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## PREFACE

During both his visits to Corinth St Paul was beset with serious troubles through the implacable hostility of the Jews, and it is a strange psychological phenomenon that in this epistle which tradition represents as having been written by him from Corinth no hint is furnished of those troubles. The epistle addresses a severe reprimand to Jews for their arrogance, and one would have thought that the temptation to tell them not to behave after the ways of theirCorinthian kinsmen was irresistible. Such reticence is all the more astonishing because the apostle's temperament was not particularly phlegmatic ; rather he was prone to resent injury and not soon forget it, a trait which comes out distinctly in his refusal, as narrated in the Acts, to associate again with Mark, though he thus lost the friendship of such a wholehearted helper as Barnabas. ${ }^{1}$ How are we to account for this discrepancy? To my mind we have no option but to conclude that St Paul never wrote this epistle from Corinth.

Nor is it admissible that it was addressed to Rome. What is the picture of society which it presents? It depicts a mixed Christian community of Jews and Gentiles possessing agapae, and therefore an organized church; this church dates from a fairly old period, for dissensions have broken out in its bosom, and for many years a visit to it has been contemplated; lastly,

[^0]judging from the more lenient tone in which they are handled, the Gentile section of that community form the majority. But in the account furnished in the concluding chapter of the Acts no facts correspond with such a picture. Is it likely that the historian would have omitted to say a word respecting the dissensions if they existed and were so serious that an admonitory letter had specially to be written in order to compose them? Then, the agapae simply vanish; and so do the Gentiles, for clearly the men whom the apostle met in Rome were all Jews. Thirdly, the Acts read as if even among those Jews no Christians were to be found; in their interview the Jews vaguely say that they heard of the new religion as being discussed everywhere, but do not add, as one would have expected, that they knew of adherents to it who dwelt in Rome. What must have misled scholars into fancying that there existed such adherents is probably the fact that the men who met St Paul at the Three Taverns are called brethren. But this term could be quite properly applied to non-Christian Jews-it is so employed in Acts 22-5, 23-1, and 23-6 - and then we must remember that to the end St Paul remained a steadfast Hebrew whom, as Lightfoot says (Gal. p. 346), the traditions and feelings of his race held in captivity. Besides, after such a long intercourse with heathen strangers of a low type, whose manneis and customs were doubtless repulsive to him, he would be all the more prone to look with affectionate feelings upon any decent Jews he encountered. In fact, the Acts do not allow to think of any Christians at all living at Rome, much less of an organized church; nor do we possess any evidence worth speaking of as to such a church from other documents.

It is just possible that the epistle has been dated by its author himself as from Rome, for in those times anything connected with the capital was expected to acquire a certain standing. It was with this idea, for instance, that BishopDionysius of Corinth inscribed his own catholic epistle as one addressed to Romans, or that an interpolator had the audacity to represent the letter to
the Galatians as one from Rome, being followed in this by the authors of the Ephesians and the Hebrews. But the tradition as regards our epistle is rather that our author did not so inscribe it, for the best Ms, namely G, supported by D, by Origen and a scholion, omits the words 'in Rome' in the first chapter both at vv. 7 and 15.

Where the epistle was produced we have no data whereby to judge with any degree of assurance ; but the most likely place. 1 seems to me to be Alexandria. Its spirit is to urge mutual tolerance upon the Jewish and the Gentile sections of the Christian communities, and a liberal spirit of this kind due to Gnosticism was prevalent in that city from the times of Cerinthus or even earlier to the times of Pantaenus. Then, the taunt at the heathen worship of animals in the first chapter, whether written by the original author or a subsequent theologian, is what would at once occur to an Alexandrian, as it did to Philo, Clemens, and the author of the Sibylline Oracles. The Greeks were not worshippers of animals; and a resident of a Greek city in European or Asiatic Greece, in sneering at idolatry, was much more likely to expatiate upon points connected with the making, material, or futility of idols-such as we find in Apocalypse 9-20-or at any rate to add those points, as does Seneca in Fragm. 3 (quoted by Lightfoot, Phil. p. 289). The same way points the legendary journey to Spain, for Alexandria was commercially connected with North Africa and regions further west, as Philo puts it, where Jews had settled (Flac. 7).

As regards the date we may speak more confidently. The latest limit can be fixed with precision, for early in the second century the scission between the Jews and Christians was complete (Antiqua Mater, p.5) and antagonism to Christianity became a national question with the Jews. A few sporadic conversions were possibly effected, but that there should then exist a compact Jewish section in a Christian community or church, such as is indicated in this epistle, is unthinkable. On the other side, in the third chapter (v. 1 ff .) a punishment inflicted upon the Jews
is alluded to, and the allusion most probably is to the destruction of Jerusalem in A.d. 70. So that the epistle must have been written within the narrow period between A.D. 70 and the end of the century. Therewith agrees the severe tone in which the Jews are addressed, for it is the tone which men employ towards a minority, and it was towards that period that the Church became predominantly Gentile.

The author evidently was a Jew, as may be gathered from the fact that he does not openly refer to the destruction of Jeru-'salem-no doubt out of a charitable feeling towards his kins-men-and from the fond hope and wish he expresses for the final redemption of the Jews. It is in referring to them that he finds some accents of tenderness and eloquence (see 9-1 ff. and 1113 ff .).

His letter was what is known as a catholic letter, not addressed to any particular community-though it may have been prompted by what he was witnessing at Alexandria-but meant to inculcate harmony and mutual forbearance in all mixed communities where questions of meats and holidays were a constant source of friction; and an additional object possibly was to encourage collections by instancing what had been done in the time of St Paul.

In order to invest his work with authority, the author inscribed it as being one by St Paul, adding a few biographical particulars which he borrowed from the genuine epistles; such fabrications, whether innocent or malevolent, were a common practice in the early centuries, and from Eusebius E. H. 4-23 and 2 Thes. 2-2 we learn that Clemens and St Paul himself were thus personated whilst they were still living. But the counterfeit is transparent. How could St Paul have told such a puerile untruth as that he went so far as Illyricum? This journey and that to Spain are alike myths on a par with Andrew's tour throughout Thrace, Philip's journey to Parthia, and Matthew's visit to the land of the Sunless and Hole-dwellers (see Acta Phil. 30, where for $\dot{\alpha} \nu \eta \lambda \epsilon \epsilon i ̂ s ~ r e a d ~ \dot{\alpha} \nu \eta \lambda i ́ o u s) . ~ M o r e o v e r, ~$
the wish to deposit the collections at Jerusalem and then visit friends on the way to Spain is but a plagiarism after 1 Cor. ch. 16 and 2 Cor. ch. l, save that Spain is substituted for Macedonia and the collections are to be carried to Jerusalem prior, and not subsequently, to the visit. But the language by itself is a decisive proof. In the prograph, for instance, there occurs at v .4 a rhetorician's studied parisosis; is it conceivable that the apostle affected such trivialities? My own belief is that he was utterly unconscious of their existence. The language of the Romans throughout lacks that spontaneity, unconventionality, and ruggedness which we so very much admire in the Corinthians and the Galatians; it is that of a schoolman, whereas St Paul was not a schoolman, and so he himself tells us in 2 Cor. 11-6, where he protests that hé was an $i \delta t \omega \tau \tau \eta \tau \hat{\varphi} \lambda \lambda{ }^{\prime} \gamma \dot{\varphi} \dot{( }$ (see also 1 Cor. 2-4). The author showed good sense in not attempting to imitate the genuine Pauline style, for of a certainty he would have descended from the sublime to the ridiculous; St Paul is inimitable (see Renan, p. 231), perhaps more truly so than any other writer.

In its original form the epistle was fairly simple, and its simplicity probably commended it to the Alexandrian faithful and made it popular ; with the result that, as it has happened more or less to other popular writings of antiquity, it was tampered with. One of the interpolators, a theologian-or perhaps more than one-tacked on long and irrelevant disquisitions between chapters 6 and 11 ; and the work was further amplified by all manner of accretions, so that finally it became one of the hardest to follow in Greek literature. Origen himself, the acutest of the Fathers, was mystified by its argument, for in Philocalia (ch. 9-3) he confesses that Romans impressed him as if Paul did not adhere to his theme; though on the other hand modern critics have thought that they could thread their way out through the maze.

The best text which has come down to us is, on the whole, the one represented by the Mss FG, as I think I make plain

## PREFACE

in my commentary ; and that is the text which I have adopted throughout.

In the paraphrase subjoined the spurious parts are printed in italics, and again the portions which were not intended by the interpolators to be incorporated with the text but were either comments or substitutes or links appear as foot-notes. The paraphrase accords with my idea of what the text was like as far back as it is now possible to trace.








 $\Theta \epsilon o \hat{v} \pi \alpha \tau \rho o ̀ s ~ \grave{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \alpha \grave{\imath}$ кuрíov 'I $\eta \sigma o \hat{v}$ X $\rho \iota \sigma \tau o v$.
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$\mu \iota s$ каi $\theta \epsilon \iota o ́ t \eta s, ~ \epsilon i s ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \epsilon i ̂ \nu \alpha \iota ~ \alpha u ̉ \tau o \grave{' s ~ \alpha ’ \nu \alpha \pi o \lambda o \gamma \eta ́ t o v s ~ \delta \iota o ́ t \iota ~ y \nu o ́ v \tau \epsilon s ~} 2 \mathrm{I}$


















 т̀̀s, кат $\alpha \lambda \alpha ́ \lambda o v s ~ \theta \epsilon o \sigma \tau v \gamma \epsilon i ́ s, \dot{v} \beta \rho \iota \sigma \tau \grave{\alpha} s, \dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \eta \phi \dot{\alpha} \nu o u s, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \alpha$ Sóvas, 30


 $\mu o ́ \nu o \nu \alpha u ̉ \tau \grave{\alpha} \pi o \iota o v ̂ \sigma \iota \nu \alpha \grave{\alpha} \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ каi $\sigma v \nu \in v \delta o \kappa o v \sigma \iota l \nu \tau o i ̂ s ~ \pi \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \sigma o v \sigma \iota \nu$.

























 $\kappa \alpha \tau \grave{\alpha}$ тò $\epsilon \dot{U} \alpha \gamma \gamma \in ́ \lambda \iota o ́ v ~ \mu o v ~ \delta ı \alpha ̀ ~ ' I \eta \sigma o ̂ ̂ ~ X \rho \iota \sigma \tau o v ̂ . ~$


 $20 \epsilon \mathfrak{\epsilon} \nu \alpha \iota \tau v \phi \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu, \phi \hat{\omega} s \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \sigma \kappa o ́ \tau \epsilon \iota, \pi \alpha \iota \delta \in v \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \alpha \dot{\alpha} \phi \rho o ́ \nu \omega \nu, \delta_{\iota} \delta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \alpha \lambda o \nu$






































































 $\tau \omega \nu$ di' $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \rho \circ \beta v \sigma \tau i ́ a s, ~ \epsilon i s ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \lambda o \gamma \iota \sigma \theta \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota ~ \kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ a v ̉ \tau o i ̂ s ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu ~ \delta \iota \kappa \alpha \iota o \sigma u ́ \nu \eta \nu$,








































 $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\kappa} \alpha \tau \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \gamma \grave{\eta} \nu$ モ́ $\lambda \alpha \alpha^{\beta} \beta \mu \epsilon \nu$.






 $\kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \chi \alpha ́ \rho \iota \sigma \mu \alpha \cdot ~ \epsilon i ́ ~ \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \tau \hat{\varphi}$ тov̂ $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \nu \grave{\nu} s \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \pi \tau \omega ́ \mu \alpha \tau \iota$ oi $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda o i$ $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \in \alpha \nu o \nu, \pi o \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \mu \bar{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \nu \quad \dot{\eta} \chi^{\alpha} \rho \iota \iota \tau \sigma \hat{v} \Theta \epsilon o \hat{v} \kappa \alpha i \grave{\eta} \dot{\eta} \delta \omega \rho \epsilon \grave{\alpha} \chi^{\alpha} \rho \iota \tau \iota$



 $\dot{\epsilon} \beta \alpha \sigma i \lambda \lambda \epsilon \nu \sigma \epsilon \nu$ dià $\tau o \hat{v}$ ध́vòs, $\pi o \lambda \lambda \widehat{\omega} \mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ oi $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma \epsilon i ́ \alpha \nu \tau \hat{\eta} s$

























































 $\Theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi}$. " $O \tau \epsilon \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \hat{\eta} \mu \epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \rho \kappa \grave{\prime}, \tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \alpha \theta \dot{\eta} \mu \alpha \tau \alpha \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \iota \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \grave{\alpha}{ }_{5}$


 каі̀ oủ $\pi \alpha \lambda \alpha$ וóт $\eta \tau \iota ~ \gamma \rho \alpha ́ \mu \mu a \tau о s . ~$





























 $\Theta \epsilon o \hat{0}, \tau \hat{\eta} \delta^{\delta} \epsilon ̀ ~ \sigma \alpha \rho \kappa \grave{\imath} \nu o ́ \mu \varphi \dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau i ́ a s$.

 в 2




 $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{\nu} \mu \alpha$. Oi $\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \kappa \alpha \tau \grave{\alpha} \sigma \alpha ́ \rho \kappa \alpha$ oै $\nu \tau \epsilon s \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \hat{\eta} s$ $\sigma \alpha \rho \kappa o ̀ s ~ \phi \rho о \nu o v \sigma \tau \nu, 5$























































 тô̂ кข














 $\tau 0 \hat{v} \pi \alpha \tau \rho o ̀ s ~ \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu . M \dot{\eta} \pi \omega \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \eta \theta \in ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$ ทै $\pi \rho \alpha \xi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu \tau \iota \alpha \dot{\alpha} \gamma \theta \partial ̀ \nu$ uI


 'H $\boldsymbol{H} \alpha \hat{v}$ '́ $\mu i \sigma \eta \sigma \alpha$.






























 $\alpha \dot{\tau} \hat{\underline{Q}}$ oủ $\mu \grave{\eta} \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \iota \sigma \chi v \nu \theta \hat{\eta}$.

















 ${ }^{\prime} E \lambda \lambda \eta \nu 0 s$, ó $\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ av̉còs кúpoos $\pi \alpha ́ \alpha \tau \omega \nu, \pi \lambda o v \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ єís $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha s$ тoùs














 $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \lambda \alpha o ̀ \nu ~ \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \iota \theta o v ̂ \nu \tau \alpha$.

















 $\sigma \alpha \nu$ ї $\nu \alpha$ т $\quad$ '́ $\sigma \omega \sigma \iota \nu ; M \grave{\eta} \gamma^{\epsilon} \nu o \iota \tau o . ~ ' A \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \tau \hat{\omega} \alpha u ̉ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \pi \tau \omega \mu \alpha \tau \iota$

 $\dot{\epsilon} \theta \nu \hat{\omega} \nu, \pi o ́ \sigma \omega \mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \nu \tau o ̀ ~ \pi \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \rho \omega \mu \alpha \alpha \hat{\jmath} \tau \omega \nu$.






























 тov каì бофías каì $\gamma \nu \dot{\omega} \sigma \epsilon \omega s$ тồ $\Theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$, $\dot{\omega} s \dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \xi \in \rho \in \dot{\jmath} \nu \eta \tau \alpha \tau \grave{\alpha}$ крí-








 $\tau \epsilon ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota \circ \nu$.







 $\lambda i ́ \alpha$, ó $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \kappa \alpha \lambda \omega ิ \nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma \epsilon \iota$, ó $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \delta \iota \delta o u ̀ s$ є́ $\nu \dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda o ́ \tau \eta \tau \iota, 8$


























































































 $\kappa \nu \rho i ́ o v ~ \grave{\eta} \mu \omega ิ \nu$ 'I $\eta \sigma o \hat{\chi} X \rho \iota \sigma \tau о \hat{v}$.










 $\tau \hat{\eta}$ ढ̀ $\lambda \pi i ́ \delta \iota \dot{\epsilon} \nu \quad \delta \nu \nu \alpha ́ \mu \epsilon \iota \pi \nu \in \dot{v} \mu a \tau o s \dot{\alpha} \gamma i ́ o v$.



 ${ }^{16}$ тov̂ $\Theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$ єis $\tau o ̀ ~ \gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota ~ \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \tau o v \rho \gamma o ̀ \nu X \rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{v}$ 'I $\eta \sigma o \hat{v}$ єis $\tau \grave{\alpha}$




























 $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$.






























 $\tau \alpha ́ \chi \epsilon \iota$.




 каì Kov́apтos ò à $\delta \in \lambda \phi o ́ s$.
'H $\chi^{\alpha} \rho \iota s ~ \tau o \hat{v} K \nu \rho i ́ o v ~ \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \alpha ́ \nu \nu \tau \omega \nu \dot{v} \mu \bar{\omega} \nu$. ' $A \mu \dot{\eta} \nu$.

## COMMENTARY

1. $\kappa \lambda \eta$ тós. Equivalent to a perfect participle passive; as such this form gained a wide popularity since post-classical times through the influence of Latin -tus. See Jannaris, Hist. Gr. Gr. § 1052.
 in a large establishment who was assigned to a special work. Cf. Tac. Germ. 25 servis non in nostrum morem, descriptis per familiam ministeriis, utuntur.

In $G$ there is a lacuna from $\dot{a} \phi \omega \rho \iota \sigma \mu$ évos down to $\pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega s$ of v .5 , which perhaps points to the existence at one time of variations in the prograph.
 $\beta o v \lambda \hat{\eta} \tau o \hat{v} \theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$ (Acts 2-23).

 plıasing was modified so as to effect a $\pi \alpha \rho i \sigma \omega \sigma \iota s$ with кат $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \alpha{ }^{\prime} \rho \kappa \alpha$. The Peshitto каì $\pi \nu \epsilon \dot{\prime} \mu a \tau \iota$ ai $\gamma \iota \omega \sigma v v^{\prime} \eta$.



 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \nu \epsilon \kappa \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$, as we must also read in Apoc.1-5. The doctrine expressed is that Jesus assumed his divine sonship after he severed in the grave all connection with the flesh. It is probably affirmed both against those who with Cerinthus and the Ebionites (see Evang. Ebion. in

 at the time of the baptism, and against those who taught that Jesus was the son of God ever since his conception (cf. Mt 1-20 $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ ò $\gamma \grave{a} \rho$ év

$\boldsymbol{\nu} \kappa \boldsymbol{\kappa} \boldsymbol{\omega} \nu$. Really $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \nu \epsilon \kappa \rho \omega ิ \nu$, from amony the dead. Cf. Eplı.5-14
 wording was contracted by frequent use.
 $\left.{ }_{\epsilon} \mu \circ i\right)$ etc. In post-classical times the employment of the plural in the first person instead of the singular spread extensively, so that it occurs even in demotic private letters. Cf. Oxyr. Pap. 1479 Фıлорои́бш єip $\eta^{-}$ $\kappa \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu .1481 \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu .1491 \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$. For the plural, though a singular precedes, and vice versa, cf. Lk 23-14 and 15 єîpov-ín $\mu \mathrm{â}$. Jn 3-11 גa入ov̂-


 $\dot{v} \mu \omega \nu)$.
 Chrysostom.

 brought under submission to, and acknowledgement of, the faith.

 $\tau \hat{\eta} \chi^{\chi}$ ápıтos av̉rov̂.














[^1]
 reference to Rome when at the top of every page he added $\pi \rho o{ }^{\text {s }}$ ' $\mathrm{P} \omega$ maiovs? A parallel suspicious addition of locality is that in Eph.1-1. Sanday and Headlam remark that there seems to be 'some ground for the inference that there were in circulation in ancient times a few copies from which all local references had been removed.' But, on the contrary, a priori one would infer that the propensity was to tack on but not to remove local references, for details as to addressees, places of issue, names of authors, and so forth, if added, would strengthen the semblance of authenticity; and so points, so far as I am aware, our available evidence. Thus, all our pseudepigraphic epistles-those of Barnabas, Clemens, Justin, Ignatius, Polycarp-invariably record addressees; and in some Mss of 1 Peter we find a place of issue interpolated into the subscription. On the other hand, what motive could have led forgers to suppress local or personal details?
 of praise ; and therefore he adds through Jesus Christ, as through the great High Priest.' Origen, quoted by Gifford.

 $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \kappa \cup \cup \omega \nu$ боv $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi i \sigma \tau \iota \nu \grave{\eta} \nu \stackrel{y}{\epsilon} \chi \epsilon \iota s$. Similar contracted phrases in v. 18. 11-16. 14-22. 16-19.
9. $\mu$ áptus $\gamma$ áp $\mu$ oí évтıv. So several important authorities in accor-

 Mss give $\mu o v$ instead of $\mu o l$, and the same fluctuation recurs in Phil. 1-8. Acts 1-8. Ignat. Philad.7-2.
 $\mu a \tau \iota \theta \in \hat{Q}$ (so to read with D and other authorities) $\lambda a \tau \rho \epsilon$ vovtєऽ, which

$\lambda a \tau \rho \in \dot{\omega} \omega$. This word brought to mind the heathen and Jewish ceremonies with their carnal sacrifices to which Christians, in this respect agreeing with Greek philosophers and Essenes, felt a strong abhorrence, repeatedly quoting Isaiah 1-11 $\sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \alpha \rho \dot{\alpha} \rho \nu \omega \bar{\nu} \kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ \alpha i ̂ \mu \alpha ~ \tau \alpha u ́ \rho \omega \nu ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~ \tau \rho u ́ \gamma \omega \nu$

 contending that Moses himself repudiated them. Cf. Clem. Hom.3-45


 $\mu a \pi i \mu o v$ added in order to distinguish that the worship here meant was not what the heathen or the Jews understood by $\lambda a \tau \rho \epsilon i ́ a$, but
 see note.
 Cf. Acts 5-42. 8-35. Gal.1-16.
$\pi \omega ิ s$. The same as $\dot{\omega}$ s, ötı. In my Notes on the Gospels according to St Mark and St Matthew, p. 19 I gave an instance of this use of $\pi \hat{\omega} s$ from Mk 10-23 and added 'In MGk $\pi \omega \bar{\omega}$ is really the only declarative particle used colloquially, and Dr Jannaris (Hist. Gr. Gr. App.VI, §13) gives instances of its use from a period as early as the first and second centuries.' To the numerous instances quoted by Jannaris add Just.

 ported by the Latin version $g$ and Origen. All other Mss read iss, which-if a learned correction as is probable-lends point to what I further added in my note on Mk $10-23$, namely ' It is likely that the declarative use of $\pi \hat{\omega} s$ in the Gospels ${ }^{1}$ was originally much more extended than would now appear, and that when their language was gradually revised towards classicism, $\pi \omega \bar{s}$ was often changed into ö ot. .'
10. пávтотє. Connect with $\delta \epsilon$ ó $\mu \epsilon \nu \sigma$. Cf. Phil.1-4. Col.1-3. 4-12. 2Thes.1-11.

סєó $\mu \in v o s$ єil $\pi \omega \boldsymbol{c}$. To the instances quoted by previous commentators in illustration of this combination add Pseudo-Ignat. Smyrn.4-1 $\pi \rho 0 \sigma-$

 larly Acts 8-22 $\delta \epsilon \eta^{\prime} \theta \eta \tau \iota \epsilon \dot{\alpha} \alpha \rho a \dot{a} \phi \epsilon \theta \eta_{\eta \sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha i ́} \sigma o \iota$. Pseudo-Ignat. Philad. 3.

 $\pi \omega \varsigma \stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \rho \alpha \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \nu о \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \iota \varsigma$.

єủoסo日ウ́roual．Wordsworth＇In Greece and Asia at this day the parting wish to travellers is Kadòv катєvódov．＇Correct，save that the exact form is Kadò кaтaßódıo．Its equivalent in Apostolic times is


 But both forms mean the same，for both represent $\sigma \grave{v} \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \theta \in \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu a \tau \iota$ ．See notes on 2－12．2－27．15－29．For $\delta_{\iota}=\sigma \grave{v} \nu$ see Milligan，The New Testament Documents，p． 50.

11．émımo日ज．The preposition possesses no special force as is generally assumed，but was added by analogy with $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \theta v \mu \hat{\omega}$（a derivative，I may


 $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \nu \kappa \kappa \hat{\omega}(8-37), \dot{\epsilon} \mu \mu \alpha \theta \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \nu$（Soph．Ant．175）by analogy with $\sigma v \nu \eta \gamma \circ \rho \hat{\omega}$ ，

 the saints at Jerusalem．
 required is a corrective one，${ }^{1}$ such as $\delta \eta \lambda a \delta \grave{\eta}$ in MGk，c＇est－$\grave{a}$－dire in French，I mean in English．Therefore the proper reading is $\tau \sigma v \tau \epsilon \in \tau \tau \nu$ ，as it stands in A and in Origen and is further supported by Latin versions． A．V．correctly that is．
 the author had in his mind，namely，єis тò à $\mu \phi о \tau \epsilon ́ \rho o v s ~ \sigma v \nu \pi a \rho a \kappa \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota$

 $\pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega \mathrm{~s}$ ．G probably indicates the original reading，i．e．$\delta \iota \grave{\alpha} \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega \mathrm{~s}$

 The words $\tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \hat{\eta} \lambda o \iota s$ ，having perhaps in the first instance been missed by the transcriber，were afterwards added in the margin， whence they were restored in a different form in different Mss．

[^2]13. oủk olouac. This reading is supported by DE and Ambrosiaster, and best suits the apologetic tone of vv. 14 to 16, which read as though the writer protested that, if a previous promise made to visit the addressees had been unduly delayed, ${ }^{1}$ the reason was not that he felt any misgivings regarding his gospel. Ov̉火 olo $\mu \alpha \iota \dot{v} \mu \hat{s} \mathrm{~s} \dot{\alpha} \gamma v o \epsilon \in \nu$ occurs also in 2ClemR.14-2. Hom.13-5. The other Greek Mss ov $\theta$ '́ $\lambda \omega$.
${ }_{\epsilon}{ }^{\prime} \chi \omega$. All other Mss $\sigma \chi \hat{\omega}$. But the present form where we should have expected to find the aorist re-appears in v. 28. 8-23. 15-4. Also in


 ${ }_{\epsilon}{ }^{\prime} \chi \omega \nu$ must stand for $\sigma \chi \grave{\omega} \nu, \lambda \alpha \beta \grave{\omega} \nu, \delta \epsilon \xi \alpha{ }_{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma$, for otherwise there would be a tautology with $\tau \eta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$. This usage was not unknown even in

 and imperfect forms were often tampered with by classical purists. For instance, in $1 \mathrm{Jn} 2-28$ the original reading in the Sinaiticus, supported by most Mss, is ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \chi \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$; but a later hand changed it into $\sigma \chi \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$, which figures also in B. ${ }^{2}$ The tense fluctuates in Mt16-8( ${ }^{\prime \prime} \chi^{\prime} \tau \tau \epsilon-$ ė $\lambda \alpha \alpha^{\beta} \beta \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ ). 19-16. Jn 8-6. Acts 25-26. 2 Cor.1-15. 2-3. Phil.2-27. Eph. 1-7. 1Thes.1-9 (in the last two passages read $\epsilon^{\prime \prime} \chi о \mu \epsilon \nu$, and so also in Gal.2-4). Apoc.6-9.

 in FG instead of örov. See note on 4-15. So far as it depends upon
 tive was also employed. See Porson on Eur. Orest. 1338 and Blaydes on Soph. Ant.889. The sentence should proceed $\pi \rho o{ }^{\prime} \theta v \mu o ́ s ~ \epsilon i \mu \mu$, but

[^3] reading $\tau \grave{o} \kappa \alpha \tau^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \mu \grave{\epsilon}$, which is that of all other Mss, is inappropriate; it means as regards my affairs or health. Such is its sense in all the passages quoted by Lightfoot, namely, Eph.4-21. Col.4-7. Phil.1-12. Thobit 10-8. Esdr.1-22.
$\hat{\epsilon}^{\prime} \phi^{\prime} \dot{u} \mu \hat{i} \nu$. A misreading no doubt of $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{v} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$, which is the reading of
 preposition.

After $\dot{v} \mu \hat{i} \nu$ all other Mss add $\tau o i ̂ s ~ \dot{\epsilon} v{ }^{\text {' }} \mathrm{P} \dot{\omega} \mu \eta$ in accordance with v. 7.
16. oủ $\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ émaloхứvoual. This points to the times when educated men had adopted Christianity and boldly defended its truths without being intimidated by sneers of the kind described in Acts 17-32 and


 of Philosophoumena 1-4 declares that ö $\sigma \alpha \dot{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta^{\prime} \theta \epsilon \iota \alpha$ ن́ $\pi \grave{o} \tau \hat{\eta} s$ тov̂ $\pi \alpha \tau \rho o ̀ s$ $\chi$ व́рıтоs $\pi \alpha \rho a \lambda \alpha \beta o v \sigma \alpha(=\delta \iota \delta \alpha \chi \theta \epsilon i \sigma \alpha$; see note on 15-5) $\dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \dot{\omega} \pi o \iota s ~ \delta \iota \eta-$
 No doubt at the outset it was generally thought in the Greek world derogatory to the standing of philosophers and enlightened men that they should profess Christian doctrines. Hence the retort oúk ধ̇ $\pi a l-$ $\sigma \chi v ́ v o \mu a \iota$ and $\dot{a} \nu \epsilon \pi a \iota \sigma \chi$ v́vт $\omega$. Meyer aptly refers to 1Cor.1-18.

 $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \grave{\imath}$ тoîs к $\dot{\eta} \pi о \iota s$. For the accusative instead of the dative see note above on $\bar{\epsilon} \pi^{\prime}{ }^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \mu \boldsymbol{\mu}$. Cf. also Mt 14-14. Mk 6-34, where the reading varies

 the addition of the preposition is equally possible, nor is it a Latinism as some commentators think. Duplications of prepositions are common enough.
 words were left out purposely or by oversight by the copyist of G; they must have been absent from his prototype in the same way as
 The addition is probably owing to a reader who wished to explain this passage by 1Cor.1-18, where he misunderstood the exact meaning of $\sigma \omega \zeta о \mu \epsilon ́ v o l s$.

After 'Iovסaí $\omega \tau$ all Mss add $\pi \rho \omega \hat{\tau} \tau o \nu$ save that $G$ is supported by B. This addition is due to $2-9$, as it is likewise due in $2-10$. In $2-9 \pi \rho \omega \pi \neq \frac{1}{}$ accords with reason, inasmuch as the Jew who was taught out of the Law was more to blame than an ignorant heathen if he disobeyed

 a merit in obeying it, it was rather on the side of the heathen, and therefore it could not be rationally enunciated that the Jew would be first rewarded. The word was absent in Marcion's text. This is a clear case of superiority in the text of $G$.
17. Sıкасocóvŋ. The reverse of the following $\dot{o} \rho \gamma \bar{\eta}$ and therefore $=$ $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha i \omega \sigma \iota s$, acquittal (represented as clemency; see note on 3-5), in which sense it is occasionally employed. Cf. 3-21. 1Chron.18-14 тоt $\hat{\nu}$ кр̂̂ر $\alpha$ каi $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha \iota \sigma \sigma v ́ \nu \eta \nu=$ condemnation and acquittal.

 is this reading that the imitator of $3-22$ found, for he says $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha \iota \sigma \sigma v v^{\eta} \eta \in о \hat{v}$



 compendium INXN was misread under the influence of mív $\tau \epsilon \omega$.


ráp. Asseverative, as so often not only in Hellenistic but also in classical writers. Cf. Aesch. Eum.750. Rom.2-2 (so the Sinaiticus and Eplraem). 4-2. 15-29. Jn 9-30, etc. The same is the meaning of ötc in Mk 14-21; but it was not observed, and so the particle disappeared from several Mss.
$\pi \hat{a} \sigma a v$. Whetber committed by Greeks or Jews.
d $\delta \iota \kappa i ́ a v-$ d $\delta \iota \kappa i \alpha a$. An incredibly unskilful combination. Probably the first word was originally ả $\nu о \mu i ́ \alpha \nu$. Cf. Enoch 9-1 пи̂ $\sigma \alpha \nu \dot{\alpha} \sigma \epsilon ́ \beta \epsilon \iota \alpha \nu$ киѝ
${ }^{a} \nu o \mu i ́ a v$. The alteration may have been made by a Jew-hater who understood ảvouíav as a breach of the Jewish Law (see note on 4-7) and was offended at such a breach being regarded a sin. The text also in 11-27. Mt 23-28. Hebr.1-9. 8-12. 1ClemR.35-5. Deut.9-5. Zeph.1-9.
 or $\pi o v \eta \rho i ́ a$. See note on 6-19.
$\tau \grave{\eta} \nu{ }^{2} \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \epsilon \iota a \nu$ means, as the preceding verses show, the gospel, a sense which it often has in Christian literature. But in what follows it is taken as meaning what the Jews called the truth, namely, that God is the only true God. Probably therefore Marcion's copy was correct in omitting v. 19 down to the end of this chapter (excepting v. 32). The sudden onslaught upon the heathen seems uncalled for, and in its place I suspect that some allusion existed to the carping and hypercritical spirit of the Jews. Without such an allusion preceding, 2-1 (where see note) to 2 are too indefinite as a reference to the Jews.

катєХóvтшv. Out of the rather numerous meanings of катє $\chi^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \tau \tau \omega \nu$ the one which to some extent expresses hostility is restraining or imprisoning, in illustration of which commentators refer to Lk 4-42. 2'Thes.2-6.

 the attitude of the heathen conflicts with the feeling of both Jews and Christians as set forth in controversial writings, where they are represented either as misguided and iguorant or as persecutors. I believe the original reading was калалрє $\chi$ óv $\tau \omega \nu$, a verb which has survived in
 $\tau \rho \epsilon \in \chi \omega$, persécuter.' In this sense it is not unknown in the Hellenistic period. Cf. Philo 2-302 rov̀s $\pi \lambda \eta \sigma t o \chi \omega ́ \rho o v s ~ к а \tau \alpha \tau \rho \epsilon ́ \chi o v \tau \epsilon s . ~ J u s t . ~ 47 ~ a ~ \mu \grave{\eta}$
 A scholiast at Aesch. Eum. 734 gives катат $\varrho \in \chi \epsilon \iota s$ as an interpretation

 Cf. Iren. Frag.14. A synonym is катабv́рєє in XII Patr. Asch.2-8.
19. $\gamma \nu \omega \sigma \sigma o v^{2}$. Read ${ }^{\alpha} \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \tau o \nu$, as is perfectly clear from the context. It was a rather commonplace among ancient writers that, though God is unknown in a concrete form, his existence and power are deducible from his works. Cf. Wisd.13-1 $\mu \alpha ́ \tau \alpha \iota o \iota ~ \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \epsilon s ~ \ddot{u} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi o \iota ~ o i ̂ ̀ ~ \pi \alpha \rho \hat{\eta} \nu \quad \theta \epsilon \theta \hat{v}$







 Minutius) 'Dieu est évident à l'esprit; la Providence résulte d'un coup d’œil sur l'ordre du monde.' Similarly Clem. Hom.6-23 єí каì tí $\theta$ єòs
 Notes on St Mk and St Mt that it was a frequent form of error to insert or omit a negative particle ; see on 2-12.5-14.12-11; in Mt 27-
 But nowhere does this happen so often as in the case of the a privative. So in v. 20 óparà for áópara. 1Cor.2-13 probably read ảdıס́́ктоиs ${ }^{2}$ for סь $\delta \alpha \kappa \tau o i ̂ s .2$ ClemR.19-13 read $\delta^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \theta^{\prime} v a \tau o v$ (corrected by Gebhardt and Harnack) for $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ Өávazov. Enoch $2-2$ read ä $\phi \theta a \rho \tau \alpha$ for $\phi \theta \alpha \rho \tau \alpha ́ . ~ M a r c$.



 $\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha ́ \theta \eta \tau o \nu$ for $\pi \alpha \theta \eta \tau o ̀ \nu$ (corrected by Gallius). Cebes, p. 146 (Coray's edition) read $\kappa \alpha \lambda \lambda \omega \pi \iota \sigma \mu \grave{\nu} \nu$ for $\dot{\alpha}^{\kappa} \kappa \alpha \lambda \omega \dot{\omega} \pi \iota \sigma \tau o \nu$. The reading fluctuates in the following passages. 1Cor.1-19 $\sigma v v \epsilon \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ and $\dot{a} \sigma v \nu \epsilon ́ \tau \omega v$. 1ClemR.

 Just. 1 Apol. 65 a $\delta \iota a \phi \theta o ́ \rho \omega \nu$ and $\dot{\alpha} \delta \iota a \phi \theta o ́ \rho \omega v$. Philos. $127 \sigma \nu \mu \pi \alpha \dot{\theta} \epsilon \iota \alpha$ and


[^4]a similar error in MGk cf. Palamas's Парáкаı $\alpha$, p. 3 $\sigma \tau \alpha ̀ \pi \epsilon ́ \rho a \tau \alpha$ instead of $\sigma \tau \grave{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \rho \rho \alpha \tau \alpha$, as corrected by the poet himself.

 1Cor.7-15. Gal.1-16, and often. Occasionally the reverse occurs, the simple dative forthcoming where we should have expected to find
 The reason is that in Hellenistic times $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ came to be identified with the dative as a sort of prefix ; and the $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \mu \pi \rho \rho^{\prime} \theta_{\epsilon \tau \sigma \nu}$ and the $\dot{\alpha} \pi \rho \sigma^{\prime} \theta \epsilon \tau о \nu$ to


 (instrumental) use of $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \nu$ becomes considerably frequent in Hellenistic times, notably among Biblical writers and their imitators, who often go so far as to place it before any dative, a phenomenon which points to Hebrew influence, and moreover indicates the retreat of the loose dative.' The partiality to this idiom in consequence of its frequent appearance in the LXX eventually led to its being employed instead

 absurd abuse in that $\underset{\epsilon}{\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \nu} \boldsymbol{a} \boldsymbol{\jmath} \tau \underset{\sim}{\varphi}$ was occasionally foisted by writers affecting a sacred style upon active verbs as a sort of repetition of the



aủtoîs. Probably aủrós. He himself.
20. ópará. An oversight for áópara.
$\theta \epsilon$ cót $\eta \mathrm{s}$. Preferably $\theta \epsilon$ ót $\eta$ s with P. Didymus of Alexandria testifies to the existence of this reading in his time, imputing it to the heretics. But $\theta \epsilon \iota o ́ r \eta s$ would mark a distinction as between God and humanity, whereas the argument is that there exists an omnipotent Godship. So

[^5]Fusebius in his Hist.1-2, in emphasizing that the Son is equally God, among his privileges enumerates $\theta \epsilon$ ó $\tau \tau \tau \alpha$ and $\delta u v_{\nu} \mu \mu \nu$.

21. $\delta$ ót $\tau=$ öt $\tau$. See note on 8-20.
 єं $\pi \iota \gamma \nu \dot{\omega} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ of v .28.
 of confusion $\epsilon\rangle$ was used very frequently for $\epsilon$ 's.'
 verbal difference, which created the impression as though there also existed a difference in sense. Cf. Gal.1-12 ov̉o̊è $\pi \alpha \rho \epsilon ́ \lambda \alpha \beta o v ~ a v ̉ \tau o ̀ ~ o u ̛ \tau \epsilon ~$
 English rhetoricians often use an Anglo-Saxon derivative and then add its French or Latin equivalent, or vice versa, under the illusion that they emphasize two different ideas. Cf. Col. Claude Lowther (House of Commons, April the 16th, 1919)' The telegram to the Prime Minister was not sent in a minatory or threatening manuer.' During. the war it was a commonplace to be told that we had to fight for both freedom and liberty.
$\pi \epsilon \tau \epsilon\llcorner\hat{\omega} \nu$ каì тєтратó $\delta \omega \nu$ каì єртєтஸ̂v. A frequent sneer of the Alexandrian Jews and Christians at the Egyptian idolaters. Cf. Philo 2-566


 $\rho v \gamma \mu a-\Pi$ '́ $\tau о v$ (ClemA. Strom.6-5-40). Cf. further Orac. Sibyl.5-279. ClemA. Paed.3-2-4. Plilostr. Apoll.6-19.
24. ákaӨapoiar. A noun denoting an unholy conduct by deed or word or thought, and its various manifestations are specified in vv. 29 to 31 . But an interpolator understood it in too literal a sense, and by way of explanation added the words $\dot{\alpha} \tau \iota \mu \dot{\alpha} \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ to $\dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\eta}^{\prime} \nu$. That these words are a fresh accretion is made manifest (1) by $\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\eta} \lambda \lambda a{ }_{\varsigma}^{\xi} \alpha \nu \tau \grave{\eta} v \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta^{\prime} \theta \epsilon \iota \alpha \nu$
 of $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta^{\eta} \theta_{\epsilon \iota \alpha \nu} \kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon \chi \dot{\sigma} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ of v .18 combined with $\eta_{\eta} \lambda \lambda \alpha \xi \alpha \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \delta \delta_{\xi}^{\xi} \alpha \nu$
 repeats v.23. Subsequently, some prurient Apologist, finding this accretion as part of his text, thought it a convenient peg whereon to
hang the abominations of vv. 26 and 27 , and thus relieve his feelings against the heathen (cf. Just. 69 a and 70 d ). He wrote the lemma $\delta$ oo $\pi \alpha \rho \in ́ \delta \omega \kappa \epsilon \nu$ av̉rov̀s ó $\theta$ єòs and appended his own reflections. All this a subsequent copyist transferred bodily into his text. But the taste of a fourth reader, a literatus as shown by the verbal antithesis édo- $^{\circ}$ $\kappa \dot{\mu} \mu \alpha \sigma \alpha \nu-\dot{\alpha} \delta$ óкс $\mu о \nu$, revolted at the shamelessness of vv. 24 to 27 , and by way of substitution he wrote in the margin v .28 as far as vov̂v; and this substitute likewise eventually found its way into the text. Similarly in 1Thes.4-7 $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \alpha \theta \alpha \rho \sigma i \alpha \nu$ led some interpreters to a fantastic interpretation of 4-6 $\mathbf{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \beta a_{i} \nu \epsilon \iota v$. Scrivener, Introduction, p. 151, states that in $d$ vv. 24 to 27 are supplied by a later hand.
év éautoîs = $\dot{\epsilon} v \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta}^{\eta} \lambda o \iota s$, as often. So written both here and in v .27 by the influence of $\epsilon$ is $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda_{\hat{\eta}} \lambda$ ovs of v .27 . But many witnesses read $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ du̇rois, which appears the right reading. It is a kind of subject to $\dot{\alpha} \tau \iota \mu \dot{\alpha} \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$, repeating $\tau \grave{\alpha} \sigma \omega ́ \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$; see my note on v. 19. Similarly in XII Patr. Sim.6-5 and Lev.2-11 $\epsilon^{\boldsymbol{\prime}} \boldsymbol{\nu} \alpha \mathbf{u} \tau \boldsymbol{\varphi} \hat{\varphi}$ was misunderstood and altered into $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \nu \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} a v \tau \hat{\varphi}$.

26. mapà фứw. The fellatrices meant. Cf. Barn.10-8. In what they denounce in vv. 24 and 25 , the interpolators probably had in view the licentiousness of a certain sect of Gnostics who ' maintained that the moral law with the whole Jewish economy having proceeded from an evil being, it was a duty in the enlightened man to transgress the law, in order to free himself from the yoke of the Creator of the material world.' See Mansel, The Gnostic Heresies, p. 68 ; and my note on 3-8. The favourite motto of such men was $\tau \grave{a} \tau \hat{\eta} s$ coapкòs $\tau \hat{\eta} \tau \alpha \rho \kappa i$. . See note on 8-12.
 vovtєs. See note on v. 24.
 probably was $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha \pi o \lambda \alpha \mu \beta a ́ v o \nu \tau \epsilon s$, i.e. the reverse of $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha \pi o \delta i \delta o ́ v \tau \epsilon s$.


 pointed out in the note on v.21, the statement here made contradicts the one in that verse.
 Cels.3-16 $\pi \epsilon \iota \rho \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \theta \alpha \mu \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha}$ 入ó ${ }^{\prime} о v \pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \epsilon \iota v$. Tert. Apol. 40 humana gens male de deo meruit ; primo quidem ut inofficiosa ejus, quem cum intelligeret ex parte, non requisivit. Sophocles gives an instance of this

 on 3-5.
 $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \gamma \nu \omega \dot{\sigma} \epsilon \iota, \gamma \nu \omega \hat{\nu} \alpha \iota$.
 v. 11 and 3-20.
29. $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \mu \dot{\varepsilon} v o u s \pi \alpha \sigma \eta$. The construction with the dative instead of the genitive also in 15-13 (where $\dot{\epsilon}^{\prime} \nu \pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \eta=\pi \alpha ́ \sigma \eta \eta$, see note on v.19); Eph.5-18; Lk 2-40; XII Patr. Ben.6-3; Josep. Bell. Jud. 6-6-1; Just. 224 d, etc. It is a Latinism which spread to other verbs. So кoぃ $\omega \nu \omega$ in 1Pet.4-13; $\sigma v \mu \mu \epsilon \rho \iota \zeta о \mu a \iota$ in the sense of коь $\omega \nu \hat{\omega}$ in 1Cor.9-13; $\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \in \chi \omega$ in 1Cor.10-30; $\phi \epsilon$ éסoual in XII Patr. Sim.2-7; кvрєєv́ш in ibid. Neph. 8-6; Jos.3-2 ; etc. I have not met with any instances of such a construction in classical writers; those given by Tiddell and Scott from Aesch. Theb. 464 and Eur. Her. 373 are different.
 by DE and other authorities, notably the Vulgate, reversely exhibits
 of G. For (1) тоуррía would be tautological, being a synonym of какía, and accordingly in Mk 7-21 we find $\pi o \rho v \iota^{\prime} \alpha$ and $\pi o v \eta \rho \alpha^{\prime} \alpha$ combined without the addition of какía; (2) it is unthinkable that $\pi$ торvía, which was the principal accusation levelled at the heathen in those times (see Acts 15-20; Gal.5-19; Eph.5-3 and 5; Col.3-5; Just.61b and 343 d ; Clem. Hom.1-18, and chiefly Hom. 13 where the question of mopvía is extensively treated), should have been passed over; and (3) the substitution of $\pi o v \eta \rho i ́ a$ for $\pi o \rho v i^{\prime} a$ is very frequent, as in 1 Cor. $5-8$; Sir.41-17; Is.47-10; Je.13-27; XII Patr. Reub.3-3; 4-11; Jud.14-2; Dan.5-5.
$\phi \omega \nu \hat{\nu}$. G gives $\phi \circ \nu \omega \nu$, which I take for a misspelling of $\phi \omega \nu \omega \nu$. So in Eph.4-31 it is enjoined that Christians should avoid крav $\begin{aligned} \text { g. and }\end{aligned}$



 Lk 23－23 є́ $\pi \epsilon ́ \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu \tau о ~ \phi \omega \nu a i ̂ s, ~ a n d ~ s i m i l a r l y ~ i n ~ M G k ~ \phi \omega \nu \grave{\epsilon}$ каì какò when narrating a brawl．All the other Mss give фóvov；but éf $\rho \circ \delta \alpha$ s would then mark an anti－climax．
épıoas．A neo－Hellenic form．I do not know how far back it may be traceable．All other Mss give＇${ }^{\prime} \rho \iota \delta o s$.

30．$\theta$ eooruyeis as an independent attribute，whether in an active or a passive sense，${ }^{1}$ is not in its proper place．I have therefore construed it with катада́入ovs：it would thus indicate the writer＇s intense abhor－ rence of slanderers．Kaza入á入oc were particularly objectionable to the



 vó $\mu о \nu . ~ H e r m P . ~ 2 M a n d . ~ \pi о \nu \eta \rho \grave{~} \mathfrak{\eta}$ ката入а入ıà，ảкато́бтатоv $\delta a \iota \mu o ́ v \iota o \nu, \mu \eta-$

 $\tau \grave{\alpha} \rho \mathfrak{\rho} \mu \boldsymbol{\mu} \alpha a$.
éфєupєtàs какิ̂v．As pointed out loy previous commentators，this expression is further met with in 2 Macc．，Philo，Tacitus，and Virgil． Add Lactant．Mort．Pers． 7 Diocletianus scelerum inventor：But such a general abuse，following and preceding as it does accusations of distinct vices，seems strange．Moreover，in this long enumeration of vices we miss the vain ingenuity of Gnostics or Philosophers so often insisted upon，namely，a word such as кєvodógovs（Gal．5－26），єipe $\quad$ ，

 as we find кєvoסogía by the side of $\dot{a} \lambda \alpha \zeta_{o v \epsilon i a}$ in 1ClemR．35－5（who clearly had our passage in mind）and HermP． 8 Mand．5．Cf．also




31. äouvérous. Not amenable to reason.
àquv日étous. Irreconcilable, persistent in their feuds. Cf. Philo, Cai. 30


32. тò Sıкаí $\omega \mu \alpha$ тоû $\theta \epsilon o u ̂$. This must mean the Mosaic Law. Cf. 8-4
 v. 32 refers to the Jews, and therefore is disconnected with what precedes but connected with what follows; it probably forms part of the original text which was displaced by vv. 19 ff. See my note on $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \epsilon \iota a \nu$ of v.18.
èmrү $\boldsymbol{\text { ónvtes. Deleted in }} \mathrm{D}$ by superscribed dots.
ėmıyvóvtes oủk $\notin \gamma \nu \omega \sigma a v$. Most Mss omit oủk ${ }^{\epsilon} \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \alpha \nu$, but the reading of $G$ is supported by DE, Latin versions, and some few minor authorities; and seems preferable. The meaning then would be who (the Jews), though conversant with the Law (cf. 2-17 ff.), have not perceived that it is not enough to conform to ritual practices, and that the essential point is to shun the vicious acts condemned by the Law. These acts would have been specified in the lost passage, ${ }^{1}$ and one of them probably was censoriousness or slander. There is a parallel thought in Gal.5-19 to

 ка $\theta \grave{\omega} \mathrm{s} \pi \rho \circ \epsilon i \pi \sigma \nu$ of $v .21$ is a reference to this verse. If those verses in Galatians were genuine, they would prove a connection between vv. 29 to 31 and v. 32 of this Epistle; but they are not. In that Epistle the part from $5-16$ right down to $6-10$ is supposititious; its flatness when compared with the passionate tone of the preceding chapters is most striking.
 construction is lame, and I suspect that we should read ov $\mu$ óvov av่ $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \alpha$
 (1) with the Latin versions non solum qui ea faciunt (or ea qui faciunt). sed et qui consentiunt if through iotacism $\epsilon i$ was misread for oi; (2) with the parallel passage in 1ClemR.35-6 таv̂ $\tau \alpha$ रà $\rho$ oi $\pi \rho \alpha^{\prime} \sigma \sigma o v \tau \epsilon s$ $\sigma \tau v \gamma \eta \tau o \grave{ }$


[^6]

 بóvov $\pi$ oiov̂vтєs $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ ка̀̀ $\sigma v \nu \epsilon v \delta o \kappa o v ̂ \nu \tau \epsilon s$. We should thus obtain the import which common sense demands, namely, that men are equally guilty whether they be actual perpetrators or only abettors. Paul's guilt, for instance, by his being a $\sigma v \nu \epsilon v \delta o \kappa \omega ิ \nu$ (Acts 7-60 and 22-20) in the murder of St Stephen would be accounted as great as the guilt of those who stoned the martyr. The common reading è $\pi \iota \gamma \nu o ́ v \tau \epsilon$ s ö $\boldsymbol{\tau} \tau$
 каì $\sigma v \nu \epsilon v \delta о к о$ v̂ $\sigma \iota v$ roîs $\pi \rho \alpha \alpha_{\sigma} \sigma \sigma o v \sigma \iota v$ is absurd. Lightfoot (Phil. p. 289) regarded our passage as being the same in import with Seneca's (Epist. Mor.39-6) turpia non solum delectant sed etiam placent. But the two ideas are different and only agree in form; our passage affirms the equality of guilt whether doing or abetting, whereas in Seneca the question concerns a man who begins by liking vices and ends by thinking them morally right. At the same time it is not unlikely that our passage reflects a Stoical conception. The Stoics laid down their great doctrine-one that for the first time must have placed law upon a just foundation-that culpability resides in the will and not in the fact (Renan, Marc-Aurèle, p.28) ; and a corollary to this would be that a man is a criminal even if be only concurs in, or abets, a crime.

бuvєuסoкoûбıv. Cf. XII Patr. Ash.6-2 $\delta \iota \sigma \sigma \omega ̂ s ~ к о \lambda a ́ \zeta ̧ \nu \tau \alpha \iota, ~ o ̈ \tau \iota ~ к а i ̀ ~ \pi \rho a ́ \sigma-~$


## CHAPTER THE SECOND

1. Sto. A censorious person then being damnable. See note on $\tau \grave{\eta} r$ $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\eta}^{\prime} \theta \epsilon \epsilon \alpha \nu$ in 1-18.


${ }^{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \epsilon$. The usual exclamation of impatience in answering an unreasonable disputant. Cf. 9-20. Lk 12-14. Just. 249 b. 256 b. 263 c. Epict. Ench.29-5, and often. Also classically; cf. Aeschin. Tim. 22.
 $\kappa \rho \hat{\imath} \mu \alpha$, ö $\sigma \tau \iota s$ 彣 $\nu \hat{\eta}$. Even a Jew, who prides himself upon his member-
ship of a nation specially favoured by God，shall be helpless before the judgement－seat should his conduct be proved reprehensible．For，as

ó крíver．＇Jhe Christian Jew who naggingly criticized his Gentile brethren for not conforming to his own standard of propriety．Cf． 14－3．
 cally．

## 2．$\delta$ é．A variant $\gamma$ áp．

ả $\lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \epsilon$ cav．What is just，as frequently．Cf．1Cor．13－6．Jn 3－21．7－18．


 But $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta^{\prime} \theta \epsilon \epsilon \alpha \nu$ might also mean the gospel（see note on 1－17），the author
 $\sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$ ．

4．$\mu$ акро $\theta$ upias．God is $\mu \alpha \kappa \rho o ́ \theta v \mu o s$ so as to afford a chance of repen－ tance．Cf．Clem．Hom．16－20 $\mu \alpha \kappa \rho о \theta v \mu \epsilon \hat{\imath}, ~ є i s ~ \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha ́ \nu o t a \nu ~ к а \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath}$.
 $\delta \omega \lambda o \lambda a \tau \rho \epsilon i ́ a \nu \dot{\prime} \delta \eta \gamma \epsilon \hat{i}$ ．

ठó乡 $\alpha \nu \kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ \tau \iota \mu \eta ̀ \nu=\pi \rho \omega \tau \epsilon \hat{\imath} \alpha$ ．
kai àф0apoíav．It should be obvious that these words are not in their place but must follow $\zeta \omega \grave{\eta} \nu$ aívıov．Cf． 2 Tim．1－10 そんウ̀v каi $\dot{\alpha}$－



 ä $\phi \theta$ артоs．


 popular etymology it was probably taken as of the same root as that of $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon \theta \iota \sigma \tau \grave{\eta}=a$ quarrelsome or contentious person，namely，as being another form of $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon \theta \iota \sigma \mu o ̀ s=q u a r r e l s o m e n e s s, ~ p r a c t i c a l l y ~ m e a n i n g ~ t h e ~$ same as épcs．
9. 'louסaíc $\tau \epsilon \pi \rho \omega ิ \tau o \nu ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~ " E \lambda \lambda \eta \nu c$. So also a few cursives and the Peshitto; the rest 'Iovסaiov $\tau \epsilon \pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau о \nu \kappa \alpha i{ }^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E} \lambda \lambda \eta v o s$.
10. $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{v}$. Not appropriate in this passage. See note on 1-16.
12. àvóncs. Not under the Law, not blessed with the possession and guidance of the Jewish Law. It is the opposite of $\epsilon \nu v o ́ \mu \omega s$. So in 1Cor. 9-21 тoîs ảvó $\mu o \iota s$ is contrasted (in v. 20) to тoís $\mathfrak{v i \pi o ̀ ~ \nu o ́ \mu o v . ~}$
 advantage of knowing the Law and may conform to its ritual, still should he be a sinner, he shall be punished as the Law prescribes. Now what is the converse to this? It is that a man may not be a Jew, still should he do no wrong, he shall not suffer, but be justified in spite of his ignorance of the Law. Therefore we must read $\dot{\mu} \pi$ odv́rov

 on 1-19) was almost a matter of course. ${ }^{2}$ A $\pi \frac{1}{}{ }^{2}$ vovoval is the opposite
 $\dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \boldsymbol{\alpha} \nu \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$.
€̇v vópu. G ovo $\mu \omega$; a curious misreading.
Sı̀̀ vó $\mu$ ou $=\sigma \grave{v} \nu \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\mu} \mu \boldsymbol{\text { . }}$. See note on v. 27.
13. ảкроатаі. Students, disciples. See note on 10-17.

ả $\lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ тoı $\eta \tau a i$. Read $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ oi $\pi o \iota \eta \tau a i$ with all other Mss.
$\pi \alpha \rho \alpha ̀ \theta \in \omega ̣$ (after $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha \iota \omega \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma o v \tau \alpha \iota)$. Unnecessary and absent from all other uncials.
14. This verse, as indicated by the particle $\delta$, was originally a marginal note, added no doubt by an anti-Jewish Apologist. It disturbs the context, which is that those men alone shall be justified who will have practised the moral precepts of the Law as proved by a record engraven upon their hearts. Most witnesses $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ instead of $\delta \epsilon$.
$\phi$ úvєı. Misunderstood by previous expositors. It is connected with $\tau \grave{\alpha} \mu \grave{\eta} \nu o ́ \mu o \nu$ è $\chi о \nu \tau \alpha$ (so Bengel) and means by the fact of birth. So v. 27
 $\phi \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \iota \dot{\partial} \rho \gamma \hat{\eta} s$. To be supplied also to the following ${ }^{\prime}$ ' $\chi o v \tau \epsilon s$.
moьồv. The suffix assimilated to that of the indicative, a phenomenon which, according to Jannaris $\$ 779$, is not unknown even in the popular speech of classical times. Most Mss $\pi o \iota \hat{\eta}$ or $\pi o \iota \omega \sigma \iota \nu$.
éautois. For the force of the dative Wordsworth refers to Aristot.

 compares Tert．Prax．5－7 Deus erat solus，ipse sibi et mundus et locus． But I am inclined to think that in this passage éavroîs has a different force，and that it was intended，as a contrast to $\phi$ v́ $\sigma \epsilon \iota$ ，in the sense $b y$ their own conduct（ $\tau \hat{\eta}$ éavcôv $\pi$ odırє＇ía）．What the author had in mind

 е＂$\rho$ ротs．

15．évסeíkvuvial．But it was on the day of judgement that men would be called upon to prove their righteousness．Therefore $\bar{\epsilon} \nu \delta \epsilon \epsilon^{\prime} \xi=v \tau a t . \mathrm{Cf}$ ． $\delta_{\iota \kappa \alpha} \omega \theta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \jmath^{\prime} \tau \alpha \iota$ of v .13 and $\kappa \rho \iota \nu \in \hat{\iota}$ of v .16 ．The corruption was probably due to the influence of ci⿱宀八工 close by．
 the performance of the Law：It is not the men who pride themselves upon being Jews that shall be justified，but those who will have performed good actions，such as the Law enjoins．

үрamtóv．The record of their actions will have been engraven upon




 －of a righteous man before the judgement－seat．Cf． 2 ClemR．6－9 ris
 Conscience is here represented as an advocate；sometimes however as


The preposition in $\sigma v v^{\mu} \alpha \rho \tau v \rho o v i \sigma \eta s$ alded by analogy with $\sigma v \nu \eta \gamma^{-}$ $\rho \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$ ．See note on 1－11．
$\sigma u v \epsilon i \delta \eta \sigma \epsilon \omega \mathrm{~s}$ ．This noun really means $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \epsilon \delta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \omega \mathrm{s}$ ，what a man alone knows within his heart as to his doings or motives．From ov́voi $\delta \dot{\text { a }} \boldsymbol{\tau i}$ rivt，I know something concerning another man＇s actions which is pub－
 alone or within my own heart my actions，whereas the latter meaning．

[^7]
 $\dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau i \alpha v$. The misapplication as a matter of course was extended to the noun, which finally from inner knowledge came to mean in the Stoical schools (see Lightfoot, Phil. pp. 281 and 303) one's our inner debate and conclusion as to one's actions or motives.

каi $\mu \in \tau \alpha \xi \dot{c} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega \nu$. Among themselves in reciprocally arguing.
$\delta \iota \alpha \lambda о \gamma \iota \sigma \mu \omega \hat{\nu}$. All other witnesses $\lambda_{0} \gamma \iota \sigma \mu \omega \nu$.
кат $\eta \gamma \circ \rho o u ́ v \tau \omega \nu$. 'The object is $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi o \not \eta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau o \hat{v} \nu o ́ \mu o v$, which must likewise be supplied to $\dot{a} \pi \sigma o \lambda o \gamma o v \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$ in the form $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \grave{\rho} \rho$ aủ $\boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\omega} \nu$; it is not $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \hat{\eta} \lambda \omega \nu$, for the $\delta_{\iota a} \lambda o \gamma \iota \sigma \mu o i ~ d o ~ n o t ~ a c c u s e ~ o r ~ d e f e n d ~ e a c h ~ o t h e r, ~ b u t ~$ the men who stand their trial.
 were pictured upon the morbid imagination of the Jews as though the men accused were invariably guilty and had to answer for crimes brought home to them. Cf. XII Patr. Jud. $20 \tau \grave{o} \pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu \alpha \alpha \hat{\eta} s \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon i \alpha s$


 first presented itself before our author's mind ; but as it did not accord with his argument which dealt with righteous men, he seems to have corrected himself by adding ' nay, such $\delta \iota a \lambda o \gamma \iota \sigma \mu \omega \nu$ also as might even (каi) defend them.'
16. From $\tau \grave{\alpha} \kappa \rho v \pi \tau \grave{\alpha}$ down to vó $\mu o v$ गुs of v. 25 there is a lacuna in G. The text followed is that of D.
 also in 16-25. 2'lim.2-8. ${ }^{1}$ 2Cor.4-3.
 connected, and form as it were a parenthesis apart from the argument. The author declares that the Messiah through whom God at the last judgement will judge the world, according to his teaching, is Jesus.
18. סокцца́与єıs тà סıaфє́povza. The version approvest the things that are excellent seems to me quite correct. Phil.1-10 ought to place its correctness beyond dispute.

1 In 2 Tim. $2-8$ the author in the same way confirms his own gospel, which taught that the Messiah was from the seed of David; namely, incarnated.
tà Scaф́́porta. What is excellent or best. Cf. Iren.1-4-1. Orig. Cels. Praef.2, and often. But where does $\delta$ taф $\epsilon \rho o \nu \tau \alpha$ occur in the sense of good and evil as some interpreters take it to mean?
19. $\sigma \in \alpha u \tau o ́ v$. Proleptically joined with $\pi \epsilon \in \pi o \partial \theta$ as as its object, but in
 $\theta \epsilon i v$. Gal.6-1 $\sigma \kappa о \pi \hat{\omega} \nu \sigma \epsilon \alpha v \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \mu \grave{\eta} \kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ \sigma \grave{v} \pi \epsilon \iota \rho a \sigma \theta \hat{\eta} s$, etc. But in such constructions the case of the word proleptically placed should conform

 $\pi o \tau \epsilon \theta \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$. In strict grammar therefore the phrase should run $\pi \epsilon \in \pi o \iota \theta$ ás




20. $\pi \alpha \iota \delta \in u \tau \dot{\eta} v . ~ A ~ c h a z a n ~ o r ~ \dot{\alpha} \zeta \alpha \nu i \tau \eta$, (see Sophocles) is meant who combined the office of a schoolmaster with that of a public chastiser. See Sanday and Headlam, p. xxiii. The same seems to be the meaning of $\delta \delta \delta \alpha, \sigma \kappa \alpha \lambda o t$ in Jam.3-1.
$\mu о ́ \rho \phi \omega \sigma \iota v=\pi \alpha i ́ \delta \epsilon v \sigma \iota v$, education. Similarly in MGk a well-educated person is called $\mu о \rho \phi \omega \mu$ évos. Theod. Mops. $\mu$ ó $\phi \omega \sigma \iota \nu \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota ~ o v ̉ ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \pi \rho o-$ $\tau v ́ \pi \omega \sigma \iota v, \vec{a} \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \alpha v ̉ \tau \eta ̀ \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ v́ vóc $\sigma \alpha \sigma \iota v$. Probably a Stoical term. Sen. Epist. 117 morum formatio. Quint.10-2-20 praeceptor est alienorum ingeniorum formator. The following genitives are objective as if $\mu o ́ \rho \phi \omega \sigma \iota \nu$ were an equivalent of $\delta \iota \delta a \sigma \kappa \alpha \lambda i ́ a$, which in fact it approximates.
22. ípoou入єis. Regarded by Bentley corrupt, and rightly so. If genuine, it would here mean a sacrilege upon idols, and specially to denounce the Jews for such a sin were strange; it would rather have been a special $\sin$ in the eyes of those who reverenced idols. ${ }^{1}$ The word required by the context is one denoting an act abhorrent to an idolhater, namely, some sort of idolatry. Bentley conjectured iєpotvreîs, which comports with the fact that Christians of those times strongly

[^8]stigmatized sacrifices (see note on $1-9$ ), the argument occasionally employed being that sacrifices were a heathenish practice. Cf. Pseudo-


 $\alpha u ̀ \tau \grave{\nu} \nu \dot{\epsilon} v \delta \epsilon \iota \kappa \nu v \mu \epsilon \in \nu \omega v$ фıлотı $\mu i a \nu$. But I am rather inclined to think that we should look for a word denoting magic of some kind, such as divination, augury, necromancy, astrology, etc. Such practices were very common in antiquity, and nowhere more so than in Egypt whence this work most probably emanates. Cf. Orig. Cels.1-28 $\delta \nu \nu \alpha ́ \mu \epsilon \omega ́ \nu \tau \tau \nu \omega v$




 in Egypt that professional magicians and soothsayers, such as the Indian vagrants, or Gypsies, came to be called Aijúntoo. 'The practice was denounced by philosophers, both Epicureans and Stoics. Origen



 $\tau \omega \nu \lambda \epsilon \gamma o \mu \epsilon ́ v o c s$. It was also condemned by Jewish authorities. Cf.




 Enoch 8-3 all arts of divination are the teachings of the devil. But in spite of these denunciations the Jews every where stooped to these arts as a profitable trade. Hadrian, in his letter to Servianus (Vopisc. Saturn.8), records that in Egypt nemo archisynayogus Judaeorum, nemo Samarites, nemo Christianorum presbyter non mathematicus, non haru-

 Sanday and Headlam, p. xxiv 'The fairly plentiful notices which
have come down to us lead us to think of the Jews of Rome as largely a population [among other things] of fortune-tellers.' Ramsay, St Paul the 'Jraveller, p. 143 'Schïrer has shown that gross superstitions were practised by the Jews at Thyateira.' In Acts 19-17 to 19 we are told that the magicians whose books in such large numbers were burnt consisted of both Greeks and Jews. The charge of magic or divination was bandied among sectarians against each other, and by all of them against the Jews. Cf. Philos.9-14 (respecting the School of Callistus)






 self in Clement's Homilies is held up to reprobation under the disguise of Simon Magus, and Tertullian in Haeret. 37 to 43 accuses the heretics of magical practices. And this charge was specially selected because magic and divination, and notably augury, were regarded as heathenish arts or a kind of idolatry. Cf. Deut.18-14 $\tau \dot{\alpha}{ }^{\epsilon} \epsilon \theta \eta \eta \kappa \lambda \eta \delta o ́ v \omega \nu$



 1-15-6 єіठшдотоьє Ма́ркє каі тєратооко́тє. Precepts of the Apostles



So then, as instead of icporvicis we need a word denoting some kind of idolatry and the kind of idolatry practised by and imputed to the Jews was magic or soothsaying, one might suggest $\nu є к \rho о \sigma к о т \epsilon i s$, $\tau \epsilon \rho a \tau о \sigma к о \pi \epsilon i ̂ s$ ol $\tau \epsilon \rho a \tau о \pi о \lambda \epsilon i ̂ s, \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \epsilon \rho \gamma о \sigma \pi о v \delta \epsilon i s$ (cf. Acts 19-19 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \grave{\alpha}$
 augury, and the probabilities are that our author would not have passed over augury in favour of a rarer kind. Perhaps therefore o opve Өобкотєîs or oiшעобкотєîs or úpvєобкотєís or коракобкотєís. Cf. Epict.

stantinople A.d. 692 (see Oeconomos, La Vie religieuse dans l'Empire Byzantin, Paris, Ernest Leroux, 1918, p. 223) it was enacted $\tau$ às à $\pi \grave{o}$
 palaeographically would be iєракобкотєís, and iépaśs may have been used generically instead of ö $\rho v \epsilon o v$, or wild bird, as кópa $\xi$ is in Lk 12-24.

Since writing this long note I have found what I had been looking for so eagerly, namely, that iépa $\xi^{2}$ was one of the birds of augury in

 $\pi a \rho a ̀ ~ M \omega v \sigma \hat{\eta}$ ủєто́s тє каi íćpaš. In Greece also íf́ракєs were thought to


 improbable.

 the singular is corroborated by versions and Origen, and recurs in 8-4
 dropped out owing to the preceding - $\tau$ a.
27. крьvєi. A retort to крív $\omega \nu$ of 2-1.

After $\kappa \rho \iota \nu \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ all other Mss add $\dot{\eta}$ є̇к $\phi \dot{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \omega \mathrm{s}$ ( $=\gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$, see note on v.14) áкро $\beta v \sigma \tau i ́ a$; but this addition is inappropriate, for the reverse of סıà $\gamma \rho a ́ \mu \mu a \tau o s$ would be $\chi \omega \rho i s ~ \gamma \rho a ́ \mu \mu a \tau o s ~ a n d ~ n o t ~ \epsilon ̇ \kappa ~ ф v ́ \sigma \epsilon \omega s . ~$
 $\sigma \tau о \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu \tau о v ́ \tau o v s \pi \epsilon \epsilon \mu \psi \omega .2$ Cor.2-4 ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \gamma \rho \alpha \psi \alpha \delta \iota \alpha ̀ \pi o \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \alpha \kappa \rho v \omega \nu .2$ Pet.1-3


ös $\pi v \in u ̛ \mu a \tau \iota$. This reading, which is supported by Latin versions, seems to me prefcrable, for $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau о \mu \grave{\eta}$ карסias $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \pi \nu \epsilon \dot{v} \mu a \tau \iota$, which is the
 ally perhaps ó $\pi \nu \epsilon \cup{ }^{\prime} \mu a \tau \iota$, namely, ó $\pi \nu \epsilon \dot{\prime} \mu a \pi \iota$ 'lovסaîos.

Efravos. A play upon the name Jew-Judah meaning praise-as explained by Gifford. A somewhat similar play in 2 Cor.2-15, where

[^9]$\epsilon \dot{v} \omega \delta i u=\chi \rho^{\prime} \sigma \mu \alpha$; and in Apoc.17-5, where $\mu v \sigma \tau \eta \eta^{\prime} \rho o v$ is a play upon $\mu v \sigma a \rho o ́ v$. Gifford adds ' It is not at first sight apparent why St Paul has added the clause Whose praise is not from men but from God.' I believe the author had in view some precept like Mt 6-1, namely, that the righteous man is not a Jew with his external signs and ostentatious practices, whose ambition is to be admired by the public,
 looks but to God for approbation.

## CHAPTER THE THIRD

1 to 2. The author now, being himself a Jew, proceeds, in the spirit of the Clementine Homilies (see 11-29), to protest that his strictures must not be misunderstood as condemnatory of the whole Jewish nation. The Jewish nation as a whole was worthy of respect in that God chose it as the trustee of his Law, an idea further developed in 11-13 to 31. But the author probably felt that the destruction of Jerusalem, so often and exultingly rubbed in to the Jews (see Orig. Cels. $1-47$ and $2-8^{1}$ ), had to be accounted for, and he explains that the Jews of the present generation, having proved unworthy trustees by reason of their denial of the prophecies respecting the advent of Jesus as the Messiah predicted, had to be punished.

1. $\dot{\omega} \phi e ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota a$. Read $\dot{\eta} \dot{\omega} \phi \epsilon ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota a$ with most Mss.
$\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau о \mu \hat{\eta}$. Circumcision was derided by the Gentiles, and the author as a Jew appears to wish to say a word in its defence. He defends it by defending the Jews who practised it.
2. $\pi \boldsymbol{\rho} \hat{\text { êtov }} \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} v$. Parry 'the enumeration is not carried out.' So also in 2 ClemR.3-1, Justin 70 c , and probably 1Cor.15-3. So in English you often hear to begin with and in MGK $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau \boldsymbol{\mu} \mu_{\epsilon} \nu$ or $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau \alpha \pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau \alpha$ without any intention on the part of the speaker to adduce a second reason. 1-8 is different.
 Cf. Clem. Hom.16-2 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \alpha \rho \grave{~ ' I o v \delta \alpha i o ı s ~ \delta \eta \mu о \sigma i ́ a ~} \pi \epsilon \pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon v \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu ~ \beta i ́ \beta \lambda \omega \nu$.
${ }^{1}$ Also 4-2\%.
${ }^{2}$ In $G$ the pronoun is interlinear, and was probably suggested by the Latin version.

16-5 ràs $\pi \epsilon \pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \nu \mu \epsilon ́ v a s ~ \gamma \rho a \phi \grave{a} s \pi a \rho a ̀ ~ ' I o v \delta a i o t s . ~ B u t ~ i t ~ i s ~ a b s e n t ~ f r o m ~$ all other Greek Mss. Cf. Clem. Hom.11-29 $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \mathbf{M} \omega v \sigma \epsilon \epsilon \omega s$ ė $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{\theta} \theta \eta \sigma \alpha \nu$ $\kappa \alpha \theta$ є́ $\delta \rho a \nu$. So either reading might be correct.


 tion, few in number as compared with those of past and future generations. ${ }^{1}$ 'To the latter, who were destined one day to acknowledge Jesus, all promises wouid be fulfilled, as affirmed in 11-25 f.; oúdèv $\gamma$ à $\rho$, as





${ }_{\epsilon}^{\prime \prime} \sigma \tau \omega$. All other Mss $\gamma \nu^{\prime} \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \theta \omega$ or $\gamma \epsilon \nu^{\prime} \epsilon \sigma \theta \omega$. The true reading seems to be $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i \nu$ as read in Latin versions. Taken in conjunction with $\gamma \grave{a} \rho$, when transferred here, it best suits the context, for the meaning would thus be Speal thou no blasphemy, for God keeps faith; those men however who will have been found false trustees must stand their trial and be punished for their falseness. The indicative is confirmed by Fragm. 24 of St Irenaeus, who in commenting upon Num.23-19 rests his argument upon this passage and says $\delta \epsilon i ́ \kappa \nu v \sigma \iota \nu$ és $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \epsilon s ~ \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ \grave{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi o \iota \psi \epsilon v ́-$
 another instance of the superiority of $G$. The change into the imperative was no doubt effected under the influence of the preceding $\gamma^{\prime}$ votro. For the change of ' ' $\sigma \tau \omega$ into $\gamma^{\prime} \nu^{\prime} \epsilon_{\sigma} \theta \omega$ and vice versa compare 1 Cor .
 Jn 20-27 where D reads íc $\theta \iota$ and all other Mss $\gamma^{\prime} \nu o v$; Jn 17-5 where D gives $\gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ and all other Mss єival; Jn 10-8, where $\bar{\eta} \sigma \alpha \nu$ interpreted by fuerunt. See also notes on 11-6. 15-16. In all such passages the eival forms are probably preferable as representing the popular speech. The reason of the confusion is that both è $\sigma \tau \grave{\iota}$ and $\gamma i v \epsilon \tau \alpha l$ were occasionally represented by a slanting line. See Kenyon, Palaeography of Greek Papyri, pp. 154 and 156.

[^10]
 accordance with the foregoing $\dot{\eta} \pi i \sigma \tau \eta \sigma \alpha \nu, \dot{u} \pi \iota \sigma \tau i a, \pi i ́ \sigma \tau \iota \nu$, but $\dot{u} \lambda \eta \theta$ 立s was preferred as verbally antithetical to the following $\psi \in v \sigma \tau \eta s$. See note on v. 7. Reversely, 1 Cor. 10-13 $\pi \iota \sigma \pi o ̀ s=u ̈ \alpha \eta \theta \eta_{j}^{\prime}$.
$\pi \hat{a} s$ रáp. All other Mss $\pi \hat{\alpha} s \delta \dot{\epsilon}$, which best suits the context. if we read $\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ after $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i \prime$. In $\mathrm{G} \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ and $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ seem to have changed places. See note on 4-15.
$\pi a ̂ s ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon}-\kappa \rho i v \epsilon \sigma \theta a i ́ \sigma \epsilon$. The import of this passage has been misunderstood to the extent which assumes that the author applied the quotation as if God himself were to be tried. What the author means is that the faithless trustee will lue put upon his trial and called upon to justify his conduct, receiving punishment should he be unable to establish his innocence. In saying so the author meant to borrow terms out of Ps.51-6, but instead of modifying them so as to fit exactly his idea, he merely reproduces the quotation. Similarly in 11-9, instead of saying $\dot{\eta} \tau \rho a ́ \pi \epsilon \zeta \alpha \alpha \dot{v} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu{ }^{\prime \prime} \sigma \tau \sigma \alpha$, he reproduces the quotation $\gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \theta_{\eta}^{\prime} \tau \omega$ $\dot{\eta} \tau \rho \alpha{ }^{\prime} \pi \epsilon \zeta a \alpha \dot{\tau} \tau \omega \bar{\nu}$. Instances of this style are abundant. Cf.15-3. 1Cor.
 $\left.\pi \hat{\alpha} \nu \dot{\rho} \eta \mu a=\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\omega} s \tilde{v}^{\mu} \hat{\imath} \nu \lambda \epsilon \prime \gamma \omega\right)$. 1Pet.2-7. XII Patr. 6 Sim.2, etc. What

 to this passage. See also note on $4-7$ and 8 . In all languages quotations on becoming proverbial, such as To be or not to be-Allons, enfants de la patrie-Addio del passato, are prone to a loose use of this kind. Cf. from The Cloister and the Hearth, ch. 35 I just put my foot against his stomach, gave a tug with my hand and a spring with my foot, and sent him flying to Kingdom come. But in early Christian works this peculiarity was much abused, probably in imitation of the style of Jewish doctors.


 -a practice easy then and frequent-was looked upon as a crime of an exceptionally heinous character, and it was strongly denounced by Christians. Pliny records of them that they bound themselves with
an oath ne depositum appellati abneyarent（Ep．10－96）．Cf．Tert．Apol． 46 Anaxagoras depositum hostibus denegavit；Christianus et extra fidelis vocatur．Jews also were very punctilious in matters of trust． In Orac．Sib．2－172 false trustees are denounced as $\pi \iota \sigma \tau 0 \lambda$ étal．

5．$\eta \mu \hat{\omega} v$ ．The Jews are meant in whom the author includes himself．
 of the Jews was that they denied the Messiahship of Jesus．
 19．Ex．15－13．Just．Diogn．9－3，etc．See also note on 1－17．The anti－ thesis between 放炏ía and $\delta \iota \kappa a \iota o \sigma v v^{\prime} \eta v$ is only verbal．See note on 1－28．
aviornow．Proves．Wordsworth refers to Gal．2－18．See note on
 тоиิто бvaтท̂бai סévacal；Pseudo－Ignat．Trall． 6 iva vóuov $\sigma v \sigma \tau \eta ̆ \sigma \omega \sigma t v . ~$
 $\theta_{\epsilon 0 \hat{}}$ amodeikrvad．The meaning is If it come to this，that the clemency of God is proved by the Jewish sin．
rí époûmev；What must our conclusion be？But the speech proceeds as if it had been said What will a man，a non－Jew，say？Will he not be troubled in his mind and argue that，etc．？
 píav ėmá ${ }^{2} \omega v$ ．

катà äv日pwior．As a non－Jew or a healhen might argue．The author protests that he himself would not for one moment admit that God


7．$\epsilon i$ yáp．All other Mss $\epsilon i$ d $\partial$ é．
$\dot{d} \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta \epsilon i a$ ．From the context it is clear that $\dot{d} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \theta \epsilon \epsilon a$ is here employed in the same sense as $\delta$ okauovívp in v．5．Apparently a Hebraism； cf．Ps． $24-10$ é $\lambda$ єos кaì $\dot{\alpha} \lambda_{\eta} \eta_{\theta \epsilon a}$ ．The word was probably chosen all the more because it presented itself as antithetical to $\psi \in \dot{v} \mu a \tau \iota$ ．See note on $\dot{a}^{2} \eta \theta \dot{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$ in v ． 4 ．
 probably added in the form $\epsilon$ is $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \delta \delta \kappa \alpha u \sigma \sigma \dot{v} \eta \eta$ a $\begin{gathered}\text { voov̂ } \\ \text { by a commentator }\end{gathered}$ who did not perceive that the preceding $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \epsilon \epsilon a$ meant $\delta \kappa \kappa \alpha u \sigma$ viv $\eta$ ． See notes on v． 23 and 9－23．




 тòv $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \alpha$ цоv $\delta \alpha \pi \alpha \nu \alpha ̂ \nu ~ \chi \rho o ́ v o v ; ~ O r i g . ~ C e l s .2-70 ~ \tau i ́ ~ к а i ̀ ~ v o \mu i \zeta \epsilon \iota ; ~ L u c i a n . ~ 61 ~$
 $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \rho$, etc.

кả $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega$. Mankind in general.
8. $\mu \dot{\eta}$. Namely, $\mu \grave{\eta} \pi o \omega \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$, but added to $\lambda \epsilon$ ' $\gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ in the form in which the sinner would have expressed it.

кai кa日ळ́s. In $G$ there are three dots under кaì (not noticed by Tischendorf), an indication that the word should be deleted. It is also absent in B, and much better away.
$\stackrel{\oplus}{\omega} \nu$ тò крípa ${ }^{\text {ëv }} \boldsymbol{\delta}$ ธкоv éativ. If the text is correct, I should refer the pronoun to $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ in v. 5 , meaning $\tilde{\omega}^{\omega} \nu$ 'Iov $\alpha a i \omega \nu$. This would accord with the context, for the author would thus say that, though the Jews as a whole are estimable, still those of the present generation, who in spite of the proofs from the prophetic writings do not believe in Jesus, must be rightly condemned and punished. But I suspect that instead
 with variations seems to have been a current one. Cf. 1Tim. $\delta-24 \tau \tau \nu \omega v$

 Pseudo-Ignat. Philad. 8 X $\rho \iota \sigma \tau o ̀ s ~ o v ̃ ~ \pi а \rho a \kappa o v ̂ \sigma \alpha \iota ~ \pi \rho o ́ \delta ̀ \eta \lambda o s ~ o ̈ d \epsilon \theta \rho o s . ~ W i t h ~$ this alteration the pronoun would refer to the men who uttered the preceding calumny, and the meaning be whose sin in so arguing is obvious. ${ }^{1}$ But who specifically were the men who so argued? I cannot trace. They probably belonged to a branch of that extravagant school of Carpocrates who 'is said to have taught that it was necessary for those who aspired to the higher life to pass through every form of action usually reputed sinful, in order to complete their defiance of the powers which rule the world.' See Mansel, p.120, and my note on 8-12. Upon this supposition $\tilde{\eta}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{s}}$ must mean the Christians generally, who no doulst were taunted by their adversaries with the doctrines

[^11]of Carpocrates as if they were held by the whole Christian body. If so, to attribute this part, at any rate, of the Epistle to St Paul is to commit a flagrant anachronism.
9. tí oûv трокатéx $о \mu \epsilon \nu$ тeptaoóv; So also D and Latin versions in verbal accordance with v.1. The meaning is $W^{\prime}$ hat is then the privilege which you find that the Jews (see note on $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \bar{\omega}$ in v. 5) enjoy? An
 But this assumes the previous argument to have been that the Jews .occupied a superior position to that of other nations, whereas on the contrary it was that they did not, and it is the latter statement that the reading of $G$ presupposes.

трокате́хонєข. The first preposition is not indispensable, for its meaning is supplied by $\pi \epsilon \rho \frac{\sigma}{}$ oróv. On the other hand, GD give $\mathfrak{\eta}$ raará$\mu \epsilon \theta a$, whereas most Mss exhibit $\pi \rho o \eta \tau \tau a \sigma a ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a$. It may be then that the scribe of the archetype of GD found $\pi \rho \bar{o}$ in the margin of the Ms which he was himself copying, and instead of adding it to $\eta_{\boldsymbol{\eta} \tau u a c \alpha} \mu \epsilon \theta a$ he added it to катє́ $\chi о \mu \epsilon \nu$.
 in Oecumenius, see Gifford) formed from a deponent, for $\pi \rho \rho$ é $\chi$, though active in form, is a deponent. Such formations were frequent







 Latin version correctly quando una cum sensum non habentibus timetur).

 larly from active deponents Col.1-6 картофорои́лєขоv. Ignat. Rom. 8
 фópous.
oü, $\pi \alpha^{2} \boldsymbol{u}^{2} \omega_{s}$. So I think we must accentuate and punctuate. Namely, $\pi a ́ v \tau \omega s$ ov̉, by no means. See Lightfoot at 1Cor.5-10.
12. $\dot{\eta} \times \rho \in \omega \dot{\theta} \eta \sigma a v$. No doubt $\dot{\eta} \chi \rho \epsilon \epsilon \omega \theta \eta \sigma \alpha$, which is also the reading of most Mss.
13. $\lambda_{\alpha}^{\rho} \rho \nu \nu \xi$. So 8-38 ${ }^{\alpha} \nu \gamma \epsilon \lambda о s . ~ 9-19 \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \phi \epsilon \tau \alpha t$.
éסo入ıoûrav. The same form in MGk.
19. $\lambda \epsilon ́ y \epsilon \iota-\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota$. Most Mss $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota-\lambda a \lambda \epsilon \epsilon$. The same fluctuation in 1Cor.9-8. Jn 8-26. 8-45 to 46.

From [ $\nu$ ó] $\mu \omega$ to the end of the Epistle we possess the text of F , which is practically identical with $G$. So that henceforth my text represents both F and G .
 Eph.2-9 ìva $\mu \dot{\prime} \tau \iota s$ каvх ${ }^{\prime} \sigma \eta \tau \alpha \iota$.
$\pi \hat{\alpha} \nu \quad \sigma \tau o ́ \mu \alpha$. So that the Jews themselves may not in their arrogance claim that, unlike all other nations, they are not $\dot{v} \phi^{\prime}$ a $\mu a \rho \tau i a v$.
20. $\delta$ เótı $=\delta \iota o ̀$, therefore. In this sense $\delta$ oórı recurs in Acts 20-26. 1Pet.2-6. 1Thes.2-18. 3-1 (only in B), etc. ${ }^{1}$ But in all these passages $\delta \iota o$ also exists as a variant, and I am inclined to think that it is the true reading both there and in this place. l'robably the same correction needed in 1Cor.10-17, where otherwise we must give öt the sense of $\delta \iota o$.

 $\nu o ́ \mu o s ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon} \pi \alpha \rho \epsilon \iota \sigma \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \iota^{\iota \prime} \nu \alpha \pi \lambda \epsilon o v \alpha ́ \sigma \eta$ тò $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha ́ \pi \tau \omega \mu a$. But it is more likely that the reading of the other Mss $\delta \iota \grave{\alpha} \gamma$ à $\rho$ vó $\mu$ ov $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \pi i ́ \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \iota s$ á $\mu a \rho \tau i a s$ is the correct one, the sense being Surely what the Law effected was to
 єí $\mu \grave{\eta} \delta i \grave{\alpha} \nu o ́ \mu o v)$; it was not meant to condone sin through adherence to circumcision and ceremonial practices. The genitive érrıvóvocws may be accounted for by its proximity to doá.
$\gamma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho$. It would be more appropriate to say $\delta \epsilon$; but the use of $\gamma \grave{a} \rho$ in Hellenistic times as an exclusively causal or explanatory particle is not strict. See note on 1-18.
$e^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \nu \omega \sigma$ os. Concerning the addition of the preposition see note on 1-11.
èni $\gamma \nu \omega \sigma t \dot{s}$ áraprias. This seems to be an echo of the Epicurean
 Lightfoot at Phil. p.281). Cf. Seneca, Epist. Mor. 28 Initium est salutis notitia peccati. Egregie mihi hoc dixisse videtur Epicurus. Nam qui peccare se nescit corrigi non vult; deprehendas te oportet antequam 'emendes. But the virtue of the comprehension of $\dot{a} \mu a \rho \tau \dot{\eta} \mu a \tau o s$, which in the Greek philosophy was applied to one's own personal moral defects, is here transferred to the Jewish Law which is held to have expounded sin. Though probably noticed already by previous students, I may here mention a few Greek thoughts which, in a more or less modified form, have been embodied in the sacred literature, as was







 of the evangelical parables may have been adaptations from Greek sources now lost.

21 to 31 . A later addition. For (1) chap. 4 links up with $3-20$ quite logically, whereas the intervening verses disturb the argument; (2) $\delta \iota-$ $\kappa \alpha \iota o \sigma v ́ v \eta$ $\theta \epsilon o \hat{v} \pi \epsilon \phi \alpha \nu \epsilon \in \rho \omega \tau \alpha \iota \delta \iota \alpha ̀ \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega s$ ' $\bar{I} \eta \sigma o \hat{v} \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau o v ̂$ is but a repetition

 tion of what has just been stated in v.19; (4) $\lambda o \gamma \iota \zeta_{o}^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \theta a \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho-o r ~ o v ̉ v-$ etc. of $v .28$ represents a conclusion, and this verse therefore must have been penned by some one who was arguing independently of chap. 4 , which contains the real conclusion; in fact, by $\cdot \boldsymbol{\eta}$ 'Iovoai $\omega v$ o $\theta \epsilon o ̀ s ~ \mu o ́ v o v, ~ o v ̉ \chi \grave{\iota} \delta \grave{\epsilon}$ кaì $\grave{\epsilon} \theta \nu \hat{\omega} \nu$ the contention against the uncircumeised Gentiles is indignantly and definitely hurled back as preposterous and outside a serious argument.
21. $\delta \iota \kappa a l o \sigma u ̛ v \eta=\delta \iota к a i ́ \omega \sigma \iota s$. See note on 1-17.







кai émi $\pi \alpha ́ v \tau a s$. Absent in a few luat important Mss. It adds nothing
 ferred from the margin into the text.




 v. 7 and 9-23. The meaning is All men have sinned and can lay no claim to justification; if they are justified at all, it is a gift.

25. After סckacoov́vŋs av̉rov̂ all Mss, with the exception of FG and a few cursives, add $\delta \iota a ̀ ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \pi \alpha ́ \rho \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu ~ \tau \omega ̂ \nu ~ \pi \rho о \gamma є \gamma о \nu o ́ \tau \omega \nu ~ \alpha ́ \mu \alpha \rho \tau \eta \mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu ~ \epsilon ̄ \nu$
 remarks 'transiliendo om.' But it is not so. Clearly $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \notin \nu \delta \epsilon \iota \xi \in t$
 $\tau \omega ิ \nu \pi \rho \sigma \not \epsilon \gamma о \nu o ́ \tau \omega \nu$ á $\mu \alpha \rho \tau \eta \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$ adds anything new to what was stated in vv. 23 and 24.

ठıà ( $\tau \mathfrak{\eta} v)$. Forthe purpose off. See Jannaris §§ 1521 and 1534 . Sophocles limits this usage of $\delta \iota \alpha$ to its combination with the infinitive ; but he is mistaken.
$\pi \alpha ́ \rho \epsilon \sigma \omega$. I doubt its correctness, for as a derivative from $\pi \alpha \rho \dot{\prime} \eta \mu \iota$ it should mean neglect, and such a meaning is unsuitable at this place. Perhaps тapópactr. Cf. Wisd.11-23 (quoted by Sanday and Headlam)



 note on $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \pi \sigma \lambda \lambda \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha \kappa \rho o \theta v \mu i \underline{q}$ of 9-22.
cis tò єival. It should be rov̂ єîval as explanatory of סıкalooviv $\eta \mathrm{s}$. But pedantic interpolators affecting the style of the LXX were very partial to the use of eis.

Sikalov. Clement. See note on v. 5 .
סıкaıồta кт入. Showing his clemency upon such as are believer's. All other Mss, with the exception of two cursives, add кai before $\delta \iota \kappa a \iota o \hat{v} \tau \alpha$

tò $\mathbf{e} \mathrm{k} \kappa$ miarces. As it were from the party of by analogy with oi $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa$

 After $\pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega$ all Mss, excepting FG and 52 (see Baljon), add 'I $\eta \sigma o v$ or 'I $\eta$ ooôv (the latter no doubt an oversight). Either reading of course is possible.
27. т $\omega \uparrow$ Ëpyuv; How could a Jew be rationally asked whether his claims were set aside by legal works? The reverse question could only be rational, namely, whether on the strength of the argument the Jew could still contend that his claims were valid by reason of his adherence to works. Either the interpolator got mixed or the

 thou find a reason for glorying? in what? is it in legal worles? Not so, for such glorying is set aside by the new law of faith.



रáp. Most Mss ov̂v. But there is no room for a conclusion ; what is required is a reason in support of the previous verse.
30. èmeitep cis ó $\theta$ és. As we Jews acknowledge in our Shema. For
 єîs $\grave{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau i v$.
ék $\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \epsilon \omega \mathrm{s}$. See note on v. 26. The Jew, notwithstanding his circumcision, shall only be justified provided that he adhere to the party of faith.
$\delta \grave{\alpha}$ đๆ̂s míctews. The Gentile, in spite of uncircumcision, shall be justified by means of his faith.
31. vópov ícávouєv. The interpolator as an Apologist probally protests that he must not be understood as repudiating the Law. We, he explains, far from denying the Law, prove it. For the Apologists contended that, just as the predictions in the Law proved the advent of E 2

Jesus, so the advent of Jesus proved the validity of the Law. Cf. Orig.


$\sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\rho} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\nu}$. The first letter has dropped out, the word beginning a line; a frequent occurrence. See note on 4-15. But. perhaps $\sigma v \nu$ $\iota \sigma \tau \alpha^{\prime} \nu \circ \mu \epsilon \nu$, we prove. Cf. Pseudo-Tgnat. Trall. 6 ǐva vó $\mu o v \sigma v \sigma \tau \eta^{\prime} \sigma \omega \sigma t v$. See note on v. 5.

## CHAPTER THE FOURTH

1. eúp $\begin{aligned} \text { кéval. I do not quite follow how this word can, as is supposed, }\end{aligned}$ mean to have derived an advantage. To me it seems devoid of any sense satisfactory to the context. The true reading, I suspect, is $\epsilon i p \eta-$
 3-19. The intervening interpolation would naturally have obscured the connection between the two verses and made eip $\boldsymbol{c}^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon} v a \iota}$ unintelligible and liable to be tampered with. Of course $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \rho \circ \hat{v} \mu \epsilon \nu$ єipqкє́vaı is not elegant, but cf. Justin 358 d ö́тav $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \eta$ ó $\lambda o ́ \gamma o s ~ \epsilon i p \eta \kappa \epsilon ́ v a i ~ \tau o ̀ v ~ \theta \epsilon o ́ v . ~$




$\pi a \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a$. Several Mss $\pi \rho о \pi \alpha \dot{\tau} о \rho a$, but $\pi a \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a$ is confirmed by vv. 11 and 12. Nowhere else does $\pi \rho o \pi \alpha ́ \tau \omega \rho$ occur in the N.T. It was probably a special Gnostic term applied to the Super-God, if I may so call the Gnostic Supreme Being. It so occurs in a Gnostic fragment, No. 1081 of Oxyr. Papyri, which according to Dr Hunt's restoration runs thus;

 $\pi \alpha ́ \tau \omega \rho$.
$\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} v$. Of us the Jews. See note on 3-5.
2. रáp. Certainly, I grant you that. See note on 1-18.


${ }^{\prime \prime}$ 'xєı. This reading with 'A $\beta \rho \alpha \grave{\alpha} \mu$ as the subject makes the reasoning illogical, for the conclusion would be that, if Abraham was not
proclaimed righteous by reason of his works, there remained no occasion for any pride on his part. The true reading, I have no doubt, is é $\chi$ Ess, the subject being thou the Jew. The passage thus, in accordance with the argument which aims at refuting the pretensions of the Jews, states that they would be justified in glorying for adherence to works only if Abraham had been proclaimed righteous by reason of

à $\lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ où $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \theta \epsilon o ́ r$. . Briefly expressed (see note on $1-8$ ) for $\hat{a} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ ov̉к
 yround for glorying, for it is not by reason of his works that Abraham was proclaimed righteous in his affairs with God.
mpòs $\theta$ Eór. In his affairs with God; or, as we now say, in matters religious. Such is the meaning also in 5-1. 15-17. 2Cor.3-4. Acts 24-16.
 прòs $\hat{v} \mu \hat{a}$ ( $=$ lest my God make me fail in my dealings with, or my
 the matter of truth).
3. movteúovi. The lazy servant is spared because by appealing to his master for pardon he demonstrates his belief in obtaining it and thus attributes to him a clement and generous heart.

Tò $\mathfrak{d} \sigma \epsilon \beta \hat{\eta} v$. Bloomfield 'it clearly appears from the context that tò $\nu$


$\dot{\mathbf{a}} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \beta \bar{\eta} \eta$. For this form of the accusative see Jannaris § 432, who however only quotes instances of proper names. In 16-11 some Mss $\sigma v \gamma \gamma \epsilon \hat{\eta} v$. Hebr.6-19 $\dot{a} \sigma \phi a \lambda \hat{\eta} \nu$, where see Tischendorf.
6. $\lambda^{\prime} \hat{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ к $\kappa \lambda$. The author would have made his meaning clearer had

 in David-that passage where the blessing occurs-which shows that a man can be justified without the performance of works on his part. Now how does that passage in the author's view show this? It shows it by mentioning that non-performance of the Law (ảvouial) has been


7 and 8. The whole passage quoted, but the essential words therein

$\sigma \eta \tau a \iota$ ки́pıos $\dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau i a r$. So in Eph.4-8 the only essential words in the
 besides 8-36. 9-9. 9-17.1 Cor. 3-16, where av̉ròs $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \sigma \omega \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ redundant, etc. ${ }^{1}$
 $\nu^{\prime} \mu$. $\quad$ v. See note on 1-18.
8. $\hat{\underset{\sim}{\dot{w}}}$. So F ; but G, supported by D, oṽ.
9. Having shown that the performance of works is immaterial, the author now proceeds to expound how the essential point is faith.
ó $\mu$ акарเซцòs oûv oûtos кт入. Is then the application of these words in the $\mu \alpha \kappa \alpha \rho \sigma \mu$ òs as to non-reckoning of sins linited to the circumcised only or does it equally extend to the uncircumcised? F ausós.
ráp. A more appropriate particle would have been $\delta \dot{\eta}$. See note on 13-6.
11. $\sigma \phi \rho a \gamma i \delta \alpha$. Read $\epsilon i s \sigma \phi \rho \alpha \gamma i \delta \alpha$ as required by the usage. PseudoBarnabas 9-6, in refuting seemingly our passage, quotes it as $\pi \epsilon \rho<$ $\tau \epsilon ́ \tau \mu \eta \tau \alpha \iota$ ó $\lambda \alpha o ̀ s ~ \epsilon i s ~ \sigma \phi \rho \alpha \gamma i ̂ \delta \alpha$.
 circumcision was a kind of honorific sign, a decoration as it were for righteousness; as a liberal-minded man however he contends that this righteousness consisted in faith and not in Jewish works. In later times the Apologists contended that circumcision was a brand of infamy. See Justin 234 a.
 clearly is wrong; on the other hand, in v. 13 it is absent from these same Mss. Probably $\delta \iota \grave{\alpha}$ was added at one time in the margin as a correction of v .13 , but was mistaken for a correction of this passage.
cis to civat. And so he became. See note on 1-20.
єival $=\gamma \epsilon 1 \epsilon$ ' $\sigma$ Өal. See note on 3-4.
$\pi \alpha \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a$. In accordance with the Jewish notion that the vices and

[^12]virties of the fathers reflected upon the sons, on becoming the father of all believers Abraham transmitted to them the righteousness which he himself acquired through faith.
$\delta_{\imath}{ }^{2}$ akpoßuorias. What is the meaning of these words? It seems to me that they lack any. The version though they be in uncircumcision is totally unwarranted, and shows that they cannot be made to yield a rational meaning without forcing. The references to 2-27. 14-20. 2 Cor. 2-4 to which commentators appeal do not help us. The force of the preposition in those passages is $\sigma \grave{v} \nu, \mu \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha}$ (see my note on $2-27$ ), and how can $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon v o ́ v \tau \omega \nu ~ \mu \epsilon \grave{\alpha}$ à $\kappa \rho о \beta v \sigma \tau i a s$ mean them that believe though they be in uncircumcision? The words were apparently foisted by an over-zealous Gentile who would not have it on any account that a circumcised man could be a true believer. When this interpolation was established, another interpolator from the opposite party probably came along and added каì $\pi a \tau \epsilon \rho a \quad \pi \epsilon \rho \tau \tau о \mu \bar{\rho}$ with the idea of protesting that even a circumcised Jew could be a proper Christian. That these words also are an interpolation is shown (1) by the syntax, for $\tau o i ̂$ cannot be construed with $\pi a \tau \epsilon \in \rho a$ which requires a genitive, and (2) by кaì roîs $\sigma \tau o \circ \chi o v \sigma \iota \nu$ with which they are incompatible unless
 Gifford that an amanuensis inserted a supertluous кaí. When $\delta \hat{l}^{2}$ áкро$\beta v \sigma \tau i a s$ and $\pi a \pi \epsilon \in \rho a$ $\pi \epsilon \rho i \tau o \mu \hat{\eta} s$ are discarded, the passage becomes perfectly lucid and logical. It states that Abraham became the father of all believers, so that they can all expect justification, no less the uncircumcised but believing Gentiles than the circumcised Jews. At present the passage teems with inextricable difficulties.

кaì aùroîs. Even to them. Righteousness is reckoned to them as much as it was to Abrabam. Some witnesses omit the intensive.
 added because the author had $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu \mu \sigma \theta \partial ̀ v$ of v .4 in his mind.
13. oủ $\gamma$ áp. By none of its meanings does $\gamma$ à $\rho$ fit the context. I suspect oủк äpa (see note on 5-17.7-8. 7-15), the sense being: Thus it is demonstrated that it was by reason of his faith that Abraham was promised the world for his heirs, and not, as the Jews contend, on condition of his heirs adhering to the Law.
$\boldsymbol{\sigma \pi} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \rho \mu a \tau$. In Gal.3-16 it is argued that $\sigma \pi \epsilon$ ' $\rho \mu a \tau \iota$ indicates Christ.

In fact, the whole of Abraham's case is there argued upon quite different lines to those followed here, showing a distinct aùthorship.

Sıkatooúvŋs. So G, $\delta i a ̀ ~ b e i n g ~ s u p p l i e d ~ f r o m ~ \delta i a ̀ ~ v o ́ \mu o v . ~ B u t ~ F ~ g i v e s ~$ $\delta_{\iota \kappa a t o \sigma v}^{v} \eta \nu$, which points to an old variant $\delta_{i a ̀} \delta_{\iota \kappa \alpha}$ seems to me of some value. See note on $8-37$. All other MSs $\delta \iota \grave{\alpha}$ ठıкаıобv́vŋร.
15. ó $\gamma$ à $\rho=$ ó $\delta \epsilon$. See note on 3-4.

пои. I.e. ö́nov. The same mistake in 2Cor.3-17. An initial letter often drops out. So 1-15 ö̀ for $\tau о ́ ; 3-31 \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \nu о \mu \epsilon \nu$ for í $\sigma \tau \alpha ́ \nu \nu \mu \in \nu ; 5-18$ and $20 \rho \alpha$ and ouos (not recorded by Tischendorf) for ${ }^{\alpha} \rho \alpha$ and $\nu o ́ \mu o s$, etc. All other Mss ỗ. The same fluctuation in 5-20.
mov̂ $\gamma a ́ p$. NABC give oủ $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$, which probably represents an attempt at imparting to the corrupt text a tolerable sense.
$\pi \alpha \rho \dot{\beta} \beta a \sigma \iota s$. No meaning. Read $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha ́ \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma \iota s$. The sense is that, if only Jews as the possessors of the Law can be justified, then not only is faith a vain thing, but the Law itself a fatal instrument, for those not born under the Law could hope for no consolation or salvation. Tho practically the same effect is it stated in Gal.2-21 $\epsilon i \gamma$ àp $\delta \iota a ̀ ~ v o ́ \mu o v ~$


 v.12. Either reading might be right.
${ }^{2} A \beta \rho a \alpha \mu$. Hereafter the argument is pursued in v.18. The intervening words are pointless and irrelevant; they probably were inspired by $\pi \alpha \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \alpha \pi o \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \theta \nu \omega \nu$ of $v .18$ and noted in the margin, whence they were inserted in the wrong place.
17. катévavtı $=\dot{a} \nu \tau$ í.
 $\theta \in \boldsymbol{\sigma} \hat{v}$ in accordance with the following genitives. The reading of FG represents the words as though they were a continuation of the quotation, which however in the LXX stops at $\tau^{\prime} \theta \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \alpha ́ \sigma \epsilon$. On the other hand,
 $1-20$ à $\nu \theta^{\circ}$ ஸ̂̀ ov̉k є̇ $\left.\pi i ́ \sigma \tau \epsilon v \sigma a s ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o u s ~ \mu o v\right) ~ y i e l d s ~ a ~ p e r f e c t ~ s e n s e, ~$ whereas the common reading is very strange. The English version who is the father of us all (as it is written, A father of many nations have. I made thee) before him whom he believed, even God is a mere make-
shift. Should FG represent the original text, the following genitives must be a genitival solecism such as in the Hellenistic period was not

 $\mu \epsilon ́ v \omega \nu$. Mart. Petri, ch. 3 кататєбórıos av̉тov̂ є̇к $\lambda v \theta \epsilon i s ~ \sigma v \sigma \tau \hat{\eta}$; see also note on 8-39); or they might be a still later addition.
 $\theta \hat{\eta} \tau \omega \tau$ тò $\phi \hat{\omega} s$ as narrated in the Genesis. Meyer ' калєîv often denotes the creating call of God.'







 18-7. 18-10. Acts 2-26. XII Patr. Ben.10-11, etc. Oxyr. Pap.1597, where Grenfell $\epsilon^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon} v} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \lambda \pi i \delta t$.

 versions. Added as though it were a continuation of the quotation, but it is not in the LXX. Both ai $\dot{\mu} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \epsilon s$ and $\tau \dot{\alpha}{ }_{\alpha} \mu \mu o v$ show that the words were added by a foreigner, who no doubt was translating as well as he could from Latin. The Latin translators apparently took the words from Hebr.11-12, one of them following very closely
 and rendering velut arena quae est in litore maris.
 weakened in his faith from the fact that he realized.
 All other Mss omit the preposition.
oû. The same as örov, which soon after classical times made its appearance in popular speech as a substitute for the relative pronoun. Jannaris § 608 quotes as early an instance as 1ClemR. $23 \dot{\eta} \quad \gamma \rho a \phi \grave{\eta}$ $a v ̃ \tau \eta$ ö ótov $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota$. Our passage shows that it likewise became a substitute in certain cases for ötl, though Jannaris, so far as I can trace, does
not record such a usage; it is so employed in MGk after such verbs as $\phi o \beta \hat{a} \mu \alpha \iota, \delta_{\iota} \lambda \iota^{\prime} \zeta^{\prime} \omega, \lambda v \pi \hat{\alpha} \mu a i, \kappa \tau \lambda$. But the use of ö öov as a pronoun must have been preceded by that of oiv, ${ }^{1}$ which came to be felt as an undeclinable particle from the fact that constantly, though dependent from a verb requiring an accusative, it was attracted to an antecedent genitive. Here oú was mistaken for the negative by learned readerswho hardly ever took much notice of popular speech-and under the illusion that they would thus clothe the passage with a rational sense they changed $\epsilon \mathfrak{i s} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda i ́ a \nu$ to $\epsilon \mathfrak{i s} \delta \grave{\epsilon} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \alpha \sigma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \dot{\imath} \alpha \nu$, and in some Mss they also erased oi altogether.
20. єis tìv émaүүє入íav. All other witnesses, with the exception of the Aethiopic versions, $\epsilon i s ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda i a v$. Here is another clear case of superiority on the side of FG.

 $\theta$ cis mean anything very different. I think the original reading was є́ $\delta v \nu \alpha \mu \dot{\epsilon} \theta \eta \tau \hat{\eta}$ баккí. Abraham was physically reinvigorated ${ }^{2}$ when, feeling confident in God's promise, he rendered thanks to lim. The same is said of Nephthalim (XII Patr. Neph.4) סoģ̧̆́́ $\omega \nu$ тòv $\theta$ єòv $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \kappa \rho \alpha-$ $\tau \alpha \omega \dot{\theta} \eta$, on rendering thanks to God he regained strength. The reverse phrase Nah.3-3 $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma o v \sigma \iota \nu ~ \grave{\iota v} \nu \tau o \imath ̂ s ~ \sigma \omega ́ \mu a \sigma \iota v . ~$
21. $\pi \lambda \eta \rho о ф о \rho \eta \theta \epsilon i ́ s$. All other Mss каi $\pi \lambda \eta \rho о \phi$ о $\eta \eta \epsilon \epsilon$ 's. The particle is better away. Abraham thauked God because he felt confident in God's ability to fulfil his promise.
23. $\delta_{\imath}{ }^{\text {º }}$ aủtòv $=\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{i}$ av̉roû, concerning him. Cf. Gal.2-4. XII Patr.
 'I $\omega \sigma \check{\eta} \phi$ (altered in some Mss to $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{i}$ тov̂ 'I $\omega \sigma \eta{ }^{\prime} \phi$ ). So likewise in MGk; see Jannaris § 1534. But the following $\delta \iota^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\alpha} s=$ for our sakes, $\pi \rho o ̀ s$ $\nu o v \theta \epsilon \sigma \sigma^{\prime} \alpha \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, as expressed in 1Cor.10-11. Cf. also 1Cor.9-10.
24. éyєipauta. Throughout this Epistle there is no question of exhorting to belief in God; such a belief was indeed a matter of course. The exhortation is to believe in Jesus and his resurrection. Therefore द́ $\gamma \epsilon \rho \theta_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \tau \tau \alpha$. Similarly in $6-6$ we find a variant катар $\gamma_{\eta} \sigma \eta$ instead of $\gamma \alpha$ $\tau \alpha \rho \gamma \eta \theta \hat{\eta}$. Cf. Oxyr. Pap, $1600 \pi \alpha \tau \alpha \dot{\xi}_{\alpha} \alpha \tau \alpha$, where Grenfell $\pi \alpha \tau \alpha \chi \theta \epsilon \in \tau \alpha$.

[^13]
## CHAPTER THE FIFTH

1. $\pi$ pò̀s tòv $\theta$ єóv. As regards our relations with God. See note on 4-2.
2. $\pi \rho \circ \sigma a \gamma \omega \gamma \eta{ }^{\prime} \nu$. In the sense of introduction by which this word is commonly interpreted it ill fits $\epsilon i s \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \chi \alpha ́ \rho \Delta \nu$; it is suitable where the object is personal. Cf. Eph.2-18 $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi \rho o \sigma \alpha \gamma \omega \gamma \grave{\eta} \nu \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o ̀ \nu \pi \alpha \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \alpha$. 1Pet.
 believe that $\chi^{\alpha} \rho \iota \nu$ is here pictured as a haven, and that $\pi \rho o \sigma \alpha \gamma \omega \gamma{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ means approach in a nautical sense. Cf. Plut. Aem. 13 i $\delta \rho u \mu \epsilon^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ os $\pi \rho o ̀$
 $\tau i s \pi \rho o \sigma \eta^{\prime} \gamma \alpha \gamma \epsilon \nu($ i.e. $\epsilon i s ~ \Lambda \hat{\eta} \mu \nu \nu \nu) \chi \rho \epsilon^{\prime} \alpha$; cf. also Polyb.10-1-6. Diod.13-46 (quoted by Liddell and Scott), and $\dot{\alpha} \nu a \gamma \omega \gamma \grave{\eta}, \kappa \alpha \tau a \gamma \omega \gamma \eta \eta^{\prime}$. It has been a commonplace both in ancient and modern times to liken salvation








toû $\theta \epsilon o \hat{u}$. A noteworthy variant, viêv $\theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$, is recorded in versions.
 the persecutions, similar to those at Vienne, where Sanctus, in answer to all questions, would only exultingly repeat Christianus sum. If

3. Soксцйv. Attested genuineness. Cf. Jam.1-12 $\mu \alpha \kappa \alpha ́ \rho ı o s ~ a ̉ v \eta ̀ \rho ~ o ̈ s ~ v i \pi o-~$
 ròv $\sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \phi \alpha \nu o v$. A man might profess Christianity, but it is only when in defiance of persecution he cleaves to his faith that he establishes its genuineness ; and it is as a test of such genuineness that God tolerates
 $\psi v \chi \eta ̂ s ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \delta ı a \beta o v ́ \lambda ı o v . ~ C l e m . ~ H o m .3-43 ~ \epsilon ̇ \pi \epsilon i ́ p a \zeta \epsilon ~ к v ́ \rho ı o s ~ r o ̀ v ~ ' A ~ \beta \rho a ̀ ̀ ~ \mu ~ i ̌ v a ~$ $\gamma \nu \widehat{\varphi} \epsilon i \dot{i} \dot{i} \pi o \mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \hat{\epsilon}$. This verse and the preceding invite to martyrdom, as was so often done in primitive Christianity. Cf. Mt 16-24 єí $\boldsymbol{\tau} \iota \mathrm{s} \theta_{\epsilon} \lambda_{\epsilon} \epsilon$


4. катаıбхиขєi. Commonly written катає $\chi \chi$ v́vєı. But v. 9 б $\omega \theta \eta \sigma o ̛ ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a$. Qu. ov̉ $\mu \grave{\eta} \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \iota \sigma \chi v \nu \theta \hat{\eta}$.

 are forced to interpret $\dot{\eta}$ ả $\gamma \dot{\pi} \pi \eta$ тồ $\theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$ by God's love towards us. But if the whole sentence be recast into an active form, so: $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{\nu} \mu \alpha$ ä $\gamma o v$
 this interpretation is untenable. For how can it be said that the holy spirit pours into our hearts God's love towards us? What the holy spirit does is to fill our hearts with the love of, and devotion to, God. Equally forced is the interpretation of éккє́ $\chi v \tau \alpha \iota$ by it floods. I have no
 comment upon $\kappa \alpha v \chi \omega^{\prime} \mu \in \theta \alpha \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \alpha \hat{\imath ̂}_{\mathbf{S}} \theta \lambda i ́ \psi \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu$, which was meant to account for the Christians so exultingly bearing their tribulations; their fortitude, it is explained, comes from the fact that they are inspired by intense love of God.
 of oviv in v. 9 , were contrived with the intention of clothing vv. 6 to 8 with some appearance of sense. But I do not believe that even with these alterations the acutest subtlety can elicit any. This much is clear
 As regards vv. 6 and 7, they were, I think, a comment upon $\epsilon l^{\prime \prime} \notin \tau \iota \dot{c} \mu a \rho-$
 have been thus: Eis $\tau i ́ \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ X

 $\tau 0 \lambda \mu \hat{a}$ ă $\pi \circ \theta \alpha \nu \epsilon \hat{\iota} \nu$. But wherefore, while we were yet weak, did Christ in due. time die? He died from exceeding love. For barely for a linsman will any one die; but for one's own friend does perhaps one dare to die. I suspect that in the Hellenistic period it was a current theme of discussion as to when and for whom it was a good act or otherwise to die or not to die, this theme being perhaps a development out of Plato's Phaedo. We possess an indication of this fashion in XII Patr.

 $\sigma \omega \pi o ́ \nu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu$, тò $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \pi \hat{\alpha} \nu$ как̀̀ $\pi \rho \hat{\alpha} \xi \iota s$. In our passage the contention apparently is that self-immolation for a kinsman-such as a Jew was to Jesus-was hardly ever witnessed, but not infrequently courted for the benefit of one's beloved friend. A similar point is urged by

 $\alpha i \rho \epsilon \tau \omega ́ \tau \epsilon \rho o \iota ~ \sigma о ф о i ̂ s ~ a ̉ \nu \delta \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \iota v . ~ C f . ~ a l s o ~ A r r . ~ E p i c t .2-7 ~ \grave{\alpha} \nu ~ \delta \epsilon ́ \eta ~ \kappa \iota v \delta v \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \sigma \alpha \iota$



úmèp dं $\sigma \in \beta \hat{\omega} v$. There is no conceivable ground for this addition. The only impression that $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \epsilon \beta \hat{\omega} \nu$ creates is that the courtesy implied in saying $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu \hat{\omega} \nu$ instead of $\dot{\alpha} \pi i \sigma \tau \omega \nu$ is at once replaced by rudeness. I have conjectured $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho a \gamma a \pi \omega \hat{\omega} v$. Cf. Gal.2-20 $\tau 0 \hat{v}$ viov̂ $\tau 0 \hat{v} \theta \epsilon o \hat{v} \tau o v ̂$


5. Tischendorf 'Apud Irint 207, ubi vv. 6 usq 10 continua serie exscribuntur, v. 7 omittitur.'

Sıkaiou-ajaatoû. It has baftled the ingenuity of both ancient and modern commentators to establish such a distinction between סíкано and $\dot{a} \gamma a \theta o ̀ s$ as would explain why we should less hesitate to die for a good than for a just man. The fact is that these adjectives were special terms out of the theology of the Gnostics, who called their demiurge סíкalos and their Super-God ảjäòs, and through the Gnostics it eventually became fashionable to dwell upon and discuss the point of the difference (see chiefly Clem. Hom.4-13 and 18-1 ff.); but how is such a disquisition applicable to this passage? I have conjectured oiкєíov- $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \pi \eta \tau o \hat{v}$, which probably were misread by a scribe pre-occupied by the passionate controversy of his day. I may add that Lk
 echo of those debates.
ajadoû. I have conjectured $\dot{a} \gamma a \pi \eta \tau o \hat{v}$, which as a noun equivalent to ф'̃os is frequent in V.T., though less so in N.T. Cf. also Enoch 10-12

kai. Not intensive ; it follows $\tau$ á $\chi$ a redundantly, as in MGk it often follows 亢̈ $\sigma \omega \mathrm{s}$.
 with the object of effecting in the argument a sequence from v. 7 to öт८ $\epsilon i \notin \tau \iota \kappa \tau \lambda$.
ouvíatŋow. Proves. So Euthymius. See note on 3-5.
9. $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega}$. Most Mss add oủv. But, FG are supported by D, Latin and other versions, besides patristic authorities. See note on v. 6 .

ámò $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ ỏp $\gamma \hat{\eta} s$. The last judgement fancied as a time of wrath only. See note on $\vec{\eta}$ каі̀ $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \lambda о \gamma о v \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$ of 2-15.
11. This verse, which disturbs the argument, appears to be a voice from a convert who understood кат $\eta \lambda \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \gamma \eta \mu \epsilon$ as $=$ we have been converted, and who not only owns to, but also glories in, his conversion.
$\kappa \alpha \cup \chi \omega \bar{\omega} \boldsymbol{\nu}$. A barbarous form ${ }^{1}$ for каш $\boldsymbol{\chi}^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \theta \alpha$, the reading of L , and many other authorities. But D, which so often coincides with FG, reads $\kappa \alpha v \chi \omega \mu \mu \nu o \iota$, and probably therefore this is the word which FG were copying. If so, the marginal commentator adapted his grammar to $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \gamma^{\prime} \nu \tau \epsilon s$ instead of to $\kappa \alpha \tau \eta \lambda \lambda \alpha{ }^{\gamma} \gamma \eta \mu \epsilon \nu$.
12. The syllogism to the end of v .17 is as follows, stress being laid upon $\pi o \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \nu$. I said that by the death of his son we were reconciled to God at a time when we were his enemies; but far more shall we be saved by his life now that we have gained this reconciliation. And for this reason. Sin and consequently condemnation entered the world through the fault of one man, Adam ; and grace has been vouchsafed through one being, Jesus. But the grace is on a far larger scale than the condemnation, because the condemnation was inflicted but for one sin, that of Adam in eating of the fruit of knowledge, whereas the grace is vouchsafed in spite of many sins which have accumulated since Adam's time. ${ }^{2}$ Therefore, the grace being out of all proportion greater than the condemnation, we, obtaining such a grace, shall be saved far more completely than we were condemned.

סıà тои̂то. The reason is this. So Mt 18-23 סıà тov̂тo: © $\mu \circ \iota \omega \theta \eta \eta \dot{\eta}$

[^14]ßacincía (= for this reason : The kingdom is like). So also I believe 1Cor.11-10 $\delta \iota \alpha ̀$ тov̂тo: 'O $\quad{ }_{\epsilon \epsilon} \lambda_{\epsilon \epsilon \iota} \kappa \tau \lambda$. Usually the proof of a preceding statement is introduced by $\delta \iota \alpha$ тov̂ro, o̊ ơ $\tau$. Cf. Mt 13-13. Jn 5-16. 8-47. 10-17. 1Thes.2-13, etc.

Oávatos. All other Mss ó Oávatos.
кai oütws. Even so. But the usual collocation is oüt $\omega$ к кai, and such was probably the original reading. Cf. vv.15.18.19.21. The meaning is: As in the first instance one man sinned and so died, even so all men, having sinned, died. The accepted version and so introduces a hopeless confusion both into the construction and the argument.
$\delta_{i n} \lambda \theta \epsilon v$. Went throughout. In most Mss preceded by í $\theta$ ávatos, an addition which appears necessary.




13. ápapтia $\delta \grave{\varepsilon}$ ктл. The author would have made his meaning clearer had he constructed his sentence somewhat in this way: каíroı $\delta \grave{\epsilon}, \mu \grave{\eta}$

14. à入入́. Nevertheless.
$\mu \grave{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \alpha \tau \alpha s$. The variant without the negative-which exists in several cursives, in the version $d$, and is testified by Origen in various places-is what fits the context. The drift surely is this: It is true that $\sin$ is not imputable when there is no law to direct one's conduct; nevertheless death overtook all those who sinned during the period from Adam to Moses when the Law did not exist, just as it overtook Adam when he transgressed, though also then there was no law.
 $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \nu o \hat{\nu} \nu \pi \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \eta$ ì $\mu \eta$ خे $\delta \epsilon \hat{c}$. I do not see how any rational sense can be evolved out of the negative. Concerning the loss of the negative see note on 1-19.


 of what was to happen thereafter; namely, of what was to befall subse-

15. таралт $\omega \mu$. The antithesis requires крíда. See v.16.

 the argument and afford no explanation of what precedes; the expla-
 by one who probably, in opposition to the Gnostics, emphasized that grace blessed not the learned alone but equally the mass of the uneducated folk. It is in this spirit that in Mt 20-28 (whence Mk 10-45) it is said $\delta 0 \hat{v} v a \iota ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \psi v \chi \grave{\eta} v$ av̉rov̂ $\lambda v ́ \tau \rho o v ~ a ̉ \nu \tau i ̀ ~ \pi o \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$ and in 26-28 $\tau \grave{o}$
 by a deliberate omission of the article. Cf. also Hebr.12-15 $\mu \grave{\eta} \mu \mathrm{La} \mathrm{\nu}$ $\theta \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu$ oi $\pi o \lambda \lambda o i$, where the article is absent from some Mss.
oi $\pi о \lambda \lambda \frac{1}{}$. 'Several of the Fathers saw and testified that of mod入oi, the many, in an antithesis to the one, are equivalent to $\pi \alpha, \nu \tau \varepsilon s$, all, in v.12.' So Bentley (see Wordsworth). With all due respect, I do not see how oi $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda o i ̀ c a n ~ b e ~ e q u i v a l e n t ~ t o ~ \pi a ́ v \tau \epsilon s . ~ I t ~ w a s ~ a ~ G n o s t i c ~ t e r m, ~$ signifying the common herd as distinct from the $\Gamma \nu \omega \sigma \tau \iota \kappa$ or possessors of penetrating wisdom.
 All other Mss $\delta \omega \rho \in \dot{\alpha}$ є̇v $\chi$ र́ $\rho \iota \tau \iota$.
 Docetae over the question of the incarnation Jesus was occasionally referred to as $\alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi o s$; but there is no trace of that dispute in this passage. The addition therefore of $\dot{\alpha} v \theta \rho \dot{\omega} \pi \pi o v$ is objectless. On the other hand, we miss in the first colon of the parallelism the name 'A $\delta \grave{\alpha} \mu$ which the antithesis to 'I $\eta \sigma o v$ demands. So I believe that 'A $\nu \theta \rho \dot{\sigma} \pi \sigma$ (with a capital A) as the Greek equivalent of 'A $\delta \grave{\alpha} \mu$ should be trans-


 passage replaced by ' $\overline{\eta \sigma o v}$ ) $\dot{\alpha} \pi о к а \tau \eta \lambda \lambda a ́ \gamma \eta \mu \epsilon \nu$. In Iren. Fr.32, which is a parallel of Tren. $5-16-3$, instead of ' $A \delta \grave{\alpha} \mu$ we find $\dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \dot{\sigma} \pi o v$. Cf. also Ignat. Smyr.4-2, where the meaning of $\tau 0 \hat{v} \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \dot{\prime} \circ v \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \dot{\sigma} \pi o v ~ I ~ t h i n k ~$ is of sinless Adam. Reversely, 'A $\delta \grave{\alpha} \mu={ }_{\alpha}{ }^{\prime \prime} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \sigma$ s in XII Patr. Sim. 6
 see note on 1-18) тòv 'A $\delta \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \mu$. Philos.5-1-7 'A $\delta \alpha{ }^{\prime} \mu \alpha \nu \tau o s ~ \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega ́ \pi o v$.

intention of creating a link between the foregoing interpolation and what follows. But it is a feeble link. Discarded in my paraphrase.
 a satisfactory sense obtainable.

крі́ца. Condemnation.
ẻ§ évós. Supply $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \pi \tau \omega \dot{\mu} \mu a \tau o s$ from $\pi \alpha \rho a \pi \tau \omega \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$. So Rothe (see Meyer).

єis катáкрцца. To a sentence of death. See note on v. 18 and 8-3.
17. $\epsilon i \gamma{ }^{\prime} \rho$. Read $\epsilon i \not \partial \alpha \rho \alpha$ (see note on 4-13), for in this verse we have the conclusion of the proposition laid down in v.10. As a causal sentence it would advance as an argument the very proposition which the author started there to prove.
 nothing different to $\delta \iota a ̀ ~ \tau o v ̂ ~ e ́ v o ́ s . ~$
évós. Add 'A $\nu \theta$ р ćtrov. See note on v. 15.
$\pi о \lambda \lambda \omega \hat{\omega} \mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda \frac{\lambda}{} \kappa \tau \lambda$. An altered construction. Given the form of the first colon, the construction would be $\pi o \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o v \tau \hat{\eta} \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma \epsilon$ ía $\tau \hat{\eta} s$

 the interpolator of v .15 find it in his text.
$\lambda \alpha \mu \beta o ́ v \tau \epsilon$. Nearly all other witnesses $\lambda \alpha \mu \beta \alpha ́ \nu о \nu \tau \epsilon s$.
18. A spurious verse. It introduces (1) a second conclusion; (2) the new conclusion is irrelevant, for the point is not that from one trespass there has been a condemnation and from one gracious act a justification, but that there has been a great preponderance of justification over condemnation. Besides $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha i^{\prime} \omega \mu$ in the sense of righteous act is singular in N.T., for its meaning in Apoc.19-8, to which Grimm refers, is privilege. Probably a bad variant of the second colon of v .15.
äpa oûv. A favourite expression with the interpolator.
 $\pi \alpha \rho a \pi \tau \omega \mu \mu a \tau o s$ with an impossible grammar. Cf. besides v. 16 тò $\mu$ є̀


 Ignatius repeatedly calls himself като́крıгоs as a man sentenced to death. See note on v. 16.

тò Sıкаíшرа. So GDE and one cursive; F каì סıкаí $\omega \mu$. All other Mss $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha \iota \omega ́ \mu a \tau o s$. See note on $\tau \grave{̀} \pi \alpha \rho a ́ \pi \tau \omega \mu \alpha$.
19. This verse is as irrelevant as the preceding one.



 tov̂ eivós. Another instance of the superiority of FG.


20. vó $\quad$ оs $\delta \epsilon$. But as regards the Law. This is an answer to a supposed question (see Wordsworth): If it be faith that matters (cf. v.1) and the consequence of faith be such an abundance of grace, how comes it that the Law intruded at all?


 $\epsilon ' \sigma \delta v \sigma \iota v \pi \lambda \alpha{ }^{\prime} \eta \eta s \pi o \iota \neq \sigma \alpha$, . The preposition has a contemptuous sense (cf. $\pi \alpha \rho a ́ \sigma \iota \tau o s, \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \beta \lambda \omega \psi$, etc.) and expresses the sentiment of the supposed questioner.
íva $\pi \lambda \epsilon o v \alpha^{\prime} \neq \eta$ rò $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \pi т \omega \mu \alpha$. The Greek Fathers (see Gifford), in giving iva the force of effect and not of purpose, wished no doubt to dissociate St Paul from the doctrine of a providential design in the multiplication of $\sin$. The theory unfortunately existed and re-appears in 7-13 and 11-19, and in a modified form also in 11-25. During the controversialistic period all manner of queer theories were broached, and this is one of the most perverse. It was probably an opposition theory to the Rabbinical doctrine (Schürer 2-2-28-1) which taught that God gave so many commandments and so many laws to the people of Israel that by the observance of so many they might obtain great rewards.
ótrou. All other Mss oṽ. See note on 4-15. I understand neither. Probably à $\phi^{\prime}$ ố either in a temporal or causal sense. Jannaris § 1792 ' $\dot{a} \phi$ ' ồ, since, applies to both time and cause and refers either to the past or to the present and future.'


 i $\delta i \omega \mu a]$.' So in 11-11. Jn 10-38, and often.
$\mathfrak{\eta}$ ápaptía êv $\theta a v a ́ t \omega$. . In accordance with the second colon the writer
 genuineness of this verse ; its import is disconnected with what was stated in the preceding verse. Like v. 15 , it is probably a bad paraphrase of v .17 .

## CHAPTER THE SIXTH

 understood. What then shall we say? Shall we say Let us persist? So van Hengel (see Meyer).
 Gnostics exhort as a conclusion growing out of the theory that sin was designedly caused to multiply in order that grace might correspondingly abound.

 is instrumental, and so likewise is the emprotheton $\dot{\epsilon}^{v} v a v ̉ \tau \hat{\eta} \hat{\text {. See note }}$ on 1-19. Cf. 1Pet.2-24 $\tau \alpha i ̂ s ~ \dot{~} \mu \alpha \dot{\rho} \tau i ́ a \iota s ~ \dot{\alpha} \pi о \gamma є \nu o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu о \iota . ~$
 is equivalent to $\beta a \pi \tau i \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ єis ővoua $\tau \iota v o{ }^{\prime}$ s.' Cf. Acts 22-16 $\beta$ án $\tau \iota \sigma a \iota$

cis Xpıatòv 'I $\eta$ ooûv. Primitively the rite was effected in the name of
 But when the point as to the Messiahship became a burning controversy, X $\rho \iota \sigma \tau o ̀ \nu$ was added by way of profession that Jesus was indeed

 invocation was reversed, 'I $\eta$ oov̂s being omitted and only X X ortòs

[^15]invoked, and this is the final stage, represented by the reading of $B$,
 words still chanted in the liturgy of the Eastern Church. But in our passage I suspect that X $\mathrm{X} \iota \sigma \tau$ òv was interpolated, for it vitiates the beauty of its point, which is: that by the baptism we went through a purgatory process reproducing the process which Jesus as Jesus submitted to, to the end that just as he rose in all his Messianic (cf. X $\rho \iota \sigma \tau o ̀ s ~ i n ~ v .4) ~ a n d ~ s p i r i t u a l ~ p u r i t y, ~ s o ~ m i g h t ~ w e ~ r e s t a r t ~ u p o n ~ a ~ n e w ~$ and purified life. See note on 8-11. Xpıriòs must frequently have been added to 'I $\eta \sigma o v{ }^{\prime}$ and vice versa; there was a constant temptation to do so. An instance of such an addition we have in 1Thes. $5-9$, where all our Mss give 'I $\eta \sigma o v$ X X $\quad$ totov̂, but Oxyr. Pap.1598, newly discovered, apparently read IHY only.

єis tòv $\theta$ ávarov aùroû. Into that death which he died. This death in the case of Jesus consisted in depositing in the grave all that in him was human and then rising as Christ, and in the case of a convert it consisted in his throwing off by the baptismal rite as into a grave his sinnable nature so as to emerge a righteous man. The old theologians taught that baptism was a symbol of our Lord's death and

 et resurrectionis Christi. It is a fanciful doctrine, the product of that imaginative period when with great licence all manner of things were said to be tútoo. Baptism was but a purifying process, and it was enjoined probably by all religious revivalists before our Lord died.
${ }^{\prime} \beta a \pi \tau^{\prime} \sigma \theta \eta \mu \in \nu$. There is a difference in sense between the first and the second $\epsilon \beta a \pi \tau i \sigma \theta \eta \mu \epsilon \nu$. The first means we were baptized, we went through the rite of baptism, the second we were plunged into. See notes on 7-4. 10-8.
4. єis $\theta$ ávarov. . So also D and Scriv.k; the rest cis ròv Өávarov. But I doubt its genuineness in either form. After saying that a convert dies the death of Christ and as a consequence (ov̉v) is buried with him, how can one now say that a convert, having been buried, dies? The paralleI


Xpıatós. As Christ. A predicate. See note aloove on eis Xpıotòv 'I $\eta \sigma \circ$ ข̂v.
$\delta \iota a ̀ ~ \tau \eta ̂ s ~ \delta o ́ \xi \eta \mathrm{\eta}$ toû $\pi \alpha \tau \rho o ́ s$. No sense. Read $\delta \iota a ̀ ~ \tau \eta ̂ s ~ \delta \epsilon \xi ́ a ̂ s ~ \tau o v ̂ ~ \pi a \tau \rho o ́ s . ~$


 $\beta \epsilon \tau o ́ \mu o v$. Evang. Inf. Arab. 23 Deus te dextra sua sustentabit. It is the idea of lending a helping hand, which is also implied in the verb $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \tau \lambda \alpha \mu \beta \dot{\nu} \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha c$. The belping hand has always been represented as being the $\delta \epsilon \xi(\dot{c}$, the strong and auspicious hand. Cf. Clem. Hom.7-3



The conclusion from the foregoing discussion is in v.12. After saying that we were baptized with the object of emerging into a new or moral life, the author logically in that verse concludes that we ought not to defeat that purpose by allowing sin any longer to rule; in other words, that we ought not to persist in $\sin$. The intervening words consist of interpolations which stray off from the point.
 be, the intended scope is quite clear, namely, that as we were identified with Christ by a like death, so shall we be identified with him by a like resurrection. But how could this be a reason for what was said in v. 4 and relevant to the contention that sin is not permissible? I suspect that the interpolation is a comment upon $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ кalvór $\eta \tau \iota \zeta \omega \hat{\eta} s$, made by one who mistook those words as meaning a new material life. The interpolator confirms that Christians, as men united with Christ by a like resurrection, will enjoy a new material life, the union in the first instance having been effected by a like death, that death in both cases being a real material death, namely, one by martyrdom. This reflection was suggested by the spectacle of the religious persecutions.
ouvouro. Of the same nature. Rutherford one nature with him.
$\gamma \in \gamma^{\circ} v a \mu \epsilon$. The subject is Christ and ourselves.
ä $\mu \alpha$. All other Mss correctly ${ }_{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha \alpha^{\prime}$. It is added as if what preceded stated каíoo ${ }^{\text {é }} \dot{\theta} a v a \tau \dot{\prime} \dot{\theta} \eta \mu \epsilon \nu$. Liddell and Scott ' In hypothetical sentrences the apodosis is often opposed to the protasis by $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{a}$, yet, still, at least.'

6. Here begins another interpolation by one who understood év каıvóтทт८ $\zeta \omega \hat{s}$ correctly as denoting that our life henceforward is to be sinless, but who on the other hand, in common with many others,
 his remark he comments in a loose way upon the words $\sigma$ v́vфvтot $\gamma \epsilon-$
 $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi \alpha \tau \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$, but utterly ignores (see note on v. 11) the words $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$


тоиิто $\gamma\llcorner\omega \dot{\sigma} к о \nu \tau \epsilon$. The knowledge here claimed is probably that

 $\rho \omega \mu$ а.
 extraordinary statement; it is in flat contradiction with the view of future retribution, so firmly held by all Christians, and, as a matter

 каí $\omega \tau \alpha \iota$ reproduces a proclamation customary at funeral rites, which notified that the departed whose remains were being laid in the grave had obtained his grace from God, his wrongs to those present having been forgiven. This comforting idea is still alive among the Greeks, who generally refer to a dead man as $\delta \sigma v \chi \omega \rho \in \mu \in ́ v o s .{ }^{1}$ As a develop-

 $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \iota \alpha ́ \zeta \omega \dot{\epsilon} \mu \alpha v \tau o ̀ v$, for their good $I$ saint myself $\left(=I\right.$ die). ${ }^{2}$ It is in this latter sense I think that the interpolator quoted the ritual words as a proof that we, having once died and become díkaoo, no longer shall be liable to sin. The words $\dot{a} \pi \grave{o} \boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\eta} s \dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau i a s, ~ I ~ s u s p e c t, ~ w e r e ~ s u b s e-~$ quently inserted as a link. I may add that 1Pet.4-1 óть ó $\pi \alpha \theta \grave{\omega} \nu \sigma \alpha \rho \kappa \grave{~}$
 common interpretation, is different; it is an exhortation to martyrdom.
8. $\epsilon^{i}$ y ${ }_{\mathrm{a}}^{\mathrm{a} \rho} \boldsymbol{\kappa} \tau \lambda$. In sense a mere repetition of v .5 , probably a para-

[^16]phrase. If so, $\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ would be distinctly preferable to $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$, which is the reading of all the other witnesses with the exception of the Toletanus.
 of which no rational being could be guilty. I think that instead of X£ we should read $\pi \hat{\alpha}$ s, the meaning being that no man who has once risen from the dead need fear a second death; for in dying we die by the power of sin which may only exercise its power once and not again after our resurrection, but in rising we rise unto eternal life by the will of God whose power is unlimited, and therefore above that of $\sin$.





 $\pi a ́ v \tau \alpha$ (i.e. oî̃ol $\pi a ́ v \tau \epsilon s)$.'


\}n̂ $\tau \hat{\omega} \theta \in \hat{\omega}$. And therefore eternally. Either $\dot{\epsilon} \epsilon i$ or $\delta \iota \grave{a}$ тavròs dropped out or is implied. Euthymius ' $\zeta \omega \eta{ }^{2} \nu$ äî̀ov.'
11. oütus кai í $\mu \mathrm{\epsilon is}$ кт入. This last interpolation comes from a com-
 whatever died died to sin, and who argues that, since everything that died died to sin, you must reckon yourselves also as being dead to

12. ėmakoúev. All other Mss ímaкovév.

 as answers to the question in v. 1 , which was whether we possess a right to $\sin$ and not whether we should yield to the promptings of our flesh.
13. тà $\mu^{\prime} \lambda \eta$. The baser parts of one's body, such as arms, feet, belly, in contradistinction to the nobler and spiritual parts, such as


тарабтйбатє éautoús. In a military sense, as Calvin perceived (see

See note on 16-2.
$\dot{\omega} \boldsymbol{s}$ ék vekpêv ̧̧̂̀vtes. The adverb indicates a simile, and the simile seems to be a soldier who abandons the wrong side, which is also the side of unrighteousness and defeat and death, and joins the right side, that of victory and life. But the imagery is obscured in the traditional reading; probably we should read $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \nu \epsilon \kappa \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \epsilon i s ~ \zeta \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \alpha s$.
$\zeta \omega \hat{\nu} \tau \epsilon \mathrm{s}$. So also D; all other Mss $\zeta \hat{\omega} \nu \tau a s$.
tà $\mu e ́ \lambda \eta$. Here the arms are meant, which carry the sword and the

öm $\lambda \alpha$ Sıkalooúrys. It is, I think, these words which the writer of

 and $\pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon ́ \lambda \epsilon v \sigma \iota \nu$ from $\pi \rho o \sigma a \gamma \omega \gamma \grave{\eta} \nu$ of 5-2.
14. This verse does not form part of the original work. In the first place, in chap. 5 it was laid down that salvation comes through grace vouchsafed to us; this proposition led to an argument demonstrating that from the fact that we are saved by grace it does not follow that we are free to $\sin$; and this argument led to the conclusion, expressed in the form of an exhortation, that we ought not to sin. But abruptly in v. 14 a reason for that conclusion is sprung upon us, and this reason consists in the very proposition-namely, that we are under grace-which led to that very conclusion. Secondly, in v. 13 a Christian is represented as a defender of God, but in v. 14 the reverse is contended for. How could a serious mind reason so incongruously? Now, what follows from v. 14 to the end of chap. 8a part far too abstrusely theological and wandering away from the theme of the Epistle-is connected with that verse, and therefore if that verse is spurious, that part must be spurious also. Chap. 9 however links up with v. 13 quite logically. It is natural for the author who was a Jew finally to express his deep concern that his nation should not conform to a right conduct, but rely for justification exclusively upon its descent. In Marcion's copy 8-11 to 10-2 were missing; or according to Tertullian-not a good witness-they had been expunged.
 an error when we withdrew from the Law and placed ourselves under grace? The question is answered in chap. 7 from a Jewish point of
view, as from a Jew to Jews. But what is said in vv. 16 to 23 could only have been addressed to idolaters (cf. 1-24), for a Jew would not, unjustly accuse his own people of being dंќ́日aртоь; it was by their Alexandrian rivals that $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \alpha \theta a \rho \sigma i ́ \alpha ~(c f . ~ J o s e p h . ~ A p i o n .1-32) ~ w a s ~ i m-~$ puted to the Jewish nation. I therefore look upon those verses as a second interpolation occasioned by the corruption of $\dot{\eta} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \eta \sigma \alpha \mu \in \nu$ to ${ }_{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \eta \sigma \sigma \mu \mu \nu$.
$\dot{\eta} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \eta{ }_{\eta} \sigma \alpha \mu \epsilon v$. In the classical sense of committing an error. All other Mss $\dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \eta \sigma \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$ or $\dot{u} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma о \mu \epsilon \nu$.
16. Soúdous. Cancelled by Bentley, and also absent in two cursives. Without its elimination the sentence states that, if by obedience to anything you are its slaves, you are the slaves of that which you obey; not an impressive truism.

థิ. Probably ồ.
cis Өávarov. Not in DE, the Peshitto, and some other authorities.
$\hat{\eta}$ úmakô̂s cis $\delta$ ккаıoбúvŋv. Parry 'the antithesis fails: we expect
 that, when a man is a slave of that which he obeys, he is a slave of obedience. The original reading no doubt was $\ddot{\eta} \tau о \iota \dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau i a s ~ \hat{\eta} \delta \iota к а \iota о-~$ бv́v $\begin{aligned} & \text { s, which accords with vv. } 18,19 \text {, and } 20 \text {, and twice occurs in Origen }\end{aligned}$ (see Tischendorf).






 St Chrysostom (see Gifford), namely, willingly, by the promptings of


 $\theta \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu \dot{\eta} \rho \nu \eta \mu \epsilon \epsilon_{\nu} \iota$. This interpretation would be in accordance with the idea that a good action was only meritorious if done willingly. Cf.
 sense of you have been taught rather favours the former interpretation.

єis öv. Equivalent to a dative. Cf. Jn 15-21 $\pi \dot{d} \nu \tau \alpha$ пoıク̆́ovvov $\epsilon$ is $\dot{\tau} \mu a ̂ s$ (where a variant $\dot{v} \mu i v$ ), etc. See Jannaris § 1348.





 Also $\pi \alpha \rho a \lambda a \mu \beta a ́ v \epsilon \nu$, cf. Col.2-6, where see Lightfoot's note. Also $\lambda a \mu-$

 form of teaching which you have been tautght.

тúmov. The same as $\mathbf{~} \pi$ тоүра $\mu \mu \grave{\nu}$, a copy, pattern. Probably a scholastic term.
18. $\delta \epsilon$. The right reading is ovv, as exists in NC and some other witnesses, for the exhortation $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \kappa \pi \lambda$ presupposes a previous conclusion. See note on 13-10.
$\epsilon \in \delta u \lambda \omega \theta \eta \tau \epsilon$. Read $\delta o v \lambda \omega \theta \eta \tau \epsilon$ in accordance with $\pi a \rho a \sigma \tau \eta \eta^{\sigma} \alpha \tau \epsilon$ of v.19.
 agreed that this form of expression was employed by way of softening the harshness of the term $\dot{\epsilon} \delta o v \lambda \omega \dot{\theta} \theta \tau \epsilon \epsilon$.' I believe that the harshness lies in the term $\dot{\text { к. }}$ к月apoía, and therefore that this sentence originally stood as a parenthesis after that word. What I mention is human, a result of the weakness of your flesh. In other words: In mentioning àкаӨafoíay I do not mean to impute a deliberate vice to you; it was your misfortune, a weakness inherent in your heathen (see note on v. 15) flesh, and as such pardonable. It is in the same charitable spirit that in XII Patr. Zab. 9 we are told that ov̉ doyís $\epsilon$ rau [ $\dot{\delta}$ кúplos]



$\mu^{\prime} \hat{\lambda} \lambda \eta$. See note on v.13.


[^17]



20. öтє $\gamma$ àp $\mathrm{k} \mathrm{\tau} \mathrm{\lambda}$. For it was when you were slaves of sin that you were free from righteousness (omitting the comma after $\dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho t i a s) . ~$ The import seems to be: Do not hesitate to submit to a new kind of servitude, which is a servitude to righteousness. True, there was a time when you were free from this new servitude; but on the other hand you were then slaves of sin. If in any case you must be slaves, is it not better that you should be slaves of righteousness?
 we expect $\dot{\alpha} \pi o ̀ ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s \delta_{\iota \kappa \alpha u o \sigma u ́ v \eta s ~ a s ~ i n ~ v v . ~} 18$ and 22.
 What fruit had you then by reason of which (cf. Arist. Equ. 1320 т $i v \nu^{\prime}$ ' $\chi$ ' $\omega \nu$
 circumstances? The common reading èmaurxúve $\theta \theta \epsilon$ is unsatisfactory. Nor is the version what fruit had ye then in those things whereof ye are now ashamed warranted by the words.
èmaloxúveöal. The shame which might be felt from the fact that they would be designated by the opprobrious term of slaves.

## Chapter the seventh

1. $\gamma \iota \nu \dot{\sigma} \sigma \kappa о \sigma \iota$. Probably a clerical error. All other Mss $\gamma \iota \nu \dot{\omega} \sigma \kappa о v \sigma t \nu$.

 the woman, and in the former case with the woman's husband. The interpolator was in difficulties as to how to express himself.
 husband living. All previous expositors, so far as I can discover, have gone astray over the construction of this sentence, taking $\tau \hat{\varrho} \hat{a} \nu \delta \rho i$ as the object and $\nu o ́ \mu \varphi$ as an instrumental dative. But it is the other way



 $\gamma a \mu \eta \theta \hat{\eta} v a l$. The argument runs thus: As a woman is bound to her marriage contract during her husband's lifetime, so was a Jew bound to the Law so long as his carnal nature (cf. ó ó $\epsilon \hat{\eta} \mu \in \nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \rho \kappa i)$ was quick; but as by the husband's death a woman is freed from her bond and may remarry, so a Jew, when his carnal nature was killed through Jesus's crucifixion, was released from his subjection to the Law and might wed Christ. The fruit of this new union is righteousness, and not sinful passions as was the fruit of a Jew's connection with his carnal nature under the Law.

Following Gifford's plan of equations, I should put the matter in this way :

1. The woman
2. The marriage bond
3. The woman bound to the marriage bond whilst the husband lived
The husband dies and thereby the woman released from her marriage bond
4. The woman remarries.
5. The Jew
6. The Mosaic Law
7. The Jew bound to the Mosaic Law so long as his carnal nature was quick
8. The Jew's carnal nature dies and thereby the Jew released from the Law
9. The Jew espouses Christianity.



кати́рүๆтац. The word not well chosen; $\dot{\eta}_{\lambda} \lambda \epsilon \theta \epsilon \epsilon$ 'ि $\omega \tau \alpha \iota$ would have been more to the point.

тoû ảvסрós. Qu. тท̂s vimáv $\delta \rho o v$.
4. ả $\delta \in \lambda \phi$ oí $\mu \mathrm{oc}$. All other Mss correctly $\dot{\alpha} \delta \in \lambda \phi o i ́ \mu o v$.
$\dot{\text { úcis }}=$ ye in your carnal state, but the following $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\mu} s=y o u$ in your purified state.
$\tau \hat{̣}$ Nó $\mu \omega$. . Here the Mosaic Law is meant. The word in this chapter now designates the Mosaic Law, now a rule in general (see note on ${ }_{\epsilon} \beta \beta a \pi \tau i \sigma \theta \eta \mu \in \nu 6-3$ ); but the argument by a $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \pi i \pi \tau \omega \nu$ dó ${ }^{\prime}$ os (sec note on $10-8$ ) proceeds as though both meanings were identical because expressed by the same word.

Xpıorov̂．It would have been clearer had the interpolator here said


картофорє́ $\sigma \omega \mu \epsilon v$ ．So in MGk：форө̄－форє́ $\sigma \omega$ ．All other Mss карто－ $\phi \quad \rho \dot{\prime} \sigma \omega \mu \in \nu$ ．The same divergence in v．5．In 1 Cor．15－49 all Mss є́форє́ $\sigma a \mu \epsilon \nu$ and форє́ $\epsilon о(\omega) \mu \epsilon \nu$ ．
 Analogously $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ Oavá $\tau \underset{c}{ }$ in v． 5.

5．Tท̂ $\sigma a \rho k i ́$. All other documents，excepting fg，$\hat{\epsilon}^{\prime} \nu \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \rho \kappa i ́$.
Sıà roû Nópou．By enforcing their union with the flesh the Law was responsible for the passions in the Jews being active．The result was for sin leading to death to be engendered．
$\eta \quad \eta \in р \gamma \in i \neq 0$ ．Jannaris，$\S 750$ a quotes $\eta^{\eta} \nu o t \xi \in v$ from the Acts and the Apocalypse；but no doubt this kind of augment dates from an earlier period．See also New Phrynichus XX．
$\mu e ́ \lambda \epsilon \sigma \omega$ ．See note on 6－13．

 practically is the same as катє́ $\chi \eta \tau \alpha \iota$ vó $\mu \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\varphi}$ ．

סou入єúєเv．The metaphor from картофорєiv is now changed into one from $\delta o v \lambda \epsilon v \in \epsilon \nu$ by the influence of $\kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon \iota \chi o ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a$ ．A new spirit is to be the master in future，and not an outworn script．
$\hat{\varepsilon} v$ каivórŋтı．Construed with $\delta o v \lambda \epsilon u ́ \epsilon \iota \nu$ as an equivalent of a simple dative．See note on 1－19．

7．ả入入á．It is a fact however that．So likewise in v．13．5－14．The interpolator repudiated the idea of the Law being a sin，but on the other hand grants that the Law has worked disadvantageously in that it disclosed the reality of $\sin$（see my note on $3-20$ ），and so after its advent，no sin being committed in ignorance，all transgressors were punishable；prior to that event however they were excusable．Cf．


 ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \chi \epsilon \epsilon$ ，etc．In other words，the intentions of the Law were praise worthy， but its effect proved to be our undoing．Things were in the end righted through Christ by grace ；cf．v． 25.
$\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$. So also Latin versions and Origen; the rest $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \tau \epsilon \gamma \alpha{ }^{\prime} \rho$.



 very rare. Parry refers to 2 Cor.10-8.
 was a sin. Lusting existed and was practised, but it was practised innocently, for men did not know that it was a sin.
oủk $\eta_{n} \delta \epsilon \iota \nu=$ ov̉к $\grave{\alpha} \nu \eta \eta_{\eta}^{\eta} \delta \epsilon \tau \nu$. See note on 9-3.
8. áqopuŋ̀v $\delta e ̀$ ėė $\pi \iota \theta u \mu i ́ a v$. Obviously a marginal variation of v.11. Its insertion has obscured the argument.

үáp. Read ${ }_{\alpha} \rho \alpha$ (see note on v. 15 and 5-17). The argument is: It was first through the Law that sin became known; therefore before the advent of the Law sin was unproductive of death.

$\mathfrak{\eta} \nu$. Absent in most witnesses. But it is indispensable, for the question is as to what happened before the advent of the Jewish Law, cf. $\delta$ $\nu o ́ \mu o s$ and $\eta_{n} \delta \epsilon \iota \nu$ in $\nabla .7$ and also what was stated in $5-13$. Were $\hat{\eta} \nu$
 general and the statement becomes a reference to what happens in the absence of such a law. Probably $\eta_{\nu}$ was represented by a slanting line, as often is éctiv. See Oxyr. Pap.1086. Also note on v. 13.

The theory that during the ante-Law period sin lay dormant, namely, that it did not engender death, is in antagonism with 5-14
 polator.

The full stop commonly placed after $\nu \epsilon \kappa \rho \alpha \alpha_{\text {d }}$ destroys the essence of the argument. The interpolator contrasts the pre-Law conditions with the post-Law conditions; in the latter case sin revived and man died, and in the former sin was dead and man alive.
9. потє́. Read тóтє (cf. Gal.4-8), the reference being not to any unspecified period, but to that distinct period when there was no Law.
10. єis $\theta$ ávarov. The interpolator follows a theology of his own, for death came in not when the commandments were enacted but when Adam fell.

## 11. A plagiarism of the history of Adam's fall.

12. 由̈øtє. My conclusion then is that the Law by itself is not sinful; it is thoroughly good, for admittedly (v. 14 oí $\delta a \mu \in \nu \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ ) it is spiritual. The fault must be sought in man who is a creature made of flesh and as flesh may be sold; he is therefore sold to sin and slave-like must obey its orders. To this effect I believe the argument to be, pointed probably at the Marcionite antinomianism ; but it is obscured by the insertion of v .15, made apparently by yet another theologian whose doctrine differed from that expounded in v .7 ff . There it was held that what led to death was an acquaintance with sin; here we are taught that an intent to produce overwhelming sin was the cause.


 8-3). With the object of ulterior salvation. The idea is that intolerable sin, such as entails death, leads eventually to salvation. Similarly in 11-11 we are told that it was through the trespasses of the Jews that the Gentiles obtained salvation.
 which we meet with so frequently in Hellenistic writings. Without an imperfect I do not see how the sentence could be rationally construed. See note on v. 8.
îva $\gamma \in ́ v \eta \tau \alpha \iota \kappa \tau \lambda$. Connected with $\delta \iota \alpha \grave{\alpha} \tau o v$ ả $\gamma \alpha \theta o v$. The interpolator would have made his meaning clearer had he worded his sentence


$\kappa_{\alpha} \theta^{\prime}$ и́тєр $\beta$ о $\lambda \neq \eta$. When $\sin$ succeeded in establishing itself no longer through what was evil, such as the promptings of Satan, but also through what was good, it became complete and intolerable. Whence is the origin of the doctrine that excessive sin leads to eventual salvation? Was it a Gnostic theory, or rather a development out of the story of Lot-or Noah-in which crimes carried to excess are represented as bringing destruction upon the wicked but relief unto the



13. $\sigma$ ápкıvos. And therefore a $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$, a slave. See note on 8-23.
 cause of being a slave is ignorance of one's handiwork or actions? But from the fact of being a slave flows as effect an inability to act
 ö $\gamma \iota \nu \dot{\omega} \sigma \kappa \omega$. See note on v .8 and 4-13.
 I don't do what I myself know as the best. Cf. Jn 6-6 ${ }_{\eta}{ }^{\prime \prime} \delta \epsilon \iota$ (i.e. as the best) $\tau^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \epsilon \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon \nu \pi o t \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu$.
ò $\gamma \iota \omega \omega \sigma \kappa \omega$. As taught out of the Law.
oủ $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ ô $\theta$ é $\lambda \omega$. The theologian would have made his meaning clearer had he written ov̉ $\delta^{\prime \prime}$ ò $\theta \epsilon ́ \lambda \omega$.
ò $\mu \iota \sigma \hat{\omega}$, roûto $\pi 0 \iota \omega$. For a slave hates his work and does it under compulsion. In this case the compulsion is exercised by the flesh.
14. $\epsilon \mathfrak{i} \delta \epsilon{ }_{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \lambda$. The argument seems to be this: By hating sin we demonstrate our approval of righteousness, and thereby admit that the Law is sinless since it enjoins the very thing we approve of.
 had been represented in the foregoing as maintaining its innocence.

Here ends the argument as to the sinlessness of the Law. The theologian now flies off, to another question, occasioned by ov $\kappa a \tau \in \rho-$ زálopaı ò $\gamma \iota \nu \omega \dot{\sigma} \kappa \omega$ of v.15, and proceeds to show in accordance with the dualistic theory that man in his spiritual essence is not responsible for his sins, but that sin resides in the flesh.

tò ảyaOóv. The article omitted in nearly all other Mss.
таро́кєเтаí $\mu$ o. Bloomfield ' the expression recurs at v.21, but nowhere else in the N.T.' Probably $\pi \alpha \rho \epsilon \in \sigma \chi \eta \tau \alpha i ́ ~ \mu o t$, has been granted to me.

oủX єúpítкш. NABC and some other witnesses omit єúpíck $\omega$, the omission being a felicitous guess. For I think єípíqкш was a lemma
 piled from vv. 15 to 17 , were to be restored to the text in the place before єípíбкш of v. 21.
15. $\mu \iota \sigma \hat{\omega}$. Omitted in G.
16. àpa. Read $\gamma \alpha{ }^{\prime} \rho$.
ròv vópov. Cancelled by Homberg; see Bakhuyzen, ConjecturaalKritiek.
époi. Viewed as man's spiritual part.
őtı époì тò какòv тарáкєıтаı. Missed in FG.
rò какóv. Viewed as Satan, who was often called ảvтıкєípєvos. See note on 8-3.

тара́кєьтаl. The thought in v. 21 was borrowed from Gal.5-17 $\dot{\eta} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$

 $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau i \kappa \epsilon \iota \tau a l$, which in $v .23$ is repeated as $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota \sigma \tau \rho a \tau \epsilon v o ́ \mu \epsilon v o v$. Theodore seems to have found dं $\nu \tau \iota \pi \rho \alpha \dot{\sigma}_{\tau \tau \epsilon}$ or an equivalent, for evidently, when

 $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \epsilon \in \epsilon \epsilon \nu$, he had in mind this part of our Epistle down to 8-3.
22. $\sigma u v \dot{\eta} \delta o \mu \alpha \iota$. Formed by analogy with $\sigma v \nu \epsilon v \delta o \kappa \hat{\omega}$ and $\sigma v \gamma \chi^{\alpha i \rho} \omega$. Lightfoot compares 1Cor.13-6 $\sigma v \gamma \chi a i \rho \epsilon \iota ~ \tau \hat{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon \epsilon_{i}^{\prime} .{ }^{1}$ Cf. also Clem.

 $\lambda o ́ \gamma \varphi$, etc.
 á $\mu a \rho \tau i ́ a s$.

 agencies at work; the inner man, residing in the mind, who draws me towards the divine commandments, and the outer man, residing in the flesh, who overpowering the spiritual man enforces upon me the will of $\sin$. See Gal.5-17 quoted at v.21. The compendium $\overline{\alpha v o v}$ led to the corruption. In Lk 19-38 it led to ovjpav $\underset{\sim}{\text { th }}$ through ovjpavois, corrected by Valckenaer, and similarly in Philos. 5-4-26 to ov̉pav仑̣̂ ov̉po.voîs, corrected by Schneidewin.
 ${ }^{\epsilon} \theta \nu \eta$. See note on 1-23.

[^18]

$\mu e ́ \lambda \epsilon \sigma \omega$. See note on 6-13.
24. $\sigma \dot{\mu} \mu \boldsymbol{\tau}$ оs. In $v .23$ expressed by $\mu \epsilon \lambda \bar{\omega} \nu$.


25. $\mathfrak{\eta}$ Xápıs kupiou (Tischendorf $\tau 0 \hat{v}$ киpíov). The correct reading is probably that of DE $\dot{\eta} \chi$ ápls zov̂ $\theta$ єov. But the most attractive, as an outburst of thankfulness at the thought of escape from a dilemma, is that of $\mathrm{B} \chi^{\alpha} \rho \iota s \tau \hat{\omega} \hat{\omega} \hat{\epsilon} \hat{\varphi}[\epsilon \ddot{\eta} \eta]$, thanks be to God for my deliverance.
äpa oûv кт入. A marginal comment on vv. 22 and 23. Venema (see Meyer) conjectured that this passage followed v. 23.

## CHAPTER THE EIGHTH

1 and 2. These verses as a conclusion (äpa) do not fit at this place, for no proof precedes showing that through the agency of Christ we should be saved; that proof follows in vv. 3 ff. But they fit after v. 11 as an answer-justified by the argument pursued in v.11-to the question $\tau$ is $\mu \in$ f $\dot{\text { víréral }}$ of 7-24.
 sentence (see note on 5-16) to fear for those who adhere to C'hrist.
 yospel.
 баркòs instead of d́aapтías. Cf. v. 6 .
 FG are supported by NB and the Peshitto; most other witnesses

тoû vóuou. Of the jurisdiction.
 corrupt, for (1) the construction is impossible; (2) in 7-15 and 23 it was $\begin{gathered}\epsilon \\ \gamma \\ \omega\end{gathered}$ that was said to be weak; and (3) in v. 23 the law is repre-


d.vi'ícos. Satan, man's adversary, the enemy adverted to in 7-23.
 Other appellations of Satan : $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota \kappa \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \nu$ оs 1Tim. $5-14$; $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \rho \gamma \hat{\omega} \nu$ Barn.2-1;



 (see Meyer).
 standing for $\dot{v} \pi \grave{\varrho} \rho$, as often.


 ( $=\tau \hat{\varphi} \sigma \omega \dot{\mu} \mu \alpha \tau \iota$ ). So Grotius (see Meyer).
 ảvтídıóv $\mu$ ov, had been corrupted.
 rov $\theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$, which at $7-22$ was called vó $\mu o s \theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$. The phrase recurs in 1-32 and Lk 1-6; borrowed from the LXX.
${ }_{\epsilon}^{\prime} v \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{i} \nu=\dot{v} \phi^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$; see note on 1-19. The import is that our tlesh was mortified to the end that we, by thus becoming spiritual, might be enabled to fulfil God's commandments.

тоі̂s $\mu$ ท̀ ката̀ бápка ктл. Who now walk not according to the dictates of the flesh.
5. The theologian now begins to wander from his point. Moreover, in the sentences from here to the end of the chapter I cannot myself perceive a nexus of reasoning working from one proposition towards one conclusion; to me they look like a succession of a theologian's jerky side-thoughts, jotted without any regard for relevancy to the theme of the Epistle.
ővтєs. Living. Cf. v. 12 катà ба́рка $\zeta \hat{\eta} \nu$.
 flesh. A political phrase. Cf. Arist. Pac. 640 ís ф $\rho o v o i ̂ ~ \tau a ̀ ~ B \rho a \sigma i ́ \delta o v, ~$ copiously illustrated by Blaydes.
 the flesh means death, inasmuch as it means antagonism and revolt against God. Cf. Jam.4-4 $\dot{\eta} \phi \iota \lambda i ́ a ~ \tau o v ~ к o ́ \sigma \mu o v ~ \stackrel{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \chi \rho \rho a \tau \hat{\varphi} \theta \in \varphi \hat{\varphi}$.
$\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$. A metabatic conjunction would be more apt, for the verse deals with the respective consequences, but not the cause, of siding with the flesh or the spirit.
 Hofmann (see Meyer).
 7-21) the revolter.
oủסè Yàp Súvatal. Cf. XII Patr. Jud.18, where it is said of vice that
 be a theory, probably held by both Jewish and Christian moralists, that by its own effort vice is naturally incapable of reforming itself.
8. of $\delta \epsilon$. Qu. of oûv.
$\theta \in \hat{̣}$ ảpécal oủ Súvavtal. Cannot so act as to please God.
9. Xpıotov. The reference in the preceding colon and in $v .11$ is not to the spirit of Christ but to that of God; and there is besides a close

 end of v. 10 are an addition by a second theologian.
10. $\epsilon \mathfrak{i}$ 8è Xpıaтòs év úpiv. Missed in FG.
 purpose of (producing) sin. For $\delta \iota \grave{\alpha}=$ for the purpose of see Jannaris § 1534 c .
$\zeta \hat{\eta}$. Most witnesses $\zeta \omega \bar{\eta}$ or $\zeta \hat{\omega} \nu$. The latter reading only in lectionaries, but it is the one which the antithesis demands. Its sense is alive (= active) for the purpose of (producing) righteousness.
11. тои̂ ȩ́eipavtos 'İбô̂v. Of him who raised up Jesus. Cf. Mt 3-9

 the following $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \epsilon i \rho a s$. The same difference between Acts $13-23 \boldsymbol{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \iota \rho \epsilon$
 on $\mathcal{\epsilon} \beta a \pi \tau i \sigma \theta \eta \mu \epsilon \nu$ of $6-3$. The import is: If the spirit of God, who sent his own son in a human form as Jesus to lead you to righteousness, dwells in you, God who raised him from the dead as Christ (see note on єis Xpiorò̀ 'I $\eta \sigma o v ̂ \nu$ of 6-3) shall likewise infuse new life into your dead bodies at the palingenesis as a reward for that righteousness which will have dwelt in you. The import however was not perceived, and thus $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \nu \epsilon \kappa \rho \omega \bar{\nu}$ was added to $\begin{gathered}\epsilon \\ \gamma \epsilon i \rho a v \tau o s . ~\end{gathered}$

Xotoróv. So FG , supported by BE and other authorities; most
 especially the latter, destroy the point. See note on 6-3. Wordsworth 'But if the spirit of him who raised Jesus-the man Jesus-[from the dead] dwelleth in you, then he who raised Christ-the anointed onefrom the dead will quicken your mortal bodies also.' A clear case of superiority on the part of FG.
 $\pi \nu \epsilon$ úpatos, an alteration dictated no doubt by theological considerations. See Tischendorf's extract from Athenagoras. The sense is for the sake of, or as reward for, that spirit which will have dwelt in you.



 to the Gnostic $\tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \hat{\eta} s \sigma \alpha \rho \kappa o ̀ s ~ \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \rho \kappa i ́$. See note on 3-8.

тoû. Read $\tau 0 v \tau \epsilon ́ \sigma \tau \iota$, which could easily be misread for rov̂ owing to $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \boldsymbol{i}$ being often indicated by a slanting line. See note on 7-8. The interpolator explains what he means by баркi. In like manner 7-18


ката̀ бápка. According to the dictates, or lusts, of the flesh.
13. $\mu \in ̇ \lambda \lambda \epsilon \tau \epsilon$. You are destined. Cf. v. 18 and often.
 reading.




 substance, property $=\hat{v} \pi o ́ \sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \iota s, ~ \tau \grave{a} ~ v i \pi a ́ p \chi о \nu \tau a . ' ~$

Tท̂S $\sigma \alpha \rho \kappa o ́ s . ~ S o ~ F G D E ~ a n d ~ o t h e r ~ w i t n e s s e s ~ i n ~ a c c o r d a n c e ~ w i t h ~ к a \tau \grave{\alpha}$
 etc. Most witnesses tov̂ $\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a r o s$.
15. oủ $\gamma^{2} \rho^{*} k \boldsymbol{k} \lambda$. The sense is: Yea, ye are the adopted sons of God and filled with a son's confident spirit-not with the abject spirit of slaves-and ye may boldly address yourselves to God as to a father.
$\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{\mu} \mu \boldsymbol{\delta}$ סou入cias. An expression borrowed from demonological terminology. See Charles, Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, p. 4.



' $\mathrm{A} \beta \beta \hat{\alpha}$ o $\boldsymbol{\pi} \alpha \boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\eta} \rho$. A curious coincidence that both here and in Gal.4-6 it should have been thought necessary to add the interpretation of such a well-understood word as ' $A \beta \beta \hat{\alpha}$; the fact however is that $\nabla v .15-17$ were borrowed from the Galatian passage. Mk 14-36, where the interpretation recurs, is probably a later addition.
 I suggest that $\tau$ ò $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu \alpha$ means the inspired sacred word, ${ }^{1}$ as it does in



краи́үнать. Not in the Dictionaries, but cf. ф'́v $\eta \mu a$, $\lambda \alpha{ }^{\prime} \lambda \eta \mu \alpha$. It would stand for $\kappa \rho \alpha v \gamma \grave{\eta}$, as 9-19 $\beta$ ov́ $\eta \mu \alpha$ for $\beta$ ov $\grave{\eta}$, Acts 25-7 air $\iota \omega \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$
 12-12 $\sigma \tau \rho \epsilon ́ \mu \mu \alpha$ for $\sigma \tau \rho \circ \phi \eta^{\prime}$. Cf. also v. 39 vै $\psi \omega \mu \alpha$ for v̌ vos.
 a vacuum in F . But D reads каi $\sigma v \nu \kappa \lambda \eta \rho o v o ́ \mu о \iota$ instead of каi к $\kappa \eta \rho о-$ vó $\mu \circ \iota$, which points to an old reading єi $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon \in \kappa \nu a$, каі $\sigma v \nu \kappa \lambda \eta \rho о \nu o ́ \mu о \iota$ X рıбтои.
 そó $\mu \epsilon \theta a$. See note on 1-8.
 (see ńote on v.13), shall be revealed when the millennium arrives.
19. $\boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ ктi $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \epsilon \omega \mathrm{s}$. Of the world. The antithesis to $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu v i \omega \hat{\nu} \theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$,



 confident (cf. 4-18) hope.
 the heathen world itself so intensely yearns for the revelation. The

[^19]reason adduced is that the world from the first was unwilling to favour idolatry, but was constrained by Satan who had mastered or beguiled it.
 The special error meant is idolatry. Cf. Lev.17-7 ov̉ $\theta \dot{v} \sigma o v \sigma \iota \nu$ ê $\tau \iota ~ \tau a ̀ s ~$
 è $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \rho \in ́ \phi \epsilon \iota \nu$ èmì $\theta \in o ́ v$.
śmetáyŋ. In a middle sense, submitted.
ou $\theta$ é nouga. Mansel, p. 18 ' Under the Gnostic hypothesis there is no free will in man, and therefore no voluntary transgression.' All other Greek Mss oủx $\mathfrak{e} \kappa \circ \hat{v} \sigma a$, no doubt a theological alteration by a supporter of the free will doctrine.
 belief that idolatry, being an evil, was the work of demons or of Satan was very prevalent with early Christians.


22. бuvoteváhec. Sighs with one accordant sigh. Cf. $\sigma v v a ̨ \delta \epsilon \iota \nu$. See notes on 1-12 and 9-1. Farrar, St Paul, I, p. 67 'The very heathen yearned for some deliverer, and felt that there could be no other end to the physical misery and moral death which had spread itself over their hollow societies.' Renan, Égl. Chrét. p. 159 'Basilides enseignait une sorte de gémissement universel de la nature, un sentiment mélancolique de l'univers.'

 the Greek idiom.
àmapxív. Christians received but an instalment of spiritual life and grace through the incarnation; they would not be completely spiritualized and emancipated until the apocalypse. Therefore they prayed and sighed for that consummation.
 (Mss $\grave{\alpha}^{\alpha} \rho \chi \grave{\eta} \nu$ ) $\delta \iota a \tau a \gamma \hat{\eta} s$.
éxovtes $=\sigma$ до́vтеs. See note on 1-13.
aüroì êv éautoîs. Among ourselves, when we are alone, meeting for prayers. For primitively the uninitiated were excluded from Christian
services. The import of the phrase not having been understood, $\dot{\eta} \mu \in i \bar{s}$ кaì was added by a corrector before the second aviroi, and as a consequence $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon i \hat{s}$ was eliminated from before the first aủroí. But FG are supported by D and partly by several other witnesses.
$\sigma \tau \epsilon v a ́ \zeta \rho \mu \epsilon v$. Fervent praying (cf. v. 26 бтєvaүرois) represented as sighing. No doubt, when references were made to a future life during service, the congregations gave utterance to their anguish by emotional exclamations and sighs, such as are now usual in mosques (Allah! Allah !). Kv́pıє é $\lambda$ é $\eta \sigma o \nu$ was not then a formal response, but a cry from the heart. Cf. Enoch 9-10 ai $\psi v \chi a i ̀ ~ \epsilon ่ \nu \tau v \gamma \chi a ́ v o v \sigma \iota \nu ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \chi \rho \iota ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi v \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \pi \hat{v}$

 $\delta \epsilon \chi^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\sigma}$. Grammatically vio $\theta \epsilon \sigma i \alpha \nu$ is in the air unless we take $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ $\dot{\alpha} \pi{ }^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \lambda^{\prime} \tau \rho \omega \sigma \iota \nu$ as explanatory; but the text would then state that adoption signifies nothing more than redemption, a statement to which no one I presume would subscribe. Judging from v. 25 , I should conclude that in the space occupied now by vio $\theta \epsilon \sigma i a \nu$ there was once $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{v} \pi \pi \rho \mu \nu \hat{\eta}$ or $\delta \iota^{\prime} \dot{v} \pi \sigma \mu о \eta \eta$ s.

тои̂ $\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu$ атоs. Added in order to represent $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ as slaves. See note on 7-14. So also 1Cor.6-20. Cf. Phryn. (Lobeck, p. 378) ' $\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$ '่ $\bar{\pi} i$
 $=$ slaves. Orac. Sil.3-463 $\sigma \omega ́ \mu a \tau \alpha$ סov̂入a. See Sophocles.
24. $\tau \hat{\eta} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ è $\lambda \pi i \delta_{\imath} \kappa \tau \lambda$. An argumentative counsel for patience addressed to such as felt troubled in their minds by the continued postponement of the revelation (cf. 2 Pet. $3-4$ ) and of exemption from death. The argument was probably suggested by the Stoical dictum spes incerti boni nomen est; see Lightfoot, Phil. p. 289.
 salvation or baptism. What we were offered and we accepted at the time of our baptism was to hope.
 wished to convey was and there is no such a thing as a hope of things visible. If so, the original reading may have been ${ }_{\epsilon} \lambda \pi i \stackrel{s}{s} \delta \grave{\epsilon} \beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \sigma \mu \epsilon \in \omega \nu$

$\mathfrak{\eta} \boldsymbol{\beta} \lambda_{\epsilon \pi \pi} \mu \epsilon \in \neq \eta$. All other Mss omit the article, and thus corroborate my surmise as above.
 actually see? B omits $\tau i$. Most other Mss $\tau i ́ \kappa \alpha i \grave{\epsilon} \lambda \pi i \zeta \epsilon i$, which probably is right; see note on 3-7.
26. тò $\pi \nu \in \hat{u} \mu a$. The gospel. See note on v. 16 .
 us, in our prayer.
 cistical reading $\tau \hat{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta_{\epsilon \nu \epsilon i ́ q}^{q}$, or $\tau \alpha \hat{\imath} \mathbf{s} \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu \epsilon i \alpha \iota s, \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, which is that of all other witnesses, represents a marginal explanation as to its being due to our weakness that we need help.

тò-тí. The same as $\tau i$. Cf. Arist. Nub.748. 776. Lkk 1-62. 19-48. HermP.8Sim.1-4, and often.
$\pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon \cup \chi \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \theta a$. FG and one cursive $\pi \rho о \sigma \epsilon v \chi o ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a$. An orthographical error. All other Mss $\pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon v \xi \xi^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \theta a$ or $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \epsilon v \xi \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \theta a$. But an expression of continued or repeated action is preferable.

 to the end of v. 27 , made probably by an adherent to the doctrine of angelolatry and intercessory prayer, who understood the preceding $\tau o ̀ ~ \pi \nu \epsilon \hat{\jmath} \mu \alpha$ as denoting a mediatory spirit or angel. This angel was known among the Elchasaites as $\dot{\delta} \dot{\alpha} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda$ os $\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon \chi \chi \hat{\eta} s$; see Philos. 9-3-15. ${ }^{1}$ As intercession by our Lady and the Saints this doctrine in course of time gained wide popularity both in the Eastern and the Roman Churches. Angelolatry is referred to in Col.2-18, where see Lightfoot.

 (see note on v. 23) or prayers.
27. ó ס̀è épeuvêv tàs карठías ктл. Though in praying the angel utters no sound, God, the searcher of all hearts, knows not only that the angel inwardly prays for a favour such as God would approve of but also that the men interceded for are not unworthy.

 єis $\delta \in ́ \eta \sigma \iota \nu$ av̉ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$.

[^20]28. тávтa. Always, ever, as in MGk; see B $\lambda$ áxos. Cf. 1Cor.11-2.13-7 (opposed to the following ov̊б́єтотє). XII Patr. Iss.3-8. Philos.8-2-12.
 $\sigma \tau \gamma \hat{\omega} \sigma \alpha \nu)$. 5-13-3. HermP. 3 Vis. $6 \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \alpha \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \rho \omega \tau \hat{a} s$ (old Latin version semper). Also änavтa. Cf. Achil. Tat.7-16-4. Also classically, as in Arist. Nub.1381. But the word, owing to its being rather demotic, was often changed into $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau o \tau \epsilon$. So in 2 Cor. $7-14$; HermP. 10 Mand. 3 we find $\pi \alpha \dot{\prime} \nu \tau o \tau \epsilon$ as a variant. In HermP. 1 Vis. 2 the Mss give $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \sigma \tau \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$, but the old Latin version is omnia ridens. In Lucian. 54 and Clem.Hom. 11-13 it became $\tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \alpha{ }^{\prime} \nu \tau \alpha$. In Eph.1-23 the chief Mss likewise read $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \alpha$, but a few minuscules have preserved the correct reading $\pi \alpha{ }^{2} \nu \tau a$.
 and $\mu$ ккро̀v $\chi$ рóvov. Cf. Jn 7-33. 13-33. Also áka $\hat{\eta}$.in Arist. Nub.496.
ouvepyєi. The subject of $\theta$ єòs is expressed in $A B$. The imitator in
 $\pi \alpha ́ v \tau \alpha$ as the subject. The Peshitto omits ó $\theta \epsilon o ̀ s$, but understands it as the sulject; see Field, Otium Norvicense, III, p. 95.

бuvepүєî єis ảyaOóv. For $\sigma v \nu \epsilon \rho \gamma \epsilon i v \tau \iota \nu \iota$ єìs $\tau \iota$ see Liddell and Scott. Cf. also XII Patr. Gad 4 (quoted by SH) $\tau o ̀ ~ \pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a \tau \hat{\eta} s ~ \dot{\alpha} \gamma^{\prime} \pi \eta \rho \sigma v \nu \epsilon \rho \gamma \epsilon \hat{\imath}$

 preferable. The same variation in 13-4.
$\pi \rho o ́ \theta \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu=\pi \rho o o \rho \iota \sigma \mu o ́ v$.
29. o̊t oüs. What suits the context best is a relative clause specifying the $\kappa \lambda \eta \tau o o^{\prime}$. Such a clause is introduced by the connective ö of, which in the Hellenistic period began occasionally to be employed in the place of the pronoun (see note on 4-19). For the nominative cf. Mt







 (referred to at the beginning of the verse as $\tau$ ò $\theta \eta \rho_{i o v}^{\prime}$ ö $\epsilon i \hat{i} \delta \mathrm{~s}$ ). If the
genitive or the dative or an emprotheton is required, the demonstrative pronoun (see Jannaris §1439) is subjoined. Cf. Mk 4-41 tís oûtós éṽıv


 $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \alpha$. 2-8 X



 $\alpha \boldsymbol{u} \tau \hat{\varrho}$; For the accusative with or without the demonstrative pronoun



 comma after $\pi \rho о є ́ \gamma \nu \omega$.
$\pi \rho o \in ́ \gamma \nu \omega$. He knew and owned (as his own or friencls) in the past.



 The preposition = in the past, in a remote past. Cf. 1Pet.1-20 $\pi \rho \sigma_{-}$

$\boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \boldsymbol{s}$ єixóvos. A Docetic repudiation of the notion that man could possibly be $\sigma \dot{u} \mu \mu о \rho \phi$ os of Christ; he is merely $\sigma \dot{v} \mu \mu о \rho \phi o s$ of his earthly image.

єis tò eival кт入. What the interpolator wished to convey evidently

cis tò cival. And so they are. See note on 1-19.

 than FG.
$\pi \alpha ́ v \tau a$. So also D ; most other witnesses $\tau \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha ́ v \tau a$.


34. Xpıoтòs 'I $\eta \sigma o u ̂ s . ~ M o s t ~ w i t n e s s e s ~ o m i t ~ ' I ~ \eta \sigma o v ̂ s . ~$
 which is a better reading. The following кai also is omitted in some witnesses.

35. oûv. Absent in most witnesses.

Xpıбтồ. The context requires $\theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$, and so several witnesses. Cf. v. 39.
otevaxwpía. So only FG. This form survives in MGk as an alternative for $\sigma \tau \epsilon \nu o \chi \omega \rho i ́ a$.
$\lambda \iota \mu o ́ s$. Originally there followed probably $\eta$ ท $\lambda o c \mu o ́ s$. Plague was one of the calamities most dreaded in old times in the Levant-it continued to rage almost endemically until quite recent times-and it is hardly likely that it would have been forgotten in this enumeration of evils, especially as $\lambda_{\iota} \mu o ̀ s$ and $\lambda_{o \iota \mu o ̀ s ~ w e r e ~ s o ~ o f t e n ~ m e n t i o n e d ~ t o g e t h e r . ~ C f . ~}^{\text {en }}$ Mt 24-7. Lk 21-11. XII Patr. Jud.23. Orac. Sib.3-269, 540, etc. Tert. Apol. 26 fames et lues. In Mt 29-7 $\mathfrak{N B D E}$ omit $\hat{\eta} \lambda_{0} \mu o t$, as in this place. 36. öть. Meyer 'A part of the quotation.' See note on $9-28$.
ëvekev бov̂. Added only because it stands in the quotation. See note on 4-7 and 8.
 $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \beta a ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$. See note on 1-11.
 $\pi \dot{\eta} \sigma a \nu \tau o s$. The construction with the accusative was demotic, and therefore tampered with by the literati. So 15-28 FG and Latin versions $\delta i^{\prime}$ $\dot{v} \mu \hat{a}_{S}$; the rest $\delta i \imath^{\prime} \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$. Jannaris § 1534 ' When, with the opening of the transitional period [A.D. 300-600], the construction of all prepositions became uniform by substituting the accusative for the other oblique cases, the various meanings of did. with genitive were naturally transferred to its accusatival construction.' This transference, I have no doubt, dates from much earlier times, for even éк is found construed with the accusative in an inscription dated b.c.162, see Jannaris $\S 1570$, footnote. But neither is the reverse phenomenon unknown, for carried away by their antipathy against demotic-or vulgar, as they imagined-expressions, literati occasionally gave preference to the genitival where grammar called for the accusatival construction. So 12-1


 0 tto refers to 85 b and 93 d ．

38．oüт ${ }^{a} \nu \gamma \epsilon \lambda$ оs $\kappa \tau \lambda$ ．There is considerable divergence of reading， as follows：
 $\delta v \nu \alpha ́ \mu \epsilon \iota s$
 бv́va $\mu \iota s$（ $\mathbb{E} \delta v \nu a ́ \mu \epsilon \iota s$ ）






Notwithstanding so much divergence，the original reading I think can be traced with some degree of probability．For it is certain（1）that
 transferred to some place before ov゙ $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sigma \boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\omega} \boldsymbol{\tau} \alpha$ ；（3）that the passage had been framed upon a plan of syzygies the members of which were antithetical．Cf． 2 Cor．6－8 to 10．（In the parallel 1Cor．3－22 K $\eta \boldsymbol{\phi} \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ as and ко́⿱㇒日⿱㇒日勺心 form a syzygy）．Then，apart from the greater authority of FG ， it is more probable that ${ }_{\alpha} \nu \gamma \bar{\epsilon} \lambda$ os became ${ }^{\prime} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda$ oc than the reverse．Upon these considerations I conjecture that the original reading was ov̋ $\epsilon$





 ［ $\delta \iota \grave{\alpha} \tau o v ̂ ~ o ̉ \nu o ́ \mu \alpha \tau o s ~ \tau o v ̂ ' I \eta \sigma o v ̂] ~ \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \lambda v ́ \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \lambda o v \sigma \iota \nu . ~ E p h .2-2 ~ \tau o ̀ v ~ a ̈ \rho \chi o v \tau \alpha ~$

 referred to as $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ énì $\tau \hat{\eta} s \gamma \hat{\eta} s$ ．The antithesis consists in the former noun denoting a relegated and the latter an inborn faculty．The two nouns are found combined in Lk 4－36．9－1．1Pet．3－22．1Cor．15－24．Eph．1－21． Apoc．17－13．
39. ü $\psi \omega \mu \alpha$. The same as $\begin{array}{r}v \\ \psi\end{array}$ s. See note on v.16. oütє ктíøเs є́тéfa. Nor any other thing created. roû kupíou. So FG; see note on 4-17.

## CHAPTER THE NINTH


 é $\mu$ oì virtually $=1$ swear by Christ's truth, namely, by such absolute truth as one would tell before Christ. 1-12 '̇v єỉ<cкрıvєía rov̂ $\theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$, in such sincerity as one would show before God. In MGk $\mu \grave{\alpha} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta^{\prime} \theta \epsilon \epsilon \alpha$ $\tau o \hat{v} \theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$, by God's truth, is very frequently heard, notably at Corfu.
'i $\eta$ oov. Added also in DE ; absent in most witnesses.
$\sigma u v \mu a \rho т u \rho o u ́ \sigma \eta s$. Joining in testifying. See note on 1-12. 8-22.
 $\pi v \epsilon \hat{v} \mu \alpha$ being the second witness indispensable in Jewish law. Cf. Acts

2. $\lambda u ́ \pi \eta \eta \mu \circ \iota$ ध̈ $\sigma \tau \iota v \mu \epsilon \gamma a ́ \lambda \eta$. Imitated in XII Patr.Jud.23, where 'Iov́סas
 $\mu o v, \delta i \alpha ̀ ~ \tau a ̀ s ~ a ̉ \sigma \epsilon \lambda \gamma \epsilon i ́ a s ~ a ̈ s ~ \pi o c \eta ́ \sigma \epsilon \tau \epsilon$.
 a sense of continuance. I would have wished (now and always). That is how Pbotius (see Bloomfield) interpreted the tense by saying $\epsilon \mathfrak{i} \epsilon \nu-$ $\epsilon \chi \omega \rho \in \iota$. The omission of $\ddot{\alpha} \nu$ is very frequent. Cf. Jn 9-33 $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\imath} \mu \grave{\eta} \hat{\eta} \nu$ oîzos

 $\tau$ às $\gamma \rho a \phi \grave{\alpha} s \dot{\alpha} v \hat{\eta} \gamma \epsilon s$, etc. But often no doubt it was added by Atticists;

 added in some Mss. But such additions were unnecessary even from the point of view of the Atticists. See Blaydes, Arist. Ran. 866.

єival $=\gamma \epsilon \nu_{\epsilon ́ \sigma \theta a l . ~ S e e ~ n o t e ~ o n ~ 3-4 . ~}^{\text {. }}$
 $\mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \circ \hat{\text {. }}$
$\sigma u v \gamma^{\epsilon v} \boldsymbol{\omega} v$. So also D; most witnesses add $\mu \mathrm{D}$.
$\tau \omega ิ \nu$ кaтà $\sigma \alpha \alpha^{\rho} \kappa \alpha$. So also DE and several cursives; most Mss only кат̀̀ $\sigma$ áрка.
4. $̂ ้ \nu$ vio $\theta \in \sigma i \alpha-\epsilon \mathfrak{e} \pi \alpha \gamma \gamma \in \lambda i ́ a$. Absent in A; the copyist could not brook so much praise bestowed upon the Jews.

ท̣ Sója. The son's glory or honour, that high standing and con-
 $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha ̀ ~ \pi \alpha \pi \rho o ́ s$.
$\dot{\eta} \delta \iota \alpha \theta \dot{\eta} \kappa \eta$. For the variant ai $\delta \iota a \theta \hat{\eta} \kappa \alpha \iota$ see note on 13-13.
5. $\pi a \tau \epsilon \rho \epsilon s$. The article again missed in FG.
 from whom even Christ himself, is the most attractive, denoting Christ's Jewish descent as the crowning glory of the Jewish nation.

катд̀ $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \rho к \alpha$. All other Mss $\tau \grave{̀}$ катà $\sigma \alpha ́ \rho к а$. 'The article probably added with the intention of emphasizing that the sole relation of Cbrist with the Jews was his birth. It is recorded also in Patristic literature.
6. oiov. Very rare for oióv $\tau \in$, as Sanday and Headlam remark. Cf. Clem. Hom.11-5 oióv є́ $\sigma \tau \iota \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$. Philos.5-1-7 (Cruice, p.145) ov̉dèv oîóv

 at investing it with some other rational sense are hopeless. Read o $\lambda a o ̀ s, ~ t o ~ w h i c h ~ \tau \grave{\nu} \nu \kappa \lambda \eta \rho o v o \mu i ́ a \nu(a ~ v a r i a n t ~ \tau o ̀ v ~ \lambda a o ̀ v) ~ o f ~ 11-1 ~ a n d ~ \tau o ̀ v ~, ~$ $\lambda a o ̀ v$ of 11-2 hark back. The author laments the fact that there is no salvation possible for the Jews, God's chosen people, for they have fallen away from grace. Similarly in 7-7 dó

 corrected by Grabius (see Stieren's Iren. I, p. 912). Also in Barn.14-4 for єis $\lambda \alpha o ̀ v ~ к \lambda \eta \rho o v o \mu i ́ a s ~ r e a d ~ \epsilon i s ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o v ~ к \lambda \eta \rho о \nu о \mu i ́ a s ; ~ c f . ~ § ~ 5 ~ \delta \iota a \theta \eta ́ к \eta s$

'Iopaŋ入itcal. A better reading than ' $I \sigma \rho \alpha \grave{\eta} \lambda$, which is that of most other witnesses.
 was not both his sons, but solely Isaac who became his effective heir, so at the present time-the author explains in ch. 11-it is not all the Jews, but only a fragment, a катá $\epsilon \epsilon \mu \mu \alpha$, namely, the believers in Christ, who have obtained grace.

The extract from the LXX quoted in its own form, but the meaning
 See note on 3-4.
8. Here begins another long and irrelevant theological disquisition, extending down to the end of ch.10. It consists of three parts. (1) The author had lamented the fact that not all the Jews fulfilled such conditions as would entitle them to membership of the chosen nation; but the theologian, misconceiving the point, proceeds now to comment upon ov̉ $\pi a ́ \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma \tau \epsilon \in \kappa \nu a$ and to specify in vv. 8 to 13 those descendants of Abraham in favour of whom, according to the narrative in the V.T., God's promises were declared. (2) Having explained God's preference, he asks whether, as was urged by the Gnostics, we must conclude that God is unjust, a question which is the same practically as the one asked in $3-5$; and he refutes this contention by the argu-ment-to which the Apologists were in the habit of resorting-of God's irresponsibility. Incidentally he also touches upon the theory of the $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \lambda_{\epsilon} \ell \mu \mu \alpha$, the proper place of which is in ch.11. (3) Lastly, in ch. 10 he strays off to the relative merits of Law and Faith, a question already settled in ch. 4.
$\theta \in o \hat{0}$ Most authorities rov̂ $\theta \in o \hat{v}$.

 oviros. It is in these words in which Sarah alone is named that the promise was specified. The syntax is the same as $2-28 \delta \dot{\delta} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \nu \widehat{\varphi} \phi \alpha \nu \in \rho \hat{\varphi}$

 $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon і о \nu$.

ÉGTal $\operatorname{tin}$ इáppac uiós. This is the only relevant part of the quotation. See note on 4-7 and 8.
 to évós. It was a literary trick to lay stress upon the fact that from one man a whole nation or all the nations were procreated. Cf. Acts






 $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon ́ \rho \alpha \nu$. For the sake of the literary trick our passage was so constructed that it conveys the impression as if the writer wished to emphasize the fact that Rebecca did not procreate from two, but from one husband.

 $\tau \hat{n} \gamma \alpha \sigma \tau \rho i ́ \sigma o v$ etc.
 Cf. XII Patr. Iss. 2 vioùs єíX $\epsilon \tau \epsilon \epsilon i ̂ v . ~ J u s t .310 \mathrm{c} \tau i ́ \kappa \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$ है $\mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon$.
 quoted in the preceding paragraph from the XII Patriarchs there is a variant ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon$ for $\epsilon_{i}^{i} \chi \epsilon$. This idiom servilely imitated in PseudoMt 12-4 cognoscere habeo.
toû $\pi \alpha \tau \rho o ̀ s ~ \tilde{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$. Has the parallel case of Ephraim and Manasseh been forgotten? It is hardly credible. As a matter of fact, Barnabas, who was apparently inspired by our passage, ${ }^{1}$ found it in his text. See his ch.13. The unconcluded construction after $\pi a \tau \rho o ̀ s ~ \tilde{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ indicates a lacuna, and the missing part I suspect told the end of Rebecca's story and the beginning of that of Joseph's sons, vv. 12 and 13 completing the latter story. If a lacuna has really occurred, the following words must have been taken as applying to Rebecca and modified accordingly. The modifications would be $\gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \eta \theta \epsilon \in \tau \tau \nu$ for $\gamma \nu \omega \nu \tau \omega \nu$ and $\alpha v ̉ \tau \hat{\eta}$ for $\alpha u ̛ \tau \hat{\varphi}$.
 $\pi \alpha \iota \delta i o v ~ a ̉ \gamma a \theta \grave{v}$ グ како́v.
$\hat{\eta} \pi \rho \alpha \xi_{\alpha} v \tau \omega \nu$. A variant $\mu \eta \delta \grave{\epsilon} \pi \rho \alpha \xi_{\alpha}^{\prime} \nu \tau \omega \nu$, an absurd reading.
какóv. NAB фav̂дov, a substitution by a literatus. The same variation in 2Cor.5-10.
$\mu \epsilon i v \eta$. Most witnesses $\mu \epsilon v_{\eta} \eta$. No sense. The context requires $\phi a \nu \hat{\eta}$, and this is what St Chrysostom (quoted by Sanday and Headlam, p. 245)

[^21]seems to have had before him, for he says iva $\phi a \nu \hat{\eta} \phi \eta \sigma i ̀ \tau o \hat{\imath} \theta \epsilon o \hat{v} \dot{\eta}$
 $\theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$. Clem. Hom.8-9 öт
12. aủtn̂. I suspect aủtê. See note on v. 10.
 younger, the elder. Also classically ; cf. Soph. OK. $374 \chi \rho o ́ v \underset{\sim}{\mu \epsilon} \dot{\prime} \omega v$.
 only to Rebecea, but my conjecture makes them likewise an answer to Joseph, as does Barnabas in ch. 13.
13. Should my conjecture be right, this verse is a later addition.
14. тí oûv ̇̇poû $\mu \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\kappa \tau} \lambda$. See note on v. 8.
$\theta \epsilon \hat{\omega}$. All other Mss, except $\mathrm{D}, \tau \hat{\omega} \theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi}$.
15. т $\hat{\imath}$ M $\omega u \sigma \epsilon \hat{\imath} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ кт $\lambda$. From what he said to Moses and Pharaoh respectively we find that God favours or places at a disadvantage whomsoever he pleases; God has thus declared by both these opposite examples that he means to act according to his pleasure. That is his law, and it is not for us to question it. It is the theory of $\epsilon \in \delta o \xi \in v a v \tau \hat{\epsilon}$,

 тò $\zeta_{\eta \tau \sigma v} \mu \in \nu \% \nu$. Which is a perverse development of the admirable Stoic doctrine that the Gods, leeing perfectly benevolent and just, have done what is best, and we must feel assured that it was unnecessary for anything to be differently ordered from what it now is. Cf. Marc. Aur.12-5



${ }^{e} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon^{\prime} \sigma \omega$. I shall favour. In the Oriental fancy a favour is an act of mercy, a merban as they say in India. So was the word understood by the copyist of L, who substituted $\epsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\delta} \delta o \kappa o \hat{v} \nu \tau o s$ for $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \omega \bar{\omega} \nu \tau o s$ in $v .16$.
 Lord. 2 Cor.4-1, etc.
16. äpa oûv oủ тoû $\theta$ é $\lambda$ ovtos кт $\lambda$. Not only does this verse destroy the antithetical point explained in my note on v. 15, but the genitives also of the sentence are in the air. It is plainly a comment upon a preceding statement in which a genitive occurred, and that genitive can be no other than кadov̂vos of v.11. The commentator apparently
wished to lay stress upon the point that God's preference is determined by no man's desires but by his own favour.
$\theta$ é $\lambda$ ovtos. A reference probably to Joseph, whose desire was that Jacob should bless his firstborn, as narrated in Gen. 48.
 as a reference to Manasseh, who as the firstborn could claim precedence over Ephraim.

то̂̂ $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \omega \hat{\omega} \tau \tau \mathrm{s}$. See note on $\tau \hat{\varrho} \mathrm{M} M \omega v \sigma \epsilon \hat{\imath} \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ of v. 15.
è $\lambda \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu \tau o s$. A frequent demotic form in Hellenistic literature. Most Mss classically $\hat{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon o \hat{v} v \tau o s$.
 $\tau \hat{\varrho} \mathrm{M} \omega v \sigma \epsilon \hat{\imath} \gamma \dot{\mathrm{a}} \rho \lambda \epsilon \epsilon^{\gamma} \epsilon \iota$ is totally obliterated. The original form must

 people and give me cause to punish thee. In the LXX the corresponding word is $\delta \iota \epsilon \tau \eta \rho \eta^{\prime} \theta \eta s$, a corruption probably of $\left.\delta \iota \eta \gamma \epsilon \epsilon \rho \theta\right\rangle$ in the sense of thou wert aroused to anger. Cf. 2Macc.7-21 ròv $\theta \hat{\eta} \lambda v v^{\prime}$

 then I will show thee my power, and then by stern punishment thou shalt feel my power.

év $\sigma o i=\sigma o i ́$. See note on 1-19.
каi $\bar{\circ} \pi \omega \boldsymbol{\kappa} \kappa \boldsymbol{\pi} \lambda$. Added because it exists in the quotation. See note on 4-7 and 8.
${ }_{0} \pi \pi \omega \mathrm{~s}$ äv. All other Mss ö $\pi \omega \mathrm{s}$. Either is equally good. The same variation in Mt 6-5. Lk 2-35. Acts 15-17, etc.
19. Tí oûv. So also BDE; oûv omitted apparently in all other Mss, probably on grounds of elegance.

Є̈тт. Any more. Cf. 3-7. 6-2, etc.
$\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\varphi} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\tau} \alpha$. The argument that man is not to blame for wrongdoing and ought not to be punished, since it is by God's will and instigation that he sins, was apparently a favourite one with the Gnostics, for it is handled and refuted in Clem. Hom.12-31. Its form there is oi
 $\mu \epsilon ́ \nu \phi \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ instead of $\mu \epsilon ́ \mu \phi \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ see note on 3-13.
20. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ä $\nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \epsilon$. See note on 2-1.

All Mss-with the exception of FGD, one cursive, and the Latin and Aethiopic versions-after ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \epsilon$ add $\mu \epsilon \nu \circ \hat{\nu} \nu \gamma \epsilon$, which as the reverse of ov̉ $\mu \in \nu \gamma \hat{v} \nu$ was frequently employed in post-classical times at the head of affirmative sentences in spite of scholastic fulminations.

 so employed with interrogative sentences. Probably $\mu \alpha \iota v o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon$. It was not unusual to accompany one's answer to an unreasonable or mad remark with an opprobrious epithet of this kind. Cf. Arr. Epict.1-1 2-11



 Similarly $\mu$ aìv. Cf. Acts 12-15. 26-24. Also Just. 258 a $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \phi \rho o v \in i ̂ s$ $\tau \alpha \hat{\tau} \tau \alpha \lambda^{\prime} \gamma \omega \nu$. "Aкovбov, 今̉ où ơos, ov̉ $\mu \epsilon ́ \mu \eta \nu \alpha$.
 body or too insignificant a person. Cf. 14-4. Jam.4-12. Exod.16-7.
 $\kappa v \rho i ́ o v . ~ I s a i a h ' s ~ w o r d s ~ \tau i ́ s ~ o ́ ~ a ̉ \nu \tau a \pi о к \rho i v o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o ́ s ~ \mu o \iota ; ~ a ̉ \nu \tau \iota \sigma \tau \eta ं \tau \omega ~ \mu o \iota ~ \eta ̈ ~ \tau i ́ s ~$


 how wide the difference between the humane philosopher's appeal to piety and reason and the petulant rebukes of the fanatical sectarians !

є̇поínoas. DE and the Peshitto ${ }^{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \alpha a \sigma a s$.
21. кєрацєùs тои̂ $\pi \eta \lambda о$ ô. Otherwise $\pi \eta \lambda o v \rho \gamma o ́ s$.

єis àtıцiav. For a vile use, in accordance with Wisd.15-7 $\tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \epsilon \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$

 $\pi \rho \epsilon \pi \epsilon \in \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \nu$. In this sense also Just.57d $\dot{\alpha} \tau i ́ \mu \omega \nu \tau \kappa \epsilon \nu \omega ิ \nu$.
 $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \pi i ̀$ (see note on $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \grave{\imath} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \cup{ }^{\eta} \eta$ in v. 23) is right, the apodosis begins at $\kappa \alpha i$

 clearer if $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ had been added before каı́; but cf. Jn 10-38 кӓ $\nu \dot{\epsilon} \mu о \grave{\imath}$
 his design ultimately to show his power God created vessels of wrath, but on the other hand it is equally true that in order to show how more abundant lis kindness is he made vessels of favour.

テ̀̀ $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ ỏpyŋ̀v. It is a strange notion that God should have created with the intention of showing his wrath upon his creatures. Read $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \tau \dot{\eta} \nu$. That is the word which Origen found, for his Frag. 3 states
 $\delta_{\epsilon \iota} \chi \theta \hat{\eta}$.

тìv ápєтŋ̀v—тò Suvaróv. God's kindness was shown by what he said to Moses, and his power by what he said to Pharaoh.


 The meaning seems to be brought forth out of his store, as it were, or workshop.
 dition, still it was an act of tolerance and generosity on the part of the Creator to create them at all.
cis $\sigma \kappa \epsilon \dot{\eta} \eta$. All other Mss $\sigma \kappa \epsilon u ́ \eta$. The addition of the preposition due probably to a reminiscence of $\mu \alpha \kappa \rho o \theta v \mu \epsilon i v \epsilon$ є's $\tau \iota .{ }^{1}$
 in all other Mss. See Lightfoot, Col.1-27.

סó乡 $\eta$ s. Read $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha \iota \sigma v v^{\prime} \eta$ s. See note on $3-7$ and 23 . The reading $\chi \rho \eta-$ бто́т $\eta \tau o s$ of P no doubt is a glossa on $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha \iota \sigma \sigma v_{v \eta s . ~}^{\text {. }}$
ėmì $\sigma \kappa \epsilon u ̛ \eta$. Agreeably to the context read é $\pi$ oín $\boldsymbol{\eta} \epsilon \nu \sigma \kappa \epsilon v^{\eta} \eta$, without which alteration the construction besides is hopeless.
 or ${ }^{\text {é }} \rho \rho \in \epsilon^{\prime} \theta \eta$ [av̉rois] in accordance with the LXX.
27. 'Hoaías $\delta \underset{\text { к }}{\text { крábєı. But Isaiah on the other hand declares, }}$
$\dot{\epsilon} \dot{a} \nu \hat{\eta} \hat{\eta} \kappa \boldsymbol{\lambda}$. The words quoted as they stand in Isaiah, but by viôv

[^22]the wicked or infidel sons of Israel are meant and by $\tau \grave{o} \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota \mu \mu$ a remnant is meant. See note on 3-4.

28. $\lambda$ óyov үà $\rho$ кт入. Out of this long quotation the only essential
 fulfil his word. The theologian means to say that God's promise to Israel will be kept, for, as is said in 11-29, $\dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \eta \tau \alpha ~ \tau \grave{\alpha} ~ \chi ~ र ् \rho i ́ \sigma \mu a \tau \alpha ~$ $\kappa \alpha i ̀ \dot{\eta} \kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \iota s ~ \tau o v ̂ \theta \in o v ̂$, but the salvation promised shall only come to a remnant, namely, to those Jews who may adhere to Christianity.
$\gamma \alpha \dot{\rho}$. This causal introduces the explanatory words, but the following ${ }^{\circ}{ }^{\circ} \tau \iota$ is only mentioned because it forms part of the quotation. See note on 8-36. 14-11.
29. $\epsilon i \mu \eta ̀ \kappa \tau \lambda$. To suit the context these words should have taken

 on 3-4.
$\omega$. Absent in all other Mss. Its meaning is not apparent.

 ठєкацобv́v $\eta$ s for $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha \iota \sigma \sigma$ v́v $\eta \nu$.
31. vó $\mu$ ov סıкaıooúvŋs. I do not understand this phrase. Nor is it true that the Jews were pursuing a law, or the Law, of justification; what they pursued was justification by conforming to the Law. The anti-





 $\pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega \mathrm{~s}$ (a parallel to this passage). Cf. also 1Tim.6-11 $\delta \dot{\omega} \omega \epsilon \epsilon \delta \kappa \alpha \iota o-$ $\sigma$ б́v $\eta \nu$. 2-22.
cis vópov [8ıkacooúvis]. So F, but G with NABDE and other authori-
 has crept in I have no doubt. Probably the correct reading is cis ódòv


 $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho i \alpha s . \mathrm{Mt} 22-16$ т $\grave{\nu} \nu$ ódò̀ $\tau 0 \hat{v} \theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$.
 The same variation in 1'Thes.2-16.
32. $\omega$ s. Practically the same as $\delta \hat{\eta} \theta \epsilon \nu$, soi-disant, as though. So also


 before $\begin{gathered}\boldsymbol{\tau} \\ \pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \cup ́ \omega \nu \\ \text {. }\end{gathered}$
$\pi \rho о \sigma$ є́кофа⿱ instearl of $\pi \rho о \sigma$ є́ко廿аข only FG. Not an impossible reading as an alternative form of $\pi \rho о \sigma \kappa$ є́кофа (see Jannaris § 736), the suffix $-\alpha \nu$ representing an assimilation to the aorist.
33. ídoù $k \tau \lambda$. Nothing more is intended by this extract than to quote the passage where the phrase $\lambda i$ íos $\pi \rho о \sigma \kappa o ́ \mu \mu a \tau o s ~ o c c u r s, ~ a n d ~ t h e ~ s a m e ~$ is the case in 1Pet.2-7. See note on 4-7 and 8.

## CHAP'IER THE TENTH

Regarding the point as to justification by faith see note on 9-8.
 є̇ $\sigma \tau i v$.
2. oủ кar émíyroow. Not intelligently. The usual disparaging sneer of the Apologists at their adversaries, whether Jews or others. Cf.


 quid in sanctis scripturis offenderunt [philosophi] digestis, neque satis credentes divina esse neque satis intellegentes, ut adhuc tunc subnubila, etiam ipsis Judaeis adumbrata. The sneer was started by the Gnostics who imputed to the ordinary Jews and Christians want of intelligence in their reading of the Scriptures.
3. i¿íav סıкаıocúvŋ̀. ABDEP and some other witnesses omit סıкаıo$\sigma v ́ v \eta \nu$, no doubt on grounds of elegance. TF $\delta<\kappa a \iota o \sigma v ́ v \eta \nu$.
$\sigma \pi \hat{\eta} \sigma a$. . This word, in conjunction with the context, shows that $\delta \iota-$ кalocúvŋv and $\delta \iota \alpha a \iota o \sigma v v^{\prime} \eta$ in this verse signify law or ordinances. The theologian would have made his meaning clearer had he said $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha \epsilon^{\prime} \omega \mu \alpha$ or $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha \iota \dot{\prime} \mu a \tau \alpha$. See note on v. 5.
4. rểos $\gamma$ d̀ $\rho$ vópou Xpıatós. For Christ is, or means, the end of the Mosaic Law.

єis $\delta \iota \kappa a \iota o \sigma u ́ v \eta \nu=\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \delta \iota к a \iota o \sigma v ́ v \eta \nu, ~ f o r ~ t h e ~ p u r p o s e ~ o f ~ j u s t i f i c a t i o n . ~ . ~$
5. रáp. Asseveratively. I grant, it is true, that. See note on 1-18.

 which our passage alludes.

т $\grave{v} \nu$ éx toû vópou. Which is of the side, or party, of the Law. See note on 3-26.
éx. So only F. The earliest instance, so far as I know, of this form, which, always accompanied with the article, has partially survived in MGk as óX. See Jannaris § 1571.
aủtá. As if $\delta \iota \kappa a \iota \omega \mu \mu \tau \alpha$ had preceded instead of $\delta \iota \kappa a \iota \sigma \sigma v ́ v \eta \nu$.
 cordance with the LXX. The Peshitto however supports FG.
ėv aủvoîs. NAB and a few other authorities $\grave{\epsilon} v$ aủr $\hat{n}$, due to a misconception as to the force of $\delta<\kappa \alpha \iota \sigma \sigma v^{v} \eta \nu$. As a consequence $\aleph \mathrm{NDE}$ and other authorities omit av̉rá. But our quotation is from Lev.18-5, recurring in Nehem.9-29; Ezek.20-11. 13. 21 ; Just. 238 b , and in all these passages $\alpha \dot{v} \tau \grave{\alpha}$ is retained.
 from the side, or party, of faith. To what Moses enjoins in Lev.18-5 our theologian opposes the passage from Deut.30-12 as a tenet from the school of faith, and in so doing he assumes presumably that Deuteronomy, being a code by a second Lawgiver, superseded Leviticus. It is all of a piece with the outrageous A pological methods of handling

 $\delta \epsilon \dot{\tau} \tau \rho \rho \sigma \sigma \tau \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \eta$.
 plied X $\rho \iota \sigma \tau \grave{\partial} v$ к $\kappa \tau \alpha \gamma \alpha \gamma \epsilon \hat{\iota} \nu$ is a very wild assumption.

X $\rho \iota \sigma \tau o ́ v$. Namely, $\sigma \omega \tau \hat{\eta} \rho \alpha$. Cf. v. $9 \sigma \omega \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \eta \eta$. The drift is : Travel not far and wide in quest of a saviour; if only thou believe in Christ and declare thy belief, thou shalt be saved.

The Gnostics, probably the Valentinians, were the first to use $\mathrm{X} \rho \boldsymbol{\mathrm { C }}$, $\overline{\text { òs }}$


3-14-1 Salvatorem quem et Christum dici. But there are traces of a like usage in our canonical writings. Cf. Lk 2-11 $\sigma \omega \tau \grave{\eta} \rho$ ös ${ }^{\text {ć }} \sigma \tau \iota \nu$



 St Paul, I, p. 300, footnote) $\delta$ кv́pos. This synonymity was no doubt the result of confusion on the part of men unacquainted with Hebrew, who imagined that it was with M $\operatorname{m} \sigma \sigma$ ias that the word $\sigma \omega \tau \grave{\eta} \rho$ (or rather $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho i a)$ was related and not with 'I $\eta \sigma o v s$ s.
7. ėk veкрติv. An allusion to the descensus ad inferos; or more probably an interpolation.
8. $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ tí [ $\dot{\eta} \gamma \rho a \phi \eta ̀] \lambda \in ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota$; The adversative particle because an antecedent clause, such as $\dot{\eta} \delta_{\iota \kappa \alpha \iota o \sigma v ́ v \eta ~ o v ̉ ~}^{\lambda \epsilon \epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \iota \dot{\omega} \delta \delta \hat{\imath} \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \beta \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota$, is implied. The drift is: The faith-ordinance says that thou needst not travel so far as heaven or the abyss in quest of a saviour. But where must I then look for salvation? If thou confess Jesus and believe in his resurrection, thou shalt be saved. For what does the faith-ordinance further say? It says etc. The point however is spoilt by the addition of $\dot{\eta} \gamma \rho \alpha \phi \grave{\eta}$-absent in most witnesses-for it makes the text read as if $\dot{\eta} \delta \iota \kappa a \iota o \sigma v ́ v \eta$ were refuted by $\dot{\eta} \gamma \rho a \phi \dot{\eta}$.

 argues that, inasmuch as $\tau \grave{\rho} \hat{\rho} \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha$ is enjoined in Deuteronomy, the $\dot{\rho} \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha$ of faith, namely the gospel, which Christians preach was likewise enjoined by divine authority and must be the means which confers salvation. Similarly 1Pet.1-25. The argument is of that lind which Epictetus termed ó $\mu \in \tau a \pi i \pi \tau \omega \nu$ dózos. See Arr.1-6. A like $\lambda o ́ \gamma o s$ in 7-4, where see note.


10. кapdía $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ ктл. The import seems to be that a man may believe and thus become a $\delta i \kappa \alpha o s$ or Christian, but it is only when courageously he declares his faith that he finally secures salvation; virtually, an encouragement of martyrdom. If so, this verse is unconnected with the theme pursued so far in this chapter, which has been that
a Jew cannot expect justification without adherence to the new faith. Either the theologian became diffuse or-as is more likely-from this point the chapter was amplified by successive irrelevant accretions.
11. $\pi \hat{\alpha} \hat{s}$ кт $\lambda$. This quotation does not include a confirmation, as we should have expected, of the chicf point of the preceding verse, namely, the need of an outspoken profession.
12. The quotation in $v .11$ was brought in as a proof that faith leads to justification, the essential word therein being $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon v(\omega \nu$. But the exposition in this verse only affirms the fact that every believer without distinction will be saved; in other words, it is a comment upon $\pi \hat{a} s$ as though this were the essential word in the quotation.

14 and 15. An extract probably from another work now lost, in which certain claims to apostleship were championed against a hostile denial. Such controversies unfortunately were rampant among early


 $\alpha \pi o ́ \sigma \tau o \lambda o t$ (intentionally corrupting $\psi \epsilon v \delta о \pi \rho \circ \phi \hat{\eta} \tau \alpha \iota$ of Mt 24-24).

 the extract was incorporated at this place it would be impossible now to specify; if I might venture a guess, I should suggest that it
 quotation appearing also here led the amanuensis to note in the margin what he recollected from the other work. The import is: How then can men call on him unless they believed? Therefore they must have believed. And how can they believe who (oil) were not instructed? Instruction therefore must have preceded. But how is instruction possible without an instructor and preacher? It is then clear that preachers there have been; and if preachers, then equally so Apos* tles, these being the men in respect of whom it is written: How beautiful are the feet of them that preach peace. The argument as to there having existed Apostles and Prophets starts from the point of there having preceded believers. So $2 \mathrm{Cor} .4-13 \pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon v ́ o \mu \epsilon \nu$, סıò каì $\lambda a \lambda o \hat{v} \mu \epsilon \nu$.
 in v. 15. All other Mss $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon v ́ \sigma o v \sigma \iota \nu$ or $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon$ v́ $\sigma \omega \sigma \iota \nu$.
oũ．Read oi＇．＇The traditional reading leads to an impossible con－
 $\sigma \dot{\tau} \alpha \lambda \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu$ must likewise refer to Christ，and so Christ becomes an Apostle．
ö oủk ท̋коuбav．Who were not instructed．See note on $\dot{\alpha} \kappa о \hat{\eta} s$ in v．17．
àkoúvortal．A middle future with an active meaning ；see Jannaris


 cel ${ }^{\prime \prime} o \sigma \alpha \nu$ and see Jannaris $\$ 791$ ），the rather that in v． 14 the original reading possibly was érıcrєv́rooav．If so，then the whole passage




ஸs $\dot{\omega}$ рaio $\kappa \boldsymbol{\kappa} \lambda$ ．The quotation cited to show that there have been Apostles，such naturally as the interpolator had in view；its essential word is $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \epsilon \dot{J} a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \iota \zeta_{0} \mu \epsilon \in \nu \omega \nu$ ．See note on 4－7 and 8.
 LXXX，which in NABC and other authorities has usurped the place of the original reading．

 genitive displacing the dative，a usage which became so prevalent in recent times．See Jannaris § 1350．All other Mss $\tau \hat{\varrho} \epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \mathbf{v} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda i \not \omega$ ．
＇Hoatas ү⿳亠口冋阝 ктл．For Isaiah had already predicted that there would be non－believers in the gospel．The extract quoted as it stands in the LXX，but the meaning implied is：Ka0̀ss $\gamma$ à $\rho$＇H $\sigma a i t a s ~ \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota, ~ o v ̉ \pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon$＇v－


17．äpa oûv．So also two minuscules．A frequent combination．All other Mss omit oûv．In 15－28 FG wrongly ov̉v aैpa for oûv．

17 to 21．à $\rho a$ oûv $\mathfrak{\eta} \pi i \neq \tau เ ร$ кт入．A side－thought suggested by $\epsilon \pi i-$ $\sigma \tau \epsilon \cup \sigma \epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\eta}$ ảкô̂ but detached from its purport．
 $=$ disciples or pupils in 2－13．Philos．6－5－42，etc．See Sophocles vv．

[^23]äкоиб $\mu$（ $=$ a lesson，discourse），áкоvбт̀̀s，ảкро́aбıs．Similarly in Mt 5－21
 Thomas Robinson，The Evangelists and the Mishna，p． 27 ＇The ex pres－ sion to hear was used by the Jews as equivalent to receiving as a tradition．＇In Greek however áкоv́ш as a synonym of $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \rho о \omega \mu \mu \iota ~ c o u l d ~$ simply be an equivalent of receiving instruction without necessarily a reference to tradition．Cf．Jn 6－45 $\dot{\alpha} \kappa о v ́ \omega \nu ~ \pi \alpha \rho a ̀ ~ \tau o v ̂ ~ \pi \alpha \tau \rho o ̀ s ~ \kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ \mu a \theta \omega ́ \nu \nu . ~$

After $\rho \dot{\eta} \mu a \tau o s$ all other Mss add $\chi \rho \epsilon \sigma \tau o \hat{v}$ or $\theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$ ．
18．à $\lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega$ ．But I am saying to myself．Hesitatingly．So also v． 19. 11－1．11－11．

After $\eta^{\prime \prime} \kappa о v \sigma \alpha \nu$ all Mss（not dfg）add $\mu \epsilon \nu o v \hat{\nu} \gamma \epsilon$ ，which is absent both here and in FG at 9－20．Perhaps in the space now occupied by $\mu \in \nu o v ̂ v$




єis mâбav кт入．This excerpt from Ps．19－5 quoted because it gives an idea－in an exaggerated form of course－of what happened with the gospel ；namely，that its message was carried to all parts where Jews dwelt．＇Ihe words av̇ $\hat{\omega} \nu-\alpha v \boldsymbol{v} \boldsymbol{\omega} \nu$ have no real significance；they were quoted as forming part of the excerpt．See note on 4－7 and 8.
 it was meant as an indication that，as God foretold Moses，the Jews would eventually be found to be a spiteful and $\dot{\alpha} \sigma v^{v} \ell \epsilon \tau o v ~ n a t i o n, ~ u n-~$ willing to obey his commands（the gospel）even when they came to know them．

тара弓ๆ入ш́бш．In the sense of making spiteful．
 nation of mine，that I may disown you as my nation．

20．$\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota$ ．So also DE ；all other Mss üпотод $\mu \underset{\imath}{\hat{a}}$ каì $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota$ ．The latter reading represents the interpolator as if he disapproved of Isaiah＇s saying and thought it too bold and defiant；cf．Orig．Cels．1－12 ${ }^{3} \lambda a \zeta o-$ $\nu \iota \kappa \dot{\sigma} \tau \alpha \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi о \tau \epsilon \tau о \lambda \mu \eta \mu \epsilon ́ v o \nu$ ．This is against the context．Perhaps then ब́ $\pi \lambda \frac{\prime}{\tau} \alpha \tau \alpha$（for this comparatival form see Liddell and Scott）$\lambda_{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \epsilon \iota$ ．Cf．

 be：By his prophecy Isaiah quite plainly indicated on the one hand
that God's word would be revealed to the heathen and on the other that the Jews would turn recalcitrant and disobedient to his word.
èv roîs $=\dot{v} \pi \grave{o}^{2} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$. See note on 1-19. All other Mss, except BD, omit $\epsilon \cdot v$.

 $\beta o \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu$, etc.


## CHAPTER THE ELEVENTH

1. $\lambda \epsilon$ ' $\gamma \omega$. Hesitatingly. See note on 10-18.
 of 9-6.' The course of the argument is: Have then Isaac's descendants been cast away? Not so. God has not wilfully disinberited Israel ; it is by their own recalcitrancy that they forfeited their privilege. To conclude otherwise were a blasphemy impugning God's faith, who said $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \quad$ 'I $\sigma \alpha \grave{\alpha} \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \theta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha i ́$ a Christian disproves such an impious assumption. Euthymius 'Ei
 'Eßpaîos каì aủròs ${ }^{\text {© }} \nu$.'

 suiting best the context. All other Mss ròv $\lambda$ aòv, a correction followed in AD and 76 by $\partial \nu \nu \rho \circ \epsilon ์ \gamma \omega$.
2. $\pi \rho \circ \notin \neq \gamma \omega$. Acknowledged as his own in times past. Cf. 1Pet.1-2 $\kappa \alpha \tau a ̀ ~ \pi \rho o ́ \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \iota \nu ~ \theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$.
 Cf. Acts 25-24. Enoch 7-6, etc.
'lopaŋ́入. NL and most witnesses add $\lambda \epsilon{ }^{\prime} \gamma \omega \nu$, which is probably right.
3. $\tau \hat{̣}$ Báa入. All other witnesses $\tau \hat{\eta}$ Báa $\lambda$. See Sanday and Headlam's note.
 or selection of yrace, as if there existed several manifestations of grace. The version according to the election (the article presumably intruded in order to signify that the election $=$ the elected) of grace is
unwarranted. For $\chi$ ápıros read $\chi$ ápıtı, which is picked up in the next verse. Translate a remnant according to selection made by grace.
4. єi $\delta \dot{\text { è }} \chi^{\alpha} \rho \iota \tau \iota \kappa \tau \lambda$. A marginal comment. The commentator, availing himself of the opening offered in the antecedent verse, shoots his own malevolent shaft at the Jews by trying to disprove the virtue of their ceremonial works. This point however had been adequately dealt with in ch. 4.
ėmei. Parry otherwise.
$\gamma^{\prime}$ or ${ }^{\prime} \sigma \sigma \tau \iota \nu$, which is what suits best. With $\gamma^{\prime} \nu \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ we should have had
 in 3-4.

 including BL, are probably a genuine part of the comment; incidentally, they confirm ${ }^{\prime} \sigma \sigma \tau \iota \nu$ as against $\gamma^{\prime} \nu \epsilon \tau a \iota$.
 by 9-30.

тои̂то. The antithesis demands av̉zòs or oítos.
oi $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ 入otтoí. Antithetically to $\lambda \epsilon i \not \mu \mu \alpha \kappa \alpha \tau^{\prime}$ éк $\lambda о \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \nu$.
 of the noun, but is not easily paralleled by the uses of the verb.' Sophocles, in giving $\nu v \sigma \tau \alpha \gamma \mu o ̀ s$ as the equivalent of $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \alpha^{\prime} v \xi \iota \iota$ in Ps. 59-5 and Isai.29-10, adds 'a strange meaning.' In Isaiah the correct reading is probably $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \mu v ́ \sigma \epsilon \omega \mathrm{~s}$, for the passage runs $\pi \epsilon \pi \delta \dot{\tau} \tau \kappa \epsilon \nu \dot{v} \mu a \hat{s}$ $\kappa v ́ \rho \iota o s ~ \pi \nu \epsilon v ́ \mu a \tau \iota ~ \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \nu v ́ \xi \epsilon \omega \mathrm{~s} \kappa \alpha \grave{~} \kappa \alpha \mu \mu v ́ \sigma \epsilon \iota \tau o u ̀ s ~ o ̉ \phi \theta a \lambda \mu o v ̀ s ~ \alpha v ̉ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$.

9 and 10. The imperatives given because they stand in the quotation; the real meaning is ${ }^{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \alpha \iota-\sigma \kappa \sigma \tau \iota \sigma \theta \eta^{\prime} \sigma о \nu \tau \alpha \iota-\sigma v \nu \kappa \alpha \mu \phi \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma о \nu \tau \alpha \iota$. See note on 3-4.
9. $\theta \eta \dot{\eta} \rho \alpha \nu=\epsilon ̉ \nu \in ́ \delta \rho \alpha v, a m b u s h$. Cf. Luc. $293 \kappa \alpha \theta i \sigma \alpha s \pi \alpha \rho \grave{a} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \theta v_{\rho} \rho \alpha \nu$ c̉ $\theta \dot{\eta} \rho \omega \nu$, etc. The same notion in катабкот $\hat{\sigma} \alpha \iota$ of Gal.2-4.

## 11. $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega$. Hesitatingly. See note on 10-18.

$\mu \grave{\eta}$ éntaloav. There is no apparent ground for so vehemently repudiating a suggestion that the majority of the Jews fell, whatever might be the genesis of the fall alleged; with all Christians it was
an indisputable fact that the Jews did fall, and that they fell by reason of their misconduct. The destruction of Jerusalem was pointed to as a proof. Read ${ }_{\epsilon} \pi \pi \tau \alpha \sigma \sigma \epsilon$, the subject being of $\theta \in \sigma^{\prime} s$. Was it then a fault on the part of God that they fell? It is practically the same question as was asked at the beginning of the chapter, this time occasioned by ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\prime \prime} \delta \omega \kappa \epsilon \nu$ © $\theta \epsilon o ̀ s$ of v. 8. But the passage to the end of v. 12 is spurious. It anticipates vv. 25 ff ., where the theory concerning the genesis and consequences of the fall of the Jews is presented as a mystery which is there disclosed for the first time.
émtalaev. Was to blame. The verb in this sense is specific in MGk; cf. B $\lambda \alpha \chi_{\chi o s . ~ ‘ ‘ ’ \gamma \grave{\omega}}^{\pi \tau \alpha i ́ \omega}$; est-ce ma faute?’ It was already so employed in Hellenistic times. Cf. Oxyr. Pap. 1165 єїтє єौлт whether they were to blame or not. Sophocles ' $\pi \tau \alpha i \omega$, to commit a fault.'
 $\dot{\eta} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \rho \alpha \nu \tau \eta ̀ \nu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \eta \eta^{\prime} \nu$. See Jannaris $\S 1741$, where however all the instances cited are not applicable.

ả入入́. But what has happened is that.
 13-46 and 47. See Sanday and Headlam.
$\pi \alpha \rho a \zeta \eta \lambda \omega \sigma \alpha \mathrm{c}$. To provoke to emulation rather than to provoke to
 av̉тov̂. The preposition by analogy with $\pi \alpha \rho о \rho \mu \hat{\omega}, \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \kappa є \lambda є$ v́o $\mu \alpha$, etc. See note on 1-11.

 are practically tautological. What is required is v̌ $\psi o s$ or an approximate equivalent in its tropical sense, such as $\kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \iota s$.

ко́бцч. All other Mss ко́ $\sigma \mu$ оv.
ทiттๆиа. Here again the context requires a word denoting not defeat, as does $\eta^{\prime} \tau \tau \eta \mu a$, but $\dot{v} \sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \eta \mu a$, ${ }^{\epsilon} \lambda \hat{́} \tau \tau \omega \mu \alpha$, lack in a moral sense. Cf.
 from $\hat{\eta} \tau \pi o \nu$ through $\hat{\eta} \tau \tau o ́ o \mu a \iota$. This verb is not registered in Liddell


[^24] systematically been corrupted in our texts. Perliaps also in 1Cor.6-7 read $\ddot{\eta} \tau \tau \omega \mu a$. In Thuc.2-19-5 we find both $\dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \hat{\omega} \nu \tau o$ and $\ddot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \eta \nu \tau o$; in 1-30-2 read $\dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \omega ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o 兀 ~ f o r ~ \grave{\eta} \sigma \sigma \eta \mu$ évol.
$\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \rho \omega \mu \mu=\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \omega \mu \alpha, \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \omega \sigma \iota s$ (where see Liddell and Scott) in a moral sense, $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon$ cór $\tau \mathrm{s}$, perfection, as the contrast to ${ }^{\eta} \tau \tau \omega \mu \mathrm{a}$ shows.
 $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \rho \omega \mu \alpha$ тov̀ $\theta \epsilon \hat{v}$, where Alford correctly so as to be full of the spiritual perfections with which God is filled. ${ }^{1}$ For $\tau \epsilon \lambda \hat{\omega}$ and $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \rho \hat{\omega}$ with their derivatives are synonymous. Cf. Col.4-12 $\tau \epsilon \in \lambda \epsilon \epsilon о$ каі $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \rho о ф о \rho \eta \mu \epsilon ́ v o t$

 most probably the term was borrowed-by their $\pi \lambda \eta \rho_{\rho \omega \mu}$ mean perfection or an abode of perfection, and contrasted it to $\dot{v} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \eta \mu \alpha$. Cf.
 their substantive the Gnostics in their turn meant to produce a derivative from the philosophical term $\tau^{\prime} \lambda^{\prime} \epsilon \cos$, perfect-originally signifying initiated-but they adopted one from $\pi \lambda \lambda \eta^{\prime} \rho \eta$ as better conveying the notion of concreteness. I may add that to denote perfection the suffix $-\sigma t s$ would have been more appropriate, but $-\mu a$ often substitutes $-\sigma \iota s$, and in the Valentinian system $\theta^{\prime} \lambda \eta \sigma \iota \iota$, the spouse of $\beta v \theta o \partial s$, was often
 $\delta_{\iota \kappa a i} \omega \mu$ (compare $5-16$ with $5-18$ ) for $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha i \omega \sigma \iota s$, etc. The distinction in meaning made by grammarians between - $\sigma \iota$ and $-\mu a$ is often fanciful. In MGk - $\mu \alpha$ has largely substituted - $\sigma \iota$; see Jannaris § 369.
 turns to admonish the Gentiles. His tone is now less severe.
yáp. NABP and some other witnesses give $\delta \bar{\epsilon}$, which seems preferable.
 apostolic duty towards the Gentiles, my apostleship, far from suffering, will gain in lustre, if by some means I should succeed in converting



[^25] only $\mu \epsilon \epsilon^{\prime}$. DE and several cursives support FG.

סogáow. So also several authorities in consonance with the context; but most of them Do $_{\text {gá }}$ G.
14. $\pi$ apa ${ }^{\eta} \lambda{ }^{\prime} \sigma_{\sigma \omega}$. See note on v. 11. By holding up the example of the nations the author hopes to inspire a few Jews with emulation and eagerness to share in the benefits of salvation.
15. ei $\gamma$ àp $\kappa \tau \lambda$. By the rejection of the Jews a wonder was performed in that it reconciled the world to God; but the reception of even a few will be a greater wonder still as though a very resurrection from the dead were accomplished. It would indeed shed lustre upon the apostolic ministry.
 $\tau \hat{\varphi} \theta \epsilon \bar{\varphi}$.
16. $\boldsymbol{\epsilon i} \boldsymbol{\delta} \grave{\epsilon} \mathrm{k} \boldsymbol{k} \lambda$. Apparently a concise expression (see note on 1-8) for

$\mathfrak{\eta}$ amapxŋ́. The corn meant as is proved by its correspondence with $\hat{p}_{i}^{\prime} \dot{\prime} \alpha$. It is a case of a specific term taking the place of the generic

 pletely displaced i $\chi$ $\theta \dot{v}$ s-doubtless a pan-linguistic phenomenon. In Ex.22-29 $\dot{\text { ámapxàs }}{ }^{\alpha} \lambda \omega \nu o s$ the same is the sense, the Hebrew apparently indicating merely fruits and not firstfruits. By an analogous process $\dot{a} \pi a \rho \chi \grave{\eta}$ came also to be employed for vectigal hereditatum (see Herwerden, Lexicon Graecum Suppletorium) from the fact evidently that this or other taxes were paid in corn. The import of the passage then is that, if the source-the corn or the root-be good, the products-the dough or the branches-shall necessarily prove good, the source representing the original Jewish nation as a whole and the products its future members individually.
áría. The proper adjective to have used was $\dot{\alpha} \gamma a \theta \grave{\eta}$ or $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \tau \eta$; but inasmuch as àaapx̀̀ originally meant the corn set apart for sacrificial rites, ácia was preferred as an adjective appropriate to an offering.


каì tò фúpaua. Supply ধ̈ $\sigma \tau a t$.

correctly каi $\epsilon i \mathfrak{i} \dot{\eta} \dot{\rho} i ́ \zeta \alpha$. Originally the reading probably was $\kappa \epsilon i \dot{\eta}$ pís $\alpha$.
17. $\tau \iota \nu \epsilon ̀ s ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \lambda \alpha \delta \delta \omega \nu$. Namely, the Jews of the present generation. See note on 3-3.
éveкєvтрíäqs. The statement that wild olive-trees are grafted into cultivated trees is not surprising as coming from an author of that, period when exactitude of statement, notably in matters pertaining to nature, was not much cultivated or strictly attended to. Verbiage rather was then the fashion. So, in saying (Cath. Eccl. Unit.5) cum de fonte uno rivi plurimi defluunt, numerositas licet diffusa videatur. exundantis copiae largitate, unitas tamen servatur in origine, Cyprian imagines a river with source and outrunners resembling its mouth and tributaries reversed. Another random description of nature is in
 ő $\rho o \phi o s ~ \dot{\eta} \tau \omega \nu \nu v ́ \lambda \lambda \omega \nu \sigma v \mu \pi \lambda о \kappa \eta$. To a like school belonged the person who tacked $\sigma \iota \nu \alpha ́ \pi \epsilon \omega$ s to ко́ккоs in lkk 13-19. But even modern writers of repute are known to have perpetrated similar outrages. Did not Dickens make a little twinkling star reflect itself in a well a whole night through ?
év aủroîs. Namely, ėv toîs $\kappa \lambda \alpha{ }^{\prime} \delta o \iota s ~ o f ~ v . ~ 16 . ~$
 The addition is superfluous, the meaning being that Christian Gentiles partake of the benefits ( $\pi$ tó $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{r o s}$ ) which formerly the Jews alone as chosen (è $\lambda a i a s)$ people enjoyed.

 $\tau \eta \sigma \iota$; here also read $\pi \iota$ ór $\eta \sigma \iota$ or $\pi \iota$ เóт $\eta \tau \iota$.
 must not despise the Jewish nation, but remember that it is not they who laid the foundations of Christianity upon which they justly pride themselves, but the Jews. All other Mss $\epsilon \mathfrak{i} \delta \grave{\epsilon}$ катакаv $\chi^{\hat{a} \sigma \alpha \iota, ~ l e s s ~}$ vividly.
oú. In a somewhat contemptuous tone : thou, the former benighted idolater.
19. Nearly all the other witnesses ${ }^{\prime} \xi \in \kappa \kappa \alpha \dot{\sigma} \sigma \theta \eta \sigma a v$. In the next verse $\dot{\epsilon}^{\prime} \kappa \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \sigma \theta \eta \sigma \alpha \nu$ is supported by BD.
$\kappa \lambda a ́ \delta o t . D$ and several other witnesses oi $\kappa \lambda a ́ \delta o t$, less suitably. Cf. v. $17 \tau \tau \nu \epsilon{ }^{\circ} \varsigma \tau \omega ิ \nu \kappa \lambda \alpha ́ \delta \omega \nu$.

21. кatà фúvw. See note ọn 2-14.
$\mu \boldsymbol{\eta} \pi \omega \mathrm{s}$. Omitted in NABCP and several cursives. St Chrysostom (see Tischendorf) is certainly wrong in saying that $\mu \dot{\eta} \pi \omega$ s was added so that by au expression of doubt the peremptoriness of the sentence might be mitigated. On the contrary, its purpose certainly is to make the warning more emphatic, фoßov̂ being supplied.



хр $\begin{array}{r}\text { бтór } \eta \text { т. The interpolator apparently became confused and trans- }\end{array}$ ferred to man the $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \tau o ́ t \eta$ s which he was speaking of as an attribute of God.
23. This verse plainly links up with $\tau \hat{\eta} \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \notin \tau \eta k a s$ of v . 20 ; the intervening sentences are supposititious.

25. тò $\mu$ uatinpoov. This mystery is supposed to be concealed in the quotation ${ }_{\eta}^{\xi} \xi \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \in \kappa \Sigma_{\iota} \omega \nu \kappa \kappa \tau \lambda$. It was a very common Apological practice to quote extracts from the LXX as occult and prophetic saws and interpret them as it suited les besoins de la cause. Cf. Just.293 d q̀̀ cipp $\mu_{\text {évor }}$



 $\dot{\epsilon} \mu a v \tau \underset{\uparrow}{x}$. But all the other authorities $\pi \alpha \rho^{\prime}$ ' eavtoîs in accordance with 12-16 and the LXX, or èv éavtois.

фрóvццol. Arroyant, as is indicated by the context. It is an isolated instance I believe in this sense, but see Liddell and Scott vv. фрóvŋ $\mu$ a, фрогпиаті́а.
àmò $\mu$ épous. In part. See note on 3-3.
 or каi àmoөтре́ $\psi \in \iota$ with the intention of reproducing literally the wording of the LXX.
27. кai aüт $\kappa \tau \lambda$. The author probably interprets the quotation as
meaning that God's covenant shall be fulfilled when the heathen by being converted will have been cleansed from their sins.
aữ $\hat{\omega} \nu$. Assumed by the author to indicate $\dot{\epsilon} \theta \nu \omega \nu$.
28. $\delta \iota$ ' $\dot{\imath} \mu \hat{\alpha} s$. For your sakes. See note on 4-23.
$\pi a \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a s . F \pi a \tau \epsilon \in \epsilon s$, probably the earliest instance of this modern form of the accusative. See Jannaris § 267.
29. ${ }^{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \mu \epsilon \lambda \eta \tau \alpha \kappa \tau \lambda$. This statement probably reflects the Jewish idea, with which our author as a Jew was doubtless impregnated, that God is bound legally, as it were, to carry out his covenant. See Schürer, 2-2, p. 91. Cf. also my note on 3-4.
à $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \mu \epsilon \lambda_{\eta} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \alpha=\dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \nu o ́ \eta \tau \alpha, \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha ́ \kappa \lambda \eta \tau \alpha$, irrevocable. A forensic term.
 andrian legal documents. See Greek Pap. (second series) 68 and 70. Oxyr. Pap. 1208.

Xарírцата. Gifts. See note on 5-15.
30. $\ddot{\sigma} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \gamma \dot{a} \rho$. Most witnesses $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \gamma \grave{a} \rho$ каí.
31. aưroì ( $\nu \hat{u} v)$. So likewise D, 93, and versions. A demotic form for ovิ̃o which recurs in FG at 1Cor.9-12. See Jannaris § 1418 b .



$\pi \lambda$ oúrou. A reference to $\pi \alpha \dot{\sigma} \tau \alpha a s$ of the previous verse. Cf. Philo, 1-50 (by which possibly the idea of the divine benefit to all was inspired)




каì бофías. Some authorities omit каí.
36. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ aićv $\omega \nu$. Absent in most authorities.

## CHAPTER THE TWELIFTH

Having admonisbed the Jews and the Gentiles separately, the author now sets out to inculcate upon them conjointly harmony and mutual goodwill.
 mercy, in the name of merciful God. See note on $8-37$.
$\tau \omega \bar{\omega}$ oiktı $\rho \mu \omega \hat{\omega}$. The plural seemingly is a Hebraism; see Sanday and Headlam. So also đà è $\lambda$ é $\eta$. Cf. Ps.24-6. 88-1. 88-50. Sir.18-5.
$\tau$ тà $\sigma \omega \mu \mu \tau \alpha$. Not to be taken literally, for the author limself explains that the $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \sigma \tau a \sigma \iota s$ should not be understood as actually a corporeal sacrifice but as a $\lambda о \gamma \iota \kappa \grave{\eta} \lambda a \tau \rho \epsilon i ́ a$, a spiritual ceremony or worship. See note on 1-9. It means $\dot{\imath} \mu \hat{u} s$ av̉rov̀s, but in its stead $\tau \grave{\alpha} \sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau a$ was employed as more assonant with the sacrificial metaphor of the passage.

Ougiav $\zeta \hat{\omega} \sigma \alpha \nu$. Not actually a sacrifice of slaughtered creatures of God.
2. $\sigma u v \sigma \chi \eta a r i \xi \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$. A synonym often of $\sigma v v \mu о \rho \phi o v \sigma \theta u t$; cf. Phil. 3-21 $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \sigma \chi \eta \mu a \tau i ́ \sigma \epsilon \iota ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \sigma \hat{\omega} \mu \alpha ~ \sigma$ v́v $\mu о \rho \phi о \nu$. Philo, 2-557 $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \sigma \chi \eta \mu a \tau i ́ \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$ єis $\pi$ оддvтро́тоvs $\mu о \rho \phi$ ás. But here a differentiation is intended, which probably consists in this, that by $\sigma_{\chi \eta \mu a \tau i \zeta}{ }^{\sigma} \theta a \iota$ the world, or the intellectuals of those times, is represented and scoffed at as persons who, intrinsically worthless, appear important through tartufian out-
 such perhaps as Spartan cloaks and venerable beards. The traits of the charlatans who affected those tricks have been drawn and immortalized by Lucian. See his 'A $\lambda_{\iota} \epsilon v^{\prime} s$. A similar contemptuous sense attaches to $\sigma \chi \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha$ in 1Cor.7-31 $\pi \alpha \rho a ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \sigma \chi \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha ~ \tau o \hat{v}$ кó $\sigma \mu о v$ тov́тov, and to $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \sigma \chi \eta \mu a \tau \iota \zeta_{o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o \iota ~ i n ~} 2$ Cor.11-13 $\psi \epsilon v \delta \alpha \pi o ́ \sigma \tau о \lambda o \iota, \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \sigma \chi \eta \mu a \tau \iota-$





єis tò $\delta \mathbf{\kappa} \boldsymbol{\mu} \dot{\alpha}^{\zeta} \epsilon \mathrm{iv}$. That ye may examine. So Wordsworth.

 shows that $\tau \grave{\partial} \theta$ é $\lambda \eta \mu \alpha$ must be understood, as is order often in English, in the sense of the action resulting from an order, practically in the sense of ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \rho \gamma o v$. This meaning is not recorded in our Dictionaries, but
 me faire une commission?'

$\theta$ єoû. All other Mss correctly $\tau o v ̂ \theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$.
3. $\delta \iota \grave{\alpha} \tau \eta \hat{\eta} \chi^{\alpha} \rho \iota \tau o s=\delta \iota \grave{\alpha} \tau \grave{\eta} v \chi^{\alpha} \rho \iota v$. See note on $v$. 1 . The sense therefore is the same as in 15-15, namely, because of the grace.
úmepфpoveiv. All other Mss ${ }^{1}$ add $\pi a \rho$ ' à $\delta \in \hat{\imath} \phi \rho o v \epsilon \hat{\imath}$, which clashes with the spirit of the passage and of Christianity generally. It suggests that a Christian ought not to overstep the due limit of self-esteem, thus allowing it to some extent; but the Christian notion was that self-esteem, whether excessive or moderate, was a vice and that absolute humility should be practised. Cf. v. $16 \mu \eta$ خ̀ $\dot{\alpha}$ í $\psi \eta \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ ф $\rho o v o v ̂ v \tau \epsilon s ~ \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ $\tau 0 i ̂$ s. $\tau \alpha \pi \epsilon \iota \nu o i ̂ s ~ \sigma v \jmath \tau \alpha \pi \epsilon \iota \nu o v ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o \iota$. Phil.3-2 $\tau \hat{\eta} \tau \alpha \pi \epsilon \iota \nu о \phi \rho о \sigma v ́ v \eta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \eta_{\eta} \lambda o v s$ $\dot{\eta} \gamma о \dot{v} \mu \in \nu 0$.

фpoveiv eis tò owфpoveiv. What the author probably wished to say was simply $\sigma \omega \phi \rho o v \epsilon i v$, but by way of oratorical emphasis he repeated ф $\rho o v \epsilon i v$ and then qualified it by adding the word which conveyed his real idea. You are not to think of yourselves too highly, he says, but if you must think of yourselves, then so think of yourselves as to think modestly.

є́кáбтஸ. In apposition to $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha$, the subject of $\sigma \omega \phi \rho о \nu \epsilon \hat{\imath} v$, but attracted to $\bar{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \rho \rho \tau \sigma \varepsilon$.
 each man according to the measure of trust apportioned to him by God.
$\pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega$. Of trust. This passive signification of $\pi i \sigma \tau \iota s$ is very rare, but Liddell and Scott register a few examples. Every office in the Church is thus viewed as a trust from God, and the officers are exhorted in their aspirations to be content with the faithful management of


 was $\tau \grave{\alpha} \delta \grave{\epsilon} \pi \alpha{ }_{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha$, the adjective being in apposition to $\tau \grave{\alpha} \delta \grave{\epsilon}$, namely, and they have not all the same function. The idea suggested by 1 Cor. 12-12 ff.


 Oxyr. Pap.1174, col. 5, against $\tau \dot{\gamma} \gamma \mu a \tau o s$ there is a variant $\pi \rho a^{\prime} \gamma \mu a \tau o s$.

[^26]
## 5. $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu \alpha$. All other Mss add $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$.




тò $\delta \grave{\varepsilon}$ ка $\theta$ eís. The references of commentators in illustration of this combination are inconclusive. Most probably $\delta \delta_{\text {è }} \kappa \alpha \theta \epsilon i s-$ which is the reading of most Mss and of Theodore according to his comment at Gal.3-28-should be preferred. This is the MGkidiom ; but cf. besides Philos.10-32 (Cruice, p. 516) тò ката̀ ${ }_{\mathrm{e}}^{\mathrm{el}}$ (a learned falsification of the demotic $\tau \grave{o ̀} \kappa \alpha \theta \grave{\iota} \nu$ ), etc.

ка日єís. Formed from $\kappa \alpha \theta^{\prime}{ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \nu a$, which came to be felt as a monolectic accusative similar to $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon ́ \varepsilon a$. It eventually took the article by analogy
 $\pi \epsilon \nu \tau \eta \dot{\kappa о \nu \tau \alpha .}$




 according to the grace granted to us-whether preaching within the limit of our inspiration, or deaconship, or perhaps a man in lis capacity of teacher or comforter-whoever imparts let him impart to all without distinction, whoever presides let him preside diligently, whoever gives alms let him do so joyfully. The syntax is obscured because it was not perceived that the words $\delta \mu \epsilon \tau a \delta \delta \delta o v s ~ \kappa \tau \lambda$ constituted an apodosis, and so the colon єíтє $\delta \alpha \alpha к о \nu^{\prime} \alpha \nu$ to $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha к а \lambda \omega \nu$ was eked out by a corrector so as to assimilate its form to that of $\dot{o} \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \delta \delta \delta o v ̀ s ~ \kappa \tau \lambda$ by the
 $\kappa \lambda \eta^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \iota$, and (2) of the article before $\delta \iota \delta \alpha{ }^{\prime} \sigma \kappa \omega \nu$ and $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \kappa \alpha \lambda \omega \nu$.
$\pi \rho о ф \eta \tau \epsilon i \alpha v$. Preaching, the faculty of instructing by an address when the faithful met for prayers. From ch. 14 of 1 Corinthians, which treats of proceedings connected with the service, it is clear that $\delta \pi \rho o^{-}$ $\phi \eta \tau \epsilon v \in \nu$ means the person who addressed the congregation. Cf. also
 $\pi o \lambda \lambda o \hat{v} \pi \alpha \rho \epsilon \kappa \alpha ́ \lambda \epsilon \sigma a \nu$ тov̀s $\dot{\alpha} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi o v{ }^{\prime}$. And preachers must have been called $\pi \rho o \phi \hat{\eta} \tau \alpha \iota$ because they were presumed to derive their oratorical

[^27]talent from inspiration; namely, to be inspired men like the prophets



 primitive Christianity no persons were specially appointed preachers, but as was customary with the Jews any one who believed himself equal to the task might preach, doubtless after permission from or invitation




 in those times squatted, as the Armenians do to this day at Jerusalem), $\delta \pi \rho \bar{\tau} \tau o s ~ \sigma c \gamma a ́ \tau \omega$ that the latitude of free preaching was abused either by a few monopolizing the preaching or by the addresses becoming interminable. So that not long afterwards it was found necessary to restrict the privilege to the $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \sigma \tau o ́ \tau \epsilon s$, who were the forerunners of



 that certain preachers, prone to loquacity, overstepped their measure of inspiration and ranted.
tŋ̂s $\pi$ íctews. I cannot see how there can le more or less belief so that accordingly there might be more or less of the gift of preaching.

 so that the error, if it be an error, dates from a very early period, as most errors in the N.T. do.
 absurd.
 wut an ordinary teacher, a schoolmaster. The same distinction in Acts


8. $\delta$ таракалิิv. The antecedent $\epsilon i \neq \epsilon$ missed also in DE and other witnesses.

тарака入ิิv. Comforting those in distress through bereavement, sickness, imprisonment, etc. Comforting was a paramount virtue with Christians, and therefore the man capable of so helping his neighbours is quite naturally included among those gifted for good. The version exhorting is not correct, for exhortation is implied in $\pi \rho \circ \phi \eta \tau \epsilon i \alpha \nu$.
 $\phi \dot{\eta} \tau \eta \mathrm{s}$ or $\delta_{\iota} \delta \delta^{\sigma} \sigma \kappa \alpha \lambda o s$, or lorings comfort, let him do so to all men without distinction, whether they be Christians or heathen, Jews or Gentiles,


 $\kappa \alpha \lambda \epsilon i ̂ \nu ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~ \epsilon ̉ v ~ \pi a ́ \sigma \eta ~ \theta \lambda i ́ \psi \epsilon \iota$.

 Sophocles v. Є̀ $\lambda \epsilon \eta \mu \sigma \sigma v ́ v \eta$.
 ф $о \sigma$ v́v $\eta \mathrm{s}$ тàs $\tau \rho \circ \phi$ ás. Barn.19-11 oủdè $\delta \iota \delta o u ̀ s ~ \gamma o \gamma \gamma v ́ \sigma \epsilon \iota s . ~$

9. $\mu$ looûvtєs. So also Latin versions. All other Mss $\dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \sigma \tau v \gamma o v ̄ \tau \epsilon \varsigma$, which probably represents the correct reading, $\mu \sigma \sigma o v\rangle \tau \epsilon s$ being a glossa, for it is loy $\sigma \phi o ́ \delta p a \mu r \sigma o v ̂ \nu \tau \epsilon s$ that St Chrysostom (see 'lischendorf) interprets $\dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \sigma \tau v \gamma o \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \epsilon s$.
 каєоб'ข́vi.
 is in brotherly love that ye should be mutually first. Cf. Herod.8-79


 even already within our Lord's intimate circle, a spirit of jealousy and strife for $\pi \rho \omega \tau \epsilon i \alpha$, which is here denounced. Cf. $2 \cdot 7$ סóg $\alpha \nu$ каì $\tau \iota \mu \grave{\eta} \nu$



 $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath} \pi \rho \omega \tau \epsilon i \omega \nu$. Renan, Égl. Chrét. p. 86 'L'ecclésia, la réunion des personnes établie sur un pied d'égalité entre elles, est la chose démocratique par excellence; mais l'ecclésia, le club, a un défaut suprême qui fait que toute association de ce genre se détruit an bout d'un temps très-court; ce défaut, c'est l'anarchie, la facilité des schismes. Plus mortelles encore sont les luttes de préséance, au sein de petites confréries fondées sur une vocation tout-à-fait spontanée. La recherche de la première place était le mal par excellence des Églises chrétiennes.'


$\tau \hat{\eta} \tau \tau \mu \hat{\eta}$. Supply $\tau \hat{\eta} \epsilon i s \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \hat{\eta} \lambda o v s$.
$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda$ ous. The accusative because $\pi \rho o \eta \gamma o u ́ \mu \in \nu o \iota$ represents a fa-


 Else, by reason of its own principal sense and the force of the preposition, $\pi \rho o \eta \gamma o \hat{v} \mu a \iota$ should, and does, in good Greek govern the genitive.
$\pi \rho \circ \eta \gamma \circ \cup \cup \mu \in v o l$. Marching ahead of, in a military sense. So also Mt 21-31 oi $\tau \epsilon \lambda \omega \hat{\nu} \alpha \iota ~ \pi \rho o \alpha ́ \gamma o v \sigma \iota \nu$ vi $\mu a ̂ s$.
 denotes, though I cannot trace any other indubitable examples. But
 means being engaged in a diligent study of the word. Sophocles quotes three passages from Philostratus of $\sigma \pi o v \delta \alpha^{\prime} \zeta \omega$ in the sense of to teach. Most probably diligent study and culture were enjoined ${ }^{2}$ in opposition to the Jews, who towards the beginning of the second century forbade the study of Greek and thereby all secular learning. Cf. 1 Tim. 4-13 $\pi \rho o ́ \sigma \epsilon \chi \epsilon \tau \hat{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \nu a \gamma \nu \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \epsilon$.

[^28] pably impossible.

 Wetstein's remark is quite pertinent: 'Quid enim opus erat summam hanc ponere totius devotionis, quando singula membra quae ad obsequia et servitia dei pertinent memorat? In omnibus enim iis quae enumerat plenum domino servitium exhibetur.' Read $\tau \hat{\varphi} \kappa \alpha \iota \rho \hat{̨} \mu \eta े$ סov入єvovtes, serving not this age or world. For the loss of the negative see note on 1-19.


 age or world. Cf. 8-18 $\tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \alpha \theta \dot{\eta} \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$ тôv v̂̂v кaıюov̂.
 are remembered and collections made for their succour at the meetings, as described by Justin in his first Apologia, ch. 67.
$\mu \nu \varepsilon i a l s$. This reading is likewise recorded by Origen and Theodore. ${ }^{1}$
 succour as indicated by 4-15 ff. All other Mss $\chi \rho$ eials.
$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ áyícu. Namely, of all Christians in distress. See Justin as above and Tertullian's Apologia, ch. 39.
14. єủ̉оүєîтє каì $\mu \grave{\eta}$ катар $\alpha \sigma \theta \epsilon$. The writer probably had in mind chiefly the Jews, who had introduced the practice of cursing the Christians in their synagogues. Cf. Just.363c $\dot{\alpha} \delta \iota \alpha \lambda \epsilon i \pi \tau \omega \varsigma ~ к \alpha \tau \alpha \rho a ̂ \sigma \theta \epsilon ~$


 but whereas DE place this sentence after $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \rho \hat{\alpha} \sigma \theta \epsilon$, the other Mss place it before $\epsilon \boldsymbol{u} \lambda \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon$, which points to its being a marginal addition variously transferred into the text. Moreover, the deviation of the syntax both from that of what precedes and of what follows makes the whole of the vv. 14 and 15 suspicious, the more so as their proper place would have been before either v. 17 or v. 19.

[^29]
guvaтаүó $\mu \in \boldsymbol{v}$. Being carried away along with them. Cf. Gal.2-13
 $\sigma v v a \pi a \chi \theta$ '́v $\tau \epsilon s$, etc. But the sense demanded by the context is making yourselves lumble with the humble. Read ovvianeıvov́ $\mu \in v o \iota$. Cf. 1Pet.





 another form of the dative, a usage very common in the LXX (cf. Dan.



 rô̂ $\theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$ was probably misunderstood as meaning not taking thought for things inoffensive in the sight of God, but providing things beneficial to God, and this would have been regarded a blasphemy.

 $\pi \epsilon i ́ \sigma o \mu a \iota ~ \hat{\eta}$ ठvvaтòv $\mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha$.
 all other Mss.
20. тойто $\gamma$ à $\rho \boldsymbol{\kappa} \boldsymbol{\tau}$. Added because it stands in the quotation from Prov.25-21; it is not applicable to the context. See note on 4-7 and 8.
21. $\mu \grave{\eta} \nu \kappa \kappa \hat{\omega} \kappa \tau \lambda$. This probably is a quotation, alluded to likewise

àmò то仑̂ какой. Jannaris § 1507 ‘ A post-classical peculiarity of ủnò consists in its frequent substitution for $\dot{v} \pi \dot{o}$ to designate the agent in passive verbs. This phenomenon first signalized itself during the Greco-Roman period.' Occasionally also éк as a synonym of $\dot{\alpha} \pi \grave{o}$ took



## CHAPTER THE THIRTEENTH

1 to 10 . The obedience to civil authority counselled in these verses is a point foreign to the theme of the Epistle. It was very unskilfully intruded between ch. 12 and $13-2 \mathrm{ff}$., parts which form a connected whole treating of the proper conduct to be observed by Christians among themselves, or towards other men whom they have it in their power either to lit back or benefit. The counsel tendered (cf. 1 Pet. $2-13$ ) is the one which was so popular with the Apologists, who in their eagerness to turn to the advantage of their own side the Jewish unrest and resistance to a compulsory poll-tax fulsomely protested their own loyalty to the Romans. Probably therefore these verses were inserted some time after A.D. 133 , when the outbreak occurred in the reign of Hadrian. These Apological protestations were all the more frequent and vehement because the Christians themselves in the past had been made to suffer through imputations of disloyalty. A like counsel is implied in Jn 19-11, which makes the genuineness of both v. 11 and v. 10 doubtful.

 It is impossible to decide as to which reading on its own merits is preferable.
änò $\theta$ coû. Most Mss vinò $\theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$. See note on 12-21. 15-15.
ai $\delta$ è oúgat. And the present ones, and those of the present day.
2. $\delta \iota a \tau a \gamma \hat{n}=\delta \iota a \tau \alpha ́ \xi \in \iota$, oiкоvoцía, dispositions. So 1 ClemR.20-3.
 $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \alpha \kappa \omega ิ \nu$.
4. $\delta$ ıákovós ėotıv. Nearly all witnesses add $\sigma$ oí. The addition seems necessary, the meaning being that a ruler is a minister of God appointed to help thee in the performance of a good action.



 Nearly all the other witnesses add $\epsilon i s$ ob $\rho \gamma \eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \nu$, the force of which however is included in $\neq \kappa \delta \kappa \kappa о s$; it was borrowed from the following $\delta \iota \dot{\alpha}$
$\tau \grave{\eta} v \dot{\delta} \rho \gamma \dot{\eta} \nu$ and probably added with the object of effecting a parisosis with cis rò à ${ }^{\gamma} \alpha \theta$ óv.

$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha$. All other Mss correctly $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \kappa \alpha i ́$.
 24-16. The addition of the article personifies, as it were, conscience.
 бvvє८$\wp \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon$.
6. रáp. A more appropriate particle would have been $\delta \dot{\eta}$. See note

$\pi \rho о \sigma к а \rho \tau \epsilon \rho о u ̂ \eta \tau \epsilon \varsigma$. The collectors sympathetically mentionedas toilers. They are specially so mentioned because they were specially hated by the Jews. See note on vv. 1 to 10.
7. oûv. Absent in some Mss.
rélos. The distinction made between фópos and $\tau \notin \lambda$ ios, so far at least as the scope of this passage is concerned, is rather of the hair-splitting kind. Probably read ${ }^{\prime \prime} \lambda \epsilon$ cos in the sense of alms; see note on 12-8.

тò $\boldsymbol{\phi}{ }^{\prime} \beta o v$. The fear due to the rulers.
$\tau \mu \dot{\eta} \nu$. The honour due to parents, elders, preachers.
 the effect that Christians owe no duty ( $\dot{o} \phi \epsilon i \lambda \grave{\alpha} s$ ) to any one, their whole obligation consisting in mutual love, in which all virtues reside. Apparently there could still be found in the times of the Apologists some independent spirits who held that obedience to civil authorities in such questions as the payment of taxes was not a duty at all, but that it was practised as being an insignificant matter which did not hurt their principles. Cf. Mt 17-27.
8. $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon \nu \grave{\imath} \mu \eta \delta \in ́ v$. Probably $=$ ov̉ $\delta \epsilon v \grave{\imath}$ ov̉ $\delta \epsilon ́ v$; see Jannaris $§ 1818$. If so, ob $\phi \epsilon i ́ \lambda \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ is an indicative.
9. үé $\mathbf{\gamma \rho a \pi \tau \alpha \iota ~ \gamma a ́ p . ~ A l l ~ o t h e r ~ M s s ~} \tau o ̀ ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho$, which looks like an attempt at obviating the syntax. The construction is: $\gamma \in \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \gamma \rho \alpha \pi \tau \alpha \iota\left[{ }_{o}^{\circ} \tau \iota \tau \grave{o}\right]$ ov $\mu o \iota-$
 omission of ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{O} \tau$ 。.
oủ $\kappa \lambda \epsilon \in \psi \epsilon \iota$. Most Mss add ov̉ $\psi \in v \delta o \mu a \rho \tau v \rho \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \iota s$.
 uncertainty as to the existence of other commandments.
duaкєфалаьoûtal. The objector means to say that it is St Matthew
 oi $\pi \rho \circ \phi \hat{\eta} \tau \alpha \iota$, affirmed that all the commandments are summed up in

éautóv. The substitution of the third person of the reflexive for the first or second person dates from classical times. See Jannaris § 1406 f.





$\pi \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \rho \omega \mu \alpha \boldsymbol{\delta} \hat{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \lambda$. As a new statement this sentence is superfluous
 demands is a conclusion confirmatory of that statement. Therefore read with nearly all the other witnesses $\pi \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \omega \mu \mu$ oîv. See note on 6-18.
11. «aì тоüтo iठóvтєs кт入. It joins up with $12-21$ (see note on vv. 1 to 10 ) in the same participial construction. In סóre of 12-19 this construction is deviated from by the influence of the quotation in $v .20$ (and probably of that in v. 21).


 was in such frequent use.
 $\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \theta \alpha, \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi \alpha \tau \eta \sigma \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$.
ütrous. From a nominative tò v́nvos, a demotic, form which should be added to the list given by Jannaris § 249b. See note on 9-23.
$\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu . \mathrm{P} \dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$.
 by the baptism that men became Christians or believers. So in Acts 19-2 $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon v^{\prime} \sigma \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon$ is an equivalent of $\beta a \pi \tau \iota \sigma \theta \epsilon \gamma \tau \epsilon \mathrm{~s}$, as the following. ${ }_{\epsilon} \beta \alpha \pi \tau i \sigma \theta \eta \tau \epsilon$ shows.
12. аттоßа入 $\dot{\mu} \epsilon \theta$. So also DE and Latin versions; all other Mss $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \theta \omega \mu \epsilon \theta a$. Both give the same sense, let us take off'


Sophocles ' $\sigma v v^{v} \in \rho \gamma o v$, implement, tool,' citing two instances from Artemidorus and Plotinus. Add Oxyr. Pap.1159, where Hunt tools. The word has survived in MGk with exactly the same meaning. B $\lambda \alpha^{\prime} \chi o s$

 óp $\quad$ ava.

тà ö öda. A variant $\tau \grave{\alpha} \frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \rho \gamma \alpha$.
13. $\mu \grave{\eta}$ к $\omega \mu$ оьs ктл. The works of night (cf. 1Thes.5-7 oi $\mu \in \theta$ vóovтєs $\nu v \kappa \tau o ̀ s ~ \mu \epsilon \theta$ v́ovotv), in which the heathen were accused by the Christians of indulging. In like manner, when Tertullian in Apol. 39 claims of the Christians that at nightfall disceditur non in catervas caesionum nec in classes discursationum nec in eruptiones lasciviarum, he implies that it is the heathen who thus misbeluave at night.
$\kappa \kappa \dot{\mu} \boldsymbol{o s}$. The plural as in MGk when referring to something which either occurs or is mentioned repeatedly. So 14-17 $\beta \rho \omega \dot{\sigma} \epsilon \iota s$ каì $\pi o ́ \sigma \epsilon \iota s$. Such is likewise the force of the plural in the variant $\delta \iota \alpha \theta \hat{\eta} \kappa \alpha<$ of $9-4$.
$\zeta \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega$. The context requires a word designating some form of rioting or quarrelling. Perhaps ģv̀du, in sticks, in fighting with sticks, as in MGk.
 your bosom, which is encountered as a variant at 1Pet.5-5.

év èmı日uníaıs. Namely, disregard your jlesh when it is intent upors lusts. The variants $\mathfrak{\epsilon}$ 's $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \pi \iota \theta \nu \mu i ́ a s$ or $\mathfrak{e} \pi \iota \theta v \mu i ́ a \nu$ yield no satisfactory sense


## CHAP'IER THE FOURTEENTH

The author continues the admonitions begun at ch. 12, and now exhorts to mitual tolerance in matters of opinion and conscience. He shows himșelf an enlightened man and sets an example of liberalmindedness for all time. Had our religious leaders, who have ever professed deep reverence for St Paul, acted faithfully to the spirit of this exhortation, the moral side of religion would have bettered the practical conduct of men far more than it has so far succeeded in
doing. Unfortunately, it is dogmatic hair-splitting and power that have rather impassioned them in the past, causing bitter strife instead of goodwill and tolerance, and thus obstructing the fine work initiated by the Greek philosophers and authoritatively carried forward by our eternal Master of Nazareth.
 robust as to inspire him with indifference to his Jewish customs. Such Jews are called by Justin in 262 d and $266 \mathrm{~b} \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu \epsilon i s ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \gamma \nu \omega \dot{\mu} \mu \eta \nu$.


 The verb suppressed as in Gal.5-13 $\mu \grave{\eta} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ ढ̉ $\lambda \epsilon v \theta \epsilon \rho i ́ a \nu \epsilon$ єis $\dot{\alpha} \phi о \rho \mu \grave{\eta} \nu \tau \hat{\eta}$ $\sigma a \rho \kappa i$, where Lightfoot compares Mt 26-5 $\dot{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta}$ €̉v $\tau \hat{\eta}$ €́o $\rho \tau \hat{\eta} \hat{\eta}$ and Arist. Ach. $345 \mu \eta^{\prime} \mu \circ \tau \pi \rho o ́ \phi \alpha \sigma \iota v$. At the latter place the suppression of the verb is fully illustrated by Blaydes.

ठıакрі́бєıs. Discussions. Cf. 2Tim.2-23 тàs $\mu \omega \rho a ̀ s ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ a ̉ \pi \alpha ı \delta є u ́ r o v s ~$ $\sigma \nu \zeta \eta \tau \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \iota \varsigma ~ \pi \alpha \rho a \iota \tau o v ̂$.
 cussions and wrangling.

 ỏ $\rho \gamma \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ каì $\delta \alpha a \lambda о \gamma \iota \sigma \mu$ оv.
 weak eat herbs. The strong in faith may eat meat and pork and everything, and the Jew must not nag; but on the other hand, it is the Jew's own business if cattle-like he prefer to live on the herbs of the field alone, and the Gentiles must not contemn.
$\phi a y \epsilon i v$. In accordance with the above interpretation read $\phi$ áy $\eta$. For this form of the imperative see Jannaris § 1919 and Append. V, § 16. Cf. also Oxyr. Pap. 1223 ó $\nu a v i \tau \eta s$ ả $\pi \alpha \nu \tau \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \eta$, let the sailor return, as translated by Hunt. As a matter of course this form, being demotic, was often tampered with in our Mss; cf. Ignat. Castab. $5{ }^{\epsilon} \rho \rho \omega \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \eta \nu$
 also Polyc. Phil. 12 оікобо $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma \eta$ and оікодо $\mu \neq \sigma \alpha$. XII Patr. Jud. 14 тiv and $\pi i v \epsilon \epsilon$, etc. Nor are modern critics free from this lapse ; for instance, in Achil. Tat.5-26 the Mss give $\mu \eta \kappa \epsilon ́ \tau \iota ~ \Lambda \epsilon v \kappa i \pi \pi \eta \nu$ ả $\pi о \lambda \epsilon ́ \sigma \eta \rho$, but Cobet,
the great castigator of the licentiousness of the copyists, has imposed $\dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon a s$, and this reading now figures in Gaselee's edition. At 1 Act.
 $\lambda \dot{\alpha} \beta$ o七s.'

 such as is only fit for cattle. Cf. Dan.4-30 $\dot{\alpha} \pi o ̀ ~ \tau \omega \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega ́ \pi \omega \nu{ }^{\prime} \xi \in \delta \iota \omega \chi \neq \eta$

 sense Arist. 'Thesm. 456 év ả $\gamma \rho i ́ o \iota s ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ \lambda \alpha \chi a ́ \nu o ı s ~ \tau \rho \alpha ф \epsilon i ́ s . ~ A s ~ i n ~ o l d ~ G r e e k, ~$ so in MGk $\lambda \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \alpha v a$ means both cultivated cabbages and herbs generally (alike cultivated and wild). B $\lambda$ áxos ' $\lambda a ́ \chi a v o v, ~ c h o u ; ~[\pi \lambda \eta \theta] ~ l e ́ g u m e s,$. herbage, verdure.' In Clem. Hom.12-6 $\lambda \alpha \chi^{\alpha}{ }^{\prime}$ oos is wrongly translated by oleribus; it should lue herbis.
 English, we should translate let him eat grass.
évelétc. So also D, corroborated by versions and Origen and agreeably to my interpretation ; all other Greek Mss $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sigma \theta$ ícı. Possibly the original reading was $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \sigma \theta \hat{\prime} \eta=$ è $\sigma \theta \iota \in ́ \tau \omega$.

 The other Mss кaì $\delta \mu \eta$ or $\delta \delta \delta \grave{\epsilon} \mu \eta$.
4. $\sigma$ ù tís $\epsilon i ̂$; See note on 9-20.
 The same import in v. 6.
 riant кर́pıos).
5. ồs $\mu \in \in v$. A few Mss wrongly add $\gamma \alpha^{\prime} \rho$.
 observe, every other day. The Christian Jews continued to keep the Sabbath and their other holidays, to which the heathen first and then the Gentile Christians strongly objected. Now our author assumes for argument's sake an extreme case-as he previously assumed only $\lambda \alpha^{-}$ $\chi^{\alpha v \alpha}$ as food-namely, that the Jews may wish to observe not only the present holidays but every other day; even should they so exaggerate, that, our author contends, is their own look out.
 the alteration is demanded by the antithesis to коivєı, which cạn only denote condemns, disapproves of; cf. vv. 3, 4, and 10.
 It can signify nothing else. The phrase is copiously illustrated by Jannaris $\$ 1621$, and has survived as $\mu \epsilon ́ \rho \alpha \pi \alpha \rho \alpha ̀ ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \rho \alpha$.
$\pi \hat{\sigma} \sigma a v \dot{\eta} \mu \dot{\rho} \rho a v$. Assuming an extreme case again.
6. кupí $\varphi$ фроуєi. Observes it by the pleasure of God, for it is by the pleasure of God that he lives to observe it.

фроиєî. Followed in most Mss by каì ó $\mu \grave{\eta} \phi \rho о \nu \omega ̂ \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon ́ \rho a \nu ~ к v \rho i ́ \omega$

 in their omissions, for the opposite cases of the Jew and the Gentile are sufficiently indicated by $\delta \dot{\phi} \rho o \nu \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \epsilon_{\rho} \rho \nu$ as regards the Jew and by o $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \sigma \theta i \omega v$ as regards the Gentile.
ó è $\sigma \theta i \omega \omega$. Supply $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau a$.
7. oủdєis $\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ кт $\lambda$. For no man lives and dies by his own will and pleasure, but by the pleasure of God; therefore, if we live to observe days or eat, it is by his pleasure.

кирí $\omega$. Read $\tau \hat{\omega} \kappa \boldsymbol{\kappa} \boldsymbol{\kappa} \boldsymbol{\rho} i \varphi$ with all the other documents.
 misunderstood the force of the antecedent dative as being $b y$ the command of, and argues that, if we live and die by the command of the Lord, we must be his servants, whether dead or living. He reinforces his argument by pointing out that Christ has now become the ruler of all men; namely, of the dead by his descensus ad inferos and of the living by his resurrection.
9. Xpırтós. Most Mss кai Xpıбтós. Note that the interpolator unwarrantably assumes that kvpiov refers to Christ in accordance with X $\rho \iota \sigma \tau$ ô of v. 10.
àvé $\sigma \tau \eta$. NABC ${ }^{\prime \prime} \zeta^{\prime} \zeta \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu$, which is not to the point, for it can only refer to the period of incarnation, and in that period Christ suffered; it was after his resurrection that he sat at the right hand of his heavenly father and now shares his glory and power. That ' $\epsilon \zeta \eta \sigma \in \nu$ or $\vec{a} \nu \in \epsilon^{\prime} \zeta \eta \sigma \in \nu$ is an intrusion from the margin is corroborated by the fact that some witnesses read both ${ }_{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \sigma \sigma \tau \eta$ and ${ }_{\epsilon}{ }^{\prime} \zeta \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu$, the latter not occu-
pying a fixed position, but now standing before $\dot{a}^{\pi} \epsilon \in \theta a v \epsilon$, , now after $\dot{\alpha} \nu$ ย́ $\sigma \tau \eta$.
 FGDE; but on the other hand, $\mathbf{f}$ and $\mathbf{g}$ add in manducando after the second $\dot{d} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi_{0} v{ }^{\prime} \sigma o v$. I should say that it is the additions which better accord with the context, for the whole chapter is only concerned with the questions of meats and of the observance of days, and not with a deprecation of malevolence in general.
 now? Whoever does wrong shall not escape censuring and punishment when he is brought before the judgement-seat, and there all men must appear.
 made before the intrusion of $\mathbf{v} .9$. Burgon (The Traditional Text, p. 288) attributes the reading $\tau o v ̃ \theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$ to scepticism. But $\tau \hat{\varphi} \theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi}$ in v. 11. Cf. also vv. 3 and $6 .{ }^{1}$
11. $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{i} \mu \boldsymbol{\eta}$. So likewise D in accordance with Isai.45-23, where however it is an error for $\epsilon i \mu \eta \nu$. It is this $\epsilon i \mu \grave{\eta} \nu$, I may add, which
 demotic à̀ replaced $\epsilon i$ (see note on v. 14), as in many other cases, ${ }^{2}$ and then àv $\mu \grave{\eta} \nu$ coalesced into one word as à $\mu \mu \grave{\eta} \nu$ and was pronounced $\dot{a} \mu \dot{\eta} \nu$. See Jannaris $\S$ 2055, who however derives it from $\hat{\eta} \mu \dot{\eta} \nu$. All the other Mss ö̃ $\boldsymbol{\text { of }}$ from Isai.45-23; see note on 8-36 and 9-28.
12. äpa. Most Mss äpa oivv.

入óyov àmoঠَ́́cti. So also BD and 39, adopted by Westcott and Hort,;

[^30]and rightly so, for to render an account is expressed by àmodióvau dórov; I have encountered but one exception, namely, in Dan.6-2. Editors generally seem to prefer the reading of the other Mss $\lambda$ órov $\delta \omega ́ \sigma \epsilon$, but I am not clear on what grounds, for $\delta \iota \delta o \sigma^{\prime}$ al $\lambda$ órov means to promise (or communicate). Cf. 1Ki.22-15. Judg.20-7. Jud.9-13. See also Sophocles v. $\lambda$ óros.
àmoठ்َ $\sigma \epsilon$. Practically all other Mss add $\tau \hat{\varphi} \theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi}$.
13. крíveтє. Probably a demotic form for крívate. Cf. Mt 23-23 $\dot{\alpha} \phi \dot{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ (so B). Common in MGk.

тò $\mu \grave{\eta}$ titévac. Inasmuch as крivete can only signify condemn, we should read $\tau$ ò $\tau \ell \theta^{\prime}$ éal (see note on 1-19); but possibly the addition of $\mu \grave{\eta}$ is due to an error on the part of the author who may have had the imperative $\mu \grave{\eta} \tau_{i} \theta_{\epsilon \tau \epsilon}$ in his mind.
14. The statement in v. 15 is not explanatory of this verse but of v. 13. I conjecture that vv. 14 and 15 have exchanged places.
év кир́'í. An adjuration. See note on 9-1.
$\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\mu} \hat{\eta}=\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda \dot{a}^{.}$It is found so employed in 1Cor.7-17. Gal.1-7, etc. Accordingly the reading in Mk $4-22$ and $9-8$ varies between $\epsilon i \mu \eta$ (illustrated by Blaydes at Arist. Eq. 186) or $\grave{\epsilon} \alpha \nu \nu \eta$ 市 and $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha{ }^{\prime}$. In Just. 58 d it is wrongly interpreted by its ordinary signification of nisi. It often takes the form à $\nu \mu \grave{\eta}$ (see note on v. 11) or $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \dot{\alpha} \nu \mu \eta$; cf. Gal.2-16.

 in MGk; see Jannaris $\S$ 1982. Reversely, $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\gamma} \hat{\eta}$ very frequently substitutes $\epsilon i \mu \grave{\eta}$ in its meaning of $\pi \lambda \grave{\eta} v$ or $n i s i$; cf. Just. 352 a $\tau i{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\rho} \tau v \phi \lambda o े s$ $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\lambda} \hat{\eta}$ oi $\pi a i ̂ \delta e ́ s ~ \mu o v ;$ Illustrated by Blaydes at Arist. Eq.953. But Gen.
 a simple $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda a ̀$ could substitute $\epsilon \dot{i} \mu \grave{\eta}$ in the sense of nisi. Apparently therefore $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \hat{\eta} \hat{\eta}$ is merely $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ with its ending assimilated to that of $\epsilon i \mu \bar{\eta}$, and to this also points the combination $\pi \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu \grave{\eta}$ (corrupted by Kock into $\pi \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu \epsilon i$ at Arist. Nub. 361 and 734), where in point of sense $\eta$ is redundant.
 defled thereby. A rejoinder like you are another. A similar rejoinder


 inducunt ; putativum est omne apud eos. Add Phil.3-2 кататоцŋ̀ $\nu-$




 $\kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ \tau o ̀ ̀ ~ \mu ' ́ \rho o s ~ \alpha u ̉ \tau o v ̂ . ~ I n ~ l i k e ~ m a n n e r ~ t o ~ t h e ~ G n o s t i c s, ~ w h o ~ p r e t e n d e d ~$
 $\sigma \alpha \tau \alpha \nu \hat{a}$. Tit.1-15 understood our passage differently.
15. єi $\gamma$ áp. Most witnesses $\epsilon i$ $\delta \epsilon \epsilon^{\prime}$. The change made when by the displacement of v .14 the connection with v. 13 was obscured.

ả $\delta € \lambda$ фós $\sigma o u$ and $\alpha$ àmo $\lambda \lambda$ úєıv. All the other Mss ó $\dot{\alpha} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi$ ós $\sigma o v$ and


16 to 23. Probably spurious. For (1) v. 16 contains an exhortation as to a Christian's general conduct, the proper place of which would have been in ch.12; (2) v. 17 reverts to the question of meats, which




 reproduces oủ $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \gamma$ кoเvòv $\kappa \tau \lambda$ of v . 14 ; (5) v. 21 is practically only a repetition of v .13 ; (6) vv. 22 and 23 are unrelated to anything that precedes them.
16. $\dot{\beta} \lambda \alpha \sigma \phi \eta \mu \epsilon \boldsymbol{i} \sigma \omega$. Nearly all other witnesses add ov̉v.
$\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$. Most Mss $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, which is preferable.


 $\mu \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a$, , where Gebhardt and Harnack fully illustrate the phrase $\beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \phi \eta \mu \epsilon \hat{\iota} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$ тò oेvo $\mu \alpha$. Cf, also 2-24.
17. $\beta$ рө́бєเs каі то́бєเร. The plural also in Hebr.9-10. 13-9. PseudoIgnat. Trall.2. See note on 13-13. All other Mss, excepting A, $\beta \rho \omega \sigma \sigma \iota$ каі̀ то́бıs.

Bpácets. Probably an allusion to the eating of pork, and not to
that of cio $\omega \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \theta v \tau a$, for the latter question had probably evaporated by the time when this work was indited.
tióveıs. Probably an allusion to the drinking of warm water on the sabbath to which the Jews were alleged to object. In this matter the Jews were doubtless misrepresented and made to appear absurd, for their real objection was to the work on the sabbath involved in lighting fires and boiling.

19. $\phi \cup \lambda \alpha{ }^{\prime} \xi \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$. Omitted in most Mss, but it stands in DE.
 that $\mathfrak{N}$ gives $\dot{\alpha} \pi{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda v \epsilon$.

како̀v ктл. The syntax is indefensibly lame.

 крі́vaтє, тò $\mu \grave{\eta}$ т $\theta^{\theta}$ '́val $\pi \rho o ́ \sigma к о \mu \mu а$. Meyer 'Hofmann renders as though


 reading, for $\pi \rho о \sigma к о ́ \pi \tau \epsilon \iota$ and $\sigma \kappa а \nu \delta \alpha \lambda i \zeta \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ are synonymous.
$\hat{\eta} \sigma \kappa \alpha \nu \delta \alpha \lambda i ́ \zeta \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota ~ \hat{\eta}$ à $\sigma \theta \epsilon v \epsilon i$. Omitted in some witnesses.

$\sigma \in a u \tau \omega ิ$. A foreigner's error. All other Mss $\sigma \epsilon a v \tau o ́ v$.
évórtov roû $\theta$ єoû. Omitted in a few cursives and $\boldsymbol{N}$.
ó $\mu \grave{\eta}$ крiver éautóv. Who does not lay himself open to self-reproach or self-condemnation.
 being able to perform what his judgement approves of. See note on $1-18$. To be able so to do is a rare piece of good fortune; therefore the man who enjoys this blessing is $\mu \alpha \kappa \alpha{ }^{\rho} \neq o s$.

катакє́крıтаı. The context seems to me to demand a reflexive sense.
 of Tit.3-11.
 the non-eater is supposed to debate with himself.

Here follows in numerous witnesses the same doxology as stands
after $16-24$, indicating that in some copies the Jipistle closed at this point. The reason probably is that in an ancient roll from which those copies emanated there was no further space available, and its scribe could not help sacrificing the rest. For I believe that 15-14 ff. are genuine, the personal details therein being indispensable from the point of view of the author, who, being naturally anxious to issue his work under the authority of St Paul, is unlikely to have been content with an isolated personal reference, namely, the one which stands in ch. 11. Personal matter would have been still more abundant had St Paul himself penned the Epistle. It may be that Marcion's was one of those truncated copies; it is hardly credible that he intentionally suppressed ch. 15 , for there is nothing in that chapter to which he could have taken exception.

## CHAPTER THE FIFTEENTH

1 to 13. Spurious. For (1) in 14-1 we had an exhortation as to the conduct of the strong in faith towards their weaker brethren, and the object of that exhortation was specified as being mutual tolerance in the matter of meats; is it now probable that the author reverted to a like exhortation and that he did so without specifying an object

 (3) $\delta \iota o ̀ \pi \rho o \sigma \lambda \alpha \mu \beta \dot{\alpha} v \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \lambda o v s$ is thoroughly otiose after the comprehensive recommendations of ch. 12 as to help and love to wards all fellow men; (4) the point of equal favour for circumcised and uncircumcised, which is affirmed in vv. 8 and 9 , was established in ch. 4 and specially affirmed in vv. 11 and 12 of that chapter.

1. òфєíגоцєv $\delta \epsilon \in$. 'I'wo minuscules and $P$ omit $\delta \epsilon$ '.
éautoîs. Féavtoùs, possibly a demotic construction.
àpé́ккоv. An oversight in FG.
2. $\dot{u} \mu \omega ิ v$. Most Mss $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \hat{\nu}$ in agreement with the foregoing verse.

єis tò ảyaOóv. Meyer ' according to Fritzsche, immoral men-pleasing
 omits these words.
4. $\pi \rho о \sigma \epsilon \gamma \rho \alpha ́ \phi \eta$. So also D; an error for $\pi \rho o \epsilon \gamma \rho a ́ \phi \eta$, which is the
reading of all other Mss except that B gives $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \rho \alpha^{\prime} \phi \eta$. Some authorities add $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \alpha$.

є́үрáфŋ. Most Mss $\pi \rho о є \gamma \rho a ́ \phi \eta$.
mapaк $\lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \omega$. The context demands the meaning of instruction, which $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha ́ \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma \iota s$ seems also to possess in Acts 13-15 and 1Thes.2-3. ${ }^{1}$ The chief object of instruction of couise was to comfort, and so comforting may have come to mean instructing. The version through comfort of the scriptures we might have hope does not seem correct, for it is hope that affords comfort and not the reverse; besides, that we might have hope $=$ that we might hope, and this would have been

 in Col.1-5.
${ }^{\prime \prime} \chi \omega \mu \epsilon \nu=\sigma \chi \omega \bar{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$. See note on 1-13. The sense is: That through the instruction received from the study of the gospels concerning faith and conduct we may attain that bliss in heaven for which we hope.

B adds $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \kappa \lambda \eta^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \omega$. But no complement is indispensable. Cf.1Pet.
 є̉v тoîs oủpavoîs. Acts 23-6 $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath ̀ ~ e ́ \lambda \pi i ́ \partial o s ~ к р i ́ v o \mu \alpha \iota . ~}$



7. Xpıotós. So only F ; G and all other Mss ó X $\rho \iota \sigma \tau o ́ s$.
$\dot{u} \mu \hat{s}$. Numerous Mss $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{a} s$ contrary to the context.
8. $\gamma \in \nu$ ย́ $\sigma$ बal. So also BCD; the rest $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \epsilon v \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$.
$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \eta_{\theta} \dot{\prime} \alpha \mathrm{s}=\pi \dot{\prime} \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega \mathrm{s}$, trustworthiness. See note on 3-4.
9. Sogácat. Probably an optative, and so Hofmann; otherwise, we
 But it is more likely that the interpolator modified his thought in the second colon than that he adopted such a violent change of construc-

$\tau \hat{̣}$ ỏvó $\mu \alpha \tau^{i}$ oou $\psi \alpha \lambda \hat{\omega}$. Here again there is a divergence between $\mathrm{H}^{\prime}$ and G , in that the latter reads $\psi \alpha \lambda \hat{\omega} \tau \hat{\varrho}$ ỏvó $\mu a \tau i ́ \sigma o v$.
10. kaì $\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota v$. A frequent expression in Apological literature when
prophetic quotations are accumulated in proof that Christian events had been foretold by the Prophets. It occurs also in Hebr.2-13.
11. ė $\pi \alpha \iota \nu$ évarє. Several authorities $\grave{\epsilon} \pi \alpha \iota \nu \epsilon \sigma \alpha ́ \tau \omega \sigma \alpha \nu$, no doubt with the object of conforming to the LXX.
 same divergence in v. 29. Col.4-12 and 2Tim.4-17, the Mss being differently divided.
$\pi \dot{a} \sigma \eta$. For the syntax see note on 1-29. B év $\pi \alpha{ }^{\prime} \sigma \eta$, which probably is meant as a simple dative; see note on 1-19. All other Mss classically $\pi \alpha ́ \sigma \eta s$.
 meant to follow $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma \epsilon v \in \epsilon \nu \dot{v} \mu a ̂ s$.
cis tò $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma \epsilon$ úctv. But joy and peace of mind would be the consequence of abundant hope and not vice versa; unless therefore the interpolator was writing inattentively, we should bave expected éк $\tau o v ̂ \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma \epsilon$ v́єıv. 2 Cor. 9-8 is different.
$\tau \hat{\eta} \hat{e} \lambda \pi i \delta \delta \iota$. So also DE and two cursives. Cf. 1Thes.3-12 $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma \epsilon$ v́caı $\tau \hat{\eta} \hat{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \eta$. The usual construction however is to add $\hat{\epsilon} \nu$, and so all the other Mss $\epsilon \in \nu \tau \hat{n} \epsilon \in \lambda i \delta \delta \iota$.



14. кaì aủtòs ėץต. I myself, you need not protest to me your love. An answer to a supposed objection on the part of the addressees. Bloomfield ‘ Beza well compares the Homeric $\tau i ́ \mu \epsilon \sigma \pi \epsilon$ úסovтa кaì aúzòv ór $\rho$ v́veıs;' Why later expositors have deviated from this obviously correct interpretation I cannot see.
áde $\lambda \phi$ oí. Without $\mu o v$ as in v. 15 ; so also DE.
öть. With the exception of DE, all other Mss add кaì av̇тoí. Either reading might be correct. The parallel passage of 2 Pet.1-12 каím $\rho$

 $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \eta_{\eta} \lambda o v s$ favours the addition.
àүámŋs. So also Latin versions including the Vulgate; the other Mss ả $\gamma a \theta \omega \sigma v v^{\prime} \eta \mathrm{s}$.

каi $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \mu \epsilon \in \mathscr{\varepsilon} о$. The variant without the conjunction would re-
present $\gamma \nu \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota s$ as an outcome of $\dot{a} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \pi \eta \eta$ or $\dot{a} \gamma a \theta \omega \sigma \dot{v} v \eta$, and as such it is inadmissible.
 to Shakespeare's mind when he wrote RJ.3-5-182 stuffed, as they say, with honourable parts? If so, with a poet's penetration he scented its ironical tone.
 Phil.1-3. The addition of the article gives $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \eta$ s the force of ö $\lambda \eta s$, with the entire.
$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \hat{\eta} \lambda$ ous. The reading varies between $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda o v s, ~ \kappa \alpha \grave{a} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \lambda o v s$, and кail ${ }_{\alpha}^{\prime} \lambda \lambda$ dovs. The last is that of $L$ with many cursives and both Syriac versions, and I believe it to be the original one. Cf. Ignat. Mar. 5


 pensable. The reading $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \eta_{\eta} \lambda o v s$ is very tame.
15. ėmava $\mu \mu \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \omega \nu$. The variant $\dot{v} \pi \alpha \nu \alpha \mu \iota \mu \nu \dot{\gamma} \sigma \kappa \omega \nu$, recorded by Scrivener from the Cambridge cursive Mm 6-9, is the one which best
 offered modestly and not as one meant to recall a previous obligation.



 ye know) ${ }^{\prime \prime} \pi \pi \xi{ }^{\prime} \alpha_{\alpha} \nu \tau a .^{1}$ This is a practical proof out of several of the soundness of Scrivener's contention in p. vi of Codex Augiensis ' what we do resist is a scheme which shall exclude the cursive Mss from all real influence in determining the text.'

ảmò toû $\theta$ єoû. So F and NB; G and the rest vimò tov̂ $\theta \epsilon o \hat{\text { an }}$. See note on 13-1.
16. $\gamma^{\epsilon \iota \in ́ \sigma \theta a l . ~ S o ~ a l s o ~ D ~ ; ~ a l l ~ o t h e r ~ M s s ~ \epsilon i v a l . ~ P r o b a b l y ~ є i v a t ~ i s ~ r i g h t, ~}$ for the Latin versions defg read sim. See note on 3-4.
cis rà ë $\theta \nu \eta$. Absent in $B$. Possibly an omission added in the margin, which was disregarded in some copies, but restored in others where it now stands instead of after $\tau \grave{o}$ є $\dot{v} a \gamma \gamma^{\epsilon} \lambda_{\iota o \nu} \tau o \hat{v} \theta$ cov̂.

үє́vŋтаı. B $\gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \theta \hat{\eta}$. The same divergence in 16-2. Phrynichus (Lobeck,
 $\gamma \in \nu \eta \theta \hat{\eta}$ represents the demotic speech, it should probably be preferred. See note on 3-4.
 might be right.
17. oûv. It implies that the offering up of the nations has actually proved acceptable.

тク̀ $\nu$ каúx $\eta \sigma \iota v$. The article denotes a distinction, namely, that the
 therefore glory in my success as regards my ministry, if not as regards my secular affairs. Most Mss omit the article.
ėv Xpıotẹ. Instrumentally. By the help of Christ. The R.V. has not improved the translation by rendering in Christ Jesus instead of through Jesus Chirist.
tà $\pi \rho \frac{̀ ̀ s}{\text { tò } v ~} \theta$ cóv. In my affairs with God. See note on 4-2.
 Xpıaròs $\delta_{\imath}{ }^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \mu \mathrm{ov}$. These words can signify nothing else buti what the A.V. gives: For I will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ hath not wrought by me. The unfitness of this is evident, and therefore by a tour de force the text has been represented as meaning : For I will venture (note the modern polite phrase I will venture) to let myself be heard only as to such things, the actual fulfilment of which has taken place by Christ through me. See Meyer. Even if the words could yield this sense, what is the object of the remark? L however and most Mss give $\lambda \alpha \lambda \epsilon i v \tau \iota$. Read therefore ov̉ $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \boldsymbol{\tau} 0 \lambda \mu \hat{\omega} \epsilon i \pi \epsilon i v \tau i ́ ~ o v ̉$
 me; namely, the work through my ministry has been so vast-I have succeeded in propagating the gospel as far as Illyricum-that if I made bold to describe it, I might not be believed. Bloomfield 'Carpzov recognizes here a delicacy of idiom, q. d. I can scarcely venture to say what C'llrist hath not done by me, i.e. how much he hath done.'


[^31]$\epsilon_{\epsilon} \pi \iota \tau \epsilon \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$; Philost. Apol.1-12 $\tau i ́ \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ ov̉ $\chi{ }_{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda i \tau \tau \omega \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \sigma \epsilon \lambda \gamma \hat{\omega} \nu$; Achil.


$\stackrel{\omega}{\omega} v$. Added because the interrogative $\tau i$ was misunderstood for an indefinite pronoun, and thus the syntax. was assimilated to that of
 $\tau o i ̂ s ~ e ٌ ~ \theta \theta \nu \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu$.
19. év $\delta u v \alpha ́ \mu \epsilon \iota-\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon i \omega v$. An unparalleled phrase so far as I know. The correct reading is supplied, I think, by the old witness $m$ et virtute eius signis et prodigiis except that the initial et is unnecessary. Thus we obtain the import that by the power of Christ when his name was invoked things pertaining to ${ }^{\prime \prime} \rho \gamma \omega$-specified as $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon i ̂ a$ and $\tau \epsilon \prime \rho a \tau \alpha-$ were accomplished, and by the power of the holy Spirit things pertaining to $\lambda o{ }^{\prime} \gamma \omega-$ in this case left unspecified-were accomplished.
áyiou. Most Mss $\theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$; both absent in B.

 tion probably was made when $\phi і \lambda о \tau \iota \mu о \hat{\mu} \alpha \iota$ (so also BDP) became

$\mu$ е́xpı тoû ' $1 \lambda \lambda u p \iota к o u ̂$. An irresponsible exaggeration. Cf. Col.1-23

 $\epsilon \lambda \theta \omega \dot{\omega}$.
20. ötou oủk. So also D. Altered into ov̉ $\chi$ ö́тov because $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ was thought to be antithetical to öтоv ov̉к $\dot{\omega} \nu o \mu \alpha ́ \sigma \theta \eta$ instead of to $\stackrel{i}{\nu}_{\nu}^{\nu} \alpha \mu \grave{\eta}$ оікодо $\mu \hat{\omega}$.

 Apostles visited the churches which he had already established and then took credit to themselves for their establishment.
 note on 3-4.

каӨ̀̀s $\gamma$ ย́ $\gamma \rho a \pi т \alpha \iota$. Parenthetically.
 $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \omega \lambda v \theta^{\prime} \eta \nu$ of $1-13$, to which this passage harks back. All the other witnesses ė $\nu \in \kappa о \pi \tau о ́ \mu \eta \nu$.

то入入ákıs. So also BDE; the other Mss, apparently all, $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ mod ${ }^{2}$, which here possesses no force and for which read ${ }^{\prime \prime} \tau \eta \pi$ тod $\alpha_{\alpha}$. So Linwood, Remarks on Conjectural Emendation as applied to the New Testament, p. 13. (I have conjectured independently.) Denounced by Scrivener, Introd. p. 434.

23 and 24. Spurious. They were meant as a substitute for vv. 25 to 32 and written by a fanatical member of the Church Catholic who objected to any sympathetic reference or help to the Ebionites or Poor (see v.26) of Palestine, for they had come to be looked upon as heretics. ${ }^{1}$ Probably therefore these verses were written towards the end of the second or the beginning of the third century. The writer started his substitute with the first word of the text which he wished to remove, namley $\nu \hat{v} \nu$ or $\nu v \nu \grave{l}$, as was done in 1-24, and noted it in the margin in two sections, the first of which, namely, vvvi $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \mu \eta \kappa \epsilon ́ \tau \iota$ тóтov ${ }^{\prime \prime} \chi \omega \nu$
 intended to precede $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota ~ \delta \iota ' ~ \dot{v} \mu \hat{a} \boldsymbol{s} \epsilon i s \Sigma_{\pi \alpha v i ́ a \nu}$ of v. 28 , and the

 $\mu$ épovs $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \pi \lambda \eta \sigma \theta \hat{\omega}$ was to follow that verse. This design however was not perceived and the link $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \dot{\prime} \sigma o \mu a \iota ~ \delta \iota^{\prime} \dot{u} \mu \hat{a ̂ s} \epsilon i s \Sigma \pi a v i ́ a \nu$ was missed, so that the two sections came together in a confused syntax. This confusion it was afterwards sought to remedy by reading $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \pi \sigma \theta_{i} \dot{a} \nu$ ס $\delta$

 of $L$ and most other witnesses.
 to fasten upon St Paul.
émımotíav. A monstrous formation comparable to $\pi \alpha \rho a \phi \rho o v i a v ~ o f ~$ 2Pet.2-16. The objector meant to say '̇ $\pi \iota \theta v \mu i \alpha \nu$, but preferred to create a new noun from $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \pi \circ \theta \hat{\omega}$ of 1-11, which he had in his mind.
${ }^{\prime \prime}{ }^{\prime} X \omega$. An oversight in $F G$ for ${ }^{\prime \prime} \chi \chi \omega \nu$.
24. $\dot{\omega} \sigma \grave{\alpha} \nu$. Generally written $\dot{\omega} s \stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \nu$; but it should be written as one word, for it is the same as örav with ó $\tau \epsilon$ replaced by its equivalent

[^32]©́s. In MGk $\sigma \grave{\alpha} \nu($ from $\dot{\omega} \sigma \grave{\alpha} \nu)=\check{\sigma} \tau \alpha \nu$. A further development is $\dot{\sigma} \pi \omega \sigma \dot{\alpha} \nu$ of Acts 3-19 and probably Lk 2-35. Cf. also є̇ $\pi \grave{a} \nu$, ė $\pi \epsilon \iota \delta a ́ v$.
25. ठıакоvŋिбаı. So also DE; the rest $\delta \iota a \kappa о \nu \omega \nu$.
 having probably been misread as part of 'A ${ }^{\prime}$ aia, the latter seems to have become 'АХаıакоi (cf. fg Achaici), which is the reading of G, and Макє $\delta o v i \alpha a$ to have followed suit and become Макє $\delta^{\prime} v \epsilon \epsilon$. All the other Mss Макєбоvía каi 'A ${ }^{\prime} \alpha i ̈ a . ~$

28. oûv àpa. I do not remember this combination from elsewhere. Perhaps $\bar{\alpha}=\pi \rho \hat{\tau} \tau \boldsymbol{\nu}$ was taken for an abbreviation of à $\rho a$; but such an abbreviation, so far as I know, has not so far been recorded. Kenyon, Palaeography of Greek Papyri, p. 154, records à for ává. Scrivener, Introd. p. 47, records the sign $\gamma$ for both $\alpha \rho$ and $\alpha$.
$\delta \iota^{\prime}$ ípâs. All other Mss $\delta \iota{ }^{\prime} \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$. See note on 8-37.
£maviav. A legendary journey; perhaps suggested by the tradition of a similar journey of Apollonius of Tyana? See Antiqua Mater (by E. Jolinson?), p. 262. A journey to Spain attributed likewise to Onesimus.


 But $L$ and most witnesses, including the Syriac versions, read $\tau 0 \hat{v}$ $\epsilon \dot{v} \alpha \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda i o v ~ \tau o \hat{v} \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{v}$ instead of the simple $\tau 0 \hat{\mathrm{v}} \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{v}$; was then the original reading $\grave{\epsilon} v \pi \lambda \eta \rho o \phi o \rho i ́ a ~ o r ~ \pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega ́ \mu a \tau \iota ~ \tau o v ̂ ~ \epsilon \dot{u} a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda i ́ o v ~ \tau o \hat{v}$ X $\rho \iota \sigma \tau$ ô ?
30. $\delta \iota a ̀$ тoû кupíou $=$ Sià tòv кúpıov. An adjuration. See note on 12-1.
31. $\delta \omega р о ф о$ ía. So also BD. The other Mss $\delta \iota a \kappa o v i ́ a ; ~ f r o m ~ 2 C o r . ~$ 8-4. 9-1.
 conversely see Jannaris § 1538.
$\pi p o \sigma \delta \epsilon \kappa т o ́ s$. A rare word, and as such it is hardly likely to have substituted $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\jmath} \pi \rho \rho o ́ \sigma \delta \epsilon \kappa \tau о \varsigma$, which is the reading of the other Mss.
32. Xpıбто仑́ 'I $\eta$ бov̂. So also DE ; the other Mss, apparently all, $\theta$ єov.



тov̂ $\mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau 0 \hat{v}$ vel similiter dictum est.' But what is true of St Paul may not apply to his imitators.
 $\kappa \alpha \grave{\iota} \sigma v \nu a v a \pi \alpha v ́ \sigma \omega \mu a \iota \dot{v} \mu i v$, which probably represents elegant polishing. B omits these words altogether.
33. ó $\delta e ̀$ é $\theta$ ès $\kappa \tau \lambda$. This doxology evidently concludes the Epistle but for the salutations of $16-21$. The other salutations were partly fabricated and partly perhaps tacked on as the Epistle passed from one Christian community to another. Of the latter process we have an indication in 16-12.

## CHAPTLR THE SIXTEENTTH

1. фoiß $\beta \nu$. This story of Phoeke was concocted when the Epistle came to be represented as having emanated from Corinth. It is a clumsy fabrication, for it is incredible that an influential and wealthy woman should have served as a deaconess in a church, where her functions would have been partly menial. People of standing in the East were then, as now, far more circumspect in matters of dignity than it is realized in the West. That is the reason why the question of $\pi \rho \omega \pi \sigma^{-}$ $\kappa \alpha \theta \epsilon \delta \rho^{\prime} \alpha$ was probably so frequent a cause of friction. The object of the story was to show that wealthy women were joining Christianity.

 v. 12 .




 are equivalent. This idiom dates from classical times. Cf. Plat. Gorg.

 Cf. 3Jn $6 \pi \rho o \pi \epsilon ́ \mu \psi \alpha$ as $\dot{\alpha} \xi ' \omega s$ тov̂ $\theta_{\epsilon \rho \hat{v}}=$ as is due to God, to a servant of God.



тapaotárıs. In accordance with $\pi a \rho a \sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon$. Meyer compares Stob. Fl.416-43 èv vóvoıs $\pi \alpha \rho a \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \tau \iota s, ~ t h o u g h ~ h e ~ p r e f e r s ~ \pi \rho o \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \tau \iota s . ~ C f . ~ a l s o ~$
 $\pi a \rho \epsilon ́ \sigma \tau \eta s \quad \chi \in \rho \sigma i v$. Blaydes abundantly illustrates this sense at Arist. Eq.564. Cf. also Soph. OK. $490 \tau \alpha v ิ \tau \alpha ́ \sigma o \iota ~ \delta \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \alpha \nu \tau \iota ~ a ̂ v ~ \pi \alpha \rho a \sigma \tau \alpha i \eta \nu . ~ T h e ~$ verb is still alive in MGk.

тробтátıs. A similar error in XII Patr. Jos.2, where now трö́бтatal instead of $\pi \alpha \rho i ́ \sigma \tau \alpha \tau \alpha$.
3. à $\sigma \pi \alpha \dot{\sigma} \theta a l$. So F throughout; G in v. $8 \dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta a \iota$, and the same in v. 16 but corrected into $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi \alpha ́ \sigma \theta a \iota$. No doubt an imperative. A very curious form.
5. ảmapxウ. Probably $=$ the choicest fruit. Cf. Clem. Hom. (Dressel,


'Agias. Most Mss 'A $\chi$ aías, so corrected probably as being more in accordance with an epistle addressed from Corinth.
 $\gamma є \gamma \dot{\sigma} v a \sigma \iota \nu$.
8. ả $\gamma \boldsymbol{\alpha} \eta$ то́v. So FB; G and all other Mss add $\mu$ оv.

 The other Mss 'Apıбтoßovidov.
11. $\sigma u v \gamma \epsilon \nu \hat{\eta}$. For the variant $\sigma v \nu \gamma \epsilon \nu \hat{\eta} \nu$ see note on 4-5.
övtas ėv kupíc. See note on 1-7.
12. Tpúфaıva. A legendary wealthy woman figuring in Acts of Praul and Thecla. See note on v. 1 .

All Mss, with the exception of FGA, add $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \in \Pi \epsilon \rho \sigma i \delta \alpha \alpha \dot{\eta} \prime$


 at Arist. Eq.534. Add $\Lambda o v \kappa \alpha \hat{s}, ~ Z \eta \eta \nu a ̂ s . ~ I t ~ i s ~ t h e ~ s a m e ~ a s ~ \Pi a r \rho o ́ \beta ı o s ~(c f . ~$ $\mathrm{M} \eta \tau \rho o ́ \beta ı o s)$ with the contemptuous suffix attached to names of slaves. Blaydes ibid. 'Forma Kovvâs pro Kóvvos contemptum exprimit.'
15. N $\eta$ péav. For this form see note on $4-5$.

кai ' $0 \lambda u \mu \pi i \delta a$. P and three cursives omit the conjunction, thus the names in this verse being mentioned in couples. DE read каi ' $O \lambda \nu \mu$ $\pi i a v$; Latin versions каi 'O $\lambda \nu \mu \pi t a ́ \delta a$. The correct reading is probably 'О $\lambda v \mu \pi \leftarrow \alpha ́ \delta a$.
16. áyíw. An affirmation that the Christian kiss at the $\dot{a} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha c$ was a chaste, and not a lustful, kiss as was imputed to the faithful by their calumniators. See Renan, Marc-Aur. p. 383. Gifford 'The custom is retained in the Greek Church.' It is only now customary among friends of the same sex or relatives on first meeting after Xpırios $\dot{a} \nu \dot{\prime} \dot{\prime} \sigma \tau \eta$, and even as such it is dying out.

All Mss, save FGDE, add $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi \alpha ́ \zeta o v \tau \alpha \iota ~ \dot{v} \mu \hat{s}$ ai $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma i \alpha \iota ~ \pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \iota ~ \tau o v ̂ ~$ Xpıoтov. On the other hand, FGDE add at v. 21 the words кai ai $\grave{\epsilon} \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma i \alpha \iota ~ \pi \hat{a} \sigma \alpha \iota \iota \tau o \hat{v} \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{v}$, whereas all the other Mss omit them.
17. таракалиิ-бкотєі̂тє. Cf. Phil.4-3 $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \rho \omega \tau \omega$ каì $\sigma \grave{\epsilon}, \sigma v \nu \lambda \alpha \mu \beta a ́ v o v . ~$
à $\sigma \phi a \lambda \omega \hat{s}$ бкотєitє. Perhạps a glossa on $\dot{a} \sigma \phi \alpha \lambda i ́ \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$. Cf. PseudoIgnat. Trall. 7 á $\sigma \phi \alpha \lambda i ́ \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$ тov̀s tooov́rovs ìva $\mu \eta ̀ ~ \lambda a ́ \beta \eta \tau \epsilon ~ \beta \rho o ́ \chi o v ~ \tau a i ̂ s ~$ $\dot{\epsilon} a v \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \psi v \chi a i ̂ s$. With the exception of FGDE, all the Mss give $\sigma \kappa о \pi \epsilon i v$.
$\lambda \epsilon ́ y o v t a s ~ \hat{\eta}$ тocoûvas. So also DE; nearly all other authorities only тoเov̂vzas.



ċ $\xi \alpha$ mat $\omega$ бr. Preceded in all Mss, save FGDE and several minuscules, by кaì єủगoरias, the meaning of which seems to be $\epsilon \dot{v} \gamma \lambda \omega \tau \tau i a s, \kappa \alpha \lambda \lambda_{l}$ doyías, elegant speech.
 $\pi a \tau \eta \theta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon, \dot{\eta} \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \dot{v} \pi \alpha \kappa o \grave{\eta} \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$. See note on 1-18.
áкєраíous $\delta$ è єis $\tau$ ò какóv. Cf. 1Cor.14-20 $\tau \hat{\eta}$ какía $\nu \eta \pi \iota \dot{\jmath} \zeta \epsilon \tau \epsilon$.
20. $\sigma u v \tau \rho i ́ \psi є \iota . ~ L ~ \sigma v \nu \tau \rho \iota \psi \eta=\sigma v \nu \tau \rho i ́ \psi \eta, \sigma v \nu \tau \rho \iota \psi a ́ \tau \omega$. See note on 14-2.

бacavâv. The prompter of those who cause discord.
 $\mu \in \theta^{\prime} \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu\left[\dot{\alpha} \mu \eta_{\nu}\right]$. A marginal addition which in some Mss was inserted at the end of $v .27$.

 $\pi \hat{a} \sigma \alpha \iota \tau o \hat{v} \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{v}$ of v. 21. Possibly the latter existed in an ancient
copy as a marginal learned correction, which was meant to substitute the demotic кai öдaı ai éкк $\lambda \eta \sigma i a \iota$, but which was mistaken or an omission to be restored in the text. As a marginal note it would also account for the fact that, whereas in FGDE it figures in $\nabla .21$, in all the other Mss it figures in v . 16.
24. ทi Xápıs-ă $\mu \mathfrak{\eta} \nu$. Not in $\aleph A B C$ and two cursives. Another marginal addition variously inserted; namely, at this place, in v. 20 , and in v . 27.

25 to 27. These verses, which are only absent from FG, run as




 A marginal addition meant to follow v. 20. The drift is that, in contradistinction to the eloquent and plausible Gnostic disputants-ironically hinted at as roфoi-it is God alone who is roфòs and through Christ can edify. Similarly, in the imitative passage of Judas which winds up that Epistle there comes first a violent denunciation of disputants ( $\delta<a \kappa \rho \iota \nu o \mu \epsilon ́ v o v s$ ), and then follows an exhortation to praise God as the only possible saviour.
25. кaтà tò єủayरé̀ıóv $\mu \mathbf{o u}$. By adherence to my gospel. The blessing of edification can only be secured by adherence to the gospel I preach.

 Christ. So Erasmus. Cf. 1Cor.1-6 тò $\mu \alpha \rho \tau$ v́ptov ( $=$ тò кй $\rho v \gamma \mu \alpha$, as St

 was being preached by St Paul in consequence of the revelation to him of the ancient mystery. The proper expression to have employed was $\bar{\epsilon} \xi \dot{\alpha} \pi \pi о к а \lambda \dot{v} \psi \epsilon \omega s$, but it was modified so as to effect a parisosis with $\kappa a \tau^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \tau \alpha \gamma \eta{ }^{\prime} \nu$. See note on 1-4.
26. $\delta \iota \alpha ̀ ~ \gamma \rho a \phi \hat{\nu} \boldsymbol{\pi} \rho о \phi \eta \tau \iota \kappa \omega ̂ \nu$. The variant $\delta \iota \alpha$ $\tau \epsilon \gamma \rho \alpha \phi \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho о \phi \eta \tau \iota \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu$, although very strongly attested, is manifestly wrong, for nowhere else does it occur as God's order that the gospel should be made known to the Gentiles through the prophetic writings. The belief was (1) that
certain mysterious sentences occurring in the Prophets became clear ( $\phi a \nu \epsilon \rho \omega \theta \epsilon \in \tau \tau o s$ ) at the advent ( $\nu \hat{v} \nu$ ) of Jesus through their agreement with the events of his life, thus confirming him as the Messiah; and (2) that, in obedience to God's command, the benefit of this revelation should not solely accrue to the Jews, but be equally extended to the Gentiles. Therefore the conjunctive, which as кai could quite easily be missed owing to its close similarity to $\kappa a \tau$, must be joined with $\kappa \alpha \tau^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \tau \alpha \gamma \eta \nu$, and such is the reading of the Peshitto and the Aethiopian versions, namely, $\delta \iota \grave{\alpha} \gamma \rho a \phi \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho о ф \eta \eta^{\prime} \iota \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \alpha \grave{\iota} \kappa \alpha \tau^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \tau \alpha \gamma \eta_{\nu} \nu$.
 which is the reading of all the other Mss.
${ }_{\omega}^{*}$. Redundant. Similarly interpolated in the Sinaiticus at Plil.4-20.

## [TO THE ROMANS]

7 To you all, men steadfast in the love of God and sanctified r by his call, greeting's from me Paul, a slave of Jesus Christ, an apostle by God's summons, assigned to the preaching of his gos${ }_{2}$ pel, which in a remote past he promised through his prophets 3 in holy writings concerning his son, an offspring from the seed 4. of David in his mortal frame but destined to rise from the dead 5 and be endowed with spirit and power as the son of God, whose favour has commissioned me to go forth and glorify his name by. bringing every race under an acknowledgement of his faith, 6 the faith to which you have yourselves been called by him. ${ }_{7}$ Grace be to you and peace from God our father and the Lord Jesus Christ.
First, I render thanks to my God through Jesus Christ as regards you all for your steadfastness in the faith, which is 9 proclaimed throughout the whole world. I say truly-and God is my witness to whose spiritual service I have consecrated myself for the propagation of his son's gospel-that I never fail ro to mention you in my devotions, and unceasingly pray in the hope that with God's will I may perhaps now at last start on ${ }_{11}$ a prosperous journey towards you. For I long to see you and ${ }_{12}$ impart to you some spiritual gift towards your support; nay, rather that when we meet we may reciprocally be comforted ${ }_{13}$ by our common faith, I by yours and you by mine. For you must know, brethren, that this is not a recent wish of mine ; many a time have I purposed to come to you-but I have been hindered so far-desiring to reap some harvest among you, as I have also done in the other nations among whom I have ${ }^{1} 4$ preached. I have a duty towards all, be they Greeks or bar${ }_{5} 5$ barians, wise or foolish ; so am I equally eager on my part to ${ }_{16}$ preach the gospel to you. For I am not ashamed of the gospel,

It brings strength from God to every believer, whether Jew or Greek; for therein it is revealed as to how God absolves from ${ }^{17}$ sin through faith in Jesus Christ, as it is written 'But the righteous shall live by faith.'

But no less is it therein revealed that the wrath of God shall 18 descend from heaven upon all those godless and lawless men who iniquitously persecute evangelical truth. For they have no 19 excuse. The unknown concerning God is clear to them; God himself has given an indication in his mighty works, which have so stood before our eyes ever since the world was created and from which the mind can deduce the invisible as to his eternal power. and godship. I say then that these men are inexcusable, since, a1 though they lnew God, it is not him that they glorified as the one God, nor is it to him that they rendered thanks, but futility seized upon their minds and darkness upon their insensate hearts. Profound philosophers by their own pretensions but 22 ignorant in fact, they debased the glory of an incorruptible God ${ }_{23}$ to images of corruptible man or birds or quadrupeds or reptiles. Therefore God has delivered them up to uncleanness [and ${ }_{24}$ bodily dishonour by the desires of their own hearts, in that they ${ }_{25}$ falsified God's truth and reverenced and worshipped the creation more than the creator, blessed be he for ever, amen] ; † and now 28 they do what they ought to shun, replete as they are with all un- 29 righteousness, wickedness, greed; full of envy, turbulence, brawling, deceit, unmannerliness; backbiters, slanderers hateful to 30 God, malefactors, haughty, conceited, inventors of empty questions, disobedient to parents, foolish, irreconcilable, void of affec- 3 tion and pity ; who, though conversant with God's decrees, do $3^{2}$ not perceive that such guilt carries the penalty of future death

[^33]not only if a man so behaves himself, but also if he does but abet others who so behave.
I Therefore thou art equally indefensible, thou a carping man, whoever thou be, and condemnest thyself by thy precious carp2 ing at thy brother who dissents from thee. We are agreed that 3 God's punishment shall visit in just measure those sinners ; is then this in thy mind when thou condemnest those men but carpest after their manner, that thou, if thou be a Jew, wilt 4 escape punishment? Or dost thou slight his abounding considerateness and forbearance and patience, forgetting that his con5 siderateness shows thee the way to repentance, but that consistently with thy stubborn and impenitent heart thou treasurest up wrath for the day of wrath, for that day when an impartial 6 God will emerge to judge? He shall then requite each man ac7 cording to his deeds ; to those who seek after glory and honour by not wearying at a good work God will grant eternal and 8 incorruptible life, but for those who employ strife, regardless of truth and yielding to wickedness, there is in store wrath and 9 anger. Sorrow and anguish await every man born, none exro cepted, Jew first and also Greek, whose handiwork is evil ; but glory and honour and peace await all men who do good, be they ir Jews or Greeks. For there is no respect of persons at the Court i2 of God; all those who, though without law, have not sinned shall be set free without law, and all those who under the Law have ${ }_{13}$ sinned shall be condemned under the Law. For it is not the disciples of the Law who are righteous in the sight of God, but its 16 doers shall be held just, $\uparrow$ who, on the day when God-through Jesus Christ as my gospel teaches-will judge men not accord${ }_{55}$ ing to legal observances but their hidden deeds, will present the performance of the Law written upon their hearts, and their conscience shall then be their advocate the while their thoughts

14 + For when Gentiles, who possess no law by the fact of birth, practise the precepts of the Law, they, though destitute of law, enjoy its benefits by their own righteous conduct,
reciprocally accuse or indeed defend them as to past conformity or no to a sinless life.

But if thou call thyself a Jew and make thy mind easy be- 17 cause of the inheritance of the Law and glory in God's protection, aware of the supreme will and an expert as to what is best 18 through constant instruction out of the Law, and credit thyself 19 with being a guide of the blind, a light of those in darkness, a 20 chastiser of perverse children, a tutor of babes--for blind and children dost thou call the other nations-possessing in the Law the science of educating men in knowledge and truth, what now 21 if thou who teachest others do not teach thyself? if thou who proclaimest 'Steal not' steal ? if thou who sayest 'No adultery' ${ }_{22}$ commit it? if thou who abhorrest idols practise idolatrous augury? if thou who gloriest in the Law of God dishonour God by ${ }_{2} 3$ its transgressions? For there are such men among the Jews, as 24 Isaiah says ' Because of you the name of God is cursed among the nations.' I say that circumcision profits if we carry out the 25 Law; if we transgress it, our circumcision is no better than acrobysty. But if again a Gentile observe the behests of the Law, 26 his acrobysty shall be reckoned to him for circumcision. And ${ }_{27}$ should not a man who thus fulfils the Law have a right to carp at thee who with writings and circumcision art its transgressor? For a true Jew is not a Jew visibly, not he who visibly shows 28 upon his flesh the mark of circumcision, but the Jew non-visibly ${ }_{29}$ is the true Jew-and circumcision of the heart is the true cir-cumcision-Jew in spirit and not according to prescripts, whose praise has its source not in men but in God.

What is then the advantage which the Jews enjoy? or what I profit is there in circumcision? Great by all means is their ad- 2 vantage. First of all, they were entrusted with the prophecies of God. What matters it if a handful of them, those of thisgenera- 3 tion, prove themselves unworthy of this trust? must their betrayal nullify God's trustworthiness to the rest? God forbid. 4 God is ever true; but every lying trustee, to quote David's expression, must look to it that he prove innocent in his pleading

5 and win at his trial. Such men shall be punished. Else, if our unrighteousness, of us Jews, established God's clemency, what must follow? Would it not be asked : Is not then God unjust who visits his wrath upon any other sinner? I speak as a god6 less man might argue. Away with such an impious thought! For then how could it any more be maintained that God shall 7 judge the world? For if through men's lies God's clemency [and goodness] abounded, why is any man at all accounted any more 8 a sinner? Why not act after the principle which some slanderers impute to me, asserting that I teach Let us do evil that good may come? Nay, palpable is the crime of such calumniators.
9 Where then dost thou find a privilege which we Jews enjoy? We enjoy none. I taxed just now both Jews and Greeks with io being the slaves of sin, as is confirmed by what is written 'There ir is none righteous, no, not one ; there is none that understandeth; ${ }_{12}$ there is none that seeketh after God; they have all turned aside; they are together become unprofitable ; there is none that doeth ${ }_{13}$ good, no, not so much as one; their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit ; the poison of asps is ${ }^{4} 4$ under their lips; whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness; i6 their feet are swift to shed blood; destruction and misery are 18 in their ways, and the way of peace have they not known; there ${ }_{19}$ is no fear of God before their eyes.' Now, we know that whatsoever the Law says is addressed to those under the Law, that every mouth might be stopped and all the world, the Jews not 20 excepted, brought under God's judgement. Therefore legal observances ensure no justification at the Court of God ; the Law only expounds sin, it does not condone it.
${ }^{21}$ But now there has been revealed a new road to justification, ${ }_{2}$ testified by the Law and the Prophets, a justification resting upon faith in Jesus Christ and blessing all such as possess it. ${ }_{23}$ Distinction is there none, for all have sinned and to none does ${ }^{2} 4$ justification come as a right, but is granted as a gift of grace ${ }_{25}$ by God's own choice. Through Jesus Christ does it ensue, him whom God preordained to atone for our sins by self-immola,-
tion-sins too long tolerated-and demonstrate at this present 26 time God's clemency ; yea, that God is merciful and will justify all those who profess faith in Jesus. Where then, 0 Jew, dost ${ }_{27}$ thou find ground for glorying in superiority? is it in thy legal formalities? Not so; for they have been superseded by faith and thy glorying is excluded. For we reclconed that it is by faith 28 that man is justified, and he needs no legal worles; or dost thou, 29 O Jeu, pretend that God is a god of the Jews alone and not equally so of the Gentiles? I say of them too, since God is one, as 30 thou proclaimest in thy prayer, and he will justify alike men with circumcision if they add faith and men with faith in spite of acrobysty. Thus it is in faith that we Christians believe; but 3 r God forbid that we should bethought thereby to abrogate the Law! Nay, to the Lav we give a new force, for we believe that it has foretold the advent of Jesus.

But what then must we infer from what the scripture says $\mathrm{m}_{\text {. }}$ concerning Abraham, our lineal father? If Abraham in relation ${ }^{2}$ to God is pronounced righteous by reason of works, thou hast a ground for pride; but it is not thereby that he is so pronounced. For what does the scripture say? It says 'And Abra- 3 ham believed God, and it was reckoned to him for righteousness.' Does not this imply a favour? For if a man work, his wage is 4 reckoned to him as a debt for work done; but if aught be entered 5 to a shirker's credit, it must be for his belief if he appeal to, and believe in, his master's goodness. Therewith agree David's words 6 where he beatifies the men to whom God vouchsafes justification in spite of unconcern as to legal works. For he says that 7 men there be who are blessed and forgiven and whose sin shall 8 not be reckoned should they even transgress the Law. Now, 9 would David's words apply to the circumcised only or equally so to the uncircumcised? Abraham's instance will show, for we said that it was to him that belief was reckoned for righteousness. How then was it reckoned? after or before circumcision? ıо Not after but before, and he received that mark as a sealed proof ir that belief even of men uncircumcised does justify; and hence
he has become the father of all believers alike, who equally with ${ }^{12} \mathrm{him}$ shall receive their due for righteousness, not those believers only who come from a circumcised stock but such also as march in the footsteps of the faith our father Abraham had when yet ${ }^{13}$ uncircumcised. So then the covenant promising the world's inheritance to Abrabam or his seed was not conditional upon the ${ }^{14}$ Law but upon righteousness resting in faith. Indeed, were heirs solely the disciples of the Law, it is done with faith and the 15 promise becomes of none effect, for where there existed no Law neither would there be any hope of comfort, and the Law is then 16 but a tool of wrath. Therefore heirs from faith, that it might be a gift by favour, a promise assured to all the seed of man, not only to disciples of the Law but also to those having the 18 faith of Abraham, $\dagger$ who against all hope confidently believed that he would be the father of many nations when he was told, as it is written, that 'So shall thy seed be, even as the stars of ${ }^{9} 9$ the heaven and the sand of the sea.' Nor did his faith weaken in that he viewed his own body deadened, already about a hun20 dred years old, and deadened Sarah's womb, but unwaveringly he trusted God's promise ; and thus he was reinvigorated in his ${ }_{21}$ flesh when he rendered thanks to God, confident that what God ${ }_{22}$ promises God is also able to effect. Therefore it was reckoned ${ }_{2} 3$ to him for righteousness. And it is not written concerning him ${ }_{2} 4$ alone that it was reckoned to him, but also concerning us, to whom it shall be reckoned if we believe in the rising from the ${ }_{25}$ dead of Jesus our Lord, who was delivered up for our trespasses and rose for our justification.
I Being then thus justified by faith, we enjoy peace as to God through our Lord Jesus Christ, who has also steered us into this haven of grace where we stand, and we may exult in the hope 3 to enter the glory of God. Yea, even our earthly troubles raise

17 † Who is our common father, even as it is written ' A father of mamy nations have I made thee as a reward for thy belief of God,' the God who quickens the dead and summons into being out of naught.
but exultation, $\dagger$ for we lnow that tribulation creates endurance, and endurance demonstrates unalloyed sincerity, and sincerity 4 holds out a hope of reward. Nor shall this hope disappoint us; if when we were yet sinners Christ died for us, $\ddagger$ now, having 8 been justified by his blood, much more do we hope to be saved from the coming wrath by his intercession. For if when we were 10 God's enemies we were reconciled to him by the death of his son, now when he lives much more shall we be saved. Nay, we is even glory in our God to whom we have now been converted through our Lord Jesus Clirist.

I said much more, and it is thus. As sin came into the world ${ }_{12}$ throughone man and then death through sin, so hasdeath spread to all men because all have sinned. For doubtless from the time $1_{3}$ of Adam to the time of Moses, before the advent of the Law, did $\sin$ exist in the world, and though $\sin$ is not imputable if there be no law, still even then death overtook the sinners in $1_{4}$ like manner with Adam, whose fall prefigured that of all transgressors, law or no law. But the condemnation is not comparable ${ }_{15}$ to the reprieve. For it was one sin that led to condemnation 16 and death, but now the reprieve is granted in spite of many commandments being broken. So then, if transgression of one 17 commandment by one sufficed toinitiate the reign of death, much more shall justification and life rule through one, Jesus Christ, by the gift of abounding grace. § What if by the intrusion of 20

+ For by the gift of holy spirit a stealfast love of God has been poured 5 into our learts.
$\ddagger$ For wherefore when we were yet weak did Christ in due time die? He 6 died from exceeding love; for hardly for a mere kinsman will any one 7 face death, but for one's own friend does at times one dare to die.

But God proves his love for us
§ For if by the trespass of one man the mass of the people died, much $\boldsymbol{I}_{5}$ more has the grace of God and the gift vouchsafed to us through the one Jesus Christ abounded to that mass.

Therefore as one man's trespass condemned all men to death, even so is by one man's merciful act shall all men be reprieved unto life. For just II as by one man's disobedience all the mass became sinners, even so by one man's obedience shall all the mass be justifed.
the Law sin was made to multiply? This has only served to increase grace manifold.
x You might ask: But what then must we say? Must we say ${ }_{2}$ Let us persist in sin that grace may abound? God forbid. We 3 who died by sin, how could we any more live thereby? Or are you not aware that those of us who were baptized in the name 4 of Jesus were immersed into a like purifying death to his? By such a baptism we consigned with him our sinnable nature to a grave, so that like as he rose a Messiah from the dead by the right hand of the father, so may we by the same help proceed ia henceforth on our path endowed with a new life. $\dagger$ Therefore let not sin prevail in your body and through that perishable ${ }_{13}$ and worthless thing enforce your obedience, nor place your right arm at sin's command as a weapon of wickedness, but like men who left the camp of death to join that of life, stand by God ${ }^{3} 4$ with your arm ready to strike for righteousness. For sin will not overwhelm you, since you are not under the Law bat under ${ }_{15}$ grace. What then? Did we err in withdrawing from the Law 16 and acceding to grace? God forbid. [You know that to pledge obedience means bondage to that which one obeys, either sin or ${ }_{7}$ righteousness; be thanliful that, renouncing your bondage to sin, you have pledged hearty obedience to the Christian form of

Hence, as for a time cleath prevailed through sin, so through justification shall now eternal life prevail by the grace of Jesus Clurist our Lord.

$$
5
$$ shall we continue by a like resurrection.

6 And this because, as we know, the old sinner within us was crucified with Jesus that our sinnable body might be done away with and we no 7 longer be the slaves of sin. For when he clies, every man is publicly forgiven; and being sainted, he is for ever averse from sin.
8 And it is our belief that if we rise with Christ we shall live eternally 9 with him; for whoever rises from the dead has done with death, which 10 masters him no longer. For in dying we die by the power of sin which is operative but once; so that if we rise it is to eterval life, since we rise by the ever potent will of God.
i I In like manner reckon also yourselves as dead to sin but alive to God by the help of C'hrist Jesus.
doctrine imparted to you. Being thus freed from sin, hesitate 18 not to re-enslave yourselves to righteousness. If you lent the ser- 19 vice of your faculties to iniquity and the result was impurity I blame you not; it was a human failing, consequent to frailty of the flesh-why not now lend a like service to righteousness for sanctity as result? True, time was when you were free from this 20 new servitude ; but this servitude is to righteousness, and then when you were free from it you were slaves to sin. What fruit had 21 you then as to be ashamed of being called slaves of such a slavery? T'he goal of that condition woas death. But now when you have 22 exchanged a slavery to sin for a slavery to God, your fruit is sanctity and the goal eternal life. For, unlike the wage of $\sin 23$ which is death, God's gift is eternal life by the help of Christ Jesus our Lord.]

Or are you not aware, brethren-but I am addressing men 1 versed in law-that a contract retains its force so long as the second party lives? A married woman, let us say, is bound to 2 her marriage contract by reason of her husbandliving ; should he die, she is released from that bond. It is only whilst her hus- 3 band lives that she is held a bad woman should she take another man; but, the husband dead, she is freed from her bond and may wed anew without dishonour. So is it with you, brethren. 4 With the death of the body of Jesus your carnal self died and freed you from the Law, so that now your purified self, set free, may contract a new union-one with him who has risen from the dead as Christ-and thus bear fruit worthy of God. When 5 we were existing in the flesh, our sinful passions, by the fault of the Law which bound us to the flesh, were being bred in us and the fruit was such as merited death; but being now liberated 6 from the Law of death which held us, we may serve a new spirit and no longer that outworn letter.

What then must we conclude?' That the Law is a sin? God: forbid. Still, true is it that but for the Law we should not have known what sin was, nor should we have lenown that a sin of lust existed but that the Law said Thou shalt not lust. Therefore in

9 the period without Lawsin was lifeless and we alive, but when with the advent of its commandments no longer could we wrong 1o unwittingly, sin was vivified and we died; and so the very commandments which were to restore life were discovered to drive ${ }^{11}$ us on to death. For sin, seizing upon the opening afforded by the commandments, beguiled us into their transgression and ${ }_{12}$ thereby subjected us to the penalty of death. $\dagger$ So then I do not deny that the Law itself is holy and the commandments holy, ${ }_{1}{ }^{2}$ just, and good, $\ddagger$ for we all admit that the Lavv is spiritual. But ${ }^{5} 5$ we are corporal, and slavelike sold and subjected to $\sin$; as slaves then we cannot perform what our judgement dictates and we 16 desire, but what we repel are we constrained to do. If thus what we do is not what both we and the Lav desire, we concur that ${ }_{17}$ the Law is good; if nevertheless we transgress it, the reason must be that it is not we who work wrong lut the sin which abides in 18 our self. For admittedly in our self, I mean its corporal part, no good abides; possessed of will, it is endowed with no faculty פ 9 to perform what is righteous. [For it is not the good which we ${ }_{20}$ desire that we do but the evil which we repel; and if we do what we do not clesire, it cannot be we who work it but the sin which abides in us.] For what do we find? That to such self of ours ${ }_{2}$ aswills good evil stands opposed. Following our inner man we ${ }_{23}$ rejoice in God's commandment, but there confronts us another man, one dwelling in our flesh, who wars against the man of ${ }_{24}$ the spirit and holds us captive under the power of sin. § $O$ wretched men that we are! Who shall deliver us from this deadly ${ }_{25}$ flesh? Thanks be to God through Jesus Christ our Lord.

For when we were impotent for good and Satan, man's foe,
$8+$ But sin, seizing upon the opening afforded by this commandment, worked up within us all manner of lust.
13 $\ddagger$ How then? did what was good for us develop into a tool of death ? God forbid. But sin, working for death not merely through an agent of evil but even through what was good for mavkind, namely the commanclments, became intensified and complete that salvation might at last appear.
25 § And so comes it that, swayed to and fro by the spirit or the flesh, the selfsame we now obey God's behest, anon that of sin.
actuated the lusts of our flesl, God sent his ovon son in a carnal image for our salvation and lilled Satan where he was entrenched in our flesh. And so we can now wall, no longer as 4 the flesh drives us, but as the spirit set free leads, and thus we can fulfil the divine commandments. For, unlike those whose 5 flesh is alive and allures them to its cause, those whose spirit is free espouse the cause of the spirit. And to side with the flesh 6 . means death, but to side with the spirit means life and peace. For adherence to the cause of the flesh involves enmity with God, 7 for the flesh will not submit to his behests, nor indeed could it do so ; and therefore those whose life is carnal must displease 8 God and die. But your own life as Christians is not carnal; 9 it is spiritual, since the spirit of God dwells in you. [If any one be void of the spirit of Christ, he is not his; but if Christ dwell 10 in you, then, unlike the bodly which is thus dead and unproductive of sin, the spirit is quick and productive of righteousness.] And if the spirit of him who raised up Jesus for your in salvation dwell in you, he who raised him from the dead as Christ will also at the palingenesis revivify your dead bodies for the sake of that righteous spirit which will have dwelt in you. There I is thus no death sentence to fear for you who adhere to Christ, Jesus, for the Word of spirit and life delivered to the voorld by 2 him has freed you from the power of $\sin$ and death.

So then, brethren, our duty is not to live for the flesh, not accord- 12 ing to its pleasure. If we so live, we must die a second time; $\mathrm{I}_{3}$ but if our spirit deaden our carnal lusts, we shall live. For as It many as are led by the spirit of God are sons of God; and so are you, brethren, his sons and filled now with a son's confident ${ }_{15}$ spirit-and not again with the abject spirit of slaves - and may boldly call to him and claim him as your father. Does not the ${ }_{16}$ holy Word itself bear witness that we are God's children when it tells us to address him in our prayers as Abba, Father? But 17 then, if we are his children, we must likewise be his heirs; heirs of God, co-heirs with Christ, whose sufferings we cheerfully share that we may be his partners in glory. For in suffering we re- 18
member that the woes of this world weigh little compared with 19 the splendour which is to break forth on us. Indeed, the heathen themselves join the sons of God in yearning for the day of revezo lation-for they have submitted to idolatry not because they willed it, but through Satanic machinations which beguiled ${ }_{2 x}$ them into this submission-in the confident hope that they also shall be liberated from the corruptive thraldom of idolatry unto that resplendent freedom which is the lot of the children of God. ${ }_{22}$ For we know that the whole heathendom has been long plunged in agony and now sighs with one accordant groan for delivery. ${ }_{23}$ Nay, even we who have happily entered a spiritual life through Christ's advent and call, even we, I say, in our joint prayers still send up a cry for mercy, patiently expecting that with the reappearance of Christ and our resurrection we shall finally be ${ }_{24}$ ransomed from death. For it was in a hope of resurrection in the future that we were baptized and not of an instant and.visible exemption from death. A hope of what is visible is not hope, ${ }_{25}$ for how could men hope for what they saw and possessed? We therefore have been hoping for what is distant and dim, and thus it is that Christians must expect immortality not forthwith but patiently hereafter.
${ }^{26}$ In these our prayers we are not left alone when perplexed as to how to pray, [but the spirit itself comes to our aid, and un${ }^{2} 7$ utterably intercedes for us with woeful appeals for mercy, and he who searches every heart discerns in the thought of the spirit that it intercedes for what God would approve of and in support 28 of worthy men]. And we have also this in our favour, that with those who love him God ever co-operates for their good, I mean ${ }_{29}$ those predestined to be Christians, whom God has from of old owned as his own and preappointed to be co-imaged with his 30 son, they many brethrer and he their eldest. Yea, it is the men so preappointed that he has called to the Christian fold ; and whom he so called, the same he has justified; and whom he so ${ }_{3 \text { I }}$ justified, the same he has reserved for glory. Now if so, what shall ${ }_{32}$ we say? If God is for us, who is against us? If God did not
spare lis own son but gave him up to human suffering for the good of us all, is it conceivable that he would now withhold any other gift? Who shall now prosecute God's elect? God has ab- 33 solved, us; who shall then condemn us? Christ Jesus has sub- 34 mitted to cleath for the love of us; nay more, he has risen from the dead and now sits at the right hand of God and pleads for us; who then shall sever us from his love? Is it afliction, or 35 anguish, or persecution, or pestilence and famine, or nakedness, orperil,or sword? True, in the words of the prophet, wearelilled ${ }_{3} 6$ all day long, we are accounted as sheep for slaughter; but out of 37 every adversity we emerge conquerors by his help who loved us. Certain am I that neither death nor life, neither angels of light $3^{8}$ nor angels of darkness, neither high nor low authority, neither things present nor things future, neither height nor depth, nor 39 any other thing created shall avail to sever us from the love of God, secured to us through Christ Jesus our Lord.
I will now tell'you-and it is the truth as I believe in Christ, I and my conscience and the holy Ghost are my joint witnessesthat a great sorrow and an unceasing pain afflict my heart. 2 I should have wished that I myself were cursed off from Christ 3 in favour of my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh, who are the Israelites, whose is the adoption and the glory and 4 the covenant and the lawgiving and the liturgy and the promise, whose are the patriarchs, and out of whom Christ himself was 5 incarnated, who is over all, God blessed for ever, amen; but 6 it is not possible, for they, the people of God, have fallen away from grace. For all who descend from Israel are not all Israelites, nor because they are Abraham's seed are they all his 7 heirs; but the chosen are his heirs, as it is written 'In Isaac shall thy seed be called.' That is to say, it is not mere offspring 8 that the scripture reckons as the seed destined to be adopted by God, but the children contemplated when the promise was made, and the promise solely specifies Sarat's son. It is so that Rebecca 9 ic through whom was to be procreated a whole nation to one man, to Isaac our patriarch, $* * *$ For, that God's design by choice in
might be made clear as not purposing a choice clependent upon ${ }^{12}$ works but upon him who calls, $\dagger$ Joseph, before his sons had yet known or done anything good or bad, was told that 'Thy elder ${ }^{1} 3$ shall serve thy younger.' [Even as it is written 'Jacob I have loved, but Esau I have hated.']
${ }^{1} 4$ What must we then conclude? that there is unfuirness with, ${ }^{15}$ God? God forbid. For in scripture we find that to Moses God says 'I will favour whom I will.favour and have compassion ${ }^{17}$ on whom I will have compassion'; and, reversely, to Pharaoh ' I purposely roused thee to anger and persecution of my people that I might show thee my power by stern punishment, such as 18 should resound throughout the world.' Thus Goct has been open with us that he means his own pleasure at all times to remain 19 supreme and unrestricted. But thou mightest rejoin: How can he any more find fault since it is his irresistible will that de20 termines? Nay but, 0 man, who art thou that thou shouldst reason with God? Is it for the creature to say to the creator Why ${ }^{2}$ hast thou made me thus? Or dost thou contend that the potter may not from the same lump make one pot for an honourable 22 and another for a vile purpose? God's design was to make known his power and clemency, and if in order to demonstrate his power he brought forth vessels meriting wrath and contrived for destruction-it was an act of tolerance that he ever created them ${ }^{2} 3$ at all-on the other hand he has demonstrated his bountiful goodness by fashioning vessels worthy of favour and prepared ${ }^{2} 4$ for glory, the men whom he has also called, I mean us the believers, believers not only from among the Jews but equally from ${ }_{25}$ among the Gentiles. For it is the Gentiles who are meant where he says in Hosea ' I will call them my people which was not my 26 people, and her I will call beloved who was not beloved; and it shall come to pass, in the land where the men will be called Ye

[^34]are not my people, there they shall be called sons of the living God.' And in respect of Israel Isaiah distinctly prophesied that, $\mathrm{a}_{7}$ though the number of infidels among them might be as the sand of the sea, still a faithful remnant would be reserved for salvation according to God's irrevocable promise. The Lord Sabaoth, 2829 as Isaiah adds, shall spare a seed, nor is Israel destined to perish as Sodom and Gomorrall. Now, what must we here conclude? $3^{\circ}$ That though the Gentiles had not pursuedjustification, they have attained that justification which springs from faith, whereas 3 x the Israelites, although they pursued it with the help of the Law, never reached its path. Why so? Because they fancied that justi- $3^{2}$ fication does not come from faith, and they acted as though it sprang from legal observances. They were blinded; they stumbled at that stone of stumbling and offence wolich occur's in the 33 words of the prophet.

Brethren, my heart's fond desire is to see them saved, and so x I pray to God, for their good. And I will vouch this of them, ${ }^{2}$ that they have a zeal for God; but not intelligently. Ignorant 3 of God's commandments and striving to establish their own, they have disobeyed those of God. Clurist came to end their Lave that 4 by faith every man might be justified. True, Levitious lays it 5 down concerning the ordinances emanating from the Law that only those men shall live who conform thereto. But what cloes 6 the message emanating from faith retort? It exhorts us not to 7 be troubled in our hearts and fancy that we need to go far and wide-to heaven or the abyss-in search of a saviour, inasmuch 8 as Deuteronomy, the corrector of Leviticus, reveals that salvation lies in our mouth and in our heart; for it says: The word is near thee, in thy mouth and in thy leart, and the word meant is that offaith, the Word we preach, namely, that ifby our mouth 9 we confess Jesus as the Messiah and in our heart nve believe that God has raised him from the clead, we shall be saved. [For if so we believe by the heart we become righteous, but salvation is finally reached if outspokenly we confess by the mouth.] [That in
belief is indispensable appears from these words in scripture 'Every man who believes in me shall not be put to shame.'] $\dagger$
I But may it not be that God himself has perhaps cast away his heirs? God forbid. Am I not myself an Israelite, from the very a seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin? No, God has not cast away his people whom he owned of old. For you know what the scripture says in Elijah where Elijah denounces Israel 3 to God. 'Lord' he quotes 'they have killed thy prophets, they have digged down thy altars; and I am left alone and they seek 4 my life.' What answer does he there receive? 'Nay' God rejoins 'I have left for myself seven thousand men who have 5 not bowed the knee to Baal.' It is so then also at the present time; a remnant selected by grace is left to whom God's

- Herein there is no distinction made between a Jew and a Greek, for God is the same God for all, bestowing his abounding grace upon all such ${ }_{13}$ as involse him. For it is said 'W'hosoever invokes the name of the Lord shall be saved.'

ITow then could they have invoked him if they did not believe? And how could they have believed if they were not instructed? And how could they have been instructed without a preacher? There must have been ${ }_{15}$ preachers. And how could they have preached unless they weere apostles? They were therefore apostles; and it is concerning them that it is written 'How beautiful are the feet of them that bring a gospel of peace [and happiness'].

But Isaial in these prophetic words 'Lord, who has believed our in${ }_{17}$ struction ?' foretold that there would be unbelievers in the gospel. [Therefore faitl comes from instruction, and instruction is imparted by word Is of mouth.] But I ask myself: May perhaps the reason be that they were rot instructed? Indeed they were, for the Psalmist says that the voice came out in all the earth and the words in the farthest ends where men live. 19 Or that Israel did not perceive? Nay, Moses prophetically described them 2I as a spiteful and insensate nation which God would disown. And then Isaiah plainly intimated that all day long did God spread out his hands 20 to them, but that they were a disobedient and gainsaying people; whereas concerning the Gentiles he said that God was found of them who sought him not, and became manifest to them who asked not of him.
word holds good, $\uparrow$ though grace is withheld from the rest who 7 are blinded, as it is written ' God gave them a spirit of stupor, 8 eyes that they should not see and ears that they should not hear, unto this very day.' As their retribution David foretells that 9 their table shall be made a snare and a trap and a stumblingblock and a recompense unto them; that their eyes shall be io darkened that they may not see, and their back shall be bowed down always. But was it perhaps then due to God that they 11 fell? God forbid. But by their fall has salvation come to the Gentiles in the hope that some day they themselves may be stirred by emulation. And if their fall has meant uplifting for the 12 world and their deficiency enrichment for the Gentiles, how much more will their perfection mean?

But I must enter a word of warning to you, Gentiles. My r3 chief apostolic work I grant is among the Gentiles ; but so long 14 as I do not neglect that duty, my ministry will gain in honour if perchance I inspire men of my race with emulation and save them. The rejection of the Jews meant a reconciliation of the ${ }^{15}$ world to God; but what will the reception of but a few of them be if not a source of glory to my ministry as though I performed a resurrection from the dead? And if a few accept the gospel, it will be a proof that all will follow. If the corn be good, so must 16 be the dough ; if the root be good, so must be the branches. And I7 if some of the branches were pruned off, and thou, a mere wild olive, hast been grafted in among the standing branches and partakest with them of the oil-richness of the tree, do not dis- 18 dain the branches, but remember that it is not thou that upholdest the root but the root that upholds thee. Thou mayest $\mathrm{m}_{9}$ retort in thy pride: Is it not true that those branches were cut out that I might be grafted in? It is so ; but remember that a ${ }^{20}$

[^35]sin caused their breakage, the sin of unbelief, as thou standest ${ }_{21}$ by a virtue, that of righteousness which comes from faith. Then sin not by pride but beware, for if God did not spare those kin${ }_{22}$ dred branches, maybe neither will he spare thee if thou sin. Heed then the goodness and severity of God; severity to those who sinned, but goodness to thee if thou only continue steadfust in ${ }_{23}$ thy goodness; else, thou shalt likewise be wrenched off. But so they again, should they not persist in their unbelief, shall be ${ }_{2}{ }_{4}$ regrafted in-it is in the power of God to effect this-because if thou wert wrenched off from thy parent wild tree and grafted into a good tree alien to thee, how much more shall the natural branches be regrafted into their own stock?
${ }_{25}$ For lest your hearts lapse into arrogance, I must not conceal from you, brethren, this mystery, that if partially blindness seized upon Israel, the purpose was to allow of the admission ${ }_{26}$ into favour of the Gentile body. When this is completed, all Israel shall be saved, for it is written that there shall come out of Zion a deliverer who shall turn away every ungodliness from ${ }_{27}$ Jacob, but that this covenant shall be fulfilled when God will 28 have first taken away the sins of the Gentiles. For your sake, that you might receive the gospel, the Jews became hateful in the sight of God as a result of his son's passion ; but for the sake of the patriarchs, whose seed they are, he still loves them as his ${ }_{2 y}$ chosen people. This choice he promised the patriarchs, and God's ${ }_{30}$ decision is irrevocable as to his gifts and calling. You in times past were disobedient to God, but now have obtained mercy ${ }_{3 r}$ through their disobedience; even so these in their turndisobeyed Christ, the source to you of mercy, that they also may obtain $3^{2}$ mercy. For God shut up all within disobedience that he might ${ }_{33}$ show his clemency to all. O how deep the treasures of God and adequate for all! How vast his wisdom and knowledge! How inscrutable his judgements and untraceable his ways! For who has known the mind of the Lord? or whose counsel does he ever ${ }_{35}$ need? or who can claim a return because he first gave to him? ${ }_{36}$ Since from him and through him and unto him are all things ; to him the glory for ever and ever, amen.

I implore you then, brethren, for God's mercy, present your- I selves like unblemished victims of a living sacrifice grateful to God, offering a spiritual worship, and do not adapt yourselves 2 to the pretentious hypocrites of this world, but transform and renew your mind, determined to search out God's message as to a conduct good, acceptable, faultless.

And trusting to my apostolic privilege, I will address to every 3 one among you this admonition : Think not too highly of yourselves, but so think as to think modestly, each one according to the measure of trust allotted to him by God. For even as there 4 are many members in one body, all with diverse functions; so we 5 though many are one body in the service of Christ, and each man though separate is a member of every other. So, possessing gifts 6 differing according to the grace granted to us-whether preaching within the limit of inspiration, or deaconship, or the faculty ${ }_{7}$ of teaching, or the means of comforting-whoever imparts let s him impart to all without distinctions, whoever rules let him rule in earnest, whoever dispenses alms let him do so with a bright countenance. Let your love be undisguised; abhorring 9 what is evil, clinging to what is good; striving for pre-eminence, 10 but pre-eminence in mutual brotherly love; forestalling one another in respect; in study, not indolent; fervent in spirit; in not obsequious to this world ; joyful in the hope of salvation, ${ }_{12}$ and so patient in distress; untiring in prayer; contributing ${ }_{13}$ when the needs of the saints are pressed; eager to show hospitality; bless and curse not; rejoice with those who rejoice, weep with those who weep; cherishing the same feeling towards one another ; not avid of superiority, but humbling yourselves with the humble; not arrogant in your intercourse ; rendering to no man evil for evil; taking care that your demeanour be inoffensive not only in the sight of God but also in the sight of men; as much as in you lies, being yourselves at peace with all men; not revengeful, my beloved, but yield in front of anger. For it is written 'Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord,' and 'If thy enemy hunger, feed him ; if he thirst, give
him to drink ; for so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his ar head;' 'Let not yourselves be mastered by evil but master evil I with good.' Be submissive to all superior authorities, for there is no authority but comes from God, and so have our present 2 rulers been set up. Hence all who resist authority resist God's dispositions, and the wrong done shall recoil upon themselves. ${ }_{3}$ Our rulers are not a terror to a good but to an evil action. Wouldst thou have no fear of the authorities? Do good and thou 4 shalt encounter nothing but praise from them, for a ruler is but a minister of God, helpfiul in the performance of all good actions; but if thou do wrong, beware, for he does not carry his sword in vain but is a minister of God ready to punish the evil-doer. 5 Therefore be sulmissive, and this not merely for fear of wrath 6 but for the sake of an irreproachable conscience. For this reason pay also your tribute, for the functionaries are ministers of God t appointed to toil at this very business. To all discharge your debts, tribute to whom tribute is due, alms to whom alms, fear to whom fear, respect to whom respect is due, $\dagger$ the rather because of the times, for the hour has come for us to rise out of sleep, as salvation has now approached nearer than when we were first is baptized. The night, I say, is far spent and dawn at hand. Let us therefore lay aside the implements of darleness and gird on ${ }^{13}$ the armour of light. Let us wallk with dignity as by day; no works of night, no revelling and drunkenness, no chambering $\mathrm{I}_{4}$ and wantonness, no brawling and beating; but take in your bosom our Lord Jesus Christ and disregard your flesh when it is intent upon lusts.

And if a man be a believer but timid in the matter of observances, befriend him rather than start arguing and wrangling ${ }^{2}$ over his doubts. Thou, a strong believer, eatest everything;
$s+$ Nay, you ove nothing to any man save mutual love, for whoever 9 loves his neighbour fulfils the whole Law. For it is written that the commandments against adultery, killing, stealing; coveting, and any other commandment, are all summed up in this saying 'Thou shalt love thy 1о neighbour as thyself.' Love broods no ill to a fellow man; it is therefore the fulfilment of the Lav.
good, but let the timid also eat as they please, even only grass if they be so minded. The eater must not depreciate the ab- 3 stainer ; nor again must the abstainer censure the eater, for God has taken him to himself. Who art thou that thou shouldst pre- 4 sume to censure a strange servant? His standing or falling concern his own master. Similarly, does a man regard every other 5 day of the year, or does another man disregard them all? Let them be ; let each one be enlightened by his own mind. The 6 observer of days lives to observe them by the pleasure of the Lord, his master; and so the eater eats, and that is why he renders thanks to God. Our life and our death are not in our hands; 7 whether we live to observe days and eat or whether we die, we 8 live and die because so wills the Lord. Therefore whether living or dead we are the servants of the Lord. For to this end Christ 9 descended among the dead and has risen, that he might be the master of dead and.living alike. Why dost thou censure thy io brother for not eating? and thou also, why dost thou depreciate thy brother for eating? Let God judge, before whose judgementseat we shall all stand, for it is written ' As I live, saith the Lord, ir to me every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall confess to God.' Therefore each one of us shall be answerable for himself 12 to God.

So let us cease this mutual censuring, but rather censure this, $\mathrm{m}_{3}$ lest we place a stumbling-block in our brother's way. For if thou ${ }_{15}$ cause thy brother grief for a mere meat, no longer dost thou walk according to love. For thy meat let him not perish for whose salvation Christ himself died. Fully persuaded am I, as I believe $x_{4}$ in the Lord Jesus, that nothing is unclean of itself; if a man argue that anything defiles, let him be defiled thereby. Guard 16 against bringing your good name as Christians into disrepute because of eating and drinking; it is not thereby that the ling- 17 clom of God is entered, but by righteousness and peace and joy in the possession of a holy spirit. It is by thus serving Christ 18 that we please God and are commendable of men. Let us then 19 pu'sue what conduces to peace and preserve a spirit of mutual
edification. For a mere meat demolish not the work of God. True, all meats are clean; but it is bad for a man to eat any${ }_{21}$ thing which offends his brother. Better to abstain from meat and wine and anything which grieves him or wounds him or 22 about which he still hesitates. Thou hast faith and scornest such trifles; good, have thou thy faith to thyselfbefore God. Fortunate is the man who fears no condemnation by what he chooses to do; ${ }_{2} 3$ but punctilious men would feel self-reproached and condemned if they ate, for they reason that they would thus violate their faith 1 and that so to act is a sin. Our duty, if we are strong, is to bear with our timid brethren in their weaknesses and not merely ${ }^{2}$ please ourselves; let rather each one of us please his brethren in 3 all things harmless for the edification of all. Christ himself did not choose his own pleasure, but suffered the scoffings of the scof4 fers to fall upon him, as the scriptures say. And whatever they record was written for our instruction, that by the enlightenment derived and patience ve may gain the fulfilment of our 5 hopes. And now the God of patience and enlightenment grant ${ }^{6}$ you concord as enjoined by Jesus Christ, that with one heart and one voice we may glorify God and our Lord Jesus Christ. 7 Therefore take in your bosom one another, even as Christ him8 self tool us for the glorification of God. For I say Christ took all in lis bosom, Jews and Gentiles alike; he became minister of the circumcised for the sake of God's trustvorthiness in asy suring the promises made to the patriarchs, and also minister of the Gentiles; may they thus obtain mercy and glorify God. Nor shall this blessing be denied to the Gentiles, for it is woritten that God shall be praised among the Gentiles and his name sung; ${ }_{11}$ and again that the Gentiles shall rejoice with his people; and yet again that all the Gentiles shall praise the Lord and all the ${ }^{12}$ peoples sing hymns of him. In the same strain Isaiah says that from the root of Jesse shall one arise as the ruler and hope of ${ }_{13}$ the Gentiles. And now may the God of hope fill your hearts with all joy and happiness from a feeling of confidence in the efficacy of a chaste spirit.

Now, my brethren, I have written to you rather outspokenly, 15 though I am persuaded myself, and need not to be told, that you 14 may be left to your own discretion, filled as you are with love and crammed with all wisdom, able to set even others right. But $\mathrm{I}_{5}$ I address to you this fragmentary admonition-it is but a re-minder-because by God's gracious gift I an a minister of Jesus in Christ appointed to perform the service of his gospel among the Gentiles in such a manner that, purified in their minds, they may be presented as an acceptable offering to God. In this spiritual $\mathrm{I}_{7}$ labour, I may say with pride, I have been successfül so far by the help of Christ Jesus; indeed, I hardly dare to tell how much is Christ has accomplished towards the conversion of the Gentiles through my hands by word and deed, by his power in signs and 19 wonders and the power of the holy Ghost, to the extent that his gospel has been preached from Jerusalem round to as far as Illyricum, it being my own ambition there to work, not where 20 baptism in the name of Christ was known; I would not build upon another man's foundation-as had been done to me-but 21 from me, in the words of scripture, those shall see to whom no tidings of him came and those who have not heard shall understand.

This during many years has interfered with my coming to 22 you; but now I shall go to Jerusalem, where I have in hand a ${ }_{25}$ business for the relief of the saints there. For in Macedonia and ${ }_{26}$ Achaia the Gentiles have been pleased to grant some contribution for the benefit of the poor among those saints, recognizing ${ }_{27}$ their debt ; for if in things spiritual they have obtained a share from the saints, they owe them a reciprocal service in their material needs. When then I have first finished this task and 28 deposited safely in their hands the fruit of my efforts, I shall start for Spain, visiting you on my way, and for this visit I 29 know I shall carry with me Christ's bounteous blessing. $\dagger$ And 30

[^36]I implore you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ and for the love of the holy Ghost, join me in this my uphill task by praying to God for me, that I may be shielded from the unbelievers in Judaea and my gift may prove acceptable to the saints. Then full of joy shall I come to you and solace myself in your society if so be the will of Christ Jesus.

Now God's peace be with you all.
I commend to you Phoebe our sister, who is also a deaconess of the church at Cenchreae. Pray welcome her as deserves a saint, and stand by her in any business in which she may need your. help, for she herself has stood by me and by many others.
3 Salute Prisca and Aquila, my fellow workers in the cause of Jesus Christ; for my life they have laid their necks under the sword, and not I alone am grateful to them but all the Gentile 5 churches. Salute also the church in their house. Salute Epaenetus $m y$ beloved, whio is the choicest firstfruit of Asicu offered to Christ. 7 Salute Mariam, who went to much trouble for your sale. Salute Andronicusand Junias,my liinsmen and fellow prisoners, men eminent among the Apostles, who indeed adhered to Christ le8 fore me. Salute Ampliatus, the beloved among the servants of ${ }_{9}$ the Lord. Salute Urbanus our fellow worker in the cause of 1o Christ, and Stachys my beloved. Salute Apelles, a man of credit among Christians. Salute our brethren in the household of Aris${ }_{11}$ tobolus. Salute Herodion my kinsman. Salute our brethren in the household of Narcissus, men steadfast in the service of the ${ }_{12}$ Lord. Salute I'ryphaena and I'ryphosa, who toil for the cause ${ }^{1} 3$ of the Lord. Salute Rufus, a man singled out for the love of the ${ }_{14}$ Lord, and his mother, a mother both to him and me. Salute Asyncritus, Phlegon, Hermes, Patrobas, Hermas, and the breth${ }_{15}$ ren who are with them. Salute Philologus and Julia, Nereus and his sister Olympias, and all the saints who are with them. ${ }_{16}$ Salute one another with a holy litss.

Finally, I implore you, brethren, bencare of those superior spirits who cause disunion and scandals by starting doctrines and practices contrary to those imparted to you, and turn auay
from them. Such men do not serve our Lord Christ but their 18 own belly. Their words may sound honest and, fine, but are only meant to deceive the hearts of the innocent. And I know you 19 will shun them, for I know your firmness, which is indeed reputed everywhere. I rejoice therefore on your account; and my desire is that, unlike those men, you continue to be wise in what is good but simple in what is wicked. The God of peace will soon 20 crush Satan their prompter under your heel.

Greetings from Timothy my fellow worker, and from Lucius 2r and Jason and Sosipater my kinsmen. Greetings also from me 22 Tertius, the writer of this epistle with the Lord's help. Gaius $2_{3}$ my host, and all the churches, salute you, as does Erastus the treasurer of the city, and Quartus our brother.

The grace of our Lord Jesus be with you.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ It is noteworthy that in the first chapter St Paul quite composedly mentions the fact of having repeatedly been obstructed in his design to start on his journey, though in 1Thes. 2-18 he is so incensed at a casual hindrance as to call it a devil.

[^1]:    
    ${ }^{2} \mathrm{D}, 82$, and e omit á ${ }^{2} a \pi \eta r o i ̂ s ~ \theta \in o \hat{v}$.

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ Euthymius＇$\theta \in \rho a \pi \epsilon \dot{\prime} \in \iota ~ \tau u ̀ \nu ~ \lambda u ́ \gamma o v . ' ~$

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ The idea of a delay in visiting in spite of a wish to visit the addressees on
    
    
     е́ $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu ;=B u t$, though such uwas my wish, did I obtain the necessary leisure?
     a correction of $\epsilon \mathcal{X} \epsilon \nu$, as given by $0 x y r$. Pap. 1599, the correction made because
    
    

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ See also 'lert. Apol. ch. 17. Epicur. (Usener) p. 6 тò ä $\delta \eta \lambda o \nu \lambda o \gamma ı \sigma \mu \hat{\psi}$ $\tau \in \kappa \mu a i \rho \in \sigma \theta a i$.
    ${ }^{2}$ I now find in Linwood's Remarks on Conjectural Emendations as applied to the New Testament, p. 18, that Bentley also conjectured ádıס́кктos; not recorded in Ellis's Bentlei Critica Sacra.
    ${ }^{3}$ Also Just. Quaest. Gentil. 13 ă $\phi \theta a \rho \tau o \nu$ and $\phi \theta a \rho \tau o ́ v . ~ A c t a ~ J o h a n . ~ 108 ~ \delta ı a-~$
    

[^5]:    
     1 Thes.1-5 $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \nu \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \mu \epsilon \nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\nu} \mu \hat{i} \nu$ (read $\hat{\eta} \mu(\nu)$. A further preposterous development
    
    

[^6]:    ${ }^{1}$ See note on $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ ủ $\lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \in \iota a \nu$ in v. 18.

[^7]:    ${ }^{1}$ Different in sense to $\sigma v \nu \mu a \rho \tau \nu \rho o v ́ \sigma \eta s$ in 9．1．

[^8]:    ${ }^{1}$ It is unthinkable that genuine Jews entered temples. What Tertullian Apol. 15 claims of the Christians, namely, Sacrilegi de vestris (= of idolaters) eemper adprehenduntur, Christiani enim templa nec interdiu norunt; spoliarent forsitan ea et ipsi si et ipsi ea adorarent, applied with equal, if not greater, force to the Jews.

[^9]:    
    ${ }^{2} \mathrm{Or}$ a different wild bird but called $i \in ́ p a \xi$.

[^10]:    ${ }^{1}$ See also note on 11-17.

[^11]:    
    

[^12]:    ${ }^{1}$ Farrar, St Paul, I, p. 47: 'The controversial use which St Paul makes of the LXX is very remarkable. It often seems to consider the mere words of a writer as of conclusive authority entirely apart from their original application. This is the essence of the later Kabbala with its Pardes; namely Peshat $=$ explanation, Remes $=$ hint, Derush $=$ homily, and God $=$ mystery.'

[^13]:    
    2 The same said of Sarah in Hebr.11-11 इáppa $\delta \dot{v} \nu a \mu \iota \nu$ '́ $\lambda a \beta \in \nu$, ̇̇ $\pi \in i$ mıotò $\nu$
    

[^14]:    ${ }^{1}$ A similar barbarism is $\dot{\alpha} \gamma a \lambda \lambda \iota \hat{\omega} \mu \in \nu$, which figures in most Mss of Apoc.19-7. Also in Acts Philip. 16.
    
    
    

[^15]:    ${ }^{1}$ Also Acts 8.16. 9-27. 11-20. 19-13. But in Acts 3-6. 4-10. 16-18. 1 Cor.6-11. Gal.3-27, the addition of X pı $\sigma \tau 0 \hat{v}$ is highly suspicious.
     $\pi \nu \in \dot{u} \mu a \tau o s$ is anachronical.

[^16]:     should be forgotten, cf. MGk $\boldsymbol{\xi} \epsilon \chi \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$ and Soph. O.T. 318 סióu入є $\sigma \alpha$.
    ${ }^{2}$ Similarly $\mathfrak{\eta} \gamma \iota \alpha ́ \sigma \theta \eta$ in Hebr.10-29.

[^17]:    
     $\nu o \nu \tau \alpha s \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \phi \lambda \lambda o \sigma o ́ \phi \omega \nu$.

[^18]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. 1 Acta Pil.16-3 $\sigma \nu \nu \dot{\eta} \rho \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \nu$ ó $\lambda o ́ \gamma o s ~ o u ̂ t o s ~ \pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \iota \nu$.

[^19]:    

[^20]:    ${ }^{1}$ Epiphanius Haer. 19-1 attributes the same tenet to the Essenes.

[^21]:    1 After reading Dr. Rendel Harris's Testimonies, I am inclined to think that both our interpolator and pseudo-Barnabas reproduce a testimony.

[^22]:    ${ }^{1}$ On reconsideration, the absence of $\boldsymbol{\eta} \nu \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \epsilon \nu^{\prime}$ and the presence of $\epsilon$ is in FG seem to me very suspicious. Possibly cis conceals a verb of the same import as $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \pi \sigma_{i ́ \eta} \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu$.

[^23]:    

[^24]:    ${ }^{1}$ The Vulgate, in translating diminutio, must have either found $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \tau \tau \omega \alpha$ or taken $\eta_{\eta} \tau \tau \eta \mu a$ as its equivalent.

[^25]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. also Eph.1-23 $\tau \grave{\partial} \pi \lambda \eta \dot{\prime} \rho \omega \mu a$ тô̂ $\tau \alpha ̀ ~ \pi a ́ \nu \tau a ~ \grave{\epsilon} \nu \pi a ̂ \sigma \iota \nu \pi \lambda \eta \rho u v \mu \epsilon ́ v o v$.

[^26]:    ${ }^{1}$ Excepting 70 and fg .

[^27]:    ${ }^{1}$ So Euthymius.

[^28]:    ${ }^{1}$ A similar Latinism is $\prime_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \pi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ with the accusative. Cf. Just. Mart. Sanct. Mart. 2 '́птода८ aúтoùs, where see Otto's note.
    
     It was chiefly at Alexandria where culture and study were wedded to Christianity.

[^29]:    ${ }^{1}$ Likewise by Eusebius. See Field, Otium Norvicense, p. 99.

[^30]:    ${ }^{1}$ Disregard the interpolation of $v \mathbf{v} .8$ and 9 , and it at once appears that $\theta \in o \hat{v}$ is imperatively demanded by the context (in spite of 2 Cor.5-10). The alteration was probably inspired by the tenet eventually embodied in the
     similar attempt at v. 11, where the Philoxenian reads $\tau \hat{\omega}$ rupi $\dot{\varphi}$ for $\tau \hat{\omega} \theta \in \hat{\varphi}$. Burgon's ideas, however great their merits elsewhere, are hardly applicable to the Romans.
    
     sentences there quoted by Schneider, it is doubtful whether $\begin{gathered}\text { èd } \nu \text { and the sub- }\end{gathered}$ junctive should not be replaced by $\epsilon i$ and an indicative.
    ${ }^{3}$ Sanday and Headlam, p. 389 'For $\delta \dot{\omega} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ of the TR. WH. read $\dot{\alpha} \pi \boldsymbol{\sigma} \delta \dot{\omega} \sigma \epsilon \epsilon$.' WH.'s edition of 1898 however reads $\delta \dot{\omega} \sigma \epsilon \epsilon$.

[^31]:    ${ }^{1}$ Likewise the Peshitto and many other anthorities.
    ${ }_{2}$ I cannot retrace this passage.

[^32]:    ${ }^{1}$ The same feeling prompted the addition $\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \nu \epsilon \dot{v} \mu a \tau \iota$ in Mt 5-4.

[^33]:    + For which cause God has delivered them up to dishonourable passions. 26 For their women have perverted their natural functions, and likewise the 27 men, turning away from their women, have abandoned themselves to unseemly practices. It is thus that they receive a meet retribution fur their idolatry.

    And as they made no genuine effort to know; God, God has delivered 28 them up to a spurious mind,

[^34]:    16 + Therefore it is not a matter determined by any one's uish or precedence' but by Gocl's favour.

[^35]:    $\dagger$ But if by grace, then it is no longer a reward for worles, for thus 6 a gift would no longer be a gift; and if as a reward for works, it is no longer by grace, for thus worle would no longer be work.

    What then? That which the Jews as a nation were pursuing they did 7 not attain; but a remnant has attained it.

[^36]:    + But as I see no further scope open to me in these parts and. I long 23 to meet you, I shall start for Spain by way of your city; on my jourrney 2824 then to Spain I hope to see you and be sped on by you when in some. measure I shall have enjoyed your society.

