

A

CRITICAL AND GRAMMATICAL

COMMENTARY

ON ST. PAUL'S

EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

WITH A

REVISED TRANSLATION.

BY

CHARLES J. ELLICOTT, B.D.,

DEAN OF EXETER, AND PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY, KING'S COLLEGE,
LONDON.

Wipf & Stock
PUBLISHERS
Eugene, Oregon

Wipf and Stock Publishers
199 West 8th Avenue, Suite 3
Eugene, Oregon 97401

A Critical & Grammatical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians
By Ellicott, Charles J.
ISBN: 1-57910-081-3
Publication date 11/12/1997
Previously published by Warren F. Draper, 1997

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

THE following pages form the second part of a commentary on St. Paul's Epistles, founded on the same principles and constructed on the same plan as that of the Epistle to the Galatians.

As I explained, somewhat at length, in the preface to that Epistle, the general principles, critical, grammatical, and exegetical, upon which this commentary has been attempted, I will now only make a few special observations on this present portion of the work, and record my obligations to those expositors who have more particularly devoted themselves to this Epistle.

With regard to the present commentary, I will only remind the reader, that as in style, matter, and logical connection, this sublime Epistle differs considerably from that to the Galatians, so the commentary must necessarily, in many respects, reflect these differences and distinctions. Several points of grammatical interest which particularly characterized the former Epistle are scarcely perceptible in the present; while difficulties which made themselves but slightly felt in the vivid, argumentative, expository language of the Epistle to the Galatians, are here, amidst the earnest hortatory comments, the deeper doctrinal expositions, and the more profound enarrations of the primal counsels of God, ever maintaining a distinct and visible prominence. In the Epistle to the Galatians, for example, the explanation of the uses of the cases did not commonly involve many points of interest: in this Epistle, the cases, *especially the genitive*, present almost every phase and form of difficulty; the uses are most various, the combinations most subtle and significant. In the Epistle to the Galatians, again, the particles, causal, illative, or adversative, which connected the clauses were constantly claiming the reader's attention, while the subordination or coördination of the clauses themselves and the inter-dependence of the different members and factors of the sentence were generally simple and perspicuous. In the present Epistle these difficulties are exactly reversed; the use of the particles is more simple, while the intertexture of sentences and the connection of clauses, especially in the earlier portions of the Epistle, try the powers and principles of grammatical and logical analysis to the very uttermost.

In the first chapter more particularly, when we are permitted, as it were, to gaze upon the evolution of the archetypal dispensation of God, amidst those linked and blended clauses that, like the enwreathed smoke of some sweet-smelling sacrifice, mount and mount upwards to the very heaven of heavens, in that group of sentences of rarest harmony and more than mortal eloquence, these difficulties are so great and so deep, that the most exact language and the most discriminating analysis seem, as they truly are, too poor and too weak to convey the force or connection of expressions so august, and thoughts so unspeakably profound.

It is in this part that I have been deeply conscious that the system of exposition which I have adopted has passed through its sorest and severest trial, and though I have labored with anxious and unremitting industry, though I have spared neither toil nor time, but with fear and trembling, and not without many prayers have devoted every power to the endeavor to develop the outward meaning and connection of this stupendous revelation, I yet feel, from my very heart, how feeble that effort has been, how inexpressive my words, how powerless my grasp, how imperfect my delineation.

Still, in other portions of this Epistle, I trust I am not presumptuous in saying that I have been more cheered and hopeful, and that I have felt increased confidence in the system of exposition I was enabled to pursue in the commentary on the preceding Epistle. I have thus (especially after the kind notices my former work has received) studiously maintained in the present notes the same critical and grammatical characteristics which marked the former commentary. The only difference that I am aware of will be found in the still greater attention I have paid to the Greek Expositors, a slight decrease in the references to some modern commentators in whom I have felt a diminishing confidence, a slight increase in the references to our best English Divines which the nature of this profound Epistle has seemed to require. I deeply regret that the limits which I have prescribed to myself in this commentary have prevented my embodying the substance of these references in the notes, as I well know the disinclination to pause and consult other authors which every reader, save the most earnest and truth-seeking, is certain to feel. Yet this I will say, that I think the student will not often regret the trouble he may have to take in reading those few portions of our great English Divines to which I have directed his attention, and which, for his sake, I could wish had been more numerous. Such as they are, they are the results of my own private reading and observation.

In the grammatical portion of the commentary I must entreat the reader to bear with me, if for the sake of brevity, and, I might even say, perspicuity, I have been forced to avail myself of the current forms of expression adopted by modern grammatical writers. They will all be found elucidated in the treatises to which I have referred, and of these, every one, to the best of my

belief, is well known and accessible, and will probably occupy a place in the library of most scholars.

I must now briefly notice the authors to whom, in addition to those mentioned in the preface to the *Galatians*, I am indebted in the present Epistle.

Of the patristic commentators I have derived great benefit from some *exceedingly* valuable annotations of Origen, which are to be found in Cramer's *Catenæ*, and which have hitherto scarcely received any notice from recent expositors, though they most eminently deserve it.

Of modern commentators on this Epistle, I am deeply indebted to the admirable exposition of Harless, which, for accurate scholarship, learning, candor, and ability, may be pronounced one of the best, if not the very best commentary that has ever yet appeared on any single portion of Holy Scripture. A second edition has long been promised, but, as far as I could learn from catalogues, and the foreign booksellers in this country, it had not made its appearance when I commenced this Epistle, nor, up to the present time, have I seen any notice of its publication.

The exposition of this Epistle by Dr. Stier, under the title of *Die Gemeinde in Christo Jesu*, is very complete and comprehensive, but so depressingly voluminous as to weary out the patience of the most devoted reader. When I mention that it extends to upwards of 1050 closely printed pages, and that some single verses (e. g. ch. i. 23, ii. 15) are commented on to the extent of nearly thirty pages, I may be excused if I express my regret that a writer so earnest, so reverential, and so favorably known to the world as Dr. Rudolph Stier, should not have endeavored to have confined his commentary to somewhat more moderate dimensions. The chief fault I venture to find with Dr. Stier's system of interpretation is his constant and (in this work) characteristic endeavor to blend together two or more explanations, and, in his earnest and most praiseworthy attempt to exhibit the many deeper meanings which a passage may involve, to unite what is often dissimilar and inharmonious. Still his commentary is the production of a learned and devout mind, and no reader will consult it in vain. A review of it may be found in the seventy-ninth volume of Reuter's *Repertorium*.

The third special commentary I desire to mention, is the full and laborious commentary of Professor Eadie. I have derived from it little *directly*, as it is, to a great degree, confessedly a compilation from existing materials, and these I have, in all cases, thought it my duty to examine and to use for myself; still I have never failed to give Professor Eadie's decisions my best consideration, and have in many cases felt myself edified by the devoutness, and, not unfrequently, the eloquence of his expositions. I trust, however, the learned author will excuse me when I say that I do not think the grammatical portion of the commentary is by any means so well executed as the exegetical, and that I cannot but regard this otherwise able work, as, to a

certain extent, an example of the truth of an opinion which I ventured to express in the preface to the *Galatians*, viz., that theological as well as grammatical learning is now so much increased, that it is hard to find a commentator who is able satisfactorily to undertake, at one and the same time, a critical, grammatical, exegetical, and dogmatical exposition of any portion of the New Testament. In his cumulative representation of the opinions of other commentators, as my notes will occasionally testify, Professor Eadie is also not always exact: with these abatements, however, which candor compels me to make, I can heartily and conscientiously recommend this commentary as both judicious and comprehensive, and as a great and important addition to the exegetical labors of this country.

I need hardly add that the last edition of the accurate, perspicuous, and learned commentary of Dr. Meyer, has been most carefully consulted throughout, and I must again, as in the preface to the *Galatians*, avow my great obligations to the acumen and scholarship of the learned editor. In many doctrinal questions I differ widely from Dr. Meyer, but, as a critical and grammatical expositor, I entertain for him a very great respect.

I have now only to commit my work to the reader, with the humble prayer to Almighty God, through Jesus Christ, that it may receive a blessing from above, and, though feebly and imperfectly, may still be permitted to minister somewhat to the more accurate knowledge of His blessed Word, and to the clearer perception of the outward forms and expressions of His everlasting Truth.

CAMBRIDGE, JUNE 1855.

C. J. ELLICOTT.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

THE second edition of the present Epistle is in all respects similar to the second edition of the Epistle to the Galatians, which appeared a few months since, and is brought up, I sincerely hope, fully to the same standard.

It is perhaps right to say that little has been substantially altered, and that the reader of the first edition will scarcely find more than half a dozen passages¹ where the opinions formerly maintained are either retracted or modified; still the additions are great, and the number of notes that have been recast or re-written by no means inconsiderable. By this means space has been obtained for the introduction of new matter; weaker arguments in contested passages have been made to give place to what might seem to put in a clearer light the stronger argument; logical and grammatical observations have been more grouped, and the links of thought that connect clause with clause or sentence with sentence, more studiously exhibited. In this last respect the additions will be found great, and will, I trust, by the blessing of God, be of no little use to the reader in properly pursuing the train of sublime thought that runs through this transcendent Epistle. This, alas! is the point most commonly neglected in our general study of Scripture: we trust to general impressions, and carry away general ideas, but the exact sequence of thought in the mind of the inspired writer is what, I fear, is only too frequently neglected. It is useless to disguise that this close analysis of the sacred text is *very* difficult,—that it requires a calm judgment, and a disciplined mind no less than a loving and teachable heart,—that it is not a power we can acquire in a week or in a month,—yet if Scripture be, what I for one believe it to be, the writing of men inspired by the third Person of the adorable Trinity, then we may well conceive no labor in this direction can be too severe, no exercise of thought too close or persistent. Let it also be not forgotten that no intelligent reader can now fairly say that he is without proper assistance; that the well is deep and he has nothing to draw with.

Setting aside all mention of the general improvement in the Commentaries of the day, and supposing the tacit objector to be either unable or unwilling

¹ I may specify for the sake of those who have the first edition, ch. i. 10, 12, 22; ii. 15; iv. 6; iv. 23 (amplified view); v. 25 (critical note).

to face the labor of reading the great patristic expositors, let him still remember that the science of grammar is now so much advanced,¹ that syntax and logic are now so well and so happily combined, that no one who is really in earnest, and to whom God has given a fair measure of ability, can for a moment justly plead that an accurate knowledge of the Greek of the New Testament is beyond his grasp, and a power of analyzing the connection of its weighty sentences not abundantly ministered to him. I studiously limit myself to saying the Greek of the *New Testament*: individual industry, however steadily exercised, may sometimes fail in making a student a good general Greek scholar; he may have no natural power of appreciating those felicities of expression, no ready ability for discriminating between those subtle uses of particles which mark the best age of Attic Greek; but the language of the New Testament, its plain, hearty, truly simple, but truly Greek diction, is, I am confident, above the reach of no one who will soundly study the general rules of thought and language, as they are now put before us by the grammarians of our own time. And this I say, partly to encourage the humbler reader who might have thought such acquirements decidedly out of his reach, partly for the sake of augmenting that kind and considerate company of students that have given these commentaries a hearing, and have borne patiently with the constant notice and repetition of grammatical details. I venture thus to dwell upon this topic,—a topic in part alluded to in the preface to the first edition, as four years of hard study since that was written, and, what is more valuable for testing opinions, one year of responsible *teaching* have convinced me that a really accurate knowledge of the language of the Greek Testament may be acquired far more easily than might at first have been imagined; and have further confirmed me in the belief that it is by these accurate investigations of the language of the Inspired Volume that we are enabled really to penetrate into its deeper mysteries, and thence to learn to appreciate the more convincing certainty of our highest hopes, and the more assured reality of our truest consolations.

But to return to the present volume. The student will find a great, and, I trust, a welcome addition in the constant citations from nine ancient versions, viz., the Old Latin, the two Syriac Versions, the Vulgate, the Coptic, the Gothic, the two Ethiopic Versions, and the Armenian.² All these have

¹ I may here remark that the Greek Grammar of Dr. Donaldson, noticed in the Preface to the *Galatians*, has now reached a second and enlarged edition, and is so complete in all its parts, and so felicitous in its combination of logic with grammar, as to form a most important contribution to the accurate study of the Greek language.

² I may take this opportunity of noticing, for the benefit of those who may be disposed to study this interesting and not very difficult language, that I have derived much useful assistance from the *Brevis Linguae Armeniacae Grammatica* (Berl. 1841) of J. H. Petermann. It is furnished with a good Chrestomathy and a useful glossary, and has the great advantage of being perspicuous and brief.

been carefully studied, their opinions maturely considered, and their views of debated passages exhibited in brief and unpretending, but (if labor may be allowed to make me hopeful) in correct and trustworthy enumerations.

Considerable additions have been made in the way of short critical notes, especially in those cases in which the Received Text differs from the reading which I have thought it right to follow. Here I have received some welcome assistance from the last, the so-called *seventh* edition of Dr. Tischendorf's *New Testament*,¹ though I regret to say I am still obliged to reiterate the opinion which I have formerly expressed, that at any rate in the citations from the Ancient Versions, Dr. Tischendorf is not always to be depended upon. His own preface, though marked by great assumption of tone, will indeed itself confirm this; as he has, by his own admissions, depended nearly entirely on Leusden and Schaaf for the Peshito-Syriac, — on the incorrect edition of Wilkins for the Coptic Version of the Epistles, to the complete neglect of the more recent edition of Bötticher, — on a collator for Platt's Ethiopic, — and for the Armenian, on the edition of a man whose general inaccuracies he has unsparingly denounced, Dr. Scholz. The subjective criticisms mixed up in the notes, cannot be pronounced as either very useful or very satisfactory, and will serve to show how hard it is to find in one and the same person the patient and laborious palæographer and the sound and sagacious critic. Still we owe much to Dr. Tischendorf, and it is probable shall have to owe much more;² his unwearied labors command our highest respect, and may only the more make us regret that they are not set off by a greater Christian courtesy in his general tone, and by more forbearance towards those who feel it their duty to differ from him.

The last addition to the present edition which it is here necessary to specify is, perhaps, the most important, — *systematic* reference to the sermons and treatises of our best English divines. This, it will be remembered, appeared to some extent in the first edition, and has always formed a feature of these commentaries; still I am now enabled to give to the reader the results of a wider reading, and to entertain the hope that he will find but few really valuable illustrations from our *best* divines overlooked in the present volume. All I have done, however, is only in the way of reference. Much I regret that neither space, nor the general character of the commentary, enable me to make long quotations: I will repeat, however, what I have said elsewhere, that, as the references have been made with great care and consideration, I venture to think that the reader who will take the trouble of consulting the writers in the places referred to, will find himself abundantly rewarded for his labor.

¹ In deference to the opinion and present usage of this critic, I now designate the MS. of St. Paul's Epp. formerly marked J. in the critical editions, by the new mark L.

² For a brief notice of the discovery by Dr. Tischendorf of a MS. of the *whole* New Test of an antiquity *said to be* as great as that of B, see the *Literary Churchman* for July 16, 1859, p. 258; *Bib. Sacra*, vol. xvi. 669.

I have already received many kind recognitions of the use which this class of references has proved to students in Theology; and I now continue them with renewed interest, feeling day by day more assured that in these latter times it is to our own great divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries we must go for our Theology; and that it is from them alone that we can provide ourselves with preservatives against the unsound, vaunting, and humanitarian theosophy that is such a melancholy and yet such a popular characteristic of our own times.

Nothing now remains for me, except to notice briefly the works of fellow-laborers that have appeared since the publication of the first edition.

A new edition has recently appeared by Harless, but, as the author himself apprizes us, too little changed to need any further notice than what has already appeared in the original Preface to this work. A very useful edition for the general reader has also appeared in America, from the pen of the estimable Dr. Turner, but is too different in its principles of interpretation to have been of much use to me in a critical and grammatical commentary such as the present. To two commentaries, however, which have appeared in this country, during the interval I have alluded to, I have paid very great attention. The first is the Third Volume of my friend Dean Alford's *Commentary*; the second is the Third Part of Canon Wordsworth's *Commentary*, — works which both deserve and have received the high approbation of all biblical students; the former for its able and attractive exegesis, the latter for its valuable citations from Patristic and English Divinity, and both for their accurate scholarship, and sound and intelligent criticism.

I now commend myself to the kind judgment of my readers; and with the hope, that some time in the course of the following year, if God be pleased to give me health and strength, I may be able to complete another portion of my laborious undertaking, I here bring to its close a work that has claimed my incessant attention for some months.

May the blessing of God rest on this reëpearance of a lowly tribute to His Honor and Glory; — may its errors and shortcomings be forgiven, and its broken and partial glimpses of Divine Truth be permitted to excite in others a deeper reverence for the Eternal Word, and a more earnest longing for the full and perfect Day.

CAMBRIDGE, AUGUST, 1859.

INTRODUCTION.

THE sublime epistle to the Ephesians was written by St. Paul during his first captivity at Rome (Acts xxviii. 16), and stands second or more probably third in the third of the four groups into which the Epistles of St. Paul may be conveniently divided. The Ep. to the Colossians (Meyer *Einleit.* p. 18, Wieseler, *Chronol.* p. 450 sq.), and also that to Philemon, appear to have immediately *preceded*, while that to the Philippians seems to have *succeeded* after an interval of perhaps a year, when the Apostle's confinement assumed a harsher character, and his prospects seemed in some measure more cheerless (Phil. i. 20).

It was thus written about the year A. D. 62, and was conveyed to the Church of Ephesus by Tychicus (Eph. vi. 21), either *while on his way* to deliver the Epistles addressed respectively to the Colossians and to Philemon, or, as has been thought more probable (Meyer *Einleit.* p. 17), *on his return* after having performed that duty.

That the Epistle was addressed to the Christians of the important city of Ephesus seems scarcely open to serious doubt. Both the critical arguments (see note on ch. i. 1) and the nearly unanimous consent of the early Church (Iren. *Hær.* v. 2, 3, Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iv. 8, Vol. I. p. 592, ed. Pott., Orig. *Cels.* Vol. I. p. 458, ed. Bened.) are so decidedly in favor of such a destination, that we scarcely seem warranted in calling in question a statement so strongly supported. Still the omission of greetings and personal notices in an Epistle sent from the founder of the Church of Ephesus (Acts xix. i. sq., comp. xviii. 19) to converts with whom he had abode nearly three years (Acts xx. 31) seems so very striking and noticeable, that we may perhaps so far adopt the opinion of Usher (*Annal.* ann. 4068) and of several recent expositors, that this Epistle, though addressed to the Christians at Ephesus, was still designed for circulation in all the churches conterminous to or dependent on that city, and was thus left studiously general in form, and free

from distinctive notices. Individual greetings and other messages of affection might well have been entrusted to a bearer who was specially commissioned to inform the receivers of the Epistle upon all points connected with the personal state of the Apostle (ch. vi. 21).

The Epistle does not appear to have been called forth by any particular circumstances, nor to have involved any warning against the peculiarities of Jewish or Eastern Philosophy, but was designed to set forth the origin and development of the Church of Christ, and to display to the Christian dweller under the shadow of the great temple of Diana the unity and beauty of that transcendently more glorious spiritual temple (ch. ii. 20) of which Christ Himself was the head corner-stone, and the saints portions of the superstructure. That it should also contain many thoughts nearly identical with those expressed in the Epistle to the Colossians is readily accounted for by the fact that both were written nearly at the same time, and both addressed to Churches which were sufficiently near to each other to have had many things in common, especially in the relations of social and domestic life.

The *genuineness* and *authenticity* admit of no reasonable doubt. The testimonies of the Early Church are unusually strong and persistent (see reff. above, and add Tertull. *de Præscr.* ch. xxxvi., Hippol. *Refut. Hær.* p. 193, ed. Oxf.), and have never been called in question till comparatively recent times. The objections are purely of a subjective character, being mainly founded on imaginary weaknesses in style or equally imaginary references to early Gnosticism, and have been so fairly and fully confuted that they can no longer be considered to deserve any serious attention; see esp. Meyer, *Einleit.* p. 19 sq., Davidson, *Introd.* Vol. II. p. 352 sq., Alford, *Prolegom.* p. 8.

The arguments in favor of the Epistle having been written at Casarea will be found in Meyer, *Einleit.* § 2, but are far from convincing.

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

CHAPTER I. 1.

Apostolic address and
salutation.

ΠΑΥΛΟΣ ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ διὰ
θελήματος Θεοῦ τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς

1. ἐν Ἐφέσῳ] *Tisch.* and *Alf.* have enclosed these words in brackets, but scarcely with sufficient reason. Without entering into detailed arguments, it may be sufficient to remark, that the facts about which all now seem agreed are as follows:— (1) As far as our present collations can be depended upon, all the MSS., mss., and Vv., are unanimous in favor of the insertion, except B, where the words are supplied on the margin by a *second* hand (*Tisch.*), and 67, where they appear in the text, but with diacritical marks indicative of suspicion:— (2) Basil of Cappad. certainly did not find the words ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς τῶν ἀντιγραφῶν, *Eumom.* II. 19. Bp. Middleton supposes Basil only appeals to the ancient MSS. as containing τοῖς οὐ σιν ἐν Ἐφ., not simply τοῖς ἐν Ἐφ.; comp. Wiggers, *Stud. u. Krit.* for 1841, p. 423: this opinion, however, has no diplomatic support of any kind, and cannot fairly and logically be deduced from the words of Basil; see Meyer, *Einleit.* p. 2, note:— (3) Tertullian (*Marc.* v. II. 17) possibly was not aware of their existence; it is uncritical to say more. His words, ‘veritas Ecclesiæ,’ do not necessarily imply an absence of diplomatic evidence, nor can ‘interpolare’ (comp. *Marc.* IV. 1, v. 21) be pressed:— (4) Origen (*Caten.* Vol. II. p. 102) appears to have accepted the omission, as he comments on the peculiarity of the expression τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὐσι; see *Tisch.* (ed. 7). The *internal* evidence, such as absence of greetings and personal notices, is of more importance. Still, both combined cannot be considered sufficient to overthrow the vast preponderance of external authority, and the appy. unanimous tradition of the early Church, that this Ep. was addressed to

CHAP. I. 1. ἀπόστολος Χ. Ἰ.] ‘an Acts xxvii. 23, οὐ εἰμί, Rom. i. 1, δοῦλος apostle of Jesus Christ:’ gen. not of *ablation* (the source from which his commission proceeded; comp. Stier *in loc.*), but simply of *possession*, in ref. to the Master whose servant and minister he was; see *Phil.* i. 1. The distinction between these forms of the gen. (which Eadie appears not to have fully felt) is often faintly marked (compare Scheuerl. *Synt.* § 16, 17); still

οὖσιν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

the Ephesians (Iren. *Hær.* v. 2, 3, Clem. Al. *Strom.* iv. 8, Tertull. *l. c.*, Origen, *Cels.* iii. p. 458, ed. Ben.). We therefore retain the words as genuine, and ascribe their omission in B to an early exercise of criticism founded on supposed internal evidence, traces of which are found in Theodoret, *Præf. in Eph.*: comp. Wieseler, *Chronol.* p. 442 sq. The different theories and attempts to reconcile conflicting evidence will be found in Meyer, *Einleit.* § 1, Wieseler, *Chronol.* p. 432 sq., and Davidson, *Introd.* Vol. II. p. 328 sq. Of the many *hypotheses*, that of Harless (*Einleit.* p. 57) — that the Ep. was designed not only for the Ephesians, but for the Churches dependent on Ephesus, or the Christians who had already been converted there — is perhaps the most plausible.

Harless seems quite correct in saying that the idea of *authorization* does not depend simply on the gen., but on the modal clauses *κατ' ἐπιταγήν*, 1 Tim. i. 1, which are commonly attached: comp. Gal. i. 1, where the nature of the relations between the Apostle and his converts suggests language of unusual precision. *διὰ θελήματος*] 'by the will of God;' modal clause appended to the preceding words, not so much to enhance his apostolic authority (comp. Alf.), as in that thankful remembrance of God's power and grace, which any allusion to his ministerial office was sure to awaken in the Apostle's heart: comp. 1 Cor. xv. 10, Gal. i. 15. These and the preceding words occur in the same order and connection in 2 Cor. i. 1, Col. i. 1, 2 Tim. i. 1; compare 1 Cor. i. 1. Though it is not possible to doubt that the Apostle, in addressing different Churches or individuals, *designedly* adopted the same or different modes of salutation, still it is not in all cases easy to trace, from external considerations, the reasons for the choice; comp. notes on Col. i. 1. Rückert, who has slightly touched on the subject (on Gal. i. 1), refers the Apostle's present specification of his authority, *διὰ θελ. θ.*, to the encyclical character of the Epistle. As this character, though probable (see crit. note), is merely hypothetical, it will be safer, and perhaps more natural, to adopt the more general explanation

above alluded to; see Meyer on 1 Cor. i. 1. *τοῖς ἁγίοις*] 'to the Saints.' Christians are appy. called *ἅγιοι* in the N. T. in three senses; (a) *generally*, as members of a visible and local community devoted to God's service (Acts ix. 32, xxvi. 10, Rom. xv. 20), and, as such, united in a common outward profession of faith (1 Cor. i. 2; see Chrys. on Rom. i. 7); (b) *specifically*, as members of a spiritual community (Col. iii. 12, 1 Pet. ii. 9); and (c) as also in many cases having personal and individual sanctity; comp. ver. 4, see Fell, *in loc.* The context will generally show which of these ideas predominates. In salutations like the present, *ἅγιος* appears used in its most comprehensive sense, as involving the idea of a *visible* (hence the local predicate), and also (as the complementary clause *καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χρ.* 'I. suggests) that of a *spiritual* and holy community; see Col. i. 1, and esp. 1 Cor. i. 2, where defining clauses involving these different ideas are grouped round *κλητοῖς ἁγίοις*: comp. Thorndike, *Review*, i. 33, Vol. I. p. 656 (A. C. Libr.), and Davenant on Col. i. 2. *πιστοῖς ἐν Χ.* 'I.] 'faithful, sc. believing, in Jesus Christ.' *Πιστός* is not here in its general and classical sense, 'qui fidem præstat' (Grot., Alf.), but its particular and theological sense, 'qui fidem habet' comp. Syr.), a meaning which it indisputably bears in several passages in the N. T.; e. g. John xx. 27, 2 Cor. vi.

² χάρις ὑμῶν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Blessed be God who has predestinated us to the adoption of sons, redeemed us by Christ's blood, revealed to us His eternal purpose of uniting all in Him, and has commenced its fulfilment by sealing with his Spirit both Jew and Gentile.

³ Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ Κυρίου

15, Gal. iii. 9, 1 Tim. iv. 3 (not 1 Tim. i. 12, Eadie), Titus i. 6, etc.; compare Wisdom i. 14, Psalm c. 6, and see Suicer, *Theaur.* s. v. Vol. II. p. 741.

ἐν Χριστῷ implies union, fellowship, with Christ (see notes on Gal. ii. 17), and qualifies only the more restricted term, πιστός, not ἅγιος (Phil. i. 1.) and πιστός (Harl., Meier). The clause is not, however, on the one hand, a mere epexegetis of ἁγίους (Beza), nor, on the other, a specification of another and separate class (Stier), but completes the description of the ἅγιοι, by the addition of a second and more distinctive predication; see Meyer *in loc.* Πιστός ἐν Χρ. thus approximates in meaning to πιστεύων εἰς Χρ. (Gal. ii. 16), except that the latter involves a closer connection of the verb and the prep. (πιστ. εἰς — Χρ.), and points rather to an act of the will, while the former involves a closer connection of the prep. and the noun (πιστ. — ἐν Χρ.), and marks a state and condition: see Fritz. *Marc.* p. 175, and Eadie *in loc.*, where the full force of the preposition is eloquently expanded.

2. χάρις ὑμῶν καὶ εἰρήνη] 'Grace to you and peace;' scil. εἴη not ἔστω (Meier, Holz.), which, though not untenable (Bernhardy, *Synt.* xi. 5, p. 392: comp. 2 Chron. ix. 8), is far less suitable and even less usual than the optative; see 1 Pet. i. 2, 2 Pet. i. 2, Jude 2, and comp. 2 John 3, where, however, ἔσται gives the wish the character of a definite expectation. The suggestion of Stier that χάρις and εἰρήνη refer respectively to the ἅγιοι and πιστοί does not seem tenable, as the formula is so common without any such antecedents (Rom. i. 7, 1 Cor. i. 3, 2 Cor. i. 2, al.); still they must not be diluted into mere equiva-

lents of the ordinary forms of salutation (Fritz. *Rom.* i. 7, Vol. I. p. 23). Χάρις expresses God's love toward man; εἰρήνη, the state of peace and blessedness which results from it; εἰρηνεύει γὰρ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ὁ τὴν εὐαγγελικὴν ἀσπασάμενος πολιτείαν, Theodoret, *Rom.* i. 8: see notes on Gal. i. 3. It may be observed that as this form is regularly maintained in all St. Paul's Epp. to Churches (Philem. 3 is no exception, being addressed also τῇ κατ' οἶκον ἐκκλησίᾳ), while in 1 Tim. i. 2, 2 Tim. i. 2, Tit. i. 4 (*Roc.*, *Lachm.*), the more personal term εἰλεος is added; the latter might seem the form addressed to individuals, the former to communities; comp. too Rev. i. 4, 2 John 3, but consider Jude 2, Gal. vi. 16, and observe that in Tit. *l. c.* the longer reading is more than doubtful. St. James alone adopts the usual formula, χαίρειν: in 3 John i. 2 the salutation passes into a prayer. καὶ Κυρίου]

καὶ ἀπὸ Κυρίου κ. τ. λ., so expressly Syr., Arm., both of which repeat the preposition. The Socinian interpretation, καὶ (πατρὸς) Κυρ., is grammatically admissible, but in a high degree forced and improbable: see esp. Tit. i. 4, and compare 1 Thess. iii. 11, 2 Thess. ii. 16.

3. εὐλογητός] 'Blessed,'—scil. ἔστω (2 Chron. ix. 8), or εἴη (Job i. 21, Psalm cxii. 2): the verb is, however, commonly omitted in this and similar forms of doxology; comp. 2 Cor. i. 3. In this solemn ascription of praise εὐλογητός (ἐπαινεῖσθαι καὶ θαυμάζεσθαι ἅγιος, Theod. Mops.), as its position shows, has the principal emphasis, the rule of Fritz. (*Rom.* ix. 5, Vol. II. 274) being approp. reasonable—that εὐλογητός or εὐλογημένος will occupy the first or some succeeding place in the sentence, according

ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁ εὐλογήσας ἡμᾶς ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογία πνευ-

as the emphasis rests on the predicate (as it commonly does), or on the substantive; comp. 1 Kings x. 9, 2 Chron. l. c., Job l. c., and esp. Psalm l. c., which are thus more satisfactorily explained than by a supposed limitation of position in consequence of the inserted copula (Alf. on Rom. ix. 5). It has been remarked by Steiger on 1 Pet. i. 3 (comp. Harless), that in the N. T. εὐλογητός is only applied to God, εὐλογημένος to man: it may be added that in the LXX, the latter is occasionally applied to God, but never the former to man. For a good analysis of the present paragraph, in which the relations of the Church to the three persons of the blessed Trinity are distinctly unfolded, see Alford *in loc.* Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ κ. τ. λ.] 'God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.' It is doubtful whether in this formula (which Rück. needlessly terms 'paulinisch,' see 1 Pet. i. 3) the gen. depends (a) on both (Theoph.), or (b) only on the latter (Syr., Æth., Theod.-Mops. 1, Theodoret) of the two nominatives. Chrys. leaves it undecided. Grammatical considerations do not assist us; for, on the one hand, the position of the article before Θεὸς rather than Πατὴρ (Olsh.) does not invalidate the latter interpretation (compare Winer. *Gr.* § 19. 3, p. 115 note), nor the omission of τὸ before καὶ (Harless) the former; the usual 'preparative force of τὸ (Hartung, *Partik.* Vol. I. p. 98, Klotz, *Devar.* Vol. II. p. 730) being here obviously out of place. To the former interpretation, Θεὸς μὲν, ὡς σαρκωθέντος, πατὴρ δέ, ὡς Θεοῦ λόγου, there can be no doctrinal objections (see verse 17, John xx. 17, and compare Olsh. on *Matth.* xxi. 31, 32), but from the considerations suggested on *Gal.* i. 4, as well as from the fact that, except in ver. 17, St. Paul has not elsewhere so designated the Father, the latter construction seems

decidedly preferable. On the most suitable translation, see notes on *Gal.* i. 4. (*Transl.*). δ εὐλογησας ἡμᾶς] 'who blessed us'; 'antianac-lasis; aliter nobis benedixit Deus, aliter nos benedicimus Illi,' Bengel. The aorist *participle* (where the aoristic force is always least obscure, Bernhardt, *Synt.* x. 9, p. 383) refers to the counsels of the Father as graciously completed in the Redemption, and is thus neither used (a) for a pres. (Holzh.) — an untenable position, except in a sense and under limitations (Scheuerl. *Syntax*, § 32. 2, p. 331) which would here be doctrinally unsuitable; nor (b) as marking 'a customary or repeated act' (Eadie) — a meaning which the aorist never appears to bear in the N. T.; see Winer, *Gr.* § 40. 4. 1. p. 248. The reference of ἡμᾶς can scarcely be doubtful: it cannot refer to St. Paul (Koppe), — for comp. *κἀγώ*, ver. 15, — but, as the inclusive nature of the context (ver. 14, 11, 12) distinctly implies, must be extended to Christians generally. No fixed rules can be laid down as to the reference of the plural pronoun: this must always be determined by the context. ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογία πνευματικῇ] 'with every blessing of the Spirit; agency by which the blessing was imparted, ἐν here being appy. instrumental (see notes on 1 *Thess.* iv. 18), and perhaps not without some parallelism to the Hebrew בְּכָל בְּרָכָה ; comp. the analogous construction, Tobit viii. 15, and James iii. 9, where, however, the instrumental sense is much more distinct. The meaning and force of πνευματικῇ is slightly doubtful. Chrys. and Theod.-Mops. find in it an antithesis to the blessings of the Old Covenant (τὴν Ἰουδαϊκὴν ἐνταῦθα αἰνίττεται εὐλογία μὲν γὰρ ἦν ἀλλ' οὐ πνευματικῇ; Chrys.; comp. Schoettg. *Hor.* Vol. I. p. 756); so distinctly Syr., Æth., and with a detailed

ματικῆ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ, ⁴ καθὼς ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν

enumeration of the blessings, Theodoret, *in loc.*

It seems, however, much more in accordance both with the present context and with the prevailing usage of the N. T. (see Rom. i. 11, χάρισμα πνευματικόν, and 1 Cor. xii. 1 τῶν πνευματικῶν, compared with ver. 11), to refer the epithet directly to the Holy Spirit (Joel iii. 1 sq., Acts ii. 16). Bengel has not failed to notice the allusion to the Trinity, which, as Stier (Vol. i. p. 57) has clearly shown, pervades the whole of this sublime Epistle.

ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις] 'in heavenly regions;

سَمَائِيَّة [in cælo], Syr., 'in cælis,'

Æth. The exact meaning of these words is doubtful. Many of the ancient, and several modern expositors, explain τὰ ἐπουράνια, as 'heavenly blessings' (ἐπουράνια γὰρ τὰ δῶρα ταῦτα, Theodoret), 'heavenly institutions' (J. Johnson, *Unbl. Sacr.* Vol. i. p. 198, A. C. Libr.), and thus, as in *ethical* contrast to τὰ ἐπίγεια (Chrys.); see John iii. 12, but comp. 1 Cor. xv. 40, where the same words are in physical contrast. This is not grammatically untenable, and would not require the omission of τοῖς (Rück., Eadie, al.), as the article would thus only correctly designate the class; see Middleton, *Greek Art.* III. 2. 2, p. 40, and comp. Winer, *Gr.* § 18. 3, p. 99. As, however, such a specification of the sphere, and thence of the spiritual character of the action would seem superfluous after the definite words immediately preceding, — as in the four other passages in this Ep. (i. 20, ii. 6, iii. 10, and vi. 12, but contr. Chrys.) the expression seems obviously *local*, and lastly, — as throughout St. Paul's Epp. (even 2 Tim. iv. 18) ἐπουράνιος has that local or physical force which the preposition ἐπὶ (Hartless) would also seem further to suggest, it will be best, both from contextual and

lexical reasons to retain that meaning in the present case. Ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρ. must then here be referred as a *local* predication to εὐλογ. πνευμ., defining, broadly and comprehensively the region and sphere where our true home is (Phil. iii. 20), where our hope is laid up (Col. i. 5), and whence the blessings of the Spirit, the δωρεὰ ἡ ἐπουράνιος (Heb. vi. 4), truly come: see notes to *Transl.*

ἐν Χριστῷ] Not for διὰ Χρ. (Chrys., Hamm.), but, as in ver. 1, 'in Christ;' 'in quo uno spirituali et sanctificâ benedictione donamur,' Beza. Thus εὐλογήσας contains the predication of *time* (Donalds. *Gr.* § 574 sq.), ἐν εὐλογ. πνευμ. the predication of *manner*, more exactly defined by the *local* predication ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρ., while ἐν Χρ. is that mystical predication which, as Stier well observes, 'is the very soul of this Epistle,' and involves all other conceptions in itself. For a good example of this species of analysis of clauses and sentences, see Donalds. *Crat.* § 304.

4. καθὼς] 'even as,' 'sicut' Clarom., Vulg., Copt., al.; explanation and expansion of the preceding εὐλογήσας κ. τ. λ., the particle καθὼς, which in most cases has a purely modal, appearing here to have also a slightly explanatory or even casual force ('inasmuch as'), and to mark not only the accordance, but the necessary connection of the εὐλογία with the ἐκλογή; see Rom. i. 28, 1 Cor. i. 6, and compare καθότι (used only by St. Luke), which has both a modal (Acts ii. 45, iv. 35) and a causal (Acts ii. 24) meaning. The form καθὼς is not found in the older Attic writers, or in Lucian; see Lobeck, *Phryn.* p. 426, and notes on *Gal.* iii. 6.

ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς] 'chose us out for Himself;' 'elegit,' Clarom., Vulg., al., — but with some sacrifice of the fullest meaning. Without entering into the profound dogmat-

αὐτῷ πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους

ical questions connected with the meaning of this verb (only used by St. Paul, here and 1 Cor. i. 27), it may be simply observed that in ἐξελέξατο three ideas are suggested; — (a) selection (not necessarily of *individuals*; see Ebrard, *Doymi.* § 560), from, out of, others not chosen (ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, John xv. 19; contr. Hofmann, *Schriftb.* Vol. i. p. 198), suggested by the plain *meaning* of the word; — (b) simple unrestricted preterition of the act (alike irrespective of duration or relation, Bernhardt, *Syntax*, x. 8, p. 380, and esp. Fritz, *de Aor.* p. 17 sq.), conveyed by the *tense*, and further heightened by the ‘timelessness’ (Olsh.) of the quasi-temporal predication πρὸ καταβολῆς; compare 2 Thess. ii. 13, εἶλατο ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς: God is ὁ καλῶν (1 Thess. ii. 2), as well as ὁ καλέσας (Gal. i. 6), but not ὁ ἐκλεγόμενος; — (c) reflexive action (for Himself; comp. Eph. v. 27, Rev. xxi. 2), implied by the *voice*. While the primary meaning of ἐκλέγ. and similar words is undoubtedly to be looked for in their general and national references in the O. T. (Usteri *Lehrbegr.* II. 2. 2, p. 271, Knapp, *Script. Var. Arg.* p. 556), the modal clauses with which they are combined show the deeper and more distinctive sense in which they are used in the New Testament. On this profound subject, and on the estates of man (the estate of wrath, of reconciliation, and of election) see esp. Jackson, *Creed*, x. 37, 11 sq., Vol. ix. p. 312 sq., and comp. Hammond on *God’s Grace*, Vol. i. p. 667 sq. (Lond. 1674), and Laurence, *Baptist. Lect.* for 1804. ἐν αὐτῷ] Not for δι’ αὐτοῦ, scil. διὰ τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν πίστεως (Chrys., Hamm.), nor for εἰς αὐτὸν (comp. Æth.) nor yet with an instrumental force (Arm.), but, as Olsh. correctly and profoundly explains it, ‘in Him,’—in Christ, as the head and repre-

sentative of spiritual, as Adam was the representative of natural humanity; comp. 1 Cor. xv. 22. πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου] This expression, used three times in the N. T. (John xvii, 24, 1 Pet. i. 20), here serves to define the archetypal character of the New Dispensation, and the wide gulf that separated the πρόθεσις πρὸ χρόνων αἰώνων (2 Tim. i. 9) of God with respect to Christians, from His temporal ἐκλογὴ of the Jews; see Neander, *Planting*, Vol. i. p. 522 (Bohn). εἶναι ἡμᾶς κ. τ. λ.] ‘that we should be holy and blameless;’ object contemplated by God in His gracious ἐκλογὴ, the infin. being that of intention; scil. ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἵνα ἅγιοι ᾤμεν καὶ ἁμώμοι, Chrys.; comp. 2 Cor. xi. 2, Col. i. 22, and see Winer, *Gr.* § 45. 1, p. 284. Donalds. *Gr.* § 607. a, p. 598. ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους ‘holy and blameless;’ positive and negative aspects of true Christian life. The meaning of ἁμώμος (ἁμεμπτος· καθαρὸς· ἄψεκτος, Hesych.) is slightly doubtful; it may be (a) ‘inculpatus,’ ὁ ἀνεπίληπτον βίον ἔχων, Chrys., in accordance with its derivation (μῶμος μέφομαι), or (b) ‘immaculatus’ (Vulg., Clarom., Arm.; comp. Syr., Goth.), with possible reference to its application in the LXX to victims, Lev. i. 10, xxii. 19; comp. 1 Macc. iv. 42, ἱερεῖς ἀμώμους, and see Tittm. *Synon.* p. 29. The latter meaning is strongly supported by 1 Pet. i. 19, ἀμνοῦ ἀμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου, and Heb. ix. 14: still, as there is here no sacrificial allusion directly or indirectly (comp. ch. v. 27), it seems best to retain the simple etymological meaning; see Col. i. 22, ἀμώμους καὶ ἀνεγκλήτους, and compare Wisd. x. 15, λαὸν ὅσιον καὶ σπέρμα ἁμεμπτον. It is more doubtful whether these epithets point to a moral condition, *i. e.* to the righteousness of sanctification (Chrys., Hamm.), or to the imputed

κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ, ἐν ἀγάπῃ ⁵ προορίσας ἡμᾶς εἰς υἰοθεσίαν διὰ

righteousness of Christ, (Olsh., Mey.) The former reference seems most consonant both with St. Paul's general teaching (1 Thess. iv. 7) and the obvious inferences that may be drawn from other passages in the N. T., 1 Pet. i. 16, Rev. xxii. 11; see Stier *in loc.*, and on the distinction between sanctifying and justifying righteousness, the excellent remarks of Hooker, *Serm.* II. 6. Vol. III. p. 611. κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ] 'before Him;' 'id est vere, sincere,' Beza; not what men, but what God esteems as such. ἀγιωσύνην ζητεῖ ἦν ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὀφθαλμος ὄρα Chrys. The form αὐτοῦ is here to be preferred, as the reference to the subject is obviously remote and unemphatic; comp. Bremi, *Jahrb. der Philol.* ix. p. 171 (Winer). The distinction, however, between the proper use of these two forms cannot be rigorously defined; see Buttm. *Mid.* (Excurs. x) p. 140, and Tisch. *Prolegom.* p. LVIII. ἐν ἀγάπῃ μοῦ be joined with ἐξελέξατο; more probably with ἀγ. καὶ ἀμώμ. (Vulg., Copt.); but appy. most probably with προορίσας (Syr., Chrys., Theod.), as St Paul's object seems here not so much to define the nature of the required ἀγιωσύνη and ἀμεμψία on the part of man, as to reveal the transcendent principle of Love which informed the προορισμὸς of God; καὶ προεῖδεν ἡμᾶς καὶ ἠγάπησε, Theod., compare Theod.-Mops. The arguments derived from the collocation of the words are not decisive, for ἐν ἀγάπῃ could as well be joined with ἀγ. καὶ ἀμ. here, as ἐν ἀγιωσύνη with ἀμέμπτους, 1 Thess. iii. 13; and again could as easily precede (emphatically) προορίσας here, as it does ἐβρίζωμένοι ch. iii. 18. Lastly, it cannot be said that the second modal clause, κατὰ τὴν εὐδ. is thus superfluous (Meier): the two clauses point to two different attributes; ἐν ἀγάπῃ to the loving Mercy, κατὰ τὴν

εὐδ. to the sovereign Power of God. For a good defence of the second form of connection see Alford *in loc.*

5. προορίσας ἡμᾶς] 'having fore-ordained us;' i. e. not 'prædestinans, Beng., but 'quum prædestinasset,' Syr.-Phil., the participle being most naturally regarded as *temporal*, not modal, and its action as *prior to*, not synchronous with (as in ver. 9) that of ἐξελ.; comp. Rom. viii. 29, 30, and see Bernhardt, *Synt.* III. 9, p. 383, Donalds. *Gr.* § 574 sq. With regard to the prep. it would certainly seem that πρὸ does not refer to others (Baumg.), nor, appy., to existence before time (Eadie), but simply to the realization of the event: the decree existed *before* the object of it came into outward manifestation; comp. προηλεκτός, ver. 12, and see Olsh. *on Rom.* ix. 1. The distinction between ἐκλογὴ and προορισμὸς is thus drawn by Scherzer (cited by Wolf); 'differunt tantum ratione ordinativâ et objectivâ,'—the ἐκ of the former referring to the mass from whom the selection was made, the πρὸ of the latter to the preëxistence and priority of the decree. On προορισμὸς, etc., see Petavius, *Theol. Dogm.* ix. 1, Vol. I. p. 565 sq., and Laurence, *Bumpt. Lect.* VIII. p. 169 sq. εἰς υἰοθεσίαν] 'for adoption,' scil. ἵνα αὐτοῦ υἱοὶ λεγοί[ω]μεθα καὶ χρηματίζωμεν, Theod.-Mops.; υἰοθεσία, however, not being merely *sonship* (Ust. *Lehrb.* II. 1, 2, p. 186), but as usual, 'adoptionem filiorum, Vulg.; see notes *on Gal.* iv. 5, and Neander, *Planting*, Vol. I. p. 477 (Bohn). εἰς αὐτόν], 'unto Him;' comp. Col. i. 20, ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν. As the exact meaning of these words is slightly obscure, it will be best to premise the following statements. (a) Εἰς υἰοθεσίαν. . . εἰς αὐτόν must be regarded as a single compound clause expressive of the manner and nature of the προορισ-