paul was there but a few days in captivity. But this rests on an erroneous interpretation of the conclusion of the Acts, on which see the Comm. The Epistles contain, collectively, no historical arguments sufficiently decided to justify us in drawing from them any conclusions as to the time and place of their composition. What may be gathered from any notices of frames of mind, and similar uncertain, because purely subjective, circumstances, can of course make no claim at all to the force of demonstration. I can find only this *one* decisive circumstance in favour of the captivity at Rome, viz. that St Paul writes, Ephes. vi. 19, 20, he had, though a prisoner, still the opportunity of proclaiming the Gospel.—*That* is imaginable from the nature of his captivity *in Rome* (see the remarks in the Comm. on Acts xxviii. 16, 30), but not in the case of that *in Cæsarea*, where St Paul was formally shut up in the prison.

According to Acts xxvii. 2, Aristarchus, as well as Lucas, were also with St Paul in Rome; we find both again, Col. iv. 10;

[1] See the details in the Comm. on the passages Phil. i. 13, iv. 22.

[2] Graul Dissertatio de Schulzii et Schottii sententiâ cet. Lips. 1836–8.

Philem. ver. 24, whereas it is not known to us that they were companions of St Paul in Cæsarea. For these reasons, therefore, in conjunction with the circumstance that the phrase οἰκία Καίσαρος always leads us to think, at least, in the first place, of the imperial palace at Rome, I decide, with the majority of the later critics and commentators, for the composition of the Epistles to the Ephesians, to the Philippians, to the Colossians, and to Philemon, in that first captivity of St Paul at Rome, with the mention of which St Luke closes the Acts.

But now in what order were the four Epistles themselves composed? The mild captivity in which St Paul was held in Rome (Acts xxviii. 30), lasted at least two years; which Epistles did he write *first* in this space of time, and which *last?* In the first place, as regards the Epistle to Philemon, which Onesimus conveyed, it is to be supposed from Col. iv. 7 to 9, that it was written and sent off at the same time with the Epistle to the Colossians, which Tychicus brought. For both Tychicus and Onesimus, according to the passage cited, begin their journey from Rome to Colossæ together, and at the same time. But Harless (p. lix.) has decided the question, whether the Epistle to the Ephesians may have been composed *before* or *after* these two, by the correct interpretation of Ephes. vi. 21, compared with Coloss. iv. 7. That is to say, in the former passage the words: ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ κατ' ἐμέ can only be explained by assuming a reference to the similar declaration, Col. iv. 7; according to that, the Epistle to the Ephesians was written after the two to the Colossians and Philemon. The space of time, however, between the composition of those two and that of the Epistle to the Ephesians, can scarcely have amounted to more than a few days or weeks at most, as Tychicus brought the Epistle to the Ephesians as well as that to the Colossians. Now the repetition of so long a journey, as that from Rome to Asia Minor, was, in the first place, in *itself* improbable; and, secondly, the near affinity of the Epistles to one another requires the composition of them to be placed at the same time. Therefore, the only question which remains *now*, is, how the Epistle to the Philippians stands, with respect to the date of its composition, in relation to that of the three other ones, which, as well with regard to the places of their destination, as also to the time of their composition, fall very nearly together. Now, there are no open and clear declarations in the Epistle to the Philippians to enable us to answer this question satisfactorily;

we shall be obliged to confine ourselves to mere probability. However, from Phil. i. 12, ss., ii. 26, ss., *that* Epistle seems to belong to the latter part of St Paul's captivity at Rome, whereas the three other Epistles might belong to the earlier period of the same. For the passages cited presuppose that St Paul had passed a long time in Rome, and could already remark the effects of his preaching. (See De Wette's Introd. p. 232.) Further, the announcement Phil. ii. 24, that he will come to them ταχέως, seems to intimate a prospect of his captivity soon coming to an end, whereas Phil. ver. 22 certainly expresses only a more distant hope of such an event.

§ 4. THE CHAIN OF IDEAS IN THE EPISTLE.

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

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

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

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

EXPOSITION

OF THE

EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

I.

PART FIRST.

I. 1.–III. 21.

§ 1. THANKSGIVING FOR SALVATION IN CHRIST.

(I. 1–14.)

After what has been already remarked in the Introduction to this Epistle (§ 1.) as to τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, the salutation (ver. 1, 2) contains nothing which has not been already sufficiently discussed in the prefaces to the earlier Epistles. The name of Timothy, which is found in the prefaces to the cotemporaneous Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Philippians, is wanting, however, in this one, therefore we do not know to whom St Paul dictated it. The Epistle itself begins (ver. 3) with a thanksgiving to God for the blessings in Christ. Though St Paul is, of course, also grateful to God for every *bodily* blessing in *earthly* things, still he had no occasion here to put forward that side of the picture, he simply thanks God here for the *spiritual* blessing in *heavenly* things. (On the phrase, ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, see the notes on Matt. xxii. 31, 32; 2 Cor. i. 4. If the meaning were intended to be only: "Praised be God, who is the Father of Jesus Christ," the words would run: εὐλογητὸς Θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ κ. τ. λ. But in this connection the genitive also must be referred to ὁ Θεός. Besides this phrase, which occurs in this passage (and which is also found in St Paul at Rom. xv. 5; 2 Cor. i. 3, xi. 31; Col. i. 3), the apostle uses the following ones as well: ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ (1 Cor. xv. 24),

ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Ephes. i. 17), ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Ephes. iii. 14), ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ (Ephes. v. 20), and Θεὸς πατὴρ (Gal. i. 1, 4; Ephes. vi. 23; Phil. i. 3; 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Tim. i. 2; Tit. i. 14), in which the reference of the conceptions of "God" and of "the Father" to the Son is always to be maintained. Now, had St Paul wished to make both conceptions: "The God of Jesus Christ," and "the Father of Jesus Christ," prominent and strictly separate, the article would certainly have been necessarily repeated before πατήρ (see Winer's Gram. p. 121, 5); but there was no *reason* for so rigorous a separation, and, therefore, since, besides this, Θεὸς and πατὴρ are of the same gender, the article might properly be left out, without weakening the reference of the genitive τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ to the first substantive.—The two meanings of εὐλογεῖν in the language of the New Testament, viz. "to praise," and "to bless," appear here side by side. The Hebrew בָּרַךְ combines both meanings in just the same way.—The εὐλογία πνευματικὴ here denotes the effects of God's grace through the Holy Spirit obtained by us by means of Christ's work, in every form of His efficacy, as well in its moral relations as also in respect to the extraordinary gift of grace bestowed on the Church.—The ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις is difficult, for the concluding words, ἐν Χριστῷ, are not connected with the former, but with the εὐλογήσας ἡμᾶς, so that Christ appears as the element in which the blessed exist, and through whose mission and work they have received the blessing. Τὰ ἐπουράνια can be understood of heavenly gifts only, or of the heavenly places. In the former case it would stand parallel with εὐλογία πνευματικὴ, and then the article surprises us; St Paul would have written ἐν ἐπουρανίοις merely. Besides, τὰ ἐπουράνια always means in St Paul absolutely "Heaven, the heavenly world;" see Ephes. i. 20, ii. 6, iii. 10, vi. 12.—We shall, therefore, be obliged to keep to this meaning *here* also, and that too in the following sense: the spiritual blessing which is in heaven, and therefore bears with it a heavenly nature. But this certainly may be reduced in meaning to the conception: "Heavenly gifts.")

Ver. 4. This divine energy, so full of blessing, is then more accurately characterized by the declaration that God hath chosen the faithful before the foundation of the world with the view that they may be holy and blameless before His eyes. This ἐκλογὴ πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου (see on Matt. xxv. 34) cannot be used in order to

derive from it the pre-existence of souls, as Origenes in the olden times of Christianity, and Benecke in the latest times, were of opinion. The phrase πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου (see at Matt. xiii. 35; Luke xi. 50; John xvii. 14) denotes, in fact, eternity in a metaphysical sense, not time *before* the creation of the world, which seems to be the nearest meaning of the words, but timelessness (*i.e.* non-subjection to the conditions of time.) It is equal to the ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων, to the πρόθεσις τῶν αἰώνων (Ephes. iii. 9, 11), or to the ἀπ' ἀρχῆς (2 Thess. ii. 13). But in the ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς the real individual existence of the faithful before the creation in the divine mind is by no means expressed, but merely the timeless act of volition on the part of God who beholds the future as present. On the other hand, it is undeniable that in the ἐκλέγειν is couched a reference to others *not* chosen, and that therefore the discourse here is of a *prædestinatio sanctorum*, but without asserting at the same time with that a *reprobatio impiorum* or a *gratia irresistibilis*. (See the remarks on Rom. ix. 1.) By the addition ἐν αὐτῷ, *i.e.* Χριστῷ, the ἐκλογὴ is more accurately defined. God sees in His election by grace man in Christ, so that, as Adam was the representative of *natural* humanity, so Christ is the representative of *spiritual* humanity. (By the καθὼς ver. 4 is united as an explanation to ver. 3, "Praised be God, who hath blessed us, as He indeed hath chosen us, *i.e.*, since He has chosen us." See 1 Cor. i. 6.) The object of the election is, however, that men should be holy and unspotted. (In Col. i. 22 ἀνέγκλητος also stands along with both expressions.) It remains to be said that it is self-evident from what follows that this is no self-elaborated holiness and blamelessness attained by our own righteousness, but *Christ's* holiness, which is imputed to faith, but manifests itself likewise in the believer, though only as the result of the experience of grace as a real state.

Ver. 5. The connection of the ἐν ἀγάπῃ with ἐξελέξατο has the collocation too decidedly against it. But one may be uncertain whether ἐν ἀγάπῃ should be taken to be joined with what precedes or what succeeds. The idea, "to be holy and unspotted in love," would not in itself be improper, since love, as the inmost root of the disposition, determines holiness itself. Neither can anything be objected to the conjunction ἄμωμος ἐν ἀγάπῃ, for designating pure love; at 2 Peter iii. 14, we read ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι ἐν εἰρήνῃ, Jude ver. 24 ἄμωμος ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει. But, firstly, the documents of critical value speak decidedly for the connection with what

follows, as well as the circumstance that St Paul generally uses ἅγιοι καὶ ἄμωμοι without any addition. (See Ephes. v. 27; Col. i. 22.) The ἐν ἀγάπῃ προορίσας ἡμᾶς, therefore, connects itself with the ἐξελέξατο as a stricter definition; God's election manifested itself in the gracious predestination to adoption, *i.e.*, God predestined us for children of God. (As to the προορίζειν, also, which appears in ver. 11, joined to κατὰ πρόθεσιν, and as to the υἱοθεσία, as also as to the ἐκλογή, what was needful has been already observed at Rom. viii. 15, ix. 1.) Since the possibility of the υἱοθεσία is entirely brought about through Christ's atonement, the addition διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ explains *itself*, but the εἰς αὐτὸν is difficult, though it might be, with Lachmann and Harless, worthy to be preferred to the αὐτὸν of Griesbach's text, as the latter surely arose merely from the wish to mark more decidedly the reference to the Father. No other reason, surely, can be assumed for this addition, εἰς αὐτὸν, than the design of St Paul to designate Christ as Him who leads man to God, through whom man comes to the Father, according to the words in St John, "No one cometh to the Father but through me;" so that we might paraphrase the sentence thus: "God has in love predestinated us unto adoption, that we might through Jesus come to Him and be led back to Him out of our lost state, in accordance with His gracious will." From the annexed κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ one might think it possible to deduce something against the connection of ἐν ἀγάπῃ with προορίσας. That is to say, as in εὐδοκία the conception of love and benevolence is couched, not that of the mere decree (see Harless on this passage), εὐδοκία τοῦ θελήματος seems exactly = ἀγάπη. But, whilst in ἀγάπη the proper essence of God is designated as love, εὐδοκία τοῦ θελήματος makes the benevolence of the individual act of the will in the election and predestination of the faithful prominent, so that there can be no question of a tautology.

Ver. 6. The praise of God's grace, to which man was meant to be incited by that gift itself, and with which St Paul had set out in ver. 3, is then brought forward as the object of this benevolent divine will. It is not necessary to explain the addition of δόξα τῆς χάριτος, which serves to strengthen the expression, by supposing it = χάρις ἔνδοξος, or by reducing it to a Hebraïsm. (See the pertinent remarks on this passage in Harless.) In what immediately follows (ver. 12, 14), we read again εἰς ἔπαινον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ without χάριτος. (See on the idea of the χάρις, *i.e.*

the unmerited expression of God's love towards His creatures, the remarks on Rom. iii. 21. χάρις is never used of Christ and the Holy Ghost. So far the form of St Paul's sentences proceeds regularly; but after ἐν ᾗ ἐχαρίτωσεν, as far as ver. 14, the writer's discourse proceeds entirely by means of relatives, which link themselves to the substantive which stands last, and thus form, as it were, a cornet of isolated sentences, without any regular periods. Similar passages are found Col. i. 9–20; 1 Pet. i. 3–12; and in our Epistle, at i. 20, ss., which directly follows, a similar circle of propositions occurs, which are all united by καί. But the separate propositions themselves, which are thus connected with one another by relatives, all issue quite naturally from one another, following the association of ideas, so that this mode of exposition only shows St Paul's fulness of ideas, which thronged forward, without allowing him time to range the isolated propositions into periods. This style of writing without periods, arising from such exuberance of ideas, extends into the fourth chapter of our Epistle: it shows itself, however, *here* most strikingly. As to the words ἐν ᾗ ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς, the reading ἧς has, it is true, important vouchers for it, especially A. and G., and accordingly Lachmann has received it into the text. But the overwhelming number of the manuscripts for ἐν ᾗ, and the facility of the alteration, on account of the preceding χάριτος, cause the latter reading to be preferred. Now the grace of God is described in the words: ἐν ᾗ ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς as the means by which He has made man acceptable to Himself; and, indeed, as it was said in verse 4 ἐν αὐτῷ, so here it is ἐν τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ, by which, as the gloss υἱῷ αὐτοῦ in D.E.F.G, correctly explains, Christ is meant to be designated, as He, the archetype of holiness, is κατ' ἐξοχὴν the object of God's love, and through Himself first makes everything worthy of God's love. Ver. 7 clearly shows that the χαριτόω relates to the work of Christ, in whom God views the elect. The use of the aorist ἐχαρίτωσε is, therefore, not to be explained by the assumption, that St Paul means to say, "God had already made him (St Paul himself), with his believing cotemporaries, acceptable to Himself, because they were inwardly atoned for, and had appropriated grace," this proposition, on the contrary, holds good of *all future* generations also; St Paul utters the ἡμεῖς in the name of all believers to all eternity. As in ver. 4 ἐξελέξατο denotes the timeless decree of redemption, so here ἐχαρίτωσε denotes the objective fact of the same, which holds good, not merely for those then living, but also for all mankind. God

has in Christ, once for all, had mercy on mankind, received them into favour, and made them acceptable to Himself. But the ἐν cannot be changed into διά; Christ is rather, as has been already remarked on ver. 4, to be understood as being the real representative of mankind, in whom all exist after the new man,—Christ in us, as they exist in Adam after the old man. (The form χαριτόω is found in the New Testament but once more, Luke i. 28; elsewhere it occurs also Sir. ix. 8, xviii. 17, and in Symmachus, Ps. xviii. 26. In profane Greek writers it is not found except in very late writers, as Libanius.)

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

fact, unless the transformation of the man proceeds from it as its consequence.

Ver. 8. In the forgiveness of sins established through Christ, St Paul sees again the riches of grace, which he has caused to abound towards man. But it is a question here, whether the ἐν πασῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ φρονήσει is to be joined to ἐπερίσσευσεν, or to γνωρίσας. We must let ourselves be guided in our decision on that point by the fact, that neither πᾶσα σοφία,[1] nor φρόνησις, nor φρόνιμος, φρονίμως, can fitly be said of God. The joining it with γνωρίσας is, therefore, inadmissible, because, according to it, both words must necessarily be referred to God. It is true, Grotius, Baumgarten, and others, have chosen to refer the ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ φρονήσει to God, even when joining it with ἐπερίσσευσε; but, besides the above-cited general reason, the comparison with Col. i. 9, where the ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει πνευματικῇ must be referred to man, should have deterred them from that interpretation. Therefore, the proposition in ver. 8 is to be paraphrased thus: ἧς ἐπερίσσευσεν εἰς ἡμᾶς, ἵνα ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ φρονήσει περιπατῶμεν. But the definition of the words σοφία, φρόνησις, and σύνεσις (Col. i. 9), which bears some affinity to the latter, and which we will here consider at the same time with the two former, is not without difficulty. Σοφία which is related nearest to γνῶσις, seems, in the language of the New Testament, to be the result of the rightly applied νοῦς, *i.e.* of the faculty by which we perceive the Eternal.[2] But, whilst γνῶσις, has only the reference to knowledge, there is constantly couched in σοφία, a reference to *the practical application* of knowledge, as in the Hebrew חָכְמָה, whilst the γνῶσις answers to the Hebrew בִּינָה. On the other hand, φρόνησις and σύνεσις are expressions of the rightly-applied φρενὲς, *i.e.* of the understanding. They answer to our German expressions "klugheit" and "verstand" (anglicè, "prudence" and "understanding"). Both words have also a re-

[1] Harless remarks very justly that one may say indeed, "God has wisdom," or, "in Him is all wisdom," but not, "He does anything in *all* wisdom," because God possesses all attributes absolutely. But the phrase "all wisdom" is here *relative*, as it must be thus paraphrased: "All the wisdom which, under existing circumstances, is imaginable, which one can suppose, in men."

[2] We have spoken already on 1 Cor. xii. 8 of σοφία and γνῶσις, but as of charismata, which cannot be meant here (see on ver. 17), not as of natural faculties, which can be cultivated even without the influences of the Holy Ghost, or excited through them. But certainly the *divine* Spirit ever attaches Himself to the *human* Spirit, whence the like names for the certainly *related*, but yet *different*, gifts. There cannot be, from the nature of the thing, a χάρισμα of the φρόνησις, or of the σύνεσις, because these are faculties of the ψυχή.

ference to the practical, like σοφία, but with the difference, that in the last expression the practical aim is directed more to great and comprehensive relations, φρόνησις and σύνεσις, on the contrary, relate to special and individual cases. As wisdom takes earthly relations in their totality, and thus knows how to estimate them in their reference to the eternal, there can be no false application of wisdom; false wisdom is only *seeming* wisdom; wisdom is always rightly applied. Prudence, on the contrary, can, just because it has to do with individual cases, be, it is true, entirely what it is, viz., a sagacious use of present circumstances, and yet be applied to ungodly ends. Therefore, St Paul, at Col. i. 9, pertinently adds: ἐν συνέσει πνευματικῇ, in order to distinguish *real* prudence, which is applied to spiritual ends, from the φρόνησις σαρκικὴ or τοῦ κόσμου, of which the Scriptures say that the children of the world distinguish themselves by it more than the children of light. (Luke xvi. 8, οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου φρονιμώτεροι ὑπερ τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ φωτός εἰσι.) But there seems to be no further distinction between σύνεσις and φρόνησις than *this*, that σύνεσις denotes more the *power* of the understanding, φρόνησις more the *application* of that power. It may be said, God has implanted the νοῦς in the spirit, as the σύνεσις in the soul, but not the φρόνησις (as neither did He implant γνῶσις and σοφία in the νοῦς), because the latter depends on the faithful application of the power of the σύνεσις. But from this relation between them it is comprehensible that they can be used quite synonymously, just as our words, "verstand" and "klugheit." (Compare on this point my essay de naturæ humanæ Trichotomiâ in my Opusc. Theol. p. 158, sq. I still perfectly approve of the definition given there, γνῶσις ἐν τῷ νοῖ, πίστις ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, only I should like to modify the proposition: σοφία ἐν ταῖς φρεσίν to the extent of saying, that the σοφία also belongs to the department of the νοῦς, as complement of the γνῶσις.)

Ver. 9. The rich manifestation of divine grace is further more accurately defined by the γνωρίσας ἡμῖν τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος κ.τ.λ. By this connection with the ἐπερίσσευσεν it will be clear enough, that the γνωρίζειν is not to be understood of a mere exterior making known, but of such a making known, by which He, to whom anything is revealed, receives at the same time the *essence* of the thing, *here* of the mystery of the divine will. For that the μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος is here Christ's becoming man, and the work of redemption which depended on it, is clearly shown by what follows. This was known as about to happen through the prophecies of the

Old Testament from even Adam downwards, but the aorist (γνωρίσας) points to something actual, and, as such, is the realization of the prophecies presented to us; by this that mystery was first made really known, which even the angels desired to look into (1 Peter i. 12). It remains to be said, that we find here θέλημα and εὐδοκία separate, whereas in ver. 5 they were fused into one idea. Κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν αὐτοῦ joins itself to γνωρίσας, and denotes the γνωρίζειν itself as an act of divine benevolence; on account of the following ἣν προέθετο, εὐδοκία is to be taken as = to "gracious decree," because προέθετο is not adapted to express the "grace and favour of God," as permanent conditions; on the other hand, τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ denotes more closely the mystery of which mention is here made, as a voluntary act proceeding from the depths of the divine being. As such, as an act of the divine will, which has its ultimate basis in the being of God Himself, Christ's manifestation and work is, and constantly remains, a μυστήριον, whilst, in other points of view, considered in its appearance, it is an actual revelation, consequently is also presented as a subject of knowledge. St Paul, again connecting what follows to the εὐδοκία by a relative, proceeds to give a more accurate account of God's gracious decree. In every case (whether one here again, as is most suitable, with Lachmann and Harless, read ἐν αὐτῷ, or even ἐν αὐτῷ) the προέθετο ἐν αὐτῳ can only refer to God and His intentions, and not to Christ, since, in what immediately follows (ver. 11), the πρόθεσις refers back to προέθετο. If by ἐν αὐτῷ it were meant to be expressed that God's purpose realized itself in the person of Christ and in His work, it would have found its place at the close of the proposition, in this way: εἰς οἰκονομίαν τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν ἐν αὐτῷ. But as regards the conception of the οἰκονομίαν, it depends on the context how the general meaning "administration, disposition, arrangement," is to be applied. In the passages 1 Cor. ix. 17 (compared with iv. 1), and Col. i. 25 οἰκονομία denotes the apostolical office. *Here*, according to the context, it refers to the dispensation of the grace of God in Christ, and the word οἰκονομία for "incarnation" is quite familiar to the Fathers, perhaps with an application of this passage. (See Suiceri Thesaur. Eccles. s. v.) But the εἰς denotes the object towards which God's πρόθεσις is directed. This object is, finally, with regard to time, more nearly defined by the addition τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν. One expects, perhaps, ἐν πληρώματι τῶν καιρῶν, the connection of the genitive οἰκονομία τοῦ πληρώματος denotes the dispensation of God in

Christ, but regarded as one that belongs to the πλήρωμα τῶν καιρῶν. On this phrase itself see the remarks on Gal. iv. 4, where πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου stands parallel to it. There is couched in it, *per se*, no reference to the ἡμέρα ἐσχάτη (although it is true that the apostles looked on the time of the second advent of the Messiah as, at the same time, the τέλη τῶν αἰώνων); there is, rather, couched in the πλήρωμα merely a reference to a pre-established term, up to which the time is considered as being fulfilled.

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

Evil itself, with its representatives, must carry out Christ's almighty will; *it* too is, although repugnant, gathered in under Christ as κεφαλή. But, for several reasons, we are not satisfied with this mode of taking the passage. Firstly, St Paul uses the metaphor, according to which Christ is represented as the κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος, not so that *the universe* is the σῶμα, but so that under it *the Church* is understood (see Ephes. i. 22, iv. 15, v. 23; Col. i. 18, ii. 19). We should be obliged, therefore, to say even that ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι is here, without any reference to the metaphor of the σῶμα, to be taken merely in the meaning, "to gather together

as a ruler," for which Col. ii. 10, the only passage in which κεφαλὴ seems to have a wider reference than merely to *the Church*, might be quoted. But the whole context also, in our passage, seems not to suit that view. The μυστήριον, of the operation of which St Paul here speaks, is surely nothing but redemption through Christ, which therefore appears, *here* also, to be necessarily prominent in the ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι, as the aim of the μυστήριον. The parallel passage, Col. i. 20, where ἀποκαταλλάξαι stands in a like connection, and the δι' αὐτοῦ is, besides, more nearly defined by διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ, raises this supposition to certainty. The meaning of the apostle must, therefore, *here* also, be taken thus, that God, through Christ's atonement, has gathered together all things, whether in heaven or on earth, in Him as the head, *i.e.* knit them together into living harmonious unity, in opposition to the present state of dissension and enmity, which is expressed in Col. i. 20 by εἰρηνοποιήσας, which Bähr erroneously separates from ἀποκαταλλάξαι. True, the same critic (on Col. i. 20) has chosen to explain the ἀποκαταλλάξαι by the word in *our* passage, instead of, conversely, our ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι, by *that;* but it has already been remarked, in opposition to *that*, on several hands, and especially, last of all, by Harless, that the more *general* expression may certainly be explained by the more *special* one, but not the more *special* one by the more *general* one. Now, if we consider more nearly that idea, which the apostle intends us to recognise in this passage, it cannot be disputed that in it the ἀποκατάστασις τῶν πάντων seems to be again favoured—a view which St Paul in general, as has been already remarked on Rom. xi. 32; 1 Cor. xv. 24, ss.; Gal. iii. 22, says more to support than the other writers of the New Testament. (See, however, in contrast to these passages, 2 Thess. i. 9, and the remarks thereon in my Comm.) For, even putting the τά τε ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς quite out of sight, the words ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα—τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, alone, seem to express the conversion of all men; for, to confine the conception of the πάντα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς to those on earth, who are elected to salvation according to God's gracious election, seems altogether arbitrary; according to the words, all, without exception, are here spoken of. But, if one also takes the τὰ τε ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς in addition, it is very easy to understand how the defenders of the restoration could understand the passage, so that they conceived τὰ πάντα of the universe, and τά τε ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς of the two halves of the universe, the spiritual and the

material world, in such a way, that in both halves *all* beings,[1] therefore also the evil spirits, along with their Prince, the Devil, (which St Paul, at Ephes. vi. 12, places in the celestial world, as being spirits), would be at some time converted through the might of the atonement, and gathered together under Christ as the head.[2] The various ways which the interpreters have struck into, in order to evade this explanation, are but little satisfactory. Some propose to understand the τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς of those who died in the hope of salvation, who were converted and atoned for by Christ; thus Beza, Calixtus, Suicer, Wolf, and others.—Others, as Schöttgen, Ernesti, and several others, proposed to understand the Jews by those in heaven, the Gentiles by those on earth. According to Schleiermacher (in the essay on Col. i. 16, ss., of which we shall speak further on that passage), τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς is meant here to denote "all matters relating to God's service, and the dispositions of mind thereto relating," τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, on the other hand, "all that belongs to earthly kingdoms, to civil order, and legal conditions."

Others, again, understood the good angels by τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς: so Calvin thought, who, without any proof, set up the assertion, that by Christ's atonement the good angels are established in purity, so that they can no more fall away; and Chrysostom, Anselm, Calovius, who understood our passage so, that they referred this to an enmity of the good angels against men who had become wicked, which Christ had put an end to. Finally, Bähr, Tholuck, Böhmer, and others, also refer this to the good angels, but in this way, that the enmity, which was appeased, is not to be sought in *them*, but in *man*, so that, thus, only a restoration of peace between two divided parties, of which *one alone* bears the guilt, is asserted. Against each of these interpretations, however, so much that is well-founded may be objected (as may be seen in detail in Harless in his Comm. ad h. l.), that we can adopt no one of them. The *generality* of the τὰ πάντα, and the division of this whole, which is kept just as general in expression, τά τε ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, are sufficient to preclude us from thinking of anything individual, whether in heaven or on earth;

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

[2] It is especially Origen, who first openly announced and spread this interpretation. That Father, besides this, assumed, altogether arbitrarily, that Christ had suffered several times in the different spheres of the universe, for the redemption of their respective inhabitants.

on the contrary, we are, no doubt, to conceive not of personal *conscious* beings *alone*, though of *them especially*, but of the whole κτίσις, even the *unconscious* part of it), which St Paul in Rom. viii. 17, ss., expressly designates as having part in the redemption through Christ; and, to be sure, we have to refer this κτίσις not merely to *the earth*, but also to *the celestial world*. The reconciliation through Christ is, therefore, to St Paul a fact, the workings of which pervade the universe, which affects the conscious and the unconscious parts of the creation equally, whether or not they be themselves touched by sin, which latter is the case in the world of good angels. Most of the interpretations quoted contain, therefore, elements of truth, they fail principally from the circumstance, that they make these one-sided elements pass for the whole. Now Harless, too, wishes in this passage to maintain a reference to the totality in its relation to the work of redemption. "Everything," says he, page 52, "whether in heaven or on earth, has a share in that fact."

In Col. i. 20, Harless finds a Zeugma, because ἀποκαταλλάξαι relates especially to τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, "and yet," continues he, "it cannot be called a Zeugmatic connection, as undoubtedly also what is in heaven is reconciled with the rest, in that it is included with the rest in the final development of the work of reconciliation, which delivers the whole creation." St Paul, therefore, does not mean to speak, "as if there were an actual need of redemption in heaven, or as if heaven were only used as a figure of speech, but he is to be taken as expressing himself *so*, because the Lord and Creator of the whole body, of which heaven and earth are members, has restored the whole body in the restoration of the *one* body, and the greatest significance of redemption consists in *this*, that it is not merely a restoration of the life of this earth, but a restoration of the harmony of the universe." But now, by this interpretation, he leaves unresolved the principal difficulty, viz., how St Paul could ever say that all have a share in the redemption, that it is a restoration of the harmony of the universe, if he shared the common view, according to which the numberless armies of angels who fell, along with the by far greatest part of mankind (Matt. vii. 13, 14), are eternally damned, and therefore shut out from the harmony of the universe. The defenders of "universal restoration" understand "the harmony of the universe" exactly and seriously according to their literal meaning, and seem, according to that, to be here in the right. Certainly,

if taken in their isolation, the two passages, Ephes. i. 10; Col. i. 20, cannot be explained otherwise. But the interpreter has the task not merely of explaining separate passages, but also of elucidating the separate passages from the general tenor of the ideas of the writer to whom they belong, and again to *throw light on* the ideas of the individual writer (of course without *encroaching on* his individuality), in connection with the expressions of the primitive Christian doctrine in all the writers of the New Testament. According to this, it may certainly be affirmed that St Paul is the writer in the New Testament who touches on the doctrine of eternal damnation most rarely, most permits it to remain in the background, and contains most of the expressions, which, considered *per se*, seem to teach a "general restoration;" at the same time, we cannot say he *teaches* that doctrine decidedly; partly, because he nowhere enunciates it outright, but always in such a way only that one is led to it by inference; partly, because the other writers of the New Testament, and especially in the Gospels our Lord Himself, maintained the contrary so unequivocally. Now, as regards our two passages Ephes. i. 10 and Col. i. 20), it might be the most simple plan to make the meaning we obtain from them harmonize with the general doctrinal type of the Scriptures, by putting prominently forward in the infinitives ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι, ἀποκαταλλάξαι, God's purpose, which, in the establishment of that redemption, which is furnished with infinite power, tends to the restoration of universal harmony, and to the recovery of all that was lost, so that the sense would be the same as in the passages 1 Tim i. 4, 6. "God will have all men to be saved, He has given Himself a ransom for all." But now that, through the unfaithfulness and wickedness of man, this purpose is not fulfilled, and that *many* men are not benefited by it, is a subject that the apostle does not feel himself called upon to put forward. It cannot be objected to this, that surely God in His omniscience foreknows that the fallen angels would not be converted, for he knows that just as well of *men*, who continue in unbelief; but an application of the divine grace, which reaches its highest climax in Christ and His work, to the evil spirits, must, according to God's universal compassion, which excludes nothing, necessarily in every case be supposed, although this very grace, in consequence of their continued resistance, effects the very opposite of reconciliation, viz., the utmost obduracy. (Lachmann reads ἐπὶ (for ἐν) τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, in which he follows B.D.E. But the connection of ἐπὶ with οὐρανοῖς

is so entirely unusual, and unsuitable *per se*, that one can scarcely take the reading for anything more than a copyist's error.

Ver. 11. The sentence is concluded by ἐν αὐτῷ, with a retrospect to ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, on one side, but the words also make a transition to what follows with ἐν ᾧ καί. But here the question is, first of all, whether ἐκλήθημεν or ἐκληρώθημεν should be read. A.D.E.F.G. and the *Itala* (Italic version) are in favour of the reading ἐκλήθημεν, which therefore Lachmann also has received into the text, and, indeed, according to his principles, was obliged to do so. But the rarity of the word, and the difficulty in explaining it speak for ἐκληρώθημεν, though it is less supported by critical authorities. The origin of ἐκλήθημεν in an explanatory gloss, which was written in the margin on ἐκληρώθημεν, is very simply brought about; the reading ἐκληρώθημεν, on the contrary, in case it is not genuine, is not to be explained in *any* way with regard to its origin. Now there is, doubtless, couched in the word κληροῦσθαι, as most and the best interpreters acknowledge, a reference to the Old Testament phrase נַחֲלַת יְהוָה which the LXX. translate by κλῆρος Θεοῦ (Deut. iv. 20, ix. 26, 29). To this we are also led especially by the parallel passage, Col. i. 12, by which we must certainly be very greatly guided in the interpretation of our expression, since both were written at one time, and out of one circle of ideas. The κληροῦσθαι, therefore, here denoted the realization in time of the ἐκλογὴ ἐν Χριστῷ, which was treated of above. But the προορισθέντες κατὰ πρόθεσιν has a reference to God's eternal decree (see on ver. 5, 9), which, as a decree of the Almighty (τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐνεργοῦντος), necessarily includes its realization also. The *prædestinatio sanctorum*, as we defined it on Rom. ix. 1, is again quite unmistakeably couched in this passage. It might seem, however, as if the τὰ πάντα led farther to a *reprobatio impiorum* also. But the definition κατὰ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ excludes that. Evil, as such, is against God's will; it is only in giving it a concrete shape that God's hand is manifest in regard to it, but in regard to the *form* of evil, we cannot hesitate, as has been already detailed in the Comm. on Rom. ix. 1, to recognise the Almighty's *influence on evil.* (The connection of βουλὴ with τοῦ θελήματος is so to be explained that the divine will, in an active sense, is represented as showing itself in distinct actions; θέλημα is therefore the more *general*, βουλὴ the more *special.*)

Ver. 12. As in ver. 5 so *here* again too the praise of the divine

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

Ver. 13. From the opposition of Jews and Gentiles, the latter of whom are here denoted by ὑμεῖς, and the connection of ver. 11 and 12, the leading idea ἐκληρώθητε can be supplied to the ἐν ᾧ καὶ

ὑμεῖς only from ver. 11. To the Jews, as the first called, the Gentiles are added, but only by their hearing the preaching of the word of truth, whereas the former had previously learnt to *hope* through the predictions of the Prophets. After this, it seems unnecessary to enclose with Griesbach the proposition ἀκούσαντες—σωτηρίας ὑμῶν in brackets, and indeed Lachmann has rightly cancelled them. For in the ἐν ᾧ καὶ πιστεύσαντες the previous ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς is not merely *resumed*, but the idea is carried out materially further; that is to say, the πιστεύειν, together with the σφραγισθῆναι τῷ πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, is joined to the ἀκούειν. (See, as to the use of the σφραγίζειν = βεβαιοῦν, "to confirm, corroborate," the remarks on John iii. 33, vi. 27; 2 Cor. i. 22.) The Holy Ghost, who is here designated as πνεῦμα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, inasmuch as He had been already promised mankind through the prophecies of the Old Testament [Joel iii. 1; Zach. xii. 10], is the Author of the sealing of the Faithful.)

Ver. 14. Finally, St Paul closes these introductory words, and also the series of propositions which are linked together by means of relatives, beginning with ver. 6, with the more accurate characterization of the Holy Ghost as an earnest of the inheritance which awaits the Faithful. St Paul calls the Spirit ἀῤῥαβὼν in 2 Cor. i. 22, v. 5, also. (See the Comm. on those passages.) But *here* it is at the same time more accurately declared of *what* He is the earnest, viz. of the πληρονομία. That by it St Paul understands final salvation, and especially the kingdom of God, has been already remarked on Gal v. 21. (See also Ephes. v. 5.) *Then* the believer becomes *entirely* an element of the spiritual life, of which what he receives here from the Spirit is only the foretaste; *then* will the earthly sphere be covered by the Spirit as by waves of the sea. The two concluding propositions beginning with εἰς, and standing parallel with one another, point to the ultimate aim of all spiritual activity, to the final redemption of the people of the possession, and to the praise of the glory of God. (Cf. ver. 5, 12.) That ἀπολύτρωσις here does not denote the beginning of the new life, as in ver. 7, is clear from the context; it is the final, complete redemption, not only of the individual, but also of the whole, just as the word occurs at Rom. viii. 23; 1 Cor. i. 30, also. But it is best to take the addition τῆς περιποιήσεως passively, and to assume that the abstract is put for the concrete, περιποίησις for περιποιηθέντες. There is couched, no doubt, in the choice of that word a reference to the

Old Testament denomination of the people of Israel סְגֻלָּה. See Exod. xix. 5; Deut. vii. 6, xiv. 2; Tit. ii. 14; 1 Peter ii. 9. (The ὅς in the beginning of ver. 14 must not be referred to Christ, it refers to πνεῦμα ἅγιον. The masculine only stands with reference to the following ἀῤῥαβών, and also, we may suppose, as in John xiv. 26 [on which see the remarks in the Comm.], because the Holy Spirit is regarded as a person.)

§ 2. THANKSGIVING FOR THE FAITH OF THE READERS.

(I. 15–II. 10.)

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

Ver. 17. Now, the theme of the prayer for the readers is, that God may vouchsafe them the spirit of wisdom and of revelation, *i.e.* that God may call forth among them the highest and noblest fruits of the Spirit. As just before (ver. 14), the discourse was

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

Harless thinks Rom. xi. 29 most like our passage: no doubt the κλῆσις, which occurs further on in that passage, contains the basis of the χαρίσματα; but the ἀποκάλυψις *here* does not so contain the basis of the σοφία; on the contrary, according to this interpretation, a definition is added to the πνεῦμα by the ἀποκάλυψις. That this can be thus brought in afterwards, can certainly not be established by any example. (Ἵνα, with the following δῷη is not to be taken τελικῶς, but to be explained by the later less forcible use of the particle after words of commanding, begging, etc. See Winer's Gramm., p. 310.—As to the ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ κυρίου see on ver. 3.—The addition πατὴρ τῆς δόξης is explained, as to the sense, by the fact that the Charismata named in what follows

are just operations of the divine δόξα; but the form is unusual. We find, in Acts vii. 2, the phrase ὁ Θεὸς τῆς δόξης, which is found Ps. xxix. 3, also, in the LXX. for the Hebrew אֵל־הַכָּבוֹד. On the other hand, there is found, Ps. xxiv. 7, ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης for the Hebrew מֶלֶךְ הַכָּבוֹד, but our phrase ὁ πατὴρ τῆς δόξης is without analogy. The assumption of a hendiadys, according to which it would be equal to ὁ πατὴρ ἔνδοξος, is not very probable; there is no intention here of adding a laudatory epithet of God, but of expressing that the δόξα proceeds from God, that He is the source of it. It is, therefore, fittest to take πατήρ here in the more extended sense of *auctor, fons*, just as 2 Cor. i. 3, πατὴρ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν stands. In like manner, at John viii. 44, the devil is called ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ ψεύδους, because lies proceed from him.

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

Ver. 18. After the reference of the πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως to the gifts of wisdom and prophecy, the ἐν ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ cannot, of course, be joined with what *precedes* (as those are wont to suppose, who will take ver. 17 to allude only to the general working of the Spirit), but to what *follows*, so that the meaning of the words is this: "that He may give you spiritual gifts of wisdom and of revelation, eyes enlightened with the knowledge of Him." Now, it is evident from the collocation, that the latter phrase is meant to denote nothing different or higher, along with the gifts of wisdom and revelation (for, *were* that so, then καὶ would not be wanting), but that the subjective state of *him*, in whom the gifts of wisdom and revelation are operative, is described by it. The following deduction, viz., εἰς τό εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς, τίς ἐστιν κ.τ.λ., just contains the special enumeration of the different ways in which the gifts of wisdom and revelation diffuse light in the inner man. For in the φωτίζεσθαι here is couched a reference to the Spirit, as the principle of light (see on John i. 4, 9), which enlightens man's soul (see Ps. xiii. 4). Only the connection of the ἐν ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ is questionable as to the sense. It has been proposed to take ἐν in the meaning of εἰς, and then to fix the sense thus: "may God give you enlightened eyes, that you may come to the knowledge of Him." But, apart from the inadmissible interchange of the propositions ἐν and εἰς, this sense does not suit the context here, because, surely, the knowledge of God is to be presupposed in the readers, as believers in Christ (ver. 15.) (See

on John xvii. 3.)—We ought rather to take ἐν ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ as designating the already existing state of the readers, on which spiritual enlightenment, as a higher step of the inner life, is to be grounded. The sense of the words would then have to be taken thus: "may God give you (possessing as ye do the knowledge of God) enlightened eyes, proceeding from that knowledge." This acceptation of the words is also favoured by the parallel passage, Col. i. 9, which is again to be compared here, and where in the words ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει πνευματικῇ the knowledge of God (which is only more accurately defined as the knowledge of His will in the work of redemption) is presupposed in the same way, and an increase of wisdom is besought of God as proceeding from that knowledge; so that the words are to be paraphrased thus: ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν—εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἐν σοφίᾳ. But the phrase ὀφθαλμοὶ τῆς καρδίας forms the chief difficulty in ver. 18, for it seems to be directly opposed to all biblical physiology. That is to say, the metaphor of the eye leads us necessarily to the perceptive faculty; and, that this is really meant here, the following εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς shows: καρδία, on the contrary, denotes, like לֵב, the department of the ψυχή which is concerned with feeling and desire. (See Opusc. Theol. p. 159.) The reading of the text. rec. διανοίας would certainly remove the difficulty completely, but it is clear enough that it is a mere correction of the difficult word καρδίας (perhaps caused by the ἐσκοτισμένοι τῇ διανοίᾳ, iv. 18), and therefore cannot be approved. How, if διανοίας stood originally in the text, could καρδίας have been written instead of it? Now, if we look into the idiom of the New Testament, analogies are by no means wanting by which this unusual connection may be explained. Thus we read, in John xii. 40, νοεῖν καρδίᾳ, where διανοίᾳ would have been expected also, and mention is often made in the Old and New Testaments of the thoughts of the heart. (See Matt. xv. 19; Luke xxiv. 38; Heb. iv. 12.) We are not, in such passages, to suppose a careless confusion of the faculties of thinking and feeling, nor a synecdoche, according to which καρδία stands for the whole man, but these modes of expression ought to be explained as follows. (See at Luke ii. 35 in the Comm.) The Scriptures speak of a thinking, or of thoughts, of the heart, when they mean to express emphatically that man has yielded to these thoughts with his inward inclination, has made them acts of his personality. If this is *not* the case, if they are mere passages of thought, into

which the inclination has not entered, they appear as the mere thoughts of the *head*, if I may so express myself. Thus, too, the phrase "enlightened eyes of the heart" is not the same as "enlightened eyes of the νοῦς;" on the contrary, the former expresses more; presupposing the enlightenment of the νοῦς, it at the same time expresses the gaining over of the innermost inclination to the enlightening principle. Balaam, *e.g.*, shows that a high degree of spiritual enlightenment can be united with a turning away of the heart from the enlightening principle; St Paul does not mean to speak of *such a one*, but of *that* enlightenment which makes the innermost core of the personality inclined to it, and which fills with its light both spirit and soul in all their faculties. —Now the εἰδέναι τίς ἐστιν ἡ ἐλπὶς τῆς κλήσεως αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ. stands out as the result of this operation of grace, which has been obtained from God by prayer. Now, that there is no question here of a merely external *intellectual* acquaintance with the objects named apart from himself, is self-evident, for man can attain *that* without a special operation of grace; *such* a knowledge is rather meant, which is, at the same time, an actual experience, so that he who hopes already bears in himself (in the germ at least) the future and the eternal. Thus, too, the γνῶσις or ἐπίγνωσις in the Scriptures is to be taken as an *essential* knowledge, as *such* a knowledge as makes the man actual possessor and receiver of what he knows. (See on John xvii. 3.) I may add that I can not, with Böhmer and Harless, set up the distinction of *a more*, and *a less*, accurate knowledge between the two forms γνῶσις and ἐπίγνωσις; for, even if it is true, that in words compounded with ἐπί the meaning of the simple word *usually* appears strengthened, yet we do not find in the dialect of the New Testament, and especially of St Paul, this rule applied in the cases of γνῶσις and ἐπίγνωσις. In that *very* place, in which mention is made of *the most exalted* form of knowledge, the Charismatic, — γνῶσις, not ἐπίγνωσις is used. (See 1 Cor. xii. 8, xiii. 8.)

Ver. 19. The object as to which the Spirit is to enlighten the readers of the Epistle is a single one, in which, however, all that is worthy to be known is comprised, viz. the glory to come, the kingdom of God, in its completeness. St Paul treats of this one object under three heads. In the first, τίς ἡ ἐλπὶς τῆς κλήσεως αὐτοῦ, hope cannot be taken as a subjective state, on account of the τίς, for the question here cannot be of the *degree* of the subjective state of hope, as an object of the exalted knowledge, but only of

the magnitude of the object of the hope itself. Τίς is here, as in the following passages, = ποταπός. The sense is, therefore, "that you may know how exalted the object of the hope is, which your calling of God holds out to you." Understood of the subjective state, the words could only be translated thus: "That ye may know of what nature the state of hope is, which your calling of God brings forth in you." According to that, the τίς must have given to it another meaning *here* than in the two other clauses; besides, it certainly requires no special operation of grace to know of what nature the subjective hope is, but *it is really* required to know the true object of the hope, viz. the still hidden kingdom of God, to which believers are called. The very general phrase, ἐλπὶς τῆς κλήσεως, is then denoted in the second article as the κληρονομία, to which the faithful have a claim after their adoption as children (ver. 5), and the earnest of which is the spirit which God has given them (ver. 14). Its magnitude is expressed by the words τίς ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης (Col. i. 27); this glory is incomprehensible to the natural man, the enlightened eyes of the heart alone can conceive it. (See on 1 Cor. ii. 9.) The connection of the ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις is uncertain. Koppe and Winer (Gram. p. 129) want to join it with τίς scil. ἐστι: "how great in the saints the riches of the glory of the inheritance is." But Harless has shown, with the most cogent arguments, this connection to be quite inadmissible; if *this* were to be the meaning of the words, ἐν τοῖς ἁγίος must have been put before, viz. before πλοῦτος, and by this connection the stress is laid on ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις, while, according to the context it must be laid on πλοῦτος. According to the parallel passages, Numbers xviii. 23; Acts xx. 32, xxvi. 18, ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις can be connected only with κληρονομία, and ἐν can only be taken in the sense of "among," ἐν μέσῳ. It is to be supposed that the same idea floated before St Paul's mind, that is expressed in the Gospels by the formula "to sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, viz., the union of the Faithful with all the saints of the Old Testament in the kingdom of God.—As the third article of the more exalted knowledge, which has been brought about by the Holy Ghost, is named, *in fine:* τί τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας. Judging from the reference to the ἐλπίς, and the κληρονομια, the magnitude of the divine power, to the knowledge of which God's Spirit leads, is also to be specially referred to the future revelation to the Faithful, whilst they are prepared for the kingdom of God, which is the inheritance.

This power of God, which perfects the Faithful, works, it is true, even here below, in them, and is in its operation on earth a pledge for their future perfection, but it will not be manifested in its full magnitude until the end of the development of all things through the resurrection of the dead, and their putting on the σωμα πνευματικόν. (We find ὑπερβάλλω in the New Testament, as also ὑπερβαλλόντως, ὑπερβολή, in St Paul alone. See 2 Cor. iii. 10, ix. 14; Eph. ii. 7, iii. 19.)

Ver. 20. St Paul exalts the work of God in Christ, His resurrection from the dead, as the highest expression of the divine power, as is usually the case in the New Testament; in accordance with this power (κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν κ.τ.λ.) God works also on the Faithful (εἰς τοὺς πιστεύοντας). According to this connection, it cannot well be doubtful, that the overwhelming magnitude of the power, of which mention was made just before, is to be specially referred, according to St Paul's meaning, to the general resurrection of all believers from the dead, with which the kingdom of God, the sacred object of Christian hope, is revealed in its glory. The resurrection of the body is, that is to say, the most exalted manifestation of God as of the power and of the true ζωή in man according to the Scriptural mode of viewing and representing truth. In favour of this we may quote also the passage ii. 1, in connection with ver. 5, which is united immediately with our passage, as all that comes between is nothing but a series of subordinate ideas, which have Christ's praise and glory for their object. The comparison of Col. ii. 12, which passage is certainly nearly connected with ours, might mislead us with regard to the here proposed connection of the κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν κ.τ.λ., "in accordance with the energy," etc., so that thereby the ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος κ.τ.λ. is more nearly defined, an interpretation which everything favours. For *there* it is ἐν ᾧ (Χριστῷ) καὶ συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν. *Here* πίστις τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ Θεοῦ is, no doubt, "the faith which God effects, which He has called forth by His operation." According to *that*, one might (as Bähr takes it to be necessary) think it needful to connect *here* too τοὺς πιστεύοντας with κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν, "who believe by means of the operation of God," *i.e.* who have attained to the faith through God's power. But it is clear that we must not stretch the application of the parallel passages so far as thereby to prejudice the context now before us, though, no doubt, if these passages are borrowed from Colossians, they must

be most particularly attended to with respect to this Epistle. Here, according to the following ἣν ἐνήργησε, it cannot be at all doubtful, that by κατὰ τὴν ἐνέγειαν a more accurate definition of the ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος τῆς δυνάμεως is to be conveyed. (The construction κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ has analogies in passages like Eph. vi. 10; Job xxi. 23. A purposeless heaping up of synonyms can by no means be assumed in it. The ἐνέργεια is, in the first place, the actual utterance of power; this word, therefore, stands out quite clearly and distinctly from the two others. Κράτος and ἰσχὺς are certainly more closely connected. But both are distinguished according to Harless' supposition, so that ἰσχὺς denotes power *in itself*, or strength, and κράτος the relation of the former to what is without—might, the prevailing over another. Calvin say, in like manner, robur est quasi radix, potentia autem arbor, efficacia fructus.) Now, hitherto the construction has been perfectly natural from ver. 15; but after the ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν St Paul lets a series of propositions follow (ver. 20–23), which all of them, relate to the person of Christ, and His glory, and are only connected with one another by καὶ, as we above (ver. 6–14) found a series of propositions connected merely by relatives. It is not till ii. 1 that St Paul again takes up the idea in ver. 19, but lets it drop again immediately, in order to deduce some subordinate ideas connected by relatives in ver. 2, 3; it is not until ii. 4, ss., that he finally stops at the leading idea, in order to conclude it in ver. 7. This description of style makes us infer a great commotion in St Paul's soul when he wrote, and which did not permit him to attain to any regular ordering of his thoughts, but compelled him to pour them out, as it were, in a stream.

Ver. 20–23. This passage is a leading one for St Paul's doctrine concerning Christ. It receives its complement from other important passages, from which the knowledge of St Paul's doctrine of Christ, which he elsewhere generally supposes to be known, admits of being gathered, particularly from Col. i. 14–19. For, whereas in Colloss. Christ is conceived of rather according to His eternal, timeless, existence, as the Word which was in the beginning, as St John expresses himself, we here find the Saviour represented pre-eminently according to His humanity, and that too in its exaltation by His ascension into heaven, and His sitting at the right hand of God, as Ruler of the World. In this reference to Christ's human nature, the Epistle to the

Philippians is the complement to our passage, for though that Epistle (ii. 9–11) describes Christ's exaltation just as it is here, yet immediately before (ii. 6–8) His humiliation is depicted after its degree. The entire Christology of St Paul is therefore comprised in the three passages Ephes. i. 20–23, Col. i. 14–19, Phil. ii. 6–11. In order to avoid repetitions, we once for all, as to what is here omitted in respect of the doctrine of Christ, refer to the explanations of Phil. ii. 6–11, and Col. i. 14–19. To the resurrection of Christ from the dead St Paul annexes, first of all, (ver. 20) His sitting at the right hand of God in the heavenly world, which presupposes His ascension. As sitting at the right hand of God (see as to the καθίζειν ἐν δεξίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ the Comm. on Matt. xxvi. 62–66, and as to ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις at Ephes. i. 3, compared with Heb. viii. 1), however, Christ, as participating in the divine government of the world, is more exalted than every *created* and therefore *derived* power. The expressions ὑπεράνω (which is here the same as ὑπέρ, see also iv. 10, and Heb. vii. 26, ix. 5) πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος of course denote, in an especial manner, *heavenly* powers, without any argument being here afforded for understanding *good* or *bad* angels *alone*.[1] Christ is surely only meant (as 1 Cor. xv. 24, where also ἀρχή, ἐξουσία, and δύναμις, stand together) to be designated generally as the Ruler of all Rulers, without reference to their moral condition. In Col. i. 16 the following four words stand together in a like way, θρόνοι, κυριότητες, ἀρχαί, ἐξουσίαι, also without distinction between good and bad angels. But, as in Col. i. 16, so *here* too the accumulation of synonyms, which are to denote powers or dominions, seems to denote not merely *heavenly* powers, but also all which declares itself as a power or dominion. Thence it follows of itself that it cannot be more accurately pointed out *how* the individual expressions relate to different classes of angels; that among the angels also there *is* supremacy and subordination, as among earthly creatures, is clear, but *how* they are distinguished cannot be shown.

The Rabbinical dreams as to the classes of angels are just as capricious and contradictory among themselves as those of the

[1] That the expressions *can* denote *bad* angels *also*, the passages Ephes. vi. 12; Col. ii. 15, on which see the Comm., show. The reason why these expressions are used here, as also in Col. i. 16, is, we may suppose, to direct attention to the over-estimation of the angel-world by many false teachers, not, it is true, *actually* existing at Ephesus, but possible at some *future* time. See the Introd., sec. 2.

Gnostics and Mystics. (See on that point Harless, ad. h. l.) How very generally St Paul conceives the idea of the dominion is especially shown by the addition καὶ παντὸς ὀνόματος κ.τ.λ., in which by ὄνομα every personal entity, and, with reference to what precedes, every personality in whatsoever way ruling, is denoted. We do not see, therefore, with what reason after this the rulers of the earth should be excepted. We can, therefore, only say with Chrysostom: ἄρα ἔστι δυνάμεών τινων ὀνόματα ἡμῖν ἄσημα καὶ οὐ γνωριζόμενα. The abstract forms, ἀρχὴ, ἐξουσία, κ.τ.λ. are also, no doubt, meant to serve the purpose of keeping the idea of power as undefined and general as possible. Therefore Meyer's hypothesis (ad. h. l.), according to which δυναμεῖς is taken to have an allusion to the Hebrew צְבָאָה, and to denote armies of angels, is altogether inadmissible. In the sense of armies of angels the ἀρχαὶ, the ἐξουσίαι, κ.τ.λ. *belong* rather to the δυναμεῖς, but *here* they are *distinguished* from them. One cannot with any certainty point to even a climax or an anticlimax in the words.—The concluding words of ver. 21, finally: ὀνομαζομένου οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι, would bring the question whether we ought here to suppose *earthly* powers also meant, to a decision, if we might understand the αἰῶν μέλλων of the *heavenly* world, and the αἰῶν οὗτος of the *earthly* one, as Meyer proposes. But we never find the phrases in the New Testament in this sense, but always in the well-known one which has been already developed at Matt. xii. 32, according to which αἰῶν οὗτος means the *terrestrial* order of things, in which sin predominates, αἰῶν μέλλων the *holy* order of the world founded by Christ, which then can be taken as either *merely interiorly* realized or *exteriorly also* at the same time, just as βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ admits of such a twofold acceptation. (See the Comm. on Matt. iii. 2.) The words, therefore, only admit of being so taken that the *future* is in them opposed to the *present*;" "Christ is above whatever name can not only *now* but also *in future* be named." In the same way ἄγγελοι and ἀρχαὶ are set by the side of ἐνεστῶτα καὶ μέλλοντα in Rom. viii. 38. Afterwards, in verse 22, Christ, exalted above all, is more closely described in His relation to what is subject unto Him; for it is self-evident that, if *the greater, the ruling*, is subject to Christ, the *inferior* must be so still more. In the πάντα ὑπέταξε, therefore, the reference to the immediately-preceding ἀρχαὶ, ἐξουσίαι, κ.τ.λ. is not merely to be *maintained*, but to be *extended* to the whole of the creation. On *this* account alone there can be no question

of a tautology with what precedes; on the contrary, the πάντα ὑπέταξε stands out as the necessary result of the καθίζειν ἐν δεξιᾷ ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς κ.τ.λ. But from the connection of the πάντα ὑπέταξε with the following ἔδωκε κεφαλὴν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, and a comparison of the parallel passage, 1 Cor. xv. 25, sq. (where the allusion to the passages of the Old Testament, Ps. viii. 7, cx. 1, appears more clearly), a further especial reference seems to be necessary for our passage, as regards the phrase πάντα ὑπέταξε κ.τ.λ. That is to say, as the *Head* of the Church, Christ is, of course, also its *ruler*, but, at the same time, it clearly cannot be said the members of the Church are laid at Christ's feet; St Paul rather makes the relation of the Redeemer to the Church appear quite distinct. According to that, the first proposition of ver. 22: καὶ πάντα ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ, might be taken to refer specially to all that strives against Christ, and is held down by His ascendancy (among which the part of the creation devoid of consciousness also is especially to be reckoned, see Phil. iii. 21), whereas the second proposition: καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδωκε κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ refers to Christ's relation to those who have given themselves up to Him in love, and have thereby become His property. The annexed ὑπὲρ πάντα only defines more closely the κεφαλή; the apostles and prophets also were in a certain sense heads of the Church, but Christ was κεφαλὴ ὑπὲρ πάντα. (Rückert wishes to uphold διδόναι here in the proper meaning: "God has given Christ to the Church as a Head over all." But, according to iv. 11, it seems *here* also more suitable to take διδόναι, according to the Hebrew נָתַן, = τιθέναι, so that it has the meaning "to set over, to arrange according to a divine decree.")

In ver. 23, finally, the Church is, in continuation of the metaphor of the Head, represented as Christ's σῶμα (see on 1 Cor. xii. 12), which is not merely guided by the Head, but also filled with its life, wherefore the Church itself is called Christ. But, before we enter on the *explanation* of the extremely obscure words (both in themselves and in the connection of our passage): τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι πληρουμένου, we must first premise an inquiry into the custom of the language in respect of the word πλήρωμα. It has been attempted to find in that word a polemical allusion to Gnostic false teachers, as St Paul combats them in the Epistle to the Colossians; thus, among the moderns, especially Meyer and Bähr. That is to say, the latter Gnostics, especially Valentine and his school, designated by πλήρωμα the whole ful-

ness of life of the kingdom of light, in opposition to the κένωμα; now St Paul is supposed, on the contrary, to have represented Christ as the true Pleroma. (See Neander's Hist. of the Christian Church, vol. i. part 2, p. 466, ss.) But, first of all, it cannot be shown that this use of the word already existed among the heretics of the apostolical age, and then there was surely couched in this appellation πλήρωμα itself nothing at all blameable, but only in the *manner* in which the false teachers conceived of the kingdom of light itself, and in opposition to the κένωμα; the mere use of the word could not refute any portion of that doctrine; and, finally, we find in the passages of Ephesians and Colossians, in which πλήρωμα occurs (Ephes. iii. 19, iv. 13; Col. i. 19, ii. 9), as Harless has already remarked ad h. l., no intimation whatever, that anything polemical is couched in the word; the *converse* might rather seem the more probable, viz., that the Gnostics had borrowed the word from the apostolical vocabulary to express their ideas. But neither can we recognise a parallel between the πλήρωμα and the well-known Rabbinical-cabalistical term שְׁכִינָה. This last word, that is to say, denotes especially (see Buxtorf lex. Talm. p. 2394) a visible form of the Divine, or, conversely, the Divinity, in so far as He makes Himself known to men in any visible form. (See on John i. 1.) This original meaning might by degrees be confounded in the minds of men, and Schechinah stand directly for God, but still it always meant the Son of God, the revealer of the Father, with whom the Holy Ghost was considered as one. But πλήρωμα is quite different, when it is used of God; it denotes neither a form of revelation employed by God, nor God Himself as the revealer, but only the infinite fulness of life, the manifold powers which the divine essence comprises, and so *God as the Infinite One.* A reference to the filling *of the world* by God is not *per se* couched in the expression, but the fulness of God in Himself is alone declared in it. If we consider the word πλήρωμα in general more closely, we find that the two forms of the *classical* language, πλήρωσις and πλήρωμα, are in the New Testament comprised in the latter one. Πλήρωσις is the act of filling, πλήρωμα the state of being filled, and the substance which fills. But even in classic writers both words are respectively interchanged. (See Passow in voce.) Now in the dialect of the New Testament both meanings occur in the case of πλήρωμα, the form πλήρωσις is never found. Thus at Rom. xiii. 10, in the words πλήρωμα τοῦ νόμου ἡ ἀγάπη, the word = πλήρωσις, "love operates the observ-

ance of the Law." On the other hand, in Mark viii. 20, σπυρίδων πληρώματα is "the filling of the baskets, what fills them," as πλήρωμα πόλεως, "the inhabitants of a town." Thus πλήρωμα can in our passage, and wherever it refers to God, either be only "God's filling act," or "the state of being filled." So at Col. ii. 9, it is πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος, by which the Divinity Himself is meant to be designated (without reference to the world), inasmuch as He is filled with infinite powers. That passage elucidates the word πλήρωμα in Col. i. 19, where πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα in like manner can only be, "the Divine state of fulness, the Divinity in so far as He is filled with infinite powers." Accordingly, in our passage the words: τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι πληρουμένου, might be translated conformably to St Paul's style of writing: "the divine fulness of Him, who filleth all in all," so that Christ would be described in them as He in whom πᾶν τὸ πληρωμα τῆς θεότητος κατοικεῖ, and who, as such, is able to fill the universe in all its forms with His powers. But this, *per se* admissible, interpretation of the words fails when we come to the grammatical connection; τὸ πλήρωμα forms an apposition to σῶμα, a retrospective reference of it to Christ is quite inadmissible. For, if it were proposed to make it depend on the ἔδωκε in the sense, "God made Him to be the fulness of Him that filleth all in all," that sense would be directly opposed to St Paul's tenets, as Christ possesses the fulness of the Godhead not through an act of will of the Father, but by the necessity of His nature. It is only what is predicated of His *human* nature, as the setting Him to be Head of the Church, that can be referred to acts of the divine will. If we, therefore, understand τὸ πλήρωμα of the Church, inasmuch as Christ, who fills *all*, fills *it also*, we find another stumbling-block in the participle πληρουμένου, which it seems must be taken passively. The interpretation of Chrysostom, of Theophylact, of Anselm, of Thomas Aquinas, of Beza, of Calvin, according to which τὸ πλήρωμα is to be understood of the Church in so far as it is *complementum*, the complement of the κεφαλή, by which the body is made complete, has everything against it so entirely that no serious mention of it can be made. For πλήρωμα can certainly mean "complement," but *there only*, where mention is made, as in Rom. xi. 12, of a defect (ἥττημα), which is filled up, made good. And besides, surely Christ is never called the head in such a way that the Church forms the complement of it, and that thus He without the Church would be a mere head without any body, but so that He insepa-

rably united with the body of the Church, fills it with His Spirit, and therefore is one with it, needs no complement. But as to πληρούμενος it is certainly true πληροῦσθαι occurs *elsewhere* only as a *passive*, for which reason Chrysostom, Theophylact, Jerome, wanted to have it taken so *here* too; but the τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι by no means permits it, as Harless has convincingly shown, and Winer (Gramm., p. 235) acknowledges; wherefore it only remains to recognise here a solecism in the use of πληροῦσθαι in the middle form with an active meaning. After that, nothing more stands in the way of the referring these words to the Church, as the body of our Lord; it is called, "the fulness of Him who filleth all in all," in order to bring its high dignity prominently out, and set it in contrast to everything else. Christ is exalted above all power and might, all adversaries God hath put under His feet, but the Church is His body, He fills it with His holy element of life.

Chap. ii. 1. What has already been shortly observed above, with respect to the construction of this verse, and its connection with what precedes and what follows, must here, in the next place, find a more extended demonstration. We must, above all, separate the purely grammatical connection from the connection of the ideas, which here do not run quite parallel; according as the attention was fixed on the one or the other *alone*, different interpretations were arrived at, which could not satisfy *per se*, but still had some truth in them. True, the connecting the acc. καὶ ὑμᾶς κ. τ. λ. with the immediately preceding πληρουμένου (which Calovius and Koppe recommended), or with ὑπέταξε at the beginning of ver. 22, sufficiently refutes itself, and can make no pretensions to correctness. On the other hand, the attempts to connect ii. 1 with ver. 19, as also those which bring ii. 1 into connection with ii. 4, 5, have both something in their favour, and what is true in both must be taken together. That is to say, it is true the acc. καὶ ὑμᾶς ὄντας νεκροὺς κ.τ.λ. connects itself with ver. 19, not by the grammatical coherence of propositions, but certainly by the connection of the ideas. For, beginning with ver. 15, the latter was as follows: "I pray God that He may give you spiritual gifts of wisdom and revelation, the eyes of your heart being enlightened in the knowledge of Him, to understand how great is the hope of the divine call, and the riches of the glory of His inheritance in the saints, and the greatness of His power to usward who believe." But with the words κατὰ τὴν ἐνεργείαν κ.τ.λ. St Paul departs from the direct address to his

readers, and occupies himself with what God has done in Christ. So far as the δύναμις of God in Christ is the measure of the greatness of the effect of His power towards the faithful (who, according to ii. 5, 6, are partakers in all that God does in Christ), this digression has, to be sure, nothing heterogeneous in it; but still it certainly carries us away from the immediate train of ideas. In ii. 1, on the other hand, St Paul again takes up the chain of ideas, which he had pursued down to i. 19, in its leading connection, only with the difference, that instead of the previous ἡμεῖς he again says ὑμεῖς, as in i. 13, thus making the reference to the Gentile Christians prominent, though ἡμεῖς recurs directly at ver. 5, after the reference touched on in verses 2, 3 has been discussed. If, therefore, according to this, ii. 1 is connected with i. 19 by the principal train of ideas, we find, on the other hand, no rhetorical connection at all with this verse, but St Paul permits himself to be determined by the propositions in verses 20, 23, καὶ ἐκάθισε—καὶ ὑπέταξε—καὶ ἔδωκε (which, conformably with the principal train of ideas, form *subordinate* clauses *only*), to proceed with the *principal* idea also in that form of proposition; we can only, therefore, at καὶ ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ. supply Θεὸς, with which συνεζωοποίησε (ii. 5), as the chief verb, is connected. But, as the subject of the principal verb had become uncertain through the introduction of subordinate remarks again in ii. 2, 3, St Paul repeats it (ii. 4), resuming with δὲ the thread of his discourse, and so does not regularly continue the discourse, which he had begun at ii. 1, till verse 5, when he pursues it down to ii. 7.

St Paul here (ii. 1–5) begins by depicting man in general (ver. 5), but first of all (ver. 2) the Gentiles, among whom sin had manifested itself in the most startling forms (see Rom. i.), as dead, but afterwards as quickened and raised up by God together with Christ. The reason of his doing so is the typical interpretation of the events of Christ's life, which often appears in the New Testament, and especially in St Paul. (See the remarks on Rom. vi. 1, ss.) There seem accordingly, as has been already observed, to be good reasons for the preceding digression concerning the person of Christ (i. 20–23). Men are of course here called *dead* through transgressions, inasmuch as the higher life of the spirit is vanished; though alive *physically* man is dead *spiritually*, ζῶν τέθνηκε, 1 Tim. v. 6. (The plural ἁμαρτίαι of course denotes also utterances of sin, not, however, decidedly sinful *acts*, as παραπτώματα, but rather inward sinful movements of the soul in

desires and words. The article before the two words is to be taken: *the* transgressions, *the* sin, which you are conscious of having committed. In the parallel passage, Col. ii. 13, νεκροί, we may add, is construed not with the dative alone, but with ἐν παραπτώματι. *Here* sin is conceived as that which kills, but in the Epistle to the Colossians as the element in which the deadness of the natural man shows itself continually.)

Ver 2. After this, St Paul, with the words ἐν αἷς ποτε περιεπατήσατε κ.τ.λ. begins a new digression, which describes the state of sinfulness before conversion more accurately, but at the same time as one that has passed away. This state is described by the phrase περιπατεῖν as a continued and permanent one (see Rom. vi. 4; 2 Cor. iv. 2) in opposition to single isolated transgressions, and that, too, as a walking in accordance not with the *heavenly* world, with the kingdom of God, but with the spirit of *this* world. Both phrases: κόσμος οὗτος, and αἰὼν οὗτος, are, it is well known, often found in the New Testament dialect, but the conjunction of both phrases, κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, in this passage is singular. We cannot suppose a reference to the Gnostic use of the word, for this reason, St Paul here characterizes no *special* error, and therefore not the doctrine of the Æons, but describes the position of the Gentiles quite *generally*. Rückert's idea that the pronoun is to be joined with αἰὼν in this way: κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦτον τοῦ κόσμου, can make no claim to be received, besides that the combination αἰὼν οὗτος τοῦ κόσμου is also quite unusual. However, one might, perhaps, starting from the generally received meaning of αἰὼν, "time," take the phrase in the sense of "course of time, tendency of the age," unless one with Harless, according to the original meaning of the word in Homer and Pindar, *vital power*, more accurately decides on its meaning, to the effect that it does not mean the abstract idea "time" at all, but "the movement and development in time,' according to which sense "Genius, spirit of the age," is more satisfactory. But what was at first expressed *impersonally* is now in what follows conceived *personally*. As he, that lives in accordance with the heavenly world, walks κατὰ Θεόν, so he, who lives in accordance with the αἰὼν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, walks κατὰ τὸν διάβολον. But the being determined or governed by the Devil is expressed at the same time in this accordance, for he knows how to lead men in accordance with his wishes through his influence. St Paul describes in his peculiar way the prince of darkness as ἄρχων τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος. The name ἄρχων, used of the Devil, is, it

is true, by no means surprising, and, to name one author, in St John he is often called so. (John xii. 31, xiv. 30, xvi. 11.) But, to go no further, the definition of τῆς ἐξουσίας is obscure, for the genitive cannot, as might at first sight be thought, be taken as an apposition, *qui est potestas*, or *cui est potestas*, but must express the object of the dominion. Neither can we by any means suppose a reference to Gnostic false doctrines, as they prevailed among the Colossians, because, as has been already observed in the Introduction, this Epistle is quite free from polemics, nor can it even be shown that ἐξουσία was in use as a Gnostic *terminus technicus*, least of all in the age of the apostles. According to Col. i. 13 (ἐξουσία τοῦ σκότους), and Ephes. vi. 12, where evil spirits are called κοσμοκράτορες τοῦ σκότους, ἐξουσία here is surely nothing more than the power of darkness in general, the kingdom of evil spirits conceived as a unity which Satan governs. But the most obscure of all is the 2d genitive τοῦ ἀέρος, which has much employed the interpreters, and has in some cases called forth the most startling views. The connection of ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος is not to be taken as if a predicate of ἐξουσία were to be expressed by it, as if the evil spirits were of an airy nature, as Chrysostum, Grotius, Cornelius à Lapide, Calixtus, and others, have fancied. The two last indeed added the definition, that the evil spirits caused storms, and other meteoric phenomena disastrous to man. St Paul considers demons as *spiritual* beings (vi. 12), not *material* ones, however refined, which they would be if they were airy beings. The genitive τοῦ ἀέρος denotes not their substantial nature, but the region of their sojourn, the place of their activity; in *that* all the better interpreters are unanimous. We can also at once repudiate the purely figurative or metaphorical acceptation of the phrase, as being worthy of no more accurate investigation. Thus Calvin and Beza insisted on finding in it a figurative designation of the great danger, which evil spirits prepared for man, as if, for instance, they hovered in the air over their heads. Thomas Aquinas, Erasmus, and others, insisted, on the contrary, on the air being taken metonymically, continens pro contento, for the earth itself surrounded by it. The supposition of Harless is very probable, that the reading of the MSS. F.G., of the Vulgate, and of several Fathers, ἀέρος τούτου, rests on that interpretation, which would accordingly be very ancient. But the acceptation of the phrase which recommends itself at first sight seems to be the one according to which ἀήρ is taken as synonymous with σκότος. The evil spirits are very com-

monly represented in biblical phraseology as belonging to the element of darkness, and it is likewise undoubted that ἀήρ, *i.e.* "the lower cloudy region," is used in the classics as synonymous with darkness. (See Homer, Iliad, v. 776, xii. 240, xvii. 645; Hesiod, Theog. vv. 119, 252; Wisdom, xvii. 9. That *the meaning* does not occur again in the Old Testament should not surprise us, as ἀήρ occurs altogether only at 1 Thess. iv. 17 besides. But the use of that meaning for the elucidation of this passage is, according to Harless' remark, made inadmissible by the circumstance that ἀήρ never means "darkness" but in a physical sense, never in the figurative one of "spiritual obscurity," for which σκότος always stands, as the opposite of φῶς. We are, therefore, obliged to go back to the proper meaning of ἀήρ. But now, that St Paul should have assigned the atmospherical air as an abode for the evil angels has both something striking in itself and seems to contradict other passages, as *e.g.*, Ephes. vi. 12, where they are described as existing ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις. The reference to platonizing and gnosticizing ideas, which place evil spirits in the region of the air, is here inadmissible, because those philosophemes could scarcely be known to the apostle, and he would not have used them as such even if they had been. He had but one source of knowledge, illumination by the Holy Ghost. Whatever in his communications coincides with views of other nations or other schools St Paul has not borrowed from the latter, but the rays of truth which are to be found in those views appear connected, indeed, with his statement, but independent of that divine illumination which filled the apostle himself. The parallel passages which have been quoted from Jewish writers seem of more importance, because among the people of Israel, even where the Old Testament is silent, opinions may have been transmitted by tradition even from the age of the prophets which find a corroboration in the New Testament, and especially because St Paul had, as a born Jew and a scholar of the Rabbis, from his early youth forward imbibed the opinions of Jewish sages, and, as it were, breathed in their spiritual atmosphere. But the Holy Spirit filling St Paul enabled him, even in this Jewish sphere of ideas, to separate with accuracy truth and error, therefore he never took up an idea merely because it was of Jewish origin and had been familiar to him from childhood, but whatever Jewish opinions known to him he held fast and made use of, those he held fast because the Spirit in him

guaranteed them. But now we must add that, after the careful inquiry that Harless (pp. 154-6) has instituted into the Rabbinical passages on which the assertion that the Jews supposed the evil spirits lived in the air is founded in general,—these passages are by no means adapted to prove that as a prevailing opinion among the people. On the contrary, there appears in this respect such an obscurity, such a confusion, and such gross superstition, in the Rabbinical writings, that the above-named interpreter justly considers "such quagmires" quite unfit to enable any one to extract anything from them for the elucidation of our passage. We therefore confine ourselves to divine revelation, and seek to determine the meaning of the words, ἐξουσία τοῦ ἀέρος, by the intimations contained in that revelation itself, in the following way. According to Job i. 6, Satan, too, appears along with the בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים plainly in heaven. In like manner as Ephes. vi. 12, compared with iii. 10, the angels, good and bad, are represented as to be found ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, which, according to Ephes. ii. 6, is equivalent to ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ. As spiritual beings they are separated from the earth, the material world, and assigned to the heavenly world, as the spiritual one. If the words are not expressly ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ the cause is to be sought for in the circumstance that οὐρανὸς is not a mere covering of the spiritual world, but also of the holy and blessed region, the abode of God. Still in St Luke x. 18; Rev. xii. 8, 9, 12, the Devil also is represented as to be found ἐν οὐρανῷ, and as not degraded to the earth till after his subjugation, though, no doubt, the figurative colouring in these passages is not to be overlooked. Now, if we compare the only other passage in the New Testameut in which ἀήρ occurs, viz., 1 Thess. iv. 17, it appears that (see the Comm. on that passage) εἰς ἀέρα is put there for εἰς οὐρανὸν, as the contemplation *by the senses* of the ἁρπάζεσθαι upwards is expressed by the phrase εἰς ἀέρα. In a like manner we find in St Matthew vi. 26 the phrase οὐρανὸς used; the birds are there called "the birds of heaven," because they seem to the view of sense to fly in heaven. Accordingly, we believe we are fully justified in understanding ἀήρ in our passage not of the atmospherical air, but of the higher regions generally, which we are wont to call heaven. St Paul here chose for the idea that phrase instead of ἐπουρανίων, with the object, perhaps, of characterizing by it the powers, to which the readers of the Epistle had been subject before their conversion, as not *earthly* ones, it is true, but certainly not *heavenly* ones either. But, further,

the *concluding words* also of this difficult second verse: τοῦ πνεύματος, κ.τ.λ., require a close investigation. The supposition of Flatt that τοῦ πνεύματος is equivalent to κατὰ τὸν ἄρχοντα, consequently for κατὰ τὸ πνεῦμα, as also the opinion of several of the Fathers that τοῦ ἀέρος τοῦ πνευματος are to be connected in the sense of πνεύματος ἀερίου, need no refutation. Rückert will have it that St Paul has departed from the construction; but that hypothesis becomes unnecessary as soon as a suitable plan of construction can be pointed out. Such a one arises if we put τοῦ πνεύματος as equivalent to τῆς ἐξουσίας, and make both genitives depend on κατὰ τὸν ἄρχοντα. That is to say, while the *objective* power of (the) evil (one), the kingdom of darkness, is denoted by ἐξουσία, πνεῦμα relates to the *subjective* side of the same, to the spirit of evil working in the souls of men. *That* proceeds from the Devil and the evil spirits, and has, therefore, the spiritual nature which they themselves bear within them; but of course it is only the created spirit. The efficacy of this evil principle begets in the children of the ἀπείθεια the παραπτώματα and ἁμαρτίαι, of which mention was made in ver. 1. As now in those words the state of sinners is described quite *generally*, leaving out of sight their relation to redemption, we have no reason to interpret the ἀπείθεια of *unbelief in the Gospel:* the expression denotes *disobedience in general*, which is the essence of sin, in whatever form it may show itself. But the νῦν is not to be understood as if the Spirit worked thus in the children of unbelief *then* only when St Paul wrote; on the contrary, it continually works in the very same way; St Paul rather means by the νῦν to set earthly conditions in general in opposition to the αἰὼν μέλλων of the kingdom of God, and by that means to make the working of the Devil appear as confined, in contradistinction to the eternal divine working of the Holy Ghost. Meyer's acceptation of the νῦν, "which even now, when the Gospel is working so powerfully counter to it, still continues to reign in the children of unbelief," is justified by nothing in the context. On the contrary, the opposition with ποτὲ gives the νῦν clearly enough its reference to the state of man without Christ, *i.e.* the αἰὼν οὗτος. (See Col. iii. 7.)

Ver. 3. Whereas ver. 1 and 2 were addressed to the Gentile Christians, St Paul, in verse 3, makes a transition to the Jewish Christians, and says the same of *them*. Before their conversion (ποτὲ) *they* too walked among the children of disobedience in the wicked lusts of the flesh. In the same way, in the second chapter

of Romans, the state of the Jews is placed in a parallel line with that of the Gentiles described in Rom. i. Let us add that in the ἀναστρέφεσθαι ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις τῆς σαρκὸς, just as in the περιπατεῖν κατὰ of ver. 2, the enduring mode (plan, direction) of life is described in opposition to isolated sinful acts. From the evil lusts proceeds the accomplishing of the desires of the flesh, and of sinful thoughts. Although it is well known that in St Paul's usual language, as I have already shown on Rom. vii. 14, σὰρξ denotes not sensuality or fleshly lust alone, but the whole God-averted tendency of man and of the ψυχὴ, yet St Paul ascribes no διάνοιαι to the σάρξ. The collocation of the words is therefore very suitably chosen; τῆς σαρκὸς could not have stood after διανοιῶν. The θελήματα σαρκὸς stand in relation to the above-mentioned ἐπιθυμίαις as the single actual lusts, which are formed according to circumstances out of the state of *concupiscentia*, but διάνοιαι denotes sinful thoughts, which have no sensual desire for their basis. As διάνοιαι here, so in Matt. xv. 19 διαλογισμὸς, but with the addition πονηρὸς, is used of sinful thoughts; but in Luke xi. 17 διανόημα by itself denotes wicked thoughts. If any one, however, should conclude from this description that all Jewish Christians, and consequently all the apostles likewise, had actually committed the grossest carnal sins, he would be very much mistaken. St Paul contemplates the inner sinful aberrations as already actually sins before God, entirely according to the spirit of the sermon on the Mount. But now at length by the ὡς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ, which has a retrospective reference to verse 2, St Paul comprises the whole picture of the sinfulness of men in the sentence: ἦμεν (scil. ποτὲ, before our conversion unto Christ) τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς, or, as Lachmann after A.D.E.F.G. reads, φύσει τέκνα ὀργῆς, but which looks more like a correction to facilitate the understanding of the passage, than like the original reading. Now, that in these words the expression ὀργὴ, which is put absolutely, is the divine anger, cannot be doubtful, whether by itself, or after the parallel passage Col. iii. 6. But as to the reality of that anger we have already, at Matt. xviii. 34, 35; John iii. 35, 36, expressed ourselves at sufficient length. Certainly in God anger is no passion (so far as the expression is anthropopathic), but the real displeasure of God's holiness at what is evil. Now men, as sinners, are the objects of this divine displeasure, *i.e.* τέκνα ὀργῆς. For the context must determine the sort of dependence which is always expressed by υἱὸς or τέκνον. The interpretation of τέκνον by ἄξιος, which Calvin, Grotius, and other interpreters

defend, does not lie uppermost in the word, but is only a derivative one; the object of the divine anger is, under all circumstances, such a one as deserves punishment. But the φύσει is here in a dogmatic point of view extremely important for the doctrine of original sin; that is to say, if ἦμεν τέκνα ὀργῆς stood alone, one might think that every single person had by his individual fault alone made himself the object of the divine anger, as the Pelagian-rationalistic mode of interpretation is wont to maintain. *That* view, now, of man's sinful nature, as produced in every individual by personal guilt, is refuted by φύσει. It is true there have been many subtleties introduced in the interpretation of it (see Harless on this passage, pp. 171, ss.), but φύσις cannot, without forcing the meaning of the word, be understood as anything else than the Latin *natura*, of the original, innate, in opposition to what has been acquired by practice. True, a thing may by custom become φύσις, but the habitual always forms a contrast with what is φύσει. Now, that St Paul does not mean the idea of the original, innate, to be here taken as if created by God, cannot certainly be deduced from this passage itself, but we see from the chief passage (Rom. v. 12, ss.) on the doctrine of original sin that St Paul derives the sinful nature, born in all individuals without exception, from the original sin of the founder of the race; this passage, therefore, receives from that chief passage its natural supplement. Accordingly, by the dogmatic connection in the doctrine of St Paul, φύσει obtains here the meaning "birth in sin," which it, of course, cannot have of itself, and thus forms the antithesis to χάριτι, verse 5. That is to say, the being by nature children of wrath rests on the transmission of sin by bodily propagation, which has continued from the time of Adam forth; what, therefore, men are by nature, they are by birth in sin. What may with the most plausibility be said against that interpretation is, that in what preceded (ἀνεστράφημεν ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις—ποιοῦντες τὰ θελήματα κ.τ.λ.) the discourse was of the doing of sin, and not of the state of sinfulness, which seems not to suit φύσει, which follows. Thus said most of the rationalist interpreters since Grotius. But, after a little more accurate consideration of the context of verse 3, one easily perceives that this objection to the above-given interpretation is totally unfounded. For, whilst in the ἡμεῖς πάντες ἀνεστράφημεν κ.τ.λ. the actual state of the walking in sin is detailed, and in the ποιοῦντες κ.τ.λ. the actual bursting forth of it into individual actual sins, both are pointed out in the concluding

words in their ultimate foundation, viz. in the inborn sinfulness of each individual through his connection with Adam. It is true this remark was not absolutely necessary here; the train of ideas on the whole would remain uninjured, even if the concluding clause καὶ ἦμεν—λοιποί were wanting; but St Paul appears, according to the judicious remark of Harless, to have wished by that means to place in a clear point of view the contrast between the state of sin and the calling of the people of Israel. St Paul would not have represented the Jews, as God's people standing under the guidance of Jehovah, in the same way as the Gentiles are described in verse 2, as being under the power of Satan; yet they walked as Adam's sinful descendants in like manner after the wicked lusts of the flesh, that is, because they were not obedient to the Law and the exhortations to a holy walking arising from the same.

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

Ver. 5, 6. Now here St Paul carries out in its separate points of view the typical interpretation of the life of Christ, which he had already touched on at ii. 1, and for which the representation of our Lord's life in i. 19, ss. was to prepare us. As Christ was dead, but was made alive by God's power, and awakened and set on God's throne, so has God with Christ made alive, awakened, and transferred to the heavenly world mankind dead through their sins. The repetition of the καὶ, before the three verbs, is explained by the vivacity of the picture, and the endeavour to place the climax in the strongest light; but the form of the aorist, in all three verbs, is striking, especially as their purport seems to be future

as yet, which the συνεκάθισε shows above all; for how could it be said of the readers then living, that God had transplanted them with Christ into the heavenly world? True, it is quite correct to say that, as the συζωοποιεῖν and συνεγείρειν are here to be understood, not of the physical awakening from the dead, but of the making alive of the spiritual being, so, too, the συγκαθίζειν denotes, in a typical way alone, the inner heavenly consciousness of the faithful, not a local raising into heaven; and, accordingly, the Protestant interpreters maintain that everything here named is to be looked on as already actually operated in the readers of the Epistle. But St Paul's intention is clearly not to represent these parallels with the events of Christ's life, as only brought to pass merely in the first readers of the Epistle, but to designate them as also valid for all who should in future believe in Christ. According to that, then, it must, at all events, be granted that St Paul, in the style of prophetic representation, describes the future as already realized. But even *that* does not suffice to exhaust St Paul's idea. If we compare Rom. viii. 30 (see the Comm. on that passage), it is clear that St Paul conceives at once as completed all in Christ's labours after his word τετέλεσται! which is gradually realized in men's hearts, according to the progress of the gradual development of the history of the world. What happened to Him, as the second Adam, the representative of the race, has actually, once for all, happened for the benefit of all. The above used phrase, that Christ's life is typically conceived by St Paul, is, therefore, not to be understood either, as if there were formed, according to a divine rule, independently of Christ and His person, a development in believers analogous to His fate; but, rather, Christ is the real type for every form of life among the saints unto the end, so that how they live is only the development of what had been already given in the germ in Him, and had been transplanted out of Him into their nature. The supplying of an ἐν before τῷ Χριστῷ, which is found in some MSS., is, therefore, totally unsuitable; the dative depends on the σὺν in the compound verbs, and is to be understood entirely in its own meaning, since Christ, as the universal man, bore all men in Him, and completed all in Him. The parallel passage in Col. ii. 13, in which σὺν is expressly repeated, is also in favour of that construction. The only thing that is surprising in this interpretation is, that, at the end of ver. 6, ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ occurs, and the ἐν is there genuine, beyond a doubt. But that addition is surely

meant only to serve the end of showing that συγκαθίζειν is here used in a figurative sense, as has been already remarked. But, in saying that, we do not say that a real partaking of the faithful in the sitting of Christ in heaven, on God's throne, will not take place; it is asserted at Rev. iii. 21, in the strongest terms, and it also follows from the nature of the thing, that what is of a heavenly nature belongs to the heavenly world. But in this passage it refers, because of the figurative σύζωοποιεῖν and συνεγείρειν, merely to the inner world, and the arousing of the heavenly consciousness, whereas, elsewhere, Christ's bodily resurrection, and whatever is connected with it, is also treated as a real type of *ours*. The distinction made between συζωοποιεῖν and συνεγείρειν deserves also to be more closely investigated. Although both words, as we said before, can here be taken only figuratively, yet they are borrowed from the process of physical resurrection, and must, therefore, have their meaning in the same. Now, in the prophetic description (Ezech. xxxvii.), there is also a plain distinction drawn between a moving, a becoming alive, of the dead bones, and an actual resurrection; the same distinction is pointed to in Matt. xxvii. 52, 53, according to which passage the bodies of the saints move, indeed, simultaneously with Christ's death, but do not awake and go forth from the graves till after His resurrection. Even, therefore, if the resurrection itself is an act, it yet presupposes, in the process of the gradual ζωοποιεῖν, a preparation advancing step by step. In the middle of the deduction, there appears, in ver. 5, the parenthetical ejaculation χάριτί εστε σεσωσμένοι, by which St Paul impresses the great thought, which filled his life, on the hearts of his readers, viz., that neither works, nor any merit whatever, but God's undeserved grace, is the sole ground of our salvation, which is further carried out in ver. 8. In the parallel passage, too (Col. ii. 13), this idea attaches itself to the συνεζωοποίησε, in the words χαρισάμενος ἡμῖν πάντα τὰ παραπτώματα. (At the addition in ver. 5, χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμμένοι, various readings are found; to name some, D.E.F.G. read οὗ τῇ χάριτι, inferior critical authorities also add γὰρ or δέ. But all these readings owe their origin to the copyists misunderstanding the nature of the short exclamation, arising from the excited feelings of St Paul, and their supposing they must connect it grammatically somehow or other, principally with reference to ver. 8.—As to the ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, see at Ephes. i. 3.)

Ver. 7. At length St Paul closes this long collection of propositions, reaching from i. 15 to this verse, with the idea that it was God's intention, by the work in Christ, to make known the abundant riches of His goodness; just as it was expressed in i. 6, xii. 14, εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, as the ultimate object of the whole creation, and of all its forms. This manifestation of the richness of the divine grace, however, St Paul places ἐν τοῖς αἰῶσι τοῖς ἐπερχομένοις. The participle ἐπερχόμενον, *quod imminet, instat* (Luke xxi. 26; James v. 1), is found united with αἰὼν nowhere else in the New Testament.—Apart from the context οἱ αἰῶνες ἐπερχόμενοι could mean only "the coming generations," in opposition to the living ones, to whom St Paul addressed his Epistle. But it has been already remarked on ver. 5, 6, that St Paul there already thought of those also who should live later; he would have Christ's benefits referred not merely to the one generation then living, but to all the races of man. Therefore οἱ αἰῶνες ἐπερχόμενοι can only be taken as = the usual term αἰὼν μέλλων, so that the sense of the 7th verse is this: "that God in the future order of things, *i.e.* in the kingdom of God (in which the glory of the faithful, which is hidden here below, will be made visible to all), may manifest His superabundant richness of grace."—The concluding words of ver. 7, ἐν χρηστότητι ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, are to be taken as a more accurate definition of the more general word χάρις; the connection of the ἐν κ.τ.λ. with ὑπερ βάλλοντα is unsuitable, because the participle belongs quite objectively to πλοῦτος. (The neuter form of πλοῦτος is with Lachmann and Harless, on the authority of MSS. A.B.D.F.G., to be preferred as the rarer one, here, as at Ephes. iii. 8, 16; Phil. iv. 19; Col. ii. 2.)

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

(See the details as to χάρις, πίστις, ἔργα, at Rom. iii. 21; 2 Cor. iii. 5.)

Ver. 10. Now, that everything in the path of salvation is thus referred to God's working, which man on his part has only to accept with faith, is based on the nature of the process of regeneration. It is like a new creation, the regenerate are God's ποίημα, κτίσμα, κτίσις (see at 2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. vi. 15), created in Christ Jesus. The ἐν is again not to be taken as = through, but to be understood as in ver. 5, 6: Christ, as the representative of the race, bears in Himself all who are His in the faith. But the aim of this inner divine creation is more closely determined by ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς, *i.e.* unto good works, that they may bring forth good works. However little, therefore, salvation *proceeds* ἐξ ἔργων, it does not, for all that, *exclude* good works, *i.e.* works which proceed from a heart in which dwells faith active through love (see Gal. v. 6); on the contrary, the fruits of faith are supposed to proceed from the new birth, as inevitable consequences. God wills it that we should walk in those fruits, by which again, as ver. 2, 3, the consistent being and living in good works is to be understood, because faith and love afford an inexhaustible source for them. The only difficulty in ver. 10 is the connection οἷς προητοίμασεν ὁ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ. The question is whether οἷς is here to be taken as a pure dative: "for which God has prepared us," or as by attraction for ἃ, in the sense: "which God has prepared that we might walk in them." Against the first interpretation it might be said that it is unsuitable to represent the persons as prepared *for* the works, since, on the contrary, the latter depend on the former. Moreover, one expects in that case ἡμᾶς after προητοίμασεν as a matter of course. In the second acceptation of the words, for which we decide, it might certainly in like manner seem strange, that God is said to have prepared the works, since those are surely deeds of man; but the idea of preparation is not to be understood as if by it man's free-will were excluded, but only in this way, that the circumstances and conditions, under which it becomes possible for men to accomplish good works, are ordered by God. (Προετοιμάζειν [see Rom. ix. 23] differs from προορίζειν and προτίθεναι only by pointing to a working of the divine eternal will, which relates more to details.)

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

(II. 11–III. 21.)

To this description of the grace of God in Christ St Paul in what follows annexes very fitly a reminiscence of the former desolate state of his readers. In order to attain to a full appreciation of the greatness of God's benefits in Christ, man must remember his condition when he was without them. Now, when St Paul had said that they had once been heathens, he had said everything to designate the wretchedness and spiritual desolation of his readers. (This ποτὲ forms, as in ver. 2, 3, an antithesis with the νυνὶ in ver. 13, and contrasts the time *before* their conversion with that *after* it.) That is to say, the name ἔθνη, answering to the Heb. גּוֹיִם, denotes, both in the Old and the New Testament dialects, the idea of all estrangement from God, and blindness. In order more strongly to mark the contemptuousness of the expression, St Paul further adds, in a parenthetical clause, οἱ λεγόμενοι ἀκροβυστία ὑπὸ τῆς λεγομένης περιτομῆς. (See as to ἀκροβυστία and περιτομή, which abstracts are used for the concretes ἀκρόβυστοι and περιτμητοί, the Comm. on Rom. ii. 26, iii. 30, iv. 9, 10.) But it is a question how, in ver. 11, the additions of ἐν σαρκὶ to τὰ ἔθνη and ἐν σαρκὶ χειροποιήτοῦ to περιτομῆς are to be understood. The latter might produce the impression that bodily circumcision, as such, is meant to be undervalued in comparison with the spiritual one (see on Rom. ii. 28, 29); but that cannot be supposed from the whole context. That is to say, St Paul means to show that the Gentiles were really inferior compared with the Jews, as ver. 2 shows; but the latter had received the circumcision in the flesh (ἐν σαρκὶ) as a divine institution, which was to distinguish them from the Gentiles; St Paul cannot, therefore, possibly mean to undervalue *that*. Nevertheless, the words ὑπὸ τῆς λεγομένης περιτομῆς ἐν σαρκὶ χειροποιήτου unmistakeably bear a colour of blame, but which is not to be referred to the symbol of circumcision in itself, but to the want of honesty of the Jews in not suffering themselves to be led by the outward symbol ordained by God to that inward purification which it was to typify.—Accordingly, the words included in parentheses are to be thus paraphrased: "Ye, who are called uncircumcised by the so-called circumcision performed in the flesh, which, however, merely as such (*i.e.* without, along with the outward circumcision, being also circumcised

in the heart), has certainly no right to look down contemptuously on you." Accordingly then it also follows that the phrase τὰ ἔθνη ἐν σαρκὶ does not form, as might be thought, an antithesis with τὰ ἔθνη ἐν πνεύματι, to designate better and worse, noble-minded and ignoble-minded Gentiles; but that ἐν σαρκὶ is to denote the want (common to all Gentiles without exception) of a symbol of the covenant in the flesh; then, too, by the reference of the passage to the Gentiles as such, is explained the article before ἔθνη.

Ver. 12. To that topic is annexed a more accurate description of the state of the Gentiles. St Paul considers, in his grand style of viewing matters, his first readers as the representatives of Gentilism, and of the Gentile age of the world in general, therefore the following picture, with which Col. i. 21; Ephes. iv. 18, 19, are to be united also, is a representation of the Gentilism of all ages and of all its forms. It is always χωρὶς Χριστοῦ, and therefore χωρὶς σωτηρίας. *Here* Ἰησοῦ also, or Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, could not have stood, as might have been thought, for the Jews too were without Jesus; Χριστὸς denotes the Messiah as an idea, of the appearance of whom the Jews had received the prophecies; as indeed these are described in what immediately follows as wanting to the Gentiles. But the phrase χωρὶς Χριστοῦ is in so far significant as the prophecies among the Jews are not to be viewed as mere abstract assurances of something future, but as real promises, in and with which the germ of what was promised was already present in the people. Christ already dwelt, as the eternal word of the Father, in the people of Israel by means of an ἐπιδημία νοητή, before the ἐπιδημία αἰσθητή, which commenced with Jesus becoming man. That indwelling of Christ's in Israel in His Godhead was wanting *in Gentilism*, thence its infinite distance, even in its noblest forms, from what the people of God included.—The condition of being abandoned of God is more accurately designated by the ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τῆς πολιτείας τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ κ.τ.λ., to which the parallel passage Col. i. 21 further adds καὶ ἐχθροὶ τῇ διανοίᾳ (=ἐν τῷ νοί) ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς πονηροῖς, that is, living in works known to be evil, and thereby standing in a spiritual enmity against God. God's people had a peculiar, politico-religious constitution, ordained by God, which was a prefiguration of the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. This regulated state of the Theocracy, which must have immensely promoted the development of the life of faith, is here designated by the word πολιτεία, which we became acquainted with in Acts xxii. 28, in the sense of privileges of a citizen, *civitas Romana*.

Now, as St Paul denies the Gentiles any *participation in* this πολιτεία τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, he certainly denies also their privileges of citizens in the same, which belonged to every Jew by birth alone; but on account of the connection with τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ we cannot here ascribe to the word exactly the meaning of "privileges of a citizen." (See Harless' remarks on this passage.) But in the word ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι seems to be couched not merely that the Gentiles have no part in the kingdom of Israel, but that the participation in it was taken from them. No doubt that is couched in the form of the word, but not as if they had previously had a share in the kingdom of God, and had lost it, but as if God, by the restriction of His peculiar operations of grace to Israel, had expressly excluded the Gentile world, but only in order first to let the fire acquire plenty of power by concentration in one place, and then to diffuse it over all the nations of the earth. (Ἀπαλλοτριόω is found elsewhere in the New Testament only at Ephes. iv. 18; Col. i. 21. Josephus often uses it. It is also found in Sirach xi. 35; 3 Macc. i. 3, as also in the LXX. for זוּר, Ps. lviii. 3, and נֵכָר, Job xxi. 29; Jerem. xix. 4. The clause ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, which some unimportant MSS. endeavoured to make easier to their comprehension by means of the corrections τῶν ἐπαγγελίων τῆς διαθηκῆς or τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῶν διαθηκῶν, is to be viewed as a further exegesis of the χωρὶς Χριστοῦ. It appears, in fact, as if it would have been sufficient to say: ξένοι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, *i.e.* far from the promise of the Messiah, which composed the central point of all the prophecies of the Old Testament; for the attempted connection of τῆς ἐπαγγελίας with ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες is inadmissible, because then the collocation τὴν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ἐλπίδα would be requisite. However, the plural τῶν διαθηκῶν would still only then have anything surprising in it, if it denoted the Old and New Testaments, but, according to Rom. ix. 4, by that word are understood the covenants of God with the fathers of the Jewish people, for which view the passages Wisdom of Solomon xviii. 22; Sirach xliv. 11; 2 Macc. viii. 15, also speak. Those covenants are here called διαθηκαὶ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, because the promise of the Messiah was the support of those Covenants. —At such a distance from the divine institutions, the Gentiles are are therefore ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες, *i.e.* not only without the hope of the Messiah, but in general wanting *all* real hope, and therefore also ἄθεοι, *i. e.* Godless, without actual connection with the living God. The addition ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, *i.e.* in this wicked world, gives a point

to the idea, inasmuch as it is to be paraphrased by: "in this wicked world, in which one has such urgent need of a sure hope, of a firm hold on the living God." But it might be thought that St Paul, by this interpretation, fell into contradiction of Rom. i. 19, where the heathens are ascribed τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, and of the historical matter of fact, that individual heathens elevated themselves to a purer knowledge of God, throwing superstition aside; but that is not the case. True, one must not try to solve the apparent contradiction by saying that St Paul here speaks merely of the particular Gentiles living in spiritual blindness; but that such single individuals, who arrived at a purer knowledge of God, as Socrates, Plato, and others, had properly ceased to be heathens, for we have remarked already, on the phrase τὰ ἔθνη ἐν σαρκὶ that τὰ ἔθνη ἐν πνεύματι ought not to be distinguished from them by a tacit contrast; St Paul speaks of the whole of the Gentile world, *i.e.* of all mankind except the Jews; he divides the human race into Israel and non-Israel. On the contrary, we can solve that apparent contradiction in this way only. No natural knowledge of God, as we find in such non-Jewish thinkers and sages, however valuable it may be considered in itself, can be compared with the knowledge of God which was spread in the bosom of God's people, because it was not the result of true divine enlightenment and of God's communicating Himself in the inner man, but the product of mere reflection on the existence of the distant Deity, from the contemplation of nature, and from conscience. But God can *there alone* be truly understood, where he communicates Himself beforehand to the person understanding Him. Οὐδεὶς ἔγνωκε τὸν Θεὸν, καθὼς δεῖ γνῶναι, εἰ μὴ ὃς ἔγνωσται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. (Compare on 1 Cor. viii. 3.) The Gentile knowledge of God, so far as it deserves that name, could not therefore but exhibit itself as rather negative and formal than positive, and the knowledge of Socrates, that he knew nothing, is an adequate expression for it. But the less the Jews used their great privileges as they ought, the more guilty they became before God, and the more did those heathens put them to the blush, who in their ἀθηότης with their weak light were more faithful than the Jews, with their clear blaze of revelation.

Ver. 13. To the description of the Gentile estrangement from God, is then further annexed the picture of the state of the converted. In it all live ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, *i.e.* in communion with Jesus of Nazareth, in whom the idea of the Messiah was realized.

St Paul here expresses the altered state of the Gentile world by ἐγγὺς ἐγενήθητε, in opposition to the preceding μακρὰν εἶναι. That is only a resumption of the previous ἀπαλλοτριοῦσθαι τῆς πολιτείας τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. In God's people God was present in the Shechinah of the temple—the Jews were, therefore, near him; the Gentiles, on the contrary, were far from him, inasmuch as they were not allowed to approach the temple. (See on ver. 17, 18.) The act of coming near, and, consequently, the state of the εἶναι ἐν Χριστῷ, is represented as at length brought about ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ. The shedding of His blood, and the atonement earned thereby, ended the separation among mankind, which God had ordained till the completion of Christ's work, and enabled the Gentiles to unite themselves to the community of Christ, just as immediately as the Jews were allowed. (Cf. ii. 18.)

Ver. 14, 15. For Christ produces such an effect by His nature; He Himself is our peace. In that idea there is couched, not merely that Christ institutes peace, that He is the εἰρηνοποιὸς, but that He Himself, in His essence, is peace, and that he alone has peace who lives in Him and His element. Where discord dwells inwardly, there outwardly, too, peace is only mock peace. Thus Christ is called, as early as Isaiah ix. 6, שַׂר־שָׁלוֹם, ἄρχων εἰρήνης. Therefore, in the name εἰρήνη ἡμῶν by ἡμεῖς are to be understood, not the Jews alone, but St Paul here speaks from the point of view of the whole human race, in which all distinctions are smoothed down. (See on Gal. iii. 28.) Christ manifests Himself as our peace, both inwardly and outwardly; here St Paul, no doubt, on account of the special need of his first readers, makes the latter side amply prominent. Christ abolishes the division of mankind into Jews and non-Jews, He makes both halves one. The neuter τὰ ἀμφότερα St Paul himself (verses 15, 16) interprets by τοὺς δύο, τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους, *i.e.* Jews and non-Jews. Both form a unity in their relation to Christ (John x. 16), one flock under one shepherd. This uniting efficiency of Christ's is still more closely described by St Paul in the explanatory words: καὶ λύσας τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ. The idea of the μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ is further explained by τὴν ἔχθραν, and the whole train of thought is more accurately determined by the final words, ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασι καταργήσας. True, it has been proposed to connect τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ, and even Lachmann has accepted that punctuation, but no suitable meaning at all admits of being obtained from that mode of

taking the context, for the interpretation of Bugenhagen, Schulthess, and others, according to which ἔχθρα ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ is taken to mean, "enmity in His people, in the corporeal relatives of Christ" (as σὰρξ is used Rom. xi. 14), refutes itself sufficiently by itself. It is only in the above-given connection of the words that the writer's exposition proceeds step by step elucidating itself. Now, first of all, as to the form of the phrase λύειν τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ, it is clear that λύειν here, as at John ii. 19, has the meaning of "to dissolve, destroy, and therefore remove." Μεσότοιχον, *paries intergerinus* or *intermedius*, denotes a party-wall, a partition-wall; Phavorinus interprets it: τὸ διάφραγμα. It is very rare in profane writers, yet Athenæus has it, Lib. vii. p. 281. Ed. Casaubon. The combination μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ is meant, however, to render the barrier prominent, as the means of separation, "the barrier which forms, and is meant to form, the hedge, the separating medium." One is naturally at once reminded, by this idea, immediately of the Law, which produced the separation between those who were under theocratic government and those who were not under it, by expressly declaring the Gentiles unclean, and forbidding all communication with them on the part of the Jews. In the Rabbis, therefore, the Law is called סְיָג or סְיָגָא, *sepes*, *sepimentum*, and the Masoreh again סְיָג לַתּוֹרָה. (See Buxtorf lex. talm. p. 1447.) The investigations as to what sort of barrier St Paul meant seem idle; if, however, it is to be supposed that he, in using the universally intelligible figure, had something *special* in his mind, it is most reasonable to understand the wall which divided the fore-court of the Gentiles from the precincts of the inner temple, and thus was a symbol of their separation from the covenants of promise. The presupposed reference of the μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ to the Law seems, however, to have a doubt cast on it by the epexegetic τὴν ἔχθραν. Erasmus, Cornelius à Lapide, and Rückert, choose here to think of the reciprocal enmity between Jews and Gentiles. But, if τὴν ἔχθραν is to be something different from μεσότοιχον, καὶ would not be wanting; if it is to explain the previous phrase, the idea, "the party-wall *is* enmity," seems unfitting; the ἔχθρα may well be a consequence of the separating medium, but not the separating medium itself. Besides, St Paul himself surely gives the explanation immediately by the following τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν καταργήσας, which stands exactly parallel to the μεσότοιχον λύσας. The ἔχθρα can and must be here taken as an effect of the

Law. But the question is, as *what* effect? Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Œcumenius, to whom Harless has given in his adhesion, understand by the ἔχθρα the enmity of the Jews and Gentiles together against God, which arises through the operation of the Law, in that it makes sin abound. (Rom. v. 20, vii. 13, viii. 3; Gal. iii. 10.) The last-named interpreter defends this acceptation, by laying emphasis on the καὶ ἀποκαταλλάξῃ—τῷ Θεῷ, which follows in ver. 16, and which he will have to be understood of the inward reconciliation through Christ, and, therefore, of the abolishment of guilt and enmity against God, in opposition to the merely outward union of Jews and Gentiles. According to this, as Harless interprets the passage, the two members of the clause expressive of purpose are intended to correspond to the two members of the principal sentence; that is to say, the *first* member of the *subordinate* sentence, ἵνα down to εἰρήνην, to the *first* member of the *principal* sentence, ὁ ποιήσας down to ἕν, and the *second* member of the *subordinate* sentence, καὶ ἀποκαταλλάξῃ down to ἐν αὐτῷ, to the *second* member of the *principal* sentence, καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον down to καταργήσας. Thus, then, St Paul spoke not merely of the amalgamation of the Jews and Gentiles into one through Christ, but also of the abolishment of the enmity of the sinful world against God through the atonement. But just this twofold object, which must be supposed according to this interpretation, is not found in St Paul's exposition. The ἀποκαταλλάσσειν (verse 16) is by the addition τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι referred to the relation between Jews and Gentiles, just as the preceding κτίζειν τοὺς δύο. In ver. 17–22 one sees as clearly as possible that this relation continues the chief subject of the Epistle in what follows, just as from ver. 11–15 it forms the central point of the argument. One is therefore at a loss to say wherein the justification is to consist for introducing along with *this* idea, which forms the basis of the whole exposition from verse 11 to verse 22, *another* idea in verses 15, 16 merely, and that too the perfectly general one, that God has reconciled both Gentiles and Jews with Himself through Christ. This idea must have seemed to St Paul the more completely superfluous here, that he had treated of it in chapter i. already. But it is here *irrelevant* also, inasmuch as the making the inward reconciliation with the outward amalgamation of Jews and Gentiles prominent must have excited the notion, that the latter was only just an outward one, as if it was

separated from the inner atoning operation of Christ. But that is not St Paul's meaning at all; rather, Christ, inasmuch as He is the reconciler of man to God, and therefore their peace, is also in and by those very relations He that abolishes the separation between Gentiles and Jews. Therefore St Paul could not possibly hit on the idea of placing the inward reconciliation side by side with the outward amalgamation, because to him the amalgamation is no mere outward one. Then there comes, in addition to the above, the farther fact, that nowhere is it said, either in St Paul or in the whole New Testament, that "the effect of the Law is enmity against God." Certainly there is found that "it works wrath or a curse," but never "enmity."—Finally, on the assumption that τὴν ἔχθραν denotes the enmity of both of the Jews and of the Gentiles, against God, we must also assume that St Paul in speaking of the Law thought of the law of the Gentiles also, written in their hearts. But the succeeding phrases do not at all suit that view, and one cannot find a passage in the whole of the New Testament which declares *this* law, too, of the conscience to operate wrath or a curse. If, therefore, we must reject this reference of the ἔχθρα to the enmity of both, of Jews and Gentiles, against God, nothing remains but, with most of the interpreters, to refer it to the object which is spoken of both before and after in these verses, to the relation of the Law to those *under* theocratic government and those *not*. The bitter enmity between the two was the result of the Law, of the separating hedge. As, therefore, the latter was through Christ and the completion of His work taken away, so was the reciprocal enmity of the Jews and Gentiles taken away, *objectively* immediately, *subjectively* so far as they receive Christ in the faith; Christ was their peace in this relation also. Thus we rigorously maintain the closest connection of this whole passage; that is to say, the following ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ. now describes the operation of the λύειν more accurately, and interprets authentically for us the μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ, which caused the ἔχθρα between Jews and Gentiles. And such an interpretation was necessary, because those words might have been misunderstood. For it might seem as if the idea λύειν τὸ μεσότοιχον, from its relation to the Law, stood in antagonism with the declarations of the Lord at Matt. v. 17, 18, where the abolition of the Law is expressly disavowed. St Paul cannot intend to utter the antinomian error that Christ had abolished (καταργήσας) the Law in general, both in its moral and ceremonial parts,

in *every* relation, but only that the Law had obtained through Christ a totally different position, and so far was made inoperative in a *certain* relation. This relation, which through Christ is changed in reference to the Law, St Paul designates by the phrase νόμος τῶν ἐντολῶν and the addition ἐν δόγμασι. The word ἐντολὴ denotes the expression of the νόμος for the individual case, therefore the unity of the Law comprises a multitude of ἐντολαί. It cannot be supposed that the ceremonial ordinances alone are here so called, the moral commandments of the νόμος are also to be taken as ἐντολαί; but St Paul names the Law here ὁ νόμος τῶν ἐντολῶν, in order to contrast it in the dividedness of its precepts with the oneness of the Spirit (ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι, ver. 18) which reigns in the Gospel. Whereas the Law says, do this, do that, do not this, do not that, the Gospel has but the one commandment of love, and even that not in the form of a commandment, but as an operation of grace. Certainly this holds good, also, of the law of the Gentiles written in their hearts. This, too, declares itself in a multitude of separate exhortations and warnings; but we need not mention that ὁ νόμος τῶν ἐντογῶν cannot possibly be referred to this inner law also. If it were still doubtful, the ἐν δόγμασι which follows would, at all events, make the reference to the universal moral Law impossible.

But certainly the interpretation of *this* expression again is very uncertain. It is true, the reference of the δόγματα to Christian precepts, which, besides the Fathers, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Œcumenius, also Grotius, Bengel, Fritzsche, Winer,[1] and others, defend, seems inadmissible, because δόγμα elsewhere occurs only in the sense of "imperial decree, edict," in the New Testament, as Luke ii. 1; Acts xvii. 7, in the Septuagint, Daniel ii. 15. The meaning "dogma, Christian precept," is not found either in the earliest Fathers. We may suppose it was first formed when philosophers entered the Christian Church and transferred to Christ the custom of their dialect to call the precepts of the philosophers δόγματα. However, that is not decisive against that acceptation of the word in this passage, for, even if it does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament in the meaning "dogma," it might have it though, just here and in Col. ii. 14, as it was used of the doctrines of philosophical schools. But here that meaning neither suits the context, nor does the idea then agree with the system of doctrine

[1] Winer has proposed this view in the third edition of his Grammar, but has given it up in the fourth (p. 196, ss.).

elsewhere used by the sacred writers. We nowhere find that it is taught in the New Testament that Christ had *by His precepts* made the Law of no effect; it is constantly said *by His death, by His blood.* Well, then, *here* too ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ is to be connected with καταργήσας, so that by it the means is expressed by which Christ operates the abrogation of the Law; it denotes the giving up of His flesh, and therefore = ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ (ver. 13), or διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ (ver. 16). But now it is by no means to be perceived how afterwards ἐν δόγμασι also is possibly to be connected with καταργήσας, so that it means, "He made the Law of no effect through His doctrines." In any case it should have been ἐν τοῖς δόγμασιν αὐτοῦ, if St Paul meant it to be understood so. Therefore other interpreters (to name some, Ambrose, Calvin, Beza, Calovius, Wolf, Michaelis, Storr, and, among the later ones, Koppe, Flatt, Theile, Rückert) join ἐν δόγμασι with τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντοῶν, which precedes. But Winer (Gramm. p. 196, ss.) and Harless have already correctly observed, in opposition to that view, that the article must necessarily have then been repeated. If ἐν δόγμασι were meant to contain a more accurate definition for the νόμος, it must have been τὸν ἐν δόγμασι; if, on the other hand, the definition was meant to refer to ἐντολῶν, τῶν ἐν δόγμασι should have stood. Besides, one cannot well avoid tautology so; "the law of the commandments in ordinances" say *idem per idem.* Nothing remains, therefore, but with Harless (in favour of whose interpretation Winer, too, declares *ubi supra*) to *join* indeed ἐν δόγμασι with καταργήσας, but not to refer it to Christian precepts, but to the commanding form in which the Law of the Old Testament appears, and to consider that form as the part of the Law abolished by Christ, so that the sense of the words is this: "Christ has, by giving up His flesh, put the Law, which declared itself in a multitude of precepts in relation to the commanding form of its ordinances, out of operation, and earned for man in lieu of it the one spirit of love."

Ver. 16. To the above is further annexed the description of the design of the Lord in this abolishment of the separating hedge of the Law, which divided mankind into itself, into Israel and non-Israel, into God's people and not God's people, into man and wife. (For, as under the *New* Testament, Christ has a relation [to the Church] as the man to the wife [see v. 23, ss.]; so is, under the *Old* Testament, Israel as the man related to the heathen world as to the wife.) But the ἵνα admits of no immediate con-

nection with the chief verb of the previous sentence, αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, for in it Christ's essence is described, not His operation; the particle of intention connects itself with the participles ποιήσας, λύσας, καταργήσας, which are parallel to one another. The description of Christ as personally our peace is again resumed in the ποιῶν εἰρήνην, for which ποιήσας could not have stood here; for which reason, also, the εἰρηνοποιήσας διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ, Col. i. 20, stands parallel in *fact*, it is true, but not in *phrase*, with this passage. The two national masses, Jews and non-Jews, are, however, represented as greater individuals; thence τοὺς δύο, τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους. Indeed, those united through Christ, who, in verse 14, were represented as ἕν = ἑνότης, are here called εἷς καινὸς ἄνθρωπος. As, therefore, the separate individuals in the nation coalesce into a higher personality, so do nations in the totality of the race coalesce into one man; of that isolating contemplation of mankind, according to which it forms a sum of absolutely separate individualities, which are placed only *side by side*, and of which each stands and falls by itself,—the Scriptures know nothing. The human race is in Christ a living unity, filled and borne by one Spirit. (See the Comm. on Gal. iii. 21, 28.) However, the phrase κτίζειν ἐν ἑαυτῷ εἰς κ. τ. λ. shows that St Paul does not use εἷς καινὸς ἄνθρωπος as a mere personification. According to the phrase κτισθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ in verse 10, *here*, too, the ἐν ἑαυτῷ is not to be referred to Christ's death, as if it were = ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ in verse 15, but St Paul represents in it Christ Himself as the true one universal man, the representative of the race, in whom the two separated halves have returned to a perfect unity. As Adam is the one old man, in whom and through whom all the individuals of the race receive the old man, so is Christ the one new man, in whom and through whom all receive the new man, made after God in righteousness and holiness. (See the obss. in the Comm. on Rom. v. 12, ss.) Accordingly, it is clear that the τὰ ἀμφότερα ἓν ποιεῖν, the κτίζειν τοὺς δύο εἰς ἕνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον, is not to be something merely outward, a purely negative removal of the separating medium, but something really inward; the process of Christ's life was the actual creation of this one new man. But now the question arises, how, after this, is the second half of the subordinate clause ἵνα ἀποκαταλλάξῃ κ. τ. λ. to be taken, without merging in the former half? If we, with Harless, conceive the union which Christ effected between those under and those not under theocratic

government as an *outward* one only, there certainly results here *an advance*, inasmuch as those at first *outwardly* united are afterwards, by the cross, *i.e.* by the death of the Son of God on the cross, also *inwardly* reconciled with God. But this hypothesis, that the union of Israel and non-Israel is to be conceived as a merely outward one, can only be purchased at the expense of the idea in the preceding words. We must, therefore, look about us for another acceptation of the ἵνα ἀποκαταλλάξῃ, in relation to the preceding ἵνα κτίσῃ. First of all, it is decided that the words τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι scil. ὄντας are to be closely connected. The one body forms the antithesis to the former separateness in the dual state, and σῶμα denotes, as is usual in the language of St Paul (Rom. xii. 5, πολλοὶ ἓν σῶμά ἐσμεν ἐν Χριστῷ, 1 Cor. x. 17, xii. 13, εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν, Ephes. iv. 12, 16, v. 23; Col. i. 18, 24, ii. 19, iii. 15), the Church as Christ's body, which He fills with His life. The ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι in our passage is parallel with the ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι in verse 18; Jews and Gentiles are in spiritual unity in one body. (See at iv. 4.) As the individual is divided into σῶμα and πνεῦμα, so also does the united Christ of the Church (1 Cor. xii. 12) bear in Himself σῶμα and πνεῦμα. (In the same way also in Col. iii. 15 it is said ἐκλήθητε ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι.) The referring the words to the atoning death of Christ, as if they were = ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ, verse 15, is unsuitable in every respect. In the first place, the διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ already expresses that idea; for to take those words as a subordinate definition to ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι in the sense, "by means of the giving up of His one body, that is to say through the cross," is altogether opposed to St Paul's usual style. It is self-evident that the giving up of the body took place through the death on the cross, and so St Paul in using σταυρὸς constantly supposes the body as what was put to death by the cross. But then in this acceptation of the ἐν σώματι the addition of ἑνὶ is unsuitable. That Christ's body was One has no relation to the atonement at all, but, on the contrary, the previous duality of the Jews and the Gentiles is very properly placed in opposition to the unity of both in the body of the Church, whereby too the close juxtaposition of τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι is alone satisfactorily explained. Finally, it is but little likely that St Paul should have expressed the same idea five times in ver. 15 and 16, and that the phrases: ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ, ἐν ἑαυτῷ, ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι, διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ, and ἐν αὐτῷ, which are so different, mean exactly the same thing.

True, a similar heaping up is found in Col. i. 22 in the words: ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου, but brought together, however, on one point, not as a repetition in the same proposition in different places.

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

Ver. 17, 18. To the representation of the work of Christ itself is annexed in these verses the mention of the announcement of that work to man. The clause καὶ ἐλθὼν εὐηγγελίσατο can by grammatical connection only be joined with ver. 14, αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστιν κ.τ.λ.; but, as the intermediate ideas do not discover the nature of a parenthetical clause, ἐλθὼν cannot be referred to Christ's becoming man, and to His teaching before His death, because mention had already been made before of that death, as the means to abolish the divided condition of mankind; it is rather to be understood of Christ's being come in His Spirit. (See John xiv. 18.) Before the completion of His work by His death, Christ was not our peace, His teaching before His death was only a prophesying as to Himself, the true publication of the Gospel did not begin till the pouring out of the Spirit. Before the completion of His work, so little did the Lord view those under, and those not under, theocratic government as one, that He even said to His disciples, Matt. x. 5, 6, "Go not into the way of the

Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not," and to the woman of Canaan, "I am not sent but only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. xv. 24). The ὅτι δι' αὐτοῦ ἔχομεν κ.τ.λ. also necessarily supposes Christ's work as already completed; for δι' αὐτοῦ means διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, and the προσαγωγὴ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα supposes the υἱοθεσία (i. 5) which first imparts the experience of salvation. The ἀμφότεροι ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι, which answers to the ἀμφότεροι ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι above, ver. 16, shows, as does also what follows (ver. 19, ss.), that St Paul still continues to have the leading idea in his mind, namely, the difference between Jews and non-Jews which had been abolished by Christ. (In ver. 17 B.D.F.G. read εἰρήνην repeated before τοῖς ἐγγύς, a reading which Lachmann has justly received into the text.—Ver. 18. As to προσαγωγὴ see Rom. v. 2.—From the idea of the μακρὰν is obtained of itself that of access, of the being permitted to approach; if one wishes to suppose further a special reference, the only admissible one is that borrowed from the Temple, which the Gentiles were not allowed to approach.—Ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι is, of course, not "*through* one spirit, but *united in* one spirit," thus forming an unity of spiritual life, in which the former distinctions are abolished. Comp. Gal. iii. 28.)

Ver. 19, 20. After this, St Paul then introduces the close of this chain of ideas, by representing, with a retrospect to the picture of the Gentile world in ver. 12, this state of estrangement as now removed from among his readers; like the Christian Israelites, *they* too, the Gentile Christians, are members in the πολιτεία τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, yea, stones in the building of the Temple, which the Church of Christ represents. (Ver. 19. As to ἄρα see on Rom. vii. 25.—Whilst ξένοι and συμπολῖται τῶν ἁγίων correspond to each other, πάροικοι and οἰκεῖοι τοῦ Θεοῦ are opposed to each other. The two former words are sufficiently explained by ver. 12. The form συμπολίτης is not found again in the New Testament; the grammarians designate it as not Greek. [See Phrynichus, Lobeck's Edn. p. 172.] However, Josephus uses the word, Antiqq. xix. 2. 2. But the second antithesis gives rise to a difficulty, because πάροικοι does not seem to suit this connection. It usually means an emigrant, *i.e.* one who is allowed to *live* in a city or land, but has no right of *citizenship*, connected therefore with ξένος, as indeed it occurs Acts vii. 6, 29; 1 Peter ii. 11, along with ξένος. But that meaning does not suit here as an antithesis to οἰκεῖοι τοῦ Θεοῦ. This phrase points to the

image of a family of God (Gal. vi. 10) to which the idea of a Father naturally leads; in this family the Jews are conceived as the proper inmates, and the Gentiles as next neighbours, or as Meier expresses himself, as vagrants (Beisassen, manants, Fr.) who are, it is true, in the great house of God along with the Jews, but do not properly belong to the family.) The figure, according to which all believers together are conceived as a temple, the corner-stone of which is Christ, whose foundations are the apostles and prophets, often occurs in the Scriptures. Each individual is called a temple (1 Cor. vi. 19), and again all together also form a ναὸς Θεοῦ (1 Cor. iii. 16). The figure is most completely carried out in 1 Peter ii. 4, ss. There Christ is called λίθος ζῶν, ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων μὲν ἀποδεδοκιμασμένος, παρὰ δὲ Θεῷ ἐκλεκτὸς, ἔντιμος. The individual believers, who are built upon Christ (ἐποικοδομεῖσθαι, see 1 Cor. iii. 10), also bear the name λίθοι ζῶντες, and the whole building of the Temple is designated an οἶκος πνευματικός. The basis of this figurative representation is formed by the typical conception of the stone Temple in Jerusalem, which was not arbitrarily built on that exact plan, but after patterns from a higher world (Exod. xxv. 8, 9). The only difficulty in our passage is caused by the remark that the apostles *and* the prophets form the θεμέλιος, which again is to be conceived as reposing upon Christ, as the proper foundation and corner-stone. For in other passages, to name one, Rev. xxi. 14, the twelve apostles alone form the δώδεκα θεμελίους of the Church. It is a question, first of all, are we here to think of the prophets of the Old Testament or of those of the New Testament? Everything is in favour of the latter. Not merely the circumstance, that the prophets are named *after* the apostles, but also the absence of the article, which makes apostles and prophets appear most intimately united, and the nature of the case; the prophets of the Old Testament cannot well be called foundations of the Temple which grows out of Christ (ver. 21). But how can the prophets of the New Testament be set on a par with the apostles in relation to the foundation of the Church? Inasmuch as the Holy Ghost, which fills them both, is the real element which lays that foundation; whilst Christ is called the corner-stone in His person, the apostles and prophets are called the foundation, not in relation to their persons, but in regard to their doctrine and the Holy Ghost, which accompanied it, taken together. It is otherwise in Revelations; that *there* stress is laid on the number 12 is

connected with the whole description of the new Jerusalem in that passage, and can therefore exercise no influence over our passage, otherwise neither could St Paul, as not being comprised in the number 12, be reckoned among the founders of the Church. (Ver. 20. ἀκρογωνιαῖος is found again in 1 Peter ii. 6. It stands for the Hebrew אֶבֶן פִּנָּה or רֹאשׁ פִּנָּה, κεφαλὴ γωνίας, Is. xxviii. 16; Ps. cxviii. 22; Matt. xxi. 42.

Ver. 21, 22. As the building of the Church rests *on* Christ as the corner-stone, so it also increases continually *in* Him, *i.e.*, in the fellowship of all the members of the Church with Christ in their introduction into Him. Both verses express substantially the same idea, for the second ἐν ᾧ must not be connected with ναός, but with κύριος, and is consequently parallel with the first ἐν ᾧ. But ver. 22 again in the καὶ ὑμεῖς renders the reference to the Gentile Christians expressly prominent, as necessary parts for the completion of the building of the Church. But the concluding words of ver. 24, εἰς κατοικητήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν πνεύματι, define more accurately the idea of the ναὸς ἅγιος ἐν κυρίῳ. Indeed this addition ἐν κυρίῳ is produced by the image which St Paul made use of in ver. 20; as it has this meaning to designate the ναὸς ἅγιος as a spiritual community: ἐν κυρίῳ has nothing at all pleonastic in it either, though ἐν ᾧ went before, for that ἐν ᾧ only defines the participle συναρμολογουμένη. But the κατοικητήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν πνεύματι describes still more expressly the nature of this spiritual community, which is built up in Christ with Gentiles and Jews. The Church is in it described as the lodging, in which God Himself takes up His abode (see 2 Cor. vi. 16, ss.), and that too permanently, inasmuch as it is of a spiritual nature, in opposition to the κατοικητήριον γήϊνον, from which the whole simile is borrowed. (Ver. 21. The ἡ after πᾶσα is wanting in B.D.E.G., it is, therefore, no doubt, to be struck out. Only πᾶσα οἰκοδομὴ must not be rendered "every building," since mention is made here of the one Temple only, but "the whole building." In the Greek of later times πᾶς often has the meaning *totus* even without the article. [See generally on the use of πᾶς Winer's Gramm. p. 110, and Harless on this passage.]—Συναρμολογεῖν is found again only at iv. 16. It = συμβιβάζειν, and refers to the firmness of the building, in which the different personalities and opinions [iv. 10] are put together. The form αὔξω, instead of the usual αὐξάνω, is found nowhere else in the New Testament but Col. ii. 19.—Ver. 22. On account of ἐν ᾧ, which precedes, the ἐν πνεύματι can-

not be connected with συνοικοδομεῖσθε, but only with the collective idea κατοικητήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ. Harless chooses to take ἐν πνεύματι "in the Holy Ghost;" but against that acceptation are: 1, the preceding ἐν ᾧ, *i.e.* ἐν κυρίῳ; 2, the τοῦ Θεοῦ. St Paul certainly says χαρὰ, ἀγάπη, ἐν πνεύματι, but he does not, and cannot say: Θεὸς ἐν πνεύματι, because the Spirit itself is God. Ἐν πνεύματι forms here the antithesis with ἐν σαρκὶ, with a glance at the ναὸς χειροποίητος.)

Chap. iii. 1. To this description of the glory of the Church St Paul meant now to add only a prayer, in which he beseeches God to realize in his readers all that belongs to the idea of the Church, in order with it to close entirely this general part of his Epistle; but he allows himself by the liveliness of his feelings to be once more led into a discussion, so that he does not till ver. 14 again resume the discourse begun in ver. 1. Certainly there has been no want of attempts to avoid the assumption of an Anacoluthon in ver. 1, by proposing to make ver. 1 an independent proposition, by supplying the verb which is wanting. Some MSS., to name some, D.E., supply πρεσβεύω, which may be supposed to have come into the text from vi. 20, others κεκαύχημαι, perhaps after Phil. ii. 16. Most of the interpreters, who are against the ἀνακόλουθος, content themselves with the supplying of εἰμί. But, to make no mention of the difficulty, which the τούτου χάριν causes on this assumption, the article must then necessarily have been wanting before δέσμιος. But, if we are to suppose a digression in ver. 2, St Paul cannot possibly take up the discourse again in ver. 8, or ver. 13, or even iv. 1, as many have been pleased to think, but only, as all the better later interpreters assume, in ver. 14, where the τούτου χάριν expressly marks the resumption of the discourse. *Thus* the thanksgiving prayer in ver. 14 ss. is brought into connection with the description of the Church in ii. 19 ss., in the glory of which the Gentiles also have a share, and the τούτου χάριν appears, therefore, in well-founded connection. But St Paul makes mention of his bonds here, in order, we may suppose, to allow the glory just described to appear in stronger contrast with the then existing state of the Church, and especially to make the Gentiles observe, by what sacrifices on his part their entrance into the Church had been purchased. Considered in and for itself, one might here take the ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν τῶν ἐθνῶν "for your sake, *i.e.* because I have preached to the Gentiles." But if one compares verse 13, and especially the decisive parallel passage Col. i. 24, it results that *here* too the

words are to be taken "for your benefit:" in what sense this is more particularly to be understood will be found determined at Col. i. 24 more in detail. (We find at iv. 1 ὁ δέσμιος ἐν κυρίῳ for ὁ δέσμιος τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ. The genitive here is to be taken as a designation of the active cause, "whom Christ and His cause have made a prisoner, and that too unto salvation for you, the Gentiles, *i.e.* for the whole body of Gentiles," as in Philem., verse 13, δεσμοὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου denote bonds, which the Gospel has brought with it.)

Ver. 2, 3. The expression which follows, and with which the digression extending to verse 13 begins, shows the uncertainty of St Paul as to whether all his readers were acquainted with him personally. By it is explained the naming his name in verse 1, and the picture of his then existing state, and that very uncertainty was also the occasion for St Paul in what follows to expatiate on his position with regard to the Gospel and on the comprehension of the latter, again with reference to the main point of the calling of the Gentiles for the kingdom of God, before the chief thread of his discourse is again taken up. St Paul does not name his apostolical office in general, but the dispensation of the grace of God, that to *him* was made known the mystery of the redemption by immediate revelation, and with special reference to the Gentiles, as that, with regard to which he shows himself uncertain in respect to his readers' knowledge of it. The subordinate clause ὅτι κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν κ.τ.λ. defines, that is to say, the idea of the chief clause εἴγε ἠκούσατε τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῆς χάριτος τ. Θ. κ.τ.λ. more accurately. (Verse 2. See on εἴγε and its relation to εἴπερ the remarks in the Comm. on Rom. viii. 9; 2 Cor. v. 3; Gal. iii. 4. Εἴγε here contains the idea of pre-supposition in itself: "that is to say, if you, as I may suppose, have heard."—On οἰκονομία see on i. 10. It cannot *here*, as at 1 Cor. ix. 17; Col. i. 25, mean "the apostolical office," as people have let themselves be misled into thinking *here* also by the latter parallel passage; on the contrary, the reference to the office here is couched in the χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ as the addition τῆς δοθείσης μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς shows, while Col. i. 25 relates to οἰκονομία. The οἰκονομία here denotes only the way how the office came into St Paul's hands, viz., κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν. In verse 7 κατὰ τὴν δωρεὰν τῆς χάριτος κ.τ.λ. stands together just in the same way, and in verse 8 St Paul himself explains the grace of his apostolical call to preach to the Gentiles.—In the εἰς ὑμᾶς the special reference to the Gentiles is again pointed to, for whom St Paul was espe-

cially called.—Verse 3. The ἀποκάλυψις relates, of course, to the occurrence at Damascus, Acts ix.—Instead of the reading of the *text. rec.* ἐγνώρισε, which was surely put in the text only on account of the ἐγνωρίσθη which follows in verse 5, we must read ἐγνωρίσθη on the authority of A.B.C.D.F.G., and with all the better critics and interpreters.)

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

Ver. 5. St Paul does not mean, in the words which follow, to explain why he calls this decree of God a μυστήριον, which is Meyer's opinion, but to place the apostolical form of revelation as the higher one, in comparison with all previous ones. The

decree of God in Christ is called a μυστήριον only, inasmuch as it cannot be perceived by human power, but only by means of divine revelation. Stress must, therefore, be laid on the ὡς νῦν ἀπεκαλύφθη, to which an οὐχ οὕτως ἐγνωρίσθη, as an antithesis, is to be understood. (The ὅ is connected with the μυστήριον immediately preceding, not with that in verse 3, which would be requisite if a parenthesis were supposed. Υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων is a general designation of men as such; St Paul certainly thought especially of the prophets of the Old Testament, but he seems designedly to conceive the idea in quite a general way: "the mystery has not been made known to men in general, wherever they may have been, and whenever they may have lived, as it is now revealed to the prophets." Γενεὰ denotes here *age, generation.* The ἐν is rejected by the MSS. with an overwhelming majority. The dative is usual in definitions of time.—See Winer's Gramm. p. 194. On the juxtaposition of ἀπόστολοι καὶ προφῆται see on ii. 20. The αὐτοῦ here added, which refers to God, is certainly genuine, since the omission of it is easily explained by ii. 20. But it is undoubtedly singular, that St Paul here calls the apostles, and, consequently, himself along with them, "*holy* apostles." Certainly it is carried too far, when De Wette finds in that a mark of the non-apostolical origin of the Epistle; but still the expression is unusual. I explain it to myself by the fact of St Paul's here conceiving the apostles and prophets as a corporation [see iv. 11], and gives them as such, therefore, in their official character, the predicate ἅγιος, just as he calls the faithful, considered as a body, ἅγιοι, or ἡγιασμένοι, but never an individual, ἅγιος, etc. The connection of ἁγίοις with ἐν πνεύματι, which Meier proposes, has no recommendation at all; ἐν πνεύματι is undoubtedly to be taken as a closer definition of ἀπεκαλύφθη.)

Ver. 6. The circumstance in which St Paul now finds the progress in the revelation of the mystery of Christ, as it was imparted to the apostles and prophets, is once more the calling of the Gentiles, along with the Jews, through the Gospel. But now *that* certainly seems to have been *already* clearly taught in the Old Testament also (see Isaiah lv. 5, lx. 3, ss. 10 ss.; Jerem. iii. 16, sq.), and, therefore, everything *specific* in the revelation in the New Testament to be lost! But, in the Old Testament, just *that* point, which was the decisive one in regard to the question as to the relation of the Gentiles to the Church, and which St Paul had to defend against the Jewish Christians, was not

discussed; the Gentiles were, it is true, represented in the Old Testament as called to the kingdom of the Messiah, but without any clear information on the point that they would enter it immediately, not through the medium of circumcision and of the ceremonial law. The universal character of Christianity was first completed by enlightenment on that decisive point. The apostles officially recognised that great truth, under the illumination of the Holy Ghost (Acts xv.); but St Paul was called, more than the rest, to translate it into life, and to defend it against all gainsayers. (The infinitive εἶναι connects itself with what precedes, as denoting, not the *design*, but only the *explanation*, "that is to say, that the Gentiles are to be," etc.—We have already had συγκληρονόμος, i. 14. Σύσσωμος, we may suppose, was invented by St Paul himself, it is found in ecclesiastical writers alone, who certainly borrowed the word from St Paul's Epistles. Συμμέτοχος is found also in v. 7.—There is no climax couched in the words; it rather seems as if the former expression was only more accurately defined by the two latter ones; however, the repetition of the σὺν is meant to put the leading idea in a clear light.—Lachmann has erased the αὐτοῦ before ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ on the authority of A.B.C.D. Only, one does not perceive who would have added it, if it were originally wanting in the text, whilst we can understand how it might easily have been blotted out by copyists.)

Ver. 7, 8. The apostle represents himself, then, as a servant of this Gospel, according to the grace bestowed on him to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles, but designates himself, in his humility, in spite of the grandeur of his call, as the least of all the saints; therefore, not merely of the holy apostles, but of all the saints, with reference to his former persecution of the Church of the Lord before his conversion. (Ver. 7. Compare Col. i. 23, 25, as a parallel passage.—As to δωρεὰ τῆς χάριτος, see on ver. 2. Ver. 8 explains more in detail what the χάρις consists in, viz. in the authority to preach the Gospel among the Gentiles.—Τῆς δοθείσης is, after Griesbach and Lachmann, to be justly preferred to the reading of the *text. rec.* τὴν δοθεῖσαν, as the χάρις, not the δωρεὰ, denotes the office.—On the combination ἐνέργειαν τῆς δυνάμεως, see i. 19. The mention of the power of God is founded on the circumstance that St Paul sees in his change of heart from a foe to a friend of Christ an act of omnipotence. Calvin had already taken it so quite correctly, saying on this passage: domini est homines nihili extollere; hæc est potentiæ ejus efficacia, ex nihilo grande aliquid efficere.—

Ver. 8. The designation of himself by St Paul as ἐλαχιστότερος πάντων ἁγίων is no false modesty. He was even well aware on the other hand [1 Cor. xv. 9, 10] that he had laboured more than they all, but *that* he ascribed to the grace of God alone, *himself* he knew only in his righteousness.—On the comparative form of the superlative see Winer's Gramm., p. 67, and Wetstein, ad h. l.—Ἀνεξιχνίαστος is found again at Rom. xi. 33.—On τὸ πλοῦτος see at ii. 7.)

Ver. 9. But St Paul's task as the preacher of the Gospel is further also to enlighten all men as to the preparation of the mystery of redemption which was hidden in God from eternity and revealed in Christ. The καὶ φωτίσαι πάντας cannot, as Meier will have it, form merely a more accurate definition of the ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαι, which precedes, but is a fresh idea. True, St Paul has first of all the task of preaching among the Gentiles, but afterwards also the one of enlightening all men on the mystery of Christ, and he therefore, according to the testimony of the Acts, really always offered the Gospel to the Jews first. Of course, however, the φωτίσαι πάντας is to be understood not of the actual result, but of the tendency of the office, so that what St Paul himself could not execute remained for his successors to do. Further, here is no occasion in the idea of the οἰκονομία τοῦ μυστηρίου to assert also the reference to the calling of the Gentiles to the kingdom of God, to which acceptation it may be supposed the reading κοινωνία owes its origin. In ver. 18, 19, St Paul himself explains the expression τίς ἡ οἰκονομία. It is to denote merely the riches of the divine grace which are revealed in the ordinance of redemption through Christ. This mystery, however, is designated as hidden in God from eternity in order to contrast the present in the νῦν, as the time of the revelation, with the past. But the object of the addition, τῷ τὰ πάντα κτίσαντι, is the most difficult thing to point out in this passage. For that the reading διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, which is wanting in all the better MSS., is not genuine, may be considered just as decidedly certain as the interpretation of the words of the *physical* not of the *spiritual* creation of the new birth, in conformity with the striking remarks of Harless ad. h. l. Usteri and Meier have again recommended the latter acceptation of the words in addition to Calvin, Calixtus, and others. But both the aorist of the participle and the τὰ πάντα require the reference of the words to the creation generally. But for what purpose does St Paul here exalt the creative energy of God? In order, we may suppose, to make it observed that the institution of the redemption

in Christ Himself is a creative act of God, and could emanate from Him only who has made all things; the Creator alone could also be the Redeemer. (On φωτίζειν see at i. 18. A.B.C.D.E.F.G. and other important critical authorities read οἰκονομία, so that there can be no question whatever as to the decision for it and against κοινωνία.—In addition to ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων = מֵעֹלָם, Gen. vi. 4, F.G. read also καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν. But this addition is quite incongruous, for it points to the historical development of mankind, but St Paul intends, as the ἐν τῷ Θεῷ shows, to speak of the metaphysical eternity, of the decree of redemption, as God conceived it in His eternal being, which is called πρόθεσις τῶν αἰώνων in the following verse.)

Ver. 10. The following idea is clear, it is true, when taken literally, but it contains a difficulty, partly in itself, partly in the connection of the passage. "The infinite wisdom of God," says St Paul ("which reveals itself in the Gospel—the mystery of redemption), is through the Church (as the theatre of His working) made known to the angels in heaven." According to this St Paul supposes the angels capable of an increase of their knowledge. We have no reason, on this occasion, to think of *good* angels *only* or *bad* angels *only*. St Paul speaks quite generally. All higher beings receive by means of the Church a deeper insight into God's wisdom. We found in the Gospels that sympathy with what goes on in the Church is attributed to the angels; to name one case, joy at the penitence of sinners (Luke xv. 10). St Paul says further, in the first Epistle to the Corinthians, "we are become a spectacle to the angels" (iv. 9); but *here* only is the discourse of an increase of their insight into God's wisdom through the Church and the events in her. An echo of it is also found in 1 Pet. i. 12 in the words, εἰς ἃ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἄγγελοι παρακύψαι. This idea now is difficult to conceive, since, as we cannot imagine in the angels any *propagation*, so neither can we imagine any *development*, nor, therefore, in general, any *history*. The earth, along with man, the bearer of her consciousness, appears, according to this idea of the apostle, again as the centre of God's workings, as the Golgotha of the universe. The universe takes part in the occurrences on her, not merely in the *contemplation* of them, but also in the actual reaction of them. The increase of knowledge in the angels is to be conceived as at the same time a change of their position; all that is in heaven and on earth is reconciled through Christ. (Ephes. i. 10; Col. i. 20.) The particular thing, however, which is now

first (νῦν), *i.e.* after the revelation of the hidden decrees of God, made known to them, as πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ, is the wonderful way of God in the pardon of the sinner, through the settlement in him of the antagonism between justice and grace. But how comes St Paul upon this idea here in this connection? St Paul wishes to contrast the grandeur of his call with his personal nothingness, and therefore pursues the theme of his labours through all its stages. "First of all," says he, "he has to preach among the Gentiles, then to enlighten all men as to the mystery, and both in order to make known the infinite wisdom of God even to the angels in heaven." (Νῦν is wanting in F.G., but it certainly is necessary to the context; it forms the antithesis to the eternal hiddenness of the divine decree.—As to ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, see on i. 3, 20. —Πολυποίκιλος is, it may be supposed, coined by St Paul himself, for it is not found again in Greek. It means properly *multiformis*, manifold, maniformed, polymorphous; as a predicate of God's wisdom it denotes the various forms in which it manifests itself.)

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

sible. The genitive αὐτοῦ relates to Christ; see on this construction in lieu of εἰς αὐτὸν the remarks in the Comm. on Rom. iii. 26.)

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

Ver. 14, 15. Here now St Paul resumes with τούτου χάριν the course of ideas from ver. 1, and utters the prayer for his readers, which should come in immediately after ii. 22. The bending of the knees is mentioned Acts xx. 36 as a symbol of devotion and humiliation before God. But the designation of the Father by the addition ἐξ οὗ κ. τ. λ. is peculiar here; for the words τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ here are decidedly not genuine, according to A.B.C., and indeed Lachmann has on that account justly erased them. The proposition ἐξ οὗ κ. τ. λ. is therefore immediately connected with πατέρα, by which means the reference to Christ is excluded, or rather God is designated in the most general sense as Father, *i.e.* as Creator of all beings. According to the special reference of the prayer to the Gentile Christians (ver. 1), the clause declares expressly that God is the Father of the Gentiles also, not of the Jews alone. The meaning of the clause ἐξ οὗ κ. τ. λ. is entirely determined by the acceptation of the word πατριά, for the formula ὀνομάζεσθαι ἐκ τινὸς cannot be translated

otherwise than: "to receive the name from something," and not as = εἶναι "to be," much less "to be made." Now πατριὰ is found again in the New Testament only at Luke ii. 4; Acts iii. 25, in the sense of φυλή, "family, the whole of those who are descended from one πατήρ." But the idea, "every family in heaven and on earth," has something unsuitable in it. That is to say, the reference to heaven can only extend to the world of angels, in regard to which, however, there can be no question of a φυλή, because no propagation takes place in it. Grotius, Wetstein, and Holzhausen, thought they could solve that difficulty by availing themselves of the Rabbinical idea, according to which the Jews are represented as the earthly, the angels as the heavenly, family of God. (See Buxtorf. lexic. talm. p. 1753. The Rabbis had received the word כְּמַלְאָךְ also.) But surely in this Epistle St Paul is precisely occupied with proving that Jews and Gentiles are equals; it is therefore utterly improbable that he would here pay any attention to that particular representation. And besides, then the article too would necessarily have had to be repeated before ἐν οὐρανοῖς and ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. Just as little admissible is another interpretation, according to which πατριὰ is taken in the sense of "fatherhood," πατρότης. For if that meaning *does* seem to afford a good sense, still it is not demonstrable that πατριὰ ever occurs so. Again, the idea "fatherhood in heaven" is unsuitable, because in the world of spirits no development takes place. The passage seems *then only* to become plain, when we take πᾶσα *here* too, as at ii. 21, in the sense of "entire," although the article is wanting. St Paul conceives in his mind all the beings of the creation in their two halves, the spiritual and the material world, as one posterity, as one family of God (compare ii. 19, οἰκεῖοι τοῦ Θεοῦ), and this entire family has its name of children from God. As to the sense, therefore, Luther's version: "all that are called children in heaven and on earth," is quite correct.

Ver. 16. The first thing which the apostle now begs of God for his readers, is, that He, according to the riches of His glory (which includes along with it His almighty power particularly), may strengthen them as to the inner man. The κραταιωθῆναι, which is further enforced by the adverbial δυνάμει, refers especially to the will; the strengthening of the will through God's Spirit alludes, however, to the fight which awaits all Christians. In the εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον, finally, the direction of the working of the Spirit is more accurately defined; the Divine Spirit operating in

the believer refers particularly not to the σῶμα, the ἔξω ἄνθρωπος, but to the human πνεῦμα, or the latter considered as a faculty, to the νοῦς, as the ἔσω ἄνθρωπος. Mention of this antithesis was made as far back as Rom. vii. 22, 23. The inner man is not=the καινὸς ἄνθρωπος, even the unregenerate man, living under the Law, has the ἔσω ἄνθρωπος, the νοῦς. But without the operation of divine grace through the Holy Ghost it remains in that ματαιότης (iv. 17), which makes it incapable of conquering; it is only through strength from above that the νοῦς becomes a conqueror. (See on Rom. vii. 25.)

Ver. 17, 18. The meaning of the κατοικῆσαι τὸν Χριστὸν διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν cannot in and for itself be doubtful after what has been observed at ii. 22. By it is denoted the indwelling of Christ, the Χριστὸς ἐν ἡμῖν (Col. i. 27), which realizes itself in the new birth through the working of the Holy Ghost on the *one* side, and of the receptivity of man (of the πίστις) on the *other*. (Compare the remarks on John xiv. 23; Gal. ii. 20.) But how is the idea here connected with what precedes and with what succeeds? St Paul cannot entreat God: ἵνα δῷη κατοικῆσαι τὸν Χριστὸν ἐν ὑμῖν, for surely Christ already dwelt in the hearts of the readers (ii. 22), inasmuch as they are treated by the apostle as regenerate. Certainly the regenerate man may by degrees be more and more strengthened in the work of sanctification by the inner man, but regeneration itself, and the dwelling of Christ in the heart connected with regeneration, are incapable of increase, they merely *are*, or they *are not*. This difficulty can only be removed by connecting the following words: ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἐῤῥιζωμένοι καὶ τεθεμελιωμένοι immediately with the κατοικῆσαι κ.τ.λ.—True, the passage being considered from a purely grammatical point of view, the connection of the clause ἐν ἀγάπῃ κ.τ.λ. seems to require a Metathesis of the ἵνα; but the isolation of the κατοικῆσαι τὸν Χριστὸν διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν thereby produced totally forbids that supposition, on account of the intrinsic difficulties. The Anacoluthus, which is accordingly to be supposed here (just as in Col. ii. 2), is excellently justified by Harless remarking (p. 318), "the change of construction (in the nominative of the participles) was the more natural here, that the predicate applied in like manner to καρδίαις and to ὑμῶν, therefore could be less properly joined exclusively with one of the two, and moreover the definition of the predicate as an essential point in the clause could not be subordinate to the preceding, but must appear independently." In this mode of

taking it then that great difficulty entirely vanishes. St Paul prays for the indwelling of Christ not as something else after the being strengthened in the inner man, but this latter appears as a subordinate definition only of the being strengthened, in this sense, that a dwelling of Christ in a mind not as yet established is distinguished from a dwelling in the established one. "That therefore Christ may by faith dwell in you, as in such as are established in love." The new birth is therefore presupposed in them, but St Paul beseeches God that they may wax in sanctification, that they may be firm also in their regeneration, and not relapse into their old ways. The τεθεμελιωμένοι has a retrospective reference to the above figure of the Temple (ii. 20, ss.); on the other hand, ἐρριζωμένοι is to be explained by the figure according to which the faithful are compared with plants. (Comp. Ps. i. 3; Matt. xv. 13.) But the ἀγάπη here cannot be God's or Christ's love towards the faithful, but *vice versâ* the love of the faithful towards *them*, which is the expression of the will strengthened by the Holy Ghost, which makes it capable of manifesting the faith in keeping the law, *i.e.* in love. However, that the article is wanting when properties are conceived as subjective possessions, —which Harless is pleased to assert,—I have been as little able to persuade myself as Winer was (Gramm. p. 113).

Ver. 18, 19. From this grounding in love next proceeds an increased insight into the essence of the Gospel, which insight is here taken telologically as the aim. As the object of the spiritual apprehension (see, on καταλαβέσθαι, Acts iv. 13, x. 34, xxv. 25) we must understand neither the ἀγάπη going before, nor the one coming after, but that mystery hidden from eternity (ver. 9, 10), which to the angels themselves is first made known through the works of God in the Church. The natural powers of man do not suffice for this καταλαβέσθαι, he is first made capable of it by the power of grace; therefore it is said ἵνα ἐξισχύσητε καταλαβέσθαι. But this comprehension is not restricted to this or that esoteric circle, as Meier thinks, choosing to understand the ἅγιοι of the apostles and prophets alone; it is rather to be referred to *all* believers. The four dimensions, that is to say, borrowed from the relations of space, are not, in connection with the καταλαβέσθαι, to be understood as denoting distinct, conceptional knowledge, just as little as the γνῶναι which follows (that is to say, such a one cannot indeed possibly be the possession of all believers in common), but of that comprehensive knowledge of essentials which

by implication knows everything, and which St John describes as the anointing of the Spirit which teaches everything. (See on 1 John ii. 27.) As the second point is then named the ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ, which is the root of the mystery itself, the length, breadth, depth, and height of which is to be comprehended. But the combination: γνῶναι τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς γνώσεως ἀγάπην, "to know the love, which passeth knowledge," forms an Oxymoron. The incomprehensible cannot be comprehended. One cannot well answer to *that*, that the knowledge to which love is to lead is the knew one operated by the Spirit, the other, which love surpasses, that of the natural man; for the love of Christ surpasses even the knowledge of the regenerate man. But the true knowledge of divine things, and also of the love of Christ, is just this, to recognise that it is the infinite which to a constantly increasing knowledge must ever present fresh aspects for knowledge. *At first* Luther had correctly rendered *this* passage also, "and know that the love of Christ surpasses all knowledge." But afterwards he allowed himself to be led astray, to understand the love of Christ of the love of men towards Christ, and translated; "and to know that to love Christ is better than all knowledge." (Ἐξισχύω does not differ in meaning from the simple verb; this is the only place in the New Testament in which it is found.—As to τί, see on i. 18.—As to ὑπερβάλλειν, see i. 19, ii. 7.) But the last words of ver. 19, ἵνα πληρωθῆτε εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ, are still difficult. However, if one compares i. 23, it cannot be doubtful that πλήρωμα τ. Θ, is *here* too the Divine Being, as comprising the fulness of life and of power. The referring πλήρωμα to the Church, which Koppe in particular has defended, is here inadmissible, as Meier has already well proved. The reading πληρωθῇ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα in B. was, we may suppose, devised by such copyists as thought they must interpret πλήρωμα of the Church. Then, with the reference to God, the meaning of the words would be this, "that ye may be filled (with all Christian gifts and virtues) unto the complete fulness of God, *i.e.* that ye may be so filled, as God is filled," according to Christ's word: "ye shall be perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect." (Matt. v. 48, on which see the remarks in the Comm.) But is not that already couched in the κατοικῆσαι Χριστὸν (ver. 17)? Where Christ, the living Son of God, dwells, is surely πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ already. Christ in us and we in Christ are to be carefully distinguished. The new birth begins with Christ being in the heart, but it is only by degrees that

the new man grows up from childhood to manhood, so that we are also completely in Christ. This aspect of the personal completion in the new birth, up to manhood in Christ, is here denoted by the πληρωθῆναι εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ.

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

II.

PART SECOND.

(IV. 1–VI. 24.)

§ 4. THE UNITY OF THE FAITH.

(IV. 1–16.)

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

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

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

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

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

Ver. 4–6. How unity, and consequently union, among the faithful is a necessary condition of their successful development,

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

The following subjects (ver. 5, 6) appear now as the cardinal points which the universal Church has inwardly recognised as the supports of her life. The question here is not as to the determining of the doctrine upon those points, but as to those points as such. St Paul does not say, "the Church has exactly the same doctrine as to the Lord, the faith," etc., but, "she has but one Lord, she has but one baptism," etc.—Now, no doubt it is true that, by false doctrine, truth concerning the Lord—faith, baptism, nay, God Himself—can be made something totally different; but it is just as true, that differences in doctrine may exist without the nature of the objects of faith suffering by them. According to the apostle's meaning, therefore, *those* errors in

doctrine are alone to be excluded here, which destroy the unity of the essential objects of *faith*. According to this acceptation, it may justly be said this passage belongs to those which give information upon the fundamental articles, as 1 Cor. xv. 3, ss.; Heb. vi. 1, sq.; 1 John iv. 2. At first sight, however, the collocation of the words seems improper; *i.e.* one expects the Father to be put before the Son. But St Paul begins with Christ, because all new life in man proceeds from Him; faith is lighted at Him; baptism, which supposes, and does not make, faith, relates to Him: the Father is named last, because it is only through baptism, *i.e.* taken subjectively, through the new birth, that man recognises *himself* as *child*, and *God* as *Father*. In the next place, it might seem odd that the Lord's Supper is not mentioned. Harless explains this by the assumption "that St Paul here names only the fundamental conditions of Christian communion, as they exist with regard to every one at his first entrance into the same." But, surely, that is as true of the Lord's Supper as of baptism, since, in the early Church, at the baptism of adults, the Lord's Supper followed directly after baptism. If one reflects, that in no one of the passages treating of the fundamental articles is mention made of the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. xv. 6; Heb. vi. 2; 1 John iv. 2), there can be no doubt that the omission of the Lord's Supper must be explained in some other way. The enjoying Christ is what is specific in the Sacrament, though it belongs to faith also, leaving out of sight the exterior act of the Lord's Supper. (See on John vi. 40, 47, 54.) In the εἷς κύριος, μία πίστις, accordingly, the participation of the Lord in the Lord's Supper is also included, *i.e.* as faith is not the *fides quæ creditur* (in which sense it surely included all the rest of the points named), but the *fides quâ creditur;* so also mention is made of the Lord, not merely as known outwardly, but as possessed inwardly, by man. But now, according to the preceding exposition (ii. 11–18), there appeared as the leading idea, which brings St Paul to this dissertation on the unity of the faith, the like right, competence, of the Gentiles as of the Jews to an entrance into the kingdom of God. That St Paul *here* too again addresses himself especially to the Gentile Christians is shown by ver. 1 compared with ver. 17. According to this, we can understand this description (ver. 4–6) also in the meaning of the apostle only thus: "Gentiles, like Jews, have but one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God." The πάντων, therefore, cannot be taken as a

neuter, it must be taken as a masculine. Whilst the Jews considered God as *their* Father exclusively, and not as the Father of the Gentiles also, St Paul calls Him πατὴρ πάντων. But of course afterwards again, in the last words of ver. 6, ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ διὰ πάντων καὶ ἐν πᾶσι can be taken as the masculine only. The MSS. D.E.F.G. add ἡμῖν to πᾶσι, which is to be regarded as a perfectly correct interpretation, but can put forward no pretensions to be received into the text. It remains to be said, that we became acquainted as far back as Rom. xi. 36 with this sort of designation, according to which God is represented, in His various relations to His creatures, by means of various prepositions, as Lord over all, and the origin whence they arise, as the instrument through which they are, as the element in which, and the object for which, they exist,—and this as the simplest expression of the relation of the respective persons in the Holy Trinity.

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

Ver. 8–10. But now, instead of directly describing the different gifts themselves more accurately, and so calling on each man well to fill his place in the great whole, St Paul introduces a series of ideas, which is not only difficult in itself, but, through the way in which it is connected with what precedes and what succeeds it, belongs to the obscurest passages of the New Testament, to the real *crucibus interpretum*, and for that reason has also been obliged to put up with the most discrepant interpretations. If we, first of all, consider this passage quite generally as to the manner of its insertion in the body of St Paul's discourse, it seems

altogether unadvisable to separate it by crotchets from what precedes and what succeeds, as a totally incidental subordinate remark. For, apart from the consideration that it must surely always be one's last resource, to charge the author with having introduced into a discourse, which is strictly progressive, something completely heterogeneous, and without any connection with what precedes it, here the διὸ in ver. 8, and the καὶ αὐτὸς ἔδωκε in ver. 11 (which refers back to the αὐτός ἐστι καὶ ὁ ἀναβὰς), are so decidedly in favour of the writer's intention of meaning to insert ver. 8–10 in the context, that the interpreter must rather look for the fault in *himself*, if he cannot point to the connecting thread of the discourse, than *his author*. Accordingly, if we start with the supposition, that St Paul intended to make here no far-fetched, nor even only *incidental*, remark, but proceeds strictly in his argumentation, the first question that arises is: what does St Paul want to prove by the quotation, what does the διὸ λέγει, scil. ἡ γραφή, refer to? Since there occur in the quotation the words: ἔδωκε δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, and it was said in ver. 7: ἑνὶ ἑκάστῳ ἡμῶν ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις, it is most natural to say: St Paul does not mean by the quotation especially to represent Christ as the dispenser of the gifts, but to prove from the Old Testament itself the universality of the gifts of Christ, and therefore the equal right of the Gentiles; He has by His redemption bestowed gifts not on these persons, or those, not on the Jews alone, but on men as such, on the human race.[1] The stress, would, therefore, have to be laid on the last word, τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, not on ἔδωκε δόματα. It is true, F.G. read ἐν before τοῖς, but that reading can make no claim to reception, it is merely taken from the LXX., of the constitution of whose text we shall speak more in detail presently. The other difficulties which we find in the quotation are, it is true, considerable, but have nothing to do with the main difficulty in this passage, the connection with the context; ver. 8 suits it very well. Let us first treat of those particular stumbling-blocks, which result from the form of the quotation, ere we pass to the discussion of what follows.

The passage Ps. lxviii. 19 (according to the Septuagint Ps.

[1] Harless gives (p. 362) as the sense of the passage according to St Paul's design: "The identity of the God of the Psalm with Christ, from which the way, in which Christ leads His follower whither he will, follows, as an ordinance previously intimated and determined on by God (vers. 10, 11)." I confess I don't see how Christ's humiliation and ascension to fulfil all things can be connected with the above train of ideas.

lxvii. 19) is taken from a poem, in which Jehovah, the God of Israel, who went forth before the people in the wilderness (ver. 8), is described as victor over all His enemies. Although Ps. lxviii. is no *direct* prophecy *of* Christ, still, according to this purport of it, its typical allusion to the Redeemer was obvious, since it was the God of Israel, the Son of God, the Revealer of the hidden Father, who was made man in Christ, and completed the divine victory in the work of atonement. The assumption, therefore, that we have here not a quotation from the Psalm, but one from an unknown Christian hymn, which Storr and Flatt proposed, is plainly quite inadmissible, and the mere production of the embarrassment how to smooth down the divergence in the quotation from both the original text and the LXX. That is to say, it seems striking that the *first words*, indeed, of the quotation: ἀναβὰς εἰς ὕψος ἠχμαλώτευσεν (for which A. and some MSS. of less importance read ἠχμαλωτεύσας after the LXX.) αἰχμαλωσίαν, harmonize exactly with the LXX. and the original text, but those very words, which are decisive for the carrying on of the connection, viz. ἔδωκε δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, deviate from the Hebrew text and from the LXX. That is to say, those first words describe in an Oxymoron our redemption by Christ, which appears completed by His ἀναβαίνειν εἰς ὕψος = עָלִיתָ לַמָּרוֹם; but in the context of this passage mention is made, not of redemption through Christ, but of the gifts of Christ, which He has got for the human race. It remains therefore, it is true, in reference to what precedes, only a subordinate idea, that the bestowing gifts by Christ is put in connection with the completion of redemption through the return of the Son to the Father; but we shall see in the sequel of the interpretation that St Paul knows how to use it skilfully for his chief object in what follows. (For the rest, see on this connection between the completion of Christ and His work with the gifts of the Spirit, John vii. 39, xiv. 12, xvi. 17, and the remarks on those passages in the Comm.) But now as to the words which differ in the second half of the quotation, they run thus in the Hebrew: לָקַחְתָּ מַתָּנוֹת בָּאָדָם, *i.e.* "thou hast taken gifts to man;" the LXX. give it: ἔλαβες δόματα ἐν ἀνθρώποις (for which some MSS. read ἀνθρώπῳ). At first sight there certainly seems to exist here not merely a *difference* from the apostle's: ἔδωκε δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, but a complete *contradiction*. Whilst St Paul talks of *giving*, the text of the Hebrew speaks of *taking*. This contradiction seemed so insurmountable to Whiston, that he made the naïve

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

Now, in verse 9, the idea: τὸ δὲ ἀνέβη τί ἐστιν, εἰ μὴ ὅτι καὶ

κατέβη, *i.e.* "what does the ascension mean other than that he that *a*scended has also *de*scended," is quite intelligible in itself. That is to say, in the case of *men* it does not follow from the ἀναβαίνειν, it is true, that a καταβαίνειν preceded, but certainly in the case of the God that dwells in heaven if it is said: "God ascends," it necessarily follows from that circumstance that He has previously *de*scended. But what induces St Paul to take up out of the quotation the idea of the ἀναβαίνειν, and to follow it up through two verses, since it certainly belongs to that part of the quotation which we were obliged to designate as containing the main-thread of the line of argument? One would have expected that the words ἔδωκε δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις would form the basis of the more extended deduction. On the answering of this question much depends for the understanding of the whole of this difficult passage; but it cannot be derived from the ideas ἀναβαίνειν and καταβαίνειν alone, but only from the more accurate definition, which they receive through ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν, and εἰς τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς. Since this latter expression again is the condition preliminary of the former, we require only a more accurate investigation as to the meaning of the formula τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς. (Lachmann has still preserved the μέρη in the text, but, as it is wanting in B.E.F.G., and the addition of it is easily explained, while the omission of it is difficult to account for, we view it in accordance with the best later interpreters as a gloss, which however is quite correct according to the sense. The πρῶτον before εἰς has been blotted out of the text ever since Mill and Bengel's time by all the better critics.) Since the phrase is not found again in the New Testament, we are in regard to it obliged to have recourse to the Old Testament, where the expression תַּחְתִּיּוֹת אֶרֶץ in general is considered as answering to the one here. But in the three passages in which it occurs it has every time a different meaning. In Ps. lxiii. 10 it denotes the world of the dead, the Sheol, and is rendered by the LXX. τὰ κατώτατα τῆς γῆς. In Ps. cxxxix. 15 it denotes the womb, and here too the LXX. translate it τὰ τατώτατα τῆς γῆς. But in the third passage, Isaiah xliv. 23, it denotes the earth in opposition to heaven, and here the LXX. render it by θεμέλια τῆς γῆς. In Ezekiel we find the cognate phrase: אֶרֶץ תַּחְתִּיּוֹת, which is, however, constantly rendered by βάθος or βάθη τῆς γῆς (compare Ezek. xxvi. 10, xxxii. 18, 24), as a designation of the Sheol. On the other hand, Ezek. xxxi. 16, אֶרֶץ תַּחְתִּית is rendered ἡ γῆ κάτω (κάτω is wanting, however, in

several MSS.), just as in Isaiah li. 6, אֶרֶץ מִתַּחַת is translated ἡ γῆ κάτω. But in the formulas בּוֹר תַּחְתִּיּוֹת (Ps. lxxxviii. 7; Lamen. iii. 55), שְׁאוֹל תַּחְתִּיָּה, the LXX. have always preserved the κατώτατος, translating λάκκος or ᾅδης κατώτατος. The result of this comparison is, therefore, that the comparative form τὰ κατώτερα does not occur in the Old Testament for the formula תַּחְתִּיּוֹת אֶרֶץ and similar modes of expression, though the superlative form κατώτατα does. But even the latter, the superlative, is not used when mention is made of the earth absolutely in opposition to heaven (τὰ θεμέλια τῆς γῆς, or ἡ γῆ κάτω, is used for it), but firstly of the place of the dead, the Sheol, and that, too, predominantly, and secondly of the womb in the remarkable passage Ps. cxxxix. 15 (cxxxviii. 15). (In this latter passage the reading ἐν τοῖς κατωτάτω is found in some MSS. of the LXX. instead of ἐν τοῖς κατωτάτοις.) After this we can at once reject the interpretation of the τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς of *death* as Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Œcumenius wish), or of *the grave* (according to Beza and Baumgarten), as inadmissible. But even the interpretation of the phrase of *the earth*, so that καταβαίνειν εἰς τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς might denote Christ's being made man, which has defenders of such number and importance, to name some, Schöttgen, Grotius, Storr, Winer, Harless, seems to have nothing to recommend it after this. The passage in Acts ii. 19, which is appealed to, and where ὁ οὐρανὸς ἄνω and ἡ γῆ κάτω are put in opposition to each other, can, after what has been said above, decide nothing as to our phrase; τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς is something different from ἡ γῆ κάτω. To take the genitive τῆς γῆς as *genitivus appositionis* (see Winer's Gramm. p. 336) is admissible, it is true, in a grammatical point of view, but is in this phrase by no means founded on Hellenistic custom of language; the genitive in it rather denotes the locality in which the depths are, as the parallel βάθος τῆς γῆς plainly shows. Neither is καταβαίνειν ever used of Christ's incarnation. Moreover, the interpretation of the comparative κατώτερα by the comparison of the earth with heaven will not bear inspection. For such a comparison is made in all the passages which are quoted, and even in Acts ii. 19, but nowhere is the comparative found; it is constantly *thus* the formula runs: ἡ γῆ κάτω. There is also another difficulty, which can be removed in a forcible way only, viz. that along with the ἀναβαίνειν there stands the corroborative phrase ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν, which is clearly put as an equi-

valent, corroborative of the antithesis τὰ κατώτερα. A simple καταβαίνειν εἰς τὴν γῆν would be put in opposition to the mere ἀναβαίνειν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν (as in verse 8 ἀναβὰς εἰς ὕψος stands); but since St Paul raises the ἀναβαίνειν εἰς ὕψος to the ἀναβαίνειν ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν (a phrase, which is explained by the well-known assumption of several heavenly regions, see at 2 Cor. xii. 2), the more emphatical τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς also comes in instead of the simple καταβαίνειν. Whilst the ἀναβαίνειν ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν denotes not merely the being taken up *into* heaven (which is accorded to *men* too), but also the being set *over* all things that were made, the καθίζειν ἐν δεξίᾳ Θεοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας κ.τ.λ. (see at i. 20), the καταβαίνειν εἰς τὰ κατώτερα γῆς γῆς denotes the deepest depth answering to the highest height. As our Lord's death is wont to be named to denote the former, it is intelligible how the notion could be hit on of explaining our phrase of *death* or *the grave*, against which, however, as we saw, is the custom of the language with regard to the Hebrew formula. Very important reasons, therefore, stand opposed to the taking the τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς = ἡ γῆ κάτω.

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

There remains, then, assuming the identity of our phrase with the Hebrew parallels, only the interpretation, according to which τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς is supposed to denote the Sheol, the dead world, which, after Jerome and Ambrose, the Roman Catholic interpre-

ters especially, and among the Protestants Calovius, Bengel, and Rückert, and others, have defended before all; to those accepting this interpretation it was natural to understand by the liberated αἰχμαλωσία (verse 8) the souls liberated from Hades by Christ, and after this it was thought that there had thus been found in our passage a leading one, along with that 1 Peter iii. 18, to prove Christ's descent into Hell. Now much, no doubt, in the ver. 8–10 is in favour of that assumption; to name two points, the custom of the dialect of the Old Testament, as well in regard to the κατώτερα τῆς γῆς, as to the καταβαίνειν, which usually occurs of Hades (see the above-cited passages), and the antithesis with the ὑπεράνω πάντων οὐρανῶν. But, on the other side, in the case of *this* interpretation, too, great difficulties occur. The comparative here strikes us more still than in the case of the interpretation of the earth absolutely; for, first, the Old Testament has always the form τὰ κατώτατα of the Sheol, and second, the nature of the thing also seems to require the plural, inasmuch as Hades is supposed in the depth of the earth, ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τῆς γῆς. (See Matt. xii. 40.) But then with this interpretation the connection, too, is completely dissolved. For, since in verse 7 the discourse was of the communication of the Holy Spirit to the *living* (ἑνὶ ἑκάστῳ ἡμῶν), how is the διὸ λέγει then to bring about a connection between that idea and those that had been delivered from Hades by Christ, consequently the *dead?*—But now the number of the possible interpretations seems exhausted with that one, if, that is to say, one starts with the supposition of the identity of the τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς with the Hebrew תַּחְתִּיּוֹת אֶרֶץ. As no interpretation of the passage which starts with that hypothesis is without difficulty, it might be fit just to consider the phrase τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς without reference to the Hebrew phrase. For the still remarkable form of the comparative might seem to be in favour of the independence of our formula. If one lays a stress upon that, the κατώτερα μέρη might form an antithesis to the ἀνωτερικὰ μέρη (cf. Acts xix. 1), the former of which denote the low tracts of country lying on the sea shore, while the latter denote the inner and higher ones. (See Wetstein's New Testament, vol. ii., p. 579.) This might be symbolically referred to the regions inhabited by Gentiles, in accordance with the custom of the language, according to which Jerusalem and Mount Sion with the Temple are considered, not so much as a physical, but as a moral, height, to which one ascends from all sides. This idea of the descending to the

most forsaken of the human race would certainly suit the context of the whole passage very well, for we saw *that* in the very beginning of the exposition of this passage, that St Paul has here the opposition between Jews and Gentiles again before his eyes, and wishes to make it observed that Christ obtained *those* gifts too. But how can it be said that the Redeemer descended to the Gentiles? It would be clearly arbitrary to understand this idea of the half-Gentile Galilee, or to say it referred to the fact that Christ was preached by the apostles among the Gentiles; the καταβαίνειν here, equally with the ἀναβαίνειν, must be taken necessarily as a personal act of Christ's. We here, therefore, find the way out completely closed, and come to the conclusion, that no stress can be laid on the comparative form, and that the identity of our formula with תַּחְתִּיּוֹת אֶרֶץ is to be maintained. Since the meaning of it in the translation κατώτατα τῆς γῆς according to the LXX., which St Paul had *here* too, as usual, before his eyes, is constantly Hades, we shall just be obliged to be contented with this meaning. Now, after the above criticised interpretation of our passage, according to which the meaning "Hades" was employed, it was especially the impossibility of pointing out a connection, which deterred us from it. But this interruption of the connection is not so much brought about through the idea "Hades," as through the interpretation of the αἰχμαλωσία which precedes, by which the souls in Hades are to be understood, and which is connected with the explanation of the τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς as applying to Hades. The idea of verse 9: "the expression, 'He ascended,' what else does it say but that He (the person ascending) also *de*scended first into Hades?" stands in no disturbing connection with the whole context; the addition "into Hades" merely strengthens the idea of the καταβαίνειν, like the addition "down to the earth," also, according to the other interpretation. If we, therefore, interpret αἰχμαλωσία only of men upon earth, inasmuch as they are fettered by sin, and, if we look to the bottom of the question, by the prince of this world, and particularly, too, of the Gentile world as the part of it which lay most of all in the bonds of darkness, the principal stumbling-block against the interpretation of our passage of Hades, viz., that it interrupts the connection, is removed. But certainly by that interpretation the passage loses its dogmatical importance; that is to say, it only teaches that Christ *went to* Hades, but the idea that he *redeemed* the prisoners in Hades falls to the ground. The going to Hades is the

natural consequence of the real death of our Lord; *that* may, therefore, be concluded from the nature of death, but that He was working among the dead as the Redeemer, *that* is a new idea, for which we now have only 1 Pet. iii. 18 remaining. But if we thus consider the descent to Hades as the fulfilment of death, then, too, the objection falls to the ground that the καταβαίνειν εἰς τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς forms no antithesis to the ἀναβαίνειν ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν, because Christ's descent into Hell did not belong to the state of abasement, but to that of exaltation. For here the question is not principally as to those two states, and their line of demarcation, but merely as to the contrast of the ἀνέβη and κατέβη, for which reason also the addition εἰς τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς is not at all to be considered as a necessary point in the train of argument, but merely as adding force to the κατέβη. If κατέβη stood alone, the exposition would have to be taken in just the same way as with the addition. This contrast of ἀνέβη and κατέβη, however, is meant to show, that the same Lord, who has power over all, has not shrunk from descending to the lowest depths, and that, too, for the purpose of filling everything with His gracious presence, and, consequently, with His gifts also—not merely the Jews, but the Gentiles also. Thus the double αὐτὸς, in ver. 10, 11, is explained, and the transition to the distribution of the gifts (ver. 11), of which St Paul had already begun to speak in ver. 7. Although, therefore, the passage still remains an exceedingly difficult one, we may yet hope, by this interpretation, to have substantially removed the stumbling-blocks, and especially brought the connection of ver. 8–10, with St Paul's whole train of argument, to light. To facilitate a general view of the result of the exposition, we subjoin a paraphrastic translation of the whole piece. "The Church is one body and one spirit; she has one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father (ver. 6.) But grace is not uniformly distributed among believers. It is given, it is true, to each of us, Gentiles as well as Jews, but, according to the measure of the gift of Christ, to one more, to another less (ver. 7). Therefore, too, say the Scriptures: He has, by ascending up on high, redeemed the captives (especially the Gentiles), and given gifts unto all men (ver. 8). But the ascension necessarily presupposes (in Christ, the Son of God) a descent, *i.e.* a partaking of the misery of those fettered by sin even unto death, *i.e.* even unto the depths of Hades (ver. 9). He that descended is Himself

also He who ascended up far above all heavens, and rules over all the powers of the universe, in order to fill all things with His power, and to give gifts unto each (Gentiles as well as Jews), according to the capacity and the calling of each (ver. 10). He Himself has made some apostles, others prophets," etc. Thus, then, the above-mooted question, why St Paul connects ver. 9 with the ἀνέβη, and not with the ἔδωκε δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, which seems to contain the leading idea, meets with its answer. That is to say, this is done because St Paul wishes, by the ἀνέβη and κατέβη, to carry out the idea of the totality which Christ governs, and which, to him, is important beyond everything, in order, by that means, to make it evident that He obtained His gifts for *all*. With this appears at last plainly the bearing of exhortation also in the passage. Each (according to ver. 2) is to walk with lowliness and meekness; therefore the Gentiles are not to overvalue themselves, nor, on the other hand, are the Jews to despise the Gentiles. Christ is the example of true lowliness. He, the highest, descended to the lowest deeps, in order to fill all things with His life. According to this, Phil. ii. 5, ss., where also Christ is set up as a type of humility, in that He humbled Himself, but was, on that account, exalted by God, so that all in heaven, in earth, and under the earth, adore Him, seems very similar. Here, therefore, an allusion is made to Hades, too, for the completion of the idea of the universe.

Ver. 11. In the following enumeration, the gifts give way to the offices for which the gifts qualify, whereas, in the parallel passage, 1 Cor. xii. 28, it was the contrary. (See the remarks in the Comm. on Rom. xii. 6, ss.; 1 Cor. xii. 28.) The apostles differ from the prophets in such a way, that (see, as to the idea of the προφήτης, the Comm. on 1 Cor. xiv. 1) the apostles, as such, are, it is true, prophets, but the prophets, as such, are not, conversely, apostles. This latter expression is to be taken here in its most special sense, as denoting the twelve along with St Paul. As to the rest, it is self-evident that the fancy of the Irvingites, that there must be always apostles and prophets in the Church, has no foundation at all in the Scriptures; just as little do the apostles correspond to the later bishops. The εὐαγγελισταὶ are such teachers as, journeying about, laboured for the wider extension of the Gospel, as Theodoret had already correctly interpreted οἱ περιϊόντες ἐκήρυττον. (See Eusebii, H. E. iii. 37, v. 10.) On the other hand, the ποιμένες and διδάσκαλοι are such

teachers as are permanently settled with one church; in the *former* the *administrative power* is predominant, in the *latter* the *didactic office*, as in 1 Cor. xii. 28, the κυβέρνησις is distinguished from the διδασκαλία. This passage, therefore, is certainly not fitted to furnish data for the organization of churches in the first ages; the *two latter* expressions *alone* relate to it. (See Rothe on the Church, Wittenberg, 1837, p. 257.) (Ἔδωκε, for which ἔθετο stands in 1 Cor. xii. 28, answers to the Hebrew נָתַן.) But now it might seem difficult that, in ver. 11, the above idea, conceived quite generally, "to each of us is grace given, according to the measure of the gift of Christ" (ver. 7), here appears restricted to *the teachers alone*, as if the laymen had no gift distributed to *them*. But, first, *all* the expressions are not designations of offices in the Church; the gift of the προφητεία, like other gifts of grace, *laymen too* could have; and, secondly, *some* gifts only are here named instead of *all*. 1 Cor. xii. shows that there were many more. It clearly results, from ver. 16, that St Paul here speaks, not to the *teachers* only, but to all Christians without exception.

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

Ver. 13. But the object of the perfecting of the saints is further

that all may come to the unity of the faith, and to the knowledge of the Son of God. The first person of the verb (καταρτήσωμεν), with the article before πάντες, points to the fact that St Paul includes *himself* in the body of those who are engaged in the development of Church-life. That is no mere figure of speech; Phil. iii. 13 plainly shows that St Paul knew his individual life to be not yet perfected, he pressed towards the mark (to see) whether he might lay hold on it. The direct putting forward the totality, no doubt, again refers, according to ver. 7 and 16, to the placing the Gentiles and the Jews on a par; the *former* too, St Paul means to say, take their place in the great whole, *they* too are to grow up unto perfection. But, it is asked, of *what* growth is mention here made; whether of that of the individuals in themselves, or of that of the body of believers? Of the growth of both together, for, along with the separate members, the whole Church also grows up from childhood through youth unto manhood (1 John ii. 13, sq.) But does St Paul refer in the sequel to perfecting of the individuals and of the whole here below, or yonder in the other world? St Paul doubtless did not imagine this in his own mind at all as an antithesis. To him the Church is one, and one only; it is not only those living on earth that constitute her, but those also who died in the faith. That body forms itself into a compact, organic whole, in which each has to occupy his place; if he has attained it, then the μέτρον ἡλικίας exists for him also. The absolute revelation of the Church, therefore, in full manhood certainly occurs first in the kingdom of God, but as St Paul at that time encouraged *his* cotemporaries, so every teacher can in every age encourage *his* on their part to strive on unto the perfect manhood of Christ, and the true strivers of every generation attain this their mark, yea actually already while here below, according to the calling and talent of each. Were not *that* the meaning of St Paul's exposition, the ἑνότης τῆς πίστεως could not be made such a point of, for in the other world faith has passed into contemplation. But now it seems strange in this passage that the mark, to which all are to come forward, is designated as the ἑνότης τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ. It seems that faith and the knowledge of the Son of God is the beginning of the life of faith, not the highest aim of its development; as it was indeed actually said, even already in ver. 3, "that all might *preserve* the unity of the Spirit (they were already, therefore, *in* that unity), because the Church is one body and one Spirit, has one Lord, one faith," etc.

Even the coupling "faith and knowledge" together is striking, for it might be easily thought that St Paul said: "until we, taking faith as a starting-point, press forward to knowledge," in which case the ἐπίγνωσις would seem like a step gained going forth from the basis of faith, but in the parallel juxtaposition the unity of the faith is always set up as the mark, whilst it seems to be the beginning of the development in the new birth. We might think we were able to resolve this considerable difficulty in the following manner. Either, 1, a stress might be laid on οἱ πάντες, in the sense that the advance consists in the circumstance that *all* arrive at the point to which many have already attained. But the first person of the verb (by which, as we have seen, St Paul includes himself, and consequently all the apostles, among those who are to arrive at the unity of the faith and knowledge), is against that interpretation. Or, 2, a stress might be laid upon ἑνότης; it is true all Christians, as such, have faith and the knowledge of Christ, but their task is to attain to unity in them. That might mean, in the first place, "that they may all attain to the same faith, the same knowledge," but that identity is surely already, in ver. 2, presupposed to exist in his readers: he that has not the right faith and the right knowledge has really none at all at bottom. Secondly, however, the stress laid on the unity of faith and knowledge might also be taken so that what each has in himself is to melt away into an organic unity, in the following sense: "that all may attain to unity in faith and knowledge (which are presupposed"). Then the advance would consist in the growing up of individuals into the unity, supporting one another reciprocally. But if *that* were meant to be the meaning of the words, ἐν τῇ πίστει would be put instead of ἑνότης τῆς πίστεως, κ.τ.λ., and in what follows εἰς ἕνα ἄνθρωπον τέλειον must necessarily have been put, as it stands ii. 15. It is to be added that *that* idea does not correspond with the truth in the development of the Church; believers do not stand, first of all, each for himself in faith and knowledge, and then grow up in the progress of development among one another unto unity; but each is immediately in the new birth born into the unity of the whole as a living grown member. Or, 3, and lastly, a stress might be laid on ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, so that the discourse would be, not of the unity of the faith and knowledge in general, but of that of the Son of God, to which one was to attain. Certainly St Paul uses the name ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ but seldom, and where he does it is emphatically of the divine nature of Christ. (See at 2 Cor. i. 9; Gal. ii 20.) Now,

if one considers how St Paul, in the Epistle to the Colossians of the same date (i. 16, ss.), zealously defends the divine nature of our Lord against false teachers, one might suppose one's self obliged to assume here a polemical allusion, in the sense that St Paul sees the progress of the development in the circumstance that all have overcome Ebionitish and Arian representations of Christ. But we have already seen in the Introduction (and we shall immediately, viz. at ver. 14, come back to it), that polemical references nowhere appear in the Epistle to the Ephesians; we can the less recognise the like in this passage, that it treats solely of the development of the Church in itself in the totality of her members, and not of contrasts. Only this must be conceded, that *here* too the leading idea of the whole Epistle, viz. that the Gentiles have just as much part in the kingdom of God as the Jews, floats before St Paul's mind in such a way that he ascribes to the Gentile Christians also a share in the development of the Church. Besides, by that plan of laying a stress upon υἱὸς τ. Θ., it would seem as if Ebionitish and Arian errors were necessary in the beginning of Christian life, and were able to be surmounted by degrees only; a representation which certainly cannot be justified as Scriptural.

The only correct interpretation of this very difficult passage is, I am convinced, that, according to which the phrase ἡ ἑνότης τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ is understood not as if there were two different things named in it, viz., first, the unity of the faith, and, secondly, the unity of knowledge (in which acceptation the passage is quite inconsistent with all that the Scriptures elsewhere teach as to the beginning of the life of faith, and the mode of its development), but so that *one* unity alone is meant, viz. that which is possible between faith and between knowledge. The progress in development of which St Paul here speaks consists in the circumstance that faith and knowledge are made one, *i.e.* that faith, with which the Christian life begins, is really exalted to knowledge. It is true, no doubt, that, at the very first beginning even of regeneration, faith does not exist without knowledge, but *that* knowledge, which exists together with faith, is that *implicit* knowledge which is eternal life itself (John xvii. 3). But the *explicit* knowledge, which has appropriated to itself the total substance of faith, is the fruit of the complete inner development alone. (See as to the relation between the developed and the undeveloped gnosis, as also of the charismatic and non-charismatic gnosis, the observations in the Comm. on 1 Cor. xii. 7, ss., xiii.

9.) According to this acceptation of our passage, the parallel passage, 1 John ii. 13, sq., comes out in the plainest light; that is to say, *here* too the knowledge of Him who was from the beginning, *i.e.* Christ, is represented as the characteristic of fatherhood, *i.e.* of manhood in Christ. (See the details in the Comm. ad h. l. Lücke erroneously wishes the terms: fathers, young men, children, to be taken in a physical sense; they plainly denote steps in the development of the inner life. The physical periods of life, as such, have no influence on the position of men with regard to the Gospel; an old man may be a child in Christ, a youth may, on the other hand, be a man in the Lord.) In Col. iii. 10, too, the ἐπίγνωσις appears as the object of the renewal in the image of the Creator. In it is expressed the idea that beings recognise only those related to them; therefore God recognises the soul that has been made divine and no other. But the knowledge is here especially referred to the Son of God, because in Christ all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge lie shut up (Col. ii. 3), so that he who knows Him knows all. (1 John ii. 27.) But how that comprehensive knowledge is related to the ἐκ μέρους γινώσκειν, and how in the perfected γνῶσις here below the foundation of the Christian life (the πίστις) is never taken up, has been already detailed at 1 Cor. xiii. 9. It remains to be said that the truth of the striving to attain to the ἑνότης of the πίστις and of the ἐπίγνωσις, which pervades the whole history of the development of the Church, receives a complete confirmation through this passage of the apostle's. Lastly, the concluding words of ver. 13 characterise epexegetically the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of Christ. The phrase εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον denotes manhood, in which the idea of personality and of self-consciousness is completely expressed. (Τέλειος is the opposite of νήπιος. See Heb. v. 13, 14.) This phrase is totally different from the εἰς ἕνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον (ii. 15), by which is denoted no degree of development, but the union of what was before separate in the human race to a new spiritual unity in Christ. In the εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον that unity is presupposed, and starting from it the highest development of its living principle is striven after and attained. Therefore it could not either be εἰς ἄνθρωπον τέλειον, because ἀνὴρ exactly expresses the idea of life developed to its full self-consciousness. That idea is more accurately described by the following words: εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, *i.e.* unto the measure of the age in which fulness dwells in us. The ἡλικία here is, of course, not

bodily stature, but the degree of complete spiritual development, therefore = ἀνὴρ τέλειος. But the phrase obtains a more accurate definition through the τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, which Holzhausen, Meier, and Harless correctly take in the sense above given. But *here*, too, as at i. 23, and iii. 19, the discrepancy among the interpreters in their acceptations of the word πλήρωμα is great. The reference of the expression to the Church, which Koppe and Storr defend, and which has even crept into some of the MSS., is here at all events quite inadmissible. One might rather take πλήρωμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ as a circumlocution for Christ Himself. The age of Christ would then be that climax of development which Christ Himself attained, the highest self-consciousness. But the other passages, in which πλήρωμα occurs, are not in favour of that paraphrastic use. We had best, therefore, be contented with the above interpretation of the words, which is completely in accordance with the context. If εἰς ἡλικίαν alone stood here, then one would not be at all doubtful as to the sense of the passage, only the εἰς μέτρον leads one astray to suppose a comparison. But μέτρον denotes here "the full measure, *i.e.* ripeness," as we find in Homer, μέτρον ἥβης, "the ripeness of youth." See Passow's Lex. ad. v. (On μέχρι without ἄν see Hartung's Doctrine of the Particles, vol. ii., p. 291, ss. Lobeck ad Phrynichum, p. 14, ss.)

Ver. 14. Next there is placed, in juxtaposition to the positive representation of the development of Christian life, what is no longer to be, in a negative style of expression. In the perfected man, who has attained the unity of the faith and of knowledge, there is fixedness and steadiness of conviction; undeveloped νήπιοι are exposed to waverings of every kind; each wind of doctrine sets them in motion. One sees clearly here that the ἐπίγνωσις is no practical one, as Meier erroneously assumes, but the theoretical insight into the faith. Certainly true knowledge always rests on the practical ground of sanctification, but it is not merely practical itself. Now this passage might really create an appearance (see also at v. 6) as if false doctrine *had* been spread though, also in the churches to which St Paul addresses this Epistle; but it is plain that St Paul here gives no information about the actual state of his readers, but only describes quite objectively the nature of the νήπιοι wherever they may be. Even *here* it can at most be said that St Paul foresaw that Ephesus and the neighbouring churches would not be spared by false teachers any more than other churches, and there-

fore gave the exhortation to strive after the unity of the faith and of knowledge, in order to be able to withstand their temptations. When St Paul wrote it was still, therefore, in Ephesus as at the time of his discourse to the Ephesian presbyters (Acts xx. 29, 30), according to which St Paul prophesied: *εἰσελεύσονται λύκοι βαρεῖς εἰς ὑμᾶς, μὴ φειδόμενοι τοῦ ποιμνίου, καὶ ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν ἀναστήσονται ἄνδρες λαλοῦντες διεστραμμένα.*—Lastly, the concluding words of ver. 14 designate the element in which the false doctrine, which confuses the believer, consists (and whence, too, it therefore proceeds), together with the way in which it is wont to be spread by the false teachers. (*Κλυδωνίζεσθαι* is found only here in all the New Testament.—"To be moved by waves" is figuratively "to be brought into an uneasy agitation of mind," an antithesis to *πληροφορία*.—The second expression here is, we may suppose, taken from a ship which the winds toss about.—*Κυβεία*, playing at dice, was used by the Rabbis too in the form קוּבְיָא [see Buxtorf's lex. talm., p. 1984], and that, too, in the figurative sense, "deceit, fraud," connected with *πανουργία*. The *μεθοδεία τῆς πλάνης* denotes the premeditated plan which the false teachers pursue in their deception. [See vi. 11.] The addition *τοῦ διαβόλου* has crept into the text here out of that passage, and is to be erased according to the critical authorities. The preposition *πρὸς* points to the circumstance that it is the *πανουργία*, which makes fit for the *μεθοδεία τῆς πλάνης*.)

Ver. 15. It is clear that what follows is grammatically dependent on *ἵνα ὦμεν κ.τ.λ.* in ver. 14. "That we may no longer be children who let themselves be moved by every wind of doctrine, but may grow up well into the body of Christ in all relations." It cannot surprise us that the discourse here is of growing, whereas, in ver. 13, the state of perfect growth, of manhood, had already been described; for, in ver. 13, the discourse was surely not of manhood, as of a state already attained, but as of one that is yet to be attained. Further, as to the details in ver. 15, we may consider the usual connection *ἀληθεύοντες ἐν ἀγάπῃ* as sufficiently refuted. The *ἀληθεύειν*, "to be, walk, in the truth," forms the antithesis to the preceding *ἐν κυβείᾳ, ἐν πανουργίᾳ εἶναι*. But *ἐν ἀγάπῃ* does not suit that, for instance in the acceptation, "to teach the truth in a loving, gentle, temper," as these words are usually taken; in opposition to which is the circumstance that *ἀληθεύειν* means not "to teach the truth," but "to be in the truth." On the other hand, in connection with *αὐξήσωμεν*, the *ἐν ἀγάπῃ* affords

a very beautiful sense, inasmuch as love is the root of all spiritual growth, wherefore we read also, ver. 16, εἰς οἰκοδομὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ. But the growth is to be an every-sided one, wherefore St Paul adds, τὰ πάντα. The article is satisfactorily accounted for by the reference of the growth to the idea of the Christian, "to grow in all those things in which the Christian must advance." The development of the regenerate man is, lastly, no isolated one, proceeding in *him alone*, but such a one as is completed in the connection of the individual as a limb with the whole, and especially with Christ, the head of the whole organic unity of the Church. This sort of growth is expressed by αὐξάνειν εἰς αὐτόν, ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλή. As in what immediately follows in ver. 16 Christ is by the ἐξ οὗ represented as the source whence all growth takes its first impulse and nourishment, so He is here as the mark to which the act of growing leads. Inasmuch as the faithful are to be conceived as already existing in Christ, ἐν αὐτῷ also might have stood here.

Ver. 16. Proceeding from Christ as the head, the growth of the whole body into a compact structure is at length accomplished, while each, according to the measure of his talents and powers (ver. 7), fills his place. The metaphor, according to which the Church is compared to a σῶμα, has already been taken into consideration at 1 Cor. xii. 14, ss., where it is treated especially in detail. Col. ii. 19 is a special parallel passage for this one. Instead of the turn: ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα—τὴν αὔξησιν τοῦ σώματος (*i.e.* ἑαυτοῦ) ποιεῖται, it is there (Col. ii. 19): ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα αὔξει τὴν αὔξησιν τοῦ Θεοῦ. (See as to the form αὔξει at Ephes. ii. 21.—The genitive τοῦ Θεοῦ is correctly taken by Böhmer, not as designating the superlative, but as an expression of the truth, that the growth of the Church proceeds from God, and not peradventure from inferior powers, the angels, as the Colossian false teachers thought.) The nature of the σῶμα is further more accurately described by the epithets συναρμολογούμενον καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον, the former of which has occurred already, ii. 21, the latter is found, Col. ii. 2, 19, in the same meaning, whereas at Acts ix. 22, xvi. 10; 1 Cor. ii. 16, it is used in a figurative sense. The interarticulation of the members, and the firm establishment of the structure thence arising, is expressed in these epithets. But the somewhat obscure addition: διὰ πάσης ἁφῆς τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας, receives a more accurate definition through the words διὰ τῶν ἁφῶν καὶ συνδέσμων ἐπιχορηγούμενον. Joints and ligaments unite the limbs of the body, thus too the spiritual body of the Church is joined together by all the

forms of union of the individual members of it one with another. Ἐπιχορηγεῖν means (see at Gal. iii. 5) "to bestow richly, to proffer," here of course with reference to the higher powers of the Spirit, which fill the Church and direct her development. But that meaning seems more suitable in Col. ii. 19, than in this passage. The combination ἁφὴ τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας has already induced the Greek Fathers of the Church to take ἁφὴ in the sense (from ἅπτεσθαι) of αἴσθησις, as if the meaning were: "through every feeling of the proffering and co-operation of the Holy Ghost." But that meaning of ἁφὴ does not suit here on account of the parallel passage in the Epistle to the Colossians, and of the πάσης, which only finds an intelligible meaning through the interpretation of the word as "joint, connecting limb." One might with Meier rather understand the ἐπιχορηγία of the support and lending of hands of the faithful among themselves, so that the sense would be this: "the body, which is joined together and firmly fixed by all the bonds of the reciprocal lending of hands." Nevertheless, on account of the close parallel of Col. ii. 19, it might be more suitable *here* too, with Harless, to take the ἐπιχορηγία of the communication of the Holy Ghost, and to explain the combination ἁφὴ τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας, so that the communication of the Holy Ghost itself is the link of connection between the individual believers. For the working of the believers themselves is spoken of in the following words: κατ' ἐνεργείαν ἐν μέτρῳ ἑνὸς ἑκάστοῦ μέρους, *i.e.* "efficiency, according to activity, in the measure of every part of the body." According to ver. 7, therefore, to every *part* again is attributed its peculiar measure of gifts and powers, and, accordingly, a peculiar position as to the whole. (The reading μέλους has, it is true, the important authorities of A.C. in its favour, but the change into μέρους is utterly inexplicable; this various reading might, therefore, be really the original one.) The last words: εἰς οἰκοδομὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ can, according to the αὔξησιν ποιεῖται, just before, only denote the object of the growth, so that thus the οἰκοδομὴ *sensu prægnanti* expresses the complete edification of the Church, as the end of the development. But, whereas the ἐν ἀγάπῃ in ver. 15 made the element in which the development is accomplished prominent, the addition *here* expresses that love is *that* in which the complete Church has her abiding condition.

§. 5. ISOLATED MORAL PRECEPTS.

(IV. 17–V. 20.)

Ver. 17, 18. The exhortation to a worthy walk, which was begun at iv. 1, is now again taken up here, and now for the first time applied to special relations. St Paul commences with reminding his readers of the Gentile standard of morality, and urgently calling on them to renounce it, whilst he describes the state of the Gentiles in such a way that it is clear what different preliminaries exist among them as Christians, in order to attain to pure morality. In the μηκέτι is couched that their own state was also such, as the description, which follows, purports, but their walk can no longer be thus, in accordance with their present position. The reading λοιπὰ here is certainly genuine; it was only omitted, because it was thought the readers of the Epistle were surely, as Christians, no longer Gentiles. But St Paul even within the sphere of Christianity still adheres to the *descent* from Israel, and the contrary. Lachmann has, on the authority of A.B.D.F.G., erased λοιπά. The wicked course of life of the Gentiles is now described as proceeding from, and therefore, consisting in, the ματαιότης τοῦ νοὸς αὐτῶν. The νοῦς denotes here too, as in Rom. vii. 23, 24, the higher element in man, the Spirit conceived as a faculty. In the degraded Gentiles (Rom. i. 18, ss.) this higher element in man appears powerless and of none effect, is not capable of drawing them up to heaven, they sink, therefore, into the flesh and its lusts. The antithesis of this ματαιότης τοῦ νοὸς is the εἶναι ἐν Χριστῷ πεπληρωμένος, Col. ii. 10. Νοῦς is therefore here by no means = φρόνημα, as Harless insists, but on the contrary, the ματαιότης τοῦ νοὸς is the basis of the being so minded: "I conjure you henceforth to walk no more as the other Gentiles walk in the nothingness of their spiritual life." The outward walk is an expression of the inward disposition, of the φρόνημα, and *that* is founded on the ματαιότης τοῦ νοὸς; where through God's Spirit the νοῦς is again strengthened and reinforced, and therefore the δύναμις τοῦ νοὸς is re-established, there the φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς is also changed into a φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος, and the course of life improved along with it. (See Rom. viii. 6, and in the opusc. theolog. p. 157.) In what follows, the propositions, ἐσκοτισμένοι τῇ διανοίᾳ—διά τὴν ἄγνοιαν τὴν οὖσαν ἐν αὐτοῖς, and ὄντες ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ—διὰ τὴν πώρωσιν τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, correspond to one another. But

Meier erroneously refers the *former* to the Gentiles, the *other* to the Jews; the discourse here is of the Gentiles alone. In the *first* member of the sentence the reference to the *intellect* rather prevails, in the *second* that to the *feelings* (therefore to the *soul*). In the words ἐσκοτισμένοι τῇ διανοίᾳ the last expression causes difficulty; for διάνοια occurs = νοῦς, but also as the action of the νοῦς, = διανόημα. (See my opusc. theolog. p. 156, sq.) After ματαιότης τοῦ νοὸς standing just before, διάνοια cannot well be here again taken in the meaning of νοῦς, that general expression is rather defined more closely in the succeeding propositions. Where the νοῦς is impaired in power, the process of thinking exhibits itself without discernment by reason of the ἄγνοια, and by reason of the hardening of the heart the feelings (the conscience) appear without excitability, man being estranged from the life of God. The ἄγνοια is the state of the ἀθεότης (according to ii. 12); where the knowledge of God is wanting, the true light is in general wanting, the active thinking faculty is obscured. The phrase ζωὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ, which is found *here* only, is not to be referred to a general form of speech, such as *this:* "virtuous life," because it is produced by God; it rather denotes the life which God himself is and has, and which is granted to the creature as long as it continues in communion with God, and does not by sin separate itself from the source of its life. (Ver. 17, μαρτύρομαι, like διαμαρτύρομαι, 1 Tim. v. 21; 2 Tim. ii. 14, iv. 1, stands in the meaning of *obtestari.* —Ἐν κυρίῳ must not be taken as a form of swearing, but as a designation of the element, standing in which St Paul propounds what follows [τοῦτο].—As to καθὼς καὶ see Hartung's Doctrine of the Particles, vol. 1, p. 126, ss.—As to ἀπαλλοτριοῦσθαι see on ii. 12. As to πώρωσις see on Rom. xi. 25.)

Ver. 19. As a result of the hardening of the feelings, which, however, is on its part induced by sin alone even, the giving one's self over to the impurest transgressions is also named, *in fine*, just as in Rom. i. sin is represented as a result of the service of sin. Of course the words εἰς ἐργασίαν ἀκαθαρσίας πάσης are not to be understood as if each individual had personally committed all forms of uncleanness; according to Rom. ii. 14, 26, and the testimony of history, there were certainly sober, chaste, characters even in the world before Christ; it is only the state of the *whole body of the Gentiles*, as such, that is described in them. Comp. at v. 12. For the rare ἀπηλγηκότες D.E.F.G. read ἀπηλπικότες. But despair is nowhere named as the motive for the giving one's self up to sin,

but the hardening of heart, which makes insensible to the exhortations of the Holy Spirit, *is*. The participle is, therefore, to be translated: "who, because they have hardened themselves." Ἀπαλγεῖν, *doloris expers esse*, it remains to be said, is found in the New Testament in this passage only.—Ἀσελγεία is nearly akin to ἀκαθαρσία, and is expressly used for designating lust, but it rather makes, however, the *inner* side of it prominent, the want of self-control, of power for self-subjection, whereas ἀκαθαρσία makes the *outer* side of it so. The addition of πᾶσα points to all the forms of uncleanness which were in vogue among the Gentiles, and are enumerated Romans i.—The addition of ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ Grotius wished to refer to the practice of uncleanness for money; but that cannot certainly be said of all Gentiles as something universal. The usual meaning "covetousness" cannot well be here used, if the ἐν is to retain its meaning. The word seems here used in the more extended sense, in which it occurs elsewhere too, and in which the Greek Fathers had already taken it. [See Harless on this passage.] Chrysostom and Theodoret take it as = ἀμέτρως, καθ' ὑπερβολήν. But it is more correctly understood of physical avidity, of overfilling one's self with meat and drink, by which the sins of lust are promoted. (See on this subject at v. 3, 5 also.)

Ver. 20, 21. To this description the exhortation to his Gentile Christian readers, to renounce that course of life as Christians, which the Gentiles pursue,—is then annexed. The οὐχ οὕτως is clearly to be taken thus: "ye have not so learned Christ, that ye could combine a Gentile life with the profession of Christ." But the formula μανθάνειν τὸν Χριστὸν has something singular in it, for μανθάνειν cannot, from the nature of the case, be construed with the *acc. pers.* It has some plausibility here, if one interpreted Christ figuratively, of *the doctrine of* Christ. But in the peculiar relation of Christ to the Church is couched the satisfactory justification of the singular mode of expression. The *person* of the Lord Himself is the object of the sermon, not a mere *doctrine* of Him; accordingly, one may likewise speak of a μανθάνειν Χριστὸν, *i.e.* of a taking up *into* one's self and appropriating *to* one's self the person of Christ Himself, what is called Col. ii. 6 παραλαμβάνειν τὸν Χριστόν. (See John i. 5, xi. 12.) In Col iii. 16 stands the kindred phrase ὁ λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐνοικεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν; which does not mean His doctrine, but His living word, which is He Himself. Ἀκούειν αὐτὸν, which follows, is also to be explained by the same

mode of contemplation. That phrase does not mean "to hear about Him, of Him, through others," but to perceive in themselves Christ Himself, the Eternal Word (see on John iv. 42 and Matt. xi. 27). Therefore the act of regeneration is denoted by it, proceeding from which act the progressing renewal in sanctification, of which mention is made in what immediately follows, is developed. Finally, the ἐν αὐτῷ διδαχθῆναι, which comes next to the above, is to be taken thus: "to be taught, so that one through faith is in Him, *i.e.* in community of being with Him," which again presupposes the communication of the being of Christ to the soul. (See 1 Thess. iv. 9, where the Christians are called θεοδίδακτοι by St Paul.) It remains to be said that the two last phrases have such a relation to one another, that they together constitute the μανθάνειν τὸν Χριστόν. He that perceives His voice in himself, and permits himself to be so taught by it, that he enters into communion with the Lord, is a true μαθητὴς of Christ. In the εἴγε (see on iii. 2), however, St Paul again supposes the state of his readers not sufficiently known to him, although he is ready to assume the best. "If, that is to say, as I may assume as certain, ye have heard him, etc." But the addition, καθώς ἐστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ Ιησοῦ, in this verse 21, is difficult. The retrospective reference of the καθὼς to an οὕτως preceding: "If ye have heard Him so as the truth is in Jesus, *i.e.* according to the right knowledge of His person, is inadmissible, because then, first, the article must necessarily have stood before ἀλήθεια, and secondly, because *Jesus* would not have been put, but *Christ*, because the former name refers to the human side of the person of Christ. Again there is no true and no false hearing of Christ: one either hears Him or hears Him not. Lastly, if the proposition is closed after Ιησοῦ, the infinitives ἀποθέσθαι, ἀνανεοῦσθαι, etc. would be left there without any connecting link. For the interpretation of the passage, according to which the infinitive stands for the imperative, is inadmissible, because that use of the mood is certain in *one* passage only in the N. T. generally (see Winer's Gramm. p. 304, ss.), and here in particular the ὑμᾶς with ἀποθέσθαι makes that interpretation impossible. The infinitives are rather to be conceived as dependent on ἐδιδάχθητε, and the clause, "as truth is in Jesus," is to represent the person of the Redeemer according to its human development as a pattern for the faithful, after which they on their part are to form themselves. Thus Harless, correctly. The advantages of this interpretation are, that thus not only the choice

of the name Jesus, denoting the human side of Christ, is explicable, but also the making the ὑμᾶς with ἀποθέσθαι prominent, whereby Jesus and the believers on Him are to be placed in juxtaposition. What in Jesus is Truth, not semblance, is to become Truth also in the faithful.

Ver. 22. Now first the *negative* side of the sanctification is described, the laying aside the old man, or the crucifying of the same (Gal. v. 24), afterwards the *positive* one, the putting on of the new man. Of course in the inner life the *one* cannot exist without the *other*, they are two essentially correlative sides of the same state. But now what is to be laid aside in the sanctification is not merely the habit of sinning, but the entire old man, also the (original) sinfulness inherited by birth itself, whence the habit of sinning first developed itself by unfaithfulness. But the addition κατὰ τὴν προτέραν ἀναστροφὴν seems to oppose that. Storr and Flatt wished to combine ἀποθέσθαι ὑμᾶς κατὰ τὴν προτέραν ἀναστροφὴν, τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον, so that the sense would be: "to lay yourselves aside according to your previous course of life, *i.e.* the old man." But it has been already observed by Rückert and Harless, that "to lay one's self aside" would be expressed by ἀποθέσθαι ἑαυτούς, and besides the self-contradicting formula "to lay aside one's self" is nowhere found. Ἀποθέσθαι is here to be explained from the antithesis ἐνδύσασθαι, and refers to the figure of a garment, which is laid aside and put on. But of course no one can lay aside himself, his own being. We have already seen at verses 20, 21, that ὑμᾶς is repeated merely for the sake of the antithesis with Jesus. The addition κατὰ τὴν προτέραν ἀναστροφὴν is rather to be taken as a more accurate definition of the παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος for this particular case. That is to say, the old man must certainly be laid aside by *him* even who has not given himself over εἰς ἐργασίαν ἀκαθαρσίας πάσης, but has led a respectable life according to the Law; yet the necessity of so doing appears much more clearly though in the deeply sunken man, and it is just in order to make that observed that St Paul adds it expressly for the Gentile Christians. In the parallel passage Col. iii. 9 σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτοῦ is added to the παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος which is to be laid aside, in just the same way; but in many passages "the old man" is not added, even to bring forward such actual wicked works, as they are mentioned Col. iii. 5, ss. For the same reason the addition: τὸν φθειρόμενον κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπάτης also is further added. That is to say, the old man has the φθορὰ and ματαιότης in him as neces-

sary qualities; every natural man, even he that has not heightened his *original* sin by *actual* sin, is of nought, without power to fulfil the Law. But it cannot be said of every one that the old man in him is corrupt in consequence of the lusts of deceit. The ἐπιθυμίαι τῆς ἀπάτης, that is to say, are the lusts which provoke εἰς ἐργασίαν ἀκαθαρσίας πάσης, which stifle even the good that is still in man, which was left after the fall, which put out the light in him, and thus cause a total darkness (verse 18). (See on Matt. vi. 23.) The ἀπάτη denotes the nature of sin which amuses man with a show of joy, without being able to afford him true satisfaction. (See on Rom. vii. 11.) We cannot therefore find "the unhappy state of the old man" denoted by the φθειρόμενος κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπάτης, as Harless will have it to be, but that especial form of sinfulness, as it had developed itself among the Gentiles in the mass, therefore just so as St Paul describes it in Rom. i. From this form of sinfulness (the ἐργασία ἀκαθαρσίας πάσης) individual Gentiles, and the Jews in the mass, were free; among the *latter* the original sin had certainly, in consequence of their unfaithfulness, generated *another* form of *actual* sin, self-righteousness, presumption, and pride; but still their sinful state could not be described as παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος ὁ φθειρόμενος κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπάτης, because the pernicious effects of sensual excesses are meant to be characterized by those words.

Ver. 23, 24. To the *negative* aspect of the matter, the laying aside of the *old* man, is subjoined the *positive* one, the ἀνανεοῦσθαι καὶ ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον. No distinction is to be sought for between ἀνανεοῦσθαι and ἀνακαινοῦσθαι (2 Cor. iv. 16; Col. iii. 10); no more than between νεὸς and καινὸς ἄνθρωπος. (See Col. iii. 10.) In Rom. xii. 2 we read ἀνακαίνωσις τοῦ νοὸς, whereas *here* the ἀνανεοῦσθαι of the νοῖς is spoken of. Both words answer to the Hebrew חַדֵּשׁ Ps. li. 12. (See Antonin. πρ. ἑαυτ. iv. 3, ἀνανέου σεαυτὸν.) As in *the old* the idea of the obsolete is at the same time couched, so in *the new* is that of the original, of the corresponding with its ideal. In the combination ἀνανεοῦσθαι καὶ ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον the latter expression appears as a more accurate epexegetic definition of the former, which is particularly shown in the more extended characterization of the new man. (See on ἐνδύσασθαι the remarks at Rom. xiii. 14; Gal. iii. 27.) But if the laying aside the old, and the putting on the new, is here referred to man, of course it is not St Paul's meaning that sanctification is to be completed by one's own power; Christ is

our sanctification, as He is our righteousness (see on 1 Cor. i. 30); but all, that Christ through the Holy Spirit operates in man, can in the form of the Law be put to him as a demand, because man by his unfaithfulness can hinder the operation of the Spirit. But in verse 23 the πνεῦμα τοῦ νοὸς, a combination which is found nowhere else, requires consideration too. Every separate expression would have sufficed, as Rom. xii. 2 shows, and would have been intelligible, but how is the idea of πνεῦμα and νοῦς in this combination of the two words to be understood? We take νοῦς absolutely as the faculty of perceiving the eternal, in which is contained as well that which we call reason as also the conscience (or self-consciousness), which last reference plainly comes out in 1 Cor. 14 in the formula προφητεύειν ἐν νοῖ. In the natural state from this faculty proceed all impulses to what is good (Rom. vii. 23), but the νοῦς is found in the state of the ματαιότης (verse 18), it is therefore overcome by the flesh; it is only through Christ that the νοῦς can serve the law of God (Rom. vii. 25). In the renewal, therefore, the νοῦς is reinforced, so that it can overcome. The reinforcement is to be derived from the communication of Christ's higher spirit to the soul, and this is meant to be expressed by the formula ἀνανεοῦσθαι τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοὸς. Πνεῦμα is the substance, and νοῦς the power of the substance; when, therefore, the renewal is referred to the substance, by that is meant to be expressed the operation of the Divine Spirit on the human spirit, which operation is strengthening, sanctifying, purifying. We can, therefore, find in this passage no occasion for departing from the view of the biblical psychology, which we have propounded in the dissertation on the Trichotomy (opusc. theolog. p. 143, ss.); on the contrary, we find its fundamental ideas completely established here. On the other hand, I must consider as totally inadmissible the reference of the νοῦς to the disposition, for which καρδία usually stands, or the feelings (φρόνημα). (See further the remarks on Col. ii. 18.) Lastly the words: τὸν κατὰ Θεὸν κτισθέντα ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας, are of great dogmatical importance, for they characterize the new man as a re-establishment of the divine image, and at the same time give the specific tokens of that image. Now, the less is found elsewhere in the Scriptures of the idea of that image, the more important must these communications of the apostle appear. In the words κατὰ Θεὸν κτισθεὶς is couched no doubt an allusion to the creation of man, Gen. i. 27, καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, κατ'

εἰκόνα Θεοῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτόν. The new birth is the second creation (see at ii. 10), wherefore the new man is called καινὴ κτίσις בְּרִיָּאה חֲדָשָׁה. (See at 2 Cor. v. 17; Galat. vi. 15.) Now, as God in the beginning, created man after His own image, so too in the new birth He again creates him after the same, because sin had dimmed the image of God. That, according to St Paul's meaning, the κατὰ Θεὸν in our passage stands for κατ' εἰκόνα Θεοῦ is shown by the parallel passage, Col. iii. 10, κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν. The archetype, however, after which man is made in the new birth is Christ, the second Adam, εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου (Col. i. 15; 2 Cor. iv. 4). Therefore the new man is also called the Christ in us; Christ makes His likeness in every human heart, He everywhere begets Himself again. But the idea of the divine image is more accurately determined by the words: ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας. That is to say, by the preposition ἐν the state in which the property of being like the image of God consists and exhibits itself is designated. The two expressions, δικαιοσύνη and ὁσιότης, are put in juxtaposition, but in an inverted order, in like manner in Luke i. 75; Book of Wisdom of Solomon ix. 3. The adjectives and adverbs are found in conjunction at 1 Thess. ii. 10; Titus i. 8. The δικαιοσύνη denotes the right relation inwardly between the powers of the soul, outwardly to men and circumstances. (See at Rom. iii. 21.) On the other hand ὁσιότης denotes, like the Hebrew תָּמִים (Prov. ii. 21; Amos v. 10), the integrity of the spiritual life, and the piety towards God which it supposes. The two expressions together complete, therefore, the idea of moral perfection (Matt. v. 48). And indeed in the regenerate man *that* is not show, but reality; the τῆς ἀληθείας refers to the combined idea δικαιοσύνη καὶ ὁσιότης, and is used in the same sense as in verse 22; as in Jesus there is nothing but reality, no show, He also operates reality in those that are His. Whereas, therefore, *here* the *ethical* aspect of the image is put forward, Col. iii. 10 puts the *intellectual* one in the foreground; renewal alone leads to the ἐπίγνωσις, all knowledge that proceeds not from the renewal of the heart, as was that of those false teachers in Colossæ, is seeming knowledge. On the other hand, in the Wisdom of Solomon ii. 23, the *physical* side of the image is insisted on, that is to say, the ἀφθαρσία of the body, κατ' εἰκόνα τῆς ἰδίας ἰδιότητος God made man exempt from death.

Ver. 25. Now, after this general discussion, special precepts could follow, and indeed, down to v. 2, such as refer to duties

towards others. Among these St Paul places first the exhortation to truth, because it is the condition of all sound relations of men among themselves. Therefore, too, St Paul gives his reason for the exhortation in the words: ὅτι ἐσμὲν ἀλλήλων μέλη, without truthfulness no Christian communion of life can subsist. (The laying aside of lying and the speaking truth are connected as in ver. 22, 24, the laying aside of the *old* and the putting on of the *new* man; by that means the negative and the positive aspects of truth are designated. The words in Zachar. viii. 16, according to the LXX., seem, we may add, to have been present to St Paul's mind here; for they run thus: λαλεῖτε ἀλήθειαν ἕκαστος πρὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ.)

Ver. 26. 27. The first words ὀργίζεσθε καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε are quoted after Ps. iv. 5. As, however, they are not to be viewed as a formal confirmative quotation, but only as a reminiscence after the LXX., no stress is to be laid on the difference between the Greek translation and the Hebrew. According to the context of the Psalm רְגְזוּ means "fear ye," to wit, God; the LXX. have given it ὀργίζεσθε, as alone the expression, taken by itself, admits of being taken. But as to the meaning of the obscure words here in the context of this Epistle, it might be assumed with Winer that St Paul is supposing a just anger, and means to say: "you may be angry, but sin not in your anger," if in what directly follows (verse 31) anger were not represented as utterly to be reprobated. But to refer the negation to both verbs: "be not angry and sin not," its position plainly does not allow. Harless proposes to take the proposition: "be angry and sin not," as = "be angry in the right way," *i.e.* without bitterness against the person, with a reconcilable heart. But even in *this* mode of taking it the permission of anger would surely be given, which stands in contradiction to verse 31. Man's anger is never in itself just and permissible, God's anger alone is the holy and just one; to Him, therefore, alone is anger to be left according to Rom xii. 19. The only satisfactory interpretation is that which Œcumenius had already propounded, and Meier last defended, viz., to take the imperative hypothetically: "if ye are angry, as it is to be foreseen that it will happen, at least sin not in anger. This use of the imperative is explained from the Hebrew (see Ewald's Gramm. p. 556, ss.). The being angry and without sin then presupposes that the heart was not embittered by it, but remained appeasable. Taken thus, the following proposition then connects itself very naturally with it, as it is

just in *it* that placability is recommended, the sun is not to go down upon the wrath, *i.e.* it is not to be carried forward to the following day. (Παροργισμὸς differs from ὀργὴ so that the former denotes the individual paroxysm of anger; ὀργὴ, on the contrary, anger as a passion, without regard to the special cause for it. Παροργισμὸς is not found again in the New Testament, but often in the LXX. for כַּעַס and קֶצֶף, 1 Kings xv. 30; 2 Kings xxiii. 26; Jer. xxi. 5.) The exhortation in verse 27, μηδὲ δίδοτε τόπον τῷ διαβόλῳ, which it itself wears a perfectly general character, since the devil, as the prince of darkness, incites to everything bad, obtains by the reference to what precedes the special reference to the pernicious element of anger, when it exasperates the heart, in that it destroys peace and stirs up enmity and hatred. The devil is mentioned in a similar way at 2 Cor. ii. 11. (The phrase τόπον διδόναι [Rom. xii. 19], for which χώραν διδόναι also occurs, answers to the Hebrew נָתַן מָקוֹם in the sense "to permit to come into operation, to offer an opportunity for operation." The reading μηδὲ is, with Lachmann, decidedly to be preferred to the μήτε, and μηδὲ also suits very well the above-given reference of the passage to the disturbance of peace. See Harless ad h. l.; Winer's Gramm. p. 456.)

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

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

Ver. 30. What now follows is not to be taken as quite a new exhortation, but as a warning against the use of a λόγος σαπρός, on account of the effect of it on the Holy Spirit, which fills the heart of the believer, and which is grieved thereby. The λυπεῖν of the Holy Ghost is, of course, different from the βλασφημεῖν of the Holy Ghost (Mark iii. 29; Luke xii. 10); it expresses the operation of inferior degrees of sin on the Holy Ghost. In Isaiah lxiii. 10, we find a similar phrase, παροξύνειν τὸ πνεῦμα (עָצַב.) But it is a question, if this expression, "grieve not the Holy Spirit," is to arouse the fear lest the Spirit should depart from them; or whether it is to awaken love: "you will not surely wish to grieve the good Spirit in you." The decision depends on how the following ἐν ᾧ ἐσφραγίσθητε εἰς ἡμέραν ἀπολυτρώσεως is taken. The idea of the sealing (see on i. 13), is that of confirming, establishing, here in the state of grace; and the ἀπολύτρωσις is here, as at 1 Cor. i. 30, the absolute redemption; therefore, the phrase εἰς ἡμέραν ἀπολυτρώσεως denotes the whole course of the sanctification, unto the completion of the work of God in the soul of man. Accordingly, the εἰς is not to be translated "for the day of redemption," as if that were considered as a critical day, but "until the day of redemption," *i.e.* therefore, "in which Spirit ye now, and evermore, through the whole course of your development,

are confirmed in the state of grace." According to this meaning of the addition, it cannot be doubtful that St Paul here wishes to work upon his readers through love, and the holy shrinking from grieving the good Spirit dwelling in them, and not through fear. The idea is to be thus paraphrased: "Grieve not the Holy Spirit, for He it is, surely, to whom ye owe the great grace of the sealing in the life of faith, and will owe it unto the end of your Christian development, until the day of redemption." The question here is not at all as to the possibility of an apostacy from the faith, and of the departure of the Holy Spirit; neither are we to think of a set allusion to Isaiah lxiii. 10, where similar things occur, as St Paul would else certainly have retained the παροξύνειν which is there used; the apostle only means to encourage his readers to walk circumspectly, by calling on them not to grieve the Holy Spirit which fills them. That this λυπεῖν means merely "to restrict in its operation," might not be demonstrable. This expression rather belongs to the order of those which represent the Divine essence as capable of being affected by sin. Certainly these expressions have in them something of human passion, but in them is couched the important truth, that God will not be unaffected by human sin and misery, but, as the most exalted and purest love, really feels even *both*, only without grieving of His beatitude, because He never contemplates sin without its connection with redemption.

Ver. 31, 32. Christians, then, are to become also like the Divine love, which has manifested itself in Christ as the forgiving, and to that end put away all uncharitableness, both in its root and its expression. (Θυμὸς differs from ὀργή, as the inner cause from the outward effect; the emotion of the soul and the outburst of anger. Πικρία, however, again contains the cause of the inward boiling up of anger, "irritation, bitterness of mind," which easily occasions anger to arise. Lastly, κραυγὴ and βλασφημία are the outbreaks of the ὀργή. The latter expression does not here refer to God, but to man, against whom the anger is directed. The κακία is finally, according to the context, here specially uncharitableness in all forms of its manifestation. Compare here, with the parallel passage, Col. iii. 8.—In ver. 32, χρηστοὶ forms the antithesis with the πικρία. Perhaps there is couched in that word, which, by Itacismus, is pronounced χριστοὶ, an allusion to the name of Christians; the apologists of the first centuries often use it.—The form εὔσπλαγχνος is not found again

except at 1 Peter iii. 8, "easily to be moved to compassion." At Col. iii. 12, ἐνδύσασθε σπλάγχνα stands for it.—The concluding words: χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς κ.τ.λ. are found, *word for word*, at Col. iii. 13. Χαρίζεσθαι stands here like ἀφιέναι elsewhere. Ἑαυτοῖς = ἀλλήλοις. See Matthiæ's Gramm. vol. ii., p. 920. At the end of the verse, it seems that ἡμῖν after B.D.E. should be read with Lachmann. For the change into ὑμῖν is easily explained, because, both before and after, the second person stands. It is also intelligible how the consciousness of St Paul, that he had to thank God in Christ for *his own* forgiveness also, urged him here to include himself along with his readers.

Chapter v. 1, 2. As a winding up of this exhortation to exercise the duties which relate to others, St Paul further expressly calls upon his readers, as children of God, to imitate God, and so to walk in love, as Christ has loved them, viz., with self-sacrifice and self-denial. There is the same idea in Matt. v. 48, "Be ye perfect, as your Father in heaven is perfect." This endeavour seems here more closely enforced by the motive implied in ὡς τέκνα ἀγαπητά. As children bear in them their father's nature, so they can also imitate his example. The relation of children here spoken of refers, of course, to the new birth, and the divine life communicated to man in it. But St Paul makes a transition, without more ado, from the imitation of God to Christ, because God was in Christ, and has loved us in Him and through Him. The aorists ἠγάπησε, παρέδωκε, point to the historical fact of the death in which Christ's self-sacrificing love reached its climax. The giving up Himself by Christ is now more accurately described as a sacrifice of His life for man. (Προσφορὰ, the more general word for sacrifice, is, by θυσία, more closely defined as a sacrifice of blood.) The closing proposition of ver. 2, τῷ Θεῷ εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδιάς, is also taken from the idea of sacrifice. It answers to the Hebrew רֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ, Gen viii. 21; Lev. ii. 12, iii. 5. In Phil. iv. 18 it is found again, and is there interpreted: θυσία δεκτὴ, εὐάρεστος τῷ Θεῷ. But the pleasure that God takes in the sacrifice of His Son, does not refer to Christ's suffering and death as such, but to the love and obedience that Christ exhibited therein. Against this very old acceptation of our passage, which so completely corresponds with the words and the sphere of St Paul's ideas (see on Rom. iii. 25; 1 Cor. v. 7), it has, in the latest times, been objected by Rückert, Meier, Usteri, that the question here is not as to the atoning death of Christ, but merely of

Christ's love, by means of which He has left us a pattern. Usteri (St Paul's system, 4th ed. p. 113) expresses himself upon our passage as follows: "The context contains only this: Christ has, in His giving up of Himself, so well-pleasing to God, left us a pattern. That is to say, the giving up Himself by Christ was, as we know from Phil. ii. 8, at the same time an act of obedience towards God, and, therefore, attended by the Divine well-pleasedness. Ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας, at Phil. iv. 18, and εὐωδία, at 2 Cor. ii. 15, are used in a similar way to denote the Divine well-pleasedness, without the slightest allusion being made to an atonement." Now, it is certainly correct to say, that the phrase ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας, by itself, is not enough to show the idea of sacrifice, but, surely, that idea is couched in the words παρέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν. It is also to be acknowledged that, according to the context of this passage, nothing is meant to be especially taught as to the idea of sacrifice—the first object of it is rather to set up Christ as a pattern; but it cannot and must not be denied, that the idea of Christ's sacrifice of His life is here supposed by St Paul to be known; that he exhibits Christ's giving Himself up as a sacrifice, for a pattern to his readers, just exactly as it is done in Matt. xx. 28, in Christ's own words. (See the Comm. on that passage.) That Christ's sacrificial death cannot be a pattern for men in *all* relations, does not prevent its being set forth as such a pattern for some virtues—to name some, for obedience and pure self-sacrificing love. Thus, at Phil. ii. 5, ss., the putting off His divine nature by Christ is also represented as a pattern for humility, without meaning to suppose anything quite analogous in man. Even the idea of the imitation of God would be unsuitable (ver. 1), if every imitation required complete equality with the pattern.

Ver. 3–5. Whereas, from iv. 25 down to here, St Paul has recommended duties towards *others*, he now (ver. 3–20) addresses himself to the duties one owes to one's self. The exhortations, which he gives out, relate, collectively, to the warning against fleshly lusts and sensual enjoyments, with which a holy enjoyment and spiritual gladness are contrasted, as worthy of the Christian (ver. 18–20). This series of exhortations (ver. 7–14) is interrupted by a new comparison of Gentilism and Christianity, in which the former is characterized as the element of darkness, the latter as the element of light. But everything, as to the comprehension of the context in this section, depends on the in-

terpretation of the expression πλεονεξία, πλεονέκτης. That is to say, if by it "covetousness, avarice," is understood, the exhortations do not confine themselves to fleshly sins. But, as everything else in this section admits of being referred to those, and as it is only on the assumption that St Paul means to treat of them here, that ver. 18 is fitly combined with what precedes; moreover, as we have been already (at iv. 19) obliged to take πλεονεξία = pampering of the flesh, that meaning seems to be required *here* also. But the addition in ver. 5, ὅς ἐστιν εἰδωλολάτρης (for which Lachmann, without any sufficient reason, reads ὅ), compared with Col. iii. 5, πλεονεξία ἥτις ἐστιν εἰδωλολατρεία, seems to make that assumption doubtful. That is to say, there seems to be couched, in this definition, a reference to Mammon, as the god of this world, by which, then, the acceptation of the πλεονεξία as "covetousness," in the proper sense, would seem to be favoured. Harless attempts to avoid this difficulty, by referring ὅς, not to the last preceding substantive merely, but to all together, so that all the above-named phases of sin would be called idolatry. But that seems to me to be capricious. It is more natural to say, that St Paul takes just the πλεονεξία in the sense, "carnal desire of enjoyment," as idolatry, because he, as Phil. iii. 19 shows, views in it a deifying of the belly, ὧν ὁ Θεὸς ἡ κοιλία. St Paul takes the sins of lust first, as consequences of the pampering of the flesh (Rom. xiii. 14). To *that* is now to be added that, in Col. iii. 5, too πλεονεξία is ranged among the sins of carnal nature, and, therefore, may very well be *there*, too, taken as it is here. (See also 1 Thess. iv. 6.) St Paul now represents all carnal-mindedness, in word or deed, as unworthy of the Christian; unholy things do not become saints; the kingdom of God, the fellowship of the saints, permits nothing unholy in it. But, of course, the idea, that no one that lives carnally can have a portion in the kingdom of God, is not to be understood as if no one that ever committed a carnal sin can enter into the kingdom of God; why, the very readers of St Paul's Epistle had previously lived like heathens (ver. 8). It is rather meant to declare that, without thorough conversion and purification from such things, no one can be in the holy kingdom of God. (In ver. 3 the μηδὲ ὀνομαζέσθω ἐν ὑμῖν, *i.e.*, ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν, forms the antithesis with the committing. Such carnal sins are to be quite unheard of among Christians, not even known by name.—In ver. 4, αἰσχρότης is, from its combination with μωρολογία, and from Col. iii. 8, where αἰσχρο-

λογία is mentioned, to be understood of indecency in language.—Μωρολογία, which is found here only, means by itself only *stultiloquium, ubi risus captatur, etiam sine sale*, as Bengel interprets. But according to the context this expression also has predominantly its reference to such discourses, in which double-entendres are introduced.—Near akin is εὐτραπελία also, which in like manner is found nowhere in the New Testament but *here*. It comes from εὐτράπελος, one who knows how to turn about skilfully; therefore *lepidus, facetus*. The substantive is used in the meaning *scurrilitas in dicendo*, which is also wont to take especial pleasure in lascivious talk. Plautus characterizes the Ephesians as especially tempted in this respect. [Miles glorios. iii. 1.] To the *im*pure use of speech St Paul places in opposition the *pure* and holy use of it in prayer. In ver. 5 the reading ἴστε is, according to the view of all more modern critics, decidedly to be preferred to the ἔστε of the *text. rec.* The conjunction of the two kindred expressions strengthens the idea of knowledge: "you surely know of your own knowledge that," etc. It is odd that βασιλεία τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ is found at the end of the verse. The reading Θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ in F.G. is, we may suppose, to be explained merely from the notion that God must be named *before* Christ. The name βασιλεία τοῦ Χριστοῦ now occasions no difficulty, for although in most instances by far βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ stands, still τοῦ Χριστοῦ also is found, *e.g.*, 2 Tim. iv. 1; Matt. xvi. 28. And even if it were not found in the New Testament, the name would follow from the idea that Christ is the King of the kingdom of God, that the Father has handed the dominion over to Him (1 Cor. xv. 27) as admissible in itself. Even among the Rabbis the kingdom of God is therefore called מַלְכוּת הַמָּשִׁיחַ. The striking part of the phrase is merely the addition καὶ Θεοῦ. That St Paul meant to characterise Christ as God in opposition to the false gods is improbable, because then we may suppose τοῦ Χριστοῦ Θεοῦ would have been written. The missing article before Θεοῦ can therefore prove nothing in favour of that acceptation, because Θεὸς is very often put without the article, and no accurate distinction is meant to be made here between Christ and God. It might be most correct to suppose in the καὶ Θεοῦ a more accurate definition to the ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, in this sense: "in the kingdom of Christ, which is also the kingdom of God." St Paul adds that definition in order to direct observation to the holiness of the kingdom, in which God, the author

of all holiness, reigns. Compare the parallel passages Rev. xi. 15, xii. 10.)

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

Ver. 8–11. That communion with those that walk carnally must be put an end to is deduced by St Paul from the contrast of his readers' present state with their previous one. They were, as Gentiles, darkness, *i.e.* they belonged to the element of darkness and to its prince, as they now are light and belong to the lord of light, through communion with Him the original light. (John i. 4.) Hence follows the necessity for walking as children of the light, *i.e.* to bring fruits of the light, and to that end carefully to search what the Lord's will is. (Compare ver. 15, 17.) Darkness, on the other hand, is represented as the element which is incapable of producing fruits. What it does produce is only deceitful show. In 1 Thess. v. 4, ss. is found a parallel quite similar between light and darkness and those who belong to them. See also 2 Cor. vi. 14. (Ver. 8. As to τέκνα φωτὸς see at 1 Thess. v. 5.—The participle δοκιμάζοντες connects itself with περιπα-

τεῖτε, so that a colon therefore cannot stand after the verb. The parenthetical clause ὁ γὰρ καρπὸς τοῦ φωτὸς κ.τ.λ. is meant especially to form the antithesis to the ἀπατᾶν κενοῖς λόγοις, on which account also ἀγαθωσύνη, δικαιοσύνη, and ἀληθεία are named, and not such virtues as form the antithesis to the πορνεία κ.τ.λ. in ver. 3. —The reading φωτὸς in ver. 9 is, on extrinsic and intrinsic grounds, to be preferred to the reading of the *text. rec.* (πνεύματος), which we may suppose to be a gloss from Gal. v. 22.—On ἀγαθωσύνη see Rom. v. 14; Gal. v. 22; 2 Thess. i. 11.—Ver. 11. The ἔργα σκότους are those named in ver. 3, ss. But the epithet ἀκάρποις struck even the copyists; it was therefore arbitrarily altered into ἀκαθάρτοις or ἀτάκτοις. For *wicked* works seem to be equally fruits too, only fruits of *darkness*. [Compare Matt. vii. 17.] But ἄκαρπος means not only "without fruit, unfruitful," but also "useless, fruitless." That which is produced of darkness is merely, therefore, to be designated as something which does not deserve the name of a fruit, which has only the appearance of one without the reality. Light alone has real power of production, it alone can create works which bear in them the eternal luminous nature, and follow him that executes them into eternity, Rev. xiv. 13.)

Ver. 12. The last words of verse 11, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐλέγχετε, from the transition to verse 12, the γὰρ unites itself with them. The μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐλέγχειν forms a climax to the μὴ συγκοινωνεῖν, "not only have no part in such works of darkness, but rather, on the contrary, even rebuke them as children of the light," *dictis et factis luce dignis*, as Bengel expresses himself. Whereas, therefore, in the συγκοινωνεῖν a sinking down to the Gentile level is indicated, the ἐλέγχειν supposes a rising of the Gentiles, and of those who are similar to them, to the Christian standard. It is, therefore, not a mere declaration that those things are disgraceful, without any operation on the sinner, but the idea of the ἐλέγχειν involves the conviction of the sinner, it is "to convince by denunciation, to work the conversion of." But how does verse 12 unite itself to that with the γὰρ which gives a reason for what precedes? The words τὰ κρυφῇ γινόμενα ὑπ' αὐτῶν = ἔργοις τοῦ σκότους in verse 11, they are not meant to express that one does not, and can not, at all know what they do because it is done secretly (for surely the apostle both here and in Rom. i. openly declares what they do), but only to designate the actions as shunning the light, as such that the conscience of the very persons who

do them condemns them. The following words: αἰσχρόν ἐστι καὶ λέγειν, are meant to express the enormity of the hideous vices, "it is not only disgraceful to *commit* such things, but one is ashamed even to *express* it only; it is so filthy that one cannot speak of it." Now, the γὰρ joins this idea quite simply with the μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐλέγχετε, so that the necessity for the rebuke is founded on the magnitude of the offences: "rather rebuke them even, for their sin is so great that they urgently need awaking out of their dark sleep of sin" (ver. 14). The magnitude of the sin is therefore meant to move pity in the hearts of the faithful, and *that* is to incite them to save the lost ones.

Harless wishes to have the γὰρ depend on μὴ συγκοινωνεῖτε, and to refer nothing to ἐλέγχετε before ver. 13; but this passing over the verb which stands last, and introduces the whole of the succeeding treatise, has nothing to support it. Meier's interpretation is also to be designated as quite a failure. He understands the λέγειν of "mere indifferent speaking and relating of such secretly-committed vices, which is of itself even infamous and low." That indifferent relating is to form a contrast with the ἐλέγχειν, "the openly blaming to one's face." But the passage does not contain the slightest intimation that St Paul intended a contrast between λέγειν and ἐλέγχειν.

Ver. 13. But the main difficulty in this passage has been found in ver. 13, the proverb-like conciseness of which no doubt carries along with it a certain obscurity;[1] however, if we have only defined the idea of the ἐλέγχειν correctly, what *follows* connects itself plainly with what *precedes*. That is to say, St Paul means in what follows partly to describe more accurately the effect of the ἐλέγχειν to the salvation of the sinner, partly to represent it as secured in its success, and does that so that he refers it to the contrast of light and darkness which has been used ever since verse 8. St Paul designates light as the divine element of life, as what illumines darkness with all that is done in it, *i.e.* as the principle which makes darkness manifest in its nature and frightful form; but at the same time also light metamorphoses darkness and its works by its creative power, and makes them light themselves. It follows then from *that*, that light alone is the true reality which has the power to scare darkness into its nothingness; therefore, where light is as in the faithful (verse 8, φῶς ἐν

[1] See Kuinoel's dissertation on Ephes. v. 6–14 in Velthusen's, Kuinoel's, and Ruperti's Collection of Theol. Essays, vol. iii. pp. 173, ss.

κυρίῳ), there is also the certainty of the victory over darkness, if they only dare to rebuke it. Thus then the διὸ λέγει ἔγειρε κ.τ.λ. in verse 14 is closely united with what precedes, for the rousing voice ἔγειρε, ἀνάστα, is exactly the ἐλέγχειν recommended to the faithful by the apostle in verse 11, and the illumination, which Christ performs, is equal to the ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτὸς φανεροῦσθαι in verse 13.

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

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

Ver. 15, 16. After that, St Paul then again resumes the above exhortation (ver. 8), and summons his readers to a circumspect walk, which appreciates the relation of things, and shows

wisdom by that means. (Comp. the parallel passage Col. iv. 5, where the further subordinate definition πρὸς τοὺς ἔξω is added, which, according to the context of the whole passage [see ver. 6, 7], must *here* too be supplied. *There* we find to the phrase ἐξαγοραζόμενοι τὸν καιρόν, which Luther plainly translates incorrectly, "adapt yourselves to the time." *That* acceptation also, according to which it is understood of the diligent use of time, is unsuitable, for then ὅτι αἱ ἡμέραι πονηραί εἰσι could not follow, the *shortness* of life on earth would rather need to be insisted on. The days are called evil (in the first instance those of the then time, in the more extended sense of the whole αἰὼν οὗτος, in which sin has dominion), because of the manifold temptations which obstruct the believer. With regard to *that*, the ἐξαγοράζειν τὸν καιρὸν can only be referred to the foreseeing, prudent use of circumstances for the salvation of one's self and of others. Beza had already correctly observed, that the phrase is taken from the figure of a a foreseeing merchant who uses everything for his ends. The parable in Luke xvi. 1, ss., also recommends that prudence. (Ver. 16. On the phrase ἡμέραι πονηραὶ see vi. 13; Ps. xlix. 6; Prov. xxvi. 4.)

Ver. 17, 18. Therefore, continues St Paul (viz. because the time is evil), be not ἄφρονες. That ἄφρονες is not = ἄσοφοι is self-evident; they differ as σοφία and σύνεσις or φρόνησις. (See at i. 8.) Here the true σύνεσις is designated as that one which searches out God's will, and at the same time also follows it, which gives for the antithesis of the ἀφροσύνη the following one's own will and one's own desires as a characteristic sign. Just in the same way, piety is in the Old Testament treated as real prudence, godlessness, on the contrary, as folly. The μεθύσκεσθαι οἴνῳ is put by synecdoche for all the modes of gratifying one's own lusts (the πλεονεξίᾳ, ver. 3), as appears by the addition ἐν ᾧ ἐστιν ἀσωτία. Pampering of the flesh bears in itself all the rest of the moral errors, especially the sins of lust, because it invests the σάρξ with the government, and brings the νοῦς into a servile relation. St Paul insisted here on that form of sin in particular, in order to make more marked the contrast with the πληροῦσθαι ἐν πνεύματι. Man in his ματαιότης τοῦ νοὸς (iv. 18) feels the want of a strengthening through spiritual influences from without; instead of seeking for these in the Holy Spirit, he in his blindness has recourse to the *natural* spirit, *i.e.*, to wine and strong drinks. Therefore, according to the point of view of the Law, the Old Testament, in the institution of the

Nazarenes, recommends abstinence from wine and strong drinks, in order to preserve the soul free from all merely *natural* spiritual influences, and by that means to make it more susceptible of the operations of the *Holy* Spirit. (Comp. Numbers vi. 1, ss.) We must not by any means suppose *special* references of this exhortation: μὴ μεθύσκεσθε οἴνῳ, for instance, to abuses at the Agapæ, as they are reproved at 1 Cor. xi. 21 (a supposition which Koppe and Holzhausen defend), having regard to the context of the passage. (The reading ουνίετε for συνιέντες, which Lachmann has admitted on the authority of A.B., is to be considered as a mere facilitating correction. — Ἀσωτία is found Tit. i. 6; 1 Pet. iv. 4, ἀσώτως Luke xv. 13, in the meaning of *vita luxuriosa*, a loose, dissipated life. The Spirit with which the believer is to be filled, is of course the Holy Spirit, not *his own;* the addition ἁγίῳ, however, which some *minusculi* have, is spurious.)

Ver. 19, 20. In conclusion, St Paul names, as effects of the being filled with the Holy Ghost and the spiritual joy proceeding therefrom, the public adoration of God in songs of praise, the purport of which is thanksgiving to God in Christ's name. No doubt, the implied contrast, which this spiritual joy bursting forth into songs of praise forms with the carnal joy, which is wont to prevail at worldly banquets, where the μεθύσκεσθαι οἴνῳ takes place, floated before St Paul's mind here. In ver. 19, however, the λαλοῦντες ἑαυτοῖς forms an antithesis with the ᾄδοντες and ψάλλοντες ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ. The *former* denotes the *public* adoration of God in the religious assemblies, the *latter* the *silent inward* communion with God in the heart. We see, therefore, from this passage, that even in the apostle's time singing was an element of divine worship. According to 1 Cor. xiv. 15, ss., the γλώσσαις λαλεῖν also manifested itself in a poetical shape, and the improvised poems seem to have been immediately presented in musical measures. (See the details in the Comm. on 1 Cor. xiv.) Thus Pliny too relates (Ep. x. 96) of the Christians: Carmen Christo quasi Deo dicunt secum invicem. Unfortunately, of that primeval Christian poetry there has been as good as nothing preserved; only under the name of Clemens of Alexandria a hymn, of perhaps, primeval date, has survived, which I have had printed. (See my Monumenta Hist. Ecclesiæ., vol. i., p. 279, ss.) That assemblies for public worship are here spoken of is likewise shown by the parallel passage Col. iii. 16, 17, in which the department of teaching, properly so called, is put forward, in the words: ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ διδάσκοντες καὶ

νουθετοῦντες ἑαυτούς. Böhmer finds in those words an indication of the universal priesthood of the first Christians; but the διδάσκειν and νουθετεῖν ἑαυτοὺς, *i.e.* αλλήλους, does not exclude order in the form of instruction which required appointed teachers. See the details on this point in the interpretation of the pastoral epistles. As to the synonyms ψαλμὸς, ὕμνος, ᾠδή, the first properly denotes every song performed with a musical accompaniment. It is, however, highly improbable that in the congregations of the primitive Church instrumental accompaniments to the singing were already used; ψαλμοὶ are probably here the Psalms of the Old Testament, which passed from the synagogue into the Church-service. Ὕμνος is every song, the main contents of which are praise of and thanks to God, therefore a song of praise; ᾠδή, on the contrary, can have another purport as well; the epithet πνευματικὸς defines the songs here meant, as such as are of genuine religious purport. The same terms are also found in the parallel passage, Col. iii. 16. The reading καρδίαις has probably intruded into the text here from Colossians, though *there* too καρδίᾳ is found altered from this passage in some MSS. The peculiar addition; ἐν χάριτι (Col. iii. 16), is not to be referred to the grace of the song (for it is ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις, therefore purely inward, but to the grateful feeling of the believer.—Ἀᾴδειν καὶ ψάλλειν is to be viewed as a collective idea, by which the inward spiritual joy is to be denoted.—In ver. 20 ὑπὲρ πάντων is to be taken as neuter, "for all that befals you, be it good or evil." The discourse here is not of prayer for others. On the formula ἐν ὀνόματι, which = בְּשֵׁם, see the Comm. on Matt. xxi. 9, xxiii. 39; John xiv. 13.—On τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ see i. 3. In Col. iii. 17 there is further added: τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ δι' αὐτοῦ, as every prayer is rendered acceptable to God the Father through Christ).

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

(V. 21–VI. 9.)

St Paul comes now, in the progress of his exhortations, to marriage, on which he expresses himself at great length (ver. 21–33), and that too by drawing a parallel between the relation of Christ to the Church, and that between man and wife. To the consideration of marriage are further annexed moral exhorta-

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

Ver. 21, 22. As to the ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις ἐν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ (verse 21), one may doubt whether it is to be referred to what *pre*cedes or what *suc*ceeds. In the *former* case it must, with λαλοῦντες and the other participles in verses 19, 20, depend on πληροῦσθε ἐν πνεύματι (verse 18); that is the way Winer (Gramm. p. 319) and Lachmann take it. But, first, one does not see how the exhortation to subordination can be introduced into the invitation to spiritual joy, and, secondly, the τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ forms, and plainly too, the conclusion of the preceding treatise, so that another participle cannot possibly be joined on. United, however, with what follows, the participle at the beginning is strange. For the supposition of Calvin, Koppe, Flatt, and others, that the participle stands for the imperative, is inadmissible in a grammatical point of view. The connection with what follows is made still more difficult by the uncertainty of the reading in verse 22.—B. leaves ὑποτάσσεσθε out altogether, D.E.F.G. have it before τοῖς ἰδίοις: On the other hand, A. 17. 57, and other inferior critical authorities, have ὑποτασσέσθωσαν. However, all these deviations seem to have arisen only through the difficulty of the ὑποτασσόμενοι (verse 21). Probably the case stands thus with the passage: verse 21 is meant to declare the principle of subordination quite compre-

hensively for all the relations which are afterwards treated of singly, to which then, next, in verse 22, the exhortation to married women is subjoined. According to this view the participle ὑποτασσόμενοι is most simply explained in accordance with the context by the assumption of an ellipse: "all believers are subordinate one to another in the fear of Christ."—The definition ἐν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ excludes all slavish fear, the fear of Christ is the tender timidity which love has in its train. (Cf. verse 33.) It remains to be said that the reading Χριστοῦ is defended by A.B.D.E.F.G., and is no doubt preferable to the readings Θεοῦ, κυρίου, Ἰησοῦ. In verse 22 ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ is also added, for which in the parallel passage Col. iii. 18 ὡς ἀνῆκεν ἐν κυρίῳ stands, in order to exclude every slavish idea. Wives are, therefore, to be subject not to their husbands as such, but to God's ordinance in the institution of marriage; just as the Christian in his relation to those in authority serves not man, but the ordinance of God, of which men are the representatives. Finally, the addition ἰδίοις cannot with Meier be referred to the right of property, which, according to the view of the whole ancient world, the husband had over the wife; the following representation does not say anything in favour of such a conception of marriage; but men are meant by it to be designated as *married* men. (See the passages quoted by Harless at p. 490.)

Ver. 23, 24. The necessity of this subordination of the wife to the husband is deduced from the relation of the two parties to each other ordained by God. The man is the head, *i.e.* the directing, determining, power of the wife, as Christ is of the Church. (See on 1 Cor xi. 3, ss.; Ephes. i. 22, iv. 15.) Therefore, as the latter is subject to Christ, consequently is determined and guided in its will by Him, so should the wife be by the husband. All frivolous reveries of an emancipation of women to be expected are annihilated by this energetic declaration of St Paul. Among them must also be reckoned Rückert's (ad h. l.) thinking that there is expressed in this declaration of St Paul, as to the relation of the wife towards her husband, a remnant of still unsubdued Judaïsm in him, as if *that* alone, not God's ordinance, had introduced the subjection of the wife to her husband. Only the ἐν παντί scil. ὑποτασσέσθωσαν might be viewed as an exaggeration. That is to say, the Church is, it is true, subject to Christ absolutely in everything, because only *holy* claims on her proceed from Him; but the husband, as being a sinner, cannot require of his wife obedience to *unholy* suggestions. Neither is that, of course, the apostle's

meaning. As in the case of the unconditional command to obey those in authority (see on Rom. xiii. 1), the restriction is still self-evident, that those in authority order nothing against God's commandments, and therefore the law "to obey God more than men," always has precedence of all others, so it has *here* too. Just because wives are to be subject to their husbands ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ, they cannot obey their husbands against the Lord's will. But, as St Paul has *Christian* marriages in view, it was needless to insist particularly on that self-evident restriction. No doubt, however, the commandment relates not to *kind* husbands only, but also to the *unreasonable* and *wayward* ones; as long as the demands of the husband keep within the domain of the morally indifferent only, —are against no objective divine commandments,—it is the wife's duty to perform them. The addition αὐτὸς σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος with ἀλλὰ following alone requires particular notice in these verses. For, that in that addition καὶ and ἐστι are to be erased, with Lachmann, the MSS. A.B.D.E.F.G. prove decidedly enough; but certainly ἐστι must be *supplied*. The main question, however, is: what is the object of the whole observation, which seems to interrupt the connection, and how is the ἀλλὰ, that one stumbles at, to be taken? Harless (p. 488, sq.) thinks St Paul, in the whole section down to ver. 33, "shows himself to be under the influence of two purposes." St Paul intends, according to Harless, to give instruction not merely on the relations of man and wife, but also on that of Christ to the Church, allowing, indeed, that the conditions of the last named relation would not in all their parts afford parallels for the marriage state. Harless accordingly takes ἀλλὰ (ver. 24) and πλὴν (ver. 33) as particles used to recal the reader from a digression to the main subject. But if this *does* seem quite suitable in the case of πλὴν in ver. 33, because there ver. 32 clearly exhibits itself as an idea that interrupts the parallel, still the addition αὐτὸς σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος will too greatly oppose the taking it as a digression. To what purpose is this observation, that Christ is the Saviour of His body, if it is to be supposed a digression, as it was surely already known to the readers from i. 22, and to what purpose is, after this rhapsodical digression, a formal resumption of the main subject with an ἀλλὰ? Winer (Gramm. p. 421) has already correctly explained the conjunction ἀλλὰ in this connection. Ἀλλὰ here simply introduces the proof which is drawn from what precedes. In ver. 23 it was said "the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ is the head of the Church." Now

from that parallel St Paul concludes for the necessity of the subordination of the wife; "but, as the Church is subject unto Christ, so now must wives also be subject to their husbands." Only, we must supply here not ὑποτάσσονται, but ὑποτασσέσθωσαν; from the actual subordination of the Church to Christ St Paul deduces the obligation of the subordination of the wife to her husband. According to this, then, the addition αὐτὸς σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος appears by no means as a digression, but merely as an apposition to the idea of the κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, which has the sole object of setting forth Christ more clearly as κεφαλή, whilst it (the addition) denotes the Church as the σῶμα which He governs. (In ver. 24 ἰδίοις is decidedly spurious, and is erased from the text by the better critics.)

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

It might he said that surely the wife also is to practise this self-sacrificing, sanctifying, conduct towards her husband; but from the normal position of the sexes, the positive influence must certainly always proceed from the man; and therefore the exhortation finds its appropriate place *here*, not in the description of the relation of the wife to her husband. It remains to be said that it is self-evident, and inherent in the nature of such a parallel, in which *every* line cannot accurately fit, that the separate expressions have each their bearing indeed, but must not be forced. Thus it is said of Christ: ἑαυτὸν παρέδωκεν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς, "He gave Himself up to death as a vicarious sacrifice for her;" in reference to marriage, St Paul means to be understood by that merely a love capable of a self-sacrifice even unto death; in just the same way the καθαρίσας τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος refers in the case of Christ to baptism, and the new birth effected by it, but in reference to marriage it merely designates love bent upon moral purification. It is extremely tasteless on this phrase to remind one of the Jewish custom of the bathing of the bride before the nuptial night. But *still less* can *a digression* be supposed here; the essential ideas, so far as they can be referred to marriage, are

meant, according to St Paul's intention, to apply to *it* also, so far as they are applicable to it. The closing words alone of ver. 26 require a particular consideration. In them the combination ἵνα αὐτὴν ἁγιάσῃ καθαρίσας is to be taken so that the ἁγιάζειν appears as a consequence of the καθαρίζειν: "that He may sanctify her, after He had previously purified her by the bath," *i.e.* baptism (comp. Tit. iii. 5, where baptism is called λοῦτρον παλιγγενεσίας.) But the mode of taking the ἐν ῥήματι is uncertain. Most of the interpretations exhibit themselves as false at the first glance; *e.g.* that of Koppe, according to which ἐν ῥήματι ἵνα are to be joined, which then, as he thought, would stand for the Hebrew עַל דְּבַר אֲשֶׁר, which phrase, however, the LXX. never translate so. Moreover, the order of the words is against the connection with ἁγιάσῃ; the conjunction of the phrases would otherwise not be improper from the analogy of the ἁγιάζειν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ. (Cf. John xvii. 17.) It can only be joined to λοῦτρὸν τοῦ ὕδατος. In this connection, people have usually either thought of the ordinance of Christ in the institution of baptism, by which the bath receives its purifying power, or of the declaration as to reconciliation, and forgiveness of sins. But in both the relations one does not see how the article could be wanting before ῥήματι, as, according to them, St Paul would have had a definite word in his mind. Ἐν ῥήματι rather stands here = ἐν πνεύματι (ii. 22) as to the sense, and that too with the object of intimating that baptism is no *mere bath*, but a bath *in the Word*, *i.e.* such a one by means of which man is born again of water and of the Spirit (John iii. 5). Thus, in 1 Pet. i. 23; James i. 18, the Word of God is represented as the seed of the new birth. Ῥῆμα accordingly is here, as in Heb. i. 3, xi. 5, a designation of the divine power and efficacy in general, which, from its nature, must be a spiritual one. But in Christianity the Word does not appear in the indeterminate form of universal spiritual efficacy as in the creation, but the Spirit manifests itself only in the Word of Truth, which is in Christ. On this property of the Spirit of being indissolubly joined to the Word of Christ, and further on their respective identity, see particulars at vi. 17.

Ver. 27. The idea of the ἵνα ἁγιάσῃ is further carried out and described in its results. Christ wishes to set up the Church for Himself, *i.e.* for His joy and glory, in splendour and without spot. In the description of the spotless beauty St Paul plainly has in view the image of the bride; for a proof that we have

here no digression to do with. As Christ purifies and cleanses the Church, so likewise a faithful husband wishes to deliver his wife from every moral stain. (On παριστάνειν in such a combination see at Rom. vi. 13, xii. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 2; Col. i. 22.—A.B.D.E.F.G. read αὐτὸς for αὐτήν, and therefore Griesbach and Lachmann have with good reason received it into the text.—Σπῖλος is found nowhere again but at 2 Pet. ii. 13. Ῥυτίς does not occur again in the New Testament.)

Ver. 28, 29. This description of the love of Christ is applied to the love which the husband owes to his wife. Οὕτως refers back to what preceded, and contains the two points of self-sacrifice and of sanctification; neither can be wanting in a really Christian marriage, in which love rests, not merely on a sensual contentment, but is to have a moral basis. By this retrospective reference to what precedes, it becomes clear that, in ver. 26, 27, no digression is to be looked for; St Paul means even the individual traits of the love of Christ to be referred to marriage—of course, so far as they are applicable to human conditions. But here a progress in the chain of argument is shown, in the circumstance that St Paul will have the wife loved by her husband, ὡς τὸ σῶμα ἑαυτοῦ. As the Church is called Christ's body, thus also man and wife form an unity (ver. 31). But here σῶμα has not πνεῦμα, but κεφαλή (ver. 23), which is certainly the organ of the spirit, for an antithesis; in ver. 33 ὡς ἑαυτὸν stands directly. The intimateness of the connection, in a genuine marriage, is, therefore, such, that the wife is a part of self: "whoever loves his wife loves himself." As, therefore, care of the flesh naturally proceeds from self-love, thus, too, is it with the love of the husband, and with the relation of Christ to the Church; the opposite of that, the want of love in the husband, is, accordingly, something unnatural. It remains to be said, that σάρξ, in ver. 29, has, by no means, the subordinate idea of the sinful, σῶμα might stand here just as well; σάρξ is here chosen only in order to make the physical neediness of the σῶμα appear more plainly. As for the rest, it might seem as if too much were asserted, when it is said, in ver. 29: οὐδείς πότε κ. τ. λ. Why, St Paul himself warns (Col. ii. 23) against false asceticism, which deprives the body of what is necessary for it. Meyerhoff (on the Ep. to the Colossians, p. 144) has singular views on this point. He finds, without any foundation, in the whole section about marriage, a diatribe against false asceticism, which rejected marriage, and,

in ver. 29, he lays a stress on πότε, in such a way, that he refers it to past ages under Gentilism. "*Then* no one did such a thing as hate his own flesh," with which we should have to supply: "but some do *now*." This acceptation of the passage requires no refutation; there is not even the slightest vestige of polemics in the whole comparison between the matrimonial relation and the relation of Christ to the Church. Besides, there are surely found, even before Christ, vestiges of strict discipline among Gentiles and Jews; even if more rarely in the West, yet in the East. We can only say, St Paul takes the idea: οὐδεὶς γάρ πότε ἐμίσησε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σάρκα, thus generally, because cases of an opposite description are at bottom only aberrations of the mind; the love of one's own body and life is an essential natural instinct; it can, it is true, be led astray by inferences of the intellect, but never be annihilated.

Ver. 30. In what follows, St Paul proves, in detail, that the unity of Christ with the Church is not a merely figurative, metaphorical, nor even a purely spiritual one, but also a truly bodily one, and that, too, so that he, in doing so, again has the comparison of marriage before his eyes. The relation of Christ to the Church is also described after Gen. ii. 23, which passage refers immediately to the relation of man and wife. Because the wife is taken from the man, and in marriage becomes one flesh with him (ver. 31), the man loves his wife in himself; thus Christ also loves in the Church His own body, for we are taken from Him. This ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ κ. τ. λ. cannot, of course, be referred, as Chrysostom, Augustine, and others, wished, to Christ's being made man, for it must have been said of that conversely: "He took on Him our flesh and bone;" but to the imparting His glorified corporeity to believers, through the communion of His flesh and blood. It is not especially the *spiritual* birth which is here mentioned—the *corporeal* aspect is, both here and in ver. 31, made too emphatically prominent; it is the self-communication of His divine-human nature, by which Christ makes us His flesh and bone. He gives to His followers His flesh to eat, His blood to drink, ἐκτρέφει καὶ θάλπει τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. The reference of the phrase: ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ merely to the general idea of an inward communion, would leave the depth of the idea in this passage absolutely unexhausted; Christ, who took on Him our nature (John i. 14), changes us, in return, into Himself (2 Peter i. 4). The omission

of the ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς—ὀστέων αὐτοῦ in A.B. can only be considered as an oversight; Lachmann has omitted them without sufficing grounds.

Ver. 31. To the words from Gen. ii. 23 is immediately subjoined, with the omission of some words which were of no importance to St Paul's argument, the following verse, Gen. ii. 24, which is quoted literally from the LXX., only they read, instead of ἀντὶ τούτου, the equivalent formula ἕνεκεν τούτου = עַל־כֵּן, and instead of προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς they have the dative. The Greek here, as also in the LXX., deviates from the Hebrew text especially in the point that οἱ δύο stands, while in the original text the words are: וְהָיוּ לְבָשָׂר אֶחָד. This emphatic mention of the οἱ δύο is considered as an establishment of monogamy, which is nowhere else in Scripture expressly recommended. According to the context in Genesis the passage quoted refers now to the relation of the sexes in marriage; as the woman was originally one with the man and is taken from his body, so too she again becomes one with him in marriage, and indeed not merely one *spirit*, which also happens in friendship, but also one *flesh*. Because, then, the unity is original, and the duality yearns to return again to unity, man will give up the most intimate ties even, in order to attain that unity. The exhortation to husbands to love their wives gains therefrom a powerful support; the object, for which the husband leaves father and mother, must also necessarily lay claim to his entire love. But as, both in what precedes and in what succeeds, the discourse is of the relation of Christ to the Church, St Paul's meaning seems to be, that that relation finds its analogy in *this* verse also. But how is this to be taken? That the love of the sexes, which has received its holy consecration from God the Lord in marriage, is a reflection and an echo of the eternal, holy, love of the Son of God towards man,—that therefore the attachment of the husband to his wife and their intimate conjunction into one flesh can be compared with the intimate, essential conjunction of the Son of God with the Church into one unity,—is clear enough, and proceeds unmistakeably from the spirit of the whole parallel. But the leaving of one's father and mother can have no special reference here to the relation of Christ to the Church, because here His becoming man is the only thing that could be imagined; and *that*, as has been already observed on ver. 30, is to be excluded here, because according to it Christ took on Him *our* flesh and blood, *we* did not take *His* on *us*. If, therefore, it has

been proposed, as has often happened, to refer the καταλείψει τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ to the leaving of the Father and of heaven, or of the upper Jerusalem (Galat. iv. 26), which took place when the Son of God became man, it has no foundation in the context of the whole train of argument. The reference of the quotation to Christ and the Church is couched here in the last words only: καὶ προσκολληθήσεται—σάρκα μίαν. But the reference of these words, which first of all relate to union in marriage, extends in its application to Christ and the Church, beyond the idea of a merely *spiritual* union, as, even among the Fathers, Theodoret, in later times, Calvin, Beza, Calovius, Grotius, among the moderns, Holzhausen and Harless, have understood. As we saw at ver. 30 that the faithful are of Christ's flesh and bone, because they were made partakers of His glorified corporeity; so here too the σὰρξ μία is to be understoood with reference to the communication of Christ's flesh and blood to His followers. This His divine human nature the Saviour imparts, it is true, in *faith* also (see on John vi. 45, ss.), but the most intense, most concentrated, communication of it happens at the Holy Communion. As, therefore, man and wife are, it is true, *always* one in love; but in the moments of matrimonial conjunction, in which the peculiar property of marriage consists, become one flesh in an *especial* sense; so too the Church in the mass, and every congregation, as also every soul in it, is *constantly* one spirit with Christ, the head of the body,—but in the moments of the Holy Communion the believing soul solemnizes the union with its Saviour in an entirely special sense, in that it takes up His flesh and blood into itself, and along with it the germ of the immortal body, that divine σπέρμα, which does not permit one to sin (1 John iii. 9), from which the plant of the σῶμα πνευματικὸν grows up. It then plainly proceeds from this interpretation that St Paul does not conceive the relation of the glorified body to this mortal one, so that at the resurrection the former is all at once produced by a creative act of God (see in the Comm. on 1 Cor. xv. 52, where the ἐν ῥιπῇ ὀφθαλμοῦ refers only to the suddenness of the opening, not of the production), but the new body is, even while here below, built up through the communion with the Saviour, and imparting of His nature, in the mortal body; just as in Christ Himself, even before His resurrection, the glorified body was in His mortal body, and at times shone through the latter (see in the Comm. on Matt. xvii. 1, ss.) was already communicated to the disciples at the institution of the Lord's

Supper, and finally, at the resurrection, came forth complete, swallowing up death in life.

Ver. 32. Here now St Paul breaks off the parallel, which he has carried through so grandly and profoundly, by breaking out into the exclamation: τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν, upon the relation of Christ to the Church, therefore to the exclusion of marriage. By this it is not meant to be denied, that marriage, too, bears in it something mysterious; on the contrary, *that* is couched, as self-evident, in the fact that marriage can be compared with such a mystery; but the words do not refer first of all to marriage. This suffices in order to judge with what reason the Catholic divines find in this passage an argument for the assertion that marriage is a sacrament, with which expression the Vulgate, after the custom of the language of the first Christians, translates the word μυστήριον. Now, if we refer the communion of Christ with the Church, described in verse 31, to the *spiritual* side only, it is not to be conceived for what reason St Paul should have used that strong expression, τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν. On the other hand, the phrase is completely accounted for by the interpretation given by us, according to which in fact the relation of Christ to the Church is a continuous miraculous process of production of a higher glorified life. We see in it the creative action of God, which seems *outwardly* completed, *inwardly* proceed, and in mysterious, deeply hidden operation build up the temple of glorified corporeity, and at the same time also the great joint temple of the new heaven and the new earth. If we, to wind up this remarkable section, cast another glance at the whole comparison carried through in it, it is surely already contained, as to its fundamental idea, in the Old Testament, which often describes Jehovah's relation to the people of Israel as that of a bridegroom. (See Ps. xlv.; Isaiah liv. 5; Hezek. xvi. 1, ss.; Hosea ii. 16, ss., and the Song of Solomon.) This same image is found in the New Testament, in Matt. ix. 15; Mark ii. 19; Luke v. 34; John iii. 29; 2 Cor. xi. 2; Rev. xxii. 17. But it is peculiar to our passage that this parallel with marriage is expressly extended to the glorified corporeity also, and placed in connection with the special attribute of marriage, sexual union. However greatly marriage appears sanctified by that parallel, however entirely all suspicions of marriage, which proceed from false ascetic ideas, appear unscriptural; yet, on the other hand, it is comprehensible that the very special references to the mysteries of marriage may be thought dangerous to meddle with;

in such scruples we have certainly to look for the reason of the phenomenon, that so many interpreters of greater penetration than most, have yet hesitated to understand the parallel in our passage in all that latitude, that St Paul's words unmistakeably mean it to be understood in. For those scruples are explicable by the fancy's being just in reference to this point so polluted, that a pure contemplation of such images is seldom possible. One ought, therefore, to be as cautious as one can in the application of them in liturgical and homiletical use; but it is self-evident that a possible abuse cannot deter the interpreter from showing the comparison just as it is laid down in God's Word. Truth cannot shape and restrict itself according to the excitability of sin, but the latter is to be mastered and in God's might at last to be subdued by the former. To the pure all things are pure, and thus too says the mouth of the chastest of all the children of men, "He that hath the bride is the bridegroom; but the friend of the bridegroom, who stands (that is to say, before the door of the bridal chamber) and hears him, rejoices greatly because of the bridegroom's voice" (John iii. 29), in which words, just as here, the union of the bride and the bridegroom is an image for the communion of Christ and the Church.

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

Chapter vi. ver. 1–3. St Paul makes a transition in his exhortations from parents to children, to whom above all obedience, as the natural duty, based on the right relation of children to their parents (that is the idea of the δίκαιον, see on Rom. iii. 21), is held up. But by the addition of ἐν κυρίῳ this duty too is meant to be designated as to be practised in the Spirit of Christ; the parallel passage, Col. iii. 20, has instead of it τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν εὐάρεστον ἐν κυρίῳ. But with respect to this commandment St Paul refers expressly to the ordinance of the Old Testament (Ex. xx. 12; Deut. v. 16), not, however, in order to illustrate the necessity of practising it, for *that* is sufficiently well based on the nature of

the relation, but in order to draw attention to the magnitude of the promise which is coupled with the faithful performance of this commandment. But now here the phrase ἐντολὴ πρώτη ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ creates a difficulty. Πρώτη could only be understood of the order or of the importance of the commandment, in case, as Holzhausen maintained, ἐντολὴ referred merely to such commandments as related to duties towards men, not towards God; that is to say, the commandment "honour thy father and thy mother" is the first on the second table, which regards those duties. But the collation of Matt. xxii. 36; Mark xii. 28, ss.; and Hebrews ix. 19, shows that Holzhausen's view is erroneous. We must, therefore, join πρώτη ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ, so that the fourth commandment is designated as the first that is couched in a promise derived from divine mercy, which is quoted in verse 3. But here it seems again embarrassing, that the *first* commandment has a promise *too*. But the addition to the first commandment (Ex. xx. 5, 6) is no promise referring to that first commandment, but merely a perfectly general characterization of Jehovah as the Just One, who punishes sin and rewards virtue. The words of the promise itself are quoted freely from memory (verse 3). The LXX. have ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται καὶ ἵνα μακροχρόνιος γένῃ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τῆς ἀγαθῆς, ἣν κύριος ὁ Θεός σου δίδωσί σοι. According to the point of view of the Old Testament the divine blessing is referred to the earthly possession of the land of Canaan, which is promised the people (to whom the laws are given as a whole) on the presupposition of a faithful fulfilment of them, and especially of the fourth commandment. St Paul takes this blessing figuratively, in conformity with the point of view of the Gospel (just as Matt. v. 5, on which see the remark in the Comm.), and reaches out after it beyond this earth into the kingdom of God. Compare the typical acceptation of Canaan also in Hebrews iv. 1, ss. (In verse 1 Lachmann leaves out ἐν κυρίῳ, on the authority of B.D.F.G., but probably it is left out in those MSS. only because it is wanting in Col. iii. 20. Ver. 3. μακροχρόνιος is not found again in the New Testament.)

Ver. 4. The exhortation makes a transition from children to fathers. These are named *alone*, because the education of adolescent children is intended, which from the nature of the thing belongs more to the fathers than to the mothers. To take the idea "Fathers" as = "Parents" seems less proper. The treatment of children on the part of their fathers is to be in the spirit of love, the children are not to be provoked to anger by

undue strictness. Instead of μὴ παροργίζετε the parallel passage, Col. iii. 21, has the synonymous μὴ ἐρεθίζετε, with the addition: ἵνα μὴ ἀθυμῶσιν, *i.e.* that they (the children) may not be discouraged, viz., in the fulfilment of their duty towards their parents. In our passage beside the *negative* side the *positive* one also is brought forward. Christianly-minded fathers are duly to temper gravity with mildness in the education of their children: the side of gravity is denoted by the ἐν παιδείᾳ, that of mildness by the ἐν νουθεσίᾳ, and both characterized by the addition of κυρίου as supported by the Spirit of Christ. (The genitive κυρίου is to be explained by the circumstance that both, discipline and exhortation, are conceived as proceeding from Christ Himself.)

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

Now the way in which St Paul first exhorts slaves to be obedient to their masters (which, *detractis detrahendis*, is applicable also to the servants of our days), says much both for the

profound wisdom which filled him, and the purest moral bias which he followed. He teaches them in the earthly masters (κυρίοις κατὰ σάρκα) to obey the true κύριος κατὰ πνεῦμα, Christ; by that means the fear and trembling which he requires become the expression not of a slavish mind, but of the tender timidity of love, which fears to mistake in any way the will of the beloved one (see on v. 21, 33). Whilst the slave, therefore, in his state of life recognises God's will, his obedience is also to be pure, without double-dealing (ἐν ἁπλότητι τῆς καρδίας), the will of the Lord is to be performed not for outward show, merely before men's eyes, but in truth. Through this operation of Christianity, directed to the inmost state of the soul, it is the power which transforms the world. It makes each in his place what he is intended to be, the master a true master, the servant a true servant. But further, not merely is the *whole* will of the master to be done, even in secret, where no eye observes the performance, but it is to be done from the heart also, *i.e.* with willingness and joyfulness. The will of the earthly master is here conceived exactly as θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, because the relation of dependence comes from God, and so therefore do the individual manifestations of it. It remains to be said that *here* too, again, it is self-evident, that this absolute obedience to the earthly master (at Col. iii. 22 there stands expressly ὑπακούετε κατὰ πάντα) does not extend to that which is forbidden by God; he that serves his master as if he served God will never fall into the temptation to sacrifice God's will to his master's. (Ὀφθαλμοδουλεία is found again only in Col. iii. 22. It is a word coined by St Paul himself. In the same way ἀνθρωπάρεσκος is found again in the New Testament only at Col. iii. 22, and in the LXX. in Ps. liii. 5. [For the rest compare as to this word Lobeck ad Phrynichum, p. 621.]—The ἐκ ψυχῆς here and at Col. iii. 22, instead of the more usual ἐκ καρδίας, to which our "from the heart" corresponds, is peculiar. Yet we have also the completely corresponding phrase: "to love a person with one's whole soul." See on the relation of ψυχὴ and καρδία my opusc. theol. p. 159, sq.) The connection of the words in ver. 7 is uncertain. Some persons punctuate thus: ποιοῦντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ· ἐκ ψυχῆς μετ' εὐνοίας δουλεύοντες, others put the colon after εὐνοίας, uniting the participle δουλεύοντες with what follows: finally, others, again, join ἐκ ψυχῆς with Θεοῦ, but separate μετ' εὐνοίας from it. This last is in any case to be preferred, because by means of it the nearly kindred expressions ἐκ ψυχῆς and μετ' εὐνοίας are duly sepa-

rated, the sense being then as follows: "as such as do God's will from their hearts, who with good-will (not with repugnance) do service, as to the Lord, and not to men." (Εὐνοία occurs only once again, viz. 1 Cor. vii. 3, but in a totally different sense there.) Finally, in ver. 8 St Paul brings forward, as a motive for true resignation in servitude, the future recompense at the day of retribution, by which the unequal distribution of lots here below is equalized. The parallel passage Col. iii. 24, where the general phrase κομιεῖται παρὰ κυρίου is explained by the ἀπολήψεσθε τὴν ἀνταπόδοσιν τῆς κληρονομίας, is illustrative of this passage. That is to say, the inheritance here, as elsewhere also, is the participation in the kingdom of God (see at Ephes. i. 18). Besides *that*, in Col. iii. 25 the threat of punishment is also added in the words: ὁ δὲ ἀδικῶν κομιεῖται ὁ ἠδίκησε. (In ver. 8 the collocation ὅτι ὃ ἐάν τι ἕκαστος, for which many important MSS. read ὅτι ἕκαστος ὃ ἄν ποιήσῃ, which facilitates the understanding of the passage, and which Lachmann has received into the text, causes a difficulty. But how, assuming the original existence of this *last* reading, the *ordinary* one could have arisen, is completely incomprehensible. Besides, the collocation of the words ὅ ἐάν τι is to be explained by supposing a Tmesis. See Harless, p. 528.)

Ver. 9. St Paul makes a transition from the slaves to the masters, and exhorts the latter not, as one might suppose, to make their slaves free; *that* is left to the free motion of the Divine Spirit: but only on *their* part to exercise mildness towards them, in the consciousness that *they* too, like the former, have a master in heaven, with whom no consideration of the person is of any value. In the Epistle to the Colossians we find the proposition: καὶ οὐκ ἔστι προσωποληψία at the end of iii. 25, so that it therefore still belongs with the foregoing to the exhortation addressed to the slaves. In Col. iv. 1 the exhortation to the masters runs thus: τὸ δίκαιον καὶ τὴν ἰσότητα τοῖς δούλοις παρέχεσθε. Here the δίκαιον refers to what the slaves are justified in requiring, clothing, food, etc., but of course ἰσότης cannot mean equality with their masters," that would be abolishing slavery, which is against St Paul's intention. That expression rather denotes the equal treatment of all, whereby the preference of one at the expense of another would be excluded. In our passage the phrase ἀνιέντες τὴν ἀπειλὴν can only excite doubt, as the idea: "to forbear threatening, to cease to threaten," seems unsuitable, because St Paul cannot mean to say that merely the outward signs of unkindness

towards slaves are to cease, but the unkindness itself. In the same manner as the slaves, the masters too must do everything towards their slaves ἐκ ψυχῆς and μετ' εὐνοίας. Ἀπειλή here must be understood of the hardness of heart, whence the threatening proceeds as a consequence; the effect stands figuratively for the cause. (The reading καὶ αὐτῶν καὶ ὑμῶν might with Lachmann be preferable to καὶ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν. A.B.D. defend it. The reading ὑμῶν αὐτῶν, that is to say, might very easily arise from the collation of the Epistle to the Colossians [iv. 1], whereas αὐτῶν καὶ ὑμῶν presents a perfectly independent idea, viz., that of the identity of the Lord for all. As to the form προσωποληψία see Acts x. 34; Rom. ii. 11; Gal. ii. 6.)

§ 7. OF THE SPIRITUAL FIGHT.

(VI. 10–24).

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

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

Ver. 12. The mention of the devil occasions St Paul to compare the spiritual fight of the Christian with ordinary fights. (Ὑμῖν is to be read instead of ἡμῖν with Lachmann, on the authority of B.D.F.G., as indeed both in what preceded and what follows the second person constantly stands. In the *latter* one has weak men for antagonists, and needs therefore only *common* weapons for them; but in the fight against *spiritual* powers *spiritual weapons* also are required. The understanding of the passage is principally determined by the interpretation of the phrase αἷμα καὶ σάρξ; this denotes, like בָּשָׂר וְדָם, not the sinfulness of human nature (how could St Paul say that the Christian did not fight against *that?*), but men in general with the accessory idea of weakness. (See on Matt. xvi. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 50; Gal. i. 16.) Now certainly the Christian may fight with men, in as far as evil incitements proceed from them, but, fully realizing the contradictions of the universe, he will always view hostile men as only the instruments of the prince of this world, so that his real fight will not be directed against men (in whom the believer always sees

objects of salvation rather), but against the devil, who abuses them. Οὐκ—ἀλλὰ here shuts itself completely out; St Paul conceives the spiritual fight in its inmost root. The spiritual powers themselves are fully described in what follows; the kingdom of Satan is, as it were, dissected into its constituent parts. For, that the terms ἀρχαὶ and ἐξουσίαι denote spiritual powers of more or less might, good or evil nature (which the context alone can decide), we have already seen at i. 21, ii. 2. As there are archangels, so are there archdevils also, *i.e.* evil spirits of more comprehensive influence. But we must entirely renounce any attempt at closer determinations of the difference, as Scripture nowhere gives us any instruction on the point.[1] The following term, κοσμοκράτορες τοῦ σκότους τούτου, is without further analogy in the new Testament, although the devil by himself is often elsewhere in the Scriptures called ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, especially in St John xii. 31, xiv. 30, xvi. 11, and in St Paul, 2 Cor. iv. 4, ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου. What is elsewhere attributed to Satan alone, is here ascribed to all evil spirits, viz., dominion in a world that has fallen a prey to sin. The name קוֹסְמוֹקְרָטוֹר was also adopted by the Rabbis (see Buxtorf lex. talm. et rabb. p. 2006, sq.), and used by Gnostic sects as *terminus technicus*. But the phrase τοῦ σκότους τούτου is striking, that is to say, οὗτος can well be added to αἰὼν or κόσμος, because there is an antithesis *there to* μέλλων, but σκότος is in itself the element of darkness in the universe, which οὗτος does not suit. It is, therefore, very intelligible that τοῦ αἰῶνος, which, however, is decidedly spurious according to A.B.D.F.G., was inserted. Therefore τοῦ σκότους τούτου is to be interpreted "of the darkness which is here diffused, in which too ye live," so that the name κοσμοκράτορες τοῦ σκότους τούτου appears as the foundation for the necessity of the fight with them. As to the rest we certainly are not to suppose any climax in this phrase in its relation to the ἀρχαὶ καὶ ἐξουσίαι, for there is couched in the very idea ἀρχὴ the idea of more exalted angels, who rule others; on the contrary, the κοσμοκράτορες only defines more accurately the entirely general idea of the ἀρχὴ, just as τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας in its turn defines that of the κοσμοκράτορες. That is to say, by this last phrase the antithesis to the αἷμα καὶ σὰρξ is meant to be set forth in its whole force: "*spirits* of wickedness it is with whom ye have to fight, therefore the weapon of

[1] Meyer (de præstigiis dæmonum. Basileæ 1563) pretends to fix even the number of the archdevils; he supposes 572 of *them*, and 7,405,926 of the *common ones*.

the *spirit* is needful." For the rest, πνευματικὰ is a substantival adjective, as also is δαιμόνια. Finally, St Paul further adds: ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις. The junction of those words with ὑμῖν or πάλη in the beginning of the verse is at once inadmissible on account of the position of ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις. But there also arise, besides that, *other* difficulties from that junction, which must deter us from it. If joined with ἡμῖν the words would have to be taken, "we who are in the kingdom of God;" but τὰ ἐπουράνια never stands for βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. Joined with πάλη the sense of the words is said to be: "the fight for heavenly blessings;" but ἐν cannot stand for διὰ ὑπέρ. From the position of ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις it can only be an addition to the preceding nouns, ἀρχαί, ἐξουσίαι, κοσμοκράτορες, πνευματικὰ, by which their place of residence is denoted. The fight with flesh and blood on earth is put in opposition to the fight with spirits in heaven. Because people were scandalized at the placing of the evil spirits in heaven, ἐν τοῖς ὑπουρανίοις was put instead of the above, but that reading is found only in totally insignificant authorities. As to the rest, we have already explained ourselves at ii. 2 on this biblical notion of placing the evil spirits in that part of the world which is perceptible to the senses, as also upon the idea ἐπουράνια in i. 3. Heaven denotes here only the spiritual world in opposition to the material one, and not the region of holy and blessed life, in which sense the evil spirits are out of heaven.

Ver. 13. After this description of the greatness of the Christian fight, St Paul again takes up the exhortation of verse 11: "therefore (because the fight is so hard and of a spiritual nature) take unto you the armour which God through His Spirit bestows on His warriors against the power of darkness; it is only in *it* one can offer resistance to attacks." The addition ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ πονηρᾷ is not to be understood of the day of the fight, for that can surely be also a good, a successful day; it rather denotes a point of time in which temptation, and consequently the danger of succumbing, is especially great, therefore the day "in which darkness has power" (Luke xxii. 53). Observation of our own state of mind enables us plainly to distinguish different times, at which the soul feels itself alternately more free and triumphant, more fettered and tempted; seasons of the latter sort are called evil days. This contrasting of good and evil days is found even in the *Old* Testament. (See Eccles. vii. 15; Ps. xlix. 6; Prov. xvi. 4.) In the last words: καὶ ἅπαντα κατεργασάμενοι στῆναι the κατεργασάμενοι can-

not be taken of the preparation for the fight, for the preparation for that is surely already assumed in the ἀντιστῆναι; nor of the "well-performing" of all that the Christian is charged with either, as, among others, Luther takes the passage, for the στῆναι, which follows, shows that St Paul still continues in the metaphor of the fight; rather the only right way is, with Beza, Calovius, Koppe, Flatt, Rückert, Holzhausen, and Harless, to take κατεργάζεσθαι = καταπολεμεῖν, in the sense of "to overpower, beat down," so that ἀντιστῆναι denotes the *negative* aspects of the fight, the repulse of the attack,—ἅπαντα κατεργασάμενοι στῆναι, on the contrary, the *positive* aspect of it, the overcoming of the enemy with the victorious maintenance of one's own position connected with it.

Ver. 14–17. Now follows the prosecution of the figure of the armour in its separate parts. That it is not to be too much forced, as if every individual Christian virtue must have been compared exactly with that piece of armour and no other, is shown by the collation of 1 Thess. v. 8, where faith and love are designated as a breast-plate, whereas *here* righteousness is called the breast-plate, and the shield is brought into a comparison with faith; the helmet is *there* compared with the hope of salvation, *here* with salvation itself. St Paul moves freely about in such figures, and therefore applies them differently according to necessity. As the entire image is taken from the warrior, and indeed, as we have seen, probably from the Roman prætorian guards, every single feature of it must also necessarily be referred to pieces of armour. Now, first of all, St Paul describes in detail the *defensive* armour of the believer against the attacks of his spiritual enemies; the only weapon of *attack* which is named is the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God. The most vulnerable part of the body, and the one least defended by nature herself, ὀσφύς, the space above the hip below the ribs, is first named as protected by the girdle, *subligaculum*. Then the breast covered by the breast-plate, the feet by the military boots (*caligæ*). Here now, by strict rule, the helmet should have been named *next* as a close-fitting weapon of defence; but St Paul further names the shield before it, and then with it the whole department of defensive armour is completed. With these separate pieces of armour the separate features of Christian character are composed. St Paul first names truth, which, here taken quite generally, is the bias of mind which is opposed to falsehood as the element of the διάβολος, therefore up-

rightness of disposition, whence everything else proceeds. Then follows justice; this cannot be here justness of faith, because faith is also named specially, but merely the δίκαιον εἶναι, as the most general result of the ἀληθεία, in opposition to the πονηρία of the enemies (ver. 12). The third point, ἐν ἑτοιμασίᾳ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς εἰρήνης, is more difficult. It was natural to interpret the ἑτοιμασία, as it is brought into parallel with the ὑποδήμασι, of the readiness to proclaim the Gospel of peace, as, besides Chrysostom, Œcumenius, Theophylact, and Grotius, Luther, too, translates; "ready to promote the Gospel of peace." But that readiness cannot possibly be compared with a *weapon*, and that, too, a weapon of *defence;* the propagation of the Gospel is here a very remote idea. After Beza's example Wolf, Bengel, Morus, Koppe, and Flatt, wanted to take ἑτοιμασία, after the analogy of the Heb. כּוֹן, which the LXX. translate by ἑτοιμασία (Ps. x. 17, lxxxix. 15, cxii. 17), in the sense of "foundation, firm groundwork," or "base." But even *so* the comparison does not suit, the weapon of defence must answer to a subjective state, not to a predicate of the Gospel. The only correct way is to take ἑτοιμασία, with Calvin, Baumgarten, Matthies, Holzhausen, and Harless, in the meaning of *alacritas*, and indeed, in connection with the genitive, as *alacritas quam gignit evangelium pacis.* A vigorous freedom of movement may properly be compared to the ὑποδήμασι, as the latter promote ease and security in walking. The Gospel of peace, *i.e.* that brings peace to the mind, is properly taken as the cause of the spiritual freedom of movement, because peace removes all obstructions of the spiritual life. That, fourthly, faith is compared to a shield is in itself clearly extremely suitable. Upon the shield the arrows of the enemy, *i.e.* here of the devil, are received. (Ὁ πονηρὸς = διάβολος in verse 11.) But here a definite class of especially dangerous arrows are named, which were enveloped in combustible materials and discharged burning, so-called πυρφόροι ὀϊστοί (see Thucyd. ii. 75; Amm. Marcell. xxiii. 4. Against these it was usual to cover the shields with moist hides, in order to extinguish the fire in them. In this metaphor there seems to have been present to the apostle's mind the form of temptation by Satan, according to which abominable thoughts, like arrows of Satan, suddenly attack the soul, which by their fire can inflame desires, if they do not become extinct and lose their power on the shield of faith. Lastly, salvation is compared to the helmet. True, one cannot take σωτήριον = ἐλπὶς τῆς σωτηρίας

(1 Thess. v. 8), however, τὸ σωτήριον too, like all the rest of the heads named, must be taken by its subjective side; but not so much as *hope*, rather as *a possessing present salvation*. Finally, the spirit is named as the sole, but fully sufficient, weapon of attack (sword). It is self-evident that πνεῦμα here is not the *human* but the *divine* spirit, which *the Christian alone* receives; surely, it is the armour of *the Christian* that is being described. That man is called upon to seize this sword of the Spirit, to carry it, therefore, in a certain sense to *govern* it, can be no argument against our here supposing the *divine* Spirit, for it appears everywhere in Scripture, so far as it is active in man, as subject to the conscience, although this Holy Spirit is the principle of the religious-moral life. St Paul also enounces in perfectly plain terms, but superfluously, this important maxim, which must be considered as the rampart against all fanaticism, in that section (1 Cor. xiv.) which is so instructive as to the operation of the Holy Spirit in the believer's soul, where it is said (verse 32): πνεύματα προφητῶν προφήταις ὑποτάσσεται. (See on this subject the remarks in the Comm. on that passage.) Now in this acceptation one easily comprehends how the Spirit which fills the faithful can be considered as the sword with which they fight against the πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας; the nature of this uncreated Holy Spirit guarantees the victory over the created spirits of evil. But it is obscure how St Paul can add: ὅ ἐστι ῥῆμα Θεοῦ, as an explanation of the Spirit. For that this phrase designates something individual out of the Divine Word, the Divine threats against the wicked, or the commands of Christianity, is exceedingly improbable, considering the general character of it. St Paul himself explains the phrase ῥῆμα Θεοῦ by Rom. x. 8, τὸ ῥῆμα τῆς πίστεως ὃ κηρύσσομεν. The revelation of God in the Word of Truth is therefore, in the most comprehensive sense, the Gospel of peace (verse 15). But how can this Word of God be designated as the Spirit itself? It seems the Holy Spirit is something accompanying the Word of God, an operation which the Word of God produces, but not the Word of God itself. But, leaving out of sight the form of the appearance of the Word of God in the letter of the Holy Scriptures, or in *vivâ voce* preaching,—it is from its inward nature the manifestation of the Deity Himself, consequently Spirit, as the efflux of God the Spirit. Whether it is taken as the Word of God the Father, or as the Word of Christ (Col. iii. 16), or as the Holy Ghost, depends merely on the writer's mode

of viewing it; as manifestation of the triune God it reconciles also the different relations to the Trinity.

Ver. 18–20. What follows describes the manner and way in which the sword of the Spirit is to be handled. Col. iv. 2, ss. is parallel with it. It is in *prayer*, and indeed *suitable* prayer, prayer in the spirit, and relating to all the details of life, that the Christian wields the sword of the Spirit, and thus strives for himself and the whole Church of God against the might of darkness and its powers. Again, by the ἐν πνεύματι is designated not the *human* spirit, as if the words meant: "with devout mind," but the *divine* Spirit in whose strength and by whose influences alone we can pray in a manner really well-pleasing to God. (As to the ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ = πάντοτε προσεύχεσθαι, see the remarks on Luke xviii. 1.—As to the two synonymes προσευχὴ and δέησις, the LXX. use the former constantly for תְּפִלָּה, the latter, on the contrary, for תְּחִנָּה. Προσευχὴ is rather the more general expression, "prayer in general, communion with God;" on the other hand, δέησις is *in specie* a "petitioning prayer," in which a favour is solicited.) Whereas, at first, the discourse was merely of prayer, as relative to the person praying, in the words: καὶ εἰς αὐτὸ ἀγρυπνοῦντες κ. τ. λ. it is conceived in the form of intercession, and therein consists the progress of the idea. The εἰς αὐτὸ refers, accordingly, not to the *following* words, but to the *preceding* προσεύχεσθαι ἐν πνεύματι, "watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication." That is to say, the object of the supplication for all saints is just the abiding of all in continual spiritual prayer. By this interpretation, the apparent tautology which is couched in the ἐν πάσῃ δεήσει, after διὰ δεήσεως προσευχόμενοι had already preceded it, is also removed. (In ver. 18, the τοῦτο after εἰς αὐτὸ is, no doubt, spurious, and probably came into the text here from ver. 22. The origin also of the reading αὐτὸν in D.F.G., is only to be explained by the original reading αὐτό.—As to προσκαρτερεῖν, see Rom. xii. 12; Acts i. 14.) St Paul also solicits intercession for himself in a special relation, viz., for a blessing on his labours, not for his personal religious life. We constantly find it so in St Paul's Epistles. He never solicits his readers for their intercession for the strengthening of his life in the faith, but only for the promotion of his efficiency, and for aid in external distresses. (Cf. Rom. xv. 30; Col. iv. 3; Phil. i. 19; 2 Thess. iii. 1.) With respect to the development of their own lives, the apostles were sufficiently secured by the peculiar

operation of the Holy Ghost in them. The object of the supplication for himself St Paul expresses by: ἵνα μοι δοθῇ λόγος ἐν ἀνοίξει τοῦ στόματος, for the connection of the ἐν ἀνοίξει κ.τ.λ. with what follows is to be considered as decidedly inadmissible. From the parallel passage, Col. iv. 3, ἵνα ὁ Θεὸς ἀνοίξῃ ἡμῖν θύραν τοῦ λόγου, it was proposed to translate ἐν ἀνοίξει στόματος here quite arbitrarily *in occasione datâ*. There rather seems to have been regard had here to passages like Ps. li. 17, "Open Thou my lips," and Matt. x. 19; Mark xiii. 11, where the Holy Ghost is promised the apostles in their discourses. St Paul, therefore, wishes the congregation may, by their prayers, obtain for him that the gift of utterance may be given unto him, *i.e.* that the Spirit, which alone speaketh rightly on divine things, may bestow on him all that is necessary, on each occasion as it arises, for his ministerial efficiency. In this sentence, the difficulty might be found that St Paul had surely received the Holy Ghost once for all, and with it the due faculty of speaking, and thus required no intercession of the congregation on that score. But the Holy Ghost is not to be viewed in the apostles as a constantly operating power, but as a power which manifested itself in different degrees and forms of efficacy at different times. No doubt, the Spirit was *abiding* in the apostles, not *momentary* as in the prophets of the Old Testament, but it operated now *more* now *less* urgently, at times even quite arresting outward action. (Cf. Acts xvi. 6, and the remarks on it in the Comm.) The sense of this request, therefore, of St Paul's, for intercession for himself, is this: "Pray that the due faculty of speaking may be given to me in my present position, and, as far as is possible, ever and everywhere." In fact, this idea coincides with the prayer: "Pray that it may be given unto me to convert as many as possible to the kingdom of heaven." The consequence of the δοθῆναι λόγον ἐν ἀνοίξει στόματος is afterwards the possibility of the γνωρίσαι ἐν παῤῥησίᾳ τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. (See as to παῤῥησία and μυστήριον, iii. 12, and iii. 3.) We are not to think here of *outward* freedom (viz. from bonds), but of *inward* joyfulness of soul, which enhanced the power of his labours, and is for *that* reason so desirable to St Paul, not on account of its *subjective enjoyment*. With this freedom the exterior state of his being in bonds, of which St Paul here makes mention, is meant to contrast; *mundus habet legatos splendidos*, says Bengel, *Christus vinctos*. (In the singular, ἐν ἁλύσει, to find an allusion to the

manner of fettering St Paul in his Roman captivity, as Flatt still insists on doing; that is to say, to the circumstance that St Paul was fastened by a chain to a Roman soldier [see the Comm. on Acts xxviii. 20], is plainly unsuitable. In the parallel passage, Col. iv. 3, it is said: δι' ὃ καὶ δέδεμαι.) Finally, the last words: ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ παῤῥησιάσωμαι κ.τ.λ., are usually taken as a resumption of the ἐν παῤῥησίᾳ γνωρίσαι, ver. 19. But that supposition would appear justified only if the words ran, for instance, ἵνα καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ, "that I too might have joyfulness even in bonds." It is more suitable to put this conclusion parallel with the ἵνα μοι δοθῇ κ.τ.λ., and to look for the peculiarity of the idea here expressed in the ἐν αὐτῷ—ὡς δεῖ με λαλῆσαι. That is to say, the ἐν αὐτῷ is to be referred to μυστήριον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου; "to be joyful in the Gospel" means "to make known the Gospel joyfully," as it is said, Col. iv. 3, ἵνα φανερώσω αὐτὸ ὡς δεῖ με λαλῆσαι. In these last words, namely, the manner of the παῤῥησία is pointed to, as it is becoming for an apostle of Christ. No worldly, earthly joyfulness is it, but a holy, heavenly one, which he is to manifest in the proclamation of the mystery of salvation, and by means of which he wins hearts unto that mystery.

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

Ver. 23, 24. The last verses show clearly that St Paul had only a general knowledge of the circle of his readers. The turn εἰρήνη τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς and χάρις μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἀγαπώντων κ.τ.λ. is

against any special acquaintance with his readers; for, as every polemical reference is wanting in the Epistle, the object cannot be to form a contrast with those who do *not* love the Lord. But in ver. 23 the juxtaposition εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη μετὰ πίστεως is strange; as the πίστις is the basis of the Christian state of mind, one expects the inverted order, faith, love, and peace. Meier translates the μετὰ: "*in conformity with* their own faith." This translation is certainly not quite accurate, but it is extremely probable that it is implied in the connection by means of μετὰ that faith is supposed to be already in existence, as indeed the idea of "brother" requires. In addition, therefore, to faith, love and peace only are wished. In ver. 24 ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ causes another difficulty. The connection with ἀγαπώντων, in the sense *perpetuo, sine fine*, recommends itself but little. So Flatt, Meier, and others, take it. The connecting it with χριστὸν, "the glorified Christ," which Wetstein recommends, is entirely unsuitable. The ἀφθαρσία here can only be referred to the believers themselves, so that the perfected state to which grace leads is denoted by it. The ἀφθαρσία = ζωὴ αἰώνιος, and the coupling it with ἐν is to be considered as an abbreviation for the complete formula, ἵνα ζωὴν ἔχωσιν ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ. (Compare Rom. ii. 7; 2 Tim. i. 10.)

EXPOSITION

OF THE

EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. OF THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE EPISTLE.

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

St Paul travelled twice through Phrygia (Acts xvi. 6, xviii. 23); but he probably never touched at the city of Colossæ. In any case he had no share in the foundation of the Christian Church there (Col. ii. 1); that seems rather to have proceeded from Epaphras (Col. i. 7), who was with St Paul at Rome, when the latter wrote the Epistle (Col. iv. 12; Philem. ver. 23), and from whom St Paul, no doubt, received the information which caused him to compose this Epistle to a community personally unknown to him. Epaphras, however, is most probably not identical with Epaphroditus, the apostle of the Philippians (Phil. ii. 25, iv. 18), from whom he

had brought St Paul an aid in money to Rome. (See as to the person of Epaphras Winer's Real-Lex. vol. i., p. 389. Winer seems to be in favour of the identity of Epaphras and Epaphroditus; Steiger and Rheinwald declare themselves against it in their Commentaries at the passages relating to the point, and Böhmer in the Isagoge in Ep. ad Col. p. 41.) No more accurate accounts can be procured from other quarters as to the importance of the Colossian Church. We only see by the Epistle to Philemon, which St Paul, as we showed in the Introduction to the Epistle to the Ephesians, wrote at the same time as the Epistle to the Colossians, and sent by the same messenger Tychicus (Col. iv. 7–9), that that Philemon had the meetings of the church in Colossæ held in his house, and was probably himself, like his son Archippus, invested with some ecclesiastical office in it. (Comp. Philem. ver. 1–3 with Col. iv. 17.) The insignificant population of the inconsiderable city of Colossæ does not admit of our supposing that there were meetings of the faithful at more than one place; at all events, the meeting in the house of Nymphas, mentioned in Col. iv. 15, relates to the neighbouring city of Laodicea, not to Colossæ.

Now, since we have already, in the Introduction to the Epistle to the Ephesians, observed what was needful as to the time and place of the composition of this Epistle, and shown that the Epistle to the Colossians was written from Rome during the first Roman captivity, at the same time as those to the Ephesians and to Philemon, and was sent by Tychicus, there remain to us but two points which require a closer investigation in this Introduction, viz. the question as to the authenticity of this Epistle, and the question as to the occasion for its composition, *i.e.* as to the false doctrine disseminated in Colossæ. As to the genuineness of it, the Church of Christ had been 1800 years in undisputed possession of this writing as genuinely apostolical, when it occurred to Dr Mayerhoff in Berlin to cast doubts on this well-established inheritance. Then, after him, Dr Baur also, in Tübingen, threw out objections against the genuineness of this Epistle, without, however, up to this time, making them good. But, as he places the pastoral Epistles at so late a date, principally on account of the false teachers pointed out in them, it may be supposed that, in the controversy as to the Epistle to the Colossians the heretics mentioned in it again constitute the chief argument in his mind against the authenticity of the Epistle, because they are very closely connected with the heretics of the pastoral Epistles. We shall therefore apply ourselves merely to

Mayerhoff's arguments against the idea that the Epistle to the Colossians owes its origin to St Paul, which are laid down in a posthumous work of his: "The Epistle to the Colossians, with especial reference to the three pastoral Epistles." (Berlin, 1838.) It has already been remarked in the investigation of the arguments brought forward against the authenticity of the Epistle to the Ephesians, that it is not adapted to dispose us favourably towards the critical works here coming under review, when we see that the impugners of the Epistle to the Ephesians base their arguments against that writing on the presupposition of the authenticity of the Epistle to the Colossians, and *vice versa* the impugners of the Epistle to the Colossians on *their* side necessarily postulate the authenticity of the Epistle to the Ephesians. The critics thus cut away from one another reciprocally the bases of their operations, and by that means make their whole proceeding extremely suspicious. According to Mayerhoff the Epistle to the Colossians is to be considered as an abstract of the Epistle to the Ephesians, composed in perhaps the second century, and with which the polemical part is interwoven by the author in order to combat with apostolic authority heretics that were hateful to him. This representation certainly furnishes a not altogether inconceivable motive for the transformation of an apostolical epistle, whereas those who make the opposite assertion, that the Epistle to the Ephesians is a detailed new-modelling of the Epistle to the Colossians, are entirely unable to bring forward an object for such an undertaking, because in *that* case the polemical element, which was certainly the usual motive for such forgeries under apostolical names, must have purposely and directly been eradicated from the Epistle to the Colossians. But such an assumption as Mayerhoff's could, in opposition to the unanimous testimony of the ancient Church from the earliest times, *then* only lay claim to recognition, if decisive and clear evidence could be produced, which proved that the Epistle to the Colossians was not St Paul's, and that therefore the ancient tradition of the Church must be rejected. But it scarcely needs to be mentioned that Mayerhoff has been able to point out nothing of the sort. In the first section of his work he is occupied with the relations of the Epistle to the Colossians towards the rest of St Paul's Epistles in respect of language. The style of the Epistle to the Colossians has hitherto been viewed by the sharp-sighted critics as undoubtedly bearing on it the stamp of St Paul's mode of writing. Mayerhoff is of another opinion. But the way in which he seeks

to show the difference in style between this Epistle and the genuine Epistles of St Paul proves that he proceeded in this inquiry on totally untenable principles. In p. 12 he thinks it worthy of consideration that the words: ἀποκαλύπτω, ἀποκάλυψις, ὑπακούω, ὑπακοή, ἄρα, διὸ, διότι, ἔτι, οὐκέτι, μηκέτι, are not found in the Epistle to the Colossians, that γὰρ occurs but six times in it, whereas it occurs seventeen times in the Epistle to the Philippians, twenty-four times in the first Epistle to the Thessalonians, forty times in that to the Galatians, 170 times in that to the Corinthians, 150 times in that to the Romans. He that can take account of such pure accidents, and take it so *seriously* too that he counts how often γὰρ occurs in each Epistle, pronounces on himself the sentence of incapacity for giving his vote on affinity or difference of style. In an Epistle of but few chapters *then only* can something be inferred from ἅπαξ λεγομένοις and similar deviations, when they are found in such modes of expression for which the author has been acknowledged to have coined standing formulas, and even *then* they have demonstrative force only when they can be brought forward in connection with other decisive arguments. Such Mayerhoff in the second section of his essay (p. 42, ss.) thinks are found in the anomalies in the mode of thinking and of putting forth thoughts which are supposed to show themselves between the Epistle to the Colossians and the genuine Epistles of St Paul. He begins here with the remark that the setting forth of the ideas in the Epistle to the Colossians entirely wants the life, freshness, and force, which distinguished the *genuine* Epistles of St Paul.[1] "In the latter," says Mayerhoff, "St Paul pursues a strict logical order in the *dogmatical* part, but, tired with the conflict between the crowd of ideas and the spirit of systematizing (!), he then lets himself be carried away in the hortatory part of the Epistles, so that in it everything is mixed together; in the Epistle to the Colossians, on the other hand, it is just the contrary; the *hortatory* part is quite logically arranged, but the *dogmatical* part exhibits a confused intermixture." We can oppose nothing more cogent to this remark than if we in the following Commentary on this Epistle prove the close connection of the *dogmatical* part also, just as we, in respect of the *hortatory* parts of the *other* Epistles, have al-

[1] Erasmus, the great connoisseur of antiquity, judged differently, *tonat, fulgurat, meras flammas loquitur Paulus*, says he of this Epistle. Böhmer likewise finds, in his "Isagoge in Epist. ad Coloss.," the mode of setting forth the ideas in the Epistle to the Colossians, *viva, pressa, solida, nervis plena, mascula* (l. c. pag. 160).

ready sufficiently shown the complete untenableness of Mayerhoff's assertion, or shall show it in the sequel in the Epistles which are yet to be explained, by pointing to the excellent arrangement in them. Whereas in early times the Church of Christ particularly admired the Epistle to the Colossians on account of the *richness* of its ideas both profound and compressed into a small space, Mayerhoff discovers *poverty* of ideas in it (p. 46), and then finds too (p. 59, ss.) "although the doctrine of the Epistle is *essentially* St Paul's, in *separate* points more or less deviation from the doctrine of St Paul's Epistles." On *this* point too we abstain from all further remarks here, as the exposition itself will give us sufficient opportunity to show the complete identity of the doctrine of this Epistle with St Paul's system of doctrine in general. To that is subjoined in the third section of Mayerhoff's Essay the collation of the two Epistles, to the Colossians and to the Ephesians, which now, as has been already remarked, results in favour of the Epistle to the Ephesians, in direct opposition to the inquiries of De Wette and other critics. To every unprepossessed person the impossibility of making proof of the one or the other of these Epistles having been copied from a genuine one of St Paul's will by these contradictions have been made clear enough, and consequently the authenticity of both has by that means only been confirmed anew. A refutation of that section would be possible only in case of a special following up of the collation of the two Epistles carried out by Mayerhoff, which, it is self-evident, cannot be undertaken here. But by whomsoever it may be instituted it will never leave behind it a satisfactory impression in all points, since it is certainly true that, as we have already seen in the Introduction to the Epistle of St Paul to the Ephesians, *this* Epistle is near akin to *that*, and indeed in such a way that the Epistle to the Colossians appears as the shorter; and the assertion that this shorter Epistle was made by an officious person by means of an unskilful abridgement of the longer one will ever be scarcely refutable in the eyes of those who see or choose to see *poverty* of intellect in *abundance* of intellect, and a want of connection in the strictest order.

Thus, then, there remains but the fourth and last section, in which Mayerhoff treats of the *false doctrine* in the Epistle to the Colossians. Here he seeks to show that this false doctrine is that of Cerinthus, and, as that heretic did not live till after the apostle's time, therefore the Epistle to the Colossians cannot be by St Paul. Now, that would certainly be a just conclusion, if the premises

showed themselves capable of proof; we should then have an historical point which we could oppose to the uninterrupted tradition ascribing the origin of this Epistle to St Paul; by that means we should come out of the airy regions of so called internal arguments (*i.e.* of merely subjective opinion) on the firm ground of history. But, as Mayerhoff himself confesses (p. 5) that Baur's attack on the authenticity of the pastoral Epistles, on the ground that the doctrine of the Marcionites is combated in them, fails on the inadmissibility of that single assumption being pointed out, which, as M. owns, has been already done by Baumgarten; so too will *his* polemical arguments against the Epistle to the Colossians having been written by St Paul fail, on the single proof being brought that there is no necessity in the case of the false doctrine designated in it to think of Cerinthus' gnosis. That demonstration we attempt in what follows, after we have more accurately weighed the characteristics which the Epistle to the Colossians gives of the false doctrine spread among the first readers of it, as also the different hypotheses which have been set up on the subject.

§. 2. OF THE FALSE DOCTRINE SPREAD IN COLOSSÆ.

The circumstance which caused the Apostle Paul to write to the Christians in Colossæ, who were not personally known to him, was the spread of serious errors in doctrine among them, as also in the neighbouring church in Laodicea (Col. iv. 16), to whom St Paul had also written, and, it is extremely probable, with the same design of warning them, as he commands that both Epistles, which might be complements of each other, are to be read at both places. St Paul had, no doubt, received information of those false doctrines through Epaphras, who, as has been already observed, was then with St Paul, and, as founder of the Colossian church, stood in the nearest relation to it. In Coloss. iv. 12 St Paul remarks, in delivering salutations to the Colossians from Epaphras, that Epaphras is earnest in prayer for them, that they, grounded in God's will, may stand firm against all temptations. It does not appear from this Epistle in what manner this false doctrine may have been spread in Colossæ. St Paul does not say that persons from without had brought it thither, neither does he name any individuals who defended it; he does not even strictly separate the *heterodox* from the

orthodox believers, but speaks to the whole body of the Colossian church, as if both the heretics and those that remained faithful were still in church-fellowship. This is especially shown by Col. ii. 20; εἰ ἀπεθάνετε σὺν Χριστῷ ἀπὸ τῶν στοιχείων τοῦ κόσμου, τί ὡς ζῶντες ἐν κόσμῳ δογματίζεσθε; we cannot here suppose that the false teachers merely are addressed, with an exclusion of the rest of the church, for such a separation of two elements is nowhere indicated, the exhortations go on without interruption, and always refer to the whole church. A later writer would certainly not have selected that form of representation; the latter would have made the heretics appear rigorously separated from the orthodox believers, and combated them as standing out of communion with the church. St Paul writes here perfectly in accordance with the first beginnings of the Christian life. The first symptoms only of heretical doctrine showed themselves in Colossæ. St Paul hastened to suppress them in the bud, and to bring back the misguided to the right way. He had no grounds for deducing those errors from an evil intention; he saw their origin in inexperience and weakness; therefore he does not directly apply severe measures, exclusion from communion with the Church, and the like, but he proceeds forbearingly. He views and treats the misguided as still members of the church, and seeks to bring them back to the truth by a gentle exposure of their errors. The matter had assumed a totally different aspect some years later when St Paul wrote his pastoral letters at the end of his life. *Then* the evil intention of the false teachers had been brought clearly to light, and St Paul durst therefore no longer permit unseasonable gentleness to sway him. The diseased members were now obliged to be removed in order to keep the whole frame sound.

From this position of the Colossian false teachers towards the church it may now be already inferred that no elaborate system can be supposed in them. The enthusiastic element, which existed in the character of the Phrygian people, and which had found vent for itself under Gentilism in the fanatical worship of Cybele, produced similar phenomena on the reception of Christianity, as the Montanism which arose in Phrygia in the second century shows. The Phrygians had received Christianity as a religion endowed with mighty spiritual powers, but without entirely renouncing with real self-denial their previous predilections; by which means there afterwards arose mixtures of truth and falsehood, as they meet our view in St Paul's sketch of the errors

there. Moreover, the Eastern was mingled with the Western element in this part of Asia Minor, numerous Jews, with their different sects, were settled there,[1] a propensity to speculations on the world of spirits was generally diffused, and that too not only in the form of the Greek philosophers, but also in that of the Oriental theosophists,—nothing was therefore more natural than that Christianity, entering that mass full of fermentation, should be eagerly received by the excitable population, but also capriciously disfigured. Before we, however, look any closer into the quality of the Colossian false teachers, we must answer the preliminary question, "Are all the traits mentioned by St Paul to be supposed united in the same persons, or are they men of totally different tendencies of mind, whom he combats?" By far the most of the later critics suppose the *former*, Heinrichs alone insists that there were in Colossæ not merely false teachers of one opinion, but Judaïsts, Gnostics, and other heretics, side by side. We must allow that the representation in our Epistle by no means justifies the confidence with which the moderns suppose but one sect in Colossæ. If our Epistle were addressed to a numerous church, such as the Roman one was, it would be even *more* natural to suppose that St Paul wished to warn them against *various* erroneous opinions. For he nowhere says that the same persons teach all that he blames; since he, as we have seen, always writes to the church as such, not to individuals in it, it appears absolutely grounded in the nature of the thing that he ranges the errors to be avoided side by side, without its following from *that* that the same persons entertain them. One might even say that, at ii. 16, 17 two tendencies, the Judaïzing and the Gnostic, are distinguished, as St Paul, after the: μὴ οὖν τις, begins anew: μηδείς ὑμᾶς κ. τ. λ., and intimates by that means that he makes a transition to something fresh. However, neither that passage, nor any other in the Epistle to the Colossians, is decidedly against the assumption that all the traits mentioned by St Paul were combined in the same persons; and if one considers that Colossæ was a small place, in which many opinions can scarcely have been propagated—further, that the pastoral Epistles introduce us to perfectly similar false teachers in Ephesus and Crete, in whom kindred heretical elements appear combined, as in the Colossians,

[1] According to Josephus (Arch. xii. 3) Antiochus the Great had brought 2000 Jewish families from Babylon and Mesopotamia to Phrygia, and made them settle there; he expected of them protection against the unruly native population.

—it certainly becomes *probable* that the same persons taught all that St Paul reprehends, but one will not be able to go *beyond* the probability. If we, after this, consider the separate features of the portrait which St Paul draws of the Colossian false teachers,[1] we find, first, that they had a tendency to Judaïsm. They laid a stress on exterior circumcision and the outward observance of the Law (ii. 11, 16, 21, iii. 10), required the keeping of the ordinances of the Old Testament as to meats, the solemnization of the feasts, new moons, Sabbaths. In opposition to them, St Paul exalts the *spiritual* circumcision in regeneration, and urges that through Christ the distinctions in the Old Testament between Jews and Gentiles, circumcised and uncircumcised, are abolished, that the mystery of Christ is to be made known unto *all* men, even unto the Gentiles. But, besides that, St Paul also warns against a φιλοσοφία καὶ κενὴ ἀπάτη κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ οὐ κατὰ Χριστόν (ii. 8). What that false speculation discovered itself in is particularly shown by ii. 18, ss. Instead of keeping to Christ, the one and only head, those heretics occupied themselves with inquiries into the world of spirits, and even dedicated worship to the angels. St Paul therefore strives above all to put the divine dignity of Jesus in a clear light, and to show that not merely all earthly, but also all heavenly, powers are subject to the eternal Son of God. On the pretended insight into the spiritual world, which the Colossian false teachers recommended, and which, as usually happens, produced conceit and haughtiness, along with apparent humility (ii. 18, 23), the Epistle gives us no more detailed information; but it may be deduced from the pastoral Epistles that they were occupied with genealogies of the angels, therefore, we may suppose, assumed Syzygies amongst the angels, after the manner of the later Gnostics. Finally, as to the practical tendency of these heretics, a strict asceticism was cultivated among them, which induces us to suppose that they assumed a Hyle, or substance of evil, although it is nowhere openly expressed. In like manner it is nowhere declared by St Paul that the ascetic principles of the false

[1] More extended remarks on the heretics of the apostolic age are found in the Introduction to the three pastoral Epistles, in which particularly the false teachers of the Epistle to the Colossians are compared with the false teachers of the pastoral Epistles as regards the affinity and the difference between them. We therefore refer to the more detailed discussion in the Introduction to the pastoral Epistles, in respect of all points which are here either not at all, or but briefly, touched on.

teachers in Colossæ had extended to the rejection of marriage, and to docetic views of Christ. (See the Comm. on ii. 21.) Now, if these features are conceived as referring to the same persons, the difficulty arises that they seem to have something contradictory in them. That is to say, the stiffer Judaïsts used to be strongly averse from Gnostic speculation and false asceticism, the Gnostic ascetics, on the other hand, were commonly opposed to the tendency to regard the Law as merely external. Thus it is explained how the views of the learned as to the nature of these false teachers could prove so different. However, the majority of these hypotheses sufficiently refute themselves. (See Böhmer's Isagoge, p. 56, ss., and Bertholdt's Introd., vol. vi., p. 3448, ss.) The notions of Eichhorn, Schneckenburger (contributions to the Introduction, p. 146, ss., and on the antiquity of the baptism of proselytes App. p. 189, ss.), and others, that no *Christians* at all are meant here, but *Jews*, which is deduced particularly from ii. 19, needs no further consideration, for the οὐ κρατεῖν τὴν κεφαλήν does not mean "not to believe in Christ at all," but only "not to hold fast unto Christ as one ought." Had these persons not been Christians, St Paul's polemical arguments would surely have had no aim at all; it was self-evident that in non-Christians there was much to blame. In like manner the views of Wolf, Junker, and others, who thought Christian Platonists, or Alexandrian supporters of the doctrines of the Logos, were the heretics at Colossæ, can make no pretension to recognition, because the inflexible tendency of the Colossian false teachers with regard to the Law, from which the Platonists and Platonizing Judaïsts were free, cannot be explained by those views. Again, the assertion of Grotius, that the false doctrine is to be deduced from Pythagorean elements, or those of Kleuker and Hug, that it proceeds from the influence of the Magi or Chaldees, are not merely indemonstrable, but improbable also. The same holds good, too, of J. D. Michaelis' hypothesis, that they are disciples of Apollos, which the friendly relation of that man to St Paul is entirely opposed to. Thus, then, there only remains, as tenable, the single supposition that they were Jewish Gnostics, or Theosophists, who had endeavoured to harmonize their particular views with those of the Gospel. To suppose exactly Essenes or Therapeutæ to be meant here, as Zachariæ, Storr, and others, wished, is certainly less advisable, because those formed exclusive societies, and it is hardly probable that they would, before the destruction of Jerusalem, have spread

themselves out of Judea and Egypt into the other provinces of the Roman empire. But neither do we need any annexation to such existing sects, in order to explain the mixing up of Jewish Theosophy with Christianity. Theosophical and ascetic opinions of many kinds, shapeless, and without having as yet assumed a decided character, were, in the apostolical times, diffused among Gentiles and Jews. (Only see what Josephus [vita, cap. 2] relates of a certain Banus.) Those ascetics in Rome, of whom St Paul writes (Rom. xiv.), and, in later times, the appearance of Cerinthus and of the Gnostic Ebionites, of whose opinions a remarkable monument has been preserved in the followers of Clement, sufficiently prove how a theosophical-ascetic tendency, as it appeared in the system of the Cabbala (see the Introduction to the pastoral Epistles) could associate itself with a tendency strictly legal *in Judaism;* and, on these grounds, such a coalition of those different tendencies was then also possible *in Christianity*. The later inquirers, namely, Neander and Böhmer, coincide in this conception of the quality of the Colossian false teachers, and Mayerhoff too, in fact, joins them. The latter scholar only concludes, as we have already observed, from the affinity of the heretics in Colossæ with Cerinthus' bias, that the author of this Epistle had combated the latter and his disciples, and that, as Cerinthus lived after St Paul, the Epistle to the Colossians must be considered spurious. However, it is to be observed, in opposition to *that*, that the circumstances of Cerinthus' life are by no means accurately enough known to us to enable us to say, with any certainty, he was not living so early as St Paul's times. That he was along with John the Evangelist in Ephesus, is reported to us by such safe witnesses, that only the extreme of caprice can throw doubts on their declarations. (See Neander's Church History, vol. ii., p. 672.) It is true we know nothing certain of any relation between Cerinthus and St Paul, for the uncritical Epiphanius, who supposes St Paul, in all his Epistles, to combat Cerinthus, cannot, of course, come under consideration here; but, in spite of that, Cerinthus might even at that time have been active, at least, we have no decisive evidence that would preclude that assumption; therefore, an argument against a writing, which is founded on the most irrefragable testimonies, cannot possibly be based on so uncertain a matter. But then, nothing obliges us to assume that it is just Cerinthus and his adherents who are combated in the Epistle to the Colossians. That false teacher certainly did not

first stir up the tendency of mind which declares itself in his system. It was, on the contrary, before him diffused in wide circles already. Cerinthus only adopted it for his own, worked it up in his own fashion, and succeeded in gaining over a good many to it. The very *general* manner in which the false doctrines are set forth in this Epistle, as we have seen, speaks clearly for the opinion that there had not yet risen up any individual who had adopted, independently for his own, the tendency of mind which they suppose, and given it a characteristic and definite form. Cerinthus may, therefore, when St Paul wrote, have already been in Colossæ, and committed himself to those views, but he had hardly exercised influence already, and made himself the independent master of that tendency.

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

§ 3. THE COURSE OF IDEAS IN THE EPISTLE.

The Epistle to the Colossians falls, like the rest of St Paul's Epistles, into two parts: in the first of which (from i. 1 to ii. 23) the *dogmatical* element predominates, in the second (from iii. 1 to iv. 18), on the contrary, the *ethical*.

We further divide the first part into two paragraphs, the first of

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

Epistle, for more detailed news as to the apostle personally. Salutations, and the charge to communicate this Epistle to the Christians in Laodicea, and, on the other hand, to read publicly in Colossæ also that addressed to the Laodiceans, fill up the last verses of the Epistle, on which St Paul further stamps the seal of authenticity by means of a salutation written with his own hand.

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

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

EXPOSITION

OF THE

EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

I.

PART FIRST.

I. 1.–II. 23.

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

(I. 1–23.)

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

Ver. 3, 4. Exactly as in Ephes. i. 15, ss., *here* too St Paul begins with thanksgiving to God and mentioning his intercession for the Colossian Christians for the sake of their faith and their love, therefore for the sake of their Christian state of mind, of which St Paul, however, had information (ἀκούσαντες) only through the communications of others (especially of Epaphras, ver. 8), not through beholding it himself, for he had neither founded the church in Colossæ, nor ever visited it (see Introd. § 1).—As to the connection of the words, it is more correct to join πάντοτε with what *follows* than with what *precedes*, for the incessant prayer for the

readers appears as the more important point here. In εὐχαριστοῦμεν is expressed the thanksgiving of St Paul, which he expressed *at the moment*, and by the medium of writing; the *intercession*, on the contrary, is meant to be represented as *going on*, and to be grounded on what St Paul had heard of the Colossians' life of faith. So too, ver. 9, where this idea is again taken up and further carried out. Love is again (as in Ephes. i. 15) conceived of as *brotherly* love, because Christian love manifests itself as such in the first place, without thereby derogating from *universal* love. In ver. 3 MS. B. reads for τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ, as St Paul generally writes,—τῷ Θεῷ πατρὶ, and D.G. τῷ Θεῷ τῷ πατρὶ, which latter reading Lachmann has received into the text. In fact, it seems to deserve the preference, as the more unusual form of expression could easily be changed into the usual one.—Ὑπὲρ is to be preferred after B.D.F.G. to περί.—In ver. 4 the reading ἣν ἔχετε after τὴν ἀγάπην is vouched for by so many and important MSS., viz., by A.C.D.E.F.G., that one cannot hesitate to declare it the original one, the rather as the reading τὴν seems to have come into the text here from Ephes. i. 15.

Ver. 5. St Paul represents the faith and the love of the Christians in Colossæ as purchased by the hope shown them by means of the Gospel. *Here* too again St Paul disdains not to cast his eyes on the divine μισθὸς, which even the Saviour Himself often places before His disciples. The ἐλπίς, accordingly, is here not, as in 1 Thess. i. 3, *subjective* hope, but *objective* hope, *i.e.* the hoped-for object, eternal happiness in the kingdom of God. It is designated as ἀποκειμένη ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, in order to indicate partly its being securely laid up, partly its not being yet present. But man cannot deduce the existence of such a heavenly hope from himself, he perceives it only in the Word of Truth, which is in the Gospel. (Τοῦ εὐαγγελίου is to be taken as *genit. appositionis.*) In this, the Colossians have already here (*before* the fulfilment) received information of that hope. For the προηκούσατε is to be taken *so*, not, as Böhmer wishes, with reference to the Apostle's Epistle, as if the meaning were, "of which you have already heard before the composition of this Epistle." For that this was the case was surely already plain enough from the ἀκούσαντες preceding. Again, in the words which follow: τοῦ παρόντος εἰς ὑμᾶς καθὼς καὶ κ.τ.λ., the bare fact that the Gospel is preached in Colossæ is not related; the citing of that would be completely needless, as the existence of faith necessarily presupposes the preaching of the

Gospel. St Paul means rather in that addition to render prominent the nature of the Gospel, as a treasure belonging to the whole of mankind, and which for that very reason could not be withheld from them (the Colossians) either: "which is come unto you, as it is also (in conformity with its destination) in the whole world." The reason why the apostle makes the universality of Christianity prominent here is the same which causes him at the end of the chapter (i. 27, ss.) to repeat so often, that he teaches and warns *all* men, viz., opposition to the one-sided bias of the Judaïstic false teachers, who looked on the Gospel as intended first of all for the Jews merely. Neither, therefore, can the ἐν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ be taken with Böhmer as an hyperbole, for even if, when St Paul wrote those words, the Gospel was not actually as yet generally diffused, still it has in its first elements even the tendency and energy to fill and govern the world; from his knowledge of that energy St Paul prophetically expresses the future as if already realized. (See on i. 23.) For the rest, in the τοῦ παρόντος εἰς ὑμᾶς is to be seen an antithesis to the ἐλπὶς ἀποκειμένη ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς; whereas the glory and blessedness of the kingdom of God are still far off, the substance of these blessings is already spiritually near to the faithful in the Word of Truth.

Ver. 6. Here the connection of the words is disputable, in consequence of the different readings; St Paul's discourse proceeds with καθὼς καὶ thrice repeated: it is true, the καὶ is wanting in the third, in very many and important MSS., but the *omission* is far more explicable, because it had already been put twice before, than the *addition* of it. But then A.C.D. read in the beginning of ver. 6 καθὼς καὶ ἐν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ ἔστι καρποφορούμενον. By that reading the proposition καθὼς — κόσμῳ is separated from what precedes, and joined with what follows, which brings with it the great inconvenience that *then* the words: καθὼς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν do not fit the beginning of the proposition: καθὼς καὶ ἐν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ, since the Colossians are to be conceived as included of course with the rest in the whole world. It is with reason, therefore, that Steiger, Bähr, and others, have retained καὶ ἔστι κάρποφορούμενον, and supplied ἔστι at καθὼς καὶ ἐν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ. The existence of the Word of Truth, therefore, in the world is to be more accurately represented as not unfruitful, but efficient; from its productive power it brings forth fruits in the souls of those who receive it, and it had just shown itself so in the Colossians also from the moment that they had heard of the grace of God

(viz., in Christ, as the object of the preaching of the Gospel), and had truly received what they heard. But a difficulty is created by the καὶ αὐξανόμενον, which, it is in the highest degree probable, is to be considered genuine, and to be taken into the text, after A.B.C.D.E.F.G., though it might have been interpolated here from ver. 10. But the idea of growing seems of necessity to precede the bringing forth fruit, and not to be able to follow it. The reference of the καρποφορεῖσθαι to the inward, αὐξάνεσθαι to the outward, growth, is plainly improper after the mention of καθὼς καὶ ἐν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ. It corresponds better with the context to refer αὐξάνεσθαι to the growing and ripening of the fruits themselves, with which the parallel passage, ver. 10, also suits best. The operation of the Word of Truth is not yet concluded with the bringing forth of fruits, it works away, on the contrary, on and on, to present the fruits still more ripened and complete, so that a growing is, therefore, to be recognised in the bringing forth of fruit itself. The acceptation of the ἐν ἀληθείᾳ may be questionable. That no reference back to the λόγος τῆς ἀληθείας in ver. 5 is couched in it, and that therefore ἐν ἀληθείᾳ must not be joined with χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ, in the sense: "grace of God in truth," follows decidedly enough from the article being away. The ἐν ἀληθείᾳ can only be taken as an adverbial accessory definition to the whole proposition, by which the nature of the ἐπίγνωσις as a *true* one, in contrast to a mere *apparent* knowledge of the grace of God, as it showed itself in the false teachers, is to be designated. (See Bähr on this passage, and Winer's Gramm. p. 128.) But the καθὼς καὶ ἐμάθετε points also, as Steiger has already correctly perceived, to a further reference of the ἐν ἀληθείᾳ to the idea in verse 7; St Paul in it ratifies the preaching of Epaphras in Colossæ as the genuine apostolical one (perhaps with regard to suspicions which might have been disseminated on the part of the false teachers against Epaphras and his doctrine), and with it refers the Christians there to *that*, as the only true one, in opposition to the arbitrary disfigurement of the Gospel, which the false teachers had permitted themselves.

Ver. 7, 8. The ratification of the doctrine, and authentication of the person, of Epaphras, here pronounced, are so far important, as from them we learn how the apostles considered themselves as the true possessors of pure evangelical truth, and maintained their title. He whom they did not recognise was by that very circumstance shut out from the body of Christ, the true Church of the

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

Ver. 9. Exactly as in Ephes. i. 15, St Paul in what follows again takes up the idea of his diligence in prayer for them, which had been already touched on in verse 3, and details *what* he prayed for on behalf of the Christians in Colossæ. He designates this his praying as an uninterrupted one since the day that he heard of them and their faith. (Διὰ τοῦτο connects verse 9 with what precedes, so that the life than existing in the Colossians was the motive to St Paul to pray for the perfection of his readers in the same.—Αἰτεῖσθαι after προσεύχεσθαι denotes the particular act of beseeching in the more general idea of praying.—As to the use of ἵνα after verbs of commanding, praying etc., see Winer's Gramm.

p. 310, sq.—The construction of the πληροῦσθαι with the accusative is quite regular. See Winer's Gramm. p. 205, sq.)

St Paul now wishes and beseeches for his readers the being filled with the knowledge of the Divine will, which makes itself known, and proves itself in all wisdom and spiritual knowledge. As to the ideas σοφία and σύνεσις we have already observed what was necessary on Ephes. i. 8, which passage stands parallel to this one. The idea of the *being filled* with the knowledge of the divine will is to be explained by the fact, that ἐπίγνωσις is to St Paul no mere act of reflection, to which certainly πληρωθῆναι would not be adapted, by a real contemplation, which has its origin in the communication of the Holy Ghost. The idea would, therefore, have to be paraphrased thus: "that you may be filled by the Holy Ghost, and by means of His illumination may receive knowledge." But the "knowledge" is, by the addition τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ, designated as *practical* knowledge, in opposition to an unfruitful *theoretical* knowledge, such as the false teachers made great efforts to attain to. (See on ii. 8, 23.) According to this, Steiger's view is quite a failure. He is pleased, on this passage, so to distinguish γνῶσις from ἐπίγνωσις, that by γνῶσις vague knowledge without any complete insight into the reality is understood, while ἐπίγνωσις is supposed to be a seeing into the special, resulting from meditation and design. The uncertain nature of his view is sufficiently apparent from the single fact of his bringing in *another* definition alongside of the *former* one. He thinks that ἐπίγνωσις is sometimes *above*, sometimes *beneath*, γνῶσις: if the *latter* be the case, then γνῶσις means the full, pure, knowledge of things, as it arises in intellectual contemplation; and ἐπίγνωσις, on the contrary, is then the result of a partial investigation on a more laborious road. As we have already observed in the exposition of the Epistle to the Ephesians (at i. 8), there is no specific difference at all between γνῶσις and ἐπίγνωσις to be assumed in the dialect of the New Testament, and particularly in St Paul's; both terms always denote the immediate knowledge by the reason through the perception of the eternal, by means of the νοῦς illuminated by the Holy Ghost (compare on ii. 3); on the other hand, the insight which is gained by an intellectual process through the activity of the reflective powers is called φρόνησις or σύνεσις. (See my *Opusc. acad.* p. 156, ss.)

Ver. 10. From the true practical knowledge of God proceeds, of itself, an outward walk which is worthy of the Lord; *i.e.* re-

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

Ver. 11. The constitution of those who can bring forth fruit in every good work, is more accurately defined to the effect, that the spiritual strength requisite for it is imparted to them by God: "as such, who are strengthened in all might, according to the power of His (*i.e.* God's) glory." (On the relation between δύναμις and κράτος see the remarks on Ephes. i. 19.—As to κράτος τῆς δόξης see at Ephes. i. 6, 12, 14, 18.) It cannot be doubted that, by the δυναμούμενοι κατὰ τὸ κράτος, "strengthened in accordance with His power," the strengthening of the faithful is meant to be designated as one proceeding from God. God Himself fulfils His will by His Spirit in them! Exactly corresponding to the word: "with God nothing is impossible;" and to this other: "to him that believes all things are possible," for it is God who works in the believer. (See the Comm. on Matt. xix. 26; Mark ix. 23.) But Θεοῦ must not be supplied at ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει also; on the contrary, πάσῃ plainly points to the variety of human situations and wants, and of the strength requisite for them. These forms of life, in which that strength is a necessity, are

more closely defined by: εἰς πᾶσαν ὑπομονὴν καὶ μακροθυμίαν. St Paul is thinking of times of suffering and temptation of various kinds, as they then befel every church, in which events the faithful have to approve their patience and forbearance, and *that*, too, not by any means in hypocritical peevishness, but *with joy*, as in *that*, too, fulfilling God's will. Certainly, the words μετὰ χαρᾶς are, by several critical authorities, joined with εὐχαριστοῦντες which follows, but Steiger and Bähr have already with justice declared themselves against it. For in the εὐχαριστεῖν, by itself alone, is couched the idea of joyful resignation to God's will; but the ὑπομονὴ and μακροθυμία need the closer definition by μετὰ χαρᾶς, in order to characterise them as genuinely Christian.

Ver. 12. From the state of mind described in the foregoing verses, the prayer of thanksgiving to God proceeds as an efflux. For he that, in God's might, can bring forth fruits in good works, finds in it an inexpressible joy (the feeling of which urges him to thanksgiving towards the Father of light, who has regenerated him to such an existence), and, at the same time, a guarantee of his future eternal happiness; he sees that he is, by the Spirit, made fit for the holy kingdom of God, that he bears it in himself even here below, and that it will, therefore, also certainly belong to him at some time. According to this connection, St Paul here places in the foreground the conception of the Father (proceeding from the consciousness of adoption), and that of the being made meet. It is true, the readings vary *here* too very much, as in ver. 3; for in *some* MSS. τῷ Θεῷ πατρὶ, in *others* τῷ Θεῷ τῷ πατρὶ, and other words, are read for τῷ πατρί. But these various readings are sufficiently explained by the fact, that nowhere else in St Paul's Epistles does ὁ πατὴρ occur alone. As to the idea of ἱκανόω see 2 Cor. iii. 6. The aorist form points to a divine action which was performed but once, by which the faithful are made meet, viz., to the work of Christ, as it is described in ver. 13, 14. (MSS. D.G. read καλέσαντι for ἱκανώσαντι, MS. B. has both, side by side. Lachmann has, without sufficient reason, received this latter reading. Doubtless ἱκανώσαντι is the right reading. But if one referred the having made meet to the *subjective* state of the mind, one could easily take offence at it (because, surely, in none was the meetness absolutely realized), and, therefore, think καλέσαντι must be substituted for it.) Lastly, in the concluding words of the verse the object is mentioned for which God the Father makes His children meet, viz. εἰς τὴν μερίδα τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἁγίων.

The saints, *i.e.* all regenerate, true children of God, conceived as a unity, have a joint κλῆρος (נַחֲלָה), of which each individual has his μερὶς (חֵלֶק or חֶלְקָה). In like manner, it is said, John xiv. 2, "In my Father's house are many mansions." Here the house answers to the κλῆρος, the mansions in it to each individual μερίς. The question of whether St Paul is here thinking of the earthly kingdom of God, or of the heavenly world, is idle, inasmuch as here it is not exactly meant to distinguish between the various forms in which perfection may realize itself. *That* world is, as a portion left by the Father to the children, without further distinction, contrasted with *this* sin-ridden earthly world. Akin to the expression in this passage, are not only Ephes. i. 18, ἡ κληρονομία ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις, but also Acts xx. 32, κληρονομία ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις πᾶσιν, and xxvi. 18, κλῆρος ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις. Only in *these* passages the distinction between μερὶς and κλῆρος, which is so prominent *here*, is wanting. But a comparison with Canaan, the earthly heritage of Israel, in which every Israelite had his share, lies at the root of the whole form of expression. (See Heb. iv. 1, ss.) In conclusion, it is also a question how ἐν τῷ φωτὶ is to be connected. The connecting it with ἱκανώσαντι, as if light were the element through which God has made the children of God meet, is a failure in every respect. Φῶς is never used in such connection, but always πνεῦμα; to refer it to baptism, as several of the Fathers proposed, is, in like manner, quite unsuitable, because φωτισμὸς, at least, would have to stand for that; further, ἱκανώσαντι does not refer, as we have remarked above, to the already complete subjective process of being made meet, for St Paul is really only just praying (ver. 9, ss.) that God may be pleased to fill them with the knowledge of His will. We must rather take ἐν τῷ φωτὶ as a more accurate definition of the nature of the κλῆρος τῶν ἁγίων. As, in ver. 13, the element of sin is called σκότος, so here the element of good, in which the saints are, is called φῶς; as children of light, they are heirs of the kingdom of light.

Ver. 13, 14. No pause can be made here with Griesbach; on the contrary St Paul's discourse moves on again as at Ephes. i. 6, ss., by means of nothing but relatives, which join one clause to another by connecting it with the last substantive. God, who is the subject of the last proposition, is represented as the author of redemption by Christ (2 Cor. v. 19). Redemption is represented as *positively* accomplished by deliverance from the power of darkness, *negatively* by translation into the kingdom of Christ. Now, the

ἐξουσία σκότους, as an antithesis to the kingdom of Christ, is not merely subjective sinfulness, but that in connection with the whole element of evil in the devil and in his angels. The deliverance of the faithful from the power of darkness does not, however, exclude the continued fight against the evil powers; on the contrary, St Paul describes it as subsisting precisely for Christians (Ephes. vi. 12, ss.). The deliverance from the power of darkness consists rather in the fact, that the believer exactly through faith knows himself as Christ's servant, and therefore can fight against the darkness as *without* him, as belonging to it himself no more. But this deliverance from one element and its determining influence supposes a being transferred to another element; this is denoted by the phrase: μετέστησεν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ. Here, just as in Luke xvii. 21, the kingdom of Christ is imagined as inwardly present, "the kingdom of God is inwardly in the faithful, and they in it;" Christ is that spiritual kingdom itself, He is in us, and we in Him. Into that inward kingdom the regenerate man is even here below transplanted in the spirit, as he also through the death of the old man presses through unto life even here below (1 John iii. 14). Christ's kingdom is, therefore, here not = the μερὶς τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἁγίων (ver. 12) by which the future state in glory is designated, in which man will be in a holy and perfect state as to all his powers, even as to his body. The name that Christ bears here is also peculiar: ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ. It is erroneously taken as a merely Hebraïzing designation of υἱὸς ἀγαπητός; the expression rather corresponds in St Paul to the μονογενής of St John (see on John i. 18). Christ is called "Son of His love," inasmuch as He was born of the essence of God, as St Augustine (de trinit. xv. 19) had already correctly interpreted it: filius caritatis nullus est alius, quam qui de substantia est genitus. This Son of the divine love is the personal love itself, which induced him to give Himself up unto death for men; therefore it is further said of Christ: ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν κ. τ. λ., words, which we have already explained at Ephes. i. 7. Not merely *through* Him, St Paul means to say, is redemption accomplished, we rather possess it as an abiding reality *in* Him; Christ is from His representative character, the never-failing source of redemption; *he* alone who is *in* Him truly possesses it. As to the rest, διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ is to be struck out here in accordance with A.B.C.D.E.F.G. It seems to have only come into the text here out of Ephes. i. 7.

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

First, Christ is called εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου. St Paul had already at 2 Cor. iv. 4 called Christ εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ (ἀοράτου is *there* spurious); it is a question what the expression, when used of Christ, means, for the image of God is attributed to *man* too (see iii. 10). But as *everything* is created through Christ (ver. 16), so is *man* too; he, consequently, has the image of God in a *derivative* manner only, he is the image of the image, Christ is the original image of God. It must not be concluded from the absence of the article that we must translate in this passage: "*an* image of God;" on the contrary, the article is wanting because εἰκὼν τ. Θ. is a familiar collective idea, like πνεῦμα τ. Θ., υἱὸς τ. Θ.; in 2 Cor. iv. 4 the article is wanting in the same manner, and even Philo uses εἰκὼν τ. Θ. without the article. Now it would be altogether leading one astray to refer this expression: "Christ is the

"original image of God" to the *human* nature of Christ along with the *divine* one, as Junker and Schleiermacher will have it; for here the Son of God, still purely in His eternal divine being, is set on a par with the Father. It would be just as wrong to suppose the idea of "the designedly-made or formed" in the term εἰκὼν, by which Christ would be degraded into a creature. The meaning of the term is here made completely plain by the epithet ἀόρατος (1 Tim. i. 17). Christ is not called image of God as a being formed after God, but as He who manifests, so that they can be seen in Him, the fulness of the essence and of the divine attributes, which are hidden in the Father. (So judges, *correctly*, I think, besides Bähr, Steiger, and Böhmer, Usteri also, on St Paul's system, p. 308.) As, therefore, it is said, John i. 18: Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακε πώποτε (1 Tim. vi. 16, φῶς οἰκῶν ἀπρόσιτον, ὃν εἶδεν οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων, οὐδὲ ἰδεῖν δύναται), but it is added afterwards: ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο, so St Paul designates the Father as not to be viewed (for it is plain enough that there is no question here as to a physical seeing), but as manifesting Himself in the reflection of His essence (Heb. i. 3) the Son. Accordingly, then, our Lord says too, John xiv. 9: "he that sees me, sees the Father, for the Father manifests Himself through the Son," who ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχει, Phil. ii. 6. Thus taken, then, the essential equality is expressed in the name εἰκὼν τ. Θ., but, as the being begotten is couched in the name υἱὸς, so is the idea of the radiation of the divine glory in the conception of εἰκών. The Father is the source, the eternal and original cause, of light, from whom the Son, as image of the divine nature, proceeds. (Philo had already got this view of the relation of the Son to the Father correctly in the essential points. Compare some passages from him belonging to this subject in Usteri *ubi suprà*; they are fully collected in Grossmann *quæstiones philoneæ*, Lips. 1829. The idea of a תְּמוּנָה, in which God manifests Himself, is found even in the Old Testament [see Numb. xii. 8; Ps. xvii. 15], and from those instances it passed over to the Cabalists, who describe the Metatron [comp. on John. i. 1] as God's image or countenance).

The *second* phrase, by which Christ's nature is described, is πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως. That πᾶς stands here without an article, as it has been already observed on the Epistle to the Ephesians (on ii. 21) for *totus*, after the more modern custom of the language, Bähr has already correctly remarked. The κτίσις is the whole of the creation, not the creation in its individual parts. But the term

πρωτότοκος is difficult, and one cannot but think it very intelligible that, from the first, Arians, Socinians, and other impugners of the divine nature of Christ, strove to found their views on this passage. For it must be granted that the words πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, viewed purely grammatically, *can* be so understood that Christ Himself is reckoned in the κτίσις, and is only placed at the summit of the whole κτίσις. The possibility of such an acceptation of the words is sufficiently proved by the πρωτότοκος τῶν νεκρῶν, which follows, and which cannot be understood otherwise than that Christ Himself was dead too. But the context of the whole passage speaks so decidedly against the possibility of taking the words so, that there can be no doubt at all that St Paul means the phrase πρωτότοκος τῆς κτίσεως to be taken in another sense. For in ver. 16, 17, all created things are represented as in absolute dependency on Him, the Son of God, who cannot, therefore, possibly be meant to be designated as Himself belonging to the rank of creatures. The appeal to the passages of the books of wisdom (Prov. viii. 22, ἔκτισέ με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν, LXX., Sir. i. 4, 8, προτέρα πάντων ἔκτισται σοφία, κύριος αὐτὸς ἔκτισεν αὐτὴν) can therefore prove nothing, for in the latter κτίζειν is merely used in a more extended sense = γεννᾶν. The σοφια is by no means to be represented as itself κτίσμα. To interpret the passage by altering the accent, with Erasmus, J. D. Michaelis, and others, will at the present day hardly come into any one's head again. That is to say, πρωτότοκος is used in a *feminine* sense only, ἡ πρώτως τέξασα, as Thomas Magister explains it. But, even without looking at *that*, the creative operation of the λόγος can never be designated by τίκτειν, and indeed the combination with πρῶτος also in this acceptation would be extremely inconvenient; for, if Christ were called *primus genitor totius creaturæ*, it would seem as if there were several *more*, *without* and *after* Him. But just as little can Schleiermacher's proposition lay claim to approval. He insists on having πρωτότοκος joined with εἰκὼν (as he in ver. 18 joins also ἀρχὴ πρωτότοκος together, but just as unsuitably), in the sense: "Christ is, in the collective compass of the spiritual world of men, the first-born image of God." The interpretation of the term κτίσις of the world of men is, it is true, not impossible in itself, for mankind can certainly, as an essential part of the creation, be designated by the name κτίσις. (See the Comm. on Rom. viii. 17 and on Col. i. 23.) But πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις without any further definition never does and never can so occur, neither does the context here per-

mit the employment of that signification. The τὰ πάντα in ver. 16 clearly interprets the πᾶσα κτίσις, which precedes, as the whole of the creation. But, even without looking at that, Schleiermacher's interpretation is totally inadmissible. For, *first*, πρωτότοκος seems not to be a suitable epithet for εἰκών. Böhmer has already justly remarked that one would rather have expected πρωτότυπος. But, *secondly*, grammar necessarily requires the article before πρωτότοκος in the connection with εἰκών, as Matt. i. 25, τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον shows. (See Winer's Gramm., p. 125.) The omission of the article is only explained by the supposition that πρωτότοκος is treated as a well-known idea, which, besides, in the connection with πάσης κτίσεως, cannot belong to any other. The use of this phrase had, no doubt, its origin in the Old Testament, where it is said, Ps. lxxxix. 27, κἀγὼ πρωτότοκον (בְּכוֹר) θήσομαι αὐτόν. (See Heb. i. 6.) Philo calls the λόγος both εἰκὼν and πρωτόγονος (see Bähr on this passage, p. 61), which name is near akin to the μονογενής of St John. Just in the same way Jehovah is called in the Kabbala the first-born, as the original manifestation of the infinite, through whom the creation is brought about. After this the name πρωτότοκος τῆς κτίσεως can only, with the oldest Fathers, be taken so that the Genitive is dependent on the πρῶτος in the signification of *prior* (see at John i. 15), in the sense, πρωτότοκος πρὸ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων, as Justin Martyr calls the λόγος, in complete accordance with the phrase in ver. 17, αὐτός ἐστι πρὸ πάντων. There is then couched in the name the Son of God's being born of God in the beginning before every creature.

Now that St Paul represents Christ as εἰκὼν τ. Θ., as πρωτότοκος τῆς κτίσεως, had doubtless its origin in the circumstance that the heretics in Colossæ called in question the divine dignity of Christ. In all probability they saw in Christ a mere man (like Cerinthus and his disciples) with whom at His baptism a higher Æon had united itself, but which again left Him after the completion of the work of redemption. The supposition of Steiger and others (p. 139) that the Colossian false teachers had themselves employed the terms εἰκὼν and πρωτότοκος of Christ, only in another sense, is extremely improbable. Had that been the case, St Paul would have defined those terms so much more accurately that it might be perceived wherein the genuine apostolical use of those phrases differed from the false one of those false teachers. But any such more accurate definitions are wholly wanting. On the contrary, St Paul uses the name πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως with so little reserve,

that it might be understood in a sense *derogatory* to Christ, which surely would have been avoided, if the heretics, whom St Paul means to combat, had applied the word in an exactly similar way. But the apostle's mode of expression seems suitable, if the heretics, in like manner as Cerinthus and his school, proclaimed Christ straightforwardly an ordinary man, and only supposed an Æon to have been united to Him during His labours as the Messiah: the force of St Paul's argument lies in the *idea*, not the *words*.

Ver. 16. With all the difference in the *expressions* there still appears in the *thing* the completest agreement between the Christologies of St John and St Paul. The names εἰκὼν τ. Θ., πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, St John is a stranger to, but, on the other hand, *he* likewise declares that one sees in the Son the invisible Father in all His glory, that the Son is the only-begotten of the Father. So now verse 16 too corresponds perfectly with the description in St John i. 3, πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν ὃ γέγονε. (Compare also Heb. i. 4, xi. 3.) But the idea that all is created in Christ is joined by St Paul with what precedes by ὅτι, and by that means the sense which we obtained of πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως is established. "He (the Son of God) must have been born of the substance of the Father before all the creation, *for* all things are created in Him." Considering the accurate distinction drawn afterwards between the prepositions διὰ, εἰς, ἐν, it is extremely improbable that ἐν stands here instead of διά; ἐν rather denotes here very comprehensively the connection of the Son with the creation, which is afterwards divided into its separate relations. "In Him are all things created, *i.e.* the Son of God is the intelligible world, the κόσμος νοητὸς, *i.e.* things themselves according to the idea of them, He carries their essentiality in Himself;" in the creation they come forth from Him to an independent existence, in the completion of all things they return to Him. The referring of the τὰ πάντα merely to the collective body of the regenerate, and of the κτίζειν to the transforming energy in the regeneration, is quite inadmissible, as the following development of the purport of the πάντα shows. It is incomprehensible how Schleiermacher could say (ubi suprà, p. 507) κτίζειν is not used for בָּרָא of creating, as it often occurs so, Deut. iv. 32; Ps. l. 11; Isaiah xlv. 7, and elsewhere. (Cf. Schleusn. Lex. in LXX. vol. iii., p. 402.) The conception of the πάντα is now carried out by means of two antitheses, τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (cf. Ephes. i. 10; Rev. x. 6), τὰ ὁρατὰ καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα, by which

the ideal and material sides of the creation are meant to be expressed, and consequently its totality. Then, in continuation, the highest forms of those two departments of the creation are named separately, εἴτε θρόνοι, εἴτε κυριότητες, εἴτε ἀρχαί, εἴτε ἐξουσίαι, in which there is the assumption that, if the highest is created in Christ, it is self-evident that the low and insignificant is so too. From Col. ii. 10, 15, and the remarks on Ephes. i. 21, it cannot be doubtful that St Paul means by those four synonymous expressions particularly to designate powers of the spiritual world, angels and angel-princes, without making a more accurate distinction between good and bad angels. As to the impossibility of defining more accurately the differences between the separate expressions we have already explained ourselves at Ephes. i. 21. But the question may arise whether, from the connection with the foregoing antithesis, heaven and earth, visible and invisible, we are not in the four names of governors and powers, at the same time with *heavenly* powers, kings, princes, magistrates, to suppose *earthly* ones also to be meant, who indeed, as administrating their offices in the name of God, are even called Elohim in the Old Testament. For the assumption, that reference is here made only to *earthly* relations, which even Schleiermacher has propounded, is at all events inadmissible. That divine would even understand the antitheses τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς κ.τ.λ. thus: "everything which refers to heavenly, *i.e.* religious, relations, and which refers to political, legal conditions." That is decidedly inadmissible, because, no doubt, in that declaration of St Paul, that everything on high was created in Christ, consequently He is higher than all high things, is couched an antithesis against the view of the Colossian heretics as to the dignity of the angels, whom they, according to the Gnostic idea of the Æons, even adored with invocation and worship (cf. on Col. ii. 18), and with the greatest probability named by these and similar names. (See Steiger and Bähr in their Comms. on this passage, where passages of the later Gnostics are collected.) Only St Paul did not borrow them from the habitual language of the Gnostics; they were familiar to him already from the general sphere of Jewish ideas in which he had grown up. But certainly much may be said for the notion, that St Paul was thinking of earthly powers along with the heavenly ones, because directly after, in ver. 17, the τὰ πάντα appears again, and St Paul has plainly the intention of representing the absolute totality of the creation as determined in regard to its existence by

Christ. Only we find no trustworthy passage elsewhere, in which these expressions, used commonly of angels absolutely, are also employed of earthly powers. If one will lay a stress on the circumstance that Christ is elsewhere, with reference to earthly powers, called King of kings, Lord of lords (1 Tim. vi. 15; Rev. i. 5, xvii. 14, xix. 16), it seems more reasonable to find this might of Christ's over every earthly greatness in the words τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς than in the names θρόνοι κ.τ.λ.

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

[1] See Bähr, p. 82, and the passages cited there.

through Him." The absoluteness of the Father, as the foundation also of the Son and of the Spirit, comes out unmistakeably in this mode of speech.

Ver. 18. After this there follows in the apostle's description of the Christology the especial relation of Christ to the Church, which His being made man supposes. He, the eternal Son of God, who is infinitely exalted above every creature, He Himself has even entered into the life of a creature, and has Himself tasted death; but even in this relation to the creature and its sufferings He is the leader and guide of all. St Paul designates the Lord first as the κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος (see Ephes. i. 22), in which is couched the exhortation to let one's self be determined by Him who is the head; it was just *that* the false teachers did not do, and it was for that reason they were so blameable. Secondly, Christ is called ἀρχὴ, πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν. *Here* it is certainly more easily explained, how one might seek to connect ἀρχὴ πρωτότοκος; for the ἀρχὴ without an article has something striking by the side of the substantive-like πρωτότοκος. In some of the MSS. we find ἡ ἀρχὴ in others ἀπαρχὴ, in others ἐν ἀρχῇ, but in such unimportant ones, that those readings can make no claim to reception into the text. But the combination "first-born beginning" has also something repugnant in it; no adjective like πρωτότοκος, which must refer to a *concrete*, suits ἀρχὴ as an *abstract*. For to take ἀρχὴ downright for ἀπαρχὴ, "first-fruits," might both have its difficulty, viewed as a point of language, and the expression in this mode of taking the passage coincides with πρωτότοκος, which is used as = בְּכוֹר. The two must therefore be separated, and πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν be taken as a more accurate definition of the more general ἀρχή. The absence of the article with ἀρχὴ is explained by the abstract form of the worm (see Winer's Gramm. pp. 113, 117); Christ, however, is not called "beginning" in the sense in which He is above called πρωτότοκος τῆς κτίσεως, *i.e.* not as He, in whom the creature, as such, has its beginning, but as He, who in the life of the creature, which was fallen under the power of death, Himself established a new beginning through His victory over death. Christ is called in the same sense ἀρχηγὸς, Heb. ii. 10, xii. 2. This reference must be adhered to, because Christ is here throughout represented as He that became man. How far Christ is called exactly "the beginning" is more accurately determined by the addition πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν. Christ himself was dead, and, as such, *among* the dead in Hades, but He was the

first of them who, by resurrection unto life, was born in the glorified body, and thus became the beginning of a new series of developments. In His unglorified humanity He was, through Mary, ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβίδ, therefore ranked among mankind as such, but when glorified He was an absolutely new man, the ἀρχή. (In Rev. i. 5 the ἐκ is wanting, and Christ is called merely ὁ πρωτότοκος τῶν νεκρῶν. On the other hand, in Rom. viii. 29 we find the expression πρωτότοκος ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς.)

The raising of many from the dead cannot be quoted against Christ's being called πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, for those were raised with their mortal bodies, and died again at a later day. But Enoch and Elias did not taste death at all, and cannot be brought forward either against Christ as the first-born of the dead. In general, the corporeal glorification of the body in those Old Testament worthies seems to have been a preliminary one only, which cannot be compared with Christ's glorification. Neither, certainly, is a reference of the words ἀρχή, πρωτότοκος, to the customary language of the Gnostic false teachers to be looked for here; had the latter made use of those expressions in another sense, St Paul would have more accurately defined the true sense in which they must be used. An antithesis could be couched in St Paul's words only so far as he seems in them to assert the reality of the resurrection against spiritualistic false doctrines. But this Epistle is wanting in a definite explanation as to the docetic tendency of the false teachers, as will be detailed farther on (see at ver. 22); St Paul seems to have intended to designate Christ as only the beginner of the glorification. According to the teleologic conception of the life of Jesus, St Paul sees in it a special divine design; Christ was necessarily so the first-born of the dead by God's direction, in order to have the first place in all; He, the Lord of all things, was necessarily to have the first place in all earthly relations also. The ἐν πᾶσιν is not, with Beza, Flatt, Heinrichs, and others, to be taken as a masculine, "among all men," for then πάντων would certainly have stood, but as a neuter, "in all points, in every point of view." Excellently says Chrysostom: πανταχοῦ πρῶτος. ἄνω πρῶτος, ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρῶτος, ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει πρῶτος. (The verb πρωτεύω is not found in the New Testament except here. In the LXX., it is found Esther v. 11. It also occurs 2 Macc. vi. 18, xiii. 15.)

Ver. 19. Christ's precedence in all respects is grounded on the relation of the divine to the human nature; by God's good plea-

sure there resided in Him the whole fulness of the divinity. He was therefore no mere man, like the rest, but the God-Man; human nature was the residence, the temple, for the divinity which filled Him. Thus it is said of the faithful too (John xiv. 23) that Father and Son will come to them and take up their abode (μονὴν) with them. But whereas in Christ *the whole fulness* dwells, *i.e.* permanently manifests itself as active, the individual believer receives *but a ray* of the divine light. Now the idea of the πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα is authoritatively explained by πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος in the passage ii. 9. It is, therefore, the divine essence itself, inasmuch as it is conceived as comprehending in itself a fulness of vital powers: the abstract form θεότης suits that better than Θεός. But, as the divine essence can manifest itself in an all-embracing (central), or partial, manner, πᾶν is added to express that in Christ the *former* is the case. But *here* again it may be asked, whether in the selection of the expression πλήρωμα there might not be supposed an allusion to the customary language of the Gnostics. For the Gnostics used, as is well known, the word πλήρωμα to denote the kingdom of light, the world of Æons, in opposition to κένωμα. Now, as the Colossian false teachers devoted a worship to the individual angels or Æons, St Paul's design might have been to oppose the truth to those erroneous notions by describing Christ as the only object of adoration, in whom more than one Æon resided, that is to say, the whole πλήρωμα. But we have already detailed at Ephes. i. 23 the reasons which determine us not to suppose such an allusion to the customary language of the Gnostics in the use of the word πλήρωμα. We cannot point out that the false teachers in the time of the apostles already used the word πλήρωμα as the latter Gnostics did. But, even were that demonstrable, St Paul, if he had had in view an antithesis in the word πλήρωμα, would have more strictly defined the sense in which he took it, in opposition to the Gnostics' use of it. One may rather admit the supposition of an antithesis in the expression κατοικῆσαι, against such Gnostic views as look upon Jesus' animation by a higher Æon as only temporary, from His baptism till His death. (See the remarks on ii. 9.) Nevertheless, we must adhere to *this* as a principle, that we can see in this whole passage only a dispute against the teachers of the heretics in the mass and on the whole, and not against what was special in their mode of expression, as Steiger and Bähr particularly have assumed in great detail; in no case have we a right to admit into the polemics of the *first* chapter points which

receive no confirmation in the accurate description in the *second*. The false teachers mistook the true divinity of Christ, and placed Æons on a level with Him as objects of veneration; *this* it is which St Paul combats by describing Christ as the Son of God, and as Him through whom also all angels and powers have received their existence. In ver. 18, I should without hesitation see an antithesis against docetic errors, if the passage occurred in the Pastoral Epistles, for the heretics there described seem no doubt to have followed a docetic bias (see the Introduction to the Pastoral Epistles), but in the Epistle to the Colossians we find nothing of the kind; on the contrary, the low view of Christ held by the false teachers combated in this Epistle seems more to point to a materialist tendency than to a spiritualist-docetic one. However, see particulars on this point at ver. 22, where the supposition that the Colossian false doctrines too had a docetic tendency has a certain plausibility. (That conception of the construction of this verse, according to which πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα is looked on as the subject of εὐδόκησε, "it pleased the whole fulness of the Godhead to reside in Him," cannot possibly recommend itself. Ὁ Θεὸς is rather to be considered as the subject of εὐδόκησε, as the incarnation of the Son is regarded as the ordinance of the divine decree of grace and mercy.—In the selection of the word κατοικῆσαι here and at ii. 9 the reference to the idea of the Shechinah is not improbable. [See at John i. 14 on that point.] Jesus walked on earth as an abiding Shechinah; he that saw Him saw the Father.)

Ver. 20. As a further tendency of the divine intention of grace in Christ's incarnation, the reconciliation through Christ to Himself, so that He is both means and end (ver. 16), is named. What sets on foot the reconciliation (there is no real difference to be sought between εἰρηνοποιεῖν and ἀποκαταλλάσσειν) is more closely defined as the blood of Christ, and indeed as the blood of His cross, *i.e.* as the blood shed in the death of the Saviour on the cross, and for the sake of emphasis the δι' αὐτοῦ is once more repeated. That the totality of the creation to be reconciled is here meant is made more clear by the fact that the τὰ πάντα is explained by: εἴτε τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, εἴτε τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (ver. 16). The difficulties of this passage have been already spoken of in the explanation of the parallel one, Ephes. i. 10. The more general term ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι, used *there*, cannot be employed, as Bähr insists it can, to explain the more special one ἀποκαταλλάξαι *here*, but *vice versâ*, the latter illustrates the former. But the absolute acceptation,

which is here given the atonement of Christ, must, as we prove at Ephes. i. 10, be understood of the *tendency* of the same. That resistance is made to the comprehensive divine design of grace by a part of the creatures, is a point which is here not reflected on by St Paul. As to the rest, τὰ πάντα cannot be interpreted here otherwise than in what preceded (ver. 16, ss.), viz. of the absolute totality of the creation, not merely of the conscious beings; for the reconciling power of Christ, beginning with fallen men as the first objects of its operation, influences properly also the universe to its restoration and perfection. (See the Comm. on Rom. viii. 17, ss.) As to the rest, from what follows (ver. 27–29), the reference to the Gentiles especially seems to have been present to St Paul's mind in this representation of the universality of Christ's reconciling power; these too are not to be imagined as shut out from salvation in Christ, St Paul means to say, as the Judaïstic false teachers probably maintained they were.

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

Ver. 22. St Paul here names "the death of Christ"[1] as what operates reconciliation, as just before (ver. 20) "the blood," but ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ is added. The combination σῶμα τῆς σαρκὸς is not found in the New Testament except here and at ii. 11. It seems to have something incongruous in it, for it is understood of itself that the σῶμα is of σάρξ. The formula can only be explained, either by a polemical consideration, or by the intention of contrasting the σῶμα, as the physical one, to a spiritual σῶμα, *i.e.*, the Church (ver. 24). For the former interpretation the later interpreters, Böhmer, Steiger, and Bähr, decide. They conclude, from the strict asceticism of the Colossian false teachers, that they necessarily look on matter as the seat of evil, and must, therefore, have taught Doceticism: that St Paul wished to combat the latter, and therefore asserts the true corporeity of Jesus and His real death. But that conclusion is by no means necessary, especially in that early age, in which errors had not as yet developed themselves in all their consequences. The Epistle to the Colossians contains not the slightest *certain* trace of docetic doctrines in the heretics of that place, such as the pastoral Epistles undoubtedly betray. As the Jewish ascetics in Rome were free (Rom. xiv. 1, ss.) from docetic doctrines (for otherwise St Paul would have refuted those errors, and not represented those ascetics as merely weak brothers), the same may be supposed of the Colossian false teachers also. Had they favoured such heresies, St Paul could not have failed to direct an open attack against them. The allusion here is so cursory that one cannot possibly recognise in it a serious antithesis against so dangerous an error. We decide, therefore, for the other acceptation, viz., that by the subordinate definition τῆς σαρκὸς the σῶμα is intended to be distinguished from the Church as the *spiritual* σῶμα. Had St Paul written merely: νυνὶ δὲ ἀποκατήλλαξεν ἐν τῷ σώματι διὰ τοῦ θανάτου, one would be apt to take the words thus: "but now He has reconciled you through His death to unity in the Church." In order to prevent that St Paul added τῆς σαρκὸς, by which the body is meant to be designated as the *physical* body of Christ upon which death passed. If other interpreters have chosen to find here another antithesis between σῶμα τῆς σαρκὸς and δόξης, that interpretation is to be rejected, because nothing is given in the

[1] See, as to the unusual expression in St Paul "to be reconciled through the *death*," instead of through the *blood*, of Christ, the remarks on Rom. iii. 25 (in the Comm., p. 155). It stands here only because διὰ τοῦ αἵματος came just before in ver. 20.

context which could lead to the distinguishing the *natural* and the *glorified* body. In Col. ii. 11 σῶμα τῆς σαρκὸς refers not to Christ but to man. *Here*, therefore, the term requires a special consideration, as σὰρξ *there* denotes not merely the *physical* but also the *sinful*. However, Col. ii. 11 shows that the phrase σῶμα τῆς σαρκὸς has nothing polemical in it. The last words of verse 22, παραστῆσαι ὑμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους καὶ ἀνεγκλήτους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ, express the aim of the reconciling labours of Christ, which relate to the making the faithful like the Lord. (See on Ephes. v. 25–27.) Here this aim is placed in the time of the judgment, at which the faithful will appear before Christ, *i.e.* before His judgment-seat. (See on Rom. xiv. 10.)

Ver. 23. As the condition of attaining this end (εἴγε, "provided that you, as I meanwhile may suppose," different from εἴπερ, see at 2 Cor. v. 3; Ephes. iii. 2, iv. 21) St Paul names the continuing grounded in faith and in hope, for it is only through the believing state of mind that man receives into himself the powers of the invisible world, which generate the new, spotless man, the Christ in us. The terms τεθεμελιωμένοι καὶ ἑδραῖοι are to be explained by the figure of the temple, of the κατοικητήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ (Ephes. ii. 22), in which every individual forms (1 Pet. ii. 5) a living stone, which is inserted firmly into the whole building through faith (see ii. 7). No doubt St Paul, in using the ἐπιμένειν and μὴ μετακινεῖσθαι, was thinking principally of the false teachers and their misleading, although personal moral unfaithfulness can also subvert the foundation of faith. The hope of the Gospel is again to be taken objectively, as in ver. 5, so that the participation in the kingdom of God, which the Gospel promises, must be understood by it. It is joined for brevity with μὴ μετακινούμενοι, instead of ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλπίδος αὐτοῦ. The apostle then anew (see ver. 6) extols the universality in the Gospel, and designates himself as (by God ordained) the minister of the same (ver. 25); both, we may suppose, with reference to the contradictions of the heretics, who declared the Jews a privileged nation, and threw suspicions probably on St Paul's apostolical authority, although they did not openly combat him, for otherwise more definite explanations on that point would be found in the Epistle. (The aorist τοῦ κηρυχθέντος is, as has been already observed at ver. 6, to be explained by prophetic contemplation; St Paul saw the universal tendency of Christianity already realized in the spirit. The πᾶσα κτίσις has here its restriction in the addition ἡ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν, there-

fore the κτίσις ἐπίγειος is the one meant. It is understood at once that by that, in the first place, men, and indeed *all*, Jews as well as Gentiles, are intended [ver. 27, ss.]. However, the choice of the expression is probably to be explained by the fact that St Paul, as Rom. viii. 17, ss. shows, always conceived nature also, along with mankind, as the object of the work of Christ. The ἐν before πάσῃ κτίσει is also in favour of that interpretation; for, if the πᾶσα κτίσις were designated downright as the object of redemption, the dative alone would have been put.)

§ 2. WARNING AGAINST FALSE TEACHERS.

(I. 24–II. 23.)

The following obscure and difficult passage may be designated as a real *crux interpretum*, especially the Protestant ones. Before we enter upon the difficulties themselves, however, we have to point out what justifies us in making a fresh paragraph begin here. Were the reading ὅς νῦν, which D.E.F.G. defend, correct, undoubtedly ver. 24 would connect itself intimately with ver. 23; but the later critics generally have justly rejected ὅς, as it probably owes its origin only to the endeavour to connect ver. 24 more closely with ver. 23, to which it seemed to the copyists to belong, especially on account of ver. 25. But that is only an illusion, that ver. 25 is a continuation of ver. 23. On the contrary, St Paul in ver. 24, with the νῦν χαίρω κ.τ.λ., begins a totally fresh idea, which, however, he does not carry out and complete till ii. 1, ss.; in ver. 25–29 he permits himself, according to his custom, to be led away from it, in order to pursue the idea (so important to him on account of the Judaïzing heretics in Colossæ) that he is called, according to the dispensation of God, to preach the Gospel *to all* without exception, to the Gentiles no less than to the Jews. The fresh idea, however, is that the sufferings and conflicts of St Paul are a means of perfection to the Church of Christ, and consequently to each individual also in her, therefore their (the Colossians') steady perseverance in the life of faith essentially depended on them, and their increase is brought about by them, as is further detailed at ii. 2, ss.—But, according to this, νῦν cannot be a mere particle of transition, as Bähr still insists on making it, but a definition of time. The emphatical placing of

the νῦν first (as at 2 Cor. vii. 9, where it is also to be taken as a definition of time), whereas it usually stands after when used as a mere particle of transition, is already sufficiently against that supposition. (Comp. Matt. xxvii. 42, 43; Mark xv. 32; John ii. 8; Acts vii. 34; James iv. 13, v. 1; 1 John ii. 8.) But now, how does the νῦν obtain here its complete signification of time? By reference back to the preceding τοῦ εὐαγγελίου—του κηρυχθέντος. St Paul, in the consciousness of being near the end of his labours, contemplates the Church as firmly established in the world, and, proceeding from that contemplation, breaks out into the words: "*now* I rejoice in my sufferings for you, for *those* too serve to the perfection of the Church;" working and suffering, St Paul means to say, I am a minister and a promoter of the Church, I am thought worthy to take a part in the sufferings of Christ for truth and righteousness. (See Matt. v. 11, 12.) Lücke (Göttingen Christmas Programm of the year 1833) endeavours to combine both meanings, the one relating to succession and the one relating to time. He says, p. 6, *verissimum hoc est, particulam νῦν, ut solet etiam Latinorum nunc, aliquid habere consecutionis, et quidem ita, ut Paulus dicat, se, quum de lætissimis laborum suorum etiam apud Colossenses fructibus audiverit, ob id ipsum gaudere de calamitatibus ex illâ re sibi ortis* At the end of the same treatise on this passage that scholar thus assigns (p. 15) the connection with what precedes: *quæ cùm ita sint* (i. 3–23), *tantum abest ut me pœniteat, inquit apostolus, ut gaudeam de malis, quæ vestrâ causâ pertulerim.* Lücke seems, therefore, certainly also to recognise the beginning of something new with verse 24, even if he *does* ascribe to the νῦν a connecting signification. So likewise Göschen and Lachmann, who make a break at verse 24 in their editions.—The μου after παθήμασιν is certainly a gloss, but a *correct* one, for the παθήματα = the θλίψεις ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου. According to this interpretation of the particular words, neither can, in what follows, the ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν of course be understood as, "for your sakes," nor even "in your stead," but "for your benefit." (See Ephes. iii. 1, 13.) But this idea, "I rejoice in my sufferings for you," which St Paul expresses often enough, would not have the interpreters put into perplexity, as it readily admits of being taken in a modifying form, *e.g.* what, as the extreme, presents itself first, through the benefit which the example of a resigned sufferer affords, unless the words which follow it gave it apparently a meaning which may justly make one hesitate. However, taken literally, the words which

follow would suit neither the Roman Catholic nor any other notion of the reconciling and redeeming force of human sufferings, *e.g.* that of Gichtel. For in all of them the suffering of the person of the God-man is certainly represented as in itself sufficient for redemption, and as the source through which alone the suffering of men can become a redeeming one also;[1] but here the suffering of Christ Himself seems to be represented as insufficient, so that St Paul's suffering must first make it complete. Therefore the incompleteness of Christ's sufferings, and the ability of St Paul to fill up that deficiency, through his sufferings in the flesh for the Church of Christ, seem to be asserted in this difficult passage, both which assertions are equally dark and repugnant to Scripture doctrine elsewhere. One conceives how the Roman Catholic Church eagerly seized on the passage, in order by its means to prop up their doctrines of the merits of the saints and of the treasure of good works plausibly. But the phrase ὑστερήματα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ, referred to Christ's person, contradicted as we have just remarked, the Roman Catholic theory also of the sufficiency of Christ's sufferings. On the other hand, understood of the Church, the words would certainly, taken by themselves, admit of being interpreted in favour of those Roman Catholic doctrines; but the apostolical doctrine, taken as a whole, contradicts the idea of any redeeming and reconciling work of other men along with and besides the God-Man so completely, that the interpreter is obliged to look about him for another acceptation of the words. After setting aside several totally untenable interpretations of this passage, as that of Bolten (who translates: "now you cause me joy in my sufferings, and for the afflictions which I myself endure I have a recompense in His body, that is, in the Church"), or that of Heinrichs.[2] ("Jesus' passion was become known *in Judea only*, therefore τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ is the circumstance that they had not come to the knowledge of *the Gentiles also*, which St Paul therefore supplies by *his* suffering,")—the following, in which the decision turns on the expressions ἀνταναπληροῦν, and θλίψεις τοῦ Χριστοῦ, are to be taken more accurately

[1] Thus the Roman Catholic Church refers the atoning sufferings of Christ especially to original sin, and the reconciling power of the sufferings of the faithful and of the saints to the actual sin of themselves and of others. But the redeeming power of human suffering is derived, along with faith and holiness themselves, from Christ's work as the final cause.

[2] Who gives at the end of his Commentary on this Epistle a particular *excursus* on the passage Col. i. 24,

into consideration. We must look on the latter as the leading idea for the whole passage, for the nature of the ὑστερήματα and of the filling up of them depends altogether on the definition of it; we therefore begin with the consideration of it. The genitive τοῦ Χριστοῦ can be taken *subjectively* or *objectively*. In the *latter* relation the interpretation *propter Christum* can alone be endured, for that of earlier theologians, as of Calovius, Sebastian Schmidt, Carpzovius, and others, "sufferings which Christ sends," or even "which are similar to Christ's sufferings," are to be rejected as arbitrary.[1] But the interpretation "sufferings for Christ's sake" is grammatically possible and defended by many interpreters, especially last by Böhmer also with an appeal to 2 Cor. i. 5; Philem. 13; Heb. xi. 26, among which passages, however, Philem. ver. 13, can alone be acknowledged as a satisfactory proof. Lücke entertains the same view *in substance*, though he takes the genitive somewhat *differently*, viz. as *genitivus auctoris*, so that the θλίψεις τοῦ Χριστοῦ are said to be sufferings, *quæ Paulo apostolo, Christo auctore et auspice Christo, perferendæ erant* (l. c. p. 13, sq). In the passages Philem. verses 1, 13; Ephes. iii. 1; Gal. vi. 17, Lücke finds likewise this genitive of the author. That acceptation of the words may also, like Böhmer's, be called grammatically possible. But we cannot come to a decision whether one of these possible interpretations is applicable here, till we have more closely considered the other side too, the explanation of the genitive τοῦ Χριστοῦ as *genitivus subjecti*. Now, in the subjective acceptation of the genitive, it is most obvious to think of the sufferings of Jesus on earth, of His agony in Gethsemane, and His death on Golgotha. That this explanation would be possible, the collation of 2 Cor. i. 5 shows (see the remarks on it in the Comm.), although to me it is probable that, if the apostle had wished to express *that* idea here, he would have written θλίψεις Ἰησοῦ or Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. But, without regarding *that*, this idea, that something was wanting in the sufferings of Christ, which were vicarious and reconciling for the whole of the human race, and that St Paul by *his* sufferings supplies that deficiency, is *so completely* repugnant

[1] That holds good, therefore, also of Schleiermacher's interpretation of this passage in the sermons upon this Epistle, edited by Zabel. (Berlin, 1835, vol. ii., p. 259.) He thinks St Paul calls *his* sufferings *Christ's* sufferings, because they were similar to them in the point that St Paul was persecuted by the Jews even as Christ was. "And," says Schleiermacher, "St Paul *did* suffer for the Church, inasmuch as he by his activity among the Gentiles first established the Kingdom of God properly." I doubt whether this interpretation of the great theologian will be found satisfactory.

to the whole of Scripture doctrine, and especially to St Paul's system, that we should place the author in the grossest contradiction with himself by the adoption of that acceptation. For the fancy that St Paul points here to certain forms of outward suffering which Jesus did not undergo and he himself supplied, *e.g.* imprisonment, needs only to be known in order to refute itself. Τοῦ Χριστοῦ can be understood *subjectively* of the *mystical* Christ alone, *i.e.* of Christ so far as He fills the Church with His life and being. This interpretation has been received by Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, Beza, Grotius, J. D. Michaelis, besides several Greek and Latin Fathers (Augustin, Chrysostom, and others), and in the latest times by Steiger and Bähr, and *we* also decide in favour of it. For, if the interpretations "sufferings on account of Christ," or "sufferings imposed by Christ," are grammatically *possible*, still they recommend themselves the less that elsewhere too, according to the representation of the Scriptures, Christ is set forth as suffering in the faithful (according to the term of the dogmatists σχετικῶς, in opposition to the suffering of Christ in his corporeity, ὑποστατικῶς), and the emphatic way in which St Paul here expresses himself as to his sufferings makes us expect more than the bald idea of an outward suffering for the sake of Christ and of the labour in His gospel, in which idea the indwelling of Christ, which St Paul always makes appear in the foreground, is entirely ignored. Such passages are Acts ix. 4, 5 (where the persecutions of the faithful are represented as a persecution of Christ Himself), 2 Cor. i. 5 (on which, however, compare the Comm.), Phil. iii. 10 (where the power of His [Christ's] resurrection and the κοινωνία τῶν παθημάτων αὐτοῦ is not to be understood of an outward uniformity, but of an inward essential community through the indwelling of Christ, as also Rom. vi. 5, 8, 17; 2 Tim. ii. 10–12; 1 Pet. iv. 13), Heb. xi. 26 (where ὁ ὀνειδισμὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ cannot be merely "reproach *propter Christum*," but the reproach which Moses, as the real type of Christ, through His Spirit working in him, bore), Rev. i. 9, where St John calls himself συγκοινωνὸς ἐν τῇ θλίψει καὶ βασιλείᾳ καὶ ὑπομονῇ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, which expresses more than a mere outward similarity and community. From this reference of the θλίψεις τοῦ Χριστοῦ to the Christ in us it follows naturally how the ὑστερήματα of the same are to be taken. (See 1 Thess. iii. 10; Phil. ii. 30.) The Church of Christ, which had suffered much from the very beginning, is to endure more suffering still by God's dispensation: a

certain measure of suffering is allotted her, which must be filled up; St Paul supplies that deficiency on his part by his sufferings in the flesh. In the ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ is couched not merely the proper *bodily* suffering, but also the sufferings *of the soul*, in short, all those conflicts which (ii. 1, ss.) the apostle had to stand against, in consequence of the sin in the world, and which the Christ in him bore as His sufferings jointly with him (St Paul).

But next, the term ἀνταναπληροῦν requires an interpretation, for which it is ripe only now. This doubly compound verb is not found again in the New Testament; it also occurs but rarely in classical language, though it is by no means entirely wanting. (See Wetstein ad. h. l.) Now it must certainly be adhered to as a principle to maintain the force of the preposition in compound verbs where it is possible. First of all, then, ἀνταναπληροῦν must signify not merely *explere*, but *vicissim explere*, "to fill up something as an equivalent for something else." This meaning would here admit of being applied so that the apostle's sufferings would be brought into comparison with the sufferings of Christ; as the Lord suffered for men, so too the Church in return suffers for Him, and St Paul thus fills up what is wanting in the sufferings of the Church *in return*. So Böhmer, Bähr, Tittmann (de synonymis N. T. p. 230), and others, take it. If one translates θλίψεις τοῦ Χριστοῦ "sufferings for Christ's sake," as Böhmer does, one has certainly good reason to lay such stress on the ἀντὶ, but not, if one takes the phrase, as must be done: "sufferings of Christ, *i.e.* of the mystical Christ in the Church." Bähr, who decides for this also had therefore no occasion to lay a stress on the meaning of ἀντί. For the conception of substitution can *then* only be adhered to, when man is conceived as standing opposite the person of Jesus; but here he is *not* considered as standing opposite the person of Jesus, but as filled with the life of Christ Himself, so that *He* suffers in man. Therefore the context requires us to say that St Paul after his manner uses a doubly compound verb here, without laying a special emphasis on the preposition ἀντί. The meaning of the words is only this: "now rejoice I in the sufferings for you (viz., because I know the Gospel victorious in the whole world), and fill up in my flesh that which is yet wanting in Christ's sufferings for His body, *i.e.* the Church." But here now, according to our interpretation, another difficulty arises, which is couched in the ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ. It is clear that the ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν is meant to be

more accurately defined by it; St Paul suffers not merely for *the one* church in Colossæ, but he names that one for *the whole* Church. In accordance with her organic unity, she increases *all together* when *a part* increases, and suffers *all together* when *a part* suffers. (See at 1 Cor. xii. 26.) For the rest, it cannot be doubtful that ὑπὲρ is to be taken here in the sense "for the good of," and not in that of "instead, in lieu of," as Steiger insists. For St Paul is himself a member of the Church; he cannot therefore possibly mean to say he suffers *instead* of the Church, as a substitute for her. Christ alone can be vicarious, as *He* is not an individual member of the Church, but is potentially the Church herself. But a difficulty is involved in the circumstance that St Paul designates his sufferings after the indwelling of Christ in him as sufferings of Christ, and yet afterwards represents the same as advantageous to the Church, *i.e.*, the mystical Christ (1 Cor. xii. 12), for, according to that, Christ seems to suffer for Christ, the Church for the Church. But this difficulty is removed thus: as the suffering of Jesus served for the salvation of mankind, but perfected *Himself* also (Heb. ii. 10), so too the suffering of the individual believer advances *him* and the Church of which he is a member. For the Church in the mass, though a living single, organism, the body of Christ, is yet divided into more active and more passive, into advanced members and members requiring advancement. To the *former* St Paul of course belonged, he could therefore justly represent his sufferings, *i.e.* the sufferings of the Christ in him, as a means of advancing those members of the Church who especially required increase, and *their* advancement was then an advancement of the whole Church, from the connection of every member with the whole body.

But this idea itself, the advancement of the *individual* and thereby of the *whole* too through suffering, still needs a closer consideration; for it might seem as if the principle of a false asceticism were couched in it. Nevertheless, we read in 1 Pet. iv. 1 declared quite openly: *ὁ παθὼν ἐν σαρκὶ πέπαυται ἁμαρτίας.* The false asceticism is, however, completely excluded by the mere fact, that the question here is not of *self*-chosen, *willfully* invented and imposed, sufferings, but of such as *God* imposes, and indeed, as we have already remarked, not merely of *physical* sufferings, but also of sufferings *of the soul*, in short, of all that which befals human nature, weighing it down in its

weakness (the σάρξ). That such sufferings have something that advances men in sanctification, that they exercise men in patience, meekness, and resignation, is surely as clear as possible. There is no question here of a vicarious, sin-forgiving, efficacy of sufferings (Jesus alone has by His once-performed sacrifice established reconciliation with God and forgiveness of sins), but only of the advancement in sanctification by means of sufferings. Forgiveness of sins the Church *has already*, otherwise she could not be called the body of Christ, but she is also expected, proceeding from *that*, to increase in the new life, and sufferings are in God's hand a means of advancement in that. But they evince themselves as such only when they are taken in the right spirit (met with resistance and bitterness, sufferings do not profit, but rather injure, the inward life), the completely right mind which is well-pleasing to God can be given by regeneration only, in which Christ takes up His abode with us, wherefore St Paul speaks not of *his* sufferings merely, but of the sufferings of Christ in him. But, as everything in the development of mankind has its measure and its order, so too has the way of perfection through sufferings; wherefore St Paul represents *his* suffering as a complement of the joint suffering, which, according to God's dispensation, mankind will have to bear. By this manner of taking the difficult passages their contents are clearly in perfect harmony with the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures in general and of St Paul in particular. But the idea that Christ suffers in the faithful, though not vicariously and reconcilingly, but merely sanctifyingly and perfectingly, has its difficulty. For one would think the *old* man was the *suffering* one in the faithful, that, on the contrary, the *new* man, the Christ in us, was *in heavenly joy* even in all *sufferings*. No doubt the *old man* suffers too, but *he* suffers what his deeds deserve, *his* suffering is the punishment of sin, and has no profiting, sanctifying, power, but one that destroys him (Col. iii. 5). But here the discourse is of such sufferings as can be a means of advancement to the individual on the whole; those are sufferings of the Christ in us, because they refer to sin as such, not merely to its consequences and their disagreeableness. Christ suffering is a type not merely of the whole *Church*, but of the whole of *mankind;* and indeed not only an *outward empty* type, but a *living substantial* one, in that Christ, as the eternal Word of God, has filled and borne up mankind in its true members with His power from eternity forth, suffers in them, overcomes in them,

and by means of the victory tempers and perfects them.[1] Thus Moses even bore the reproach of Christ (Heb. xi. 26), and took it upon him willingly in the knowledge of the blessing which is in it; thus even in the prophets of the Old Testament the Spirit of Christ worked and testified to them of the sufferings which are in Christ, and the glory after them (1 Pet. i. 11), *i.e.* not merely the sufferings of the historical person Jesus, but of the entire holy Church, the substantial type of which He is; thus the Prophet Isaiah (chap. liii.) already describes the suffering of the saints and the suffering of the person of the Messiah as coinciding in their fundamental features. Christ is the suffering God in the history of the world; in the sinful world He has suffered in all pious men from eternity forth, and through sympathetic indwelling He constantly transforms the curse of sin into blessing, on which account too, according to Scripture, no one is saved without suffering (2 Tim. iii. 12); in Christ pain and suffering are sanctified, His cross is the royal road to salvation for all. In the *person* of Jesus suffering was *vicarious* and *reconciling*, in the times *before* Christ *preparing* for His appearance, in the times *after* Christ it operates by *sanctifying* and *perfecting*. For the rest, it is quite clear that the idea of God's sympathy with sanctified humanity cannot becloud the idea of God in its purity, therefore must not be taken so as to derogate from the perfect, eternal, blessedness (1 Tim. i. 11, vi. 15) of God. As God is present in the creature in every moment of its development, without by that means Himself becoming subject to the limits of time and space; so too He is present in the suffering creature, without feeling its suffering as suffering. The compassion of God must therefore be considered as only the form of the presence and operation of compassionate, divine love in the suffering creation.

Ver. 25, 26. As has been already remarked at the beginning of the explanation of verse 24, St Paul here begins a digression, in which he describes his relation to the Church; his suffering and conflict are not further pursued till ii. 1, ss. St Paul treats (it is to be presumed in opposition to the theosophical Judaïsts in Colossæ, who *cast suspicion on* his apostolical authority, even if they did not exactly *impugn* it) of how he was called to the ministry of

[1] However, the difference between the Old and the New Testaments still remains *this*, that in the Old the divine essence is present only *substantially* in man, not *personally* and forming a person as in the New; and that, therefore, it is only in the *latter* that there can be any question of a new birth, which supposes the *personifying* form of the divine energy, a form which creates a higher consciousness.

the Church, and that too among the Gentiles (εἰς ὑμᾶς), according to God's dispensation, in order to spread abroad on all sides the mystery so long hidden, but now made manifest. See Ephes. iii. 7. (As to οἰκονομία see on Ephes. iii. 2. As to the phrase πληρῶσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ see the Comm. on Rom. xv. 19. It is to be interpreted: "to proclaim the Word of God completely in its whole meaning and extent." [See also Tholuck's Interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount, p. 135, sq.] Verse 26. See, as to the μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων, the remarks on Ephes. iii. 8. It stands here as an epexegesis of τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ.—As to the juxtaposition of γενεὰ and αἰὼν see at Ephes. iii. 21. The νυνὶ δὲ ἐφανερώθη, which is subjoined by anacoluthon, has given occasion to alterations in the MSS. Some of minor importance read ὃ νῦν ἐφανερώθη downright, which openly betrays itself as a correction, and D.E. have the reading νυνὶ δὲ φανερωθὲν, which certainly recommends itself very much to us, but cannot however make any claim to reception into the text either, because it is extremely probable that *it* too arose from the alteration of the copyists. Before ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ F.G. read ἀποστόλοις, which, it is to be supposed, was taken up into the text here from Ephes. iii. 4. But, considering the close affinity of the two Epistles, it certainly seems that we must assume that the gloss is correct as to the sense, and that under "saints" the apostles are to be understood, only, however, as representatives of the body of all the faithful.)

Ver. 27. The reason of making known the mystery to the apostles does not consist in their worthiness, but in God's will (Ephes. i. 9); this ἠθέλησεν ὁ Θεὸς points then to the necessity of reverencing that will of God, and of recognising the apostles as those from whom the pure Gospel is to proceed. The glory of the Gospel is then exalted in the words: τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου, to which Ephes. i. 18 (on which see the Comm.) corresponds. (The neuter form τὸ πλοῦτος is to be preferred *here* too with Lachmann after A.B. The genitive τῆς δόξης is not to be taken adjectively, but to be considered as a definition of the nature of the heavenly mystery, in which the glory of the latter is insisted on as an independent attribute.) As to the rest it is clear by the addition of ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν to μυστηρίου τούτου, that neither "the mystery" in itself alone, nor even the "Word of God" (verse 25), denotes the diffusion of the Gospel among the Gentiles, otherwise the addition would be superfluous; the mystery is rather the Gospel as such, in the manifestation of the infinite

compassion of God in Christ. The riches of the glory of the Gospel manifested themselves *most* brilliantly in its operation among the Gentiles only because it appeared among them in the sharpest contrast with the deep shade. In the last words of the verse Christ Himself is at length designated as the mystery of redemption. For in the Gospel Christ is everything living; in it there is not preached a mere doctrine *about* Christ, but He Himself, the living, personal Christ, the Eternal Word of the Father, is Himself doctrine and teacher in one. The Colossians had already recognised Him as such. He was not merely outwardly preached *among* them,—He had made His abode *in* their hearts, as it is said Ephes. iii. 17: Χριστὸς διὰ τῆς πίστεως κατοικεῖ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν. (A.F.G. have ὁ ἐστι Χριστὸς, which Lachmann has also adopted, but probably that is only a correction for ὃς, which is to be explained by attraction to the Χριστὸς following. See Winer's Gramm., p. 482.) But it seems striking that the Christ in us is designated as the ἐλπὶς τῆς δόξης scil. μελλούσης; it might seem where Christ lives in the heart *there* is already the kingdom of God and all its glory subsisting. *In the germ*, no doubt; but the *inward* divine life yearns also for a completely homogeneous *outward* state, and *that* makes its victorious entry only at the end of the development. The Christ in us is therefore the living hope of the glorious future, inasmuch as he bears in Himself the energy to realize it, and with that the pledge of it.

Ver. 28, 29. Now, this Christ, who is the mystery itself, is the object of the apostles' announcement (1 Cor. ii. 2), and, indeed, in such a way, that they preach Him to the human race as such, without regarding the theocratical distinctions. The thrice repeated πάντα ἄνθρωπον has, as we have already remarked on i. 6, a manifest polemical reference in favour of the universalism of St Paul against the Jewish one-sidedness of the Colossian false teachers. In the νουθετεῖν the *practical* phase of instruction is more pointed to; in the διδάσκειν the *intellectual*. (As to the ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ see the Comm. on Ephes. i. 8.) The object of it is the τέλειον ἐν Χριστῷ παραστῆσαι. (Compare ver. 22.) The definition, "perfect in Christ," is to be explained, "perfect in communion with Him through His life which is imparted to us." The perfection of the believer is none of his own, separate, beside God and Christ, but *Christ's* perfection is *his* in the faith. (See at Matt. v. 48.) As that is the universal task of *all* teachers of the Church to form all unto perfection in Christ, so St Paul

declares then of *himself* also, that he strives to guide his disciples thither. But it is not in *his own* strength that he fights for that exalted aim, but according to the power of Christ which worketh in him. (See as to κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν on ver. 14.) But the conflict, the magnitude of which St Paul mentions on this occasion, refers, as Steiger justly observes on this passage, not merely to *outward* enemies and obstacles, but especially to the *inward* power of darkness, which strives against the consequences of light. (See on ii. 1.) J. D. Michaelis proposed to refer the ἐν δυνάμει to the miraculous gifts. In fact, these cannot be conceived as *excluded* in the mention of the power working in St Paul, but just as little are *they alone*, or even only *particularly* insisted on in it; ἐν δυνάμει is an adverbial addition to ἐνεργουμένην, and comprises all the outward and inward manifestations of power of the Spirit of Christ filling St Paul together. It is, secondly, intimated at the same time, in this description of His operation, that it is not without success, but overcomes the world; consequently the opposition also proceeding from the false teachers who were active in Colossæ against him.

Chap. ii. 1. St Paul describes, in the following verses, the magnitude of the conflict, which was especially for the Christians in Colossæ and Laodicea, and all whom he could not instruct personally. St Paul with that again takes up the idea of ver. 24 completely; for the ἀγὼν περὶ ὑμῶν coincides with the παθήμασι ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν. The conflict on behalf of the Christians there was, along with other grievous circumstances, a real suffering, on the part of St Paul, for them, as the temptations which the heretics there prepared for them sorely grieved his heart, but, at the same time, also incited the faithful apostle to the most ardent conflict in prayer for them. As to the rest, that St Paul here designates the Christians in Colossæ and Laodicea as such who did not know him personally, and, therefore, had received no instruction from him, is convincingly shown by Steiger and Böhmer (in the first Appendix to his Commentary, p. 411, ss.). But why does St Paul add καὶ ὅσοι οὐκ ἑώρακαν κ.τ.λ.? It seems as if his conflict for those who knew him personally would necessarily be more painful than one for those not known to him, because he must have had more at heart the welfare of the former; but the words of this passage give one the impression as if the magnitude of the conflict were defined by the *absence* of personal acquaintance. No doubt it *is* so, and, indeed, this idea is explained by the fact

that St Paul is the more solicitous for those unknown to him, the less it has been possible for him to labour in person for their life in the faith, and to convince himself of their established state. The weaker children require the most faithful care and the most earnest prayers. (The addition καὶ τῶν ἐν Ἱεραπόλει is derived from iv. 13, and is spurious here. On the other hand, the form ἑώρακαν is to be preferred, with Lachmann, after A.B.D. as the more rare.—Πρόσωπον ἐν σαρκὶ puts the bodily countenance in opposition to the spiritual physiognomy; the *latter* the Colossians knew well, but the *bodily* appearance of St Paul was unknown to them.)

Ver. 2. Now, the aim of St Paul's conflict is the advancement of the faithful. This is expressed in the words: ἵνα παρακληθῶσιν αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν. The idea of consoling does not suit παρακαλεῖν here, because there is no question of any grief or any persecutions of the readers of the Epistle. It is just as little suitable to take παρακαλεῖν in the meaning, "to exhort, to instruct," for καρδία does not suit *that*. The heart can, indeed, as the organ of feeling, be *comforted*, but not *exhorted* or *instructed*. Παρακαλεῖν is, therefore, with Böhmer and Flatt, to be taken here in the meaning, "to confirm, strengthen," after the analogy of the Hebrew חִזֵּק. (Deut. iii. 28; Isaiah xxxv. 3; Job iv. 3), which, however, is not applicable at 2 Thess. ii. 17 also, as Böhmer will have it to be. Generally παρακαλεῖν is to be taken only *per metonymiam*, so that the cause is put for the effect. Exhortation, where it bears fruit, has a strengthening, heart-establishing, operation, and in that relation the context here requires the term παρακαλεῖν to be taken. It was not going far out of the way, in what follows, to alter the reading συμβιβασθέντες, which is certainly the original one, into συμβιβασθέντων, as the *text. rec.* reads, in order to make the construction more uniform. The MSS. A.B.C.D.E. and other authorities defend the more difficult συμβιβασθέντες. (See, as to such anacoluthias Winer's Gramm., p. 497.) We have already had the term in the same signification at Ephes. iv. 16. The figure, by which the Church of Christ is compared to a σῶμα, is the foundation of it. Love is that in which the individual members are joined and combined into unity. Of course, this συμβιβασθῆναι ἐν ἀγάπῃ also is to be conceived as dependent on what precedes. The aim of St Paul's conflict is to make his readers firm (against all corruption of them by means of false doctrine), and to unite them in love, with the victory over all

controversies and divisions. Finally, the exalted insight into the mystery of God is brought forward as the object of this union in love, with which, afterwards, security against being led astray is given by Christ, as the only possessor of all true wisdom. But the καὶ before εἰς πᾶν has something perplexing in it; it is either to be explained by the omission of a verb, perhaps ἔλθωσι, or to be taken *in prægnanti sensu* as *et quidem*, for which Böhmer decides. (Compare Matt. xxiii. 13; 1 Cor. iii. 5; Heb. x. 25.) The σύνεσις is here more accurately defined in its riches by the addition πληροφορία (see as to πληροφορεῖσθαι on Rom. iv. 21, xiv. 5), by which the insight is meant to be characterised as not a mere *outward* one, dependent on the intellect, but as an *inward* one, resting on the testimony of the Holy Spirit. This Spirit testifieth to the truth by His presence (1 John v. 6), and operates thereby a divine πληροφορία. To the idea of the σύνεσις (see at Ephes. i. 8) the πᾶν τὸ πλοῦτος answers well, because the understanding conceives in itself the manifold forms of the concrete. The ἐπίγνωσις, on the contrary, is the knowledge, through the reason, which gathers every individual thing into unity. St Paul, therefore, could not write καὶ ἐπιγνώσεως, so that *this* genitive also should be dependent on πλοῦτος. (See at i. 9.) The ἐπίγνωσις appears here as a higher grade of knowledge than the σύνεσις. True, knowledge precedes the cultivation of the understanding in the individual, but, by means of the latter, knowledge is also raised to a more perfect degree of depth and inwardness. At the end of ver. 2 a number of various readings are found. A.C. read τοῦ Θεοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ, D. reads τοῦ Θεοῦ ὅ ἐστι Χριστὸς, B. τοῦ Θεοῦ Χριστοῦ, the *text. rec.* τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Most of the modern critics and interpreters, especially Lachmann, Böhmer, Steiger, and others, decide for the reading Θεοῦ Χριστοῦ. Steiger tries to set forth, in detail, how from *that* reading all the rest arose, partly by mere interpolations, partly through interpretation. But I cannot convince myself of the correctness of that assumption; I rather believe τοῦ Θεοῦ only is the original reading, as Griesbach and Bähr likewise suppose, and my arguments are the following. It is inconceivable that St Paul should have written Θεοῦ Χριστοῦ, which never occurs elsewhere either; for the words may mean: 1st, "of the God of Christ" (but, in that case, St Paul always puts the *plena locutio* ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, as Ephes. i. 17); or, 2dly, Θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ, *i.e.* "of God, which here means Christ;" or, lastly, as the advocates for this

reading will have it, "of Christ, who is God." The possibility of this last acceptation is, however, undoubtedly to be denied; St Paul would have expressed that idea by: Χριστοῦ, Θεοῦ. The two others, as is confessed, do not suit the context; it appears, therefore, as the simplest way, to view Χριστοῦ as a gloss of the copyists, and the reading ὅ ἐστι Χριστὸς, which stands parallel with it, plainly shows that it is nothing else. But they came to that gloss quite naturally as follows: in ver. 27 of chap. i. Christ Himself was designated as the mystery; now, as it was thought necessary, in ver. 3 of chap. ii., to unite the ἐν ᾧ to the last subject Θεὸς, it seemed also necessary, in this passage, that Θεὸς should be Christ, not the Father; for which reason the explanatory Χριστὸς was added. But, if Θεοῦ Χριστοῦ was once written, this unheard-of juxtaposition could not fail to give rise to the most various readings intended to facilitate the understanding of the passage.

Ver. 3. But the connection of ἐν ᾧ with Θεὸς here is by no means to be recommended, because Θεὸς is not the *principal* substantive, but only defines the principal idea of the μυστήριον more accurately; the *latter* forms, ever since i. 25, the centre of the argumentation. *In fact*, it again coincides, it is true, with the *other* mode of connecting the words; for God in Christ is Himself His mystery (i. 27), the mystery in which all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, *i.e.* of both practical and theoretical knowledge, are hidden. That mystery is no abstract doctrine separated from its author, no dogmatical formula, but the living God Himself, who in Christ entered into humanity; without knowledge of God, therefore, neither is there any knowledge of this mystery nor any eternal life (Matt. xi. 27; John xvii. 3). Consequently, in Him alone are all the treasures of wisdom and of knowledge to be sought, not, as the heretics in Colossæ insisted, in all sorts of sham wisdom, apart from Christ. But in the phrase: ἐν ᾧ εἰσι πάντες οἱ θησαυροὶ ἀπόκρυφοι it is not intimated that they, as being absolutely hidden, can and may never be taken up—(St Paul in ver. 2 actually uttered the very hope that they might come to the knowledge of the mystery, and, with it, of its purport, *i.e.* of its treasures),—but that *human* strength is not sufficient for it, that, in one word, no one knows God, but he to whom He manifests Himself (Matt. xi. 27). God veils Himself to the prudent and wise of this world, whose wisdom is in themselves, and proceeds from themselves alone; they know nothing of Him, their knowledge is mere show; God reveals Himself only to "babes and sucklings"

and to the humble, by imparting Himself to them as their portion. For the rest, this passage sufficiently refutes all those dreamers and fanatics, who thought they were bound to expect a still higher and more comprehensive revelation of God than that in Christ is: viz., an age of the Holy Ghost. All that the Holy Ghost reveals He takes from that which is Christ's (John xvi. 15), in Him are *all* the treasures of wisdom and of knowledge. (From the context of ver. 3 and 2 γνῶσις here can be nothing else than ἐπίγνωσις is in ver. 2, which testifies against the asserted difference between the two expressions. See the remarks on i. 9.)

Ver. 4, 5. St Paul now applies the preceding general exhortation to the special circumstances of his readers. Its object is to warn them against the deceitful discourses of the false teachers. St Paul bases this interest in the welfare of the absent on the spiritual union in which he knows himself to be with them, his readers, and which enables him with joy to perceive the firmness of their state of faith. (Παραλογίζεσθαι is not found again in the New Testament, except at James i. 22, as here, in the sense, "to deceive by false conclusions [paralogisms"]. The choice of the term is to be explained by the form of arguing which the false teachers made use of for their views.—Πιθανολογία is found only here. In 1 Cor. ii. 4 ἐν πειθοῖς σοφίας λόγοις stands for it. The term has here a subordinate idea of blame, it designates a striving not to *convince* by the *force* of truth, but to *persuade* by the *show* of it.—Ver. 5. Comp. the parallel 1 Cor. v. 2 to the antithesis here: σαρκὶ ἄπειμι —πνεύματι σὺν ὑμῖν εἰμι. Πνεῦμα is of course, not the Holy Ghost, but forms here the antithesis with σάρξ, "*outwardly far*, I am yet *inwardly near* you, and take part in your welfare." The collocation χαίρων καὶ βλέπων is strange; for it seems necessary that βλέπων should come first. Schott and Bähr choose to take it as a Hendiadys: *lætabundus observans*, or *cum gaudio considerans*. But Winer [Gramm., p. 440] and Böhmer justly remarked that it is simpler to take καὶ in the meaning of *scilicet*, by which means the καὶ βλέπων κ. τ. λ. receives the character of an epexegetic addition: "in the spirit I am with you in joy, viz., inasmuch as in the spirit I see your firm attitude." Τάξις is taken from the metaphor of military service which so often occurs; "the compact order of the warriors which attests their ability for fighting out the combat well." The στερέωμα τῆς εἰς Χριστὸν πίστεως ὑμῶν, which follows, and in which faith is described as the power which strengthens them in their position for the fight, explains τάξις.

The reading ὑστέρημα has arisen merely from the circumstance, that from what follows [ver. 20, ss.] it seemed not well possible to predicate firmness in the faith of the Colossians. But St Paul praises their firmness, in order to show what he expects of them. As to the rest, neither need ver. 20, ss., be understood as if the Colossians had already given themselves up to the false teachers; the question is there more an oratorical figure. [See the explanation at that passage.] Στερέωμα is not found again in the New Testament, the LXX. use it for רָקִיעַ, Gen. i. 6; however, the *verb* occurs Acts xvi. 5.)

Ver. 6, 7. With reference to the instruction received (from Epaphras, chap. i. ver. 7), St Paul then exhorts them to remain faithful to it. But Christian instruction, as at Ephes. iv. 20 (on which compare the Comm.), is not represented as a mere reception of *a doctrine of and on* Christ, but is designated as an actual reception of *Himself*, in that really a higher living principle fills the faithful by means of the communication of the Holy Ghost; in Him (Christ) they are to walk, in Him be firmly rooted and built up. But Christ is here emphatically designated as the Lord, in order to make the necessity of letting Him rule be observed. (As to ἐρριζωμένοι and ἐποικοδομούμενοι see Ephes. iii. 18, ii. 20, 22. —From the ἐν αὐτῷ Christ cannot in the ἐποικοδομεῖσθαι be conceived as the foundation and foundation-stone, *on* which the faithful are built up, but He is the element that fills the whole building as the life-giving breath. The metaphor is rather to be taken thus: the building is begun, the foundation has been laid by the apostles and prophets [Ephes. ii. 20], all now are built up *on* that foundation through being and living *in* Christ. Christ is the author and finisher of the faith [Heb. xii. 2].—In the words βεβαιούμενοι ἐν τῇ πίστει καθὼς ἐδιδάχθητε, πίστις cannot be understood of the *subjective* πίστις, but of the *objective* one, of the *fides quæ creditur*, of the *doctrine*. In the *latter* one may be instructed and establish one's self in accordance with the instruction that one has received. St Paul means therefore that the Colossians are to adhere to the doctrine of Epaphras, which he confirms as true, and not suffer themselves to be led away from it through the deceits of the heretics. [The opposite to βεβαιοῦσθαι is κλυδωνίζεσθαι, Ephes. iv. 14.] But they are not merely to *adhere to* that faith, but also to *increase in* it [ἐν αὐτῇ *scil.* πίστει], and that too with thanksgiving, consequently with thankful hearts, for God's grace given them through the communication of the pure truth. As to the rest, ἐν

αὐτῇ is wanting in A.C., and D.E. read ἐν αὐτῷ, but the omission and alteration are too easily explained for any stress to be laid on those various readings.)

Ver. 8. After that, the apostle then pronounces an open warning against false philosophy, as the Colossian false teachers disseminated it; a warning, however, which is not, before ver. 16, again resumed and carried out more in detail, as in ver. 9–15 the idea that one must not depart from Christ, as in Him everything needful unto salvation is given, is carried out. The destructive element, which St Paul warns against, is called ἡ φιλοσοφία. But that, according to St Paul's intention, not *every* philosophy, not *every* striving after an insight into, and a knowledge of, the truth, is meant here to be rejected, and a blind uneducated faith recommended,—is partly clear already from the doctrine of St Paul in general, in which there plainly manifests itself a striving after knowledge, and the endeavour to reconcile faith and knowledge, therefore Christian philosophy and science, is expressly recommended, nay, is set up as the aim of the development of the Church (compare the remarks in the Comm. on Ephes. iv. 13); partly from the addition καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης· For the absence of the article shows that this is not meant to be a second and different point, by the side of philosophy; it also lies in the nature of the thing that such discordant matters as philosophy and vain deceit cannot be placed side by side, if, that is to say, the term "vain deceit" were meant to designate generally every form of empty delusion. Διὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης rather forms one joint idea, and *that* too so that the empty deceit must be taken as manifesting itself precisely in philosophy. The *empty*, *deceptive*, philosophy, therefore presupposes another *genuine* one as acknowledged. The former is here the self-styled fictitious "wisdom," which the false teachers in Colossæ extolled, pretending to possess (ver. 18) knowledge of a peculiar kind as to the spiritual kingdom, whereas they were in fact blind in divine things; only such *false* wisdom (the ψευδώνυμος γνῶσις of 1 Tim. vi. 20, which does not deserve the noble name of knowledge) is meant to be blamed, not the *true*. That false wisdom receives from St Paul for a more accurate definition the predicate: κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων. But still every human endeavour to find the truth, manifesting itself in following the traditions of a school, seems to be blamed here, and revelation *alone*, which is not *man's* at all, but *God's only*, seems to be represented as the rightful source; for, as, after this, κόσμος

and Χριστὸς are opposed to one another, so here Θεὸς forms the tacit contrast to ἄνθρωπος. No doubt; but human philosophy is only blamed in so far as it sets itself on a par with, or in opposition to, the revelation of God. Where the question is not of revelation, *e. g.* as among the Greeks before Christ, there St Paul would not blame a φιλοσοφία κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων as such. But certainly *within* the domain of revelation no *human* wisdom can or dare claim authority along with, much less *against*, the *divine* wisdom; philosophy must always be κατὰ Χριστὸν, *i.e.* be in harmony with the truth manifested by and in Him, if it wishes to pretend to the name of a Christian philosophy. Christ, who is personal truth itself, can also alone be the truth of philosophy. As to the rest, St Paul shows by the term παραδοσις that these false teachers had not invented their views themselves, but received them in the way of tradition.[1] That is in favour of the view expressed in the Introduction, that the Colossian false teachers sought to amalgamate the Cabbalistic tenets, which were already in existence, and which had come down to them in the way of tradition, with Christianity. The name φιλοσοφία can be no argument against our supposing *Jewish* wisdom to be here meant, for the Jewish inquirers also were called philosophers, not only by the platonizing Philo, but also by the Pharisee Josephus. Certainly Bähr is right in maintaining against Tittmann that φιλοσοφία cannot mean merely knowledge of the Jewish Law, much less, as Heinrichs insists, "religious worship according to the Law;" but Josephus calls philosophy every more than usually deep inquiry into religious matters. Thus by him the sects of the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes, are called philosophers (B.J. ii. 12. 1.) The correctness of this declaration that "the deceptive philosophy" here denotes the Gnostic-Cabbalistic system of the false teachers, which they knew how to present in a very plausible way (ἐν πιθανολογίᾳ verse 5), is further confirmed in what follows by the phrase κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου. We have already at Gal. iv. 3 made acquaintance with the same phrase, which is explained ib. iv. 9 by ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα. *This* phrase, too, points to the Old Testament, and therefore is in favour of the Judaïstic character of the false teachers. The name στοιχεῖα *alone* would contain no reproach, it is only the Old Testament that is characterized by it as containing the elements of religious life, whereas

[1] It is not improbable that in the term παράδοσις an allusion to the name קַבָּלָה, *i.e.* tradition, is contained.

in Christ the τέλος of the Law, the τελειότης, is contained. But the addition τοῦ κόσμου involves the blame; for St Paul does not mean to blame the Old Testament in itself, but that spiritless, external, literal, manner, in which the false teachers understood it. Instead of considering it as actually fulfilled in Christ in its *spirit*, they endeavoured faithfully to observe it outwardly in the *letter*. Thus they degraded the Word of God to a mere form of the world, to beggarly elements. (See the particulars as to the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου in the Comm. on Gal. iv. 3.) The assumption, that elements of Gentile wisdom are also to be understood by the "elements of the world," is here, as at Gal. iv. 3, not demonstrable. Verses 16, 17 pronounce too decidedly for the purely Jewish character of the Colossian false teachers for any one to be able to feel himself justified in supposing any Gentile elements in their system. Even though the Cabbalists might originally have received their impulse from Persian and Chaldean ideas, yet their system had long so entirely passed over into the Jewish life and mind, that St Paul could have no motive still to distinguish in it the originally Gentile ideas from the Jewish ones. (Βλέπετε μὴ with an indicative following expresses the conviction that what the warning is given against might actually take place. The article with the participle συλαγωγῶν denotes a definitely-conceived personality [see Winer's Gramm., p. 100]; it is supposable that that perverse tendency in Colossæ originated with some definite individual whom St Paul had in his thoughts here.—Συλαγωγεῖν, from σύλη, booty, is only found here. One need not imagine, as the object, faith, or anything of the kind, *in* the Colossian Christians, it is *they themselves* who are meant to be caught by the false teachers. In 2 Tim. iii. 6, αἰχμαλωτίζω is used in the same combination.)

Ver. 9. That St Paul here, directly after naming the name of Christ, permits himself to be determined to come back to the sublimity of the person of Christ, of which he had in i. 15, ss. already so copiously treated, plainly shows that the error of the false teachers as to the person of Christ appeared to St Paul's mind especially dangerous. The idea of ver. 9 unites itself to what precedes as follows: "beware lest any one should spoil you through the deceptive philosophy which is not after Christ, for one must beware of it, because in Christ dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead, consequently *that alone* can be true which is after *Him*." According to the parallel passage, i. 19, the sense of our passage cannot be doubtful: the interpreting the πᾶν τὸ

πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος of the totality of the Church, or of the whole circle of doctrine which God had meant to convey to man through Christ, is so arbitrary and contradictory to the context that it must be rejected as completely inadmissible. (See Bähr in the Comm. ad h. l.) St Paul speaks here, as at i. 19, of the conjunction of the divine and human natures in Christ, of the Son of God's being made man in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. Only the σωματικῶς is obscure, and requires a closer consideration. The interpretation *totaliter*, which Hermann among others defends, is to be rejected at once; for, not to mention that no passage can be adduced in which σωματικῶς has that meaning, the totality is surely already expressed in the πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα in the strongest way. Neither, likewise, can the taking the σωματικῶς in the meaning *verè*, *realiter*, in opposition to the typical, which Grotius, Nösselt, and others, defend after Augustine, recommend itself. For, even if σῶμα, as the opposite to σκιὰ, means the essential fulfilment in opposition to what is typical, still no example occurs in which σωματικῶς is used in opposition to τυπικῶς. Besides, in that sense, the combination with κατοικεῖ does not suit. For one *can* indeed say: "the temple is a type of Christ," but not "the Son of God dwells typically in the Temple;" but that would necessarily have to be said, if we wished the antithesis to the idea: the fulness of the Godhead dwells *really* (not merely *typically*) in Jesus, to come out clearly. Now the σωματικῶς can mean either "bodily," or "in substance." For the former acceptation many of the Fathers had already declared themselves, in later times Calixtus, Calovius, Gerhard, Storr, Flatt, Bähr; Böhmer leaves it undecided which might be preferable. Steiger expresses himself too harshly in calling that acceptation nonsensical; on the contrary, it is very intelligible how it was hit upon, especially if one considered the heretics as docetics. Now *we* cannot do that, as was remarked on i. 22; but, even putting out of sight that point in the doctrine of the Colossian false teachers, the explanation of σωματικῶς = ἐν τῷ σώματι does not recommend itself, because surely that indwelling in the human nature of Jesus, and therefore also in the body, is already couched in the ἐν αὐτῷ. Now, if this ἐν αὐτῷ were meant to be more accurately defined, St Paul would not certainly, for that purpose, have chosen the adverb by which the idea is united with the verb κατοικεῖ, but would have written simply: ἐν τῷ σώματι. The adverbial form admits of no other acceptation than *essentialiter*, *substantialiter*, οὐσιωδῶς. Thus Athanasius,

Theophylact, Œcumenius, have already interpreted, and later the Reformers in a body, as also Wolf, Bochart, Steiger, and others. For the explanation of this use of σῶμα = *substantia* one must appeal, not so much to the Hebrew עֶצֶם, to which σῶμα does not accurately correspond, as to the use of גּוּף, body, which in the rabbinical dialect is completely analogous to our "substance." (See Buxtorf. lex. rabb. et talm. p. 405.) But the further question arises, what is the meaning of this clause, "the whole fulness of the Godhead dwells essentially, substantially, in Him," against what heretical mode of conception is it meant to form the antithesis? The verb κατοικεῖν and the present tense are especially to be insisted upon; by them St Paul opposes those Gnostic views, according to which a merely *temporary* influence of a higher spirit upon Jesus was supposed, from His baptism to His death; Christ is a *permanent* divine Schechinah, even on the throne of the Father the glorified human nature is combined with the divine nature. But in the σωματικῶς is intimated the difference between the Being of God in Christ and that in man, of which the words next following treat; in *Christ* God is *essentially* present, not merely as *operation*, but *centrally*, so that Jesus is not a *deified man*, but *Godman*; on the other hand, the indwelling of God in *man* is to be considered as only *operation*, *God* is *in them*, but *they* are not *God*.

Ver. 10. That καί ἐστε cannot be taken imperatively is sufficiently inherent in the very idea; one cannot demand to be filled by God. Besides, the New Testament puts γίνεσθε for the imperative, not ἔστε. The clause depends, like ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ, on ὅτι, with which no doubt an express ὑμεῖς would have been suitable, because the dwelling of the fulness of God in Christ, and the believers' being filled by Him, form antitheses. With ver. 8 this clause is thus connected: "beware of a philosophy οὐ κατὰ Χριστόν, for He fills you, recollect; therefore you must not give place to any foreign influence." Only the ἐν αὐτῷ is strange. One might think one's self obliged to take ἐν here in the sense of διά, as Christ is certainly to be considered as He who fills His own. But it is more suitable to suppose a conciseness in the phrase, in that ἔστε ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι stands for: "in Him, *i.e.* as being in communion with Him, ye are filled with His life." After this, St Paul details further how everything is given to the faithful in Christ, therefore they have to keep themselves to Him alone, as the Head, which is just what the false teachers do not do (ver.

19), in that they unite themselves to subordinate powers, whom Christ governs. Therefore St Paul calls Him ἡ κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας. (See at i. 16.) The name κεφαλὴ is derived from the image of σῶμα; the Church is usually so called; the reading ἐκκλησίας for ἀρχῆς in D.E. could therefore very easily arise. Here St Paul seems either to have conceived the whole spiritual world as the σῶμα whose κεφαλὴ Christ is, or he has only in this latter expression adhered to the idea of Him that guides and governs. As to the rest, the names ἀρχαὶ and ἐξουσίαι in themselves might be used as well of *bad* angels as of *good* ones; only, from the polemical tendency of St Paul against the angel-worship of the Colossian heretics, it is to be assumed that St Paul had the *good* spirits principally in his mind. (See, however, at ver. 15.) The reading ὅ or ὁ has certainly important authorities in its favour; Lachmann has received ὅ into the text, and Steiger defends it, considering πλήρωμα as the subject. But *then*, in ver. 11 and 12 too, ἐν ᾧ would necessarily have to be referred to πλήρωμα, which, however, is entirely unsuitable; it is not in the fulness of the Godhead as such that the faithful are circumcised, dead, risen again, but in the person of Jesus Christ, in whom the fulness of the Godhead dwells, therefore in the Son of God who was made man, in the God-man. This decides, even with inferior critical authorities, for ὅς as the true reading.

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

The aorists receive by this means their proper meaning (see on Rom. viii. 30); in Christ all is fulfilled once for all, His τετέλεσται holds good for eternity, the life of the Church and of the individual in her is only the development of what has already been given in Him. It seems peculiar in this passage that the vicarious operation of Christ (according to which the ἐν ᾧ is to be taken quite literally, inasmuch as the faithful are conceived as reposing spiritually in Christ, the spiritual Adam, in the same way as all reposed bodily in Adam, their bodily progenitor) is referred, not merely to the particular events of the death and the resurrection, as usual, but to circumcision also. But in the ἐν ᾧ καὶ περιετμή-

θητε we must not think, for instance, of the bodily circumcision of Christ, as if that were understood as a circumcision of *all* (for the discourse here is surely of the *spiritual* circumcision of all, and not of the *bodily* one), but the ideas of death and circumcision are here treated as identical, as the epexegetic annexation of the clause συνταφέντες αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι to what precedes shows.

For the burial is only the absolutely consummated death, to which baptism is compared, as Rom. vi. 4, with reference to the rite of submersion, by which the *old* man is withdrawn from sight in the same way as the *dead* man by burial. But circumcision is a figurative death; the entire old man ought to die as a sacrifice for sin, instead of which his blood is partially shed and the foreskin removed, as a type of the sinful appendages of the soul (προσαρτήματα, as the Gnostics said). The faithful are therefore circumcised in Christ spiritually, as His death in the faith is *their* death too; in baptism, as the act in which the new birth is realized, the faithful died with Christ, are buried with Him, and receive therewith the circumcision of Christ, *i.e.* the περιτομὴ ἀχειροποίητος, which Christ accomplishes by His Spirit, the circumcision of the heart. (Comp. Deut. x. 16, xxx. 6; Jerem. iv. 4, with Rom. ii. 28, 29.) The epexegetical addition ἐν τῇ ἀπεκδύσει τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκὸς is also peculiar. The whole of the context shows that σῶμα τῆς σαρκὸς cannot *here* denote, as at i. 22, the physical body, for the spiritual circumcision certainly does not liberate from the physical body; σὰρξ here has a reference to the sinfulness of human nature. If we compare Col. iii. 9, ἀπεκδυσάμενοι τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτοῦ, it cannot be doubtful that the ἀπέκδυσις τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκὸς is meant to denote the same thing. Σῶμα τῆς σαρκὸς = σῶμα σαρκικὸν, a σῶμα, which contains in it the nature of the σὰρξ, of sinfulness. It is presumable that St Paul chose that expression with reference to the death which the συνταφέντες coming after presupposes. Death is the laying aside of the body: in like manner the spiritual death which man dies with Christ—the total circumcision which Christ performs—the laying aside of the sinful body, *i.e.* the putting *off* the *old* man and the putting *on* the *new* one. This way of taking the words was, no doubt, the foundation also of the reading τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, which, it is *true*, can make no claim at all to reception into the text, but is a correct interpretation of τῆς σαρκός. On the other hand, that interpretation of the σῶμα τῆς σαρκὸς, for which among the latest interpreters Bähr and Steiger declare themselves, and according to which

σῶμα is said to mean not the corporeity, but the totality, and the allusion to circumcision is so taken, that the removal of an insignificant *part* of the body is meant to be opposed to the removal of *all* the sinfulness,—seems to me far-fetched. St Paul himself declares, Rom. vii. 18, οὐκ οἰκεῖ ἐν ἐμοί, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου, ἀγαθόν, certainly, therefore, the body is not, as such (as matter), the cause of sin, but sin takes root *in* the body, as the latter now exhibits itself; *i.e.* in the body and the soul which animates it, without which the body cannot exist, unless it is to sink down to the mere κρέας. In this sinful condition the body is a σῶμα τῆς σαρκός, and Christ delivers from it. Of course, the operations of Christ are here conceived ideally, as surely verse 12 plainly shows; it cannot, therefore, be objected: "the Christian is not really here below freed as yet from the carnal body;" just in proportion as he is not yet freed, he is also not yet Christ's; hence at iii. 5 the exhortation νεκρώσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

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

Ver. 12. As the faithful are in Christ's death dead with Him,

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

Ver. 13. At first sight the idea of verse 12 seems to be tautologically repeated here, but, whereas in what precedes from verse 9 downwards the person and work of Christ were described quite generally, here now the special application of that work to the readers of this Epistle and to their Christian experience is made. It is true the second person (περιετμήθητε, συνηγέρθητε) had already been put in ver. 11, 12; with those words, however, the Colossians are not addressed as such, but the second person is meant to set forth the readers of the Epistle as representatives of the totality of the church. The emphatic καὶ ὑμᾶς first marks the point at which the apostle's discourse makes a transition to his readers personally, since it must be taken: "and thus He hath quickened *you* too, who were dead in your sins." For the rest, the passage is completely parallel to Ephes. ii. 1, 5, and we therefore refer in respect to it to the exposition there. It might seem, however, as if this passage contradicted the difference between συζωοποιεῖν and συνεγείρειν assumed at Ephes. ii. 5, as the latter here *precedes* the former expression, whereas, according to the difference there

declared, it should have *stood after*. But, as we have already remarked above, no progress is to be supposed in verse 13 in relation to verse 12, which rather expresses the objectivity of Christ's work, while verse 13, on the contrary, expresses the actual state of the Christians in Colossæ. These were roused, quickened, but not yet arrived at the fulness of the risen life; *here* too, therefore, the difference between the two words assumed by us is fully verified. The life-giving, resuscitating, point in the Gospel is the forgiveness of *all* sins, not of the *actual* ones merely, but also of *original* sin, not of the *past* only, but of the *future* sins also; for in Christ an inexhaustible stream of forgiving love is opened, which stream is accessible to every one who approaches it in true, profound repentance, and pure, unfeigned faith—therefore with a lively yearning to be made pure from sin. Only the addition to νεκροὺς—τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν is peculiar to this passage. It plainly refers to the above comparison (verse 11) with circumcision; the spiritually dead, carnally living, state, in which the flesh is master, is the one analogous to the ἀκροβυστία, but the spiritual and living condition, in which the lusts of the flesh are mortified, answers to the circumcision. (The σὺν αὐτῷ is not, of course, to be understood of outward companionship, but is to be interpreted of inward unity, in accordance with the preceding ἐν ᾧ.—Instead of the reading ὑμῖν of the *text. rec.*, the MSS. with an overwhelming majority have ἡμῖν, which might easily have been altered on account of the ὑμᾶς preceding.)

Ver. 14. The idea of the forgiveness of sins is further expounded in what follows, but in an entirely peculiar, and besides extremely obscure, manner. At first, one is inclined to believe, that, after the well-known figure, according to which sin in its relation to God's justice is conceived as a relation in the nature of a debt, the burden of sin is here called a bond or note of hand, which the Redeemer has blotted out, nay destroyed, by His work. For that reason many interpreters have understood either Adam's sin, as the original sin, which comprises all others in itself (so had thought already Irenæus, Tertullian, Ambrose, Theophylact, Œcumenius), or the conscience, *i.e.* the consciousness of sin in man; thus particularly Luther and the other reformers, Calvin excepted. But, if *that* were the meaning of the words, in the first place χειρόγραφον ἡμῶν would be said, not καθ' ἡμῶν, and secondly the addition τοῖς δόγμασιν is decidedly opposed to that acceptation, for the expression cannot be under-

stood of the dogmas of Christianity, which has been already observed on Ephes. ii. 15. The reference of χειρόγραφον to the body of Christ, as Theodoret proposes, is based on the last words of this verse: προσηλώσας αὐτὸ τῷ σταυρῷ. But Bähr (ad h. l.) has convincingly shown in opposition to Steiger, who in the exposition of the first Epistle of Peter (p. 294) had declared himself for that interpretation of Theodoret's (in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Colossians Steiger himself has altered his view), that the body of Christ cannot possibly be designated as a note of hand or acknowledgment of debt. Besides, the τοῖς δόγμασιν finds no satisfactory explanation even *so*. According to the parallel passage Ephes. ii. 15, the discourse can *here* too be of the Law alone, not only of the law of the conscience, nor even merely of the ceremonial part of the Mosaical Law (for, as Böhmer convincingly proves, the πάντα τὰ παραπτώματα preceding obliges us to adopt a comprehensive acceptation of the Law), but of the Law in all its relations, only, however, in respect to its commanding, requiring, form, without the faculty of communicating higher power, by which it can kill but not make alive. (See on Rom. vii. 9, ss.; 2 Cor. iii. 6; Gal. iii. 10.) Inasmuch as this characteristic of the Law has arrived at the completest development in the Mosaical Law, we must direct our thoughts especially to the latter. Accordingly, χειρόγραφον is not a bond, by which man acknowledges himself to be a sinner, but a bill which declares the guilt of man on the part of God, and rouses in man the consciousness of it. God's Law is, on account of this operation, a bill against man, and that bill is also blotted out with the debt itself, *i.e.* in the case of the reconciled sinner the Law has no longer the effect of condemning him, for Christ's righteousness is *his* righteousness. The δόγματα suit this way of taking the word very well, just as in the passage Ephes. ii. 15; for this expression denotes exactly the imperative form of the Law. Only one might *here* too, as *there*, wish for ἐν τοῖς δόγμασιν, instead of the dative alone. It is true, *Fathers and translations* read ἐν, but no *MSS.* The annexation, however, of the dative to χειρόγραφον for the idea: "bill, which consists in ordinances," is intolerably harsh; it would certainly have been obliged to be rendered by τὸ ἐν τοῖς δόγμασιν. I prefer, with Winer (Gramm., p. 196, ss.), the connection with what follows, in the sense: "which bill, by means of the ordinances, stood hostilely against us." Certainly, even *so* the position of the dative is not quite natural, but Winer draws attention,

no doubt with justice, to the analogous passage Acts i. 2; at all events that difficulty cannot be put in comparison with that which is caused by the connection of the τοῖς δόγμασιν with what precedes. In the sequel of this passage a more accurate explanation of the ἐξαλείψας would be alone perceptible in the καὶ αὐτὸ ἦρκεν ἐκ τοῦ μέσου, if the clause προσηλώσας αὐτὸ τῷ σταυρῷ did not lead to something else. For the opinion that a law is proclaimed to be abrogated by a nailing of it up, which Grotius propounds, does not recommend itself, because, even if the custom is capable of proof, yet the Scriptures do not know it, and particularly in this connection, after the discourse having been, in ver. 11 and 12, of the death and resurrection of Christ, His cross alone can be thought of. Neither, of course, is this passage to be referred to the superscription: "This is the King of the Jews," but to the nailing of Christ Himself to the cross, consequently to the atonement of our Lord, by which surely the Law itself in its merely imperative form was also abrogated along with the blotting out of sin, therefore the Law, as χειρόγραφον, was abolished, nailed, as it were, with its δόγμασι, in Christ Himself, together with Him, to the cross. Then the αἴρειν ἐκ τοῦ μέσου receives by that means the signification of being killed, annihilated; *Christ's* death was also *the Law's* death, or, by a different turn of the thought, the faithful are with Christ dead to the Law, as it is said Rom. vii. 6: κατηργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, ἀποθανόντες, ἐν ᾧ κατειχόμεθα. (Ἐξαλείφω is found Acts iii. 19, of the forgiveness of sins. See also the LXX., Isaiah xliii. 25; Ps. l. 10. In Rev. [iii. 5, vii. 17, xxi. 4] it is found in the sense of to "wipe away, to blot out."—Χειρόγραφον denotes properly every writing, but especially a bond, γραμματεῖον χρέους ὁμολογητικόν.—Ὑπενάντιος is found again in the New Testament at Heb. x. 27.—The LXX. often use it for נגד. Böhmer wishes without sufficient reason to lay a stress on the ὑπὸ, and to take the idea thus: "which is *secretly* hostile to us."—The reading ἦρκεν is with justice preferred by Griesbach, Lachmann, and others, to that of ἦρεν, which D.G. afford. Αἴρειν ἐκ τοῦ μέσου answers to our "put out of the way," either in the meaning, "remove, exclude from a community," as 1 Cor. v. 2, or in that of "kill," as 2 Thess. ii. 7; Isaiah lvii. 2.—Προσηλόω, from ἧλος, a nail, is not found again in the New Testament.)

Ver. 15. St Paul at length closes all this grand and profound description of the person of Christ and of His work with the idea, that the Redeemer is the victor over all the hostile powers of the

universe, that He leads them all in triumph as vanquisher of them on His cross. As to its form, this idea is subjoined independently as an asyndeton, since, after the foregoing καὶ αὐτὸ ἧρκεν κ.τ.λ., no new *tempus finitum* could be expected without a conjunction. For the rest, *here* too the representation is still so conceived that God is the subject; He, the Father, performs everything through Christ. Therefore, too, at the end of this verse, the reading ἐν αὐτῷ is to be preferred to ἐν αὐτῷ. Now, that the ἀρχαὶ and ἐξουσίαι, which are here spoken of, are not the Jewish magistrates and theocratic powers, nor the good angels either, is admitted by all later interpreters and convincingly shown; it can only be the evil powers, which, as κοσμοκράτορες, have in their power men who are in sin. (See at Ephes. vi. 12.) Along with sin itself the princes of this world, the devil and his angels, are also conquered. But the comprehension of the ἀπεκδυσάμενος is difficult, especially on account of the remarkable reading τὴν σάρκα, which F.G. and several of the Fathers defend. Were that reading correct, the accusatives τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας must have been joined with what follows, and then ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὴν σάρκα would refer to Christ's laying aside the flesh in death. But intrinsic and extrinsic arguments are against that reading. The critical authorities for the omission of τὴν σάρκα preponderate, and the origin of that addition is easily explained by the foregoing προσηλώσας αὐτὸ τῷ σταυρῷ, upon which it seemed necessary for death to follow. Besides, St Paul would certainly have said ἀπεκδύσασθαι τὸ σῶμα of the death of Christ, instead of τὴν σάρκα. If, therefore, we have to connect ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ ἐξουσίας, it is a question, how then might the verb ἀπεκδύσασθαι have to be taken? With reference to the θριαμβεύειν following, the evil spirits must be imagined as warriors in their armour (see Ephes. vi. 12), against whom Christ fights and deprives them of their armour, strips them of it. The meaning answers to the words εἰς τοῦτο ἐφανερώθη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα λύσῃ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ διαβόλου, 1 John iii. 8. To the mention of the *vanquishing* the evil powers is further subjoined the making an open *show* of them by means of the triumph. In the ἐδειγμάτισε we are not to see something different from the θριαμβεύειν, on the contrary, the former is effected in and through the latter. As, therefore, St Paul at 1 Cor. iv. 9 represents himself and his fellow apostles as a spectacle for the world, and for angels, and for men; so is Christ's victory in an exalted form a spectacle for the universe, in which He leads the conquered in

triumph. The expression of this powerful image is still further strengthened by the trait, that it is Christ's *cross* in which this triumph is accomplished. For the ἐν αὐτῷ is to be explained with a reference to ἐν σταυρῷ (ver. 14), as indeed many MSS. *read* too here ἐν σταυρῷ or ἐν ξύλῳ, in which, to be sure, merely explanations of the ἐν αὐτῷ are to be seen. The cross of Christ, the apparently shameful destruction of His work, was therefore the victorious triumph over all His enemies, over the visible and over the invisible ones. (Δειγματίζω stands here = παραδειγματίζω, Matt. i. 19; Heb. vi. 6. The conception of the showing at the triumph necessarily passes into that of an exposing to shame. Ἐν παῤῥησίᾳ here expresses the publicity. [See John vii. 4, xi. 54.] But, of course, the idea of publicity is to be understood here spiritually, "Jesus led them in triumph before the eyes of the world of spirits," not before the physical eyes of men.—On θριαμβεύειν see 2 Cor. ii. 14, where, however, it stands, as in the Hebrew voice hiphil, for *triumphare facere.* Here it is = πομπεύειν, *triumphum agere.*)

Ver. 16. After this long discussion on the person and work of Christ (ver. 9–15), St Paul, connecting his discourse again with ver. 8, returns to the direct combating of the Colossian false teachers. Their Judaïzing character stands out here quite unmistakeably, inasmuch as St Paul calls on his readers not to let themselves be frightened by their requiring a strict fulfilment of the ceremonial ordinances of the Mosaical Law. It is questionable, however, whether these Judaïsts preserved the ordinances of the Old Testament *pure*, or *mixed* them with Rabbino-Talmudical additions. The *latter* is the more probable from the whole of their character. As they practised a rigorous asceticism (ii. 23), they will not have confined their decisions as to meat and drink to the Law of Moses (in which, besides, no ordinance was given in regard to drinks), they will rather, as may be supposed, have avoided all indulgence in meat and strong drinks, like the Roman ascetics (Rom. xiv.). At the root of this ascetic tendency there lay, probably obscurely, the opinion that matter is the cause of evil, which must have led as a natural consequence to Docetism. But in the commencement of heresies we do not find the perverted fundamental ideas developed as yet in all their consequences; we have, therefore, no right on that account, viz., because they lived ascetically, to suppose Docetism in the Colossian false teachers. The Roman ascetics were no Docetes either. As to the rest, the

feasts denote here the well-known three great feasts of the Jews, the Passover, Pentecost, and the Feast of Tabernacles. The new moons were, according to Numb. xxviii. 11–15, solemnized as great and joyful festivals. See details in Winer's Encyclopædia, vol. ii., p. 176, ss. (Κρίνειν has here, as at Rom. ii. 1, the meaning of a rejecting, condemnatory, judging.—The ἐν μέρει ἑορτῆς, instead of the simple ἐν, is difficult. The reading ἐν ἡμέρᾳ is plainly a mere refuge from the difficult reading μέρει, and can make no pretension to recognition. The attempts of earlier interpreters to get its special meaning out of the phrase, according to which μέρος was to be taken as *segregatio* or *participatio*, are recognised as untenable in the latest times. Ἐν μέρει is used adverbially in *profane* writers also, in the sense, "with respect to, with regard to," and that is here perfectly suitable. [Compare the passages in Wetstein and Loesner belonging to this subject.] —The plural σαββάτων is not to be referred to the sabbatical years and the years of jubilee, there is only to be seen in it, on the contrary, a plural form which is used along with the singular form, as Matt. xii. 1; Luke iv. 16, show. Compare in the LXX., Ex. xx. 10; Levit. xxiii. 32; Numb. xxviii. 9, 10. Also 1 Macc. ii. 38; Josephus Arch. i. 1. 1.)

Ver. 17. Those institutions of the Old Testament (ἃ refers to *all* that precedes, not to σάββατα merely) are designated as σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων (μενόντων is a totally needless conjecture). The antithesis to σκιὰ is formed by σῶμα, shadow and substance are opposed to each other; *that* substance is in Christ and the New Testament which He established. For the *latter*, therefore, the images (or shadows) serve no longer. To imagine in the σῶμα the spiritual body of Christ, the Church, was possible only through a total misapprehension of the passage. Nevertheless, the genitive Χριστοῦ has some difficulty in it (the article before the word is according to the best MSS. to be expunged), one expects the nominative ὁ Χριστὸς a reading which is, however, found only in authorities of no importance. But the genitive here denotes property: "the substance is Christ's, *i.e.* it comes from Him, is derived from Him." Of course, Christ and His operation on the human race are precisely τὰ μέλλοντα, of which the Old Testament with its symbolical-typical character forms the σκιά. That Christ was *already* come, and the Church already established, at the time that St Paul wrote this, can cause no difficulty as regards the choice of the term μέλλοντα, for that is chosen from the

point of view of the Old Testament, seen from which the New Testament was the future. But, as to the more accurate idea of the σκιὰ, there is, of course, couched in the antithesis to σῶμα, *first of all* the idea of the nothingness, unsubstantiality of the shadow, compared with the body, which forms it; but *further*, also the *analogy* between shadow and body. The latter, the body, portrays itself accurately in the shadow, which presents an image of the body; thus too the Old Testament is a shadow (image) of the New, a μόρφωσις τῆς ἀληθείας (see at Rom. ii. 20), as symbol and type of Christ, of His works and of His Church. Thus, Heb. viii. 5, the tabernacle is called σκιὰ τῶν ἐπουρανίων, and, x. 1, the Law is called σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, to which εἰκὼν τῶν πραγμάτων is an antithesis. According to this, it is clear that it cannot possibly have been St Paul's meaning that the institution of the Sabbath by Moses is to hold good even in its outwardness for the Christian Church; this is surely, like all the rest in the Old Testament, to be reckoned among the σκιαὶ τῶν μελλόντων. According to Rom. xiv. 5, 6, there seems to have been no particular festival-time at all in the ancient Church, their whole life was just one feast in the joy of the Holy Spirit. It is true, inasmuch as in the outward Church of the present the idea of the Church of Christ is only approximately realized, certain regulations and ordinances become a necessity, but a Christian celebration of Sunday is still ever to be distinguished from the slavish service of the Old Covenant. This is well shown by Rücker, in the essay "of the Lord's day," Erlangen, 1839. 8. in opposition to Liebetrut's work, "of the Lord's day and its celebration."

Ver. 18. The Colossian false teachers had, however, other considerable errors also, besides their outward adherence to the ordinances of Moses;[1] they pretended to a deeper knowledge of divine things, which with an apparent humility, was accompanied by an excessive pride. Against this tendency, which may easily infect nobler minds thirsting after truth and knowledge, St Paul gives the most emphatic warning. The word καταβραβεύειν, which the apostle here employs, is not found in the New Testament except here. Jerome thinks he discovers in it a Cilicism peculiar

[1] It has already been observed in the Introduction to this Epistle (§ 2, ¶ 2), that these words might be taken as if these false teachers here designated were different from those described in ver. 16; their identity is not expressly asserted, but the analogy of the heretics in the Pastoral Epistles makes their identity in the highest degree probable.

to St Paul, but without reason, as Demosthenes, Polybius, and others use it. Βραβεύειν is to adjudge the prize of combat (βραβεῖον), therefore, in general, "to determine, decide;" accordingly, καταβραβεύειν is used = κατακρίνειν in the sense of, "to decide against any one," properly, "to deprive him of the price of victory." That meaning suits here perfectly well, as the μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς καταβραβευέτω here answers to the μή τις ὑμᾶς κρινέτω in ver. 16. Hesychius and Suidas had already explained the expression thus with reference to our passage. Since St Paul makes use of the figure of the βραβεῖον elsewhere too (Phil. iii. 14), after the comparison of the Christian life with the running on the race-course, we can here keep to the proper meaning of the word καταβραβεύειν, so that the sense of the words is this: "let no one (by leading you astray to his false doctrines) rob you of your prize," that is, draw you away from Christ, and consequently from your eternal happiness which rests on Him. The four participles which follow describe more accurately the nature of these heretics, and depend therefore, one and all, on μηδεὶς καταβραβευέτω. By that construction then the interpretation is already refuted, which Steiger, among others, has once more defended, according to which θέλων is to be taken adverbially here, in conformity with the well-known Greek use of the word, according to which it stands for "willingly." For Bähr justly observes that each of the four participles must clearly have its independent meaning, as each has its particular appendage. Besides, no combination gives a natural sense, if θέλων is taken adverbially. Connected with what *follows*, the words would necessarily mean, "willingly walking solemnly with humility and angel-worship." But Steiger himself confesses that it is unsuitable to take ἐμβατεύειν in the sense "to walk in state," and besides, then the ἃ μὴ ἑώρακεν does not join on well. But neither will θέλων give a suitable sense when connected in an adverbial acceptation with what *precedes*: "let no one willingly rob you of your prize," gives an incongruous idea; for, even if we turn the words so, "let no one have a pleasure in robbing you of your prize," the awkwardness surely remains, that, according to this, the words would contain an admonition to the *heretics*, whereas, according to the meaning of the whole passage, it is intended to be addressed to the *Colossians exposed to the being led astray*. But just as little does the interpretation recommend itself which takes θέλων in the usual meaning of the word, so that the sense is this: "as he (the mis-

leader) will designedly deprive you of your crown in false humility and angel-worship." For how the angel-worship of *others* is to contribute to deprive the Christians in Colossæ of their prize is not to be seen. The only correct method is, certainly, according to Hesychius and Phavorinus, whom most of the interpreters have followed, especially among the latest, Bähr, Böhmer, and others, to take θέλων here = εὐδοκῶν: "who takes a delight in humility and angel-worship." Θέλειν is often found so in the Hellenistic dialect, with ἐν following after the analogy of the Hebrew חָפֵץ בְּ. (See the LXX. at 1 Sam. xviiii. 22; 2 Sam. xv. 26; 1 Chron. xxviii. 4; Ps. cxvi. 2.) It is clear from the nature of the case that the ταπεινοφροσύνη here is a *pretended* humility; elsewhere the term is used of *true* humility, as Ephes. iv. 2; Phil. ii. 3; 1 Pet. v. 5; and also Col. iii. 12. *Here*, on the contrary, and at ver. 23, that stimulated humility is denoted by it, which appeared in those heretics coupled with conceit and pride. But as to the second phrase, θρησκεία τῶν ἀγγέλων, the more ancient interpretations, according to which the genitive was taken subjectively, may be viewed as sufficiently refuted. (See Bähr on this passage, p. 209, ss.) The translation "worship, which is taught by angels," or "which the angels practise," *i.e.* worship in angel-like holiness, plainly does not suit the context. Bähr observes with justice that the defenders of this interpretation seem to be compelled to it only by the circumstance that they had interpreted the names ἐξουσίαι, ἀρχαί, κ.τ.λ., in what precedes, not of *angels*, but of *human powers*. The οὐ κρατῶν τὴν κεφαλήν, *i.e.* Christ (ver. 19), leaves no doubt that the discourse is here of a worship dedicated to the angels, which many of the Gnostic sects practised, and for that purpose clothed themselves with secret names of angels. (See Iren. adv. hær. i. 31, 2, ii. 32, 5; Tertull. de præscr. c. 33. Josephus also relates similar things of the Essenes [B. J. ii. 8, 7].) With this interpretation the conjunction of "false humility" and "angel-worship" is also made distinct; that is to say, the false teachers in the worshipping of angels strove after a humility false in so far as they thought they durst not venture to approach the supreme God Himself; in like manner as the adoration of angels and saints in the Romish Church is usually justified. Thus Chrysostom had already observed of this false humility: εἰσί τινες οἱ λέγοντες· οὐ δεῖ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ προσάγεσθαι, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων, ἐκεῖνο γὰρ μεῖζόν ἐστιν ἢ καθ' ἡμᾶς. (See Böhmer's second *excursus* after his *isagoge*.)

This self-chosen and invented worship is called afterwards in ver. 23 ἐθελοθρησκεία, which term also there again appears in conjunction with ταπεινοφροσύνη.

In the words following: ἃ μὴ ἑώρακεν ἐμβατεύων the critical authorities vary exceedingly. First of all, F.G. read οὐκ instead of μὴ, but A.B.D. leave the negative out altogether. This latter reading Lachmann has adopted, and it seems, in fact, to deserve the preference; for it is *easily* understood how people thought they were obliged to add a negative to ἃ ἑώρακεν, which was afterwards expressed at one time by οὐκ, at another by μὴ, but *scarcely* how one could strike out the existing μὴ. For, without a negative, the ἃ ἑώρακεν is to be taken ironically; it refers to the pretended knowledge of the heavenly world on the part of the heretics which they give out that they possessed through visions and intuitions. The readings ἑωράκαμεν and ἑωράκατε have but inconsiderable authorities for them, and their origin is also explained by the assumption that ἃ ἑώρακεν was the original reading, which some copyists endeavoured to make intelligible to themselves by referring the contemplation to the apostle or to the readers. The word ἐμβατεύειν is not found again in the New Testament, but is often found elsewhere in the sense, "to go, intrude, into something," and that, too, both of God, inasmuch as He penetrates the world and the hearts of men, and of men in relation to God and divine things. (Compare the citations in Bähr on this passage, p. 212, ss.) The meaning, "to go in state, *incedere*," which Erasmus ascribes to the word, is founded on a false etymology. In meaning the ἐμβατεύειν here answers to the term κενεμβατεύειν, which, however, is read here only by a conjecture. It means εἰς τὰ κενὰ βαίνειν, *i.e.* to strive to find out empty things. The words blame, therefore, the pretended possession of profound wisdom which these false teachers boasted of. For the relative ἃ refers to the angels and to all which is taught concerning them. They thought they had penetrated into the depths of the spiritual world by means of spiritual contemplation, εἰκῇ φυσιούμενοι ὑπὸ τοῦ νοὸς τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτῶν. Their conceit had not even a *show* of truth, when taken along with the absurdity of their pretended secrets as to the realm of spirits, they were so conceited εἰκῇ "without ground or reason." (See as to φυσιοῦσθαι 1 Cor. iv. 6, v. 2, viii. 1, and passim.) The combination νοῦς τῆς σαρκὸς is found only here. The apparently contradictory form of the combination is chosen purposely in order to mark the unnaturalness of their condition of mind. That which

should *govern* the flesh, the νοῦς, is itself in those false teachers *sunk under the power of* the flesh, their νοῦς is become σαρκικός. (See my *opusc. theol.*, p. 157, note.) For the rest the σὰρξ here is not to be understood of gross fleshliness, for the Colossian false teachers were actually given to a rigorous asceticism (see ver. 23). The term rather marks the entire ungodly tendency of the natural man, even when it exhibits itself in more spiritual forms.

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

Ver. 20, 21. To this warning description of the perverseness of those heretics, the fundamental features of whose character fit the sects of all ages, so far as they pursue a similar direction as to knowledge, St Paul now annexes an apostrophe which sounds as if the heretics themselves were members of the Church, or as if the Christians in Colossæ had already lapsed to the false doctrine altogether. But the remaining contents of the Epistle fit neither of those suppositions. The defenders of that false philosophy (ii. 8) cannot possibly be conceived as to be found in communion with the Church; they rather wish to draw the Christians in Colossæ out of *that* into their circle. But, again, the laudatory description (ii. 5), and the continuing exhortation (ii. 8, 16, 18) not to let themselves be led astray, do not suit the supposition that the Co-

lossian Christians were already led astray. We can therefore in ver. 20 see only a form of representation, "Ye who are dead with Christ to the worldly elements, why do ye again set up worldly ordinances?" stands for the idea: "ye incline that way; ye are on the point of again setting up worldly ordinances." In order to bring the inconsistency of that proceeding more home to them, St Paul represents their apostacy as already accomplished. With reference to the description ii. 11, 12, St Paul assumes that the Colossians, as true believers, are with Christ dead to the world in general, and therefore to the worldly elements also, *i.e.* to the Law in its outward literal mode of conception. (Cf. on ii. 8.) It must therefore appear as something contradictory if those dead to the world, like those who still live in the world, wish again to set up ordinances which are in accordance with the στοιχείοις τοῦ κόσμου. (Ver. 20. as to ἀποθνήσκειν ἀπὸ see on Rom. vii. 6; Gal. ii. 19.—Ζῶντες ἐν κόσμῳ forms the antithesis to ἀποθανόντες. The discourse, therefore, is not of physical life, in the world, but of life in the element of worldliness which forms the antithesis to the element of Christ.—Δογματίζω is not found again in the New Testament. It means "to set up an ordinance," in the middle, "to let an ordinance be imposed on one." But in the "letting be imposed on one" is couched the acknowledgment of the righteousness of the ordinance; consequently, the giving one's self up to error. In the choice of the word is couched a clear reference to the δόγματα in ver. 14. The imperative form μὴ ἅψῃ, κ.τ.λ. unmistakeably expresses the character of the δόγματα.) In ver. 21 the μηδὲ γεύσῃ points back to the laws as to meats, which were spoken of in ver. 16, but the two expressions μὴ ἅψῃ and μηδὲ θίγῃς present a difficulty because of their being synonymous. *One* of those two expressions might be referred to the touching of corpses and other things which the Mosaical Law pronounces unclean, but how then is the *other* to be taken? It has a certain plausibility if one (as, to name one, Böhmer still does) refers the μὴ ἅψῃ to the prohibition of marriage. For ἅπτεσθαι is used *per euphemismum* for matrimonial cohabitation. It is so in 1 Cor. vii. 1, and according to 1 Tim. iv. 3 the false teachers in Ephesus, who were akin to those at Colossæ, decidedly forbade marriage. The ascetic tendency of the Colossian false teachers (see ver. 23) also well suits the assumption that they abstained from marriage. But, as any certain intimation on that point fails us in this Epistle, just as it is with regard to the docetic tendency, it might be too bold though

to be found on the word ἅψη alone a fresh and so important a feature of the heretics in Colossæ. In the passage 1 Tim. iv. 3, St Paul designates the opposition to marriage as a devilish doctrine. From that it is scarcely probable that he would have here touched merely thus by the way on that error. To me it is most probable, as Bähr, too, supposes, that the three synonymous words are to express together the formal tendency of the false teachers, and their reception of the Law according to the *letter* only, looking for holiness in the *outward* instead of the *inward*, although the individual prohibitions have not, and cannot have, a definite separate reference to different objects.

Ver. 22. The succeeding words admit of being interpreted in two ways, either so that the reasons of the false teachers for their ordinances are given in them, or so that they contain condemnatory words of St Paul in respect of those worldly ordinances. In either case by ἃ πάντα are to be understood, not the prohibitions *themselves*, but the different *objects* to which the prohibitions of the heretics, μὴ ἅψῃ, κ.τ.λ. refer; but φθορὰ, in the case of the reference to the false teachers and their defence of their ordinances, is to be interpreted of eternal perdition; in the case of the reference of the words to St Paul and his argumentation against the false teachers, on the other hand, of the physical destruction of the prohibited substances. In the *former* case the meaning of the words would be this: "all which, by the use which is made of them after the commandments and doctrines of men, lead to everlasting perdition, and therefore must be avoided." This interpretation is defended by Storr and Böhmer. In the case of the *other* acceptation the words would have to be translated thus: "all which are destined to destruction through using them, *i.e.* which, according to God's design, are meant to be used," whence it follows that God's will cannot possibly be that we should avoid them, and that the avoiding these objects is not capable of producing any holiness. In this acceptation the words ἃ ἐστι—ἀποχρήσει have a parenthetical character; the words following, viz. κατὰ τὰ ἐντάλματα καὶ διδασκαλίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων allow, according to it, of no immediate connection with what comes just before, but contain a more accurate definition of the δογματίζεσθε· μὴ ἅψῃ κ. τ. λ., in that they designate the δόγματα of the heretics as mere human inventions. For this interpretation Chrysostom, Theodoret, and other Fathers of the Church, had already declared themselves, afterwards Luther, Grotius, Bähr, Steiger, and others.

The decision between these two interpretations is difficult, as many things are in favour of both, and yet no other is admissible. For if Ambrose, Augustine, and some later interpreters, wished to explain the words so that ἅ would refer to the δόγματα themselves, and the sense would be this: "which commandments, if they are followed, all lead to man's destruction,"—it is decidedly against that plan, that ἀπόχρησις cannot be taken as fulfilment of the commandments. Or, if one chose in ἀπόχρησις to insist on the meaning "abuse," in opposition to the *right* use, in the sense: "all these things tend through the abuse of them to the destruction of men, but not through the *right* use of them," that thought would lead into a totally different circle of ideas. For St Paul is not occupied with the question as to where the limit between use and abuse of meats and other outward things passes, but is combating the whole principle of the heretics again to enslave under a new Law the faithful released from the old Law. There remain to us, therefore, only those two above-given interpretations, which are equally admissible, grammatically viewed. Nevertheless, though, the context might seem to be in favour of the supposition that confutatory words of St Paul are to be seen here, and not defensive utterances of the heretics. For, in the first place, the whole passage is not of the sort to admit of our supposing that St Paul wished here to draw attention to the way in which the false teachers defend their opinions. But, in the second place, it is unsuitable to consider the words: κατὰ τὰ ἐντάλματα καὶ διδασκαλίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων as utterances of the heretics, for then according to that, the apostles themselves and all true believers would be the ἄνθρωποι here. From the phrase in ii. 8, κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, it is in the highest degree probable that the analogous one in this passage is also meant to characterize the ordinances of the false teachers as mere human conceptions, in opposition to the divine doctrines of Revelation. Besides, we find the same idea, that meats and such outward things are, as being empty, without influence on the moral life, elsewhere also in St Paul (comp. 1 Cor. vi. 13, with 1 Tim. iv. 4; Matt. xv. 11); it is, therefore, not improbable, that he has laid a stress on it *here* too. It is clear then, according to this, that St Paul is far from reckoning the Mosaical ordinances, as such, among the στοιχείοις τοῦ κόσμου, it is only in the purely outward acceptation and arbitrary transformation of them by human teachers that he treats them as *human* ordinances. The terms ἐντάλματα and διδασκαλίαι seem

to differ here, so that the ἐντάλματα are the definitely-conceived commandments or prohibitions, and the διδασκαλίαι the principles on which those are grounded. (See Matt. xv. 9; Mark vii. 7.) In consequence of this our interpretation of the words: ἃ ἐστι πάντα εἰς φθορὰν τῇ ἀποχρήσει, the interpretation of ver. 21 above given is then *also* confirmed. We declined in the μὴ ἅψῃ the reference to the rejection of marriage, ver. 22 shows that such a supposition is inadmissible for this reason also, that otherwise the repulsive meaning would arise, that the woman, according to God's design, exists for the purpose of being used by man. (Ἀπόχρησις is not found again in the New Testament. The proper meaning of the word is "use, wear and tear," *i.e.* the consuming by use. It is, however, used, even by good writers, without that reference, as completely = χρῆσις. Thus by Polybius i. 45, 2, xvii. 15, 9.)

Ver. 23. St Paul, in finishing off this warning against the false teachers at Colossæ, again recapitulates in conclusion the preposterous notions in them. They have but an *apparent* wisdom in their hypocritical worship, in their affected humility, in their self-invented and self-imposed mortification of the flesh; in short, all is human and earthly in them, not divine and heavenly as in Christ's doctrine. The ἅτινα connects itself quite simply with the preceding phrase, ἐντάλματα καὶ διδασκαλίαι; but the construction of the ἐστὶ is questionable. Some have proposed to connect it with the οὐκ ἐν τιμῇ τινι, or even with πρὸς πλησμονὴν τῆς σαρκὸς, as, to name one, Bähr still does. But Böhmer justly observes, that then ἐστὶ would stand altogether unsuitably, not only separated from the words with which it was especially connected, but also unduly separating ἅτινα from the λόγον ἔχοντα belonging to it. In the second place, the connection ἐστὶ πρὸς πλησμονὴν τῆς σαρκὸς would, it is true, afford a good sense, but, when connected with οὐκ ἐν τιμῇ τινι, a less suitable idea appears: "these precepts are not exactly in a certain honour, have no direct significance." Who can persuade himself that St Paul would have declared himself so indefinitely as to doctrines which he elsewhere blames so severely? The τινὶ along with τιμῇ leaves no doubt that the foregoing ἀφειδίᾳ σώματος is meant to be more accurately defined by it. The only correct combination, for which, too, most interpreters by far have from the first decided, is *that* in which ἅτινα ἐστὶ λόγον μὲν ἔχοντα σοχίας are united. For λόγος is here, as it occurs also elsewhere, an antithesis to δύναμις or ἀληθεία (1 Thess. i. 5;

1 John iii. 18). The μὲν is to be explained by the suppressed antithesis, "but not the *substance* of wisdom." By means of ἐν now the particulars are introduced in which this show of wisdom after the opinion of men declares itself. With regard, first, to the ἐθελοθρησκεία out of the three points produced, that word is found in the classics not at all, and in the later Christian writers it is, we may presume, to be considered as borrowed from St Paul. We are, therefore, in respect to the interpretation of that word, which we may presume to have been formed by St Paul himself, obliged to have recourse to its etymology. But the numerous words compounded with ἐθέλω have a twofold meaning: in them is couched the idea either of what is voluntary, self-made, or of what is simulated, self-pleasing. Accordingly, ἐθελοθρησκεία may mean "a self-invented, arbitrarily-contrived worship," as a contrast to that ordained by God. Thus Suidas explains the term: ἐθελοθρησκεί by ἰδίῳ θελήματι σέβει τὸ δοκοῦν. Or ἐθελοθρησκεία may mean "a self-pleasing, hypocritical, worship," as Theophylact explains ἡ ὑποκρινομένη εὐλαβεία ἐν τῇ θρησκείᾳ. The parallel passage, ver. 18, decides for this latter explanation, as in *our* passage a reference to the θέλων ἐν θρησκείᾳ τῶν ἀγγέλων *there* is, no doubt, to be seen. In the same passage (ver. 18) is also found the second of the three particulars, in which the apparent wisdom of the false teachers shows itself, the ταπεινοφροσύνη, *i.e. here* too the hypocritical humility, which acts as if it dares not draw near to God. And thirdly, *in fine*, the ἀφειδία σώματος is mentioned, *i.e.* the rigorous asceticism which deals unmercifully with the body as a dungeon of the soul. This is especially adapted to create the appearance of wisdom and godliness, because it represents itself as an abnegation of what is earthly, as a mastery over the desires, and yet such self-chosen abnegation is exactly calculated to make the old man strong. For the more accurate defining the preposterousness of this asceticism, St Paul further adds: οὐκ ἐν τιμῇ τινι, where only σώματος can be supplied. These words point to the doctrine; that to the body, as the temple of the Holy Spirit, a relative honour and care, determined by its position towards the spirit, are due; that, therefore, the withholding that care is not holiness, but sin. The connecting the last words: πρὸς πλησμονὴν τῆς σαρκὸς with the directly foregoing οὐκ ἐν τιμῇ τινι, and the referring them to the satisfying of the body, as if the sense were: "without showing the body a certain honour, so that the flesh is satisfied,—cannot possibly recommend itself.

Neither does πρὸς admit of that connection, nor is it conceivable that σάρξ and σῶμα should have been exchanged so. Even the difference between those two words leads to the opinion, that σάρξ has here the ideal meaning "sinful nature," by which means then this pertinent meaning of the words, which is also one that accords with experience, arises, that outward abnegation and chastising of the body may yet afford nourishment to sinfulness, in that they, as proceeding from one's own strength, beget conceit and pride in the mind. All abnegation possesses value only when it is done for Christ's sake, and therefore is born of faith in Him and love to Him. (See Comm. on Matt. x. 39.)

II.

PART SECOND.

(III. 1–IV. 18.)

§ 3. GENERAL ETHICAL PRECEPTS.

(III. 1–17.)

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

Ver. 1, 2. With a retrospective reference to ii. 12, St Paul conceives his readers, and in them all believers, as risen with Christ. Now, as the Redeemer, who rose in the body, ascended into heaven also in the body, because He belonged to the earth no longer, so also must those risen in the Spirit tend towards things above, with all their thoughts and in all their ways, for *there* is the magnet which attracts them to it, viz., Christ, who sits at the right hand of God, *i.e.* takes part in the government of the world, who is, therefore, the Lord, and, as such, must alone be the object of aspiration. (On the formula καθῆσθαι ἐν δεξίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ see the remarks in the Comm. on Matt. xxvi. 62, ss.—In the antithesis τὰ ἄνω and τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς the idea of the τὰ κάτω alone is to be sought in the latter phrase; but, no doubt, heaven and earth, above and below, have here their own reference to the opposition of the spiritual and pure to the material and impure [compare ver. 5], without, however, placing the

origin of evil in matter as such. It need not be observed that it is improper at τὰ ἄνω to supply ἀγαθὰ, for the οὗ, which is connected with it, obliges us to keep the locality of heaven in mind. Between ζητεῖν and φρονεῖν here the distinction is to be supposed that φρονεῖν denotes the *state* in which ζητεῖν has passed over altogether into the disposition.)

Ver. 3, 4. The necessity of aspiring after the heavenly and pure is further grounded on the assertion, that they as dead (in the old man) can no more be turned towards earthly things, in that the receptivity for such is wanting. Their real life is now hidden with Christ in God; all their aspirations, therefore, must be directed towards divine things. The life of believers is called hidden, inasmuch as it is inward, and the outward does not correspond with it. The believer bears a twofold life: outwardly poor, weak, and in shame; inwardly, filled with divine life and heavenly peace, as St Paul, 2 Cor. vi. 8, ss., so beautifully describes it by a series of antitheses. In like manner the Redeemer, dying on the cross, the most despised and unvalued of all men, was, at the same time, the victor over all the foes of the spiritual world. (See on Col. ii. 15.) The κέκρυπται ἐν τῷ Θεῷ is not to be flattened by the translation, "is known to God alone." God is rather conceived of here as the element into whose essence the faithful, like Christ Himself, are taken up, and in which they are concealed, so that no one can penetrate into this element of life, as God is called and is φῶς οἰκῶν ἀπρόσιτον (1 Tim. vi. 16). But when Christ shall manifest His glory which He has of the Father (John xvii. 24), viz., on the day of His appearance, then the faithful too will be made manifest with Him in their glory which Christ has given them (John xvii. 22). As such a one who has communicated His glory to us, which is His essence and life itself, Christ is called ἡ ζωὴ ἡμῶν, Christ in us. The expression must, therefore, not be resolved into the more general idea: "author of our life." No, He is the element itself of the spiritual life. *He* lives in *us*, and we in Him. (In ver. 4 the reading ζωὴ ἡμῶν is, with Griesbach, Lachmann, and others, to be preferred, on the authority of C.D.E.F.G., to the usual one ζωὴ ὑμῶν. As at the end of ver. 4 the second person again appears, ἡμῶν might easily be changed into ὑμῶν.)

Ver. 5. The exhortation of ver. 1 and 2: τὰ ἄνω ζητεῖτε, μὴ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς φρονεῖτε, is now specially extended to individual points. But, with the phrase τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, *i.e.* τὰ ἐπίγεια, "what belong

to the earth" (which is expressed at Tit. ii. 12 by κοσμικαὶ ἐπιθυμίαι), there is here conjoined the image of the body and its separate members, as which the natural man is represented, with his lusts and desires. Those members, that is, lusts, which are here named, are only cited by way of example, for ver. 8, where the exhortation is again taken up with another turn of expression, mentions other forms of sin. But it is remarkable that, whereas, in ver. 3, it was ἀπεθάνετε, St Paul here writes νεκρώσατε, for the mortifying presupposes a life of the being to be mortified, and, therefore, is opposed to the being dead. In a similar way St Paul describes, in the Epistle to the Philippians, iii. 12, ss., the state of the faithful as completed, and yet directly afterwards says, " not that I am perfect, but I follow after." For, at first, St Paul views the believer quite *objectively*, in the manner that God looks on him in Christ, but afterwards he views him in his *subjective* position, viz., according to the actual degree of sanctification, which is determined by the gradual extension, through all the functions (members) of the man, of the life of Christ, which is rooted in his inmost being. Both modes of expression are necessarily grounded on St Paul's doctrine of the δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ and the λογίζεσθαι εἰς δικαιοσύνην. (See the Comm. on Rom. iii. 21.) What is *here* expressed by means of νεκροῦν τὰ μέλη is, at Gal. v. 24, denoted by σταυροῦν τὴν σάρκα σὺν τοῖς παθήμασι καὶ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις. As to the rest, it is understood at once that the mortification of the old man is not to be achieved in one's own strength, but in the strength of the Holy Spirit. The exhortation is, accordingly, to be thus taken: " leave through fidelity room in you for the Spirit which mortifies the old man!" Among the members to be mortified, St Paul names, above all, the carnal sins in their various shades, because, proceeding from *them*, all the rest of the tendencies of human nature are poisoned. Whilst πορνεία denotes the *natural* gratification of sexual desire, though without marriage, ἀκαθαρσία refers to the *unnatural and secret* sexual sins. On the other hand, πάθος refers to the disposition towards lust, to the inward lasciviousness of desire, as it is put together with ἐπιθυμία, 1 Thess. iv. 5. By the ἐπιθυμία κακὴ being here further distinguished from πάθος it is presumable that the special manifestation of the more general πάθος in a definite case and for a definite object, is intended to be denoted. But the explanation of the expression πλεονεξία is rendered difficult, partly by its combination with nothing but sins of lust, partly by

the addition ἥτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρεία. However, it has been already proved, at Ephes. iv. 19, v. 3, 5, that St Paul uses the word πλεονεξία also of greediness, in so far as it declares itself as pampering of the flesh, and by that means promotes lust. The designation of the πλεονεξία as εἰδωλολατρεία is sufficiently elucidated, as has been observed already on Ephes. v. 3–5, by the circumstance that St Paul, at Phil. iii. 19, conceives the pampering of the flesh as making a god of the belly. In the passage, 1 Thess. iv. 6 πλεονεκτεῖν is used of adultery as a sin in which an inroad on the property of one's neighbour is seen; that aspect of the idea is, of course, inapplicable here, on account of the addition ἥτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρεία. The article might seem to be in favour of the supposition that πλεονεξία is intended here to designate another vice different from the former expressions, unless the supposition that it has been put on account of the ἥτις which follows were more natural.

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

Ver. 8–10. Hereupon the apostle again takes up the ethical exhortation of ver. 5, but in another metaphor: "Now (νυνὶ is a designation of the state of conversion, an antithesis to ποτὲ in ver. 7—compare Ephes. ii. 11, 13) do ye too lay aside every sinful thing." The expression ἀποτιθέναι, like the ἀπεκδύσασθαι (ver. 9), has for its foundation the figure of a garment, which is laid aside when soiled, in order to be put on again fresh and clean. (Com-

pare ver. 12, ἐνδύσασθε οὖν κ. τ. λ., and at Rom. xiii. 14; Col. ii. 11.) *Here*, too, neither completeness nor accurate order was kept in view by St Paul in the enumeration of individual sins which are to be laid aside. (On ὀργὴ and θυμὸς see Rom. ii. 8; Ephes. iv. 31.—The very general term κακία has been already interpreted by the Fathers here as μνησικακία, *i.e.* as malice, in the sense of revenge, desire to resent injuries.—Βλασφημία is here, as at Ephes. iv. 31, not the speaking impiously of God, but all abuse and railing, as an effect of anger.—Αἰσχρολογία, lewd discourse, see on Ephes. v. 4.) Now, in ver. 9, all that is to be laid aside is called ὁ παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος, from whom sins proceed as πράξεις. (See, on this point, the remarks on Rom. vii. 21–23.) But the act of laying aside the old man has for its indispensable correlative the putting on the new man, because the creative efficiency of God, which calls for the *latter*, alone mortifies the *former* at the same time. (See at Ephes. iv. 23, 24.) As to the description of the new man, as the renewal of God's image, in ver. 10, compare the remarks on the parallel passage, Ephes. iv. 23, 24. In the εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν scil. τοῦ Θεοῦ the knowledge of God, in its true meaning, is represented as the result of the renewal alone; without Christ man is without God (Ephes. ii. 12; 1 John ii. 23). Ἡ εἰκὼν τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτὸν, *i.e.* the image of God, the Creator of man, is, according to Col. i. 15, Christ, ἡ εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου; after *Him*, as the prototype of man, the υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου—man is created.

Ver. 11. With a retrospective glance at the Judaïstic heretics in Colossæ, St Paul sets up, as the peculiarity of the new man, of the Christ in us, the circumstance that the national distinctions of race acknowledged and prevailing apart from Christ, and the religious differences occasioned by the same, have in Him no longer any meaning; in the Gospel and the kingdom of God, which the former establishes, Christ alone has any value. We have already spoken about the sense of this passage at the parallel one, Gal. iii. 28, 29. St Paul does not mean that *every* distinction whatever between the opposites just adduced is abolished (for he immediately [at ver. 22] allows the distinction between slave and freeman to subsist, *even* for *believers*, and, at Gal. iii. 28, even man and wife are named among the antitheses which no longer hold good in Christ); but that, in a *religious* point of view, all nations, all ranks, have, through Christ, a like access to God, whereas, in the Old Testament, the people of Israel had

a more immediate position towards God than the heathens. And yet, even in the New Testament, in the *outward* Church, the position of the nations is not equal. According to Rom. xi., even after the appearance of Christ the election remains to the people of Israel, and the apostles, for instance, could not have been chosen from the Gentiles also. St Paul, therefore, means especially to describe the *inward* condition alone of the renewal; no *outward* distinctions hold good as to that condition; no one is shut out from this favour by his *outward* position; nothing in *outward* advantage can supply the place of, or bring about, the renewal; Christ alone operates it in an equal measure in all, and thereby unites all to unity in Himself. Bähr finds in this passage the assertion, that there is no distinction in Christianity between *esoteric* and *exoteric* religion; but the discourse, in the main, is only of these points, that the entrance into the Church stands open to all, that all may experience regeneration; all that extends beyond *that* can only be derived from this passage by deductions. (The ὅπου refers to the ἀνακαινοῦσθαι above, it can, therefore, be paraphrased by ἐν τῇ ἀνακαινώσει.—As to ἕνι see at Gal. iii. 28. While Ἕλλην and Ἰουδαῖος designate the *national distinctions*, περιτομὴ and ἀκροβυστία refer to the *religious difference*. But it is difficult duly to define βάρβαρος and Σκύθης. That is to say, St Paul seems to intend to conjoin four pairs, according to which one would think that of *those two* terms also the *one* is meant to designate the condition of higher cultivation, the *other* that of barbarism. But the attempts to get the signification of the "civilized man" out of the βάρβαρος are to be entitled total and complete failures. We must, therefore, give up the distribution of the words into four pairs, and look on βάρβαρος, Σκύθης, as merely an amplification of the meaning of ἀκροβυστία according to local differences, so that the sense is this: "In Christ there is no distinction between circumcised and uncircumcised, be they even barbarians, yea, even Scythians, as the rudest among the barbarians, be they slaves or freemen." The concluding words: τὰ πάντα καὶ ἐν πᾶσι Χριστὸς are remarkable, compared with the simple, easily understood, πάντες εἷς ἐν Χριστῷ, Gal. iii. 28. But the words, "Christ is all and is in all," are meant to declare the very same thing which the εἷς in the Epistle to the Galatians expresses, viz., that Christ, without the exclusion of any nation or any sect, unites all in the Church, and so, through His indwelling in all, is Himself all, on which account also the

community of the faithful is called, in plain terms, Christ. [1 Cor. xii. 12.])

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

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

Ver. 14. Finally, St Paul, again connecting his discourse to the ἐνδύσασθε (ver. 12), names, as the virtue to be striven after above all, love, in which all else is comprised, which alone is of an eternal nature (1 Cor. xiii.), because God is love itself (1 John iv. 8). In the closing words of the verse the reading ἑνότητος is certainly an alteration of the copyists, from their erroneously making use, as a parallel passage, of Ephes. iv. 3, where the discourse is of the unity of the Spirit. (Compare the remarks in the Comm. on Ephes. iv. 3.) But for ἥτις A.B.C.F.G. read ὅ, and Lachmann has, in accordance with his maxims, put that reading

in the text. But, without regarding the many extrinsic important testimonies, the less supported reading ἥτις might yet be preferable *here* on intrinsic grounds. For ὅ could only refer to the ἐνδύσασθαι of all those virtues; but that this personal act should be called a σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος is extremely improbable. But copyists might easily think, in their own minds, that love *alone* was placed too high by such a designation, and that St Paul had meant to call all the virtues named *jointly* a σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος, overlooking the fact, that ἐνδύσασθαι, the leading idea in what precedes, denotes a subjective activity. But love is here called σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος, inasmuch as it bears all the single phases of the perfect life, all virtues included, as it were bound up, in itself. In like manner the Pythagoreans called friendship σύνδεσμον πασῶν τῶν ἀρετῶν. In meaning, the phrase ἡ ἀγάπη πλήρωμα νόμου, Rom. xiii. 10, is equivalent. This mode of taking the phrase is preferable to the reference of it to the unity of the faithful among themselves, in the sense: love is the complete bond, *i.e.* it unites all completely one with another (thus Erasmus, Melanchthon, Michaelis, and others interpret), because that unity is first spoken of at ver. 15. For that reason, too, Ephes. iv. 3 cannot be considered as a real parallel. But Storr's opinion that σύνδεσμος τελειότητος stands for τελειότης itself, as, according to his erroneous view, in Acts viii. 23 σύνδεσμος ἀδικίας denotes ἀδικία itself, needs no refutation.

Ver. 15. To the exhortation in ver. 12 ἐνδύσασθε οὖν a fresh one is here annexed, but in the form of a wish, as the nature of peace requires. For no one can acquire peace for himself, though it follows, according to God's ordinance, the honest striving after sanctification; in that respect St Paul might rank what follows among the moral exhortations. But peace, *i.e.* the sentiment of peace, manifests itself in the heart, as the centre of personality, and the depository of feeling. All believers are called to the enjoyment of this peace, as they, being united in one body, the Church (which Christ fills with His Spirit of peace), are to have a share in its life. Then St Paul begs them to let the inward peace be also outwardly perceptible in meekness. (A.B.C.D.F.G. read Χριστοῦ for the usual εἰρήνη Θεοῦ, which reading the later critics have justly preferred. Christ, who is Himself our peace [Ephes. ii. 14], creates peace also in us.—Βραβεύειν is, first of all, "to dispense the prize of combat," then, generally, "to decide something, to determine, regulate, rule." Philo often uses it

and as entirely = βασιλεύειν. The proper meaning does not admit of being here retained without violence, but the idea: "let peace reign in your hearts," is very suitable; in it is couched the wish that peace may make itself known to the feelings so powerfully, that all other disturbing feelings may be subdued by it, may, therefore, be unable to raise themselves to dominion in the mind, —In the ἐκλήθητε ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι a studied brevity is to be seen: "to which peace ye are called, inasmuch as ye all, united in one body, are to be made partakers of His life and peace." [See at Ephes. ii. 16.] The form εὐχάριστος is not found again in the New Testament. The word has the twofold meaning of "grateful," and "gentle, mild," *comis*, *blandus*, synonymous with εὐχάριτος. The latter meaning suits the context better, for the summons to gratitude seems very incoherent here, it has no place till the end of the section at ver. 17; but the summons to let the inward peace be also outwardly perceptible in mildness and meekness is connected very properly with what precedes. In Ephes iv. 32, the clause γίνεσθε εἰς ἀλλήλους χρηστοὶ answers to this passage.)

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

Ver. 17. With the summons to do and say all in the name of Christ, and in gratitude to the Father, St Paul concludes this general ethical part. On *this* passage, too, what was needful has been already observed at Ephes. v. 20. Only, with regard to the

construction, one may be doubtful whether πάντα is a resumption of the πᾶν with ποιεῖτε supplied, or is to be taken adverbially, so that εὐχαριστοῦντες is immediately subjoined: "in all that ye do thanking God." Storr has defended this latter view of the passage. But it clearly has something very forced in it, especially because then πάντα must be taken quite arbitrarily = πάντοτε; we therefore decide, with Bähr and others, for the *former* one.

§ 4. SPECIAL MORAL PRECEPTS.

(III. 18–IV. 19.)

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

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

Ver. 2–4. Before St Paul passes on to the purely personal relations (ver. 7, ss.), he utters a further exhortation to prayer, and particularly an invitation to intercession for himself, and for a blessing on his labours. With *this* passage, too, the parallel one, Ephes. vi. 18, ss., is nearly connected. We refer *here* also on the whole to the remarks there made in the Commentary. We only add to them what follows. In ver. 2 the preceding προσκαρτερεῖτε is more accurately defined in the γρηγοροῦντες ἐν αὐτῇ. By the "watching" here no physical keeping awake is to be understood, but the spiritual wakefulness of the inner man, without

which no perseverance well-pleasing to God in prayer is imaginable. But by ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ the more general προσευχὴ is again more accurately defined. The Christian's prayer can never, in the consciousness of the grace which has befallen him, be anything else than a thanksgiving. In ver. 4 Lachmann reads δι' ὃν for δί ὅ, on the authority of B.F.G. No doubt the ὃν might easily have been changed into ὅ, on account of the position of μυστήριον; but the majority of the copies is for ὅ, for which numerous MSS. also vouch, reading διό. As to the rest, the δέδεμαι points to the fact that this Epistle was written during a captivity of St Paul's; by which, as was shown in the Introduction, we have to suppose the first Roman one.

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

Ver. 7–9. For *these* verses, too, Ephes. vi. 21, sq., is a parallel passage. As we have already remarked in the Introduction to the Epistle to the Ephesians, Tychicus brought both Epistles, that to the Ephesians and that to the Colossians. According to ver. 9 Onesimus, of whom particulars will be noted in the Introduction to the Epistle to Philemon, was in Tychicus' company. (Ver. 7, ἐν κυρίῳ refers not merely to σύνδουλος, but also to διάκονος and ἀδελφός.—Ver. 8. The reading γνῶτε τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν has such important authorities for it that one cannot hesitate to prefer it. Bähr thinks, as the same thing is put in ver. 7 and 9, it would be inconceivable that St Paul should again have said in ver. 8 that he would communicate to the readers news of himself, it would be more reasonable to suppose he had here expressed the wish to hear through Tychicus something of the readers too. But that very consideration might easily cause the alteration of

the original text. But it is also found, on more accurately viewing it, that there is no mere repetition in these verses; for in ver. 7 St Paul announces that Tychicus will make communications to the reader as to his state; in ver. 8 the remarks that he has sent that, his fellow-labourer, expressly for the purpose of making those communications; finally, in ver. 9 he speaks not of himself alone, but of all that was occurring in Rome where St Paul wrote; *here*, therefore, he gives news of the circumstances of *the Church in general*, not of *himself alone.)*

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

the kingdom of God and so became a comfort unto him. For the majority of the Jewish Christians were his opponents, and prepared *grief* for him instead of *comfort*. (Ver. 11 παρηγορία is found nowhere in the New Testament but here. Plutarch often uses the term in the sense "comfort.")

Ver. 12, 13. To this are annexed salutations from Gentile Christians, and first indeed from Epaphras, the apostle of the Colossians and of the Christians of the neighbouring cities of Laodicea and Hierapolis. (See on Col. i. 7.) Epaphras was a Colossian born, (ὁ ἐξ ὑμῶν), and therefore took an especially hearty interest in his nearer and more remote countrymen. This interest declared itself by earnest prayer for them, which St Paul compares with a spiritual wrestling and a labouring. The object of this supplication of Epaphras is the spiritual welfare of the Christians there: they are, as being perfect, to stand fast (with an allusion to the fight which the faithful have to wage in the world), and as πεπληρωμένοι ἐν παντὶ θελήματι τοῦ Θεοῦ. It is very intelligible that the copyists stumbled at these words; in fact A.C.D.F.G. read πεπληροφορημένοι, which Lachmann, in accordance with his critical principles was, obliged to receive into the text. But precisely the circumstance that πεπληροφορημένοι, is better and more easily connected with the στῆτε τέλειοι makes it more probable that it is a correction of the copyists. If one, however, compares Col. i. 9, where it is said: ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος, it is conceivable how the term πεπληρωμένοι could be placed by St Paul along with τέλειοι, for the being filled is only a closer definition of perfection, as the being filled with the Holy Ghost is meant, by which alone man is made perfect. The words ἐν παντὶ θελήματι τοῦ Θεοῦ connect themselves quite naturally with πεπληρωμένοι. For the acceptation which Bähr defends, "by means of or by virtue of the whole will or decree of God," is unsuitable, because πᾶν does not fit that interpretation. The *whole* will of God has unmistakeably its reference to the ideas of perfection and of the being filled, in which it arrives at fulfilment. The connection of πληροῦσθαι with ἐν has no difficulty in it; at Ephes. v. 18 we read πληροῦσθε ἐν πνεύματι, and one does not see why that passage should be translated, as Bähr wishes: "*through* the Spirit." Being filled *by* or *through* anything presupposes a being *in* that element, and accordingly πληροῦσθαι is directly united to ἐν. But if the πληροῦσθαι here is referred to the will, the view, according to which God's will is one with His spirit and being, is the foun-

dation of it; "to be filled with the whole will of God" is to be made capable through the Spirit of executing the will of God in every relation. As to the two cities which St Paul names in ver. 13 as near Colossæ, both are situated in Phrygia. Laodicea, situate on the Lycus, was a very considerable city, to the church of which one of the seven Epistles in the Revelation is addressed. (See Rev. iii. 14.) Hierapolis was only a small place, but has become celebrated in the ancient history of the Church by means of the well known bishops of the church there, Papias and Claudius Apollinaris.

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

αὐτῆς for αὐτοῦ, which B. defends, Lachmann has received into the text; A.C. read αὐτῶν. The latter reading is alone explained by the hypothesis that αὐτῶν was joined to ἐκκλησίαν, and referred to the brethren in Laodicea. Αὐτῆς, however, certainly arose from the circumstance that Nymphas was erroneously looked on as a woman's name.)

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

The closing words of this verse alone occasion difficulty. The reading ἐν for ἐκ is supported by too few vouchers for it to be taken into the text. But the words ἡ ἐπιστολὴ ἐκ Λαοδικείας admit of being variously explained. However, the context clearly shows that the discourse here is of an Epistle of St Paul's; we must not, therefore, at those words think of an Epistle of the Laodiceans to St Paul; but St Paul himself never was in Laodicea, therefore the words cannot express either: "read also that Epistle which I have written from Laodicea." The ἐκ is rather chosen by St Paul only because he put himself in the position of the Colossians receiving the Epistle. It came from Laodicea for *them*, it therefore was for *them* ἡ ἐπιστολὴ ἡ ἐκ Λαοδικείας, though it was addressed by St Paul to the Christians in Laodicea. But is the Epistle here meant that to the Ephesians, which might be intended for Laodicea also as an encyclical Epistle, or is it to be considered as distinct from the Epistle to the Ephesians, and therefore as lost? This question has already been decided in the Introduction to the Epistle to the Ephesians, to the

effect that we have to consider the Epistle to the Laodiceans mentioned here by St Paul as a lost writing of his, and by no means as identical with the Epistle to the Ephesians. For, even were it supposed that the Epistle to the Ephesians was, as an encyclical Epistle, addressed to the Church in Laodicea conjointly with that in Ephesus, still the charge of St Paul here in ver. 16 scarcely admits of being interpreted of that Epistle, for, considering the near affinity of the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians, St Paul could have no special occasion further to refer the Christians in Colossæ expressly to the Epistle to the Ephesians. Surely too the same Tychicus brought both Epistles; according to *that* it is hardly probable that the circular Epistle could have come so quickly from Ephesus to Laodicea that St Paul could, in his Epistle to the Colossians, designate the same as already to be found in Laodicea.

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

which is usual in the New Testament.—With that acceptation the αὐτὴν is then, according to the Hebraïzing style, redundant at the end of the verse, since διακονίαν depends on πληροῖς.)

Ver. 18, 19. The salutation by his own hand shows that St Paul, as usual, dictated the Epistle; from Col. i. 2 Timothy was, we may suppose, the writer of the Epistle to the Colossians. The addition, however, is not merely an expression of St Paul's love, but is also meant to be a mark of the authenticity of the Epistle. (See the remarks on 2 Thess. ii. 2, iii. 7.) In the request: μνημονεύετέ μου τῶν δεσμῶν, we are not to suppose assistance in money, but aid by supplication; and that, too, partly by prayer for patience and other Christian virtues, partly for a speedy deliverance from bonds. That St Paul hoped for a speedy deliverance when he wrote this Epistle is clearly shown by Philem. ver. 22. True, there has already been above, Col. iv. 3, a mention of supplication for St Paul, but merely in respect to his labours in the ministry, not in respect to his personal situation.

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

EXPOSITION

OF THE

EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS.

INTRODUCTION.

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

The city of Thessalonica in Macedonia was originally called Thermæ; it first received the name of Thessalonica from Cassander. On the conquest of Macedonia by the Romans it was fixed on for the chief city of the second district of that province, and, as such, was the seat of the Roman authorities.[1] The city now bears the name of Salonichi. As early as at the time of the Roman dominion there dwelt a numerous body of Jews at Thessalonica, as is even now the case, because, being situated on a fine gulf, it drove an extensive trade. To this body of Jews many Gentiles of consideration, especially women, had united themselves as proselytes. (Acts xvii. 1, ss.) Now, when St Paul, about the year 53, visited Thessalonica with Silas, on his second missionary journey,[2] he made his appearance three Sabbaths one after another in the synagogue there, and showed from the prophecies of the Old Testament that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah. The space of a few weeks sufficed to assemble the church in Thessalonica; a remarkable testimony to the Divine power which manifested itself in the labours of St Paul. It is true, Schott thinks the three Sabbaths mentioned in Acts xvii. 2 related merely to his labours among the *Jews*, and that it is to be presumed St Paul had laboured a longer time among the *Gentiles*. But, according to the representation of the Acts, the tumult of the Jews, which drove St Paul out of Thessalonica, followed immediately on the third Sabbath; there is no mention at all of special labours of St Paul merely among the Gentile inhabitants of Thessalonica. But when Schott lays a stress on the circumstance that St Paul worked at his craft

[1] See Tafel's Historia Thessalonica. Tubing., 1825.

[2] See Schottii *isagoge hist. critica in utramque epistolam Pauli ad Thessalonicenses.* Jenæ, 1830, and Burgerhoudt *de cœtûs Christ. Thess. ortu fatisque, et prioris epist. consilio atque argumento.* Lugd. Bat., 1825.

in Thessalonica (1 Thess. ii. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 7, 8), which he did only where he meant to remain a rather long time, that objection is avoided simply by saying that St Paul seems, no doubt, to have had the design of remaining a longer time than usual in Thessalonica, but was hindered in doing so by the tumult. Finally, the manifold supplies, of which mention is made Phil. iv. 16, refer, not to the *first* sojourn of St Paul in Thessalonica, but to the *later* one, which followed upon his flight from Ephesus (Acts xx. 1, ss.). Among the dwellers in Thessalonica who became believers but few *Jews* were found (Acts xvii. 4: τινὲς ἐξ αὐτῶν [scil. Ἰουδαίων verse 1] ἐπίσθησαν); on the other hand, however, a great number of *proselytes*, especially many women of rank. This success excited the envy of the Jews, who raised a mob which drove St Paul away. The rioters assembled before the house of a certain Jason, with whom St Paul dwelt (Acts xvii. 5); and, as they did not find St Paul and Silas, dragged Jason along with some of the brethren before the magistrates. In their malice they here accused the same of high treason, in that they acknowledged another sovereign than Cæsar, namely Jesus. For the rest, one perceives from this charge, what the Epistles themselves confirm, that St Paul might in Thessalonica have represented Christ especially as the King of the kingdom of God which was to be expected. Now, in order to moderate the rage of the Jews, St Paul left the city, and went first to Berœa, then to Athens. His yearning after the Christians in Thessalonica, to whom he had only been able to devote himself so short a time, left him, however, no peace; he made, starting probably from Berœa, two attempts to return to that city, but in vain. (See 1 Thess. ii. 18.) There remained, therefore, nothing for him but to send thither Timothy at least from Athens (1 Thess. iii. 1, ss.) in order to collect information as to the state of things there. St Paul meanwhile betook himself to Corinth, and here Timothy, who brought with him the best accounts of the young church in Thessalonica, again met with the apostle. (Acts xviii. 5; 1 Thess. iii. 6.) Hereupon St Paul wrote from Corinth the first Epistle to the Thessalonians, taking notice of the reports of Timothy; its composition, therefore, falls within the year 54, or thereabouts. A very short time thereafter the second Epistle was also sent off. (Cf. the general Introd. to the life of St Paul, p. 24.) The Epistles to the Thessalonians are, accordingly, the earliest among the apostolical writings which have been preserved to us. They fall some years even before the com-

position of the Epistle to the Galatians. This view, which is all but generally received by the critics, has been in the last instance again victoriously defended by Schneckenburger (Klaiber's Stud. for 1834, part i., p. 137, ss.) against Wurm, who thought it necessary to set the composition of these Epistles after the journey from Corinth to Jerusalem, only hinted at by St Luke, to be supplied in Acts xviii. 22. (Tübingen Journal for 1833, part i.) But Wurm has on his side again refuted, with striking arguments, Schrader's (vol. i., pp. 90, sq., 164, sq.) utterly inadmissible hypothesis, supposing the Epistles to the Thessalonians to have been written during the three months' stay of St Paul in Greece (Acts xx. 2, ss.), and Köhler's, who places them even as late as the latest times of St Paul's life, after the Acts (pp. 68, ss., 112, ss.).

Now the first Epistle to the Thessalonians contains, like that to the Ephesians, entirely general encouragements to the life in faith and in love. Only in the fourth chapter (iv. 13, ss.) mention is made of a particular point which affords an insight into the special condition of the church in Thessalonica, and at the same time was the occasion of the composition of the second Epistle. For, as we have already observed above, St Paul seems in Thessalonica to have especially preached Christ, as King of the kingdom of God, and the hope of the setting up of that kingdom on earth. This the Christians there had eagerly caught up, but not without misapprehensions and mistakes, as being inexperienced in that difficult field. Their view was directed more to externals, more to the outward glory of that kingdom, than inwardly to the moral conditions of participation in the same, and to its spiritual nature. It was indeed because of this outward relation to such hopes that it also happened that (as Timothy, we may suppose, had reported) the Christians were in anxiety whether their dear departed ones would not lose the kingdom of God, and those only come to the enjoyment of it who should be alive at the coming again of the Lord. Now St Paul relieves them on that point by the assurance that the dead would rise first, and the living be, along with them, lifted into the air to meet the Lord. The time, however, of His advent did not admit of being fixed, as the Lord would come like a thief in the night. They should, therefore, continually expect Him, and be found watching as children of the light. However, these instructions by no means relieved the Christians in Thessalonica. On the contrary, symptoms developed themselves there which afforded reason to fear that the

Church would become a prey to fanaticism. Probably St Paul was indebted for the knowledge of these errors to an Epistle of the Christians in Thessalonica to him. He therefore replied immediately in a second Epistle, in order to bring back those in error as soon as possible into the right way. For it is apparent from 2 Thess. ii. 2 that the believers in Thessalonica were thrown into great agitation, and that, too, not merely by pretended revelations and prophecies, but also by a fictitious Epistle under the name of St Paul, from which they thought they might gather that the coming of Christ was quite near. They had in consequence of those announcements given up their handicrafts and callings (2 Thess. iii. 11), and went about in a state of religious bustle but real idleness; a proceeding, of which, according to the first Epistle (1 Thess. iv. 11), signs had shown themselves even earlier among the Christians of Thessalonica. With regard to that error, as if Christ's coming were certainly immediately impending (whereas in the first Epistle, v. 1, ss. it was only asserted the Lord *could* come at any time), St Paul now details the necessary conditions, without which that coming would not take place. It is particularly the appearance of Antichrist which must first precede the coming of Christ, but *that* is still kept back by something. Before, therefore, that something is removed the Lord comes not. Now this explanation (2 Thess. ii. 3, ss.) is extremely important, because it is the only connected communication of St Paul's on the end of the world. We therefore obtain by means of it a necessary complement to the doctrinal system of St Paul. But, if we compare these elucidations as to the end of all things with the intimations on that subject in the later Epistles, all that can be referred to the second coming of Christ and the kingdom of God in these latter loses its prominence in a remarkable way. St Paul seems in later times not only to have given up the hope of living to see Christ's second coming *himself* (compare Phil. i. 23 with 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17), but also to have allowed in his teaching the proposition of the approach of the *outward* kingdom of God to retire into the background, and to have brought more forward the *inward* aspect of the kingdom of God. One need not hesitate to assume that the experience of what misapprehensions that doctrine, preached to the neglect of others, had given occasion to in Thessalonica, brought St Paul to this modification of his form of teaching. His dogmatical conviction remained unaltered, St Paul only modified his manner of propounding it according to

the necessities of his mostly Gentile auditors, who, after such experience, justly seemed to him but ill adapted to receive that doctrine pure and unclouded. Without concealing it either in later times, he yet never permitted it to appear except as an appendix on the basis of the foundation of the new birth first inwardly laid down, in which form no further abuse of it was then to be apprehended.

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

The *first* Epistle to the Thessalonians belongs to the few in the New Testament which have had the luck neither in ancient nor in modern times to be attacked with regard to their authenticity. Even the most ancient of the Fathers use it as an authentic apostolical writing, and the carping criticism of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries has also been forced till now to recognise its collective contents as genuine. It has not fared quite so well with the *second* of these Epistles; for, though it was clearly in ancient times just as much recognised as the *first*, yet modern critics have thought they remarked in it something that seemed suspicious to them. No one has yet ventured, however, decidedly to deny St Paul's authorship of the second Epistle on account of those points. In fact, too, such weighty arguments have been brought forward in favour of the authenticity of it[1] by the defenders of the same, and such sufficient solutions of the doubts which were propounded, that we cite the chief articles on which they have attempted to ground the doubts only for the sake of noticing them. J. G. Chr. Schmidt (Library for Criticism and Exegesis, vol. ii., p. 380, ss.; Introd. to the New Testament, vol. ii., p. 256) expressed first and most decidedly the doubts as to the authenticity of the second Epistle, which De Wette (Introd., p. 229) repeats with but slight approbation. Now Schmidt insists on the following points: that there is no mention at all of the first Epistle in the second; that the latter is on the whole a mere repetition of the first; that the author of the second lays a stress on his being the *writer* of it, as if he had a distinct purpose in it (2 Thess. ii. 15, iii. 17); that the mention of a fictitious Epistle (2 Thess. ii. 2) points to his

[1] See especially J. G. Reiche authentiæ poster. ad Thess. epist. vindiciæ, Gött. 1829. 4, and Guericke, Beitr., p. 92, ss.

own consciousness of having fathered an Epistle on St Paul; that St Paul himself could not possibly have thought of it, as he had written but two Epistles, that to the Galatians, and the first to the Thessalonians. (For Schmidt supposes an earlier composition of the Epistle to the Galatians.) But these arguments are plainly one and all without any significance, for, even if the Epistle be authentic, there is no absolute necessity for making mention of the first Epistle in it; the assertion that the *second* Epistle is a mere repetition of the *first* shows itself completely untrue; it is only the first chapter that is of similar purport, the second and third are altogether independent. Of a distinct purpose in the writer to designate himself as St Paul so much only is true that, on account of the fraud which was attempted with a supposititious letter, a mark of authenticity is added. But such an occurrence is by no means improbable, considering the great authority of St Paul; it does not come under consideration in that inquiry, whether he had already written many letters or but few; the only question is whether one might hope to attain an object by means of such a fiction under an apostolical name; that this *was* possible in Thessalonica is sufficiently vouched for by the attachment of the Christians there to the person of St Paul. But now the apostle had, no doubt, at that time even, already written many Epistles, only we by accident possess none of the earlier ones. De Wette's question: "Did the apostle even *then* think of writing many Epistles?" (Introd., p. 198) appears, accordingly, completely superfluous. The apostle's writing Epistles was a natural consequence of his position towards the churches, not an act of reflection on his part; if he did not wish to drop all connection with them, there remained to him no other means, as they were in such remote countries that he could seldom visit them in person. Certainly the circumstance, which Schmidt lays a stress on, that in 2 Thess. iii. 17 a mark of the authenticity of the Epistles is given, which however is not found everywhere in the Epistles of St Paul that we have, would be important; but it actually *is* found in 1 Cor. xvi. 21; Gal. vi. 11; Col. iv. 18; Philem. v. 19; where it does not occur, either special circumstances prevailed, which made such a precaution superfluous, or the fear of the repetition of such frauds was lost altogether. Thus, then, but two arguments are left, by means of which Schmidt justifies his suspicion against the authenticity of the second Epistle to the Thessalonians with some show of reason. Firstly, the doctrine of Antichrist, as it is brought

forward in 2 Thess. ii., is said to be not in St Paul's manner; secondly, such a contrast is said to exist with the first Epistle that it almost seems as if it were meant to excite suspicion against the same. But, even if the doctrine of Antichrist is not found further propounded elsewhere in St Paul's Epistles, it is not on that account against St Paul's doctrines. *That* could only be asserted if passages could be pointed out in the rest of his Epistles which were opposed to the doctrine of Antichrist. Such, however, are not to be found. St Paul's silence on the subject in his later Epistles is satisfactorily explained by the arguments already given above. But the other assertion, of contradictions of the first Epistle, looks somewhat comical by the side of the previous one, that the second Epistle to the Thessalonians is a mere repetition of the first. One does not rightly perceive how they can subsist side by side. But, overlooking *that*, what then is that contradiction said to consist in? Nothing more can be cited than that in the *first* Epistle (iv. 13, ss.) Christ's second coming seems to be represented as just impending, whereas in the *second* (ii. 3, ss.) signs are given which must first appear. The two, however, are very easily reconciled by the assumption that St Paul imagined those signs might very quickly be realized. No doubt, experience has not established *that*, but surely St Paul also freely admits that neither he nor in general any man knows the day and hour of that coming. As long, therefore, as no more tenable arguments can be brought forward, we may be perfectly easy with regard to the authenticity of the *second* Epistle as well.[1]

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

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

[1] It was not till after the completion of the work that Dr Kern's essay (Tübing. Magazine for 1839, part 2), in which the unauthenticity of the second Epistle to the Thessalonians is decidedly asserted, came to hand. However, this scholar founds his assertion entirely on his interpretation of the passage, ii. 1–12. We shall therefore show, in the exposition of the same, that those verses contain nothing which can lead us to infer for them a date after the time of the apostles.

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

In the second part of the first Epistle (iv. 1–v. 28), St Paul in the first paragraph gives exhortations to some Christian virtues (iv. 1–12), he then comes in the fifth paragraph (iv. 13–v. 11) to the question as to the latter days, and shows that the dead by no means lose the kingdom of God, but would be with the Lord at the same time as the living. With respect, however, to the time of Christ's coming St Paul remarks that the Lord comes quite unexpectedly, and therefore His coming must be constantly looked for; they should consequently walk like children of light, in order to be found waking and not sleeping (iv. 13–v. 11). To this are finally annexed in the sixth paragraph some further exhortations, with the prayer that God may sanctify them in spirit, soul, and body. A blessing concludes the Epistle (v. 12–28).

The second and shorter Epistle contains three paragraphs, the first of which (i. 1–12), after the greeting, begins with the remark, how much reason he, St Paul, has to praise God for the patient faith of his readers under all persecutions, by means of which God intended to make them worthy of His kingdom, on the coming in of which a punishing of the wicked, as well as a rewarding of the good, would take place. Therefore also he prayed continually for them, and wished that they might be filled with all good things unto the glorification of the name of Christ. To this is subjoined in the second paragraph (ii. 1–17) the ex-

hortation not to let themselves be troubled by any prophecy, doctrine, or pretended Epistles, as if the day of Christ were already there; on the contrary, the man of sin must first be revealed, whose revealing is however withheld by something; when *that* is taken away, then he would appear, but Christ would subdue him and make known His whole glory, to a participation in which *they* too are called. He must, therefore, exhort them most urgently to take fast hold on his traditions, and would beseech God to establish them in every good word and work. Finally, in the third paragraph (iii. 1–18) St Paul calls on the readers to pray for Him, in order to promote the dissemination of the Gospel, and to save him from the violence of the wicked. To themselves, however, he expresses the sure hope that they would act according to his exhortations, avoid all disorderly conduct, and especially after his example faithfully continue their outward labour; he threatens the disobedient with emphatical chastisement. A blessing concludes the Epistle.

§ 4. COMMENTATORS ON THE TWO EPISTLES.

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

EXPOSITION

OF THE

FIRST EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

I.

PART FIRST.

(I. 1–III. 13.)

§ 1. THANKSGIVING FOR THE FAITH OF THE READERS.

(I. 1–10.)

Together with St Paul, Silvanus and Timothy send salutations. According to Acts xvi. 1, 19, they had accompanied him in his missionary labours in Macedonia; then they had at first indeed remained behind in Berœa, but soon came after him to Athens (Acts xvii. 14, 15), whence Timothy was sent to Thessalonica, and met with St Paul in Corinth, as has already been detailed in the Introduction. One of the two is probably the writer of these Epistles, St Paul dictating to him, for, according to 2 Thess. iii. 17, St Paul had appended the salutation alone with his own hand. The addition: ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ καὶ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ in the salutations of both Epistles, for which at 2 Thess. i. 1 the fuller phrase: πατρὶ ἡμῶν is read, is peculiar. For in *several Epistles* ἐν Χρ. Ἰ., it is true, is found (Phil. i. 1; Col. i. 1), not joined with ἐκκλησία, however, but with τοῖς ἁγίοις. But in *no* salutation except in those in these two Epistles do we read ἐν Θεῷ πατρί. Now it is a question whether the ἐν refers to the salutation itself, for instance with χαίρετε supplied (Winer's Gramm., p. 129), or is to be joined to τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ with οὔσῃ supplied. The absence of the article τῇ is in favour of the *former*, in favour of the *latter* is the apostle's custom constantly to unite the formula ἐν Χριστῷ in the salutations with the *persons*, never with the *salu-*

tation itself. The latter argument seems to me the more preponderating that it is quite unimaginable that St Paul should have left his beloved church in Thessalonica, whose faith he immediately rates so highly, without any epithet of praise; the absence of the article is then to be explained by the fact that ἐκκλησία ἐν Θεῷ κ. τ. λ. is conceived as a collective idea. The last words: ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς—Χριστοῦ are wanting in B.F.G. and other critical authorities; however, for all that, even Lachmann has not ventured to strike them out downright, but has only included them in crotchets; without them the salutation would be altogether too bald.

Ver. 2, 3. In the usual words (Rom. i. 8, 9; Ephes. i. 16; 2 Thess. i. 3; 2 Tim. i. 3) St Paul first of all expresses his thanks to God for his readers, of whom he makes mention in his prayers, while he remembers their faith, their love, their hope. In 1 Thess. v. 8, these three Christian cardinal virtues stand in the same order as here, while at 1 Cor. xiii. 13 (see the Comm. there) love stands last. The latter collocation is more in accordance with the *abstract* style of contemplation, in the *concrete* Christian life hope appears as the last and highest, because it is the connecting link between *this* world and the world *to come.* Each of the three virtues has, however, an epithet, which are not merely, as Koppe thinks, to be taken paraphrastically, but are meant to represent those virtues in *their practical exercise.* They are ἔργον τῆς πίστεως, κόπος τῆς ἀγάπης, ὑπομονὴ τῆς ἐλπίδος. The two latter designations are intelligible of themselves. Κόπος τῆς ἀγάπης is meant to characterize love not as a mere beneficent feeling, but as a power which is active in self-denial and exertion; in the same way ὑπομονὴ τῆς ἐλπίδος describes hope as it held fast and proved in combat with temptations to doubt. But the phrase ἔργον τῆς πίστεως is difficult. Several interpreters (to name some, Calovius, Wolf, and others), took it so, that by it faith would be described as a work of God in the souls of men, as it is, no doubt, to be taken at 2 Thess. i. 11. But there is nothing in the context here to lead us to lay a stress upon this at all, the interpreter must rather let himself be guided in the acceptation of the ἔργον τῆς πίστεως by the analogy with the other two virtues named here. As in *those* the proving them in real life is insisted on, so in the case of *faith* too that aspect is here designated. In 1 Cor. xvi. 3; 1 Tim. vi. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 7, the discourse is of a fight of faith, by which this passage is elucidated. For, though faith is a work of

God in men's souls, just as love and hope are, yet man bears not an absolutely passive relation towards it; he has to fight against the faith-stifling power of sin in him and in the world. The phrase ἔργον τῆς πίστεως is meant to denote that independent activity in the life of faith. It must not, therefore, be taken as exactly = ἔργα τ. π., but it is to be translated: "labour or conflict of faith." For the effects, which proceed from the living faith maintained and increased by conflict, are particularly mentioned in love and hope. The whole passage, therefore, is meant to paint the independent manner in which the Christians in Thessalonica let Christianity become operative in them, and know how to uphold it against all attacks of the world.—The genitive τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is not to be joined with ἐλπίδος merely, as if the sense were: "of the hope of the speedy coming again of Christ," for this special utterance of hope cannot be alone spoken of here, since hope is taken quite generally, just as faith and love are; this genitive rather refers to all three virtues, in order to show that they are one and all derived from Christ, and are instilled into man by His Spirit. The last words of the third verse, however, ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν, admit of no other construction than with μνημονεύοντες; but the remembering, the thinking of, in God's sight is = to the εὐχαριστεῖν, or to the μνείαν ποιεῖσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν ἡμῶν, so that thus verse 3 is to be considered as only a detailed elucidation of verse 2.

Ver. 4, 5. That thanksgiving, continues St Paul, is derived in him from the knowledge (εἰδότες) that they are really elect, and *that* knowledge, again, is grounded on the matter of fact, that he, St Paul, was able to work so powerfully among them. The train of thought is, therefore, this: "I know ye are elect, for, where elect are, there God gives His Spirit also, in order to bring the election to completion." This certainly sounds quite predestinarian; but, that St Paul does not mean personal self-activity to be excluded, plainly appears from ver. 3, where he insisted on that very quality. (See a more accurate account of the idea of *election* at Rom. ix.) St Paul here means only to show how he, from the way in which the Spirit operated in him at a certain place, drew a conclusion as to the disposition of the persons there. Where it manifested itself powerfully, argued he, there must be elect; where the contrary was the case, he concluded the contrary. Thus, at Acts xvi. 7, the Spirit suffered him not to travel through Bithynia, because there were no elect

there. (Ver. 4. ἀδελφοὶ ἠγαπημένοι ὑπὸ Θεοῦ, or, as it stands 2 Thess. ii. 13, ὑπὸ κυρίου, denotes the faithful as the true Israelites, as they are called in the *Old* Testament also. See 2 Chron. xx. 7.—Ver. 5. The τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν is = κήρυγμα ἡμῶν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, by which the εἰς ὑμᾶς also is explained. See at ii. 9. As to the antithesis of λόγος and δύναμις, or ἔργον, see Col. ii. 23; 1 John iii. 18.—The words: καὶ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ ἐν πληροφορίᾳ πολλῇ explain the δύναμις epexegetically, and, indeed, so that the Spirit renders the *objective*, the full assurance the *subjective*, side prominent. As to πληροφορία, πληροφορεῖσθαι, see Rom. iv. 21, xiv. 5; Col. ii. 2.—The last words: καθὼς οἴδατε, κ.τ.λ. appeal for confirmation to the knowledge of the readers themselves.—The οἷοι is, according to the context, to be taken: "in what power and freshness of spirit." By δι' ὑμᾶς all secondary objects are excluded: "for your own sake, for the salvation of your souls.")

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

Athens and Corinth belonged, according to that, to Achaia. See on Acts xix. 21.)

Ver. 8. A pattern for others the church in Thessalonica could have become only when their faith had been heard of; but this, continues St Paul, was the case, and to such a degree, that the report of the same had spread everywhere even (ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ), wherefore he (St Paul) had no need to say anything about it (viz. about their faith). According to this, there results as a climax in the sentence, that the whole world is put in opposition to the one country (Greece), to which also the collocation of the οὐ μόνον—ἀλλὰ is alone suitable. But now it is understood at once from ver. 7, that not *all men*, but only *all believers*, in all countries are meant as those to whom the faith of the Christians in Thessalonica had penetrated. One might suppose, however, that even more was couched in this verse than the information that the knowledge of the life of faith of the Thessalonians had spread abroad even beyond the borders of Greece. The phrase ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἐξελήλυθεν, it is true, cannot well be understood of the spreading abroad of the faith to other cities from Thessalonica as the starting point; if it were meant to express *that*, the words must have run: ἡ πίστις ἀφ' ὑμῶν ἐξελήλυθεν. It is clearly meant to declare only: *the report of* your faith has come to other believers. But it seems to be otherwise with the first clause: ἀφ' ὑμῶν ἐξήχηται ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου. These words, viewed in themselves, *can* be translated: Christianity has spread from you to others, *i.e.* you are become efficient under the further propagation of the Gospel. But *that* would be a statement of wider purport than the mere spreading of the fact that the Christians in Thessalonica continued so lively in the faith; besides, *then* the οὐ μόνον—ἀλλὰ would not suit well. Moreover, it is not known historically that Christianity *had* spread further from Thessalonica as a centre. The course which Grotius, Storr, Flatt, Koppe, follow for the solution of this difficulty, but which Pelt has already justly designated as monstrous, is clearly quite inadmissible. For they want to join οὐ μόνον with ἐξήχηται, and ἀλλὰ with ἐξελήλυθεν, so that ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ would merely stand parallel with Macedonia and Achaia. The train of thought appears quite simple, as soon as one only takes the ἀφ' ἡμῶν ἐξήχηται ὁ λόγος = ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἐξελήλυθεν. St Paul puts foremost the source of the report (ἀφ' ὑμῶν), and on account of the genitive κυρίου could not add ὑμῶν to λόγος, as he subsequently did to πίστις. But the word of the Lord is here to

be taken subjectively, as the word received by the Christians in Thessalonica (ver. 8), so that the passage is to be rendered thus: "from you (*i.e.* your church) as a starting point, not only has your reception of the word of the Lord become publicly known in Macedonia and Achaia, but the report of your faith in God has also penetrated to all countries." (Ἐξηχεῖσθαι is not found again in the New Testament, but at Joel iii. 14; Sir. xl. 13, it occurs in the sense: "to resound, to sound."—Καὶ is wanting after ἀλλὰ in A.B.D.F.G., and is, no doubt, an interpolation, as it usually follows upon οὐ μόνον. Yet it is wanting also at Matt. iv. 4; Acts xix. 26. [See Viger, p. 522.] As to πίστις πρὸς see Gal. vi. 10; 2 Cor. iii. 4; Philem. ver. 5.—A.B.C.D.E.F.G. read ἔχειν ἡμᾶς for ἡμᾶς ἔχειν, and it is undoubtedly preferable. As to the rest, the ὥστε μὴ κ. τ. λ. is not to be understood: "so that I have no need here in this Epistle to say anything about it," but "so that I have no need anywhere in the course of my personal labours first to make your faith known by recommending it, for all know of it already.")

Ver. 9, 10. We need praise you to none, for men themselves have already related to me how ye have been converted, and how ye walk. In the ὁποῖος, πῶς is expressed not merely the quickness but also the radicalness of the conversion. (Ver. 9. Αὐτοὶ are all those to whom St Paul preaches, who come in contact with him. How the copyists could alter περὶ ὑμῶν for ἡμῶν is very explicable, and the ἡμῶν is to be explained by the ἔσχομεν following. St Paul only means to say: "they show of me inasmuch as ye have received me." Εἴσοδος refers not merely to the outward entrance, but also to the access which St Paul found to their hearts. Compare ii. 1.—As to ἐπιστρέφειν see Luke i. 16; Acts xxvi. 18. The conversion is attributed to *God*, because St Paul is thinking of the Gentile standing ground of the readers. If *Jews* were in question, πρὸς τὸν κύριον would certainly be put. The absolute infinitives, δουλεύειν, ἀναμένειν, are put to denote the aim of the conversion, for which commonly the infinitive with εἰς τὸ is put. For, while in the ἐπιστρέφειν faith is couched, the δουλεύειν denotes love, and the ἀναμένειν hope, both which proceed from the former. Θεὸς ζῶν (= אֱלֹהִים חַי) and ἀληθινὸς (= אֱלֹהֵי אֱמֶת.) [2 Kings xix. 4; Isaiah lxv. 16; Rev. iii. 4] form the antithesis to the dead unsubstantial idols. The expectation of the second coming of Christ, in which Christian hope concentrates itself, is named as the last point. At Phil. iii. 20 ἀπεκδέχεσθαι stands for ἀναμένειν.—

Ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν scil. ἐρχόμενον.—Ῥύεσθαι = σώζειν 2 Cor. i. 10.—Ὀργὴ ἐρχομένη = μέλλουσα. See at Matt. iii. 7; Rom. ii. 5, iii. 5.)

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

(II. 1–16.)

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

Ver. 1, 2. First, St Paul reminds his readers of the way in which he appeared among them in the beginning. "He had, it is true," says he, "had even before in Philippi much to suffer; he had also in Thessalonica itself taught in much contention, but still with joyful heart and in God's strength." These two verses are substantially of equivalent purport with i. 5. (Compare also 1 Cor. ii. 4, 5.) The phrase ἔισοδος οὐ κενὴ γέγονε answers to the ἐν δυνάμει, ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ; the παῤῥησία *here* is the outward expression of the πληροφορία *there*. As to the previous sufferings and ill-usage of St Paul in Philippi, of *them* Acts xvi. informs us. But the ἐν πολλῷ ἀγῶνι, which refers to St Paul's sojourn in Thessalonica, can be referred at the same time to an outward and an inward contention; but, according to ver. 9, it refers certainly to the former in particular. (Ver. 1. On ἔισοδος see i. 9.—Προπάσχειν is not found again in the New Testament.—On παῤῥησιάζεσθαι see Acts xiii. 46, xviii. 26. The ἐν τῷ Θεῷ is to be immediately joined with it, as the παῤῥησία is meant to be represented as founded on the living union of the soul with God.)

Ver. 3, 4. To the idea of the παῤῥησία what follows is so united by means of γὰρ, that the purity of his intention, the consciousness of having no impure underhand designs, is a guarantee to the apostle that God's protection does not fail him. The παράκλησις is to be understood here in the wider sense of his labours

in Christian teaching generally (Acts xiii. 15, xv. 31). St Paul first denies of these that they had an impure origin (ἐκ), then that they were connected with an inherent perverseness (ἐν). The πλάνη is more accurately defined by δόλος which follows; it denotes the state of the being deceived, be it by the deceit of others, or by fanaticism, while δόλος denotes one's own intention to deceive. The ἀκαθαρσία is not to be understood here of sexual, but of moral impurity; covetousness is certainly especially pointed to in it. That such reproaches *were* made St Paul the section 2 Cor. chap. xi. to xiii. especially shows.—Verse 4 puts the positive side in opposition to the negative. "We speak (*i.e.* work in our office) so as being approved, *i.e.* acknowledged of God, in order to preserve the Gospel intrusted to us, not as pleasing *men* but *God*." But now we should take this idea in a sense contradicting the doctrine of St Paul to the utmost, if we understood it thus: "I have been tried by God who knows all hearts, and have stood the test; on account of my purity and sincerity God has intrusted His Gospel to me, and in the same purity also I now preach it, pleasing God alone, seeking no man's honour." For, as (Rom. i. 2) St Paul denies *all men* purity, so he denies it *himself* also; every thing good in man is God's work of grace in him (2 Cor. iii. 5, 6). But now, if St Paul's disposition is something operated in him by God, it seems obscure how St Paul can say, "we have been approved of God as such to whom the Gospel can be intrusted;" it seems as if the idea should of necessity have run thus: "as God, in His election by grace, has made us able through regeneration to preserve the Gospel committed to us, we are also in a condition to labour in purity for the same. But in the δεδοκιμάσμεθα seems to be expressed not the being created anew, but the trial, and, in consequence of that trial, the approval of what already existed. One seeks in vain for explanation from the interpreters here; perhaps, however, the following remarks may throw some light on the subject. All positive good St Paul attributes to God as its real source; on the other hand, he derives just as decidedly evil only from the human will as the final cause; this will, now, can, in spite of the universal sinfulness, still be corrupted and polluted in a very different degree in different men; the *one* may be so far pure, that, when he sees the light, he receives it as such, without polluting it by a sinful taint; the *other*, on the contrary, has added so much of his own guilt to his innate sinfulness, that he pollutes even what is holy. According to this

then, St Paul can say, perfectly in harmony with his fundamental ideas, that God committed the Gospel to him because He had found him approved; not as if St Paul had been by nature good, but only so that he was in a state to receive in purity the holy matter which was to be committed to him, and not to corrupt it by mingling his sin with it; therefore on account of the *negative* good in him. Man in all his sinfulness can still, however, be sincere and upright, acknowledge good as good, evil as evil; such upright souls God can alone make use of as labourers in His kingdom, and as such St Paul represents himself here. (In verse 3 οὐδὲ is certainly on the authority of A.B.C.D.F.G. to be preferred to οὔτε with Lachmann and Winer [Gramm., p. 460]. Verse 4. As to the well-known construction of πεπίστευμαι see Winer's Gramm., p. 237; Gal. ii. 7; 1 Cor. ix. 17.—Rom. iii. 2.—Θεὸς ὁ δοκιμάζων τὰς καρδίας see Acts i. 24, xv. 8; 1 Sam. xvi. 7; 1 Kings viii. 39.)

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

Ver. 7, 8. The ἀλλ' ἐγενήθημεν ἤπιοι (which latter word is only found again at 2 Tim. ii. 24) comes in aptly in opposition to the assumption that is couched in the δόξαν ζητεῖν. St Paul compares his indulgent gentleness, as he exhibited it in Thessalonica, to the care which a nursing mother devotes to her little children; as *she* dedicates herself, her own life, to the children, so, says St Paul, *he* also gives himself to them, as to such as have become dear to him. Without the clause: δυνάμενοι ἐν βάρει εἶναι, ὡς Χριστοῦ ἀπόστολοι the connection is clear enough, with it the connection is confused, for which reason, indeed, Griesbach has separated it by crotchets from the rest of the discourse. That is to say, one feels tempted to take the ἐν βάρει εἶναι as = ἐπιβαρεῖν (ver. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 8), or καταβαρεῖν (2 Cor. xii. 16), and to refer it to the bodily support, which St Paul as an apostle could demand, as indeed Baumgarten, Koppe, and Flatt, have taken the passage, after the example of Theodoret. But, taken so, the passage will not agree at all well with what precedes, and, if taken with what follows, the ἀλλὰ is plainly unsuitable. But, if one only takes ἐν βάρει εἶναι in the wider sense, viz. of the authority and dignity that belonged to St Paul as an apostle, generally, of which properties the ἐξουσία to allow himself to be maintained by the churches was only *one* conquence among *several*, a satisfactory connection presents itself. For the δυνάμενοι κ.τ.λ. connects itself with the preceding ζητεῖν δόξαν thus: "we seek no glory of men, although we should surely, as apostles of Christ (clothed with that exalted dignity), be in a condition to present ourselves with high authority; but we have not done that, we have made ourselves efficient among you with indulgent gentleness." So Vitringa,[1] Wolf, Pelt, Schott, have already interpreted correctly. (Ver. 7 Τροφὸς is properly "a nurse," here "a nursing mother," on account of the τὰ ἑαυτῆς τέκνα. The ὡς ἄν, with the subjunctive following, is to be taken as *utcunque*. See Schott, p. 68.—Instead of ἱμειρόμενοι the reading of the *text. rec.*, ὁμειρόμενοι is to be read according to the preponderating majority of the MSS. But the word is found nowhere else. The lexicographers only have it, but perhaps merely from this passage. Theophylact explains it by ὁμοῦ and εἴρειν, *firmiter alicui adhærere*. [See Winer's remarks on it, Gramm., p. 92, sq.] Hesychius and Phavorinus explain it by ἐπιθυμεῖν. In any case it is, according to the context, quite synonymous with ἱμείρεσθαι.—The οὐ μόνον—ἀλλὰ καὶ might perhaps have something in it to give

[1] See Vitringa's Essay on this passage in the *observatt. sacræ.*, p. 852, ss.

one pause, in so far as the Gospel of God certainly seems to be more than one's own life. But St Paul here considers the Gospel not in its objective value, but as the gift entrusted to him for distribution. Now, the proclamation of the Gospel is a *duty* to St Paul (1 Cor. ix. 16), but the giving up his life is a voluntary *act of love*; the latter, therefore, is set higher.—Ἐγενήθητε is to be read at the close of ver. 8; γεγένησθε, which Griesbach has in error put into the text, proceeds from such copyists as took εὐδοκοῦμεν for the present tense, whereas it is the imperfect, the augment being omitted, which is often the case in the words compounded with εἰ. See Schott ad h. l.)

Ver. 9. For a proof of his pretensionlessness, St Paul appeals to the fact, well known to the Christians in Thessalonica, that he maintained himself there by the work of his hands, in order to prove a burden to no one. Of the reasons which moved St Paul to this renunciation of something appertaining to him as a matter of right, we have already spoken in detail at 1 Cor. ix; 2 Cor. xi. It is only to be observed here, that St Paul perhaps finds himself impelled to lay this before the Thessalonians, because they had, in consequence of religious idleness, begun to abandon their handicrafts. (1 Thess. iv. 11; 2 Thess. iii. 11.) (The expression μόχθος is stronger than κόπος. See 2 Thess. iii. 8.—The ἐργάζεσθαι here is to be understood of the exercise of the handicraft, which has the object, among others, of relieving the Christians in Thessalonica from all the burden of his maintenance.—On the construction of the κηρύσσειν with εἰς see Mark xiii. 10; Luke xxiv. 47; 1 Pet. i. 25; Winer's Gramm., p. 189, sq.)

Ver. 10–12. As in this one point, so too in everything else, respecting his blameless walking, and his faithful, fatherly, labours among them, St Paul appeals to the Thessalonian Christians' own witnessing. (Ver. 10. ὁσίως denotes the relation towards God [see at Luke i. 75], δικαίως and ἀμέμπτως the relation towards men, and indeed δικαίως from the *positive*, ἀμέμπτως from the *negative*, point of view.—Ver. 11. As St Paul in *verse* 7 compared himself to a *careful mother*, so he *now* compares himself to a conscientious father who brings up his children to all that is good. The words παρακαλεῖν, παραμυθεῖσθαι, and μαρτυρεῖσθαι, form a climax. [See Phil. ii. 1 as to the two first.] Μαρτυρεῖσθαι = הָעִיד *obtestari*, "to conjure by all that is holy."—In ver. 12 βασιλεία καὶ δόξα stands as ἓν διὰ δυοῖν for βασιλεία ἔνδοξος. That St Paul by this kingdom does not understand merely the *inner* kingdom of God we shall

see farther on. [Comp. on the idea of the βασ. τ. Θ. in general the note on Matt. iii. 2.] As to the rest, it is not implied in the καλεῖν εἰς that the Thessalonians are already in that kingdom, they are only called to be citizens of it at some future time. In the connection in which the apposition τοῦ καλοῦντος κ.τ.λ. stands with the εἰς τὸ περιπατῆσαι ὑμᾶς ἀξίως τοῦ Θεοῦ is intimated a strong motive for a serious, holy, walk: "to walk worthy of God, who has, out of love to you, prepared such glory for you," therefore to love *Him* again, who has first loved *you*.)

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

ably: "which is made effectual in you." But the Word of God is itself the principle of all moral activity, it is not made effectual by means of something else. In the participle τοῖς πιστεύουσιν the condition of all efficiency is pointed to: "In you who believe, *i.e.*, because and inasmuch as ye believe and continue believing."

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

Ver. 15, 16. St Paul, however, uses this comparison of his readers with the Christians in Judea, in order to remind the former of the old sin of the Jews and their hostile feelings towards him and his labours among the Gentiles. This diatribe is only explained by the assumption that St Paul wished to draw the attention of the Thessalonian Christians to the intrigues of those men, with whom the Judaïzing Christians stood quite on a level, as it was to be foreseen that they would not leave this church undisturbed either. (Verse 15. Christ Himself represents the Jews as murderers of the prophets, Matt. xxiii. 31, 37.—The πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἐνάντιοι reminds one of the *odium generis humani*, that Tacitus (Hist. v. 5) reproaches the Jews with. As to the rest, it is understood without explanation, that *that*, according to St Paul's meaning, is not couched in the Jewish national character, nor in the influence of the Mosaïcal institutions either, but solely in the perverted pharisaïcal spirit which had taken possession of the supreme power over the people.—Verse 16. λαλῆσαι stands *prægnanti sensu* for εὐαγγελίζεσθαι. Now here St Paul seems to say

that the Jews entirely forbid preaching to the Gentiles, which Baur might take advantage of for his strange hypothesis. [See my essay in the Stud. for 1838, part 4.] But St Paul clearly means *here* too that *such* a preaching alone is offensive to the Jews, by which the Gentiles would not be moved to allow themselves to be circumcised; therefore the form of preaching of St Paul. That Jews had ever forbidden Gentiles to become Jews or Jewish Christians, to have themselves first circumcised and then baptized, is entirely indemonstrable and in itself improbable. In this bitter jealousy, which begrudges the poor Gentiles even their salvation, St Paul justly sees God's chastisement according to the teleological conception of history; the Jews must by that means make their own sins, that is, the measure of their sins, full [sin becomes the chastisement of sin], and thereby become ripe for the chastisement. [We find the same idea Matt. xxiii. 32, on which see the remarks in the Comm.]—The πάντοτε is striking. In the ordinary meaning "ever" it does not suit here; for St Paul does not mean to say, that the Jews had at all times filled up their sins, nearly in the sense that every generation had been equally godless, but he clearly represents to himself the nation, as a whole, engaged in a course of development in sin, whose last and most flagrant consequence is the enmity against Christ in His saints. Therefore Bretschneider's view [in the Lex. *in vocabulo*] that πάντοτε here stands = πάντως or παντελῶς, may be correct. That learned man finds the same meaning at 2 Cor. ix. 8, but the ordinary one is quite sufficient here. In consequence of this completion of their course of development in sin, concludes St Paul, the wrath of God, *i.e.* His chastisement, has, however, already overtaken it. Schott insists that the aorist ἔφθασε stands prophetically instead of the future; that is quite inadmissible for surely St Paul in this passage utters no prophecy. The passage is rather to be explained by the apostle's fundamental view, that the latter days, and consequently also the manifestation of the Divine wrath, were already at hand. The sufferings, therefore, which even then under the dominion of the Romans came upon the Jews, St Paul considers as beginnings of the great manifestation of wrath nearly impending, in perfect analogy with the representation in Matt. xxiv., according to which the destruction of Jerusalem is treated as a type of the last judgment. By this acceptation, then, the obscure εἰς τέλος also is explained. That is to say, it cannot possibly be = *tandem*, *postremo*, for which τέλος occurs alone. [Ælian, V. H. x. 16, xii.

22; Xenoph. Mem. ii. 7, 13.] Justice must be done the εἰς; the phrase εἰς τέλος can be taken only as "on unto the end," so that all that has now happened appears as merely the beginning. Neither, accordingly, can we supply αὐτῶν, "till *their* ends," *i.e.* their annihilation, but the end must be referred to ὀργή, and understood, as Grotius, Flatt, and Pelt, have already correctly taken it, of the full magnitude of the Divine chastisement. "The wrath [of God] is come upon them, and will now work on to its full manifestation." A reference to the eternity of punishments, as Chrysostom, Theodoret, Benson, and others, insisted on finding here, as they take εἰς τέλος = ἕως or ἄχρι τέλους, is clearly not couched in the words.—As to the rest, D.E.F.G. have added Θεοῦ after ὀργή; however, this is surely to be considered as only a gloss.)

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

(II. 17–III. 13.)

Now, the third chapter ought to have begun here, for with ii. 17 St Paul makes a transition to something new; between ii. 20 and iii. 1, on the other hand, there is no break in the ideas, but the most intimate connection exists. For St Paul in what follows declares his heartfelt desire to see the Christians in Thessalonica again, and describes how he has exerted himself to satisfy that desire. On this occasion he again starts with the figure of his parental position towards his readers, as carried out in the second chapter, and calls them "orphans," an expression by which the abandonment by the beloved being, and the longing to see it again, are denoted most purely and forcibly. (The form ἀπορφανίζεσθαι is not found again in the New Testament. The word is commonly used of children in relation to their parents; here it is employed conversely.—Πρὸς καιρὸν ὥρας, usually πρὸς ὥραν, "for a short while." John v. 35; Gal. ii. 15; Philem. ver. 15. St Paul could not know, it is true, whether and when he should see them again in general, but considering the nearness of the kingdom of God which St Paul supposes, they would find themselves united there in any case shortly. To the believer this whole temporal life is but a short span of time.—The antithesis of προσώπῳ and καρδίᾳ is merely meant to designate the separation as a purely outward one. Comp. 2 Cor. v. 12, x. 7.—No particular comparison is to be sought in the comparative περισσοτέρως here, any more than in

the analogous Latin ones *abundantiùs, vehementiùs.* St Paul never uses the *positive* περισσῶς adverbially, but constantly the *comparative* alone. It only means "more vigorously than it is usual," that is, very vigorously.)

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

Ver. 19, 20. The γὰρ in the beginning of ver. 19 connects itself with the ἠθελήσαμεν in this sense: "to whom could I well have more urgently desired to come than to *you,* for you are indeed

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

Chap. iii. 1, 2. As St Paul's attempts to come himself to Thes-

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

Ver. 3, 4. It was inherent in the nature of the thing that young churches not yet well confirmed, such as that in Thessalonica was, might easily be shaken by the vehemence of the persecutions. St Paul had, therefore, even directly after the founding of the church, made them observe the inevitableness of the same. The Christian Church *must* have been persecuted, because light and darkness, the spirit and the flesh, are necessarily opposed to one another. (See on 2 Tim. iii. 12.) But in the εἰς τοῦτο κείμεθα is couched more yet than the mere necessity (μέλλομεν θλίβεσθαι), viz., the ordinance of God that the Christians are to suffer, inasmuch as suffering is for them a means of perfection, if it is borne in the right spirit. (In ver. 3, the dative of the intention τῷ σαίνεσθαι is very harsh, in a grammatical point of view. [See Winer's Gramm., p. 303.] The Codd. A.D.E. read τὸ, which Lachmann has received; then εἰς would have to be supplied from what precedes. But the very harshness of the construction naturally occasioned a correction of it to be attempted. The τῷ might, therefore, be still worthy of retention, the more so as the σαίνεσθαι cannot be co-ordinate with, but only subordinate to, the other two infinitives. One must certainly explain to

one's self the dative by the use of the infinitive with לְ in Hebrew. —Σαίνω occurs no more in the New Testament. It is, properly, "to wag the tail insinuatingly like dogs." [Ælian V. H. xiii. 42.] Then, generally, "to move, shake." Hesychius interprets σαίνεται by κυνεῖται, σαλεύεται, ταράττεται. — As to the phrase, κεῖσθαι εἴς τι, see on Luke ii. 34; Phil. i. 17.—In ver. 4, the καὶ οἴδατε at the close of the verse, merely alludes to what St Paul had foretold having actually come to pass. It forms, therefore, no tautology with the αὐτοὶ γὰρ οἴδατε at the beginning. In Griesbach's text, all from αὐτοὶ, ver. 3, to οἴδατε [at the close of ver. 4] appears included in parentheses, which is, however, quite unnecessary, as the course of ideas moves on uninterruptedly.)

Ver. 5. Now, exactly because St Paul knew the Christians in Thessalonica to be wrestling with persecutions, it was (διὰ τοῦτο) that he felt so urged to gather information as to the state of their faith, in order that the tempter might not incite them to apostacy, and thus St Paul's entire labour be lost. (The κἀγὼ is explained by the circumstance that St Paul, in *his* sufferings, had also experienced great sympathy from the Thessalonians, which he now reciprocates on his side.—At γνῶναι, αὐτὸν is first of all to be supplied, St Paul learnt it then only by Timothy.—That ὁ πειράζων is Satan, as at Matt. iv. 3; 1 Cor. vii. 5, is understood without explanation; the μήπως ἐπείρασεν ὑμᾶς surprises one, however, inasmuch as the temptation seems to be there already, in the shape of the persecutions that had happened. But St Paul does not consider the persecution in itself as temptation; he had, indeed, in ver. 4, just represented it as, under God's direction, resulting in the salvation of the faithful: it *then* alone becomes a temptation, through Satan's power, when the latter succeeds in calling forth in the heart of man doubts of the truth of the Gospel,—unbelief, therefore, on occasion of the persecution. As to the connection of the μήπως with the indicative and conjunctive, see Winer's Gramm., p. 473.—Εἰς κενὸν = לְרִיק, Lev. xxvi. 16.—The idea that St Paul's labour is lost, if the Thessalonians fall away, has something child-like and simple in it. Of course, no spiritual selfishness is to be seen in it, but the expression of the conviction that the Thessalonians will also let themselves, by love to him, St Paul, be induced to hold fast to the faith.)

Ver. 6–8. St Paul then further describes, with a touching sensibility, how beneficially the good tidings which Timothy

brought of their firm state of faith and of their love had operated on him; he says they are a comfort to him in all distresses, they had brought him life in death. (In ver. 6 ἄρτι shows that St Paul wrote directly after Timothy's return.—As to εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, employed in the wider sense, of every sort of good tidings, see on Luke i. 19.—In ver. 7 the διὰ τῆς ὑμῶν πίστεως is the explanation of ἐφ' ὑμῖν, while ἐπὶ θλίψει denotes the subjective state in which St Paul was when he received the comfort.—As to the rest, the collocation ἀνάγκῃ καὶ θλίψει might, according to the MSS., be preferable, as Lachmann and Schott also think.—In ver. 8, the νῦν ζῶμεν supposes that St Paul did not live *previously*; from 1 Cor. xv. 31, "I die daily," it is clear that he considers the continual conflicts and dangers in which he was obliged to move as a continual dying, into which joy at the firmness in the faith of the Christians in Thessalonica entered as a new element of life. Therefore, also, the idea of life must not be diluted here into the more general one of joy.—In the ἐὰν στήκητε the *future*, too, is intimated besides the *present*: "if ye stand, and continue standing.")

Ver. 9, 10. St Paul justly considers these tidings as the fountain of life; *for* nothing more grateful could happen to him, no thanks can sufficiently recompense the benefit. (Ver. 9. As to ἀνταποδιδόναι see Luke xiv. 14; Rom. xi. 35.—Perhaps with this idea the parallel passage, Ps. cxvi. 12, was in the apostle's mind. —As to χαρὰν χαίρειν see John iii. 29.—The ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ characterises the joy as a holy one admissible before God's countenance.) But the greater the joy the more lively becomes the wish also in St Paul to see them and to complete their life of faith. The ὑστερήματα τῆς πίστεως are to be referred not so much to infirmities of the *power* of faith (for that had been up to that time certainly described as energetic), as to defects in the *knowledge* of faith which developes itself by degrees only, which defects admit of being gradually supplied through a longer intercourse and instruction. On the other hand, true faith has in the very first beginning full power to oppose resistance to all dangers. For the rest, it is understood without difficulty that St Paul imagines the καταρτίσαι practicable not with his own powers, but only in the strength of the Holy Spirit. (Ver. 10. ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ has already occurred at Ephes. iii. 20, it is also found at 1 Thess. v. 13. —The εἰς τὸ after δεόμενοι expresses the object of the praying.—As to ὑστέρημα see 1 Cor. xvi. 17; 2 Cor. ix. 12.—Καταρτίζω is *pro-*

perly to set up again something that is destroyed [Matt. iv. 21; Gal. vi. 1], *here* to bring to perfection without reference to antecedent destruction, = προσαναπληρόω or ἀνταναπληρόω, 2 Cor. ix. 12; Col. i. 24.)

Ver. 11–13. In conclusion, St Paul explicitly utters the petition that God and Christ may prepare for him the way to his dear Christian brethren in Thessalonica, and fill the latter themselves with love, and confirm them in sanctification. It is peculiar to this passage that *Christ* also is here besought along with *God* to prepare the way. The external relations are commonly attributed, in the Scriptures, to *the Father*, but this passage shows that it is allowable to bring these also before *Christ*. However, no example but this occurs in the New Testament, as indeed prayers *generally* to Christ are but seldom found. But the juxtaposition of Father and Son taken strictly is to be understood thus: "may the Father operate so and so by means of His Son." (Ver. 11. κατευθύναι is the optative aorist, as at 2 Thess. iii. 5, not the infinitive. —Ver. 12. The readings ὁ Θεὸς and ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς are, it may be supposed, only interpretations of the simple ὁ κύριος. That *Christ*, not *the Father*, is to be understood by it cannot be doubtful after verse 10.[1] Πλεονάζειν and περισσεύειν are related to one another as cause and effect, "to grow, and the riches proceeding from the growth."—The love εἰς ἀλλήλους and that εἰς πάντας are related to one another as brotherly love and universal love, 2 Pet. i. 7. [Compare 1 Thess. iv. 9.] With the καθάπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς not πλεονάσαι, but ἀγάπην ἔχομεν, can be supplied.—Ver. 13. The growth in love has afterwards the consequence of confirming the heart in holiness, similarly to the way in which it is represented 2 Thess. ii. 16, 17. The combination ἀμέμπτους ἐν ἁγιωσύνῃ unites the negative and positive sides. [Upon ἁγιωσύνη

[1] The words: αὐτὸς ὁ Θεὸς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς κατευθύναι τὴν ὁδὸν ἡμῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς are certainly decisive for the opinion that prayers to the Son are not inadmissible, even if they refer to external relations. But the very circumstance that such occur no more in the New Testament, and then the whole analogy of faith, are, surely, decidedly opposed to making prayers to the Saviour frequently, much more predominantly and almost exclusively, in all external occurrences, as is done in the community of Moravian brothers. The entire ancient Church knows of no prayers to Christ which have reference to externals. If, therefore, beginners in the life of faith often confess themselves to be uncertain whether they shall address their prayers to the Father, or to the Son, or even to the Holy Ghost perhaps, it is to be assumed as a general rule according to the rightly understood relation of the Trinity, that external relations must be brought before the Father in prayer, but the religious moral relations before the Son and the Holy Ghost, or, in fine, that one should pray for everything *of* the Father *through* the Son *in* the Holy Ghost.

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

II.

PART SECOND

(IV. 1–V. 28.)

§ 4. EXHORTATIONS TO A HOLY LIFE.

(IV. 1.–12.)

After the prayer, that God will through His Spirit fill the Thessalonians with love, St Paul now turns to *them* also, and calls upon them to do *their* part in the work of sanctification, so that *here* too *human* agency seems not to be *annihilated* by the *divine*, but *stimulated*. But now, as a rule for their walking so as to please God, St Paul appeals to the commandment given them by him during his personal presence among them. We may, of course, assume that the exhortations which follow contain only a repetition of the same, for they keep altogether to generals, and it is scarcely imaginable that St Paul in the short time of his sojourn could have gone beyond generals. (Ver. 1. We have already had λοιπὸν, used as an adverb, 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Gal. vi. 17; Ephes. vi. 10; Phil. iii. 1, iv. 8. In that expression alone the tendency of St Paul's hastening to the conclusion is announced. The reading of the *text. rec.*, τὸ λοιπὸν, must for extrinsic reasons give way to the λοιπόν.—The collocation of the words, in so far as the ἵνα περισσεύητε μᾶλλον ought to subjoin itself immediately to ἐρωτῶμεν ὑμᾶς καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν, is not quite accurate; again, an οὕτως ought to have corresponded with the καθώς. It is true, B.D.E.F.G. have ἵνα before καθὼς παρελάβετε, and Lachmann has even put it into the text, but in all probability this is only a correction of the more difficult original reading. On the other hand, Lachmann has with perfect justice, on the authority of A.B.D.E.F.G., adopted the addition καθὼς καὶ περιπατεῖτε wanting in the *text. rec.* after ἀρέσκειν Θεῷ. The apostle acknowledges

their Christian walking, but exhorts them to increase still in the care and fidelity with which they live.—Ver. 2. We find the term παραγγελία, "commandment, precept," also at Acts v. 28, xvi. 24; 1 Tim. i. 5–18.—The addition διὰ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is to represent St Paul as empowered to publish moral commandments, that is, as invested by Jesus with the full powers of an apostle.)

Ver. 3–5. To this general exhortation St Paul now causes the special moral precepts to succeed, and first of all indeed those for sexual purity and chastity (ver. 3–8). The sinfulness of human nature *in general*, which makes temptations in this point particularly dangerous, and the immersion of the Gentile world in sins of lust, which were even pre-eminently in vogue in Thessalonica, *in particular*, justly induced St Paul to put this exhortation in the foreground. The ἁγιασμός, "the state of holiness," is to be taken here in a special sense as "chastity," as it is also used at Rom. vi. 19; 1 Tim. ii. 15. The proper term for it is ἁγνεία, 1 Tim. iv. 12, v. 2. But, considered as true inward chastity, it is necessarily conjoined with universal moral purity, whence the justification for such a special application of the word proceeds. But now St Paul first describes chastity *negatively* as abstinence from all impure sexual acts (πορνεία taken in the widest sense), then *positively* as governing the body in chastity and honour. The body *here* too appears, according to the Christian fundamental view, not as a prison of the soul, but as its holy organ, which, like the soul itself, must be preserved pure and undefiled, in order to be made a temple of the Holy Spirit. (See the remarks on 1 Cor. vi. 15–20.) The antithesis to κτᾶσθαι σκεῦος ἐν ἁγιασμῷ καὶ τιμῇ is κτᾶσθαι ἐν πάθει ἐπιθυμίας. In this phrase the ἐπιθυμία is imagined as a power operating perniciously on man; he must comport himself only passively, *i.e.* receptively towards the Holy Spirit of God; on the other hand, as regards everything connected with sin and nature he is to stand up as a master, and at the same time as a sentinel. (See on this point especially 1 Pet. ii. 11.) This simple acceptation of the words, which is also perfectly adapted to the context of the passage, has been already defended by Chrysostom, Theodoret, and other Greek Fathers, in the West by Tertullian, Ambrosiaster, and Pelagius, then by Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Le Clerc, in later times by Baumgarten, Flatt, and Pelt. In fact, the use of σκεῦος as = כְּלִי offers no difficulty. Philo, too, uses several times the phrase ἀγγεῖον

τῆς ψυχῆς (*de migr. Abr. p.* 418. *Quod deterior pot. insid. p.* 186). In the New Testament 2 Cor. iv. 7 is decisive. It is true, Schott is of opinion πνεύματος or ψυχῆς must be added to σκεῦος if it be meant to denote the body. But 2 Cor. iv. 7 shows that this is not necessary, where the context makes the meaning of the word sufficiently clear. But besides, in reality, such an addition is also couched in the ἑαυτοῦ, by which the individuality, the ψυχή, is distinguished from the σκεῦος, and the *latter* designated as belonging to the *former*. The only difficulty which seems to arise with our interpretation is couched in the κτᾶσθαι. For in the *present* that word is "to acquire," in the *perfect alone* "to possess," *i.e.* "to have acquired." But now it seems improper to speak of an "acquiring" of the body, as it is inborn in man. But even if the substance of the body is inborn in man, yet the *dominion over* the body is not, and by this dominion the body is first made a true σκεῦος, a serviceable organ for the soul. We may, therefore, aptly take the expressions thus: "let each know, *i.e.* let each learn, by means of practice and experience, to guide and to master his body as a true instrument of the soul, and not abandon it to a fierce violence of the passions." Thus Chrysostom on this passage has already quite correctly interpreted in the words: ἄρα ἡμεῖς αὐτὸ (τὸ σκεῦος) κτώμεθα, ὅταν μένῃ καθαρὸν, καὶ ἔστιν ἐν ἁγιασμῷ, ὅταν δὲ ἀκάθαρτον, ἁμαρτία *scil.* κτᾶται αὐτό.—In comparison with this sole admissible interpretation of this passage other acceptations of it must decidedly give way. First of all, that defended by Erasmus Schmid, that σκεῦος stands like the Latin *vas*, for the male organ of generation. For, though σκεῦος occurs in that sense in *profane* writers (see Ælian hist. anim. xvii. 11), still the Holy Scriptures are not acquainted with that use of the word, and, besides, nothing in the context justifies us in such an assumption. But, secondly, very distinguished interpreters, after the example of Augustine, viz., Schöttgen, Wetstein, Koppe, and Schott, choose to understand σκεῦος of the woman, who in the Oriental mode of contemplation is looked on as the instrument of the man, as כְּלִי, or Chaldee as מאן, Daniel v. 2, 3, 23. According to this, then, the woman is called 1 Pet. iii. 7, σκεῦος ἀσθενέστερον. But the altogether general conception of the exhortation is against the application of that meaning in this passage. To abstain from πορνεία refers not to the men only, but just as much to the women; but if σκεῦος is interpreted of the woman the ἕκαστος ὑμῶν would refer to the men only, and

even among them only to those living in wedlock, with the exclusion of the unmarried and of the widowers, which clearly does not suit the general nature of the expression. Neither can one look for any support of this view in the use of the κτᾶσθαι, for κτᾶσθαι γυναῖκα means, it is true, "to marry" (Ruth iv. 10; Sir. xxxvi. 29), but not "to be married, to live in wedlock," which meaning the context here would require. (In ver. 4 τιμὴ forms the antithesis to ἀτιμία. It answers here to our "honourableness." The reading ἀτιμίας for ἐπιθυμίας has surely only come into the text here from the parallel passage Rom. i. 26. In verse 5 the καὶ after καθάπερ is, similarly as at iv. 13, to be explained by the assumption that St Paul is thinking of those Jews or Christians who allow wicked lusts to reign in them; these, continues he, act as the Gentiles also do, they thus place themselves on an equality with the Gentiles, deny the knowledge imparted to them of the true God which the Gentiles do not even possess, and are plainly, so far, yet more amenable to punishment than they.)

Ver. 6, 7. That in the two verses here there cannot by any means be contained an entirely fresh precept and warning, different from the previous one, as the one against covetousness would be, is clearly shown by the connection of ver. 7 with ver. 6, by which the calling of the Christians to chastity (ἁγιασμὸς, as at ver. 3), not to ἀκαθαρσία, is joined by means of γὰρ to what precedes. But to understand ἀκαθαρσία here otherwise than of sexual uncleanness is decidedly unallowable, and then ver. 6 cannot well come in between with something heterogeneous, the less that the infinitives ὑπερβαίνειν and πλεονεκτεῖν plainly unite themselves to the τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστι θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, and thus stand co-ordinate with the ἀπέχεσθαι and εἰδέναι κτᾶσθαι. The idea now of the ὑπερβαίνειν is so general that it forms no difficulty in the reference of ver. 6 to sexual relations; that is to say, it denotes, with or without νόμος, "the sinful transgressing of the law," in Hebrew עָבַר and הִתְעַבֵּר, which Symmachus, Aquila, and Theodotion, in the passage Prov. xx. 2, render by ὑπερβαίνειν, whereas the LXX. translate it παροξύνειν. But certainly the second verb πλεονεκτεῖν seems, according to the nearest meaning of the word, to be in favour of the supposition of Origen, to which Grotius also, Rosenmüller, Koppe, and Flatt, have adhered, viz., that ver. 6 contains a warning against covetousness, and especially against over-reaching in trade. However, the ἐν τῷ πράγματι forms in its turn a great difficulty for this interpretation, without looking at the doubts as to it already

touched on, which result from the connection of ver. 7 with ver. 6. For πρᾶγμα is not something like "bargain and sale," as Grotius insists, but πραγματεία. Then the article gives rise to great doubt. True, it has been proposed to conjecture τῳ, *i.e.* τινι, but the circumstance that no MS. leaves out the article is sufficient evidence for the original existence of it. But all becomes intelligible if we, with the Greek Fathers, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and others, afterwards Wetstein, Baumgarten, Pelt, and Schott, take πλεονεκτεῖν in the figurative sense, and understand the whole of adultery, of the greedy invasion of the property of a brother, therefore of the seduction of his wife, for there is no ground at all for thinking of unnatural sins of lust. The words ἐν τῷ πράγματι are then quite simply "in the matter which is here in question." This mode of taking the πλεονεκτεῖν recommends itself the more that, as we saw at Ephes. iv. 19, v. 3, 5, St Paul uses πλεονεξία elsewhere too of sins of the flesh. The second half of ver. 6 contains a further enforcement of the exhortation to chastity through the admonition that God punishes all sins of lust, which it was by no means superfluous to remark for the benefit of the Greeks, who treated those relations very lightly. It is for that reason too that St Paul remarks, that he has already set before them previously the guilt of those acts. (Ver. 6. ἔκδικος, avenger. Sir. xxx. 6; Rom. xiii. 4.—The form προείπαμεν, which the *text. rec.* has, is certainly unusual in the compound, but it deserves the preference for that very reason, especially as the critical authorities also favour it pre-eminently.—Διαμαρτύρεσθαι = μαρτύρεσθαι: see ii. 12.—In ver. 7 ἐπὶ and ἐν are to be so taken that ἐπὶ "unto" denotes the object of the obligation, ἐν, on the other hand, the permanent state of chastity in which the Christians are to live, so that the words may be thus paraphrased: "the holy God called us not to uncleanness, *i.e.* that we should serve uncleanness with His will, but that we might be and continue in chastity.")

Ver. 8. St Paul closes this serious exhortation with the remarks, by which ver. 7 is completed, that every one that despiseth the same despiseth God Himself, viz., because it emanates from Him, in that He not only operates by means of the apostle, but also gives to all Christians the Holy Ghost, who urges to chastity. Τοιγαροῦν is the strengthened τοιγάρ. Heb. xii. 1.—Ἀθετεῖν has rarely an accusative of the person with it, but usually one of the thing [Mark vii. 9; 1 Tim. v. 12.] Joined with the former, it is "to despise,"

Gal. ii. 21. As to the strict mode of taking οὐκ—ἀλλὰ see Winer's Gramm., p. 464, upon this passage; it is not to be translated: "not so much men, as God," all the emphasis is rather to be laid on God and the despising Him alone.—Lachmann reads τὸν διδόντα for τὸν καὶ δόντα, but it is extremely improbable that the καὶ would have been added, if it were originally wanting. On the other hand, the *omission* of it is easily explained, especially with the reading εἰς ἡμᾶς, which it will not suit at all. However, the reading εἰς ὑμᾶς is to be preferred on extrinsic and intrinsic grounds, for the idea of the verse is considerably heightened by it, if the sense is this: "whoever despiseth this commandment unto chastity, depiseth God Himself, for He giveth it not merely by means of us the apostles, who are filled with the Spirit, but also in that He gave yourselves the Holy Spirit, *i.e.* the gift of examination and insight into divine things, along with the strength to keep God's commandments," they are thus in *this* respect, also, Θεοδίδακτοι, as they are directly (in ver. 9) called with reference to brotherly love.)

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

26.]—In the εἰς τὸ ἀγαπᾶν ἀλλήλους the intimation is couched that God, who is love, also teaches all to love.)

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

§ 5. INFORMATION AS TO CHRIST'S ADVENT.

(IV. 13–V. 11.)

As we have already remarked in the Introduction to the

Epistles to the Thessalonians, the doctrine of the second coming of Christ to the kingdom of God had become especially important to the Christians there. This circle of ideas might till then have been quite unknown to them as formerly Gentiles. The new and striking nature of them made itself, therefore, master of their excitable Greek fancy, and threatened to hurry them into fanatical vagaries. As to the rest, it was only during the composition of the first Epistle that St Paul had notice of a misunderstanding, which he here, ver. 13–18, rectifies. The expressions in v. 1–3 do not as yet point to the fact that St Paul feared the Thessalonians might also engage in fixing the time of the second coming of the Lord, which, however, occurred at a later date notwithstanding, as the second Epistle shows. But the misapprehension, which is first of all coming under discussion, consisted in their supposing at Thessalonica that those only who were living on earth at Christ's coming again would have part in the kingdom of God. This excited anxiety on account of the departed, as if they were debarred the kingdom of God. Not, as Koppe thinks, in so far as if they had altogether doubted the resurrection of the dead, *that* was the case with *Gnostics alone*, of whom we find no trace in Thessalonica. They rather seem not to have been duly informed of the *first* resurrection and its relation to the *universal* one. They thought (as St Paul's communication which follows shows) that those only who were found *alive* at Christ's coming again would enter with Him into His kingdom. *The dead*, they therefore thought, would not return to life till at the general resurrection of the dead after the kingdom of God, and would therefore be debarred from the bliss in the kingdom of God. To this error St Paul now opposes the information that those dead in the faith would arise before the general resurrection, and accordingly those living at Christ's coming could not possibly anticipate the former. From this, then, it follows that St Paul in his eschatologic views has appropriated the two fundamental views of the Jewish theology, just as the other writings of the New Testament do, which 2 Thess. ii. establishes even still more, viz. *first*, the distinction of a double resurrection, one of the just or faithful, and the general one, on which the remarks in the Comm. on Luke xiv. 14; John v. 25, ss.; Acts xxiv. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 22, 23, and, above all, Rev. xx. 5, ss., xxi. 1, ss., are to be compared; *secondly*, the supposition of a kingdom of God on earth, the so-called Millennium. True, nothing certain can be concluded from the phrase βασιλεία

τοῦ Θεοῦ or Χριστοῦ in St Paul, for he uses it in such a comprehensive manner, as is done also in the Gospels (see on Matt. iii. 2) and the other books of the New Testament, that he always comprises in it at the same time with the earthly kingdom eternity also, as indeed it is understood at once that whoever has a part in the kingdom of God also enjoys eternal happiness, because no falling away again can happen in the kingdom of God; but, *vice versâ*, not every one that attains eternal happiness has also a part in the kingdom of God. (Compare Rom. xiv. 17; 1 Cor. iv. 11, 20, vi. 9, 10, xv. 24, 50; Gal. v. 21; Ephes. v. 5; Col. i. 13; 1 Thess. ii. 12; 2 Thess. i. 5; 2 Tim. iv. 1, 18.) But St Paul never uses the phrase βασιλεία τ. Θ. so that he understands by it eternity alone with an exclusion of the earthly kingdom; if he means to express *that* he makes use of the words σωτηρία, σώζεσθαι, for that purpose. The only passage in St Paul's Epistles, in which it can seem as if βασιλεία τ. Θ. denoted eternity alone without the kingdom of God, is 2 Tim. iv. 18, where the epithet ἐπουράνιος is used. But the kingdom of God is not called heavenly here, in so far as St Paul imagines it to himself in heaven, but in so far as it is of heavenly nature, makes earthly relations heavenly. The expression ἐπίγειος of course does not occur, because it would inevitably give rise to misapprehensions. The Jews erred in their otherwise correct doctrine in that very point that they deemed the Messiah's kingdom earthly, and that too in such a way that in place of the Gentiles, who reigned at that time, the Jews would reign in *it* and the Gentiles serve. If the better-minded among them, who followed the pure instructions of the Old Testament more than the perverted views of the Rabbins, willingly acknowledged the *moral* transformations also, the reign of justice, truth, and love, in the kingdom of God; still even among *them* the look to the outside predominated too decidedly. Therefore it was that so few only were able to recognise in Christ and His followers the germ of the kingdom of God. (Ver. 13. See as to οὐ θέλομεν ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν Rom. i. 13; 1 Cor. x. 1; xii. 1; 2 Cor. i. 8.—Lachmann has, on the authority of A.B., preferred the reading κοιμωμένων, which in fact the circumstance, that the form of the perfect κεκοιμημένων is so predominant in the New Testament, that it can easily be supposed that it was put in where it was not found,—is in favour of. The name, to go no further, points to a waking at some time or other from the slumber of death.—Ἵνα μὴ λυπῆσθε scil. περὶ αὐτῶν, as if they were debarred from the king-

dom of God.—As to καὶ after καθὼς see at iv. 5.)—Οἱ λοιποὶ οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες ἐλπίδα, *i.e.* the Gentiles; certainly these mourn in another sense over *their* relations that are fallen asleep, viz. as such who consider death as annihilation; but St Paul means precisely by this forcible comparison to render the total inadmissibility of such sorrow prominent.

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

with the ἁρπάζεσθαι, which subjoins itself to the former in ver. 17, on which see the particulars.)

Ver. 15. St Paul now announces more explicitly to his readers the progress of the occurrences as certain revealed truth. At first he expresses himself in ver. 15 only *negatively*, the living will not come before the dead, *i.e.* they will not go into the kingdom of God alone, nay not even earlier than the latter; then in ver. 16, 17, he gives the *positive* heads in the sequence of occurrences. But the most important thing in this verse is the ἡμεῖς before οἱ ζῶντες οἱ περιλειπόμενοι, which is repeated ver. 17. It is unmistakeably clear from *that*, that St Paul deemed it possible he and his contemporaries might live to see the coming again of Christ. But now this supposition need not excite even the slightest doubt. For, that it has continued unfulfilled, this hope of St Paul's, is, no doubt, true; but St Paul himself, with all the apostles, acknowledges also in terms, that no one knows the time or hour (see on v. 2), not even the angels, nor the Son (Mark xiii. 32); the Lord Himself declares that man may not know them (Acts i. 7), but that still the coming again is to be at all times expected as near (see on Luke xii. 34, ss.; Matt. xxiv. 1.) Therefore this passage would be a stumbling-block only in case the τοῦτο λέγομεν ἐν λόγῳ κυρίου were also to be referred to the subordinate point which is couched in the ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες. For, had St Paul said: "I know by a communication of the Lord that we shall witness the advent of Christ even in our life-time," then a detrimental conclusion might with justice be drawn from the non-fulfilment of that saying; but here the saying of the Lord refers merely to the *chief* idea, that those remaining will not prevent them that are asleep, and not to the *subordinate* designation of the ἡμεῖς. St Paul supposes the hope of living to see the advent of Christ as generally diffused, and finishes speaking of it without declaring anything at all about it itself; the sense of the words is therefore only: "we, who *hope* to continue to live until the advent of Christ." A misapprehension could not take place in this relation, because it is immediately explained in what follows (v. 1, ss.) that the time is not known. Certainly, the mode of proceeding of the older interpreters, who thought St Paul spoke in the plural only conversationally, without really meaning to say that they themselves, he and his readers, might be still living at the occurrence of that catastrophe, is decidedly to be rejected. For this passage does not stand there isolated, but all the writers of the New Testament consider Christ's

advent as near (1 Cor. xv. 51, 52; 1 Pet. iv. 7; 1 John ii. 18; James v. 8); in fact, the whole doctrine even would not have the slightest practical signification, unless the longing after the second coming of Christ were each moment alive, and therefore continually deemed it possible. It was only towards the end of his life (Phil. i. 23) that Christ's advent retreated in St Paul's mind to a remoter distance. (The λέγομεν ἐν λόγῳ (= בְּדְבַר) is to be explained: "we express our ideas in a word of the Lord's," and this stands then in opposition to the mere subjective γνώμη of St Paul. [See on 1 Cor. vii. 10, 12, 25.] But it is a question, does St Paul mean by "word of the Lord" an immediate revelation which was bestowed on him, or a declaration of Christ's which had come down to him by tradition, and which, in that case, either may or may not be preserved to us in the Gospels? Pelt insists on it that Matt. xxiv. 31, ss., was in St Paul's mind, but the very special idea of this verse occurs neither there nor anywhere else. The appeal to a lost expression of Christ's has something very arbitrary in it; I decide, therefore, for an immediate revelation, as St Paul elsewhere also claims them for himself, *ex. gr.* 1 Cor. xi. 23, in reference to particular points.—The περιλειπόμενοι is to be explained by the notion of death snatching the majority away, leaving but few remaining; εἰς, which connects itself immediately with that, expresses then the terminus up to which the living are left.—Upon οὐ μή, which recurs v. 3 also, in the meaning *neutiquam*, see Winer's Gramm., p. 472, and upon the form of the aorist, which follows, ib., p. 473.—Had the Thessalonians believed in no resurrection at all, then there could have been no talk of a φθάνειν of the living: in that case too their dead must have been called νεκροὶ, not κοιμηθέντες.)

Ver. 16. To this the *positive* side is then subjoined, from which follows the groundlessness of the anxiety of the Thessalonians for their dear ones dead in the faith. For at Christ's coming again these will arise *first*, consequently none can come before them. Christ's coming is expressly referred to His holy person and glorified body itself (αὐτὸς ὁ κυριος),—therefore every manifestation of Him as in mere operations is excluded,—and represented as a descent from heaven, clearly with an allusion to the ἀναληφθῆναι εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, Acts i. 11. That this descent of Christ's will be a visible one, and prepared by means of a sign of the Son of man, is clearly shown by Matt. xxiv. 30 (on which passage see the remarks in the Comm.), but whether the glorified Redeemer will tread the earth, or only show Himself to men, which ver. 17 might

make the more probable, is nowhere in the Holy Scriptures openly declared. In Revelations the passage xix. 12, ss., describes this appearance of Christ's for the Millennium ; but *there* too the discourse seems in like manner to be only of a showing Himself on the part of Christ, to the terror of the unbelieving, to the joy of the believers. In the ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ heaven, the right hand of God, is designated as the present place of Christ's abode since the ascension (see on Matt. xxvi. 64). How the appearing of the Lord will have an annihilating effect on the wicked and their head, Antichrist, 2 Thess. i. 8, ii. 8, declare more in detail; in accordance with which the Lord is here described as a leader of armies, as a heavenly στρατηγός. He comes not alone, but all His saints with Him (iii. 13), who form, as it were, His heavenly army, which surrounds Him, like as in the Old Testament Jehovah appears with His armies of angels (Gen. xxxii. 2). The description in Revelations (chap. xix.) is completely in accordance with it; a heavenly army follows Christ on his appearance (ver. 11–13, " clothed in white and clean silk" (ver. 14). This addition leaves no doubt upon the fact that sanctified men are to be understood by it, for, according to ver. 8, clean silk is the mark of the righteousness of the saints. But in our passage the phrase ἐν φωνῇ ἀρχαγγέλου excites the doubt whether by the army *angels* might not be meant. (See on Matt. xxiv. 31.) For, although *men* may bear the name of *angels* (Matt. xi. 10; Mark i. 2; Luke vii. 27, compared with Mal. iii. 1), yet no passage is found where man is named ἀρχάγγελος. True, it is, as we shall immediately show further on, very questionable, and to me not probable, that ἀρχάγγελος here denotes an angel, Christ Himself seems rather to be understood by it. But, even if one takes the expression to be used of an angel, it does not follow from *that*, that the army is composed of angels *only;* on the contrary, as in Rev. xix. 17, xx. 1, also angels are named too *along with* men, it seems most correct to suppose that sanctified men as well as angels too will accompany Christ's appearance. Compare 2 Thess. i. 7, 10. (Κέλευσμα according to vulgar pronunciation, *atticè* κέλευμα, means in general " a command, loud call," then particularly in war " the word of command, for marching, for the attack." See Thuc. ii. 92; Prov. xxx. 27.—The phrases ἐν φωνῇ ἀρχαγγέλου καὶ ἐν σάλπιγγι Θεοῦ are to be considered as epexegeses of the κέλευσμα. As all signals in war were usually given by means of the trumpet, the term σάλπιγξ is chosen to designate the mighty working which will penetrate

the universe, and which will be connected with Christ's appearance, and by which both the assembling of the faithful then living, and the awakening of those asleep, will be operated; external physical phenomena, earthquakes, storms, and the like, will, no doubt, accompany this working; but it is principally to be conceived as of a spiritual nature. [See on Matt. xxiv. 7, 31; 1 Cor. xv. 52, and especially Rev. viii. 2.] The genitive Θεοῦ is not meant to show the force of the sound, but God as the author of the κέλευσμα given by means of the trumpet. The combination ὁ κύριος καταβήσεται ἐν κελεύσματι, ἐν σάλπιγγι, is to express the permanent and concomitant operations of the Divine power during the appearance of the Lord: "He descends in the sound of the trumpet," *i.e.* so that God's energy, which penetrates and calls into life all things, permanently accompanies His descent.—The middle phrase ἐν φωνῇ ἀρχαγγέλου denotes the commander of the heavenly army [the ἄρχων στρατιᾶς οὐρανίου, Luke ii. 13], as ordering it with His voice and giving the κέλευσμα. But the question occurs, are we to imagine a particular angel to be meant by the expression or not? One might from Rev. xii. 7; Dan. x. 13, xii. 1, be inclined to think of the Archangel Michael; but, as the article is wanting, this is plainly inadmissible: "the voice of *an* archangel," therefore, would admit of being so taken that the powerful quality of the voice would be thereby denoted, unless it shall be preferred to suppose that Christ Himself is here called ἀρχάγγελος. For the circumstance, that Christ plainly appears here as the leader of the heavenly hosts, the κέλευσμα is His word of command, the voice, therefore, must also be *His* voice,—is in favour of *that*.[1] If one understands a created angel by the word, the order of the series would be too startling: ἐν κελεύσματι Χριστοῦ, ἐν φωνῇ ἀρχαγγέλου, ἐν σάλπιγγι Θεοῦ. Certainly it is not found elsewhere that Christ is called ἀρχάγγελος, but, if one only resolves the expression into its fundamental idea, ἄρχων τῶν ἀγγέλων, there is surely not the least cause for scruple to call Christ so; the name denotes nothing else than יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת, Jehovah Sabaoth, by which Christ is meant to be described as infinitively exalted above all *human* leaders of armies.)

Ver. 17. To this description of Christ's appearing are then annexed details as to the relation of those fallen asleep to the living.

[1] Thus Ambrosiaster had already correctly interpreted. *Ipse enim Christus Dominus*, says he on this passage, *voluntate patris quasi primus angelus Dei cum exercitu cœlesti, sicut continetur in Apocalypsi* (*cap.* 11), *descendet de cœlo ad gerendum bellum contra antichristum.*

That is to say, the course of events will be this according to the revelation which had been made to St Paul on the subject: *first* the dead in Christ shall rise, *then* those remaining alive (after they have been changed, *i.e.* have received the glorified body clothed upon them, see 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52; 2 Cor. v. 2–4) will be caught up to the Lord together with the believers risen up. The living do not, therefore, come before those that were asleep (verse 15), but both come to the Lord together. Schott erroneously chooses in this verse to join ἐν Χριστῷ to ἀναστήσονται, not to νεκροί, for he thinks this passage cannot be used for the distinguishing of a double resurrection, that of the just, and the universal one, the former before, the latter after, the kingdom of God, because the ζῶντες οἱ περιλειπόμενοι cannot refer to the universal resurrection. Now, *that* is, no doubt, correct, for, as to the ζῶντες, there is no mention at all of a resurrection, they are clothed over (2 Cor. v. 4, ss.); neither can anything, therefore, be inferred from the πρῶτον and ἔπειτα, for both, the resurrection, and the catching up of the living, occur *before* the beginning of the kingdom of God; but there are other reasons which compel us to the combination οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ. For if the meaning of the words were: "the dead, *i.e.* all those that have died, good as well as bad, believing as well as unbelieving, rise by Christ's power," all the apprehensions of the Thessalonians (ver. 13) would have had no foundation. How could they possibly have feared their dear ones that slept might be debarred from the joys in the kingdom of God? if *all* the dead arose at Christ's coming, then surely *theirs* too must arise. By this interpretation, therefore, one would be driven to Koppe's utterly inadmissible assumption that the Thessalonians doubted the resurrection altogether; a doubt, which St Paul would have treated in a totally different way than is done here, as 1 Cor. xv. shows. The whole exposition of St Paul acquires meaning solely on the supposition already given above, that two resurrections are distinguished by him; now, that the dead of the Christian Church there would also return to life at the *general* awaking of the dead was not doubted in Thessalonica, but, if they were awakened *then* only, in that case they would necessarily be debarred from the kingdom of God, which preceded the general resurrection, and therefore it must have afforded them comfort to hear that those who died in Christ would be awakened even *before* the change or clothing-over of the living. Accordingly, if this passage, like 1 Cor. xv. 23, 24, testifies unmistakeably to

a twofold resurrection, whom have we to understand by the νεκροῖς ἐν Χριστῷ? merely those converted after the ascension, or the pious men of the Old Testament also? The decision of this question depends especially on the way of taking Matt. xxvii. 52, 53. If one finds there no awaking of the dead, one must suppose that all those under the Old Covenant who really believed in the Messiah, as also those who at Christ's *descensus ad inferos* laid hold of the salvation preached unto them (see on 1 Pet. iii. 18, iv. 6), are awakened with the dead believing Christians at the first resurrection. If, on the contrary, one finds, as *we* do, the awaking of the believers of the Old Testament in Matt. xxvii. 52, 53, the awaking of the believing Christians alone is to be supposed at the first resurrection. Only one might lay more stress on the πολλὰ σώματα, Matt. xxvii. 53, than has been done in the Comm. on Matt. xxvii. 52, 53, and combine with the resurrection of Christ the awakening of *some* early-ripe natures indeed of the Old Testament, but suppose *the mass* of them to rise only with the Christians before the kingdom of God. But now the concluding words of iv. 17 are still to be considered, and they evince themselves as particularly difficult but also as exceedingly influential on the doctrine of the end of the world. For if we read in this passage merely: καὶ ἅμα σὺν αὐτοῖς πάντοτε σὺν κυρίῳ ἐσόμεθα, we should not be able to think otherwise than that St Paul meant to say that the faithful will live and reign with Christ on this earth, which has been renewed and restored as paradise. (See on Rom. viii. 17, ss.) But, instead of that, we also find in this verse the enigmatical words: ἁρπαγησόμεθα ἐν νεφέλαις εἰς ἀπάντησιν τοῦ κυρίου εἰς ἀέρα. The meaning of these words cannot be doubtful. The quick and the dead (both of whom are to be imagined clothed with their glorified body), borne by clouds, caught up from the earth by a sudden power, come to meet the Redeemer descending from heaven in the air, and thus (οὕτω="under these circumstances, in the given state of things") are gathered together unto the Lord (see 2 Thess. ii. 1, as to this ἐπισυναγωγὴ ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον), therefore not on the earth but in the higher regions. (The ἁρπάζεσθαι is used of the forcible sudden catching up through the power of the Spirit. See on 2 Cor. xii. 2, 4; Rev. xii. 5. The clouds [*i.e. bright* clouds, see on Matt. xxiv. 30; Acts i. 7; Rev. i. 9, xi. 12, xiv. 14] appear as the visible means by which this snatching up is performed.—The phrase εἰς ἀπάντησιν (=לִקְרַאת is found also at Matt. xxv. 1, 6; Acts xxviii. 15). But how shall we

represent to ourselves this being caught up in the air on the part of the faithful, and their being together with Christ? This question can with difficulty be answered, because in the whole of the New Testament no parallel passage affords any elucidation of the idea expressed here. We can in no case imagine a diatribe against the Jewish doctrine of the earthly kingdom, because this doctrine is a necessary presupposition for the understanding of the whole of St Paul's exposition in this section. However, it is extremely probable that the passage must be understood so, from the doctrine of the New Testament as to the end of the world and the state of existence in the kingdom of God on the whole. We nowhere read in the New Testament, not even in the leading passage, Rev. xx. 4, ss., that Christ and the glorified believers will abide permanently in the Millennium on this earth (even if it be restored to the purity of paradise). In the passage Rev. v. 11 the βασιλεύειν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς is to be translated: "to reign over the earth," and not "to reign as dwelling on the earth." To suppose a permanent dwelling of Christ and the saints on the earth presents also great objections, inasmuch as it leads almost unavoidably to fanatical notions. Now, if one imagines to himself that Christ and His saints will, it is true, reign absolutely by their influence in the kingdom of God (whereas now many withdraw themselves from their dominion), perhaps even now and then appear to individuals as Christ did in the forty days after His resurrection, and the saints in like manner (Matt. xxvii. 53), but not dwell permanently on earth,[1] this passage receives complete elucidation. Those risen again, like the living clothed over, cannot then remain here below but go to Christ; as, however, Christ is described as coming away from heaven to meet them, it is not said εἰς οὐρανὸν, but εἰς ἀέρα, in order to mark in a distinct manner the direction of the movement (in the passage Ephes. ii. 2 ἀήρ is used in quite another sense); there is couched in it, however, that the Redeemer, after His aim has been attained by means of His coming, returns with them all into His heavenly abode at the right hand of God. How by this view everything else which regards the doctrine of the kingdom of God takes an easier and more harmonious form, we shall take occasion to show in detail in the Exposition of the Revelations. But in any case Usteri's assertion that, according to this

[1] What classes of men in the kingdom of God are to be imagined as permanently dwelling on earth it will not be possible to indicate more closely till the exposition of Rev. at xx. 3, 8.

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

ascension into heaven; it is the elevation of the perfected believers with their glorified corporeity above coarse matter into the spiritual kingdom.

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

Chap. v. 1. After this *special* dissertation, St Paul comes also to the *general* question as to the time of the coming again of the Lord. It is asked what can have induced him to bring this point under discussion here? From the communication in 2 Thess. ii. one might think that the Christians in Thessalonica had even then, when St Paul wrote this first Epistle, supposed Christ's coming too near, which the exhortation in this Epistle (iv. 11), "to continue at their handicrafts," seems to countenance. But the representation in this passage does not give one the impression at all as if St Paul meant to blame the Thessalonians because they thought the coming of Christ too near, he rather blames those who talk of peace and security, and calls upon all to watch, that they may not be unexpectedly overtaken by the day of the Lord. Had St Paul so conceived their position in regard to this hope, as he knew it when composing the second Epistle, then he would, no doubt, have expressed himself more cautiously. Now, as Timothy had only come from Thessalonica shortly before the composition of this Epistle (iii. 6), it is improbable that such a tendency should have continued unknown to St Paul, if it had then already developed itself in the Christians there. If we must, accordingly, assume that the Thessalonians had not at that time, when St Paul wrote the first Epistle, as yet shown in any striking manner that they went wrong, not merely in thinking the time of Christ's coming *possibly* near at hand, but also in teaching as *certain* this nearness of His coming again; it is also probable that the exhortation (iv. 11) not to give up their work, does not stand quite parallel with the same exhortation in the second Epistle (chap. iii.). According to the *latter* Epistle, the notion of the certainly and infallibly imminent advent of Christ had, no doubt, an influence on the opinion that it did not pay to earn their bread any more for themselves painfully with the work

of their hands; on the other hand, at the time of the composition of the first Epistle the Thessalonians seem, merely out of heedlessness and religious excitement, to have given themselves up to idleness, which then was certainly but too well adapted to generate such enthusiastical aberrations as St Paul had to combat in his second Epistle. But now, as there must surely have been some motive or other which induced St Paul to discuss the question of time in connection with the doctrine of Christ's advent, it seems most natural to suppose that the Thessalonians, impelled by their restless zeal, had sent the question to St Paul through Timothy, when the advent was to be expected. Now St Paul answers the question so that he pronounces *every* settling of the time as inadmissible, but for that very reason summons them to continual watchfulness. Neither is it to be asserted: "the Lord is coming even now!" nor yet: "He comes not now, but only at such and such a time;" every fixing of the time, be it of a positive or of a negative nature, is of evil. In this acceptation the doctrine of the advent is of a truly practical nature, in that it promotes moral watchfulness, without countenancing anything fanatical. (The two expressions χρόνοι and καιροὶ bear such a relation to each other, that the latter defines the former more accurately, as a time suitable, adapted to the circumstances. The plural, however, is explained by the consideration that in the collective fact of the advent many separate points are contained together, which precede and succeed one another, as has just been decided on iv. 16, ss.)

Ver. 2. St Paul now appeals to the knowledge which his readers would necessarily already possess through the instructions by word of mouth which he had given them: he designates the day of the Lord as κλέπτης ἐν νυκτί, in order to express the αἰφνίδιον in it, no doubt with reference to the word of Christ, Matt. xxiv. 43; Luke xii. 39. We have at those passages already spoken of the offensiveness that is couched in that comparison. Here we have only further to consider Schott's remarks (ad h. l.), declaring in order to remove the stumbling-block, that Christ Himself is not compared with a thief, but only His coming with a thief's coming. Certainly, but the offensiveness is only very little mitigated by *that*, as so many other nobler images presented themselves in order to express the suddenness in Christ's coming. We shall, therefore, be forced to assume for the explanation of the choice of this precise expression, that the image is conceived from a state of security in the possession of worldly

things, in which point of view the advent of Christ will appear to man like a thief's unexpectedly breaking into his well-guarded house. (Compare further the passages 2 Pet. iii. 10; Rev. iii. 3, xvi. 15.) As to the rest, the ἡμέρα κυρίου is only another phrase for the παρουσία (iv. 15), but in the ἡμέρα the idea of the judgment-day, the ἡμέρα κρίσεως, to which idea the ὄλεθρος here points, comes forward more. St Paul very often uses the appellation ἡμέρα κυρίου or Χριστοῦ. See 1 Cor. i. 18, v. 5; 2 Cor. i. 14; Phil. i. 6, 10; 2 Thess. ii. 2. Now here in this passage the reference of the phrase to the coming of Christ to the kingdom of God is quite clear by means of the context, but usually, as in the Gospels (see on Matt. xxiv. 1) so also in St Paul, the future decision is not conceived in its separate points, but these are understood collectively under that one expression. Though the decision did not await the *Gentiles* at the advent, *before* the kingdom of God, but not till *after* it, at the beginning of eternity, yet St Paul speaks of the day of the Lord in reference to *them* also (Rom. ii. 5, 16). Both older and later interpreters have chosen here to understand by "the day of the Lord" *death*, but that is so far only correct as death has for all those who die before Christ's coming a great similarity with the occurrence of the last judgment. For, though the dead will not experience the actual judgment till after their resurrection, yet there is also a preliminary decision given with death itself. Thus, then, is also explained how the doctrine of Christ's coming again has significance for *all* generations, although that one only, which lives to see it here below experiences it in its effects. The whole history of the world, accordingly, as has already been declared in another place, is in a certain point of view a continual advent, a continual judgment of the Lord; in every great event in the world, indeed in the death of every individual, the Lord comes and judges! Thus the prophecy is a truth for every one, not merely for the few who just happen to live when the advent takes place. (See on Matt. xxiv. 1.)

Ver. 3. St Paul uses yet a second comparison in order to make the sudden bursting in of the day of Christ clear; as a pregnant woman is seized quite unexpectedly with the pains of the hour of delivery, so the day of Christ suddenly seizes mankind. (See as to this figure the remarks on Matt. xxiv. 8; Mark xiii. 9. It is also found very often in the Old Testament, especially in Jerem. vi. 24 xiii. 21, xxii. 23, xlix. 24, l. 43.) There is couched in it not only a parallel with the Lord's coming on account of the suddenness

and violence of the pain, but the very striking figure points also to the circumstance that a more elevated life is to be produced in human nature from this painful state according to God's will. As to the rest, St Paul here takes Christ's coming on its threatening, punishing, side, in order to excite the Thessalonians to serious watchfulness, in order not to grow like the God-estranged men of this world, whose soul's state is denoted by the exclamation, εἰρήνη καὶ ἀσφάλεια, in using which the passage Ezekiel xiii. 10 was certainly in St Paul's mind. Peace and security where sin reigns, where a lively faith in the reconciliation and redemption in Christ is wanting, is pitiful self-delusion.

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

Ver. 7, 8. St Paul designates the night as that time in which sleep and drunkenness usually take place; those things, therefore, no longer become those who have night in the spiritual sense behind them, they are awake and armed for the combat. The metaphor of arming we became fully acquainted with at Ephes. vi. 10, ss., and there also spoke of the discrepancies which are found between the two passages in the comparison of the several

weapons with different Christian virtues. As to the rest, we find the order of succession of the three Christian cardinal virtues here again just as it is in the passage i. 3, where see the Commentary.

Ver. 9–11. St Paul fastens on the ἐλπὶς σωτηρίας in order to express the idea, that God hath not appointed the faithful to wrath, but to salvation, that therefore also the day of the Lord brings them not destruction, but blessing. The election of grace by God is, no doubt, couched in the ἔθετο, but only in the sense of a *prædestinatio sanctorum*, as it has been proved in the Commentary at Rom. ix. to be scriptural, and especially to be St Paul's doctrine. The atoning death of Christ is named as the means by which the σωτηρία is realized according to God's ordinance. The εἴτε γρηγορῶμεν, εἴτε καθεύδωμεν seems strange at first sight, as in ver. 6 sleeping among the faithful was altogether denied. But it is clear that the two expressions are here used in a totally different sense, viz. of the antithesis of the ζῆν and the κοιμᾶσθαι, iv. 13, ss. St Paul again connects his discourse with the previous discussion, in which he had made it clear that those fallen asleep in Christ forfeit nothing of their blessedness; with a reference to *that* he says, we believers shall live with Christ (iv. 17), whether we be still in the body when He cometh, or already fallen asleep. (Compare Rom. xiv. 8.) As to the rest, καθεύδειν is found in no other passage of the New Testament used of death, for in the history of the awakening of Jairus' daughter (Matt. ix. 24; Mark v. 39; Luke viii. 52) it means, in opposition to ἀπέθανε, really "to sleep": κοιμᾶσθαι is everywhere else found of the death-sleep. In the same way γρηγορεῖν is found nowhere else in the meaning "to live, to walk in the body." The passage, therefore, has certainly something singular about it, and the more so indeed, as no one can avoid the impression that a preference is given the γρηγορεῖν, as the state of waking consciousness over the καθεύδειν, whereas we are inclined to claim for the soul of the pious man released from the body a *higher* degree of consciousness.[1] However, this difficulty is solved on the ground which we have already detailed in the Commentary on 1 Cor. xv. 19, 20. From the representation of the New Testament the state

[1] How universally this notion is spread appears from the ordinary mode of expression which one uses in reference to the dead: "now everything is clear to them, the veil is removed from them!" from which it appears unmistakeably that one conceives the connection of the soul with the body as a hinderance to complete consciousness.

of the soul separated from the body is not, it is true, an *unconscious* one, but yet of such a nature, that the consciousness seems depressed. The complete self-consciousness only comes in again with the resurrection of the body; a living on without bodily resurrection St Paul treats (1 Cor. xv.) as a losing of eternal life. The striking part of the passage is really, therefore, solely couched in the use of the words chosen, and not in the idea.—Verse 11 then closes, like iv. 18, with a summons to reciprocal encouragement and edification. (Ver. 9. περιποίησις, "attaining, acquiring," St Paul uses also at 2 Thess. ii. 14; Ephes. i. 14; it is also found Heb. x. 39; 1 Pet. ii. 9.—Ver. 10. As to the use of the conjunctive instead of the optative in this passage see Winer's Gramm., pp. 246, 270, note.—Ver. 11. εἷς τὸν ἕνα = ἀλλήλους iv. 18 is found in *profane* writers also. See Kypke observv., p. 339.)

§ 6. CONCLUDING EXHORTATIONS.

(v. 12–28.)

Ver. 12, 13. The two first verses of the closing exhortations which follow concern the relation of the readers to the teachers and heads of the church. St Paul exhorts the Thessalonians duly to honour them in their position. As nothing similar is found in the second Epistle, and no express polemical doctrine shows itself in this passage, nothing obliges us to suppose that in Thessalonica theoretical or practical errors in regard to the relation of laymen to the teachers of the church had been disseminated. As it is inherent in human nature that such errors ever and everywhere appear in individuals, because obedience and subordination are such difficult duties, it may reasonably be supposed that St Paul found himself impelled to give his precepts merely with a view to the relation as such. Only the slight intimation v. 27 (of which passage see the explanation) might seem to countenance the idea that the relation between the church and its heads was not altogether untroubled. However, nothing *certain* can be deduced from that. So much, however, results unmistakeably from these verses, viz. that St Paul supposes a difference among the members of the church. All do not stand on a level according to the principles of democratical equality, but there are teachers and learners, leaders and led, as will be discussed more in detail in the exposition of

the Epistles to Timothy and Titus. As to the rest, the terms by which the teachers are here designated are to be taken so that the appellative *οἱ κοπιῶντες ἐν ὑμῖν* designates them quite generally as labourers (*ἐν ὑμῖν* is to be taken in the sense "among you," not as = *ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν*, as Flatt and Pelt insist; for the question is not merely of a purely inward labour, but also of outward guidance of the church). On the other hand, *προϊστάμενοι* and *νουθετοῦντες* do not denote, for instance, two other classes along with the *κοπιῶντες*, but two different forms of the labours of the *κοπιῶντες* are denoted by them, as is clear from the absence of the article. One could labour in the church in a more outward or in a more inward way; the former is the *προΐστασθαι* (compare 1 Tim. v. 17, where *προεστῶτες* are named), the latter the *νουθετεῖν*. Whether, indeed, St Paul already conceives these two forms of labour in the church as two entirely separate church-offices, may, it is true, appear uncertain, considering the church in Thessalonica was so young, and, no doubt, small too; but in later times (see 1 Cor. xii. 18; Ephes. iv. 11; 1 Tim. iv. 17) such a distinction between the offices is decidedly expressed. (Ver. 12. *εἰδέναι* is used, after the analogy of the Hebrew יָדַע, Gen. xxxix. 6; Prov. xxxi. 13, and the Latin *respicere*, in the sense of respectful acknowledgment. See 1 Cor. xvi. 18.—Ver. 13. *ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ*, see iii. 10.—The phrase *ἡγεῖσθαί τινα ἐν ἀγάπῃ* is harsh. Schott compares Job xxxv. 2, *ἡγεῖσθαί τι ἐν κρίσει*, חָשַׁב לְמִשְׁפָּט. The phrase is to denote the esteem and love which are equally due to the rulers of the church for their painful labour so beneficial to the laity.—By the *εἰρηνεύετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς* disputes among the Christians in Thessalonica seem, it is true, to be pointed to, but the whole remaining contents of the Epistle, which breathe only acknowledgment on the part of the apostle, do not suit that at all though. (But compare v. 27.) Certainly one cannot well take the words by themselves as an independent exhortation, nor annex them to what follows, because the *παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς* answers to the *ἐρωτῶμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς* (ver. 12) and marks a fresh beginning; but they afford a very good sense also in connection with what precedes, if they are taken so that the exhortation to preserve the proper relation towards the labourers for the church is, in conclusion, comprised in the exhortation to peace. Where teachers and taught stand in a false position towards each other, *there* the peace of the church is already undermined. D.E.G. read *αὐτοῖς* for *ἑαυτοῖς*, but it is presumably only a slip of the pen for *αὐτοῖς*. Further,

it is again to be taken, as in ver. 12, in the meaning ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν.)

Ver. 14. As to the rest, how far St Paul is from hierarchical notions of the dignity of the rulers, is shown by the circumstance, that he here immediately summons *all* to the νουθετεῖν, which he seemed in ver. 12 to adjudge to the *labourers alone*. (The exhortation to warn the ἄτακτοι, *i.e.* to return to subordination, refers, it may be supposed, to the state of things brought under discussion in 1 Thess. iv. 11; 2 Thess. iii. 6, 11.—Ὀλιγόψυχος is found nowhere in the New Testament but here, often, however, in the LXX. for the Hebrew קְצַר or שְׁפַל־רוּחַ, Isaiah liv. 6, lvii. 15; Prov. xiv. 29.—Ἀντέχεσθαι, "to care for one, to support one." See Matt. vi. 24; Luke xvi. 13. The ἀσθενεῖς are surely to be understood less of the bodily, than of the spiritually, weak.—The πρὸς πάντας is more accurately defined by the εἰς ἀλλήλους καὶ εἰς πάντας, which follows in ver. 15, to the purport that the absolute universality of all men is to be understood by it.)

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

to grammar.—As to the rest, definite reasons cannot be shown for the position of the several propositions, one might conceive them just as well arranged in the inverse order.

Ver. 19–22. The next exhortation: τὸ πνεῦμα μὴ σβέννυτε supposes the comparison of the Spirit to a candle or fire, which, as is well-known, is frequently found in the New Testament, and has occasioned various modes of expression. (See John iv. 24; Ephes. vi. 16; 2 Tim. i. 6; Heb. xii. 29. But the question whether πνεῦμα is to be taken here as a religious-moral principle, or as the source of the Charismata, is to be altogether declined, because the two cannot be separated, or at least did not make their appearance separately in the apostolical times. Where the Spirit was, He showed Himself as well in a religious-moral relation as also in the extraordinary gifts. But, inasmuch as the efficacy of the Spirit was *outwardly* recognisable in the Charismata, therefore also in *those* a quenching was alone possible, perhaps out of fear of enthusiasm, of which there could be no question in a religious-moral point of view (for who would have thought of quenching the virtues of faith, love, and hope, called forth by the Holy Ghost?), for that reason we are, first of all, in connection with πνεῦμα, to think of the gifts, and what follows suits this view well, for a form of Charisma, viz. the προφητεία, is there especially brought forward and recommended. (See at 1 Cor. xii. 4, ss., xiv. 1, ss.) As to the rest, we plainly see, from these exhortations, that St Paul had no presentiment at the time when he wrote this, that the Christians in Thessalonica were in danger of becoming a prey to fanaticism, though this was the case later, according to the second Epistle. True, the προφητείας μὴ ἐξουθενεῖτε, considered by itself, might be understood so that St Paul would wish by it to make the Thessalonians, like the Corinthians (1 Cor. xiv. 1, ss.), observe the value of calm conscious prophesying over the more fanatical tongue-haranguing. But the πνεῦμα μὴ σβέννυτε does not permit this mode of taking the words. From this exhortation the Christians in Thessalonica must rather have had the sorrowful notion of *all* gifts that they might easily give occasion for abuses, and, to avoid those, have slighted the gifts themselves. When St Paul at a later date wrote the Epistles to the Corinthians, he himself even found it proper to moderate the over-estimation of them, and at length in his latest Epistles the gifts retreat entirely into the background, which is especially shown in the pastoral Epistles (comp. the Introduction to the Pastoral

Epistles).—Ver. 21. Now it is clear from the context that the words: πάντα δὲ δοκιμάζετε κ. τ. λ. are not to be taken in the totally general sense in which they are usually employed; they rather refer to the Charisma of the διάκρισις πνευμάτων, 1 Cor. xii. 10, 30; 1 John iv. 1. The readers are called on to prove the representations of the prophets by the gift of proving, dwelling in them; the individual gifts are meant to complete and rectify one another. (Compare the remarks in the Comm. on 1 Cor. xii. 10, xiv. 29.) Here, then, reason, as man's natural power, is not set up for a judge over divine revelation, but by God's ordinance the modes of operation of the Holy Ghost are variously distributed, so that in *some* the communication of what is new predominates, in *others* the criticism of what is communicated.[1] The words in ver. 22: ἀπὸ παντὸς εἴδους κ. τ. λ. form no fresh sentence, but only the complement to the τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε. The idea, therefore, of the δοκιμάζειν (= κρίνειν, to separate, to sift) is divided into its two aspects, into the recognising of the good and the rejection of the evil, which latter has mixed up the sinfulness of the prophets with the Divine power operating in them. It can only be doubtful how the εἴδους is to be taken. The meaning "appearance" is inadmissible, because the combination εἶδος πονηρὸν is without example, the idea, too, of abstaining from evil *appearance* does not suit what precedes. Therefore, in case of employing that meaning, ver. 22 must first have been brought into connection with ver. 23, but *that* too is not suitable. The exhortation to abstain from evil *appearance* presupposes that they are already free from evil *itself*, but in ver. 23 that deliverance from evil seems in the ἁγιάσαι κ. τ. λ. to be only gained by prayer. Now, even if this admits of being put aside by the remark that ἁγιάσαι here can only be understood of the growth of the already existing pure new man, yet the αὐτὸς δὲ κ. τ. λ. shows that something fresh is to follow. Εἶδος is, therefore, to be taken in the signification, "species, sort," as Josephus (Arch. x. 3. 1) writes πᾶν εἶδος πονηρίας, so that πονηροῦ is taken as a substantive. (Ver. 21. The conjecture πνεύματα for πάντα is not only unnecessary, but also unsuitable; the discourse is not of distinguishing true and false prophets, but only of true and untrue utterances of such to whom the gift of prophecy belonged.

Ver. 23, 24. As the Thessalonians are, as members of the Chris-

[1] In meaning the exhortation coincides with the well-known apocryphal utterance of Christ's: γίνεσθε φρόνιμοι τραπεζῖται.

tian Church, already ἅγιοι, *i.e.* set apart from the sinful world, filled with the principle of true holiness (see the remarks on Rom. i. 7), stress is especially to be laid on the ὁλοτελεῖς. Sanctification extends itself only by degrees over the collective powers and natural qualities of man; it is precisely progress in this process of glorification and the preservation of the whole personality spotless, till the judgment at Christ's coming (iii. 13), that St Paul wishes them in these words, and that too of God Himself, through His Spirit, as no one can sanctify Himself by his own power. But God is here called Θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης, because sanctification is the condition of outward and inward peace; God, therefore, who carries peace in Himself, will also impart it to men through sanctification. (Ὁλοτελὴς is found only here in the New Testament. Aquila renders Deut. xiii. 17, כָּלִיל by ὁλοτελῶς. It stands here quite synonymous with ὁλόκληρος, which, according to James i. 4, is found in the meaning of τέλειος, as it also often occurs in the LXX. and Josephus for שָׁלֵם or תָּמִים. Of course the ὁλόκληρον refers to every single one of the three parts of human nature named. Each is to be preserved *entire* in itself, and altogether are to be kept *spotless*. By sin not only the proportion of the parts among themselves, but also the stability of each single one by itself, may be weakened.) That, lastly, the juxtaposition of the three terms: πνεῦμα, ψυχή, σῶμα, is not a mere rhetorical amplification for the idea of the totality, nor yet that πνεῦμα can be understood of the *Holy* Spirit, but denotes the *human* spirit (see on Rom. viii. 16),—is acknowledged by the latest interpreters, though Pelt and Schott will not admit that the distinguishing of πνεῦμα and ψυχή pervades the system of anthropology of St Paul and of the Bible generally. But, as the distinguishing of πνεῦμα and ψυχή here cannot surely be merely accidental,—as, further, a difference in the use of the two expressions can be proved to exist elsewhere also (even if in many passages, where nothing depends exactly on an accurate distinguishing of them, the one expression also stands, and may stand, for the other),—as, lastly, the partition into spirit, soul, and body, was current among the Jews, just as it was among the Platonists; it appears, even in the case when one cannot one's self recognise this division, indispensable, according to a purely historical mode of contemplation, to acknowledge the triple division of human nature as a doctrine of the apostolical age. But now it follows that many Christian points of doctrine (to name some, the doctrines of regeneration, of the relation of the old to

the new man, and whatever connects itself with that), can be made intelligible only by assuming the distinction between spirit and soul. We have, therefore, by continued investigation, been only more and more convinced of the correctness of the result of our treatise *de trichotomia humanæ naturæ* (printed in the *opusc. theol.*, pp. 143, ss.), which in essentials Vitringa also had already (*observ. sacr.*, pp. 549, ss.) in earlier times expressed in reference to cabalistic[1] and Platonist views, just as in later times Usteri (in "the system of St Paul," pp. 404, ss.) at least recognised it as an historical fact. For, whilst the ψυχή denotes the lower region of the inner man,—comprises therefore the powers to which analogous ones are found in *animal* life also, as understanding (φρένες), appetitive faculty (καρδία), memory, fancy,—the πνεῦμα includes those natural dispositions which constitute the true *human* life, viz. reason (νοῦς), as the faculty of perceiving the divine; conscience, as the faculty of distinguishing moral good and evil; free-will, as the faculty of moral choice, by which the ability to form a history is purchased. Just according to the predominance of the one or the other principle in man he appears either as πνευματικός, or ψυχικός, or even σαρκικός. The *divine* spirit, attaching itself to the *human* spirit weakened by sin, and filling it with complete energy, frees man from the power of sin which rules him, and exhibits him as πνευματικός in the full sense of the word. (See the remarks on Rom. vii. 23 to viii. 3.) The certainty of the fulfilment of the wish for his readers expressed in ver. 23 St Paul now finds (ver. 24) grounded in the faithfulness of God, who has called them unto participation in the merits of Christ; the will of God exhibited in this calling will also, in accordance with His unchangeableness, arrive at completion. The necessity that is couched in this idea is to be referred to the *prædestinatio sanctorum* alone, in the sense in which we set it forth as a doctrine of Scripture at Romans ix. 1. St Paul does not mean here to say God knows how to make good His calling by the force of His *gratia irresistibilis* even to the complete sanctification of man *against* his free will; but God knows how to lead the will of man

[1] The Cabbalists assumed, in appearance only, besides רוּחַ and נֶפֶשׁ, also נְשָׁמָה as different from both; therefore three spiritual powers, and, with the corporeity, four parts of human nature. For נְשָׁמָה answers to the πνεῦμα ἅγιον of the New Testament, which also St Paul distinguishes from the human πνεῦμα (Rom. viii.16), so that in the regenerate man also three spiritual powers are to be supposed; but the πνεῦμα ἅγιον is not an integral part of human nature, but a working of God in him which elevates it above itself.

through the influences of His grace even to full concordance with His holy decrees. The possibility of resistance is not excluded by that, it remains to man even after his conversion, but then too, by reason of the all-knowing eye of God, no *true* calling takes place in rebellious persons. As to the rest, the ὅς καὶ ποιήσει has something elliptical in it; one comprehends how copyists might then be themselves obliged to complete the sentence. In some, though unimportant MSS., we find the addition: τὴν ἐλπίδα ὑμῶν βεβαίαν. But it seems more suitable to supply merely ταῦτα πάντα, inasmuch as the ποιεῖν is most naturally referred to what is prayed for in ver. 23. (As to the πιστὸς ὁ Θεὸς see at 1 Cor. i. 9, x. 13.)

Ver. 25–28. The recommendation of praying for him, and the commission to greet all the brethren with a holy kiss, are also found Rom. xv. 30; Col. iv. 3; Rom. xvi. 16; 1 Cor. xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 12, on which passages compare the remarks in the Commentary. Only in the three last cited passages it is always said ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους, whereas here the commission is given to *some* to kiss *all* the other brethren. But this is sufficiently explained by the fact that, as ver. 27 clearly shows, this Epistle is first of all addressed to the rulers of the church, yet only so that it is at the same time designed for the whole brotherhood. It was, therefore, we may suppose, delivered to the elders according to St Paul's intention, read first by *them*, and then read out to the whole church in public assembly. But that St Paul lays this injunction on the elders with the formula of adjuration, ὁρκίζω ὑμᾶς τὸν κύριον, so emphatically, is certainly striking, and points to a special reason to us unknown. If one looks back to ver. 12, 13, one might think that at least slight traces of differences between the church in Thessalonica and its rulers had suffered themselves to be perceived, and that St Paul, therefore, apprehended the rulers might not communicate the Epistle to all. Michaelis proposed, with reference to the fact that an Epistle had been forged (2 Thess. ii. 2), to take the passage so that ἀναγινώσκειν would be understood of the recognition of the Epistle as a genuine writing of the apostle's throughout the church. But the term constantly denotes in St Paul "to read, to read to," only. (See especially Col. iv. 16.) Besides, surely St Paul cannot possibly here take cognisance of a fact that only happened later. (Ὁρκίζω, with a double accusative in the meaning *obtestari aliquem per*, with νὴ to be supplied, is found again in the New Testament at Mark v. 7; Acts

xix. 13. Lachmann has, on the authority of A.B.D.E., preferred ἐνορκίζω, which, at all events, has the rarity of the form in its favour. The same critic, supported by the authority of B.D.E.F.G., leaves out ἁγίοις, but the rarity of the term, "holy brothers," which is only found at Col. i. 2; Heb. iii. 1, renders it more probable that it is primordial here. The ἀμὴν after the benediction is, like the subscription, certainly not genuine here.)

EXPOSITION

OF THE

SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

---

§ 1. THANKSGIVING FOR THE FAITH OF THE CHRISTIANS IN THESSALONICA.

(I. 1.–12.)

After the salutation, which coincides literally with that of the first Epistle (see the explanation of 1 Thess. i. 1), St Paul begins, just as at 1 Thess. i. 2, to express his thanks to God on account of their faith and love (ver. 3). Now this has something extraordinary in it, inasmuch as he had by no means, as chap. ii. shows, reason to be so contented with the then state of the church as he could be at the time of the composition of the first Epistle. In the short time which might fall between the dates of composing the two Epistles, circumstances had, certainly, already changed very much, and the weak stirrings of enthusiasm at first existing were now come to their full development. Nevertheless, St Paul might, in spite of those aberrations against which he steps forth in chap. iii. with such emphatic denunciations, thankfully acknowledge the faith and love of the Thessalonians with a good conscience, as those aberrations proceeded not from unbelief, but rather from a too great eagerness of belief, to which only a clear judgment was wanting. This exaggeration in the eagerness of belief St Paul perhaps indulgently points to by means of the expression ὑπεραυξάνειν, in which there is scarcely couched a mere intensification of the simple verb. (Ver. 3. The καθὼς ἄξιόν ἐστι is to be referred not so much to the greatness of the thanks, as to the indispensability of the thanks in themselves.—It cannot be inferred from the ἑνὸς ἑκάστου that no differences at all had taken

place among the Thessalonians; chap. iii. shows the contrary. But St Paul recognises even in these differences a foundation of love, which only manifested itself in them in a perverted form of application; they had both faith and love, but without being as yet able rightly to direct them by means of wisdom.)

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

Ver. 5. Now St Paul finds in this approving of their patience and faith in every combat an evidence of the just judgment of God, that they may be made worthy of the kingdom of God, for which they suffer. The words ἔνδειγμα τῆς δικαίας κρίσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ unite themselves very strictly with the preceding idea of the sufferings endured with patience and faith; so that it stands for εἰς ἔνδειγμα or ἐνδείγματι, which some MSS. also read from a desire to make the passage easier through the correction. (Hesychius interprets ἔνδειγμα by ἀπόδειξις. At Phil. i. 28 the form ἔνδειξις is found for it, in the same meaning, "evidence, proof.") Now this idea is commonly explained so that δίκαια κρίσις is said to be the *future* judging of the world; but how can the *present*, patiently endured, suffering for the sake of the kingdom of God, be an evidence of the *future* just judgment of God. It is said, in so far as God will in His future judgment reward those who have

suffered for the sake of the good, and punish the persecutors. But one does not see by the present that God rewards the good; to take their patience as reward might certainly be too bold; neither, therefore, does it suit that the present is to be an evidence for the future. The passage becomes clear only if one conceives the present sufferings even already as an expression of the future just judgment of God. The parallel passage 1 Pet. iv. 17, 18, is elucidatory of this idea. The sufferings of the church are there called τὸ κρίμα τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ Θεοῦ, the judging of the world begins with the faithful, and their sufferings are represented as a means of perfection for the faithful. Now in like manner St Paul too here (compare at 1 Thess. iii. 4) contemplates their sufferings as a testimony that God is executing His just judgment on them, not however in order to destroy them, but in order to perfect them, and so make them worthy of God's kingdom. By this kingdom is of course, from the historical connection of the two Epistles, to be understood the kingdom of God on earth expected as quite near at hand. Even for that reason alone the δίκαια κρίσις cannot be the universal judgment of the world, because that will not take place till *after* the kingdom of God on earth.—In the ὑπὲρ ἧς καὶ πάσχετε there is of course no mention of a purchasing the kingdom of God by means of sufferings, as if they conferred a merit, but ὑπὲρ here denotes only the object of the suffering, "for the sake of which ye also suffer, which ye therefore represent, in that ye bear it in you, and to which ye, accordingly, must also at some time *outwardly* belong." (The compound καταξιωθῆναι does not differ in meaning from the simple verb. See Luke xx. 35, xxi. 36; Acts v. 21.)

Ver. 6, 7. And now the judicial action of God is described in detail, as it manifests itself in Christ's advent (ver. 6–10). This detail does not connect itself with ἔνδειγμα δικαίας κρίσεως, but with the words εἰς τὸ καταξιωθῆναι κ.τ.λ., by means of εἴπερ δίκαιον. Suffering here below in the cause of what is good supposes also, in conformity with God's justice, the receiving the reward of fidelity. As in the whole course of the world's history, so also in the coming of Christ, God manifests Himself as the just one, who weighs out reward and punishment by an unalterable law; however, this is not yet the κρίσις ἐσχάτη, that does not take place till the general resurrection after the kingdom of God. (See on Matt. xxv. 1, xiv. 31; Rev. xx. 12, ss.) Now, justice is here conceived quite in its strict form, as *jus talionis;* the θλίβοντες are requited

with θλίψις, the θλιβόμενοι rewarded with ἄνεσις. It need not be mentioned that the θλίψις as such is not meant here to be represented as giving a title to peace and comfort in the kingdom of God, without looking at the disposition with which it is undergone, but that the patient, believing, endurance of the same must be supplied as described in ver. 4. Just as little does the δίκαιον form an antithesis with the divine grace; St Paul does not mean to say God *must* grant the eternal happiness of the believing sufferers,—it can be *demanded* of Him. The point of view is only, as at Rom. ii. 5, 6, taken purely in the manner of a judge according to the principle of retribution, without denying that another point of view also comes into consideration, which St Paul declares at Rom. xi. 35, according to which the worthiness of man at the tribunal of God is itself God's work. (Ver. 6. As to εἴπερ, *siquidem*, see Rom. viii. 9, 17; 1 Peter ii. 3. Only it is not here to be translated "if at least," but "if, that is to say," with an assumption of the certainty that it is so, whereas "if at least" admits the possibility of the contrary.—Παρὰ = לְפִי.—Ἀνταποδοῦναι see Luke xiv. 14; Rom. xii. 19; 1 Thess. iii. 9. Ver. 7. As to ἄνεσις see 2 Cor. vii. 5, viii. 13. It is = ἀνάψυξις, Acts iii. 19, which is equally used of the kingdom of God also.—The μεθ' ἡμῶν is to be referred to St Paul and his companions. Of these, after their election by grace, the attainment of eternal happiness in the kingdom of God is so confidently assumed, that the others are designated as uniting themselves to them, who constitute the flower of the inhabitants of the kingdom of God.—The ἀποκάλυψις ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ = the καταβαίνειν ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ described 1 Thess. iv. 16.)

Ver. 8. Christ's coming is now again described (comp. 1 Thess. iii. 13, iv. 16), as accompanied by angels. As, however, the article is wanting, we can only suppose *some* angels, not the whole countless army of angels, as has been already remarked at the passages cited. As δύναμις stands *after* ἀγγέλων, it cannot, of course, be taken, as Michaelis wanted, in the meaning "army," but is meant to designate, conjoined with ἄγγελοι, the angels as servants and executors of the power of Christ. A new feature in the picture of the advent, as St Paul sketches it, which did not occur at 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17, is ἐν πυρὶ φλογός, for which Lachmann, in accordance with authorities of importance, has adopted ἐν φλογὶ πυρός. But this reading is easily explained by the endeavour to bring the phrase nearer the usual mode of expression, in which one talks of a flame of fire, *i.e.* fire-flame, indeed, but not of a fire

of flame. For the question here is not of a single fire-flame, but of a flaming, glowing, fire, in opposition to a low fire not breaking out into bright flames. But this is here named as the element which consumes all that resists, and lends at the same time its fearful brightness to the appearance of the divinity. (Compare Ex. iii. 2, ss.; Dan. vii. 9, ss.) It stands, therefore, = to the ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ, Matt. xxv. 31, or to the ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, Ibid. xxvi. 64, by which, as has already been remarked at 1 Thess. iv. 17, bright clouds are to be understood. The description at Rev. xix. 12, where Christ is represented in His advent as sitting on a white horse, and with eyes ὡς φλὸξ πυρός, is, according to the analysis of the figurative language of the Apocalypse, also parallel to this passage. The primitive aspect of Christ's coming is here now particularly treated of, not certainly in order that the Thessalonians might feast to their heart's content on the future punishment of their persecutors, but as means of warning, in order to deter them from falling away. For the Scriptures know no such pretended divestment of all egoism, that man needs neither fear nor hope, even of damnation or eternal happiness, as motives, and rightly, for it exhibits itself either as a fanatical error, as in the instance of Madame Guyon, or, which is certainly the most common, as indifference and torpidity.—The repetition of the article before ὑπακούουσι certainly countenances the idea that St Paul means to name two classes of persons who will not escape punishment at Christ's coming. But the supposition that the Θεὸν μὴ εἰδότες are the Gentiles, and the τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ μὴ ὑπακούοντες the Jews, is improper for *this* reason, to go no further, that surely many *Gentiles* also did not receive the Gospel offered to them, and, on the other hand, many *Jews* also did not know God, that is to say *in reality* (John viii. 54, ss., xv. 21, ss.); for a merely outward knowledge of the existence of God cannot surely be meant here; only the *true* ἐπίγνωσις τοῦ Θεοῦ is everlasting life (John xvii. 3). The two phrases denote not classes of nations, but moral conditions; those among the Jews and the Gentiles who knew not God in the sense pointed out, and were not obedient to the Gospel which was preached unto them and whose divine power touched their hearts,—meet with their recompense in the day of the Lord (see 2 Thess. ii. 11). There is, indeed, also couched in them, that *all* so-called Gentiles are not rejected *as such*, but only those who were not true to the light that shone even for them too, but by actual sins augmented their original sin to the com-

plete blinding of the spiritual eye. Compare the remarks in the Comm. on Rom. i. 19, 20, ii. 14, 15, 26. (Ἐκδίκησιν διδόναι or ποιεῖν = ἐκδικεῖν. Compare Luke xviii. 7, sq.; Acts vii. 24.)

Ver. 9.—Ὄλεθρος αἰώνιος is named as the punishment which the reprobate (by which, according to ii. 8, Antichrist with his followers is to be understood), at the coming of Christ have to suffer. This is the only passage in St Paul's Epistles in which everlasting damnation is openly declared, whereas not a few occur in which a bringing back of all the lost ones is apparently assumed as possible. (Compare the Comm. on 1 Cor. xv. 25–28.) For, although but little can be inferred from the expression αἰώνιος considered in itself, as it might also denote merely an uncommonly long time, yet it is not to be disputed that the comparison with the formula ζωὴ αἰώνιος does not permit us to interpret the phrase ὄλεθρος αἰώνιος otherwise than of everlasting damnation. For the supposition that St Paul did indeed in this earliest of his Epistles still teach everlasting damnation, but gave it up in later times, there exists no sufficient foundation, because the bringing back again is nowhere freely and openly declared. This *alone* admits of being maintained: that among the writers of the New Testament St Paul is the one that lets the doctrine of everlasting damnation retire to the background most, and affords the defenders of the Apocatastasis the most plausible support. (The formula δίκην, ζημίαν, τίειν, so common in the profane writers, is found in the New Testament here alone.—Ὄλεθρος is used in the New Testament by St Paul alone, 1 Cor. v. 5; 1 Thess. v. 3; 1 Tim. vi. 9. In the last passage it stands beside ἀπώλεια, which is elsewhere commonly used as an antithesis to σωτηρία.) It is very difficult to decide how the ἀπὸ is to be taken in the concluding words of ver. 9. For it can be taken merely as denoting either the source of the punishment or the separation of the reprobate from the face of the Lord. Flatt, Storr, and Pelt, among others, advocate the *former*, either taking πρόσωπον κυρίου as a mere circumlocution for the person of the Lord, or understanding πρόσωπον emphatically of the threatening avenging countenance. The *latter* interpretation is defended by Beza, Michaelis, Koppe, and Schott. The decision is very difficult, because the two members of the sentence which stand parallel to each other, ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ κυρίου and ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ, seem to favour the two different interpretations. The words "from the face of the Lord" seem more to declare for the idea of the separation, because the look-

ing on the face of the Lord is used to denote the approach of God and of eternal happiness, but the phrase "from the glory of His power" seems more to favour the other acceptation, viz., that ἀπὸ is meant to denote the point of departure of the punishment. The mention of power does not suit well the idea of the separation, division, from God. We should allow ourselves to be determined by this latter important point to conceive the idea thus: "they will receive their punishment from the face of God as its source," so that the latter is imagined as menacing (the eyes like flames of fire, Rev. xix. 12), the rather that it is somewhat harsh to interpret the ἀπὸ alone of the separation, unless the collation of Isaiah ii. 10, 19 made it more than probable that St Paul had that passage, which accurately coincides with this of Thessalonians, before his eyes. But in the prophet the ἀπὸ is sufficiently explained by a κρύπτεσθαι preceding, and accordingly we have to acknowledge a conciseness here, in which St Paul assumed the allusion to the passage of the Old Testament as well known.

Ver. 10. The other phase of the advent, the rewarding of the faithful, is denoted only indirectly, viz. so that Christ Himself is represented as glorified and as an object of admiration by the recognition of them. But the greatness of the recompense which is given to the faithful is plainly declared in it, only the recognition of them is referred not to *them* but to Christ as the author of it. In Rom. ix. 23 St Paul utters the same idea. In like manner it is also expressed in Psalm lxxxix. 8. As everything serves the end of manifesting the glory of God, so do especially the great events at the συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος, in which the justice and mercy of God will beam forth in the brightest splendour. As to the rest, the ἐν must be translated not merely an (German, anglicè, "at, on,") but "in," for Christ is represented as glorified in the faithful by His inward indwelling in them. (See details at ver. 12.) Then it certainly is not put here *expressly* that Christ comes *with* His saints, as it was said at ver. 7 that He comes *with* the angels, but, according to the doctrine of the ἐπισυναγωγὴ of the faithful with Christ in heaven (1 Thess. iv. 17; 2 Thess. ii. 1), this must here too be necessarily assumed. (The compound ἐνδοξάζεσθαι is found in the New Testament only here and at ver. 12. In the Old Testament it occurs Ex. xix. 4; Ezek. xxviii. 22, for הִכָּבֵד.) Lastly, as to the concluding words of ver. 10, the connection: ὅτι ἐπιστεύθη τὸ μαρτύριον ἡμῶν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ is inadmissible, because the aorist cannot possibly have the meaning of

the future. Besides, the acceptation of the words as: "my testimony as to you, *i.e.* the testimony which I bear to your faith (ver. 4) will be established on that day, which the defenders of that connection, Grotius, Bengel, Koppe, and Flatt, urge, is not without harshness. For, on the *one* hand, μαρτύριον generally refers to the testimony of Christ, the κήρυγμα τῆς ἀληθείας; on the *other*, ἐπιστεύθη, in accordance with the πιστεύσασι which precedes, is also to be taken in the meaning "to believe." Therefore ὅτι ἐπιστεύθη τὸ μαρτύριον ἡμῶν ἐφ' ὑμας, can only be taken as a parenthesis, in the sense: "ye have truly believed our testimony unto you, *i.e.* received the Gospel preached unto you by us. The ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ, on the contrary, belongs to the former half of ver. 10, ὅταν ἔλθῃ κ.τ.λ. (Πιστεύσασι is, on the authority of the MSS., to be preferred to πιστεύουσι, the reading of the *text. rec.* Their faith is represented as completed, as they on that day have passed into seeing (the face of God).

Ver. 11. To this is then subjoined the remark that St Paul remembers his readers in praying for them that God may perfect them in their life of faith. (Εἰς ὅ is our "for that purpose, to that end," viz. "that Christ at His coming may be glorified through you," as ver. 12 shows.—Ἀξιοῦν τῆς κλήσεως might in itself mean: "to favour with the call," *i.e.* "to hold worthy to be called." But, as the Thessalonians were already called, the context requires: "to make worthy of the call which has already taken place," viz. by fidelity and zeal in sanctification. These would, therefore, not be looked upon as a work of man, but as God's work in man's soul, which he may, however, hinder through unfaithfulness. The concluding words: καὶ πληρώσῃ—ἐν δυνάμει describe more in detail the process of the ἀξιοῦν. Εὐδοκία ἀγαθωσύνης might in itself, like the corresponding Hebrew רָצוֹן טוּבָה, be referred to God's goodness, which He manifests unto man according to His good pleasure, for ἀγαθωσύνη is only the abstract form of the ἀγαθὸν, and receives its closer definiteness by means of the context alone. But the ἔργον πίστεως, which stands parallel with it, requires that εὐδοκία ἀγαθωσύνης also be referred to the condition of the Thessalonians, so that the sense is: "God fill you with all the good which is well-pleasing to Him, *i.e.* may He fill you with all the good which is well-pleasing to Him in you."—The phrase ἔργοι πίστεως is not put merely for πίστις itself, neither can the independent activity of man in the fight of faith be understood by it here, as at 1 Thess. i. 3, because the discourse is of God's work,

and not of man's: ἔργον πίστεως rather denotes here faith as God's work in the souls of men, which is capable of a continued development in respect to its discernment and depth. Ἐν δυνάμει refers to the whole clause ἵνα πληρώσῃ κ.τ.λ., and is to be taken adverbially: "in a powerful, efficacious, manner."—As to the rest, the construction of the πληροῦν with a double accusative is altogether unusual; it is usually joined with the accusative and the genitive, or the dative, πληροῦν τινὰ τινός or τινί. [Compare Acts ii. 28, xiii. 52; Rom. i. 29; 2 Cor. vii. 4.] If one does not choose to let εὐδοκίαν and ἔργον pass for accusatives absolute, one might from what precedes refer merely ἵνα without ὑμᾶς to πληρώσῃ, and supply ἐν ὑμῖν with the accusatives εὐδοκίαν and ἔργον. But *this* construction too is clearly so harsh, that the former acceptation might yet be worthy of the preference. It is true at Ephes. v. 18 πληροῦσθαι is found joined with ἐν, but there it is put with the thing, not the person, which latter would hardly be found.)

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

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

(II. 1–17.)

After this introduction acknowledging his readers' state of faith, St Paul now comes directly to the chief point of his Epistle, to the question with regard to Christ's coming again, as to which fresh errors had developed themselves in Thessalonica after the first Epistle was sent off. In a properly *prophetic* communication St Paul delivers himself on the point of what must precede the coming of Christ, and imparts on this occasion extremely important information as to the nature of Antichrist, the mode of his operation, and what still hinders his being revealed. The *two first* points, the nature of Antichrist and the mode of his operation, are, it is true, circumstantially described in Revelations also, so that we here learn nothing new from St Paul; however, this communication still serves very much for the confirmation and elucidation of the profusely figurative descriptions of the Apocalypse. But the *third* point, on the contrary, viz. what still withholds the revelation of Antichrist, is of that nature, that neither in the Apocalypse, nor elsewhere in the Old or New Testament (slight, and by themselves unintelligible, intimations excepted), does anything similar occur, so that by means of this communication an entirely new, and, as we shall see, deeply penetrating, point in the doctrine of the last things is thus unveiled to us. But, before we examine the particulars of the important communication which follows, we have to answer the preliminary question, whether St Paul declares in it only his private view, which he might have formed for himself in concordance with the reigning Jewish notions, or propounds the doctrine of Antichrist and what is connected with it from a divine revelation. St Paul certainly does not observe here expressly, as at 1 Thess. iv. 15, τοῦτο λέγομεν ἐν λόγῳ κυρίου, but nevertheless we have to consider *this* communication of his also as objectively true divine information, and that for the following reasons. Firstly, we nowhere in the New Testament generally, and in St Paul particularly, find that the distinction between purely subjective private views and objective divine revelation receives a reference to the dogmatic department. All that belongs to *that*, and without any fear of mistake the following information as to the end

of all things is also to be reckoned to that mass, is everywhere and without distinction considered and treated as a communication through the Holy Ghost who leads into all truth, as the result of the anointing which teaches all things (1 John ii. 27). Subjective private views are acknowledged as admissible in the department of discipline and indifferent things alone. (See the remarks in the Comm. on 1 Cor. vii. and Rom. xiv.) But to this *general* consideration there comes here in addition the *special* one, that St Paul in what follows (2 Thess. ii. 15) recommends his instructions to the Christians in Thessalonica with such emphasis for their observation, that it cannot possibly be misunderstood that he wishes to perceive it considered as a divine revelation, so that we have to supply here from the first Epistle the express declaration about it. Further, the undoubting, confident, manner, in which St Paul propounds what follows testifies that he is conscious of declaring not *subjective conjectures* as to futurity, but *objective certainty*. It remains to be said that, beyond Matt. xxiv. and the parallel passages in Mark and Luke, this passage is the most copious in the New Testament in which the purely prophetic element, in the sense of seeing into futurity, exhibits itself; but it is not till we come to the Apocalypse that all the individual features scattered in these and in other passages of the New Testament as to the last catastrophes of the history of humanity and of the earth, are united into one great picture, and placed in living connection with the intimations of the Old Testament on the subject.

Ver. 1, 2. St Paul now collects his eschatologic communications with his previous information in the first Epistle. There he had (iv. 15, ss.) spoken of the παρουσία of Christ, and of the manner in which at Christ's coming the faithful (both those risen from the dead and those still living clothed over) will gather themselves unto Him, as they will be moved forward in clouds into the air to meet the Lord. This St Paul here denotes with the phrase ἡμῶν ἐπισυναγωγὴ ἐπ' αὐτόν. The putting ἡμῶν before has the object of forming an antithesis with the παρουσία Χριστοῦ, *Christ's* coming and *our* being gathered unto Him, *i.e.* our coming to meet Him, denote in this proceeding the divine action and the human action, which meet one another. The substantive ἐπισυναγωγὴ is found in the New Testament only once more, at Heb. x. 25, of meetings for divine service. The verb, on the other hand, is often found (to name some passages, at Matt. xxiv. 31; Mark xiii. 27), likewise of the elect being assembled before the advent. Only in

those passages the discourse is not of a being assembled *in heaven*, but *on earth*, which *latter* is to be conceived as preceding the *former*, as the lifting up into the air is not to be imagined taking place with each individual *by himself*, separated from the others, but as a joint process in *all*, and proceeding from *one* place. This leads to the idea of a mountainous place on which the faithful are assembled in order to go to the Lord from it. [Compare on this point the remarks on Matt. xxiv. 31.]—The use of the ἐπί in ἐπ' αὐτὸν is most simply explained by the contemplation according to which the person of Christ is, as it were, the centre of the assembly, to which centre the entire assembling movement goes along. (See Winer's Gramm., p. 386.) What is now propounded here in reference to the coming of Christ and the assembling of the faithful unto Him by St Paul as an exhortation (ἐρωτάω stands, as at 1 Thess. iv. 1, *per euphemismum* for παρακαλέω), consists, according to ver. 2, in warning the readers not to imagine the day of the Lord as immediately, impending, and allow themselves to be made uneasy by it. One might think that a person considered the day of the Lord as immediately impending, without being made uneasy by it, viz. while he looked forward to the coming of Christ in calm cheerful faith, nay in blessed joy (compare on Luke xxi. 28); though even in the faithful and regenerate will be found fear of the day of the Lord along with the joy, inasmuch, that is to say, as even in *them* the old man still makes his influence good, for he knows he cannot stand before the Lord: in that case the confidence with which such a one fixed the time or the hour would alone be blameable. But among the Christians in Thessalonica complete disquiet, utter loss of their calm inward peace, took place, inasmuch as they were yet too unenlightened to be able in the power of faith to bear the notion of the nearness of such prodigious events. The moral harm of this disquietude is further spoken of in the third chapter. (Σαλεύω, a verb that often occurs in the New Testament, denotes first, of all, "to produce the wavy motion of the sea," thence σαλεύεσθαι, "to be in motion as waves are." Transferred to conditions of mind it denotes all violent passions of joy, grief, or fear. The latter relation predominates here, as the θροεῖσθαι, which defines the term σαλευθῆναι more closely, shows. Θροεῖσθαι, from θρόος, "a noisy cry," is not found in the New Testament again except at Matt. xxiv. 6; Mark xiii. 7.)—But the ταχέως is difficult; it means not merely "swiftly, hastily," but also "soon," with reference to a previous point of time. But

the reference to a point of time seems here inadmissible, because it seems alone possible for the meaning of St Paul to be that the Thessalonians are not to let themselves be disquieted *at all*, not merely that they are not to let themselves be *soon* put in anxiety. But, if one conceives St Paul's personal presence with them, or the receipt of his first Epistle, as the point of time to which St Paul refers, their fault certainly shows itself greater, if they, directly after, let themselves be led away from the right state of mind, than if this had not taken place till many years later. For the short interval also supposes but a short employment of assaults against their established state of faith, and that *these* nevertheless soon overthrew them supposes a weakness of faith in them which is meant to be reproved by the ταχέως. It is to be added that St Paul, sparing them, chooses the form of representation, that he assumes they had not yet allowed themselves to be altogether disquieted, which is couched in the ἐρωτῶμεν—εἰς τὸ μή. By that means he not only prepossessed in his favour those among the Christians in Thessalonica who had in some measure remained firm, but also linked himself to the better element in those already quite carried away, in order to bring them back the easier. The tone of opinion from which they are not to let themselves be led away is denoted merely by νοῦς. One expects an epithet to it, as they are not to let themselves be led away "from the right disposition, from sentiments firm in the faith," by far-fetched illusions. But St Paul deems an epithet unnecessary, because to him the νοῦς is of itself the designation of the higher powers of the soul in man which define self-consciousness. (See on Rom. vii. 23.) Where anxious fear becomes dominant the νοῦς loses its power, the condition of the ἄνοια commences. (Instead of μήτε θροεῖσθαι one expects, according to the rules of the language [see Winer's Gramm., p. 456], undoubtedly μηδὲ, which Lachmann has even received into the text, although in opposition to his critical principles, and Schott also approves. For not a single MS. or critical authority reads μηδὲ, and we must decidedly reprobate the altering of the text by conjecture. It is rather to be openly acknowledged that St Paul has not here observed the more accurate distinction between μηδὲ and μήτε.)

But now what St Paul further communicates in ver. 2 as to the causes which had brought about this disquietude of the Christians in Thessalonica is especially important for the understanding of the state of affairs in the church there. For it might

have been thought quite legitimately that the expectation of the immediate proximity of the day of the Lord and the disquietude of the Thessalonians produced by it had developed themselves without any especial cause. St Paul had called on them in the first Epistle (chap. 5) to be above all things watchful, not to think in themselves they had still peace and safety; after this it was natural to light upon such views as St Paul is now combating, viz. that it was *certain* the Lord must come shortly. From the description in the third chapter of this Epistle we have to imagine this "shortly" as certainly some weeks or months at most, which the Thessalonians thought they still had for a respite until the day of the Lord. For, if they had supposed even *some years* only until this catastrophe, the giving up their handicrafts would have been insufficiently accounted for. But we perceive from St Paul's more detailed communications, which here follow, that, besides those *general* causes producing similar notions out of the folly of men at *all* times, there were in Thessalonica *special* causes also, which had there called forth the fanatical expectation of the proximity of Christ's coming. He names *three* such causes: *μήτε διὰ πνεύματος, μήτε διὰ λόγου, μήτε δι' ἐπιστολῆς ὡς δι' ἡμῶν.* That St Paul means to denote by these only *possible* sources of fanaticism, not such as had already become *actually operative* in his readers, is utterly improbable, especially as at iii. 17 precautions are taken against Epistles fathered on him, a case which must, therefore, have already happened. Now, before we take the separate points more closely into consideration, we have to answer the preliminary question as to whether the *ὡς δι' ἡμῶν* refers merely to the *last* member of the sentence, or to the *two last*, or even to *all three*. If the last were the case, the sense of the words would then be that the Christians in Thessalonica had been deceived, not merely by means of supposititious doctrines and Epistles, but also by means of pretended prophecies of St Paul's. Such an acceptation of the words would be utterly impossible, yet Reiche (in the essay above cited, p. 9), approves of it. Had St Paul wished to express that idea, not only would he undoubtedly have written not *πνεῦμα*, but *προφητεία* (for that *πνεῦμα* denotes an isolated prophecy is without any example), but it would also be difficult then to escape tautology, as then *λόγος* and *ἐπιστολή* could surely be only understood again too of different forms of the communication of that prophecy which had been granted to the apostle. If we, accordingly, must decline the connection of the *ὡς δι' ἡμῶν* with all these sub-

stantives, the reference, on the other hand, of the words to the two last articles, not to ἐπιστολὴ only, is more than probable. For some doctrine propounded by a man unknown to, or without influence among, the Thessalonians could be no inducement for them to take up such opinions into their minds as St Paul blames in them, but that could well be and was necessarily the case, if they believed the doctrine came from their beloved apostle. If we, accordingly, do not refer the words διὰ πνεύματος to St Paul, the question is how the words are to be taken. The referring them to prophecies of the Old Testament is plainly quite inadmissible, for nothing could be deduced from them as to *the time* of Christ's coming. True, it has been proposed to understand διὰ λόγου of calculations (comp. Phil. iv. 15, 17) which were instituted in consequence of prophecies in the Old Testament; but, *firstly*, we find no example of such calculations having been instituted in the time of the apostles, and *secondly*, the usual combination of λόγος and ἐπιστολὴ for denoting *vivâ voce* and written instruction, which recurs directly at ver. 15, is decidedly against it. Accordingly, διὰ πνεύματος can only be referred to the gift of prophecy of the Charismata, so that the abstract is put for the concrete πνευματικός. Of course, St Paul cannot recognise this prophesying as a *pure* one, but one need not still on that account turn one's thoughts to false prophets, properly so called, who were urged on by the evil spirit (*these* St Paul would certainly have designated by stronger expressions), on the contrary, the true Charisma of προφητεία, and especially that of the γλώσσαις λαλεῖν, in which the personal consciousness retired very much into the back-ground (see in the Commentary on 1 Cor. xiv. 1), might easily be defiled by admixtures from the sinful nature of him that exercised the gift, wherefore indeed St Paul ordained that the words of the prophets and of those speaking with tongues should ever be judged by such as were in possession of the gifts of the διάκρισις πνευμάτων. (See in the Comm. at 1 Cor. xiv. 29.) By this acceptation then the question of what men these prophecies may have proceeded from is also solved. Emissaries who had penetrated from without into the church at Thessalonica are not to be thought of even in what follows (chap. iii.), in spite of the strict measures which St Paul recommends, not the slightest intimation is found that intruders had caused these disturbances. The authors of those prophecies were, no doubt, members of the church, who had brought their Charismata into employment in

fanatical guise, and thus by subjective inmixtures dimmed the Holy Spirit in them. That in this conduct a conscious evil design was at work is scarcely to be supposed; this overclouding of the gifts of grace of the Spirit will rather have been occasioned by a one-sided predominance of the feelings and imagination. But the case must have been otherwise with those who pretended declarations of St Paul by word of mouth or in writing; for in the ὡς δι' ἡμῶν scil. γεγραμμένης is plainly expressed the intention that the non-apostolical epistle should be taken for apostolical according to the design of the deceivers. It is true, Jerome, Krause, Nösselt, and others, have thought misapprehensions merely of St Paul's doctrine and Epistles may be spoken of;[1] but iii. 17 is decidedly against *that;* for St Paul, in order to obviate such deceptions, there gives a fixed mark for his genuine Epistles. But in what mind are we to imagine those persons to have been? One does not perceive at all what they could have in view with such a deception. It was this consideration that prompted Hug (Introd. vol. ii., p. 344) to the supposition that those persons might have had no evil design in their deception, but had been induced to it solely by the wish to operate a wholesome fear, and, by that means, amendment, in some thoughtless members of the church in Thessalonica by a representation of the proximity of the day of Christ. This assumption, however, of a pious fraud has clearly not sufficient foundation; it is simpler to imagine that fanaticism, that fruitful source of deceit, suggested to certain persons, by means of supposititious communications of St Paul's, to give preponderance to their notions of the immediate proximity of the advent in Thessalonica. (In ver. 2 the ὡς ὅτι = οἷον ἐι or ὡς ἄν, as Pelt has already justly remarked in accordance with Alberti's *observ. phil.*, p. 318. By means of the ὡς the assertion: ὅτι ἐνέστηκεν ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου is meant to be represented as the notion which was intended to be propagated by πνεῦμα, λόγος, and ἐπιστολή.—As to ἐνέστηκεν see Rom. viii. 38; Gal. i. 4.)

Ver. 3, 4. Now St Paul warns his readers (μή τις κ. τ. λ. *scil.* βλέπετε, ὁρᾶτε) against all these forms of deceit, and that too because the day of the Lord had necessary preliminaries which must have first been fulfilled, before it could come. For it need not be mentioned that the ἐὰν μὴ before ἔλθῃ must not be taken with

[1] Kern (Tübingen Journal for 1839, p. ii. p. 150) will have the expression understood of a false exposition of the first Epistle; but this would be inadmissible for *this* reason, to go no further, that then the article before ἐπιστολῆς could not be omitted.

Storr and Flatt *certissimè*, but that the apodosis, as being understood of itself from verse 2, is to be supplied, in this way: ἐὰν μὴ ἔλθῃ ἡ ἀποστασία πρῶτον, οὐκ ἔρχεται ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου. The passages to which Storr and Flatt refer (Numb. xiv. 28; Ezek. xvii. 19) cannot be compared with this one, because אם is there a form of an oath. "But when," St Paul means to say, "the apostacy shall have happened and Antichrist have been revealed, then too the day of the Lord will *immediately* come,—immediately follow Antichrist. The coming in of the apostacy, and the revealing of Antichrist, are therefore named here as preliminaries. Whilst *the latter* is described circumstantially and in exceedingly characteristic features, nothing further is said of the ἀποστασία, and it remains therefore uncertain what St Paul wishes to have understood by it. The article points to something known to the readers, and indeed St Paul refers in ver. 5 to his *vivâ voce* instructions on the point. Since we do not *know those*, there remain to us only the general analogy and the whole body of doctrine in order to determine what St Paul most probably wishes to have understood by "the falling away." Many interpreters, as Le Clerc, Nösselt, Rosenmüller, and Usteri, choose to imagine the revolt of the Jews against the Romans, before the destruction of Jerusalem, to be meant. If the term occurred in the passage Matt. xxiv., this acceptation would be well-grounded, supposing, that is to say, that it, like the destruction of Jerusalem itself (see the Comm. on Matt. xxiv. 1), is referred typically to a remoter event. But no reference at all to events lying nearer is traceable here; we have therefore no occasion either to overlook the most general idea of the falling away from the faith, from love, from hope, in short from everything divine and holy, as it is described by the Lord Himself in Matt. xxiv. 8, ss., and from which, according to Matt. xxiv. 24, the *elect* alone are preserved by God's grace. The article points to a *known* falling away; St Paul will have already given his readers information about it by word of mouth. Only it is a striking feature in the case, that the coming in of the falling away is put *before* the revealing of Antichrist, whereas it seems that the falling away arrives at fulfilment only by means of Antichrist and his seductive arts, as St Paul himself describes it ii. 9 in harmony with Rev. xiii. 14, ss. It was, we may suppose, this apparent impropriety which induced many of the Fathers to take the falling away for Antichrist himself, as him that operated the falling away, as, to name some, Chrysostom and Theodoret among the

Greeks, Augustine among the Latins. But nothing whatever countenances that. However, the difficulty of the falling away being put before the revelation of Antichrist certainly requires its solution. The simplest interpretation and the one most corresponding to the representations in Matt. xxiv. and the Revelations seems to be this. In a certain aspect Antichrist and the revealing of him are themselves a result of the falling away, which will take place not among the Christians merely, but among all nations and in all religions and constitutions a falling away from the fundamental pillars of all truth and universal justice will take place,[1] as St Paul describes it 1 Tim. iv. 1, ss.; and Antichrist will, viewed from the *one* side, grow out of this as the fruit, viewed from the *other* side, however, conversely, himself accomplish in its totality this tendency of the falling away, and endeavour to bring to it even the truly faithful; an attempt which must, it is true, through God's grace, serve to the perfecting of the saints and of the Church in general. Particulars as to these events can only be taken into consideration in the explanation of the thirteenth chapter of Revelations, in which the great falling away of mankind and the influence of Antichrist and of his prophet upon it are described more in detail. (As to the form of the word ἀποστασία, it is of laterorigin. The earlier is ἀπόστασις. See Lobeck's Phrynichus, p. 528. In the Greek translations ἀποστασία is met with for בִּגְדוֹ and סָרָה 2 Chron. xxix. 19; Jerem. xxix. 32.) The revealing of Antichrist is then named as the second of the events without which the coming of Christ is not to be expected. The idea of his ἀποκάλυψις is to be explained by the pervading parallel between Christ and Antichrist, as indeed in ver. 9 the latter's "coming" is also spoken of. But *another* idea, to which also the ἀποκάλυψις leads, is not to be separated from *that* one, viz. that, as Christ before His ἐπιδημία αἰσθητή was already present among men in His ἐπιδημία νοητή, so too Antichrist veiled has been long at work already, as ver. 7 openly declares. But a time will come when he throws off every veil and makes himself known bodily (σωματικῶς), as an incarnation of Satan himself, in which sense Judas Iscariot was his prototype (whom the Lord Himself [John vi. 70] calls the devil, *i.e.*, him, who was *that* among the disciples, which the devil is among the children of God), and at John xvii. 12 is called ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας, just as An-

[1] Thus the Scholion in Matthæi explains quite correctly: ἀποστασία ἡ διὰ τοῦ ἀντίχριστου ἀλλοτρίωσις τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπὸ Θεοῦ.

tichrist is here. Now the names too which St Paul gives him characterise Antichrist as such. The two first, ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας, might also denote every bad man quite fallen under the power of sin, for instance such a one as committed the sin against the Holy Ghost. But the article only admits of the reference to a definite, known, individual, to whom sin and destruction belong in a special sense, viz., so that he not merely *has* sin and *falls into* destruction, but that sin and destruction *proceed from* him as their source, and that he drags every one else into sin and destruction after him. As such, he is afterwards in ver. 7 also called ὁ ἄνομος, whose element the ἀνομία is, in that he acknowledges no law, no higher will, but, as selfishness personified, will have his own will recognised as the one only law. In like manner as Satan is often called ὁ πονηρὸς and ὁ ψεύστης (John viii. 44), Antichrist also is called ὁ ψεύστης 1 John ii. 4, 22, and ὁ πλάνος 2 John ver. 7. However, the name ἄνθρωπος characterises him at the same time as a real man, with body and soul, whom Satan, the principle of evil, thus makes his dwelling, as the Son of God united Himself with the man Jesus. The revelation of Antichrist exhibits itself, therefore, as an aping of the appearing of Christ. What in the Redeemer was a profound substantial truth appears in Antichrist as a caricature counterfeit, as, generally, evil prolongs its existence only by aping the good. Thus the Fathers had already correctly interpreted, the leading passages from whom Pelt has collected in his Commentary. (In using these phrases it is to be presumed passages of the Old Testament were in St Paul's mind. Ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἁμαρτίας answers to the Hebrew אִישׁ אָוֶן, Isaiah lv. 7; Prov. vi. 12, υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας to the יֶלֶד פְּשָׁעִים, Isaiah lvii. 4, which the LXX. translate by τέκνον ἀπωλείας. The reading of the Codex B and some MSS. of less authority, ἀνομίας for ἁμαρτίας is, we may suppose, only come into the text here from ver. 7). Proceeding in the painting of the portrait of Antichrist, St Paul further names him ὁ ἀντικείμενος, where the article is again to be remarked. Although the LXX., in the passage Zechar. iii. 1, put ἀντικείμενος for שָׂטָן, yet Antichrist can signify not here Satan downright, because in ver. 9 he is distinguished from him. But he has certainly the disposition and tendency of the devil, viz. resistance to God and against all that is godlike in Church and State. Whilst he seeks to destroy what is God's, he aims at setting himself in His place, at making himself God, which is the highest pitch of wickedness, but also at the

same time the expression of the perfect folly and inward contradiction which are the attributes of evil. This highest manifestation of Antichrist St Paul describes in the concluding words of ver. 4, ὁ ὑπεραιρόμενος ἐπὶ πάντα λεγόμενον Θεὸν κ.τ.λ. According to this, as Chrysostom has already correctly remarked on this passage, Antichrist will not promote idolatry, but seduce men from the true God, as also from all idols, and set himself up as the only object of adoration. This remarkable idea, that sin in Antichrist finally issues in a downright self-deification, discloses to us the inmost nature of evil, which consists in selfishness. In Antichrist all love, all capability of sacrifice and self-denial, shows itself entirely submerged in the making of the I all in all, which then also insists on being acknowledged by all men as the centre of all power, wisdom, and glory. Daniel (xi. 36, ss.) had already said in his description of Antichrist, whom he represents as a king, as an universal monarch, ὑψωθήσεται καὶ μεγαλυνθήσεται ἐπί πάντα Θεὸν κ.τ.λ., and in the 13th chapter of Revelations, ver. 15, it is prophesied how an image of Antichrist will be vivified by pretended miracles, and the adoration of that image required of all on pain of death. (Ὑπεραίρεσθαι has already occurred 2 Cor. xii. 7.—The phrase ἐπὶ πάντα λεγόμενον Θεὸν reminds one of 1 Cor. viii. 5. We are not to understand merely the *true* God, but also all forms of religious life, even the lowest. These show themselves by the side of the worship of Antichrist as still, relatively, worthy forms of God's worship, for the men who were worshipped as gods or heroes were certainly mostly benefactors to humanity, in whom some rays of the better element gleamed; but in Antichrist the quintessence of all that is evil appears combined, and yet presents itself for adoration. Even the self-deification of the Roman Emperors appears as modesty by the side of that of Antichrist, for the Cæsars did not elevate themselves *above* the other gods, they only wanted to have a place *beside* them as representatives of the genius of the Roman people. Antichrist, on the contrary, wants to be the only true God, who suffers none beside him; what Christ demands for Himself in truth, he in the excess of his presumption claims in falsehood.—The supposition of Michaelis, Baumgarten, and others, that Θεὸς here, after the analogy of the Heb. אֱלֹהִים, is meant to denote the princes and authorities, is to be utterly rejected, as the mention of the ναὸς which follows shows.—Σέβασμα denotes everything holy as an object of worship, be it a person, an idol, or a place [Acts xvii. 23]; but, as it does

not appear as a fresh idea by the repetition of the article, the first reference to persons is preferable. It may be presumed St Paul in using it thought of the heroes and other subordinate personalities of the heathen mythology.) The words: ὥστε αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ καθίσαι ἀποδεικνύντα ἑαυτὸν ὅτι ἐστὶ Θεός, are substantially a result, which is understood of itself, of what precedes. Whoever exalteth himself above all that is called God must necessarily consider and declare himself God. But more is couched in the ἀποδεικνύντα than the mere assertion; it is, doubtless, as Schott has already correctly assumed, to be referred to the proving his pretended divinity by means of sham miracles (ver. 9), such as is described Rev. xiii. 15 also. The reading ὡς Θεὸν before καθίσαι, which Matthæi, Koppe, Knapp, and Schott, defend, would in itself, it is true, be not unsuitable, but the critical authorities are so decidedly in favour of the omission, that we, in concurrence with Griesbach and Lachmann, must strike it out. But the most difficult point is the καθίσαι εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ. If there stood merely εἰς ναὸν, "into any temple," it might be thought the phrase was meant in symbolical wise to denote only the act of presenting one's self for adoration; viz. the sitting, after the analogy of the sitting of kings on the throne, is here to denote his taking possession of the Temple as his property, and his readiness to receive the homage of his subjects. But ὁ ναὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ seems necessarily to refer to the Temple of the only true God in Jerusalem, which still stood at the time at which St Paul wrote. If we glance, first, at the parallel passages, if there be any, in Matt. xxiv. 15 the phrase βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως ἑστὼς ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ presents itself. These relate, as is well known, to the passages of Daniel ix. 26, 27, xi. 31, xii. 11, and allude (compare the Comm. on Matt. xxiv. 15) not to Antiochus Epiphanes, but to the destruction of Jerusalem and pollution of the Temple by the Romans. It will hardly be possible to give the fact indicated more definitely with sufficient certainty. But, in any case, in all that occurred to pollute the Temple at the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, but a faint type of the occurrences here prophesied by St Paul can be recognised. The Apocalypse contains nothing which might explain this mention of the Temple; true, Hezek. xxviii. 2 bears a certain typical analogy, where the King of Tyre is represented as declaring himself God; but neither *there* is the Temple spoken of. We are, therefore, absolutely tied down to this passage alone. Now, if one reflects that in the

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

Ver. 5, 6. St Paul told the Christians in Thessalonica nothing new in these communications; he only reminds them of the fact that he had already declared the same thing to them during his presence in person. That these subjects had already come under discussion in the few weeks of his stay there (see the Introd. to these two Epistles, § 1) cannot surprise us if we reflect what importance the doctrines of the kingdom of God and the advent of Christ had in the apostles' time; an importance which they will receive again only at the end of the world. It might rather surprise us that so little on the subject is found in St Paul's *other* Epistles. To *me* it is probable, as I have already remarked above, that St Paul was induced by his experiences in Thessalonica to dismiss his eschatologic views more into the back-ground in the Gentile world. They were too new to the Gentiles, and excited their fancy in a way which almost inevitably generated fanatical errors. But now the question, οὐ μνημονεύετε, has here the meaning: "Have ye quite forgotten that I propounded this to you, that ye have been able to give ear to such deceitful discourses (ver. 2)?" Even the next communication as to the κατέχον St

Paul supposes to be known to his readers in the words: καὶ νῦν τὸ κατέχον οἴδατε. Still deferring the investigation as to the difficult and extremely obscure κατέχον, we first investigate how the νῦν here might have to be taken. Storr, Schott, and Flatt, take it as an antithesis to ἔτι in ver. 5. But in that case one would expect the collocation νῦν καί. Besides, one does not see how the Thessalonians could now have known anything of the κατέχον, unless St Paul had already in person made communications to them about it, for neither Epistle contains the least thing on the subject. For the same reason it will not suit either to take, in concurrence with Pelt and others, νῦν as a mere transition-particle, for something following as a consequence is surely couched in it even so; *igitur* or *nunc igitur* requires that there should have been something in what precedes which could serve for the knowledge of the κατέχον. If we compare the phrase ὁ κατέχων ἄρτι ver. 7, it seems most suitable *here* too to connect νῦν with κατέχον. True, one expects in this connection the collocation τὸ νῦν κατέχον or τὸ κατέχον νῦν, but in any case the adoption of an inaccurate collocation of words is an unsubstantial difficulty in comparison with the aid this connection affords for the comprehension of this obscure passage. For, as we shall see later, it is precisely the idea, "what *now* withholds, hinders, the revealing of Antichrist," that promotes the explanation. If, however, one will not condescend to the adoption of an inversion, and chooses to prefer one of the two other above mentioned ways of taking the νῦν, still the ἄρτι must, at all events, be supplied *here* too from ver. 7.[1] Now an appointed time is ascribed to the ἀποκάλυψις (ver. 3) of Antichrist by the apostle, as it must needs happen according to God's dispensation (ἐν τῷ ἑαυτοῦ καιρῷ. Cf. John vii. 6, 30.) In *this*, too, the analogy with the advent of Christ declares itself. When the time was fulfilled God sent His Son (Gal. iv. 4). What withholdeth is, accordingly, operative not *against* God's will, but in conformity with it. It is the medium in God's hand for keeping back the appearance of Antichrist till the time appointed him. The Divine intention with the κατέχον is precisely intimated in

[1] Kern (ubi suprà, p. 161) also lays a stress on the νῦν as a definition of time, and with justice. With regard to the connection with νῦν he considers, as to sense, the connection with κατέχον and that with οἴδατε on a par, grammatically that with οἴδατε seems to him to be preferred. But the ἄρτι (ver. 7) is, in my opinion, more for the connection with κατέχον. The question is not of the fact that they (the readers) now know something which they did not know before, but that they know what hinders the appearance *now*.

the εἰς τό: "which is meant to serve the end that Antichrist may be able to reveal himself only in his time (not earlier)." According to this, the idea of the κατέχειν is plainly strictly defined, viz., as the hindering operation by which the evil power urging Antichrist to appearance is paralyzed in its operation.

Ver. 7. This position of the κατέχον (for which ὁ κατέχων here comes in, of which change of gender we shall speak later), to the Satanic power which urges forward Antichrist as its fruit, ver. 7 describes more closely. The power that produces him is already continually active (ἤδη ἐνεργεῖται), only the κατέχων does not allow him to appear, as soon as it shall be removed Antichrist will reveal himself. But the phrase μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας here is peculiar. The reference of it to the ἀποστασία (ver. 3), or to the heretics who shall desolate the Church, is inadmissible, because these phenomena can only be considered as subsequent, or at most preparative, operations of Antichrist. From the relation of the opening words of ver. 7 to the closing ones (opening ones of ver. 8 by *our* version of the Bible): καὶ τότε ἀποκαλυφθήσεται ὁ ἄνομος—μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας can also denote only Antichrist himself. But, it is asked, on what ground does St Paul use this phrase in order to characterise him? In the Apocalypse too the Babylonian whore, ἡ μήτηρ τῶν πορνῶν καὶ τῶν βδελυγμάτων τῆς γῆς (Rev. xvii. 3), in whom the formation of the universal antichristian spirit in the city of Rome is alone to be recognised (ib. ver. 18), bears on her forehead the name μυστήριον (ib. ver. 5, ss.), it is true not principally in reference to the ἀνομία, but to the peculiar mysterious formation of antichristianity in the rulers of the kingdom which the whore of Babylon represents. But if we compare 1 Tim. iii. 16, Christ is there called τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον, and that too because in Him God Himself appeared in the flesh: Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί. In accordance with the pervading analogy between Christ and Antichrist, we shall, therefore, not be in error if we say St Paul here calls Antichrist μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας because ὁ διάβολος ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί. As the Holy Scriptures speak of deep things of the Deity (1 Cor. ii. 10), so too they know βάθη τοῦ σατανᾶ (Rev. ii. 24); these are, fortunately, veiled even to the sinful man, but at the appearing of Antichrist these depths of Satan will reveal themselves, just as in Christ and His appearing the depths of God have revealed themselves. Through the entire history of the world the activity of the powers of darkness, an element which excites our horror and dread, manifests itself

to the deeply penetrating inquirer; the wickedness of Satan exhibits itself now in *this* form, now in *that*, but the time will come when these scattered appearances will present themselves all together in their highest power, and in complete fusion in Antichrist as a real embodiment of Satan. It follows from this, that what now still keeps back the revealing of him (τὸ κατέχον or ὁ κατέχων), must be a beneficent power, which is only overpowered in the end by the power of evil, under God's permission, becoming predominant. By this acceptation the choice of the phrase ἐκ μεσοῦ γίνεσθαι, in which the intimation of a hostile power which removes an object by force is always couched, is also explained. That is to say, it is chosen from the point of view of the growing Antichrist, who exerts himself to put aside that which hinders his full development. (Compare 1 Cor. v. 2; Col. ii. 14; Isaiah lvii. 2.) But the construction in ver. 7 offers difficulties, which it has been attempted to resolve in various ways. Storr and Flatt, whom Pelt too joins, propose to supply the verb κατέχει αὐτὸ from the participle κατέχων. But that is not enough, for even *so* ἕως with the καὶ τότε following does not come in well. Others, as Baumgarten, propose to supply merely ἐστὶ after μόνον, but then the troublesome ἕως with καὶ τότε following is equally unexplained. Rosenmüller, Nösselt, Heidenreich and Schott, suppose a transposition of the ἕως, and translate as if it stood before ὁ κατέχων ἄρτι, in this way: "till only he who still withholds it shall have been taken away." But this is very harsh, because, according to it, a wrong meaning must be given to the ἐνεργεῖται τὸ μυστήριον; that is to say, the words must then be taken thus: "illegality works in secret only *so long*, until," etc. The ἤδη is decidedly against this acceptation. The only plan that remains is to acknowledge in this passage a fusion of several propositions into one; St Paul meant to say: "the mystery of lawlessness is already at work, it is already in motion; nothing hinders its revelation but he *only* that now keeps its back; *until* he shall have been removed it cannot come forth; but when he has been removed, *then* the lawless one will reveal himself without delay." But this series of ideas fuses itself in St Paul's vivacious style into the single irregular sentence, which does not admit of being fairly analysed.

Here now closes the description of Antichrist and of what keeps back his being revealed. In what follows, Christ's conflict with him at His coming, and the efficiency of Antichrist for the seduc-

tion of men by lying wonders, are alone described, which things have no further influence on the chief ideas. We, therefore, in conclusion, here review the whole remarkable representation in its entirety. The idea that the principle of good does not gradually extend itself victoriously in the development of the history of the world, but that *beside that principle* the evil also heightens itself within itself, and by no means gradually disappears, but is first entirely overcome in a last great fight in which it apparently conquers, is not peculiar to this passage only, but pervades the whole of Holy Writ, and has already met with examination in the Comm. on the parable of the wheat and the tares. (See on Matt. xiii. 29, 30.) But one might be uncertain whether the representation here given of Antichrist, according to which he is plainly described as a person, as an individual, is the general form of representation in Scripture. The proof of the individuality of Antichrist can plainly be wrested from this passage only by forcing its meaning. He is not merely called expressly ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἁμαρτίας κ. τ. λ., ὁ αντικείμενος (ver. 4), but a coming is also ascribed to him as to the person of Christ, and an action (καθίσαι εἰς ναὸν), such as is imaginable in *a person* only (verses 4, 9). But the description of the Apocalypse, to go no further, seems less favourable to that assumption; the representation of Antichrist as a beast with seven heads (Rev. xiii. 1) rather seems to lead to a multiplicity of Antichrists, which is at length expressly declared by St John in his Epistles (1 John ii. 18, 19, 22, iv. 3; 2 John ver. 7), where the name ἀντίχριστος[1] alone occurs. Elsewhere, too, as *e.g.* Acts xx. 29, 30; 2 Pet. ii. 1, ss., iii. 3, ss.; Jude ver. 18, ss., where the hostile powers and seducers in the latter days are described, several, not one, are always spoken of. In Daniel alone chap. xi., the individuality in the picture of Antichrist again predominates in a typical form. Now how are we to explain this apparently contradictory form of doctrine to ourselves? Is Antichrist to be considered as only a spiritual tendency diffused in many individualities? or merely as a single individual, who communicates his tendency to others? Neither of the two could be the correct solution; rather the conjunction of both points, the individuality and the spiritual tendency in masses of individuals. As

[1] See particulars as to the etymology of the word at 1 John ii. 18. The ἀντὶ denotes not taking the place of another, "one, who appears *instead* of Christ, arrogates to himself His position" (*that* is rather couched in the word ψευδόχριστος [see on Matt. xxiv. 4, 24]), but hostile opposition, "him, who is full of enmity *against* Christ." (See Lücke, ad h. l.)

has been already remarked above (ver. 3), Antichrist does not step on the scene suddenly without any preparations; on the contrary, a stream of Antichristian sentiment and conduct pervades the whole history of the world. From this stream in the last days proceeds Antichristianity as the completed evil fruit; it will announce itself in many individuals, but by all these one personality will be considered as the centre of all their striving, and acknowledged as the master by whom they let themselves be guided.[1] A struggle to mould all the depths of good and evil into concrete appearances manifests itself in history. In the case of Christ's advent this struggle has arrived at the highest forms, and those too, in accordance with the tendency of history to form persons, living personalities, in whom all the ideas of good and evil present themselves embodied. We cannot, accordingly, assent to the view that Calixtus had already expressed, and which Pelt (pp. 167, 204, ss.) also makes his own, viz., that the mystery of iniquity, here described by St Paul, will be as nothing outward, that strikes the eye, but merely an inward spiritual proceeding, viz., the inward dominion of the principle of evil (evil principle).[2] The communications of St Paul (ver. 5) as well as, particularly, those of the Apocalypse (chapter xiii.), are of that nature, that they necessarily suppose outward facts, as indeed too the dominion of evil inwardly must manifest itself outwardly, and the French revolution with the abolition of Christianity and the setting up prostitutes on the altars for adoration, gives us *outwardly*, as the daily wider spreading denial of the fundamentals of all religious truth and morality, of the doctrines of God, freedom, and immortality, as also the self-deification of one's own I as a consequence of erroneous speculation, give us *inwardly*, a strong foretaste of what might at some future time be but too really executed in the universal monarchy of Antichrist under his iron sceptre. But

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

[2] Lücke too (on 1 John ii. 18), seems to leave the personality of Antichrist at the least very doubtful, when he writes: "St John's conception of Antichrist is of that nature, that it is easier in it than in St Paul's to carry back the idea to its true universal import, by a severance of the form of a definite outward historical personality, in which form it had been first of all conceived,—and to make it thus more easy to be realized." That St John does not either deny the definite personality of Antichrist we shall see in the interpretation of his Epistles.

if one chose to say, "true, there is nothing to object to the assumption that the evil principle, which arrives at dominion in many, will bring forth real evil fruits outwardly too, in increased proportion, as happened in the French revolution; only it is not to be imagined that such occurrences should be set in motion and conducted by *one* personality, which is as it were Satan himself incarnate; Antichrist is, like the devil, a mere abstraction, only there are many Antichrists, *i.e.* men, in whom the evil principle operates, no doubt, very powerfully, but who yet always bear in them still something better along with the evil;" if one chose to say *that*, *we* say historical analogy is altogether opposed to that argumentation. All great movements in the history of the world have definite personalities for pillars, who are, as it were, the centres, proceeding from whom they are carried on. No doubt the spirit that animates them is also spread in many others, but more in a derivative, not in an original, way. According to this, the assumption that the last and utmost development of evil will also attain to its centre in a personality, that all the labour of the evil powers strives, as it were, after the production of this individual, has the analogy of history in its favour throughout. But the opinion that evil is only to be conceived as abstract in Antichrist as in the devil, contradicts the doctrine of Scripture quite clearly; it may be said on the contrary, evil is never *abstract*, but ever appears in concrete personalities. This view of the devil and Antichrist as real personalities is far removed from Manicheism by the circumstance that their powers must be still acknowledged as good in substance, as they are God's powers, only the misapplication of them against God's will to objects of selfishness constitutes the essence of evil.

If we, after this, turn to the contemplation of the various interpretations which have been made of this passage,[1] it is, first of all, clear that all those who believe that the prophecy is already exhausted in one fact of the past are decidedly in error. As Christ's coming and the kingdom of God are still impending in the future, so too are the occurrences which immediately precede those, viz., the universal falling away, the appearance of Antichrist, and his destructive operation. Among the interpretations which find the fulfilment of this passage in the past, the class of those which suppose in it the time next to St Paul's own day, is to be named first.

[1] See the special excursus on this passage in the latest Commentaries, particularly in Koppe, Pelt, and Schott.

As in Matt. xxiv. Christ Himself connects His coming with the insurrection of the Jews against the Romans and with the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans which followed it, so too they will have St Paul's representation here referred to those events. Accordingly, the ἀποστασία is said to denote the insurrection of the Jews, or, according to Hammond, the falling away of the Gnostics. The man of sin is said to be Simon Magus, as the father of heresy, or, according to Wetstein, the Emperor Titus and the gens Flavia along with him, because Titus at the destruction of Jerusalem, according to Josephus (B. J. VI. 2.) sacrificed in the Temple. Grotius, on the other hand, declared the Emperor Caligula for the ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἁμαρτίας described; others Nero, because he first persecuted the Christians. Kern too belongs to the interpreters who refer this passage to past events, and therefore attribute no farther prophetic meaning to it. This divine thinks it necessary to transfer the description of the Antichrist to be expected to the time after Nero's death, when the report was spread that that Emperor was not dead and would come again (Tac. Hist. ii. 8; Seut. Nero c. 57), out of which the notion was developed among the Christians that Nero would return as Antichrist. (Lactantius de mort. persec. c. 2. Augustin de civ. Dei xx. 19.) On account of this circumstance, then, Kern also believes, as has been already remarked in the Introduction to these Epistles, it necessary to place the composition of the second Epistle to the Thessalonians in the times after Nero, and therefore to declare it spurious. But we find nothing in the description of Antichrist, as St Paul gives it here, which would lead to the inference, that he exactly means Nero to be understood by it, and that the notion of Nero's return after death is supposed. This description contains such traits alone as could be cited even before Nero's time, from the picture of Antichrist already sketched by Daniel: viz. insolent transgression of the law, and scornful presumption towards the Gods, whom he puts himself on a par with, or even sets himself above. No doubt these traits are in part found in Nero, and that madman is also, doubtless, to be considered as a type of Antichrist just as much as Antiochus Epiphanes; but that holds good of many others also. The prophecy cannot be looked on as fulfilled in him in its fulness, because the facts foretold by St Paul have not met with their accomplishment in his person.

Just as discrepant are the views as to the κατέχων. Either Christ Himself, or the divine will, or the Apostle Paul and his

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

viduals and parties who came out as hostile opponents to the hierarchy; but it is especially since the Reformation that this view has been the prevailing one among the Protestants, whereas the Catholics designated Mahomet as Antichrist in earlier times, but afterwards Luther and his labours by way of retaliation. The interpretation of Antichrist of the Papacy has even passed into the confession of faith of our church. (See the articles of Smalcalde, art. vi., p. 314, edit. Rechenberg.)

If we, after this, turn to the critical examination of these various opinions upon Antichrist and upon what detains him, we must by all means lay it down as an axiom that every interpretation is false which admits the apostle's representation to be exhausted in any phenomenon of the past. For, according to his express declaration, Christ's coming, and with it the resurrection of the faithful and the kingdom of God, are immediately to follow on the coming of the falling away and of Antichrist. Now as up to this time nothing of that has happened, the coming of Antichrist also can only be considered as something future. But it by no means follows from *that* that the references to past historical points cited are downright false; only they must not be conceived as exhausting the prophecy of St Paul, but as real types of the last great catastrophe. Thus it is, in particular, to be decidedly acknowledged that the revolt of the Jews from the Romans, and the fearful judgment of God, the destruction of Jerusalem, with which the abolition of the independence of the people of God, and of the dispensation of the Old Testament were united, are to be conceived in this passage as a type of the Antichristian events, just as in Matt. xxiv. In St Paul's spiritual horizon the special relations of the remote future could not occur, he expected, as we saw at 1 Thess. iv. 15, ss., the advent during his life. It is, therefore, more than probable that *he* too, in conformity to the guidance of the prophecies of Christ Himself (Matt. xxiv.), which were, no doubt, known to him, in uttering this prophecy had particularly the impending catastrophe of the destruction of Jerusalem in his thoughts. That is vouched for not so much by the mention of the ναὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ (for it is extremely improbable that St Paul imagined Antichrist would place himself in the stone Temple upon Zion, as there was no throne in it, as, besides, no Jew entered it; further, this Temple was precisely the one to be destroyed according to Christ's prophecy), as on the other hand by the phrases τὸ νῦν κατέχον, ὁ ἄρτι κατέχων, for it cannot well be doubted that no-

thing else than the Roman Empire, or in the masculine form the Emperor, as representative of it, is immediately meant to be denoted by them. By means of the additions νῦν, ἄρτι, St Paul intimates the fact that the overthrow of this iron kingdom (see Dan. ii. 40, ss.) is imminent, and with the same the overthrow of all order and legality, which spread themselves among the nations through its influence. According to this, we must decidedly disapprove of one of the Roman Emperors being looked on as Antichrist, even in a typical sense only, in the interpretation of this passage; he is rather (not as an individual, in which relation he may have much that is Antichristian in him, but from his official position), the κατέχων here. St Paul, doubtless, imagined Antichrist as proceeding from the revolted Jews, or rather from apostate Christians (as it is said also at 1 John ii. 19 ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξῆλθον, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἦσαν ἐξ ἡμῶν), but in no case as a Gentile. Since he represents the highest height of sinful development, there must necessarily be also supposed in him the highest height of consciousness, which only admits of being attained under the influence of Christianity. It is not, therefore, by that denied that, *e.g.*, the Emperor Nero, no regard being had to his official position, conceived purely as *a person*, might be a type of Antichrist; on the contrary, *that* is to be assumed by all means, as indeed it is also, surely, well known that Christian antiquity so considered him, and therefore did not believe in his death, but expected his coming again (see the interpreters on Rev. xvii. 8, and the passages in Kern, loc. cit., p. 200, ss.); but in *this* passage another relation is to be made good for the Roman Empire and the Emperors, viz. the beneficent aspect in them, the strict legality, opposing all revolution and ἀνομία, of the principle of the Roman Empire.

If we go further down in the history of the world, in like manner it is decidedly to be acknowledged that in Mahomet and his spiritually devastating activity, in the development of Popery in the course of the middle ages,[1] finally in the person of Napoleon in the present age, single traits of the Antichristian spirit show themselves; but no one will be able seriously to maintain that Mahomet or Napoleon *was* Antichrist, not merely because upon their appearing *that* did not follow which Scripture represents as following upon the revealing of Antichrist, viz., the universal falling

[1] See especially the passages collected by Pelt, Comm. in Epist. ad Thess. p. 201, ss.

away and the setting up of the kingdom of God, but also for the reason that they possess, it is true, *some of*, but not *all* the traits of Antichrist. But only the combination of *all* the traits *together* consummates Antichrist in the same way as the combination of *all* the traits *together* of the picture of Christ, as the prophets had previously painted it, in the person of Jesus of Nazareth makes Him Christ. Again, if one wished to establish the view that *Popery* is Antichrist, one would be obliged previously to give up the doctrine of the personality of Antichrist, which has been expressly demonstrated as scriptural; he could in that case be conceived as a spiritual principle only. As, however, the principle of Popery has made itself good a whole series of centuries, it is not to be perceived how its appearing can constitute a fixed time for the beginning of the kingdom of God, in which sense St Paul here (ver. 3) treats of the revealing of Antichrist. But if one proposed to apprehend the reference to Popery so that it would be conceived as the principle out of which the personality of Antichrist was at some time to shape itself, so that some Pope or other would in the end present himself as the bodily Antichrist, it is to be considered that this would be imaginable only after preliminary annihilation of the Roman Catholic Church and, with it, of the Papacy too. For, as both are grounded on the confession of Christ as the Son of God, Antichrist can appear in a Pope in no other way than by the removal of this foundation, because from the description in the first Epistle of St John the denial of Christ is an essential feature in his portrait.

We may, accordingly, pronounce as the result of this contemplation that the history of the world certainly presents to us *personalities* and *tendencies*, in which significant traits out of the picture of Antichrist are predominant, also *groups of events*, in which the analogy with the last catastrophes before the setting up of the kingdom of God is quite unmistakeable, which, to name a few, is true of the insurrection of the Jews against the Romans, as of the destruction of Jerusalem which directly followed it, and of the French Revolution of 1789, but that neither in these separate occurrences, nor in all taken together, can the deep meaning of the prophecy in this passage be looked on as exhausted. The saying (2 Thess. ii. 7) τὸ μυστήριον ἤδη ἐνεργεῖται τῆς ἀνομίας still holds good yet. The demoniac powers, which we see at work in the history of the world, call forth Antichristian formations now in *this* shape, now in *that*, and that too in such a

way that an augmentation of evil is visibly to be observed. This manifests itself especially in the course of the French Revolution, which, in fact, presents in little an accurately corresponding type, especially in its Antichristian spirit, of the events of the συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος,—a course unprecedented, comparable to no event in the history of the world. But the prophecy as such still stands fast even yet, after that event. Now it might present no especial difficulty to conceive to ourselves as possible an universal ἀποστασία from all the fundamentals of religion and morality, as we see before our eyes how busily the undermining of them is worked at on more than one side, and how infidelity and superstition strive for the dominion over mankind. It presents just as little difficulty to conceive that from the universally disseminated elements of unbelief and wickedness, which are daily increasing, an individual is being produced, who, as the centre of all these Satanic tendencies, combines them in himself in the highest height and strongest strength, and so, as the fruit of the whole, sinful development in human nature, as the corporeal Antichrist, as the incarnate Son of Satan, steps upon the scene and seeks to hurl the Son of God on high from His throne. But it is very doubtful what the κατέχων is to be according to this interpretation of ours. True, it might be said, this one feature in the prophecy has no meaning for times to come, the addition of the νῦν and ἄρτι points to the fact that it has reference to the times of the apostles only; however, I cannot subscribe to that interpretation, partly because it seems to me unsuitable to declare so important a feature of the picture fulfilled, and the others not, partly because precisely the putting off the advent of Antichrist for centuries long leads to the conclusion of the enduring energy of the element that keeps it off. But I am hindered from thinking on this occasion, as has been already remarked above, of the Roman Empire, as the fourth universal monarchy of Daniel, in its German-Christian form, by the subsequent dissolution of it in 1806. The notion of a future restoration of it, such as Max von Schenkendorf dreamed of, requires, however, consideration on this ground, because the matter treated of is not the mere restoration of the *name*, "Roman Empire, Roman Emperor," but of the *thing itself*. The Emperor of the middle ages was the representative of all worldly power generally, the first prince of Christendom. But this relation had already entirely changed very long before 1806, and therefore the outward dissolution of the Empire is also plainly less important,

because it had very long changed its nature inwardly. But now it is by no means to be perceived how according to the present situation of political relations the position of the Emperor in the middle ages will ever be able to be restored again. Daniel's fourth universal monarchy will therefore have to be understood only of the preponderance of the Christian world in its German-Roman constituent parts over the terrestrial sphere, and not of the concentration of this dominion in one individual. One might, therefore, imagine the Church. But one cannot well understand the κατέχον of the Church and her earthly or heavenly representatives, because it is very plain that what Antichrist wishes to annihilate opposes him, and by that means keeps him off; the κατέχον must be something equally distinct from the Church and Antichristianity. Besides, the change of the gender remains inexplicable so, for St Paul cannot have set himself up as the representative of the whole Church, and if he meant Christ, one does not see why he does not name Him openly. And according to that there remains then the single assumption only for the explanation of the κατέχον, that we are to understand by it the whole rightly-ordered political system, with which is given on the *one* side the continual repression of all ἀποστασία and ἀνομία, and on the *other* the progressive calm development of Christianity. Of this system the Roman Empire, as the firmest and most regularly-organized state that history is acquainted with, is the natural type. This leads us then to the conclusion, that insurrection against the subsisting (see on Rom. xiii. 1) political arrangement is a principal lever of the Antichristian power, in order to bring the man of sin into existence, and indeed at Matt. xxiv. 7 insurrections are expressly named among the influences preparing the last times. With the appearance of Antichrist, accordingly, all order equally in church and state will tumble down, and the Satanic disorder of his government will alone exercise dominion, until through Christ's power the Lord's everlasting kingdom of peace shall be raised on the ruins of his universal monarchy after the last sore fight. By this mode of taking the prophecy the idea of the Roman Empire is, therefore, adhered to in its inwardness, as the regulated politico-religious order of things in general, which is defined as to the state of sin *as divine order*. By this means, then, it becomes explicable how Rome can be represented in Revelations as the depositary of the Antichristian principle without any contradiction of St Paul's description in this passage. For

a twofold element is to be distinguished in Rome and the Roman state even as in Jerusalem and the Jewish people. Firstly, the divine calling and destination, and secondly the actual realisation of the same. As Jerusalem was destined for the centre of the kingdom of God, but was turned into Sodom through its unfaithfulness (Rev. xi. 8), so also Rome was intended to maintain the principle of right and order in the world, and it is on this side that St Paul here considers it, but it took up into it in its outward appearance even Antichristian elements, in that it persecuted Christ's saints against all right, and in this point of view Rome appears in Rev. xvii. 3, 9, as the depositary of the Antichristian spirit. Such apparently different conceptions, and yet both founded on the innermost nature of the circumstances, proclaim in the clearest manner that the apostles, taught by the Holy Ghost, uttered their prophecies without external concert and conference. But, if St Paul here only *points to* the idea of the importance of the state and its relation to the development of God's designs in the human race, and does not openly express it, nothing particular is on that account to be looked for in it, because he supposes the knowledge of it in his first readers (ver. 6). It is the less possible to suppose any design which could occasion him to express himself mysteriously, as by this representation so respectable a position was appointed the Roman Empire.

Ver. 8. St Paul now in continuation of his communications as to the last times, describes Christ's victory over the hostile powers of Antichrist; when the ἄνομος thinks he has attained to all in the possession of his universal monarchy, in which he has united all spiritual and worldly power in his own person,—Christ will annihilate him by His appearance. Isaiah prophesying of the Messiah expresses the same idea in the words: πατάξει γῆν τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν πνεύματι διὰ χειλέων ἀνελεῖ ἀσεβῆ (Is. xi. 4). But in the Apocalypse the appearing of Christ and His fight with Antichrist, are described in such a way that ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ ἐκπορεύεται ῥομφαία ὀξεῖα, and Antichrist together with his prophet and whole party is conquered with it (Rev. xix. 15, 19, ss.). According to this, the sense of the words is that Christ merely by His word and His appearing, thus by the smallest means and the slightest trouble, will destroy the whole of the threatening power of Antichrist, which no earthly power could conquer. He, from whom powers of the Almighty issue, need only command, and the breath of His mouth (Ps. xxxiii. 6), the

brightness of His appearance, suffice to annihilate all His adversaries. Πνεῦμα here has no reference to the Holy Ghost, still less are we to understand storm, burning wind, by it, but it denotes the breath of the respiration, as an expression of the word and of the will. The combination ἐπιφάνεια τῆς παρουσίας, which is found here only, is, however, peculiar. That is to say, commonly ἐπιφάνεια by itself denotes the advent (so especially St Paul frequently in the Pastoral Epistles), as it in profane writers denotes divine apparitions, on account of the blinding splendour of light, the δόξα, which was thought to be conjoined with them. Here the apparent tautology is to be explained so that ἐπιφάνεια denotes the *subjective*, παρουσία the *objective*, aspect, *i.e.* this *latter* expression puts forward the actuality of Christ's appearing, that *former* one the contemplation of it on the part of man, the consciousness of His presence. (For ἀναλώσει A.B.D.F. read ἀνελεῖ, which Lachmann has received into the text. But the more uncommon ἀναλώσει is no doubt to be preferred, as ἀνελεῖ is, surely, only a gloss from Isaiah xi. 4. The word ἀναλίσκω occurs nowhere else in the New Testament but at Luke ix. 54. The LXX. often use it for כָּלָה or תָּמַם Gen. xli. 30; Numb. ix. 33.—As to καταργεῖν, so familiar in St Paul's language, see on Luke xiii. 7; Rom. iii. 31. It, of course, denotes here not absolutely to annihilate, but to make inoperative, to deprive of influence as Antichrist; for, according to Rev. xix. 20, his *condemnation* in the lake of fire, not his entire *annihilation*, follows his subjection.

Ver. 9, 10. As to the rest, the whole of verse 9 has a parenthetical nature, for the οὗ ἐστιν connects itself again with ver. 7. Here, now, the ἀποκάλυψις is called, by analogy with Christ's advent, also παρουσία. It is true, the appearing of Antichrist on earth properly stands parallel to Christ's birth in the flesh, or the Lord's official, public, appearance at the baptism, but παρουσία is used for those also 2 Pet. i. 16, as ἐπιφάνεια is at 2 Tim. i. 10. Now Antichrist's coming is also brought into comparison with Christ's labours on earth, inasmuch as *it* too makes itself known as surrounded with all the forms of wonderful action, which, however, are grounded, not, like Christ's miracles, in truth, but in falsehood, in that they are performed, not in God's power, but in Satan's power. For the Apocalypse (xiii. 2) relates of Antichrist: καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ δράκων τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξουσίαν μεγάλην. As, therefore, the Father gave all power to Christ, the Son, and lets Him sit on His throne (Rev. iii. 21), so

too in the imitation by the devil Satan gives all his power to Antichrist, his dear son. But, as Satan himself is a *created* being, although a *mighty* one, the wonders also which he performs by means of Antichrist can be merely *mirabilia*, no true *miracula*; they will exhibit themselves as striking occurrences exciting outward attention, but without connection with the salvation of mankind and the designs of the divine government of the world, as the miracles of Jesus and the apostles present themselves; consequently, as mere magical monstrosities. Nevertheless, they will yet be seductive enough for many a disordered, unsettled mind, as the remarkable word of the Lord at Matt. xxiv. 24 shows, according to which, if it were possible, even the elect might be seduced into error by the wonders of the false prophets. For the false wonders will not be done by Antichrist alone, but, as Christ imparted to His disciples also the gift to work miracles, so will also all the false prophets who accompany Antichrist execute lying wonders. In the Apocalypse the beast, which comes up out of the earth (xiii. 11), which has two horns like the Lamb, *i.e.* appears outwardly as a hypocrite, but speaks like the dragon, shows itself as a designation of the prophets of Antichrist, by means of whom men are brought to him. (See Rev. xvi. 14, xix. 20.) It is quoted (Rev. xiii. 15) as an especially characteristic wonder, that the spirit is given to an image of Antichrist, that it speaks and thus invites men to the adoration of it. As to the relation of the lying seeming wonders of Satan to the genuine divine miracles of the Lord, also as to the entrance of these phenomena into the highest developments of evil as well as of good, and their object of legitimizing the messengers of light as of darkness, and of serving for marks to recognise them for what they are, what is necessary has already been brought forward at Matt. viii. 1, in the general remarks on the miracles, and at Matt. xxiv. 24, to which we here wholly refer the reader. In like manner, the difference between the appellatives δύναμις, σημεῖον, τέρας, which terms are used likewise of the genuine miracles, has also been already spoken of at Matt. viii. 1. The genitive ψεύδους is of course to be referred to all three appellatives, for, as evil in itself is incumbered with contradiction, so too all that proceeds from it is intrinsically untrue; its seeming strength is real want of strength. In what follows (ver. 10) καὶ ἐν πάσῃ ἀπάτῃ τῆς ἀδικίας is put parallel with ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει. One may say, the wonders themselves that proceed from Antichrist and his ministers are

nothing but deceit either; meanwhile they are still really astonishing extraordinary operations in nature, which only have their foundation in the application of demoniac powers. From these, therefore, other forms of deception are distinguished which are not wonderful, and proceed all together from the disposition of ἀδικία—have their root in it. To draw men *from* God and *to* evil is to be imagined as the aim of these deceptions, just as it is in the wonders; but this only succeeds with the ἀπολλυμένοις, for God knows how to defend the ἐκλεκτοὶ through His grace; according to Matt. xxiv. 24 with these deception is impossible. In this idea St Paul's theory of predestination again comes forward, but also only in the way that it was developed at Rom. ix. 1. That is to say, the ἀπολλύμενοι are not those lost through God's decree, through a *decretum reprobationis*, but through their own act, because they, as it is expressed in the concluding words of ver. 10, τὴν ἀγάπην τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ ἐδέξαντο. *They also* would, therefore, have been able to be saved through the truth in Christ, if they had appropriated it to themselves in repentance and faith, but they loved falsehood and darkness more than light, and continued, therefore, excluded from the σωτηρία. On the other hand, the elect attain to salvation not through their merit, their fidelity, their faith, their perseverance unto the end, but fidelity, faith, perseverance, are God's work in them; there is a *prædestinatio sanctorum*, but no *reprobatio impiorum*. (In ver. 9 the ἐν before τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις is wanting in A.D.F.G., and Lachmann has therefore cancelled it. But it is surely not to be doubted that the omission of it has its origin purely in the double ἐν preceding, by which the preposition seemed to the copyists too frequent. The common reading is to be considered as the correct one. The ἐν before δυνάμει and ἀπάτῃ is to be taken as *nota dativi*, the ἐν before ἀπολλυμένοις, on the contrary, = ἐν μέσῳ, so that the lost ones form the circle in which these Satanic proceedings take place.—Ver. 10. On ἀνθ' ὧν, which = תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר, see Luke i. 20, xix. 44; Acts xii. 23.—The phrase τὴν ἀγάπην τῆς ἀληθείας δέξασθαι is significant. The natural man has *no love* for truth, the stirring up the love for truth must therefore precede the reception of truth itself. Where the first advances of grace, which attempt to stir up the love of truth, are repulsed, there neither can truth itself be received afterwards.)

Ver. 11, 12. God punishes sin *by means of* sin, *therefore* it is He sends to the lost ones, who through their fault did not allow the love for truth to be stirred up in their hearts, a strong delu-

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

Ver. 13, 14. After ending this prophetic communication, St

Paul now returns to his readers, and once more declares his obligation to give thanks to God (compare i. 3) that He had chosen them (his readers) unto salvation in Christ, had therefore preserved them from the ἀπώλεια of those who allow themselves to be deceived by the πλάνη of Antichrist (ver. 11). This election by God St Paul represents, after his manner, as an eternal one, which has proceeded ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, *i.e.* πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου (Ephes. i. 4), ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων (Ephes. iii. 9, 11). That by this phrase a preexistence of the soul is not meant to be asserted, but only the decree of election, as one independent of time, to be placed in God, has already been fully proved at Ephes. i. 4. On the formula ἀδελφοὶ ἠγαπημένοι cf. ibid.—Αἱρεῖσθαι is here used as = ἐκλέγειν, see Phil. i. 22. As to the Alexandrian form εἵλατο for εἵλετο see Lobeck's Phrynichus, p. 183. The reading ἀπαρχὴν for ἀπ' ἀρχῆς has surely arisen from a misapprehension alone. As St Paul frequently talks of the first fruits of conversion [see on Rom. xvi. 5; 1 Cor. xvi. 15] that idea was thought to be found *here* too.—The concluding words alone in ver. 13 cause difficulty, partly with regard to their connection with what precedes, partly with regard to the position of the two clauses. If one considers that both ἁγιασμὸς and πίστις denote the subjective aspect, a connection with εἵλατο seems unsuitable, and a closer definiteness of the σωτηρία appears to be aimed at by means of the ἐν ἁγιασμῷ κ.τ.λ. But, as salvation is the ultimate aim, on the attaining of which faith passes into contemplation and sanctification into sanctity, this connection seems yet nowise admissible. The connection of the words with εἵλατο can, accordingly, be only taken thus: "God has chosen you unto salvation, in the design, or on the condition, that ye walk in sanctification of the Spirit and in belief of the truth." It is understood of itself that πνεῦμα here is not the *human* spirit, which is sanctified, but the *divine* one, which sanctifies, so that it is parallel with the divine truth. But with regard, secondly, to the collocation, it seems that belief in the truth of the Gospel must precede sanctification by the Holy Ghost, as the cause precedes the effect. The interpreters pass over this difficulty, which, however, is not a slight one. It is to be presumed St Paul understood by the πίστις ἀληθείας here the faith that is perfected in judgment also (see on 1 Thess. iii. 10), which presupposes sanctification, and not the entirely *general* faith, which is given with the very first elements. In ver. 14 the εἰς ὃ cannot be joined with what immediately precedes, as it is usually taken, for St

Paul cannot intend to say, "for that reason, because men are to walk in sanctification and faith, God has called them by means of the Gospel." If St Paul had had this connection in view, he would have said: "*in order that* they may be able to walk," etc. The εἰς ὃ ἐκάλεσε can only refer to εἵλατο in this sense: "therefore, because God conceived the decree of election from all eternity, he has also called the elect by means of the Gospel;" thus εἰς περιποίησιν δόξης comes to stand parallel with εἰς σωτηρίαν, and forms a more accurate definition of this general expression. That is to say, the περιποίησις δόξης (1 Thess. v. 9) defines the σωτηρία more accurately, to the purport that it is participation in the glory of Christ in the kingdom of God. (See 1 Thess. ii. 12.)

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

Ver. 16, 17. As God must give the success to every good thing, St Paul prays in conclusion that He may afford to the Thessalonians also support for their life of faith, and the approving of it in word and work. But it is quite unusual that in ver. 16, in the juxtaposition of Father and Son, the name of the Father follows that of the Son, whereas it everywhere else precedes it. As to the rest, the epithets of God are chosen so that the prayer for comfort and strengthening from God is plainly justified through their purport. For in the ἀγαπήσας ἡμᾶς is couched, as the aorist shows, the allusion to the work of redemption, as the greatest proof of the love of God towards man. If God has established the atonement out of love, he will, surely, be also inclined to win men for it and to preserve those won by means of His Spirit. In the second epithet: δοὺς παράκλησιν αἰωνίαν καὶ ἐλπίδα ἀγάθην ἐν χάριτι God is depicted as the source of comfort in the distresses

of the present, and of good hope for the future, by means of the operation of His grace. But if the παράκλησις is here called αἰώνιος, this is only to be understood in opposition to the transitory and deceitful comfort from the earth, especially as hope is named besides. Comfort in general can find no application to eternity as the sufferings which are presupposed by the application of it cannot have any place there. (In ver. 17 ὑμᾶς is wanting in A.B.D.E.F.G., and is in concert with Lachmann and Schott to be expunged from the text. Further, the collocation ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ on the authority of A.B.D.E. seems to deserve the preference over the inverted collocation.)

§ 3. CONCLUDING EXHORTATIONS.

(III. 1–18.)

Ver. 1, 2. In conclusion St Paul then calls on the Thessalonians also to pray for *him*; not to the end, however, that God may strengthen him (St Paul) and keep him in the faith, but only that God may be pleased to bless his labours. St Paul supposes his own personal position in the faith as incapable of being lost, he was so conscious of his election by grace that with him a falling away was not to be thought of. Besides, it would have been against decorum if St Paul had begged his disciples to offer up supplication to God for his preservation in the faith. The apostles were completely secured against every falling away from the faith with the possession of the Holy Ghost. See on Ephes. vi. 19. Ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου is here = εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ. But in the τρέχειν the contrast of the being bound [2 Tim. ii. 9] is couched. A reference to Ps. cxlii. 15 is certainly comprised in the term. The δοξάζεσθαι here expresses the recognition of the Gospel in its glory. Now, in order to be able there too, where he is just now, in Corinth, to labour effectually for the Gospel, as has been done among them in Thessalonica, he utters a wish to be delivered from all adversaries who hinder him. But whether these ἄτοποι καὶ πονηροὶ ἄνθρωποι (ἄτοπος is, according to Hesychius = ἔκθεσμος, αἰσχρός) are to be looked for within or without the Church depends on the meaning of the following: οὐ γὰρ πάντων ἡ πίστις, and on the way in which one connects those words with what precedes. As πίστις has the article here, it can only mean the

Christian faith, and not, for instance, "fidelity," as one might think from the πιστὸς ὁ κύριος, which follows. But the idea "not all have the faith" is so trivial that it can find no application, especially as St Paul had only just uttered the wish that the Gospel might spread. Accordingly, there can only be couched in the clause that all are not ready to receive the faith, that they strive against the Spirit who wish to effectuate the faith in them, as St Paul calls them at 2 Tim. iii. 8: ἄνθρωποι κατεφθαρμένοι τὸν νοῦν, ἀδόκιμοι περὶ τὴν πίστιν. Only this incapacity must not certainly be thought absolute, or even derived from a divine decree, but from personal unfaithfulness and impurity. Now, if we ask after the connection of this clause with what precedes by means of γὰρ, the idea: "that we may be delivered from wicked men, for all are not capable of faith," might mean, "that God may take them away from the earth, as there is certainly no prospect of their conversion." But, if we reflect that St Paul himself in the first Epistle to the Corinthians does not imprecate death on the incestuous man, but will only have him given over unto Satan for the saving of his soul, we must also here declare that acceptation entirely inadmissible. As long as a man is in the life of this body there is also the possibility of conversion for him. Even incapability of faith and unfitness can be removed through grace. Therefore the ῥύεσθαι here can be understood only of a deliverance by change of place and other circumstances, and not of death. According to this, it follows, then, that the ἄνθρωποι ἄτοποι and πονηροὶ must not be supposed members of the Church, but persons out of the Church, and, indeed, probably the Jews in Corinth, who had set so many persecutions on foot against St Paul. (See Acts xviii. 12, ss.)

Ver. 3. From himself personally St Paul turns back again directly to his readers, and utters the conviction that God would establish them and preserve them from evil. From the context not *every* temptation can be understood by that word, but such a one only as might proceed from the influence of such hostile persons as were described in ver. 2. No relation at all is to be supposed between the πιστὸς and the πίστις which precedes. God's faithfulness refers purely to the calling of the Thessalonians unto the kingdom of God, by which the decree of election is pronounced, "and this," St Paul means to say, "God will also faithfully preserve unto you by the removal of everything which can injure you in your life of faith." Considered in itself the

ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ might by all means be taken as neuter; but, as St Paul acknowledges evil to be embodied in Satan, as he expressly teaches a fight of the faithful with Satan (Ephes. vi. 12), it is more conformable to the meaning of the author to keep to the masculine here also. As to the rest the ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ refers only to φυλάξει, not to στηρίξει too. On the contrary, the context is to be taken thus: "The Lord will establish you and, as being established, or after ye are established, also guard you from the evil one." True, it might be said, the φυλάξει must then have stood first, for what is not as yet established requires preserving from the fight, but not what is already established. But this objection disappears if one only understands the φυλάσσειν ἀπὸ not of the keeping entirely remote *from* every fight but of the guarding *in* the fight. The being established, therefore, precedes, in order to make fit for the maintaining of the fight.

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

Ver. 6. After this St Paul then delivers a command, and that too, in his apostolical authority in the name of Christ Himself. This communication which now follows enables us to perceive what moral injury the errors of the Thessalonians had brought on the church. What in 1 Thess. v. was but briefly hinted at required now an open and very severe denunciation. On account of the supposed proximity of the kingdom of God, working had been given up by many, who now wandered about in fanatical idleness.

However there was yet a number of quiet persons also in Thessalonica who had not permitted themselves to be carried away. It is to be presumed these were the elders. For that reason, too, St Paul turns to them first, and calls upon them to give up communion with the brethren that walked in a disorderly manner. (For ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου the parallel διὰ τοῦ κυρίου stands in ver. 12. In it both the command of the Lord, and His power, which knows how to operate the carrying out that command, are pointed out. Στέλλεσθαι ἀπό τινος, or ἀποστέλλεσθαί τινος, denotes, like ὑποστέλλέσθαι, which has only more the subordinate idea of the clandestine [Gal. ii. 12], "to separate, draw back, one's self, from any one." [See Eurip. Suppl. v. 598.] Ver. 14 shows more nearly how St Paul wishes to have this understood here.—Ver. 11 further elucidates the idea of the ἀτάκτως περιπατεῖν.—We have no ground for supposing other causes of the disorderly life of the Thessalonians than the errors as to the Apocalypse only; the παράδοσις which St Paul here mentions refers also merely to that. It expresses the obligation to await quietly the time and hour of the advent, without neglecting one's earthly calling.—The discrepancy of the readings at the close of the verse is very great. The *text. rec.* reads παρέλαβε, with a reference to ἀδελφὸς; the codices waver between ἐλάβοσαν, παρελάβοσαν, παρέλαβον, παρελάβετε, which last reading Lachmann has adopted on the authority of B.F.G. I should, with Griesbach, take παρελάβοσαν for the original reading; first, because the more unusual form [see Winer's Gramm., p. 73], which, however, often occurs in the New Testament, might easily be changed into the more usual one; then, because after the allocution ἀδελφοὶ the second person is expected rather than the third, or at least, with reference to the brother walking disorderly, the third person singular.)

Ver. 7–10. In order to convince the Thessalonians that were gone astray of their perversity in giving up their handicrafts, St Paul sets himself forth as an example to them; with all his spiritual labours he had yet continually followed his handicraft too, and earned his own livelihood. It is true he insists *here too*, that the privilege certainly belonged to him of allowing himself to be maintained by the churches, but, for the sake of the good example, he had made no use of the privilege. But now that this was not *the only* motive that led St Paul to this conduct has already been remarked at 1 Cor. ix. 7, 8, on which passage the Commentary is to be consulted upon the causes of this mode of proceeding of St

Paul's. This point had also already (1 Thess. ii. 9) been spoken out upon by St Paul, partly in the same words. (Ver. 7. ἀτακτεῖν is defined here by the context; it denotes: "to give up the regular earthly calling." As at that time, so even now also, on the rousing of the soul to new life happening, a contempt of external action is very apt to appear,—a tendency which he that has the cure of souls cannot counteract powerfully enough.—Ver. 8. δωρεὰν is here "without labour," therefore without having earned one's maintenance. For the phrase ἄρτον φαγεῖν = אָכַל לֶחֶם, and denotes here livelihood in general, as the ἐσθιεῖν in ver. 10.—As to the ἐπιβαρῆσαι see on 1 Thess. ii. 9.—As to ἐξουσία see on 1 Cor. ix. 4, 5.—Ver. 10. In the axiom: εἴ τις οὐ θελει ἐργάζεσθαι, μηδὲ ἐσθιέτω an allusion to Gen. iii. 19 is couched. It is an universal law in the world, that man should eat his bread in the sweat of his face; he that has no business allotted him must therefore choose for himself a useful business.)

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

Ver. 13–15. Instead of making the rebuke of the disobedient the next topic, St Paul first introduces an exhortation to those that had continued firm, which is obscure in its connection. Καλοποιεῖν can be taken in a perfectly general sense, like ἀγαθοποιεῖν 1 Pet. ii. 15, or it can be understood of almsgiving, of doing good in the narrower sense. But trustworthy passages are wanting to

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

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

Ver. 17, 18. St Paul usually dictated his Epistles; Timothy seems to have written these two. (See 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i.

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

FINIS.

MURRAY AND GIBB, PRINTERS, EDINBURGH.

PROFESSOR FAIRBAIRN'S WORKS.

In Demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d. Cloth,

PROPHECY VIEWED IN ITS DISTINCTIVE NATURE,

ITS SPECIAL FUNCTION AND PROPER INTERPRETATION.

By PATRICK FAIRBAIRN, D.D.,

Professor of Theology, New College, Glasgow.

In Demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d., Second Edition of

EZEKIEL AND THE BOOK OF HIS PROPHECY;

AN EXPOSITION.

In Two Volumes, Demy 8vo, price 18s. (Second Edition, greatly enlarged and improved),

THE TYPOLOGY OF SCRIPTURE,

VIEWED IN CONNECTION WITH THE WHOLE SERIES OF THE DIVINE DISPENSATIONS.

Extract from speech of DR CANDLISH *on proposing* PROFESSOR FAIRBAIRN *to be one of the Professors of Theology in the Free Church Divinity Hall, Glasgow :—*

"I have been, within the last few weeks, perusing with great care Dr Fairbairn's work on Typology, and especially his recent work on Prophecy, and I venture to say, so far as I am permitted to judge, that a more admirable contribution to theological literature has not appeared for many years than this work of Dr Fairbairn on Prophecy. Its completeness, its clearness, its thorough investigation of the whole subject in a systematic way from first to last, will render it, I think, the standard work on Prophecy from this time. It seems to me that I read it with the same sort of feeling with which one reads an epic poem—so complete, having beginning, middle, and end, and carrying the reader forward from the most simple exposition of first principles, to the most sublime spiritual contemplations in the view of the approaching Millennium. And I would take the liberty of saying that, looking at Dr Fairbairn's admirable work on Ezekiel, however men may differ as to some of his interpretations, I suppose all will admit that it presents a masterly specimen of skill in making use of vast and varied stores of learning, both ancient and modern, both vernacular and German, so as really to elucidate the book, and not to overlay it. In this respect, I think Dr Fairbairn's book on Ezekiel presents a favourable contrast to some other commentaries published by learned men in England and America, where the learning almost overlays the sense, admirable as it may be, of the commentary."

In Crown 8vo, price 7s. 6d. Cloth,

THE PROPHECIES OF DANIEL, AND THE REVELATION OF ST JOHN, VIEWED IN THEIR MUTUAL RELATION,

WITH AN EXPOSITION OF THE PRINCIPAL PASSAGES.

By CARL AUGUST. AUBERLEN,

Professor Extraordinarius of Theology, Basil.

Translated by Rev. ADOLPH SAPHIR.

"This work abounds with evidences of profound research, and of extensive erudition. No man wishing to be versed in the Christian Literature of Europe on the subject of Prophecy, will remain long without this new work by Auberlen."—*Wesleyan Association Magazine.* June, 1856.

"A most readable translation of one of the most remarkable Works on Prophecy which it has ever been our good fortune to peruse, pervaded by a spirit of the most profound piety, and sparkling on almost every page with gems of pure genius."—*Warder.* May, 1856.

"We cordially recommend the book as one of the ablest contributions to the important, though abstruse subject, of which it treats."—*Wesleyan Times.* June, 1856.

"This is a book for the times—a masterly book—a book of critical analysis of texts, and comprehensive syntheses of truth, penetrating both Old and New Testaments, and attempting, in no small measure successfully, to bring together, in harmonious concord, the Books of Daniel and the Revelation of St John."—*Christian News.* June, 1856.

Edinburgh: T. and T. CLARK; and sold by all Booksellers.

Just Published, one large Volume, in Demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d.,

A Commentary, Expository and Practical,

ON THE

EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

By the Rev. ALEXANDER S. PATTERSON,

Minister of Hutchesontown Free Church, Glasgow.

"We are much pleased with Mr Patterson's exposition of this noble epistle. It is discriminating, sound in doctrine, lucid in statement, and not unfrequently earnest and forcible in appeal. There is not, to our taste, too much critical discussion in it, and we think that the work, while there is much in it that will be useful to students of Scripture, may be read with advantage by the private Christian in his closet, or even in his family circle. Though not professedly a learned or critical commentary, it does not overlook any points of difficulty presented by the epistle, but meets them as they arise with sound scholarship and great judgment."—*Evangelical Magazine*, June 1856.

"This is one of these goodly well-proportioned octavos whose external appearance prepossesses one in their favour; and the author has made a valuable contribution to the department of Biblical exegesis. Less voluminous and dogmatical than Owen, not so minutely philological as Moses Stuart and Tholuck, yet combining the excellencies of them all, the work before us is one that will not soon be superseded. It is precisely the kind of exposition that is required by a large number of intelligent Christians."—*English Presbyterian Messenger*, June 1856.

"If the reader of this admirable book skip desultorily over its pages, or allow himself to be carried unthinkingly onward by the flow of its easy and sparkling style, as one is sometimes borne away by the rhythm of Pope's poetry, he will readily class it with the lighter productions of the day; but, if he take the trouble to read it deliberately, keeping closely in view the difficulties that ever now and again present themselves, in phraseology, doctrinal reasonings, and allusions, he will be struck, not only with varied evidences of refined scholarship, and with striking condensed expositions, but with the indirect proofs in the thought of the volume, that every internal difficulty has received a severe investigation. . . . . We have read the work, and with the highest interest. There is such a delightful commingling of popularized criticism, doctrinal illustration, and practical enforcement, that, as is rarely the case with commentaries, we were unwilling to lay it down. It is truly refreshing to get hold of a genial and firm work like this. The style is energetic, and glows with poetic fervour. The work is throughout eminently popular in its texture, yet philosophical in its delineations, and obviously abreast of modern exegetic scholarship. In beauty of diction, freshness of thinking, accuracy of scholarship, and fulness of evangelic teaching, it is, as a whole, one of the finest specimens we have ever examined, if not, indeed, the best, of modern expository pulpit ministrations."—*Scottish Guardian.*

. . . "On these grounds, besides others of a kindred character, such as its evangelism, its earnestness, and its power, we cannot hesitate to predict for it a place of permanent usefulness and honour in the commonwealth of sacred literature."—*Weekly Christian News.*

"Mr Patterson is an acute thinker, an able and well-read theologian, and a thoroughly evangelical minister; all these qualities appear prominently in the work."—*Eclectic Review.*

. . . "We rejoice that the instruction conveyed is so good."—*Clerical Journal.*

Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark; and sold by all Booksellers.

NEW EDITION OF

PROFESSOR FAIRBAIRN'S COMMENTARY ON EZEKIEL.

In demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d., Second Edition of

EZEKIEL, and the BOOK of his PROPHECY. An Exposition. By PATRICK FAIRBAIRN, D.D., Professor of Theology, Free Church College, Glasgow.

"A work which was greatly wanted, and which will give the author no mean place among the biblical expositors of his country and language, for in it he has cast considerable light upon one of the obscurest portions of God's Word."—*Kitto's Journal of Sacred Literature.*

"In the department of critical exposition, it is long since anything comparable to it has appeared in this country; and on that particular portion of Scripture to which it is devoted, it stands alone. What was wanted in this country was, an indigenous and independent production, to which, with foreign aids, English criticism and theology should throw their highest light on this very important part of the living oracles, and this, we can assure our readers, they will find in the work before us. Further remarks we must reserve for the present. Meantime we congratulate the author on this, the happiest effort as yet of his able pen."—*Free Church Magazine.*

"The exposition in general bears evidence that the author possesses a sound judgment and correct habits of thinking. Many of the practical remarks are pertinent and striking. It will be regarded as among the few books in the language, or even in any language, which casts much light on this very difficult prophecy."—*Bibliotheca Sacra.*

COLE'S PRACTICAL DISCOURSE of GOD'S SOVEREIGNTY; with other Material Points derived thence, viz., Of the Righteousness of God; of Election; of Redemption; of Effectual Calling; of Perseverance, 8vo, 4s., cloth.

PIKE and HAYWARD'S RELIGIOUS CASES of CONSCIENCE Answered in an Evangelical Manner; or, The Inquiring Christian Instructed, 8vo, 4s., cloth.

NETTLETON and his LABOURS: being the Memoir of Dr NETTLETON. By BENNET TYLER, D.D. Remodelled in some parts, with occasional Notes and Extracts, and Specimens of his Sermons and Addresses, and an Introduction. By Rev. ANDREW A. BONAR, Collace, Author of "Memoirs of Robert M. M'Cheyne." In fcsp. 8vo., price 4s. 6d., cloth.

"Asahel Nettleton is a man but little known among us. But when we are told that he was the instrument, in the course of his own personal ministry, of awakening to serious concern no fewer than *thirty thousand souls*, who does not feel a wish to know something more of him. He was a man worthy to stand side by side with Edwards, and Wesley, and Whitefield, and Rowland Hill, occupying an undoubtedly high and honourable position among those who have converted sinners from the errors of their ways,—saved souls from death, and hidden a multitude of sins. Let those who wish to know more of him and his labours possess themselves of the work before us, which we heartily recommend to the perusal of all who desire to study the heavenly art of winning souls to Jesus."—*News of the Churches.*

"A very remarkable work; we may safely aver that so far as the Church is concerned, it is the BOOK of the SEASON, and it will unquestionably exert a very powerful influence upon the ministry of our land. If every minister who has the good of souls at heart would now get it, we might have a summer of awakening throughout the land, and a rich harvest might yet be secured ere the winter, which we fear, set in with its stormy tempests on the Church of God."—*British Messenger.*

"The book is altogether of great interest, and very instructive to Christians generally, but especially to ministers."—*Evangelical Christendom.*

"A most animating example of a ministry, at once earnest and successful."—*Excelsior.*

"We esteem it a valuable and instructive memoir of a man on whom God put high honour in the work of saving souls from death."—*Nonconformist.*

"Decidedly one of the best of our biographies; it is a valuable book, which cannot be attentively perused without profit."—*Presbyterian Messenger.*

Rev. Dr. Fairbairn.

Now ready, in Two Volumes, demy 8vo, price 18s.

THE TYPOLOGY of SCRIPTURE. Viewed in Connexion with the Whole Series of the Divine Dispensations. Third Edition, Greatly Enlarged and Improved. By Rev. PATRICK FAIRBAIRN, Professor of Theology, Free Church College, Glasgow; Author of "Ezekiel, and the Book of his Prophecy," &c.

"It is by far the soberest, most systematic, and most satisfactory work of the kind that we have yet seen, and will, we trust, very speedily obtain extensive reputation."—*Church of England Quarterly Review.*

"A learned, judicious, and truly evangelical work."—*Dr. Pye Smith.*

"I now say, NO BIBLICAL STUDENT should be without Mr. Fairbairn's Typology."—*Dr. Samuel Lee, in his "Events and Times of the Visions of Daniel."*

"As the product of the labours of an original thinker, and of a sound theologian, who has at the same time scarcely left unexamined one previous writer on the subject, ancient or modern, this work will be a most valuable accession to the library of the theological student. As a whole, we believe it may, with the strictest truth, be pronounced the best work on the subject that has yet been published."—*Record.*

"An admirable guide to this department of biblical research."—*Wesleyan Methodist Magazine.*

Dr E. W. Hengstenberg.

EGYPT and the BOOKS of MOSES; or, the Books of Moses Illustrated by the Monuments of Egypt. With an Appendix. By E. W. HENGSTENBERG, D.D., Professor of Theology at Berlin. Translated by R. D. C. ROBBINS, Abbot Resident Professor, Theological Seminary, Andover. With Additional Notes by W. COOK TAYLOR, Esq., LL.D., M.R.A.S. of Trinity College, Dublin. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

"'Egypt and the Books of Moses,' is an invaluable addition to the means already possessed in this country, for understanding the references to Egyptian customs so often alluded to in the Pentateuch."—*Evangelical Magazine.*

DISSERTATIONS on the GENUINENESS of the PENTATEUCH. By E. W. HENGSTENBERG, D.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin. Translated by J. E. RYLAND, Editor of the "Life and Correspondence of John Foster." In 2 vols. 8vo, 21s.

"The name of Hengstenberg guarantees the sound scholarship and critical acuteness with which it stands connected. In the departments of Old Testament exegesis, no man in modern times has done so much for orthodox Christianity; his defence of the Pentateuch, and his expositions of other books of the Old Testament, place him at the very head of Biblical scholars."—*United Presbyterian Magazine.*

DISSERTATIONS on the GENUINENESS of DANIEL, and the INTEGRITY of ZECHARIAH. By E. W. HENGSTENBERG, D.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin. Translated by the Rev. B. R. PRATTEN. And a Dissertation on the History and Prophecies of Balaam by the same Author. Translated by J. E. RYLAND. 8vo, 12s.

"It stands foremost.—A very learned work, and more full and rich than even his 'Christology.'"—*Tholuck.*

Dr C. J. Nitzsch.

A SYSTEM of CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. By C. J. NITZSCH, D.D. Translated from the Fifth Revised and Enlarged German Edition, by the Rev. R. MONTGOMERY, M.A., Oxon, Author of "The Gospel in Advance of the Age," "The Christian Life," &c. &c., and JOHN HENNEN, M.D., Licentiate Royal College of Physicians, London, &c. &c. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

"A master in theological learning and thought."—*Archdeacon Hare.*

"The production of a profoundly learned man, of vast powers of mind—his delineation of the Christian life possesses the rare merit of being more practicable and full, more minute and extensive, more clear, accurate, and fresh, than is almost ever heard in the most popular enforcement of the subject from the pulpits of this country."—*Free Church Magazine.*

In one large Volume, Demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d.,

A Commentary, Expository and Practical,

ON THE

EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

By the Rev. ALEXANDER S. PATTERSON,

Minister of Hutchesontown Free Church, Glasgow.

"We are much pleased with Mr Patterson's exposition of this noble epistle. It is discriminating, sound in doctrine, lucid in statement, and not unfrequently earnest and forcible in appeal. There is not, to our taste, too much critical discussion in it, and we think that the work, while there is much in it that will be useful to students of Scripture, may be read with advantage by the private Christian in his closet, or even in his family circle. Though not professedly a learned or critical commentary, it does not overlook any points of difficulty presented by the epistle, but meets them as they arise with sound scholarship and great judgment."—*Evangelical Magazine*, June 1856.

"This is one of these goodly well-proportioned octavos whose external appearance prepossesses one in their favour; and the author has made a valuable contribution to the department of Biblical exegesis. Less voluminous and dogmatical than Owen, not so minutely philological as Moses Stuart and Tholuck, yet combining the excellencies of them all, the work before us is one that will not soon be superseded. It is precisely the kind of exposition that is required by a large number of intelligent Christians."—*English Presbyterian Messenger*, June 1856.

"If the reader of this admirable book skip desultorily over its pages, or allow himself to be carried unthinkingly onward by the flow of its easy and sparkling style, as one is sometimes borne away by the rhythm of Pope's poetry, he will readily class it with the lighter productions of the day; but, if he take the trouble to read it deliberately, keeping closely in view the difficulties that ever now and again present themselves, in phraseology, doctrinal reasonings, and allusions, he will be struck, not only with varied evidences of refined scholarship, and with striking condensed expositions, but with the indirect proofs in the thought of the volume, that every internal difficulty has received a severe investigation. . . . . We have read the work, and with the highest interest. There is such a delightful commingling of popularized criticism, doctrinal illustration, and practical enforcement, that, as is rarely the case with commentaries, we were unwilling to lay it down. It is truly refreshing to get hold of a genial and firm work like this. The style is energetic, and glows with poetic fervour. The work is throughout eminently popular in its texture, yet philosophical in its delineations, and obviously abreast of modern exegetic scholarship. In beauty of diction, freshness of thinking, accuracy of scholarship, and fulness of evangelic teaching, it is, as a whole, one of the finest specimens we have ever examined, if not, indeed, the best, of modern expository pulpit ministrations."—*Scottish Guardian.*

. . . "On these grounds, besides others of a kindred character, such as its evangelism, its earnestness, and its power, we cannot hesitate to predict for it a place of permanent usefulness and honour in the commonwealth of sacred literature."—*Weekly Christian News.*

"Mr Patterson is an acute thinker, an able and well-read theologian, and a thoroughly evangelical minister; all these qualities appear prominently in the work."—*Eclectic Review.*

. . . "We rejoice that the instruction conveyed is so good."—*Clerical Journal.*

"The author steadily aims at ascertaining the mind of the Spirit, and then exhibits the doctrine, delineates the experience, and enforces the morality. The volume we consider as an excellent specimen of Scottish exposition. It is calculated alike to be useful to ministers, to private students, heads of families, and superintendents of Sunday Schools."—*Christian Witness.*

"Sound learning, a clear judgment, plain common-sense, have united to produce a volume worthy to be recommended for devotional reading, and richly suggestive to the preacher."—*Methodist Magazine.*

DR KRUMMACHER'S New Work.

In post 8vo, price 7s. 6d., cloth, Second Edition.

THE SUFFERING SAVIOUR;

OR

MEDITATIONS ON THE LAST DAYS OF THE SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST.

BY THE REV. F. W. KRUMMACHER, D.D.,

AUTHOR OF "ELIJAH THE TISHBITE."

TRANSLATED, UNDER THE EXPRESS SANCTION OF THE AUTHOR,

BY SAMUEL JACKSON.

CONTENTS.

THE OUTER COURT.—I. The Announcement.—II. The Anointing.—III. The Entry into Jerusalem.—IV. Christ Washing his Disciples' Feet.—V. The Passover.—VI. The Institution of the Lord's Supper.—VII. "Lord, is it I?"—VIII. Judas Iscariot.—IX. The Woe Denounced.—X. The Walk to Gethsemane.—XI. The Converse by the Way.

THE HOLY PLACE.—XII. Gethsemane—Conflict and Victory.—XIII. Gethsemane—Import and Result.—XIV. The Sudden Assault.—XV. The Traitor's Kiss.—XVI. The Sword and the Cup.—XVII. Offering and Sacrifice.—XVIII. Christ before Annas.—XIX. The Judicial Procedure.—XX. The Fall of Peter.—XXI. The Great Confession.—XXII. Peter's Tears.—XXIII. "Prophesy to us, Thou Christ."—XXIV. Christ before the Sanhedrim.—XXV. The End of the Traitor.—XXVI. Christ before Pilate.—XXVII. The Accusations.—XXVIII. Christ a King.—XXIX. What is Truth?—XXX. The Lamb of God.—XXXI. Christ before Herod.—XXXII. Pilate our Advocate.—XXXIII. Jesus or Barabbas.—XXXIV. Barabbas.—XXXV. The Scourging.—XXXVI. Ecce Homo!—XXXVII. The Close of the Proceedings.—XXXVIII. The Way to the Cross.—XXXIX. Simon of Cyrene.—XL. The Daughters of Jerusalem.

THE MOST HOLY PLACE.—XLI. The Crucifixion.—XLII. The Dividing of the Raiment.—XLIII. The Inscription.—XLIV. "Father, Forgive Them."—XLV. The Malefactor.—XLVI. The Legacy of Love.—XLVII. "Eli, Eli, Lama Sabachthani!"—XLVIII. "I Thirst!"—XLIX. "It is Finished!"—L. "Father, into thy Hands I Commit my Spirit."—LI. The Signs that Followed.—LII. The Wound of the Lance.—LIII. The Interment.

This most interesting work is not inferior to the Author's "Elijah" in striking illustration, while it greatly excells it in matured thought.

In Demy 8vo, price 9s. cloth (500 pages).

HISTORY OF FRENCH LITERATURE IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

BY ALEXANDER VINET,

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, LAUSANNE.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH BY THE REV. JAMES BRYCE.

CONTENTS.

I. The Chancellor D'Aguesseau, 1668–1751.—II. Cochin, 1687–1747.—III. Duke de Saint-Simon, 1675-1755.—IV. Rollin, 1661–1741.—V. Louis Racine, 1692–1763.—VI. Crebillon, 1674–1762.—VII. Le Sage, 1668–1747.—VIII. Destouches, 1680–1754.—IX. The Abbé Prevost, 1697–1773.—X. The Marchioness de Lambert, 1647–1733.—XI. Mademoiselle de Launay (Madame de Staël), 1693–1750.—XII. Fontenelle, 1647–1747.—XIII. Houdard de la Motte, 1672–1742.—XIV. Marivaux, 1688–1763.—XV. La Chaussée, 1692–1754.—XVI. Le President Henault, 1685–1770.—XVII. Vauvenargues, 1715–1747.—XVIII. Montesquieu, 1689–1755.—XIX. Voltaire, 1694–1778.—XX. D'Alembert, 1717–1783.—XXI. Diderot, 1713-1784.—XXII. Helvetius, 1715–1771.—XXIII. Raynal, 1713–1796.—XXIV D'Holbach and Grimm, 1723–1789, 1723–1809.—XXV. Buffon, 1707–1788.—XXVI. Duclos, 1704–1772.—XXVII. J. J. Rousseau, 1711–1778. Appendix.

"A work of great interest, which abounds in illustrations of the profound views and broad literary sympathies of the author, and is the first attempt to estimate the literary age of Montesquieu, Fontenelle, Voltaire, and Rousseau, from a Christian point of view."—*North British Review.*

"Vinet combines the brilliant details of Villemain with the grand philosophy of Barante. We heartily commend the work as most valuable and most seasonable." *Guardian.*

Rev. George Lewis.

THE BIBLE, the MISSAL, and the BREVIARY; or, Ritualism Self-Illustrated in the Liturgical Books of Rome: containing the Text of the entire Roman Missal, Rubrics, and Prefaces, translated from the Latin; with Preliminary Dissertations, and Notes from the Breviary, Pontifical, &c. By Rev. GEORGE LEWIS, Ormiston. In 2 Vols., 8vo, price 21s., cloth.

"These volumes are written with a moderation and candour—with an eye upon the good as well as the evil that has sprung up in the track of Romanism—that may well conciliate for their subject the attention of those who are repulsed by works of one-sided dogmatism. They supply a void in the popular literature of this question, and fill a place that has not hitherto been occupied in a controversy so prolific of authorship. . . . The entire work we regard as one of the most valuable modern additions to the Romanist controversy, and it will, we doubt not, speedily find its place in the library of every student of that subject."—*Edinburgh Courant.*

"The exposition of these matters is conducted by Mr Lewis with great success, in a manner extremely creditable to his talents, judgment, and knowledge of his subject, and well fitted to be useful."—*Bulwark.*

"These volumes are a fine contribution to the present warfare against Roman ascendancy."—*Evangelical Magazine.*

"We regard Mr Lewis' work as a very valuable contribution to the cause of Protestantism."—*Watchman.*

Dr W. T. Hamilton

THE PENTATEUCH and its ASSAILANTS; or, a Refutation of the Objections of Modern Scepticism to the Pentateuch. By W. T. HAMILTON, D.D. In demy 8vo, price 7s. 6d., cloth, (Free by Post.)

"This work will place its author in the first rank of Christian apologists."—*Evangelical Magazine.*

"A book that is unanswerable, affording the strongest confirmation to the many and varied evidences that the Bible is essentially the Word of God."—*Bell's Weekly Messenger.*

Dr Augustus Neander.

THE EPISTLE of PAUL to the PHILIPPIANS, and the GENERAL EPISTLE of JAMES, PRACTICALLY and HISTORICALLY EXPLAINED. By Dr AUGUSTUS NEANDER. To which is added, A Discourse on the Coming of our Lord, and its Signs, by the same Author. Translated by the Rev. ALEXANDER NAPIER, M.A., Vicar of Holkham, Norfolk, post 8vo, 3s., cloth.

"In this age, when few writers do more than repeat, especially in Scripture interpretation, what others have said long before, it is pleasant to meet with one who, out of the rich fulness of his mind, can present us with something fresh, ingenious, and which, even when not new, has all the aspect of newness from the mode in which it is presented, and from the circumstances by which it is surrounded."—*Kitto's Journal.*

Dr F. Schleiermacher.

BRIEF OUTLINE of the STUDY of THEOLOGY, drawn up to serve as the Basis of Introductory Lectures. By the late Dr FREDERICK SCHLEIERMACHER. To which are prefixed, Reminiscences of Schleiermacher. By Dr FREDERICK LUCKE. Translated by WILLIAM FARRER, LL.D., post 8vo, 4s., cloth.

"The work of a gigantic mind. It is incomparably the most suggestive work we ever read—every sentence is a mine of thought."—*Kitto's Journal.*

"The work before us partakes very much of the mental character of Schleiermacher, clear, methodical, and epigrammatic. He thinks and writes with mathematical precision, and indeed may be said to have reduced theology to a science. These outlines might be called the Euclid of theology. Every article forms a distinct proposition—accompanied with explanatory notes, which may be termed the corollaries, and the publication of the work in English cannot fail to have a beneficial effect on the theological studies of our country. Its utterly unsectarian and orthodox character adapts it to all denominations, and they could not do greater honour to themselves than by adopting it as a text book. We thank him for making this timely and valuable addition to our theological literature. The work is a gem, and that too of the first water."—*M'Phail's Journal.*

Dr Cook.

STYLES of WRITS and FORMS of PROCEDURE in the CHURCH COURTS of SCOTLAND. Revised, and adapted to the present state of the law of the Church. By Rev. J. Cook, D.D., Minister of Haddington. 8vo, 12s., cloth.

"A safe and satisfactory guide."—*Edinburgh Advertiser.*

ACTS of the GENERAL ASSEMBLY of the CHURCH of SCOTLAND from 1633 to 1842. Reprinted from the Original Edition under the superintendence of the Church Law Society. Imp. 8vo, only 18s.

ACTS of the GENERAL ASSEMBLY of the CHURCH of SCOTLAND from 1843 to 1850, inclusive. Edited by Rev. Dr Cook, Haddington. Imp. 8vo, 3s. 6d., sewed.

"These Acts contain a great mass of information, generally of a sound practical character, a knowledge of which is absolutely indispensable to every member of our Church Courts."—*Edinburgh Advertiser.*

Rev. Thomas Thomson.

THE HISTORY of SCOTLAND. By the Rev. Thomas Thomson, F.S.A., Scot. 12mo, Price 3s. 6d. sheep, or 4s. cloth, gilt edges.

"By far the best school History of Scotland which has yet been published."—*Educational Journal.*

"This History of Scotland is a superior book of its class; the narrative of events is abridged with more skill and power than is often exhibited in epitomes of this kind. The History is not a mere curtailment, it has been mastered and reproduced; at convenient times the author presents his subjects in masses, so as to convey an idea of the formation or state of society, in addition to the mere narrative of the doings of great men."—*Spectator.*

Dr E. Robinson.

A GREEK and ENGLISH LEXICON of the NEW TESTAMENT. By Edward Robinson, D.D., late Prof. Extraord. of Sac. Lit. in the Theol. Sem., Andover. A new and improved edition, revised by Alexander Negris, Professor of Greek Literature, and by the Rev. John Duncan, D.D., Professor of Oriental Languages in the New College, Edinburgh. One thick vol., 8vo, price 10s. 6d.

Margaret Thornley.

THE TRUE END of EDUCATION, and the MEANS ADAPTED TO IT; in a Series of Familiar Letters to a Lady entering on the Duties of her Profession as Private Governess. By Margaret Thornley. 12mo, 4s. 6d., cloth, gilt edges.

"The authoress is both clear-headed and large-souled enough to be able to sketch an outline of prelections for a whole college of professors. The diction is always neat, and often elegant; the reasoning is clear, vigorous, and independent-minded; the erudition is rich yet chaste, everywhere abundant, yet nowhere intrusive, and the moral tone is exalted, refined, and eminently Christian. The book possesses so many and so great excellencies as to deserve our cordial and earnest commendation."—*British Mother's Magazine.*

SKELETON THEMES: Intended to Assist in Teaching and Acquiring the Art of Composition. By Margaret Thornley, Author of "True End of Education, and the Means Adapted to it." Foolscap 8vo, 3s., cloth.

"A very skilfully arranged set of outlines on subjects well suited to the purpose. The pupils will not be encumbered by too much help, nor confused by having to write on dry commonplaces; of musty morality, before he can put together two sentences decently, descriptive of common objects. He begins with the latter, is abundantly guided at first, and very gradually advances with lessening aid, through a series of historical and biographical exercises, to those which require thought and reasoning."—*Eclectic Review.*

"It is long since we met with a more valuable aid to the schoolmaster, and those of our readers who may be engaged in week-day education will thank us for drawing their attention to it."—*Literary Gazette.*

Dr. H. M. Chalybaeus.

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT of SPECULATIVE PHILOSOPHY from KANT to HEGEL. From the German of Dr H. M. CHALYBÆUS, Professor of Philosophy in the University of Kiel. By the Rev. ALFRED EDERSHEIM, Old Aberdeen. In demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d., cloth.

"I have been requested by the Publishers,—as the character and even name of the Author of these Lectures may be unknown to many British Students of Philosophy,—to state, in what estimation Author and Lectures are held in Germany. I find no difficulty in compliance; and beg leave to say,—that to those acquainted with the Philosophical Literature of that country, it is known that CHALYBÆUS has, by more than one work, established for himself the reputation of an acute speculator, a fair critic, and a lucid writer; and, in particular, that these Lectures are there universally recognised as affording a perspicuous and impartial survey of the various modern systems of German Philosophy, at once comprehensive and compendious. In Germany these Lectures are considered as popular, but not as superficial. They are viewed as even supplying a desideratum; and, in particular, are accounted an excellent introduction to a more extended and detailed study of the recent philosophical systems. Accordingly, since they were first published in 1837, at least four editions have appeared.—In this country, the book assuredly will not be deemed too elementary.

"Though (and properly) not requested to express any opinion of the version itself, I cannot refrain from adding,—that having been led to re-peruse all the first nine lectures in the translation, which I have also occasionally compared with the original, I am strongly impressed with its general fidelity and clearness. Indeed, with the exception of a few expressions, (and these I would demur to more frequently on rhetorical than on scientific grounds), this version of a work by no means easy to render adequately, appears eminently worthy of approbation. —So much in justice touching the translation: of the translator I am wholly ignorant."—*Note by* SIR WILLIAM HAMILTON.

"I have long been familiar with the work in the original, and am glad to see a translation of it into English. I have partially compared the translation with the original text, and I think no one can say that it is not as intelligible a translation as could be expected by the English reader, who is in general so little accustomed to the German mode of thinking and expression. I shall not fail to recommend the work whenever an opportunity occurs."—*Extract of Letter from* Professor HOPPUS, *of University College, London.*

"The dignity of its theme, the accuracy of its estimates, the excellence of its order and transitions, and the ease and clearness of its style, entitle it to earnest and extended attention." —*Tait's Magazine.*

PHILOSOPHICAL ESSAYS. By THEODORE JOUFFROY. Foolscap 8vo, 5s.

KANT'S METAPHYSICS of ETHICS. 8vo, 16s.

KANT'S RELIGION within the BOUNDARY of TRUE REASON. 8vo, 10s.

Rev. John Forbes.

THE SYMMETRICAL STRUCTURE of SCRIPTURE; or, Scripture Parallelism Exemplified in an Analysis of the Decalogue; the Sermon on the Mount; and other Passages of the Sacred Writings. By the Rev. JOHN FORBES, LL.D., Donaldson's Hospital, Edinburgh. In 8vo., price 8s. 6d., cloth.

"All students of Scripture will thank Dr Forbes for this excellent work; we have it here shown how fully the meaning of the Sacred writers may be brought out by a careful attention to the structure of the language, and that this parallelism is not to be sought for only in the poetical books, but also in those commonly regarded as mere prose. By accurately displaying the nature of the arrangement the author furnishes us with a most valuable commentary on the passages adduced, as well as the key to the further comprehension of the sacred writings in general."—*Church of England Quarterly Review.*

"No one could rise from an attentive perusal of his chapter on the Sermon on the Mount (for instance) without feeling himself possessed of a better arranged, a more systematic knowledge of that beautiful passage of Scripture than before."—*Clerical Journal.*

"The book is worth study; it is evidently the production of no ordinary man, and is pervaded by a spirit at once scientific and devout."—*Homilist.*

"Dr Forbes is a profound and accurate scholar; he has brought much learning, both oriental and occidental, to bear in this volume."—*Bibliotheca Sacra.*

In Demy 8vo, price 7s. 6d., cloth,

THE PENTATEUCH AND ITS ASSAILANTS:

OR,

A Refutation of the Objections of Modern Scepticism to the Pentateuch.

BY W. T. HAMILTON, D.D.

EXTRACT FROM PREFACE.

THE object of the little work now presented to the public is declared in the title-page. It is designed as a vindication of that part of the records of our faith, known as the Books of Moses, from the objections and the misrepresentations that have been advanced and diligently propagated within the last half century. These objections are drawn from various sources—from science, from critical research, and from Oriental archives. That every objection here noticed is answered satisfactorily, the Author dare not flatter himself; but that each objection has been carefully weighed and impartially examined, with the best means of judgment accessible to him, he does affirm.

CONTENTS.

Lecture I. The Character of Moses as a Scholar and a Statesman.—II. Necessity of Revelation.—III. The Bible is a Revelation from God.—IV. The Pentateuch the Work of Moses, Genuine and Authentic.—V. Genesis the Work of Moses, and Inspired.—VI. Creation in Six Days.—VII. Populousness of the Earth in the Days of Cain, and the Longevity of the Ancient Patriarchs.—VIII. Antediluvian Giants. —IX. and X. The Deluge Universal.—XI. Death among the Creatures of God—its Origin and its Extent.—XII. Man one Family.

"This work will place its author in the first rank of Christian apologists."—*Evangelical Magazine.*

"A book that is unanswerable, affording the strongest confirmation to the many and varied evidences that the Bible is essentially the Word of God."—*Bell's Weekly Messenger.*

In a large Volume, Royal 8vo, price 10s. 6d.,

THEOLOGICAL ESSAYS;

REPRINTED FROM "THE PRINCETON REVIEW."

FIRST SERIES.

THE Publishers believe that, in reprinting the First Series of the Princeton Essays in so cheap and handsome a form, they are conferring a real boon on all who take an interest in Theological learning. The volume has been long out of print, and has brought a high price when it could be met with. The interesting and varied nature of the work will be best seen by the contents, which are as follow:—

ESSAY I. The Rule of Faith.—II. The Sonship of Christ.—III. The Decrees of God.—IV. The Early History of Pelagianism.—V. Original Sin.—VI. VII. VIII. The Doctrine of Imputation.—IX. Melancthon on the Nature of Sin.—X. Doctrines of the Early Socinians.—XI. The Power of Contrary Choice.—XII. The Inability of Sinners.—XIII. The New Divinity Tried.—XIV. Beman on the Atonement.—XV. Sacerdotal Absolution.—XVI. Regeneration.—XVII. Sanctification.—XVIII. Transubstantiation.—XIX. Sabbath Observance.—XX. Bodily Effects of Religious Excitement.—XXI. Tholuck's History of Theology.—XXII. Transcendentalism.—XXIII. Cause and Effect.

JUN 19 1946