


BS2650

.C156

V.1



THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL

*With Introductions and Commentary
for
Priests and Students*

BY THE
REV. CHARLES J. CALLAN, O.P.
PROFESSOR OF SACRED SCRIPTURE IN THE CATHOLIC FOREIGN MISSION SEMINARY
MARYKNOLL, N. Y.

VOLUME I
ROMANS, FIRST AND SECOND CORINTHIANS, GALATIANS



NEW YORK
JOSEPH F. WAGNER (INC.)
LONDON: B. HERDER

Nihil Obstat

V. F. O'DANIEL, O. P., S. T. M.

J. A. McHUGH, O. P., S. T. L.R.

Imprimi Potest

J. R. MEAGHER, O. P., S. T. L.R.

Provincial

Nihil Obstat

ARTHUR J. SCANLAN, S. T. D.

Censor Librorum

Imprimatur

✠PATRICK J. HAYES, D. D.

Archbishop of New York

NEW YORK, MAY 30, 1922.

COPYRIGHT, 1922, by JOSEPH F. WAGNER, NEW YORK

PREFACE

It is, perhaps, needless to observe that the Epistles of St. Paul, chiefly on account of their lofty teaching and the unique literary style of their great author, are exceedingly difficult to understand. This has been recognized from the beginning, and was admitted by St. Peter during the Apostle's own life-time.¹ In fact, it is not going too far to say that merely to read the Epistles, without some previous training or accompanying helps, would inevitably prove fruitless, for the most part.

Properly, therefore, to understand St. Paul and his writings, it is necessary, in the first place, to know something about the Apostle's history, his training, education and labors, as well as the reasons that moved him to write, and the people to whom his letters were directed. And this done, if we would attain to anything like a thorough grasp of the wealth and sublimity of doctrine which the Epistles contain, it will be further required that we diligently study each letter as a whole and in its parts, subjecting every section and verse to careful analysis and proper scrutiny,

With these thoughts in view, it has been the endeavor, in the present work, to give to priests and students, in the light of the latest and best scholarship, a thorough understanding of the meaning and teaching of the Epistles. The study, therefore, has first been preceded by a General Introduction, embracing all the main features of the Apostle's life and writings, and this has been followed and supplemented by a Particular Introduction to each Epistle, which is calculated to give the setting and lay bare the general outline and contents of each.

The Commentary proper is based throughout on the reading of the best Greek manuscripts, as reflected chiefly by Westcott and Hort; and hence, whenever our ordinary English version or the Clementine Vulgate has been found to be out of harmony with the

¹ 2 Peter iii. 15, 16.

critical Greek text in a matter of any real importance, this has been indicated, and the correct translation has been given. If, in some instances, a reading has been preferred, which has not the support of the best MSS., the reason is that the context and other critical arguments have seemed rather to favor the reading adopted.


All criticism of the text which has been deemed necessary, has, furthermore, been made to accompany each verse, rather than put in the Introduction, simply because this has appeared to be more convenient and practical for the student. Every Chapter of the text has been separated into its natural divisions, preceded by an appropriate heading. A summary of the section then follows, before the examination and exposition of the single verses. Great care has been taken everywhere to trace and indicate the connection of thought and doctrine between verses, sections and chapters. It has been the aim throughout to give all that may be needed to satisfy the ordinary requirements of the classroom, without bewildering or confusing the student, on the one hand, or wishing to restrict desirable elaborations by the professor, on the other hand. Let us hope the work may be found adequate, at least in part, to the end and purpose for which it has been undertaken.

C. J. CALLAN, O.P.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	v
GENERAL INTRODUCTION	ix
GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY	xlvii
 AUTHORITIES FOR THE TEXT OF THE EPISTLES	xlvii
ABBREVIATIONS	lii
 THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS	
SPECIAL INTRODUCTION	1
SPECIAL BIBLIOGRAPHY	22
Introduction (i. 1-15)	23
Dogmatic or Theoretic Part (i. 16-xi. 36)	31
Practical Part (xii. 1-xv. 13)	194
Conclusion (xv. 14-xvi. 27)	225
 THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS	
SPECIAL INTRODUCTION	246
SPECIAL BIBLIOGRAPHY	260
Introduction (i. 1-19)	261
The Vices of the Corinthians (i. 10-vi. 20)	265
A Reply to the Corinthians' Letter (vii. 1-xv. 58)	318
Conclusion (xvi)	438
 THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS	
SPECIAL INTRODUCTION	447
SPECIAL BIBLIOGRAPHY	462
Introduction (i. 1-11)	463
A General Apology for the Apostle's Life (i. 12-vii. 16)	467
The Collection for the Poor in Jerusalem (viii-ix. 15)	518
The Apostle's Self-Defence against the Judaizers (x. 1-xiii. 10)	531
Conclusion (xiii. 11-13)	563
 THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS	
SPECIAL INTRODUCTION	565
SPECIAL BIBLIOGRAPHY	582
Introduction (i. 1-10)	583
Apologetic Part (i. 11-ii. 21)	588
Dogmatic Part (iii. 1-v. 12)	610
Moral Part (v. 13-vi. 10)	647
Conclusion (vi. 11-18)	656
 INDEX	661

MAP OF ST. PAUL'S JOURNEYS
Based, by kind permission, upon Maps in "Paul, Hero and Saint" (The Paulist Press).



NOTE 1.—Unbroken lines in Maps II and III indicate journeys according to North Galatian theory.

NOTE 2.—Arabic numerals along the broken lines show the progress of the journeys.

THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

I. **St. Paul.** A. BIRTH AND EDUCATION. St. Paul was born around the beginning of the Christian era at Tarsus in Cilicia, a province of South-eastern Asia Minor (Acts ix. 11; xxi. 39). His parents were Jewish, having been natives, according to St. Jerome (*De viris ill.*, v.), of Gischala, a small town in Galilee. Although a Pharisee (Acts xxiii. 6), and therefore a Jew of the more austere type, Paul's father had, in some way unknown to us, become a Roman citizen (Acts xx. 26-28), and thus St. Paul was born at once an heir to the strictest form of Judaism and to the rights and privileges of imperial citizenship. Being circumcised on the eighth day after his birth he was given the name of Saul in memory of Israel's first king, who, like himself, was of the faithful tribe of Benjamin. Perhaps at the same time, or soon afterwards, he received also the Latin form of his Jewish name. Hellenistic Jews were accustomed to take a Roman or Greek name in addition to their own. It is true that the name *Paul* does not appear, as applied to the Apostle, before the conversion of the Roman Proconsul Sergius Paulus, on the island of Cyprus (Acts xiii. 9), and that, consequently, Origen, St. Jerome and St. Augustine believed this name was then assumed for the first time in honor of so illustrious a convert; but it is perhaps more probable, as St. Thomas thinks, that the Apostle had a Latin, as well as a Jewish name from the beginning.

Though Tarsus at this time was illustrious for its Greek culture, sharing with Athens and Alexandria the preëminence of being one of the three great university centres of the world (Strabo, xiv. 10, 13-15), and while this Greek environment must have powerfully influenced the keen and receptive mind of the

young Saul, still it is more than likely that the leaven of idolatry which permeated all Greek life rather filled his religious soul with horror and dislike for a culture so grossly opposed to the pure worship of the one true God. That he spoke Greek from his infancy, and that he was perfectly familiar with that form of the language which was then everywhere current throughout the countries which had been conquered by Alexander the Great cannot be questioned. This is evident from the richness of vocabulary and the flexibility of style which the Epistles betray. Without hesitation all scholars have to admit that the Apostle was equally at home in the use of the common Greek of his day and Aramaic, which was then the spoken language of Palestine. It seems to be true also, as we shall see further on, that Paul must in some way have become acquainted with the style and method of argumentation of such classic Greek authors as Thucydides, Demosthenes, Plato and Aristotle. However this may be, and however we may account for certain striking similarities of language and thought between the Apostle and these Greek writers, it remains true that St. Paul was at all times an Israelite through and through. His education at home and in the synagogue at Tarsus was exclusively Jewish. Like the Rabbins of his time, along with his early education, he acquired a manual art, learning to be a dresser of tents, which afterwards, on his missions, enabled him to provide for his own temporal wants while ministering to the spiritual needs of his converts and hearers (Acts xviii. 3; 1 Cor. iv. 12; 1 Thess. ii. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 7).

At an early age, perhaps around his fifteenth year, as we gather from Acts xxii. 3 and xxvi. 4, the young Pharisee was sent to Jerusalem to be instructed in the science of the Law. His father had doubtless destined him to be a Rabbin, and in the Holy City at that time the Jewish schools were flourishing. According to the Talmud, Gamaliel, the grandson of the great Hillel, had then a thousand students in his charge, half of whom were studying the Law, while the other half were applying themselves under his direction to a mastery of Greek philosophy and literature. Under such a master and surrounded by such influences (Acts v. 34) Paul acquired at Jerusalem that complete mastery of Scripture, that refined method of teaching and exact interpre-

tation, that remarkable dialectical skill and subtle power of reasoning which afterwards characterized his preaching and which are so wonderfully exemplified and reflected in his writings.

We do not know how long St. Paul remained at the school of Gamaliel in Jerusalem, but doubtless he had left there and returned to his native city before the first public appearance of the Saviour; for it is certain that he never saw the Lord during the latter's mortal life. The vision of Christ on the road to Damascus the Apostle speaks of as his first meeting with the Master; and we can be sure that, had he known Jesus before, or had he taken any part in the doings at the Passion, we should have been told somewhere in the Epistles. At any rate, the next time we meet the young Pharisee is at Jerusalem shortly after the day of Pentecost, when the faithful had formed a community apart, and, under the teaching and directions of the Apostles, were endeavoring gradually to cut loose entirely from the Law and its observances. Then it was that the young Saul, fired with zeal for his Jewish inheritances and for the Mosaic institutions (Gal. i. 14), began to take an active part against those who were imperiling the sacred traditions of his forefathers. Not only did he assent to the death of St. Stephen, the first martyr (Acts viii. 1), but he felt persuaded that it was necessary for him to undertake many things "against the name of Jesus of Nazareth" (Acts xxvi. 9). With all the energy and power of his burning soul he thenceforth left nothing undone to lay waste the Church of God, entering into the houses of Christians and binding and dragging the faithful, both men and women, to the authorities and to prison (Acts viii. 3; xxii. 4, 5; xxvi. 9-11). Oftentimes he invaded the religious assemblies of the faithful and compelled them, as far as he could, to blaspheme the name of Jesus and deny their faith (Acts xxvi. 11). Nor was his zeal thus satisfied with persecuting the Christians at home; but, seeking permission and authority from the chief priests in Jerusalem, he wished to extend the fury of his attacks to foreign cities (Acts xxvi. 11), so that if possible he might utterly obliterate the name of Christian and wipe out the teachings of the Crucified.

B. CONVERSION AND EARLY LABORS. It was when endeavoring to carry out his plan of extermination that, on the highway to

Damascus, the grace of God overtook the sincere but mistaken enemy of the faith of Christ, and, dashing him to the ground in the broad sunlight of high noon, changed the fierce persecutor into an ardent Apostle. We have three distinct accounts of this extraordinary event,—one by St. Luke (Acts ix. 1-22), whose information regarding it was doubtless afterwards gathered both from the Apostle himself and from those who were his companions at the time, and two others which are taken from discourses in which St. Paul later gave an account of his conversion (Acts xxii. 1-21; xxvi. 9-20). Each repeats the substance of what happened, with only those few minor differences of detail which naturally resulted from the subjective impressions made on the witnesses of the happening, and which are therefore easily reconciled and do not in any way affect the reality of the fact.

Having received the desired papers of authorization from the chief priests in Jerusalem, Saul with his companions set out for Damascus, where a Christian community had already been formed. Whether the company were proceeding on horse or muleback, or on foot we do not know—the accounts do not distinctly tell us; but when outside the city only about an hour and a half's journey (Le Camus, *L'Oeuvre des Apôtres*, tom. I. p. 178), at midday (Acts xxii. 6; xxvi. 13), suddenly a great light from heaven, distinct from that of the sun, enveloped the Apostle and his companions, Paul was thrown to the ground, and the Lord Jesus appeared to him saying, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me"? (Acts xxii. 6-8; xxvi. 12-15). Rising from the earth, but having been blinded by the heavenly light, he was led by his companions into Damascus (Acts xxii. 11), and there he remained for three days without sight and without eating or drinking, until a certain Ananias, probably the head of the Christian community at Damascus, to whom the Lord had also appeared in Paul's behalf, came to him and, in accordance with divine instructions, cured the Apostle's blindness, conferred on him Christian Baptism, and announced to him the great mission for which God had chosen him (Acts ix. 10-17; xxii. 12-16). Immediately Paul was cured, began to take food, and regained his strength (Acts ix. 18, 19).

Rationalists, on account of their opposition to everything

supernatural, have tried in vain to give a natural explanation of the conversion of St. Paul. They find different ways of attacking the accounts we have of the event, but their various hypotheses can be reduced to two: (a) Paul was naturally a very nervous and excitable man, subject to attacks of hysteria and epilepsy, and predisposed to visions and ecstasies. The apparition of Christ, therefore, on the road to Damascus was nothing more than the first of those ecstatic experiences which often repeated themselves in after-life. (b) The conversion of Paul, with its accompanying extraordinary phenomena, was but the final crisis of an interior struggle that had been going on in his soul ever since the martyrdom of St. Stephen. The memory of that tragic event followed him like a shadow and haunted his days and nights with thoughts and feelings of uncertainty, remorse, fear and the like. He could not forget the calm sweetness of that saintly young deacon on whose beautiful countenance, as he yielded up his life for the Faith of Jesus, there shone the light of heaven and was mirrored the martyr's glory. It was these reflections, we are told, that harrowed the soul of Paul and brought the first doubts to his mind. They caused him also to ponder the current account of the death and Resurrection of Jesus, which seemed plainly to look back to the prophecy of Isaias liii. Putting together these thoughts and his personal persuasion of the insufficiency of his own justice and the sterility of the Law, he could not help but think that perhaps in the death of the Crucified there was to be found that which he had sought in vain through his Pharisaical practices and observances. It was when approaching Damascus on his final mission of hate and terror that Paul's interior struggle reached its climax and produced that psychological transformation which the historian of the Acts has erroneously materialized for us (cf. Renan, *Les Apôtres*, p. 178 sq.).

That these explanations are out of harmony with all the facts of the event in question is easily seen by a simple reference to all the accounts we possess. (a) In the Epistle to the Galatians (Gal. i. 12-17) St. Paul speaks very plainly of his conversion, which he ascribes absolutely and entirely to the grace of God and to the personal intervention of Jesus Christ. There is no hint

of any previous thoughts, fears or reasonings on his part which were in any way connected with the change, which only the grace of God and the person of Jesus had wrought in him.

(b) Again in the Epistle to the Corinthians (1 Cor. ix. 1) Paul appeals to the vision on the road to Damascus as a proof of the reality of his Apostolic mission and authority. "Am I not an apostle?" he asks. "Have not I seen Christ Jesus our Lord?" To his mind these two facts are so intimately connected that to deny one is to deny the other. If he has not actually seen Jesus, he is no real Apostle.

(c) When proving the reality of the Resurrection of our Lord and enumerating the witnesses who had actually seen the risen Jesus, such as Peter, the eleven disciples, five hundred brethren, James and all the Apostles, he finally mentions himself on a perfect footing with those others. If then we accept, as we must, the reality of the vision of those other witnesses, we cannot but admit the objective reality of St. Paul's vision.

It is useless to try to maintain with Holsten and the patrons of the first rationalistic theory explained above that Paul regarded the apparition on the way to Damascus in the same light as he did those ecstatic visions with which he was afterwards favored at times (2 Cor. xii. 1-5). The latter pertained to his private life and were never spoken of except in the place just cited, and then out of constraint and with extreme repugnance; whereas the former, as regarding his conversion, is one of the frequent themes of his Epistles. He is proud of the honor of being, like the other Apostles, a witness of the Resurrection, and of enjoying therefore equal authority with the twelve. Furthermore, he considered his ecstasies as due to the Holy Ghost, but his conversion he ever attributed to the personal physical intervention of the risen Jesus.

After his Baptism and restoration to health St. Paul soon retired to Arabia, probably the desolate region to the south and east of Damascus, where for several years he gave himself to prayer and meditation in preparation for his Apostolic labors and ministry (Gal. i. 17, 18). Some scholars have conjectured that Paul preached while in Arabia, but this is very improbable. Had he done so, there would surely have been some mention later

on in his Epistles of the communities he founded there; but not only are his letters silent in this regard, but there is no trace of any Christians in the region of Hauran until after the year 70 A.D. After the example of his divine Master, therefore, St. Paul was led into the desert to prepare for his public ministry; it was during that time of solitude, doubtless, that he received, at least in general, the completion of his revelations and instructions relative to the doctrines of Christianity.

Upon his return to Damascus he first attempted to instruct the Jews, confounding them with his arguments for the Messiahship of Jesus, but he was shortly forced to flee for his life (Acts ix. 23-25). He then went up to Jerusalem to see Peter, the head of the Church (Gal. i. 18); but there too he encountered the fury of the Jews and after fifteen days was again obliged to flee (Acts xxii. 17, 18). The brethren accompanied him to Caesarea where he took ship and returned to Tarsus, his native town. For about two years thereafter Tarsus became the centre of the Apostle's missionary activities to Syria and Cilicia, and flourishing Christian communities were organized in those regions (Acts xv. 23, 41). But when the faithful became so numerous at Antioch that the Apostles in Palestine felt it necessary to give them special attention, Barnabas was sent to minister to them. Barnabas, however, at once saw that the field of labor that presented itself there was too vast for his own efforts. He therefore sought the assistance of Paul, and the two labored for an entire year at Antioch with the splendid result that the community there became the most flourishing of all the Churches so far established (Acts xi. 19-26).

About this time a famine was threatening the faithful of Judea, and the brethren of Antioch made a collection and chose Paul and Barnabas to carry it to the Church in Jerusalem (Acts xi. 27-30). This mission of charity being fulfilled, Paul and Barnabas, with the latter's cousin, John Mark, returned to Antioch and resumed their evangelical labors there. But the time was now ripe to extend the work of the Apostles to the entire world, especially the Gentile world. Accordingly, the Holy Ghost made known to the Church that it was the divine will that Paul and Barnabas should receive episcopal consecration and be sent out

to evangelize the pagan world (Acts xii. 24, 25; xiii. 2, 3). St. Luke does not state precisely just when this took place, but from all that is said in Acts xii it is rightly inferred that the missionaries did not depart until after the death of Herod Agrippa I, in 44 A.D. This would fix the time of their departure around the year 45.

C. THE FIRST MISSIONARY JOURNEY (Acts xiii. 4-xiv. 27). Accompanied by John Mark, Paul and Barnabas left Antioch, came to Seleucia, and thence sailed to the island of Cyprus. They preached in the synagogue of Salamina, and, crossing the island from east to west, finally reached Paphos, the residence of the Proconsul Sergius Paulus. Thereafter the Apostle's Hebrew name Saul is dropped, and he is known only as Paul. Thenceforward also Barnabas, who seems to have been at the head of the mission so far, takes second place, and Paul is always mentioned first by St. Luke. Leaving Cyprus the missionaries sailed to Perge in Pamphylia. There Mark left the two Apostles and returned to Jerusalem. Paul and Barnabas made their way through the mountains of Pisidia, and in about seven days reached the Roman colony of Antioch, where they remained long enough to publish the Word of the Lord throughout the whole country (Acts xiii. 49). Having been forced by the hostility of the Jews to leave Antioch, they then visited in turn Iconium, Lystra and Derbe, everywhere encountering the same Jewish opposition which finally compelled them to move on. At Lystra the Jews from Antioch and Iconium laid snares for Paul, dragged him outside the city, and, having stoned him, left him for dead on the ground. But Paul recovered. Retracing their steps from Derbe he and Barnabas visited each community they had founded, comforting the neophytes and ordaining priests in every Church. Arrived again at Perge they preached there the Gospel until a favorable opportunity presented itself for embarking at Attalia, whence they returned to Antioch in Syria, after an absence of at least three or four years (45-49 A.D.).

D. THE COUNCIL OF JERUSALEM (Acts xv. 1-30; Gal. ii. 1-10). Upon their return to Antioch Paul and Barnabas called together the faithful and announced to them with exceeding joy the great success of their mission to the Gentiles (Acts xiv. 26). But this

raised the question of the necessity of the Mosaic observances. Was the practice of these Jewish rites and ceremonies necessary for salvation, and should Gentile converts therefore be obliged to submit to them? Some converts from Pharisaism had come down to Antioch from Judea, and without any authority from the Apostolic body, had boldly insisted that no one could be saved unless he had been previously circumcised. If this were so, it would completely upset the work which Paul and Barnabas had been doing, and which St. Paul was to continue with even greater energy on his future missions. Wherefore the two Apostles opposed this false teaching with all their might; but being unable to settle the matter, on account of the stiff resistance of their adversaries, they determined to go up to Jerusalem and confer with Peter and the other Apostles and priests on this subject. Thus was occasioned the first Council of the Church around 49-50 A.D.

At the Council two closely related questions were officially decided: (a) that converts from paganism were to be regarded as true members of the Church, without the reception of circumcision or the imposition of any legal prescriptions; and (b) that the Apostolate of Paul and Barnabas and their particular mode of preaching could not in any way be called in question. This first decision has been distinctly recorded by St. Luke in the Acts, who wrote for Gentile readers; while the second is given by St. Paul himself when insisting, in his Epistle to the Galatians, upon his title as Apostle, the orthodoxy of his teaching, and the Apostolic approbation of his work. The decision that Gentile converts were not to be subjected to any of the Mosaic observances was accompanied also by the declaration that, for the sake of peace and harmony between pagan and Jewish converts, the Gentiles of Syria and Cilicia should abstain from certain pagan practices which could give offence to their brethren from Judaism.

When the Council was over it pleased the Apostles and ancients of Jerusalem, together with the whole Church, to send with Paul and Barnabas to Antioch Judas Barsabas and Silas, as delegates, to make known the decision of the Council to the Churches of Syria and Cilicia. The announcement of the Apos-

tolie decree was received with the greatest enthusiasm, and after some time Judas, and most probably Silas also (Acts xv. 33), went back to Jerusalem to give a report of the success of their mission. The opinion that Silas did not return to Jerusalem with Judas is based on Acts xv. 34, which seems to contradict the preceding verse and is most likely not authentic.

As Jewish Christians were not forbidden by the Council to practice the Mosaic observances, if they chose to do so, converts from Judaism continued to adhere to these ancient rites. This occasioned the friction between Peter and Paul at Antioch shortly before the beginning of the second missionary journey. For a discussion of this question see on Gal. ii. 1-13.

E. THE SECOND MISSIONARY JOURNEY (Acts xv. 36-xviii. 22). Perhaps soon after the misunderstanding with Peter at Antioch St. Paul, wishing to see again the Churches he had founded on his first journey, suggested to Barnabas that they visit the fields of their previous labors. As Barnabas insisted on taking Mark with them, St. Paul parted company with him, and, choosing as his companion Silas or Silvanus, who had returned from Jerusalem to Antioch, probably with St. Peter, went first to Tarsus, his native town, then through the Cilician Gates to Derbe in Lycaonia, confirming the Churches and publishing the Apostolic decree. At Lystra, which was next visited, Paul persuaded Timothy to join him, after circumcising him in order to facilitate his labors among the many Jews of that region.

We next find the Apostolic group in the Roman province of Asia, situated in the western portion of Asia Minor. But it was there revealed to them that God did not wish that they should preach in Asia (Acts xvi. 6). They, therefore, turning northward, directed their journey through Phrygia and the Galatian country. What is to be understood by Galatia here, and whether St. Paul preached in Galatia Proper, also called North Galatia, is a disputed question, for a discussion of which see the *Introduction* to Galatians in this volume.

When the missionaries reached the upper part of Mysia they attempted to enter Bithynia, but were again forbidden by the Holy Ghost (Acts xvi. 7). Crossing Mysia, then, without preaching they came to Troas, a seaport on the Aegean Sea. It was

here that Paul had a vision in a dream of a man from Macedonia who besought him to come and help his country (Acts xvi. 9, 10). Paul and his companions delayed not in obeying the heavenly vision, but immediately passed over the sea and landed on European soil at Neapolis, a seaport in Macedonia. At Philippi they began their labors. The next places visited were Thessalonica and Berea. In each centre where he preached the Apostle had no sooner got his community organized than the Jews stirred up a persecution and forced him to retire. At Philippi he and Silas were accused of disturbing the public order and were beaten with rods. Leaving Berea Paul went alone to Athens, while Silas and Timothy for the time being remained in Macedonia (Acts xvii. 14). Before the Areopagus he delivered a set discourse without, however, producing any special effect. The Athenians were little moved, unless it was with disgust and derision, either by his doctrine or by his language. Wherefore, leaving Athens of his own accord, he proceeded to Corinth where a rich harvest was awaiting him. He remained there eighteen months, preaching in the synagogue every Sabbath, until he was forced by the violent opposition of the Jews to withdraw to an adjoining house owned by a proselyte named Titus Justus. It was during this stay in Corinth, perhaps soon after Silas and Timothy rejoined him, giving a report of the Church at Thessalonica, that St. Paul wrote his two letters to the Thessalonians, the first of his Epistles.

At the end of a year and a half of most successful labors St. Paul took leave of the Corinthians on account of a vow he had made to visit the Holy City, and, accompanied by Aquila and Priscilla, went down to Cenchrae, and sailed across the Aegean Sea to Ephesus. After a short stay at Ephesus, during which he promised to come again and evangelize the Ephesians, if God so willed (Acts xviii. 19-21), he departed alone for Caesarea, whence he proceeded to Jerusalem in fulfillment of his vow and then returned to Antioch in Syria. Thus was terminated the second missionary journey which must have taken at least three years (around 50-54 A.D.).

F. THE THIRD MISSIONARY JOURNEY (Acts xviii. 23-xxi. 26). Paul spent some time, perhaps several months, with the Church

at Antioch before setting out on his third journey. His destination this time was Ephesus which, on account of its situation, was well calculated to be the natural centre of all the Churches in the Orient. Located at the entrance of the provinces of Achaia, Macedonia and Galatia, it offered the Apostle an unusually favorable opportunity of completing his work in the East and of watching the development of the communities already founded in Asia and in Europe. Departing, therefore, from Antioch, probably with Titus, the Apostle evidently followed with little, if any, change the itinerary of the previous journey. Thus, passing through the country of Galatia and Phrygia in order, and confirming all the Churches (Acts xviii. 23), he finally reached Ephesus (Acts xix. 1). Here he pursued the same method as formerly of preaching in the synagogues, and of laboring between times at his trade to provide for his temporal needs and support.

For the space of three months after his arrival at Ephesus Paul was able to give his instructions in the synagogue, but at the end of that time he was again obliged to go elsewhere. He continued his work in the school or lecture-room of one Tyrannus, who was probably a heathen professor (Acts xix. 9). According to an addition of the *Codex Bezae*, the Apostle made use of this lecture-room or school from eleven o'clock in the forenoon till four in the afternoon. These regular instructions went on for two years, when Paul was compelled to leave the city. This time his departure was due to the pagan silversmiths of Ephesus, whose flourishing business of selling facsimiles of the temple of Diana and statuettes of the goddess was practically ruined by the preaching and progress of Christianity. So potent was the Apostle's influence against these idolatrous practices that books of superstition to the value of about \$9,000 in our money were cast into the fire and burned. Naturally this enraged the silversmiths, whose prosperity depended on the sale of these articles; and therefore, headed by Demetrius, they so roused the pagans against Paul that he was constrained to flee. He thence went to Troas, then to Macedonia, and finally to Corinth, where he spent the winter. He had intended to go back to Jerusalem the following spring, probably for the Pasch, sailing directly from Achaia; but having learned of a plot on the part of the

Jews to kill him, he eluded their wicked plans by returning through Macedonia, stopping at Philippi to celebrate the Pasch. Then crossing over to Troas he proceeded down the coast of Asia Minor to Assos where, joining his companions who had gone from Troas by boat while he made the journey on foot, he sailed to Mitylene. Two days later the ship arrived at the island of Samos, and the following day it was at Miletus. As there was to be a wait here for several days, St. Paul summoned the Presbyters of Ephesus to come to him. Having delivered to them a long and touching farewell (Acts xx. 18-38), he again set sail, and, landing in due time at Tyre, proceeded on foot to Caesarea, and thence to Jerusalem. At Caesarea the Prophet Agabus foretold the Apostle's apprehension in Jerusalem and all the faithful there discouraged his going to the Holy City, but their efforts to effect any change in his plan were unavailing. Upon his arrival he was accorded a hearty welcome by the brethren, by James and all the Presbyters of the Church in Jerusalem. At the request of the latter he submitted to a public Jewish ceremony, to be fulfilled in the Temple, in order to prove to his fellow-Jews that he did not despise the Law of Moses.

Considering that St. Paul tarried some time at Antioch before starting on his third journey, and especially his prolonged stay at Ephesus, we are safe in allowing about four years from the time of his departure till his return to Jerusalem (around 54-58 A.D.). During this time he certainly wrote the two Epistles to the Corinthians and that to the Romans. Perhaps also Galatians was written shortly after the Apostle had arrived at Ephesus, although the date and place of the composition of this letter are uncertain.

G. ARREST AND CAPTIVITIES AT CAESAREA AND ROME (Acts xxi. 27-xxviii. 31). Paul had not been able to terminate his ceremony in the Temple when Jewish enemies from Asia discovered him and stirred up the people against him, saying that he taught everywhere disregard for the Law and for the Temple, and that he had actually violated the sanctity of the latter by bringing Gentiles with him into the holy place. Forthwith the Apostle was roughly thrust out of the Temple, beaten, arraigned before the tribune Lysias, and taken down and imprisoned at Caesarea, the residence of the Procurator Felix. There he was left in chains

for two whole years, until the arrival of Festus, the successor of Felix. The new Governor desired to send Paul to Jerusalem to be tried by his accusers, but as the Apostle knew this meant only injustice, violence and death, he appealed to his rights as a Roman citizen, and was therefore dispatched under military escort to Rome.

As Festus, according to the best authorities, most probably assumed office in 60 A.D., we take it for next to certain that Paul was released and was taken as a prisoner to Rome in the autumn of that year, arriving the following spring, 61 A.D. In the Eternal City the Apostle was allowed a good deal of liberty. "He remained there two whole years in his own hired lodging; and he received all that came in to him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching the things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, without prohibition" (Acts xxviii. 30, 31).

That St. Paul was finally acquitted after a two years' imprisonment in Rome seems certain from the following considerations: (a) King Agrippa and the Governor Festus were surely convinced of his innocence, and the report of the latter, as well as that of Julius the Centurion who conducted the Apostle to Rome, was most favorable (Acts xxv. 14 ff.; xxvi. 31; xxvii. 3). (b) The Jews did not carry their accusations to Rome, because those who met Paul there knew nothing of the trouble (Acts xxviii. 21). (c) In the Epistles written at that time he speaks as if certain of his release (Philip. i. 25; ii. 24; Philem. 22). (d) Even those critics who deny the most probable authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles admit that the Apostle was free when they were written, after 63-64 A.D.

H. CLOSING YEARS. Soon after the Apostle's release from Roman captivity he doubtless undertook his long desired journey to Spain (Rom. xv. 24, 28). Towards the end of his imprisonment, when announcing his coming to Philemon (22) and to the Philippians (ii. 23, 24), he spoke as if intending to make another journey before reaching them. This was most likely his visit to Spain, of which the Acts do not speak, but for which we have as witnesses the *Muratorian Canon*, the *Acta Pauli*, Clement of Rome (1 Cor. v), St. Athanasius (*Epist. ad Dracont.* iv), St. John Chrysostom (*Hom. x. 3 in 2 Tim.* and *in Matt.* lxxv. 2), St. Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxvii. 6), Theodoret (*in 2 Tim.* iv. 17), St. Jerome (*in Isaiam*

xi. 6), St. Gregory the Great (*Mor. in Job xxxi. 53*), etc. Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl. ii. 22*) is not quite explicit with regard to Spain, but he adopts the tradition that after defending his cause in Rome, St. Paul undertook another journey between the first and second Roman captivities, and that, coming a second time to the Eternal City, he was martyred there. Even Protestants, such as Zahn, Kübel, Spitta, Steinmetz, etc. (cf. Belser, *Einleitung*, p. 584), are admitting these conclusions more readily as time goes on.

It would seem that the Apostle's stay in Spain must have been brief, as he was anxious to revisit the Churches he had founded in the Orient. Nearly all modern scholars admit this final journey to the East, which alone can explain the subsequent activity of St. Paul that is presupposed by the Pastoral Epistles. His itinerary, however, is altogether uncertain, and we can only conjecture it at best. It appears that he went first to Crete and remained there long enough to found new Churches, whose organization he left to Titus (Tit. i. 5). Next he probably visited Ephesus and saw Timothy, whom he besought to remain at Ephesus until he would return from Macedonia (1 Tim. i. 3; iii. 14). While in Macedonia he visited the Philippians, and perhaps also the Thessalonians and Corinthians. It must have been at this time that he wrote the letter to Titus and the First Epistle to Timothy, whether from Macedonia or from Corinth is uncertain. Some ancient MSS., including the Alexandrian Codex, as well as the Peshitto and Ethiopian versions, state that 1 Tim. was written from Laodicea.

The Apostle instructed Titus to join him at Nicopolis of Epirus, where he intended to spend the winter (Tit. iii. 12). Perhaps in the following spring he returned to Asia. Whether it was at that time that he left behind him at Troas the cloak and some books which he afterwards needed (2 Tim. iv. 13), and then visited Ephesus and Miletus we do not know. At any rate, it was during this obscure period that he was finally arrested and taken to Rome. When writing the Second Epistle to Timothy from Rome he regarded his end as very near (2 Tim. iv. 6), and he begged his beloved disciple to make haste to join him as soon as possible, as he was alone with Luke (2 Tim. iv. 8, 11, 21).

It is uncertain whether Timothy reached Rome before the Apostle was beheaded, which, according to tradition, occurred June 29 of

the year 67 A.D. The scene of the martyrdom was the spot outside the walls of Rome where now stands the massive Basilica of *San Paolo alle Tre Fontane* which guards the Apostle's earthly remains (cf. Coghlan, *St. Paul*, p. 283 ff.).

In the foregoing brief survey of St. Paul's career we have not been at pains expressly to construct a complete chronology of his life and labors, and yet from what has been indicated it can easily be seen that we have incidentally fixed in a broad way all the chief periods of his activities. It is only proximately, after all, that we can determine certain dates in the life of the Apostle, such as the year of his conversion, the date of the Council of Jerusalem, the precise number of years occupied by the different missionary journeys, the exact time of the writing of each of the Epistles, and so on. Only superficial critics can insist, with our present available knowledge, upon their own views or upon the views of any one particular author in all these matters. The folly of such a position can be seen from a simple comparison of authorities like Toussaint (in *Dict. de la Bible*, tom. IV. col. 2188-2230), Brassac (in *R. B.*, cited by cf. Voste, in *Com. ad Thess.*, pp. 12, 13), Prat (in *Cath. Encycl.*, vol. XI. pp. 567-573), the Dutch scholar Dr. Plooij (in the *Expositor* of May, June and Aug., 1919, cited by Coghlan in *St. Paul, His Life*, etc., pp. 1-12), and J. E. Symes (in *The Evolution of the New Testament*, pp. 12, 19, 21, 31, 112, and elsewhere). The dates, therefore, which we have given, are the most probable ones, and are supported by the majority of the best scholars.

I. PERSONAL APPEARANCE AND CHARACTERISTICS. Despite the imposing figure on the steps of the Areopagus which Raphael has drawn for us, as well as similar creations of the fancy of other artists, St. Paul, according to the persistent tradition of the Church, was anything but commanding and beautiful in his physical appearance. Glimpses, doubtless, of the great soul within could be caught now and then, or frequently by his friends, as sunbeams are seen through openings in prison walls; but for all that the bodily make-up of the man was homely and poor. That his physical presence was insignificant and weak, as his enemies had said, the Apostle himself seems to admit (2 Cor. x. 10). And when the heathens at Lystra would offer sacrifices to him and Barnabas as gods in human form, they called the latter Zeus, on account of his majestic appearance;

but Paul they named Hermes, because small and less attractive (Acts xiv. 12).

In the apocryphal work, the *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, written in the third century, we are told that St. Paul was "a man, small in size, bald-headed, bandy-legged, with meeting eyebrows, hook-nosed, full of grace." This is the earliest description of the Apostle which has come down to us in Christian literature, but it quite exactly expresses the general tradition. In the fourth century Paul is ridiculed in the *Philopatris* of the Pseudo-Lucian as "the bald-headed, hook-nosed Galilean who trod the air into the third heaven and learned the most beautiful things" (*Philopat.* 12). All the descriptions, in fact, that we have received of the Apostle from any source give us the same picture (cf. Prat, in *Cath. Encyc.*, vol. XI. p. 573).

Quite opposing opinions are held with regard to his health. Some biographers believe that he must have been unusually strong and robust, otherwise he could never have endured such a life of labor and strain as was his. The vast area over which his work extended, and the hardships he encountered for over thirty years of missionary activity of the most strenuous nature were enough to wreck the strongest constitution; and yet St. Paul seems to have been full of energy and activity up to his final imprisonment. Other authorities, on the contrary, insist that he was weakly and frail in constitution throughout his life. They point out his own frequent references to his poor health, as when speaking of the infirmity of his flesh (Gal. iv. 14), of being on the verge of the grave (2 Cor. i. 9), of his chronic illness (2 Cor. xii. 7), of the necessity which he seemed to have of companionship and help (Acts xvii. 15), and the like. Indeed, it seems that he never wanted to be alone, and that, with the exception of his visit to Athens, he was never for any length of time without attendants and companions. In all his later years Luke, the beloved physician, was constantly by his side, as if to give him the medical assistance of which he was perhaps so often in need.

The truth seems to be "that Paul was physically weak and a chronic invalid, but that he had an indomitable will which compelled his body to exertions unparalleled, and which dragged it through sufferings and labors under which ordinary men and

ordinary minds would have succumbed. We think he belongs to that dauntless and unconquerable handful of the race who by their accomplishments in despite of all physical ills put those who are well and strong to constant shame. With bodies disabled by distressing disease and racked with continual pain, they do more than a multitude of other men who never know what sickness is and never struggle against any physical handicap" (Hayes, *Paul and His Epistles*, pp. 37 ff.).

To the foregoing explanation we must also add that St. Paul was a man of destiny, specially chosen by God, and spiritually endowed as few, if any other of the saints have been, to perform a stupendous task. Humanly speaking, his frail physique would never have been equal to what he experienced in labor and in trials and sufferings, but God's grace was with him in a measure so abundant that it more than made up for his natural physical deficiencies. Therefore he said that, if it was necessary for him to glory on account of his enemies who belittled him in order to destroy his authority, he would glory in God's special favors to him, but for himself he had nothing save his infirmities whereof to boast: "For myself I will glory nothing, but in my infirmities. . . . Power is made perfect in infirmity. Gladly therefore will I glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may dwell in me" (2 Cor. xii. 1-5, 9). And again, "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Gal. vi. 14). When exposed to almost certain death and in the hands of wicked men, it was to God that he looked for help, and God alone that made him triumph: "But we had in ourselves the answer of death, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God who raiseth the dead; who hath delivered and doth deliver us out of so great dangers: in whom we trust that he will yet also deliver us" (2 Cor. i. 9, 10). "All forsook me. . . . But the Lord stood by me, and strengthened me, that by me the preaching may be accomplished, and that all the Gentiles may hear: and I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion. The Lord hath delivered me from every evil work: and will preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom, to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen" (2 Tim. iv. 16-18).

St. Paul, therefore, was physically weak and a chronic invalid,

but endowed with an unconquerable will power and singularly helped and sustained at all times by the special grace of God. He had been selected by God to carry the Gospel to the Gentile world, to fulfil a gigantic mission, and nothing could defeat him, neither enemies from without nor evils within, neither the forces of nature nor the power of rulers, neither the present nor things to come, were able to thwart his efforts, until his work was done.

It is a much more difficult undertaking to sketch Paul's moral portrait. Certainly a more complex character than his is not known to human history; it was full of contrasts, paradoxical to an extreme. "He was so versatile in his gifts and interests that we have scarcely noted one distinguishing trait when we feel we must set another beside it that looks like its opposite. His personality was magnetic; he attracted and repelled with equal force. Many never omitted to notice his insignificant stature, his marred visage, his weak and often distorted frame, his unpolished and provincial speech; but to others the bright spirit, the tender heart, and the shining light of the inspired eyes so transfigured him that they saw no defect, and were ready to receive him as an angel of God. He boasted of being both Jew and Gentile, and he sometimes showed the narrow strength of the one, and sometimes the cultured humanism of the other. He loved perfectly, and he also hated with all his might. At times he soothes with the gentle touches of a friend, but he can also lash with the fiery indignation of a foe. He is equally to be dreaded by an adversary when he endeavors to persuade and when he determines to confound. There are moments when he is prudent and cautious to a degree; anon he is impetuous and impulsive to the very verge of rashness. Moods of passion and of peace, like the changes of April skies, alternate in his life. Now he is so moved with anxiety that he cannot rest or restrain his tears; again, he is so confident in God that no disaster or infirmity can make him dismayed; now he is humble, self-abased, seemingly abject in his own eyes, and again he is radiant and jubilant, absolutely confident in the power and triumph of the indwelling Christ. One wonders if the same man speaks, and whether a single soul could ever compass in its experience such heights and depths" (Shaw, *The Pauline Epistles*, pp. 490, 91).

After all, there was no inconsistency in the apparently opposing traits of St. Paul's character. His was a real, ardent, sterling nature. He loved Christ and men for Christ's sake, and consequently he hated sin and all that was opposed to the sacred cause which consumed his life and energies. To the good and pure and true he made appeal; but to the false, insincere and wicked he was an object of hate and fear. In the sight of heaven and apart from God's grace he felt his own nothingness and imperfections; but in God he could do all things and nothing daunted him. Writing to the Corinthians, he said he was the least of the Apostles and not worthy to be called an Apostle, because he had persecuted the Church of God (1 Cor. xv. 9); to the Ephesians he admitted that he was the least of all the saints (Eph. iii. 8); and to Timothy he wrote that he was the chief of sinners (1 Tim. i. 15). Naturally these and similar expressions refer to the Apostle's misdirected zeal before his conversion, and to what he would have been at all times except for the grace of God; but they are manifestations of the humility of his soul. He counted himself as nothing apart from God.

But when there was question of the Gospel, of the cause of Christ, and of his Apostolic ministry and duties, he had the courage of a conqueror and the self-assertion of a master. "I am not ashamed of the gospel," he told the Romans, "for it is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth" (Rom. i. 16). He wrote to the Galatians that if anyone, even an angel from heaven were to preach to them a Gospel different from the one he had preached, let such a one be cursed by God (Gal. i. 8, 9). He told the Corinthians that he; that is, the grace of God in him, had labored more abundantly than all the other Apostles (1 Cor. xv. 10). When at Ephesus he said he wished to remain there till Pentecost, for there was open to him in that city a great opportunity to preach the Gospel, although there were also many enemies (1 Cor. xvi. 9).

St. Paul could also be very fierce and defiant when stirred with righteous indignation. When Elymas the sorcerer tried to pervert his illustrious convert, the Roman Proconsul Sergius Paulus, St. Paul faced him and, "filled with the Holy Ghost, said: O full of all guile, and of all deceit, child of the devil, enemy of

all justice, thou ceaseest not to pervert the right ways of the Lord" (Acts xiii. 9, 10). At his trial before the Jewish authorities in Jerusalem when Ananias, the high priest, in violation of the law, ordered him to be struck on the mouth, the Apostle replied: "God shall strike thee, thou whited wall. For sittest thou to judge me according to the law, and contrary to the law commandest me to be struck?" (Acts xxiii. 2, 3). When in prison in Rome for the last time, shortly before his execution, ablaze with indignation against the enemies of truth and justice, he wrote to Timothy: "Alexander the coppersmith hath done me much evil: the Lord will reward him according to his works: whom do thou also avoid, for he hath greatly withstood our words" (2 Tim. iv. 14, 15).

These are but a few of the traits of this many-sided man, whose whole life, thoughts and deeds were entirely consecrated to God and to Christ, who, like candles on the altar, was consumed in the service of his divine Master. The love of Christ was the one grand passion of his soul, the dominating principle of his whole existence from the time of his conversion on the way to Damascus until he gave up his spirit at the hands of the executioner. On behalf of his cause and his faith he could truly say: "For thy sake we are put to death all the day long. We are accounted as sheep for the slaughter" (Rom. viii. 36). And yet he was at all times undaunted, because to him, to live was Christ, and to die was gain (Philip. i. 21). Thus, feeling that the time of his dissolution was at hand, he serenely wrote to Timothy: "As to the rest, there is laid up for me a crown of justice, which the Lord the just judge will render to me in that day: and not only to me, but to them also that love his coming" (2 Tim. iv. 8).

II. The Epistles of St. Paul. A. THEIR NUMBER, ORDER AND DATE. In the New Testament canon we find fourteen Epistles ascribed to the Apostle Paul, and the order in which they are given is the same as that found in our Douay and Vulgate versions of the Bible. Besides these fourteen letters it is certain that the Apostle wrote also several others that have not come down to us. He himself speaks to the Corinthians (1 Cor. v. 9) of an Epistle addressed to that community of which we know nothing further. In his letter

community of the Church addressed, or to all the faithful everywhere. Thus the letters to the Romans, to the Galatians, to the Ephesians and to the Hebrews contain doctrines and messages for all Christians of all time. He tells us himself that the letters to the Corinthians were for all the Churches of the province of Achaia (1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Cor. i. 1). That to the Colossians he wished to be communicated to the Laodiceans (Col. iv. 16); and in the Epistles to Timothy and to Titus he expressly salutes the Churches of Ephesus and of Crete (2 Tim. iv. 22; Titus iii. 15). Even in the letter to Philemon (2) we see the whole community was intended.

St. Paul did not, as a rule, write his own letters, but dictated them to one or other of his disciples. But knowing that they were to be freely read and circulated among the faithful, he took precaution against falsifiers and forgers by adding some special sign of authenticity, such as writing the final salutation with his own hand (2 Thess. ii. 2).

C. STYLE. All the Epistles of St. Paul were written in Greek, not, however, in the classic Greek of Demosthenes and Pericles, but in that Hellenistic dialect which was spoken by the Jews outside of Palestine, and by people generally in the countries which had been conquered by Alexander the Great. St. Paul was well aware that his language was not of the polished kind (2 Cor. xi. 6), and yet on occasion he could speak with grace and elegance. After St. Luke, he doubtless possessed a better control of Greek than any other of the New Testament writers. Apart from the Epistle to the Hebrews, his vocabulary contains not less than 2478 different words, of which 816 are not used by another New Testament writer, and of these 150 are employed for the first time by the Apostle himself (cf. Jacquier, *Histoire*, etc., I. p. 51).

The grammatical faults and irregularities which are found in the Greek copies of St. Paul's Epistles, and which are sufficiently manifest also in our English version, are to be accounted for partly by the usage of the time, but mainly by the hurry, stress and excitement under which most of them were composed. Paul was a very impetuous character, and it was his custom to dictate his Epistles. The ideas and matter of his discourse and

letters claimed far more of his attention than the form in which they were expressed. His Epistles are a picture of their author. They represent him just as he thought and felt, and the imperfections of diction which they reveal are an added proof of their genuineness.

It would take too long to enumerate all the expressions and words in St. Paul's writings to which stylists might reasonably take exception. We must be content with a reference to only a few of his more common defects.

(a) St. Paul sometimes uses mixed metaphors, as in 2 Cor. v. 1-3, where clothing and a house are confusedly spoken of as a covering for one's nakedness. In the same Epistle (iii. 2, 3) the Corinthians are referred to, first as Paul's Epistle, then as Christ's epistle; they are first said to be written on the hearts of Paul and his companions, and then on the hearts of the Corinthians themselves. Again in the same chapter (verses 13-16) the veil is first represented as covering the face of Moses, and then as covering the hearts of the children of Israel. In the Epistle to the Colossians (ii. 6, 7) the faithful are exhorted to walk in Christ, to be rooted and built up in Him, and at the same time to be firmly fixed in Him.

(b) A very noticeable blemish in the Apostle's writings are his unfinished enumerations and sentences. In his introduction to the Epistle to the Romans (i. 8) he says: "First I give thanks to my God," etc., leaving one to think that he will later add: "Secondly I," etc., which he does not do. Again, at the beginning of the third chapter (iii. 1, 2) he asks: "What advantage then hath the Jew?" etc., and he replies: "Much every way. First indeed, because the words of God," etc. Evidently he intended to give a list of the privileges of the Jews, or to enumerate those which were primary and those which were secondary, but he is carried away into other realms of thought and does not return to the prerogatives of his kinsmen until he reaches the ninth chapter (verses 4, 5). In chapter five (verse 12) of the same Epistle he has: "Wherefore as by one man sin entered into this world," etc. We naturally expect him to add, without digression, "So by one other man redemption and salvation were brought to the race"; but it is only after a long parenthesis,

treating of the relation of death to sin, that he gives the parallel for which we wait. Witness the following long unfinished sentence: "What if God, willing to shew his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much patience vessels of wrath, fitted for destruction, that he might shew the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he hath prepared unto glory? Even us, whom also he hath called, not of the Jews, but also of the Gentiles" (Rom. ix. 22-24). In fact, the sublime sentence that closes the Epistle to the Romans is left incomplete (xvi. 25-27).

(c) So overflowing was the Apostle's thought that he sometimes did not stop to search for a word already in use, but unhesitatingly coined one which would answer his purpose, or express his meaning more exactly. In the Epistle to the Ephesians (iii. 6) we find three compound words—*συνκλμρονόμ*, *σύνωωηα* and *συνμέτοχα*, which are rendered in the Vulgate by *cohaeredes*, *concorporales* and *comparticipes*. Defending these verbal malformations and his literal translation of them St. Jerome said: "I know that in Latin it makes an ugly sentence. But because it so stands in the Greek, and because every word and syllable and stroke and point in the divine Scriptures is full of meaning, I prefer the risks of verbal malformation to the risk of missing the sense." In the same chapter (verse 8) we have the word *ἐλαχιστοτέρω*, which is translated "least" in our version, but which literally means "the leaster" or "the more least." It is a comparative formed on a superlative, or the comparative of a superlative—a grammatical impossibility and a literal absurdity; for it is plain that there can be no further degree of least. The word is called "an unparalleled barbarism of grammatical inflexion" (cf. P. Huxtable in the *Expositor*, II. vol. III. p. 273). The Apostle simply disregarded the requirements of grammar and rhetoric in his intense desire to express his own nothingness.

Let these few examples suffice to illustrate some of the more serious faults in St. Paul's compositions. His style may be said to be more or less characterized by awkward anacolutha, irregular constructions and strange forms; but it is the expression of a man overflowing with life, energy and individuality, of a soul on fire with zeal and exclusively intent upon the delivery of a

message that had been confided to him by Christ Himself. We might iron out the rough spots in his language, we might polish his sentences and periods until they would be faultless diction, but they would then cease to be his unique compositions, and their native vigor and compelling power would be gone.

Another feature which we regret in the Apostle's style is the absence of nearly all reference to the natural world around him. His writings have almost nothing of the poetic touches, drawn from the scenes and beauties of nature, which are so characteristic of the Old Testament and of the Gospels. In a single Psalm of David or chapter of Isaias or parable of our Lord there is more natural imagery, more poetic feeling than in all of the Apostle's Epistles. To the Old Testament writers, as to our Lord, the wonders of nature were ever speaking and ever furnishing apt illustrations of the sublime truths of revelation. The majestic mountains and everlasting hills were images of the almighty and eternal Creator, the rivers and lakes and the sea had voices to speak of Him, the winds and the clouds had a message to communicate from Him. Even the birds of the air, the flowers and grasses, and the lilies of the field were meek creatures that proclaimed the existence of the great God who made them, and of His paternal care of all the works of His hands. The Prophet looked up to the sun, moon and stars; he saw their glory and felt their ministry to men, but he was carried above them to the infinitely superior glory of their Maker and to the unfailing solicitude of a father for his children. The Psalmist heard the roaring of the sea and of its waves, and he thought of the power of the voice of God. Our divine Saviour saw the vultures gathering around a dead body, and He spoke of the gathering of all men for the future judgment; He beheld the fisherman letting his net into the water, and He thought of the souls that were to be brought into His kingdom; He saw the sower scattering seed on the soil, and it was a picture to Him of His Apostles implanting a knowledge of the Word of God in human hearts; He looked on the fields after the harvest, or on the vineyard after the vintage, or on the fiery splendor of the setting sun, painting the clouds and the heavens with crimson and gold, and He was reminded of the number of the elect, of the final ingathering of all the saved,

and of the glory and brightness that are to attend upon His Second Coming.

But in St. Paul all these striking images are wanting. Though born and reared within sight of the snow-capped hills of Taurus, and though he lived long under the blue skies and among the enchanting scenes and landscapes of Greece and Asia Minor, no mountain majesties, no cloud glories are ever reflected in his writings. The music of birds, the fragrance of flowers, the beauties of the heavens seem all to have escaped him; they did not exist for him. It is true, there are many passages in his Epistles of surpassing beauty and sublimity of thought, there are flights of impassioned eloquence seldom equalled by other writers, there are manifest at times a flexibility and an eloquence of expression such as we see only in classic writers; but the Apostle's language on the whole is that of a professor and teacher, and savors of the synagogue, the schoolroom and the courtroom. He was born in the city, and lived and worked in crowded centres all his life; and hence the similes and illustrations which he makes use of in writing are taken mostly from the manners and customs of men. He was familiar with military life, for the Roman legions were everywhere; he was acquainted with the athletic games and feasts of the Greeks; he lived in the midst of some of the greatest creations of Grecian art, and was constantly beholding the stately arches, monuments and palaces of the pagans; and all these furnished him with a multitude of metaphors and images to illustrate the warfare and struggle of life, the effort needed to win unfading crowns, and to attain to mansions above not built by human hands. St. Paul's imagery, therefore, is not drawn from the world of nature, but from the activities of men and the outward manifestations of human life. His language is at all times full of power and energy; it speaks to the intellect and moves the will; but it is not for the most part poetic, nor colored with nature's pictures.

Whether Paul was familiar with the Greek classics and had studied them is not quite certain; but if not, it is very hard to find an explanation for the unusual number of figures of Greek rhetoric which we see in his writings, and also very difficult to account for the marked resemblance between him and such

writers as Thucydides and Demosthenes. No other writer of the New Testament makes use of so many figures of Greek rhetoric. Farrar gives fifty examples of over thirty of these figures in the Epistles, and after a careful discussion of the subject he concludes: "It is far from improbable that, as a boy in Tarsus, he (Paul) had attended some elementary class in rhetoric, which, indeed, may have been only a part of his education in the grammatical knowledge of the Greek language" (*Expositor*, I. vol. X. pp. 4-6, 26). The Apostle's frequent use of antitheses (2 Cor. iv. 8-10; v. 21), of climaxes (1 Cor. xiii; 2 Cor. vii. 11), of enumerations (1 Cor. xiii. 4-8; 2 Cor. vi. 4-10; xi. 22-29; Philip. iv. 8), of rapid interrogations (Rom. viii. 31-34), of synonyms (Rom. ii. 17-23; 2 Cor. vi. 14-16), and the like are surely figures very common in the Greek classics.

In Thucydides we meet with a style which makes us feel that St. Paul must have chosen him as a model. There is the same carelessness of literary polish, the same intense emotion, the same remarkable eloquence at times, the same volcanic energy and power which breaks through all barriers of grammar and rhetoric in its effort for an unrestrained outlet. T. C. Baur (*Paul*, vol. II, p. 281) says of certain passages in the Apostle's writings: "They have the true ring of Thucydides, not only in expression, but in the style of thought. The genuine dialectic spirit appears in both, the same love of antitheses and contrast, rising not infrequently to paradox. . . . With both these men the ties of natural particularism give way before the generalizing tendency of their thought, and cosmopolitanism takes the place of nationalism."

Different explanations may be given of the similarities between the style of Paul and that of Thucydides, but if, as Farrar (*Life and Works of St. Paul*, p. 691) remarks, "the style of Paul more clearly resembles the style of Thucydides than that of any other great writer of antiquity," it seems only natural to say that the Apostle must have been familiar at some time in his life with the writings of the great Greek. Such a supposition is not only possible, but also probable and reasonable.

We must always bear in mind that Paul was a man of destiny, an instrument specially chosen and fitted by God to do a special work. He was to be the Apostle of the Gentiles, to labor among

Greek-speaking peoples, and to deliver to them by word of mouth and by his letters the most momentous message the world had ever received. Primarily he was to be a religious orator. Would it not be natural, then, that God should have provided that the Apostle, perhaps in early life, should have become acquainted, not only with the fervid Thucydides, but also with Demosthenes, the greatest of Greek orators? It is true, Paul did not trust entirely, or even primarily, in his preaching, to the "wisdom of speech" (1 Cor. i. 17); but is it probable that, for the handling of his great themes, he would make no effort to acquire some familiarity with the language and methods of argumentation of that most famous of Greek masters who had exercised an unparalleled persuasive power over his countrymen? Would he, who became all things to all men that he might save all, neglect one of the most ordinary means of making his message of salvation effective? Paul's trust in God and in spiritual help was ever supreme and unwavering, and yet he was no dreamer; he knew that God moves and directs everything in life, but he also knew that the Almighty makes use of secondary causes and created means to carry out His great designs.

That St. Paul, therefore, had some acquaintance with Demosthenes is probable *a priori*; and this probability is increased by the abundant evidence furnished in the Epistles. The orations of the great Athenian are particularly noted for their sincerity, their aim at truth, the spirituality of their appeal to the heart and conscience, their mastery of the emotions, their fulness of illustration, and the massiveness of reasoning and argumentation which they display. Now in St. Paul we find these same qualities in far greater number than in any other New Testament writer. In him we see the same skill and power in arranging and marshalling his arguments, the same sincerity and intensity of purpose, strengthened and heightened, of course, by his supernatural motives and outlook, the same use of rhetorical interrogation, asseveration and objection, the same irony and stinging sarcasm. In fact, St. Paul in these characteristics approaches Demosthenes more nearly than does any other ancient orator. So striking is the frequent parallelism between the Epistles of the one and the orations of the other that the ideas, the phrases, and the construc-

tion of entire sentences found in the latter are often reproduced in the former in the same way as any faithful student in later life is likely to reproduce unconsciously the ideas, principles and phrases of his former master.

Two German scholars, Kypke (*Observationes sacrae*, Breslau, 1755) and Köster (*Studien und Kritiken*) have made collections of these parallelisms and have shown that, while they are more frequent in the larger and more argumentative Epistles, yet they are to be found in every group of the Pauline letters. After a minute study of them Dr. Köster concludes: "That Paul derived them all by mere accident from the conversational language of his day is incredible. He had read, and was familiar with Demosthenes, the model of Greek popular eloquence, and involuntarily appropriated many of his expressions."

In closing our remarks on the style of the Apostle's Epistles it may be of interest to give a few of many appreciations.

Speaking of the Second Coming of Christ St. Peter (2 Pet. iii. 15, 16) says: "And account the long suffering of our Lord, salvation; as also our most dear brother Paul, according to the wisdom given him, hath written to you: as also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are certain things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, to their own destruction." Origen wrote as follows: "The Apostle is like a person who leads a stranger into a magnificent palace but perplexed with various cross and intricate passages and many remote and secret apartments. He shows him some things at a distance, out of his opulent treasury; brings some things near to his view, conceals others from it, often enters in at one door and comes out at another; so that the stranger is surprised and wonders whence he came, where he is, and how he shall get out." In his letter to Pammachius St. Jerome remarked: "I will only mention the Apostle Paul, whose words seem to me, as often as I hear them, to be not words, but peals of thunder. Read his Epistles, and especially those addressed to the Romans, to the Galatians, and to the Ephesians, in all of which he stands in the thick of the battle, and you will see how skillful and how careful he is in the proofs he draws from the Old Testament, and how warily he

cloaks the object he has in view. His words seem simplicity itself—the expressions of a guileless and unsophisticated person, one who has no skill either to plan a dilemma or to avoid it. Still, whichever way you look, they are thunderbolts. His pleading halts, yet he carries every point which he takes up. He turns his back upon his foe only to overcome him; he stimulates flight, but only that he may slay” (*Ep. Ad Pammach.* 68, 13).

Philip Schaff thus describes St. Paul's style: “It is mainly bold, heroic, aggressive and warlike; yet at times tender, delicate, gentle and winning. It is involved, irregular and rugged, but always forceful and expressive. . . . He abounds in skillful arguments, bold antitheses, impetuous assaults, abrupt transitions, sudden turns, zigzag flashes, startling questions and exclamations. . . . He drives his opponent to the wall without mercy and reduces him *ad absurdum*, but without ever indulging in personalities. . . . His terseness makes him at times obscure, as is the case with the somewhat similar style of Thucydides, Tacitus and Tertullian. His words are as many warriors marching on to victory and peace; they are like a mountain torrent rushing in foaming rapids over precipices, and then calmly flowing through green meadows, or like a thunderstorm ending in a refreshing shower and bright sunshine” (*History of the Christian Church*, vol. I. pp. 753-754). The following is Farrar's conclusion: “All that has been written of the peculiarities of Paul's style may, I think, be summed up in two words—intense individuality. His style is himself. His natural temperament, and the circumstances under which that temperament found its daily sphere of action; his training, both Judaic and Hellenistic; his conversion and sanctification, permeating his whole life and thoughts—these united make up the Paul we know. And each of these has exercised a marked influence on his style” (*Life and Works of St. Paul*, p. 691).

D. DOCTRINE OF THE EPISTLES. It would be impossible with the space at our disposal to enter into anything like a complete study of the doctrine of the Pauline Epistles. For this the student must have recourse to Fr. Prat's splendid work, *La Théologie de Saint Paul*, in two volumes, and to other similar works referred to in the general bibliography that follows. Here we shall have to confine our attention to the Apostle's teachings in general.

In the first place it would be a serious mistake to think we can find in the letters of St. Paul a complete exposition of all the doctrines which the Apostle preached and taught. This is at once evident from the fact that all the Epistles are directed to some particular Churches or individuals, and are consequently more or less restricted by the circumstances and conditions which called them forth and influenced their contents. In no one of them, not even in that to the Romans, did the Apostle intend to give a complete summary of his teachings, for each letter supposes its readers to have received, through the Apostle himself or other competent authority, doctrinal instructions of a definite character sufficient for the general practices of Christian life; and therefore in writing he has, as a rule, only to call to mind things already imparted, to correct abuses and misunderstandings, or to enlarge upon topics not yet thoroughly grasped by the faithful.

Nevertheless, although it was not the Apostle's aim to unfold his entire teachings in any one or in all of his Epistles, it is a fact that most of the doctrines of theology are contained in them, as St. Thomas remarks (*In Ep. ad Rom. prolog.*), and that the teachings of the different letters constitute an organic whole whose various parts are admirably interconnected, with Jesus Christ, the Saviour of all mankind, as their centre and pivotal thought. To understand how varied and far-reaching are the doctrines discussed by the Apostle we need only call to mind some of the principal ones. He treats, for example, of the nature and perfections of God, of the distinction between the divine Persons and their mutual relations, of the creation and fall of man, of original and actual sin, of the Incarnation of Christ and the Redemption of mankind. He discusses the mysteries of predestination and of grace, faith and justification, the redeeming merits of Christ's death, our union with the Saviour, the Sacraments and their efficacy, the Church and its hierarchy, the general resurrection and the Last Judgment, the conditions and qualities of the glorified bodies.

Besides all these dogmatic subjects, and in connection with them, the Apostle also deals with many practical questions pertaining to the life of the faithful. Thus he discusses the civil and domestic duties of Christians, the unity and indissolubility

of matrimony, the excellence of virginity over the married state, the theological and moral virtues, the divine service and celebration of the Holy Eucharist, and a multitude of other topics, some of which are dealt with in a passing sentence, while others are drawn out in detail (cf. St. Thomas, *l. c.*).

If we were to designate the central doctrines on which St. Paul most frequently insists in his letters, they would doubtless be the following: (a) Jesus Christ the Son of God, by means of His Passion and death on the cross, has redeemed all men, whether Jews or Gentiles; (b) Christ is the source of all grace, and of the justification and salvation of all mankind from Adam to the last man that shall live; (c) all men are under the condemnation of original sin, and no one can attain to justification and salvation save through the grace of Christ which is obtained only through a living, active faith in the Saviour and in the Gospel; (d) the purpose of the Mosaic Law was to lead to Christ, and therefore with the death of the Redeemer it lost its usefulness and was abrogated; (e) all the faithful are intimately united to Jesus Christ, forming with Him one mystical body of which He is the head and they the members.

From this it can be seen that Jesus Christ, the Son of God made man and the Redeemer of all mankind, is, as it were, the centre of all St. Paul's teachings. Hence also in the fourteen Epistles the name *Saviour* occurs over 300 times, *Jesus* more than 240 times, and the name *Christ* over 400 times.

E. THE SOURCES OF THE APOSTLE'S TEACHINGS. Immediate divine revelation was certainly the first and chief fountain from which St. Paul drew his knowledge of Christianity and its teachings. Of these heavenly communications frequent and special mention is made throughout the Epistles and the Acts of the Apostles (cf. Acts ix. 3-6, 13 ff.; xvi. 10; xviii. 9; xx. 22, 23; xxi. 4; xxii. 18; Gal. ii. 2; 2 Cor. xii. 2-4; Acts xviii. 11; etc.).

It seems nearly beyond question that it was by special revelation that the Apostle obtained his teaching, for example, regarding the salvation of all men through faith and the grace of Jesus Christ, independently of the works of the Mosaic Law (Gal. i. 12 ff.), regarding the institution and celebration of the Holy Eucharist (1 Cor. xi. 23 ff.), regarding the indissolubility

of marriage, the Pauline Privilege (1 Cor. 10 ff.), and the like. It is also certain that he was acquainted, at least in a general way, with many of the teachings of Christianity from Apostolic tradition, even before his conversion; for it was on account of these doctrines that he persecuted the faithful. In fact, it is not easy to draw the line and distinguish between what St. Paul received by immediate revelation and that which came to him from tradition and from those of his contemporaries who had actually seen and heard the Lord while on earth.

Another source which contributed to the Apostle's knowledge of Christian teachings was the Old Testament, which he knew so perfectly and to which he constantly refers. Thence he understood and was able to prove such doctrines as the universal sinfulness of man, the mysteries of divine predestination and of reprobation, the Divinity and Messiahship of Christ, the vocation of the Gentiles to the Church, justification by faith and many more. Of course, to admit this is by no means to deny that the full spiritual meaning of these Old Testament teachings was perfectly understood by the Apostle only after his conversion and enlightenment by special revelation. This is only what we should expect, and it receives support from the free manner in which many Old Testament texts and passages are cited in the Epistles. The Apostle usually refers to the Septuagint rather than the Hebrew, but, while always adhering faithfully to the sense, he frequently so modifies the words of the inspired writers as to clarify them and bring out their meaning more openly, as in Rom. ix. 17; xi. 4; etc. (cf. Prat, *La Théologie de Saint Paul*, I. p. 35 ss.; Jacquier, *Histoire des livres du N. T.*, 6ième. éd., I. p. 41 ss.).

While St. Paul's method of arguing is often similar to that of the Rabbins, and while there is also at times a certain sameness between some of his teachings and some of theirs, it is difficult to prove that he was influenced by the rabbinical theology of his day. It goes without saying that as a student at Tarsus and in Jerusalem he learned the method of the Rabbins, but the similarity which afterwards appeared between certain of his writings and theirs could easily be accounted for by the common source, namely, the Old Testament, on which they were based.

Moreover, the precise date of all the Jewish apocrypha and Talmudic treatises from which the Rabbins drew their theology is not entirely fixed and certain. Most likely these writings had been influenced to some extent by the teachings of Christianity. At any rate, we can be sure that St. Paul was farthest removed, in his use of the Old Testament, from the puerilities and the arbitrary and fantastic interpretations of the Jewish Rabbins. They are either enslaved to the letter or carried away by imaginary symbolism, he neither magnifies trifles nor surrenders substance to form; they are frequently sophistical and barren in their reasoning, he is always solid, rich and conclusive; they are often preoccupied with the frivolous, he is ever discussing subjects of the highest theoretical moment or of the greatest practical importance (cf. Jacquier, *op. cit.* pp. 43 ss.; Brassac *R. B.*, tom. IV. p. 565 ss.).

Since, therefore, the sources of St. Paul's teachings were immediate divine revelation, Apostolic tradition and the ancient Scriptures, it is plain that there could be no opposition between his Gospel and that of Jesus Christ as preached by the other Apostles; he was simply a faithful disciple of his Master (cf. *Decreto Lamentabili* prop. 31, 38). If at times he speaks of his Gospel (Rom. ii. 16; 2 Cor. iv. 3; Gal. ii. 2; etc.), he means nothing else than the Gospel of Christ, the Gospel of the Son of God, the Gospel of Jesus our Saviour (Rom. xv. 19; 1 Cor. ix. 12, 18; 2 Cor. ii. 12; Gal. i. 7; etc.). Before St. Paul our Lord Himself had declared the universality of the Redemption (Matt. x. 16; xv. 24; xxviii. 18-20; Luke xxiv. 7; etc.), the necessity of a justice far superior to that of the scribes and Pharisees (Matt. v. 20), and the abrogation of the Mosaic ceremonies and practices (Matt. xv. 10-30; Mark vii. 14-23). In the Sermon on the Mount the Saviour had proclaimed Himself superior to Moses and had substituted the laws of His Kingdom for those which prevailed under the Old Dispensation (Matt. v-vii); and in the course of His public ministry He repeatedly insisted on the necessity of faith for salvation. To the scandal of the Pharisees He openly declared that He came to save sinners, and to His disciples He avowed that He was giving His life and His blood for the redemption of many (cf. Boysson, *La Loi et la Foi*, pp. 294 ss.; Rivi  re, *La R  demption*, p. 68 ss.).

If, then, we compare the Epistles of St. Paul and the Gospels everywhere, and especially on such fundamental questions as God, Jesus Christ, the Holy Ghost, the Redemption, the Sacraments and the like, we shall find the most perfect harmony and identity of teaching. In no way has the Apostle altered or modified the teachings of Christianity as revealed by Christ; his letters but amplify and unfold to us the one Christian revelation. It is as absurd to say, on the one hand, that the whole teaching of Christianity and all we need to know about Christ and His Church are contained in the Gospels, as it is to maintain, on the other hand, that St. Paul's ample preaching and unfolding of Christian revelation is out of harmony with the germinal ideas, principles and more fragmentary doctrines of the Gospels. The teachings of Paul are the teachings of Jesus, only more fully developed and systematized. The conclusion of Deissmann on this subject is after all not too harsh; he says: "The modern condemnations of the Apostle, as an obscurantist who corrupted the simple Gospel of the Nazarene with harsh and difficult dogmas, are the dregs of doctrinaire study of Paul, mostly in the tired brains of gifted amateurs" (*Paulus*, etc., p. 4.).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Besides particular works referred to in connection with each of the Epistles, we give here a few of many general authorities on St. Paul, his life and his Epistles.

CATHOLIC AUTHORS

Simar, Theo., *Die Theologie des Heiligen Paulus* (Freiburg in B., 1864, 1883); Wieser, *Pauli Apostoli doctrina de justificatione ex fide sine operibus et ex fide operante* (Trent, 1874); Atzberger, *Die Christliche Eschatologie* (Freiburg in B., 1890); Fouard, *St. Paul and His Missions, The Last Years of St. Paul* (New York, 1901); Calippe, *Saint Paul et la cité chrétienne* (Paris, 1902); Le Camus, *L'Oeuvre des Apôtres*, tom. I-III (Paris, 1905); Vigouroux, *Les Livres saints et la critique* (Paris, 1906); Ermoni, *Saint Paul et la prière* (Paris, 1907); Jacquier, *Saint Paul et ses Epîtres* (Paris, 1907); Tobac, *La Problème de la justification dans Saint Paul* (Louvain, 1908); Prat, *La Théologie de Saint Paul*, tom. I-III (Paris, 1908, 1912); Tillmann, *Die Wiederkunft Christi nach den Paulinischen Briefen* (Freiburg in B., 1909); Dausch, *Jesus und Paulus* (Münster, 1910); Boysson, *La Loi et la Foi* (Paris, 1912); Benz, *Die Ethik des Apostels Paulus*, in *Biblische Studien* (1912); Brassac, *Une inscription de Delphes et la chronologie de S. Paul*, in *Revue Biblique* (1913, pp. 36-53, 207-217); Batiffol, *Saint Paul*, in the *Correspondent* of April 10, 1914; Coghlan, *St. Paul, His Life, Work and Spirit* (London, 1920); Fink, *Paul, Hero and Saint* (New York, 1921).

NON-CATHOLIC AUTHORS

Conybeare and Howson, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul* (London, 1851, 1870, 1898); Lipsius, *Die Paulinische Rechtfertigungslehre* (Leipzig, 1853); Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul* (Paris, 1870, 1881); Farrar, *Life and Works of St. Paul* (London, 1879, 1891); Pfleiderer, *Der Paulinismus* (Leipzig, 1890); Godet, *Introduction du N. T.* (Paris, 1893); Adeney, *The Theology of the New Testament* (New York, 1894); Weiss, J., *Beiträge zur Paulinischen Rhetorik* (Göttingen, 1897); Holtzmann, H. J., *Lehrbuch der Neutestamentlichen Theologie* (Tübingen, 1897); Holsten, *Das Evangelium des Paulus*, Teil II, *Paulinische Theologie* (Berlin, 1898); Cone, *The Man, The Missionary, and The Teacher* (New York, 1898); Feine, *Jesus Christus und Paulus* (Leipzig, 1902); Clemen, *Paulus, sein Leben und Wirken*, vol. I-II (Giessen, 1904); Shaw, R. D., *The Pauline Epistles* (London, 1904); Kennedy, *St. Paul's Conception of the Last Things* (London, 1904); Naegeli, *Der Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus* (Göttingen, 1905); Bacon, B. W., *Story of St. Paul* (New York, 1905); Ramsay, *Paulus, sein Leben und Wirken und the Roman Citizen* (London, 1905); Wrede, W., *Paulus* (Tübingen, 1907); Bultmann, *Der Stil der Paulinischen Predigt*, etc. (Göttingen, 1910); Zahn, *Introduction to the New Testament* (London, 1910); Goudge, H. L., *The Mind of St. Paul* (London, 1911); Deissmann, *Paulus, eine Kultur*, etc. (Tübingen, 1911); Wendt, H. H., *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Leipzig, 1913); Ramsay, *The Teaching of Paul* (London, 1913); Headlam, *St. Paul and Christianity* (London, 1913); Hayes, D. A., *Paul and His Epistles* (New York, 1919); Symes, J. E., *The Evolution of the New Testament* (New York, 1922).

AUTHORITIES FOR THE TEXT OF THE EPISTLES

Since the autograph copies of the entire New Testament have long since perished, the textual critic has for the letters of St. Paul, as for the other New Testament books, three main sources of evidence; namely, Greek copies derived from the original manuscripts, ancient translations of the originals, and quotations from the sacred text found in the writings of the early Fathers. The first constitute direct evidence, and, apart from errors of transcription, represent to us just what was originally written or dictated by the inspired author.

Ancient translations or versions are indirect witnesses to the original text. They are of less importance than the Greek copies or manuscripts, because they are subject not only to the errors of transcribers, but also to the mistakes or uncertainties in rendering the original. Other things being equal, the older a version, the better it is, because it approaches the original copy nearer.

Quotations in the writings of the Fathers, although often very valuable, are usually of least importance to the textual critic, because, in the first place, they themselves have been transmitted to us through manuscripts, which are rarely of great antiquity, and so are liable to errors of transcription; and secondly, because they were mostly made from memory, and thus often give not the words, but the sense of the text. Sometimes, too, the Fathers, in quoting the inspired words, modified and adapted them according to needs and circumstances. These Patristic quotations, however, derive great importance from the fact that they go far towards representing the Greek MSS. with which the Fathers were familiar, and which were consequently centuries older than any Greek text we now possess.

Greek manuscripts are of two kinds, *uncial* and *cursive*. The first are written in capital letters, and were made from the fourth

to the tenth century; the second are in a small running hand, and were written between the tenth century and the invention of printing, about 1450 A.D.

I. GREEK UNCIAL MSS.

- B, *Codex Vaticanus*, in the Vatican Library at Rome, dates from the first half of the fourth century and contains all the Epistles except Philemon, the later chapters of Hebrews, and the Pastoral letters.
- Σ *Codex Sinaiticus*, in the Imperial Library at Petrograd, dates from the middle of the fourth century and has all the Epistles.
- A, *Codex Alexandrinus*, in the British Museum, dates from the middle or end of the fifth century and contains all the Epistles save three leaves of 2 Corinthians.
- C, *Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus*, a palimpsest, in the National Library at Paris, dates from about the middle of the fifth century and contains all the Epistles except 2 Thessalonians.
- D₂, *Codex Claromontanus*, a Greco-Latin MS., in the National Library at Paris, dates from the sixth century and contains the Epistles with a few omissions.

Speaking of these five MSS., and of the *Codex Bezae* (D), Dr. Hort says, in particular with regard to the first two, that they "carry our Greek New Testament back to a period not later than the early part of the second century," or about 125 A.D., "and to a common parent manuscript," from which the two descended, and which itself must have been copied from papyrus rolls, such as were used by the Apostles (cf. Grannan, *Gen. Introd. to the Bible*, vol. II. p. 22).

The remaining uncials which contain the Pauline Epistles are of less importance, either on account of their fragmentariness, or because of their comparative late date. The principal ones are as follows, according to centuries:

- H₃, dates from the sixth century and contains fragments of the Pauline Epistles, scattered in several different libraries on the continent of Europe, having been used for bindings.
- F.², in Paris, written in the seventh century, has only a few verses of the Epistles.

- Ψ, *Codex Athous Laurae*, in the monastery of the Laura on Mt. Athos, of the eighth or ninth century, contains the Pauline Epistles with the exception of a leaf of Hebrews.
- S, *Codex Athous Laurae*, in the Monastery of the Laura on Mt. Athos, dates from the eighth or ninth century and contains Romans, parts of 1 and 2 Corinthians and Ephesians.
- E₃, *Codex Sangermanensis*, a Greco-Latin copy of D₂, in Petrograd, written in the ninth century.
- G₃, *Codex Boernerianus*, a Greco-Latin copy at Trinity College, Cambridge, dates from the ninth century and contains all the Epistles save Hebrews, with a few gaps in some of the others.
- F₂, *Codex Augiensis*, a Greco-Latin copy of the same exemplar as G₃, at Cambridge, copied in the ninth century and containing the Pauline Epistles, with a few mutilations, the chief omission being Romans i.-iii. 19.
- K₂, *Codex Mosquensis*, in Moscow, of the ninth century, contains the Epistles.
- L, *Codex Bibliothecae Angelicae*, in the Augustinian Monastery in Rome, dates from the ninth century and contains the Pauline Epistles as far as Hebrews xiii. 10.
- M₃, *Codex Ruber*, so called from the red letters in which it is written, is partly in the Public Library at Hamburg and partly in the British Museum; it dates from the ninth century and has only fragments of Hebrews and of 1 and 2 Corinthians.
- P₂, *Codex Porphyrianus*, a palimpsest in Petrograd, dates from the ninth century and contains the Epistles with a few mutilations.

Note: In the following Commentary the manuscripts D₂, E₁, F₁, G₁, etc., are referred to simply as D, E, F, G, etc.

II. GREEK CURSIVE MSS.

Of the vast number of these MSS. enumerated in Scrivener-Miller there are 491 which contain the Epistles of St. Paul in whole or in part. The oldest of them does not go back beyond the ninth century, and all are based on the Syrian family of New Testament MSS., known as the Byzantine, or Antiochene, or Constantinopolitan recension. It is not from their late date, so much as from their affinity to these older MSS. that the value of the cursives is to be

estimated; but as the Byzantine recension of the text, from which they were taken, and on which also the *Textus receptus* and the King James version were based, is now generally rejected by all textual critics, it follows that the cursives are not of prime importance.

The Epistles are also found in a large number of *Lectionaries* or service books, but those are likewise of secondary value to the textual critic.

III. VERSIONS

Of the many ancient versions or translations of the New Testament which we have, three are of greatest importance, namely, the Old Latin, or Latin Vulgate, the Old Syriac Peshitto, and the Egyptian versions. These translations were made directly and immediately from the Greek manuscripts, with great carefulness, by men of undoubted competence. The first two go back to the middle or early part of the second century, the third to the latter part of the same century. St. Jerome's correction of the Old Latin, now known as the Vulgate, was made in the fourth century. These ancient translations are naturally of exceeding interest and importance for the textual critic in his endeavors to arrive at the exact reading of the original Greek.

IV. QUOTATIONS FROM THE EARLY FATHERS

Although the Fathers frequently trusted to their memories in quoting the sacred text, and have, therefore, often given us the sense rather than the words of the text, still the quotations found in the writings of some of them are so numerous as to be of very great helpfulness in arriving at a knowledge of the state of the primitive text. This is especially true of such Greek Fathers as Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria and Origen, who abound in quotations made directly from the Greek text of their times. Of particular importance also are the quotations given us by such Latin writers and Fathers as Tertullian, Cyprian, Novatian, Ambrose, Jerome and Augustine, who enable us to see what was the condition of the early Latin versions, and thus indirectly carry us back to the Greek manuscripts on which those versions were based.

V. EDITIONS OF THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT

The editions of the Greek New Testament that have been produced since the invention of printing to the present time are legion. We give here only a few of the best that have come out since the year 1831, when scholars, ignoring the *Textus receptus*, began to publish Greek Testaments of really critical value.

(a) Carl Lachmann in 1831, and again in 1842-1850, brought out a Greek Testament based entirely on ancient MSS., using the Vulgate to correct their differences.

(b) Constantine Tischendorf in 1869-1890 published the eighth and best of his many editions of the Greek New Testament. The *Prolegomena* to this edition was completed by the American scholar Dr. C. R. Gregory.

(c) S. P. Tregelles, an English Quaker, between 1857 and 1879 published a beautiful edition of the Greek New Testament based on ancient MSS., early versions, and quotations from the works of the Fathers.

(d) B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort in 1881, after thirty years of labor, brought out their famous edition of the Greek New Testament, based almost exclusively on the *Codex Vaticanus* and the *Codex Sinaiticus*.

(e) E. Nestle published in 1899-1908 an eclectic text of the New Testament derived from Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, and B. Weiss.

(f) H. J. Vogels has brought out during the past year a critical edition of the New Testament, the first since von Soden's. The editor rejects the three recension theory, and gives the results of his own critical research, based on the evidence of the best manuscripts.

In connection with the foregoing we recommend the following critical works: C. R. Gregory's *Canon and Text of the New Testament* (1907); J. Drummond, *The Transmission of the Text of the N. T.* (London, 1911); F. G. Kenyon's *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts* (1911); H. von Soden's monumental work, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments* (4 vols., 1902-1913, translated into English, London, 1906); A. Souter's *Text and Canon of the New Testament* (1913); J. A. McClymont's *New Testament Criticism* (1913).

ABBREVIATIONS

- Corn.—Cornely.
Lagr.—Lagrange.
Lietz.—Lietzmann.
Light.—Lightfoot.
MacEv.—Mac Evilly.
MacR.—Mac Rory.
Orig.—Origen.
Plum.—Plummer.
Ram.—Ramsay.
R. B.—Revue Biblique.
Rick.—Rickaby.
St. Aug.—St. Augustine.
St. Chrys.—St. Chrysostom.
S. H.—Sanday and Headlam.
Tertull.—Tertullian.
Theod.—Theodoret.
Vulg.—Vulgate.
Westm. Ver.—Westminster Version of Sacred Scripture
W. H.—Westcott and Hort.

THE EPISTLES OF SAINT PAUL

THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS

INTRODUCTION

I. The Origin of the Roman Church. The establishment of the Church in Rome is shrouded in deep obscurity. Much as we might expect it, no hint whatever is given by St. Paul in this Epistle regarding its origin and founder. That the Roman community of Christians, however, had long been established and was well organized when St. Paul wrote his letter is very certain and evident from the general tone of the Epistle itself, and from the Apostle's long-cherished desire to visit the faithful there (i. 8, 10-15; xv. 22-24, 28, 29).

It seems very probable that the first Christians in Rome were converted Jews, originally from Palestine. We know that after the taking of Jerusalem by Pompey (63 B.C.) many Jews went to Rome, in order there to enjoy the favor and protection of Caesar, and that these Jews, like their brethren everywhere, did not fail to make converts and to maintain close relations with Jerusalem. Accordingly, they were accustomed to go up to Jerusalem for the regular feasts of Pasch, Pentecost and Tabernacles; and it seems likely that some of them might have been converted to Christianity by what they witnessed at the first Christian Pentecost (Acts ii. 10), and thus they would carry the faith back to Rome. Likewise it seems probable that, on account of the persecution which arose after the death of St. Stephen (Acts viii. 1),

some Christians may have fled from Jerusalem to Rome, and later also that some members of the "Italian band" might have followed the example of Cornelius (Acts x. 1) in embracing the Christian faith, thereafter returning to Rome.

These probabilities would explain how Jewish Christians were in Rome before the advent of St. Peter or any Apostle, but they are by no means sufficient to account for the flourishing and well organized community to which St. Paul at so early a date was able to address a long and profound letter like that to the Romans. As we see from the Epistle, the faith of the Roman community was already celebrated in the whole world (i. 8), the faithful had remained steadfast in the doctrine that had been preached to them (vi. 17), their religious instruction had been thorough and profound (xii. 6-8), and their charity toward one another was a source of wide admiration (xv. 14). They were also free from the Law—a condition which would be incomprehensible if the community owed its origin and organization only to some Jewish converts from Jerusalem. Neither can we suppose that the Church in Rome was organized by Gentile Christians from the communities established by St. Paul; for these, in the first place, were themselves too recently founded to undertake so great a task; and, had such been the case, St. Paul would certainly have worded his letter very differently. The Epistle gives no indication that the community addressed was in any way indebted to the Apostle as its founder, but exhibits (xv. 14-30), on the contrary, a certain delicacy of feeling about visiting them and inviting himself to preach among them.

We are forced, therefore, to admit with the unanimous decision of antiquity that the Roman Church had as its founder and organizer an Apostle, and that that Apostle was St. Peter (cf. Clem. of Rome, 1 *ad Cor.* 5; St. Ignat., *Ad Rom.* iv. 3; Papias in Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 15; St. Iren., *Adv. Haer.* iii. 1, 1, 2; Caius, in Euseb., *op. cit.* ii. 25, 7-8; and many other testimonies cited in Vigouroux, *Dict. de la Bible*, tom. v. col. 373, and in Duchesne, *Hist. de l'Eglise Anc.*, 6ième ed. pp. 61 ff.). A community so powerful and so well formed as that of Rome could not have been an exception to all the others of Apostolic times; and we know that each of those others, such as the Churches of Jerusalem, Antioch,

Galatia, Ephesus, Corinth, etc., were founded by Apostles and governed by them, or by Bishops delegated by the Apostles (Ter-tull. *De Praescript.*, cap. XXXII). Furthermore, the name *church* was not given to any community of Christians in the time of the Apostles, unless that community was governed by a Bishop as its head. If one believes with Meyer and other Protestants that St. Peter did not establish and organize the Church of Rome, he will be at a loss to explain how and by whom it was organized into such a powerful Church. It is true that some of the authorities above referred to make Sts. Peter and Paul joint-founders of the Roman community, but Papias, Clement of Alex. (Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* II. 15; III. 39; IV. 14) and St. Cyprian (*Ad. Anton ep.* 52, 8; *Ad. Cornel.* ep. 59, 14 seq.) tell us distinctly that St. Peter was the sole founder of the Roman Church. And Eusebius (*Chron. ad ann.* 43), St. Jerome (*De Viris illust.* i. 8), and others say that St. Peter came to Rome during the first years of Claudius, around A.D. 42, very probably soon after his miraculous delivery from prison in Jerusalem (Acts xii. 17). The Apostle most likely remained in Rome until near the publication of the edict by Claudius (A.D. 49), when all the Jews were expelled, and then betook himself again to Jerusalem, where, around A.D. 51, he presided at the first Council of the Church. That he later returned to Rome is certain from the fact that he suffered martyrdom there on June 29, A.D. 67, an event and date upon which authorities are generally agreed.

The silence of the Epistle, then, regarding St. Peter proves nothing; for most probably he was not in Rome when the letter was written. In fact St. Peter's temporary absence from Rome at the time was very probably a reason why St. Paul took the occasion to send the letter he had so long intended to write, which letter, in the absence of their shepherd and leader, would be a distinct assistance to the faithful in the Eternal City.

When some of the Fathers and early Christian writers speak as if both Peter and Paul were the founders of the Church in Rome, their meaning evidently is that St. Paul assisted only in the increase and growth of the community of which St. Peter was the originator, and that the two Apostles finally gave their lives in Rome for the faith. That St. Paul had no part in laying the foundations of the Christian Church there is clear from his whole letter. "Since the

great Peter had been the first to bring them the Gospel, he (Paul) of necessity added, *to strengthen you*: for he says, 'it is not a different teaching that I wish to bring you, but to strengthen the teaching already brought, and to water the plants already planted' " (Theodoret, on verse 11). "Peter had preached there, but Paul regarded his work as his own: so free was he from all envy" (St. Chrysostom, on verse 8).

II. The Composition of the Roman Church; readers of the Epistle. Scholars are not agreed as to the elements which formed the Church in Rome. From the foregoing it seems very probable that in the beginning the converts were mostly Jewish, but soon afterwards, and especially when St. Paul wrote his Epistle, the community was chiefly Gentile. This is now the opinion of the great majority of exegetes, and is based not only on individual texts, but upon the general character of the Epistle. St. Paul writes to the Romans because he is the Apostle of the Gentiles (i. 5, 6); he desires to visit them in order that he may have some fruit among them, even as among the other Gentiles (i. 13, 14); he calls himself the Apostle of the Gentiles (xi. 13), and, referring to his Gentile Apostolate, justifies his vigorous language because he is the minister of Jesus Christ among the Gentiles (xv. 15-18). Finally, the address and application of xi. 13 ff. presuppose a great majority of Gentiles, with whom the Jews (xi. 28, 31) are shown in contrast; and throughout chapters ix-xi the Apostle essays to explain to his Gentile readers the causes of the present deplorable state of his co-religionists and of God's mysterious dealings with His chosen people. From another point of view, however, it can rightly be maintained that these last-named chapters, ix-xi, as touching the question of election and the mission of Israel, would be of more interest to Jewish than to Gentile readers, and that they are, therefore, addressed primarily to the former. Whatever may be said on this point, the considerations already given are sufficient to show that the greater part of the Christians in Rome when St. Paul wrote, were of pagan origin.

It must be admitted, nevertheless, that the Roman community was not without its Jewish element, and this perhaps a more or less potent one. For although the opinion of Zahn, Bauer

and others, which—pointing to vi. 15-17; vii. 1-6; viii. 15—believes the majority of the Christians in Rome were Jewish, is not tenable, in view of what has been said above, still it seems beyond question that the Jewish Christians in the Eternal City when Paul wrote were not at all few. The Apostle, consequently, addresses the Jews directly at times (ii. 17-24). In iv. 1, 11 he speaks of "Abraham our father according to the flesh," and in vii. 1 he says, "I speak to them that know the law." Further, he treats here and there certain questions which could have little interest to the Gentiles, but were of highest importance to Jews. Such, for example, are the questions about the value of the Mosaic Law and the principle of justification (iii-viii), the election and the mission of Israel (ix-xi), the rules given to those who make distinctions between different foods (xiv. 2, 3), different days (xiv. 5, 6), etc. Obvious as is the import of these passages we must, notwithstanding, always remember that St. Paul was very Jewish by nature and training, and that he was at all times accustomed to adopt the standpoint of the Law, to regard the Old Testament as the basis of the New, and to look upon Christianity as the heir of God's promises, the true "Israel of God" (Gal. vi. 16). He took this same position in the Epistle to the Galatians, and we know that that Epistle was chiefly written for Gentile Christians who were about to submit to circumcision. Hence, when the Apostle addresses Jews in the present letter, it seems not at all unlikely that he is speaking, at least in a measure, to those who were still subject to the Law, and not to Jewish Christians at all (cf. Acts xxviii. 23-28).

III. Purpose of the Epistle. The motive which prompted the writing of this letter St. Paul himself makes known to us. For a long time he had cherished an ardent desire to visit Rome and preach the Gospel there (Acts xix. 21; Rom. i. 10-15; xv. 22, 23), but had till now been variously impeded from carrying out his purpose (i. 13; xv. 22). He considered his work in the East practically done, and was ready to turn his eyes toward the West, desiring to evangelize Spain and visit Rome on the way. For his work in the Occident Rome seemed the natural and providential centre from which his new missions should radiate; and as he had not been the founder of the Roman

Church and was personally unknown to most of the faithful in the Eternal City, it was highly needful that he should endeavor first to enlist the good will and assistance of the Roman Christians for the progress and success of his labors there, in Spain, and in all the West. The present letter was therefore written, in the first place, to prepare the Roman community for his impending visit, and by thus introducing himself to them and gaining their favor, to provide a suitable and effective base for his future operations.

But from the length and profound character of the letter, if not from his expressed and primary intentions and purposes, we feel convinced that St. Paul, in writing to the Romans, had something more in mind than merely to announce his prospective coming and win the sympathy and assistance of the Roman Christians. Just what this was is not entirely certain. The views of Protestant authorities are multiple and various, although many of them differ only as to minor details. Weiss (*Intro. to The New Testament* I, p. 307) conjectures that Paul meant the Epistle to be his testament to the Church and to Christendom generally; that he felt his life to be uncertain, and so, while enjoying a time of peace at Corinth, took care to formulate more fully than before his whole body of doctrine, to be sent to the Capital City for the Christians of the whole empire. Others, like Tholuck, Reiche, Kölner and de Wette, have thought that the Apostle wanted to make known in the Capital of the Empire the value of Christianity as a universal religion, capable of satisfying the needs and demands of the human heart, as neither paganism nor Judaism had ever been able to do. Baur and the School of Tübingen generally have believed the essence of the Epistle to consist in chapters ix-xi, and consequently they have held that St. Paul's purpose in writing to the Romans was to explain, by a beautiful page, God's eternal plan and designs for the salvation of the human race. Both similar and different views have been held by other non-Catholics.

Among Catholics two chief opinions have been advanced from the early centuries: (a) St. Hilary, Ambrosiaster, St. Jerome, St. Augustine and many later interpreters, such as Estius, a Lapide, Calmet, etc., think the great purpose of the Epistle was to show

that the Mosaic observances were not necessary for salvation, and to reconcile the disagreements between the Gentile and Jewish Christians, the latter of whom wished to subject the Gentiles to the Mosaic Law, to the faithful observance of which they attributed their own justification, while the former boasted of their philosophy, and perhaps considered that in it lay the secret merit of their call to the Gospel. Against both of these classes, we are told, St. Paul demonstrates the gratuity of justification and the impotency of the Law and of philosophy to lead man to salvation.

This opinion, however, seems out of harmony with the Epistle itself, in which the unity of faith and the charity of the Romans are so highly praised, and in which there is no trace of discord or division, especially with regard to so fundamental a doctrine as that of justification. Paul's conception of Christianity was identical with that of the Roman Church, and the polemics of the Epistle were directed, not against Jewish Christians, but against unbelieving Jews. The minor contrasts which are mentioned, such as the weak and the strong, those who had attained to complete Christian freedom, those who had not, and the like, are mildly spoken of (xiv. 5-10, xiv. 13-xv. 7) by way of precaution against uncharitable divisions which might arise and could easily develop into something serious. From his experiences in Corinth and Galatia St. Paul knew well what harm divisions could cause and how they impeded his work, and before entering upon his new field of activity in the West, he took wise precaution to exhort all the Romans to complete unity in faith and charity for their own spiritual well-being, and for the purpose of securing their confidence and assistance in his future labors.

(b) Origen, St. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, St. Thomas, Drach, Cornely and many others hold that St. Paul in writing to the Romans had a dogmatic purpose. It was not his aim to make known the Gospel in Rome, nor to teach a new doctrine, nor to correct the ideas of the Christians there, since he knew they were well organized and well instructed in the faith; but he wanted to give them the main features of his own preaching, so that when he should arrive and preach to them,

they would be able to understand and profit by his teaching, and thus, while being confirmed in the faith they had received, be the better disposed to enter whole heartedly into coöperation with him. This was the more desirable, inasmuch as his stay in Rome would be comparatively brief (i. 11, 12; xv. 24). The Apostle, therefore, discusses in this Epistle the great fundamental truths of his teachings and of Christianity, namely, the universal sinfulness of mankind, the universality of salvation gratuitously offered to men through faith in Jesus Christ, and the deep mystery of divine predestination. Hence also it was but natural that he should treat of the relation of the Mosaic Law and faith, of their relation to man, of the religious position of the Jews and of the Gentiles among themselves and towards God and Christ, and finally of the need in which all men stood of Christianity in order to attain salvation. Having been chosen by Christ Himself as the Apostle of the Gentiles, St. Paul felt his indebtedness to all (i. 14; xv. 15, 16), and was eager, consequently, to preach also to the Romans. He does not forget the evil efforts of his adversaries everywhere, and so he often writes as if forestalling the attacks of the Judaizers upon his doctrine and upon his person.

IV. Time and Place of Writing. The Epistle to the Romans was written at Corinth, most probably in the early spring of A.D. 58. It was the last letter written by St. Paul before his first Roman captivity. It shows that his experience in the Apostolate had become mature; he had covered in preaching all the territory between Jerusalem and Illyricum (xv. 19, 23); and now that his task in the East was done, he was ready to turn to the West (xv. 23, 24). First, however, he must return to Palestine with the alms he had collected in Galatia, Macedonia and Achaia for the faithful in Jerusalem (xv. 25-28; 1 Cor. xvi. 1-4; 2 Cor. viii-ix; Acts xx. 2, 3), and from there he would go to Rome on his way to Spain (xv. 24, 28; Acts xix. 21). It was his intention to leave Corinth and sail directly for Syria, but learning that the Jews had a plot to kill him, he eluded them by going through Macedonia (Acts xx. 3). As there is no mention of this change of plan in Rom. xv. 25, it is concluded that the letter had been finished and sent before he became aware of the Jews' sinister

designs. Further, we know from Acts xx. 6 that the Apostle, after setting out from Corinth on his journey, celebrated the Pasch at Philippi in Macedonia; whence it seems most probable to hold with Baronius that the Epistle was written in February or March of 58.

There seems to be no doubt that St. Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans from Corinth. It appears that he had spent a considerable time there, and this would be necessary for the composition of an Epistle so elaborate and important. Included in it are the salutations of Caius, his host, and of Erastus, the treasurer of the city; and his companions were Timothy, Sosipater and Jason (xvi. 21-23). Now in 1 Cor. i. 14 we read that St. Paul baptized a certain Caius at Corinth, and from 2 Tim. iv. 20 we learn that there lived in Corinth a Christian named Erastus. Moreover, in Acts xx. 4 we find that Timothy and Sopater (or Sosipater, as in some MSS.) were among Paul's companions as he journeyed from Corinth through Macedonia at the end of his third missionary journey; and from Acts xvii. 6, 7 we know that Jason of Thessalonica was he who had entertained the Apostle during the latter's visit to Macedonia. Finally, Rom. xvi. 1 commends to the Romans Phoebe of Cenchrae, a deaconess of the Church at Corinth, to whom was entrusted the letter to be carried to Rome. From all this we are warranted in holding with the common opinion that the Epistle to the Romans was written from Corinth.

V. Authenticity. That St. Paul was the author of the Epistle to the Romans is affirmed in the first place by the Epistle itself: "Paul a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle," etc. (i. 1); and this testimony has been accepted as authentic by all antiquity. Moreover, the earliest writings seem to betray an acquaintance with this Epistle; for it is believed that the First Epistle of St. Peter was inspired by its doctrine, that the Epistle of St. James had in view to correct certain misunderstandings of Paul's teaching to the Romans, and that in the doxology of St. Jude's Epistle (24, 25) there is a strong resemblance to the doxology of this one (xvi. 25-27) which only a knowledge of the latter could explain.

It cannot be doubted that the letter to the Romans was known

and often cited by the early Fathers. All Christian antiquity, says Bisping, has regarded the Epistle to the Romans, as it has come down to us, as forming one whole, integrally composed by St. Paul. Some of the Fathers refer to the letter by its title (Clem. of Alex., *Strom.* iii. 4; Tertull., *de Coron.* VI; *Contra Marc.*, v. 13; Iren., *Adv. Haer.*, iii. 16); others make quotations from it (Clem. of Rom., *ad Cor.* i. 35; Rom. i. 29-33; Polycarp., *ad Philipp.* VI. Rom. xii. 17; xiv. 10, 12; St. Ignat., *ad Smirn.* I; Rom. i. 3; etc.). St. Irenaeus and the Muratorian Fragment expressly attribute this letter to St. Paul the Apostle, and the latter authority places it among the inspired Scriptures. The heretics of the second century, such as Basilides, Valentine and Marcion, not only admitted the authenticity of the Epistle, but made use of it to promote their own errors.

Thus we see that the authenticity of this Epistle has been admitted from the very beginning, and the verdict of the first centuries has been continued down the ages, even to our own times, with almost entire unanimity among scholars. And yet there have been, and are some modern critics, chiefly in Germany and Holland, such as Bruno Bauer (1850), Loman (1882), Steck (1888), Van Manen (1892) and others, who have made bold to say that the authenticity of this Epistle was never established, and that, on the contrary, the letter is an invention of the second century. Somewhat less destructive was the view taken by Weiss, Michelsen, Völter and others, according to whom Romans is the result of repeated revisions of genuine Pauline fragments. Rejecting all tradition, these critics declare in effect, the testimonies of the first and second centuries to be forgeries, and they forthwith proceed to construct their own arbitrary systems of criticism. Their arguments are mainly the following: (a) Romans is not an Epistle, but a theological treatise. *Answer:* The discussion of theological or scientific questions in an Epistle was perfectly in accordance with the literature of St. Paul's time, as is evident from most, if not all, of the Pauline letters, and from the writings of other Apostles. (b) The beginning and conclusion do not correspond; and the second part treats a subject entirely different from the first. *Answer:* A careful analysis of the Epistle shows that the introduction and

conclusion are most intimately connected with the theme, and that the interrelation of the first and second parts is not only indisputable, but is expressly mentioned in ix. 30-32; x. 3-6; xi. 6, 20-23. (c) There are evident traces of compilation and of a revision, such as discordance in language and ideas, difficult periods, sudden transitions and the like. *Answer:* All this is explained by St. Paul's vehemence and impulsiveness of character, by his custom of dictating his letters, and, to some extent, by the fact that the original text has not been perfectly preserved. (d) The texts treating of the rejection of Israel are contradictory, and so cannot be Paul's composition; they must belong to a period following the destruction of Jerusalem. *Answer:* A true understanding of St. Paul renders perfectly intelligible, on the one hand, the Apostle's bitter opposition to the blindness of his fellow-Jews in failing to understand God, in persecuting and rejecting Christ, in trying to obstruct the work of the Apostles, and in insisting on the observance of the Law and their natural lineage as giving them a right to salvation; and, on the other hand, his emphasizing the fact that Israel was the first called to salvation (i. 16; ii. 10), that to her was shown the preference and given the great promise of the Messiah (iii. 1-3; ix. 4, 5; xv. 8), and that her people were zealous, although misdirected, for the honor and service of God (ix. 31-33; x. 2). These bold contrasts result from St. Paul's burning zeal and all-compelling charity for Christ. He loves his own brethren, he recognizes their privileges; but he hates their sins and blindness, because they are opposed to Christ, whom he loves first and above all.

The opinion that Romans is a forgery of the second century is too absurd to merit more than a passing remark. If a writer of the second century was the author of this Epistle, why did he represent St. Paul as intending to pay only a passing visit to Rome, or why has he not told us of the Apostle's prolonged stay there, since we know from Acts xxviii. 30, 31 that St. Paul was actually two whole years in Rome? Why did not such a writer mention St. Peter somewhere in his letter? How could a forger make St. Paul say that he had nothing to do with founding the Roman Church, and that he had had no previous connections with it, in the face of earlier writings which made

Peter and Paul co-founders of the Roman community? These questions alone are sufficient to show the entire absurdity of any forgery theory, and to establish the reliability of St. Paul's authorship. St. Paul's person and character are stamped on every page of the Epistle. "The authenticity of the Epistle to the Romans," says Jülicher, "can be contested only by those who venture to banish the personality of Paul from the pages of history."

VI. *Integrity.* While the great majority of Protestants admit with all Catholics the authenticity of the Epistle to the Romans, it must be allowed that they are not so willing to hold to its integrity. No serious attack is made on the body of the Epistle, but the two concluding chapters, xv and xvi, are rejected by many as not belonging to the original text. The Tübingen School, following the leadership of Charles Baur, has absolutely rejected both chapters; while others have inclined to the theory of Marcion who, as Origen-Rufinus expresses it, *cuncta dissecuit* after chapter xiv. 23.

In favor of their opinion these critics give the following reasons: (a) Marcion omitted these two chapters from his edition of the Epistle. *Answer:* Marcion rejected these chapters only because they did not suit his own heretical doctrines, as we know he was accustomed to mutilate other parts of the New Testament for the same reason (Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* III. xii. 12; xiv. 4).

(b) There seem to be four terminations to the Epistle in these two chapters,—at xv. 33, xvi. 20, 24 and 27. This would indicate compilation, perhaps by extractions from other letters. *Answer:* We may first observe that it often happens in our own days that a letter has several postscripts. Moreover, verse 24 of chapter xvi., being a repetition of verse 20, is omitted in most MSS., and is therefore probably not authentic; and verse 27 of the same chapter is a doxology, and not a final blessing. We have, then, only the terminations xv. 33 and xvi. 20 to account for. St. Paul, after terminating his Epistle at xv. 33, added the commendation of Phoebe and a few salutations, followed by a paragraph of warning and promise, as a postscript, and thus closed the letter again. Then it occurred to him to send the salutations of those companions who were most probably pres-

ent with him in the room, some of whom (xvi. 21) had probably just arrived from Macedonia with their collections for the Church in Jerusalem, as the Apostle wrote these final words; whereupon, moved by the very solemnity of the occasion, by the anxiety which he felt regarding the acceptance of his letter in Rome, and by the uncertainty of the outcome of his impending journey to Jerusalem, he burst forth in the hymn of praise which concludes the Epistle.

(c) The doxology occupies very different and strange positions in the MSS.,—a circumstance which casts suspicion on its genuinity. In the older MSS. (B & C D E), and in the Vulgate, Peshitto, Ethiopic and other versions it appears at the end of the letter, as in our English version. In codex L, a few of the Eastern MSS., most of the cursives, the Greek commentators, except Origen, and in the Gothic, later Syriac, Armenian and Slavonic versions the doxology is inserted at the end of chapter xiv. The A P, and the cursives 5, 17 and the oldest Armenian version, place it at the end of both chapter xiv and chapter xvi. It is entirely omitted by the codices F and G; but the former leaves a space for it at the end of xvi, and the latter, at the end of xiv.

For these reasons Holtzmann, Jülicher and others have regarded the doxology as an addition of a later date. *Answer:* In view of the testimony of the great MSS., and of the close connection which the doxology has in thought and tone with the beginning, object and circumstances of the Epistle, all objections to its authenticity must entirely disappear; they are not warranted. Likewise the authority of the great MSS. is sufficient to prove that the doxology was originally only at the end of the Epistle. Lectionaries were probably responsible for its transfer to the end of chapter xiv. The last two chapters, containing personal matters, were perhaps not considered suitable for public reading, and were therefore omitted from the lectionaries, while the precious doxology was retained and moved forward to the end of the fourteenth chapter. Thus from the lectionaries this arrangement likely passed into the later MSS. and versions.

Present-day criticism is not so much opposed to the Pauline authorship of Romans xvi as to its inclusion in this Epistle. Hence

a great many modern critics favor the opinion of David Schulz (1829), who believed that Rom. xvi did not originally belong to this Epistle, but was perhaps added to a copy of it, or to some other Epistle sent elsewhere, most probably to Ephesus. This opinion is based chiefly on the following reasons:

(a) St. Paul is writing to strangers at Rome, and yet in this chapter he seems to know all about their internal conditions, the doctrine they had received, the dangers they were in, etc. This would be perfectly intelligible in an Epistle to the Ephesians, among whom the Apostle had spent over two years. *Answer:* There is nothing unlikely in believing that the condition of the Roman Christians was well known, like their faith, "in the whole world," and like their "obedience in every place" (i. 8; xvi. 19). Furthermore, the evils St. Paul mentions as probably existing among the Romans were such as might be suspected to be anywhere and in every community.

(b) St. Paul in this chapter sends salutations to twenty-six persons with whom he seems to have been well acquainted. These persons would much more likely be in Ephesus, where his acquaintances were many, than in Rome, where he had never been. *Answer:* We know that travel between Rome and the Orient was very common and comparatively easy in St. Paul's time, owing to the splendid Roman roads, and that, consequently, many of the persons saluted in this chapter, whose names were Greek, could have been converts and friends of St. Paul who had migrated from the East to Rome. Contrariwise, those with Latin names could have been in the East and have met St. Paul during his missionary journeys, and afterwards returned to their homes in Rome.

Zahn (*Introd. to the N. T.*, pp. 382-3) also cleverly observes that St. Paul in writing to Churches where he was widely known could not have singled out particular individuals for special greetings or salutations without exciting envious divisions; and hence when he wrote to Churches he himself had founded he was accustomed to send individual salutations to only one or two persons at the close of his letters; or to none at all, as in the letters sent to Thessalonica, Galatia, Corinth and Philippi. On the contrary, at the close of the letter to the Colossians, written

to a comparatively unimportant Church which Paul had not founded, or even seen, we find greetings from six different individuals, only one of whom had ever been at Colossae; and Paul himself sends salutations to different persons at Colossae and at Laodicea. Thus at Colossae and at Rome he would have the Christians feel that they were not strange to him, nor he to them; but that, in reality, there were many close bonds of acquaintanceship and affection between him and them.

(c) Certain of the persons saluted in this chapter seem especially to belong to Ephesus. Aquila and Priscilla were at Ephesus just a few months before Paul wrote to the Romans. Is it probable that so soon afterwards they would be in Rome? Again Epenetus is called (verse 5) "the first fruits of Asia," which means that when converted he was a resident of Ephesus, or of its immediate neighborhood. Is it not unlikely that he should have moved as far away as Rome? *Answer:* Aquila and Priscilla were accustomed to travel. They had lived at Rome, at Corinth and at Ephesus, and as Epenetus very probably owed his conversion to them, it seems most likely, as Zahn (*op. cit.*, pp. 390-91) suggests that both he and they, knowing Paul's intentions and plans, had gone together to Rome to make preparations for the Apostle's coming, and were therefore in the Eternal City when the Epistle was sent.

(d) It is insisted that so many mentioned here were Paul's kinsmen, fellow-workers, fellow-prisoners, etc., that it is next to impossible to see how they could be in Rome, whereas it would be most natural to look for them in the Church at Ephesus. *Answer:* We may reply with Lightfoot, Harnack, Zahn and many other non-Catholic scholars, (a) that none of the persons mentioned in these salutations except Aquila, Priscilla and Epenetus, can be shown to have any connection with Ephesus; (b) the names, Urbanus, Rufus, Ampliatus, Julia and Junia are Latin, and would point to Rome rather than to Ephesus; while Narcissus and Aristobulus were friends of the Emperor Claudius and residents of Rome; (c) fourteen of these names—Urbanus, Rufus, Ampliatus, Julia, Stachys, Apelles, Tryphena, Tryphosa, Hermes, Hermas, Patrobas, Philologus, Andronicus and Nereus—are found in the sepulchral

inscriptions on the Appian Way in the list of persons connected with Caesar's household and contemporary with St. Paul.

(e) This last chapter gives the Epistle a new character; it seems to show that it was written not as an introduction, but as a warning to the community. For example, verses 17-20 would appear to be addressed to a well-known community, and the words, "I would" of verse 19 seem stern and authoritative, which would hardly be proper in writing to an unknown Church. *Answer:* These verses are perfectly in harmony with St. Paul's impulsive character and his sharp transitions of thought and expression when a deep anxiety suddenly took hold of him. He knew the submissiveness of the Roman Christians, whose "obedience was published in every place," and the phrase, "I would" of verse 19, as in other places in the Apostle's writings, means nothing more than "I wish."

In view of all that has been said, we are forced to conclude with the best authorities that chapters xv and xvi are not only Pauline in thought and language, but that they belong to the Epistle to the Romans. The Epistle is, therefore, integral as well as authentic.

VII. Language and Style. This letter, like all the others of the Apostle, was written in Greek. It might have been expected that Latin would have been employed in writing to the Romans, but Greek was the dominant language of the Church during the first two or three centuries. This we know both from sepulchral inscriptions and from the early writers, most of whom wrote in Greek.

St. Paul's Greek is that of his age. And as it is generally admitted now that all the words and phrases used by the Apostle are to be found in the Greek which was in common use at the time, it is altogether incorrect to say that he spoke and wrote in a translated Hebrew or Aramaic, such as is found to a great extent in the Gospel of St. Matthew. St. Paul was perfectly familiar with the best Greek of his age—able to use it with grace and exactness, and yet for the most part he chose simple words and simple phrases according to current usage. At no time, however, in the present letter does he descend to those common words which the best writers of his time habitually

avoided as too ignoble for written discourse. The tone of this letter is always elevated.

The style is magisterial, as becomes the subject matter, and yet it is often lively and full of energy—at times truly eloquent. The arguments are very closely reasoned and admirably arranged to enforce their purpose.

So varied is the style of this letter—so different the words, the images and the sentiments expressed, that some have wondered if all could have come from the same pen. But these phenomena are aptly explained by the variety of subjects treated, and by their artful and forceful development. The irregularities that occur are the result of the Apostle's temperament and the impetuous and rapid movement of his thought. On the whole the Epistle to the Romans is one of the best specimens of literature that St. Paul has left us.

VIII. Theological Importance. So doctrinal in character and so systematic in treatment are the contents of this Epistle that some, as seen above, have said that it partakes rather of the nature of a theological treatise than that of a letter. But, on the one hand, we find, especially in the beginning and toward the close of the Epistle, those personal elements and characteristic touches which properly belong to a letter; and on the other hand, as already explained, St. Paul had in mind a dogmatic purpose in writing to the Romans, and wanted for personal and objective reasons, to lay before his readers the chief features of his system of doctrine, which was in essence the teaching of Christianity. While, therefore, this is a true letter, it must be admitted also that its theological value is of highest importance and revolves about the great fundamental problem of justification. All other important questions dealt with receive their treatment only because they are in some way linked with justification. The Apostle is here not especially concerned with such particular theological questions as Christology, Eschatology and the Sacraments; these were not immediately connected with his present purpose in writing.

Justification and the first step toward salvation, according to St. Paul, are not dependent on the merits, the wisdom or the efforts of man or any creature; but proceed solely from God's

free election and grace. To this first and supreme grace neither inclusion among the children of Abraham, nor the works and practice of the Law, nor the gifts and pursuit of human wisdom and the highest philosophy are sufficient to give a title. The only assistance we can lend, the only condition we can fulfil in the attainment of this great benefit is to have faith (i. 16 ff.; iii. 24-30, 32; iv; v. 1. ff.)—an active faith in Christ who redeemed us while yet we were enemies of God (iii. 24 ff.; iv. 24 ff.; v. 6-10, 15-21; vii. 25; viii. 29 ff.); for we owe our salvation to the sanctifying blood of Christ (viii. 32-39).

But what is the nature of this faith which St. Paul requires as a condition for the grace of justification on the part of man? It is nothing less, in the first place, than that firm belief in the Word of God which was exacted from Abraham (iv. 3, 9, 13-22; Gal. iii. 6), together with those supernatural dispositions possessed by the Patriarch (Gen. xv. 6). The Christian must hold with unshaken faith that Christ is God, God's messenger and Son, that He suffered, died and rose again for us; "that if we be dead with Christ we shall live also together with Christ: knowing that Christ rising again from the dead, dieth now no more" (vi. 8, 9). "If thou confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus and believe in thy heart that God hath raised him up from the dead, thou shalt be saved" (x. 9). For St. Paul Christianity is essentially and absolutely grounded on belief in Christ's Messiahship, His Divinity, the expiatory character of His death, the Resurrection, the necessity of Baptism and the like. Such is the faith that must be the basis of all our trust in God (i. 5; iii. 3; iv. 17-21; vi. 16-19; x. 16; xv. 18). This justifying faith, then, consists in an intellectual adherence to the truths of the Gospel (iv. 19-22; x. 8-17), and in a practical submission to God's will manifested therein (i. 5; x. 3, 16; xi. 30, 32; 2 Cor. x. 5; Eph. ii. 2; v. 6-14). Accordingly, though the works of the Mosaic Law or of the natural man avail nothing for sanctification, supernatural acts, such as hope, fear, repentance and the like, which are the expression of intellectual adherence to the Gospel, are presupposed for justification.

And as the faith required by St. Paul is that which is supported and followed by good works, a "faith that worketh by charity"

(ii. 6, 7, 13; Gal. v. 6), so naturally his justification is no truce with the soul's enemy, no mere cloaking of sin; but a real internal renovation, an exclusion of all that has separated man from God (i-iii. 20), a total death to and freedom from sin, as the natural man dies to the sensible world around him (v. 1-23; viii. 1 ff.; xiii. 12 ff.).

IX. Division and Contents. Argument. There are four distinct parts in the Epistle to the Romans: an Introduction, a Dogmatic and a Moral Part, and a Conclusion.

1. *The Introduction* (i. 1-15) is one of the longest and most solemn found in any of the Pauline Epistles. In the first seven verses the author tells the Romans of his call by grace to the Apostolate, of the object and universality of his mission, of the truth of the Gospel foretold in Scripture, of Christ's human descent from David, and of His establishment as "the Son of God in power according to the spirit of sanctification," by His Resurrection from the dead. In the eight following verses St. Paul praises the Roman Christians and thanks God for their faith, tells them of his anxiety to visit them, and thus takes a first step to prepare them for his coming and his preaching.

2. *The Dogmatic or Theoretic Part* of the Epistle (i. 16-xi. 36) may be divided into three sections, the first of which (i. 16-iv. 25) treats of the necessity of justification through faith. This necessity is shown, (a) because the wrath of God is upon the Gentiles, giving them up to uncleanness, to vile passions and to reprobate minds (i. 18-32). (b) The wrath of God is upon the Jews, who judge the Gentiles, but commit the same sins, and are not shielded by special privileges (ii. 1-iii. 8). (c) All this is according to Scripture, which St. Paul cites to prove his position, and therefore every mouth is stopped (iii. 9-20). The Apostle then goes on to show that salvation is possible through faith in Christ and the Gospel. The faith of the Gospel is the only way to salvation, and this is offered to all men on the same conditions. All men, Jews and Gentiles, being sinners, deserve only punishment from God; but now salvation is gratuitously offered to all through faith in Christ Jesus (iii. 21-iv. 25).

The second section (v. 1-viii. 39) is concerned with the results of Redemption; i.e., with the greatness and blessings of justifi-

cation through faith. Here the superabundant fruits of grace and the redemption merited by Christ are described. These fruits are, (a) peace with God and hope of future glory which are within the reach of all, so that the possibility of justification and salvation are as universal as the curse (v. 1-21); (b) dominion over sin and liberation from its slavery (vi. 1-23); (c) freedom from the Law which led into bondage to sin (vii. 1-25); (d) grace for the present life to conquer sin and death and establish the divine kinship, and glory and triumph in the life to come (viii. 1-39).

In the third section (ix. 1-xi. 36) of this, the Dogmatic Part of the Epistle, after extolling the certainty and universality of salvation, the Apostle, forestalling doubts and difficulties that might arise because of the rejection or obduracy of the Jews, turns to Jewish history and explains the providence of God in regard to Israel. At first he makes pass in review God's deeds of love and power towards the chosen people (ix. 1-5), and then proceeds to show how the divine promises have not failed because of the actual exclusion of Israel from part in the redemption of the Messiah. This he proves, (a) because these promises did not apply to Israel according to the flesh, but were the fruit of grace, which God is free to grant as He pleases. God is only acting within His right when He gives grace to one, and not to another; and as Creator and Lord of all, He exercises this right according to His free pleasure, as we see from the cases of Isaac and Ishmael, Jacob and Esau, Moses and Pharaoh (ix. 6-24); and, what is more, God through the Prophets expressly announced the exercise of this right towards Jews and Gentiles (ix. 24-29). (b) Israel's rejection was due to its own culpableness in relying on its origin and in seeking its justification in the Law (ix. 30-x. 4), as well as to its blindness and disobedience toward the message of faith announced everywhere among the Jews (x. 5-21). (c) In this is manifested the wisdom and goodness of God, for not all the Jews have been rejected—a remnant has embraced the faith (xi. 1-10), and Israel's loss is the Gentiles' gain (xi. 11-24). (d) Finally, Israel's rejection is not irrevocable, for the Jews will at last find mercy and salvation (xi. 25-32). The Apostle closes his survey and study of these

great problems with a song of praise to the wisdom and knowledge of God's inscrutable providence (xi. 33-36).

3. *The Practical Part* of the Epistle (xii. 1-xv. 13) contains directions and exhortations for the daily life of Christians, and is divided into two main sections, the first of which (xii. 1-xiii. 14) gives counsels and instructions for the Christian life in general. It embraces exhortations (a) on complete self-consecration and faithful service of God (xii. 1, 2); (b) on the need of humility and mutual charity (xii. 3-21); (c) on the obligations toward superiors and the civil authority (xiii. 1-7); (d) on the necessity of charity and vigilance in view of the proximity of salvation (xiii. 8-14).

The second section (xiv. 1-xv. 13) of the Moral Part of the Epistle contains particular recommendations for the Roman community: (a) they should not criticise and condemn one another on account of differences of opinion (xiv. 1-13a); (b) self-denial is enjoined and mutual helpfulness is commended after the example of Christ (xiv. 13b-xv. 13).

4. *The Conclusion* of the Epistle (xv. 14-xvi. 27) has three parts: The first (xv. 14-33) treats of the Apostle's calling, his intended relations with the Roman community and his proposed journey. In the second part (xvi. 1-24) St. Paul commends Phoebe, salutes many and warns against divisions. The third part (xvi. 25-27) contains the sublime doxology.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

CATHOLIC COMMENTARIES ON THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS

Greek Fathers: Origen-Rufinus, in ten books on the Epistle to the Romans (Migne, P. G. tom. XIV, col. 837-1292); St. Chrysostom, *Thirty-two Homilies on the Epistle to the Romans* (P. G. tom. LX, col. 391-692); Theodoret (P. G. tom. LXXXII, col. 43-225); Euthymius, in vol. I of his work in two volumes on the Pauline and Catholic Epistles published in Athens, 1887; Œcumenius (P. G. tom. CXVIII); Theophylact (P. G. tom. CXXIV); Theodore of Mopsuestia (P. G. tom. LXVI, col. 788-876); St. Cyril of Alex. (P. G. LXXIV).

Latin Fathers: Ambrosiaster (Migne, P. L. tom. XVII, col. 45-184); Pelagius (P. L. tom. XXX, col. 645-718); St. Augustine, *Inchoata expositio* (P. L., XXXV, col. 2087-2106), *Expositio quarundam propositionum ex epistola ad Romanos* (P. L. tom. XXXV, col. 2063-2088); St. Thomas, *Com. in Omnes S. Pauli Ep.* (4th ed., Turin, 1912).

Later and Recent Commentaries: Toletus, *Ep. ad Romanos* (Rome, 1602); Cornelius a Lapide, *Com. in Omnes D. Pauli Ep.* (Antwerp, 1614); Estius, *In Omnes Pauli Ep. Com.* (Douai, 1614-16); Beelen, *Com. in Ep. ad Romanos* (Louvain, 1854); Bisping, *Erklärung des Briefes an die Römer* (Münster, 1860); MacEvilly, *Exposition of the Epistles of St. Paul*, vol. I (3rd ed., Dublin, 1875); Klofutar, *Com. in Ep. ad Romanos* (Leipzig, 1880); Agus, *Ep. B. Pauli ad Romanos* (Ratisbon, 1888); A. Schaefer, *Erklärung des Briefes an die Römer* (Münster, 1891); Cornely, *Com. in Ep. S. Pauli ad Romanos* (Paris, 1896); Van Steenkiste, *Com. in omnes S. Pauli epistolas* (Bruges, 1899); Rickaby, *Notes on St. Paul* (2nd ed., London, 1905); Lemonnyer, *Épîtres de Saint Paul* (Paris, 1905); Niglutsch, *Brev. com. in Ep. ad Romanos* (Trent, 1909); Toussaint, *Épîtres de Saint Paul* (Paris, 1913); Sales, in *La Sacra Bibbia*, vol. II (Turin, 1914); Lagrange, *Épître aux Romains* (Paris, 1916).

NON-CATHOLIC COMMENTARIES

Meyer-Weiss (9th ed., tr. Edinburgh 1873-4); Lipsius, H. J. Holtzmann, *Hand-Kommentar zum Neuen Test.* (Freiburg in B., 1892); B. Weiss, *Der Brief an die Römer* in the *Kritisch-exeg. Kommentar über das Neue Test.* (Göttingen, 1891); Sanday and Headlam (S. H.), *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (2nd ed., Edinburgh, 1896); Lietzmann, in *Handbuch zum Neuen Test.* (Tübingen, 1906); Jülicher, in *Die Schriften des Neuen Test.*, edited by J. Weiss, vol. II, *Der Brief an die Römer* (Göttingen, 1908); Zahn, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* (Leipzig, 1910); Parry, *The Epistle to the Romans*, in *The Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges* (Cambridge, 1912); Kühl, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* (Leipzig, 1913).

The Epistle to the Romans

CHAPTER I

INSCRIPTION AND GREETING; ST. PAUL THANKS GOD FOR THE FAITH OF THE ROMAN CHRISTIANS, I-15

I-15. To begin a letter with a salutation or greeting of the writer to the one written to was an invariable rule in ancient times. Sometimes these inscriptions developed the titles and credentials of the writer; sometimes those of the person or people addressed. St. Paul also observes this custom in his Epistles. The introductory part, however, of the Pauline letters usually consists of two members: the inscription or salutation, and an act of thanksgiving to God for the benefits conferred on the Church to which he is writing. The Introduction to the present Epistle (i. 1-15) is an illustration of this customary opening.

As St. Paul had not been in any sense, either directly or indirectly, the founder of the Church in Rome, and was unknown to the majority of its members, he thought it needful to preface this letter with a most solemn and unusually long inscription (verses 1-7) which would explain to the Roman Christians why he was writing to them, and why he could dare to speak with so much authority. Hence in verse 1 he indicates his Apostolic charge, his duty as a messenger of Christ; in verses 2-4 he directs attention to the dignity and gravity of the Gospel preaching, because of its divine origin and sublime subject-matter; and in verses 5, 6 he refers to the universality of his Apostolate which embraces also the Romans. The inscription is terminated (verse 7) with the usual prayer for grace and peace in behalf of those to whom the Epistle is directed.

The second part of the Introduction (verses 8-15) is an act of thankfulness to God for the faith of the Romans, which was celebrated in all the world (verse 8). Paul's good will toward

1. Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated unto the gospel of God,

them is manifest from his unceasing prayers in their behalf, and from his long cherished desire to see them (verses 9-13). This desire to visit the Roman Christians, he says, came from his vocation, which made him a debtor to all men, and which, consequently, constrained him to wish to preach the Gospel to the Romans also (verses 14, 15).

1. The first thing necessary in writing to the Romans—a community which he had not founded—was that Paul should make known his credentials. He therefore states at the outset the divine authority that is behind his Apostolate.

Paul. The Apostle probably assumed this name for the first time in Cyprus when he converted the Proconsul Sergius Paulus (Acts xiii. 9), perhaps, as St. Jerome says (*in Philem.*), in honor of his victory in making so great a convert. St. Thomas and others, however, think he was called both Paul and Saul from his infancy; the latter being his Jewish, and the former his Latin name. As Tarsus, the Apostle's birth place, was under the Roman Empire, it seems not improbable that he should have been given a Latin, as well as a Jewish name, from the beginning.

A servant, i.e., a slave (δοῦλος) consecrated to the service of Jesus Christ. St. Paul calls himself the servant or slave of Jesus Christ just as the Prophets had styled themselves servants of Yahweh (cf. Amos iii. 7; Isa. xlii. 19; Ezech. xxxvii. 24, etc.). This is the first time that "servant of Jesus Christ" stands at the head of an Epistle; but it occurs again in Philip. i. 1; Jas. i. 1; Jude i; 2 Peter i. 1.

Called to be an apostle, i.e., called by a special vocation (κλητός) to go and preach the Gospel. The term "apostle" means *one sent*, as a messenger, a commissioned agent. Thus all the Apostles were messengers sent by Christ to announce the kingdom of God, to proclaim the good tidings of redemption and salvation. St. Paul was equal in dignity to the twelve, because like them, he was called and instructed immediately by Christ Himself (Gal. i. 1).

To be an Apostle in the strict sense of the word it was neces-

2. Which he had promised before, by his prophets, in the holy scriptures, sary: (a) to have seen Christ in person; (b) to have been immediately chosen and instructed by Him; (c) to have universal authority to teach, preach, establish Churches, etc., subject, of course, to the supreme jurisdiction of the chief of the Apostles; (d) to have the power of miracles as a confirmation of one's preaching and mission.

Separated. The Greek Fathers see in this word an allusion to divine predestination, as in Gal. i. 15. It is more probable, however, to say with the Latin Fathers that the term here simply means that Paul was set apart, or especially chosen and consecrated by God, when he received his revelation to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles. Everywhere in the New Testament, except Gal. i. 15, the term ἀφωρίζω simply means to set apart from other duties and human relations, to reserve for the Apostolate (Acts xiii. 2). Father Cornely understands "separated" here to refer to Paul's preparation by natural and supernatural gifts.

The gospel of God, i.e., the good tidings, of which God is the Author and Revealer through His divine Son, and which are destined to lead man to God. Paul's call and separation were from God for the purpose of preaching and spreading the Gospel of God.

2. Which he had promised, etc. By these words St. Paul intended to show the Romans that he was not teaching something new or false, but merely announcing the fulfillment of what had been foretold throughout the Old Testament. The entire Old Testament was ordained to the New Testament, and consequently to Christ, the principal subject of the latter. The term **prophets** here means simply those who announce the future, and embraces all the seers, both great and small, of the Old Testament. The Scriptures are called **holy** (ἁγία) because inspired by God.

3, 4. These two verses are of very great importance. They cause much difficulty and have been variously interpreted. In them is summed up the whole content of the Gospel preached by St. Paul and foretold by Almighty God,—the object of which Gospel is the Son of God, who, though eternal with the Father,

3. Concerning his Son, who was made to him of the seed of David, according to the flesh,

4. Who was predestinated the Son of God in power, according to the spirit of sanctification, by the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ from the dead;

took human nature from the seed of David, and by His powerful Resurrection from the dead, was manifested and constituted, in the eyes of men, the powerful Son of God.

3. **Concerning his Son.** This shows that the object of the Gospel was chiefly Christ, as foretold by the Prophets, but more clearly preached by Paul. The words, *περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ*, indicate that the Son of God was a Divine Person existing anterior to all time and personally distinct from His Father; while the words, **of the seed of David**, etc., show that this same Divine Person, existing prior to His incarnation, and personally distinct from His Father, took flesh in time from a descendant of David, and thus, according to His human nature, was made or generated, without the intervention of any man, from Mary, His Blessed Mother, who was of the line and family of David. It was a universal belief among the Jews that the Messiah should be "the Son of David"; this for them was His most characteristic title (cf. Acts ii. 29; xiii. 34 ff.; 2 Tim. ii. 8; Apoc. iii. 7). From the present verse, therefore, it is clear that the Son of God is distinct from the Father, that He is one person, and that He has two natures, one divine and one human. Cf. Philipp. ii. 6-9.

The words **to him** (Vulg., *ei*) of this verse are not represented in the Greek.

4. Our Lord's Resurrection in time from the dead *marked* Him in the sight of men as a Divine Person, as the true Son of God.

Who, some think, refers to the seed of David, to the human nature of Christ, which from eternity was predestinated to be the Son of God, inasmuch as it would be united in time with the Person of the Word of God (a Lapide, MacEv., etc.); others understand the reference to be to the Second Divine Person, who, on account of His spirit of sanctity, was *constituted* the Son of God with regard to men, in the capacity of Messiah, and who, after His Resurrection was exalted in His

humanity. In other words, after His Resurrection this Second Divine Person was distinguished as the powerful Son of God, or the Son of God as exercising His power by raising Himself from the dead, in opposition to His state of humiliation in the flesh (cf. Cornely, Lagrange). Although, as a Divine Person, Christ was always the Son of God, still it was by His Resurrection from the dead in particular that He was manifested and constituted such before men.

Predestinated. The Greek has *ὁρισθέντος*, which, according to the Greek Fathers, means *declared, manifested*; but which is better and more literally rendered by *marked out, distinguished, constituted* (Cornely, Lagrange). It seems more natural to unite *ὁρισθέντος* with **Son of God**, than with **in power**; and thus the meaning would be that the Second Divine Person was *manifested, or constituted, marked out*, by His Resurrection, as the *powerful* Son of God.

In power, i.e., by the exercise of divine power, especially in the Resurrection.

The spirit of sanctification. Better, "The holiness of his spirit." By "sanctification" St. Paul means to indicate the sanctity which was proper to Christ as the Son of God, not necessarily the Holy Spirit. The term *ἀγιοσύνη* means *sanctity* or *holiness*; St. Paul uses *ἅγιον πνεῦμα* to express the Holy Ghost.

By the resurrection, etc. Since there is question here of an event already accomplished, the allusion seems to be rather to Christ's own Resurrection (Lagrange) than to the general resurrection of the dead, embracing also that of Christ (Cornely). The Resurrection was the principal miracle by which Christ in the eyes of men was manifested or constituted the powerful Son of God, i.e., the Son of God as exercising divine power in His human nature.

Our Lord Jesus Christ. These words are in apposition with **Son of God**, as is evident from the Greek, *τοῦ ὁρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ*. The title *Son of God*, as applied to our Saviour, occurs 68 times in St. Paul and about 20 times in the rest of the New Testament.

In the Vulgate, *prædestinatus* ought to be *definitus*, and *Jesu Christi Domini Nostri* should be *Jesu Christo Domino Nostro*, in apposition with *de Filio suo*.

5. By whom we have received grace and apostleship for obedience to the faith, in all nations, for his name;

6. Among whom are you also the called of Jesus Christ:

7. To all that are at Rome, the beloved of God, called to be saints. Grace to you, and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.

5. It is through Christ, the Son of God, risen from the dead that St. Paul received from God the grace and authority to preach the Gospel in all nations.

By whom. Better, "Through whom," i.e., through Jesus Christ, risen from the dead, who is the agent through whom God dispenses powers to the Apostles.

We have received, etc. Although speaking in the plural, Paul is here referring directly, if not exclusively, to himself, who has been given the special grace and mission to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles (xv. 5; Gal. i. 15; Eph. iii. 8).

For obedience, etc. The purpose of the grace and mission conferred on St. Paul was to lead all nations, i.e., all the Gentiles, to embrace and obey the teachings of the faith of Christ.

For his name, i.e., for the glory of Christ, that also the pagans might know and love Him. The name, both in the Old and in the New Testament, stands for the person (cf. Acts ix. 15, 16; xxi. 13).

6. **Among whom,** etc. Here the Apostle tells the Romans that they, being largely converts to the faith from paganism, are also embraced in his Apostolate to the Gentile world. This is a proof that most of the Roman Christians when St. Paul wrote his letter were of Gentile origin.

The called of Jesus Christ, i.e., a part or portion of the faithful of Christ. There is no question here of the Romans having been called *by* Christ, as St. Paul was, but only of their belonging to the number of the faithful who are Christ's by faith in the Gospel.

7. **To all,** etc. Paul addresses all the Christians at Rome, rich and poor, master and slave, Jew and Gentile. He calls them **beloved of God**, i.e., objects of God's favor and love, by which they have been called to the faith of Christ.

Called to be saints, i.e., consecrated in a special manner by

8. First I give thanks to my God, through Jesus Christ, for you all, because your faith is spoken of in the whole world.

9. For God is my witness, whom I serve in my spirit in the gospel of his Son, that without ceasing I make a commemoration of you;

10. Always in my prayers making request, if by any means now at length I may have a prosperous journey, by the will of God, to come unto you.

their vocation as Christians to the service of God, as belonging to Christ and as participating through grace in His divine life.

Grace . . . peace, etc. This form of well-wishing, which occurs in nearly all the Epistles of St. Paul, is found nowhere before the Apostle, and therefore seems to have been his own creation (Lagrange). Grace, in its proper sense, is a special gift of God by which one is made holy and agreeable in God's sight, and is rendered a participant of the divine nature, a brother of Christ, and heir to the glory of the Father in heaven. Peace with God insures interior tranquillity of mind and soul, and is one of the most precious effects of grace. St. Paul here speaks of these eminent gifts as coming from God the Father and from our Lord Jesus Christ, thus placing the latter on a level with the former, but not identifying the two as persons.

8. After his rather lengthy greeting to the Roman Christians, in which the foundations of the Gospel and his own Apostolic authority are indicated, St. Paul first thanks God the Father, the source of all good and blessings, for their splendid faith which is known everywhere. His gratitude is expressed **through Jesus Christ**, because our Lord is the medium, the channel, the Mediator and great Highpriest through whom all the blessings of the Father are conveyed to us.

For you all shows that the faith of the Roman community as a whole was beyond reproach. Cornely thinks the faith of the Romans was superior to that of all other Churches, and the model of them all; but this can hardly be gathered from St. Paul's words, which perhaps have reference more to the importance of the Roman Christians as residents of the Capital of the Empire, than to the superior excellence of their faith over that of any or all others.

9, 10. **God is my witness**. As Paul was generally unknown to the Romans he refers to God as witness of the truth of his words (2 Cor. i. 23; Philipp. i. 8; 1 Thess. ii. 5, 10).

11. For I long to see you, that I may impart unto you some spiritual grace, to strengthen you:

12. That is to say, that I may be comforted together in you, by that which is common to us both, your faith and mine.

13. And I would not have you ignorant, brethren, that I have often proposed to come unto you, (and have been hindered hitherto), that I might have some fruit among you also, even as among other Gentiles.

Whom I serve, i.e., whom I worship, venerate (λατρεύω). The service here meant was the preaching of the Gospel.

In my spirit, i.e., not only in exterior corporal service, but especially interiorly according to the spirit (St. Thomas).

In the gospel of his Son, i.e., in preaching the Gospel, of which the object was the Son of God.

That without ceasing, etc., i.e., in his frequent prayers Paul always remembered them and prayed that he might see them. By thus showing his great affection for the Romans and his desire to visit them, St. Paul hopes to gain their good will and confidence as an aid to his future work among them and in the West. When writing these words he little thought that when finally he should arrive in Rome, it would be as a prisoner (Acts xxviii.).

11. St. Paul desired to visit the Roman Christians for the sake of the mutual help that would result from his visit, and for the purpose of strengthening them in their faith. This shows he was not going to preach a new Gospel to them.

Some spiritual grace, i.e., some interior grace, such as is spoken of later in v. 15, 16; vi. 23. The term χάρισμα here does not mean *gratiae gratis datae*, such as tongues, prophesies and the like, of which there is question in 1 Cor. xii, xiv (Lagrange). The Apostle wishes to communicate some spiritual help to the Romans, and thus assist in confirming them in the faith in which they had already been well instructed by St. Peter.

12. Here St. Paul modestly tells the Romans that his purpose in wishing to visit them is not only to give them some spiritual help and consolation, but also to receive from them some edification and consolation for himself as a result of their mutual faith; the benefit will be reciprocal.

13. **Hindered**, by his many labors. It is not necessary to seek a supernatural cause for this hindrance, as in Acts xvi. 6, or an

14. To the Greeks and to the barbarians, to the wise and to the unwise, I am a debtor;

15. So (as much as is in me) I am ready to preach the gospel to you also that are at Rome.

16. For I am not ashamed of the gospel. For it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, to the Jew first, and to the Greek.

intervention by Satan, as in 1 Thess. ii. 18; 2 Cor. xii. 7. The Apostle's visit to Rome had been delayed by his many labors in the East (xv. 22).

Some fruit means some further increase in their faith. The words, as **among other Gentiles**, show that the composition of the Roman Church at this time was mainly Gentile.

In the Vulgate *habeam* should rather be *haberem*.

14, 15. **The Greeks**, i.e., those who spoke the Greek language, and who were consequently regarded as people of education and culture. The Romans are here embraced in the term "Greeks," because at this time Greek was spoken throughout the Empire. All others were considered as **barbarians**.

The wise and the unwise seems to refer to individuals rather than to nations, because even among the civilized and cultured peoples there were foolish and unlettered persons. To all mankind, therefore, St. Paul, on account of the grace of his Apostolate, felt morally obliged, so far as he could, to preach the Gospel.

THE THEME OF THE EPISTLE, 16, 17

16, 17. In these two verses St. Paul proposes the theme which he intends to develop in this Epistle, namely, that justification comes from faith in Christ, and not from the works of the Law. Being the Apostle of the Gentiles, and a debtor to all by reason of his vocation, he is not ashamed of the Gospel, but ready to announce it also to the Romans; for it is God's power for producing salvation everywhere. See *Introduction*, ix. 2.

16. **I am not ashamed**, etc. Paul assures his readers that, in spite of the learning, riches, power, culture and elegance of Rome, he is not ashamed to preach there the doctrines of the Gospel, which to the pagans were ignorance and foolishness. He will not appeal by the graces of style, but by force of the

17. For the justice of God is revealed therein, from faith unto faith, as it is written: The just man liveth by faith.

truths which the Gospel contains. These truths have a divine, compelling force, because they draw their efficacy from God.

The power of God, i.e., the instrument through which God exercises His power to save men, by remitting their sins and giving them grace and eternal life.

To every one that believeth. These words show the universality of the Gospel's saving force, on condition, of course, that it be accepted and believed, and that its teachings be put into practice. Faith is the foundation and root of all justification, and without it no one can please God and have part in His rewards.

To the Jew first, etc., i.e., the Gospel was first, in order of time, preached to the Jews, who prided themselves on their knowledge of the Scriptures, and then to the Greeks, who boasted of their learning and culture. According to the common interpretation the placing of the Jews first here indicates not only that they heard the Gospel first in order of time, but also that they received it first, in consequence of their privileges and the promises God made to them (cf. iii. 1, 2; ix. 4, 5; xi. 16-20; Acts xiii. 46).

The Jews called all Gentiles "Greeks," and the Greeks considered the Jews, and all who did not speak the Greek tongue, as "barbarians."

17. The justice of God, i.e., the justice or justification given by God to man, which has its root and foundation in faith, and renders man holy and pleasing in God's sight. This justification must be preceded, in the first instance, not by the habit, but by an act of faith.

Is revealed therein, i.e., justification is made manifest through the Gospel, inasmuch as it is a gift of God which before was hidden, but is now made known to the world. Before the Gospel it was not altogether clear just how justification was to be obtained, whether, namely, by faith in the Redeemer to come, or through the observance of the Law of Moses. But now the Gospel has made it entirely plain that justification comes through faith, and is extended to all who believe, be they Jews or Gentiles.

From faith unto faith. These words are variously understood. According to Calmet, Lagrange, etc., they refer to progress in faith. The justice of God is revealed in the Gospel, and takes its beginning in man from faith, as from its root, and increases and develops in faith. Cornely understands the words to refer to the extension of the faith among the believers, *in omnes credentes*; i.e., the justice of God, manifested through the Gospel, is not restricted to the Jews, but is extended to all those who believe in Christ, of whatever nationality they may be.

It is written, etc., to show that faith, even in the Old Testament, was the source of justification, St. Paul now cites one of the ancient Prophets. The words quoted are from Habacuc ii. 4. Literally they express the manner in which the Jews, under the Chaldeans, should conduct themselves: they should live by faith in the promise of a deliverer (Cyrus) given them by Almighty God; and thus through patient expectation, accompanied by good works, they would at length be freed. Likewise, says the Apostle, applying the spiritual meaning of the Prophet's words, he who is just by virtue of the faith revealed in the Gospel will, by good works and patient confidence in God's promises, live and continually increase in faith and spirituality, unto life everlasting. In the application of these words of the Prophet, St. Paul makes the Babylonian captivity a figure of the state of sin, "and the law of the Israelites a symbol of that of good Christians" (Calmet).

The just man liveth by faith. With the Prophet there was question in these words of life granted in recompense of one's faith; but with St. Paul there is question of the source of man's justice: faith is the source, i.e., the foundation, of the spiritual life of the just man. Justice comes from faith, and not from the works of the Law, the Apostle means to say (St. Chrys., Cajetan, Lagr., etc.).

The citation of Habacuc is from the Septuagint, although not literal. The Hebrew reads, "in his faithfulness," instead of "by faith," but the meaning is the same.

St. Paul in these verses (16, 17) has stated his thesis, that justification comes not from wisdom or learning, nor from the observance of the Law, but from faith.

THROUGH THEIR SINS THE PAGANS HAVE LAPSED INTO IDOLATRY,
18-23

18. For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and injustice of those men that detain the truth of God in injustice:

18-23. Having asserted that justification comes only through faith, the Apostle here proceeds to indicate that both Gentiles and Jews have grievously sinned, and are therefore in need of redemption (i. 18-iii. 20); this redemption can now be obtained through faith in Christ (iii. 21-iv. 25).

In the present section St. Paul points out the sinfulness of the pagans. They could have known God, and did know Him, to some extent; but they failed to render Him the homage which was His due, with the result that the notion of Him which they had through human reason became obscured, and they turned in their wickedness to dumb idols.

18. **For** (γράφ) indicates the reason why a revelation of the "justice of God" was necessary. Some, however, think that γάρ does not here denote a strict consequence, but rather a mild opposition (Lagr.).

The wrath of God, etc., is understood by older critics to refer to the anger which God will display at the Last Judgment. Cornely and other modern authorities understand it of anger already manifested. Doubtless it is to be understood of anger already displayed, the full and final issue of which, however, will be felt only at the Last Judgment.

Wrath is attributed to God anthropomorphically, and means here nothing more than a manifestation of His justice (2 Paralip. xix. 2; Neh. i. 6). Without doubt God will at the Last Judgment manifest His justice towards all sinners in ways unseen and unrealized here below. St. Paul often speaks of God's wrath in the eschatological sense (ii. 5; v. 9; 1 Thess. i. 10, etc.), but it is evident from the present tense of the verb here, ἀποκαλύπτεται, and from the context, that the Apostle is now speaking of wrath which God has already exercised on the Gentiles.

Is revealed from heaven, i.e., God's judgments on the sins of

19. Because that which is known of God is manifest in them. For God hath manifested it unto them.

20. For the invisible things of him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made; his eternal power also, and divinity: so that they are inexcusable.

the Gentiles are sent out, so to say, from the place of His dwelling, from the seat of His presence.

Ungodliness means impiety, as opposed to the virtue of religion, which renders to God His due.

Injustice expresses more openly what is also implied in "ungodliness"; for to fail in piety is likewise to fail in justice to God. Both words refer to the injustice, immorality and other sins of the Gentiles.

The pagans are said to **detain the truth of God**, etc., inasmuch as their state of injustice and sin excluded possession of the truth, and kept it, as it were, locked up from them. Truth and injustice are opposing forces; and as there is question here of religious or moral truth, the former is said to be excluded, kept away, *enslaved* (κατεχόντων) by the latter.

Of God is not in the Greek; hence *Dei* after *veritatem* of the Vulgate should be omitted.

19. In this verse St. Paul says that a natural knowledge of God, of His existence and of some of His attributes, to which unimpeded human reason can always attain, was possible to the pagans; and thence it follows that, had they rendered to God, as they could and should have known Him, the homage that was His due, they would have received further help from Him to enable them to lead moral lives and thus attain salvation. The words τὸ γνωστόν of this verse mean the objective notion or knowledge of God, which man is able to acquire from the visible universe, *notitia Dei objective sumpta*; γνωστόν is always used in this sense in the New Testament.

Is manifest, etc., i.e., is clear to them, made manifest externally among them. The Gentiles had before them that clear knowledge of God which is possible to man through the natural light of reason operating on the visible world around him (St. Thomas).

20. The Apostle wisely addresses to the Gentiles first an argument from the natural order. The nature and attributes of God are called **invisible things** because they are not naturally per-

21. Because that, when they knew God, they have not glorified him as God, or given thanks; but became vain in their thoughts, and their foolish heart was darkened.

ceptible as they are in themselves; but, by reason of things created and naturally visible, human reason has been able from the beginning of the world to rise to a knowledge of the existence of those things which it otherwise could not know, and which are at all times invisible to the senses (*Conc. Val.*, Sess. III. cap. 2). Ever since there was a created mind capable of reflecting on the visible universe, therefore, it has been possible for man to rise to a knowledge of the existence of a Creator.

Naturally the first attribute of the Creator, which would be suggested to man's mind, would be that of **power**; and upon further reflection it would be clear that such power could reside only in **divinity**. Hence the Gentiles were inexcusable in not knowing the existence of some of the attributes of the one true God, and in not rendering to Him the homage which was His by right.

21. **Because** (*διότι*) shows the connection with the preceding verse and introduces a development of the theme therein stated. St. Paul now goes on to explain why the pagans were inexcusable. Not because they had a perfect and explicit knowledge of God, and then refused to pay Him due honor and worship; but because they could have had sufficient notion of His existence and nature not to be guilty of the ignorance with which they are here reproached. Hence St. Thomas says that the first fault of the Gentiles was one of ignorance. Had they made proper use of the first knowledge which they had of God, they would have progressed to further understanding of Him, and would have recognized Him as God; they would have worshipped His supreme majesty, and rendered to Him honor and thanks as the Master and source of all good and blessings. But, having wilfully paralyzed the first help and obscured the first light that was given them, they were plunged into deeper darkness and error, with the result that, instead of thanking God as the cause of benefits, they *potius suo ingenio et virtuti suae bona sua adscribebant* (St. Thomas).

Heart here represents all of man's higher faculties, both volitional and intellectual.

22. For professing themselves to be wise, they became fools.

23. And they changed the glory of the incorruptible God into the likeness of the image of a corruptible man, and of birds, and of fourfooted beasts, and of creeping things.

24. Wherefore God gave them up to the desires of their heart, unto uncleanness, to dishonour their own bodies among themselves.

22. This verse does not explain what precedes, but rather indicates the supreme degree of error into which the pagans had fallen. The words are general and embrace not only philosophers, but all the Gentiles, represented by the most cultivated people.

For (Vulgate, *enim*) is not represented in the Greek.

23. So far in their perversity and ignorance did the pagans go that they paid to mere creatures, such as men, birds, beasts, and reptiles,—nay, even to the images and representations of these things, the honor and worship which is due to the eternal God alone. The folly of the Gentiles was in their conception of the Deity, whom they came to regard as represented by created and material objects; and their false notions begot a false worship.

The likeness of the image, i.e., the image which represented such things as man, birds, beasts and the like. Among the Greeks and Romans idols had the figure of a man, but among the Egyptians they took the form of animals.

ON ACCOUNT OF THEIR IDOLATRY THE GENTILES WERE PERMITTED TO
FALL INTO THE MOST HATEFUL CRIMES, 24-32

24-32. Moral disorders follow upon religious error as a chastisement. They who dishonored God were consequently permitted to dishonor themselves. First they degraded their own bodies by impurities; then they turned to sins against nature; and finally they were given up to a reprobate sense, plunging into every kind of sin, thus meriting the punishment of eternal death.

24. God gave them up, etc., i.e., God in just punishment of their perversity withdrew grace from the pagans, and thus permitted them to fall into hateful and disgraceful sins (St. Aug., *Serm.* LVII. 9). That which was most noble in them, their

25. Who changed the truth of God into a lie; and worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen.

26. For this cause God delivered them up to shameful affections. For their women have changed the natural use into that use which is against nature.

27. And, in like manner, the men also, leaving the natural use of the women, have burned in their lusts one towards another, men with men working that which is filthy, and receiving in themselves the recompense which was due to their error.

reason, became the slave of their sensual passions. This judgment of God, however, was not definitive, because, according to St. Paul himself, the fallen Gentiles could rise again through the grace of Christ; neither does it mean that every individual among the pagans was a reprobate. On the contrary, we know that the grace of Christ's death reached out beyond the saints of the chosen people and touched some of the Gentiles also, as is recognized by the Apostle in ii. 14-16.

25. Who changed the truth of God, etc. Better, "Seeing that they changed," etc. This can be understood in two ways, according to St. Thomas: (a) Either that, in their perversity, they changed the true knowledge which they had received from God into false doctrines; or (b) that they attributed the nature of the Divinity, which is truth itself, to an idol, which is a lie, inasmuch as it is not God. The Prophets often spoke of idols as *lies* (Isa. xliv. 20; Jer. xiii. 25; xvi. 19). The first meaning is preferred by Toletus, Lipsius, Lagrange, etc.; the second by Cornely, Godet, etc.

26, 27. In these two verses St. Paul speaks of the unnatural sins of the pagans, which were committed by women as well as men. St. Thomas says that every sin is against man's rational nature, but that sins of impurity which are not directed to the act of generation are also against man's animal nature.

The recompense, i.e., the reward that was due to their idolatry.

St. Paul's words are directed, not to the philosophers alone, but to all the pagans. Naturally, however, those were more responsible and culpable who had the intellectual and moral direction of others. It is surprising that such degrading sins as are here mentioned could have existed in the midst of a culture so high as was the Greco-Roman. These vices, however, did not

28. And as they liked not to have God in their knowledge, God delivered them up to a reprobate sense, to do those things which are not convenient;

have their beginning in Greece, but were very widespread among the Semites, even in the higher classes, as we learn from Babylonian inscriptions. Also the ancient Hebrews practiced them in forms the most repugnant and forbidden by the Law (3 Kings xiv. 24; xxii. 47; 4 Kings xxiii. 7; Deut. xxiii. 18). In Greece art and literature, which glorified unnatural vices, contributed much to corrupt the youth and to spread the immorality which St. Paul is here condemning (cf. Aristotle, *Politics*, II. 10, 9; Plato, *Laws*, VII. 836-841).

28. Because the Gentiles failed of their own volition to use their natural light of reason to acquire a more correct and accurate knowledge of the one true God, they were permitted to fall into a reprobate sense, which took wrong for right and right for wrong.

The Greek word for sense here is *voûs*, *mind*, which embraces not only the speculative judgment, but also the principle of moral actions, or practical judgment. It is this meaning of the word *voûs* that explains *sensum*, in place of *mentem*, of the Vulgate (cf. 1 Cor. ix. 27; 2 Cor. xiii. 5-7).

Things . . . not convenient, i.e., abominable, unnatural vices.

It is to be noted here that this perversity of the pagans, which led them to regard wrong as right and right as wrong, was especially manifested in their aversion for sexuality that was legitimate and natural, and in their affection for and praise of such unnatural vices as pederasty, which, as we learn from Anacreon and Theognis, among the Greeks, and Lucian and Plutarch, among the Romans, was considered not only as lawful, but as the privilege of the higher classes. There seems to be a striking analogy between this perverted judgment of the Gentiles, which St. Paul is here reprobating, and the similar distorted reasoning of many non-Catholics of our own time, who look upon such unnatural sins as onanism, unnecessary sterilization and race-suicide not only as legitimate, but as marks of a higher civilization and culture. Having forsaken the true religion and teachings of Christ these unfortunate persons have become perverse in their judgments, so that their condition and

29. Being filled with all iniquity, malice, fornication, avarice, wickedness, full of envy, murder, contention, deceit, malignity, whisperers,

30. Detractors, hateful to God, contumelious, proud, haughty, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents,

culpability seem not unlike those of the pagans of old who are condemned by St. Paul.

29. As a consequence of the reprobate sense to which God abandoned the pagans they fell into all kinds of sins against God, their neighbor and themselves.

Cornely observes that the Vulgate, having translated *ποιεῖν* (verse 28) by *ut faciant*, should have begun this verse with the nominative *repleti*, *filled*, instead of the accusative *repletos*. In Greek the accusative follows naturally *αὐτοῦς*, with which it is in apposition as the subject of *ποιεῖν*. The word *fornication*, found also in the Vulgate, is omitted from the principal Greek MSS. It seems out of place in the present enumeration, since the vices of impurity had been sufficiently noted in verses 24, 26 and 27.

Malice and **wickedness** were used promiscuously by both sacred and profane writers, but St. Paul mentions them separately, together with other general sins, to show that the Gentiles were guilty of crimes of all kinds.

Avarice, like impurity, was widespread among the pagans.

Malignity is a vice which accepts and explains all things in the worst light.

Whisperers are those who secretly spread calumnies.

30. **Detractors** are those who openly and unjustly reveal the crimes and sins of others.

Hateful to God. The Greek here has *θεοστυγείς*, which Cornely and others understand to mean *haters of God*. But since this meaning of the word is never found in profane Greek, Lagrange prefers the Vulgate translation, *Deo odibiles*. It is perhaps a general term, expressive of the condition of those who were guilty of the crimes mentioned in the present series, especially pride and detraction, which are particularly hateful to God (cf. Eccl. x. 7; Prov. vi. 16).

Haughty. Haughtiness comes from pride and is the fault of those in particular who have power or influence.

Inventors of evil things are those who are always studying new methods and means of sin (cf. 2 Mac. vii. 31).

31. Foolish, dissolute, without affection, without fidelity, without mercy.

32. Who, having known the justice of God, did not understand that they who do such things, are worthy of death; and not only they that do them, but they also that consent to them that do them.

31. **Foolish**, i.e., irreligious, those who have no taste for things religious, or who do not understand the divine Wisdom (cf. Ps. xci. 6; Wis. i. 5; xi. 15; Eccl. xv. 7; Mark vii. 22).

Dissolute, i.e., those who are unfaithful to their engagements, those without honor (cf. Jer. iii. 7, 8, 10, 11).

Without fidelity (Vulg., *absque foedere*), is not represented in many MSS., and is perhaps a gloss that has crept into the text.

Without mercy, i.e., without pity and humanity toward their needy brethren.

32. **Who, having known**, etc. Better, "For, realizing" (*οἴσιν*), etc. In this verse, which explains how to understand the "reprobate sense" of verse 28, St. Paul says that the Gentiles knew in theory that God is just, but that they did not understand this in practice. There is some difference between the Greek and Vulgate readings here, but the sense is practically the same.

Are worthy of death. Neither in the Mosaic nor in the Gentile law was death promulgated as the punishment for all faults; but St. Paul wishes only to say here that those who give themselves up to vices for which they are fully responsible are deserving of death. The pagans knew the moral law and its sanction, but so far did they go astray that they were not only guilty of committing sins themselves, but approved of others who committed them; in this, certainly, their perversity was extreme. Thus the philosophers, who favored idolatry, although they themselves did not believe it, and the writers who glorified sins against nature were beyond doubt deeply guilty.

As there is question in this verse of the moral conscience of the pagans, St. Paul was doubtless referring principally to their Stoic and Cynic philosophers, who preached virtue and a moral code in some respects more austere than that practiced by the Jews. The Greco-Romans, for example, had no legal polygamy; they did not admit that a master could have relations with his servant; and they considered as an adulterer a husband who, in his conjugal relations, sought only pleasure.

The conclusion of the present chapter is that the wrath of God is upon the Gentiles for their sins, and that therefore they are in need of redemption. Neither their philosophy, nor their culture, nor the natural virtues which some of them preached and practiced were able to keep them from sin or establish in their regard any merited claim to the Gospel. All are in the same condition. St. Paul in this chapter has not enumerated faults peculiar to the philosophers, nor to the Romans in general, but those rather that were common to all the pagan world. Hence, after speaking of the vices of luxury, his enumeration is restricted to sins against justice and charity. If particular attention is given to pride, it is not so much because this was a Roman vice, as that it is a principle or common source of social disorder. In his Epistles to the Corinthians, Galatians, Colossians, etc., the Apostle was moved by the needs and special evils of those to whom he wrote; but not so here. In the present letter his aim is to show the degradation of the pagan world. His words are addressed to all, and they are of special import to the Romans only because Rome, as the capital and centre of the Empire, pretended to maintain and was responsible for the social order and general welfare of all her people. Without charity toward God and the neighbor these benefits could not be secured, and because these virtues were not practiced, St. Paul saw that, in spite of philosophy, reason did not guide the pagans, in spite of the splendid government and laws of Rome, peace and friendship were wanting, in spite of certain natural virtues, the causes of dissolution were many and widespread, and therefore there was need of a radical change and of a new and more potent means of salvation (Lagrange, h. l.).

CHAPTER II

THOSE WHO CENSURE OTHERS WILL NOT BE SPARED; FOR THE JUST
JUDGMENT OF GOD IS THE SAME FOR ALL, I-II

1. Wherefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest. For wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself. For thou dost the same things which thou judgest.

2. For we know that the judgment of God is, according to truth, against them that do such things.

I-II. After having shown that the wrath of God is upon the Gentiles for their sins, St. Paul now turns to the state of the Jews, which he finds to be even worse. If the pagans have not followed their lights, and have thus become responsible for their sins, the Jews who, with greater lights, commit the same sins, are not only inexcusable, but are really in a more serious condition than their offending neighbors whom they condemn.

1. **Wherefore** (διό) connects this with the foregoing chapter as an inference from what is stated there.

O man. This fictitious person represented not the philosophers, nor the Greco-Roman leaders and magistrates, but men in general, and the Jews in particular. In order to gain the good will and attention of the latter, St. Paul refrains from speaking to them directly until verse 17 (St. Thomas, Jülicher, Lagrange, etc.). Cornely, Köhl and Zahn, however, think that as far as verse 17, Paul is addressing the whole world, both Jew and Gentile.

The same things, i.e., the same misdeeds. This does not mean that all the Jews were guilty of exactly the same excesses as the pagans, but only that they committed many grave faults.

2. **We know**, i.e., we as men, guided by the light of reason, know, etc.; or, according to the Vulgate reading, we as Jews, better instructed regarding the justice of God, know that the divine judgment will be in accordance with the truth and reality of things. Man's judgment is often extremely false, owing to

3. And thinkest thou this, O man, that judgest them who do such things, and dost the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God?

4. Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness, and patience, and long-suffering? Knowest thou not, that the benignity of God leadeth thee to penance?

5. But according to thy hardness and impenitent heart, thou treasurest up to thyself wrath, against the day of wrath, and revelation of the just judgment of God.

6. Who will render to every man according to his works.

ignorance or perversity; but God's judgment is always just, because it is in accordance with facts.

3. The Jews came so to pride themselves on being sons of Abraham that they believed they would all finally be saved and have part in the promises made to Israel, no matter what their faults (cf. Matt. iii. 7, 9). St. Paul here reminds them that since they judge others who commit grave faults they know that those faults are culpable, and that, consequently, they themselves will also be judged for committing the same sins.

4. In this verse the Apostle admonishes the Jews not to mistake God's patience and goodness in delaying punishment for their sins; God does not have to endure them. In showering upon them so many blessings He is only patiently waiting so that they may do penance and be saved (Wis. xi. 24).

In the Vulgate it is better to replace *an* by *aut*.

5. By reason of their stiff neck and "impenitent heart" (Deut. xxxi. 27; ix. 27) the sinful Jews, who despised (verse 4) the riches of God's graces, were laying up for themselves punishments which will be made manifest on the day of wrath, the day of the General Judgment (Ezech. xxii. 24; Soph. ii. 2, 3; Apoc. vi. 17), when God's just judgment will be revealed and will award each one according to his deeds (verse 6; Ps. lxi. 13; Matt. xvi. 27).

6. Paul is here pointing out to the Jews the necessity of making their lives conform to their doctrine. On the last day they will be judged according to their life and works. Be it observed, the Apostle does not say that God on the day of judgment will render to everyone according to his *faith*, but according to his *works*. From this it is rightly concluded, against the Lutheran doctrine, that *faith* alone does not *justify*. St. Paul was by no means disposed to grant in favor of the Christians an exception which he refused to Jews

7. To them indeed, who according to patience in good work, seek glory and honour and incorruption, eternal life:

8. But to them that are contentious, and who obey not the truth, but give credit to iniquity, wrath and indignation.

9. Tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that worketh evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Greek:

10. But glory, and honour, and peace to every one that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.

11. For there is no respect of persons with God.

(Gal. vi. 7 ff.; 1 Cor. iii. 13-15; ix. 17; 2 Cor. v. 10; ix. 6 ff.; Eph. vi. 8; Coloss. iii. 25). Modern Protestantism does not dare to make use of certain of Luther's words concerning works. The Lutherans now only pretend that one is saved *secundum testimonium operum*, *non propter opera*, i.e., *non propter meritum operum* (Weiss, cited by Lagrange).

7, 8. God will give eternal life to those who persevere in good works to the end (Matt. x. 22; xxiv. 13).

Glory and honour, etc. These are the hope and aspiration of all the just. But for those who are rebellious, who resist the truth and refuse obedience to God's law, like those Jews who opposed Moses and the Prophets and the Gospel of Christ, there is reserved severe punishment and eternal chastisement.

From verse 7 it is clear that it is right and commendable to do good for the sake of eternal reward (against *Quietism*). Cf. *Conc. Trid.*, Sess. VI. de Just., cap. 11, 31.

The *credunt* of the Vulgate is changed to *obediunt* by Cornely.

9, 10. These verses repeat under other form what was already said in the two preceding verses. Here, however, the application is distinctly made to the Jews and Gentiles, although the text continues in the singular. The Jew is placed first for punishment, because his evil deeds, committed against greater light, were more culpable; and he is also put first for rewards, since his good actions were more perfect by reason of a more perfect revelation and knowledge of God.

Tribulation and anguish are expressive of spiritual torture.

11. God rewards and punishes according to one's deserts, whether one be a Jew or a Gentile (Deut. x. 17; 2 Paralip. xix. 7; Job xxxiv. 19; Wis. vi. 8; Eccli. xxxv. 15; Acts x. 34; Eph. vi. 9; Col. iii. 25; 1 Pet. i. 17). If the Jew is first in reward or

12. For whosoever have sinned without the law, shall perish without the law; and whosoever have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law.

13. For not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified.

punishment, it is only because his merits or demerits are greater than those of the Gentile.

GOD IS NO RESPECTER OF PERSONS; BOTH JEWS AND GENTILES HAVE A LAW ACCORDING TO WHICH THEY SHALL BE JUDGED, 12-16

12-16. The Jews shall be judged according to their own written Law. And although the pagans had not the Law of Moses, yet they were not without a rule of conduct which they were obliged to follow, and this was the law of nature written on each one's heart. It was this natural law that clearly indicated to them what things God had forbidden under pain of death (i. 32), and that made them responsible for having failed to render to God the honor which was His due (i. 18-28). By the law of nature, therefore, the Gentiles shall be judged on the last day.

12. To show the impartiality of God's justice the Apostle here says that all men will be judged according to their knowledge; and hence the Gentiles, who have sinned without the law, i.e., without the written Law of Moses, will be judged by another, namely, the natural law, written on every man's heart (i. 18-28, 32). On the other hand, the Jews will be judged according to the Law of Moses, which they have violated.

The term law, *νόμος*, without the article means here the Jewish Law as distinguished from the natural law of the Gentiles.

In the Vulgate *et* should precede *peribunt*, to agree with the Greek *καί*.

13. Paul now explains how the Jews can be condemned, although they have the Law of Moses. Every Sabbath they heard this Law read to them in the synagogues, but it was not given to be heard only; it was to be put into practice. Therefore, those who did not practice the precepts of the Law could not be considered just before God.

The Apostle is not saying here that justification comes from the Law; he is speaking only of God's future judgment, without

14. For when the Gentiles, who have not the law, do by nature those things that are of the law; these having not the law are a law to themselves:

at present making any allusion to justification or to the manner by which it is effected. He will later (iii. 20 ff.) show that justification comes not from the works of the Law, but from faith, and from works performed through the grace of Christ's redemption. Hence the doers of the law shall be justified only on condition that they act through faith and with the aid of grace; without faith in Christ and the help of God's grace "no flesh shall be justified before him" (iii. 20).

14. Having pointed out (verse 13) how the Jews can be condemned in spite of their having the Law, St. Paul now goes on to show in this and the two following verses, how the Gentiles can be saved, although they have not received the Law. The Jews held that it was the Gentiles' fault that they had not the Mosaic Law, and that, consequently, they were bound to observe its precepts (Apoc. Bar. xlviii. 40, 47). But while St. Paul admits the culpability of the Gentiles, he does not reproach them for not having received the Law. He takes it for granted that the Law is not their express rule; but he supposes, nevertheless, that in certain instances, by following the light of reason, they have fulfilled its essential obligations and thus have become a law unto themselves (Lagr.).

By nature does not here mean that the Gentiles could observe all the moral precepts of the Law without the supernatural aid of grace, but only that they were able to do this without the written Law of Moses. The Apostle is speaking of those Gentiles, like Job, Melchisedech and Cornelius, who, assisted by God's grace, were able, without any help from the written Law, to know the true God, to observe the precepts of the natural law and thus attain to salvation.

Nature, i.e., the light of natural reason, in the absence of the Mosaic Law, dictated to the Gentiles what they should do and what they should avoid. Thus "The Apostle shows that even in early times before the giving of the Law, mankind had the benefit of a perfect Providence" (St. Chrys.).

The Pelagians used this verse to prove that man without grace can observe all the precepts of the natural law. Baius was con-

15. Who shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness to them, and their thoughts between themselves accusing, or also defending one another,

16. In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel.

demned (Denzing., 1022) for teaching that it was Pelagian to interpret this text of those Gentiles who had not received the grace of faith.

15. That the Gentiles who obeyed the moral precepts of the Law were therefore a law unto themselves, is manifest in the first place from their good moral lives, of which their own consciences were witnesses. The law inscribed on their hearts gave them a knowledge of moral good and evil, and by the help of grace they were able to do the former and avoid the latter. The second proof that they were a law unto themselves comes from the thoughts and judgments which they formed concerning one another's lives and actions. The common and impartial judgment of men regarding good or evil is a proof of the reality of natural obligation.

According to this interpretation, which is that of S. H., Lipsius, etc., there are two guaranties of the certitude of the natural law: (a) the conscience of each one; (b) the verdict of man. According to Cornely and others, however, there is here given only one witness, i.e., the conscience, and St. Paul explains how it asserts itself, namely, in the struggle of the thoughts (*λογισμοί*), of which some condemn, others approve. Our English translation here should read: "accusing *them*, or also defending *them*," i.e., the thoughts accuse or condemn, not themselves, but their subject or possessor (Cornely). This interpretation agrees better with the following verse.

16. This verse is a conclusion to what has been said in the two preceding verses. The existence of the natural law having been proved for the Gentiles, they, like the Jews, are in a condition to be judged. The dictates of conscience which condemn or approve the actions of the pagans will be manifested on the day of judgment, when there shall be needed no other witness for their condemnation or justification than the voice of their own conscience.

17. But if thou art called a Jew and retest in the law, and makest thy boast of God,

The secrets, etc. Only God can read the heart with certainty, and hence He only can judge the secret sins which the Gentiles committed against the law written on their hearts. For the Jew it sufficed to refer to the text of the Law, which condemned also secret sins; but for the pagan there was only the testimony of his conscience.

The incredulous Jews judged only those things which were external, and so they condemned all pagans as not obeying the Law simply because the latter had not the external written Law; but God, who is no respecter of persons (verse 11), will judge all, Jews and Gentiles, not according to things external, but according to what is written in the heart and conscience. This He will do through **Jesus Christ** whom He has constituted judge of all men (Matt. x. 31; John v. 22, 27; Acts xvii. 31).

According to my gospel means according to Paul's preaching, which was not different from that of the other Apostles, and clearly indicated that Jesus Christ would judge men by the secrets of their hearts (1 Cor. iii. 13; iv. 5; xiv. 25). We are not, therefore, to understand Paul's preaching as the manner or norm according to which God will judge, since Paul himself has plainly insisted that this norm will be the law, natural or written, as obeyed or disobeyed according to each one's conscience.

THE JEWS WHO VIOLATE THE LAW GIVEN THEM BY GOD ARE MORE
CULPABLE, 17-24

17-24. Paul now openly addresses the Jews, and vehemently denounces their delusion in thinking that they could be saved by the sole fact that they had received a written law from God. At first he enumerates (verses 17, 18) the privileges which they had in possessing the Law, thereby knowing God's will and things right and wrong, and then he ironically relates (verses 19, 20) certain claims and prerogatives on which they prided themselves, in order, in the following verses (21-24), to show more clearly the disagreement between their doctrine and their lives.

17. In verses 17-20 we have a case of anacoluthon—a protasis

18. And knowest his will, and approvest the more profitable things, being instructed by the law,

19. Art confident that thou thyself art a guide of the blind, a light of them that are in darkness,

20. An instructor of the foolish, a teacher of infants, having the form of knowledge and of truth in the law.

without an apodosis; but the irregularity is lessened if we read ἵδε in place of εἰ δέ (Lagr.). Still, the particle of contrast seems to be proper, since the thought is now passing from the Gentile to the Jew with the latter's special conditions (Parry).

Called a Jew, i.e., called by a praised and honored name. In St. Paul's time the term "Jew" was more in esteem than at present. It signified the Lord's people, the worshippers of the true God, the chosen race to whom the Messiah was promised.

Restest in the law. The principal benefit conferred on the Jews by God was the giving of the Law, which taught them what to do and what to avoid, and in which they could rest with assurance and safety. They could boast of God, because they were God's people, bound to Him by alliance and special privileges and benefits.

18. The Jews, being instructed by the Law, knew God's will and the things that pleased Him, as well as the things that displeased Him.

In the Vulgate, *eius* after *voluntatem* is not represented in the Greek.

19, 20. **Guide . . . light . . . instructor . . . having the form**, etc. Here the Apostle ironically enumerates certain claims to excellence in which the Jews gloried. Their morals in many respects were not above those of the Gentiles, and yet they considered themselves immeasurably superior to the latter. It was true, indeed, that the Gentiles, being deprived of God's revelation through the Law, were to a great degree "blind" and "in darkness," "foolish" and "infants," as regards the true knowledge of God and their consequent duties toward Him. On the contrary, the Jews, possessing the Law, had the truth, and were in a position to guide, enlighten and instruct the Gentiles; but their error lay in this, that they thought the mere possession of the Law, without its practice on their part, to be all that was required of them.

21. Thou therefore that teachest another, teachest not thyself: thou that preachest that men should not steal, stealest:

22. Thou that sayest, men should not commit adultery, committest adultery: thou that abhorrest idols, committest sacrilege:

23. Thou that makest thy boast of the law, by transgression of the law dishonourest God.

24. (For the name of God through you is blasphemed among the Gentiles, as it is written.)

21. The Apostle now interrupts his enumeration of the Jews' privileges and prerogatives to call attention to the difference between their boasted pretensions and their own lives. Their possession of the Law, their better knowledge of God and their obligations to Him only increased their sins and culpability in failing to practice what they taught and preached to others. The Jews were often guilty of *stealing*, especially in business and commercial affairs.

22. Sacrilege (*ἱεροσυλεῖς*). The Greek word *ἱεροσυλεῖν* properly signifies *to despoil, to pillage the temples*. St. Paul wishes to say that the Jews, who were so hateful of idols that they would not even touch them, had no scruples about robbing the temples of idols for the pecuniary gain they thus acquired (cf. Acts xix. 37). "The Jews were severely forbidden to touch the wealth lying in the temples of idols, as being an abomination (Deut. vi. 25, 26; 2 Mac. xii. 4); but the tyranny of love of money induced them to trample on this law" (St. Chrys.).

23. The Jews knew very well that the crimes of which they were guilty were a reproach to their religion. Their sins dishonored the Law of which they were so proud; and they themselves dishonored God, the Lawgiver, whose representatives in declaring and interpreting the Law they boastfully pretended to be.

24. The Jews, by their disorderly and sinful lives and actions, caused the name of God to be blasphemed among the idolatrous Gentiles. As the observation of the Law of God causes both God and the Law to be praised, so its transgression causes it and its giver to be despised.

As it is written refers to Isaias lii. 5, according to the Septuagint. The same thought is found in Ezech. xxxvi. 20-23.

There is no reason for parentheses here.

Per vos of the Vulgate should be *propter vos*; hence **through you** means "on account of you."

25. Circumcision profiteth indeed, if thou keep the law; but if thou be a transgressor of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision.

26. If, then, the uncircumcised keep the justices of the law, shall not this uncircumcision be counted for circumcision?

TRUE CIRCUMCISION IS THAT OF THE HEART, 25-29

25-29. St. Paul has so far shown that the Jews, by having a knowledge of God's revealed Law, instead of escaping the divine judgment, shall rather be held more responsible than the pagans, who were without that special help. But they also relied on their particular privileges as the chosen people, and appealed especially to circumcision as a sure sign of their election and eternal salvation. To disengage them from such a fatal delusion the Apostle now shows that circumcision of the flesh amounts to nothing without the observance of the Law of God; whereas fidelity to the divine precepts counts for that circumcision which alone is true and salutary.

25. This verse in the Greek is connected with what precedes by *γάρ*, *for*, which is not expressed in the Vulgate.

Circumcision was the seal of the covenant between the Jew and God (Gen. xvii). By it the Jew promised to observe the whole Law (Lev. xviii. 5; Gal. v. 3), in consequence of which he would enjoy a more complete knowledge of God and many spiritual privileges; but if he did not observe the Law, both in its moral and in its ceremonial precepts, he became as if uncircumcised, just like any Gentile. The many privileges, therefore, attached to circumcision were to be enjoyed only on condition that the circumcised observed the Law. Without a practice of the Law and true circumcision of the heart (Acts vii. 8) God was not bound by His part of the covenant, and the transgressing Jew lost all his privileges and was no better off than a pagan.

26. **The uncircumcised**, i.e., the Gentiles. The Rabbins taught that a seriously culpable Jew could be lost, but they would not admit that a Gentile who observed the natural law could be saved. Paul here asks a question, but the response is evidently affirmative. *Ἐάν* with the subjunctive can indicate a fact already realized, or, more naturally, a hypothesis, and this latter is the case here (Lagr.). If a Gentile, with the help of grace, observed all the precepts of the natural law, he had in fact the circumcision

27. And shall not that which by nature is uncircumcision, if it fulfil the law, judge thee, who by the letter and circumcision art a transgressor of the law?

28. For it is not he is a Jew, who is so outwardly; nor is that circumcision which is outwardly in the flesh:

29. But he is a Jew, that is one inwardly; and the circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.

of the heart, to which the promises were chiefly attached, and there was nothing to prevent him from entering into eternal life; thus his *uncircumcision was counted for circumcision*.

27. This is not a new interrogation, but rather a continuation, a further affirmation of what went before.

If the **uncircumcised**, i.e., if the Gentile, keeps the precepts of the natural law, the Ten Commandments, he will judge and condemn, in the Last Judgment, the transgressing Jew who, with his circumcision, failed to keep those precepts. The Apostle is not saying that a good Gentile is superior to a good Jew, but only that a good Gentile is better than a bad Jew. A virtuous Jew who observed his Law was naturally superior to a good Gentile, but a bad Jew was worse than a bad Gentile. The question here, as in the preceding verse, is theoretical, and the response here, as there, is clearly affirmative.

28, 29. The Apostle now concludes what he has been saying. The true Jew is one who is so internally as well as externally, one whose faith is religious and whose works are good, as becomes a true member of God's people. Likewise true circumcision is not that of the body, consisting only in an external sign and in the external and literal observance of the Law, but that of the heart (Jer. ix. 26; Ezech. xlv. 7, 9), which effects complete separation from sin and operates under the grace of God's Holy Spirit. The true Jew without any external sign of his Judaism like circumcision, but pure and good in the sight of God, has **praise, not of men, but of God**.

CHAPTER III

JEWISH UNFAITHFULNESS WILL NOT NULLIFY THE DIVINE
PROMISES, 1-8

1. What advantage then hath the Jew, or what is the profit of circumcision?

1-8. From the preceding chapter it is evident that both Jews and Gentiles have sinned and stand in need of redemption. The Jews are not excused on account of special privileges. But this creates a difficulty. If Jews and Gentiles are both in the same condition of sin, and if the true and salutary circumcision be that of the heart, which pagans also may possess (ii. 25-29), what special privilege have the Jews, and what use is it to have been born a Jew and to have received circumcision of the body? The Jews were God's chosen people. They had the Law and practiced circumcision as a sign of their covenant with God; but if a pagan without the Law and circumcision could be even more acceptable in God's sight than a Jew, where is the superiority of the Jews over the pagans?

Replying to this difficulty the Apostle says the Jews excel the pagans in every way, and especially in this that the divine promises were given to them. And he goes on to observe that, far from nullifying the promises made to them by God, the present infidelity of Israel will only cause the divine fidelity to shine forth with greater splendor. But hence it must not be concluded that the sins of the Jews, which shall serve to manifest the glory of God, will go unpunished. If this were true, then God could not judge and punish any sinners, since all could claim that their sins served to proclaim the divine glory. Nay more, such a conclusion would make sins abound.

A much fuller treatment of the Jewish position will be given in Chapters IX ff.

1. St. Paul does not wish his adversaries to misunderstand and distort what he has just been saying. He would not have

2. Much every way. First indeed, because the words of God were committed to them.

3. For what if some of them have not believed? shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect? God forbid.

any one think that he meant to say that circumcision, even under the Old Dispensation, had no force or value.

What advantage. Literally, "What excess" (τὸ περισσόν), i.e., what relative gain.

2. St. Paul replies to the foregoing question or difficulty by saying that the advantages and privileges of the Jews over those of the Gentiles are many in every way.

First indeed (πρῶτον μὲν). From this expression some (Beelen, Drach, Lemonnyer, etc.) conclude that St. Paul had it in mind to enumerate the various privileges of the Jews, but lost the thread of his thought and was carried out to something else. It is more probable, however, that πρῶτον here agrees with περισσόν (verse 1), and that, consequently, there is question not of the *first*, but of the *principal superiority* of the Jews, which consisted in their having "the words of God." But even this explanation does not dispel the difficulty of the expression; for if the Apostle speaks of the *principal* privilege, why, it may be asked, does he not afterwards speak of the secondary? It seems as if something was omitted by the Apostle (as in i. 8) which was not considered necessary to his purpose (Lagr.).

The words of God. The Greek Fathers understood "the words" (τὰ λόγια) to refer especially to the Law, which gave the Jews their superiority over the Gentiles. Modern critics believe the λόγια have principal reference to the Messianic promises of which there is special question in iv. 13 ff.; xv. 8. It is more probable, however, that the term embraces the whole body of Sacred Scripture, i.e., of the Old Testament (Lagr., Parry).

In the Vulgate γὰρ is not represented here, and *illis* is added.

3. In this verse St. Paul declares that the incredulity of the Jews will not make God unfaithful to His unconditional promises to them. The incredulity in question doubtless was the fault not of a few, but of the nation as a whole, and signifies their unfaithfulness to God's oracles throughout the course of their history, and in particular with regard to the Messianic prophecies

4. But God is true; and every man a liar, as it is written, That thou mayest be justified in thy words, and mayest overcome when thou art judged.

5. But if our injustice commend the justice of God, what shall we say? Is God unjust, who executeth wrath?

6. (I speak according to man.) God forbid: otherwise how shall God judge this world?

(Num. xiv. 11; xx. 12; Deut. ix. 23; Ps. lxxviii. 22; 1 Cor. x. 7 ff.). And yet the Jews, despite their many infidelities, ever continued to be the depositaries of the promises which God had made in His revelation, and which were realized later on in Christianity.

4. Here the Apostle affirms the absolute fact that God, by His very nature, is true and faithful in the fulfillment of His promises; but man, on the contrary, owing to his corrupt nature, is liable to deceive and to be deceived. The words of Psalm l. 6 are cited and accommodated to the present question to illustrate God's veracity and fidelity. David, after his sins of homicide and adultery (2 Kings xii. 7 ff.), feared that God might recall the promises made to him; but Nathan assured him of the contrary. David, therefore, in the Psalm, confesses his sins in order to show (a) that God is faithful to His promises in spite of man's unfaithfulness, and (b) that God will triumph over the false and suspicious judgments of men regarding His fidelity to His promises.

Now, the Apostle argues, the condition of the Jews is analogous to that of David. Just as the sins of David did not render God unfaithful to His promises to the Psalmist, but rather brought out more manifestly the divine justice and fidelity, so the incredulity of the Jews will not make God unfaithful to the promises He made them. Further on (Chapter IX), the Apostle will speak more definitely of the actual incredulity of the Jews, and will draw out in detail what here he only affirms in a general way.

When thou art judged (*κρίνεσθαι*) is in the Hebrew "when thou judgest."

5, 6. St. Paul here anticipates another objection which may arise out of his doctrine that God's fidelity and justice are made manifest by the sins of men. The sinner might ask, he says in effect, "if my sins cause God's justice to be recognized, is not

7. For if the truth of God hath more abounded through my lie, unto his glory, why am I also yet judged as a sinner?

God unjust in punishing my sins?" The very thought that God could be unjust is blasphemous, and hence the Apostle here hastens to tell us that the objection raised is not from himself, but **according to man**, i.e., after a merely human standard which does not understand the justice and sanctity of God. This impious supposition is energetically rejected by the Apostle, who then replies that if God could not punish sinners because their sins finally redound to His glory, He would never be able to judge the world, either Jewish or pagan, and would consequently never establish justice among men by rewarding the good and punishing the wicked. The objection is refuted by its own absurdity, because God being just, must judge all men according to their deeds.

The sins of men do not cause, but merely occasion the manifestation of God's justice and fidelity; the real cause of this manifestation is God's infinite power which is able to draw good from evil and must by its very nature always issue in something good. Hence it does not follow that sin ever becomes excusable or ceases to deserve punishment.

This world. Literally, "The world," here signifies the Gentiles as distinguished from the Jews (xi. 12, 15). Sometimes the expression embraces all men, as in I Cor. i. 2; sometimes it refers to the enemies of Christ, as in I Cor. i. 20; ii. 12.

In the Vulgate hunc should be omitted.

7. Cornely thinks St. Paul has changed here to speak in the name of a Gentile, who asks why he should be condemned for his lie, i.e., his worship of idols (i. 25), which, by its folly and stupidity has made more manifest the knowledge of the true God, while the Jew with his infidelity is let go free? But as there is nothing to indicate that the Apostle is speaking now in the name of a Gentile any more than in verse 5; and as he nowhere declares that the Jew's sins are to go unpunished, it seems better to hold with the common opinion that there is still question of the Jew. The objection now raised is bolder than that of verse 5, although the principle is the same, namely, that which contributes to the glory of God ought not to be repre-

8. And not rather (as we are slandered, and as some affirm that we say) let us do evil, that there may come good? whose damnation is just.

hensible. In verse 5 the Jew is willing to be judged, but unwilling to suffer punishment; here he does not even want to be condemned as a sinner.

The truth of God, i.e., the truth of His words, in punishing the Jews for their incredulity, as He had promised to do.

My lie, i.e., the incredulity, infidelity and transgressions of the Jew, in spite of God's threats of chastisement. The truth of God's words, and, consequently, His glory, were made more manifest by the fulfillment of His threats of punishment for the Jews' sins.

8. Here again the Apostle shows the absurd consequence of the foregoing false supposition. If sin goes unpunished because it contributes to the glory of God, why not continue to sin for the sake of promoting God's glory? As he tells here in parentheses, this impious doctrine had been imputed to himself by some of his enemies, perhaps on account of his teaching that "where sin abounded, grace did more abound" (v. 20; cf. Gal. iii. 22); but he now rejects this calumny with indignation and declares that eternal damnation will be a just punishment for its authors and for those who teach such a doctrine, making the end justify the means. It is not improbable that this series of objections (verses 5-8) was purposely introduced by the Apostle, in order that he might have a chance to refute the calumny of his adversaries.

THE SCRIPTURES PROVE THAT BOTH JEWS AND GENTILES ARE
ENSLAVED BY SIN, 9-20

9-20. St. Paul takes up here the question interrupted at verse 5. Having shown that all mankind, Jews as well as pagans, are under the cloud of sin, and that neither the privileges and divine favors of the one, nor the gross errors of the other are able to shield from the divine wrath, the Apostle now proceeds to confirm his argument by an appeal to the authority of Sacred Scripture. The Psalmist and the Prophet Isaias are cited to prove the universal sinfulness of men and the need of

9. What then? Do we excel them? No, not so. For we have charged both Jews, and Greeks, that they are all under sin.

10. As it is written: There is not any man just.

11. There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God.

12. All have turned out of the way; they are become unprofitable together: there is none that doth good, there is not so much as one.

redemption. And, lest the Jews might contend that these texts applied only to the Gentiles, the Apostle reminds that the Scriptures have reference primarily to the Jews, to whom they were given, and that they plainly declare no man to be made just before God by the works of the Law.

This section is generally regarded as a conclusion to all that has preceded regarding Jews and Gentiles. The Scriptural terms used in it are very general and applicable to all, even though they seem to pertain somewhat more directly to Jews than to Gentiles (Lagr., Cornely, etc.).

9. The Apostle asks in the name of his fellow-countrymen whether, in spite of their many privileges, the Jews excel the pagans from a moral viewpoint, and are therefore more free from sin than the Gentiles? And he replies in the negative, because both Jews and Gentiles have sinned and are under the yoke of sin, from which neither the natural law, nor the Law of Moses is able to free them (i. 11). The superior privileges of the Jews (verses 1, 2) did not make those of the Apostle's time less sinful as a class than the pagans.

There is much difference of opinion regarding the meaning of *προεχόμεθα*, literally, "are we surpassed," but here translated, "do we excel"; but these different opinions can be reduced to the following: (a) The verb is to be taken in the middle voice, meaning, to seek pretexts or excuses: "What excuse have we then to sustain us at the Judgment?" (Jülicher). (b) The verb is passive: "Are we then surpassed by the Gentiles?" (H. S., Field). (c) The verb is middle, but equivalent to an active: "Do we excel the Gentiles" (Cornely, Lagr., etc.). This last is the traditional interpretation.

10-12. These verses are a free citation of Psalm xiii. 1-3, according to the Septuagint. David in this Psalm is affirming that all men are sinners, and the Apostle, in order to prove his conclusion, that not a few among the Jews and Gentiles, but all

13. Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have dealt deceitfully. The venom of asps is under their lips.

14. Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness:

15. Their feet swift to shed blood:

16. Destruction and misery in their ways:

17. And the way of peace they have not known:

as a class are sinners, cites the Psalmist as a witness that all, whether under the law of nature, or under the Law of Moses are wanting in true justice. The Psalmist is speaking of man left to his own corrupt nature without the aid of grace, and he means to say that not all, but some at least of the sins enumerated in these and in the following verses (13-18) were found in each person.

None that understandeth was applicable to the pagans, who had not the true knowledge of God.

None that seeketh after God referred to the corrupt Jews who failed to serve the God whom they knew.

Unprofitable, i.e., useless in God's service.

None that doth good is descriptive of man without the aid of grace.

13. The first part of this verse is freely borrowed from Psalm v. 10; the last part, from Psalm cxxxix. 4. Although verses 13-18 follow in our Vulgate the preceding verses of Psalm xiii, they really pertain to several other Psalms and to the Prophet Isaias. This custom of citing passages from different parts of Scripture to prove or illustrate the subject in hand was freely made use of by St. Paul, and by the Jewish Rabbis generally.

Their throat, etc. The throat of the sinner, because of the corrupt and evil discourses that proceed from it, is compared to a sepulchre from which vile and poisonous odors are exhaled.

The venom of asps, i.e., a deadly poison.

14. This verse is a free citation of Psalm x. 7, according to the Hebrew.

15-17. These verses are freely borrowed from Isaias lix. 7, 8. They show the degradation of the sinner who, with slight provocation, spills innocent blood and spreads misery and destruction everywhere around him, and who has no peace because filled with hatred, bitterness and sinister designs.

18. There is no fear of God before their eyes.

19. Now we know, that what things soever the law speaketh, it speaketh to them that are in the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may be made subject to God.

20. Because by the works of the law no flesh shall be justified before him. For by the law is the knowledge of sin.

18. This verse, which is almost literally from Psalm xxxv. 2, gives the cause of the foregoing disorders, namely, the lack of fear of God.

19. The Apostle now warns that the Scriptural testimonies just cited have reference principally to the Jews for whom they were primarily written and to whom the Law was given. Hence there is no reason for boasting on the part of the Jews.

The law speaketh. Law is here used for the whole of Scripture, i.e., of the Old Testament. Both the inexcusable Gentiles and the proud Jews are reduced to silence, and are become liable to condemnation before God for their sins.

20. Another reason why there can be no boasting on the part of the Jews, nor for greater reason on the part of the Gentiles, is that no one shall ever be, or ever has been, justified before God by the **works**, i.e., by the legal prescriptions of the Law. This the Apostle here affirms by the words of Ps. cxlii. 2. All the Law could do was to point out what ought to be done and what ought to be avoided, but it was as powerless to give the interior help and strength necessary for the observance of its precepts, as it was to free from sin committed. Obviously the works here spoken of were the legal prescriptions of the Law performed without faith and without the aid of grace. It is not the *knowing*, but the *doing* of the Law (ii. 13), i.e., the observing of the moral precepts of the Law, which grace alone can secure, that will justify and lead to salvation.

TRUE JUSTIFICATION AND SALVATION ARE GRATUITOUS GIFTS OF GOD
BESTOWED ON ALL WHO BELIEVE IN CHRIST, 21-31

21-31. The Apostle now proceeds to show in the rest of the present chapter that, since the advent of Christ, the **justice of God**, i.e., justification independently of the Law, has by the grace of God been made manifest through the preaching of the Gospel.

21. But now without the law the justice of God is made manifest, being witnessed by the law and the prophets.

22. Even the justice of God, by faith of Jesus Christ, unto all and upon all them that believe in him: for there is no distinction:

23. For all have sinned, and do need the glory of God.

And this mode of justification independent of the Law, and due only to faith and the grace of God, is not something new and contrary to the Law, but rather all along has been witnessed to and foretold by the Law and the Prophets. As St. Augustine says: *Novum testamentum in vetere latet, vetus in novo patet*. This justification is new only in the clearer declaration of the condition by which it is to be obtained, namely, through faith in Christ, and in the universality of its extension, which is to all nations, Gentiles as well as Jews.

21. Now, i.e., under the Gospel dispensation.

The justice of God is the same as that spoken of in i. 17, which is given to every man, Jew or Gentile, provided he duly believe in Christ. This and the following verse give the key to the main argument of the whole Epistle.

22. **Even** (δε) does not indicate opposition but rather introduces a further explanation of what is meant by the justice of God, namely, that justice which is given by God to man through faith in Jesus Christ, or through the faith of which Christ is the object. Justification is attributed to faith as to its root and foundation, not as to its formal cause, which is grace. This faith, therefore, which is the root and beginning of justification, is not something natural in man, not the result of natural favors or gifts, as the Pelagians taught, but the product and fruit of the grace of God.

Upon all. These words are wanting in the oldest Greek MSS. and in some versions, but they are generally regarded as authentic, since they are in full conformity with the Apostle's mode of speaking. Likewise the words in **him** are not represented in the Greek of some MSS. and in some copies of the Vulgate.

23. All, Jews and Gentiles, have sinned and are in need of justification (i., ii., iii. 1-20), which all may have through faith in Jesus Christ.

24. Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption, that is in Christ Jesus,

25. Whom God hath proposed to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to the shewing of his justice, for the remission of former sins,

26. Through the forbearance of God, for the shewing of his justice in this time; that he himself may be just, and the justifier of him, who is of the faith of Jesus Christ.

The glory of God (δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ) may mean the glory of the elect in heaven (Cornely); or, by a metaphor, it may signify the beauty of a soul in the state of grace, of which sinners are deprived. Probably the phrase means here the good opinion which God has of the just (Cajetan, Lagr.). Sinners by their lack of grace, are in need of (ὑστεροῦνται), i.e., *they are without*, the favor and good opinion of God.

24. Here the Apostle tells us that the justification, offered to Jews and Gentiles, by which they pass from a state of enmity to a state of friendship with God is **freely**, i.e., gratuitously, granted to all through the grace merited by Christ's Redemption. It presupposes no right on man's part, and hence cannot be merited either by his preceding faith or good works, as the Council of Trent has declared (Sess. VI. cap. 8). Acts of faith, hope, fear and other good works which precede justification are, nevertheless, good dispositions, necessary in adults, that come from the mercy and grace of God (*Conc. Trid.*, Sess. VI. cap. 6).

By his grace. God is the efficient cause of justification; grace, its formal cause; and the redemption of Christ, its meritorious cause (*Conc. Trid.*, Sess. VI. cap. 7).

The redemption, i.e., the ransom that was paid by Christ for our delivery from the slavery of sin. Our justification is gratuitous as regards ourselves, inasmuch as we have been able to merit nothing towards it; but it is not so with regard to Christ who has purchased us at the price of His own precious blood (Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45; 1 Cor. vi. 20; Gal. iii. 13).

25, 26. In these two verses St. Paul continues to explain the nature of justification. Christ has not only paid our ransom, but has also expiated for us.

Whom God hath proposed (προέθετο), i.e., God in His eternal designs has determined to exhibit publicly, on the cross, Jesus

Christ, as a propitiation, or victim of expiation, who, by virtue of the shedding of His blood, has satisfied for our sins, thus appeasing the wrath of God and reconciling man to God.

Propitiation. The Greek word (*ἱλαστήριον*) may signify either a *propitiation* or a *propitiator*; and in this latter sense it is found in the Old Itala and Syriac versions, and it is preferred by some interpreters. Most probably, however, the term here means propitiation, or rather, an instrument of propitiation, or of expiation. God set forth Jesus as an instrument of propitiation and expiation towards Himself; and "through faith" the sinner has access to the fountain of expiation which is in the *blood* of Jesus Christ glorified. Faith is the means through which the fruits of Christ's expiation are applied to men; the blood of Christ was the means by which God effected the propitiation.

To the shewing, etc. The purpose, or final cause of this expiation wrought by the blood of Christ was to manifest God's eternal justice which, outraged by sin, demanded an adequate satisfaction, but which, in times past, was not sufficiently manifested, being held, as it were, in abeyance by His mercy and patience, thus permitting sins to pass unpunished, in order to exhibit more clearly in this present time that He is just in Himself (in demanding an adequate satisfaction for sin), and to render just him who believes in Christ. The Apostle, therefore, considers two epochs: (a) that before the time of Christ, the time of ignorance (Acts xvii. 30), when God, with the exception of a few instances, like the Deluge and the case of Sodom and Gomorrah, bore with sin in patience; and (b) that of the present time, after the coming of Christ, when God's eternal justice is clearly vindicated by the bloody immolation of Christ on the cross, and the sins of men are washed away through faith in that same blood of Christ.

According to the foregoing interpretation "the justice of God" means both God's attribute of justice (verse 25), which in times past was held in abeyance, but in the shedding of Christ's blood has been clearly manifested and satisfied, and the justice (verse 26) which God communicates to man, rendering him just, free from sin. This seems to be the most probable interpretation of the phrase as it occurs in both verses. Certainly "justice" in

27. Where is then thy boasting? It is excluded. By what law? Of works? No, but by the law of faith.

28. For we account a man to be justified by faith, without the works of the law.

verse 26 is wider in its meaning than in the preceding verse (cf. i. 17). Also, according to the interpretation given, the *remissionem* of the Vulgate (verse 25) should be rather *praetermissionem*.

27. Having proved that justification is not from the works of man, but is entirely due to the goodness of God and the merits of the blood of Christ, the Apostle now asks the Jews what they have to boast of; and he himself replies that their cause for boasting has been excluded; it has no further place.

By what law. Better, "By what kind of law," he further asks, is boasting done away with? By the law of works, i.e., the Old Law? No, certainly not; but by the New Law, i.e., the law of faith, which makes justification depend on faith in Jesus Christ, which faith, being a gratuitous gift of God, renders our pride and boasting impossible.

The Old Law did not remove every cause for boasting, because it required works; but the New Law requires only faith (as already explained), and faith is a gift of God requiring only acceptance on man's part. Of course the Old Law was at all times powerless to confer the help needed for its faithful observance. This help, through grace, is amply conferred by the New Law. As St. Augustine says, "The law of works is that which commands what is to be done; the law of faith is faith itself, which obtains the grace to do what the law commands. The law of works is the old law; the law of faith, the new law. The law of works contains the precepts; the law of faith, the help. The law of works gives us light to know; the law of faith, the power to perform," etc. (*De spiritu et littera*, 13, 21).

28. For. The connective γάρ is here preferred by many of the best MSS. (Ⲁ Ⲉ Ⲁ ⲉ ⲑ ⲑ Ⲓ) to the ὅτι of the ordinary Greek (B C K L P). St. Paul is not deducing an inference in this verse, but is rather appealing to the doctrine already established. Throughout this whole chapter he has been opposing faith to the works of the Mosaic Law. Therefore we should translate λογίζομεθα not by "we infer," but by "we think," "we hold."

A man, i.e., every man, Jew or Gentile.

29. Is he the God of the Jews only? Is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also.

30. For it is one God, that justifieth circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith.

To be justified by faith, i.e., faith is the source, the beginning of every one's justification (see on verse 22; *Conc. Trid.*, Sess. VI. cap. 8). It is well known that Luther added here the word *only* to faith, thus altering the text and creating between *faith only* and *faith with works*, an opposition which is found nowhere (Lagr.).

Without the works, etc., i.e., apart from the works of the Mosaic Law, or, for that matter, any other works performed by man alone, without the aid of grace. Justification comes only through faith, and faith is a gratuitous gift of God. Clearly there is question here only of works which precede justification and which are performed without faith or grace,—of which works, whether they be of the Law or purely natural, it is affirmed that they cannot be the source of man's justification. Even those good works preceding justification that are the result of grace cannot be said to merit justification. Works which accompany or follow justification, and which are performed by the aid of grace, are most surely not thought of in this present verse.

The Apostle, therefore, addressing his Jewish and Gentile readers, is speaking in this verse only of works done by the sole help of the Mosaic Law and of the natural law, without faith and without grace. The Jews thought their observance of the prescriptions of the Law of Moses was the source of their justification, while the Gentiles attributed their call to the faith to their philosophy and natural virtues.

That St. Paul never meant to teach anything opposed to the necessity of good works is evident (a) from the preceding chapter where he says (verse 13) "that only the doers of the law shall be justified"; (b) from the Epistle to the Galatians (v. 6) where he says that the only thing that availeth in Christ Jesus is "faith that worketh by charity"; (c) from the first Epistle to the Corinthians (xiii) where he says that faith is nothing without charity.

29, 30. In these verses St. Paul calls attention to the fact that

31. Do we, then, destroy the law through faith? God forbid: but we establish the law.

God is the God of the Gentiles as well as the Jews, and that, being One, He will justify all in the same way, namely, through faith. If justification depended on the works of the Law of Moses, then God would be the God of the Jews only, for whom He provided the means of salvation, namely, the Law, and not of the Gentiles, who were deprived of those means.

An (verse 29) of the Vulgate should be expressed by *aut*, to agree with *ἤ* of the Greek.

Justifieth, *justificat* (verse 30), should be future, "will justify," *justificabit* (δικαιώσει.) The Apostle is speaking about the means through which God in future will justify all men.

The difference in the phrases by faith (ἐκ πίστεως) and through faith (διὰ τῆς πίστεως) does not mark any real distinction between Jews and Gentiles. The different prepositions are used only to vary the style. Furthermore, the Apostle elsewhere (Gal. ii. 16; iii. 8) says that the Gentiles are justified "by faith" (ἐκ πίστεως).

31. This verse is better connected with the following, than with what precedes in the present chapter. From the doctrine of justification through faith, so far explained, it might seem that the law, i.e., the whole economy of revelation in the Old Testament, was useless and devoid of all authority. But the Apostle vigorously rejects such a false conclusion, and declares, on the contrary, that the Law and the Prophets have all along foretold this justification by faith, independently of the works of the Law. Therefore this new mode of justification does not destroy, but rather confirms the teaching of the Old Testament. "Of old the Law and the Prophets have rendered testimony to faith. Therefore, in receiving the faith we show the true rôle of the Law" (Theodoret).

There are other explanations of the phrase, **we establish the law**: (a) In maintaining that the promises of God are fulfilled, we confirm the prophecies (Orig., Ambrst.); (b) grace permits the accomplishment of the law (Aug.). According to Fr. Lagrange these two explanations are to be rejected. The following chapter will show how "we establish the law."

CHAPTER IV

ABRAHAM WAS JUSTIFIED BY FAITH, 1-8

1. What shall we say then that Abraham hath found, who is our father according to the flesh.

1-8. To prove that the Old Testament (iii. 31) had already taught that man was justified by faith and not by works, St. Paul cites the case of Abraham, who was declared just by the Scripture (Gen. xv. 6), and was regarded by the Jews not only as their father, but as a type of justice (ix. 35; Gal. iv. 22), and as the norm according to which his descendants should model their lives. He then goes on to show that Abraham did not receive his justification as a reward of his works, but as a gratuitous gift through faith. David is likewise cited (Ps. xxxi. 1, 2) as proclaiming that man blessed whose justice is conferred by God independently of works.

1. Then (*οὖν, therefore*) shows the connection between this and verse 31 of the preceding chapter. If it be true that justification through faith was taught by the Old Testament, how was Abraham justified? by works or by faith? From the following verse it is evident that Abraham's justification was not by works, but by faith.

According to the flesh. These words, according to the best authorities, should be joined to **our father**, thus: "What hath Abraham, our father according to the flesh, found?" i.e., how was he justified? Abraham was called the father of the Jews "according to the flesh" in opposition to a more extensive spiritual paternity which belonged to him by reason of his faith; by faith he became the spiritual father of all who believe.

Some exegetes join the above phrase to **hath found**, thus: "What hath Abraham found according to the flesh?" i.e., what profit or advantage had Abraham from circumcision? In this interpretation "flesh" means circumcision. Others understand

2. For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory, but not before God.

3. For what saith the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was reputed to him unto justice.

“flesh” to mean works performed by natural strength, hence the meaning would be: “What profit had Abraham in the works performed by his natural strength?” “Before Abraham believed God, what justice do we hear of in him accruing from works?” (Theodoret). This last interpretation is made probable by the sense in which “works” is used in the following verse.

2. **By works.** There is question here only of natural works performed without the aid of grace. The works of the Law of Moses could not be referred to, since the Law did not exist in Abraham’s time. The sense of the verse, therefore, is: If Abraham were justified by natural works, he would have reason to glory before men, i.e., in the natural order, but not **before God**, i.e., in the supernatural order of grace, because in that case justification would not be so much a benefit from God as a reward due to Abraham. We know, however, from the Scriptures that Abraham was justified in the supernatural order, and that, consequently, his justification was due to faith and grace, and not to works.

3. St. Paul now appeals to Scripture (Gen. xv. 6) to prove whereby Abraham was justified, and he finds there no mention of works, but of faith only; it was, therefore, on account of his faith, and not on account of his works, that Abraham was declared just by God. We have not, however, in this verse an explanation of the manner in which Abraham acquired his justification; this is the problem which engages the Apostle’s attention in the following verses (Lagr.).

Abraham believed God, i.e., when God promised him a numerous progeny, although he was without child at the time. Of course, the Apostle is speaking here of the faith which animated the whole life of Abraham, beginning with his vocation (Gen. xvii. 4, 15, 19-21).

It was reputed, i.e., *it was reckoned* (ἐλογίσθη).

The Lutherans pretend to find in this verse a basis for their doctrine of *imputed justice*, according to which one’s sins are not

4. Now to him that worketh, the reward is not reckoned according to grace, but according to debt.

5. But to him that worketh not, yet believeth in him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is reputed to justice, according to the purpose of the grace of God.

really pardoned, but only covered by God for Christ's sake. They say Abraham believed in God, and this faith sufficed that God should declare him just without his actually being so. This is as contrary to the true sense of Gen. xv. 6, as it is opposed to the doctrine of St. Paul.

4, 5. In these verses St. Paul adduces an example drawn from daily life to show that Abraham's justification was not due to works, but was a gratuitous gift of God. A workman, he says, is rewarded not according to favor, i.e., gratuitously, but according to what he deserves in strict justice for his labor. Hence the laborer has a claim to his wages. If, therefore, without works, and only on condition of faith, which is a gratuitous gift of God, one is freely justified, as in the case of Abraham, it cannot be said that one is receiving what is his due; but rather that he is the object of favor and of a gratuitous benefit because of which he has no reason for boasting, either before men or in the sight of God. The works to which St. Paul is referring here, as elsewhere in the same connection, are those which are performed without faith and the help of grace.

In him that justifieth, etc., i.e., in God who has the power to render just him who is unjust or sinful.

His faith is reputed, etc., i.e., his faith is reckoned, etc. Faith does not merit justification, but is the necessary foundation of it. "Nothing of those things which precede justification, whether faith or works, merits the grace itself of justification" (*Conc. Trid.*, Sess. VI. cap. 8).

According to the purpose of the grace of God, i.e., according to the decree of God's mercy by which He has determined from all eternity gratuitously to save men through faith in Christ. These words, however, are most probably a gloss, since they are not found in the Greek MSS., nor in any of the versions, except the Latin. Being a marginal explanation of how "faith is reputed," they at length crept into the text.

6. As David also termeth the blessedness of a man, to whom God reputeth justice without works:

7. Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered.

8. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord hath not imputed sin.

In the Vulgate *imputatur* and *reputatur* would better be *deputatur*. *Secundum propositum gratiae Dei* should be omitted.

6. In chapter iii. 21 St. Paul showed that justification through faith was not something new and strange, having been witnessed to by the Law and the Prophets. Likewise here, after having invoked the authority of the Law, the Apostle adduces a passage of David to prove the gratuitousness of justification. The passage cited is Ps. xxxi. 1, 2. The royal Prophet composed this Psalm after having done penance for his sins of murder and adultery (2 Kings xii. 1 ff.) and been pardoned by God according to the promise of Nathan. Supposing that sins cannot be remitted without an infusion of sanctifying grace the Apostle argues as follows: David declares his sins remitted without making any mention of works; therefore justification is not due to works, but is a gratuitous gift of God. David believed that God spoke to him through Nathan, and this faith was reputed to him unto justice; hence justification is due to faith and not to works, as explained above.

The Vulgate phrase *beatitudinem hominis* means simply, *beatus homo*. The word *accepto* is not represented in the Greek, which reads: *to whom God reckoneth justice without works*.

Here also the Protestants falsely claim to find an argument for their *imputed justice*. If sins are not imputed by God it means that they do not exist—that they have never existed, or have been forgiven. It is absurd and impious to think that God, who hates sin, could impute justice in any way to one whose sins still existed. The “reconciled are holy and unspotted, and blameless before him” (Col. i. 22).

7, 8. Blessed, i.e., happy, because just, free from sin.

Iniquities forgiven, sins covered, not imputed sin, are synonymous phrases which express in different ways how sins no longer exist in the sight of God. There is question throughout here of sins being forgiven without works and without any merits on

9. This blessedness then, doth it remain in the circumcision only, or in the uncircumcision also? For we say that unto Abraham faith was reputed to justice.

the part of the sinner. The example of Abraham illustrates the positive side of justification through the infusion of grace in view of faith, but without regard for works; while the example of David, the justified sinner, shows the negative side, i.e., the forgiveness of sins without works. In both cases, however, faith is supposed, and this shows the connection between the ideas of verses 5-8.

The *imputavit* of the Vulgate does not so well express the Greek as would *imputaret* (Lagr.).

THE UNIVERSALITY OF JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH IS PROVED BY THE
EXAMPLE OF ABRAHAM, WHO WAS JUSTIFIED BEFORE CIRCUM-
CISION, 9-16

9-16. After having proved, by the example of Abraham and the words of the Psalmist, that justification is a gratuitous gift to those who believe, the Apostle now demonstrates its universality by an appeal to the same authorities. It extends to the circumcised and to the uncircumcised alike, as is clear from the case of Abraham, who was justified by faith before he was circumcised, and afterwards received that rite in confirmation of the righteousness he had obtained through faith in order that he might be the father of all who would believe, whether Jew or Gentile. For the promises were not given under law, but under a state of justice which was due to faith. If the inheritance of Abraham is conditioned by the Law, then Abraham's faith is without effect, and the promises made to him by reason of his faith are annulled, because the effect of the Law is wrath. But God made faith the condition of the promises given to Abraham and his seed, that is, to all believers, in order that they might never be annulled.

9. The Apostle now asks if the blessedness of justification through faith which the Psalmist extols for the circumcised, i.e., for the Jews, is applicable also to the uncircumcised, i.e., to the Gentiles. First of all, it may be noted that David's words

10. How then was it reputed? When he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision.

11. And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the justice of the faith, which he had, being uncircumcised; that he might be the father of all them that believe, being uncircumcised, that unto them also it may be reputed to justice:

are general, making no distinction or restriction. Further, Scripture gives the answer; for in Gen. xv. 6 we are told that Abraham, who had not received circumcision, was justified by faith regardless of works. The case of Abraham, therefore, proves the universality of justification by faith for all, Jews and Gentiles, without the works of the Law.

10. St. Paul asks in this verse whether Abraham was justified before or after circumcision; and he replies that the Patriarch was justified before he was circumcised. Abraham's justification is narrated in Gen. xv. 6, and his circumcision, some fourteen years later, is recorded in Gen. xvii. 24. Hence, as said above, justification by faith, without the works of the Law, is possible to all, Gentiles as well as Jews.

St. Jerome, St. Chrysostom and others have thought that Paul was not alluding here to the first justification of Abraham, since it seems quite impossible to suppose that the Patriarch had remained a sinner up to the time indicated in Gen. xv. 6. Abraham was certainly the friend of God when he left Chaldea. Estius has, therefore, suggested that the Apostle is speaking here of progress in justification; but this seems unlikely, because the Apostle is speaking of justification in an absolute sense. St. Thomas has carefully avoided indicating any time for Abraham's justification other than that it was anterior to his reception of circumcision; and this is really the only point St. Paul is wishing to make. Abraham was a type of justification before he was circumcised. The first mention in Scripture of the Patriarch's justification was prior to his reception of circumcision, and that is all the Apostle is concerned with.

11. If circumcision had no part in the justification of Abraham, why did he receive it? The Apostle here tells us. Abraham received circumcision as an external sign or seal of the justification which he had before received by faith.

A seal was an external sign fixed to a contract which guaran-

12. And might be the father of circumcision; not to them only, that are of the circumcision, but to them also that follow the steps of the faithful, that is in the uncircumcision of our father Abraham.

13. For not through the law was the promise to Abraham, or to his seed, that he should be heir of the world; but through the justice of faith.

need the mutual agreement of the contracting parties. Seals of clay attached to objects were an indication of property or possession (Lagr.). Accordingly, circumcision was a seal of the alliance or contract between God and His people, a sign showing that a man belonged to Yahweh, that he was the property of Yahweh. It was also, as here stated, a seal or guarantee of the justification received through faith, i.e., of the justification of which faith is the beginning.

That he might be, etc. (*εἰς τὸ εἶναι*) governs all that follows in this and the next verse. Hence the meaning is that by justifying Abraham before circumcision God wished to make him the father and model of all the Gentiles who would believe, as well as of all the believing Jews; so that justification might come to all as it came to him, namely, through faith. The paternity of Abraham, therefore, was not only carnal and national, but also spiritual and universal, extending to all believers.

12. Abraham received circumcision that he might also be the spiritual father of the Jews, or of the circumcised, provided they imitated the faith which he had before he was circumcised. Circumcision of the flesh and carnal descent from Abraham, if they are not accompanied by faith, do not give the Jews any right to regard him as their spiritual father. "Then will you have Abraham for your father, when you walk in the steps of his faith" (St. Chrys.).

The reading of the Vulgate is not exact here. We should read *sed et ipsi* in place of *sed et iis qui* (Cornely).

13. Since the giving of the Law intervened between the promise and its realization, it might appear that the observance of the Law was a condition of inheriting the promise. But it was not on account of Abraham's observance of the Law (which did not exist at the time), but on account of the justification he received through faith that God promised to him and to his posterity the inheritance of the world. Hence it is not the Law of Moses,

14. For if they who are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, the promise is made of no effect.

15. For the law worketh wrath. For where there is no law, neither is there transgression.

but faith, that gives the right to have part in the promises made to Abraham and his spiritual children. To make a promise given to faith depend on the Law is to nullify faith; the function of the Law was to emphasize the nature of sin, and thereby *work wrath*.

The promise which God made to Abraham and his descendants was the land of Canaan (Gen. xiii. 15; xviii. 8), which was a figure or symbol of the Messianic kingdom and of all the spiritual blessings and benefits of that kingdom; for God also promised that in Abraham and in his seed, i.e., in the Messiah who would be born of the line of Abraham, all the nations of the earth should be blessed (Gen. xii. 3-7; xviii. 18; xxii. 17 ff.).

The *aut* of the Vulgate here is equivalent to *et*, because the Greek η after a negative amounts to a copulative conjunction.

14. It is clear from the preceding verse that the promises made to Abraham did not depend on the Law of Moses, but rather that they pertained to all who would imitate the faith of Abraham. And if it were otherwise, if the heirs of the promise were only those who observed the precepts of the Mosaic Law, faith would be made void and rendered useless, because in that case the inheritance would be a reward due to works. Likewise the promise would be abolished, because it was a unilateral contract by which God freely and gratuitously bound Himself to give the inheritance to those who would have faith; whereas justification by the Law would imply a bilateral contract between the people who pledged themselves to observe the Law, and God who pledged Himself to give the inheritance. Thus, contrary to the teaching of the Scriptures, neither justification nor the inheritance would be from faith and a gratuitous gift of God (Sales).

15. Another proof that the promise and the inheritance did not depend on the observance of the Law is drawn from the very nature of the Law, which gave no help for its own observance, but made man a transgressor, and thus a violator of the condi-

16. Therefore is it of faith, that according to grace the promise might be firm to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all,

tions needed on his part for obtaining the promise and the inheritance. By commanding some things and forbidding others the Law was the indirect cause, or the occasion of sin, and consequently of divine wrath, because it did not give the help and strength necessary to carry out its commands and prohibitions. That the Law was not observed is clear from Chapter II. Hence if the Law had anything to do with the promise, it would be only an obstacle to the latter's fulfillment.

For where there is no law, etc., i.e., where there is an absolute promise, not dependent on the observance of the Law, there can be no prevarication which would prevent God from fulfilling His promise (Cornely).

Transgression means a sin committed against the positive law given after the alliance between God and man was entered into. That which especially excited the divine anger was not so much sin in itself, as transgression, or the violation of the positive contract made with God (St. Aug., St. Thomas, etc.). Cornely objects to this opinion and says that sin in itself, i.e., the violation of the natural law, excited the divine anger, and that transgression only caused greater indignation on the part of God. At any rate, if the promises depended on the actual observance of the Law, the non-observance of the latter would have frustrated all hope of the fulfillment of the former.

The *enim* of the Vulgate is according to γάρ, instead of δέ, of the Greek. The reading γάρ is to be preferred (Nestle).

16. Since the promise could not be realized if it depended on the observance of the Law, God made it depend on faith, a gift of God, so that it might be a gift according to grace, i.e., entirely gratuitous, and firm, i.e., absolute, not dependent on any condition; and that it might extend to all the seed, i.e., to all Jews and Gentiles, who would imitate the faith of Abraham. The Law is excluded in order that the promise may be entirely the work of grace, and that it may be assured to all.

St. Paul, although writing to the Romans, who were mostly of Gentile origin, speaks of Abraham as the father of us all,

17. (As it is written: I have made thee a father of many nations,) before God, whom he believed, who quickeneth the dead; and calleth those things that are not, as those that are.

because the great Patriarch was in fact the spiritual father of all, Gentiles as well as Jews, who imitate his faith.

The Vulgate *ut secundum gratiam firma sit* should be *ut secundum gratiam, ut firma sit*, so as to distinguish the two finalities of the promise (Lagr.).

WHAT KIND OF FAITH WAS REPUTED TO ABRAHAM UNTO JUSTICE? 17-25

17-25. Having shown that God wished the promised inheritance to depend on the justice that comes through faith so that it might be assured to Abraham and to all his spiritual children, whether of Jewish or pagan origin, St. Paul now begins to describe the faith of the Patriarch. This he does for the purpose of making known to all those who would have part in the promised blessings what kind of faith they also must possess. It must be firm and unwavering in spite of human difficulties and natural objections, resting entirely upon God who is able to fulfil all His promises. Such perfect faith it was that God reckoned sufficient in Abraham unto justification. What the Scriptures record of this admirable faith of the great Patriarch, St. Paul says was written for us, that we, by imitating that same faith, may be justified, believing in the Omnipotent God who has raised from the dead Jesus Christ, our Lord and Redeemer.

17. The reference in parentheses is to Gen. xvii. 4, 5, according to the LXX, where it is recorded that God changed the name of the Patriarch from Abram, *high father*, to Abraham, *father of a multitude*. Abraham was in fact the father of other peoples, besides the Jews (Gen. xxv. 1, 2; xxxvi. 1 ff.); but the reference here is to his spiritual paternity, by which he became the father of all who afterwards share his faith.

Before God. These words are to be connected with the end of the preceding verse, because the parenthesis really commences in the middle of a sentence. Abraham is the spiritual father of us all, and St. Paul is picturing him before God (Gen. xviii. 22),

18. Who against hope believed in hope; that he might be made the father of many nations, according to that which was said to him: So shall thy seed be.

19. And he was not weak in faith; neither did he consider his own body now dead, whereas he was almost an hundred years old, nor the dead womb of Sara.

accepting on faith the announcement that he is to be the father of a numerous people.

Whom he believed, etc. The object of Abraham's faith was God Omnipotent who was able to give anew to the aged Patriarch and Sara, now far beyond the age of generating and bearing children, the power to have an offspring, who would be Isaac, the child of promise. Thus God would be said to *quicken the dead* loins of Abraham and the womb of Sara his wife, and to call people that did not exist and seemed not possible to come from Abraham, as though they were already in being.

The Vulgate *tanquam ea quae sunt* would be rendered better by *tanquam sint* or *ac si essent* (Lagr.).

18. St. Paul now begins to extol the faith of the Patriarch, which was neither baffled nor weakened by human obstacles. Inspired by the words of God, Abraham, against all human hope, believed that he would have an offspring and become the father of a numerous people, although he was already old and his wife Sara was sterile.

Believed in hope, i.e., not with a human but with a supernatural hope, he believed the promise of God, because he knew God was omnipotent and most faithful and true.

That he might be made, etc., as was promised in Gen. xv. 5: "Look up to heaven and count the stars, if thou canst; so shall thy seed be."

The *in spem* of the Vulgate should be *in spe*.

19. Although Abraham was about a hundred years old (Gen. xvii. 1) and Sara ninety when God promised him the birth of Isaac (Gen. xvii. 15-21), his faith did not weaken; neither did he consider the deadness of his generative powers, nor the sterility of the womb of his wife.

According to the best Greek reading the second clause of this verse is not negative, and so should read: "And without being weak in faith, he considered his own body now dead, whereas

20. In the promise also of God he staggered not by distrust; but was strengthened in faith, giving glory to God:

21. Most fully knowing, that whatsoever he has promised, he is able also to perform.

22. And therefore it was reputed to him unto justice.

he was almost a hundred years old, and the dead womb of Sara." That Abraham did believe we are assured from his practice of circumcision. St. Paul represents the Patriarch as appearing to feel that humanly speaking there was some reason for doubt (Gen. xvii. 17), but as not at all yielding to the doubt, despite the difficulty of the situation. It is said in Gen. xvii. 17 that Abraham laughed at the thought that he and Sara should have a son when they were already so old, but this indicated no doubt on Abraham's part; it only showed that the Patriarch appreciated the difficulty of the matter, and his reflection was afterwards expressed in the name of Isaac, which means *laughter*. Cornely thinks Abraham laughed for joy. His laugh was "an indication, not of incredulity, but of exultation" (St. Ambrose).

It is true that Abraham's body, here termed *dead* as to its powers of generation, was able forty years later to beget other children by Ketura (Gen. xxv. 1, 2), but this was due to the miraculous power given the Patriarch before the birth of Isaac, which abided with him long afterwards.

20. While the promise made to Abraham was somewhat astonishing to him, still he did not hesitate, but by faith abandoned himself to God, and thus gave glory to God's fidelity and omnipotence. God, therefore, did not reprove Abraham, as He did Sara for her laugh (Gen. xviii. 10).

In place of the Vulgate's *in repromissione etiam*, it is better to read *ad promissionem autem* (Lagr.).

21. This is another acknowledgment of God's omnipotence. Faith in His veracity is also implied, as appears from the preceding verses.

The emphatic *quaecunque* of the Vulgate should be simply *quae*.

22. Abraham's full unshaken faith in God's veracity and power, his complete subjection of his understanding and will to God was imputed to him *unto justice*, i.e., as the beginning and root of his justification. It was only by his perfect, strengthened

23. Now it is not written only for him, that it was reputed to him unto justice,

24. But also for us, to whom it shall be reputed, if we believe in him, that raised up Jesus Christ, our Lord, from the dead,

25. Who was delivered up for our sins, and rose again for our justification.

faith that Abraham was justified and gave glory to God (Cornely).

23, 24. Since Abraham was constituted by God the spiritual father of all who would imitate his faith, his story was written not only for his sake, to honor him, but also for all of us who believe (*τοῖς πιστεύουσιν*), i.e., he was a type and model for all future believers. Just as he was justified on account of his faith in God's promise, and not by any precedent merit of his own, so also we shall be gratuitously justified by God if we have proper faith in Jesus Christ. Abraham firmly believed that God would give new vigor to his aged body and to the sterile womb of his wife, so that the child of promise might come to him, and so likewise must we believe in the Resurrection of our Lord from the dead, if we would be justified. The Resurrection was the one great miracle of Christ which gave the seal of divine approbation to all His other miracles, and to all the doctrines He had preached to the world. Faith, therefore, in this miracle implies faith in Christ's Divinity and in all else that He said and did.

Unto justice (Vulg., *ad justitiam*) of verse 23 is not represented in the Greek.

25. Christ was delivered up to death and died to make atonement and to offer satisfaction to divine justice for our sins (2 Cor. v. 20; 1 Pet. ii. 22, 24). The first use of for (*διὰ*) in this verse expresses the *motive*, the reason on account of which Christ died, namely, for *our sins* (Isa. liii. 4); the second for (*διὰ*) expresses *purpose*, the final cause, for which Christ rose from the dead, namely, for our justification. It is true that by His death our Lord merited for us remission of sins, justification, and glory. But in order that we might profit by these merits, it was necessary that He should rise again; because, according to the plan of divine Providence, it was only after the Resurrection that the Apostles were to go forth into the world and preach the faith through which

alone we can be justified. Hence it is said that without faith in the Resurrection of Christ all "our faith is vain" (1 Cor. xv. 14). Our Lord therefore rose again, or was *raised up* (ἡγέρθη), for our justification. After His death Christ was no longer a *viator*, and so could not merit, properly speaking, by His Resurrection, and yet His Resurrection is truly the exemplary cause or type of the newness of life of the justified Christian.

It is said that Jesus Christ was **delivered up**, i.e., He was delivered up to death by His Father (John iii. 16; Rom. viii. 32), and by the Jews, who were the human agents of the divine plan, to show His obedience to His heavenly Father; and in another sense He delivered up Himself (Gal. ii. 20; Eph. v. 2) to show the willingness with which He suffered for us.

CHAPTER V

Following Cornely and others we have made the second section of the Dogmatic Part of this Epistle begin with the present chapter (see *Introd.*, vii). Up to this chapter the Apostle has been engaged in showing the need of redemption and the necessity of obtaining justification through faith. For him justification is essentially the same as sanctification, although he seems to restrict the term to the first justification from a state of sin and unbelief to a life of faith and sanctification through grace. Accordingly, after having discussed in the first section of the Dogmatic Part of the Epistle the origin and source of the new life of justification, he passes on in the second section to dilate upon the fruits of this new Christian life of sanctification.

THE FIRST FRUITS OF JUSTIFICATION ARE PEACE WITH GOD AND HOPE OF FUTURE GLORY; THE LOVE OF GOD FOR US, MANIFESTED IN GIVING TO US JESUS, I-II

I-II. In these verses we have an enumeration of the first fruits and blessings of justification. Man justified through faith in Christ enjoys first of all a state of peace. And while the present life is a time of trial, we have the hope that the same

1. Being justified therefore by faith, let us have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ:

2. By whom also we have access through faith into this grace, wherein we stand, and glory in the hope of the glory of the sons of God.

love which freed us from sin will also maintain us in our new and perfect state.

But these observations led the Apostle to reflect again on the necessity of justification, and consequently also on original sin, and the relation between it and the Law, on the one hand, and grace and justification, on the other. As a consequence, the remaining verses (12-21) of the chapter treat of the part played by sin, the Law, grace and justice in the history of humanity down to the time of Christ (Lagr.).

On account of the subjects discussed in the second part of this chapter Fr. Lagrange thinks it better to regard the whole chapter as pertaining to the first main part of the Epistle rather than to the second, or as suspended, so to say, between the two. Here, however, we have followed the division given by Cornely.

1. **Let us have peace.** The subjunctive reading of this clause (*ἔχωμεν*) has the support of the best MSS.; and yet the indicative (*ἔχομεν*) is preferred by Cornely, Lipsius, etc., because as these authors observe, peace with God is the natural result of justification, not of special personal effort after justification. Still, the phrase can readily mean: "Let us maintain the peace we have by sinning no more, by not incurring again the anger of God, or by reflecting on the anguish of soul we had while in sin."

Through our Lord, etc., i.e., through the merits of whose Passion and death we have obtained the grace of reconciliation with God (2 Cor. v. 18).

2. **By whom**, etc. By the merits of Christ we have obtained through faith, as through its beginning and root, the grace of justification which we now enjoy. Likewise through the same merits we glory and rejoice in the hope—lost through sin, but regained in justification—of having one day a part in the glory and happiness of the children of God in heaven.

The term *προσαγωγήν* means that Christ has actually reinstated us in the favor of God.

3. And not only so; but we glory also in tribulations, knowing that tribulation worketh patience;

4. And patience trial; and trial hope;

5. And hope confoundeth not: because the charity of God is poured forth in our hearts, by the Holy Ghost, who is given to us.

Of the sons (Vulg., *filiorum* before *Dei*) is wanting in the Greek. *Fide* is more literal than *per fidem* (Lagr.).

3, 4. Being justified we not only rejoice in present peace and in the hope of future rewards; but we even find pleasure in trials and troubles, because through faith we know that these give occasion for the exercise of the virtue of patience: they try our constancy and fortitude in the service of God, and thus increase our hope of future glory. We are purified and humbled by afflictions. "As gold and silver are tried by fire, so are acceptable men in the furnace of humiliation" (Eccles. i. 5).

St. James (i. 3) says, "the trying of faith worketh patience," i.e., the tribulation which tests faith produces patience. But St. Paul here (verse 4) by **trial** means the result of patient endurance, the state of those whom God has *tested* and *proved*, like gold in the furnace (cf. Philip. ii. 22; 2 Cor. ii. 9; ix. 13; xiii. 3). Hence the former is speaking of the cause of patience; the latter, of its effect or result.

5. **Hope confoundeth not**, i.e., our hope of future glory is not vain and deceptive like human hope, which rests on the uncertain power and fidelity of man; our hope is unshakable because grounded on the power and fidelity of God. The proof of this is that the **charity of God**, i.e., the love God has for us (Cornely, Lagr., and others) "is poured forth in our hearts, by the Holy Ghost, who is given to us" at Baptism; and this love of God for us now is an earnest of our future bliss with Him. Love or charity is attributed to the Holy Ghost by appropriation, because the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity proceeds from the mutual love of the Father and the Son.

Who is given to us. Literally, "Who hath been given to us."

The charity of God is understood by other authorities (St. Aug., Martini, etc.) to mean the love we have for God. Since the love we have for God is the effect of God's love for us, it seems reasonable to understand the "charity of God" both in

6. For why did Christ, when as yet we were weak, according to the time, die for the ungodly?

7. For scarce for a just man will one die; yet perhaps for a good man some one would dare to die.

8. But God commendeth his charity towards us; because when as yet we were sinners, according to the time,

9. Christ died for us; much more therefore, being now justified by his blood, shall we be saved from wrath through him.

this sense and in the sense given above. Both God's love for us and our love for Him are a pledge of salvation and future glory, because charity or sanctifying grace is a habit of the soul and already a participation of the Divine Nature.

6. Another proof of God's love for us, and of the consequent certainty of our hope, is found in the fact that Christ died for our salvation. When **we were weak**, etc., i.e., when we were in a state of sin and unable to save ourselves, Christ at the precise and opportune time foretold by the Prophets and fore-ordained by the Eternal Father, gave up His life on the cross **for the ungodly**, i.e., for sinners, to save those who were His own enemies.

In Greek the verse is not in an interrogative, but in a declarative form, *ἐτι γάρ*, according to most MSS. The Vulgate reading, however, is very old, and is preferred by Cornely and many others.

7. To show still more the charity of God for us, which was manifested in the death of Christ, St. Paul notes that it is very difficult to find anyone who would be willing to sacrifice his life, even for a just and good man; while to die for one's own enemies, as Christ has done, is indeed a singular and unheard of thing. The words just (*δίκαιος*) and good (*ἀγαθός*) here are usually taken as synonymous; but some authorities see in the former an honest man, and in the latter a benefactor. Hence there would be a stronger reason for dying for the "good man" than for him who is only "just," i.e., *honest*.

8, 9. In these verses St. Paul shows the forceful reasons we have in hoping for salvation and future glory. God, he says, **commendeth**, i.e., *proves* (*συνίστησι*) His charity towards us especially in this (as said above, in verse 6) that He has offered up Christ in death for us while we were yet His enemies. If He did so

10. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son; much more, being reconciled, shall we be saved by his life.

11. And not only so; but also we glory in God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received reconciliation.

much for us while we were still in sin and enmity towards Him, how much more will He save us eternally, now that we have been justified by the blood of Christ! If the death of Christ for sinners is a proof of God's love for us, it is also a proof of the union between God and Christ, and shows that God in Christ was redeeming the world (2 Cor. v. 19) (Lagr.). These verses illustrate how comparatively easy salvation has become under the Christian dispensation, if only men care to make use of the means provided for salvation.

The words, according to the time (Vulg., *secundum tempus*) of verse 8, are not in the Greek, and are regarded as a gloss introduced here from verse 6. The *in nobis* of the Vulgate should be *in nos* or *erga nos*, to agree with the Greek.

10. In a positive form, founded on the contrast between Christ's ignominious death and glorified life, the Apostle here repeats the same thought as in the preceding verse. If through the death of Christ we were changed from enemies to friends of God, how much more now, being His friends, shall we be saved unto life everlasting through the same Christ, risen, glorified, and immortal! Christ who paid such a price to redeem us, will surely complete His work by saving us eternally, if we will only coöperate with His grace.

According to the best Greek reading, **by his life** should be "in his life"; it is by having part *in* the Resurrection life of Jesus that we shall be saved.

11. **And not only so**, i.e., not only shall we be saved from the wrath of God (verse 9) and obtain life eternal (verse 10), but even now, in this present life, we glory and rejoice in God our Father, to whom we are united by charity, and whose adopted sons we are through the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ, who by His death has reconciled us to the Father. God has loved us, has justified us through Christ, has given us His Holy Spirit—He will surely complete His work in us.

12. Wherefore as by one man sin entered into this world, and by sin death; and so death passed upon all men, in whom all have sinned.

The indicative *gloriamur* of the Vulgate is in participial form in Greek, *καυχώμενοι*.

SIN AND DEATH CAME BY ADAM, GRACE AND LIFE BY CHRIST, 12-21

12-21. After speaking in verses 1-11 of the first fruits of justification and reconciliation with God, which are universally extended to all men on condition of proper faith in Christ, the Apostle now turns to reflect on original sin, the root and beginning of all human ills, which also, but in a contrary manner, has universally affected all mankind. Having spoken of the universality of the remedy and its effects, the Apostle is reminded, or is in a better position, to speak of, and insist again upon the universality of the disease. Through one man came the curse upon all, through one man reconciliation is provided for all. Comparing Adam and Christ he shows that, whereas through the former we were divested of grace and lost our supernatural gifts and our rights to heaven, through the latter we have been reinstated in God's favor and enriched with benefits even more abundant in many ways than those which we lost in Adam.

12. Wherefore (*διὰ τοῦτο*) is only a simple connective used to bridge over the transition from what has preceded. What follows in the chapter is not, therefore, a conclusion of what has preceded in verses 1-11.

As introduces the thought, which, however, is not completed in this verse. This defective sentence structure, or anacoluthon, is a mark of the Apostle's deeper feelings. He begins his phrase, but is then so carried away by other thoughts that he forgets its proper termination. Yet, from verses 18 ff. we know that his thought was as follows: "As by one man (Adam) sin entered into this world, etc., so by one man (Jesus Christ) has the grace of justification entered into the world," etc. As Adam, by his disobedience, brought sin and death upon all his descendants, so Christ by His obedience has merited justification and life for all who through faith become His adopted children.

By one man, i.e., by Adam (verse 14). Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 22.

Sin (ἡ ἁμαρτία), i.e., original sin personified, not sin in general. With the article the term ἁμαρτία always signifies original sin, together with its consequent evils; whereas without the article it means actual sin, or sin in general (Prat). The first actual sin was committed by Eve; but there is question here of the sin of Adam only. Adam was constituted by God not only the physical, but also the moral head of the human race; and consequently the sin committed by him has been transmitted along with human nature to all mankind, as an inheritance passes from a father to his children. All human beings, therefore, as descendants of Adam, have shared in his transgression and are stained with sin from the beginning of their existence; and thus they are born into the world as enemies of God and children of wrath (*Conc. Trid.*, Sess. V. can. 3).

Into this world. Literally, "Into the world," i.e., into the souls of men, infecting the whole human race. Doubtless, also, the pernicious effects of Adam's sin have been felt in all physical nature.

And by sin, i.e., by original sin, as is evident from the use of the article in Greek, as before.

Death means physical and moral death, death in general, which came upon all mankind by Adam's sin. Death is at once the result and the chastisement of sin. Cf. Gen. ii. 17; iii. 19; Wis. i. 13; 1 Cor. xv. 21.

The words in whom (ἐφ' ᾧ, Vulgate, *in quo*) have caused much dispute among interpreters. The phrase is understood by Ambrosiaster, and by all the Latins after him, to refer to Adam, in whom all have sinned. But this understanding of the phrase causes such grammatical difficulty that it seems better, with the Greek Fathers and most modern scholars, to render it by *because*, or *inasmuch as*. These latter authorities rightly observe that ᾧ, as a masculine pronoun, should naturally refer to the noun nearest to it, namely, to **death** or **world**, rather than to the more distant **men**; and also that ἐνί never has the meaning of ἐν, *in*. Cf. Prat, *La Théol. de S. Paul*, I, p. 296 ff.; Cornely, Lagrange, etc., h. l. However the expression may be rendered, St. Paul's meaning is clear, namely, that **all men** have sinned in Adam, and so have inherited the evil

13. For until the law sin was in the world; but sin was not imputed, when the law was not.

14. But death reigned from Adam unto Moses, even over them also who have not sinned after the similitude of the transgression of Adam, who is a figure of him who was to come.

consequences of his sin. The only exception to this rule is found in the Blessed Virgin Mary who, although born of Adam, was preserved by special privilege from every stain of original sin.

The following doctrines are taught in this verse, as the Council of Trent has declared: (a) By the sin of one man, Adam, **sin entered into this world**, i.e., came upon the human race; (b) all men have incurred the guilt of this sin; (c) in consequence of this guilt all men die (Rickaby). The opinion of some non-Catholics (cf. Parry, h. l.), that **death passed upon all men**, not because all shared in the sin of Adam, but because each and every man in turn sinned by actual personal sins cannot account for the death of infants, idiots and similar non-accountables: these surely did not die on account of their own personal sins, since they were incapable of sinning.

It is more conformable to the Greek to omit *hunc* before *mundum* of the Vulgate.

13, 14. That the Apostle was speaking of original sin, i.e., of the sin of Adam, and not of actual sins, when he said in the preceding verse, "all have sinned," is evident from the present verses. For here he says that between Adam and Moses death, the effect of Adam's sin, **reigned**, i.e., was inflicted on all, even on those who had committed no actual sins, such as infants, imbeciles and the like. Since, therefore, death was in the world, afflicting all, from Adam to Moses, i.e., before there was any other cause for universal death, except the sin of Adam, it follows that all had sinned in Adam.

Until the law, i.e., from the time of Adam to the Law of Moses.

Sin, i.e., actual sin, as is evident from the omission of the article in Greek before *ἀμαρτία*.

Was in the world, i.e., among men,—actual sins were committed by mankind; but these sins were **not imputed**, i.e., were not so imputed as to be considered in every instance as

deserving of death, and consequently could not have been the cause of death, because the positive law was not existing which inflicted such a punishment on sinners for their personal offences. The sins committed were against the natural law, which did not then oblige under pain of temporal death. These sins, however, would be punished by God on the day of judgment (ii. 14-16). Hence, such offences were "not imputed" *ad poenam*, but they were *ad culpam*.

The Apostle wishes to say that at least not all the sins committed between Adam and Moses were in themselves so serious as to deserve death—the death which fell upon all. That there were during this period some sins in themselves deserving of death, such as those that occasioned the Deluge, the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, and the like,—which sins hastened and made more terrible the punishment of death, the Apostle does not here deny. But it must be remembered that, as death to all was due to the sin of Adam, so the extreme gravity of personal sins after Adam found its explanation in Adam's fall.

Who have not sinned, etc. Better, "who had not sinned," etc., i.e., who, like infants, imbeciles and the like, had not committed actual, deliberate, grievous sins, as Adam did. Since, therefore, after the sin of Adam death was inflicted even upon those who had committed no actual sins, it is clear that death is the resultant chastisement of the first sin. That actual sins were committed between Adam and Moses is evident from the Bible and is here taken for granted by St. Paul, but those sins were not in themselves punishable by death, because they were not opposed to any positive law then existing which imposed such a punishment.

Who is a figure, etc., i.e., Adam, by contraries, as well as by certain resemblances, was a figure or type of Christ. As Adam, the first physical man, by his disobedience, brought death upon all mankind, so Christ, the first spiritual man, i.e., the second-first man, by His obedience and merits, brought life and justification to all (verse 19). This idea of Adam being a figure of Christ somewhat completes the comparison begun in verse 12. Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 22, 45-49.

15. But not as the offence, so also the gift. For if by the offence of one, many died; much more the grace of God, and the gift, by the grace of one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.

The *imputabatur* and *esset* of the Vulgate (verse 13) would be expressed, more conformably to the Greek, by the present tense, *imputatur* and *est*. Corresponding changes should be made in the English translation.

15. The Apostle now begins to show the points of difference between Adam, the type, and Christ, the antitype; and he says that the detriment and evil caused by the sin of the former has not been so destructive in its effects, as the grace and gift of the latter has been abundant and reparatory in its consequences.

But (ἀλλά) introduces the contrasts between Adam and Christ.

The offence (παράπτωμα) means the fall, or personal sin of Adam.

The gift means the gratuitous merits which Christ bequeathed to the world by His death on the cross.

If by the offence, etc. Although hypothetical in form, this proposition, like that in verse 17 below, is absolute in meaning, because the condition was entirely verified.

Of one, i.e., of Adam.

Many (οἱ πολλοί) signifies all men who are descendants of Adam, as is evident from verses 12 and 18, where it is expressly said that *all* have incurred the penalty of death.

Died (ἀπέθανον) refers to natural or physical death, considered as the punishment of the sin of Adam or spiritual death.

The grace, etc., i.e., the goodness and benevolence of God, from whom all good things come, and especially the gift (δωρεά), i.e., justification. If the sin of Adam has exercised so great an evil influence upon all humanity, much more, says the Apostle, has the grace of Christ exercised a contrary influence for the good of all. The range of sin was equalled by the range of grace, but it was surpassed in effect by the latter.

Unto many (εἰς τοὺς πολλούς), i.e., unto all men. There is absolutely no difference between the extension of the grace of Christ and that of the sin of Adam. *All men* are concerned in both cases, even though all do not profit by the former, and hence the *plures* of the Vulgate here should be *omnes*.

16. And not as it was by one sin, so also is the gift. For judgment indeed was by one unto condemnation; but grace is of many offences, unto justification.

17. For if by one man's offence death reigned through one; much more they who receive abundance of grace, and of the gift, and of justice, shall reign in life through one, Jesus Christ.

18. Therefore, as by the offence of one, unto all men to condemnation; so also by the justice of one, unto all men to justification of life.

16. A second difference between the sin of Adam and the gift of God is found in their respective effects. On account of the one sin of Adam the judgment of God's condemnation (κρίμα) is pronounced upon all men; but by the grace of Christ all men are justified, both from that one sin and from all other personal sins. "One sin availed to bring in death and condemnation; but the grace of God took away not that sin only, but all the sins that came in after it" (St. Chrys.).

Judgment (κρίμα) means *condemnation*, God's decision to punish.

Condemnation (κατάκριμα) means an extension of the decision to punish *εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους* (verse 18).

Justification (δικαίωμα) means a sentence of acquittal, on condition of faith.

The reading of the Vulgate *per unum peccatum*, although supported by a number of Greek MSS., is not considered so good as that of several other MSS. and versions, *per unum peccantem, through one who has sinned* (δι' ἐνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος).

17. Another contrast is deduced from the respective effects of the sin and the gift. If through one man's offence, i.e., through the fall of Adam, death was visited on all the people in the world, how much more through the *abundant grace* of one, namely Jesus Christ, shall life reign in the world. But in this new life only those shall have part who shall have received the *abundance of grace*, and *of the gift of justice*, i.e., the remission of sins and true justification, which can be had only through the merits of Christ. Our Lord has merited for us not only a life of grace in this world, and a life of glory hereafter, but also all the means necessary to attain these abundant blessings here and hereafter.

The majority of MSS. have "of the grace of the gift of justice."

18. This verse is a development of the thoughts expressed

19. For as by the disobedience of one man, many were made sinners; so also by the obedience of one, many shall be made just.

in verses 14 and 16, and is at the same time a continuation and completion of the comparison begun in verse 12; *ἀρα οὖν* picks up the thought begun there. As by the sin of one man, Adam, all men have been condemned to spiritual and temporal death, so by the **justice**, i.e., the merits of one, Jesus Christ, the **justification of life**, i.e., of sanctifying grace, has been extended to all men. "The justification of Christ extends to all men in point of sufficiency, but in point of efficacy it reaches only the faithful" (St. Thomas). And this justification, or sanctifying grace, which is offered to all through faith in Christ, raises man from a state of spiritual death to the life of the children of God, and gives him a right to heaven and immortality.

The force of the comparison between Adam and Christ is this, that as all who are carnally descended from the former have, by his sin, incurred the condemnation of death; so all who are spiritually descended from Christ obtain justification through His merits. Or, the second part of the comparison may be explained with St. Thomas, as quoted above, by saying that the merits of Jesus are sufficient, and more than sufficient, to save all men, although many through their own fault do not profit by them. It remains true, however, that as no one dies except on account of the sin of Adam, so no one is justified unto life except through the justice and merits of Christ.

19. **As by the disobedience of one man**, namely, Adam, who ate the forbidden fruit in the garden of paradise, **many**, i.e., all men (verse 18) became **sinners**, i.e., lost original justice; so contrariwise, by the obedience of one man, namely Christ, through His sufferings and death on the cross, **many**, i.e., all are provided with the means of justification, as explained above (verse 18). The future tense, **shall be made just**, shows that the justice to be realized personally is dependent on faith in Jesus. The justification of Christ is intended, and is sufficient for all, even though many do not profit by it.

In the previous verse justification through Christ is proved *a posteriori*, i.e., through the reign of grace, its effect; here it is proved *a priori*, i.e., through its efficient cause (St. Thomas). As

20. Now the law entered in, that sin might abound. And where sin abounded, grace did more abound.

the disobedience of Adam was the cause of all becoming unjust, so the obedience of Christ is the cause of the justification of all.

20. This and the following verse form a kind of appendix to what precedes. To prove the existence of original sin St. Paul had considered the situation between Adam and Moses, and so it might reasonably be expected that he would also discuss the situation after the giving of the Law, between Moses and Christ. What effect upon sin had the Law? Paul responds briefly by saying that instead of destroying or lessening the reign of sin in the world, as might have been expected, the introduction of the Law only increased sin. Not that the Law was bad; it was good (vii. 10) and led to Christ (Gal. iii. 24); but after its promulgation, owing to the corruption of human nature, the sins of men became more numerous and more serious, partly because the Law not only made known but also multiplied man's duties and obligations, without, however, giving any help to fulfil them, and partly also because the very prohibitions and restrictions it imposed served to excite concupiscence the more. Nevertheless, the primary end God had in view in giving the Law was not to multiply sins, but to humiliate sinners by showing them their weakness and degradation, and thus to move them to desire the Messiah and to seek pardon from God; and to this higher end God permitted the increase of sins on account of the Law (St. Aug., St. Thomas, Lagr., Cornely, etc.). In this interpretation *that* (ὅτι) would signify *the final cause* or purpose of giving the Law. **The law entered in**, in order that what was sin might be realized as sin (iii. 20). St. Chrysostom and others understand "that" in a consecutive or consequential sense.

Sin (παράπτωμα) means all the actual sins committed by men under the Law of Moses.

Where (οὗ) may mean either "where" or "when," more probably the latter here, since the Apostle is treating of a period of time rather than of a particular place.

Sin (ἡ ἀμαρτία) **abounded**, i.e., original sin, which, like a poison spread its evil among men and caused the multiplication of

21. That as sin hath reigned to death; so also grace might reign by justice unto life everlasting, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

actual sins. At this time when sin was working its ravages among mankind **grace did more abound**, because it not only liberated from original and actual sins and eternal death, but it did much more by making men, through faith in Christ and His justification, children of God and heirs of eternal happiness in heaven; it had not only a negative but a positive effect (verse 21).

It is more conformable to the Greek and to the traditional MSS. of the Vulgate to replace the second *delictum* of our present Vulgate by *peccatum*.

21. **As sin hath reigned**, etc., i.e., as sin reigned over all mankind from Adam to Christ, bringing death, spiritual and temporal, to all; so, after the coming of Christ, grace through justification has reigned, preparing souls for life everlasting. This justification is a supernatural gift of God, communicated to the soul, by which one passes from a state of enmity to a state of friendship with God; its end is life eternal, its author and source is **Jesus Christ our Lord**.

In verse 17 it was death, the effect of sin, that reigned; here it is sin which has reigned through death, temporal and spiritual.

Throughout the latter part of this chapter we find two actors, Adam and Christ, illustrated by their mutually opposing acts and effects. There are the sin of Adam, and the gift of grace (verse 15); the judgment of condemnation leading to chastisement, and the gift of grace leading to justification (verse 16); the sin of Adam inaugurates the reign of death, the gift of justice begins the reign of those who have received it (verse 17); the actual sin of only one brings punishment upon all, the meritorious act of only one provides justification for all (verse 18); disobedience makes all sinners, obedience renders all just (verse 19); original sin, increased by actual sins, reigns and kills, grace through justification reigns and prepares for life eternal (verses 20, 21) (Lagrange, h. l.).

CHAPTER VI

THE CHRISTIAN, DEAD TO SIN AND LIVING TO CHRIST THROUGH
BAPTISM, SHOULD LIVE HENCEFORTH UNTO GOD, I-II

I. What shall we say, then? shall we continue in sin, that grace **may** abound?

I-II. The Apostle discusses in this chapter the second fruit of justification, which consists in dominion over sin and freedom from its tyranny. The Christian, dead to sin, and reborn in Christ through Baptism, lives a new life, in which sin should have no part. There is, therefore, something yet more beautiful than justification through faith, and it is to live in Christ for God.

St. Paul was the more anxious to treat this subject, because there was danger that his doctrine of justification without the works of the Law might be misunderstood. It might be so interpreted as to make people indifferent to the moral life, or even as an invitation to sin, so that the grace of God might abound (cf. Lagr., h. l.).

I. **Shall we continue.** Better, "Are we to continue," etc. From what was said in the preceding chapter (verse 20) it might falsely be argued that we ought to continue in sin that the grace of God might the more abound. Forestalling this objection St. Paul proposes it himself here and answers it in the following verse.

In **sin**, i.e., according to Cornely and others, in original sin as to its material part, which is concupiscence. But Lagrange thinks it is better to say that "sin" here means a state of sin after justification: after having been justified should we turn again to sin and continue to lead a sinful life?

That grace (ἡ χάρις), i.e., the goodness of God, which pardons and sanctifies us.

The *permanebimus* of the Vulgate should rather be *permaneamus*, in conformity with the best Greek reading.

2. God forbid. For we that are dead to sin, how shall we live any longer therein?

3. Know you not that all we, who are baptized in Christ Jesus, are baptized in his death?

4. For we are buried together with him by baptism into death; that as Christ is risen from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we also may walk in newness of life.

2. Paul rejects as absurd and impious the conclusion that Christians, after the regeneration of Baptism, should again begin to live a life of sin. To be **dead to sin** means to have broken all relations with sin, as one breaks relations with sensible life by physical death. To be dead to sin is "henceforth to obey it in nothing" (St. Chrys.). We cannot at the same time live and die to the same thing; but the Christian, says St. Paul, lives and should continue to live, to Christ.

3. The Apostle here recalls to the minds of his readers something they very well knew. Baptism in the early Church was generally administered by immersion; and this form of giving the Sacrament quite aptly represented the death, burial and Resurrection of Christ. The complete plunge into the water was at once an image of Christ's death and burial, and of the Christian's death to sin; while the emersion from the water signified the Resurrection of Jesus and the Christian's birth to the new spiritual life of grace.

To be **baptized in Christ Jesus** means to be consecrated to Christ, to become His property and members of His mystical body through the Sacrament of Baptism. To be **baptized in his death** means not only to represent through Baptism Christ's death, burial and Resurrection by dying and being buried to sin, and rising to the spiritual life of grace; but also to be intimately united with Christ in His death (2 Tim. ii. 11), in his burial (v. 4; Col. ii. 12), in His Resurrection (Eph. ii. 5; Col. ii. 13) and in the life of grace (v. 8; 2 Tim. ii. 12).

In the Vulgate *an* should be changed to *aut*, in *Christo Jesu* to *in Christum Jesum*, and *in morte* to *in mortem*, to correspond with the Greek.

4. For (γάρ) is *therefore* (ὁὖν) in all the Greek MSS. The Apostle is treating of a consequence and hence *therefore* is the proper connective here. Through Baptism we are dead and buried to sin,

5. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection.

as Christ died and was buried to this world. The total immersion of the Christian in the baptismal waters was a fitting representation of Christ's envelopment in the tomb. But as Christ died and was buried, only to be raised from the dead by the power of His father; so we are immersed in the waters of Baptism only to emerge and rise to the new spiritual life of sanctifying grace, and to continue in that new life as Christ continues in His glorious risen life.

Is risen. Rather, *was raised* (ἡγέρθη) from the dead.

By the glory of the Father, i.e., by the glorious power of the Father. The Resurrection is usually attributed to the power of the Father (iv. 24; 2 Cor. xiii. 4; Eph. i. 19; Col. ii. 12), and this power is here called "glory"; *id est per virtutem Patris ex qua ipse Pater glorificatur* (St. Thomas).

The *enim* of the Vulgate should be *igitur*, and *resurrexit* should be *suscitatus est* (Cornely).

5. **For** (γάρ) indicates a continuation of the thought already expressed in the preceding verse, which supposes that Baptism effects a real, mystical resurrection (Col. ii. 12; Eph. ii. 5).

Planted (σύμφοντοι) conveys the idea of being united and growing together, after the manner of a graft on a tree, so as to form one plant or growth with the tree. Hence, the sense is: if we, through Baptism, have become participants in Christ's death by dying spiritually to sin, as He died physically to the world, we shall also have a mystical part in His Resurrection by rising spiritually to a new life of sanctity as He rose to a new and glorified physical life.

We shall (ἐσόμεθα) refers to the future spiritual life we shall live after rising from our death to sin, in mystical imitation of Christ's Resurrection.

St. Chrys., St. Thomas and others think St. Paul is alluding to our future glorious resurrection from the dead; but this seems hardly possible since the Apostle here throughout is concerned with the actual present life of Christians.

The *simul* of the Vulgate is to be replaced by *sed* (Tert., Aug.

6. Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin may be destroyed, to the end that we may serve sin no longer.

7. For he that is dead is justified from sin.

8. Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall live also together with Christ:

primo loco), or by *sic* (Aug. *secundo loco*). In English "then also" should precede the last clause, "we shall be," etc.

6. St. Paul reminds the Christians that they know, as a matter of fact, that through Baptism **our old man**, i.e., our corrupt and sinful nature which we inherited from the old Adam and which made us slaves to sin, has been nailed to the cross with Christ, the new Adam, to the end that we may live a new life of sanctity and serve sin no longer.

The Apostle distinguishes in us two men, the old (Eph. iv. 22; Col. iii. 9) and the new (Eph. iv. 24); or rather two different states, one in which we were slaves to sin, by reason of the moral corruption we inherited from Adam, the other in which we live according to God.

Our old man was crucified with Christ (Gal. ii. 20), because of our sins. "Christ was made a malediction" (Deut. xxi. 23), and died on the cross in order to destroy the dominion of sin over us; Christ took upon Himself our sins and died in our stead, and through Baptism the merits of His Passion and death are applied to our souls.

The body of sin means our body, inasmuch as it is an instrument of sin and concupiscence, or as subjected to sin and concupiscence. It is contrary to the thought of St. Paul to say that "body of sin" here means the ensemble of our sins (Lagr.).

The best copies of the Vulgate have *ut ultra* in place of *et ultra*.

7. **Is justified**, i.e., is acquitted, freed. There is question here of liberation from the servitude of sin (Cornely). As he that is dead is freed from the servitude of sin, i.e., is not any longer in danger of committing it, so also we, who, as said before, are dead with Christ, should no longer have any doings with sin. "If you are dead in Baptism, remain dead; for no dead man can sin any more" (St. Chrys.). Of course we always retain liberty, and consequently the power of overturning the effects of Baptism and reverting to sin.

8. In verse 5 the Apostle spoke of union with Christ's death

9. Knowing that Christ rising again from the dead, dieth now no more, death shall no more have dominion over him.

10. For in that he died to sin, he died once; but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God:

and Resurrection, and in verses 6 and 7 he insisted on union with the Saviour's death. Now he passes on to consider our union with the risen, living Christ (Cornely, Lagr., etc.).

If we be mystically dead with Christ we believe, i.e., we firmly trust (Cornely) that we shall also live with Him by a life of grace in this world and of glory hereafter. There is question here of the new life of Christians through grace, and not of our future resurrection, except in so far as this latter is the natural sequel to our present spiritual life with Christ. Verse 11 shows that St. Paul has always in view present moral renovation, rather than future glory (Lagr.).

The *simul* of the Vulgate is superfluous; and *cum Christo* would be better expressed by *cum illo*, according to the Greek. Corresponding changes should be made in English.

9. Christ having risen from the dead, having conquered death, shall live forever, and hence we, now through grace living in union with our risen, immortal Saviour, have part in His eternal and immortal life. The life of grace is a participation in Christ's life, because grace is a participation of the divine nature of Christ.

Shall no more have dominion, etc. Better, "Hath no more dominion," etc.

According to the best Greek MSS. *dominabitur* of the Vulgate should be *dominatur*.

10. Christ died to sin, i.e., He died for our sins, to redeem us all from the slavery of sin (Gal. iii. 13; 2 Cor. v. 21; 1 Peter ii. 24); He died to a world in which sin was dominant. And since Christ's death was of infinite expiatory value He needed to die only once to pay the debt of our sins (Heb. vii. 27; ix. 12, 26, 28; x. 10). Death, therefore, has no longer any dominion over Him; it has freed Him from the obligation which He had contracted in our behalf. Henceforth He liveth unto God, i.e., in God and for God.

In the Vulgate the comma should be after *mortuus est*, and not

11. So do you also reckon, that you are dead to sin, but alive unto God, in Christ Jesus our Lord.

12. Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, so as to obey the lusts thereof.

after *peccato*. Corresponding punctuation should be observed in the English.

11. Applying the foregoing to Christians St. Paul reminds them that through Baptism they have died to sin and risen again to the life of grace; and through this mystic death and resurrection they have become participants in Christ's death and Resurrection, and ought henceforth to live only for God "in Christ Jesus our Lord." Our Lord (Vulg., *Domino nostro*) is not in the Greek. The Christian is a new creature in Christ, and Christ liveth in him (2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. ii. 20).

HAVING BECOME SERVANTS OF JUSTICE WE CAN, AND WE OUGHT TO
LEAD HOLY LIVES, 12-23

12-23. After having spoken so forcefully about the exalted life of Christians who, through Baptism, have died to sin and risen to holiness of life with the risen Christ, the Apostle now takes care to exhort his readers to be ever on their guard against their enemy, sin, lest, resting too confidently in their new estate of grace, they become careless, and again falling under its sway, become subject to its tyrannical dominion. They can now avoid sin, because they are living under grace. Let no one think that, being freed from the slavery of the Law, we now may sin with impunity. On the contrary, as before we served sin unto death, so now we should serve justice unto life eternal.

Sin means *concupiscence*, which remains after original sin has been washed away (St. Aug., Cornely); or, more strictly, according to the text, the sin which entered the world with Adam, and which like a tyrannous monarch has sought to reign among men ever since (Lagr.). Sin reigns in the body when the will yields to the evil desires and passions of the body. As long as we live the remains of sin continue with us, ever inclining us to evil, and it is only through grace that we can resist and overcome the evil desires of our corrupted nature.

13. Neither yield ye your members as instruments of iniquity unto sin; but present yourselves to God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of justice unto God.

14. For sin shall not have dominion over you; for you are not under the law, but under grace.

15. What then? Shall we sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid.

13. Instruments of iniquity. The term *ὄπλα* may signify "instruments"; but its meaning here, and everywhere in the New Testament, is rather that of *arms*. St. Paul exhorts the Christians not to permit the members of their bodies to become weapons, instruments, in the hands of sin to subject them again to the servitude of sin; but rather as dead to sin and living for God, to use their members for God's honor and glory.

Instruments of justice. We must serve God not only negatively, by resisting sin, but also positively, by actually using our members in the cause of justice.

14. **Sin**, i.e., which dominated the Christian before Baptism. If *ἀμαρτία* is here used without the article, it is because the Apostle has been speaking all along about the same sin personified which entered the world with Adam's fall (Lagr.). He tells the Christians they are no longer under the dominion of this sin or its effects, because they are now living **under grace**, which at all times is sufficient to enable them to live holy lives. They are **not under the law**, which indicated things to be done and things to be avoided, but did not give the help necessary to carry out its injunctions. We have now "under grace," not only the Ten Commandments, but also the seven Sacraments to enable us to keep the Commandments.

The Apostle is here speaking of the Law in itself, as separated from faith and the grace which the just of the old Law enjoyed by reason of their belief and hope in the Messiah to come.

15. **St. Paul**, here, as before in v. 1, forestalls an objection which might be raised against his teaching. Some of the ill-instructed converts might argue that since they were no longer under the Law but under grace, they were free to violate with impunity the moral precepts of the Law. He hastens to correct a misunderstanding so erroneous. Such an impious teaching

16. Know you not, that to whom you yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants you are whom you obey, whether it be of sin unto death, or of obedience unto justice.

17. But thanks be to God, that you were the servants of sin, but have obeyed from the heart, unto that form of doctrine, into which you have been delivered.

18. Being then freed from sin, we have been made servants of justice.

would have been similar to Luther's pernicious doctrine regarding faith and imputed justice.

16. St. Paul, in order to show the falsity of the possible inference in the preceding verse, directs the minds of his readers to a well-known truth, namely, that no servant can at the same time serve two opposing masters (Matt. vi. 24). The masters in question are sin, on the one side, and God on the other (verse 22). Although the Christian through Baptism becomes mystically united to Christ, he does not cease to have toward God the relation of a servant to his Master. If, therefore, one yields his members to obey the behests of sin, he becomes the servant of sin which leads to death, temporal and eternal; but if, on the contrary, one uses his members to serve God, he is the servant of God and this service of God leads to justice, i.e., to sanctity, the practical fruit of a life lived in Jesus Christ.

17. Here the Apostle thanks God for that, by His grace, the Romans have ceased to be the slaves of iniquity and have become the docile servants of the Gospel of Christ. They have replaced the servitude of sin by obedience to Christ's teachings.

That you were servants, etc. Better, "Whereas you were servants," etc. (*ἦτε δοῦλοι*).

From the heart shows the alacrity with which the Romans had accepted and obeyed the Christian teaching which they had received.

The form (*τύπος*) of doctrine is the Gospel which was announced to all Christians (2 Tim. i. 13). The terms, *type*, *rule*, *form* of doctrine represent the Gospel as containing a moral teaching, but without the forbidding menaces of the Law (Lagr.).

18. This verse, which concludes the preceding one, should not be separated from it by a period, but should be taken to-

19. I speak an human thing, because of the infirmity of your flesh. For as you have yielded your members to serve uncleanness and iniquity, unto iniquity; so now yield your members to serve justice, unto sanctification.

20. For when you were the servants of sin, you were free men to justice.

gether with it. The conjunction introducing the verse ought to be *and*, instead of *then*.

The conclusion which follows from the two preceding verses is that Christians, being now servants of the Gospel, should hold themselves aloof from sin and serve only **justice**, i.e., holiness and sanctity. It is quite evident that the **sin** (ἡ ἀμαρτία) of this verse refers to that which came into the world with Adam, and not to the concupiscence which followed upon original sin. It is this same sin which has been in question all along. See above, on verses 12 and 14.

19. Here Paul explains how Christians are to serve justice. The first part of the verse, down to *for*, is a kind of parenthesis, of which there are two chief interpretations. According to the first, which is that of most Catholics, St. Paul says that the precept he is about to give his readers, the Christians, is merely **human**, i.e., light, easy to obey, namely, that for the future they should use their members in doing for justice at least as much as they had done in the past for sin. Hence this precept is called "human," as being accommodated to the human weakness of the faithful. According to the second interpretation, which is that of a few Catholics and most modern non-Catholic authorities, Paul says that when speaking before of the servitude of justice, he spoke in a human way, in order to accommodate himself to the intellectual imbecility of the Romans who could not yet comprehend this great truth that to serve God is really to reign.

The second part of this verse, which begins with **for** (γάρ), connects what follows with verse 18, and explains what is meant by being **servants of justice**. As the Romans, before their conversion, had been slaves to impurity and immorality of all kinds, they are now exhorted to become servants of "justice" unto sanctification.

20. When the Romans were the slaves of sin, they **were free men to justice**, better, they "were free as regards justice," i.e.,

21. What fruit therefore had you then in those things, of which you are now ashamed? For the end of them is death.

22. But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, you have your fruit unto sanctification, and the end life everlasting.

23. For the wages of sin is death. But the grace of God, life everlasting, in Christ Jesus our Lord.

they paid no attention to justice, but gave themselves entirely up to sin. This freedom, or rather, neglect of their own righteousness, however, did not excuse the Romans from responsibility. Sin and justice are here represented as rival masters; while serving one, it was impossible to serve the other.

21. **What fruit**, etc., i.e., what result had you then in the evil satisfactions of your sins? The answer understood is, *none*; or, only those evil fruits of which you are now ashamed, because they lead to death, temporal and eternal. According to some of the best critical editions of the Greek text the interrogation point should be after *then*, thus: "What fruit had you then? That of which you are now ashamed" (Theodoret).

22. The fruits, therefore, of the sins of the Romans were two—shame and death; but now, being free from sin, and become servants of justice, they should produce the fruits of good works, which are personal sanctification and, in the end, life eternal.

23. **The wages**. The Greek word for "wages," *ὀψώνια*, properly signifies that pay which is due a soldier for his sustenance, to which, therefore, the soldier has a strict right. Throughout St. Paul has been representing sin as a cruel master who gives death eternal as pay to the soldiers, i.e., to the sinners, who serve him. In contrast to this one might have expected the Apostle to say that the wages, or pay of justice is life eternal; but he has rather said that the **grace of God** is life eternal, i.e., life eternal is the recompense of the grace of God, or of our works which proceed from the grace of God. In other words, sin merits eternal death, but our good works of themselves cannot merit eternal life; this latter is due to the gratuitous grace of God, which is the source of our good works that merit eternal life. Our good works are the result of grace, and life eternal is given in reward for the good works which grace produces in us. This is why St. Paul calls life everlasting "the grace of

God," i.e., the result, or effect, or reward of God's grace; and this is all given in **Christ Jesus**, etc., i.e., *through Christ*, our Redeemer and Mediator, the source of all graces; or *in Christ*, in *quantum in ipso sumus per fidem et caritatem* (St. Thomas).

From the foregoing it must not be concluded that the Christian may be indifferent in his actions and works, trusting all to the grace of God. Through Baptism he is initiated into the service of God. Therefore he must use his members as faithfully in serving justice, as aforetime he did in serving sin (verses 18-20), and thus assisted by the grace which God will give him, he will procure his sanctification and eternal salvation.

CHAPTER VII

A THIRD FRUIT OF JUSTIFICATION—FREEDOM FROM THE SERVITUDE OF THE LAW, 1-6

1-6. The third fruit of justification is liberation from the Law. Already (v. 20) St. Paul had indicated that the Law had only a transitory value, and further on (vi. 14, 15) he said plainly that we are no longer under the Law. Here he explicitly declares that the Old Law is abrogated, that it no longer obliges; and he proves his statement by citing the example of the matrimonial law. We are dead to the Law, which occasioned sin, in order that we may belong to Christ in newness and holiness of life.

But when saying that the Law of Moses ceased, it is necessary to distinguish between its ceremonial observances and burdens, on the one hand, and its moral precepts, on the other. As to these latter, the Law of Moses is eternal and abides in Christianity. The great difficulty and burden of the Law consisted not only in its numerous ceremonies and observances, but especially in this that, while it indicated what was to be done and what to be avoided, it did not give any of the help necessary for the fulfilment of its precepts.

It is true, however, that the Patriarchs and all the just of the Old Testament received grace to observe the Law, but this

1. Know you not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law,) that the law hath dominion over a man, as long as it liveth?

grace came not from the Law; it came only from the living faith which they had in Jesus Christ, the Redeemer to come. And so far as they had this faith, and received the grace consequent upon it, they already pertained to the New Dispensation and Law of the Gospel. But we, says the Apostle, are entirely freed from the servitude of the Old Law, because we are living under the New Law of the Gospel, which not only indicates what we are to do and what we are to avoid, but also gives us the grace necessary to fulfil all its precepts.

1. **Know you not**, i.e., you certainly do know.

Brethren, i.e., Christians, both Jewish and Gentile. If the first law here meant the Mosaic Law, we could interpret **brethren** as referring to the Jewish Christians only, or chiefly, at least, as some authors do; but since the second "law" (which **hath dominion**, etc.) doubtless refers to a law far more general than that of Moses, namely, to a law recognized among the nations, to which St. Paul makes appeal, it seems better to understand the first "law," as meaning, not the Law of Moses, but a general law known among the Romans and all nations, and consequently to understand "brethren" as referring to all the Christians in Rome. If only Jews were addressed, Paul would have said (verse 5): "When we were under the law"; but, addressing all the Roman Christians, the majority of whom were Gentiles, he has rather said: "When we were in the flesh."

The law (*ὁ νόμος*), i.e., the law of marriage recognized by all civilized peoples (Lagr.). The Apostle's argument is this: According to the recognized law of marriage, a woman is bound to her husband as long as the husband lives, so that she cannot rightly marry another man during her husband's lifetime, but when her husband is dead, she is free (verses 1-3). But to you, Roman Christians, the Law of Moses is dead; or rather you, although really alive, are mystically dead to it, i.e., it no longer can have any dominion over you. Therefore, you are free from the Law of Moses, that you may belong to the New Law of Christ risen from the dead (verse 4).

2. For the woman that hath an husband, whilst her husband liveth is bound to the law. But if her husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband.

3. Therefore, whilst her husband liveth, she shall be called an adulteress, if she be with another man: but if her husband be dead, she is delivered from the law of her husband; so that she is not an adulteress, if she be with another man.

4. Therefore, my brethren, you also are become dead to the law, by the body of Christ; that you may belong to another, who is risen again from the dead, that we may bring forth fruit to God.

2. A married woman is bound to her husband as long as she or her husband lives, according to the primitive matrimonial law promulgated by God (Gen. ii. 24), and renewed by our Lord Jesus Christ (Matt. v. 31, 32; xix. 4 ff.). Marriage renders the wife one flesh with her husband, and hence as long as he lives, she cannot lawfully contract marriage with any other man. But when the husband is dead, the wife is freed from the law that bound her to her husband.

The Greek should be translated: *viventi viro alligata est lege*, and not as the Vulgate has it (Lagr.).

3. St. Paul again shows that there is no dissolution of the matrimonial bond before the death of one of the contracting parties, so much so that any further marriage contracted by either party while both are living would be nothing short of adulterous. What holds good for the woman holds likewise for the man. From the law of her husband is in Greek only "from the law," but the context clearly shows that the meaning is from the law of her husband.

4. The Christians are become mystically dead to the law. Literally, "Have been made to die," i.e., the Law has lost all its binding force in their regard. And this emancipation has been effected through the body of Christ, i.e., through the Passion and death of Christ, in which the Christians by Baptism have become mystical participants (vi. 2, 3, 6; Gal. ii. 19). Through Baptism the Christians have mystically died with Christ to sin and to the Law, so that they might be free to belong to another, i.e., to Christ risen from the dead and glorified, for the ultimate purpose of producing good works for the glory of God.

Although we cannot put the Law on the same level as sin,

5. For when we were in the flesh, the passions of sins, which were by the law, did work in our members, to bring forth fruit unto death.

6. But now we are loosed from the law of death, wherein we were detained; so that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter.

still it disappeared with the disappearance of the reign of sin, and the reign of sin was conquered by the death of Christ. With grace commenced the reign of righteousness.

5. **In the flesh**, i.e., in a state of sin and disorder, when the old man sin was yet alive (vi. 6).

The passions of sins, i.e., the evil disorders of our fallen nature, **which were by the law**, i.e., which the Law pointed out and made responsible, but did not give the power and help to restrain.

Did work (*ἐνργεῖτο*), i.e., were continually operative and did move our members to evil deeds (vi. 12, 19), the consequence of which was death (vi. 21). Cf. iii. 9 ff.

6. Now through our mystical death with Christ we are liberated from the régime of the Old Law which, by increasing our responsibility, and failing at the same time to give the grace necessary to fulfil its precepts, was the occasion of sin and death to us. And the purpose of the liberation from the Old Law is that we should serve God and justice in newness of spirit, i.e., according to a new principle of life, namely, the grace of the Holy Spirit (v. 15; viii. 15; Gal. iv. 6), and not in the oldness of the letter, i.e., according to the old man of sin subject to the Law of Moses.

The best Greek reading of the first part of this verse is rendered as follows: "But now we are freed from the law, being dead to that which held us bound."

THE LAW, ALTHOUGH GOOD IN ITSELF, WAS THE OCCASION OF NEW SINS, 7-12

7-12. In these verses the Apostle discusses the relations which God's positive law bore to man and sin. He is most probably not discussing his own personal religious experience, either as a Christian or before his conversion, but is rather describing the

state of man without grace and with only God's law to help him in the struggle against sin.

But here at the outset, a difficulty is raised. Paul has just spoken (vii. 4) of death to the Law, as he had before (vi. 2) spoken of death to sin. One might therefore conclude that sin and the Law were the same thing, i.e., that the Law was something bad in itself and contrary to the will of God. This view Marcion and other heretics afterwards took, although St. Paul here swiftly corrected such a fallacious conclusion by the words "God forbid." Furthermore, since there seems to be question here not only of the Mosaic Law, but also of all positive divine law or precept (ὁ νόμος . . . ἡ ἐντολή)—such as was given to Adam, Noe, Abraham, and all the ancient Patriarchs—certain critics, like Jülicher, have concluded that St. Paul meant here to reject, at least in principle, all positive divine law. Fr. Prat (*La Théologie de Saint Paul*, I, p. 320) has even asked, by way of objection, if the argument of St. Paul might not be turned also against the law of grace. If the old positive law, it is objected, was abrogated because it only served to excite concupiscence, and thus increase the number and gravity of men's sins, why impose any other law on Christians, and so augment their peril, even though they are given more grace to combat sin?

The solution given to these difficulties by Lagrange is that St. Paul is not treating in this place of the abrogation of the Mosaic Law, nor is he giving the reason why it was abrogated. The reason for the abrogation of the Law has already been given (vii. 4), which was the death of Christ, to which the faithful are associated by Baptism. The present section (verses 7-12), therefore, says the great exegete, is rather "a sincere apology for the Law, which was good, and at the same time, a very clear affirmation that all law was insufficient, because it did not give any power to conquer sin; but, on the contrary, rather afforded sin the occasion to muster force for the destruction of man. The conclusion is not, therefore: The Mosaic Law ought to be abrogated, nor: All divine positive law ought to be abrogated; but: It is foolish to place confidence in any positive law." "One might even conclude," he adds, "if one so wishes, that all laws, as laws, have their inconveniences, and

7. What shall we say, then? Is the law sin? God forbid. But I do not know sin, but by the law; for I had not known concupiscence, if the law did not say: Thou shalt not covet.

that, consequently, it is necessary to trust entirely to grace, and to count upon grace to triumph over the shortcomings of every law that is the occasion of sin" (*Ep. aux Rom.*, h. l.).

Again the question is asked who is meant by the "I" and the "me" running through these verses 7-12? There are chiefly three different responses to this question: (a) According to St. Aug. (*primo modo*), St. Chrys., and St. Thomas, the "I" represents man in general, humanity, before the Law of Moses was given; (b) according to St. Aug. (*secundo modo*), St. Jerome, Origen, and Cornely, the "I" is a young Israelite who has been instructed in the Law from his infancy; (c) according to Lagrange—modifying the opinion of St. Methodius, Cajetan, and others—the "I" here means man in the state of innocence, or Adam in the terrestrial paradise.

But what is the meaning of sin here? In the first two theories, by "sin" would be meant original sin in its proper sense, or that evil force which comes from original sin, and which we call concupiscence. In the third theory the term would designate sin in general, or sin as a concrete force or power, almost as a person, manifesting itself as original sin and otherwise (Lagr.).

We shall now proceed to explain this difficult section (verses 7-12) in accordance with the third system or theory, which to us seems perhaps best calculated to meet all the difficulties involved. We have, then, three actors to reckon with: the ancient divine positive law, man in the state of innocence, and sin personified. Cf. Lagr., h. l.

7. **Is the law sin?** i.e., was the ancient divine positive law, of which the Law of Moses was the most perfect type, bad in itself, the same as sin, being the cause of sin. St. Paul rejects with indignation such an impious deduction.

But I do not know sin, etc., i.e., man in a state of innocence did not have a practical or experimental knowledge of sin (2 Cor. v. 21), although he knew it speculatively. "Sin" means sin personified, in general, as manifested in original and other sins.

But by the law, i.e., by the positive declaration of God. There

8. But sin taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin was dead.

is here plainly an allusion to the Mosaic Law (Exod. xx. 17; Deut. v. 21), but the meaning is not necessarily restricted to it. Man would not have known sin, except theoretically, aside from the Law of God. And what is here said of the divine positive law, holds also in its measure, for the natural law which God has written on every human heart.

Concupiscence here means illicit desire in general, as a general cause or source of sin (St. Thomas). The divine positive law given even in paradise forbade not only exterior sinful acts, but also internal unlawful desires (Gen. ii. 17).

The *nesciebam* of the Vulgate does not so exactly express the Greek as would *nescirem*.

8. But sin, i.e., sin in general, the powerful enemy of man, made use of the **commandment**, i.e., of God's positive precept, to excite man's will. This was true of the serpent of old in the Garden of Eden. According to Cornely and his theory, "sin" here means concupiscence, which, remaining after the remission of original sin, found in the command *not to covet* (verse 7) an occasion to excite in the young Israelite all manner of evil desires.

It is a characteristic of our nature that we are often more inclined to those things which are forbidden us. *Nitimur in vetitum semper, cupimusque negata . . . quod licet ingratum est, quod non licet arcius urit* (Ovid, *Amor.* iii. 4, 17; ii. 19, 3). Thus sin, taking advantage of God's precept, excited all kinds of desires in our first parents, for the forbidden fruit of paradise. But **without the law sin was dead**, i.e., when there was no positive law, as for a time in paradise (Gen. ii. 16), sin was without any force; it was hidden and did not manifest itself, because before the prohibition of the law it did not have occasion to show its power by alluring to forbidden acts. Thus man was "without the law," for *peccans absque mandato non tenetur lege peccati* (St. Jerome). Cornely, in the second theory explained above, says the period "without the law" means the years of infancy, before the dawn of reason, when sin was "dead," i.e., had no meaning for the young Israelite.

There should be no comma after *accepta* in the Vulgate, and

9. And I lived some time without the law. But when the commandment came, sin revived,

10. And I died. And the commandment that was ordained to life, the same was found to be unto death to me.

11. For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, seduced me, and by it killed me.

per mandatum should precede *peccatum*. A comma after *mandatum* is the preferable construction (Lagr., Cornely).

9. I lived **some time**, etc., i.e., before the Law of Moses (St. Thomas); or before the use of reason (Cornely); or more probably before the precept was imposed on Adam in the Garden of Eden (Lagrange). It is true that "commandment" (*ἡ ἐντολή*) can signify the Law of Moses, or a precept of the Law, such as the command *not to covet*; but since there seems to be question of living a real spiritual life before the coming of the commandment, it is difficult to see how this could be reconciled with the facts as they existed from the Deluge to Moses (against the first theory). There is less difficulty in Cornely's theory, according to which the young Israelite lived a life of grace between the time of circumcision and the moment when the Law began to oblige. In this opinion **sin revived** would mean that original sin, having been effaced by circumcision, revived in concupiscence as soon as the child attained the use of reason and realized the existence and obligation of the precept, "thou shalt not covet." In the third theory **sin was dead**, i.e., was without any force against any positive law, until that law existed, but when the command was given, as in paradise, it **revived**, i.e., it began to exercise its force, overcame its victim, and man died.

10. The commandment which was given to lead man to sanctity and to life eternal became, through deliberate actual sin on man's part, the occasion of his fall from grace and of his spiritual death. The cause of this dreadful evil was not the commandment, but the weakness and sinfulness of man.

11. See above, on verse 8. The Apostle explains how the commandment, good in itself, became an occasion of death through sin. Here the reference seems to be very clearly to what took place in Eden when Eve was seduced by the serpent (Gen. iii. 13; 2 Cor. xi. 3; 1 Tim. ii. 14).

12. Wherefore the law indeed is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good.

The punctuation of this verse in the Vulgate is correct, and shows what that of verse 8 should be.

12. The Apostle now responds to the question raised in verse 7. Both the law and the commandment are holy, i.e., every precept given by God is holy. The law is **holy** as opposed to religious impurity; it is **just**, because it rewards the good and punishes the bad; it is **good** as conducing to sanctity (Euthymius). If the law was the occasion of many sins, that was on account of the weakness and wickedness of man.

Cornely understands "law" here to mean the whole Mosaic legislation, and "commandment" to refer to the precept, "thou shalt not covet" (verse 7).

The *quidem* (μὲν) of the Vulgate without its corresponding *autem* (δε), shows that the thought is incomplete, and that we must understand: "sin, however, is bad."

NOT THE LAW, BUT SIN IS THE CAUSE OF DEATH; THE LAW WAS IMPOTENT IN THE BATTLE BETWEEN THE FLESH AND THE SPIRIT, 13-25.

13-25. It is a disputed question whether here or with the following verse, begins a new section, embracing the rest of this chapter. Lagrange and Köhl (against Cornely, Jülicher and others) prefer to begin the section with the present verse, because the prevailing idea which is here introduced is that of death. It has already been made clear that the law was not the cause of sin, but now the question is raised whether it was not the cause of death. This latter inference is rejected as vigorously as was the former one. Sin was the cause of death; and the Apostle in these verses (13-25) describes the force and power of sin, and the impotency of fallen man under the yoke of the law. He shows that while man recognized the justice and sanctity of the law, he was nevertheless, unequal to the struggle which ensued between the flesh and the reason, and was lured to sin, and so succumbed to defeat and to death.

13. Was that then which is good, made death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it may appear sin, by that which is good, wrought death in me; that sin, by the commandment, might become sinful above measure.

Therefore, sin being victor, wielded its dreadful influence against the law itself.

It is further disputed whether St. Paul in these verses is speaking of man not yet regenerated in Jesus Christ through Baptism, or the contrary. The majority of the Fathers and most modern authorities, Catholic and Protestant, hold the first view; while St. Aug., St. Thomas, and many non-Catholic interpreters prefer the second opinion, namely, that the Apostle is here speaking of man already regenerated by Baptism, but aware of his inability without grace really to fulfil the law of God. The first opinion seems far the more probable, because more conformable to the context. It is admitted by all that, up to the end of verse 12, the Apostle is speaking of unregenerated man, and there seems no sufficient reason for saying that with verse 13 or 14 he begins to speak of man regenerated. If the present tense is used, it is only to give added vigor to his words. The aim of the Apostle is to show the powerlessness of the law as a principle of salvation—a powerlessness which made the triumph of sin more evident, and obliged man to have recourse to the grace of Jesus Christ (Lagr.).

We hold then, that there is question in this section (verses 13-25) of fallen unregenerated man, of sin in general, and of the general positive law of God.

13. **That then which is good** means the positive law or precept of God.

Made death, i.e., did it become the cause of spiritual death, by leading to sin? No, says St. Paul. It has already been explained (verse 10) that sin was the cause of death; the commandment was only the occasion. But it may rightly be asked why God gave the law or commandment, since He certainly foresaw it was to be the occasion of death. St. Paul replies,—(a) in order that sin might **appear sin**, i.e., might manifest its own evil nature and be recognized as such; (b) in order that sin might be recognized as something evil **above measure**, inasmuch as it made use of a good thing, **the commandment**,

14. For we know that the law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under sin.

15. For that which I work, I understand not. For I do not that good which I will; but the evil which I hate, that I do.

for an evil purpose, turning an instrument of life into an instrument of death.

The advantage, therefore, of the law, was this, that it brought out the real nature of sin. Without any law man would have known only theoretically the distinction between good and evil, but the law has made him realize in a practical way that which is good and that which is bad. If the law occasioned the multiplication of sins, it also served to expose the real nature and malice of sin, as something opposed to the will of God and the order of divine providence; and it did, moreover, make man recognize his own weakness and misery, and the powerlessness of the law to save him, thus forcing him to look to grace and to the future Redeemer for salvation (verse 24). We understand sin in this verse as in the verses preceding.

In the Vulgate *appareat* does not so literally express the Greek as would *appareret*.

14. We know, etc., i.e., we are all agreed that the law is spiritual, i.e., that God's positive law, given in the beginning to our first parents, as well as later to Moses, was from above, from God Himself. But I, i.e., fallen man, deprived of grace, am carnal, i.e., dominated by my lower nature, which corrupted by sin seeks the things that are opposed to God.

Sold under sin, i.e., become the slave of sin, obeying the behests of sin.

It is to be observed that the Apostle says here the law is spiritual (*πνευματικός*), whereas in verse 6 he spoke of the "oldness" of its "letter." *Answer:* The Apostle is not bound to observe the same terminology in speaking of different aspects of the law. This lack of uniformity or consistency of style will be further explained, if we hold that in verse 6 he is speaking of the Mosaic Law, but here of the positive law of God in general.

15. Now the Apostle speaks in terms that amount almost to an exaggeration. He says that man is an enigma, he cannot understand him, or, at least, his works and actions. Man's nature was not altogether corrupted by original sin, and hence

16. If then I do that which I will not, I consent to the law, that it is good.

17. Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.

even without grace he can know and love moral good and distinguish it from moral evil in many instances; but when it comes to the actual doing of the one and the avoiding of the other frequently he finds himself bereft of the necessary power. Often he would do the good which he likes, but he has not the power; often likewise he would avoid the evil which he hates, but he has not the power.

It is evident that I will and I hate here refer merely to simple velleity; whereas I do not and I do are external actions which, proceeding from an absolute will that has overcome velleity, are imputable to the agent.

The human situation here described by St. Paul can be as well understood as referring to the period before the Law of Moses as after that period. Just as the Mosaic Law indicated for the Jews the good to be done and the evil to be avoided, but gave no help for the execution of its mandates, so likewise did the natural law unobscured show the pagans what they should do, and what they should not do, without, however, giving them the necessary help to put into practice its promptings. The Gentiles as well as the Jews felt the conflict between their lower and their higher nature. Hence Ovid wrote: *Video meliora proboque, deteriora sequor* (*Metam.* VII. 20, 21). Similarly speaks Epictetus of the transgressor: *Quod vult non facit, et facit quod non vult* (*Enchir.* II. 26).

The *bonum* and *malum* of the Vulgate are not in the Greek; they are a gloss, evidently implied in the context. The same is to be said of good and of evil in our English version.

16. If that which I feel I ought not to do, because it is evil, is forbidden by the law, my feeling is a testimony that the law is good and holy; my mind and my conscience are a witness that the law is good.

17. Since the higher part of man desires to conform to God's law and do that which is right and good, while his lower nature makes it often impossible for him to observe the law in practice, St. Paul concludes that there are in man two principles: the I that would obey the law and do good, and sin that pre-

18. For I know that there dwelleth not in me, that is to say, in my flesh, that which is good. For to will, is present with me; but to accomplish that which is good, I find not.

vails over man's superior nature and produces evil. The Apostle speaks as if man in his unregenerated state were really possessed by an evil spirit, but he is only again personifying the sin which came into the world with Adam, which is inherited by all of Adam's descendants and which tyrannizes over man, ever inclining him to violate the law of God (Lagr.). St. Paul is not here wishing to deny or to diminish man's culpability; neither is he fixing the degree of responsibility which underlies those violent movements of passion that lead to sin, and are often the consequences of sin. He wishes only to make known both the state of misery in which man finds himself under the slavery of sin, and the cause which makes him do that which he knows is evil and which he hates. This cause, he says, is sin—sin personified, which entered the world with the fall of Adam and ever remains, infecting human nature.

18. Here St. Paul says clearly that it is a fact of experience that there are in man two forces, equivalent in a certain sense to two persons: the one which is devoid of good and is the slave of sin, namely, the flesh, which does evil; the other, the interior man (verse 20), the reason (verse 23), which, with an imperfect and inefficacious will, wishes to do good, but is unable to accomplish it. There dwells not in the flesh a principle of good that can combat sin, because the flesh is the slave of sin; and the intelligence, the reason, the judgment of conscience desires to do good, but is overpowered by the forces that incline to evil. The dualism is, therefore, between the flesh enslaved by sin, and the reason or intelligence which perceives the good; it is not between the soul and the body.

Here, as well as in verses 19 and 20, I will and I will not express mere velleity or inefficacious volition; whereas I do means a complete voluntary act, although not necessarily manifested externally.

In the Vulgate *perficere*, which signifies a complete moral act, whether internal or external, should rather be *operari* (κατεργάζεσθαι). *Invenio* is not represented in the Greek MSS., which read: *velle*

19. For the good which I will, I do not; but the evil which I will not, that I do.

20. Now if I do that which I will not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.

21. I find then a law, that when I have a will to do good, evil is present with me.

22. For I am delighted with the law of God, according to the inward man:

23. But I see another law in my members, fighting against the law of my mind, and captivating me in the law of sin, that is in my members.

adjacet mihi, perficere autem bonum non (Aug.). I find should be omitted, therefore.

19. See above, on verse 15. The Apostle is not denying free will, nor saying that man is necessitated to evil; he is merely saying that man disapproves of the evil he does and would like to do good.

20. The conclusion of verse 17 is here repeated. If man does evil which he hates and wishes not to do, it is no longer he, but sin within him, that does the evil. Yet man is responsible (see above, on verses 15, 17, 18).

Jam non of the Vulgate is not so literal of οὐκέτι as would be *non jam*.

21. Judging from what was said in the preceding verses, which is unregenerated man's daily experience, St. Paul draws this psychological conclusion or explanation, that there is in man **another law**, the law of sin (verse 23), fighting against the reason and the judgment of conscience, and leading man into sin. The law (τὸν νόμον) here does not mean the Law of Moses (Cornely, Lagr.), nor any law other than a constant rule of action, a natural tendency, the law of man's condition (verses 23, 25), which, when man wishes to do good, ever inclines him to evil and to sin.

The Fathers and ancient exegetes understood "law" here, with the article in Greek, to mean the Mosaic Law; but this view cannot well be sustained and has been rejected by nearly all modern interpreters, Catholic and non-Catholic, except Zahn. Cf. Cornely, h. 1.

22, 23. Man in his unregenerated state, considered **according to the inward man**, i.e., according to his nobler part, his reason, is delighted with the law of God, because he knows that

24. Unhappy man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?

25. The grace of God, by Jesus Christ our Lord. Therefore, I myself, with the mind serve the law of God; but with the flesh, the law of sin.

it is good and holy, but according to the law of the flesh or of sin, which has its seat in his material members, and which fights against the law of reason, he is drawn away from the law of God and led like a slave to evil. Man here is spoken of as *captivated*, i.e., enslaved by sin, and hence he is surely in an unregenerated state. *Captivating*, however, means only moving man to sin, not forcing him to consent,—*motione non consensione* (St. Aug., 2 *Ep. contra Pelag.*, cap. 10).

The term "law" (*νόμος*) occurs four times in these two verses. The more common opinion considers the law of God and the law of the mind as one; and, likewise, another law and the law of sin as one. Köhl, however, following the opinion of St. Jerome, holds that there are here four distinct laws: the law of God and the law of sin, which are exterior to man, and the law of the mind and the law of the flesh, or that *other* law, which are within him. But as St. Paul is at present considering man only as he finds him, in the state of original sin with its consequences, he is really speaking of only three distinct laws; for the law of the members, or of the flesh, is in reality the law of sin in fallen man (Lagr.).

In verse 23 *repugnantem legi* does not so well express *ἀντιστηνέναντι τῷ νόμῳ* as would *militantem adversus legem*.

24. Unregenerated man, feeling his enslavement to sin, cries out almost in despair for help from God to be delivered from the body in which dwells sin, the cause of death. He does not ask to be freed from his mortal body, but only from the body inasmuch as it is the slave of sin, and so destined to temporal and eternal death (Cornely). In other words, he asks to be delivered from sin, which resides in his members, in such a way that his body will no longer be the seat of that evil power which leads both body and soul to death temporal and eternal.

25. To the foregoing question the Apostle gives a reply that comes directly from his fervid heart. That which will deliver man from the tyranny of sin is not the power of his mind or reason, not the positive law of God, whether Mosaic or other,

but the grace of God communicated to man through the merits of Jesus Christ. Then resuming all that has preceded, he concludes by insisting on the unity of man, in whom, however, there exist contrary tendencies, one inclining to the law of God, the other leading to sin.

The first part of the verse is differently read in the MSS. The reading of the Vulgate and of the Itala is supported by only a few rare MSS. The reading preferred by Tisch., Nestle and Lagr. is $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma\ \tau\hat{\omega}\ \theta\epsilon\omega\hat{\varsigma}$. Hence the translation of the critical reading would be *gratia Deo, thanks be to God*, instead of *gratia Dei, the grace of God*. This latter translation would require the genitive, whereas the Greek has the dative case, $\tau\hat{\omega}\ \theta\epsilon\omega\hat{\varsigma}$ (cf. 1 Cor. xv. 57, for a similar passage).

The second part of this verse is regarded as a gloss by Jülicher, is placed after verse 24 by Lietzmann; but by Cornely, Lagr., Zahn, etc., is left where we find it.

CHAPTER VIII

THE FOURTH FRUIT OF JUSTIFICATION: THE HAPPINESS OF REGENERATED MAN, WHO NOW HAS GRACE TO LIVE A CHRISTIAN LIFE, AND THEREBY IS GIVEN A PLEDGE OF HIS RESURRECTION, I-II

I-II. This chapter contains a sublime exposition of the precious treasures and glorious prospects of the Christian life. In the present section the Apostle concludes, after all that has been said so far regarding the fruits of justification, that those who have been regenerated in Jesus Christ by Baptism are no longer under penalties; for the new life effected in us by the Spirit has delivered us from former tyranny. The shortcomings of the Law, which was undermined by the perversity of the flesh, God has supplied for by sending His Son to triumph over the flesh, and to enable us to live hereafter according to the spirit, thus fulfilling the Law in our lives. This last they cannot do who follow the flesh, because the flesh and the spirit are mutually opposing agencies. But the spirit of Christians has been reinforced by God's Spirit dwelling in them. Being in Christ they

1. There is now therefore no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, who walk not according to the flesh.

2. For the law of the spirit of life, in Christ Jesus, hath delivered me from the law of sin and of death.

possess His Spirit, and so are enabled not only to live a spiritual life now, but to look forward to the glorious life of the resurrection.

1. After having shown that those justified by means of faith in Christ are delivered from the wrath of God, from sin, and from the Law, St. Paul draws a very important and consoling inference, which is a conclusion to all that has preceded since Chapter VI. We know from sad experience, he says, what it means to be under the Law, and we know also what it means to be under grace. Now, i.e., under the New Law of grace, there is **no condemnation**, i.e., there is nothing that merits condemnation **to them that are**, etc., i.e., to the faithful who by means of Baptism have been incorporated in Christ Jesus (vi. 3 ff.) and live by His life (vi. 11, 23), members of His body, as the branches live from the vine (1 Cor. xii. 13; Gal. ii. 20; John xiv. 19, 20).

Who walk, etc. This final clause of the verse is wanting in the best Greek MSS., and is regarded as a gloss by most critics. Hence also in the Vulgate, *qui non secundum carnem ambulant* should be omitted.

2. This verse is a proof of the preceding. Those who are in Christ Jesus live according to the Spirit that has delivered them from the law of sin and death, i.e., they live a spiritual life through the grace of the Holy Ghost which is communicated to their souls. **The law of the spirit** can mean the law of the Holy Ghost, as such; or the law of grace, the proper effect of the Holy Ghost communicated to man (St. Thomas). The second meanings seems more probable here. The opposition is with the law of sin which was in our flesh, and to some extent with the law of the reason (vii. 23). Sin, as is supposed, has been forgiven, and the law of reason has been fortified by the law of grace.

Of life, i.e., of life in Christ Jesus. It is better to join **Christ Jesus** with **life** than with **hath delivered** (St. Thomas, Kühl, etc.).

Me (με), the reading of the Vulgate and of the ordinary Greek,

3. For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh; God sending his own Son, in the likeness of sinful flesh and of sin, hath condemned sin in the flesh;

is better supported than "thee" (σε) by the Fathers; but less so by the MSS. The sense is the same in either case, since the question regards regenerated man.

The law of sin does not mean concupiscence, because it is a matter of faith and of experience that the Christian is not free from this effect of original sin. It means, therefore, the dominion of sin, from which we are delivered by the spiritual life, the life of grace. By this same spiritual life, or life of the spirit, we are delivered from the law of death inasmuch as temporal death would be at the same time eternal death (Lagr.).

3. In the preceding verse we were told how Christians through their union with Christ are delivered from sin, and here we see how God has condemned sin through the Incarnation of His Son. St. Thomas says this verse shows three things: (a) the necessity of the Incarnation, (b) the mode of the Incarnation, (c) the fruit of the Incarnation.

What the law could not do (τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου). Literally, "What was impossible to the law"—not because it was not good and holy in itself, but because of our corrupt human nature—God has effected by sending his own Son, i.e., through the Incarnation of His Only-begotten Son.

In the likeness, etc. The resemblance between the flesh of Christ and ours was in this, that the Word of God assumed real human flesh and human nature just like our own, but without the stain of sin upon it. Christ's conception was by the Holy Ghost, not by sinful man; and the flesh and blood which He took was of the Immaculate Virgin Mary. Hence He had our real human nature and flesh, but not the corruption which sin has left in our nature—*Ostendit nos quidem habere carnem peccati, Filium vero Dei similitudinem habuisse carnis peccati, non carnem peccati* (Origen). But since the human nature of Christ, although pure and holy, was subject to pain and death, which were the consequences of sin, it is said to have had the likeness or resemblance of sinful flesh.

And of sin (καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας), i.e., on account of sin, in order to

4. That the justification of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not according to the flesh, but according to the spirit.

5. For they that are according to the flesh, mind the things that are of the flesh; but they that are according to the spirit, mind the things that are of the spirit.

destroy it. These words are to be connected with what precedes (Cornely, Lagr.); they show that the mission or purpose of Christ's coming was to conquer sin and thus redeem man.

Hath condemned sin, i.e., has destroyed the reign of sin personified which, from the fall to Christ, held mankind in slavery. But when was this destruction of the dominion of sin effected? Some say it was at the death of Christ on the cross, but others (Lagr., Zahn, etc.) hold that the deliverance here spoken of through the condemnation of sin took place at the very time of the Incarnation itself of the Son of God. It was then that God saw all that Christ would do to conquer sin, and then that sin was vanquished, because Christ took flesh free from sin (Lagr.).

In the flesh, i.e., in the flesh of Christ immolated for us all on the cross. God finally condemned and cast out sin through the sufferings of His Only-begotten Son "in the flesh," especially on the cross. This victory of Christ over sin is extended to all flesh, i.e., to all human nature, inasmuch as all by faith and grace may share in the merits and triumph of Christ.

The *in quo* of the Vulgate has the sense of *quia* or *quatenus*. The accusative *in similitudinem* (ἐν ὁμοιώματι) follows the participle *mittens* because motion is implied.

4. **That the justification**, etc. God destroyed the régime of sin in order that "the justification of the law," i.e., the moral precepts or commandments of the Law, might be fulfilled in us. The passive **might be fulfilled** (πληρωθῇ) is used to show that the observance of the Law is due more to the action and grace of God, than to our efforts and strength.

In us, who walk, etc., indicates the fact of our coöperation with God's grace in living not according to the concupiscence of the carnal man, but according to grace. Πνεῦμα, as opposed to σάρξ here, means grace, the spiritual principle of our actions, and not the Holy Ghost (Lagr.).

5. The opposition between the flesh and the spirit, indicated

6. For the wisdom of the flesh is death; but the wisdom of the spirit is life and peace.

7. Because the wisdom of the flesh is an enemy to God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither can it be.

8. And they who are in the flesh, cannot please God.

9. But you are not in the flesh, but in the spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.

in the preceding verse, induced the Apostle to show more at length (verses 5-8) the contrasts between the two. They that are according to the flesh, i.e., they that follow the concupiscence of their flesh, put their thoughts and affections in the things of the flesh, such as impurity, gluttony, and the like; whereas they who follow the spirit, i.e., grace, aspire to the things of grace, which are charity, joy, peace, etc.

Sentiunt of the Vulgate is not in the Greek.

6. The wisdom (*τὸ φρόνημα*), i.e., the *aspiration*, the *tendency* of the flesh is toward the death of the body and of the soul; but the *aspiration* or *tendency* of the spirit, i.e., of grace, is toward life and peace here and hereafter. The difference here indicated is the contrast between a life of sin and a life of grace in union with Christ.

In the Vulgate *prudentia* would better be *studium*, *affectus*.

7, 8. In these verses St. Paul gives two reasons why the wisdom, i.e., the *tendency* of the flesh is towards death: (a) because it is an enemy of God, the source of all life, since it is not subject to the divine will as expressed in God's law, but seeks rather the things that God has forbidden; (b) because they whose flesh is under the domination of sin, whose flesh coöperates with sin, cannot please God, and are consequently surely condemned to death.

Neither can it be, i.e., so long as the wisdom of the flesh holds sway, it cannot be subject; let the wisdom of the flesh cease, and man can be subject" (St. Aug.).

Verse 7 in the Vulgate has translated (*φρόνημα*) by *sapientia*, but *studium* or *affectus* is again the correct word. The phrase *inimica est Deo* should be *inimicitia est in Deum*.

9. The Apostle now applies his doctrine to the Roman Christians. But you Romans in your life do not follow the promptings of the flesh, the enemy of God, but the promptings of the

10. And if Christ be in you, the body indeed is dead, because of sin; but the spirit liveth, because of justification.

11. And if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead, dwell in you; he that raised up Jesus Christ from the dead, shall quicken also your mortal bodies, because of his Spirit that dwelleth in you.

spirit, i.e., of grace, if so (εἴπερ), i.e., if, as I have reason to believe, the **Spirit of God**, the Holy Ghost, abides in you. St. Paul takes care to note that if the Romans are following, as he believes, the promptings of grace, it is not due to their own efforts, but to the Holy Ghost who dwells in them. But since it is possible for the Christian to lose, through mortal sin, the Holy Spirit whom he received in Baptism, who is the Spirit of Christ as well as of God the Father, St. Paul goes on to observe that if anyone has lost this Holy Spirit, he no longer pertains to Christ, and has ceased to be a living member of Christ's fold.

The Spirit of God is here the Spirit of Christ, the Spirit that proceeds equally from the Father and from the Son (John xv. 22). The text proves nothing against the distinction of the Third Divine Person; neither does it prove directly that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son. The Spirit is here termed the **Spirit of Christ** because He dwells in the soul through union with Christ.

10. Here the Apostle says to the Romans that if Christ by His Holy Spirit dwells in them, their bodies indeed are **dead**, i.e., subject to death, on account of original sin in which they were born; but their **spirit**, i.e., their souls, live the life of grace for the purpose of producing good works, the fruits of "justification."

Because of justification (διὰ δικαιοσύνην) can mean: (a) that the justification given to the soul by God is the source of the spiritual life (St. Thomas, Cornely); or (b) that the spiritual life is the source of good works, that the spiritual life is *propter justitiam exercendam* (Lietzmann, Lagr.).

In the Vulgate *vivit* should be *vita*, and *propter justificationem* should be *propter justitiam*.

11. In this verse we are told that they in whom the Spirit of God dwells do not only enjoy now the life of grace for their souls, but that they shall also have their mortal bodies raised

12. Therefore, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live according to the flesh

13. For if you live according to the flesh, you shall die: but if by the Spirit you mortify the deeds of the flesh, you shall live.

gloriously from the dead on the last day. The Resurrection of Jesus and of all the dead is attributed to the Father because the Resurrection is a work of power, and to the Father especially such works are attributed. As God, of course, our Lord raised Himself from the dead (John x. 18); but as man He was raised by the Father. The Resurrection of Christ was the type of our resurrection (1 Cor. vi. 14; 2 Cor. iv. 14; Philip. iii. 21; 1 Thess. iv. 14). The reason here assigned for the resurrection of the bodies of the just is because during life they were the temples of the Holy Ghost. The Apostle is not now speaking about the resurrection of the wicked.

Because of his spirit, etc. There are different readings of this final clause. Soden prefers the genitive reading: *διὰ τοῦ . . . πνεύματος*, "through the Spirit dwelling in you," which would mean that the Holy Ghost will be the immediate cause of our resurrection. The accusative reading, which is that of the oldest MSS., has: *διὰ τὸ ἐνοικοῦν πνεῦμα*, i.e., "on account of the Spirit dwelling in you," *propter dignitatem Spiritus*, etc. This latter is the reading adopted in the Vulgate.

THE DANGER OF FOLLOWING THE FLESH, 12, 13

12, 13. These two verses are a corollary from all that has been said since chapter vi, and they give the final answer to the objections of vi. 1, 15. From what has been said it follows that for all the benefits that have been enumerated we are not debtors to the flesh, which enslaved us to sin and which of itself would again reduce us to slavery. The Apostle leaves it to be understood that we are debtors to the Spirit, to live according to Its dictates rather than according to the dictates of the flesh.

The works of the flesh lead to the death of the soul here and hereafter. But if we live in the spirit which we have received in Baptism, which is a principle of spiritual life in us, opposing to the works of the flesh the works of grace, we shall live now

14. For whosoever are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.

15. For you have not received the spirit of bondage again in fear; but you have received the spirit of adoption of sons, whereby we cry: Abba (Father).

the life of grace, and hereafter the life of glory. There are, therefore, for the Christian the alternatives of eternal life, if he lives according to the spirit; or of eternal death, if he follows the dictates of the flesh. The spirit here means the principle of the spiritual life, namely, grace (Cornely), and not the Holy Ghost (Zahn, Köhl). With this verse St. Paul has done with the flesh, and turns to consider more exclusively the spirit.

In place of *vixeritis* of the Vulgate it is better to read *vivitis*. Likewise *mortificaveritis* should be *mortificatis*, and *futurum est ut moriamini* should be *moriemini*.

THE CHILDREN OF GOD ARE HEIRS OF FUTURE GLORY, 14-30

14-30. In this section the Apostle considers the qualities of Christians, who are the adopted sons of God. If we are sons of God, we are heirs with Christ, and therefore heirs of future glory (verses 14-18). The certainty of this future glory is proved: (a) from the desire of irrational creatures (verses 19-22); (b) from the desire of the faithful (verses 23-25); (c) from the desire of the Holy Ghost dwelling in us (verses 26, 27); (d) from the designs of God Himself (verses 28-30).

14. Whosoever are led, etc., i.e., those who are governed by the Spirit of God, the Holy Ghost, and who, consequently, repress and control the desires of the flesh, are the sons of God, because sanctifying grace, communicated to them by the Holy Ghost, unites them to Christ, and makes them members of His mystical body and His brothers. To be a son of God, therefore, it is necessary not only to have received the Holy Ghost, but to be also governed by Him.

15. This and the following verse constitute a kind of parenthesis in which the Apostle shows why Christians are truly the adopted sons of God. He does not say that formerly they received the spirit of servitude, but only that the spirit they now have is unlike that which used to move them. Hence *παλιν* is to be joined to *εἰς φόβον*, and not to *ἐλάβετε*.

16. For the Spirit himself giveth testimony to our spirit, that we are the sons of God.

You have not received, etc., in Baptism the spirit of bondage or slavery which in Judaism you possessed, and which made you serve God without affection and from fear, as an unwilling slave would serve his master. Such a spirit could not come from God, or be pleasing to God.

The pagans served their divinities in this servile manner, being always moved by the fear of chastisement. The Jewish Law also was called the *law of fear*, because it did not exclude all servility. To secure its observance it had no power to confer grace (ix. 3; Gal. iii. 12, 21), but was forced to hold out threats of chastisement or promises of temporal reward (Heb. viii. 6; ix. 15). A spirit like this, says the Apostle, the Christians have not received. On the contrary, they have received the spirit of adoption of sons, i.e., a disposition of mind and soul which enables them to serve God out of love, as a good son would serve his father.

The spirit, therefore, which the Christians have received, and which is here in question, is not the Holy Ghost (verse 16), nor a supernatural principle of their actions, but a disposition of mind given by God, and as such, supernatural, similar to the spirit of wisdom spoken of in the Old Testament (Isa. xi. 2, 3; xxviii. 6). Cf. Lagr., h. 1. This spirit is a characteristic mark of a Christian, whereby he is known to be of the adopted sons of God; and of a filial disposition of soul which makes him freely choose to serve God not out of fear, but out of love. To this spirit of piety which the Christian possesses the Holy Ghost also bears witness (verse 16) that the faithful are the sons of God.

Abba is an Aramaic word which the Apostle here tells us means **Father** (cf. Mark xiv. 36; Gal. iv. 6). Some think the term pertained to an official prayer, but more probably it was only an expression of tenderness toward God, the Father.

The *in timore* of the Vulgate ought to be *in timorem*.

16. This verse completes the previous one and shows still more clearly that we are the sons of God. **For the Spirit himself giveth testimony**, etc., i.e., the Holy Ghost joins our spirit (verse 15) in bearing witness that we are truly the adopted children of God, be-

17. And if sons, heirs also; heirs indeed of God, and joint-heirs with Christ: yet so, if we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified with him.

cause it is by the impulse of this Holy Spirit, together with our own, that we, with filial love, invoke God by the name of Father (Gal. iv. 6). Here, however, we must observe that short of a special divine revelation we can never be absolutely certain that we are in a state of grace and are the sons of God; and that, consequently, the testimony which seems to come from the Holy Spirit may not be a deception of our own minds or of the evil one (cf. *Conc. Trid.*, Sess. VI. de Justif., cap. 9. can. 14, 15). Moral certitude in such matters is all we can hope for.

Lagrange holds that our spirit of the present verse is not the same as the spirit spoken of in the second part of the preceding verse, but is rather a more complete gift of God, coming from an outpouring of love from the Holy Ghost, who dwells in our souls and is the principle of our good actions.

That we are (ὄντι ἑσμέν) refers to the Christians who are the sons of God. The term τέκνα here is used in the same sense as υἱοί.

In the Vulgate *reddit spiritui nostro* should rather be *testatur una cum spiritu nostro*.

17. St. Paul now alludes to the Roman law which recognized the same rights to inheritance in adopted sons as in natural ones (Gal. iv. 1 ff.); and he concludes that since we are the adopted children of God, we shall be heirs together with Christ of God's life and glory (verses 13, 18). It is by reason of our union with Christ that we have a right to share in the eternal goods which are His by nature. But we shall be glorified with Christ only on condition that here below we suffer in union with Him. As He only through humiliation, sufferings and death entered into His glory; so we also must bear our sufferings and crosses in union with Him, in a disposition akin to His, if we wish to have part in His life and glory hereafter.

Yet so. The conjunction ἐντεπ may be translated, as in the Vulgate, by *si tamen*; or by *si quidem*, as many moderns prefer. The sense is nearly the same, except for the meaning which ἵνα receives in these two interpretations. According to the first, suffering with Christ in order to be glorified with Him is a matter of free

18. For I reckon that the sufferings of this time are not worthy to be compared with the glory to come, that shall be revealed in us.

19. For the expectation of the creature waiteth for the revelation of the sons of God.

choice; but if we choose so to suffer, it is with the intention (*eo fine ut*) that we shall be glorified with Him. According to the second interpretation, suffering with Christ is looked upon more as a fact of our present existence, the natural outcome of which is that we shall be glorified with Christ hereafter. This latter interpretation establishes a natural connection between suffering with Christ and reigning with Him, without this expressed intention on our part, which the former interpretation does not seem to recognize.

18. Having spoken in the preceding verse about suffering and reigning with Christ, the Apostle was reminded by the reference to *δόξα*, to note here the contrast between the passing trials and crosses of the present life, on the one hand, and the lasting glory that is in store hereafter for the faithful Christian, on the other. He who had suffered so much (2 Cor. xi. 23 ff.), and had also been elevated even to the third heaven (2 Cor. xii. 2 ff.) was able to speak from personal experience. Hence I **reckon** means *I am certain*.

This time means the present life of the Christian.

The glory to come, that shall be revealed, that shall be poured out upon us, body and soul (*εἰς ἡμᾶς*, *in nos*, rather than *in nobis* of the Vulg.), is now hidden from us, waiting upon death first, and for its complete and final unfolding, upon the resurrection of the body.

19. In verses 19-22 the Apostle, representing the irrational world as a person, proves the certainty of our future glory from the longing after it which is manifest even in irrational creatures. The present state of our own physical nature, with its many sufferings and limitations, finds its analogy in all material creation; for the material world shows by its actions that it is irresistibly, though unconsciously, striving after a liberation from the state of change and corruption to which it is now subjected.

Following the great authorities we have taken the creature here to mean irrational creation. It is true, however, that the

20. For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him that made it subject, in hope:

word *κτίσις* has various meanings in the Epistles. Sometimes it means the *creature* as distinguished from the Creator (i. 25), sometimes it signifies *men and angels* (Col. i. 15, 16), sometimes it stands for *creation* or the *creative act* (2 Pet. iii. 4), sometimes it means *mankind* or the *human creature* (1 Pet. ii. 13).

The expectation, i.e., the anxious yearning, of the creature, i.e., of all inanimate and irrational creation, waiteth, etc., i.e., is looking up impatiently, as it were, to the glorious manifestation of the future glory of Christians. The renovation of nature entered into the Messianic hope of the Jews (Isa. lxxv. 17; cf. 2 Pet. iii. 13; Apoc. xx. 1). The phrase *expectatio . . . expectat* is a Hebraism expressive of intense desire.

For the revelation, i.e., for the day when the just shall enter, as the sons of God, into the possession of eternal glory. There also will be the manifestation of the "new heavens and the new earth" (2 Pet. iii. 13) to which the present strife and distress of nature tends.

20. A reason is now assigned for the condition just given of the material world. The creature (*ἡ κτίσις*), i.e., irrational creation, was made subject, by the sentence pronounced by God against Adam after the latter's sin ("cursed is the earth," etc., Gen. iii. 17), to vanity, i.e., to mutability, corruption, dissolution and death,—from which condition it yearns to be delivered by participating in the glory and incorruption of the sons of God (St. Chrys., St. Thomas, Toussaint and many non-Catholics). According to Cornely, Prat, Crampon and others, "the creature" has been "subjected to vanity" inasmuch as, since the sin of Adam, in place of serving and glorifying God, it has become, in the hands of fallen man, an instrument of sin and rebellion against God.

Not willingly, i.e., irrational creation, which, like everything else, naturally seeks its own perfection and permanence, has not chosen either the corruption and death, or the profane and sinful uses to which it has been subjected by reason of him, i.e., by the ordination of God, who has cursed nature along with fallen man, but who at the same time has left in it a hope

21. Because the creature also itself shall be delivered from the servitude of corruption, into the liberty of the glory of the children of God.

22. For we know that every creature groaneth, and travaileth in pain, even till now.

23. And not only it, but ourselves also, who have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption of the sons of God, the redemption of our body.

that in the future renovation it will be delivered from its present condition and will have part in the glorification of man (Cornely, Lagr., etc.).

In spe of the Vulgate would better be *in spem*.

21. St. Paul explains in what the hope of **the creature** consists. It hopes to be delivered from the state of corruption to which it is now subjected, and to have a share in the glory and incorruption of the sons of God. This is the renovation of nature foretold by the Prophet (Isa. lxxv. 17) and expressly designated in the New Testament (2 Peter iii. 13; Apoc. xxi. 1).

It is evident that the part nature shall have in **the glory of the children of God** will be negative rather than positive. It will be delivered from its present state of corruption, dissolution and death, as well as from the profane uses to which it is now subjected.

22. **We know**, i.e., we Christians know from revelation (Gen. iii. 17) that the condition of nature is far from what it ought to be, and that it will have a better state hereafter (2 Peter iii. 13; Apoc. xxi. 1).

Groaneth, and travaileth, as a woman in the pangs of childbirth, who feels the pain of her present state, but looks forward to another one of joy when the child is born (John xvi. 21). Nature feels its state of bondage **even till now**, i.e., at the present moment, as it has felt it all along since the Fall; but the figure of parturition here used does not mean that, as in the case of a woman in childbirth, nature is soon to be delivered from its sufferings. Its emancipation will follow only upon the glorification of man.

23. The Apostle now passes to the second argument in favor of the certainty of our future glory. **Not only it**, i.e., not only irrational nature yearns for deliverance from the present state of corruption, **but ourselves also**, i.e., all Christians, have

24. For we are saved by hope. But hope that is seen, is not hope. For what a man seeth, why doth he hope for?

the same longing. It is not correct to say, as some of the ancients did, that **ourselves** refers only to the Apostles.

The first fruits of the Spirit, i.e., the first gifts of the Holy Ghost, such as faith, sanctifying grace, hope, etc., but which are not the fulness of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit that shall be ours in the state of glory. Lagrange and others understand "the first fruits of the Spirit" to mean the Holy Ghost dwelling in us with His grace, who is an earnest and a pledge of the gift of glory hereafter (2 Cor. v. 5).

The adoption, i.e., the complete and perfect adoption which will consist in the glorification of both soul and body; now we enjoy only that imperfect adoption which follows upon justification. The last and final fruit of our consummate adoption will be the resurrection and glorification of our body. The body needs redemption, because it became the seat of sin and death (vii. 24; viii. 11), because it is through the body that we are connected with the physical universe, and because our happiness would not be complete without the redemption of our whole being, body as well as soul.

Of the sons of God (Vulg., *filiorum Dei*) is not in the Greek.

St. Paul shows here that our adoption and salvation are now complete only *in hope*, and not in reality. Hence *τῇ ἐλπίδι* is a modal dative, which shows the manner in which our redemption is now complete, namely, *in hope*. Being justified we have already the beginning of our salvation and perfect adoption, the full possession and realization of which waits upon the glorification of both our body and our soul.

As a matter of fact, according to the doctrine of St. Paul, we are saved by faith; we firmly believe that God will save us, and hope vividly anticipates the fulfillment of God's promises and the realization of all we believe.

But hope that is seen, etc. The meaning is that hope regards an absent object, and not one "that is seen," that is present. That which is present and is seen, is no longer hoped for.

For what a man seeth, etc. Better, "Who hopeth for what he seeth" (*ὁ γὰρ βλέπει, τὸς ἐλπίζει*, as it is in the Vatican MS.).

25. But if we hope for that which we see not, we wait for it with patience.

26. Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmity. For we know not what we should pray for as we ought; but the Spirit himself asketh for us with unspeakable groanings.

27. And he that searcheth the hearts, knoweth what the Spirit desireth; because he asketh for the saints according to God.

25. But if we hope, etc., i.e., it is of the essence of hope to regard not that which is present, but **that which we see not**; and for this we wait with patient endurance (*δι' ὑπομονῆς*), steadily resisting all adverse influences. Patient and firm expectancy is the peculiar quality of Christian hope.

26. The third proof of the certainty of our future glory comes from the Holy Ghost who dwells in the faithful soul. As the creature, and as we ourselves yearn for our complete redemption, so **likewise** does the Holy Spirit, who dwells in our hearts. And this Holy Spirit also helpeth (*συναντιλαμβάνεται*, i.e., lends a helping hand and coöperates with us) the **infirmity** of our prayers.

For we know not, etc. Although we know in a general way from the *Our Father* (Matt. vi. 9) what form our prayers should take, still often we do not know how to ask in particular cases. At these times **the Spirit himself** comes to our aid and **asketh for us**, i.e., moves us to ask as we ought (Matt. x. 20), putting on our lips **unspeakable groanings**, i.e., words unintelligible to man, but understood by God. There is question here of an extraordinary kind of prayer in which the soul is absorbed in God, and does not understand what it says or what it does. The state is somewhat comparable to that of the gift of tongues possessed at times by the early Christians who could pray in strange languages without being able to interpret their prayers (1 Cor. xiv. 2-39); but there is not a complete parity between the state here mentioned and that of those early Christians. The gift of tongues has disappeared now, but the inspiration or direction of the Spirit concerning which St. Paul wrote to the Romans is always present to the faithful soul, teaching it how to pray (Matt. x. 20).

27. While the utterance which the Spirit frames for us and puts on our lips may be altogether inexplicable to us and unin-

28. And we know that to them that love God, all things work together unto good, to such as, according to his purpose, are called to be saints.

telligible to others, nevertheless God, whose science penetrates all the secrets of our hearts (1 Kings viii. 39; Ps. vii. 10), **knoweth** the desires (τὸ φρόνημα) which the Spirit utters through us, i.e., God knows the end to which the petitions of the Spirit tend and the purpose which they serve.

Because (ὅτι, in the sense of *quod*, *that*). God knows not only the desire of the Spirit, but He knows also that what the Spirit asks is always conformable to the divine will (κατὰ θεόν), and tends, therefore, to the fulfillment of the divine decrees and to the consequent salvation of the faithful soul (Cornely).

For the saints (ὕπὲρ ἀνίων), i.e., on behalf of those who are dear to God, namely, the faithful.

28. In verses 28-30 the certainty of our future glory is proved from the testimony of God Himself. This is the fourth proof the Apostle has given regarding the certainty of our coming blessedness. These arguments are calculated to encourage and strengthen the Christians to bear their sufferings patiently in view of their glory to come.

That the object or term of the series of divine acts mentioned in these verses (28-30), which give assurance to the hope of the just is not *grace*, as St. Chrysostom and his school have said, but *glory*, is evident from the fact that the testimony of God Himself, which is the confirmation and completion of the Christian's hope, is concerned with that which we have not yet seen, but which we hope for (verse 24), namely, future glory. St. Paul is considering two states, the state of present grace, and that of future glory (verse 21); the first has been discussed already in the preceding verses, the second remains to be considered, unless the final and supreme confirmation of our hope is to go without consideration. This would seem to result in the opinion held by St. Chrysostom.

In the present verse the Apostle tells the Christians not to be disheartened over the troubles and sufferings of this passing life, because God in His eternal, all-wise decree concerning them has so arranged matters that He will make all things—trials, crosses, sufferings, etc., contribute to their present sanctification, and thus to their future glory.

To them that love God, i.e., to the Christians, all of whom the Apostle is supposing to be in the state of grace, and therefore, through love to belong to Christ (viii. 9).

All things work together, etc. The subject of "work together" (*συνεργεῖ*) is not "all things," but **God** (*ὁ θεός*), which must be supplied,—(a) because "God" is surely the subject of the verbs that follow coördinately with *συνεργεῖ* in the succeeding verses (29, 30), and (b) because it would only be by the action or causality of "God" that "all things" could be said to coöperate or "work together" for our salvation. The meaning is that God makes use of all things as helps and aids to those whom He calls to sanctity and glory.

To such as, etc., i.e., to those who are called to be Christians, and who respond to that call (Cornely, Prat). St. Paul is not referring here to the distinction between the "called" and the "elect" (Matt. xx. 16; xxii. 14); his words are not restrictive, but explanatory, as referring to all the Christians that have embraced the faith, without entering here into the further question of those who are finally to be saved. In this and the two following verses St. Paul is speaking only of what God does, of God's calling the Christians to the faith, of His sanctifying them and of His glorifying them,—all of which is according to His eternal decree; the Apostle is not now affirming or denying the possibility of some of the Christians failing to coöperate with God's grace, thereby coming short of their eternal crowns. Had he wished in these verses to distinguish two classes among the Christians—those who were to be saved, and those who were to be lost—he would have greatly saddened some of them, at least, and this was surely contrary to his purpose, which was to encourage them all.

According to his purpose (*κατὰ πρόθεσιν*), i.e., according to God's eternal decree. Everywhere in the New Testament, with the exception of three places (2 Tim. iii. 10; Acts xi. 23; xxvii. 13), where it indicates the purpose of man, the word *πρόθεσις* signifies a divine decree to confer some supernatural benefit, as in ix. 11; Eph. i. 11; iii. 11; 2 Tim. i. 9 (Cornely). God, therefore, has called Christians to the faith, because He has decreed to do so from all eternity; and this decree is gratuitous, as not depending

29. For whom he foreknew, he also predestinated to be made conformable to the image of his Son; that he might be the firstborn amongst many brethren.

on the merits of men; it is absolute, as having for its effect an efficacious call (Lagr., Prat).

It is *de fide* that we cannot merit the first habitual grace of justification, or the grace of final perseverance; these are gratuitous gifts of God. Given the first grace, we may merit subsequent graces, with the exception of the final one. Whether God's eternal decree (*πρόθεσις*), in the mind of St. Paul, has reference to predestination to glory *ante* or *post praevisa merita* is disputed. Indeed, it seems that in this verse the Apostle is not treating either phase of this question directly; proximately and directly he is speaking at present only of an efficacious call to the faith (Cornely). Naturally, however, predestination to glory is on the horizon here, and is necessarily bound up with what is said in these verses, 28-30, and in the following chapter. If one is not predestined to be called to the faith, he is lacking the first requisite for predestination to glory.

29. This verse is explanatory of the preceding one. The Apostle tells the Christians that efficacious divine assistance is assured them, because they are predestined to be participants in the glory of Christ.

For (*οτι*, *because*) explains *πάντα συνεργεῖ*, why God causes all things to contribute to the help of those whom He calls.

He foreknew (*προέγνω*). For St. Chrysostom and other Greek Fathers, who understand *πρόθεσις*, *purpose*, of the preceding verse, to mean only the good disposition on the part of Christians which makes their call to the faith efficacious, "foreknew" of this verse does not include the idea of choice, but simply means the foreknowledge by which God understood those who would respond to His call, and whom He, therefore, predestined. For those who regard the *call* as efficacious and the *purpose* a divine decree, "foreknew" means: (a) knowledge accompanied by a choice or preference on the part of the divine will (Zahn, Allo, etc.); (b) the knowledge which God has from eternity of the perseverance of some in faith and love (Cornely); (c) foreknowledge, as distinguished from predestination, and yet accompanied by a predilec-

30. And whom he predestinated, them he also called. And whom he called, them he also justified. And whom he justified, them he also glorified.

tion of which St. Paul does not here assign the cause (Lagr., St. Thomas).

Those, therefore, whom God has known and loved from all eternity, He has **predestinated** (verse 29) **to be made conformable**, etc. This conformity is not the motive or cause, but rather the effect or consequence of predestination; and it will consist finally, in the resurrection, in our complete and perfect adoption as sons, in our transformation and glorification of body and soul, so as to share in the glory of Christ's risen, glorified body (Cornely, Toussaint, etc.). God, then, has predestined Christians to be conformable to His Son, and the Son has taken our body, in order that we might share in the glory of His risen body, in order that we might be His adopted brethren and He the **firstborn** among His **many brethren**. St. Paul is here telling the Christians that the call to the faith, to which they have responded, is, in the divine plan, the pledge of their eternal glory (Lagr.). Doubtless a conformity to Christ here below through grace is presupposed to our final and glorious conformity to Him in the resurrection, but it is only this latter that is under consideration now.

Nam of the Vulgate would better be *quoniam*, and *fili sui* should be *fili eius*.

30. The Apostle here enumerates the various acts by which God in time executes His eternal decree regarding Christians. The first of these acts is the call to the faith, the next is justification, and the last is glorification. Obviously there is question in the Apostle's mind only of an efficacious call, of an actual embracing of the faith and of a real internal justification through grace which persists to the end of life, and which is finally crowned by a glorification of body and soul that will render the Christian conformable to the glorified risen Christ. It is true that **glorified** (*ἐδόξασεν*), being in the past tense, causes a difficulty. We can easily understand how the predestination, the call and the justification of the faithful, to whom the Apostle is writing, are past; but it would seem that their glorification should be expressed by a future tense. St. Chrysostom explained

this by saying that the faithful have already acquired glory by adoption and grace. But since the great majority of interpreters hold that there is question here only of future glory, we can explain ἐδόξασεν by saying that the Apostle, speaking of the consummation of the Christian life, regards all as past, and so rightly speaks of the Christians' glorification as completed. Or it may be observed that the verbs in this verse—*predestinated, called, justified, glorified*—are in the aorist tense in Greek, and as such they abstract from time, and might be rendered by the present tense in English, as expressing an abiding truth, namely, God's eternal mode of acting.

Throughout this section (verses 28-30) St. Paul is assuring the Christians as a body of the certitude of their future glory. His aim is to encourage them to bear their present sufferings and labors, and to persevere in view of the future glory which God has decreed for them. As far as God is concerned, he wishes to tell them their call to the faith and their justification are a sure pledge of salvation; their coöperation with God's grace and their perseverance are tacitly presupposed. The Apostle is not considering the particular destiny of each Christian in the designs of God, but only the designs of God for Christianity; he is considering Christians as a body, those who have responded to God's call, who have believed, who have received Baptism and have been justified. He is taking it for granted that the faithful will do their part by coöperating with God's grace to the end, and consequently he is describing the glorious consummation of the work of their salvation as far as God's part is concerned. Cf. Cornely, Lagrange, etc., h. l.

THE LOVE OF GOD FOR US, 31-39

31-39. The certainty of the Christians' future glory being proved, St. Paul now terminates the second section of the Dogmatic Part of this Epistle with a hymn of praise and triumph, moved by the evidence of the love of God and of Christ which the reasons for our hope have inspired. He shows that the faithful have nothing to fear, and that nothing can separate them from the charity of Christ.

31. What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who is against us?

32. He that spared not even his own Son, but delivered him up for us all. how hath he not also, with him, given us all things?

33. Who shall accuse against the elect of God? God that justifieth.

34. Who is he that shall condemn? Christ Jesus that died, yea that is risen also again; who is at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.

31. What shall we, etc., i.e., what conclusions are we Christians to draw from the arguments we have just finished considering?

To these things (*πρὸς ταῦτα*), i.e., about the arguments we have just given.

If God be for us,—as He evidently is from the preceding verses—who is there that we should fear? Surely no one, is the implied response.

32. The Apostle here gives a most undeniable proof that God is for us, and that He has provided us with all things necessary to conquer our enemies.

He that (*ὁς γέ*), i.e., the God, indeed, that spared not, etc. If God has given us so immense a benefit as His only Son to suffer and to die for us, what other lesser good can He refuse us? The words *τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ* show the difference between God's own natural Son and His sons by adoption. This is the only instance in the New Testament where *γέ* is used with the relative.

The *donavit* of the Vulgate should be *donabit*, in conformity with the Greek.

33, 34. In these verses St. Paul shows the absurdity of the Christians thinking or feeling that anyone can be against them (verse 31).

Who shall accuse against the elect of God, i.e., against the Christians? Certainly no one, because it is God that has justified them, absolving them of all guilt. In the face of God's acquittal, the condemnation of the world counts for nothing.

Who shall condemn them? Certainly not Christ, the Judge of the living and the dead (ii. 16; 2 Cor. v. 10); for it is Christ that has died for our sins and risen again for our justification (iv. 25), and that now sits at the right hand of God (1 Cor. xv. 24) to make intercession for us (1 John ii. 1). Therefore no

35. Who then shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation? or distress? or famine? or nakedness? or danger? or persecution? or the sword?

36. (As it is written: For thy sake we are put to death all the day long. We are accounted as sheep for the slaughter.)

37. But in all these things we overcome, because of him that hath loved us. one shall be able to oppose us Christians. The context shows that the Apostle is speaking not alone of the future judgment, but of the general condition of the Christians, present and future. It is disputed whether the clauses, **God that justifieth and Christ Jesus that died**, etc., should be read as affirmations (Cornely, Köhl, etc.), or as interrogations (St. Aug., Tous-saint, Weiss, etc.). The sense is the same in either case, and the responses in reality are certainly negative.

35. The Apostle now shows that, after so many blessings, nothing in the world ought to be able to separate Christians from the love of Christ, i.e., the love of Christ for them.

Then (Vulg., *ergo*), is not represented in the Greek.

Love of Christ, for us, according to modern interpreters. The Apostle is insisting on the certainty of our future glory because of the gifts we have received from God, not because of our faithfulness to Christ; this latter of course is presupposed. "Love of Christ" here is doubtless the same reading as "love of God" in verse 39, which shows that St. Paul identified Christ and God.

36. The tribulations unto death of the just had already been described by the Psalmist in Ps. xliii. 22, where there was question of persecutions which the people of Israel sustained from their enemies (very probably under Antiochus Epiphanes, when some of the Israelites were put to death) for the sake of God. The Apostle applies these words to the Christians to show what they must bear for Christ, thereby again identifying God and Christ.

For thy sake, i.e., for the cause and religion of the true God.

All the day long, i.e., continually.

There should be no parentheses around this verse.

37. In all our tribulations, distresses, etc., we come out victorious because of the help we receive from God, because of the love of Christ for us. As in verse 35, so here it is Christ's love *for us* that is in question. The reading: *διὰ τὸν ἀγαπήσαντα* is sup-

38. For I am sure that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor might,

39. Nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

ported by only three MSS.; the best MSS. have: *διὰ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντος*.

The Vulgate *propter eum* should be *per eum*.

38, 39. The Apostle here tells us that, on account of the love which God has for us in Christ, nothing, even the most terrible, or the most alluring things in creation can suffice to separate us from God. St. Paul is stressing the potency of God's love for us, which nothing can shake or impair, except, of course, our own will.

Death, the most terrible physical evil.

Life, the most desirable good of the present natural state.

Angels, i.e., spirits sent as messengers.

Principalities, spirits of a superior order.

Powers (Vulg., *virtutes*), i.e., forces of nature. This term "powers" is wanting in the best MSS., and is likely a repetition of *fortitude* (*fortitudo*) of the Vulgate. No powers, conditions or influences of the present or future time, no creature, material, human or angelic, can separate the Christian from God—from the love which God has for us and which He has shown us through Christ. St. Paul is here emphasizing God's love for us, which, of itself, is able to do so much for our souls; he is taking it for granted that we shall not choose, by our own free will, to defeat the effect of God's love for us.

CHAPTER IX

With this chapter begins the third section of the Dogmatic Part of this Epistle. In the preceding chapter the Apostle exposed his conception of the Christian life—the life of faith, animated by the Holy Ghost and destined for unfading glory in heaven. The Gospel is the power of God to everyone that believes, to the Jew first, and then to the Greek (i. 16). But how is it, then, it may rightly be asked, that the great majority of the Jews have failed to embrace the Gospel and enter the Church

1. I speak the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost:

2. That I have great sadness, and continual sorrow in my heart.

of Christ? This is the problem which engages the Apostle's attention in the present and in the two following chapters. The Jews were, indeed, the chosen people of God who gave the Redeemer to the world (ix. 1-5), and although they have, notwithstanding, been in the main excluded from a part in the Messiah's redemption, still the divine promises have not failed in their regard (ix. 6-29); their rejection is due to their own culpableness, blindness and disobedience (ix. 30-x. 21); and even in this the mercy of God has been manifest, for a remnant has been saved already; the Gentiles have profited by Israel's loss, and all the Jews will find mercy at the end (xi. 1-32). These profound reflections are a reason for praising the wisdom and knowledge of God's inscrutable providence (xi. 33-36).

THE APOSTLE'S PROFOUND SORROW OVER THE STATE OF THE JEWS, 1-5

1-5. Following upon the exposition of a new system of justification by faith, the glorious life and outcome of which inspired the hymn of triumph that closed the preceding chapter, comes now an expression of sorrow the most profound. St. Paul explains to his Roman readers why his own people have been rejected by God, in spite of all their privileges, and incidentally why he himself turned from them to the Gentile world, in spite of his natural ardent love for them.

1. I speak the truth . . . I lie not. These are strong ways, one positive and the other negative, of assuring his readers of the truth of what he is about to say. The Apostle avows that he is acting in union with Christ, conformably to his own conscience, of which the Holy Ghost is the interior principle. Cf. 1 Tim. ii. 7; 2 Cor. xi. 31; vii. 14; xii. 6; Gal. i. 20.

The before "truth" is not in the Greek.

2. The fact of Israel's having cut herself off from the Messianic blessings was a continual source of sorrow to St. Paul. Some of the Jews (Acts xxi. 21) considered the Apostle to be an

3. For I wished myself to be an anathema from Christ, for my brethren, who are my kinsmen according to the flesh.

enemy of their nation, but here he shows the truth and sincerity of his feelings toward them. **Sadness** expresses mental pain; **sorrow** is grief in general.

3. To manifest his great love for his people St. Paul says here that he considers their welfare before his own, so much so that, if it were possible, he could wish rather that he should be deprived of the blessings of the Messiah than that they should suffer this loss.

I wished, etc. Better, *I could wish* (ἤχόμην, *optarem*), if it were possible. The Apostle knew this was not a serious hypothesis, and was expressing himself in the language of sentiment rather than according to cold reasoning (Lagr.); he was giving expression to an impracticable wish.

Anathema from Christ, i.e., to be separated from Christ so as to be deprived of Christianity and of the Messianic benefits. "Anathema" literally means a thing *set up to be destroyed*; it comes from two Greek words signifying *to place apart*. To the Jews it meant a person or thing cursed, and therefore fit for destruction (Lev. xxvii. 28, 29; Deut. vii. 26; Josue vi. 17). With St. Paul it meant cursed of God (Gal. i. 8, 9; 1 Cor. xii. 3; xvi. 22). According to Cornely, therefore, St. Paul meant to say that, for the sake of his brethren, the Jews, he was willing to be externally separated from Christ forever, and to be condemned to eternal torments, without ceasing, however, to be united to Christ through grace. But as there seems to be nothing in the context to suggest this distinction, and as there is not question of future time, but of the present (εἶναι), we think it better to accept for this passage the explanation of Lagrange given above.

In any event, St. Paul was guilty of no sin by this wish; for he was desiring not something sinful in itself, but only a penalty of sin; namely, separation from Christ, while remaining himself in grace. Neither did the Apostle sin against charity toward himself, since his love of God so surpassed his love of self that he was willing, if need be, to sacrifice his own happiness in order to bring many to Christ.

Optabam of the Vulgate would better be *optarem*.

4. Who are Israelites, to whom belongeth the adoption as of children, and the glory, and the testament, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises:

5. Whose are the fathers, and of whom is Christ, according to the flesh, who is over all things, God blessed for ever. Amen.

4. Here the Apostle enumerates the principal prerogatives of the Jews.

Israelites—a title of honor, comprehending all the privileges of the Jews, and given to them because they were descendants of Jacob, to whom God gave the name *Israel* (Gen. xxii. 29).

The adoption, etc., by which the Israelites had been selected from among all others, to be the people of God (Exod. iv. 22; xix. 5; Deut. xiv. 1),—which adoption, however, being only political, was merely a figure of, and therefore far inferior to that which the Christian enjoys through the grace of Christ.

The glory, i.e., the Shechinah, or sensible manifestation of the presence of God in the Tabernacle and in the Temple (Exod. xl. 34; 3 Kings viii. 10; Ezech. x. 11; 2 Mach. i. 18, etc.).

The testament. In Greek the plural is used, "the testaments," i.e., *the covenants* (αἱ διαθήκαι) that were made with Abraham (Gen. xv. 18; xvii. 2, etc.), with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (Exod. ii. 24), and with Moses and the whole people (Exod. xxiv. 7 ff.).

The giving of the law, i.e., the Mosaic Law, which regulated the **service**; i.e., the worship of the true God in antiquity (cf. 2 Mach. vi. 23).

The promises made to Abraham, and especially those concerning the Messiah, which were contained in the numerous prophecies relative to the Redeemer (cf. iv. 13; Gal. iii. 16).

In the Vulgate *testamentum* should be plural, *testamenta*.

5. The dignity of the Jews because of their origin is now shown. Their ancestors were the **fathers**, i.e., the Patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob—men beloved of God above all others (Exod. iii. 6; Deut. iv. 37; Acts vii. 32).

Of whom is Christ. The greatest of all the dignities of the Jews consisted in the fact that Christ was to come from them, that they were to give the Messiah to the world.

According to the flesh, i.e., as regards the flesh (τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, *quantum attinet ad carnem* (Erasmus)), namely, according to His human nature.

Who is . . . God, i.e., this Christ, who was of Jewish origin according to His human nature, was also God, the Creator and Ruler over all things, and had, therefore, a divine nature, and hence is blessed for ever.

St. Thomas observes that in this verse four heresies are destroyed: (a) that of the Manicheans, who said that Christ had not a true, but only an apparent body; against which the Apostle here says that Christ was descended from the Jews *according to the flesh*; (b) that of Valentine who taught that the body of Jesus was not from the common mass of the human race, but had come from heaven; whereas St. Paul here says that *according to the flesh* Christ was from the Jews; (c) that of Nestorius who held that the son of man was one person, the son of God another person in Christ; against which the Apostle asserts that the same person who was from the Jews according to the flesh was God, the Ruler of all things; (d) that of Arius, who said that Christ was less than the Father and created out of nothing; against which the Apostle insists that Christ was *God over all things* and that He is *blessed forever*: only God could be *blessed forever*.

Certain Rationalists (Jülicher, Lipsius, Lochmann, etc.), in order to weaken this clear testimony of the Apostle regarding the Divinity of Christ, have said that a period should be placed after *secundum carnem* or after *omnia*, and that the remainder of the verse should be considered as a doxology in praise of God. This opinion, however, cannot be sustained,—(a) because it is opposed to the traditional reading, found in the vast majority of MSS. and in almost all versions; and (b) because it is opposed to the authority of the oldest Fathers, who made use of this very text to prove the Divinity of Christ. Cf. Cornely, h. l.; Lagr., h. l.; *Revue Bib.*, 1903, pp. 550-570.

IN SPITE OF JEWISH INCREDULITY GOD IS FAITHFUL TO HIS PROMISES;
FOR EVEN IN THE OLD TESTAMENT ELECTION DEPENDED ON THE
FREE CHOICE OF GOD, 6-13

6-13. Up to these verses in the present chapter the condition of Israel has been only indirectly stated in Paul's wish that he might be anathema from Christ for his fellow-Jews, if that was

6. Not as though the word of God hath miscarried. For all are not Israelites that are of Israel:

7. Neither are all they that are the seed of Abraham, children; but in Isaac shall thy seed be called:

possible. Strange as it may seem, in spite of all their privileges, in spite of the promise made to them, in spite of the fact that Christ took His human nature from among them, it is they who are anathema from Christ. And yet the designs of God cannot be frustrated, neither have they been; for, on the one hand, the designs of God are not restricted to a carnal descent, and on the other hand, some of the Jews have accepted the Gospel. If all the Jews have not embraced the faith, it is because they did not all receive an efficacious call. God, who even in the beginning of Jewish history, drew distinctions within the seed of Abraham, as in the case of Isaac's children, Jacob and Esau, was not obliged to call all the Jews to the faith, nor of those called, to treat all in the same manner. God chooses men in accordance with His purposes, and this is the first explanation of Israel's condition.

6. While St. Paul found no difficulty in that the Law had been abrogated, he could in nowise admit that the word of God to Israel, i.e., the unconditional promise that Israel should be saved by the Messiah, could fail of its fulfillment. In this promise the veracity and fidelity of God were involved. Those who think the incredulity of the Jews has rendered vain the promise of God make the mistake, says the Apostle, of thinking that that promise was made to the carnal descendants of Abraham; they fail to distinguish between those who are Israelites according to the flesh (1 Cor. x. 18) and those who are Israelites according to the spirit, the spiritual children of Abraham (Gal. vi. 16).

Israel, in place of *Israelitae* of the Vulgate, is more in conformity with the Greek. Hence also, "Israelites" would better be "Israel" in English.

7. The thought of the preceding verse is more clearly developed. The Apostle says that not all who are carnally descended from Abraham shall be the inheritors of the promise, but only those who are descendants through Isaac, as Gen. xxi. 12 clearly testifies.

8. That is to say, not they that are the children of the flesh, are the children of God; but they, that are the children of the promise, are accounted for the seed.

9. For this is the word of promise: According to this time will I come; and Sara shall have a son.

Seed (σπέρμα) in the first part of this verse means carnal descendants; in the second part it indicates the descendants that inherit the blessings of the promise. Ishmael was a type of the first; Isaac of the second.

Children (τέκνα), an endearing term, are those descendants of Abraham who are recognized by God as the legitimate heirs of the promises made to the Patriarchs.

8. The preceding verse is explained here.

Not . . . the children of the flesh, etc., i.e., they are not the children of God, and the consequent heirs of the promise, that are descended carnally from Abraham, as Ishmael was; but those are the heirs that, like Isaac, **are the children of the promise**; those, namely, who, being united to Christ through faith, have imitated the virtues of Abraham, and have thereby become his true descendants and the heirs of the promise (Gal. iii. 26). People do not become the children of God because of their natural origin, but only by God's free choice in advance, as in the case of the election of Isaac. Isaac was called the child of promise (Gal. iv. 23, 29), because he was born of Abraham and Sara in their old age by virtue of the promise God made to them.

It is to be noted that the words of Genesis regarding Isaac in the preceding verse, as well as the quotations about Jacob and Esau in the verses that follow, have direct reference to temporal blessings; but the Apostle is here making use of them in their typical meaning. He wishes to say that just as God, of His own free choice, bestowed temporal blessings on Isaac in consequence of Isaac's being the child of promise, rather than on Ishmael, who was descended from Abraham only in a carnal and natural way; so will He likewise bestow His spiritual blessings of grace and justification on those who are the children of Abraham by reason of their faith, rather than by reason of mere carnal descent. Faith, and not carnal descent, establishes the true relationship between Abraham and his children.

9. This verse explains how Isaac was the child of promise.

10. And not only she. But when Rebecca also had conceived at once, of Isaac our father.

11. For when the children were not yet born, nor had done any good or evil (that the purpose of God, according to election, might stand),

12. Not of works, but of him that calleth, it was said to her: The elder shall serve the younger.

When Abraham and Sara were old and could not naturally expect to have a child, God promised them through His angel (Gen. xviii. 10-14) that in about a year's time they would have a son. Isaac was therefore the result of a miracle, rather than a child of the flesh.

According to this time, i.e., in about one year.

10. The Apostle gives a second example (verses 10-13) which proves still more clearly the liberty of God's elections, since there is question now of the same mother and her twins by the same father. **She** is not in the Greek, which reads: "Not only (this), but also Rebecca," etc. The Apostle wishes to point out from the case of Rebecca (Gen. xxv. 23) that God, in giving privileges and blessings to men, has no regard either for the conditions of their birth or for their personal merits. Thus we see that, of two sons, twins, conceived **at once**, i.e., at the same time by the same father and of the same mother, one was chosen, the other rejected by God before they saw the light of day (verse 11). Hence it follows that the promise of God was not made to all the carnal descendants of Abraham, and so it is not to be wondered at that many Jews remain in their incredulity and do not have part in the promised blessings.

The *illa* of the Vulgate should be omitted, according to the Greek.

11, 12. In these verses the Apostle shows that God, guided solely by His gratuitous election, freely chooses people to do His will; and that, consequently, just as, irrespective of the personal merits of Jacob and Esau, He chose the former on whom to bestow all kinds of temporal blessings, and rejected the latter; so has He gratuitously decreed to bestow on the Gentiles, typified by Jacob, the spiritual blessings of justification and of the Gospel, and exclude the Jews, as a race, typified by Esau, from a participation in those blessings.

When the children were not yet born. The subject of γεννηθέντων is evidently Jacob and Esau in the womb of their mother.

13. As it is written: Jacob I have loved, but Esau I have hated.

Nor had done any good, etc., i.e., before any chance of merit or demerit on their part, God preferred Jacob and made him the object of future blessings, in spite of the fact that Esau was the first-born, and as such would seem to enjoy some special rights to those blessings. But Esau, as a matter of fact, as if in fulfillment of the divine decree, sold his rights as firstborn to Jacob, and this latter obtained the blessing of his father Isaac and was made heir in place of his brother. The Edomites, the descendants of Esau, were consequently made subject to and were dominated by the Israelites, who were descended from Jacob (2 Kings viii. 13). These words of the Apostle are a refutation of the Pelagian heresy which said that grace is given by God in view of antecedent merits.

That the purpose, etc., i.e., the eternal decree of God to reject Esau and call Jacob to the inheritance of temporal blessings.

According to election. This eternal decree of God has its reason not in the present or future merits of those who are called, but only in the free and gratuitous choice of God.

Not of works, etc., i.e., not out of regard for anyone's works or merits, but solely of him that calleth, i.e., through the grace of God who calls.

The elder shall serve, etc. This reference is to Gen. xxv. 23. When Rebecca felt the infants struggling in her womb, she sought an explanation of the incident from the Lord, and she was told that she "had two nations in her womb," and that the elder, i.e., the descendants of the elder (the Edomites) would be subject to those of the younger, namely, the Israelites. This divine prediction was literally verified in the time of David (2 Kings viii. 13). The mystical application of these words by St. Paul is evident.

Nearly all modern exegetes omit the parentheses of verse 11.

13. Jacob I have loved, etc. Here St. Paul cites the Prophet Malachy (i. 2) to show the reason why God chose Jacob rather than Esau. He freely loved the former and hated the latter, and this is the sole reason why He forechose and predestined the one for future blessings, and rejected the other. The words of Malachy, like those of Gen. xxv. 23, refer both to the persons

of Jacob and Esau and to the peoples that descended from them, i.e., to the Israelites who descended from Jacob, and to the Edomites who descended from Esau; and by quoting the Prophet's words St. Paul shows that the actual course of history verified the statement made to Rebecca. Therefore, concludes the Apostle, just as the choice of Jacob was due solely to the love and freedom of God, so also is the call to the faith a free gift of God's love, not dependent on conditions of birth or personal merits. This same freedom on the part of God explains why many of the Jews, although descendants of Jacob, are excluded from a participation in the blessings of the Messianic Kingdom. God chooses whom He will to carry out His purposes, and His plans do not fail because of the failure of individuals.

Esau I have hated. God loves all things that He makes, and consequently He loves all human beings, inasmuch as He confers on all some benefits of nature and of grace, but not in the sense that He confers on all the same measure of blessings. Accordingly God, in His eternal wisdom and justice, does not give to all the efficacious call to the faith and the reward of eternal life; He is thus said to hate those whom He excludes from the prize of eternal life, and to love in a special manner those on whom He confers it. These latter God predestines to glory, the former He reprobates. There is this vast difference, however, between predestination and reprobation that, while both are eternal and unchangeable in God, predestination implies on God's part the preparation of merits in virtue of which glory is afterwards conferred; whereas reprobation does not suppose that God prearranged sins on account of which one is condemned to eternal punishment. Hence it follows that God's foreknowledge of merits cannot be the cause of predestination, since merits are rather the consequence of predestination. But positive reprobation, on the contrary, which implies not only exclusion from glory, but the infliction of eternal pain, does not take place until after the permission and prevision of sins. God will punish the wicked for the sins which they themselves commit, in which He has no part; and He will reward the just on account of the merits which they possess, not alone of them-

selves, but through the help of His grace: "Destruction is thy own, O Israel: thy help is only in me" (Osee xiii. 9) (Sales, Martini).

God, therefore, far from regulating His choice by the dispositions of persons, is guided rather by His own hidden purposes, and by His consequent personal sentiments of love or of hate; before the birth of the twins, He loved one and hated the other of His own free choice. This hatred of God, anterior to all foreseen demerits, has something awful about it, which Cornely feels forced to mitigate by softening the sense of *μισῶν* so as to mean "to love less" or "to neglect." But whatever may be said of the texts cited (Gen. xxix. 30, 31; Luke xiv. 26; Deut. xxi. 15-17; Jud. xiv. 16; Prov. xiv. 20), the text of Malachy says plainly that God detested Esau, representing the Edomites, as His subsequent conduct toward that people proved. It would be necessary, therefore, in Cornely's view, to suppose that St. Paul set aside the sense of the text of Malachy, either by eliminating all allusion to the history of the peoples represented by Esau and Jacob, or by distinguishing between the sentiments which God entertained toward these peoples, on the one hand, and their unborn ancestors, on the other—suppositions which cannot be sustained (cf. Lagr., h. l.).

Whichever view we take of *ἐμίσησα* here, whether we say that God really hated Esau before he was born, or only that He neglected him, or loved him less than Jacob, we must remember that St. Paul is quoting Old Testament language,—language natural and familiar to the Jews, but essentially severe in its tone, and oftentimes shocking to ears attuned to the mildness and mercy of Christian words. Furthermore, in trying to understand the mysteries of divine election and reprobation it makes little difference in fact whether we say that God hates, or merely neglects or loves less the reprobate, since the final outcome is the same, whatever be the words used to unfold the mystery to our human and limited intelligences. In negative reprobation God simply does not choose the person or persons in question, and this for His own hidden reasons, although in time He gives them graces and means sufficient for their salvation.

14. What shall we say then? Is there injustice with God? God forbid.

15. For he saith to Moses: I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy; and I will shew mercy to whom I will shew mercy.

GOD IS NOT UNJUST IN PREFERRING ONE TO ANOTHER, 14-24

14-24. In this section the Apostle discusses the justice of God in giving His grace to one rather than to another, without regard for their merits. It has already been proved against the Jews that God was not unfaithful to His promises, because these were made not to the carnal, but to the spiritual posterity of Abraham. But since the Jews were God's chosen people, favored with the Law and many special heavenly blessings, they might consider it unjust on the part of God to prefer the Gentiles to them. Forestalling this objection the Apostle proposes it himself, only to reject it as a blasphemy. If the Jews do not embrace Christianity, it is because they have not received God's efficacious call; but in this there is no injustice with God, since Scripture proves that God gives His favors to whom He pleases, while He hardens others (verses 15-18). But if men are thus the instruments of God, how can God blame them (verse 19)? In reply the Apostle maintains that God has a right to do as He will with His creature (verses 20, 21). He then explains the designs of God, who, while patient with the wicked, has determined to show forth His anger as well as His goodness (verses 22-24).

If we do not understand all of God's mysterious dealings with the human race the reason is: (a) because He is infinite and we are finite, and just because He is infinite there must be in all His actions and outward manifestations much of mystery which we can never fathom; (b) God has not and cannot make known to us in this life, when we must live and walk by faith, all the reasons and purposes of His actions.

14. To the objection here raised Paul at present gives no other answer than a plain and vigorous rejection. There is no **injustice** (*ἀδικία*) in God, he says. God is free to give His favors to whom He will, and hence if He chooses to give the blessings of grace and justification to the Gentiles rather than to the Jews, who can accuse Him of injustice?

15. St. Paul now appeals to the authority of God speaking to

16. So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy.

17. For the scripture saith to Pharaos: To this purpose have I raised thee, that I may shew my power in thee, and that my name may be declared throughout all the earth.

Moses, to prove that God is the free and independent dispenser of His gifts. The citation (Exod. xxxiii. 19) is according to the Septuagint. The Hebrew of this passage would be rendered by the present tense, and the first clause would be indicative of favor, the second of mercy or pity: "I show favor to whom I show favor, and I show mercy to whom I show mercy." As God was here speaking to Moses, as contrasted with Pharaoh, it is more likely that Moses in this instance is to be considered as a private person, rather than in his capacity as lawgiver to whom God was revealing His plan (Lagr.). God, therefore, like a rich man dispensing his gifts, is under no obligation to give to anyone, or to one rather than to another; and if He freely chooses to bestow His riches on some and deny them to others, there is no injustice done whatever; God is simply manifesting His own will in bestowing or withholding His gifts, and His will is essentially and necessarily righteous. If we do not understand this, or find difficulty in God's ways of acting, it is only because we are sinful finite creatures; and as such we should not expect to comprehend the actions of the infinite and all-holy God. God, therefore, is perfectly free to call the Gentiles to the faith rather than the Jews, and to call some of the Jews and reject others. Cf. St. Thomas, h. 1.

16. The conclusion to what has been said is now drawn. **It**, i.e., the showing of mercy, the election of man to the faith and to eternal life, in nowise depends on the dispositions or efforts of man, but on God who manifests His goodness.

Not of him that willeth, i.e., no internal strong desires, **nor of him that runneth**, i.e., no external strenuous efforts on man's part can make any claim to justification, or to the election to eternal life. That which follows election and the call to the faith is not in question here; neither is there question in this verse of the relation between grace and free will, but only of God's entire freedom to favor whom He chooses.

17. Having proved that God is perfectly free to show the good-

18. Therefore he hath mercy on whom he will; and whom he will, he hardeneth.

ness of His mercy to whom He will, St. Paul now goes on to indicate by a second example that God is not less free and just in refusing to call, and thereby reprobating others. Moses was an object of God's mercy and favor, Pharaoh was a type of those who resist God and refuse to obey God's laws.

The Scripture, i.e., God through the Scripture (Exod. ix. 16), saith to Pharaoh. St. Paul cites the Scripture as the Word of God. The citation is according to the LXX, but is not literal. The LXX has *διετηρήθης*, i.e., "thou hast been preserved"; but St. Paul says, *ἐξήγαγα*; which is very similar to the Hebrew, "I have raised thee up," as actors are called to the stage of life to play a rôle in human history. The sense is practically the same in either reading. We cannot say, however, that God, in making use of Pharaoh as a means of manifesting His power and glorifying His name throughout the world, excited him to sin and moved him to evil. God's primary intention in raising Pharaoh to the throne of Egypt was that the monarch might justly and rightly govern his people, and thus promote his own and their salvation; but this primary intention failing, God called into play His secondary object, which was to make of Pharaoh an instrument whereby to manifest the divine power and glorify the divine name.

In the case of Pharaoh, as in similar instances, God simply permitted man, a finite and defectible creature, to misuse his own free will by turning to evil his office, his power, his works and other things which were intended by God to lead their possessor to good. Pharaoh, as king, had his authority from God, and God permitted him freely to abuse it in oppressing and persecuting the Israelites. God, therefore, was not the cause of the wickedness of Pharaoh, but in His infinite wisdom, which knows how to draw good out of evil, He made use of the malice of the wicked king to set forth His own power and justice by at length visiting his impiety and cruelty with many and dire chastisements (Sales). Cf. Exod. xiv. 14, 15; Josue ii. 9; ix. 9; 1 Kings iv. 8, etc.

18. The conclusion which follows from verses 15-17 is that

19. Thou wilt say therefore to me: Why doth he then find fault? for who resisteth his will?

20. O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the things formed say to him that formed it: why hast thou made me thus?

21. Or hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump, to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?

God is perfectly free, and therefore just, in giving His favors to one rather than another, in showing mercy to some and in hardening others. God does not, however, harden man's heart directly, by making him obstinate in sin; but indirectly He does, by justly withholding His more abundant grace, thus permitting man to continue in sin and to offend ever more and more grievously. To all God gives grace sufficient for salvation, but many, abusing the graces they receive, become unworthy of that further efficacious grace without which final perseverance and the attainment of heaven are impossible.

St. Paul does not attempt to reconcile the action of God in hardening a sinner with man's free will. That God has the power to harden man's heart the Apostle here affirms, and this is done, not by moving man to sin, but by withholding grace from him. It is maintained in this verse only that God has the right to show mercy to whom He will and to harden whom He will, without saying that all are hardened to whom mercy is not shown, or that this hardening is lasting or merely for a time (Lagr.).

19. From the foregoing doctrine one might object that there is no room for faultfinding on the part of God, if some are not converted, because no one resists His will. Those who freely obey His law are the objects of His love and mercy, while those who refuse obedience to Him fall under His justice; hence they who think they are resisting the divine will are only obeying it in another way: there is no complete resisting the will of God.

Who resisteth, etc., i.e., who has ever succeeded in resisting God's will, since, if we do not obey it in one way, we do in another? The meaning is not: Who would be able to resist His will? (Cornely).

The *dicis* of the Vulgate should be *dices*.

20, 21. **Who art thou that repliest**, etc. The Apostle supposes there was something insolent in the above objection, as

ἀνταποκρινόμενος would imply. Has ignorant, miserable, sinful man any right to enter into a discussion with the all-wise Creator regarding the conditions of his creation and life?

St. Paul then asks in this and in the following verse two questions which are calculated to remind the objector of what he really is with regard to God. The comparison which follows in these questions is after the manner of a parable or illustration, and was often made use of in the Old Testament (Isa. xxix. 16; xlv. 8-10; lxiv. 8; Jer. xviii. 6; Wis. xv. 7, etc.), where God was compared to a potter, and man to a vessel of clay, most likely in view of the account of Gen. ii. 7. This manner of speech was, therefore, very familiar to the Jews, and had, in consequence, a special force for them.

The question of verse 21 is really an answer to that of verse 20: just as the clay has no right to object to the action of the potter, so neither has man any right to say to his Creator, "why have you made me thus?" And again, just as the potter has the right to make of the same lump some vessels for honorable, others for dishonorable uses, so has God the right and the liberty to show mercy to some men, and to use others for His own hidden purposes. There is no injustice done to man if God chooses not to use him for high and noble purposes, because man has no right to these things. Without doubt St. Paul is here indirectly treating of election to glory and of reprobation. His words have immediate reference to God's call to, or rejection from, the faith; but they apply equally to election to glory or to reprobation. The principle is the same in either case.

There is nothing, however, in these verses to justify the fatalism of Calvin, who taught that God is the cause of evil as well as good, and that He makes some people good and others bad, in order to lead the former to glory and the latter to perdition. As said above, the Apostle is making use, at present, of an illustration only, and all points between the things compared must not, therefore, be insisted upon. Hence, from the passivity of the clay in the hands of the potter we can no more argue to the exclusion of human liberty, than we can exclude the existence of a rational soul in man, on the ground that these things are not in the clay. The object of the Apostle in employing the

22. What if God, willing to shew his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much patience vessels of wrath, fitted for destruction,

comparison is merely to show that man has no more reason to complain of rejection from grace, than the clay would have of its destination for dishonorable purposes. From man's complete rejection from grace his rejection from glory would also follow; but the decree of positive reprobation from glory is always grounded on man's demerits (MacEv.).

22. After having energetically replied to the insolent objection of verse 19, St. Paul returns to the situation of verses 15-18, and sets forth certain reasons why God shows mercy to some and hardens others. If God has called the Gentiles and rejected the Jews, He is only manifesting His infinite mercy and justice, as He has a right to do; and St. Paul sees in the case of the Jews, as in that of Pharaoh, a historic incident which but serves God's infinite designs.

What if (εἰ δέ), i.e., according to Lagrange, "now, if." No apodosis follows, the period is left incompleting. The required apodosis would be something like this: What should we say? What objection could we make?

Willing (θέλων), i.e., *although willing, or while willing*, according to Cornely. This would give θέλων a concessive meaning,—God could have wished to show His anger, but He has not. Such an explanation, however, seems contrary to i. 18-iii. 20, where St. Paul shows that God has not only wished to show His anger, but has actually done so (Lagr., Kühl, etc.). Still, it can be argued that the wrath of God, which, to some extent has already been visited upon both Jews and Gentiles, is restrained and will be manifested in a special manner on all those who are eternally condemned for their personal sins.

And to make his power known, as He did in a measure, in saving His people in spite of Pharaoh, and in bearing mercifully with the Jews, whose treatment of Christ and the Apostles merited a speedy punishment.

Endured with much patience. Better, "Hath borne with much patience," i.e., according to Cornely, God bore with vessels of wrath in order to give them time to do penance and be saved. Fr. Lagrange does not exclude this interpretation, but thinks

23. That he might shew the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he hath prepared unto glory?

the Apostle meant here simply to say that God bore with vessels of wrath in order to manifest His wrath and power towards some, who willfully harden themselves, and His goodness and mercy towards others, who make use of the graces offered them (verse 23).

Vessels of wrath, i.e., sinners, those who, like the rebellious Jews, resist the will of God and become deserving of vengeance and punishment.

Fitted for destruction, i.e., prepared and ready, by their own choice and actions, for the wrath that has been visited upon them in their lives, and for the eternal perdition they deserve hereafter. Who, therefore, can take issue with God, if He has rejected and reprobated the Jews for the sins they have freely chosen to commit? God's long-suffering is salvation to those who wish to be converted (2 Pet. iii. 9, 15), but it is damnation aggravated to those who harden themselves in sin (Rick.).

23. That he might, etc. In the great majority of MSS *ἵνα γνωρίσῃ* is preceded by *καί*, which makes it especially clear that this verse follows upon the thought of the first part of verse 18. Not only has God manifested His wrath upon vessels of wrath, but He has also shown mercy to those whom He has withdrawn from sin and justified in preparation for eternal glory.

The riches of his glory, i.e., the riches of His goodness (ii. 4), by which sinners are led from evil ways to faith and justification, and finally to eternal glory in heaven.

On the vessels of mercy, i.e., on those who become objects of His grace and mercy.

Which he hath prepared, etc. God does not prepare the vessels of wrath for damnation. Of their own perversity they choose to abide in sin, and so God withdraws from them His special aid, and permits them to become hardened and to die in their sins. The vessels of mercy, on the contrary, God prepares for glory by calling them efficaciously to the faith, by sanctifying them, and by helping them to persevere to the end. Man corrupted by original sin needs only to be left to himself, to his own perverse will and tendencies, to be lost; but to be saved,

24. Even us, whom also he hath called, not only of the Jews, but also of the Gentiles.

25. As in Osee he saith: I will call that which was not my people, my people; and her that was not beloved, beloved; and her that had not obtained mercy, one that hath obtained mercy.

he needs to be helped and disposed in a special manner by the grace of God.

24. This verse ought really to be joined to the preceding, according to sense. It proves that the intervention of God has actually commenced already, as stated in the verses above.

Even us, i.e., the vessels of mercy, St. Paul and the Roman Christians. Speaking of the **called** the Apostle puts the Jews in the first place to remind them of their prerogatives; but by including the Gentiles he shows the entire freedom of God's choice, which has brought more Gentiles than Jews to Christianity.

THE PROPHETS FORETOLD THE CALL OF THE GENTILES AND THE REJECTION OF THE JEWS, 25-29

25-29. Having proved from the history of the Patriarchs that the Messianic promises did not pertain to each and all the Jews (verses 6-13), and having shown from Scripture that God is perfectly free and just in the distribution of His gifts, the Apostle now shows that the call of the Gentiles to the faith and the rejection of the Jews as a body God had already foretold in Osee and in Isaías.

25. In the present verse the Apostle freely cites the Prophet Osee (ii. 23, 24) according to the LXX. The words **not my people** and **not beloved**, literally refer to the ten schismatical tribes of Israel who had fallen into idolatry and into all the vices of paganism, but to whom God had promised mercy and restoration to the ancient privileges of His people, provided they would be converted from their evil ways. In a spiritual sense the words "not my people," and "not beloved," refer to the Gentiles, of whom the ten schismatical tribes were a figure (1 Pet. ii. 10). As God could bring back the unfaithful and disowned, so could He bring in those who had not been called before.

26. And it shall be, in the place where it was said unto them, You are not my people; there they shall be called the sons of the living God.

27. And Isaias crieth out concerning Israel: If the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea, a remnant shall be saved.

28. For he shall finish his word, and cut it short in justice; because a short word shall the Lord make upon the earth.

The words, and her that had not obtained mercy, etc., are omitted by all the Greek MSS. and the Fathers. The second clause, and her that was not beloved, etc., is also omitted by St. Jerome and a few MSS.

26. The Apostle again cites Osee (i. 10) according to the Septuagint, thus making once more the schismatical tribes of Israel a type of the pagans. As God punished the unfaithful ten tribes with exile, and afterwards reunited the remnants of Israel so as to be again His people; so can He call the Gentiles, before far from Him, and make them His people and His sons.

27. Isaias x. 22 is now cited to show that a remnant of the Jews shall recognize the Messiah and be saved. The LXX is followed with slight alteration. Literally the Prophet's words had reference to the few Israelites who, through trust in God, should escape the devastations of the Assyrians under Sennacherib; and these the Apostle makes a type of the small number of Jews that should believe in Christ and attain to salvation.

The *pro* of the Vulgate should be *super*, to agree with the Greek *ὑπέρ*.

28. The citation of Isaias (x. 22, 23) is continued according to the LXX. Quoting the LXX from memory St. Paul has given a substantial rendering of the passage, omitting the words *ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ*, from verse 22, and *ὅτι λόγον συντεταγμένον*, from verse 23, and changing the last words, *ἐν τῇ οἰκυμένῃ ὅλη* for the similar and more usual *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*. The Hebrew of this passage is somewhat different: "Destruction is decreed, bringing justice; for destruction and a firm decree the Lord God of hosts will execute in the midst of all the land." However, the two renderings of this text, the Hebrew and the Greek, differ only in minor details; the sense is essentially the same. In both instances there is question of a divine decree which is a just chastisement for sin.

For he shall finish, etc., i.e., the Lord (*κύριος*) shall completely

29. And as Isaías foretold: Unless the Lord of Sabaoth had left us a seed, we had been made as Sodom, and we had been like unto Gomorrha.

and briefly effect an accomplishment of His work on earth, regarding the deliverance of the Jews from the destructive sword of the Assyrian, by reducing to a few the number of the Israelites that are to be saved. This He shall do in justice, i.e., by justly punishing the greater number, and giving to the few the abundance of His favors.

Because a short word, etc. This clause is not found in the best Greek MSS., and is but a repetition of the foregoing one, as indeed this whole verse is but an emphasizing of the preceding verse. The words of Isaías, which literally referred to the deliverance of the Jews from Assyrian destruction, St. Paul is typically using to show that the greater number of Jews will be rejected from grace, and only a few admitted to the blessings of faith.

29. The LXX of Isaías (i. 9) is cited to prove once more that a small number of the Jews will embrace the faith of Christ. The Prophet's words, as before, literally relate to those who survived the Assyrian captivity, and these the Apostle is making a type of the few Jews that will recognize and follow Christ. As comparatively few Jews escaped the Assyrian sword in the time of Isaías, so few comparatively, in the time of St. Paul, entered the fold of Christ; and as in the former instance, so in the latter, these few were as a seed for a future growth and a harvest which shall be garnered before the end of the world.

It would be wrong to argue from these passages that the majority of Christians or of mankind are lost eternally.

THE CULPABILITY OF THE JEWS, 30-33

30-33. The Jews are responsible for their rejection by failing to believe in Christ. They were scandalized at the very object of their salvation.

Having shown, therefore, that God is not unfaithful to His promises, and having considered God's part in the rejection of the Jews, the Apostle passes on now (ix. 30-x.21) to a consideration of the responsibility and culpability of the Jews relative

30. What then shall we say? That the Gentiles, who followed not after justice, have attained to justice, even the justice that is of faith.

31. But Israel, by following after the law of justice, is not come unto the law of justice.

to their own rejection. In the remaining verses of the present chapter he points out the fundamental mistake of the Jews, which was to misunderstand the divine plan, and consequently to stumble at Christ and seek salvation where God had not ordained it to be found.

30. What then, etc. (τί οὖν). This is at once a conclusion to the preceding section, that the Jews as a whole have been rejected, and an introduction to a new aspect of the question, namely, the responsibility of Israel (Lagr.). Having shown that God has been faithful and just in His dealings with Israel, what shall we say about the rejection of the Jews and the call of the Gentiles, the Apostle asks.

That (ὅτι) introduces the answer to the question proposed; hence the meaning is: We say "that Gentiles" who did not exert themselves to seek after good, **have attained to justice**, i.e., to justification through faith, a gratuitous gift of God (iii. 28; vi. 4).

Gentiles should be read without the article (ἐθνῶν, not τὰ ἐθνῶν), because (a) some of the pagans did seek after virtue (ii. 14), and (b) there were many who never attained to justification through faith; only some Gentiles are therefore meant.

31. This verse, according to the best MSS., should read as follows: "But Israel, seeking after the law, is not come to the law of justice." The word δικαιοσύνης, *of justice*, in the first clause, was perhaps added by a copyist; but, with or without this term, the sense of this passage is that Israel, for the most part, living under a law which led to justice, or pointed the way to it, failed to attain to the rule of veritable justice (St. Thomas, Cornely). Israel as a whole pursued the justice which it was obliged to follow, but erred in the manner of seeking it (verse 32).

The law means the Law of Moses. **The law of justice** means sanctifying grace, that internal observance of the Law which, through faith in Christ to come, produced internal sanctity of soul and real supernatural justice. The Jews sought true justice in the external observance of the precepts of the Law and were

32. Why so? because they sought it not by faith, but as it were of works. For they stumbled at the stumbling stone.

33. As it is written: Behold I lay in Sion a stumbling stone and a rock of scandal; and whosoever believeth in him shall not be confounded.

content with an external holiness, instead of seeking the internal sanctity of the heart.

In the Vulgate the first *justitiae* should be omitted, and *sectans* is preferable to *sectando*.

32. Why so? i.e., what is the reason why the Jews, while seeking after justice, have not, for the most part, attained to the justification of Christ? **Because**, as has been shown in the first part of the Epistle, true justice is obtained only through faith, and the Jews have sought it, or pretended (*ὡς*) to seek it, through works, mere natural works, performed without faith and the help of grace (iv. 4-6). Thus, by rejecting faith, the Jews have failed to attain that which the Gentiles through faith have acquired.

They stumbled, i.e., they were scandalized at the lowly, suffering life of Christ (1 Cor. i. 23), who, as Messiah, did not conform to their erroneous ideas. Jesus was, therefore, a "stumbling-block" to the Jews (Luke ii. 34).

For (Vulg., *enim*) is not authentic.

33. That the Jews were scandalized and stumbled at the suffering and crucified Christ ought not to cause surprise, because it was foretold by the Prophet Isaias that they would commit this appalling error. The Apostle has blended two texts of Isaias, viii. 14 and xxviii. 16; the latter according to the Septuagint, the former according to the Hebrew. It is certain that there is question of the Messiah in the second text; and while the first one speaks of Jehovah, it must also be understood of the Messiah, as we are assured by St. Paul here, by St. Peter (1. ii. 6-8), and by the context of Isaias, which is treating of the Emmanuel to come.

Whosoever should be "he that," and *omnis* of the Vulgate ought to be omitted.

CHAPTER X

THE JEWS MISUNDERSTOOD THE JUSTICE OF GOD, 1-4

1. Brethren, the will of my heart, indeed, and my prayer to God, is for them unto salvation.

2. For I bear them witness, that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge.

1-4. The Apostle protests again (cf. ix. 1-3) to the Romans his sincere affection and sympathy for his fellow-Jews. Their failure, he says, is due, not to lack of zeal, but to the error of insisting on their own false notion in preference to the true notion of justice. The theme is the same as in ix. 30-33; but, while there he was speaking of Israel stumbling at the stumbling-block, he is here entering into a psychological analysis of the Jewish mind which, in observing the Law, came short of Christ, the end of the Law.

1. Here St. Paul gives renewed assurance of his abiding interest in the salvation of his fellow-Jews. And yet, their incredulity has put a chasm between him and them, as is evident from the fact that he speaks of them in the third person, while addressing the Romans in the second person as **brethren**.

The will of my heart (εὐδοκία), i.e., my *strong desire* (St. Chrys.), or my *inclination, purpose* (Lagr.). The particle μέν, not followed by δέ, is most probably to be used in its adverbial sense of confirmation, meaning here, *certainly* (Lagr.).

2. **I bear them witness**, etc. The Apostle, who had been a zealous Pharisee, and had himself been eaten up with zeal for God (Gal. i. 14; Acts xxii. 3), was well able to testify to the zeal of his fellow-Jews. They certainly were most assiduous in studying the law of God, but they failed to understand God's designs. They were at great pains to promote the honor and glory of God, but they were little concerned to scrutinize their own conceptions to see what God's honor and glory might consist in. Hence their ignorance was culpable. Thus St. Paul

3. For they, not knowing the justice of God, and seeking to establish their own, have not submitted themselves to the justice of God.

4. For the end of the law is Christ, unto justice to every one that believeth.

(1 Tim. i. 13) blamed his own ignorance, and St. Peter (Acts iii. 17) said that the Jews crucified Christ through ignorance.

A zeal of God, i.e., a zeal for the cause of God.

Knowledge, i.e., a profound understanding (*ἐπίγνωσις*). Cf. Eph. i. 17; iv. 13; Col. i. 9, 10; etc.

3. **They not knowing**, *through their own culpable ignorance*, the justice of God, i.e., the system of gratuitous justification by means of grace through faith in Christ to come, as the Scriptures had announced (iii. 21; iv. ff.). To receive this grace of justification it was needful that the Jews should recognize themselves as sinners, even like the Gentiles; but they were persuaded that it was necessary for the honor of God to **establish their own**, i.e., to defend as true justice their own idea of justification, based on the external observance of the Law, and the result of their own personal efforts. Considering this frame of mind we can readily understand how they would not submit themselves to "the justice of God," i.e., the justification which God communicates to men, which is a gratuitous gift of God dependent upon faith in Christ. Cf. Philip. iii. 9.

4. **For** (*γάρ*) explains why the submission of the preceding verse was required.

The end, etc., i.e., the purpose of the Mosaic Law was to lead to Christ. All the precepts and ceremonies of the Law were types of Christian mysteries, intended to prefigure Christ and to prepare man for His coming. How far astray, then, were the Jews in trying to establish a system of justification independent of faith in Christ! But Fr. Lagrange and others understand *τέλος νόμου* here to mean not that the Law was ordained and led to Christ, or that Christ was its perfection and fulfillment; but that, since the justice of God is now given in Christ, the Law has come to an end, as an instrument of justice, and has no further purpose (cf. also Gal. iii. 25). Hence in the first explanation *τέλος* would mean *purpose*; in the second, *end*, or *term*. We see no reason why both explanations cannot stand.

Law, although without the article in Greek, means the Mosaic

5. For Moses wrote, that the justice which is of the law, the man that shall do it, shall live by it.

Law, as is clear from the context (Lagr., Cornely, etc.), and not law in general (Weiss, Zahn, etc.).

That believeth. To obtain justification and salvation faith in Christ has at all times been the indispensable means,—in Christ to come under the Old Law, and in Christ already come under the New Dispensation.

THE JUSTICE OF THE LAW AND THE JUSTICE OF FAITH, 5-13

5-13. The Apostle speaks in these verses, first of the justice of the Law, as contrasted with the justice of faith; he then shows that this latter is also necessary for the salvation of the Jews; there is no distinction, both Jew and Gentile must be saved by faith.

5. The Apostle quotes Moses (Lev. xviii. 5, according to the LXX) to show the difference between the justice of the Law and that of faith. If a man is able to obtain the justice of the Law, he will have as his reward, temporal, and even eternal life; but this justice is very difficult, being beyond man's natural strength.

The justice . . . of the law, i.e., the justice which resulted from an observance of all the precepts of the Mosaic Law.

The man that shall do it, etc., i.e., the man that is able to do such a difficult thing.

Shall live by it. To the observers of the Law there was promised a life of temporal blessings (Deut. xxviii. 2-13; xxx. 9, 10), and also life eternal (Matt. xix. 17; Luke x. 25-28). But to obtain this latter it was necessary to observe, not only externally, but also internally, all the precepts of the Law; and, in particular, to love God and have faith in Christ to come (Deut. vi. 5; Matt. xxii. 36; Rom. ii. 13; iv. 11)—a task utterly beyond the powers of fallen human nature unaided by grace (vii. 22-25). This grace, however, which the Law could not provide, would be given by God in virtue of faith in Christ to come. The Jews erroneously thought they could keep the Law by their own mere natural strength, and thereby obtain the rewards promised.

6. But the justice which is of faith, speaketh thus: Say not in thy heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? that is, to bring Christ down;

7. Or who shall descend into the deep? that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead.

Wrote should be “writeth,” and *scripsit* of the Vulgate should be *scribit*, to conform to the Greek.

6, 7. To show that the justice of faith, unlike that of the Law, is not difficult to obtain St. Paul here personifies it, and makes it address man in the words of Deut. xxx. 11-14. These words, in their primary and literal meaning, refer to the Law of Moses, the precepts of which were not difficult to understand; but in their accommodated sense, here made use of by the Apostle (Calmet, Beelen, Cornely, etc.), they relate to the justice of faith,—to Christian faith, which is comparatively easy to obtain, involving no such insurmountable difficulty as **ascending into heaven, to bring down Christ**, the object of faith; or **descending into the deep**, i.e., into the grave, **to bring up Christ again from the dead**, i.e., to believe that Christ, the object of our faith, descended there. As Moses told the Hebrews that it was not necessary “to ascend into heaven,” or “go over the sea” in search of the Law which was indeed very near to them; so here the Apostle, accommodating the words of the Prophet, says that, since Christ descended from heaven and became incarnate once, and likewise once died, was buried and rose again for our salvation, it is not necessary that we should try either to ascend into heaven or descend to the abode of the dead to work out the redemption which Christ already has wrought for us. Since, therefore, the two fundamental mysteries of our redemption, the Incarnation and the Resurrection, have already been accomplished for us, our justification is easy, provided we have proper faith in God through His incarnate and risen Son.

The words of Deut. xxx. 13 (“which of us can cross the sea”) are here somewhat modified by St. Paul (“who shall ascend into the deep”), in order to render more vivid the contrast between heaven and the abyss, and better to accommodate the words of Moses to Christ’s burial and Resurrection from the dead.

8. But what saith the scripture? The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart. This is the word of faith, which we preach.

9. For if thou confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thy heart that God hath raised him up from the dead, thou shalt be saved.

10. For, with the heart, we believe unto justice; but, with the mouth, confession is made unto salvation.

8. The word **scripture** is wanting in Greek, and is considered a gloss. This verse is the positive complement of the thought of the preceding verses. Justice personified is still speaking. It is not necessary to seek salvation afar off, it is very near. It consists in a *word* which must be received by faith. As Moses said **the word**, i.e., the Law, was nigh and easy to understand; so, says St. Paul, it is with **the word of faith, which we preach**, i.e., the Gospel truths that are necessary for salvation. These words, through the preaching of the Apostles, are carried to all in such a way that all may have them in their mouth and in their heart, without the necessity of long journeys or grave fatigue.

In the Vulgate *scriptura* should be omitted; *justitia*, understood from verse 6, is the subject of *dicit*.

9. The Apostle explains yet more clearly what is required in order to have part in the salvation of Christ. Not only is it necessary to believe, but **thou must also confess with thy mouth**, i.e., make public confession that *Jesus is Lord* (the literal order) of the universe, and therefore truly God. This means a public confession of Christ's Divinity, such as was required before Baptism (Acts viii. 37; xvi. 31). Further, besides believing and confessing the Incarnation of the Son of God, it is necessary to believe in His Resurrection from the dead. Paul mentions these two mysteries because they are the principal ones of Christianity, those on which all others depend. If he speaks first of external, and then of internal faith, it is only because he is following the order of Moses' words, which speak of the mouth first, and secondly of the heart.

10. St. Paul here returns to the natural order and speaks first of internal belief, and then of external profession of faith.

With the heart, etc., i.e., the internal act of faith is the beginning and foundation of justification.

We believe. More literally, *Faith is formed* (*πιστεύεται*), i.e.,

11. For the scripture saith: Whosoever believeth in him, shall not be confounded.

12. For there is no distinction of the Jew and the Greek: for the same is Lord over all, rich unto all that call upon him.

a state of faith is formed on our part, as the present tense indicates. The phrase *εἰς δικαιοσύνην*, and not *εἰς δικαίωσιν*, shows that one attains real justice, and not a mere declaration of it, just as salvation will be really possessed (Lagr.).

Confession . . . unto salvation, i.e., salvation will follow upon our faith and justification, provided we persevere to the end of life in the justification we have received, and do not fail to make at times external profession of our faith. Again the present tense, *ὁμολογείται*, marks a state of justice, and not a mere act, on man's part. Of course, justification, if ever lost through mortal sin, can always be regained by a proper use of the Sacrament of Penance.

11. The New Dispensation is one of faith which gives to all the same rights to salvation. This doctrine of faith, however, is not new, having been already announced by the scripture, i.e., by Isaias (xxviii. 16). St. Paul had previously (ix. 33) quoted these same words of the Prophet; but here he adds the word *πᾶς*, *whosoever*, to the text of Isaias, in order to express more clearly the universality of salvation through faith.

In him, in the context of Isaias, refers to the "corner-stone," which was a figure of Christ.

Shall not be confounded, because through faith in Christ we are reconciled with God and have a firm hope of attaining salvation.

12. **There is no distinction**, etc. The Apostle had used the same argument, only more openly, to prove the universality of salvation in iii. 29. There he said God was the God of the Gentiles as well as the Jews; here he insists that both have the same Saviour.

Lord means Jesus Christ (Cornely, Lagr., etc.), and not God the Creator, as some of the older commentators thought, because there is question here of faith in Christ. Jesus is the *κύριος πάντων*, as in Acts x. 36; Philip. ii. 11.

Rich unto all, because by His death Christ has provided an

13. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord, shall be saved.

14. How then shall they call on him, in whom they have not believed? Or how shall they believe him, of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear, without a preacher?

15. And how shall they preach unless they be sent, as it is written: How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, of them that bring glad tidings of good things!

infinite treasury of merits (Eph. iii. 8) which He holds at the disposition of all, on condition that they **call upon him**, i.e., that they believe in Him with their hearts and confess Him with their mouth (verse 10).

13. St. Paul appeals to the Prophet Joel (ii. 32) to prove that whosoever will call upon the name of Jesus shall be saved. The same text from Joel was quoted by St. Peter in his sermon to the faithful on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii. 21). The Apostle applies to Christ what Joel had said of Yahweh, which is a clear proof of the Divinity of Jesus.

THE JEWS REFUSED TO BELIEVE IN THE GOSPEL, 14-21

14-21. In these verses St. Paul shows all that God has done to lead the Jews to the faith. He has shown already (verse 3) that they misunderstood the justice of God, although it was easily within their reach to grasp and understand, if only they would have had faith (verses 6-13). Now he goes on to prove that they could have made this act of faith, and that if they have not done so, it is manifestly their own fault. Faith should be supported by authorized preaching, and such preaching faith has had, as Isaias proves. But all have not believed. Yet they have heard and understood, and it is their own fault if they have not believed. Cf. St. Chrys., *Lagr.*, h. 1.

14, 15. In the preceding verse it was said that invocation of the name of Christ was necessary for salvation. But to invoke a person, it is first necessary to believe in him; and to believe, one must first have learned. One learns through preaching, provided the preaching be duly authorized and reliable. These conditions being presupposed, there is no reason for not believing.

Preaching, therefore, is the ordinary means of learning the

16. But all do not obey the gospel. For Isaias saith: Lord, who hath believed our report?

truths of faith; but it must be done by those who have the proper authority and the right to preach: there are many pseudo-apostles and pseudo-prophets (2 Cor. xi. 13; Titus i. 11). God, of course, is free to make known the truths of salvation otherwise than through preaching, if He wishes, but that would be something out of His ordinary way of acting.

How shall they believe him, etc. The Vulgate *quem non audierunt*, corresponding to the Greek οὐ οὐκ ἤκουσαν, would seem to suggest that those who had not heard Christ could not believe in Him. But ἀκούειν with the genitive sometimes means in classic Greek *to hear of or about* a person (Cornely). Our English translation, "*of whom* they have not heard," is therefore correct, and the Vulgate should read, *de quo non audierunt*. At any rate, the fact that very few who were then living had seen Christ or heard Him was an argument for the necessity of duly authorized preachers, Apostles, envoys of Christ.

Unless they be sent, i.e., by God, either directly, as was St. Paul himself, or indirectly, through the authority constituted by God, as are all those who receive their commission from the Apostolic body and Church instituted and empowered by Christ. This Apostolate which, through its preaching, is to convert souls to Christ, had already been foretold by Isaias lii. 7. The citation is more according to the Hebrew than the LXX. The Prophet's words refer literally to the messengers who announced the fall of Babylon and the return of the Jews from captivity; but in their mystical sense, as here used by St. Paul, they have reference to the preachers of the Gospel.

Of them that preach the gospel of peace is an addition to Isaias which is not found in the best Greek MSS.

Glad tidings, etc., literally refers to the announcement made by the messengers of whom Isaias spoke, but figuratively, to the preachers of the Gospel of Christ.

16. Although the Gospel was preached, St. Paul here affirms that generally, especially by the Jews, it was not obeyed. He says **all do not**, etc.; better, "all have not," etc., simply to soften, as much as possible, the sad truth of Jewish indifference and

17. Faith then cometh by hearing; and hearing by the word of Christ.

18. But I say: Have they not heard? Yes, verily, their sound hath gone forth into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the whole world.

obduracy. This deplorable fact of disobedience to the Gospel and to the preaching of the Apostles was foretold by Isaias (liii. 1), whom St. Paul cites almost literally according to the LXX. The word **Lord** is added to the citation. Isaias was about to describe the passion and humiliation of the future Messiah, and he cried out full of anguish and fear, who will believe what I am going to announce? How few they were who afterwards did believe in the Messiah we are told by St. John (xii. 37, 38).

Our report literally means "our hearing," i.e., our preaching, what they heard from us.

To conform to the Greek the *obediunt* of the Vulgate ought to be *obedierunt*.

17. As said above (verse 14), **faith cometh by hearing**, i.e., by preaching, according to God's ordinary Providence, and **hearing**, i.e., preaching, comes by **the word of Christ**, i.e., by the commission and mandate of Christ given to the Apostles and their successors (Cornely), or by the word revealed through Christ (Lagr.).

18. St. Paul anticipates an objection or excuse on the part of the Jews. Will **they**, i.e., the Jews, say they have not heard the preaching of the Gospel? That they certainly have heard it, he proceeds to prove by a quotation from Psalm xviii. 5, cited according to the LXX. The Psalmist is speaking of the glory of God being declared by the heavens; and St. Paul, accommodating the text to his purpose (Cornely, Zahn, etc.), says that as the heavens declare everywhere the glory of the Creator, so has the preaching of the Gospel been heard everywhere in the world. Hence there is no excuse for the incredulity of the Jews.

All the earth and the ends of the whole world are obviously hyperboles, used to express a great truth. The Apostle merely wishes to say that the Gospel was then widely known in the Roman world, and so could not be unknown to the Jews (cf. Acts i. 8).

19. But I say: Hath not Israel known? First, Moses saith: I will provoke you to jealousy by that which is not a nation; by a foolish nation I will anger you.

20. But Isaias is bold, and saith: I was found by them that did not seek me: I appeared openly to them that asked not after me.

19. Another objection is forestalled and refuted by the Apostle. It having been proved that the Jews had heard the Gospel preaching, could it be that they would say that they did not understand it? That is impossible; for the Apostle adduces certain texts from the Old Testament (Deut. xxxii. 21) in which it had been foretold that the Gentiles, far less prepared than the Jews, would understand and embrace the faith; from which it follows that the Jews could not plead an obscurity in the preaching of the Gospel that would excuse their failure to understand.

Hath not Israel known? i.e., have not the Jews *understood* (οὐκ ἔγνω)? There is question here of the Jews *understanding* that which they had heard, namely, the Gospel.

First, Moses, i.e., God through Moses first, in order of time among the inspired writers, threatened the Jews on account of their obstinacy in not understanding, that is, in rendering homage to "that which was no god" (Deut. xxxii. 21), i.e., to an idol; and He told them that He would incite them "to jealousy and anger" by bestowing first temporal, and later spiritual blessings upon **that which is not a nation**, upon a foolish nation, i.e., the Gentiles. The pagans were called "not a nation," i.e., an inferior nation, as compared with the religious and moral standard of the Jews. They were looked upon as "a foolish nation," i.e., as almost incapable of understanding the things of God; and yet they understood the preaching of the Gospel which the Jews, with all their superior privileges and divine assistances, did not grasp and obey. The words of Moses found their entire fulfillment when the Jews were rejected and the spiritual blessings of the Messiah were conferred upon the Gentiles.

20. St. Paul now cites Isaias (lxv. 1), whose words clarify the obscurity that might lurk in Moses' words of the preceding verse. God is speaking through the Prophet.

Isaias is bold, i.e., outspoken, without regard for the sensibilities and prejudices of his fellow-Jews.

21. But to Israel he saith: All the day long have I spread my hands to a people that believeth not, and contradicteth me.

I was found, etc., i.e., I permitted myself to be discovered, through the preaching of the Gospel, by the Gentiles that did not seek me, i.e., that were wrapped in the darkness of idolatry, and that consequently neither knew Me nor adored Me.

I appeared openly, through the same preaching of the Gospel, to them, i.e., to the Gentiles, that cared not for Me, nor desired My revelation. How much more, therefore, should the Jews have known and understood the Gospel message! In their failure to do this how great was their culpability!

21. *Isaias* (lxv. 2) is here cited directly against the Jews. It was said in verses 19, 20 that if a people that did not know God have recognized Him in His manifestations, much more should Israel have known and understood His messages. And why has Israel not recognized and understood the revelation of God in the Gospel? Simply because it was incredulous and resisted God's proffered gifts, because of its continual disobedience and opposition to God. On the part of God there were invitations the most tender; on the part of Israel, obstinate refusal. St. Paul is not retracting what he said in chapter ix about the designs of God; he is picturing here the problem under the aspect of the responsibility incurred by human wills deaf to the call of God (*Lagr.*).

To Israel. The preposition "to," *πρός*, according to modern interpreters should rather be *concerning, with regard to*. "To," however, sufficiently renders the meaning of the Vulgate *ad* and of the Greek *πρός*, in the present instance.

All the day, etc., i.e., God at all times, like a loving father, stretched out His arms and desired to embrace Israel, but in vain.

To a people, etc., i.e., to Israel, incredulous and rebellious. Throughout its history Israel was unfaithful and rebellious to the law and will of God, but its obstinacy and disobedience became most manifest when it rejected the Messiah and His Gospel. To itself alone, therefore, is due Israel's exclusion from the Messianic kingdom. Cf. *Matt.* xxiii. 37; *Luke* xi. 15; *John* viii. 48; ix. 10, etc.

CHAPTER XI

THE REJECTION OF ISRAEL IS AFTER ALL ONLY PARTIAL, 1-10

1. I say then: Hath God cast away his people? God forbid. For I also am an Israelite of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin.

1-10. Having shown in the preceding chapter that the rejection of the Jews was due to their own persistent disobedience and obstinacy to the will of God and the divine overtures, St. Paul now is at pains to observe that God, notwithstanding, has by no means ceased to be merciful to His chosen people. For their rejection is not complete; a good number have been converted, although the others have been hardened.

1. After all the Apostle has said about the culpability and responsibility of the Jews (ix. 30-x. 21), one would be inclined to think that Israel had been entirely rejected and had ceased to be the people of God. But even before this, when speaking of the absolute right of God to choose or to reject whom He will (ix. 6-26), the Apostle had insinuated, in a passing way, that there was still, as in former times of apostasy, a faithful remnant in whom the mercy of God was manifest. Here, borrowing the words of Psalm xciii. 14, he asks the question plainly whether **God hath cast away his people**. The answer must be negative, first because the Apostle's teaching cannot be contrary to the promise of the inspired Psalmist. In the second place, he refers to himself, who was an **Israelite of the seed of Abraham**, i.e., a carnal descendant of the father of the Jewish race, and a member of **the tribe of Benjamin** which, with the tribes of Juda and Levi, had, in the past, remained faithful to the Lord (2 Cor. xi. 22; Philip. iii. 5). Finally, if God had entirely rejected the Jews, He would not have selected from among them "the ministers of Christ, and the dispensers of his mysteries" (1 Cor. iv. 1), and sent them out to preach the faith to the Gentiles (i. 5). So much for an indirect reply to the question proposed.

2. God hath not cast away his people, which he foreknew. Know you not what the scripture saith of Elias; how he calleth on God against Israel?

3. Lord, they have slain thy prophets, they have dug down thine altars; and I am left alone, and they seek my life.

2. St. Paul now responds directly to the above question. It is impossible that God should reject entirely and definitely all the Jews, because God does not thus change His eternal decrees (verses 28-29).

Which he foreknew, i.e., which he formerly recognized and willingly approved as His own people. There is no question here of those who God foreknew would be faithful to Him, or of the predestined (Cornely), but of the Jewish people as a whole, who would not be finally cast off by God.

Know you not, etc. The Apostle draws an example from the history of Elias (3 Kings xix. 10) to illustrate the designs of God in the present instance. It seemed to Elias that the whole people had fallen into idolatry and had been rejected by God; but God revealed to the Prophet that a remnant had been preserved. So it is now. While it seems that all Israel has been rejected, there is no doubt that some will be saved.

The scripture, i.e., that section of the Old Testament which deals with Elias (cf. Mark xii. 26; Luke xx. 37).

Against Israel, i.e., accusing Israel.

3. The words of Elias and the reply of God (3 Kings xix. 10, 14, 18) are here abbreviated and cited according to the LXX. **They have slain**, i.e., the Israelites, at the command of the impious Jezabel, killed the Prophets (3 Kings xviii. 4).

They have dug down, etc., likely refers to private altars erected by pious Israelites on high places for good purposes, although contrary to the Law (Deut. xii. 4 ff.). Living under an idolatrous king these Israelites were not able to adore God in Jerusalem (3 Kings xviii. 30), and so felt justified in building private altars. At any rate, to destroy these altars, as was done, out of hatred toward God, was very impious.

Alone, of the faithful who adored the true God; or of those faithful who were able to act for God, that is, of the Prophets (Lagr., Beelen).

4. But what saith the divine answer to him? I have left me seven thousand men, that have not bowed their knees to Baal.

5. Even so then at this present time also, there is a remnant saved according to the election of grace.

4. **Answer.** The word *χρηματισμός* here has the sense of an *oracle*; but it may also have the meaning of *answer* or *reply*, because generally the oracles responded to questions proposed. In reality there was an interrogation at the bottom of Elias' words to God: he was imploring God to intervene. To this God replied: **I have left me**, etc. In 3 Kings xix. 18 we have the future: "I will leave me," etc. The fact remains that seven thousand were preserved from idolatry. The divine reply makes manifest the power of God's grace. In spite of the extraordinary persecution instituted by Achab and Jezabel, under which it seemed that all Israel had suffered defection, the grace of God was able to preserve from idolatry and hold fast in the worship of the true God **seven thousand men**, i.e., an indeterminate but very great number (cf. Gen. iv. 15; Lev. xxvi. 18, 24, etc.).

Baal was the chief God of all the Chanaanite tribes. Baal or Bel means the Lord, and especially the husband. We have here the feminine article with the masculine name, *τῇ Βάαλ*, most probably because the Hellenist Jews wished to avoid the utterance of the idol's name, and substituted in the reading *ἡ αἰσχυνή*, *the shame*, just as the name Jehovah was written with the pointing of Adonai. Likely the LXX MS. which Paul was using had the reading *τῇ Βάαλ*.

5. Applying to his purpose the lesson of the preceding verses St. Paul says that, as in the time of Elias a number were preserved faithful, so now there is a remnant of the Jews **saved**, i.e., brought to Christianity.

According to the election of grace, i.e., in virtue of an election altogether gratuitous, and independent of merit on the part of the saved. The grace of justification can never be merited (*Conc. Trid.*, Sess. VI, cap. 8).

St. Paul leaves all indeterminate the number of Jews that were actually converted to the faith. He is satisfied to note, (a) that the designs of God were not frustrated, because a *remnant* has been saved, which is a pledge of future restoration; and (b) that grace is the sole principle of one's call.

6. And if by grace, it is not now by works: otherwise grace is no more grace.

7. What then? That which Israel sought, he hath not obtained: but the election hath obtained it; and the rest have been blinded.

In the Vulgate *salvae* should be omitted, and *factae sunt* should be *fuert* (Lagr.).

6. Having spoken of grace the Apostle takes occasion again to insist that grace and works are two opposing principles. What is of grace is entirely gratuitous; that which is from works is due as a recompense. The Council of Trent (l. c.) says: *Nihil eorum, quae justificationem praecedunt, neque fidem neque opera, ipsam justificationis gratiam promereri.*

While St. Paul is speaking here of the call of God to Christianity, the principle he lays down is absolute. Both the call to justification and to eternal glory are equally gratuitous; but when one is already justified and living the life of grace there is no opposition between the works he performs, proceeding from grace, and grace itself. Therefore, works performed under the influence of grace are meritorious of life eternal. Of these latter works, however, there is no question in the present verse.

Some of the Greek MSS. and a Syriac version add here: "But if of works, it is no longer grace: otherwise the work is no longer a work." The addition contributes nothing to the sense already expressed.

7. This verse concludes what precedes in the present chapter.

What then, i.e., what should we say of Israel? As a nation the great majority of the Jews have not attained that which they sought; namely justification, because they sought it through works without the aid of faith and grace.

But the election, i.e., those who were chosen by God have obtained justification through faith and the grace of their divine election.

The rest have been blinded, *hardened* (*ἐπωρώθησαν*), so that they have not recognized the Messiah and the true way of salvation.

That which Israel sought should be "that which Israel is seeking"; and hence also the *quaerebat* of the Vulgate ought to be present, *quaerit*, to correspond with the Greek.

8. As it is written: God hath given them the spirit of insensibility; eyes that they should not see; and ears that they should not hear, until this present day.

9. And David saith: Let their table be made a snare, and a trap, and a stumbling block, and a recompense unto them.

10. Let their eyes be darkened, that they may not see: and bow down their back always.

8. The blindness of the Jews had already been foretold. St. Paul is citing freely, according to the LXX, and combining two texts,—the first from Isa. xxix. 10, the second from Deut. xxix. 3.

God hath given them, etc., i.e., on account of their own perversity and infidelity God withdrew His grace from the Jews, thus permitting them to have a **spirit of insensibility**, or moral torpor which made them incapable of seeing, hearing or understanding the truth, although it was in their very midst. The term *ατάνυξις* (Vulg., *compunctio*) properly means a violent puncture (from *κτανύσσειν*), and therefore great, numbing pain; but in its figurative sense, as used here by St. Paul and in the LXX (Isa. xxix. 10; Ps. lix. 5), it signifies *torpor*, *profound sleep*, *deafness*, etc. By reason of their blindness and deafness the Jews failed utterly to recognize Christ and His preaching, or the Apostles and their preaching, in spite of all the miracles that were worked in their presence in confirmation of that preaching.

Until this present day. These words show the persistence of the divine plan, and that the Jews of the time of Moses and Isaias were a type of the Jews in the time of our Lord (Matt. xxiii. 32).

9, 10. The better to point out the blindness of the Jews, St. Paul now cites the testimony of the Psalmist (Ps. lxxviii. 23, 24), whose imprecated curses on the Jews of his own time were typical of the punishment that had justly fallen on those of the Apostle's time. The Jews, says the Apostle, have come to regard as advantageous for themselves that which is their ruin.

Let their table be made a snare, etc., i.e., let their table be like a bait which draws the bird to the trap (Cornely); or let their table be set with poisoned dishes destined for certain guests who, nevertheless, will oblige the hosts themselves to consume those dishes (Lagr.). The term "table" principally means the Sacred Scriptures, which were spread out before the Jews as

11. I say then, have they so stumbled, that they should fall? God forbid. But by their offence, salvation is come to the Gentiles, that they may be emulous of them.

spiritual nourishment, but which were converted by them into sources of error and mischief, and were turned by the Christians against them (MacEv.).

Let their eyes be darkened, etc. What the Psalmist imprecates for his enemies, who were also his own people, St. Paul applies to the Jews. The Law, which was intended to be a help and a guide for the Jews, and to lead them to Christ, on account of their willful perversity became a grievous yoke and burden that bowed them down to earthly things.

According to St. Paul the hardening of the Jews was the chastisement of a first fault (i. 26). It was, therefore, voluntary (X), but was not directly relative to life eternal. It prevented the Jews from recognizing the Messiah; but, being only temporary, it can always be changed for the nation as a whole, to say nothing of individuals, for whose conversion the Apostle was ever solicitous (Lagr.).

THE REJECTION OF ISRAEL IS NOT FINAL, AND SERVES MEANWHILE
FOR THE CONVERSION OF THE GENTILES, 11-24

11-24. The rejection of the majority of the Jews is a source of great mystery and profound sorrow. And yet there is reason for consolation, because, in the first place, a few have been saved already, and then, the rejection of the nation as a whole is only a temporary evil which, in the designs of God, is made to serve for the conversion of the Gentiles.

11. Have they so stumbled, that, etc. Cornely and others give to "that" (*iva*) the sense of finality, as if St. Paul wished to ask if God, by justly withdrawing His graces from the Jews, blinded their greater number and permitted them to stumble for the purpose of making them fall without any hope of reparation. In this opinion, there is question here, not of the gravity, but of the purpose or end of the Jews' fall. But St. Chrys., Lagr., etc., hold that *iva* has not a final meaning here, and that the sense is rather, whether the fall of the Jews is so great as to

12. Now if the offence of them be the riches of the world, and the diminution of them, the riches of the Gentiles; how much more the fulness of them?

admit of no cure or remedy. At any rate, the stumbling of the Jews was not just that they might fall, nor that their fall should be irremediable, as the Apostle's reply, vigorously negative, plainly shows, and as is clear from what follows in the verse. St. Paul then goes on to explain the designs of God in permitting the Jews to go astray.

By their offence, etc., i.e., through the blindness of the Jews in not recognizing the Messiah and their unwillingness to accept the Apostle's preaching (Acts xiii. 45-48) the Gospel was carried to the Gentiles, and the error of the Jews became the occasion of the salvation of the pagans. This is the first and immediate result of the fall of the Jews. The second result is the salvation of the Jews themselves; for the salvation given to the Gentiles will finally rouse Israel to competition and emulation (*παραζηλώσαι αὐτούς*). The Jews will at length understand that their God has become the God of the Gentiles, that the Scriptures given to them have passed to others, and that God has withdrawn His blessings from His chosen people and bestowed them upon their pagan neighbors. When this takes place, the anger and jealousy of the Jews will have reached their climax and will be the occasion of a reaction against past errors, and a consequent return to the God of their forefathers. Thus, the hardening of Israel permitted by God was ordained to the salvation of the Gentiles, and the salvation of the Gentiles is ordained in turn to that of the Jews themselves (cf. Lagr., h. 1.).

12. If the failure of Israel has brought such great benefits to the world, how enormous will be the benefit of the final conversion of all the Jews!

If the offence (*παράπτωμα*) of them (*αὐτῶν*), i.e., of those hardened, be the riches of the world, i.e., be the occasion of the conversion of the Gentiles to the faith, and the diminution (*ἡττημα*) of them (*αὐτῶν*), i.e., the defeat, the loss of those hardened, be the means of inestimable blessings to the pagans, how much more the fulness (*πλήρωμα*) of them (*αὐτῶν*), i.e., how much greater

13. For I say to you, Gentiles: as long indeed as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I will honour my ministry,

14. If, by any means, I may provoke to emulation them who are my flesh, and may save some of them.

15. For if the loss of them be the reconciliation of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?

blessings will come to the world from the total conversion to the faith of all the Jews!

In this interpretation, following Lagrange, we have given to the first and second *αὐτῶν* the meaning of *those hardened*, and to the third, the meaning of *all the Jews*. We have understood *ἡττημα* here to mean, not the *remnant*, a *small number*; but *defeat*, *loss*. *Πλήρωμα* means the completing of Israel, i.e., the adding of the hardened (who will cease to be such) to the faithful Jews.

13, 14. **I say to you, Gentiles.** Continuing the theme of verses 11, 12 St. Paul openly speaks to the Gentiles, showing that the community to which he was writing was chiefly composed of them. He tells them that as long as, i.e., *inasmuch as* (*ἐφ' ὅσον*, not followed by *χρόνον*) he is the apostle of the Gentiles he honors his ministry, by consecrating himself entirely to it, with the ulterior purpose of exciting the jealousy of his fellow-Jews and moving them to emulate the faithful Gentiles, thus saving **some of them** now, and all in the end (verse 25). In St. Paul's mind there is question of the design of God which cannot be fully accomplished, even to the profit of the Gentiles, if the ultimate salvation of the Jews is not first assured. His zeal for the one would work also the profit of the other, and the profit of the latter would in turn add to and complete that of the former (Lagr.).

I will honour should be "I do honour" (*δοξάζω*) my ministry, by devoting myself entirely to the services of the Gentiles, but not for their profit alone, as explained above.

In the Vulgate *quamdiu* would better be *quatenus*, and *honorificabo* should be *honorifico*, to agree with the Greek.

15. The thought of verse 12 is taken up here and developed more vividly. **If the loss**, etc., i.e., if the rejection of the Jews from the Messianic kingdom be the reconciliation, etc., i.e., be the occasion of bringing the Gentiles into the Church of Christ, what great joy and spiritual benefits will result to

16. For if the firstfruit be holy, so is the lump also: and if the root be holy, so are the branches.

Christ's kingdom from the receiving of them in mass into the Church.

But life from the dead, εἰ μὴ ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν. These words have been variously interpreted. Some say they refer to the final consummation before the Second Coming of Christ, and consequently to the general resurrection of the dead, of which the conversion in mass of the Jews will be the signal (Orig., St. Chrys., St. Thomas, Lagr., etc.). But as the terms here used are not very precise, one cannot well conjecture what relation of time there will be between the final conversion of the Jews and the general resurrection of the dead (Lagr.). Others think there is reference in the above words to an increase of spiritual life, among the Christians already converted, that will come from the final conversion of the Jews (MacEv.). Cornely rejects this last explanation. He disapproves of the first one also, because he says that St. Paul, when speaking of the general resurrection uses a different phrase, ἡ ἀνάστασις or ἐκ νεκρῶν. He therefore believes the Apostle is speaking indeterminately here, as in verse 12, of some wonderful benefit and happiness that are to result from the final and total conversion of the Jews; or that this final restoration of the Jews will be a good so great, as to be comparable to the resurrection of the dead.

16. Although the Law has been abrogated and the mass of the Jews have been rejected, still, St. Paul reminds his Roman readers, the designs of God regarding His people have not failed, nor has the Jewish race ceased to belong, in a certain sense, to God, and to be consecrated to Him. This the Apostle proves by two comparisons.

The firstfruit and the root mean the Patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, etc., who were holy men and faithful servants of God.

The lump and the branches are the Jewish people, the descendants of the Patriarchs. When the Jews made bread they were accustomed to put aside a piece of the dough which they baked into a small cake to be offered to God and burnt, or given to the priest (Num. xv. 19-21). The whole mass was considered

17. And if some of the branches be broken, and thou, being a wild olive, art ingrafted in them, and art made partaker of the root and of the fatness of the olive tree,

18. Boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee.

to have a part in the consecration of this portion that was offered to God. Thus the Jews, by reason of their natural connection with their ancestors, the Patriarchs, who were holy men consecrated to God, have also a kind of holiness and consecration to God, even though it be only an external relation like that of the lump and the branches.

17, 18. Lest any of the Romans should feel puffed up and boastful over their call to the faith, and should therefore be inclined to despise the rejected Jews, St. Paul reminds them that they owe their inclusion in the stock of Israel only to that mercy of God which first looked with favor on the chosen people, and that if they guard not with fidelity the gratuitous gift they have received, they too will come short of their destined prizes (verse 20). No Gentile, therefore, should boast of his own condition or rejoice at that of the fallen Jew, but should rather fear for himself, while hoping for mercy toward the Jews.

The **broken branches** are the rejected Jews.

The **wild olive** represents the Gentile whom St. Paul has in mind, and who, like all the converted Gentiles, has, by the mercy of God and without any merit of his own, been **ingrafted in them**, i.e., has been ingrafted among (Cornely) the converted Jews and become **partaker of the root**, etc., i.e., of the blessings which were the Jews' by right of inheritance.

Boast not, etc., because you remember that once you were a stranger to the covenant with God, without hope or promise in this world (Eph. ii. 11, 12), and that you were liberated from your misery only by being grafted on the true stock. The Gentile has nothing, then, whereof to boast, because salvation is from the Jews to the Gentiles (John iv. 22), and not from the Gentiles to the Jews.

The **branches** (verse 18) refers to all the Jews (St. Thomas).

The verbs "be broken" and "art ingrafted" should be in the past tense, according to the Greek.

St. Paul here speaks of the wild olive being grafted upon the

19. Thou wilt say then: The branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in.

20. Well: because of unbelief they were broken off. But thou standest by faith: be not highminded, but fear.

cultivated variety. This causes some difficulty, inasmuch as the ordinary process of grafting was to graft a domestic shoot on a stock of the same kind, after cutting away all the original branches. But Prof. Fischer (Ramsay, *Pauline Studies*, p. 223 ff.) relates an exceptional process which was employed to invigorate an old olive tree that was failing; the branches of the old tree having been cut away, a shoot of the wild olive was grafted on the domestic stock to invigorate and render fertile the old tree. This process of grafting is witnessed to by two Roman writers, Columella, *De re rustica*, V. 9, and Palladius, *De incisione*, XIV. 53, and, according to Prof. Fischer, is in practice in Palestine at the present day.

19. The Gentile is here represented as justifying his triumph by the fact that his inclusion was the purpose of the Jews' rejection. As the gardener cuts away the branches in order to insert the new shoot, so the Jews were rejected in order that the Gentiles might be brought in. The rôle of the Jews, therefore, like that of the Law, was only preparatory; in the designs of God they have been replaced by the Gentiles (Lagr.).

20. There was something of truth in the above argument of the supposed boastful Gentile, and St. Paul replies, not without irony, *καλῶς, well*. But he at once observes that the Jews were cut off and rejected for the precise reason that they did not believe, they had not sufficient humility to accept on faith the Gospel teaching; whereas the Gentiles, by believing, have come into the inheritance which was primarily intended for the Jews. It was, then, the faith, the humility, the obedience and submission of the Gentiles that made possible for them the bestowal of God's gratuitous gift of faith. But this gift can be retained only by profound humility and fidelity, and hence the necessity of eschewing all pride and high-mindedness, and of cultivating the fear of God.

Because of unbelief should rather be "by unbelief" *τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ*, corresponding to "by faith" *τῇ πίστει*,—datives of cause or occasion (Cornely).

21. For if God hath not spared the natural branches, fear lest perhaps he also spare not thee.

22. See then the goodness and the severity of God: towards them indeed that are fallen, the severity; but towards thee, the goodness of God, if thou abide in goodness, otherwise thou also shalt be cut off.

23. And they also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in: for God is able to graft them in again.

24. For if thou wert cut out of the wild olive tree, which is natural to thee; and, contrary to nature, were grafted into the good olive tree; how much more shall they that are the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive tree?

In the Vulgate *propter incredulitatem* should be *incredulitate*.

21. St. Paul admonishes the Gentile whom he has before his mind to give up all high thoughts of self and to school himself in humility and fear, lest what happened to the Jews happen to him also. The Apostle is not saying here that the Gentile is going to be cut off, nor that he could be rejected more easily than the Jews were rejected (Lagr.).

22. In order still more to inculcate salutary sentiments of humility and fear, St. Paul draws the Gentile's attention to God's actions toward the Jews and Gentiles respectively. Toward the Jews, in punishment of their unbelief, God has shown severity; but to the Gentiles, for contrary reasons, He has exhibited goodness and mercy by calling them gratuitously to the faith.

If thou abide, etc., i.e., if the Gentile perseveres in the faith received, and continues to live under the divine influence of the Goodness that blessed him with faith, God will also continue to manifest His mercy toward him.

Otherwise thou also shalt be cut off, because the just man can fall from the state of grace and justice, and no one, apart from special revelation, can be infallibly certain of his own perseverance (*Conc. Trid.*, Sess. VI. cap. 16, 23).

23. If the Jews will give up their unbelief, they also will be grafted on the faithful stock; the obstacle comes from them, because they refuse to believe in Jesus Christ. But God is able to triumph over their unbelief, since His power is infinite. St. Paul's hope for Israel, hinted in verse 12, is here explicitly declared.

24. It is more natural, and therefore easier to graft on a tree a homogeneous than a heterogeneous shoot. In fact, for suc-

25. For I would not have you ignorant, brethren, of this mystery (lest you should be wise in your own conceits), that blindness in part has happened in Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles should come in.

cessful grafting there must be some affinity of nature between the subject and the shoot; one can only use for grafting, therefore, varieties of the same species, or at least of the same genus. If the Gentiles, who were like the wild olive, have been grafted on the domestic tree of Israel, how much more natural, and how much easier, to our way of thinking, will it be to graft the Israelites, who are **the natural branches, into their own olive tree.**

Contrary to nature, i.e., beside the natural course of nature, *praeter naturam*.

The natural branches. The Jews were the natural descendants of Abraham and the Patriarchs, and as such, the natural heirs of the Messianic promises and blessings.

THE CONVERSION OF THE GENTILES WILL BE FOLLOWED BY THAT OF THE JEWS, 25-32

25-32. God's final purpose is to save both Gentiles and Jews. They both have sinned and have been made to feel the wrath of God (I-II), but infinite mercy outstretches man's wickedness and in the end will triumph over all; God's designs do not change, nor does His will go unfulfilled. The salvation of all Israel is closely connected with the conversion of the Gentiles, as was foretold by the Prophets. It is according to the divine plan that Israel and the pagans should mutually help each other, and that both in the end should be objects of the divine mercy.

25. **I would not have you ignorant, brethren.** This is a favorite phrase of St. Paul's when he wishes to speak confidentially and announce some matter of great importance (i. 13; I Cor. x. 1; xii. 1; 2 Cor. i. 8; I Thess. iv. 13). He is speaking to the Gentile Christians, and he wishes to remind them of doctrines already familiar to the Church in general, namely, that the Jews were to be hardened (Matt. xii. 38-48; xiii. 11-16; xxiii. 29-36), that the failure of Israel would bring in the Gentiles (Matt. xx. 7 ff.; xxiv. 14), and that the Jews themselves would at last turn to **Christ** (Matt. xxiii. 39; Luke xiii. 35).

26. And so all Israel should be saved, as it is written: There shall come out of Sion, he that shall deliver, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob.

This mystery, i.e., the final conversion of Israel to Christianity, which will take place after the conversion of the Gentiles, but before the end of the world. St. Paul calls this great truth a *mystery*, because it could not be known short of revelation, and was in fact revealed to him by God along with the other truths of the Gospel of Christ (Gal. i. 12, 16; Eph. ii. 11 ff.; iii. 1 ff.).

Lest you be wise, etc. The quotation is from Prov. iii. 7. The Apostle is admonishing the Gentiles to guard against self-conceit, as if they had merited their call to the faith, and also against despising the rejected Jews.

Blindness in part, etc. While the Jews as a people had failed to accept the Gospel, a number of them had been converted. And the blindness or obduracy of the majority is not to last forever; but **until the fulness of the Gentiles** shall come in, i.e., until the other nations of the world have accepted the Gospel and entered the Church of Christ. It is to be noted that this fulness of the Gentiles relates to peoples, not to individuals: all the nations or peoples of the earth will be converted to Christ before the end of the world, but not all the individuals of each nation (St. Thomas, Cornely, Lagr., etc.).

God, therefore, in His all-wise designs has called a few of the Jews to the faith already. He has made the incredulity of the majority the occasion of the conversion of the Gentiles, and this latter He will make in turn the occasion for the final call to the faith of all the Jews. We have no sign, however, that this general conversion of the world will be soon. Here it may be useful to recall what Origen said on this subject: "God only knows, and His Only-begotten Son, and any friends that may be privy to His secrets, what is *all Israel* that is to be *saved*, and what is the *fulness of the Gentiles* that is to *come in*."

26. **All Israel** does not mean the predestined (St. Aug.), nor all the Jews taken individually (St. Thomas), but the mass of the people, as opposed to individuals who are converted during the time that intervenes before the last days come. Israel then as a nation, like the other nations of the world, will finally

27. And this is to them my covenant: when I shall take away their sins.

28. As concerning the gospel, indeed, they are enemies for your sake: but as touching the election, they are most dear for the sake of the fathers.

embrace the faith; but it will not be until after all those others have been gathered in that she shall enter the fold of Christ. What fate has overtaken or awaits those Jews who have been hardened meanwhile, St. Paul does not anywhere tell us.

As it is written. The Apostle has been speaking of a mystery which he has learned through revelation, and he confirms the truth of it by showing that it was already more or less clearly foretold in the Old Test. (Isa. lix. 20). The citation is fairly literal from the LXX, which faithfully follows the Hebrew with the exception that where the latter has "out of Sion," the LXX has "for Sion's sake." In the best MSS. the quotation is read as follows: "There shall come out of Sion the deliverer: he shall turn away impieties from Jacob." St. Paul seems to make the citation refer in a general way to the Second Coming of Christ, although the conversion of the Jews will just precede that Second Coming, and will be a consequence of the first advent of the Saviour.

27. The first part of this verse is from chapter lix. 21, and the second from chapter xviii. 9 of the Prophet Isaias. God promises to make a new alliance with the people of Israel, when He will take away their sins and confer upon them forever His spirit and His doctrine.

In verses 25-27 we have the following unfulfilled prophecies: (a) Before the end of the world all Gentile nations shall be converted to Christianity, that is, the greater part of all nations, not all the individuals of each nation (St. Thomas); (b) after the conversion of the Gentiles, but before the end of the world, the Jews as a people will embrace Christianity. The fulfillment of these prophecies, and therefore the end of all things seem yet far off.

28. The present incredulity of the Jews will not hinder the final realization of God's promises to them. God still loves them in their faithful ancestors.

As concerning the gospel, i.e., inasmuch as they have wilfully rejected the Gospel, the only means of salvation, **they are**

29. For the gifts and the calling of God are without repentance.

30. For as you also in times past did not believe God, but now have obtained mercy, through their unbelief;

31. So these also now have not believed, for your mercy, that they also may obtain mercy.

enemies (ἐχθροί, *odiosi*), i.e., hateful to God (St. Thomas, Lagr., etc.), and so have been excluded by God from their Messianic inheritance. This has happened to them, in the designs of God, **for your sake**, i.e., for the benefit of you Gentiles, because their unfaithfulness has been the occasion of your call to the Gospel (verses 11, 12, 15).

But as touching the election, i.e., as regards their election from among all other peoples, by which they were made God's chosen people and the depositories and custodians of God's special revelation and divine promises, **they are most dear to God for the sake of their fathers**, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob—God's special friends and faithful servants.

29. God will not forsake His people forever, because His special gifts and calling are without repentance, and are consequently not subject to change (cf. 2 Cor. vii. 10). The Apostle is not speaking here of an invariable rule of Providence as regards creatures, but only of the great designs of God, such as respected the gifts and privileges of Israel and the latter's call to be the adopted people of the Most High. As regards these privileges God will never change, or repent of having conceded them, because He pledged them to the Patriarchs with an oath (Deut. vii. 6 ff.). Despite, therefore, the unfaithfulness of the Jews, God will be true to His promises and will one day convert them as a whole to the faith. The call still holds if Israel will hear.

We read in 1 Kings xv. 11 that God repented that He had chosen Saul; but the rejection of this king was only an episode, comparable to the temporary hardening of the Jews (Lagr.).

30, 31. As mercy has found the Gentiles and led them to the faith, so at last it will seek out the Jews and bring them to Christianity.

As you Gentiles in times past were rebellious to the call of God and thus became an object of mercy, thanks to the obstinacy of the Jews, which has facilitated your conversion; so the

32. For God hath concluded all in unbelief, that he may have mercy on all.

Jews, now hardened, will become obedient to the Gospel on account of the mercy which you have experienced (Cornely, Lipsius, Jülicher, etc.). In this interpretation the mercy shown to the Gentiles will be the occasion of showing mercy to the Jews, because it will excite the latter to jealous emulation. But since St. Paul has insisted on this thought several times before, and since it does not so well fit in with verse 32, it would seem that the Apostle is here rather drawing out a general idea, namely, that it is the purpose of God to permit all to fall into disobedience, so as to give play to the exercise of mercy. The ancient disobedience of the Gentiles has been followed by mercy, and likewise the disobedience of the Jews will finally issue in a display of mercy (Lagr., Köhl, S. H., etc.).

Modern interpreters generally suppose ἀπειθεῖν to signify *to be disobedient*, and ἀπειθεία to mean *disobedience*.

32. The Apostle now draws a general conclusion, which sets out in relief the greatness of God's mercy. God has permitted all, both Gentiles and Jews, to fall victims of disobedience and to be unable of themselves to rise from their miserable state, in order that He might manifest His mercy toward all.

Hath concluded (συνέκλεισεν), *has enslaved*.

All (τοὺς πάντας) refers not to the hardened Jews only, nor to individuals among the Gentiles and Jews, but to all classes, as explained above.

In unbelief (εἰς ἀπειθειαν), i.e., in *disobedience*. All, therefore,—Jews and Gentiles, have sinned and need justification, which only the mercy of God can procure; the sinful Gentiles have already been touched by God's mercy, and the wayward Jews shall later yield to the same merciful Providence.

The omnia of the Vulgate should be *omnes* here, to agree with the Greek. *In incredulitate* should be in *inobedientiam*.

A HYMN OF PRAISE TO THE INFINITE WISDOM AND KNOWLEDGE OF
GOD, 33-36

33-36. These verses conclude the Dogmatic Part of the Epistle, but they are suited in a special manner to terminate chapters

33. O the depth of the riches of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God! How incomprehensible are his judgments, and how unsearchable his ways!

34. For who hath known the mind of the Lord? Or who hath been his counsellor?

ix-xi. In these chapters something has been said of the purposes and ways of God in dealing with humanity. Enough has been shown to confirm our faith and hope in God, the veil has been drawn aside sufficiently to give us dim glimpses of the great realities that lie behind; but with and around it all, as the Apostle now says, deep clouds of mystery hang: the infinite knowledge and wisdom of God, His inscrutable judgments and far-off deep counsels are not only but faintly reached, but are of their very nature so far beyond our utmost human capacities of comprehension that we can only bow our heads in faith and humble obedience, ever trusting, in the dire problems and experiences of life, to God's infinite goodness, wisdom and mercy for the solution of all our difficulties.

33. **O the depth.** All the Greek MSS. and the Fathers read: "O depth of riches and of wisdom and of knowledge of God." "Depth" may signify height, as well as profundity; here it means the *immensity* of God's riches, wisdom, etc.

Riches represents the treasures of God's goodness and mercy (x. 12; Eph. iii. 8, etc.).

Wisdom indicates the divine prudence with which God governs all creatures and leads them to their ends which have been ordained from all eternity.

Knowledge means the science with which God penetrates all things, knowing and choosing the means most fitted to their ends. The end here in question is the salvation of souls, to which God has ordered faith in Christ as a means.

How incomprehensible, etc. The reasons which underlie God's judgments in showing mercy to some rather than to others are altogether inscrutable to the mind of man.

How unsearchable, etc. The ways which God takes and the means He employs in executing the decrees of His infinite knowledge are beyond the power of any creature to trace.

In the Vulgate *et* should precede *sapientiae*.

34, 35. St. Paul confirms the profundity of God's divine attri-

35. Or who hath first given to him, and recompense shall be made him?

36. For of him, and by him, and in him, are all things: to him be glory for ever. Amen.

butes by three citations from the Old Testament, the first two of which are almost literally from the LXX of *Isaias* xl. 13, 14, and the third from the Hebrew text of *Job* xli. 3. God reveals to some extent, but His mind is open to no one, because none can penetrate the divine thoughts; He draws His counsels from no one, for He has no need of counselors; to none is He indebted, since He is the source and ruler and end of all.

36. We can neither penetrate the knowledge of God, nor aid Him with our counsels, nor help Him with our resources, because all things are *of him*, i.e., they depend upon Him as upon their cause and creator; all things are *by him*, i.e., they are sustained by Him; all things are *in him*, or *unto him* (*εἰς αὐτόν*), i.e., they tend to Him as to their last end (Cornely, Lagr., Zahn). Origen, St. Aug. and others have seen an allusion to the Trinity in the three expressions of *him*, *by him*, and *in him*; but there is no good reason for this opinion (Cornely, Lagr.).

To him be glory, etc. Thus, by calling on all creatures to give glory to God, does the Apostle terminate the Dogmatic Portion of this great Epistle.

CHAPTER XII

With this chapter commences the Moral Part of the Epistle. The principles already laid down in the foregoing portion are now viewed in their consequences and influences upon the Christian life. Having shown that faith is the only way to salvation the Apostle goes on in the remainder of his letter to point out what faith demands in practical ways from Christians.

This last part of the Epistle has two main sections. The first of these (xii. 1-xiii. 14) contains general instructions for all Christians; the second (xiv. 1-xv. 13) has particular counsels for the Christians in Rome.

1. I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercy of God, that you present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, pleasing unto God, your reasonable service.

THE CHRISTIAN SHOULD CONSECRATE HIS LIFE TO THE SERVICE OF
GOD, I, 2

1, 2. The practical consequences to be drawn from what has been said regarding the mercy of God toward man is the duty of entire consecration to God's service, and of a radical interior transformation, as a means to the perfect execution of God's will.

1. I beseech (παρακαλῶ), i.e., I exhort, I counsel.

Brethren, i.e., all you Christians of Rome. The term ἀδελφοί refers not to the Jewish Christians only, as Zahn pretends; but, as in xi. 25, to all the Christians in Rome.

By the mercy, or, according to the Greek, "by the mercies" (2 Cor. i. 3), i.e., on account of the mercy of God about which we have just spoken in the preceding chapter, and of which you Romans have been the object.

That you present. The word παραστήσαι means to present as a sacrifice, as the Jews were accustomed to bring their victims and present them to the altar for immolation (Lev. xvi. 6; Luke ii. 22).

Your bodies. The Christian should consecrate his whole being to the service of God. The Apostle begins with the *body*, because man's spiritual ruin began with the bodily organs, the senses.

A living sacrifice. For a sacrifice under the Old Law, the victim had to be *living*, because the sacrificial act consisted principally in the immolation of the victim; it had to be *holy*, that is, without defect (Lev. xix. 2), suitable to be offered to God and *pleasing* in God's sight. Likewise the Christian's body, dead to sin through Baptism, should be living the life of grace which makes it holy and pleasing to God and renders it a fit instrument to be used by the mind and soul in God's service.

Your reasonable service. These words are in apposition to the whole preceding clause. The Apostle wishes to say that the sacrifice we make to God in offering Him our bodies, living, holy, etc., is a *reasonable service*, i.e., a real *spiritual* (Cornely)

2. And be not conformed to this world; but be reformed in the newness of your mind, that you may prove what is the good, and the acceptable, and the perfect will of God.

worship which proceeds from the interior man, and not a mere external sensible worship like the sacrifices of animals in the Old Testament; or that when man gives his body, i.e., his external moral actions to the service of God, he is rendering to God a worship truly *reasonable* and *rational*, i.e., suited to the nature of God and of man, unlike the sensible homage which was paid to God by the ancient sacrifices of brute animals (Lagr.). Whether we take "reasonable" (λογικὴν) here to mean *spiritual* or *rational*, it is clear that the offering to God of all our bodily activities and moral actions is a service based on a *reasonable* consideration of our nature and of God's nature.

In the Vulgate *obsequium* should be replaced by *cultum*, and *miserordiam* by *miserationes* (Lagr.).

2. This verse develops the thought of the preceding one, passing from the dispositions of the body to those of the mind. The Christian's service of God involves a change in his mental attitude. He must no longer adapt himself to the standards and manners, the thoughts and sentiments of **this world** of sin and corruption; but must, through the assistance of grace, **be reformed**, i.e., *transformed* (μεταμορφωθῆτε) by the renovation of his mind so as to live according to his true, rational, spiritual nature. This change and renovation in man's higher nature is to the end that man may know what is the good, the acceptable and the perfect will of **God** (Vulgate); or, as the Greek text has it, that he may know what is the object of God's will, namely, that it is something morally good (τὸ ἀγαθόν), something well-pleasing (εὐάρεστον) to God, something perfect (τέλειον). These three adjectives, ἀγαθόν, εὐάρεστον, and τέλειον are taken substantively (Cornely, Lagr., Zahn, etc.), to explain that which God's will respects. Hence the "will of God" means not the faculty which wills, but the object of that will, the thing willed.

3. For I say, by the grace that is given me, to all that are among you, not to be more wise than it behoveth to be wise, but to be wise unto sobriety, and according as God hath divided to every one the measure of faith.

4. For as in one body we have many members, but all the members have not the same office:

5. So we being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another.

THE CHRISTIAN SHOULD BE CONTENTED WITH THE OFFICE HE HAS RECEIVED, AND SHOULD DISCHARGE HIS DUTIES TO GOD WITH HUMILITY, 3-8.

3-8. The sacrifice that we should make of our body and the corresponding renovation of our mind ought to be guarded by humility, which excludes all self-importance and enforces self-restraint in our dealings with one another. Let each Christian, by a faithful discharge of his duties, contribute his part to the common good of the Church.

3. By the grace, etc., i.e., by my authority as an Apostle (i. 5; xv. 15; 1 Cor. iii. 10; Gal. ii. 9, etc.).

To all that are among you, i.e., to each individual among you Roman Christians.

Not to be more wise, etc. *φρονεῖν* here describes the quality of one's thought or mind. There is a play in this place, on the words in Greek, which does not appear in Latin or English. The sense is that no one should esteem himself beyond that which is his due, but that each one should esteem himself according to sober-mindedness.

The measure of faith. "Faith" here does not mean the theological virtue, but rather the gratuitous and miraculous gifts that were often conferred on the early Christians at Baptism,—the charismata, of which there is question in the following verses, and in 1 Cor. vii. 7 (Cornely, Lagr., Zahn, etc.). These gifts were various in kind, and were conferred as the will of God disposed. Each one, therefore, should use the gifts God has bestowed upon him with fidelity and humility, not interfering with the gifts and duties of others.

4, 5. With ancient writers the comparison of a social organism to the body was very common.¹ St. Paul now compares the

6. And having different gifts, according to the grace that is given us, either prophecy, to be used according to the rule of faith;

Christian society to a natural physical body. As in the latter there are many members performing different functions for the benefit of the whole, so in the former, the Church, each member has his proper office and gifts with which he ought to be content, and which he ought to utilize for the good of the entire Church. This thought is much further developed in 1 Cor. xii. 12-31, where the Apostle considers the Church as a living mystical body, and compares it in detail to a natural physical organism. The unity of the one, as of the other, comes from the soul, and Christ is the soul of His mystical body the Church. In Eph. iv. 15 St. Paul speaks of Christ as the *head*, but this is only a different way of showing the mysterious and gracious relations of Christians with Christ and His Spirit.

The faithful are many, but form only **one body in Christ**, by whose spirit they are united and vivified. All, therefore, are dependent on the life that comes from Christ, their head and soul; and all the members are interdependent one on another, as sharing in the common work to which life in Christ is ordained.

6. In verses 6-8 St. Paul illustrates the different gifts of the Christians, and the different uses of these gifts. The sentences are elliptical and need to be completed by the understanding of different verbs or phrases; e.g., after **prophecy** we should understand, *let us prophesy*; after **ministry**, *let us serve*; after **teacheth**, *let him excel*; after **exhorteth**, *let him be assiduous*; after **giveth**, *let him give*; after **ruleth**, *let him rule*; after **mercy**, *let him show mercy*.

There is question in these verses of what theologians call *gratiae gratis datae*, i.e., extraordinary and supernatural gifts, which God sometimes confers on certain persons, not on account of personal merits, nor for the spiritual advantage of the recipient, but rather for the general benefit of the Church. In the early days of the Church, when there was greater need of such extraordinary happenings, these gifts were often bestowed on the faithful. St. Paul makes particular mention of them in his First Epistle to the Corinthians. There he enumerates nine gifts, while here

7. Or ministry, in ministering; or he that teacheth, in doctrine; he speaks of only seven; but in neither place does he intend to do more than call the attention of the faithful to a few for the sake of illustration.

According to the grace. This shows that the bestowal of the charismata does not depend on the personal merits of the recipient, but only on the free will of God. God distributes them as He will and to whom He will. Each one, therefore, should content himself with the gift he has received, and not desire that of another.

Prophecy, i.e., a supernatural gift by which one knows hidden and future things, and which one uses to edify the Church (1 Cor. xiv. 3 ff., 24) in explaining the sacred mysteries and stimulating the faithful to virtue.

To be used is not in the Greek.

According to the rule of faith. "Rule of faith" should be rather *measure of faith*, according to the Greek. By these words St. Paul cautions the prophet not to exceed the limits of his supernatural gift, that is, not to mix up his own personal thoughts with the suggestions that come from the Holy Ghost (Lagr.). The prophet is to use his gift for the benefit of the faith, and consequently in conformity with the teaching of faith; that is, he must use it *secundum rationem fidei, id est non in vanum, sed ut per hoc fides confirmetur; non autem contra fidem* (St. Thomas). This interpretation, following the Latin Fathers, regards the *rule of faith* as an objective measure, rather than as a subjective disposition. Cornely and the Greek Fathers, however, prefer this latter view; but it is difficult to see how one subjectively, could know whether or not he was exceeding the revelation given him (Lagr.).

In the Vulgate *rationem fidei* should be *mensuram fidei*.

7. Ministry, *διακονίαν*, is a general term embracing all ecclesiastical functions, but used here to designate certain services in the community, which are going to be enumerated. The offices about which there is question in this verse were of an extraordinary and supernatural kind, which required corresponding supernatural gifts in those who exercised them (Cornely).

He that teacheth, etc. The change of construction may be merely for literary reasons, or because the different ways of

8. He that exhorteth, in exhorting; he that giveth, with simplicity; he that ruleth, with carefulness; he that sheweth mercy, with cheerfulness.

ministering are now to be spoken of. The *teacher* (διδάσκων) occupies the third place, after the Apostles and prophets (1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. iv. 11). His office is to expound, elucidate and systematically explain the truths of Christianity. It does not appear that the teacher or doctor was inspired like the prophet, whose function was to discover and to declare.

In doctrine, i.e., let the teacher faithfully exercise his office.

8. **He that exhorteth** (ὁ παρακολῶν). Nowhere else is this gift spoken of. It seems to have consisted in the special grace of imparting counsel and stimulus, or encouragement to others, thus moving them to the practice of virtue.

He that giveth (ὁ μεταδιδούς) is he that is moved by the Holy Ghost to give alms to the poor (1 Cor. xiii. 3).

With simplicity, i.e., not seeking one's own interest, but only the welfare of his neighbor for God's sake.

He that ruleth (ὁ προϊστάμενος) does not refer to ecclesiastical superiors, properly speaking, but to those who were charged with various duties, such as looking after the widows, the orphans, the poor and the like (Cornely, Lagr., etc.).

With carefulness, i.e., let the office be exercised with zeal and fidelity.

He that sheweth mercy (ὁ ἐλεῶν) means one who gives personal care and attention to the miserable, the poor and the sick.

With cheerfulness, i.e., with pleasantness and sweetness of manner, in order to show fulness of affection for those in distress, and to inspire hope (2 Cor. ix. 7).

THE EXERCISE OF MUTUAL CHARITY, 9-21

9-21. As in 1 Cor. xii. 31; xiii. 1 ff., so also here, after treating of the charismata or special gifts of Christians, St. Paul passes on to an enumeration of the general qualities of the faithful, beginning with charity (ἀγάπη), the most excellent gift of God to the soul. While the counsels that follow are not arranged in any very determinate and logical order, yet it can be said that the Apostle treats first of the mutual exercise of charity

9. Let love be without dissimulation. Hating that which is evil, cleaving to that which is good.

10. Loving one another with the charity of brotherhood, with honour preventing one another.

11. In carefulness not slothful. In spirit fervent. Serving the Lord.

among the Christians (verses 9-16), and then of duties toward all men, especially one's enemies (verses 17-21).

9. **Love** (ἡ ἀγάπη), i.e., charity toward God and the neighbor.

Without dissimulation, i.e., without *hypocrisy* (ἠνυπόκριτος), sincere, and not from the lips only (2 Cor. vi. 6; 1 John iii. 18).

Hating that which is evil, etc. Our love for our neighbor should be regulated according to a stern and uncompromising moral standard, and so should detest evil and seek good wherever they are found.

10. In verses 10-21 there is a remarkable series of coördinated participles, adjectives, infinitives (verse 15) and imperatives,—all of which have an imperative sense. The participles are expressive of habits which manifest themselves in daily life.

With the charity of brotherhood. The Christians, being all of one faith and of one family, whose head is Christ, should have a fraternal love for one another. And this brotherly love among the Christians should prompt them to be eager to exhibit mutual signs of respect, one trying to get a start on the other, in external manifestations of honor and esteem (Cornely). Fr. Lagrange and others think St. Paul is speaking here of interior sentiments, rather than of external demonstrations. Naturally, however, the internal habit would show itself in external actions.

The *fraternitatis* of the Vulgate would better be *fraterna*.

11. **In carefulness**, etc., i.e., in regard to solicitude we should be active and diligent in helping others and in executing our private duties.

In spirit fervent, i.e., acting with great fervor of mind under the influence of the Holy Spirit.

Serving the Lord. We should be animated with a spirit of great fervor, because we are serving our Lord Jesus Christ, to whose service we are entirely dedicated.

The reading of the Vulgate, *Domino servientes*, is according to the best Greek reading, τῷ κυρίῳ δουλεύοντες; rather than τῷ καιρῷ,

12. Rejoicing in hope. Patient in tribulation. Instant in prayer.
13. Communicating to the necessities of the saints. Pursuing hospitality.
14. Bless them that persecute you: bless, and curse not.
15. Rejoice with them that rejoice; weep with them that weep.

serving the time, i.e., making good use of one's time and opportunities.

12. **Rejoicing in hope**, i.e., be joyous in the hope of heavenly rewards which wait upon the fervent Christian; be **patient in tribulation**, i.e., be constant and *persevering* (*ὑπομένοντες*) in trials, which lead to hope (v. 4) and increase your merits for future blessedness; be **instant in prayer**, i.e., be habitually devoted to prayer by which you obtain from God the grace necessary to observe all the other precepts of the law.

13. **Communicating**, etc., i.e., imparting aid, when necessary, to your fellow-Christians, the saints, regarding their need as your own.

Pursuing hospitality. The practice of hospitality is often inculcated in the New Testament (Heb. xiii. 3; Tit. i. 8; 1 Tim. iii. 2; 1 Pet. iv. 9), and was most necessary, because many of the Christians had been forced to leave all things to follow Christ.

14. **Bless**, etc. Although the Christians were subject to more or less constant persecution for their faith, still it was their duty to return good for evil, to love those that hated them, etc., as our Lord had commanded (Matt. v. 44; Luke vi. 27, etc.). The Apostle admonishes the Christians to wish their enemies well, and not to curse them. This was a vastly different spirit from that of the Jews who introduced into their official prayers maledictions against the Christians (cf. Lagrange, *Le Messianisme*, etc., p. 294).

15. **Rejoice . . . weep.** The infinitives here in Greek have an imperative meaning. Since the Christians are all members of one body, each one should share in the joy or sorrow of each other one. The Apostle says first, **rejoice with them that rejoice**, because, as St. Chrys. observes, "it requires a very generous soul, when your neighbor prospers, not only not to envy him, but even to rejoice with him; whereas only a stony heart is unmoved by the distress of another."

16. Being of one mind one towards another. Not minding high things, but consenting to the humble. Be not wise in your own conceits.

17. To no man rendering evil for evil. Providing good things, not only in the sight of God, but also in the sight of all men.

16. **Being of one mind, etc.** The Apostle again counsels the Christians to cultivate modesty and humility—virtues which will promote mutual agreement among them, causing each one to feel and act towards his neighbor as towards himself. No one should on account of birth, riches or the like, consider himself better than his neighbor, because all are one with Christ (Gal. iii. 28), and there is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, rich nor poor.

Not minding high things, etc., i.e., in the social order, not in the intellectual and moral orders.

Consenting to the humble, i.e., condescending to humble offices, being contented with humble gifts, not refusing to do anything, however lowly, provided it be good. Another interpretation understands the Apostle to mean that the Christians should condescend to live on a level and associate with those of lower condition of life and of lower culture. This interpretation makes τοῖς ταπεινοῖς masculine here, as it is everywhere else in the Old and New Testaments, with the possible exception of Psalm cxxxvi. 6; whereas the other understands it to be neuter, to refer to things and not to persons. Those who make the phrase neuter are influenced by the antithesis to τὰ ὑψηλά.

Be not wise, etc., i.e., do not entertain so high an opinion of your own judgment as to despise and refuse the counsel of others; avoid self-conceit.

17. There is a turning now to the Christian's attitude toward his enemies outside the community of the faithful.

To no man rendering evil for evil. This had been already forbidden by the Psalmist (Ps. vii. 5) and by the sane moral code of the ancients (Lagr.). Cf. also Matt. v. 38; 1 Thess. v. 15; 1 Pet. iii. 9, where all private revenge is prohibited.

Providing good things in the sight of all men, i.e., giving edification to all men, whether of the fold or not (Matt. v. 15).

The words, **not only in the sight of God, but also,** are most probably a gloss from 2 Cor. viii. 21. Consequently the corresponding words of the Vulgate here ought to be omitted.

18. If it be possible, as much as in you, having peace with all men.

19. Revenge not yourselves, my dearly beloved; but give place unto wrath, for it is written: Revenge is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord.

20. But if thy enemy be hungry, give him to eat; if he thirst, give him to drink. For, doing this, thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head.

21. Be not overcome by evil, but overcome evil by good.

18. **If it be possible**, etc. St. Paul implies that it may be impossible always to live in peace with all men, because to do so would at times mean the forfeiture of the rights of conscience and of faith. In such a case, however, the disturber is the sinner who wishes wrong to triumph over right.

19. **Revenge not**, etc. One sure way of guarding peace is to forego all private revenge.

Give place unto wrath, i.e., avoid anger, leaving vindictive justice to God, who will finally avenge the injuries done to His saints.

It is written, in Deut. xxxii. 35. The citation follows neither the Hebrew nor the LXX literally.

The *defendentes* of the Vulgate has the meaning of *vindicantes*, or of *ulciscetes* (Lagr.).

20. Not only should the Christian refrain from revenge, but he should positively succor his needy enemy. St. Paul backs up this precept with a quotation from Prov. xxv. 21 ff., cited according to the LXX. The meaning is that we are to be willing and ready to help our enemy, if we can, in any and every necessity.

Heap coals of fire, etc., means that, by the aforesaid generosity towards our enemy, we shall unintentionally inflict upon him healing pains of remorse and repentance for his past conduct, and thus effect his conversion (St. Aug., St. Jerome). Nothing is farther from the doctrine of Paul and the context of Prov. than to think we should be beneficent to our enemy for the sake of causing him pain. Such an attitude and intention on our part, if at all perceived by the enemy, would defeat its own purpose.

21. This verse confirms the interpretation given of the preceding verse. Evil feeds and thrives upon evil, but is wasted and conquered by good.

CHAPTER XIII

OBEDIENCE DUE TO THE CIVIL AUTHORITY, 1-7

1. Let every soul be subject to higher powers: for there is no power but from God: and those that are, are ordained of God.

1-7. We find here no special introduction to the subject which the Apostle begins to discuss. The connection, however, with what precedes is this, that after having given certain counsels regarding the private life of Christians, he now turns to consider their duties to the civil authority. Aside from a desire for completeness in indicating the duties of Christians, there seems to have been no special reason why St. Paul took up this question of civil obedience. The treatment is general, and does not appear to have been occasioned by any pressing need in Rome. Of course in those early days the Christians were generally regarded as a Jewish sect, or at least as having sprung from the Jews, and there was perhaps reason to fear lest, for some causes, the punishments which were frequently inflicted by the Roman authority on the latter might at times be visited on the former. At any rate, the Christian communities throughout the Empire were becoming more and more numerous, and there was an ever-increasing need, for the sake of private duty as well as public peace and safety, of clear and explicit views regarding the Christian's attitude and obligations toward lawful civil authority. Therefore, the Apostle enjoins that the faithful be obedient to their civil rulers; for to resist their lawful superiors is to resist God, from whom all authority is derived. Civil superiors are divinely empowered for the promotion of good and the repression of evil. Hence it is needful to be obedient for the sake of one's conscience. The Apostle confirms his doctrine by the fact that the faithful pay their taxes to civil magistrates as if to the ministers of God. Let each one, therefore, render to all men their dues.

1. **Every soul**, i.e., every human being. There is no question here of animals or things inanimate.

2. Therefore he that resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God. And they that resist, purchase to themselves damnation.

3. For princes are not a terror to the good work, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? Do that which is good: and thou shalt have praise from the same.

Be subject, i.e., be respectful and obedient, saving, of course, the rights of God and of conscience. St. Paul is supposing the authority to be just and lawful, and to be rightly exercised.

To higher powers, i.e., to the State, to those that have lawful authority in any degree. Those who have authority are said to be *higher powers* (*ὑπερχούσας*), or to possess *higher powers* by reason of the superiority which is theirs with respect to those under them. Hence the meaning is that all lawful superiors are to be obeyed, whether those superiors are personally good or bad, or are in places of higher or lower dignity. And the reason for this is that all power is **from God**. God is the Creator and supreme Regulator of all things, and consequently all power to administer affairs, or to rule under God, comes radically from Him alone.

Those that are, i.e., the superiors that now possess authority **are ordained**, i.e., have been constituted by God, and should therefore be obeyed in all things that come within the limits of their authority.

2. Since all authority is from God, it follows that he who **resisteth power** or authority, i.e., he who will not be subject to authority, opposes the divine ordinance which God has established. To rebel, therefore, against authority is to sin against God and against man; and they who act thus **purchase**, better, "shall purchase," **to themselves damnation**, i.e., they shall become liable to temporal punishment here and to eternal punishment hereafter. As said before, St. Paul is supposing the civil power to be exercised within its proper limits, and consequently not to encroach upon the rights of God. *Habet autem hoc divina ordinatio, ut potestati inferiori non obediatur contra superiorem* (St. Thomas). In the Vulgate *acquirunt* should be future, to agree with the Greek.

3. The civil authority has been ordained by God and holds its power from God, in order to promote good and to curb evil.

4. For he is God's minister to thee, for good. But if thou do that which is evil, fear: for he beareth not the sword in vain. For he is God's minister: an avenger to execute wrath upon him that doth evil.

5. Wherefore be subject of necessity, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake.

6. For therefore also you pay tribute. For they are the ministers of God, serving unto this purpose.

Princes, i.e., *rulers* (ἄρχοντες) are not objects of fear to those who do good, but to those who do evil. Those who do good, far from fearing, have a right to expect praise from those in authority. Cf. 1 Pet. ii. 13, 14.

The *boni operis, sed mali* of the Vulgate should be *bono operi, sed malo*, according to many MSS.

4. **He**, i.e., civil authority, or the one possessing it, has been constituted by God and ordained for good, i.e., for the benefit of all the members of society. The first object of authority, then, is to promote the welfare of its subjects; the second is to repress and punish evil as a menace to the good to which the members of society are entitled. **The sword** is the symbol or emblem of the right to inflict capital punishment for crimes committed against the social and civil power.

5. As a result of the fact that authority is from God, and the possessor of authority is God's minister, it follows that we should be subject to our lawful superiors by the very nature of the case. Not that our liberty is taken away, but only that *there is need to be subject* (ἀνάγκη ὑποτάσσεσθαι), and this for two reasons: for **wrath**, i.e., out of fear of the punishment which disobedience merits, and for **conscience' sake**, i.e., for the peace of our conscience, which dictates submission to those who represent God. From this it is clear that legitimate human law and authority oblige in conscience, so that those who transgress them are liable to temporal punishment and are guilty of sin and deserve punishment from God.

6. **For therefore** (διὰ τοῦτο γάρ). St. Paul appeals to the ordinary practice of the Christians to prove their duty of obedience to the civil authority. They pay tribute, because they recognize that they are held in conscience to obey the law, and further because they look upon the revenue officers as **ministers of God** (λειτουργοὶ θεοῦ), i.e., as taking care of the public interest and pro-

7. Render therefore to all men their dues. Tribute, to whom tribute is due: custom, to whom custom: fear, to whom fear: honour, to whom honour.

8. Owe no man anything, but to love one another. For he that loveth his neighbour, hath fulfilled the law.

viding for the public welfare—functions committed to them by God. Civil rulers who fulfil their charge faithfully are truly ministering to God, they are “God’s ministers” in temporal and profane affairs; as, in a higher and more sacred sense, they who serve God in spiritual and eternal matters are His ministers.

The *servientes* of the Vulgate should be *assidue incumbentes* (Cornely), or *perseverantes* (St. Aug.).

7. Making some practical applications of his doctrine the Apostle, in conformity with the teaching of our Lord (Matt. xxii. 21), says to render to every superior, high or low, the obedience which is due him according to his office. **Tribute** is tax on land or on persons, land-tax or poll-tax. **Custom** is tax on exports and imports. **Fear** means the respect and reverence that are due to lawful superiors.

The *ergo* of the Vulgate is not represented in the Greek; hence **therefore** should be omitted.

THE NECESSITY OF CHARITY AND VIGILANCE, 8-14

8-14. That which is fundamental to all our duties to all men, whether superiors or equals, is charity, the distinctive mark of the Christian. In it are summed up all the precepts of the Decalogue. There is special need for us to practice this virtue, since our lives are drawing to a close.

8. **Owe no man anything**, etc., i.e., have no debt to any man, except the debt of love or charity. All other debts besides this latter can be paid finally and completely, so as no longer to exist; but the debt of charity, however constantly paid, is ever due, because it rests on God’s abiding precept and upon the relations of nature and of grace that we have in common with our neighbor. *Semper autem debeo caritatem quae sola etiam reddita detinet redditorem* (St. Aug.). St. Thomas gives the reasons why we can never pay our debt of charity to our neighbor: “First, because we owe our neighbor love for the sake of God, whom we can never sufficiently recompense (1 John iv. 21); secondly,

9. For Thou shalt not commit adultery: Thou shalt not kill: Thou shalt not steal: Thou shalt not bear false witness: Thou shalt not covet: and if there be any other commandment, it is comprised in this word, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.

10. The love of our neighbour worketh no evil. Love therefore is the fulfilling of the law.

because the motive of love always remains, being likeness in nature and grace (Ecclus. xiii. 19); thirdly, because charity does not diminish, but increases by love (Phil. i. 9)."

He that loveth his neighbour, hath fulfilled the law, because the love of one's neighbor is founded on the love of God (John xv. 17), and the love of God implies the fulfillment of all the precepts of "the law" of Moses. Cf. Matt. xxii. 35 ff.; Gal. v. 14; 1 John iv. 20, 21.

9. This verse proves that "law" of the preceding verse meant the Law of Moses, of which only certain precepts are here cited. St. Paul does not recite the whole Decalogue, but only those precepts of it regarding the neighbor which one might fail to see were involved in the general precept of charity. That he did not wish the other Commandments regarding God and the neighbor to be omitted is evident from the words, "and if there be any other commandment," etc. The order here differs from the Hebrew text in Exod. xx. 13 ff.; Deut. v. 17 ff.; Mark x. 19; Luke xviii. 20.

Thou shalt not bear false witness. These words are omitted in the best Greek copies, but they are included in the statement, and if there be any other commandment, etc.

Thou shalt love thy neighbour, etc. These words are taken from Lev. xix. 18, and signify that we should love all men with the same kind of love with which we love ourselves.

The *instauratur* of the Vulgate would better be *recapitulatur* (St. Jer., St. Aug.).

10. Summing up what he has said about charity the Apostle observes that **love of our neighbour worketh no evil to the neighbour**, as it is in the Greek. That over and above this negative good it works positive good to the neighbor is clear from what follows in the verse, which is a repetition of the end of verse 8. To love perfectly is to fulfil the law, because, as said above, the love of

11. And that knowing the season; that it is now the hour for us to rise from sleep. For now our salvation is nearer than when we believed.

12. The night is passed, and the day is at hand. Let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and put on the armour of light.

the neighbor is based on the love of God, and this, when perfect, means the fulfilling of all the precepts of the law.

In the Vulgate *dilectio proximi* should be *dilectio proximo*, according to the Greek.

11. Another reason for practicing charity is drawn from the special circumstances of time in which the Romans found themselves. The Apostle admonishes them that it is now needful that they should rise from sleep, i.e., from the state of tepidity and negligence into which some may have fallen since their conversion. The reason is because time is growing shorter for them.

Our salvation, i.e., our final deliverance from earth is nearer than when we believed, i.e., than when we were converted to the faith, consequently we should lose no time, but should stimulate all our energies and increase our fervor. Every day that passes brings us nearer to death and to our eternal reward. This was certainly true of individuals, and of the whole generation whom St. Paul was addressing, but we must not thence gather that the Apostle meant to teach anything about the nearness of the Second Coming of Christ for all; he had not forgotten his teaching (xi. 25) regarding the conversions of the nations and of Israel, which were surely far off. The "salvation" of the Christians began with their conversion, and its final glorious consummation is drawing nearer every day. This fact the Apostle makes use of here to rouse the faithful from tepidity and negligence, and to stimulate them to vigorous and spiritual effort. Beyond this his argument at present does not go.

12. The night is passed, i.e., our course in this world of darkness and sin is far advanced (*προέκοψεν*). The night began with the sin of Adam, but the day of salvation dawned with the death of Christ. This day, already shedding its light over the world, and cheering the Christians in particular, will reach its meridian later on in the final glorification of our souls and bodies (v. 9; 2 Tim. iv. 18). Since, therefore, we are living in the daylight of redemption, we should conduct ourselves as children of light

13. Let us walk honestly, as in the day: not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and impurities, not in contention and envy:

14. But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh in its concupiscences.

and put aside all sins, because these are works of darkness (v. 13; John iii. 20; Eph. vi. 12) and lead to eternal night; we should put on the **armour of light**, i.e., the armor of Christian virtues, and war against evil (1 Thess. v. 8; Eph. vi. 11 ff.; 2 Cor. x. 4 ff.).

The *praecessit* of the Vulgate should rather be *processit*, to conform to the Greek.

13. In this verse the Apostle is showing how different should be the conduct of Christians from the practices of pagans. The vices he enumerates were those commonly practiced by the pagan Romans during the night at their feasts and banquets. The Christians, then, who are living in the bright day of redemption, should be adorned with all virtues and should live and act as becomes children of light, and not according to the immoral standards of paganism.

The first two vices here mentioned pertain to gluttony and debauchery (Gal. v. 21); the second two refer to sins of luxury (Gal. v. 19); and the remaining were sins against charity and one's neighbor (1 Cor. iii. 3; 2 Cor. xii. 20; Gal. v. 20).

Chambering means all kinds of acts of impurity.

14. Not only should the Christian put away and shun the works of darkness, but he must go further and **put on the Lord Jesus Christ**, i.e., he must clothe himself with the virtues, the spirit, and the grace of Christ. Already in Baptism Christians are clothed with Christ (Gal. iii. 27), but it is their duty thereafter to coöperate with grace and thus increase their likeness to our Lord by constantly imitating the virtues which shone in Him.

Make not provision, etc., i.e., cease to provide for the flesh in the way of exciting and satisfying its unclean and perverse desires and tendencies; all necessary provision and care for the body is not here in question, except in so far as the needs of the body must not be the dominant motives in the Christian's life.

It is well known that St. Augustine was converted by the reading of the last two verses of this chapter (*Confess.*, viii. 12, 22).

CHAPTER XIV

THE ROMAN CHRISTIANS SHOULD NOT CRITICIZE AND CONDEMN ONE ANOTHER ON ACCOUNT OF DIFFERENCES OF OPINION ; THE STRONG MUST HAVE REGARD FOR THE WEAK, 1-23

1. Now him that is weak in faith, take unto you: not in disputes about thoughts.

1-23. In the Roman Church there was a Jewish, as well as a larger Gentile element. The Jewish Christians there, as elsewhere, naturally retained, to a greater or less extent, their love for the Law and the Mosaic observances. It was likely, therefore, that some of these converts in Rome should carry their inherited practices and prejudices so far as to observe some of the Mosaic feasts, and so distinguish between different foods as entirely to abstain from certain meats and drinks. This some of the Gentile Christians would doubtless imitate; and thus there was danger of uncharitable divisions in the Church,—those who were given to these scrupulous and obsolete customs, and those of stronger and more enlightened consciences, who might look down upon and despise their weaker brethren, morally forcing them perhaps to act against their own conscience.

St. Paul, therefore, thought it well to treat this subject in writing to the Romans, and to urge all to abstain from unfavorable judgment of one another, leaving all judgment to God (verses 1-13a). He then counsels the strong to bear with the weak, and not to do anything that could scandalize the latter (verses 13b-23).

1. The Apostle first addresses the strong, and touches upon the principal object of possible disagreement. The strong should bear with the weak. All have not the same conscience, though all mean to do their best.

Weak in faith, i.e., he that, while firmly admitting the great principles of faith, does not fully realize their import in all matters. Such a one has imperfect knowledge, and does not

2. For one believeth that he may eat all things: but he that is weak, let him eat herbs.

3. Let not him that eateth, despise him that eateth not: and he that eateth not, let him not judge him that eateth. For God hath taken him to him.

understand that justification through faith in Christ has freed him from all the ceremonial observances of the Mosaic Law; hence he abstains from meat and wine, scrupulously fearing they may be unclean, having first been offered to idols. Fr. Lagrange thinks "faith" here does not mean simply *conscience*, otherwise there would be question of the whole moral law, and not of certain Jewish observances only. The term doubtless means the living principle of conduct.

Take unto you, i.e., admit into your company and friendship.

Not in disputes, etc., i.e., not disputing and judging about one another's ideas of right and wrong, thus interfering with one another's consciences, even though one is erroneous in some things.

2. The principle laid down in the preceding verse is now illustrated. St. Paul is giving an example of two extreme parties.

One, i.e., the strong Christian believeth, i.e., is persuaded, convinced that he can eat any kind of food without injury to his faith or conscience; whereas he that is "weak in faith" refuses to eat meat out of fear of contamination, and satisfies himself with **herbs** only.

The English **let him eat**, etc., is a wrong rendering of the Greek indicative *ἐσθίου*, found in all the best MSS. The correct translation of the last clause of this verse is: "But he that is weak eateth (only) herbs."

In the Vulgate *se* before *manducare* should be omitted, and *manducet* should be *manducat*.

3. The practical application of the above principle is that the Christian with strong faith and a right conscience should not despise his brother of weaker faith and erroneous conscience; and also that the latter should not condemn the former as lax and guilty of violating the law of God, because such a judgment would be against God Himself, who **hath taken him**, i.e., the strong Christian, and made him His faithful servant and a member of His Church.

4. Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? To his own lord he standeth or falleth. And he shall stand: for God is able to make him stand.

5. For one judgeth between day and day: and another judgeth every day: let every man abound in his own sense.

6. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord. And he that eateth, eateth to the Lord: for he giveth thanks to God. And he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth thanks to God.

4. St. Paul cautions the "weak" not to condemn the "strong," because both are the servants of the same Christ (verses 7-9), and no one has a right to judge **another's servant**: only the master is the lawful judge of his servants. All Christians, therefore, being the servants of Christ, will be judged by Christ according to their individual service, and the judgment upon them of any one else besides Christ is wrong and out of place (see below, on verse 12).

To his own lord, etc., i.e., a servant is approved or condemned by the sole judgment of his master.

And he shall stand, i.e., this strong Christian shall not fall from his faith and piety because God will provide for him.

Deus of the Vulgate should be *dominus*.

5. A second example is given to show that the actions of one Christian do not pertain to another.

One, i.e., a Jewish Christian distinguishes between different days, judging some to be more sacred than others; **another**, i.e., a strong Christian makes no more distinction between days than between meats, knowing that the old Mosaic observances regarding the Sabbath, the New Moon and other feasts, no longer oblige under the New Dispensation. St. Paul later on (verse 14) gives his personal advice about meats, but he does not return to the distinction of days.

Let every man abound, etc. This and the equivalent Vulgate reading, *unusquisque in suo sensu abundet*,—which can only mean: *suo sensui dimittatur* (St. Thomas),—do not conform to the Greek, which is: Let every man be certain in his own mind (Cornely), i.e., a conscience practically and morally certain is the only kind with which it is proper to act.

The Vulgate *diem inter diem* would better be *diem plus quam diem*.

6. The Apostle now urges mutual tolerance, because both the

7. For none of us liveth to himself; and no man dieth to himself.

8. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; or whether we die, we die unto the Lord. Therefore, whether we live, or whether we die, we are the Lord's.

9. For to this end Christ died and rose again; that he might be Lord both of the dead and of the living.

10. But thou, why judgest thou thy brother? or thou, why dost thou despise thy brother? For we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ.

parties in question are prompted by the same spirit and intention of serving and pleasing God. The scrupulous Christian who regards one day as holier than another, and refrains from certain foods, does so because he feels he is thus pleasing and serving God. In like manner the strong Christian, who disregards these distinctions, is moved by his desire to do the will of God, as is evident from his giving thanks to God after the example of his Lord and Master (Matt. xv. 36; xxvi. 26).

7, 8. A proof that each Christian is following his conviction and conscience in all he does is this, that each one is living, not for himself, but for his Lord. The Christian who lives up to his calling consecrates his whole life and actions, together with his death, to God. Having been purchased at a great price (1 Cor. vi. 19, 20), by the very blood of his Master, the true Christian knows that both in life and in death he is the property of his Lord Jesus Christ.

9. Christ died and rose again to establish the relationship described in the preceding verses. By His death and Resurrection He acquired universal dominion over all men, He conquered death and opened the gates of life to all.

The Vulgate, *mortuus est et resurrexit* follows the Greek ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἀνέστη. A better reading has: ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἔζησεν, *mortuus est et revixit*.

10. Since we are all servants of Christ, none of us has a right to set himself up as judge of his fellow-servant. Christ is the judge of us all.

But thou, scrupulous Christian, why do you judge and condemn as a transgressor of the Law your brother for whom you ought to have real charity? or thou, Christian of strong faith, why do you despise your weaker brother as a superstitious fellow? Both of you have usurped a right which belongs to God

11. For it is written: As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God.

12. Therefore every one of us shall render account to God for himself.

13. Let us not therefore judge one another any more. But judge this rather, that you put not a stumbling block or a scandal in your brother's way.

alone, before whose tribunal we must all appear to render an account of our works (ii. 6).

The best Greek MSS. have "judgment seat of God," instead of judgment seat of Christ. To St. Paul it is all the same whether he says judgment seat of God or of Christ (2 Cor. v. 10), because Christ is also God.

11. The Apostle now cites a conflation of Isaias xlv. 23 and xlix. 18, according to the LXX, to prove that all men must appear before the judgment seat of God. The citation was probably from memory, because it is not literal. The direct meaning of the Prophet's words is that Yahweh, the only Saviour, shall receive the homage of the whole world; however, the question of the judgment is also implied.

As I live is in the LXX, "I swear by myself," i.e., by the life which I live.

Every knee shall bow to me, i.e., all men shall render homage to Me as their Sovereign and Supreme Judge.

And every tongue, etc., is in the LXX, "And every tongue shall swear by God." The sense in either case is the same, because every lawful oath is a recognition of God's omnipotence and supreme justice.

The *flectetur* of the Vulgate ought to be *flectet*.

12. The general conclusion is drawn: each one shall have to give an account to God for his own life and actions. God, therefore, is the supreme Judge of all we do, and we should not rashly judge one another. This counsel is meant in particular for the weak Christian who is over solicitous for the doings of the strong.

13. The preceding verses have been chiefly addressed to the "weak"; but now St. Paul, first counselling both weak and strong not to judge each other, turns his attention to the "strong" and bids them beware of scandalizing their weaker brethren.

14. I know, and am confident in the Lord Jesus, that nothing is unclean of itself; but to him that esteemeth anything to be unclean, to him it is unclean.

15. For if, because of thy meat, thy brother be grieved, thou walkest not now according to charity. Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died.

Judge this, etc., i.e., take care that, etc. (*κρίνατε*, used in a different sense from *κρίνωμεν* just preceding).

Stumbling block . . . scandal, both mean an obstacle put in another's way which can cause one to fall. The former is placed by chance, or carelessness; the latter, with deliberate intent to trap. The "strong" Christian should keep in mind the delicate conscience of the weak and avoid, as far as possible, eating meat or doing anything in the latter's presence which would cause him to act against his own conscience, or with a doubtful conscience, and thus fall into sin.

14. St. Paul here, as in 1 Cor. viii. 1-6, clearly declares his own position regarding things clean and unclean. He fully approves of the doctrine of the strong Christian, and holds in theory that it is lawful to eat any kind of food; but in practice it may sometimes be necessary to abstain from certain foods out of charity to one's neighbor (verse 15).

I know, and am confident, etc., i.e., on the authority of the teaching of Christ (Mark vii. 1 ff.), or as a minister and Apostle of Christ (ix. 1; 2 Cor. ii. 17; xii. 19), **I am certain that nothing is unclean of itself**, i.e., of its own nature (*δὲ ἑαυτοῦ*); or, according to another reading, "through him" (*δὲ αὐτοῦ*), namely, through Christ, who abolished the distinction between foods (St. Thomas). This was against the teaching of the Pharisees, commonly followed by the Jews, that certain meats were unclean and contaminating by their very nature. Of course if one really thinks a food is unclean, then it becomes so subjectively for him: an erroneous conscience is binding.

According to the reading of the best MSS. the Vulgate *per ipsum* should be *per seipsum*, or *per se*.

15. **For if** (*εἰ γάρ*, according to the best MSS.) probably refers back to verse 13, verse 14 being a parenthesis. If the meat which you, as one strong in the faith, are able to take, grievously offends your weaker brother, who thinks your conduct seriously

16. Let not then our good be evil spoken of.

17. For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but justice, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.

wrong and is thereby unnecessarily angered, you ought to avoid it; otherwise your appetite, and not charity, rules you.

Destroy not, i.e., do not, by your example, encourage your weak brother to act against his conscience and do what he thinks to be wrong; for thereby you lead into serious sin and ruin a soul for whom Christ died (1 Cor. viii. 8, 13; Matt. xviii. 6, 7).

16. According to the ancient opinion (St. Chrys. and others) **our good** here refers to the Christian faith, or the kingdom of God in the Gospel. This meaning fits in well with the following verse and could be sustained, if the best reading were ἡμῶν, instead of ἐμῶν τὸ ἀγαθόν. Following, therefore, the better reading St. Thomas, Cornely and others understand by "our good," or "your good," the liberty received from Christ to eat all meats of whatever kind. Hence the Apostle's meaning is: Let us not so use our Christian freedom that it will be misunderstood, vilified and calumniated by our weaker brethren. This liberty we have from Christ is a great blessing, but we should use it with prudence, so that it may not become an occasion of sin to those who do not understand it fully.

The *nostrum* of the Vulgate ought to be *vestrum*, and the "our" of the English ought to be "your," according to the best Greek reading.

17. **The kingdom of God**, i.e., according to one opinion, the essence of Christianity and the Gospel (Cajetan, Maier, etc.); or, that by which God reigns in our souls: God reigns in us by justice, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost (St. Thomas, Cornely). To use or abstain from certain foods is a minor affair considered in itself, and when compared with those fundamental and essential virtues by which we are spiritually united to God. If, however, the use of any foods should imperil the spiritual life of our neighbor, the justice within us, which requires us to render to everyone his due, will demand that we abstain from such foods.

Peace is an effect of justice or sanctity.

18. For he that in this serveth Christ, pleaseth God, and is approved of men.

19. Therefore let us follow after the things that are of peace; and keep the things that are of edification one towards another.

20. Destroy not the work of God for meat. All things indeed are clean: but it is evil for that man who eateth with offence.

21. It is good not to eat flesh, and not to drink wine, nor anything whereby thy brother is offended, or scandalized, or made weak.

Joy is the natural outcome of justice and peace, and the product of charity which the Holy Ghost diffuses in our hearts, moving us to seek the glory of God and the good of our neighbor.

18. In this, i.e., in justice, in peace, etc.

Pleaseth God, because he procures the glory of God.

Is approved of men, i.e., men do not have wherefore to find fault with him, as they do in the case of verse 16.

19. This is a conclusion to the passage which began in verse 16. The best MSS. have *διώκομεν*, *sectamur*, *we follow after*, etc., instead of *διώκωμεν*, *sectemur*, *let us follow after*.

Keep is not in the best MSS., and so *custodiamus* of the Vulgate should be omitted.

20. The Apostle returns to the thought of verse 14; but the repetition is not useless, because here he brings out the high character of the weak Christian who is imperiled by the other's conduct: this weak Christian is the work of God who has converted and sanctified him. Although all things are clean in themselves, it is evil for the strong Christian to disregard the tender conscience of his weak brother, and, by doing in his presence what the latter thinks is wrong, to lead him, by force of example, to violate his own conscience and eat the food which he feels to be unclean.

21. It is good and noble on the part of the strong Christian to abstain from all those indifferent things whereby the weak may be **offended**, i.e., made weak in his faith or unsettled in his conscience.

Not to drink wine. Some of the Christians perhaps thought wine was unclean because "the heathen used to pour libations to their idols from the firstfruits of their wine, and offered many sacrifices at the wine-presses themselves" (St. Aug.). Cf. 1 Cor. viii. 13.

22. Hast thou faith? Have it to thyself before God. Blessed is he that condemneth not himself in that which he alloweth.

23. But he that discerneth, if he eat, is condemned, because not of faith. For all that is not of faith is sin.

22. The Apostle counsels the strong man to follow in private his convictions and eat anything he pleases, but to be careful when there is danger of doing harm to another. Blessed, he says, is the man of strong faith who is not tormented by doubt and scrupulosity in his actions.

Faith, i.e., a firm conviction, a clear conscience regarding the lawfulness of eating all kinds of foods.

Have it to thyself, etc., i.e., let it guide thy conduct in private.

Blessed is he that is not troubled in conscience by his own conduct or actions, i.e., blessed is he whose conscience approves his actions.

23. **He that discerneth**, i.e., he that hesitates and acts with a doubtful conscience is **condemned**, i.e., is culpable and actually guilty of sin. A conscience practically and morally certain is the only rule of conduct.

All that is not of faith, etc., i.e., all that is not approved by a certain conscience is sinful; "faith" here means a good conscience.

CHAPTER XV

AFTER THE EXAMPLE OF CHRIST THE CHRISTIANS SHOULD SHARE
ONE ANOTHER'S BURDENS, I-13

1. Now we that are stronger, ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves.

I-13. Not only should the strong Christian avoid scandalizing the weak, but all should try to bear with one another, and by positive acts help to bear one another's burdens. This must be done to the end that God may be glorified; for all are one in Christ, whose example we must imitate.

1. We that are strong in the faith ought to bear with the infirmities of those that are scrupulous and weak in faith, i.e.,

2. Let every one of you please his neighbour unto good, to edification.
3. For Christ did not please himself, but as it is written: The reproaches of them that reproached thee, fell upon me.
4. For what things soever were written, were written for our learning: that through patience and the comfort of the scriptures, we might have hope.

with their faulty judgments and erroneous ideas and scruples (xiv. 1, 2; 2 Cor. xii. 10). St. Paul enlarges the range of his theme here, and includes himself in the general exhortation, but he does not insist on his own example, as when writing to his own converts (Parry).

Not to please ourselves by selfishly resting in our thoughts and judgments, glorying in our firm faith and despising our weak brethren.

2. **Every one of you.** The best MSS. have "of us." Here again the larger range is brought out; not only the strong, including the Apostle, but all the Christians should consult the welfare and wishes of their **neighbour**, i.e., of all men. We ought to try to please all men, not for the sake of vain popularity and glory (Gal. i. 10), but for the **good and edification**, i.e., for the spiritual advancement and interest of all (1 Cor. x. 33).

The *vestrum* of the Vulgate should be *nostrum*, according to the best Greek MSS.

3. We should imitate the example of Christ, who, for our salvation and the glory of His Father, submitted Himself to the reproaches that were heaped upon God. The citation is from Ps. lxxviii. 10, according to the LXX. Directly the Psalmist is speaking of the just who says that the reproaches of those that reproach God fall upon him. The Psalm is certainly Messianic, and the just man suffering is a type of Christ suffering in Himself the reproaches heaped upon God (xi. 9, 10; Matt. xxvii. 27-30; John ii. 17; xix. 29).

4. The reason for the above citation of Scripture is now given.

What things soever were written, i.e., in the Old Testament, were intended for our instruction as Christians (1 Cor. x. 11; 2 Tim. iii. 16). And the purpose God had in giving us the Scriptures, with their sublime examples of patience and all other virtues, their manifestations of God's goodness and promises of reward, was to inspire us with hope for our future rewards.

5. Now the God of patience and of comfort grant you to be of one mind one towards another, according to Jesus Christ.

6. That with one mind, and with one mouth, you may glorify God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

7. Wherefore receive one another, as Christ also hath received you unto the honour of God.

8. For I say that Christ Jesus was minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers.

We might have hope. Better, "We may have hope." In the Vulgate *per* should precede *consolationem*, to agree with the Greek.

5. St. Paul now passes from Scripture to its Author, God, who enables us to endure, and who encourages us by the Scriptures; and he expresses the wish that God, by His grace, will enable the Christians all to avoid discord and cultivate unity of peace, having the same thoughts and sentiments **according to Jesus Christ** (or, "Christ Jesus," as in the best Greek), i.e., according to the will of Christ (Cornely); or in the spirit and according to the example of Christ (Lagr., S. H., etc.).

6. The purpose of the desired unity is that, by oneness in faith and charity, the Christians may praise and glorify God with one heart and one mind.

God and the Father. Better, "the God and Father," etc., as in the Greek. God is the *God* of Christ's human nature, and the *Father* of His divine nature (2 Cor. i. 3; xi. 31; Eph. i. 3; Col. i. 3).

7. This verse is a restatement of verses 5 and 6. Each and all the Christians are asked to do for one another what above the strong were requested to do for the weak, and this in imitation of Christ who has brought all to Himself, in spite of their differences and sins, to the end that God may be glorified.

8. The great and fundamental argument in favor of the unity St. Paul is urging for the Roman Christians is to be found in the fact that all, both Jews and Gentiles, have been received by Christ with the view to form one people for the glory of God. The Apostle begins here to speak of what God has done for the Jews.

Jesus is not in the Greek.

Minister of the circumcision, i.e., minister of the Jews, whom our Lord served by His preaching (Cornely). The Saviour came

9. But that the Gentiles are to glorify God for his mercy, as it is written: Therefore will I confess to thee, O Lord, among the Gentiles, and will sing to thy name.

to minister to all men (Matt. xx. 28); but He was in a special manner the servant of the Jews, to whom His personal mission directly pertained (Matt. xv. 24), to whom He gave His heavenly teaching, and whose Law He observed. This service Christ rendered the Jews for the truth of God, i.e., in the interest of God's truthfulness, to confirm, by fulfilling, the faithfulness and veracity of God's promises, which were primarily made to the Patriarchs and their descendants.

Jesum of the Vulgate should be omitted.

9. But that the Gentiles are to glorify God, etc. A better rendering would be: "But the Gentiles to honor God," etc. The infinitive "to glorify" (*δοξάζειν*) of this verse, like to confirm (*βεβαιῶσαι*), of the preceding verse, being dependent upon *εἰς τὸ*, marks a further result of Christ's ministry to the Jews.

Christ was minister of the circumcision, etc., for a twofold purpose: (a) in order to confirm, by fulfilling, the promises made to the Patriarchs; and (b) in order that the Gentiles should glorify God for His mercy in calling them to the faith, independently of any merits on their part. St. Paul is admonishing the Gentile converts not to despise their Jewish brethren on account of any obsolete and scrupulous practices of the latter, because, as he says, Christ preached only to the Jews in fulfillment of the promises made to their ancestors, but with the further intention that the Gentiles should later be objects of God's mercy and, through faith, become heirs of the promises originally made to the Jews. Thus has Christ embraced all, both Jews and Gentiles, for the glory of God. What an incentive to unity and charity among the Christians themselves.

As it is written. The Apostle now (verses 9b-12) cites several texts of the Old Testament to prove that the praise which the Gentiles render to God was foretold of old.

Therefore will I confess, etc. The quotation is from Ps. xvii. 50 and 2 Kings xxii. 50, almost literally according to the LXX. The Psalmist is singing the praises of God who has helped him to triumph over his enemies and establish his throne,

10. And again he saith: Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with his people.

11. And again: Praise the Lord, all ye Gentiles; and magnify him, all ye people.

12. And again Isaias saith: There shall be a root of Jesse, and he that shall rise up to rule the Gentiles, in him the Gentiles shall hope.

13. Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing; that you may abound in hope, and in the power of the Holy Ghost.

so as to glorify the name of Yahweh among the heathen. David was a type of Christ, and hence St. Paul, understanding the words of the royal Psalmist in their typical sense, puts them on the lips of the Saviour and makes Him say: **I will confess**, etc., i.e., I will praise the mercy of God among the Gentiles who, through the Apostles, shall be converted to the faith and render thanks to God for the mercy He has shown them.

10. This second quotation is from Deut. xxxii. 43, from the Song of Moses, according to the Septuagint. Moses calls upon all the pagan peoples to unite with the people of Israel in praising God for His mercies to all.

11. Psalm cxvi. 1 is now cited according to the LXX. The Psalmist invites the Gentiles directly to praise the Lord for His mercies and faithfulness, which one day they will experience in their call to the faith.

12. This fourth citation is from Isaias xi. 10, freely according to the LXX. The Hebrew of this passage reads: "In that day there shall be the root of Jesse, who shall be raised as an ensign for the people; him the Gentiles shall beseech." The **root of Jesse** is the Messiah who would be an *ensign* or standard around which the Gentiles would rally, and whose authority they would obey. **The Gentiles shall hope** in Christ, because they shall know His designs of mercy to save them, although they are outside His chosen people.

13. The Apostle terminates the Moral Part of his Epistle with the ardent wish that the Christians may ever possess that joy and peace which are the consequences of the hope that God has given them. The idea of hope was suggested by the end of the preceding verse.

The God of hope, i.e., the God who is the source of all our hope.

Fill you with all joy, which comes from hope in God's infinite

14. And I myself also, my brethren, am assured of you, that you also are full of love, replenished with all knowledge, so that you are able to admonish one another.

15. But I have written to you, brethren, more boldly in some sort, as it were putting you in mind: because of the grace which is given me from God.

mercy and goodness that have reconciled you with Him and given you that peace which springs from the true faith.

May abound, etc., i.e., may ever increase in hope of eternal life.

In the power, i.e., through the power or charity of the Holy Ghost, who is the cause of this desired increase in hope.

ST. PAUL WRITES TO THE ROMANS AS THE APOSTLE OF THE GENTILES;
HIS PLAN TO VISIT ROME, 14-33

14-33. The Dogmatic and Moral Parts of the Epistle being finished, the Apostle subjoins an epilogue (xv. 14-xvi. 27) in which only personal matters are treated. At first (verses 14-21) he apologizes for the freedom with which he has written them and offers a justification. He is the Apostle of the Gentiles and wishes to make known in the Eternal City the contents of his preaching to other Gentiles. Next he says (verses 22-29) that, after visiting Jerusalem, he hopes to realize his long desire to see Rome on his way to evangelize Spain. Meanwhile he ardently implores (verses 30-32) their prayers for protection against his enemies in Jerusalem. Verse 33 is his final salutation.

14. With this verse the Apostle begins to explain why he has written at such length and so openly to the Romans. It was not that he doubted the purity of their faith or the sanctity of their lives; for he is **assured** (perhaps through letters sent him by Aquila and Priscilla) that they are full of love (*ἀγαθωσύνης*), i.e., of moral *goodness* and *kindliness*; and that they are **replenished with all knowledge**, i.e., with a profound and accurate understanding of the truths of faith, so as to be able to **admonish**, i.e., to *warn*, to *instruct* one another (*ἀλλήλους νοουθετεῖν*).

In the Vulgate *bonitate* would be more literal than *dilectione*; *etiam* should precede *alterutrum*.

15. St. Paul wrote to the Roman Church **more boldly in some**

16. That I should be the minister of Christ Jesus among the Gentiles; sanctifying the gospel of God, that the oblation of the Gentiles may be made acceptable and sanctified in the Holy Ghost.

17. I have therefore glory in Christ Jesus towards God.

sort, i.e., in terms *somewhat bold* (τολμηροτέρως), at times, not to teach them any new doctrines, but only to put them in mind, i.e., to remind them of things they already knew. This he felt to be his duty because of the grace, i.e., because of the commission, given him as the Apostle of the Gentiles (i. 5; xii. 3).

Brethren (Vulg., *fratres*) supposes the less probable reading ἀδελφοί.

16. Here the Apostle describes the nature and purpose of the grace and commission he has received. His Apostolate to the Gentiles was a kind of priesthood which, as Gospel-priest, he exercises under Christ.

The minister (λειτουργόν) means here the priest as discharging the sacred ministry. The object of this ministry is the Gentiles.

Sanctifying the gospel. The word ἱερουργοῦντα implies the act of fulfilling a sacred function, and especially the offering of sacrifice. Thus the preaching of the Gospel among the Gentiles is here represented by the Apostle as a sacrifice. The preacher is the priest, the Gentiles are the victim to be offered, and preaching is the act by which the victim is brought to the altar and prepared for immolation. By preaching the Gospel the Apostle is performing a sacrificial act, the purpose of which is to prepare and dispose the Gentiles to be an oblation acceptable to God.

Sanctified in the Holy Ghost. As in the ancient sacrifices the victim, before being immolated, had to be cleansed and purified so as to be pleasing to God, so the Gentiles, in order to become an oblation acceptable to God, should first be purified from their moral unfitness. This purification of the Gentiles by which they became acceptable to God was finally effected through Baptism and the action of the Holy Spirit.

In the Vulgate *sanctificans evangelium* should rather be *operans* (in a ritual sense) *evangelio* (Lagr.). The *et* before *sanctificata* should be omitted; consequently also the *and* in English.

17. Therefore (οὖν) shows we have here a deduction from the

18. For I dare not to speak of any of those things which Christ worketh not by me, for the obedience of the Gentiles, by word and deed.

19. By the virtue of signs and wonders, in the power of the Holy Ghost, so that from Jerusalem round about as far as unto Illyricum, I have replenished the gospel of Christ.

contents of the preceding verse. Since he is engaged in a work for Christ and acting under Christ's direction, the Apostle has spoken more boldly than he would have done had he been acting on his own account (Parry).

Glory. The glory and fruit that come from the Apostle's ministry are due, not to him, but to Christ whose minister and instrument he is.

Towards God, τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, i.e., for that which regards the work of God, namely, the preaching of the Gospel.

18. The Apostle briefly and modestly alludes to the fruits of his Apostolate. The verse is made awkward and obscure by the double negative, but the sense is: I will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ worketh through me, as if they were my own, etc. If St. Paul speaks of what he has done, by word and action, in fulfillment of his commission to preach the Gospel and bring the Gentiles to the obedience of faith, it is only because this redounds to the glory of Christ.

By word and deed, i.e., by his spoken and written words—his preaching of the Gospel, and by his example and miracles.

19. St. Paul now shows the means by which his preaching was confirmed, and indicates the vast area over which the course of his labors extended.

Signs and wonders both mean miracles. *Signa appellantur, in quibus cum sit aliquid mirabile, indicatur quoque aliquid futurum; prodigia vero, in quibus tantummodo mirabile aliquid ostenditur. Signa vero et prodigia quasi quae utrumque contineant dixit (Origen).*

Virtue and power (δύναμις) also mean miracles; but here δύναμις means both the power to work miracles and to manifest the Holy Ghost (Lagr.).

So that (ὥστε). Through the help of Christ and the power of the Holy Ghost the Gospel has been preached in the whole Orient, beginning from Jerusalem (Acts ix. 28 ff.) and its envi-

20. And I have so preached this gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation.

21. But as it is written: They to whom he was not spoken of, shall see, and they that have not heard shall understand.

rons on the southeast, and extending to **Illyricum** on the north-west. Illyricum was the name given to the western districts of the province of Macedonia, bordering on the north-east shore of the Adriatic. We have no record of St. Paul preaching in this district, hence it marked the westernmost boundary of his missionary labors up to the present time. Throughout all this extended region, from Jerusalem and its environs on the east to Illyricum on the west, St. Paul had **replenished**, i.e., had fully preached the Gospel in all the principal centres. He does not say that he had converted all the pagans, or even the greater number of them; but he had sufficiently promulgated the good news so that all might learn thereof.

20, 21. The Apostle explains the principle which determined the choice of the regions in which he preached. It was not his practice to preach the Gospel where Christ was already known. This is not contrary to his desire to evangelize the Romans (i. 15), because, first of all, he was well aware that the Roman Christians were thoroughly grounded in the knowledge of the faith (i. 8, xv. 14), and secondly he had no intention of appearing at Rome as the Apostle of that Church, but only of paying a visit there (verses 22-24).

I have so preached. Literally, "I so make it a principle to preach," etc. It was the Apostle's rule not to preach where Christ was known already, because he did not want to **build upon another man's foundation** (1 Cor. iii. 10; 2 Cor. x. 15, 16). It was his office to lay the foundations of new Churches, and leave to others the continuation of his work (1 Cor. iii. 10; xii. 28).

As it is written, in Isa. lii. 15, cited according to the LXX. The Prophet says that the Gentiles who have not heard the Messiah spoken of shall hear of Him and shall understand. St. Paul identifies the Messiah with our Lord, and applies to himself the fulfillment of the Prophet's words in making Christ known to the pagans who before had not heard of Him.

22. For which cause also I was hindered very much from coming to you, and have been kept away till now.

23. But now having no more place in these countries, and having a great desire these many years past to come unto you,

24. When I shall begin to take my journey into Spain, I hope that as I pass, I shall see you, and be brought on my way thither by you, if first, in part, I shall have enjoyed you:

25. But now I shall go to Jerusalem, to minister unto the saints.

22-32. The Apostle says that the completion of his work of founding Churches in the Orient has finally left him free to undertake his visit to Rome on the way to Spain. First, however, he must go to Jerusalem with the collections that have been made for the poor there. He beseeches the Christians at Rome to pray that he may escape the hands of his enemies in Jerusalem.

22. **For which cause**, i.e., because I was continually engaged in the establishing of Churches in the east (verses 17-20).

And have been kept away till now. These words are not in the Greek or ancient versions, and are wanting in some copies of the Vulgate. They are considered as a gloss from i. 13. The corresponding words of the Vulgate should be omitted.

23, 24. **No more place**, etc., not that there is nothing further to be done, but that, having established Churches in all the principal cities and centres, his work of founding Churches in the East is finished.

When I shall begin to take my journey into Spain, etc. The Gospel had surely not been preached in Spain and the Apostle, on his way thither, would make his long-desired visit to the Romans.

And be brought on my way, etc., i.e., be accompanied by some of the faithful at Rome for a certain distance when departing, as was the custom after visiting a community (Acts xx. 38, xxi. 5).

If first, etc. The Apostle modestly expresses the wish that he may first enjoy the company of the Romans for a little time, before going to Spain.

25. The subject of the preceding verse is suddenly changed, as the Apostle remembers the necessity of his going first to Jerusalem. He is very anxious to visit the Gentile Christians of Rome, but

26. For it hath pleased them of Macedonia and Achaia to make a contribution for the poor of the saints that are in Jerusalem.

27. For it hath pleased them; and they are their debtors, For if the Gentiles have been made partakers of their spiritual things, they ought also in carnal things to minister to them.

28. When therefore I shall have accomplished this, and consigned to them this fruit, I will come by you into Spain.

he is also solicitous for the Jewish faithful in Jerusalem: his great heart embraced them all, because all belonged to the one Church of Christ.

26. This explains why St. Paul must go to Jerusalem. He must take there the collection of alms which the faithful of Macedonia and Achaia have contributed for the poor in the Holy City (1 Cor. xvi. 1-4; 2 Cor. viii, ix; Acts xx. 3; xxi. 17; xxiv. 17). The poverty of the Christians in Jerusalem was due partly to the fact that many had transferred all their possessions to a common fund (Acts iv. 32), and particularly to the persecutions which they suffered, during which their common possessions were often plundered and confiscated (Acts viii. 1; Heb. x. 34).

27. The alms contributed by the faithful of Macedonia and Achaia were given out of the abundance of their love and charity, as St. Paul says, *ἡὐδόκησαν*; and yet they had only fulfilled their duty and paid a debt that they owed. They, like all the Gentiles, had been made partakers of the spiritual benefits of the Gospel, which primarily came from the Jews and through Jewish messengers; and if they had thus shared in the spiritual goods of Israel, it was only just and right that the latter should be assisted in their need by some of the temporal blessings and riches of the Gentiles. "By praising the Corinthians for their charity, the Apostle also delicately reminds the Romans of the debt of kindness they owe to their fellow Jews" (Origen).

The expression *λειτουργῆσαι*, *to minister*, here means to render a service from man to man; it has not the sense of a sacred service (Lagr., Parry against Cornely).

28. Consigned to them this fruit. Literally, *set my seal for them on this fruit*, i.e., when I have securely conveyed to them this fruit. The seal was primarily a mark of ownership and authenticity, and then secondarily of security and correctness. St.

29. And I know, that when I come to you, I shall come in the abundance of the blessing of the gospel of Christ.

30. I beseech you therefore, brethren, through our Lord Jesus Christ, and by the charity of the Holy Ghost, that you help me in your prayers for me to God,

31. That I may be delivered from the unbelievers that are in Judea, and that the oblation of my service may be acceptable in Jerusalem to the saints.

Paul set his seal on this collection for the poor in Jerusalem to prove that the alms were the fruit of the charity of the Gentiles (Cornely); or that they were the product of his own Apostolic labors (Jülicher).

29. St. Paul feels assured of the conditions that shall attend upon his arrival in Rome. His mission to Jerusalem safely finished, he will bring to the Romans the blessing of Christ (Cornely, S. H., Lagr., etc.).

Of the gospel (Vulg., *evangelii*), is not the best MSS.

30. I beseech shows the state of supreme tension and anxiety which prevailed in St. Paul's mind. He knew that the Judaizers, together with the unbelieving Jews, must now be at the flood tide of their animosity and hatred for him, seeing the success that had crowned his labors in the Orient; and yet he must discharge his duty to the faithful in Jerusalem regardless of the results to his own person (Acts xx. 22-25; xxi. 4, 13). He appeals to the prayers of the Romans through our Lord Jesus Christ, their and his common Master and Head, to whom they are all united by the charity of the Holy Ghost.

The words Holy and your, and the corresponding *sancti* and *vestris* of the Vulgate, are not in the Greek of the best MSS.

31. The Apostle is beset with two fears. First, there is the implacable hostility of the unbelieving Jews who, before he left Corinth, had planned to kill him on his way to Jerusalem (Acts xx. 3); and secondly, there were the Jewish Christians themselves to whom he was bringing the collection, but on whose friendship he could not fully depend, because of their zeal for the Law (Acts xxi. 20) and their consequent possible dislike for one who had made so little of the Law. Speaking thus he shows that he feels the Romans are animated by a very different spirit in his regard (Lagr.).

And that the oblation, etc. Better, "And that my ministry at Jerusalem be acceptable," etc.

32. That I may come to you with joy, by the will of God, and may be refreshed with you.

33. Now the God of peace be with you all. Amen.

32. It is the Apostle's hope to go to Rome **with joy**, if it be the **will of God**; and as he will bring to the faithful there the blessing of Christ, he trusts that he himself will find the visit a source of rest and spiritual repose. Little did he know that he would be captured by his enemies at Jerusalem and taken to Caesarea, there to be retained in prison for two whole years before being allowed to go to Rome, and that, when at length he would arrive in the Eternal City, it would be as a fettered and guarded prisoner.

33. A final salutation implores the God of peace to be with all the Roman Christians. The implication is that peace prevails in the community as a whole, and that discord is far removed from them. This is a characteristic salutation which St. Paul is accustomed to place at the end of his letters (cf. 1 Thess. iv. 28; 2 Thess. iii. 18; 1 Cor. xvi. 24; 2 Cor. xiii. 13; Philip. iv. 23).

CHAPTER XVI

COMMENDATION OF PHOEBE, AND PARTICULAR GREETINGS TO MANY FRIENDS IN ROME, 1-16

1-16. That Phoebe, a deaconess of the community at Cenchrae, was the bearer of this letter to the Eternal City has been commonly believed by both ancient and modern interpreters, and is attested to by the subscriptions of many codices, Greek, Latin, Syriac and Coptic. Entrusting her with the care of this momentous Epistle, St. Paul considers Phoebe worthy of commendation to the Roman faithful for two reasons: first, because she is their, as well as his "sister," that is, a Christian; and secondly, because of her kindly offices and helpfulness to many, including himself. After this follow special greetings to a number of converts and close friends of the Apostle.

1. And I commend to you Phebe, our sister, who is in the ministry of the church, that is in Cenchræ:

2. That you receive her in the Lord as becometh saints; and that you assist her in whatsoever business she shall have need of you. For she also hath assisted many, and myself also.

3. Salute Prisca and Aquila, my helpers in Christ Jesus,

4. (Who have for my life laid down their own necks: to whom not I only give thanks, but also all the churches of the Gentiles,)

5. And the church which is in their house. Salute Epenetus, my beloved: who is the firstfruits of Asia in Christ.

1. I commend, i.e., I introduce to you Phebe, the bearer of this letter.

Who is in the ministry, etc. This is the only place in the New Testament where it is said that a woman exercised the office of *διάκονον*, *deaconess*; 1 Tim. iii. 11 cannot be taken in the same sense (Lagr.). Another proof, however, of the existence of deaconesses in the primitive Church is found in Pliny the Younger (*Ep.* x. 96. 8): *Necessarium credidi ex duabus ancillis, quæ ministræ dicebantur*, etc. The duties of deaconesses in the early Church were chiefly: (a) to assist at female Baptisms, which were by immersion; (b) to help in the care of the poor and the sick; (c) to instruct female catechumens in their homes. It is certain that these devout women took no part in preaching, or in the discharge of liturgical functions (1 Tim. ii. 12).

Cenchræ, a small town, a port of Corinth, on the Ægean Sea.

2. In the Lord, i.e., out of love for the Lord, as becometh the saints, i.e., in a manner worthy of Christians who are all members of the same body, whose head is Christ, and who are therefore bound by the same bonds of charity.

That you assist her, etc. This shows that Phoebe had much other business of her own to attend to in Rome. By applying the term *προστάτης* to Phoebe, St. Paul does not mean the word to be taken in its official and technical sense, as patron or representative; he wishes only to say that she was of great assistance to himself and to the faithful in looking after their needs.

3-5a. Prisca and Aquila. Prisca, the wife of Aquila, was most likely of Jewish origin; she is the same person as Priscilla of Acts xviii. 2, 18. Aquila was by birth a Jew of Pontus; his Latin *cognomen* probably came from his own, or his ancestors' association with a Roman family. Both Aquila and Prisca were per-

haps converted to the faith in Rome by St. Peter. St. Paul first met them in Corinth on his first visit there. They had lately come from Rome, having been driven from the Eternal City with other Jews and Christians by the edict of Claudius. Accompanying the Apostle to Ephesus they remained in that city and established a church in their house, while St. Paul went on his way to Jerusalem. They were there still, or again, when the first letter to the Corinthians was written (1 Cor. xvi. 19); later, when this present letter was written, as we see, they were in Rome; and some years later still they were again at Ephesus (2 Tim. iv. 19).

The authenticity of this present passage has been questioned on account of the frequent change of abode on the part of Aquila and Prisca. But the following considerations will clear away the difficulty: (a) It was common among the Jews of this time often to change their home; (b) it is clear from this passage, from 1 Cor. xvi. 19, and from Acts xviii. 26, that Aquila and Prisca were engaged in propagating the Gospel; (c) it was only natural that they should wish to return to Rome to prepare for the Apostle's advent there (Acts xix. 21), and after his release from prison they would wish again to visit the faithful of Asia. They probably died at Ephesus some time after the writing of the Second Epistle to Timothy.

Since Aquila and Prisca, when at Ephesus the first time, knew of the Apostle's intended Roman visit (Acts xix. 21), and in all probability returned there to arrange for his coming, it is most reasonable to suppose that they communicated with him from Rome, giving him such information about friends and conditions there as would explain the list of salutations that follows here, and which also perhaps influenced in some measure the whole character of the present Epistle.

Who have for my life, etc., i.e., to save my life, etc. What were the sufferings here alluded to we do not know. That Aquila and Prisca, however, exposed their own lives to danger in order to save the Apostle is clear from this verse. The reference is doubtless to some such events as are spoken of in Acts xviii. 12 ff.; xix. 23 ff.; 1 Cor. xv. 23; 2 Cor. xi. 26.

But also all the churches of the Gentiles, etc., whose members

6. Salute Mary, who hath laboured much among you.

7. Salute Andronicus and Junias, my kinsmen and fellow prisoners: who are of note among the apostles, who also were in Christ before me.

had been so much assisted by Aquila and Prisca at Corinth, at Ephesus, and at Rome.

The church which is in their house. The Apostle sends his salutations to those Christians who were accustomed to assemble in the house of Aquila and Prisca in Rome. This phrase seems to indicate that St. Paul had heard from Aquila and Prisca after their return to Rome. The faithful, in the early days of the Church, not having special buildings for the celebration of the divine mysteries, were accustomed to assemble in private houses, and there assist at the Holy Sacrifice, receive Holy Communion, listen to sermons and instructions, etc. (Acts xii. 12; 1 Cor. xvi. 19; Col. iv. 15; Philem. 2). Doubtless there were many such houses of worship in Rome and in other large cities.

There should be no parentheses enclosing verse 4.

5b. **Epenetus**, who was a Gentile Christian, was probably converted at Ephesus by Aquila and Prisca and went with them to Rome.

The firstfruits of Asia, i.e., the first person, or among the first persons converted in the Roman Province of Asia, which had Ephesus for its capital, just as Stephanas, baptized by St. Paul himself, was among the firstfruits of Achaia (1 Cor. xvi. 15).

6. **Mary** was doubtless a Christian of Jewish origin, if the reading *Μαριάμ* is correct; but if we read with Soden *Μαριάν*, the name may be either Jewish or Roman.

Among you. This phrase is read *εἰς ἡμᾶς*, *ἐν ὑμῖν*, and *εἰς ὑμᾶς* in various MSS.; but the last reading, found in the best MSS., is to be preferred. What were the great services rendered to the Church of Rome by this pious lady we do not know.

The *in vobis* of the Vulgate should be *in vos*.

7. **Andronicus**, a Greek name often used by Jews.

Junias. The Greek *Ἰουνία* is probably the accusative of *Ἰουνία*, and thus, being feminine, would signify the wife or sister of Andronicus. It is also possible, however, that we have here an abbreviation of the masculine *Ἰουνιάδος*, *Junianus* in Latin, which would mean a man.

8. Salute Ampliatus, most beloved to me in the Lord.

9. Salute Urbanus, our helper in Christ Jesus, and Stachys, my beloved.

10. Salute Apelles, approved in Christ.

My kinsmen, i.e., descendants from St. Paul's own tribe of Benjamin. It is unlikely that "kinsmen" here means merely Jews, because this appellation is not applied to Aquila and Prisca, who were also Jews. We do not know when Andronicus and Junias were fellow prisoners with St. Paul.

Of note among the apostles, i.e., distinguished, esteemed among the Apostles, or by the Apostles (Cornely, Zahn), as having been converted to the faith before St. Paul, and consecrated to the work of the Apostles. They were not, however, Apostles in the strict sense of the term.

The Vulgate *nobiles in apostolis*=*nobiles inter praedicatores*, or rather, *apostolos* (St. Thomas, Lagr.).

8. **Ampliatus** is a Latin name found in inscriptions of the imperial household. In a chamber in the cemetery of Domitilla, one of the first of the Christian catacombs in Rome, there are two inscriptions, one of which contains in bold letters *Ampliati*, the other *Aurel. Ampliatus*; the first goes back to the end of the first or the beginning of the second century, and the other belongs to the end of the second century. It seems very probable that this is the Ampliatus of whom St. Paul here speaks. That he should have been buried in a richly painted tomb in Domitilla seems to show that he was very prominent among the early Roman Christians and dear to St. Paul by reason of his many virtues and great services.

The Vulgate *dilectissimum* should be *dilectum*. The most before beloved in English should be omitted.

9. **Urbanus**. A Roman name, common among slaves and frequently found in Latin inscriptions. St. Paul speaks of him as **our helper**, showing that he was a helper of the Roman Christians, rather than a personal friend of his own.

Stachys, a Greek name, but found in inscriptions of the imperial household. According to tradition St. Andrew made Stachys first Bishop of Byzantium.

Jesus (Vulg., Jesu) is not in the Greek.

10. **Apelles**, a Greek name that passed into Latin under the

11. Salute them that are of Aristobulus' household. Salute Herodian, my kinsman. Salute them that are of Narcissus' household, who are in the Lord.

12. Salute Tryphæna and Tryphosa, who labour in the Lord. Salute Persis, the dearly beloved, who hath much laboured in the Lord.

13. Salute Rufus, elect in the Lord, and his mother and mine.

form *Apella*, then *Apelles*. Cf. Horace, *Sat.* I. v. 100. It was also borne by Jews. *Apelles* was an approved Christian.

11. **Them that are of Aristobulus' household**, i.e., the servants, or Christian slaves of Aristobulus. Perhaps Aristobulus was not himself a Christian, or was already dead. There is probably question here of Aristobulus, brother of Herod Agrippa I, who lived a long time in Rome and was a friend of the Emperor Claudius (Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* II. 11. 6; *Antiq.* xx. 1. 2).

Herodian, perhaps a slave pertaining to the household of Aristobulus, and through the latter, connected in some way with the Herod family.

Narcissus, a Greek name, probably the famous freedman of Claudius (Tacit., *Ann.* xi. 29 ff.), put to death by order of Agrippina during the first year of Nero. His slaves became the property of the Emperor, but continued to be called *Narcissiani*, or of the household of Narcissus.

Who are in the Lord, i.e., who are Christians.

12. **Tryphæna and Tryphosa** are Greek names, belonging perhaps to two sisters, or to a mother and daughter. They were probably deaconesses, who gave their lives to the service of the Church in Rome. These two names are found in Latin inscriptions.

Persis, a Greek slave name. St. Paul speaks of Persis as of a personal acquaintance; the use of the past tense, **hath laboured**, would indicate that his labors for the Church were over and that the faithful servant had gone to his reward.

13. **Rufus** was probably the son of Simon the Cyrenian, and brother of Alexander (Mark xv. 21). Rufus was therefore from the Orient, and his mother had long been known to St. Paul; perhaps she had been of some special helpfulness to the Apostle in his youth when studying in the school of Gamaliel (Acts xxii. 3), and hence he speaks of her with affection and gratitude. St. Mark, who wrote his Gospel for the Romans, speaks

14. Salute Asyncritus, Phlegon, Hermas, Patrobas, Hermes, and the brethren that are with them.

15. Salute Philologus and Julia, Nereus and his sister, and Olympias; and all the saints that are with them.

16. Salute one another with an holy kiss. All the churches of Christ salute you.

of Alexander and Rufus as persons well known to the Christians there.

14. The five persons here mentioned, together with their brethren not so well known, perhaps formed a distinct group among the Roman Christians. They all have slave names, some of which are found in inscriptions among the imperial household.

Hermas is not to be confounded with the author of the book called *Pastor*, written in the second century.

15. We have here another group of five persons bearing slave names, with the members of their domestic church, who doubtless constituted one more distinct Christian centre among the Romans.

Philologus was probably the husband of **Julia**, and **Nereus** and **his sister** were their children.

16. Having enumerated the various persons to whom he wished his personal greetings to be conveyed, St. Paul bids all the Christians at Rome to salute one another in his name with a **holy kiss**. The Christians, after the manner of the Jews before them (Matt. xxvi. 48; Luke vii. 45; xxii. 48), were accustomed to greet one another with a kiss as a sign of charity; this custom became with the Christians a liturgical ceremony expressive of the unity and charity that prevailed among them, and was practiced especially at their religious reunions after the celebration of the divine mysteries (St. Justin, *Apol.* i. 65; Tertull., *De Orat.* 18; *Const. Apost.* ii. 57; etc.).

All the churches of Christ, etc. St. Paul is speaking in the name of all the Churches, perhaps because there were present with him as he wrote representatives of many, if not all, of the other Christian communities, and also because the Church of Rome was an object of special veneration to all the rest.

17. Now I beseech you, brethren, to mark them who make dissensions and offences contrary to the doctrine which you have learned, and avoid them.

WARNINGS AGAINST PEACE DISTURBERS, 17-20

17-20. This section causes a somewhat serious difficulty. It is indeed surprising to find placed between St. Paul's personal greetings and those of his companions a section warning against the sowers of discord, the Judaizers. The interruption appears unnatural and strange. It will not do to say that the passage is out of place, since it is uniformly found here in all MSS. Certain critics, like Lipsius and Kühn, have regarded this warning against agitators as contrary to the tone of the whole Epistle, which everywhere else supposes unusual unity and concord, and they have therefore regarded the passage as unauthentic. The following may be said in reply: (a) St. Paul is not warning against an actual existing situation among the Roman Christians, but is putting them on their guard against a possible future peril. Having just spoken of the greetings of "all the churches" he suddenly recalled to mind the trouble he had encountered almost everywhere with disturbing Judaizers, and he at once inserted this section of warning to the Romans (Cornely, Zahn, etc.); or (b) St. Paul had knowledge that the Judaizers were already beginning their evil work in Rome, although the Christian community as such was not yet seriously troubled by them, or even aware of the danger among them. While he feels that the Romans will not allow themselves to be deceived, he does not hesitate to lay bare the peril with all his usual vigor. The Apostle has outlined his teaching to the Romans, and now at the end of his Letter, otherwise calm and speculative, he wisely cautions against adversaries who are already seeking to gain the confidence of his readers (Lagr.). (c) This abrupt change of tone and subject here is not more strange than that of 1 Cor. xvi. 21 ff. (Jülicher), and is quite in keeping with the Apostle's vigorous and impulsive spirit.

17. Now, etc. It is only natural and in keeping with his practice elsewhere (Philip. iii. 17 ff.), that St. Paul, after directing who should be greeted in his name, should now point to those

18. For they that are such, serve not Christ our Lord, but their own belly; and by pleasing speeches and good words, seduce the hearts of the innocent.

19. For your obedience is published in every place. I rejoice therefore in you. But I would have you to be wise in good, and simple in evil.

20. And the God of peace crush Satan under your feet speedily. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you.

against whom the Christians of Rome ought ever to be on their guard, namely, the Judaizers (Gal. i. 6; v. 20; 2 Cor. x. 7 ff.; xi. 12 ff., etc.).

To mark, etc., i.e., carefully to watch those Judaizers who had before caused so much trouble, and who were always and everywhere opposing the Gospel preached by St. Paul. From these facts and from the words, **the doctrine which you have learned**, it is plain that the Gospel of Paul was also that of the Romans.

18. Those Judaizers who try to undo the work of St. Paul are naturally not serving Christ, but themselves and their own selfish aims. They prefer the Law to Christ; and while pretending to shoulder all the burdens of the Law, they are guilty of gluttony and self-indulgence (2 Cor. xi. 20; Tit. i. 10; Philip. iii. 2), and make use of pleasing words only to deceive the simple and the guileless.

19. **Your obedience**, i.e., the docility with which you embraced the faith is everywhere known. This shows that the community in Rome was as yet undisturbed.

I rejoice therefore, etc., assures the Romans that St. Paul has no doubt of the integrity of their faith; but he would have them be as wise as serpents and as simple as doves (Matt. x. 16) in dealing with the treacherous Judaizers.

Wise in good, i.e., not deceived by false appearances and led to doctrines contrary to those already learned.

Simple in evil, i.e., not knowing or taking part in evil (1 Cor. xiv. 20).

The Vulgate *in bono, in malo* should be *in bonum, in malum*, to agree with the Greek.

20. St. Paul assures the Romans that God, the author of peace and happiness, *will crush* (συντρίψει) under their feet Satan, the author of discord, whose emissaries the Judaizers are. The allusion here is to Gen. iii. 15, where the crushing of the serpent's head was announced.

21. Timothy, my fellow labourer, saluteth you, and Lucius, and Jason, and Sosipater, my kinsmen.

The grace of our Lord, etc. This is the formula by which St. Paul, with some slight variations of detail, is accustomed to terminate his letters (1 Cor. xvi. 23; 2 Cor. xiii. 13; Gal. vi. 8; Eph. vi. 24; Philip. iv. 23; Col. iv. 18; 1 Thess. v. 28; 2 Thess. iii. 18; Heb. xiii. 25, etc.). It seems, therefore, somewhat singular to find this formula placed here before the greetings of the Apostle's companions. But since the best MSS. and versions leave no doubt as to its genuineness before verses 21-23, we must conclude that those texts which have omitted it here and placed it at verse 24, or after verse 27, have not the traditional and correct reading; while those texts, like the Vulgate and our English version, that have it both in the present verse and in verse 24 have combined the two readings (Cornely, Lagr., etc.).

The *conterat* of the Vulgate here ought to be *conteret*, in conformity with the Greek.

GREETINGS FROM ST. PAUL'S COMPANIONS, 21-24

21-24. This section is a postscript to the letter. Most probably St. Paul had intended to add the doxology immediately after his prayer for grace of verse 20, and thus terminate the Epistle. But remembering that he had not included the greetings of his companions, as was often his custom (1 Cor. xvi. 19 ff.; Philip. iv. 21; Col. iv. 10 ff.; 2 Tim. iv. 21; Tit. iii. 15; Philem. 23), he preferred to insert them between his prayer and the doxology rather than omit them altogether (Cornely). Perhaps this addition of greetings caused the Apostle to repeat in verse 24 the prayer of verse 20, as some critics hold, so that the doxology might immediately follow the prayer, as he had first intended.

21. **Timothy** was also associated with Paul in the writing of several other Epistles (2 Cor. i. 1; Philip. i. 1; Col. i. 1; 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1; Philem. i). It is uncertain whether Timothy was with Paul all during the composition of this Epistle, or whether he joined the Apostle only at the end.

22. I Tertius, who wrote this epistle, salute you in the Lord.

23. Caius, my host, and the whole church, saluteth you. Erastus, the treasurer of the city, saluteth you, and Quartus, a brother.

Lucius, although Roman in name, was probably Lucius of Cyrene spoken of in Acts xiii. 1 among the Christians of Jewish origin.

Jason is perhaps the same person that was St. Paul's host at Thessalonica (Acts xvii. 5-7, 9), a Jewish Christian.

Sosipater is the same name as Sopater, and doubtless the same person as Sopater of Beraea (Acts xx. 4). Lucius, Jason and Sosipater were relatives of St. Paul. The last two, with Timothy (2 Cor. i. 1), had come from Macedonia to Corinth, perhaps to bring their collections for the poor in Jerusalem and to accompany the Apostle on his way thither. Very likely the others here mentioned had come for the same purpose. Their arrival just as the Epistle to the Romans was being terminated would explain this postscript of greetings.

22. I Tertius. St. Paul made use of a certain Tertius as secretary in writing the present Epistle. It was usual with the Apostle to dictate his letters (2 Thess. iii. 17; Gal. vi. 11; 1 Cor. xvi. 21; Col. iv. 18; Philem. 19), but it was not customary for the secretary to include his personal greetings as here. Perhaps Tertius was known to the Romans, and so was told by St. Paul to add his own salutation.

23. Caius, also written *Gaius*. This is very likely the person spoken of in 1 Cor. i. 14, a wealthy Corinthian, baptized by St. Paul during the latter's first visit to Corinth. St. Paul doubtless enjoyed the hospitality of Caius throughout his stay at Corinth.

And the whole church. Better, "And the host of the whole church," i.e., all the faithful of Corinth that were accustomed to assemble in the house of Caius for divine service (Origen, Lipsius, Jülicher, etc.); or all the faithful that were freely permitted to come to Caius' house while St. Paul was there (Kühl); or all those Christians who were wont to seek the hospitality of Caius when passing through Corinth (St. Chrys., Cornely, Lagr., etc.).

Erastus does not seem to be the person by the same name of Acts xix. 22, of whom St. Paul probably spoke in 2 Tim. iv. 20.

The treasurer, i.e., the officer in charge of finances in the city of Corinth.

24. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen.

25. Now to him that is able to establish you, according to my gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret from eternity,

Quartus, as his name would indicate, was perhaps a Roman Christian, and therefore known to the Romans.

A brother, i.e., a Christian.

The Vulgate *universa ecclesia* ought to be in the genitive, *universae ecclesiae*, as in the Greek.

24. This verse is usually regarded as a mere repetition, due to copyists, of verse 20b. It is wanting in the most ancient MSS. and in many versions.

THE FINAL DOXOLOGY, 25-27

25-27. From verse 22 we gather that the whole Epistle, up to the present section, was dictated by St. Paul to Tertius, his secretary. At this point the Apostle very probably took the pen in his own hand and wrote the doxology by way of solemn conclusion and signature.

The doxology sums up briefly, yet completely, the whole doctrine of the Epistle, reproducing its most significant language, and extolling the omnipotence of God which alone is able to confirm the neophytes in the faith they have received.

25. **To him that is able**, etc., supposes, as its complement, "glory," as in verse 27, $\phi \eta \delta \acute{o} \xi \alpha$. A similar formula of praise the Apostle often made use of in other Epistles (Gal. i. 1; Eph. iii. 21; Philip. iv. 20; 1 Tim. i. 17; Heb. xiii. 20).

To establish, etc. When he would be in Rome the Apostle hoped to confirm the Romans in the faith they had received (i. 11), and meanwhile he prays that the grace of God, without which nothing can be accomplished, will stabilize and hold them fast in their faith.

According to my gospel, i.e., according to the Gospel which St. Paul preached everywhere (cf. ii. 16; xi. 28; 2 Tim. ii. 8), and which was the doctrine of Jesus Christ as also preached by the other Apostles. Although St. Paul in his preaching laid stress on the universality of salvation for all, Jews and Gentiles, and the gratuitousness of this salvation through faith alone, inde-

26. (Which now is made manifest by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the precept of the eternal God. for the obedience of faith), known among all nations;

pendently of antecedent personal merits or the works of the Law; and while the scope of his Gospel thus differed naturally to some extent from that of the other Apostles, since he was in particular the Apostle of the Gentiles, he was, nevertheless, like the others, always teaching the one Gospel of Christ, else how could he ask God to confirm the Romans, to whom he had never preached, in his Gospel, if it were something distinct from and contrary to the teaching of those others?

The preaching of Jesus Christ, i.e., the doctrine which Christ had announced to the world and had commanded the Apostle to preach; or, according to others, the doctrine which has for its object Jesus Christ, dead and raised again to life (Cornely, Kühn, etc.).

According to the revelation. This phrase is to be coördinated with the previous one, "according to my gospel," etc.; and the meaning is that this Gospel, this preaching, is the revelation of a **mystery**, namely, the universality of salvation for all men, Jews and Gentiles, through faith in Jesus Christ. This great mystery God had decreed *from all eternity*, but had **kept secret**, until it was made manifest in the appearance of Christ, in His life and Resurrection and the preaching of the Apostles (Lagr.).

26. **Which now**, i.e., by the corporal presence of Christ in this world, **is made manifest**, better, "hath been made manifest," God's eternal secret in the Person and life of Christ, His Only-begotten Son.

By the scriptures, etc., i.e., by the ancient prophetic writings, through which Christ and the Gospel were foreshadowed and announced, and of which the Apostles made use in their preaching and writing in confirmation of their teaching (i. 2; iii. 21; ix. 25, 26; x. 13, 15, 18, 20; xv. 9-12; Eph. iii. 21; Acts ii. 17-21, 25-28; xiii. 47; xv. 16, etc.).

For the obedience, etc., i.e., that the Gospel might be accepted, that men might believe in Jesus Christ—this was the aim and object of the revelation of the great mystery spoken of in the

27. To God the only wise, through Jesus Christ, to whom be honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen.

preceding verse, which was for **all nations**, Gentiles as well as Jews.

27. By a prayer of praise to the wisdom of God the Apostle terminates his sublime Epistle to the Romans.

The only wise, i.e., whose infinite wisdom alone was able to guard His eternal secret and prepare His revelation for the redemption of man **through Jesus Christ**, His Only-begotten Son.

Honour (Vulg., *honor*) is not represented in the Greek. The construction of the verse is made irregular by the relative *ὃ* which, however, seems to be undoubtedly authentic, as being found in the best MSS., and, which, by referring back to God rather than to Jesus Christ, serves somewhat to complete the sentence begun in verse 25.

THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS

INTRODUCTION

I. **Corinth.** The city to which the Corinthian letters were addressed, and which St. Paul first visited and evangelized on his second missionary journey, was not the ancient metropolis by the same name. The old city, which Cicero (*Pro Lege Manil.* 5) called the "light of all Greece," was destroyed by the Romans under the generalship of Lucius Mummius in 146 B.C., and lay in complete ruins for an entire century. In 46 B.C. Julius Caesar laid on the ancient site the foundations of the new metropolis and called it *Colonia Julia Corinthus*.

In a comparatively short time the new city became nearly as populous and flourishing as the old one had been. This was due to its remarkable location. Lying at the southern extremity of the isthmus, about four miles in breadth, that connects the Peloponnesus or lower portion of the Grecian peninsula with the mainland, and fed by the two famous seaport towns, Lechaenum on the west and Cenchrae on the east of the isthmus, Corinth was bound to be, as it had been in the past, a commercial center of highest importance. Its position was conspicuous on the highway of commerce between the Orient and the Occident, and it was not without reason that the great business thoroughfare of the then-known world passed this way; for all trading between the East and Rome took this route in order to avoid the perilous and more or less continual storms that swept the seas about the southern coast of Greece. Although inferior to Athens as an intellectual center Corinth was very eminent in this respect also. It was proud of its many schools of philosophy and rhetoric, as well as the excellence of its architecture.

Overlooking the city and towering above it nearly eighteen hundred feet was the great rock called Acrocorinthus, from the top of which one could survey all the country and the blue waters of the Ionian and the Ægean Seas for many miles around. Nearby on the isthmus below stood the temple of Poseidon, and also the vast amphitheatre or stadium where every three years all Greece was accustomed to resort for the celebration of the Isthmian games.

As might be expected, Corinth was unrivaled in its wealth, in the variety of its population, and in its profligacy. Being the capital of the Roman Province of Achaia it was the residence of the proconsul, and its political and civil influence was mainly Roman. Asiatics were also there from Ephesus, and Jews in sufficient numbers to have their synagogue. And yet, having been Greek in its origin, the city never lost the spirit and customs of its ancestors; its language, its literature and its laws remained Greek.

St. Chrysostom pronounced Corinth "the most licentious city of all that are or ever have been." During the daytime its streets were packed with peddlers, soldiers and sailors; with foreign and domestic traders, boxers and wrestlers; with idlers, slaves, gamblers and the like. At night the great metropolis was a scene of drunken revelry and of every kind of vice. "To live like a Corinthian" was to lead a dissolute and lawless life. Far from correcting or restraining the shameless immorality of its inhabitants the religion of Corinth only added to it. Aphrodite Pandemos, the goddess of lust and sinful love, was the guardian deity of the city. In her temple, which stood on the Acrocorinthus, were a thousand professional prostitutes who gave lascivious dances at public festivals, and carnal intercourse with whom was looked upon as a religious consecration. Little wonder that a city of such gross sensuality should have been filled with defrauders, fornicators, idolators, adulterers, effeminate, liars, thieves, covetous, drunkards, railers and extortioners (I Cor. vi. 8-10). St. Paul, from his long residence there, had personal knowledge of conditions as they existed, and hence the vividness and force of the letters he addressed to the faithful of that wicked city.

The ancient site of Corinth possesses now only a miserable town of five churches and a few thousand inhabitants. Aside from some Doric columns, still defying in their massive grandeur the wastes of time, no relic remains of the glories and powers that once were gathered there. The site of the old city is now so desolate because, not only has it been repeatedly plundered since ancient days, but in the year 1858, after a destructive earthquake, it was largely abandoned, and a new city by the same name was built on the west of the isthmus on the Corinthian gulf.

II. The Foundation of the Church in Corinth. Leaving Athens on his second missionary journey St. Paul came to Corinth, perhaps around the year 52. He found lodging and means of support with Aquila and Priscilla (also called "Prisca"), a Jewish man and wife who with other Christians and Jews had recently been expelled from Rome by the edict of Claudius (Sueton., *Claud.* xxv; Acts xviii. 2). Like Paul himself this couple were tent-makers. The Apostle worked at his trade in their home during the week, and every Sabbath they were hearers of his preaching in the synagogue, being converts and devoted Christians. Silas and Timothy arrived without delay from Macedonia (Acts xvii. 14); and, encouraged by their presence, St. Paul redoubled his efforts in declaring to the Jews that Christ was the Messiah (Acts xviii. 5). This preaching, however, was shortly resented in the synagogue, and the Apostle in disgust turned from the Jews saying, "Your blood be upon your own heads: I am clean; from henceforth I will go unto the Gentiles" (Acts xviii. 6). Departing from the synagogue he entered into the near-by house of a pagan convert named Titus Justus. With him went also Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue, and all his family, besides Aquila and Priscilla. Soon they were joined by such influential persons as Chloe, Stephanas, Gaius and Erastus, the treasurer of the city. Many more, doubtless, especially from the poorer classes, formed a part of this group of the first faithful of Corinth. St. Paul remained there for eighteen months. So successful was his preaching and so great was the progress of the new Christian community that the Jews, being enraged, stirred up a great persecution against the Apostle and forcefully

brought him before the judgment-seat of the Roman proconsul Gallio, who was the brother of Seneca, the famous philosopher. Being little concerned about their religious controversies and disputes Gallio dismissed the Jews almost with contempt. St. Paul then continued his work in Corinth for some time, until he was ready to return to the Orient. Aquila and Priscilla accompanied him from Greece to Ephesus, where they remained, while he went up to Jerusalem. From Ephesus Apollo, a new convert to Christianity, was sent to Corinth by Priscilla to continue St. Paul's work there (Acts xviii. 26 ff.). Later on the Apostle himself returned to Greece and certainly must have visited Corinth (Acts xx. 2, 3), but on this occasion he was probably engaged chiefly in collecting alms for the poor of Jerusalem. It seems very likely that he also paid a visit to the Corinthians during his long stay at Ephesus on his third missionary journey (2 Cor. xii. 14; xiii. 1). Some, with Cornely, think that after his arraignment before Gallio St. Paul made the journey to Illyricum, and upon his return to Corinth tarried the "many days" spoken of in Acts xviii. 18.

St. Peter also perhaps preached in Corinth; at least he had many followers there (1 Cor. i. 12; cf. Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 24).

While it is clear that the Church of Corinth included among its members some Jews, such as Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue, Aquila and Priscilla and others, it is also certain that the majority of the Christians there were of Gentile origin. Many of these were Romans, as we gather from their Latin names (1 Cor. i. 14, 16; xvi. 15, 17; Rom xvi. 21-23; Acts xviii, 8, 17), but a number were also of Greek descent. Among the various converts some were of noble birth, wealthy and learned; but by far the greater number were poor and unlettered (1 Cor. i. 26). Slaves also there were (1 Cor. vii. 21), and those who aforetime had been addicted to hateful crimes (1 Cor. vi. 9-11). It was a mixed community of Jews and Gentiles, learned and ignorant, slave and free; but the majority were of pagan origin and belonged to the poorer classes.

St. Paul wrote at least three letters to the Corinthians, the first of which (1 Cor. v. 9) has not come down to us. The other

two give us a pretty thorough insight into the moral and religious condition of the Corinthian Church.

III. **Occasion and Purpose of this Letter.** After St. Paul had left Ephesus on his way to Jerusalem at the close of his second missionary journey, an Alexandrian Jew of great eloquence by the name of Apollo came to Ephesus and began to teach "diligently the things that are of Jesus" (Acts xviii. 25). But Aquila and Priscilla, seeing that Apollo was not well instructed in the faith, knowing only the baptism of John, "took him to them, and expounded to him the way of the Lord more diligently" (Acts xviii. 26). When they had thus imparted sufficient instruction and had doubtless baptized him, they wrote to the faithful of Corinth, whither he desired to go, to receive him. Arrived in Corinth, Apollo preached the Gospel with his usual power, convincing the Jews that Jesus was the Christ (Acts xviii. 27, 28). So extraordinary was his eloquence and his knowledge of the Scriptures that he made a much more striking appeal to certain of the educated classes among the Corinthians, who loved philosophy and rhetoric, than St. Paul, the founder of their Church, had made. These pursuers of earthly wisdom and lovers of the Old Testament Scriptures soon began to institute odious comparisons between Paul and Apollo. The latter, unlike the former, they said, was a man of eloquence (1 Cor. i. 17; ii. 4, 5, 13), he was practiced in the rules and art of rhetoric (2 Cor. xi. 6), he had the physique and appearance of an orator (2 Cor. x. 10). As for St. Paul, besides lacking all these qualities, his very Apostolate was questionable, since he had not been among the original disciples of Jesus (1 Cor. ix. 1), his authority was inferior to that of the twelve (1 Cor. ix. 5, 6), and his doctrine different from theirs (Gal. ii. 7-13).

About the same time there came to Corinth Judaizers, perhaps from Antioch, who had heard St. Peter preach, or had been converted by him, and who therefore, as belonging to the Prince of the Apostles, considered themselves superior to the Corinthians. They regarded Paul and Apollo, with their respective followers, as of inferior rank in the Church, and accused them of believing and preaching doctrines offensive to the Jews which had not the approbation of St. Peter and the other primitive

Apostles. Those among the faithful of Corinth who were of Jewish origin were naturally influenced by these teachings of their fellow-countrymen, and it was only a short time when a Judaizing party was formed that declared Cephas to be their patron. We need not suppose that St. Peter preached at Corinth, as did Apollo; and yet it is indeed possible that, passing through there on his journeys east or west, he did so.

It would seem there was still another faction in Corinth whose adherents pretended to belong not to Paul, nor to Apollo, nor to Peter, but only to Christ (1 Cor. i. 12). On what the superior boast of these Christians was based it is difficult to say. Had they seen Christ here on earth in the flesh, and received their call to the faith directly from Him? Were they Judaizers who, in their love for and obedience to the Law of Moses, claimed to imitate our Lord more strictly than others? Or had they some special gifts of the Spirit which put them in more intimate communication with the Saviour? These are some of the conjectures which scholars have made to determine the character of those who protested that they were of the party of Christ (cf. Jacquier, *Hist. des Livres du N. T.*, tom. I, p. 115; Fillion, h. l.; Lemonnyer, h. l.). Nevertheless Cornely, Le Camus and others hold that there were only three factions at Corinth, and consequently that the words, "I of Christ" (1 Cor. i. 12), do not represent a distinct faction, but rather those right-minded Christians who kept aloof from all divisions and dissensions. This opinion is now considered more probable, especially in view of the fact that St. Paul nowhere condemns a fourth party, but on the contrary (1 Cor. iii. 22-25), when speaking of the three factions mentioned above, declares that all the faithful belong to Christ.

With reference to the various factions at Corinth, it is to be observed that there was no essential difference between them, as seems clear from 1 Cor. iv. 6, and as commentators admit. Moreover, the Apostle's words in this Epistle show that among the several groups there was not a question of doctrine, but only of preference for different teachers of one and the same faith. It was the relation which exists between every disciple and his master. In the second letter, however, we see the division between Pauline and Judaizing Christians later became so marked as to threaten

a real schism (2 Cor. x-xiii). Still, even in the beginning these minor disputes and dissensions could not escape producing a general relaxation of authority and discipline. (a) In consequence a grave social scandal had taken place, and the Corinthians had passed over it without notice (v. 1, 2). Their differences of opinion on various subjects had led to open quarrels, and these in turn to lawsuits, even before heathen tribunals (vi. 1 ff.; vii. 1 ff.; viii. 1 ff.). They thus gave the impression to the outside world of mistrusting and hating, rather than of loving one another. (b) At the public assemblies of the faithful women appeared with uncovered heads, and insisted on the right to speak and to teach (xi. 3 ff.). (c) The celebration of the Eucharistic mysteries had become an occasion of disgraceful disorders and shameful conduct (xi. 17 ff.). (d) The special endowments of the Holy Spirit, so plentifully distributed in those early times, were often abused and made a pretext for pride and uncharitableness towards those who had not been favored with them. And even among those who possessed these divine gifts there was often manifested such a spirit of rivalry in exercising them that the Christian assembly frequently became an exhibition of fanatical frenzy and irreligious antagonism (xii. 1 ff.; xiv. 1 ff.). (e) Besides these disorders there were other difficulties and disputes demanding solution, such as the resurrection of the dead, the condition of the risen body, etc. (xv. 1 ff.).

A knowledge of Corinthian conditions came to St. Paul during his three years' sojourn at Ephesus on his third missionary journey. Corinth and Ephesus were only some 250 miles apart, and the distance could be covered under ordinary conditions in less than a week. Travelers were constantly going from the one city to the other, except perhaps in the winter time. Accordingly, from the household of a lady named Chloe (i. 11) the Apostle learned of the divisions and dissensions among the Corinthians. Apollo, who visited him at Ephesus (xvi. 12), as well as the three legates of the Corinthian Church who came to him there (xvi. 17) must have informed him very thoroughly regarding conditions among the faithful of Corinth. Moreover, the Apostle had written a letter to the Corinthians (v. 9) which has been lost to us, but which at the time caused a number of misunder-

standings and provoked not a few questions relative to marriage and celibacy, the eating of meats offered to idols, etc. (vii. 1 ff.; viii. 1 ff.), that were submitted to him in reply. The purpose of this present letter was therefore (a) to denounce and correct the existing abuses among the Corinthians; (b) to answer the questions and difficulties that had been referred to St. Paul by letter.

It may be asked if there were not local superiors, a Bishop and some priests in the Corinthian Church? And if so, why they did not attend to the matters treated in this letter? In reply we may say first that St. Paul had doubtless provided local superiors for Corinth, just as years before he had appointed "presbyters" in all the Churches he had founded in Asia Minor (Acts xiv. 22; xx. 17; Philip. i. 1; 1 Thess. v. 12; Tit. i. 5). As to the other question, we must remember that the local superiors at Corinth, like the Church itself, were very young and inexperienced and perhaps found it difficult to deal with so many and such grave matters as were demanding solution. They felt the need of appealing to the infallible authority of the Apostle, and in all probability it was these local superiors themselves who replied to the lost Corinthian letter of St. Paul (1 Cor. v. 9), and who, consequently, were the immediate occasion and the first recipients of this present Epistle. This letter was sent to the Church through the local superiors at Corinth, and hence the existence and authority of those superiors is not mentioned, but taken for granted.

IV. Date and Place of Writing. From 1 Cor. xvi. 8 it is clear that this letter was written at Ephesus; and from 1 Cor. xvi. 5, where there is question of a proximate visit to Macedonia, it is also clear that it was written toward the end of the Apostle's sojourn in Ephesus on his third missionary journey, very probably in the spring of the year 57; for it was about this time that Timothy and Erastus were sent to Macedonia (Acts xix. 22), just shortly before the tumult stirred up by Demetrius (Acts xix. 23 ff.), following which St. Paul left Asia. That the Epistle was written around Paschal time also seems very probable from the allusions in it to the Pasch, to unleavened bread (v. 6, 7; xv. 20, 23; xvi. 15), and to the Resurrection of Christ

(xv. 4, 12). Cornely thinks it was written in 58. The exact time depends on the date assigned to the close of St. Paul's stay in Ephesus on his third missionary journey, and since this cannot be fixed with entire certainty and precision, the date given for the writing of the Epistle can be only approximate.

The Epistle was probably carried to Corinth by the delegates who had come from there to Ephesus, namely Stephanas, Fortunatus and Achaicus. This is according to the note attached to the end of the letter in the Received Text. That Timothy could not have delivered the letter to the Corinthians, as some have said, seems evident from the fact that he had departed for Macedonia before it was completed.

V. Authenticity and Canonicity. The authenticity of this Epistle has been so universally accepted by critics of practically every school that it seems hardly necessary to cite arguments in proof of it. Even the German Rationalists of the Tübingen School admitted as genuine the Epistles to the Corinthians, the Romans and the Galatians. A few minor objections to First Corinthians have in recent times been raised by such Rationalists as Bruno Baur, Naber, Pierson and Loman; but they are too insignificant to merit any serious attention. It will be sufficient, therefore, to give some of the principal proofs for its genuineness and canonicity.

(a) External proofs. This Epistle was certainly known to the earliest ecclesiastical writers. Clement of Rome, who was the friend and companion of St. Paul (Philip. iv. 3), and later Bishop of Rome (Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 4), in his first letter to the Corinthians (xlvii. 1-3) wrote about the year 98 as follows: "Take up the Epistle of the blessed Apostle Paul. What did he write to you at the time when the Gospel first began to be preached? Truly, under the inspiration of the Spirit, he wrote to you concerning himself and Cephas, and Apollo, because even then parties had been formed among you," etc. Polycarp, the disciple of St. John the Evangelist, in his letter to the Philippians (xi. 2) cites 1 Cor. vi. 2, attributing it directly to St. Paul: "Do we not know that the saints shall judge the world, as Paul teaches." The enumeration of the vices of the Philippians given by Polycarp in the same letter is exactly parallel with 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10,

and terminates with the very words of the Apostle: "They shall not possess the Kingdom of God." In the Greek edition of the letters of St. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch (✠ c. 98-117), there are many quotations from this Epistle. St. Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons and a disciple of Polycarp, cites (*Adv. Haer.* iii. 11, 9; 18, 2) the Epistle over sixty times, often observing that it is the work of St. Paul and was written to the Corinthians. Clement of Alex. (*Paedag.* i. 6) and Tertullian (*De resur. mort.* xviii) also cite First Corinthians a great number of times, and frequently by name. Many other authorities might be given in proof of the authorship of this Epistle, but it will be sufficient to add that it was also admitted as authentic by Basilides, Marcion and other heretics of the first centuries.

(b) Internal proofs. Even a casual examination of the nature and contents of the present Epistle shows beyond question that it was written by St. Paul. Its historical facts and dogmatic teaching, its peculiarity of language and style, the manner in which it refers to the Old Testament, the characteristic way in which arguments are developed, beginning with general principles and coming to particular conclusions, the personal touches which it bears on every page,—all prove conclusively that it could not have been written by anybody except the Apostle Paul. Moreover, all that we otherwise know of St. Paul and of Corinth we find to be in perfect agreement with the information furnished by this Epistle. As Charles Baur has said (*Der Apostel Paulus*, Stuttgart, 1845, vol. I, p. 260), "this letter is its own guarantee of authenticity; for more than any other writing of the New Testament, it carries us to the living midst of a Church in formation and gives us an inner view of the development of the new life called forth by Christianity."

VI. **Style and Language.** Of all the Epistles of St. Paul this one is perhaps the most distinguished for its simplicity and clarity, and for the beauty and variety of its figures of speech. The kind and number of subjects with which the Apostle deals in this letter surely account in great part for the pleasing qualities of his language, but doubtless there was also a desire to prove to the Corinthians that he was not by any means so rude and ungifted in the use of speech as they may have concluded from his presence among

them. Of course this letter, although much more logical than some other Pauline Epistles, is far inferior to Romans in argumentative force. In the latter Epistle there was question of establishing a great thesis and of unfolding the essence of his preaching. The present letter, on the whole, also comes far short of Second Corinthians in impassioned and sustained eloquence, in anxiety for the spiritual welfare of his imperiled converts, in sternness and vehemence of feeling, in biting sarcasm, and in the general roll of his thunder peals against the enemies who would destroy his Apostolic authority and the fruits of his heroic life and labors; and yet the grace and polish of the diction here is far superior to that of 2 Cor., and to many authorities this Epistle excels the other in the uniform loftiness of its eloquence (see *Introd.* to 2 Cor., IV, V).

This letter contains over 100 words not found in any other of the Pauline letters, and about the same number which occur nowhere else in the New Testament. There is a general regard for the rules of syntax, and comparatively few of the sudden digressions and unfinished phrases so frequent in Second Corinthians. If certain words are employed too frequently for good taste, we can only say that this is a consequence of St. Paul's principle never to hesitate to repeat the same word so long as it expressed his meaning.

VII. Doctrinal Importance. In point of doctrine the First Epistle to the Corinthians is unexcelled by any other of St. Paul's letters. The unusual variety of the subjects treated mainly accounts for this. Practically every verse conveys some dogmatic or moral truth, as will appear in the exegetical treatment that follows. It will be enough here to point out the principal doctrines to which the Epistle refers, or which it discusses: (a) Baptism (i. 13, 14); (b) excommunication (v. 3-5); (c) ecclesiastical tribunals (vi. 2-5); (d) the states of matrimony and celibacy (vii. 1-40); (e) the signification of Holy Communion (x. 16, 17); (f) the institution and celebration of the Eucharist (xi. 23-34); (g) the unity of the Church of which Christ is the head and the faithful the members (xii. 4-27); (h) the various ministries in the Church (xii. 28, 29); (i) the virtue of charity (xiii); (j) public worship, prayer, preaching, prophecy (xiv); (k) the Resurrection of Christ (xv. 4-7);

(1) the general resurrection, the glorified bodies, the future life (xv. 35-58).

VIII. Division and Analysis. In this Epistle we distinguish three main parts: an Introduction (i. 1-9), a Body (i. 10-xv. 58), and a Conclusion (xvi).

1. The Introduction contains: (a) the salutation of St. Paul and his "brother" Sosthenes to the Church at Corinth and to all those who call upon the name of Jesus Christ (i. 1-3); (b) an expression of thanksgiving to God for the gifts of speech and knowledge accorded the Corinthians, and a hope of their final perseverance, founded on the faithfulness of God and their communion with Jesus Christ (i. 4-9).

2. The Body of the Epistle falls naturally into two divisions, of which the first (i. 10-vi. 20) reprehends the vices of the Corinthians, and the second (vii. 1-xv. 58) replies to their letter and questions.

A. The First Part of the Body of the letter, also composed of two parts, condemns first the divisions in the Corinthian Church (i. 10-iv. 21), and secondly the moral disorders among the faithful of Corinth (v-vi).

There ought to be unity in the Church, but it is a fact that there are divisions among the faithful (i. 10-12). These factions are most injurious to the Church of which Christ is the center and head (i. 13-17a). The fact that the Gospel was preached in simplicity to the Corinthians should not be a cause of dissension or disagreement, because God's message is not after the manner of human conceptions, but according to divine wisdom (i. 17b-iii. 4). Preachers of the Gospel are simply ministers and instruments of God and must render an account of their stewardship (iii. 5-17). The faithful, therefore, ought not to glory in this or that preacher, but in God alone: He only is the judge of His ministers (iii. 18-iv. 6). Humility is necessary in preachers of the Gospel (iv. 7-13). St. Paul has suffered much for the faithful, and they should imitate him (iv. 14-16). The Apostle is sending Timothy to visit the Corinthians and he himself will come shortly (iv. 17-21).

Following upon their lack of unity, moral disorders and a relaxation of religious discipline set in among the Corinthians. The faithful should have put out of their number the incestuous man,

whom St. Paul now excommunicates (v. 1-5). That case was a cause of grave scandal; the Corinthians should remember the warning contained in the Apostle's first letter, to avoid sinners (v. 6-13). Disputes among Christians should not be carried to heathen courts; those who are the cause of such lawsuits shall receive a severe judgment (vi. 1-11). All things lawful are not expedient; the faithful must fly the sin of fornication (vi. 12-20).

B. The Second Part of the Body of this letter (vii. 1-xv. 58) replies to the questions and doubts raised by the Corinthians.

Matrimony and its use are perfectly lawful (vii. 1-9). Marriage is indissoluble (vii. 10-24). The state of celibacy is more excellent than that of matrimony (vii. 25-40).

With regard to meats offered to idols it is to be noted that such meats are not bad in themselves, although it may be necessary to avoid them on account of scandal (viii. 1-13). On account of the danger of scandal, the Apostle says it is sometimes necessary to forego one's rights, as he himself did in refusing support from the faithful (ix. 1-18). He suffered countless privations and made many sacrifices for the salvation of souls (ix. 19-23). Thus also should the Corinthians be willing to make many sacrifices in order to save their souls (ix. 24-27). Many benefits received from God are no guarantee that we shall be saved (x. 1-13). Therefore, all things being considered, the faithful should take no part in sacrifices offered to idols; we cannot be on the side of God and of His enemies at the same time (x. 14-22). The practical deductions for all, then, are that we should have regard for the needs of others, avoiding what may injure them, and seeking in all things the glory of God and the edification of our neighbor (x. 23-xi. 1).

At the public services of the Church women should have their heads covered, as is evident from various considerations (xi. 2-16). All disorders and unseemly conduct are especially out of place at the Eucharistic celebration (xi. 17-22). The institution of the Lord's Supper, and the manner in which it should be observed (xi. 23-34).

The Corinthians have abused their spiritual gifts, allowing them to become an occasion of pride and envy. The extraordinary gifts which the faithful enjoy come from God. They should not be a source of discord, since they all come from the same Holy Spirit

(xii. 1-11). The faithful are all members of the same spiritual body; and hence they who possess lesser gifts should not envy those who are blessed with greater ones; and, on the other hand, those who are more highly favored should not despise their more humble brethren (xii. 12-30). While each one ought to be content with the gifts he has, it is not forbidden to desire the better ones (xii. 31). The most excellent of all gifts and virtues is charity, without which everything else is as nothing (xiii. 1-3). The nature of charity; it endures forever (xiii. 4-13). Of the gifts of tongues and prophecy the latter is more excellent, because more useful to the faithful and to unbelievers as well (xiv. 1-26). Some practical directions are necessary with regard to the use of the various spiritual gifts (xiv. 27-36). St. Paul observes that he is speaking with divine authority (xiv. 37-40).

Regarding the resurrection of the dead St. Paul affirms its truth and reality, proving it first from the Resurrection of Christ (xv. 1-28), and then from a practice of some of the faithful and from his own life and sufferings (xv. 29-34). Next the manner of the resurrection and the qualities of the glorified bodies are explained (xv. 35-50). The just shall be transformed at the coming of Christ (xv. 51-53). The victory of Christ over death (xv. 54-58).

3. The Conclusion of the Epistle (xvi) treats (a) of the collection to be made for the poor in Jerusalem (xvi. 1-4); (b) of the Apostle's forthcoming visit (xvi. 5-9); (c) of the welcome that should be extended to Timothy and Apollo (xvi. 10-12); (d) of the necessity of earnestness and love (xvi. 13, 14); (e) of the charity and gratitude the Corinthians ought to show towards their delegates Stephanas, Fortunatus and Achaicus (xvi. 15-18). The Epistle closes with a greeting, a warning and a blessing (xvi. 19-24).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

CATHOLIC COMMENTARIES ON FIRST CORINTHIANS

Greek Fathers: St. John Chrysostom, *Forty-four Homilies* (Migne, P. G. tom. LXI, col. 9-381); St. Cyril of Alex., *Fragmenta explicationes* (P. G. tom. LXXIV, col. 855-915); Theodoret, *Interpretatio* (P. G. tom. LXXXII, col. 225-376); Œcumenius, *Commentarius* (P. G. tom. CXXVIII, col. 639-905); Theophylact, *Explanatio* (P. G. tom. CXXIV, col. 563-793); St. John Damascene, *Loci selecti* (P. G. tom. XCV, col. 569-705).

Latin Fathers: Ambrosiaster, *Commentarius* (Migne, P. L. tom. XVII, col. 183-276); Pelagius or, a Pelagian, *Commentarius* (P. L. tom. XXX, col. 717-772); Primarius Adrum., *Commentaria* (P. L. tom. LXVIII, col. 507-553); Sedulius Scotus, *Collectanea* (P. L. tom. CIII, col. 127-161); Walafrid Strabo, *Glossa ordinaria* (P. L. tom. CXIV, col. 519-550).

Later and recent Commentators: St. Thomas Aquinas, *Commentarius* (Paris, 1880); Denis the Carthusian, *Commentaria*; Cajetan, *Literalis expositio* (Rome, 1529); Estius, *Commentarius* (Douai, 1614); Cornelius a Lapide, *Commentarii* (Antwerp, 1614); Calmet, *Commentaire* (Paris, 1704); Noel Alexander, *Commentarius literalis* (Naples, 1741); A. Maier, *Kom. über den ersten Korinth.* (Freiburg in B., 1857); Bisping, *Erklärung des ersten Korinth.* (Münster, 1863); MacEvilly, *An Exposition of the Epistles of St. Paul* (Dublin, 1875); Rambaud, *Les Épîtres de Saint Paul analysées* (Paris, 1888); Cornely, *Com. in priorem Ep. ad Corinth.* (Paris, 1892); Seidenpfening, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (München, 1893); Couard, *Die Briefe Pauli an die Korinther* (Potsdam, 1901); Rickaby, *Notes on St. Paul* (London, 1905); Toussaint, *Lettres aux Thess., aux Galat., aux Corinth.* (Paris, 1910); Sales, in *La Sacra Bibbia*, vol. II (Turin, 1914); MacRory, *The Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians* (Dublin, 1915).

NON-CATHOLIC COMMENTARIES

Non-Catholic Commentaries on this Epistle are very numerous. We give a few of the best.

Hodge, Charles, *An Exposition of First Corinthians* (London, 1857); Stanley, A. P., *The First Ep. of St. Paul to the Corinthians* (London, 1876); Evans, T. S., *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinth.* (in *Speaker's Commentary*, London, 1881); Edwards, T. C., *A Commentary on The First Ep. to the Corinth.* (London, 1885); Godet, F., *Commentaire sur la première Épître aux Corinth.* (Neufchatel, 1886-87); Ellicott, C. J., *A Critical and Grammatical Commentary on St. Paul's First Ep. to the Corinth.* (Andover, 1889); Findlay, G. G., *St. Paul's First Ep. to the Corinth.* (London, 1900); Schmiedel, P. W., *Hand Kommentar zum Korintherbrief* (Frieburg, 1900); Robertson and Plummer (in *International Critical Com.*, London, 1911); Lias, J. J., *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (London, 1912).

The First Epistle to the Corinthians

CHAPTER I

THE SALUTATION AND INTRODUCTION, 1-9

1. Paul, called to be an apostle of Jesus Christ, by the will of God, and Sosthenes a brother.

1-9. In his own name and in that of Sosthenes St. Paul, while asserting his Apostolic authority, greets the faithful of Corinth and of all Achaia with the wish that they may enjoy all heavenly grace and peace. He gives thanks to God for the many divine favors conferred upon them, and expresses the hope that, through the goodness of the Eternal Father and their union with Christ, these blessings may abide with them throughout life.

1. Paul, called to be an apostle, etc. See on Rom. i. 1. Although St. Paul was called *immediately* by Christ to be an Apostle (Acts ix. 3 ff.; xx. 7 ff.; xxvi. 13 ff.), the reference here is perhaps not so much to the manner as to the fact of his divine vocation.

Jesus Christ. There is about equal authority in the MSS. for the reading, "Christ Jesus."

By the will of God, i.e., not by his own, or by any other human choice did St. Paul become an Apostle, but only by the call of God. He was therefore not free to refuse the Apostolate. See on Gal. i. 1, 15, 16.

Sosthenes a brother. Literally, *the brother*, i.e., a fellow-Christian. All we know of this person is that he must have been an intimate associate of St. Paul's and well known to the Corinthians. Le Camus and others identify him with the ruler of the synagogue spoken of in Acts xviii. 17, who, by this time, had become a fervent Christian and follower of St. Paul. Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* i. 12) says he was one of the seventy-two disciples of our Lord.

2. To the church of God that is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, with all that invoke the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, in every place of theirs and ours.

Sosthenes was not a joint-composer of this letter (Findlay), but a witness of it. Some think he was the Apostle's secretary, who wrote it down; but it is not St. Paul's custom to mention the name of his secretary (cf. Rom. xvi. 22).

2. **Church.** See on Gal. i. 2. **Of God.** This is added by St. Paul to show both the divine origin and the unity of the true Church; "the name of the Church is not one of separation, but of unity and concord" (St. Chrys.).

To them that are sanctified, i.e., to those who, through Baptism, have been cleansed from sin and consecrated in Christ Jesus to God. The words in **Christ Jesus** indicate the meritorious cause of our sanctification. The use of the perfect participle, *ἡγιασμένοις*, *have been sanctified*, shows that the holy state of the regenerated is supposed to continue.

Called to be saints. Literally, "called saints," i.e., saints through their call. The Corinthians, like all Christians, are called to sanctity; and this call is due, not to themselves or their own merits, but solely to the gratuitous grace of God. We are not to infer from the phrase here that the faithful of Corinth were called directly and immediately by God; their vocation was through the preaching and labors of St. Paul and his co-workers.

With all that invoke, etc. These words are not addressed to all the Churches of the whole world. They may be connected with the beginning of the verse; or, less probably, with the phrase "called to be saints." In the first case the meaning is that the Apostle salutes not only the Corinthians, but all the faithful of the Roman Province of Achaia. In this interpretation the following words of the verse, **in every place**, etc., refer to all the places that have Corinth for their capital, and that have been evangelized by Paul and his companions.

If we connect the above passage with "called to be saints," the sense is that the Apostle salutes only the faithful of Corinth, whose call to sanctity is the same as that of all who invoke the name of our Lord Jesus Christ in every place. According to this interpretation the final words, **of theirs and ours**, are con-

3. Grace to you, and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.

4. I give thanks to my God always for you, for the grace of God that is given you in Christ Jesus,

5. That in all things you are made rich in him, in all utterance, and in all knowledge;

6. As the testimony of Christ was confirmed in you,

nected with **name of our Lord**, etc., and mean, "of their Lord and ours."

3. See on Rom. i. 7. Cf. 1 Thess. iii. 11; 2 Thess. 16, 17, where the Father and the Son stand together as subjects of a verb in the singular, showing the perfect unity of their nature.

4. See on Rom. i. 8. The Apostle here speaks in the singular, in his own name, as sole author of this Epistle. He thanks God for the graces given to the Corinthians at the time of their conversion, without saying whether that happy condition has persisted.

Always, i.e., as often as he prayed he actually thanked God for them.

In **Christ Jesus**, i.e., through Christ, as the medium of their graces, or as united to Christ.

5. That in all things, etc. Better, "Because in all things (*ἐν παντί*, in a distributive sense) you have been," etc., i.e., in all things conducive to salvation. Two of the graces received by the Corinthians at their Baptism are now mentioned.

In all utterance, and in all knowledge, i.e., in the Gospel truths that had been preached to them, and in their understanding of those truths (St. Thomas, Cornely, etc.). Since knowledge is prior to expression, "utterance" does not seem the proper word for *λόγος* here; neither is the reference to the gift of tongues, but rather, as we have said, to the *doctrine* the Corinthians had heard preached by St. Paul and his companions.

Knowledge means such an understanding of the doctrine they had received as would enable them to explain it and give their reasons for holding it (St. Thomas). The Corinthian Church as a body had heard and understood all the doctrines that were necessary for salvation.

6. The abundance of doctrine and understanding which the Corinthians enjoyed is explained by the way in which the Gospel

7. So that nothing is wanting to you in any grace, waiting for the manifestation of our Lord Jesus Christ.

8. Who also will confirm you unto the end without crime, in the day of the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.

9. God is faithful: by whom you are called unto the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord.

was preached among them; for the testimony of Christ, i.e., the preaching of the Apostles (Acts i. 8; xxvi. 16; 2 Tim. i. 8) was confirmed, i.e., was firmly established by means both of the external miracles which the Corinthians witnessed, and of the internal gifts and graces that they experienced.

7. The greatness of the divine gifts enjoyed by the faithful of Corinth is seen in this, that **nothing is wanting to you**, etc., i.e., they are not inferior in grace to any other Churches or any other Christians. That the term *χαρίσμα* here does not mean only *gratiae gratis datae* (1 Cor. xii), but also *gratia sanctificans* is evident from the fact that it enabled the soul to look forward with faith and confidence to the manifestation, i.e., to the Second Coming of our Lord Jesus Christ as judge.

Here again the Apostle is speaking of the Corinthians as a body. We shall see later (iii. 1 ff.) that there were among them some who were far from perfect.

8. After thanking God for the gifts already conferred on the Corinthians the Apostle proceeds to give thanks for those benefits which he trusts the heavenly Father is yet to grant them; or, according to others, he passes from an act of thanksgiving for gifts received to an act of petition for new benefits (cf. Cornely, h. 1.). God who has given the first blessings (verse 4) will also **confirm you**, etc., i.e., He will continue to keep you firm in faith and in the practice of Christian virtue. **Who**, therefore, refers more probably to God (verse 4) than to Jesus Christ of verse 7, otherwise the rest of this verse should read: "in the day of *his* coming" (Estius).

Unto the end, i.e., to the end of your life, or to the end of the world, so that you may be found **without crime**, i.e., free from sin, when Christ comes to judge you. In the Last Judgment the just will be free from all sin, venial as well as mortal.

Of the coming (Vulg., *adventus*) is not represented in the Greek.

9. The fidelity of God is the ground of the Apostle's confidence

and hope. He who began the good work of calling the Corinthians to the faith will also by His grace continue to help them to complete their salvation and to arrive at the judgment free from offence. He will give them the helps necessary to work out their salvation, and to perfect their adoption through grace as His sons and as brothers of Christ.

By whom you are called, etc. Better, "Through whom you have been called," etc.

Fellowship of Christ is the natural consequence of the Christian's adoption, through grace, as the son of God (Gal. iv. 5, 6).

THE FIRST PART OF THE BODY OF THE EPISTLE, I. 10-VI. 20

i. 10-vi. 20. Although in his Introduction the Apostle lauds the Corinthian Church for its spiritual progress and perfection, he is not unmindful that there are those in it who are guilty of serious disorders. In fact, the unity of the Church is not a little imperiled by the existence among the faithful of a number of disturbing factions; these, which have already led to serious moral disorders, he forthwith condemns and endeavors to correct. Beginning, therefore, with a general exhortation to unity, he introduces the subject he is about to treat (i. 10-12); then comes a stern condemnation of the existing factions (i. 13-iii. 17); following upon this he gives certain practical results and a concluding exhortation (iii. 18-iv. 21), before taking up the evil consequences among the Christians of the relaxed state of their discipline (v. 1-vi. 20).

THE EXISTING SITUATION IS DECLARED, I. 10-12

i. 10-12. In view of the many and special graces which the faithful of Corinth have received, one would suppose that the greatest unity and concord should be reigning among them; they ought to have one mind and one voice. But St. Paul has learned, on the contrary, that there are contentions and minor divisions among them which disturb their peace and hinder their progress

10. Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all speak the same thing, and that there be no schisms among you; but that you be perfect in the same mind, and in the same judgment.

11. For it hath been signified unto me, my brethren, of you, by them that are of the house of Chloe, that there are contentions among you.

12. Now this I say, that every one of you saith: I indeed am of Paul; and I am of Apollo; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ.

10. The Apostle exhorts the Corinthians, by the name of Christ which they invoke in common, first to external unity, that they **all speak the same thing, and that there be no schisms** among them. "Schism" means literally a fissure or rent; metaphorically, a division, a dissension. In theology it means a complete separation from the authority of the Church. Here it is taken in the sense of dissension.

But external unity is not sufficient; neither will it continue without internal unity. Hence the Apostle requires that they **be perfect in mind**, i.e., that they profess the same principles, and that they draw the same conclusions, whether theoretical or practical, from their common principles. In other words, St. Paul wishes the faithful of Corinth to be one in thought and in word when there is question of Christian doctrine,—a teaching somewhat opposed to the principles of Protestantism.

11. The reason for the preceding exhortation to unity is now indicated. The Apostle has learned through reliable witnesses that there are dissensions at Corinth.

Signified unto me, i.e., *made clear* (ἐδηλώθη) by certain information.

My brethren, a conciliating term, so that they will accept in good part his reproof.

By them that are of the house of Chloe. This Chloe was probably a pious woman who had lived at Corinth and was well known to the Corinthians, but who now had either moved to Ephesus, or had sent to St. Paul at Ephesus one of her children or domestics for the purpose of informing him of the conditions among the Corinthian Christians.

12. What the divisions at Corinth were this verse makes plain.

Every one of you, etc. This must not be taken too literally; not every Christian at Corinth was involved in dissension (MacEvilly, Bisping), otherwise the preceding commendatory

words in the Introduction to this Epistle would be false. Many of them, however, must have belonged to one or the other of the factions mentioned.

I am of Paul. The divisions among the Corinthians consisted in adhering to one rather than another of the preachers who had announced the Gospel to them. As St. Paul was the founder of the Church (Acts xviii. 1 ff.), all the faithful at first clung to him as their father. But when he had left Corinth and had gone to Asia, Apollo, sent by Aquila and Priscilla, came to take his place. Being remarkable for his eloquence, his allegorical interpretation of the Scriptures, and his physical bearing, Apollo soon so won the admiration of many of the Corinthians that they began to make unfavorable comparisons between him and St. Paul, turning away from the latter and adhering to the former as their patron and leader. There was a group, however, that remained steadfast to the Apostle and proclaimed him as their head. Thus some were boasting that they were "of Paul," and others that they were "of Apollo."

Of Cephas. Those who claimed St. Peter as their leader were doubtless Judaizers, as would appear from their use of the Apostle's Aramaic name, *Cephas*. The organizers of this faction had likely come to Corinth from Palestine, where they had heard St. Peter preach, and perhaps had been received into the Church by him. Cf. *Introduction*, iii.

Of Christ. It is more probable that this was not a dissenting group like the others, but that it either represented those Christians who refrained from all dissension and division, or that the phrase was added by St. Paul himself in opposition to the three parties he was condemning (Cornely, h. l.). Cf. *Introd.*, iii.

It is the common teaching that the parties here mentioned and condemned by St. Paul were not guilty of any erroneous doctrines or formal differences in faith. Their disagreement regarded rather the personality of their respective patrons than any real differences in teaching; and yet these divisions were injurious to unity and could easily lead in a short time to very serious consequences.

13. Is Christ divided? Was Paul then crucified for you? or were you baptized in the name of Paul?

14. I give God thanks, that I baptized none of you but Crispus and Caius;

FIRST ARGUMENT AGAINST THE DIVISIONS AMONG THE CORINTHIANS:

FACTIONS ARE DETRIMENTAL TO THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH,

13-17a

13-17a. As Christ is the head of the Church and of all Christians there should be no divisions among the faithful. It was Christ who died for all, and in His name all have been baptized. St. Paul thanks God that he has not been the occasion of any of the Corinthian factions.

13. The contending parties are rebuked.

Is Christ divided? Christ founded one Church, of which He is the sole head. As the head is one, so the body should be one. But if there are in the body of the Church, among its members, different groups, disagreeing one with another, it is clear that the body is divided, and consequently also the head. Christ would then be divided against Himself. Such a condition would be, not only absurd, but destructive of all unity in the Church.

Was Paul crucified for you? Since the faithful have been redeemed by Christ alone, who died for them on the cross, and since, through Baptism, they have been consecrated to Him (Rom. vi. 3), becoming members of a mystical body of which He is the head, it follows that they owe allegiance only to Him, and not to Paul or any other earthly leader.

Were you baptized in the name of Paul? Literally, "Were you baptized *into (unto) the name* (εἰς τὸ ὄνομα) of Paul," so as to become his followers?

14. Some of the Christians who were less instructed might have thought that they were in a sense bound to and dependent upon the one who had baptized them. But the Apostle shows that is not so; and he thanks God that, while he was the founder of the Corinthian Church, he gave no occasion for any of their divisions arising from such a misunderstanding, for he did not baptize any of them, except two.

Crispus was a Jew who had been the ruler of the synagogue in Corinth at the time of St. Paul's first visit (Acts xviii. 8), and

15. Lest any should say that you were baptized in my name.

16. And I baptized also the household of Stephanus; besides, I know not whether I baptized any other.

17. For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel: not in wisdom of speech, lest the cross of Christ should be made void.

Caius, or *Gaius*, was the Apostle's host there during his third visit, when he wrote the Epistle to the Romans (Acts xx. 2, 3; Rom. xvi. 23).

15. **Baptized in my name**, i.e., *into* (*unto*) my name (*εἰς τὸ ἔμὸν ὄνομα*), so as to become my followers. A better reading has: "Lest any should say that I baptized into (*unto*) my name."

16. The Apostle remembers a few whom he baptized, namely, the family and domestics of Stephanus. Later on (xvi. 15, 17) St. Paul speaks of Stephanus as among the first converts of Achaia, and as one of the legates who came from Corinth to Ephesus before this letter was written.

I know not, etc. This shows what little importance St. Paul attached to the fact of his having baptized anyone, so far as making followers was concerned.

17a. The reason why St. Paul did not baptize many, or why he paid so little attention to the number on whom he conferred the Sacrament of Baptism, was that baptizing did not strictly pertain to his mission; he was sent principally to **preach the gospel**. This does not mean that the command given to the twelve (Matt. xxviii. 19) was not also for him, since he was a true Apostle, but only that his chief work, like that of the other Apostles, was to preach. Baptizing, for the most part, they all left to their assistants, after the example of Christ Himself (John iv. 2) and that of St. Peter after he had instructed Cornelius and his household (Acts x. 48).

The Apostle now gives a second argument against factions, attacking directly the party spirit of those who were following Apollo (i. 17b-iii. 4). If his own preaching among the Corinthians was simple and unadorned that affords no cause for divisions among them. The first reason why he used simple language in preaching to them was because the Gospel is opposed to human wisdom (i. 17b-ii. 5), and secondly because the Gospel contains a wisdom which only the perfect can grasp (ii. 6-iii. 4).

18. For the word of the cross, to them indeed that perish, is foolishness; but to them that are saved, that is, to us, it is the power of God.

WHY ST. PAUL MADE USE OF SIMPLE SPEECH IN PREACHING THE
GOSPEL TO THE CORINTHIANS, 17b-II. 5

17b-ii. 5. Human wisdom and loftiness of speech are not to be made use of in preaching the Gospel, lest the cross of Christ be deprived of its real power and efficacy. This is clear, first from prophecy (i. 19); secondly from experience, which shows that the wise of this world have not been chosen to preach the Gospel (i. 20-25), nor are many of them to be found among those who have embraced its teachings (i. 26-ii. 5).

17b. **The wisdom of speech**, etc. There is no article in Greek. The meaning is that it was not the will of Christ that St. Paul, in preaching the Gospel, should have recourse to such human wisdom and such elegance of expression as the Greeks admired and cultivated. This would have deprived the Gospel of the real source of its power, namely, the death of Christ on the cross, and would have made its success depend, or at least appear to depend, on human means.

Later preachers of the Gospel are not forbidden to make use of the arguments of philosophy or of the powers of rhetoric in their sermons, first because the efficacy and preaching of the cross have been thoroughly established now; and secondly because, not having the inspiration and the marvelous powers of St. Paul, they need those human aids.

18. **The word of the cross**, i.e., the preaching of a crucified God, to **them that perish**, i.e., to those, whether Jew or Gentile, who by their infidelity are on the way to perdition, **is foolishness**; because to such worldly minds it was absurd to think of a God becoming man and then dying the death of a malefactor in order to save the world.

But to them that are saved, i.e., to those who, through faith, are working out their salvation, the cross of Christ is **the power of God**, i.e., the source of the efficacy of the Gospel which, unlike Greek philosophy and rhetoric, is able to transform and perfect the life of all who sincerely believe it and put into practice its teachings. The term for **power** here is *δύναμις*, which means

19. For it is written: I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and the prudence of the prudent I will reject.

20. Where is the wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the disputer of this world? Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?

internal capability as opposed to *ἐνέργεια*, or the exercise of power.

The cross, then, has the power to save men from sin, if they will make use of its teaching. Saving power is also attributed by St. Paul to the Gospel (Rom. i. 16; 1 Thess. i. 5), to God (2 Cor. iv. 7; xiii. 4), to the Holy Spirit (Eph. iii. 16, 20), to the Resurrection (Philip. iii. 10), and to Christ (Col. i. 28, 29).

19. That the preaching of the Gospel ought not to be according to human wisdom the Apostle now proves by appealing to the Prophet Isaias (xxix. 14) through whom God announced that He would confound the wisdom of those who confided in human rather than in divine help. Literally the Prophet's words, here cited almost exactly according to the Septuagint, refer to those Jews who, when God had promised to deliver them from the terrors of the Assyrian King Sennacherib (705-681 B.C.), relied on their own prudence and trusted in the help they hoped to receive from Egypt, rather than in the divine promise. It was not, says the Prophet, by such worldly wisdom that God would save His people from the coming invasion. Now, what literally referred to these Jews had reference spiritually to the worldly-wise at the time of the preaching of the Gospel; these, like the Jews of old, were not to be saved by means of human wisdom, but by the preaching of what seemed foolish to merely carnal and earthly minds.

The clause, **I will reject**, is put by St. Paul in the place of "I will hide," of the LXX.

20. Whether the Apostle is quoting here from Isa. xxxiii. 18, or speaking his own words, is not quite clear. Perhaps he is not quoting, but only referring to facts commonly known. As the Jews triumphed over the Assyrians, so the preaching of the cross has won the victory over human learning. For among the preachers of the Gospel **where**, asks the Apostle, **is the wise?** i.e., the one distinguished, like the Greeks, for his human learning? **Where is the scribe?** i.e., the doctor of the Jewish

21. For seeing that in the wisdom of God the world, by wisdom, knew not God, it pleased God, by the foolishness of our preaching, to save them that believe.

22. For both the Jews require signs, and the Greeks seek after wisdom: Law? **Where is the disputer?** etc., i.e., the philosopher and the sophist, who dispute every question that arises?

The words, **of this world**, better, "of the world" (with (B & A C D)), mean the sinful, faithless world, and are more probably to be connected with each of the preceding substantives,—“wise,” “scribe” and “disputer.”

Since God has not chosen the wise and the learned of this world to propagate His Gospel among the nations, is it not evident that he has **made foolish the wisdom of this world?**

In the Vulgate, *huius mundi* should be simply *mundi*.

21. There was a very good reason why God did not choose the wise of this world for the propagation of His Gospel, namely, because they could not grasp so great a mystery. The worldly-wise and the carnal-minded failed to recognize God when He revealed Himself, both in the works of nature and in the revelation of the Old Testament; hence God chose to save, through the preaching of Christ crucified, those that believe.

Wisdom of God more probably means that divine wisdom that was manifested in the book of nature for the pagans, and also in the Old Testament Scriptures for the Jews.

The world, i.e., the worldly-minded, both Gentile and Jew.

By wisdom, i.e., by the use of only natural learning, embracing the philosophical systems of the pagans as well as the doctrines of the faithless Jews (Cornely).

Knew not God, i.e., had not that correct knowledge of the one true God which was necessary and able to lead them to salvation.

In view of this failure on the part of the pagan philosophers and the carnal Jews to arrive at anything like an adequate notion of the Deity **it pleased God**, i.e., God in His wisdom, justice and mercy thought it well (Tertullian), or decreed (Hilary) to open a new way to divine knowledge and salvation, namely, the preaching of a crucified Saviour, which would save all who would accept it with faith.

22. This verse continues to explain how the preaching of the

23. But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews indeed a stumbling block, and unto the Gentiles foolishness:

24. For unto them that are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God.

25. For the foolishness of God is wiser than men; and the weakness of God is stronger than men.

cross, or of Christ crucified, was a stumbling-block to the Jews and foolishness to the pagans. The former were expecting signs, i.e., miracles of their own choosing to be performed by the Messiah; that is, they expected Him to be a glorious and powerful King who would subjugate the temporal rulers of the world and place the Jews in triumph over their enemies; while the Greeks always required something that would appeal to their reason and human intelligence. To the latter "it seemed opposed to human wisdom that God should die, and that a just and wise man should willingly give himself over to a most shameful death" (St. Thomas).

23, 24. **But we**, etc. Contrary to the expectations of both Jews and Gentiles the Gospel is the preaching of a crucified Messiah. It was, therefore, a **stumbling block**, i.e., a scandal, an offence, to the Jews, giving them a pretext to reject the Christ; and to the Gentiles, **foolishness**, because it seemed to them the height of folly that God should die and that human salvation should be obtained through the death of a man on an infamous gibbet.

But the reason why the Gospel is an offence to the Jews and foolishness to the Gentiles is because both these classes of infidels do not receive it with faith (verse 21). For **unto them that are called** (τοῖς κλητοῖς), i.e., to those that *hear and obey the call*, whether Jews or pagans, the Gospel of Jesus Christ crucified is **the power of God**, i.e., the divine force that has manifested itself, not only in the whole series of miracles performed by Christ and narrated in the preaching of the Apostles, but which, through the Apostolic preaching, was constantly operating, making all things new. It was furthermore **the wisdom of God**, because it unfolded a plan of salvation which God alone could have formulated and executed (Cornely).

25. The reason why the results of a thing apparently weak and foolish are so extraordinary is because they are the effects of **divine wisdom and divine operation**; for **the foolishness of God**,

26. For see your vocation, brethren, that there are not many wise according to the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble:

27. For the foolish things of the world hath God chosen, that he may confound the wise; and the weak things of the world hath God chosen, that he may confound the strong.

i.e., that which to merely human minds appears to be foolish, is wiser than all the wisdom of men; and likewise, that which men call the **weakness of God** is stronger than all the strength of men. This, indeed, has been verified in the preaching of the cross, which has effected what all the wisdom and power of earth could not effect, namely, the destruction of sin and the renovation of the world.

26. Not only did God cast aside the wisdom of this world in choosing the preachers of the Gospel, but He did likewise in the choice of those whom He first called to embrace the teachings of the Gospel. This is illustrated among the Corinthians themselves. Hence the Apostle bids them consider their own vocation. Among those who had become Christians there were not many distinguished for their human learning, not many who enjoyed great wealth and influence, not many of noble birth; the vast majority of the faithful of Corinth, as of all the early Christians, were from the humbler walks of life and society. The pagans in fact reproached the Church for being made up of low classes,—of slaves, artisans and the like (Tacitus, *Ann.* xv. 44; Justin, *Apol.* ii. 9; Origen, *Contra Celsum*, ii. 79); and yet all this was in conformity with the prediction of Isaiah and with what our Lord Himself said of His Kingdom (Isa. lxi. 1; Matt. xi. 5; Luke iv. 17; etc.).

27. The reason of the foregoing actions on the part of God is now given. Man, in his pride and self-sufficiency, had misused the gifts of God, thinking that all the blessings he enjoyed were due to himself, and despising those who were less favored than he. Thus, earthly wisdom and power had been made by man a means of sin and disorder. To counteract this state of things God called, as preachers of His Gospel and as members of His Church, those who were considered ignorant and weak, while He left to their own confusion those who considered themselves wise and powerful.

28. And the base things of the world, and the things that are contemptible, hath God chosen, and things that are not, that he might bring to nought things that are:

29. That no flesh should glory in his sight.

30. But of him are you in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and justice, and sanctification, and redemption:

Although **foolish things** and **weak things** are in the neuter gender, they are understood for the masculine (cf. John vi. 37; Gal. iii. 22; Heb. vii. 7).

28. Here again we find the neuter plural used for the masculine to heighten the paradox between the ways of God and the ways of men. The Apostle cites three classes of persons, called by God to the faith, who were in striking contrast to those of noble birth (verse 26) that were not called: **the base**, i.e., those who have not sprung from noble ancestry; **the contemptible**, i.e., those that are despised and regarded as nothing; **things that are not**, i.e., those who are considered as not existing. All these kinds of persons God has brought to the faith of the Crucified, in order to confound and prove to be useless in the work of saving the world those who were considered great according to earthly standards.

If, with \aleph A C D F G and Old Latin, we omit *καί* before *τὰ μὴ ὄντα*, *things that are not*, these words form only a clause in apposition to the preceding clauses of the verse, and are not the climax of the sentence. B E, Rec. Text, Vulg. and Peshitto are in favor of retaining *καί*.

29. The purpose of God's action in choosing the rude, the weak and the "things that are not" to confound the wise and the strong and to bring to naught the "things that are," was **that no flesh should glory in his sight**, i.e., that no one might be able to attribute his justification and salvation to his own wisdom, or power, or noble birth, but only to the goodness and mercy of God, and that thus all should recognize God as the sole author of human sanctification and salvation. Supernatural things are from us only through the operation of God's grace.

In his sight (Vulg., *in conspectu eius*) should be "in God's sight," to agree with the best Greek reading.

30. Although the Corinthians have nothing of themselves whereof to glory before God, they may, nevertheless, glory in

31. That, as it is written: He that glorieth, may glory in the Lord.

this, that of **him**, i.e., from God, as from the source of their supernatural life, they are in **Christ Jesus**, i.e., they have, through Baptism, been incorporated in the mystical body of Christ, being made members of Christ's Church. To be "in Christ Jesus" means in St. Paul to be a member of the Church of Christ (cf. ix. 1; Rom. xvi. 7; Gal. i. 22; etc.).

Who of God, etc. Since Christians are His members, Christ communicates to them the gifts He possesses from God, namely, His **wisdom**, by which the darkness of error and ignorance are expelled from the mind; His **justice**, and **sanctification**, by which they are made truly holy and pleasing in the sight of God; His **redemption**, by which they are liberated from the service of sin and the devil.

Justice and **sanctification** are closely connected by *τε καί* to show they are really the same; for man is not first justified and then sanctified, but both at one and the same time through the infusion of sanctifying grace (Cornely).

It is evident that the Apostle here is not speaking about imputed justice in the Protestant sense, because just as Christ, through faith, has communicated to us real wisdom, so has He imparted to us real sanctity and justification.

31. Therefore, since the Christian has received all from God, if he wishes to glory, he must do so in God, as is clear from Jeremias (ix. 23, 24).

He that glorieth, etc. The citation here is only a summary of the Prophet's words.

After **that** in the beginning of the verse the verb is understood (*γένηται*, *it may come to pass*).

May glory should be imperative, "let him glory" (Vulg. *glorietur*).

Lord (*κύριος* in the LXX) really means Yahweh, God.

CHAPTER II

AS A TRUE PREACHER OF THE GOSPEL, THE APOSTLE USED SIMPLE LANGUAGE WHEN ADDRESSING THE CORINTHIANS, 1-5

1. And I, brethren, when I came to you, came not in loftiness of speech or of wisdom, declaring unto you the testimony of Christ.

2. For I judged not myself to know anything among you, but Jesus Christ, and him crucified.

1-5. After having shown (i. 17 ff.) that the Gospel is both preached and received by the humble and the simple, St. Paul now tells the Corinthians that when announcing to them the glad tidings he observed the characteristic method of evangelical preaching. This he did in order to conform to the divine plan, as already explained, and also in order that the Corinthians might derive the greatest profit from hearing the Gospel.

1. **And I**, etc., i.e., in conformity with the nature of the Gospel ministry, **when I came to you** the first time my preaching was simple in style and contents; I simply declared unto you the Gospel, avoiding all loftiness either in form or in matter. The Apostle came to Corinth from Athens, where he had engaged in high dispute with the Stoics and Epicureans (Acts xvii. 18 ff.). Perhaps his failure there induced him to employ at Corinth a method more in harmony with the requirements of the Gospel.

Testimony of Christ should be "testimony of God," according to the Greek; and the meaning is that the Gospel, which Paul announced, was God's witness to Christ. Some MSS. read "mystery" in place of "testimony."

The Vulgate *testimonium Christi* should be *testimonium Dei* or *de Deo*.

2. **For I judged not**, etc. If the negative οὐ, *not*, is to be connected with *ᾔκρυνα*, *judged*, the sense is: "I did not pretend to know," etc.; if with *εἰδέναι*, *to know*, we have: "I judged it better, or I decided, not to know," etc. The meaning is that, while at Athens just before coming to Corinth, St. Paul had argued learnedly

3. And I was with you in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling.

4. And my speech and my preaching was not in the persuasive words of human wisdom, but in shewing of the Spirit and powers;

5. That your faith might not stand on the wisdom of men, but on the power of God.

with the philosophers, he made up his mind upon arriving in Corinth that it was better to keep to simple doctrines about Christ, especially the mystery of the Redemption. Hence **among you** is in contrast with the Athenians.

St. Paul's preaching at Corinth was centered principally about **Christ crucified**, i.e., the Redemption, but by no means exclusively, as we see from xi. 23 ff.; xv. 3 ff. His preaching there, however, was generally simple and useful in diction and in doctrine.

3. **In weakness, and in fear**, etc. The weakness referred to was perhaps bodily infirmity (Gal. iv. 13; 2 Cor. x. 10; xii. 10), or the natural spiritual infirmity which he felt aside from the help of God (Acts xviii. 9, 10). The fear and trembling were probably caused by the poor results he had just experienced at Athens (Acts xvii. 33), by the prospect of stripes and persecutions (St. Chrys.), and by the greatness of the task that confronted him in Corinth (Acts xviii. 9).

4. **My speech**, i.e., my private instructions given to individuals, and **my preaching**, i.e., my public discourses to the multitudes (St. Thomas), were **not in the persuasive words**, etc., i.e., not after the manner in which the philosophers and rhetoricians were accustomed to address their hearers.

But in the shewing of the Spirit, etc., i.e., his preaching was directed by the Holy Ghost, who enlightened his mind to know and moved his will to say what was most useful and instructive; and who, at the same time, by His grace disposed the hearts of his hearers to receive his words with faith (Rom. i. 16; 2 Cor. iv. 7). Some authors understand the word **powers** to refer to the miracles that were worked in confirmation of the Apostle's preaching.

Human (Vulg., *humanae*) is found only in A C; it is omitted by all the best MSS., Old Latin, Peshitto, and some copies of the Vulgate.

5. St. Paul had a special reason in avoiding a display of human

6. How be it we speak wisdom among the perfect: yet not the wisdom of this world, neither of the princes of this world that come to nought;

wisdom and lofty language at Corinth, namely, that the faith of the Christians there might not be based on anything so vain and subject to error, but might have as its foundation the power of God, working through grace and miraculous gifts, which cannot err or be led into error.

WHY ST. PAUL DID NOT TEACH LOFTIER DOCTRINES TO THE
CORINTHIANS, II. 6-III. 4

ii. 6-iii. 4. In the previous section (i. 17b-ii.5) St. Paul explained why he used simple language among the Corinthians, and not the loftiness of speech which they so much admired in Apollo; it was because simple diction was proper to the preaching of the Gospel. In the present section he will explain his reason for avoiding also loftiness of doctrine in his discourses to them. It would be a serious error, however, on their part to conclude that the Gospel contains only simple teachings. On the contrary, it embodies a wisdom that is above human powers to grasp (ii. 6-12), and which, having been revealed to the Apostles by the Holy Ghost, is announced only to the perfect (ii. 13-16). If these sublime doctrines have been withheld from the faithful of Corinth, it is because the faithful are not yet sufficiently developed to receive them (iii. 1-4).

6. This verse shows that St. Paul did not preach to all Christians as he did to the Corinthians. The faithful, in fact, were divided into two classes: (a) those who were yet "sensual," "carnal," who were in "need of milk, and not of strong meat" (ii. 14; iii. 1, 2; Heb. v. 12); and (b) those who were "perfect," i.e., they "who by custom have their senses exercised to the discerning of good and evil" (Heb. v. 14), who are not deceived by "cunning craftiness" (Eph. iv. 14), but who have arrived at the age of maturity in the Christian life, and, as being spiritual, are capable of strong food (i. 13; iii. 2). The latter are able to receive a profound knowledge of Christian mysteries, while the former cannot bear more than an elementary instruction. The distinction is the same as the difference between a class in theology and a catechism class.

7. But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, a wisdom which is hidden, which God ordained before the world, unto our glory:

Wisdom means the higher teaching of Christian mysteries, such as is found in the Epistles to the Romans and to the Hebrews. This wisdom is not of **this world**, i.e., it is not the product of human reason, its object is not the things of this world, neither is it sought after or possessed by the **princes of this world**, i.e., by the philosophers, by the worldly Jewish scribes, or the like. The wisdom of this world is perishable like its authors; it comes to **nought**.

Other authorities interpret "princes of this world" as meaning the devils, who are "the spirits of wickedness, the rulers of the world of this darkness" (Eph. vi. 12; John xii. 31; xiv. 30; 2 Cor. iv. 4). Doubtless the two explanations come to the same thing, since mere human teachers were devoid of spiritual insight into Christian mysteries, and were often in their false doctrines only instruments of evil spirits. Hence "princes of this world" embraces both the devils and their wicked human agents.

7. The Apostle now considers the positive character of the Gospel message.

We speak, i.e., the Apostles preached the perfect divine doctrines—a wisdom that came not from this world, but from God. It is **the wisdom of God** because it proceeds from God and treats of God; and **in a mystery**, i.e., it consists of doctrines so exalted that the human mind, unaided by divine revelation, could never attain to a knowledge of them. It is **hidden**, i.e., even after revelation the mysteries of this divine wisdom remain obscure to us, and can be held only by faith.

Which God ordained, etc. The mysteries revealed in the Gospel and preached by the Apostles, such as the fall of man, the Trinity, the Incarnation, the mystery of Redemption through the cross of Christ, man's eternal destiny, and the like, were decreed from everlasting in the counsels of God, and intended for the eternal glory of all the faithful (Cornely). This glory the faithful, through the practice of virtue, experience to some extent even in this world; but it will be fully revealed only in the world to come when we shall see God as He is, face to face.

8. Which none of the princes of this world knew; for if they had known it, they would never have crucified the Lord of glory.

9. But, as it is written: That eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man, what things God hath prepared for them that love him.

8. Which (Vulg., *quam*) must be referred to the "wisdom" which the Apostles explained to the perfect (verse 6). We must understand **princes of this world** here also as in verse 6. The wicked Jewish and Roman rulers and leaders who instigated and procured the crucifixion of Christ were the human instruments and agents of the evil spirits; the death of our Lord can rightly be ascribed to both. While the demons could have known that Christ was the Messiah and the Son of God, yet they were not aware of the fact that His death would mean the end of their own despotic rule over men, and the exaltation of the human race to the highest glory (Cornely). Had the devils, like their vicious human agents, been at all well disposed, they would have known that Christ was God. The numerous miracles performed by our Lord throughout His public life, of which the demons were witnesses, were of themselves sufficient to convince any well disposed mind. In fact it would seem from many passages of the Gospels that the devils did recognize, or at least strongly suspected Christ to be the Son of God (cf. Matt. viii. 29; Mark v. 7; i. 34; Matt. ii. 11; iii. 17; John i. 29 ff.). "The evil one did not persuade the Jews to crucify Christ because he thought He was not the Son of God, but because he did not foresee that His death would mean his own ruin" (St. Thomas). However, if for want of proper disposition or other cause the devils were ignorant of the high mysteries or purpose of our Lord's life and death, how much more so were their human agents!

Christ is called the **Lord of glory** because, as God, He is the author and source of the glory prepared for us hereafter (Col. iii. 4; Heb. ii. 10). This phrase is a proof of the Divinity of our Lord.

9. The Apostle now proves by a quotation from the ancient Scriptures that the exalted wisdom preached by him and the Apostles had before never been known to men, devils or angels.

10. But to us God hath revealed them, by his Spirit. For the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God.

The words, **as it is written**, show that the passage is cited as a proof of what has been said.

Because this quotation, which St. Jerome (Isa. lxiv. 3) proves is here freely cited by the Apostle from Isaias lxiv. 4, is not found in the same identical words in any extant book of Scripture, some Protestants, after Origen, have thought that St. Paul was quoting from an apocryphal work, the *Apocalypse of Elias*; others, like St. Chrysostom and Theodoret, believe the reference is to some lost book of Holy Writ. There can be little doubt, however, that we have here a free rendering of Isaias lxiv. 4; the Apostle is putting into clearer words the sense of the Prophet. The meaning is that a supernatural knowledge of God which, through the Gospel preaching, was revealed to the "perfect" (verse 6) was before revelation unknown to all created beings. Even yet a clearer and satisfying grasp of the mysteries of faith is reserved for heaven, for the beatific vision.

For them that love him, i.e., for those who hear the teachings of the Gospel and practice them. God gives the first grace gratuitously, and we thereafter, by coöperating with the graces we receive, can attain to eternal delights.

10. Although this deep wisdom of the Gospel was hidden from the great and wise ones of earth and from all men, nevertheless the Apostles can make it known, because to them God has manifested it through His Holy Spirit.

But to us, i.e., to the Apostles, the preachers of the Gospel.

God hath revealed them, i.e., the high mysteries of faith.

By his Spirit, i.e., through the Holy Ghost, by whom the Apostles were inspired.

The Spirit could make known these truths because He **searcheth all things**, etc., i.e., He understands all mysteries. Since the Holy Ghost knows the deep secrets of God, it follows that He must be God Himself. This verse, therefore, and the following verse afford a proof of the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, and also of His distinction from the Father. If He were in every way identical with the Father, He could not be said to search out the **deep things of God**.

11. For what man knoweth the things of a man, but the spirit of a man that is in him? So the things also that are of God no man knoweth, but the Spirit of God.

12. Now we have received not the spirit of this world, but the Spirit that is of God; that we may know the things that are given us from God.

13. Which things also we speak, not in the learned words of human wisdom; but in the doctrine of the Spirit, comparing spiritual things with spiritual.

11. By an illustration it is shown that only the Holy Spirit could know the deep mysteries and secret counsels of God, and that consequently He alone could reveal them to the Apostles. There is no question of excluding the Father and the Son from this perfect knowledge; the comparison is solely between the Holy Ghost and creatures, as in Matt. xi. 27 and Luke x. 22 there is comparison between the knowledge of the Son and that of creatures. As no one from the outside world can know with certainty what is going on in a man's mind and heart, but only the spirit of the man himself; so no creature, but only the Spirit of God, can know the mind and counsels of the Most High.

No man knoweth should be "No man hath known (*ἐγνωνκεν*), according to all the best MSS.

12. **We**, i.e., the Apostles, as contrasted with the wise ones of this world.

The spirit of this world. The definite pronoun, "this," is not in the best MSS. These words are understood by St. Thomas and others to mean the wisdom of the world; but by Calmet and Cornely, to refer to the devil, considered as the author of false human wisdom (2 Cor. iv. 4; Eph. ii. 2).

The things that are given us, etc., i.e., the *gratuitous gifts* (*χαρισθήντα*) bestowed upon us by God through Christ for our eternal salvation.

The *huius* of the Vulgate should be omitted, according to the best Greek MSS.

13. The Apostles have received a knowledge of high spiritual truths in order that they may communicate them.

Not in the learned words, etc. Better, "Not in words taught by human wisdom, but in those taught by the Spirit," i.e., the Apostles are to explain to the perfect (verse 6) in the manner dictated by the Holy Ghost the doctrines revealed to them by the same Holy Spirit.

14. But the sensual man perceiveth not these things that are of the Spirit of God; for it is foolishness to him, and he cannot understand, because it is spiritually examined.

15. But the spiritual man judgeth all things; and he himself is judged of no man.

Comparing spiritual things, etc., i.e., (a) comparing the doctrines of the New Testament with those of the Old, and illustrating them by means of figures and types drawn from the latter (St. Chrys.); or (b) explaining spiritual things to spiritual men; or (c) explaining spiritual things in a spiritual way; or (d) adapting spiritual language to spiritual subjects.

14. From the class of the perfect, to whom the Apostles explain the high mysteries of faith, certain others are excluded by their very unfitness. These are now described (ii. 14-iii. 4).

The sensual man, i.e., not necessarily the man who is given up to concupiscence and sensual indulgences, but the merely natural man, guided by his own natural lights and contented with his own reasonings.

Perceiveth not, i.e., *does not accept* (οὐ δέχεται) **these things that are of the Spirit of God**, i.e., the great mysteries which God, through the Holy Ghost, has revealed to the Apostles. The reason is because prior to taking the trouble to examine into them he regards them as **foolishness** (i. 18). And even if he would seriously consider them, **he cannot understand**, because he is without the supernatural light of faith. Just as the senses cannot judge about things of the intellect, and as the blind are unable to perceive color, so the natural man, without the gift of faith and the Spirit of God, cannot pass judgment upon the mysteries revealed by the Spirit of God; these truths are **spiritually examined**, i.e., they are subject only to spiritual tests by spiritual minds.

In the Vulgate *est* and *examinatur* should be plural to agree with their antecedents *ea* and *quae sunt*.

15. **But the spiritual man**, i.e., the man who has faith and grace, and is guided by the Spirit of God, is able to judge all things pertaining to his salvation and perfection, things of the higher as well as the lower order (Cornely).

But **he himself is judged of no man**, i.e., the spiritual man is

16. For who hath known the mind of the Lord, that he may instruct him? But we have the mind of Christ.

judged by no one who is without the Spirit of God. The natural man is deprived of the criterion by which to judge the spiritual man; they are not in the same category.

Certain Protestant sects appeal to this text to prove their doctrine of private interpretation of Scripture. But it is clear, from the context, that St. Paul is speaking of those who are able to grasp doctrines taught them by authorized teachers; hence he is teaching just the opposite of private individual interpretation in the Protestant sense.

16. The statement of the previous verse is proved by a free quotation from the Septuagint of Isaias xl. 13. Trying to fire the Israelites with confidence in the promise of God to deliver them from servitude the Prophet asks: **Who hath known the mind**, etc., i.e., who has known the thoughts and counsels of the Most High so as to be able to instruct and correct Him? Obviously the answer is: So great is the wisdom of God, that no one can presume to act as His instructor. This proposition the Apostle lays down as a major of a syllogism. The minor is: **But we have the mind of Christ**, who is God. Therefore the conclusion follows that the Apostles are judged by no man; for to judge or condemn them would be to judge or condemn God Himself. The argument simply means that the believer has the mind of Christ, and therefore of God, and that the workings of such a mind, enlightened as it is by a higher power, are altogether inscrutable to those who are destitute of spiritual vision.

It is to be noted here that the Apostle makes identical the wisdom of God and the wisdom of Christ; and the wisdom of Christ in this verse is the same as the wisdom of the Holy Ghost in verses 13, 14. Thus is furnished a clear argument for the Divinity of Christ and of the Holy Ghost.

CHAPTER III

ST. PAUL REFRAINED FROM PREACHING EXALTED MYSTERIES TO THE CORINTHIANS BECAUSE THEY WERE NOT READY FOR THEM, 1-4

1. And I, brethren, could not speak to you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal. As unto little ones in Christ.

2. I gave you milk to drink, not meat; for you were not able as yet. But neither indeed are you now able; for you are yet carnal.

3. For whereas there is among you envying and contention, are you not carnal, and walk according to man?

1-4. After having explained the Apostolic method of preaching in general St. Paul now defends in particular his preaching at Corinth. He abstained from giving them the higher wisdom because they were not yet fitted for it; they were like infants as regards high spiritual doctrines. Even yet they are not sufficiently advanced to receive deep knowledge, as is proved by their factions.

1. As unto spiritual, i.e., as unto perfect Christians, who have arrived at spiritual maturity.

But as unto carnal, i.e., as unto those who were yet weak in the faith, and not entirely free from the domination of the flesh, although members of Christ through Baptism.

As unto little ones, etc., i.e., as unto those who were still in their infancy as Christians.

2. Since, therefore, the Corinthians were not matured as Christians St. Paul, when he came to them first, explained only the elements of faith. And even when he wrote this Epistle, some few years later, they were not able to receive the higher wisdom which consisted in a knowledge of the loftier doctrines of the Christian religion, as expounded in the Epistle to the Romans.

In the Vulgate there should be a period after *Christo* and a comma after *carnalibus* of the preceding verse. Hence this present verse would better be separated from the preceding one by a full stop, as in our English version, in order to agree with the best Greek reading.

3. That the Corinthians were still carnal to a certain extent was clear from their actions; for among them there was **envying**

4. For while one saith, I indeed am of Paul; and another, I am of Apollo; are you not men? What then is Apollo, and what is Paul?

and contention over their various leaders. These vices St. Paul elsewhere (Rom. xiii. 13; Gal. v. 20) classed among the works of darkness and the products of the flesh.

To walk according to man is to live according to human nature, destitute of the Spirit of God (St. Thomas). In so far as they were given to jealousies and contentions the Corinthians were living according to man.

4. St. Paul now designates the contentions of which the faithful of Corinth were guilty. Some were proclaiming him as their leader, others were adhering to Apollo. Did this not show that they were **men**, i.e., carnal, judging things after human standards, uninfluenced by the Spirit and grace of God? The Rec. Text and the Peshitto have: "Are you not *carnal*" (σαρκικοί); but this is likely due to a copyist, who omitted *ἄνθρωποι* as unusual in St. Paul in the sense in which it is here employed. The fact that we have *ἄνθρωποι*, therefore, where we might expect *σαρκικοί* as in the preceding verse, shows that "men," and not "carnal," must be the correct reading here.

Inquiring into these factions the Apostle asks: **What is Apollo, and what is Paul**, i.e., what office do they hold, what ministry do they exercise? The answer is given in the following verse.

SINCE THE PREACHERS OF THE GOSPEL ARE ALL MINISTERS OF ONE
GOD, DIVISIONS AMONG THEM ARE ABSURD, 5-9

5-9. So far St. Paul has given two arguments against the factions in the Corinthian Church. In the first (i. 13-17a) he showed such divisions to be injurious to the unity of the Church of which Christ is the head; in the second (i. 17b-iii. 4) he established, against the followers of Apollo, that his own method of using simple, unadorned speech when preaching to them was in conformity with the character of the Gospel and accommodated to the capacity of his hearers, and consequently afforded no reason for their factions. Now he comes to his third argument and proves the absurdity of Corinthian divisions from the

5. The ministers of him whom you have believed; and to every one as the Lord hath given.

6. I have planted, Apollo watered, but God gave the increase.

7. Therefore, neither he that planteth is anything, nor he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase.

8. Now he that planteth, and he that watereth, are one. And every man shall receive his own reward, according to his own labour.

fact that all their religious teachers were only ministers and servants of one and the same God.

5. It is plain then who Paul and Apollo are; they are only **ministers** of God "through whom" the Corinthians have received their faith. The term *διάκονοι* is used here in the sense of *servants*. Instead of the phrase of **him whom**, etc., the Greek MSS. have: "through whom" (*δι' ὧν*). The Apostles are, therefore, not the authors of the faith they have preached, but only instruments of God who has called them all to His service, and has given to each the particular part of the ministry he is to perform.

In the Vulgate *eius, cui* should be *per quos*, to agree with the Greek.

6. **I have planted**, etc. The Apostle explains the different ministries exercised in the vineyard of the Lord. He it was who first preached the Gospel, who sowed the seed of faith at Corinth. Then came Apollo who by his preaching nourished that seed (Acts xviii. 27 ff.). But both Paul and Apollo were only exterior agencies to the growth of the faith among the Corinthians; for it was God that made their labors fruitful in the hearts of their hearers.

7, 8. The first conclusion that follows from what has been said in the two preceding verses is that, without the grace of God in the hearts and souls of the faithful, the work of the preacher is vain and useless. Secondly, it follows that, while compared with God the preachers of the Gospel are of no account, when compared with one another they are all on the same level and all equal, inasmuch as all are servants of the one God, working in the same vineyard and for the same end.

The faithful, therefore, should not make distinctions between the preachers of the Gospel, preferring one to another. But from this we must not conclude that God will treat all alike, for **every man shall receive his own reward, according to his**

9. For we are God's coadjutors: you are God's husbandry; you are God's building.

10. According to the grace of God that is given to me, as a wise architect, I have laid the foundation; and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon.

own labour, i.e., each one shall be rewarded, not according to the office he has held, nor according to the success of his efforts, but in proportion to his labors performed in the state of grace.

The Greek term *μισθός*, *reward*, used here means wages paid for work performed. Hence this verse affords a proof that good works do of themselves merit before God, as the Council of Trent teaches (Sess. VI. *De Justificatione*, can. 32). The same doctrine is declared more clearly in 2 Cor. iv. 17: "For that which is at present momentary, etc., *worketh* for us above measure exceedingly an eternal weight of glory."

9. This verse is to be connected with the second part of the preceding verse, and shows who will reward the laborers in the Lord's service. The evangelical workers are not *slaves* (δοῦλοι) who have no right to reward, but **God's coadjutors** (συνεργοί), i.e., free workers, who earn a wage for their labors; they are co-workers with God.

You are God's husbandry, etc., i.e., God's cultivated field, God's spiritual edifice.

SINCE GOD WILL JUDGE THE LABORS OF HIS PREACHERS, THESE
SHOULD TAKE CARE HOW THEY WORK, 10-17

10-17. Although the various preachers of the Gospel are the same, as being the servants of the one God and as working for the one end, yet God will distinguish between them when He judges their labors and confers their respective rewards. This reflection moves St. Paul to call attention to the grave responsibility that rests upon the ministers of the Gospel.

10. **According to the grace**, etc., i.e., the grace of the Apostolate among the Gentiles. **That is given to me**. Better, "That was given me."

I have laid, etc. St. Paul laid the foundation of the faith of the Corinthian Church, since he was the first to preach the Gospel at Corinth. Afterwards **another**, i.e., Apollo, came to

11. For other foundation no man can lay, but that which is laid; which is Christ Jesus.

12. Now if any man build upon this foundation, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble:

13. Every man's work shall be manifest; for the day of the Lord shall declare it, because it shall be revealed in fire; and the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is.

continue the work begun by Paul. Perhaps "another" does not mean any one in particular, but only the teachers who were to come after St. Paul.

Let every man take heed, etc., i.e., let every preacher of the Gospel be careful of the doctrine he delivers, lest he add something which is out of harmony with the true foundation of the faith as laid by St. Paul.

11. There is only question of how preachers subsequent to St. Paul should build on the foundation already laid; for the Church and the faith have but one foundation, and that is **Christ Jesus**, as preached by Paul.

12. All must build on the one foundation, which is Christ; but all do not build with the same material. Some add solid enduring materials, i.e., solid, useful doctrine, represented by **gold, silver, precious stones**; others, while unlike heretics, they do not try to lay a different foundation, contribute only useless material, i.e., needless, unsubstantial or passing doctrines, typified by **wood, hay, stubble**.

The poor materials here do not signify heresies, because (a) they are supposed to be added to the one true foundation; and (b) those who build with them are said to be saved (verse 15). The Apostle likely had in mind those, like the followers of Cephas, who were extolling the Jewish privileges and obligations and trying to impose them on the Corinthians. At any rate, it is the doctrine of teachers, and not the conduct of the faithful, that is directly referred to here.

13. At the present time it may not be easy to determine just what material each builder adds to the one foundation; but **the day of the Lord**, i.e., the General Judgment at the end of the world shall lay open each one's life, and shall manifest every man's work, whether good or bad. "Of the Lord" is not represented in the Greek, but "the day" can only refer to the Gen-

14. If any man's work abide, which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward.

eral Judgment, since neither during this life, nor at the Particular Judgment can every man's work be said to be made manifest (cf. iv. 3, 5).

Because it shall be revealed in fire. Literally, "It is revealed" (*ἀποκαλύπτεται*), i.e., the day of the Lord, or the General Judgment, is to be disclosed in fire. The use of the present tense for the future indicates the certainty of the event. That the world is to be destroyed by fire at the General Judgment we know from various parts of Scripture (cf. 2 Thess. i. 8; 2 Peter iii. 7), and hence "fire" here must be taken in its literal sense; real fire and real burning will bring about the end and renovation of this world, and so will usher in the General Judgment.

Fire shall try every man's work, etc. The action here attributed to fire can be more easily understood figuratively; for fire cannot really burn one's preaching or other actions. The reference then would seem to be to God's judgment, represented by fire. However, many of the Fathers have understood that "fire," i.e., the final conflagration that shall consume the world, will, in its literal sense, as an instrument of divine justice, test each man's works, leaving unscathed those that are good and consuming those that are bad. That there is question here only of the final conflagration, and not of the fire of hell or of purgatory, is clear from the words, *τὸ πῦρ αὐτὸ δοκιμάσει*, *that fire shall try*, namely, the fire of the day of the Lord mentioned in the beginning of the verse. "That fire" is read by B A C and Peshitto against the fire of \aleph D E, Old Latin, and Vulgate.

The Domini of the Vulgate should be omitted, to agree with the Greek.

14. If any man's work abide, etc., i.e., if the fruits of any preacher's doctrines to the Corinthians shall stand the test of the final conflagration and thus be found good, such a preacher shall receive a special reward. There is not here a question of the essential reward which all the saved shall receive, otherwise it would follow, contrary to what is said in the next verse, that he who contributed poor material to the one true foundation is lost.

15. If any man's work burn, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.

It is uncertain whether "abide" should be present or future (μένει or μενεί). The future is found in the Old Latin and Peshitto.

15. Those who have added poor material, i.e., poor and useless doctrines, to the common foundation shall receive the ordinary reward given to all the saved, but nothing more; hence their labors will be without the special merit and the special recompense promised to the Apostles. Different workers may contribute different materials to the same building. Some may add enduring things, such as gold, silver and precious stones; while others furnish only perishable materials, like wood, hay and stubble. When fire comes, both classes of workers will escape and be saved; and the works of the one will endure, but those of the other will be destroyed.

Yet so as by fire. The meaning is that the preacher who is alive at the time of the final conflagration, and who has mingled useless words and human teachings with his sacred preaching, shall, while suffering the loss of the special reward of the perfect preacher, save his own soul, but only by passing through the fires of that dreadful time, which for him will have a purging and purifying effect, constituting his purgatory on earth. Or, if we take *διὰ πυρός* in a proverbial sense, the reference is more clearly and directly to purgatory in the strict sense. The meaning, then, would be that those preachers who, at their death or at the end of the world, are found to have been negligent in their teaching shall be saved, but only with difficulty, namely, after passing through the purifying fires of purgatory.

The Apostle is speaking here of what will take place at the end of the world, and not directly of purgatory; and yet his teaching clearly is that, for venial offences unsatisfied for at the close of life, there must needs be a purging and a purifying before the soul can enter heaven. Hence the doctrine of purgatory naturally follows from this verse. That there is fire in purgatory is made probable by this passage, but nothing more; neither has it ever been defined by the Church.

Some have concluded from the present verse that St. Paul expected the end of the world during the lifetime of those to

16. Know you not, that you are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?

17. But if any man violate the temple of God, him shall God destroy. For the temple of God is holy, which you are.

whom he was writing. He speaks in a similar way elsewhere (xv. 51; Philip. iii. 20; iv. 5; 1 Thess. iv. 14-17; v. 23; Titus ii. 13). But he certainly never meant to teach any such a doctrine, since he knew that the Gospel must first be preached in the whole world and the obstinate Jews converted. In Eph. ii. 7 and in 1 Tim. vi. 15 the opposite of such a conclusion seems clearly taught by St. Paul.

16. The severity of God's dealings with imperfect preachers and teachers arises from the fact that they contribute unworthy material to a sacred structure. Hence the Apostle reminds the Corinthians that they are **the temple of God**, i.e., God dwells in them through faith and charity, and hence it is of real moment that they should not be defiled in any way. The Corinthians, like all good Christians, are the dwelling place of God, because **the Spirit of God**, i.e., the Holy Ghost, abides in them. It is to be noted that the Apostle is here identifying the Holy Spirit and God.

17. So far there has been question of those who build on the one true foundation, some using good, some poor material. Now the Apostle speaks of those who, by false doctrines and erroneous teachings, destroy the foundation, which is Jesus Christ.

If any man violate. Better, "If any man *destroyeth*" (φθείρει) the temple of God, i.e., by preaching false doctrines and leading the faithful away from Christ. The Corinthian Church was the temple of God, the special dwelling place of God, and therefore it was holy. In other words, the faithful are the temple of God; but the temple is holy; therefore the faithful are holy. If any man, by his false teachings, should destroy this sacred temple, **God shall destroy** (φθερεί) him, i.e., will deprive him of eternal salvation.

To agree with the Greek, the *violaverit* of the Vulgate would better be *corruperit*, as in the Vetus Itala.

THE FAITHFUL SHOULD BE CAREFUL NOT TO PREFER ONE TEACHER
TO ANOTHER, 18-23

18. Let no man deceive himself: if any man among you seem to be wise in this world, let him become a fool, that he may be wise.

19. For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. For it is written: I will catch the wise in their own craftiness.

20. And again: The Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise, that they are vain.

18-23. From the doctrine so far explained against the Corinthian factions St. Paul now deduces some practical conclusions. By preferring one master to another the faithful have laid claim to the right and power of judging their teachers; but the Apostle warns them that this is exercising mere human wisdom, which goes for nothing before God. It is wrong for them to glory in men, especially since all the good they enjoy, whether from this or that human agent, has been bestowed by God: in God and Christ only should they glory.

18. It is disputed whether the admonition of this verse is addressed to the teachers of the faithful, or their followers. If **any man among you**, etc., i.e., if any of you Christians thinks himself to be wise and shrewd, or is so regarded by others, judging by the standards of this world, let him renounce this false wisdom, which God despises, and learn from the Gospel to be truly wise. The admonition seems to be against those who thought themselves capable of judging the respective qualities of their different teachers,—Apollo, Paul and Cephas.

19, 20. That mere human wisdom is foolishness in the sight of God the Apostle now proves from two passages of the Old Testament. The first is from Job v. 13, agreeing almost perfectly with the Hebrew, and substantially with the Septuagint. From the words, **It is written**, we can see that St. Paul regarded the quotation as having divine authority.

I will catch, etc. Better, "He catcheth," etc. (ὁ δρασσόμενος), i.e., God turns against the worldly-wise their own craftiness, in which they are caught as in a snare. For example, Joseph was sold by his brothers into slavery, but their action resulted in his becoming ruler of Egypt (St. Thomas).

The second quotation is from Psalm xciii. 11, taken substan-

21. Let no man therefore glory in men.

22. For all things are yours, whether it be Paul, or Apollo, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; for all are yours;

23. And you are Christ's; and Christ is God's.

tially from the LXX. The Psalmist is speaking of the enemies of Israel, who in their folly thought God did not know their secret designs against the chosen people.

The *comprehendam* of the Vulgate does not exactly express the Greek or Hebrew of Job v. 13, which literally would be "He who catcheth."

21. Since, therefore, the wisdom of the world, separated from God and His grace, is vain and leads its patrons to their own confusion, the Corinthians ought diligently to keep from it, not glorying in men, i.e., in this or that human leader.

22, 23. All the teachers sent to the Corinthians were sent by God for the spiritual benefit of the faithful. The Christians did not belong to Paul, or to Apollo, or to Cephas, as subjects to a leader, as servants to a master; but, on the contrary, all those teachers were but instruments in the hands of God for the sake of the Corinthians. On account of their dignity as Christians all things—teachers, the visible world around, life and death, things present and things to come—were theirs, to be made use of for their spiritual benefit and advancement.

But neither in these, their own privileges and dignity, should the Corinthians glory, for they were not for themselves; they were Christ's; they were the possession and property of Christ who created them (John i. 8), who redeemed them with His own blood (vi. 20; vii. 23), and who, therefore, was their only head and only master. If then they would glory, let them glory in Christ and in God.

Christ is God's, i.e., Christ, according to His divine nature, is one in essence with God (John x. 30), and, as the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, He proceeds eternally from the Father (xi. 3). Christ's human nature was created by God, and was ever and in all things subject to the will of God (xv. 28).

CHAPTER IV

THE FAITHFUL SHOULD NOT JUDGE THEIR TEACHERS, 1-6

1. Let a man so account of us as of the ministers of Christ, and the dispensers of the mysteries of God.

2. Here now it is required among the dispensers, that a man be found faithful.

1-6. Thinking themselves capable of judging their spiritual teachers the Corinthians had made distinctions between them, preferring one to another and glorying in their choice. After having shown that their glorying was human and vain, the Apostle points out the true norm by which the preachers of the Gospel are to be judged, but at the same time he warns that only the Omniscient God is able to make use of that norm. The faithful, therefore, must refrain from judging their teachers, not putting one above another, but leaving all things for the final manifestation at the Last Judgment.

1. The preachers of the Gospel are not independent workers, each doing what he pleases. They have been chosen by Christ to do His work, and hence they are dependent upon and accountable to Christ for the discharge of their ministry. Let everyone, therefore, consider them as **ministers**, i.e., as *servants* (ὑπηρέτας) of Christ, doing the will of their Master; and as **dispensers**, i.e., as *stewards* (οἰκονόμους) of the **mysteries of God**, i.e., of the doctrines of faith which the Apostles preached, including, of course, the Sacraments, of which the Apostles were the ministers (cf. ii. 7 ff.; iii. 5 ff.; Rom. xi. 25; Eph. i. 9; Matt. xiii. 11; *Conc. Trid.*, Sess. XXI., *De Commun.*, cap. 2). The doctrines and Sacraments preached and administered by the Apostles are called "mysteries" because they are beyond human understanding.

2. Since then the Apostles are the servants and stewards of Christ, their Master, they must be judged by the norm which governs all servants and stewards, that is, by their faithfulness in the discharge of their duties. If the Apostles are faithful in serving Christ and in dispensing the mysteries of God, it makes

3. But to me it is a very small thing to be judged by you, or by man's day; but neither do I judge my own self.

4. For I am not conscious to myself of anything, yet am I not hereby justified; but he that judgeth me, is the Lord.

5. Therefore judge not before the time; until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts; and then shall every man have praise from God.

little difference what otherwise they may possess or lack, whether their natural gifts be many and great or few and unimportant.

In the Vulgate *inter dispensatores* should be *in dispensatoribus*.

3. But as God is the Master whom the Apostles must serve, He alone can judge them. Hence St. Paul says it is of small importance to him how he is considered by men, whether he is preferred to another or not, because men are not able to judge of his fidelity to God.

Man's day means the judgment of men, as opposed to the judgment of God. That the Apostle is not rejecting the judgment of men out of pride or other unworthy motive is evident from the fact that he says he does not dare to judge himself, so uncertain is he of his precise standing in His Master's eyes.

4. Although the testimony of his conscience bears witness to his faithfulness, or at least does not reproach him with fault or neglect, yet so great is human frailty that he would not dare to pronounce himself entirely faithful in the exercise of his ministry. **He that judgeth me, is the Lord**, because only the Lord can read the secrets of man's heart with infallible certainty and correctness. If, presently, the Apostle proceeds to judge the incestuous man, he does so by divine authority and illumination, which was not enjoyed by those to whom he was writing.

What St. Paul says about himself is true of every Christian, because none, aside from a special revelation, can be absolutely certain that he is in the grace and friendship of God (cf. *Conc. Trid.*, Sess. VI., *De Justificatione*, cap. 16). Of this we can have only moral certainty.

The present text is a refutation of the Protestant doctrine that faith is *fiducia*, or absolute confidence that one is in the friendship of God (Cornely).

5. From what has just been said the conclusion follows that the Corinthians ought no more to judge their preachers **before**

6. But these things, brethren, I have in a figure transferred to myself and to Apollo, for your sakes; that in us you may learn, that one be not puffed up against the other for another, above that which is written.

the time, i.e., until all things are made known to them, which will be when the Lord comes for the General Judgment, to reveal to the light and knowledge of all the secret deeds, thoughts and desires of every man, good and bad.

Then shall every man have praise, etc. This shows that the Apostle is speaking directly only of the Corinthian teachers, all of whom are good, and each of whom, consequently, will receive from Christ on the day of the General Judgment the praise that is due him. Of course all men on that day will receive from God what they deserve, but all will not be praised.

6. The Apostle now observes that what he has been saying about Apollo and himself applies equally to all preachers.

These things, i.e., what he has just been telling them regarding the preachers of the Gospel, I have in a figure transferred, etc., i.e., I have by a *change of form* (μετεσχημάτισα), i.e., figuratively, applied only to Apollo and myself, for your sakes, i.e., for your benefit, that through us you may learn how to regard all preachers of the Gospel.

That one be not puffed up, etc. The meaning is that no one, or class, of the faithful should be considered better than another on account of any particular leader or teacher. All should learn to practice humility according to "that which is written" in many passages of Holy Scripture. The allusion is doubtless to such passages as i. 19, 31; iii. 19-20; or perhaps to what is said in verses 1, 2 of the present chapter; or, as some authors think, to a rabbinical proverb. Cornely thinks the reference is to the Old Testament as a whole, where throughout man's proper relation to God and genuine humility are taught.

That which is written, ἡ γράμματα with B & A C; or ὁ γράμματα with D E F G, Rec. Text, some copies of Old Latin and Peshitto.

THE LEADERS OF THE DIFFERENT FACTIONS SHOULD IMITATE THE HUMILITY OF THE APOSTLES, 7-13

7-13. When recommending humility to all the Corinthians in the preceding verse, the Apostle doubtless had chiefly in mind the leaders

7. For who distinguisheth thee? Or what hast thou that thou hast not received? And if thou hast received, why dost thou glory, as if thou hadst not received it?

8. You are now full; you are now become rich; you reign without us; and I would to God you did reign, that we also might reign with you.

of the factions at Corinth. Now he directly attacks them with bitter irony, placing before them the life of real Apostles (Estius, Cornely, etc.). St. Thomas, however, and the Fathers generally believe that the present section continues the thought of verse 6, and that the Apostle consequently is here, as there, addressing the faithful rather than their leaders. We see no reason why both in general cannot be meant.

7. How foolish it was for the Corinthians to glory in those human leaders, in whom there was nothing whereof to glory; or to glory in themselves as if they were better than their neighbors! If they have anything that distinguisheth them, whether in the natural, or in the supernatural order, this is not due to them, but to God from whom they have received all they possess. Therefore they have nothing in themselves whereof to glory.

St. Thomas and most of the Fathers have understood this verse to refer to supernatural, as well as natural gifts; and St. Augustine constantly urged it against the Pelagians and Semipelagians to prove that man cannot accomplish, or even begin, a salutary work without the grace of God (MacR.). Using this verse the Second Council of Orange declared: *Apostolo dicenti: Quid habes, quod non accepisti, resistere eos, qui gratiam ex operibus nostris naturalibus, non vero opera nostra bona ex gratia esse asserant* (cap. 6).

8. In their own estimation the Corinthian faithful and leaders of factions are completely sufficient unto themselves. They are full, i.e., they want nothing; they are rich, i.e., they possess all wealth; they reign, i.e., already arrived at the state of the blessed they reign with Christ triumphantly even in this life,—all this without us, i.e., without the true Apostles, Paul and his companions, who converted them to Christianity and put them on the way to happiness.

I would to God, etc. Dropping the irony of his remarks, St. Paul says I wish you actually did reign, so that we Apostles, the

9. For I think that God hath set forth us apostles, the last, as it were men appointed to death: we are made a spectacle to the world, and to angels, and to men.

10. We are fools for Christ's sake, but you are wise in Christ; we are weak, but you are strong; you are honourable, but we without honour.

11. Even unto this hour we both hunger and thirst, and are naked, and are buffeted, and have no fixed abode;

founders of your Church, might also share in your felicity, being freed from our distresses, trials, labors, and the like.

The Vulgate, *et utinam regnetis*, etc., would better be: *et utinam regnassetis, ut regnaremus* (Cornely).

9. I think that. "That" (Vulg., *quod*) is omitted by all the best MSS. How different from the apparently glorious condition of the Corinthians is the state of the true Apostles! Far from already reigning in Christ's kingdom, the Apostles are like men reserved for the beasts in the grand finale of the games; they are the most abject and the last of men.

God hath set forth, etc. God has made public display of us Apostles.

Appointed to death, i.e., doomed to die as gladiators or slaves in the public arena; "they were appointed to fight with beasts" (Tertull.).

A spectacle to the world, etc. Like men exposed to wild beasts in the theatre, the Apostles became a spectacle to good angels and good men who admired their fortitude, mildness and humility in the midst of sufferings and persecutions, and to bad angels and evil men who rejoiced at their trials and sorrows.

10. Continuing ironically to take the Corinthians at their own measure the Apostle further contrasts their fancied state with the condition of the Apostles.

We are fools, etc., i.e., the Apostles who preached Christ crucified in simple language were regarded as fools by the worldly Corinthians who gloried in eloquence and human wisdom.

We are weak, etc., i.e., the Apostles were regarded as weak, because destitute of human resources; they were without honour, i.e., derided and despised, because wanting in worldly science and eloquence: whereas the Corinthians gloried in their human aids and natural attainments.

11. The abject and destitute condition of the Apostles was not

12. And we labour, working with our own hands; we are reviled, and we bless; we are persecuted, and we suffer it.

13. We are blasphemed, and we entreat; we are made as the refuse of this world, the offscouring of all even until now.

14. I write not these things to confound you; but I admonish you as my dearest children.

15. For if you have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet not many fathers. For in Christ Jesus, by the gospel, I have begotten you:

something of the past that no longer endured; it continued **even unto this hour** when the Apostle was writing, and throughout his life. At all times Christ's true Apostles were in want of the things that were necessary for human life, such as food, drink and clothing; and moreover, they were unceasingly pursued by persecutions from one place to another.

12. In order not to be dependent on those for whom he labored preaching the Gospel, St. Paul worked at his trade of tent making to earn his daily bread (Acts xviii. 3; xx. 34; 2 Cor. xi. 7; 1 Thess. ii. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 8). For reviling and persecutions on the part of his enemies he returned blessing, sweetness and resignation.

13. The refuse . . . offscouring, etc. The Apostles were treated as outcasts, as *scapegoats* (*περὺημα*), as unfit to live in human society. Some think the above words refer to the custom at Athens of reserving certain worthless persons to be cast into the sea as a kind of scapegoat sacrifice against plagues, famines, or other public calamities.

EXHORTATION TO THE FAITHFUL, 14-21

14-21. After severely upbraiding the factionists at Corinth the Apostle now gives expression to the tender love which he really bears toward the faithful there. He is their spiritual father, and as such, ought to be an object of imitation for them. Timothy is coming to them; he himself will come later, and when he arrives he will deal with them according to need.

14. The severe language of the preceding verses had not for its purpose to humiliate and shame the faithful and their leaders, but to admonish and correct them. As a father out of love may use harsh words to his children, so has St. Paul spoken to his **dearest children**.

15. If the Apostle has spoken harshly to the Corinthians it is

16. Wherefore I beseech you, be ye followers of me, as I also am of Christ.

17. For this cause have I sent to you Timothy, who is my dearest son and faithful in the Lord; who will put you in mind of my ways, which are in Christ Jesus, as I teach everywhere in every church.

because, as their father, he has a right to do so. However many instructors and preachers of the Gospel they may have, there is only one who has founded their Church and begotten them spiritually, and that is himself.

Ten thousand, i.e., a very great number, an indefinite number.

Instructors, i.e., tutors, *pedagogues* (παιδαγωγοί). The pedagogue was a trusted slave who looked after a child during his minority, corrected his faults, and took him to those charged with his education. See on Gal. iii. 24. By tutors and pedagogues the Apostle means here the different preachers of the Gospel at Corinth who had followed him after he had founded the Church there.

For in Christ Jesus, etc., i.e., by the power and authority of Christ St. Paul, in leading the Corinthians to the faith, had given them a new and spiritual life.

16. As a father loves his children more than any pedagogue does, so should children love and imitate their father more than others. The Apostle, by his humility, modesty and patience imitates the example of Christ; the Corinthians should likewise follow the example of their Apostle and founder.

The words, as I also am of Christ are not found here in the best MSS. and many versions; they are doubtless a gloss from xi. 1. Therefore their equivalents in the Vulgate should be omitted.

17. For this cause, etc., i.e., in order that they may be able the better to imitate him he has sent to them Timothy, his faithful companion, who will remind them of himself. Apparently Timothy had already been sent into Macedonia with instructions to visit Corinth (Acts xvi. 10-16).

My dearest son, etc. Timothy had been converted by St. Paul (1 Tim. i. 2, 18; 2 Tim. i, 2) and had been the Apostle's companion on his second missionary journey (Acts xvi. 1 ff.).

My ways, i.e., my whole manner of life and action (Cornely). Some authors understand "ways" to refer to the Apostle's doc-

18. As if I would not come to you, so some are puffed up.

19. But I will come to you shortly, if the Lord will: and will know, not the speech of them that are puffed up, but the power.

20. For the kingdom of God is not in speech, but in power.

21. What will you? shall I come to you with a rod; or in charity, and in the spirit of meekness?

trine. It is not, however, his doctrine, but his manner of life that is proposed for imitation.

As I teach everywhere, etc., i.e., I teach in every Church that we Apostles are to be imitated; hence nothing singular is required of you Corinthians (Estius). Others explain thus: Timothy will remind you of my ways, which are uniformly the same in every Church.

18, 19. It seems that some of the Apostle's adversaries at Corinth had circulated the report that, on account of the greater reputations there of Apollo and others, he would not dare to visit the city again (2 Cor. x. 9-11). In view of this rumor he announces his coming.

The power, i.e., the efficacy and fruit of their preaching for the increase and progress of the Church of Christ. Miracles are perhaps not referred to here.

20. The kingdom of God, i.e., the Church of God owes neither its existence nor its growth to human eloquence and other natural means, but to the grace of the Holy Ghost working in the hearts of men.

21. What will you? etc. It is left to the Corinthians to choose whether the Apostle shall come to them as a teacher to chastise his disciples, or as a father to greet them with mildness and love.

CHAPTER V

THE CASE OF THE INCESTUOUS MAN, 1-13

1-13. So absorbed were the Corinthians in their party strifes that the internal perfection of Christian life and the observance of ecclesiastical discipline seem to have become to them things of secondary consideration and importance. A scandalous case of incest had occurred among them, and they were so indif-

1. It is absolutely heard, that there is fornication among you, and such fornication as the like is not among the heathens; that one should have his father's wife.

2. And you are puffed up; and have not rather mourned, that he might be taken away from among you, that have done this deed.

ferent about it as to allow the offender to remain undisturbed in the Church. For this the Apostle severely rebukes them. The danger of tolerating one scandal is that it may corrupt the whole Christian community and lead the faithful away from Christ. In a previous Epistle, now lost, the Apostle had warned the Corinthians to fly the company of fornicators; but here he explains that he meant they must avoid the company of those sinners that are members of the Church. God will judge those who are outside the jurisdiction of the Church.

1. It is absolutely heard, etc. Better, "Impurity is actually reported (to exist) among you, and such impurity," etc. The word *πορνεία* (literally, *fornication*) is used here in a wide sense, as also in vii. 2, to designate unlawful sexual intercourse.

Such fornication, etc. The offender was either living in concubinage with his stepmother, or more probably had actually attempted marriage with her, and this, as may be argued from 2 Cor. vii. 12, while his father was still living. Such a crime was forbidden not only by Mosaic legislation (Lev. xviii. 8; Deut. xxii. 30), but also by Greek and Roman law, as we learn from Cicero: *Nubit genero Socrus. O mulieris scelus incredibile, et praeter hanc unam in omni vita inauditum* (*Pro Cluentio* v. 6). If the marriage had actually taken place, it seems the Roman authorities had not learned of it; or, if they had, did not care to interfere with Jewish and Christian marriage laws. It was not Rome's policy to meddle in the particular customs of her colonists (cf. Acts xviii. 12).

The name of the man is not mentioned, evidently because known to all. The stepmother was probably a Gentile, and hence St. Paul had no jurisdiction over her. See on 2 Cor. ii. 5; vii. 11, 12.

2. The Greek Fathers think the incestuous man was one of the worldly-wise teachers whom the Corinthians had esteemed above St. Paul. At any rate, the Apostle now shames the factionists

3. I indeed, absent in body, but present in spirit, have already judged, as though I were present, him that hath so done,

4. In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, you being gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus;

5. To deliver such a one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ.

for their inconsistency in glorying of the eloquence and knowledge of their leaders, while at the same time allowing such a scandal to go unpunished among them.

3. Although the Apostle was **absent in body**, being at Ephesus, he was **present in spirit** with the faithful at Corinth; and he had **already judged**, i.e., he had already decided to **deliver to Satan**, etc. 'verse 5) **him that hath so done**, etc., i.e., the incestuous man.

Many interpreters think **I have already judged** means that the Apostle, though absent in body, had actually pronounced sentence against the offender and left its execution to the Corinthians.

4. **In the name of**, etc. These words are to be connected with the preceding clause, "I have already judged." Hence the meaning is: "I have already decided in the name and with the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ to deliver such a one to Satan, you being gathered together in council, I being with you spiritually, and Christ being present with His power" (Matt. xviii. 20). The Apostle will preside in spirit over the assembly, and will pronounce sentence, by virtue of the power and authority he has received from Jesus Christ.

5. **To deliver such a one to Satan**, etc., i.e., to expel the incestuous man from the Church, thus cutting him off from all participation in the Sacraments and other spiritual benefits, and leaving him a prey to the attacks and temptations of the devil (Estius). In this view the words, **for the destruction of the flesh**, mean the mortification and destruction of concupiscence or carnal desires, which is necessary for amendment of life. But according to the Greek and Latin Fathers generally the phrase "to deliver," etc., means to hand over to the possession of the devil, so that the evil one might harass and torture the body with sickness and disease, as in the case of Job. That the Apostles had the power of inflicting such punishments seems evident also

6. Your glorying is not good. Know you not that a little leaven corrupteth the whole lump?

7. Purge out the old leaven, that you may be a new paste, as you are unleavened. For Christ our pasch is sacrificed.

from St. Peter's action against Ananias and Saphira (Acts v. 1-11), and St. Paul's against Elymas the sorcerer (Acts xiii. 11). Cf. 1 Tim. i. 20.

For the destruction, etc. The purpose the Apostle would have in view when delivering the offender over to Satan was that his **flesh**, i.e., his inordinate carnal appetite, might be destroyed so as to save his soul. There is no question of procuring the death of the man.

From 2 Cor. ii. 6 it is argued that the Corinthians did try the incestuous man, and condemned him; but that he repented and was afterwards pardoned both by them and by St. Paul (2 Cor. ii. 10).

6. The Apostle now tells the Corinthians that their glorying in their party leaders is doubly out of place and unbecoming, since they have retained among them such a scandal as the incestuous man. So strong is the force of bad example that the presence of one sinner or serious public transgression is enough to corrupt the whole community, just as a little leaven communicates its influence to a whole mass of dough.

The Apostle uses **leaven** in its evil signification (Gal. v. 9), while our Lord employed the term to express both good and evil influences (Matt. xiii. 33; Luke xiii. 21; Matt. xvi. 6; Mark viii. 15).

7. Continuing the similitude of the preceding verse St. Paul here counsels the Corinthians to rid themselves and their community of all sin and sinners, like the incestuous man, as the Jews before the celebration of the Paschal feast were accustomed to cleanse their houses of all leavened bread (Exod. xii. 18; xiii. 7; Matt. xxvi. 17).

As you are unleavened, i.e., as you, by reason of your vocation and condition as Christians, are pure and holy (i. 2), you should cleanse your community from all sin and sinners, so that your Church may shine anew by the splendor of its virtues.

For Christ our pasch is sacrificed, better, "hath been sacri-

8. Therefore let us feast, not with the old leaven, nor with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.

9. I wrote to you in an epistle, not to keep company with fornicators.

ficed" (ἐνύθη). The Jews were obliged to clear their houses of all leaven each year for the annual celebration of the Paschal lamb; but Christians should put away the leaven of sin forever, since Christ, their Paschal Victim, "by one oblation hath perfected forever them that are sanctified" (Heb. x. 14). "Christ was the Passover, (a) because He was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world (Apoc. xiii. 8), of which the Paschal lamb was a type (John xix. 36); (b) because His blood, sprinkled on the soul, delivers us from the destroying angel; (c) because we feed on His flesh and blood (John vi. 51-57), and are thereby nourished for our escape from the land of Egypt, the house of bondage. This is why we are to purge out the old leaven, because Christ, the Paschal Lamb, has been slain, and we are bidden to keep perpetual feast on Him" (Lias).

This and the following verse afford a pretty good proof that the present letter was written at Paschal time, or perhaps during the Paschal week.

8. As Christians keep a continual Paschal feast they should eschew the old leaven, i.e., their former habits of sin and the company of sinful men.

Malice means simply sin; **wickedness** is sin accompanied by hypocrisy or guile (Theod.).

The unleavened bread of sincerity and truth, i.e., the practice of virtue and the company of virtuous men.

9. In verses 9-13 the Apostle explains a precept he had given the Corinthians in a previous letter regarding the avoidance of the society of sinners. They misunderstood him then to speak of all sinners, whereas he meant only those who were Christians. He had no jurisdiction over pagans.

I wrote to you, etc. (Ἐγραψα ὑμῖν). St. Chrysostom and some others think the Apostle is referring here simply to what he has said in the preceding verses 1-8. It is difficult, however, to see how from the preceding verses there could arise the misunderstanding which St. Paul now proceeds to explain. With the majority of commentators it is better, therefore, to hold that

10. I mean not with the fornicators of this world, or with the covetous, or the extortioners, or the servers of idols; otherwise you must needs go out of this world.

11. But now I have written to you, not to keep company, if any man that is named a brother, be a fornicator, or covetous, or a server of idols, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner: with such a one, not so much as to eat.

there is question here of a letter sent to **Corinth** which has not come down to us.

Not to keep company, etc., i.e., not to keep the society of **fornicators**, i.e., of those who were given to sins of impurity of whatever kind. **Corinth** was a large and most corrupt city, and the temptations to immorality were very numerous and very strong.

10. This verse should be separated from the preceding by a comma only.

I mean **not**, etc. Better, "not meaning," etc., i.e.; I wrote you to avoid the society of impure people, not meaning, of course, the impure of **this world**, i.e., of the pagan world, in which there were also **covetous**, **extortioners**, and **servers of idols**. If it were required to avoid the company of all these, one would have to leave the present world altogether, so numerous are such sinners in it.

This (Vulg., *hoc*) before **world** in the last line of this verse should be omitted.

11. The real meaning of the Apostle's letter was that the faithful should shun the society of any Christian who was publicly known to be impure, covetous, etc., in order that such a sinner, being abandoned by all, might be brought to a better life, or at least might not be able to spread the contagion of his sin to other souls.

A brother, i.e., a Christian.

A fornicator (*πόρνος*), i.e., one who is named, or publicly known to be a fornicator.

Covetous, i.e., one who unjustly takes his neighbor's goods.

A server of idols, i.e., a Christian who takes part in the worship of false gods. Some of the converts, who before had been idolaters, doubtless found it hard to break completely with all of

12. For what have I to do to judge them that are without? Do not you judge them that are within?

13. For them that are without, God will judge. Put away the evil one from among yourselves.

their old practices, and so mixed up idol worship with Christian devotions.

An extortioner was one who took the goods of others by violence. With such as all these the faithful were not so much as to eat at the same table. Van Steenkiste, h. 1., observes as follows: *Haec ad litteram urgenda non sunt, sed significant tantum, scandalum et seductionis periculum sedulo cavenda esse, et ea quae statuit Ecclesia contra excommunicatos, praesertim vitandos, fideliter observanda*" (cf. *Codex J. C.*, Can. 2257 ff.).

12. The Apostle now explains that his authority extends only to those who, through Baptism, have been made members of the Christian community, the Church.

Them that are without, i.e., those outside the jurisdiction of the Church. The Jews were accustomed to speak of all those who did not pertain to the chosen people as "those without" (οἱ ἔξω), and the Apostle is here making use of the same expression to designate those outside the Church.

Do not you, etc. Better, "Is it not those within that you judge?" The Corinthians ought not to wonder at the Apostle's practice of judging only Christians, since that is their own practice.

13. If Christians are not to sit in judgment on pagans, it does not follow that the latter will escape being judged; for God will judge them.

Put away the evil one, etc. This refers to the incestuous man. The formula here used by the Apostle is taken from the words of Moses decreeing death against certain classes of sinners (Deut. xvii. 7; xix. 19; xxii. 24; xxiv. 7 ff.). Excommunication is a kind of punishment that resembles spiritual death.

From what is said in this chapter it is clear that the Church is made up of good and bad members, and that she has the power to judge and condemn the latter.

The *nam eos* of the Vulgate would better be *eos autem* (Cornely).

CHAPTER VI

CHRISTIANS SHOULD NOT CONDUCT THEIR LITIGATIONS BEFORE PAGAN
TRIBUNALS, I-II

1. Dare any of you, having a matter against another, go to be judged before the unjust, and not before the saints?

I-II. Speaking at the end of the last chapter of judging, St. Paul is reminded of another abuse at Corinth. It was natural that in a city so large and busy there should arise disputes and difficulties among the Christians, as among others; but it was seriously wrong in the faithful to have recourse to Gentile courts for the solution of their difficulties. The gravity of the matter lay in this, (a) that in those early times such a custom was likely to cause a division between the Gentile and the Jewish Christians, for the Jews had received from Claudius permission to have their own courts of justice (Josephus, *Antiq.* xix. 5, 3); and (b) that the pagans would become aware of all the troubles of the Christians, and would thereby be scandalized. The Apostle, therefore, blames the Corinthians for bringing their disputes before pagan tribunals (verses 1-6), and then rebukes them for having any serious misunderstandings at all (verses 7-11).

1. **Against another**, i.e., a fellow Christian.

The unjust, i.e., unbelievers, who were generally called unjust by the Apostle because they did not have faith, by which the just man lives (Estius). It is to be noted that the Apostle identifies the *ἀδίκων*, *the unjust*, of this verse with the *ἀπίστων*, *the unbelievers*, of verse 6. Doubtless justice was not to be expected from the heathen (St. Chrys.).

The saints, i.e., Christians, who are all "called to be saints" (i. 2), and are therefore supposed to be holy and just. It was from such as these, who were just by their vocation and manner of life, that justice was to be sought, and not from pagans who were without faith, the very principle of justice.

2. Know you not that the saints shall judge this world? And if the world shall be judged by you, are you unworthy to judge the smallest matters?

3. Know you not that we shall judge angels? how much more things of this world?

4. If therefore you have judgments of things pertaining to this world, set them to judge, who are the most despised in the church.

2. Know you not, etc. Our Lord had promised the Apostles (Matt. xix. 28) that in the final judgment of the world they should have part in judging the tribes of the earth. And now St. Paul says that a similar honor will be conferred on all faithful Christians (Wis. iii. 8; Apoc. ii. 26, 27; xx. 4). If then, the saints, i.e., the Christians, are ultimately to sit in judgment on the whole world, are they not worthy to judge the smallest matters, literally, "are they unworthy of the lowest tribunals?"

3. Not only are faithful Christians to sit in final judgment on all men, but on angels also. If St. Paul's argument is a real proof of his thesis, that Christians are able to judge the cases of their fellow Christians, his words here must be taken in their literal sense. Then the faithful will hereafter really judge angels. This they will do not independently of Christ, but as associated with Him, "who was appointed by God Judge of the living and the dead" (Acts x. 42).

Are Christians to judge all angels, or only some of them? The text seems to mean only some, for it says ἀγγέλους, not τοὺς ἀγγέλους. Therefore St. Thomas says: "This word of the Apostle is to be understood of the judgment of comparison, because *some men* shall be found superior to *some angels*" (*Suppl.* q. 89, a. 8 *ad* 1). Probably, however, all angels, both good and bad, are to be judged by the Christians. But why are good angels to be judged in the General Judgment? Because men and angels constitute the one Church of which Christ is the head and judge; and that good angels should be judged in the General Judgment pertains both to the glory of divine justice and to the praise of angels (a Lapide).

4. Things pertaining, etc. Literally, "Things of every-day life," i.e., if you have cause for litigation, rather than go to pagans, take the lowest and meanest of Christians as your judges; they will be able to settle your difficulties, since one day they are to be the judges of men and angels. Some exegetes read the

5. I speak to your shame. Is it so that there is not among you any one wise man, that is able to judge between his brethren?

6. But brother goeth to law with brother, and that before unbelievers.

7. Already indeed there is plainly a fault among you, that you have lawsuits one with another. Why do you not rather take wrong? why do you not rather suffer yourselves to be defrauded?

second clause of this verse interrogatively, understanding the pagans to be referred to: "Do you set up as judges those who are most despised in (the eyes of) the Church, namely, the pagans?" (Le Camus). It seems better, however, to take *καθίζετε* as imperative, in view of its emphatic position, as well as that of *ἐξουθενήμενους*.

5. Is it so that there is not, etc. Better, "Is there then no one wise among you," etc. Having spoken ironically in the preceding verse, saying that the Corinthians should choose as their judges the most ignorant of the faithful rather than go to pagans, the Apostle now explains that he was not laying down a rule which they should follow, but only emphasizing the shame and absurdity of their conduct.

Any one wise, etc., i.e., have you not among you anyone who is competent to handle your cases and solve your difficulties—you who are glorying in the greatness of your respective party leaders? (iii. 18; iv. 10).

6. The shame of their conduct is still further indicated. It is a disgrace that one Christian should be going to law with another; and further, such a thing is a great scandal to the pagans. What respect could a Gentile have for the faith of Christians in the face of knowing all about their mutual quarrels, frauds, dissensions and injustices?

7. It is an imperfection in their life that the faithful should have lawsuits before any tribunal whatsoever.

A fault. Literally, a "defect," a "falling off." The Apostle is counselling, not commanding, that the Christians should avoid having lawsuits when defrauded. Those authors, like St. Chrysostom and Estius, who hold that in such a case it is a sin to go to law "have to make so many exceptions, in which lawsuits are free from sin, that they show how erroneous is their opinion" (Cornely). The imperfection and fault of a just law-

8. But you do wrong and defraud, and that to your brethren.

9. Know you not that the unjust shall not possess the kingdom of God? Do not err: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers,

10. Nor the effeminate, nor liers with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor railers, nor extortioners, shall possess the kingdom of God.

suit lies in the many evils that are usually connected with it, such as, lying, anger, defaming, and the like (Martini).

Why do you not rather, etc., as our Lord also counselled (Matt. v. 39, 40). It is *per se* more perfect patiently to bear injuries and injustices than to insist on one's rights; but there are exceptions to this rule, as we learn from the conduct of our Lord and St. Paul (John xviii. 23; Acts xvi. 37; xxii. 24).

8. Instead of practicing the perfection counselled in the preceding verse the Corinthians in their litigations wronged and defrauded their own brethren, to whom they were bound to show special charity.

But you. "You" (*ὑμεῖς*) is emphatic, in contrast with those who follow the counsel of our Lord to bear wrongs patiently.

9, 10. A severe punishment is reserved for those who do injustice to their brethren. This the Corinthians should know from the doctrine already explained to them.

The unjust, i.e., those who violate justice.

Shall not possess, etc., i.e., shall be excluded from the kingdom of heaven.

Do not err, i.e., do not be deceived by false doctrines. Perhaps there were in Corinth some, like the Antinomians afterwards, who taught that it was not necessary to keep the Commandments. Or it may be that some of the Christians thought that the abrogation of the Mosaic Law did away, not only with its ceremonial observances, but also with its moral precepts, the Decalogue. At any rate, the Apostle proceeds to call attention to certain grave sins that were very prevalent at Corinth.

The effeminate (*μαλακοί*) are those who passively commit unnatural sins of impurity.

Liers with mankind, i.e., sodomites, those actively guilty of unnatural sins.

11. And such some of you were; but you are washed, but you are sanctified, but you are justified in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Spirit of our God.

11. The faithful are reminded that before their conversion to Christianity some of them were guilty of the sins just enumerated, but that now their whole condition of life has been changed.

You are washed, i.e., you are cleansed in the waters of Baptism from all stain of sin. The past tense is used in the original: "You have been washed, sanctified, justified." The allusion is to the effects of Baptism.

You are sanctified, i.e., you have received sanctifying grace, the theological and moral virtues and the gifts of the Holy Ghost.

You are justified, i.e., you are not only called just, but you are actually rendered just, so that, whereas before your conversion you were enemies of God and slaves of Satan, you are now God's friends and adopted sons. The verbs expressing *sanctification* and *justification* are in the passive voice in Greek, thus strongly indicating that a real interior change is effected in the individual Christian soul, and not a mere external imputation, as Protestants teach.

In the name, etc. Christ is the meritorious cause of justification; the Holy Ghost, by appropriation, is its efficient cause. This verse shows the perfect equality between the Son and the Holy Ghost (Theodoret).

THE FAITHFUL SHOULD FLY THE SIN OF FORNICATION, 12-20

12-20. After having condemned the practice among the Corinthians of going before heathen tribunals for a settlement of their difficulties, the Apostle takes up the case of those Christians who, following the example of pagans around them, practiced fornication as if it were a matter of indifference. Perhaps these deluded persons had misunderstood the doctrine of Christian liberty taught by Christ (John viii. 32, 36) and preached by His Apostles (Rom. viii. 2; James ii. 12; 1 Peter ii. 16), and so felt they were perfectly free to follow their inclinations. Whatever the reasons for their conduct, St. Paul shows that they are in error, and that the sin of fornication is an enormous crime against

12. All things are lawful to me, but all things are not expedient. All things are lawful to me, but I will not be brought under the power of any.

13. Meat for the belly, and the belly for the meats; but God shall destroy both it and them: but the body is not for fornication, but for the Lord, and the Lord for the body.

14. Now God hath both raised up the Lord, and will raise us up also by his power.

the dignity of their bodies which are members of Christ and temples of the Holy Ghost.

12. All things are lawful to me. When preaching at Corinth the Apostle had perhaps made use of this phrase with reference to the ceremonial observances of the Mosaic Law, telling his hearers that they were now free to eat all kinds of foods. Here he cautions that there are certain limitations to this Christian liberty, even in indifferent matters. Abusing the maxim, some of the Christians had extended it to the practice of fornication. All indifferent things, regarded in themselves, are permissible, but they are not always **expedient**, i.e., not profitable; and they may become positively harmful, if they bring us under their power and make us slaves. Thus one is obliged to abstain from the use of certain foods and drinks, if he foresees that these will enslave him to intemperance and gluttony. Furthermore, if an indifferent thing becomes a source of scandal it should be avoided (x. 22, 23).

13, 14. After having shown that there are limitations and restrictions in the use of even indifferent things, St. Paul goes on to say that fornication is by no means to be classed among things indifferent.

Meat for the belly, etc., i.e., food is for the stomach, and the stomach is for food.

But God shall destroy, etc., i.e., these things serve only a passing purpose in the present life, after which they will no longer exist. Very different, however, is the relation of the human body to impurity. The body was not made for fornication, but for the Lord, whose property it is by reason of the sanctifying waters of Baptism.

And the Lord for the body, in order that He may sanctify it now in this life, and raise it from the dead to have part in His glory hereafter. For God, who raised our Head, our Lord Jesus

15. Know you not that your bodies are the members of Christ? Shall I then take the members of Christ, and make them the members of an harlot? God forbid.

16. Or know you not, that he who is joined to a harlot, is made one body? For they shall be, saith he, two in one flesh.

Christ, from the grave, will also raise us, Christ's members, from the dead (Rom. viii. 11).

Using the stomach, then, for food in moderation is natural, and serves the purpose of nature; but the use of the body for impurity is a perversion of the natural order and turns man, both body and soul, away from God, for whom alone he was created. Fornication, therefore, under no consideration can be classed among indifferent things.

15. The enormity of the sin of impurity is furthermore seen in this, that the bodies of Christians are parts of Christ's mystical body.

Your bodies are the members, etc. Through the Sacrament of Baptism the Christian, in body as well as soul, becomes a member of Christ's mystical body, the Church. So close is the union thus established between the faithful and Christ that the Apostle elsewhere (Eph. v. 30) says: "We are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones." In virtue of this union, not less real than mysterious, the life of grace is communicated to our souls, the seed of immortality is implanted in our bodies, making them capable of future resurrection and glorification.

God forbid then, that Christians should be guilty of a crime so monstrous as to take the members of Christ, and make them the members of an harlot.

16. That the bodies of fornicators become members of harlots is now proved from the testimony of God speaking through Sacred Scripture.

For they shall be, etc. These words, quoted from Gen. ii. 24, were uttered by Adam under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost (*Conc. Trid.*, Sess. XXIV., *De Sacr. Matr.*) with regard to the union between husband and wife in matrimony. Illicit carnal intercourse between man and woman effects the same relationship as the use of marriage, because the two acts belong to the same species (St. Thomas). Therefore the fornicator and a harlot become two in one flesh.

17. But he who is joined to the Lord, is one spirit.

18. Fly fornication. Every sin that a man doth, is without the body; but he that committeth fornication, sinneth against his own body.

19. Or know you not, that your members are the temple of the Holy Ghost, who is in you, whom you have from God; and you are not your own?

17. As the members of a fornicator become the members of a harlot in virtue of the union that is established by reason of illicit carnal intercourse, so the members of the Christian's body, as instruments of his soul, become members of Christ on account of the union which faith and charity effect between the soul and Christ (St. Thomas). Since, then, the faithful are one in spirit with Christ they should practice holiness and purity of body and soul.

18. Fly fornication. So great is the evil of impurity that we must avoid it at all cost. The Apostle says "fly," because, as St. Thomas and the Fathers teach, the vice of impurity is to be overcome not by resistance, but by flight.

Every sin that a man doth, etc. Another reason for fleeing from this sin is that, more than any other, it dishonors and degrades the human body; for so enslaved does man become by it that he is totally occupied and absorbed in its pursuit, and can give it up only with greatest difficulty (St. Chrys., Theod., Estius, etc.). Others explain thus: All sins except impurity are either spiritual, like pride, hypocrisy and the like; or tend to some external object or end, as the glutton tends to food, the drunkard to drink, the avaricious to money and possessions, etc. But the fornicator sins only against his own body and that of his partner who becomes one with himself (St. Aug., Cornely, etc.). Still other authors think the Apostle is exaggerating here, and means to say that most other sins which a man commits are without the body. This last opinion seems too much opposed to the evident meaning of St. Paul's words.

19. Still another potent reason for flying the sin of impurity is that the bodies of Christians are temples of the Holy Ghost; to violate them is to violate the dwelling-place of God's Holy Spirit.

The body of a Christian is said to be the temple of the Holy Ghost because it is the dwelling-place of the soul and the instrument of the soul in the exercise of virtue; and the soul of a just

20. For you are bought with a great price. Glorify and bear God in your body.

man is the special habitation of the Holy Ghost through the latter's personal presence, through sanctifying grace and charity. The Holy Spirit, then, dwells primarily in the soul and secondarily in the body, having been given us by God the Father. Consequently it follows that the Christian's body and soul do not belong to himself, but are the property of their divine tenant, the Holy Ghost, who abides in them and has consecrated them to His own service.

20. **You are bought**, etc. Literally, "You were bought," etc. The Holy Ghost dwelling in the soul and body of the just, as in His temple, is in rightful possession of His own property; for Christians have been redeemed by the blood of Jesus Christ (1 Peter i. 18, 19), and are consequently the property of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

Glorify and bear God, etc. Since the bodies of the just are the temples of the Holy Ghost, and therefore of the Most Holy Trinity, the faithful should not only keep themselves free from defilement, but should glorify God in the positive practice of virtue.

The words **and bear** (Vulg., *et portate*) should be omitted, and "therefore" inserted in their place, according to the best MSS.

CHAPTER VII

The second part of the body of the present letter (vii. 1-xv. 58) starts here. See *Introduction*, viii. 2. B.

LESSONS RELATIVE TO MARRIAGE AND CELIBACY, 1-9

1-9. It seems that some of the faithful at Corinth were uncertain whether it was better to make use of their matrimonial rights and privileges or not,—whether, namely, they should abstain from carnal intercourse, if married, and remain single, if unmarried. St. Paul replies that, while it is better for a man to surrender his matrimonial privileges, the use of marriage is a protection against the danger of incontinence, and that for this

1. Now concerning the things whereof you wrote to me: It is good for a man not to touch a woman.

2. But for fear of fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband.

reason married people ought not to deny each other their lawful rights, except under certain conditions and for a special legitimate purpose. It would be better if all could be celibates, as he is, but this gift is not bestowed on everyone. If there is fear of incontinence, it is better to marry.

1. Concerning the things, etc. This shows that the Corinthians had written St. Paul a letter proposing questions about the subject he now undertakes to discuss.

Not to touch a woman, i.e., not to have carnal intercourse with one's wife. The reason is that it is more excellent to abstain from intercourse. The term *γυνή* is taken for "wife" here, since it is used in this sense throughout the present chapter. And if it is more perfect in married people to abstain from using matrimony, it is likewise more excellent to abstain from marriage altogether.

Marriage and legitimate carnal intercourse are good and virtuous, but it is, absolutely speaking, more perfect for the individual to abstain from them. When God said (Gen. ii. 18), "It is not good for a man to be alone," He was speaking not of individuals, but of mankind in general, for whom matrimony is necessary as the only lawful means of propagating and perpetuating the human race. The Apostle is here speaking of individual cases.

2. Although it is, absolutely speaking, more excellent for married people to abstain from using matrimony, and likewise more excellent for individual men and women to refrain from marriage altogether, still if there is danger of incontinence, of fornication and other impurities, it is better to make lawful use of one's matrimonial rights.

It seems more probable that there is question in this verse of using matrimony already contracted, than of entering the married state, because the expression *γυναῖκα ἔχειν* is nowhere else used in Scripture of taking a wife. However, if one wishes to hold, with many exegetes, that there is question here of con-

3. Let the husband render the debt to his wife; and the wife also in like manner to the husband.

4. The wife hath not power of her own body, but the husband. And in like manner the husband also hath not power of his own body, but the wife.

5. Do fraud not one another, except, perhaps by consent, for a time, that you may give yourselves to prayer; and return together again, lest Satan tempt you for your incontinency.

tracting marriage, it must be noted that the Apostle is not giving a precept but only a counsel (verse 6). Furthermore, it is to misunderstand St. Paul to say, as some Rationalists do, that he has a low concept of marriage, regarding it only as a means of avoiding a greater evil. That the Apostle considers matrimony as a high and holy state is evident from verse 14 of this chapter, from xi. 3, and from Eph. v. 23-27.

Fornication is plural in the Greek, to signify the various sins of impurity to which a man abstaining from his marriage rights might be exposed.

3, 4. By reason of their mutual contract and the mutual rights thence resulting the husband is bound to yield to the wishes of his wife, and the wife to those of her husband, when there is request for legitimate intercourse. Man and woman united in lawful wedlock become one flesh; hence the use of the body of each is subject to the will of the other, provided, of course, there exists no reasonable impediment.

5. **Defraud not one another.** Better, "Deprive not one another," i.e., married people are not to deny each other the right to intercourse which each party has from the very nature and contract of matrimony. Of course the exercise of this right can be suspended by mutual consent, either for a time, or perpetually.

That you may give yourselves to prayer, i.e., to some special devotions, such as prayer accompanied by fasting, with which the use of matrimony would interfere. There is no question here of ordinary prayer, because the injunction to "pray always" (1 Thess. v. 17) holds for married people as for all others.

Return together again. Better, "Be together again," i. e., return to the use of matrimony.

Lest Satan tempt you, i.e., lest Satan take occasion, by your

6. But I speak this by indulgence, not by commandment.

7. For I would that all men were even as myself: but every one hath his proper gift from God; one after this manner, and another after that.

abstinence from your mutual rights, to tempt you to unlawful indulgence.

6. I speak this, etc. What does "this" refer to? Those who understand verses 1, 2 to treat of entrance to the married state think the Apostle here is saying that he does not command, but only counsels getting married. Others, with greater probability and with better conformity to the context, understand "this" to refer to what is said in verse 5 about abstaining from the use of matrimony only for a time and then coming together again, as if perpetual continence were wrong. Hence, when the Apostle said "return together again," he was not giving a command, but a counsel only, as he here explains. This interpretation agrees with the more probable meaning of verses 1, 2 and with what follows in verse 7.

7. I would that, etc. Since continence is more perfect than intercourse, and celibacy more excellent than the married state, the Apostle wishes that all men might have the grace to be like himself, unmarried and free from sexual indulgence. It is the common opinion of the Fathers that St. Paul was never married.

But if all men were, like the Apostle, to live a life of continence, human generation would cease, and the plan of divine Providence would not be carried out. To answer this difficulty some have said that the Apostle restricted his wish to the Corinthians; others, that he was expressing mere velleity, knowing that it was impossible (Estius); others, that he was speaking in the abstract, not considering the present order of things (St. Thomas); still others, that he was expressing a real wish, even though it cannot be realized (Cornely).

The opinion of St. Thomas seems preferable, because St. Paul goes on to say that in the present order of things God has willed it otherwise, calling some to the married, some to the celibate state, and that the fulfillment of the duties of either state is a gift from God.

8. But I say to the unmarried, and to the widows: it is good for them if they so continue, even as I.

9. But if they do not contain themselves, let them marry. For it is better to marry than to be burnt.

10. But to them that are married, not I, but the Lord commandeth, that the wife depart not from her husband.

11. And if she depart, that she remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband. And let not the husband put away his wife.

8, 9. Even though marriage is good, being a gift from God, it is more perfect to remain single, if this is possible. I say to **the unmarried** (*τοῖς ἀγάμοις*), i.e., to all those now unmarried, men and women, whether ever before married or not. Although widows would be included among unmarried persons, St. Paul mentions them in particular to encourage them to remain single in spite of their usual destitute state in ancient times and other special reasons they might have for wishing to remarry. He returns to them again in verse 39, as he also speaks again in verse 25 of those who were never married.

Even as I, i.e., it is good, it is a more perfect thing, if all who are unmarried, even including widows, should remain unmarried, like the Apostle himself. Of course, if they are unable to observe continence, let them marry; for it is better to choose a less perfect state, like matrimony, than so **to be burnt** by the fires of concupiscence as to be unfaithful to the more excellent life of continence.

MATRIMONY IS INDISSOLUBLE, 10-24

10-24. However more excellent celibacy is than the married state, it remains true that matrimony is a holy union of man and woman which has been ordained by God for high and noble purposes, and that for the proper accomplishment of these purposes the marriage bond is sacred and firm. Among the faithful it is altogether indissoluble by the ordinance of God Himself. And while some exception to this rule may be allowed, when one party is Christian and the other non-Christian, it must be remembered that the conditions of matrimonial unity which obtained before conversion remain for the most part after one has embraced the **faith**.

10, 11. Fearing that some of his married readers might take

12. For to the rest I speak, not the Lord. If any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and she consent to dwell with him, let him not put her away.

13. And if any woman hath a husband that believeth not, and he consent to dwell with her, let her not put away her husband.

too seriously the counsels he had just uttered and try to separate from their lawful partners, the Apostle now warns them of the sacred character of the marriage tie.

To them that are married, i.e., to those Christians of Corinth to whom St. Paul was writing, as to all the faithful everywhere, the Lord (Matt. v. 32; xix. 3 ff.; Mark x. 11, 12; Luke xvi. 18) has said that their marriages are indissoluble, and cannot be put asunder by any human power. This command of the Lord has been explained by the Church of Christ as pertaining to marriages that have been lawfully contracted and consummated. Of course the words of St. Paul here, as well as the command of Christ, apply also to pagan and Jewish marriages, since our Lord bases His teaching of the indissolubility of the marriage tie on the character of its primitive institution (Gen. ii. 24).

The Apostle here supposes that there may be just reasons which will permit two married Christians, whose matrimony has been consummated, to live apart; but it is just in such cases that the inseparable nature of their marriage bond is perceived, for they must be reconciled to each other, or **remain unmarried**, until one of them is dead.

It is evident that what is said of the wife in this verse applies equally to the husband, (a) because the rights and duties of married people are the same for both parties; and (b) because Christ said of the husband: "Whosoever shall put away his wife and marry another, committeth adultery against her" (Mark x. 11).

12, 13. In verses 8, 9 the Apostle had spoken to the unmarried; and in verses 10, 11 he addressed directly married Christians, indirectly and implicitly touching also the marriages of Jews and pagans. Now he begins to speak **to the rest**, i.e., to those who were married before they knew of the Gospel, and one of whom has since embraced the faith, the other remaining in paganism or Judaism.

I speak, not the Lord, i.e., Christ had given no declaration regarding mixed marriages, but St. Paul, the inspired Apostle,

14. For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the believing wife; and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the believing husband: otherwise your children should be unclean; but now they are holy.

who is speaking in the name and with the authority of the Holy Ghost (verses 25, 40) now says, by way of counsel, not of precept (St. Thomas), that in mixed marriages the Christian party should not depart from the non-Christian, provided the latter be willing to dwell in peace and not interfere with the other's Christian duties.

That St. Paul is giving a counsel here and not a precept seems more probable on account of the practice of the Church, which has understood his words as a counsel and not as a command, and also on account of the mild language he uses here (λέγω, *I speak*). Many grave authorities, however, hold that the Apostle is giving a precept in this matter, and consequently that the Christian party must not leave his or her peaceful and inoffensive non-Christian partner.

14. A reason is now given why the Christian party ought to follow the counsel just given.

The unbelieving husband is sanctified, etc. It is plain that there can be no question here of real internal sanctification of which the unbelieving party is the recipient by reason of marriage with a Christian. The meaning is that the non-Christian party is to some extent disposed and inclined to the faith by the good life and example of the other party; or that, by virtue of the close union between husband and wife, who become one flesh, the unbelieving party participates, to some degree, in the sanctity of the Christian party, inasmuch as he begins to subject himself to the sway of Christ, withdrawing from the power of the evil one (Cornely).

Is sanctified by the believing husband. Better, "Is sanctified in the brother," εν τῷ ἀδελφῷ (with B 8 A C D E F G).

Otherwise your children should be unclean, i.e., if, as I have said, the unbelieving husband or wife, in a mixed marriage is not to some extent sanctified by the faithful party, it would follow that your children, i.e., the children of you Corinthians, would not be sanctified, which is admittedly false. It is evident that the Apostle is here speaking in general of the children of

15. But if the unbeliever depart, let him depart. For a brother or sister is not under servitude in such cases. But God hath called us to peace.

the Corinthian Christians, and not of the mixed marriages of the first part of the verse; for there he spoke in the third person singular, "the unbelieving husband," etc., while here he uses the second person plural, "your children," meaning the children of the Corinthian Christians to whom he was writing this letter.

Therefore just as the unbaptized children of Christians participate to some extent in the holiness of their parents, inasmuch as they are destined to receive the faith and the graces that follow upon Baptism, so in a mixed marriage the unbelieving party is sanctified by living with a partner who has embraced the faith.

From the above explanation of the final clause of this verse it would seem that the practice of baptizing infants had not been introduced in the Corinthian Church when this letter was written.

15. This verse announces what is known as the "Pauline Privilege," by virtue of which the Christian party of a mixed marriage that was contracted when both parties were non-Christian is not bound by the matrimonial tie and can remarry when the unbelieving party refuses cohabitation or makes this morally impossible. This privilege, however, is not recognized by modern civil legislation.

If the unbeliever depart, i.e., if he refuses cohabitation with the Christian party, or makes their living together a moral impossibility.

For a brother or sister, etc. "For" is not in the Greek; and "the," instead of "a," should precede "brother" and "sister." The meaning of the passage is that when one of an unbelieving couple is converted to the faith, and the other either departs, or makes cohabitation practically impossible, the Christian party is no longer under servitude, i.e., is no longer bound by the matrimonial tie, and consequently can remarry at discretion. The first marriage, however, is not dissolved before the second is entered into. Such is the unanimous teaching on this text of the Fathers and of the Popes, and the common view of theologians and canonists.

This doctrine is not *de fide*, but it is theologically certain. Evi-

16. For how knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband? Or how knowest thou, O man, whether thou shalt save thy wife?

17. But as the Lord hath distributed to every one, as God hath called every one, so let him walk: and so in all churches I teach.

dently St. Paul is making a greater concession here than he made in verse 11, where separation was supposed as permissible. But if the right to remarry is not granted here, it is hard to see how the Christian party with an unbelieving and contumelious partner is any better off than the Christian wife of verse 11, who may separate from her Christian husband, but must remain unmarried.

The reason why a Christian is not obliged to live with an unbelieving and injurious husband or wife is because the faithful are called by God to a life of holy peace. But there can be no peace if the Christian is in constant turmoil with the unbelieving party.

The *enim* of the Vulgate should be omitted, to agree with the Greek.

16. The only cause that could induce a Christian to bear with the abuse of a disagreeable and unbelieving partner is the hope of the latter's conversion. Since, however, this is most uncertain, liberty and peace are to be preferred to such a life.

St. Chrysostom makes this verse refer to verses 12, 13, as giving a reason, namely, the hope of conversion, why the Christian party ought not to separate from his or her unbelieving partner.

17. But as, etc., (*εἰ μὴ*, in an adversative sense), i.e., whatever may be said of the doctrine of the preceding verse, (Erasmus); or, aside from the case given in verse 15 (Cornely, Van Steenkiste), we must not think that conversion to the faith breaks up previous relations. Therefore let each one continue after his conversion in the same state of life and relationship to society in which he was before, provided this is not incompatible with the holiness required of every Christian.

I teach, i.e., this same doctrine St. Paul taught everywhere, namely, that it was not necessary to change one's respectable state of life after conversion to the faith.

18. Is any man called, being circumcised? let him not procure uncircumcision. Is any man called in uncircumcision? let him not be circumcised.

19. Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing: but the observance of the commandments of God.

20. Let every man abide in the same calling in which he was called.

21. Wast thou called, being a bond man? care not for it; but if thou mayest be made free, use it rather.

18, 19. The Apostle illustrates the meaning of the previous verse. It makes no difference whether a man was circumcised or uncircumcised before his conversion to the faith. There is only one thing that counts for salvation, and that is the keeping of the commandments of God.

Is any man called in uncircumcision (verse 18). Better, "Hath any man been called," etc. (*κέκληται* with B S A D F G).

20. So long as a man was leading a good respectable life before he was called by God to the faith, there is no reason for changing it after he becomes a Christian. A good natural calling in the world is also a gift of God.

Calling, i.e., the invitation to lead a certain kind of life. The word *κλήσις*, *calling*, used here, means everywhere in the New Testament the invitation to embrace Christianity. Thus whatever be one's occupation in life, if it be decent, this will not interfere with his summons to lead a Christian life. Let every man abide, then, in the respectable condition of life in which God's call to Christianity found him.

21. Therefore, whether one be a slave or a free man, his call to Christianity ought not to interfere with his previous respectable state.

But if . . . use it rather, i.e., when converted to Christianity as a slave do not change your condition, but remain faithful to your master. In this interpretation, which is that of the Fathers generally, "use it" means continue in your state as a slave. The explanation is made very probable by the fact that St. Paul would have incurred the great displeasure of Roman power had he meant to encourage slaves to become Christians as a means of getting their freedom. Moreover, St. Paul is counselling everyone to continue after his conversion in the state of life in which Christianity found him, provided that state offers no obstacles to piety. However, a Lapede, Calmet, Bisping and

22. For he that is called in the Lord, being a bondman, is the freeman of the Lord. Likewise he that is called, being free, is the bondman of Christ.

23. You are bought with a price; be not made the bond-slaves of men.

24. Brethren, let every man, wherein he was called, therein abide with God.

others think the Apostle is counselling slaves to embrace Christianity in order to gain their liberty. In either case, the Apostle is giving only a counsel and not a precept.

22. Whatever may be their external condition of life, all Christians are equal before Christ (xii. 13; Gal. iii. 28; Col. iii. 11). Hence the **bondman** when called in the Lord, i.e., when converted to the faith, becomes the **freeman of the Lord**, i.e., is liberated from the slavery of sin and the evil one. In like manner, when a freeman is called to the faith he becomes the **bondman of Christ**, i.e., the slave of Christ, who has redeemed him from the servitude of sin.

Freeman should rather be *freedman*.

23. Addressing the Corinthians in general, the Apostle tells them that they were all, slaves and freedmen, formerly under the tyranny of sin, but now they are bought with a price (*τιμῆς ἡγοράσθητε*), i.e., with the blood of Jesus Christ (vi. 20; 1 Peter i. 18, 19). Wherefore, since they are now the property and possession of their Redeemer, they should not permit themselves to be **made the bond-slaves of men**, i.e., they should not so make themselves the slaves of human masters as to neglect in any way their duties to their divine Master.

As Christ is here contrasted with men, His Divinity is clearly implied.

24. Again for the third time (cf. verses 17, 20) the Apostle counsels that every convert should continue in the honest and upright state of life in which the faith found him.

Abide with God. This shows that St. Paul is presupposing that the life in which he advises to continue was good in the sight of God.

THE EXCELLENCE OF VIRGINITY OVER THE MARRIED STATE, 25-40

25-40. What the Apostle had just said in the preceding verses, about remaining after conversion in the same condition of life

25. Now concerning virgins, I have no commandment of the Lord; but I give counsel, as having obtained mercy of the Lord, to be faithful.

26. I think therefore that this is good for the present necessity, that it is good for a man so to be.

as before, might cause much uncertainty and doubt in the minds of the Corinthians. Did he mean that young persons who were not yet married should remain single? And that widows should not remarry? It is true he had briefly touched on these questions in verses 8, 9; but after all that had been said in verses 17-24, regarding the advisability of continuing unchanged in one's former state of life after receiving Baptism, it became quite necessary that the questions involved be more thoroughly discussed and elucidated. Accordingly, the Apostle now explains that, while virginity is only a counsel, it is far more excellent than married life. He then gives some practical advice to parents in regard to their daughters, and terminates with a few words of instruction for widows.

25. Beginning to speak of virginity and its excellence, the Apostle observes in the first place that he has no precept from the Lord in the matter, as was otherwise in the question of matrimony (verse 10).

Virgins (*παρθένων*). Perhaps this term here embraces both sexes, as in Matt. xix. 12; Apoc. xiv. 4, and as would seem probable from verses 28, 32, 33 of this chapter.

No commandment of the Lord. Our Lord extolled the excellence of virginity (Matt. xix. 12), but He did not command it as something necessary for salvation.

I give counsel (*γνώμην δὲ δίδωμι*), i.e., he gives very serious advice, as one who has obtained mercy of the Lord, i.e., who has been called to the Apostolate by the divine mercy, and has been commanded to preach by Christ Himself (Gal. i. 1).

To be faithful, i.e., he must speak as he does, and give counsel regarding virginity, otherwise he will not be faithful to his mission and to the grace that has been given him; he must counsel as one "worthy of belief, called by the Lord's great mercy, and entrusted with the ministry of preaching" (Theodoret).

26. The Apostle's counsel regarding virginity is this, that it

27. Art thou bound to a wife? seek not to be loosed. Art thou loosed from a wife? seek not a wife.

28. But if thou take a wife, thou hast not sinned. And if a virgin marry, she hath not sinned: nevertheless, such shall have tribulation of the flesh. But I spare you.

is good, i.e., excellent, more perfect than the married state (cf. on verse 1)

For the present necessity, i.e., on account of the trials, troubles and anxieties of this present life, to which married people are more exposed than those who remain single (Cornely, Fillion, and most of the older interpreters); or, on account of the near approach of the end of the world (Bisping, Toussaint, Prat in *La Théologie*, etc., vol. 1, p. 154). This latter explanation is out of harmony with the teaching of St. Paul in a previous Epistle (2 Thess. ii. 2 ff.; iii. 5 ff.), and with the decisions of the Biblical Commission of June 18, 1915, on the Parousia. Whatever may have been St. Paul's private opinions on this, or any other subject, we cannot admit that he ever taught or wrote anything which subsequent facts have proved to have been false.

27. Notwithstanding the excellence of virginity, those who are already married should stay with their wives. On the other hand, those who are unmarried should remain single.

Loosed from a wife could include widowers, but the context seems to restrict it to men who have never been married.

28. If thou take a wife (λάβῃς γυναῖκα with D E F G). Better, "If thou marry" (γαμήσῃς with B 8). The Apostle wishes to say that what he has just counselled about not seeking a wife must not be understood as meaning that those who marry will thereby sin; for matrimony is good, having been instituted by God Himself in the garden of paradise (Cornely). The verbs **hast not sinned** (Vulg., *non peccasti*), **hath not sinned** (Vulg., *non peccavit*), although representing the Greek aorist, would better express the meaning here, if they were in the future tense. The aorist is thus at times correctly rendered by the future in the Vulgate (cf. John xv. 6).

Tribulation of the flesh means the trials, anxieties and annoyances of life, which are more numerous for the married than for the single.

29. This therefore I say, brethren; the time is short; it remaineth, that they also who have wives, be as if they had none;

30. And they that weep, as though they wept not; and they that rejoice, as if they rejoiced not; and they that buy, as though they possessed not;

31. And they that use this world, as if they used it not: for the fashion of this world passeth away.

I spare you, i.e., I do not insist on your leading a life of virginity, which would be very difficult, if you have not the gift of continence. Others explain as follows: I recommend virginity to you in order to "spare you" from the difficulties and hardships of married life.

29. This therefore I say. Better, "But this I say." The Apostle explains why it is better to remain unmarried.

The time is short, i.e., the days of this life are few and short, and so it is better to avoid the cares and anxieties inseparable from married life, in order to give ourselves more fervently to the service of God. Some interpret these words as referring to the nearness of the day of judgment, which cannot be allowed, since this would make the Apostle teach something which was not true. Of course it is a fact that each one's particular judgment is never far off, and all uncertain to the individual whom, therefore, it behooves to keep as free as possible from distracting annoyances and to be ever watching for his Master's coming.

It remaineth, etc. The conclusion which follows from the brevity of our life on earth is that we ought to keep our hearts detached from all temporal cares, solicitudes, joys and sorrows which may obscure the vision of our real purpose in life, namely, the service of God and the salvation of our souls.

30. The meaning is that we must not allow any of our earthly experiences, whether of sorrow, of joy, or of business, to absorb our attention and distract us from loving and serving God. We must rather turn all these things to our sanctification by regarding them in the light of faith.

31. Use this world, as if they used it not. Better, "Use the world, as not using it to the full" (*χρῶμενοι τὸν κόσμον ὡς μὴ καταχρῶμενοι*).

The fashion . . . passeth away, i.e., the show, the external appearance, of things, such as riches, honors, pleasures, sorrows and the like, are fleeting, and should not be permitted to take

32. But I would have you to be without solicitude. He that is without a wife, is solicitous for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please God.

33. But he that is with a wife, is solicitous for the things of the world, how he may please his wife: and he is divided.

34. And the unmarried woman and the virgin thinketh on the things of the Lord, that she may be holy both in body and in spirit. But she that is married thinketh on the things of the world, how she may please her husband.

35. And this I speak for your profit: not to cast a snare upon you; but for that which is decent, and which may give you power, to attend upon the Lord, without impediment.

our hearts away with them. These external things of the present world shall be destroyed at the judgment; the substance of the world, though changed and purified, shall not be destroyed (Rom. viii. 19 ff.; 2 Peter iii. 13; 1 John ii. 17; Apoc. xxi. 1).

32, 33. St. Paul says that he prefers the Christians to be free from the cares and responsibilities of married life, in order that they may give their thoughts and affections more entirely to God. If one is unmarried, he can more easily give his undivided attention to his spiritual welfare; whereas, if married, one's wife and family justly claim a part of his thoughts and affections, and thus he is divided.

God (Vulg., *Deo*) at the end of verse 32 ought to be "Lord" (*Domino*), as in the Greek.

34. What was just said of the unmarried and of the married man is also true of the unmarried and of the married woman.

The beginning of this verse has two readings, namely, that of the Vulgate and our version, which is supported by some of the best MSS. and the majority of critics; and that of the Revised Version, Tischendorf and others, which makes the verse begin with the last words of verse 33, *καὶ μεμέρισται*, and he is divided. Those who follow this less probable reading translate the beginning of the present verse as follows: "And there is a difference also between the wife and the virgin."

It is clear that the meaning is the same in either reading; for both proclaim the one thing, namely, the superior perfection of the unmarried over the married state.

35. After having extolled the superior excellence of virginity the Apostle tells the Christians that he has spoken only for their

36. But if any man think that he seemeth dishonoured, with regard to his virgin, for that she is above the age, and it must so be: let him do what he will; he sinneth not, if she marry.

37. For he that hath determined being steadfast in his heart, having no necessity, but having power of his own will; and hath judged this in his heart, to keep his virgin, doth well.

profit, for their greater advantage. He does not want to **cast a snare** upon them, i.e., to deprive them of their liberty to get married, if they want to, but only to encourage them to seek **that which is decent**, i.e., what is seemly, more perfect, so that they may be better able to serve **the Lord, without impediment**, i.e., without the distracting cares of wedded life.

36. This and the two following verses give practical rules to guide parents in marrying off their daughters. The Apostle addresses the father to whom, according to ancient custom among the Jews and the Greeks, it pertained in particular to direct the future choice of the daughters of the family.

If any man think, etc., i.e., if a father of a family thinks he is being disgraced in the eyes of his neighbors for not providing a husband for **his virgin**, i.e., his daughter, and allowing her to get married, since **she is above the age**, i.e., since she has reached, or already passed the flower of her age, and **it must so be**, i.e., and, either she is determined not to lead a life of virginity, or there is need to let her marry on account of the danger of immorality, **let him do**, etc., i.e., let the father permit his daughter to marry; he commits no sin thereby.

If she marry. Better, "Let them marry" (γαμείτωσαν), i.e., let the daughters get married; or, let the daughter and her suitor get married.

37. For should be "But" (δέ). On the other hand, if **he that hath determined**, etc., i.e., if a father, being **steadfast** (ἑστηκεν) **in his heart** against the criticism and erroneous judgments of his neighbors, **having no necessity**, i.e., being under no necessity of giving his daughter in marriage, but being able to follow his own wishes and hers, **hath judged**, etc., i.e., has decided to keep his daughter from marriage, permitting her to follow a life of virginity—such a father **doth well**, literally, "shall do well."

The *statuit* of the Vulgate should be *stat*, and *facit* should be *faciet*, to agree with the best Greek.

38. Therefore both he that giveth his virgin in marriage, doth well; and he that giveth her not, doth better.

39. A woman is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth; but if her husband die, she is at liberty: let her marry to whom she will; only in the Lord.

40. But more blessed shall she be, if she so remain, according to my counsel; and I think that I also have the spirit of God.

38. Since, therefore, matrimony is good, a father does well to give his daughter in marriage; but he does better that keeps his daughter for a life of virginity. The Apostle's teaching on this subject is decisive. **Doth better** (Vulg., *melius facit*) should be in the future tense.

39. St. Paul now turns to the question regarding widows. In this verse he teaches three things: (a) The indissolubility of marriage; (b) that a widow has the right to remarry; (c) that she should marry a Christian.

The words, **by the law** (Vulg., *legi*) are not represented in the best MSS. here, and were probably inserted from Rom. vii. 2.

40. But a widow shall be more blessed, literally, "is more blessed," if she continue in her widowhood, since the state of the unmarried is more perfect, giving greater freedom from the cares of life and enabling one to serve God more constantly and more fervently (verses 25, 26, 32-35).

I think that I also, etc. The Apostle had no doubt of his inspiration to counsel as well as teach, but he speaks modestly, saying less than he wishes to be understood (Estius). The "also" looks back to the other Apostles and leaders among the Corinthians who were so much admired by the faithful.

CHAPTER VIII

Another question asked St. Paul by the faithful of Corinth regarded meats offered to idols. It was true that the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv. 23 ff.) had legislated in this matter, but since the decision there given seemed intended especially for the Christians of Antioch, Syria and Cilicia, where there were great numbers of Jews whom it was important not to scandalize by pagan practices, the Corinthians, as being mostly of

7. Now concerning those things that are sacrificed to idols, we know that we all have knowledge. Knowledge puffeth up; but charity edifieth.

Gentile origin and surroundings, were not certain just what their attitude should be toward pagan feasts and sacrificial meats.

The difficulty was increased by the fact that nearly all pagan banquets, both public and private, took on a religious character (Aristotle, *Ethics* viii. 9; Thucydides, ii. 38); and of the victims offered to the idols only a part was destroyed on the altar, the rest being given to the priests and those who offered the sacrifice for their own consumption in a sacrificial banquet, the remainder to be taken home for private use, or to be sold on the public market. It was customary for pagans to invite their friends to these private religious banquets, and it was held to be the part of loyalty to the State also to attend those that were celebrated publicly. Some of the Christians did not hesitate to attend these festivities and freely to partake of the meats offered to the idols, and to purchase such meats at the public market. Others were scandalized at such conduct, holding that it was entirely wrong to eat things profaned by idol worship. Still others ate with a bad conscience, feeling it was wrong to do so, but being unable to resist. Hence the matter was submitted to St. Paul. The present chapter gives his reply, which is to the effect that, while it is not wrong in itself to eat meats offered to idols, yet on account of scandal it is necessary sometimes to abstain from them.

MEATS OFFERED TO IDOLS ARE NOT IN THEMSELVES DEFILED, 1-7

1-7. It is not possible that anything offered to an idol be really defiled, since an idol is nothing. Those who have true knowledge understand this, because they know that there are not many gods, but one God only. But some are weak in the knowledge of the truth, and hence it is unlawful for them to eat meats offered to idols.

1. Now concerning . . . we know that. St. Paul here departs from the subject he starts to discuss, and through the second half of verse 1 and all of verses 2, 3, speaks parenthetically of "knowledge." Perhaps those among the Corinthians who were

2. And if any man think that he knoweth anything, he hath not yet **known** as he ought to know.

3. But if any man love God, the same is known by him.

scandalizing their weaker brethren had boasted in the letter to the Apostle that they had superior knowledge, and consequently knew there was no harm in eating meats offered to idols.

We all have knowledge, i.e., the Apostle and most of the faithful in Corinth knew very well how to regard the rites, sacrifices, and gods of pagans—they knew that idols were nothing.

Knowledge puffeth up, i.e., human wisdom, and even divine science, without charity, are often the occasion of pride and arrogance. Some of the Corinthians had knowledge, but without charity.

Charity edifieth. Literally, "Love buildeth up," i.e., the love of God (verse 3), which includes also love of our neighbor, *builds up* (οἰκοδομεῖ) the temple of God, the Christian society, by procuring the spiritual welfare and progress of the Christian community.

2. If any man think, etc., i.e., if anyone thinks he understands that meats offered to idols are not defiled, and has not charity, which will teach him further that he must not overlook the weakness and needs of his neighbor, such a one **hath not yet known**, etc., i.e., has, as yet, only imperfect and one-sided knowledge. True knowledge consists in knowing our limitations, and in subordinating everything to the love of God and the good of souls. Socrates said: "He is the wisest of men who knoweth that his wisdom is in truth worth nothing" (Plato, *Apology*, IX.).

3. If any man love God, etc., i.e., if anyone have real supernatural charity, which always includes the love of our neighbor (1 John iv. 20), he will be **known**, i.e., *approved* (cf. Matt. vii. 23; John x. 14, 27; Gal. iv. 9; etc, for this sense of γινώσκω) by God. In other words, such a person will not only understand the question of meats offered to idols, but will also know all that is necessary for his own salvation and that of his neighbor, and therefore will have God's approval and blessing upon him.

While we are all loved by God prior to our knowledge and love of Him, this *approving* love of God follows only upon our love of Him (MacR., against MacEv. and Estius).

4. But as for the meats that are sacrificed to idols, we know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is no God but one.

5. For although there be that are called gods, either in heaven or on earth (for there be gods many, and lords many);

6. Yet to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we unto him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.

4. The Apostle now takes up the thought broken off in verse 1, and begins to treat directly the question of meats offered to idols.

But as for the meats, etc. Better, "Concerning, therefore, the eating of things offered to idols."

We know that an idol is nothing, etc. Better, "We know that there is no idol in the world, and that there is no God but one," i.e., there is nothing really and objectively corresponding to the images representing false gods, there is no being actually existing which has the properties of God except the one true God (Psalm xcv. 5; cxiii. 4; Isa. xli. 24; xlii. 17; xlv. 9; etc.). Hence meat offered to idols is really not a bit different from other meat.

5, 6. The thought of the preceding verse is amplified. Although, according to the erroneous beliefs of various pagan nations, there are many so-called gods and lords, some celestial, some terrestrial, in the world; for us Christians, who know that God means the first principle and the last end of all things, there is only **one God, the Father**, from whom all things proceed as from their first cause, and to whom we tend as to our ultimate end (Rom. xi. 26). Furthermore, for us who know that Lord means Him on whom all entirely depend, there is only **one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom**, as the exemplar and efficient cause, all things were made (John i. 3), and through whom, as God incarnate, we Christians have been redeemed (cf. Eph. iv. 5, 6).

The equality of the Father and the Son as God is clearly set forth in this verse. If the Arians would conclude from it that the Son is not God, then they ought consistently to conclude that the Father is not Lord, because (it says) there is "one Lord Jesus Christ." Of course to deny that the Father is Lord would be blasphemy (Theodoret).

7. But there is not knowledge in every one. For some until this present, with conscience of the idol: eat as a thing sacrificed to an idol; and their conscience, being weak, is defiled.

8. But meat doth not commend us to God. For neither, if we eat, shall we have the more: nor, if we eat not, shall we have the less.

7. The conclusion from the preceding verses (4-6) is that, since an idol has no real objective existence aside from its mere image of stone or plaster or the like, it cannot affect food offered to it. So much was clear to most of the Christians, but there were some who had not yet been sufficiently instructed to grasp this truth, and who consequently were not entirely persuaded that it was harmless to eat meats offered to idols. However, following the example of others they did eat such meats with conscience of the idol, i.e., believing that the idol had power to defile, and so went against the dictates of their conscience, and became defiled with sin. It is sinful to act against even an erroneous conscience (Rom. xiv. 23), but one is obliged to do all he can to correct his false conscience.

Instead of the reading of the Vulgate and of most MSS. and versions, *τῇ συνειδήσει τοῦ εἰδώλου*, *with conscience of the idol*, the three oldest Greek MSS. and some versions have *τῇ συνηθείᾳ τοῦ εἰδώλου*, *through being used to the idol*. The former is the preferable reading.

SCANDAL MUST BE AVOIDED IN EATING, 8-13

8-13. The eating of meats offered to idols is harmless in itself, and yet it is forbidden to those who do not understand that it is harmless. And even they who have a correct conception of the matter must abstain from such food when their eating of it might give scandal to others who would misunderstand their action, or who would, through frailty, be induced to follow their example, and thus violate their own conscience. Those who give scandal and lead others into sin commit a most grievous crime.

8. In this verse the Apostle declares that meats considered in themselves are indifferent, being governed by no law; hence *per se* it is all the same in the sight of God whether we eat them or not.

Meat doth not commend, etc. Better, "Food will not com-

9. And take heed lest perhaps this your liberty become a stumbling-block to the weak.

10. For if a man see him that hath knowledge sit at meat in the idol's temple; shall not his conscience, being weak, be emboldened to eat those things which are sacrificed to idols?

11. And through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom Christ hath died?

mend," etc., i.e., food is a matter of indifference before God; for whether we eat it or abstain from it we are neither better nor worse in God's sight.

The doctrine of this verse looks to meats objectively considered, without any reference whatever to the legislation of the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv. 23, 29), or to the Catholic teaching and practice regarding fasting. The Church can make laws affecting meats, if it wishes, but there was no such law binding the Corinthians; and this latter is all that St. Paul is talking about.

9. But take heed, etc., i.e., those who are well instructed must be on their guard against doing anything that could scandalize and lead into sin those of their brethren who are wanting in more perfect knowledge.

10. Him that hath knowledge. Better, "Thee (σέ) that hast knowledge." The Apostle gives an example of the scandal he is warning against.

In the idol's temple, i.e., in the house or shrine devoted to idol worship. It often happened that the meats offered in sacrifice were partaken of, not only in the temple or shrine of the idol, but in the courts or grove adjoining. Later on (x. 14 ff.) St. Paul denounces such action on the part of anyone under any circumstances, but here he is concerned only with the scandal it gives.

Being weak. Weak refers to the condition of the man (αἰροῦ ἀσθενούς), rather than to his conscience; he is weak in knowledge, and hence his conscience is erroneous.

Emboldened, usually employed in a good sense, meaning to edify, is here used ironically.

11. Behold the enormity of the sin of scandal! A Christian who is well informed, by his injudicious and careless action, causes a fellow-Christian, to whom a double portion of charity is due, to commit a grievous sin and lose his soul—a soul for

12. Now when you sin thus against the brethren, and wound their weak conscience, you sin against Christ.

13. Wherefore, if meat scandalize my brother, I will never eat flesh, lest I should scandalize my brother.

whom Christ died on the cross (Rom. xiv. 15, 20). **Shall the weak brother perish.** This is the reading of E F G, Rec., Vulg., Peshitto, and Iren.; B 8 have the present tense, "perisheth."

It follows from this verse that Christ died for more than the elect.

12. The sin of scandal is not only an injustice to one's neighbor, whose right to charity it violates and whose conscience it wounds, but it is also an injustice and a cruelty to Christ, of whom our neighbor is a member and who died for all. What is done to the least of Christ's servants is done to Him (Matt. xxv. 34 ff.).

13. The Apostle proposes his own resolve and example to the Corinthians for imitation. As far as he goes he will abstain from all meats (*βρῶμα*, i.e., *food of any kind*), whether offered to idols or not, and this forever, if it be necessary to avoid giving scandal to his brother.

We must, therefore, avoid things perfectly licit in themselves, if there is danger of giving scandal to "little ones" (Matt. xviii 6). Of course things necessary for salvation are never to be abandoned for fear of scandal; neither are we obliged to take any notice of Pharisaical scandal (cf. St. Thomas, II^a II^{ae}, q. 43, aa. 7, 8).

CHAPTER IX

At the close of the preceding chapter St. Paul, in order to encourage the Corinthians to abstain from whatever might imperil the eternal welfare of their weaker brethren, called attention to his own determination never to do anything, however licit in itself, that could scandalize his brother in Christ. And now, lest they should say or think that he had promised more than he would be willing to fulfil, he goes into his own past life, as that of one who was free and a genuine Apostle, and shows

1. Am not I free? Am not I an apostle? Have not I seen Christ Jesus our Lord? Are not you my work in the Lord?

how he had renounced the rights that were his, so as to promote the Gospel and the spiritual good of others. He had foregone the support which he could have claimed from the faithful, in order to make more beneficial his preaching and to attain to greater perfection (ix. 1-18); he had made himself the slave of all men in order to save all (ix. 19-23). The Corinthians, therefore, should imitate his life of austerity and self-denial for the sake of gaining the incorruptible crown of eternal life (ix. 24-27).

THE APOSTLE REFUSED SUPPORT FROM THE FAITHFUL FOR THE SAKE
OF HIS PREACHING, 1-18

1-18. As a genuine Apostle, equal in every way to the twelve, St. Paul had a right to be supported, as they had been, by the faithful for whom he labored in preaching the Gospel. But for fear that the pagans and the new converts might think he preached only for this temporal purpose, and not for their eternal interests, he freely chose to earn his living by his own hands. From this the Corinthians could see and learn what it meant to deny one's self for spiritual ends and for the sake of others.

1. The Apostle anticipates what may be in the minds of his adversaries. They will explain his self-denial by saying he was not free to do otherwise; that he was not a real Apostle, and so could not demand his support from the faithful.

Here, therefore, St. Paul first claims the right of freedom which belongs to every Christian who is properly instructed; he next insists that he is a true Apostle like the rest. To be a genuine Apostle it was necessary (a) to have seen Christ risen from the dead (Acts i. 21, 22); and (b) to have been immediately commissioned by Christ to go and preach (Acts x. 41; Gal. i. 1, 12). Now St. Paul had seen Christ, had been called to the Apostolate by Him, and had been commissioned to preach by Him (Acts ix. 17; xviii. 9; xxii. 14 ff.; xxvi. 15-18).

A further proof that he was a real Apostle lay in the evidence afforded by the fruits of his labors. Were not the Corinthians

2. And if unto others I be not an apostle, but yet to you I am. For you are the seal of my apostleship in the Lord.

3. My defence with them that do examine me is this.

4. Have not we power to eat and to drink?

5. Have we not power to carry about a woman, a sister, as well as the rest of the apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?

his work in the Lord, i.e., had he not converted them to the faith by his Apostolic labors among them?

Christ (Vulg., *Christum*) is not in the Greek.

2. **If unto others**, etc., i.e., if in other places where he had not preached, he was not regarded as an Apostle, the Corinthians could not doubt the truth of his mission; for he had founded their Church and they were **the seal**, i.e., the proof and confirmation of his Apostleship.

In the Lord, as in verse 1, may mean in coöperation with the Lord; or that as Christians, whom he had converted, they were incorporated in the Lord.

And (Vulg., *et*) at the beginning of the verse should be omitted.

3. **My defense with them**, etc., i.e., his defense against those who would question his Apostleship was the Corinthian Church which he had founded, and which, in confirmation of his work, the Lord had blessed with abundant graces and favors (2 Cor. iii. 2).

4. **Have not we power**, etc. Although the plural is used, the Apostle is referring only to himself. He asks if he has not the right to receive their food, drink and other necessities of life at the expense of the faithful. The reply is obviously in the affirmative, as illustrated in the following verse.

5. Just as the other Apostles, and even our Lord Himself (Matt. xxvii. 55; Luke viii. 1 ff.), were accustomed to be followed on their missions by certain pious ladies of means who supported them, so St. Paul could have had such faithful assistants who would have provided for his needs; but he chose to labor with his own hands for his food and clothing, independently of anyone's help.

A woman, a sister, i.e., a lady who is a Christian, a *Christian lady* (ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα). The word *γυνή* is a general term signifying woman, married or single, and it is against the whole context and tradition, as well as what the Apostle said above (viii. 7, 8) about

6. Or I only and Barnabas, have not we power to do this?

not having and not wanting to have a wife, to restrict its meaning here to a *wife*, as the Revised Version does. The great majority of the Fathers, both Latin and Greek, understand St. Paul here to speak of being accompanied by a woman like those who were accustomed to provide support for the Apostles on their missions. There was no fear of the Jews taking offence at such a custom on the part of those Apostles who preached to them, because their own Rabbins often received similar assistance from their pious female disciples (cf. Luke viii. 2, 3). If St. Paul, however, had availed himself of his right in this matter, it might have caused scandal among the pagans.

It may be admitted that some of the Apostles had wives before being called by Christ (Mark i. 30), but afterwards they left all things to follow their divine Master (Matt. xix. 27; Luke xviii. 28, 29), and our Lord replying to Peter's declaration, "Behold we have left all things," enumerated "wife" among the things the Apostles had left for His "name's sake." If, therefore, on their missions the Apostles were accompanied by pious ladies, these were "not wives, but sisters," as Clement of Alex. says (*Strom.* III. 6).

Brethren of the Lord, i.e., James the Less, Joseph, Simon and Jude (Matt. xiii. 55), who were cousins of our Lord (Matt. xii. 46; xxvii. 56; Mark xv. 40; John xix. 25). James (Mark xv. 40; Acts xv. 13; xxi. 18), Simon and Jude (Matt. x. 3, 4; Acts i. 13) were Apostles.

Cephas, the Prince of the Apostles, is mentioned to give emphasis to the lawfulness of the custom just spoken of.

6. **Power to do this.** Better, "Power to refrain from working" (*ἐξουσίαν μὴ ἐργάζεσθαι*), i.e., the right to be supported without working with our own hands, either by the faithful or by the help of pious ladies who could accompany us. St. Paul here, as in the preceding verse, is insisting that he was not obliged to support himself, as he had done; he could have had his living provided for him either by the faithful, or by Christian ladies of means. Protestants lose the force of this whole argument by maintaining that *wife* is meant in verse 5. A wife would have been an added expense to St. Paul, a reason why he would have

7. Who serveth as a soldier at any time, at his own charges? Who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not of the fruit thereof? Who feedeth the flock, and eateth not of the milk of the flock?

8. Speak I these things according to man? Or doth not the law also say these things?

9. For it is written in the law of Moses: Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn. Doth God take care for oxen?

10. Or doth he say this indeed for our sakes? For these things are written for our sakes: that he that plougheth, should plough in hope; and he that thrasheth, in hope to receive fruit.

had to work harder with his own hands, to provide support for her as well as himself.

The mention of Barnabas looks as if he was known to the Corinthians.

7. Just as the soldier has a right to support from his country, as a husbandman and a shepherd have a right to the fruits of their farm and their flock, so has the Apostle a right to his maintenance from the faithful.

"This verse shows that a priest should have a soldier's courage, a husbandman's care, and a shepherd's solicitude; and for it all should seek no more than bare necessities" (St. Chrys.).

8, 9. What has been just said is very reasonable, but St. Paul points to the divine sanction which he also has for his words. The Mosaic Law, given by God to the Jewish people, forbade the muzzling of the ox that was used to thresh the grain of their owners (Deut. xxv. 4). The sheaves were spread on the floor of the barn and the ox was driven round and round upon them, until all the grain was trodden out of the straw. Now the Law forbade that the animal should be muzzled during this labor, so that, if it wished to grab a mouthful now and then, it might do so.

Doth God take care for oxen, i.e., did God make this law only for the sake of oxen? Did He not give it primarily for the sake of man, over whom He has a special providence? The meaning is that if God does not want the irrational laborer to be deprived of the food necessary for its maintenance and usefulness, how much more does He wish the human worker to receive his needed support!

10. **Or doth he say**, etc. Better, "Or is it not, indeed, said for our sakes?" This shows that God, in giving the above law, had

11. If we have sown unto spiritual things, is it not a great matter if we reap your carnal things?

12. If others be partakers of this power over you, why not we rather? Nevertheless, we have not used this power: but we bear all things, lest we should give any hindrance to the gospel of Christ.

13. Know you not, that they who work in the holy place, eat the things that are of the holy place; and they that serve the altar, partake with the altar?

our instruction chiefly in view, so that we may labor with the hope of receiving something for our work.

For these things, etc. Better, "For it was written for our sakes."

In hope to receive fruit. Better, "In hope of partaking."

11. The Apostle's contention that he has a right to support from the faithful is strengthened by a new thought. If for material labor one has the right to that temporal maintenance which is necessary for his life and usefulness, how much more has St. Paul a right to temporal support from the faithful for whom he has performed such a great spiritual service as he has done in making known to them the faith, and in converting them to Christianity! Temporal support would be little compensation for such surpassing blessings.

If we reap, etc. Two well-supported readings are possible here, namely *εἰ ἡμεῖς θερίσσομεν* with B & A D), or *εἰ ἡμεῖς θερίσσωμεν*. The former, which follows the oldest MSS., would seem to imply an actual partaking on the part of the Apostle of the Corinthians' temporal goods. But as this does not fit the context, it is better to follow the other reading, which is supported by the Vulgate, Vetus Itala and the MSS., C D E F G.

12. If others, i.e., most probably, the other genuine teachers, like Apollo, who followed St. Paul at Corinth, and who, it seems, made use of their right to support by the faithful. If these subsequent preachers insisted on their rights, how much more could St. Paul, the founder of their Church, have insisted on his! And yet he did not, lest the evil and suspicious minded might thence take occasion to accuse him of false purposes, and thus hinder the spread of the Gospel.

This power over you (*τῆς ὑμῶν ἐξουσίας*), i.e., this right of support in regard to you (cf. vii. 4).

13. Another argument is drawn from the practice of the

14. So also the Lord ordained that they who preach the gospel, should live by the gospel.

15. But I have used none of these things. Neither have I written these things, that they should be so done unto me: for it is good for me to die, rather than that any man should make my glory void.

priests of the Old Law, who shared in the victims offered for sacrifice.

They who work in the holy place, i.e., they who minister in the Temple, *performing the sacred functions* (τὰ ἱερὰ ἐργαζόμενοι), namely, the priests and Levites, eat the things, etc., i.e., have part in the sacrifices offered in the Temple at Jerusalem, as was ordained by God (Num. xviii. 8-20; Deut. x. 9; viii. 1).

They that serve, etc., i.e., the priests who shared with the altar the victims that were given for sacrifice; a portion of the offering was burned in sacrifice upon the altar, and a portion given to the priests for their personal use (Lev. iii. 4; Deut. xviii. 3).

And (Vulg., *et*), connecting the clauses of this verse, is not in the Greek.

14. That the genuine preachers of the Gospel have a right to their temporal support has been so far proved from reason, from the authority of the Law, and from the practice of the priests of the Old Testament. A final argument is now given from the words of Christ Himself who said that the evangelical "workman is worthy of his meat" (Matt. x. 10 ff.; Luke x. 7). The words of our Saviour do not mean that the Apostles were bound to insist on their right to support, but that they could, if they wished, and the faithful are obliged to admit this right and to comply with it.

15. I have used none of these things, i.e., I have used none of the arguments just given to enforce my rights; or, better, I have made use of none of my rights as an Apostle.

Neither have I written, etc., i.e., the Apostle has not written these things with the intention of insisting on his temporal maintenance at the hands of the Corinthians; he would rather die than give up the superior benefit of preaching the Gospel without present emolument.

For it is good, etc. The Apostle breaks up his sentence here, in his eagerness to give vehement expression to his feelings. A better translation is: "It were well for me rather to die than—

16. For if I preach the gospel, it is no glory to me, for a necessity lieth upon me: for woe is unto me if I preach not the gospel.

17. For if I do this thing willingly, I have a reward: but if against my will, a dispensation is committed to me:

18. What is my reward then? That preaching the gospel, I may deliver the gospel without charge, that I abuse not my power in the gospel.

my boast no one shall make void." The meaning is that just given above.

The *fiant* of the Vulgate should be *fiat*, *that it should be so*.

16. The glorying (*καύχημα*) spoken of at the end of the preceding verse did not refer to the fact of having preached the Gospel, for since St. Paul was acting in obedience to the command of Christ in preaching (Acts xxvi. 16 ff.; Rom. i. 14), he was not free to do otherwise. His glory, therefore, consisted in preaching without insisting on his temporal rights, in denying himself the maintenance he might justly claim.

17. This verse is very difficult. To what does *this thing* refer? Does it refer to the mere fact of preaching the Gospel, which St. Paul was obliged to do, or to preaching the Gospel *gratis*, which he was not obliged to do? In our judgment the reference is rather to the fact of preaching the Gospel, of which there was question in the preceding verse. *Willingly*, then, means "uncommanded," and *against my will* means under "necessity" (verse 16). The meaning of the verse therefore is: If St. Paul had preached the Gospel without having been *commanded* to do so, of his own choice, he would receive a special reward, and would have reason for glorying (verse 16); but if, as was the case, he preached because he had been commanded to preach, therefore under *necessity*, he was only fulfilling the commission entrusted to him, and so was not deserving of anything but the ordinary reward due to the fulfillment of one's obligations.

A dispensation is committed, etc. Literally, "I have been entrusted with a stewardship."

18. Had then the Apostle no special reward awaiting him, since the preaching of the Gospel was not his free choice but his bounden duty? Yes, his special reward consisted in foregoing his right to temporal support by the faithful and in preaching the Gospel without charge.

I abuse not. Better, "I use not to the full" (*μὴ καταχρῆσθαι*).

19. For whereas I was free as to all, I made myself the servant of all, that I might gain the more.

20. And I became to the Jews, a Jew, that I might gain the Jews:

21. To them that are under the law, as if I were under the law, (whereas myself was not under the law), that I might gain them that were under the law. To them that were without the law, as if I were without the law, (whereas I was not without the law of God, but was in the law of Christ), that I might gain them that were without the law.

This and the preceding verse prove the existence and merit of works of supererogation.

ST. PAUL RENOUNCED HIS LIBERTY THAT HE MIGHT GAIN ALL FOR THE GOSPEL AND INCREASE HIS OWN MERITS, 19-23

19-23. The Apostle has just told us at considerable length how he refused the temporal support to which he was entitled, in order not to impede the spread of the Gospel. But this was only one of the privations he freely chose to undergo. He also gave up his liberty and became all things to all men, that he might gain all for Christ, and that his own reward might be the greater. How such an example ought to shame those Corinthians who were unwilling to abstain from eating meats that offended their weaker brethren!

19. St. Paul was God's messenger to men, and as such he was in no wise subject to human beings. He could have lived and acted as he pleased so long as he was in conformity with his mission; but he surrendered his rights to such liberty of life and action and became **the servant of all** to whom he preached, in order that he **might gain** a greater number to Christ.

20, 21. When he was with the Jews he lived and acted like one of them, observing the Law and its ceremonies (Acts xvi. 3; xviii. 18; xxi. 23-26), although he knew these were unnecessary. All this he did that he might win the Jews more easily to the Gospel. Likewise when among those that **were without the law**, i.e., with the pagans who had not the Law of Moses, he conducted himself as if he also knew not that Law. And yet he did not, like the Gentiles, observe no law; for he was subject and obedient to the law of Christ which imposes the moral precepts of the Mosaic Law, summed up in the two great Com-

22. To the weak I became weak, that I might gain the weak. I became all things to all men, that I might save all.

23. And I do all things for the gospel's sake: that I may be made partaker thereof.

24. Know you not that they that run in the race, all run indeed, but one receiveth the prize? So run that you may obtain.

mandments of the love of God and of our neighbor (Rom. xiii. 8-10; Gal. v. 14).

22. **To the weak**, etc., i.e., for the sake of those who were weak in faith and easily scandalized (viii. 7, 9-12; Rom. xiv). St. Paul refrained from indifferent actions which they might misunderstand and take to be wrong.

I became all things . . . that I might save all. A better reading of this last clause is, "that I may save some" (*ἵνα πάντως τινὰς σώσω*). Thus, he acted in such a way as to save all, in order to save some.

The Vulgate *ut omnes facerem salvos* should be, *ut aliquos faciam salvos*.

23. The sacrifices and works of supererogation performed by St. Paul were not only for the sake of others, but for his own sake as well.

For the gospel's sake, i.e., for the sake of the great rewards promised in the Gospel. The Apostle has labored so generously, in order that he **may be made partaker**, along with his converts, of the blessings held out in the Gospel.

ST. PAUL MAKES GREAT EFFORTS AND SACRIFICES IN ORDER TO GAIN THE PRIZE OF ETERNAL LIFE, 24-27

24-27. The Corinthians must not think that to be Christians is enough to make certain their salvation. The Apostle directs their attention to his own life of severity: he so labors that there may be no doubt of his gaining the eternal prize; he chastises his body that he may save his immortal soul. If they would be saved, the faithful likewise must labor arduously to gain their crowns.

24. To illustrate the effort necessary to save one's soul St. Paul reminds the Corinthians of what they were accustomed to witness every three years at the famous Isthmian games on the sea-coast about nine miles from Corinth. Those competitors in the *stadium*,

25. And every one that striveth for the mastery, refraineth himself from all things: and they indeed that may receive a corruptible crown; but we an incorruptible one.

26. I therefore so run, not as at an uncertainty: I so fight, not as one beating the air:

27. But I chastise my body, and bring it into subjection: lest perhaps, when I have preached to others, I myself should become a castaway.

or race-course, exerted every effort, and yet only one received the prize, which was a garland of leaves of the pine or olive. As the mere entrance into the arena was not sufficient to gain this material prize, so the bare fact of one's being a member of the Church is not sufficient to win the prize of eternal life. On the contrary, we must, like the racers, so strive for the victory as to overcome and defeat our spiritual adversaries.

The Apostle is insisting on the effort that must be put forth to gain heaven, without wishing to say how many are saved. For all a place is prepared hereafter, but all will not attain to their destined seats in glory.

25. In the days of the Grecian games, as now, athletes who took part in the public contests severely disciplined themselves beforehand for a long period of time, abstaining from every indulgence that might weaken their bodies and lessen their strength; and all this that they might win a corruptible crown of leaves. How much more, then, should we Christians deny ourselves for the glory of never-fading crowns in heaven!

From ancient writers we learn that candidates for the prize at the Isthmian and Olympic games had to abstain from every kind of sensual indulgence for ten months, and to undergo a most rigorous bodily training (cf. Horace, *De Arte Poetica*, 412; Epictetus, *Enchir.* 29).

And (Vulg., *et*) after all things is not represented in the Greek.

26. Calling attention to his own conduct, which the Corinthians should strive to imitate, St. Paul says he directs all his efforts to the goal of eternal life. He *so runs* as to obtain the prize; he *so fights* as to overcome his adversaries. The latter figure is an allusion to the pugilistic contests in Greek games.

27. I chastise. The best Greek reading here (*ὑπωπιάζω*) means literally, "I beat the face black and blue." As the pugilist beat the face of his adversary black and blue, so St. Paul practiced

1. For I would not have you ignorant, brethren, that our fathers were all under the cloud, and all passed through the sea.

such corporal austerities as figuratively to make his body black and blue.

And bring it into subjection, i.e., conquer its evil propensities and bring it, as it were, into bondage. The conqueror in some Greek contests was permitted to lead his adversary around the arena and exhibit him to the spectators as a captive and slave.

When I have preached. Literally, "Having announced" (*κηρύξας*). The allusion is again to the games in which a herald made the announcements of the combatants, proclaimed the conditions, and excluded any who were unworthy. St. Paul was not only a herald but a competitor in the struggle for eternal life, and he feared that while he had announced the conditions for victory to others, he himself might fail to observe them and thus lose his own prize.

CHAPTER X

THE CORINTHIANS SHOULD LEARN THE NEED OF SELF-DENIAL FROM THE TERRIBLE FATE THAT BEFELL THE JEWS OF THE EXODUS, 1-13

1-13. At the close of the preceding chapter the Apostle had proposed his own austerity of life to the Corinthians as an example which they should imitate. And lest they should think his fear exaggerated and groundless, he now cites a fact of Jewish history, which shows that, though all the Israelites that went out from Egypt received the same typical Baptism and were fed with the same miraculous food, only those few finally entered the promised land who had the spirit of self-denial and sacrifice, all the rest having perished for their sins. Therefore, we have need of watchfulness at all times. And yet there is no reason for discouragement, because God will always do His part, if we do ours.

1. The Corinthian faithful must have known the history St. Paul now refers to, and so he proceeds to unfold to them its

2. And all in Moses were baptized, in the cloud, and in the sea:
3. And did all eat the same spiritual food,

spiritual meaning. For (γάρ) links this chapter, or at least the first thirteen verses of it, very closely with the preceding chapter.

Our fathers, i.e., the Jews of the Exodus, who, like the other ancient Jews, were really the spiritual forefathers of all Christians, whether Jewish or Gentile, because the Church had naturally succeeded the Synagogue, and the faithful were the true heirs and sons of Abraham (Rom. ix. 6-8; Gal. iii. 6-9).

Under the cloud is an allusion to the "pillar of cloud" which guided the Israelites in their march out of Egypt, screening them from the Egyptians and protecting them from the sun (Exod. xiv. 19 ff.; Num. xiv. 14; Ps. civ. 39; Wis. x. 17; xix. 7).

The sea, i.e., the Red Sea (Exod. xiii. 21; xiv. 19 ff.). All those Jews of the Exodus received divine favors that were typical of the two greatest Sacraments of the New Law: Baptism, which is the most necessary, and the Blessed Eucharist, which is the most excellent. They all received a typical Baptism and a typical Communion (Cornely, MacR.).

2. **All in Moses were baptized**, i.e., all the Jews of the Exodus were baptized unto the following of Moses as their leader, whose Law they were thereafter obliged to observe, just as Christians, through the Sacrament of Baptism, are enrolled under the leadership of Christ, promising to obey His law.

In the cloud, and in the sea, i.e., the cloud, the sensible sign of the presence of God, was a type of the Holy Ghost who is given in the Sacrament of Baptism; and the sea, through which the Israelites were delivered from the bondage of Pharaoh, was a type of the waters of Baptism through which we are liberated from the power of sin and the devil.

The Vulgate *in Moyse* should be *in Moysen* (εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν), *unto Moses*.

3. Besides a typical Baptism the Israelites had also a typical Communion; for they all ate **the same spiritual food**, i.e., the manna (Exod. xvi. 15), which, as being given in a miraculous manner and as typifying the Eucharist, is rightly termed "spiritual food" (John vi. 35, 48, 50).

4. And all drank the same spiritual drink; (and they drank of the spiritual rock that followed them, and the rock was Christ.)

4. A further great blessing enjoyed by the Jews of the Exodus was that while in the desert they **all drank the same spiritual drink**, i.e., the water which was miraculously produced from the rock in the desert the second year after leaving Egypt (Exod. xvii. 6), and in the desert of Sinai during the last year of the Israelites' wanderings (Num. xx. 8). This water was a "spiritual drink," both because of its miraculous origin, and because it was a figure of the blood of Christ given us in the Eucharist.

And they drank of the spiritual rock. Better, "For they drank," etc. What was this "spiritual rock"? According to St. Chrysostom and the majority of Catholic exegetes it was Christ (*Verbum incarnandum*), who was spiritually present with the Jews in the desert, and who, on at least two occasions of which we are told (Exod. xvii. 6; Num. xx. 8), provided the water in question. It is the opinion of many of the Fathers that the Son of God used to appear at times as an angel or messenger in Old Testament days. And furthermore, there is no objection to Christ being called a *rock*, because this same term is often applied to God in the Old Testament (Deut. xxxii. 4, 15, 18, 30, 31, 37; Isa. xvii. 10; xxi. 4; etc.). In this explanation there is no difficulty in the subsequent words of the verse, **that followed them**, etc.

But others believe the "spiritual rock" was an actual material rock, just as the "spiritual food" and the "sea," spoken of in the verses preceding, were corporal food and actual water respectively. It was called a "spiritual" rock because of the miraculous water that flowed from it and because of the holier reality it typified, namely, the blood of Christ. But how could a material rock be said to *follow* the Israelites in their wanderings? Some have answered that it rolled with them, as an old Rabbinical fable had it (*Bemidbar Rabbah*, c. 2), supplying them with water as they needed it. If this were so, how could we explain the distress of Num. xx. 1-13? Others hold with greater probability that St. Paul means to say that any rock they met in their wanderings, which Moses was divinely directed to strike, responded with its flow of miraculous water.

And the rock was Christ, i.e., Christ spiritually present, accord-

5. But with most of them God was not well pleased: for they were overthrown in the desert.

6. Now these things were done in a figure of us, that we should not covet evil things as they also coveted.

7. Neither become ye idolaters, as some of them, as it is written: The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play.

8. Neither let us commit fornication, as some of them committed fornication, and there fell in one day three and twenty thousand.

ing to the first opinion explained above; or Christ in figure, a type of Christ, according to the second view just explained.

5. More than 600,000 men of twenty years and upwards went out of Egypt; and although each and all of them partook of the same spiritual favors, they all perished because of their sins, except two, Josue and Caleb, who lived to enter the promised land (Num. i. 46; xiv. 20; xxvi. 63 ff.).

6. **These things were done in a figure**, etc., i.e., the benefits bestowed, and the punishments later inflicted on the Israelites were figures of what has happened and will happen to us if we, like them, are unfaithful. "As you eat the Lord's body, so did they eat manna; and as you drink His blood, so did they drink water from the rock; and as they were severely punished for their sins, so shall you be punished, if you sin like them" (St. Chrys.).

That we should not covet, etc. Perhaps the reference is not to avoiding sins in general, as St. Chrysostom thinks, but only to the fault of the Corinthians, who should not covet meats offered to idols, for fear of idolatry, as the Jews coveted the fleshpots of Egypt and turned to idolatrous worship.

7. Above all we Christians must avoid all idolatrous practices, such as those of the Jews in the desert (Exod. xxxii. 6), who sacrificed and feasted and indulged in idolatrous dances in honor of the golden calf.

8. The reference here is to the sins committed by the Hebrews in the desert with the daughters of Moab (Num. xxv. 1) who had invited them to their sacrifices in honor of the idol Beelphegor. The worship of this idol included many impurities. The Corinthians are admonished to be on their guard against taking part in similar licentious sacrifices in worship of Aphrodite, whose temple on the Acrocorinthus contained a thousand prostitutes.

Three and twenty thousand. The account of the same event in

9. Neither let us tempt Christ: as some of them tempted, and perished by the serpents.

10. Neither do you murmur: as some of them murmured, and were destroyed by the destroyer.

11. Now all these things happened to them in figure: and they are written for our correction, upon whom the ends of the world are come.

Num. xxv. 1-9 gives four and twenty thousand. The difference is doubtless due to a copyist, who wrote *three* for *four* in transcribing St. Paul. Or perhaps St. Paul is speaking of the number that fell in one day, whereas Num. gives all who fell on that occasion. Others say the Apostle is speaking in round numbers.

9. **Neither let us tempt Christ**, etc. The best MSS. have "the Lord" instead of "Christ," but the latter is also well supported (by D E F G, Old Lat., Vulg., Peshitto). The Corinthians are warned not to complain of their humble conditions and restrictions as Christians, as the Israelites in the desert murmured against the providence of God and doubted His faithfulness (Num. xxi. 4-6), and in consequence were destroyed by serpents.

10. The Apostle is warning the Corinthians not to complain of him and their other lawful superiors. Some think the murmuring here referred to was the complaint of the Jews at being deprived of the delights of Egypt, and their demand for meat (Num. xi. 4 ff.); but it is more probable that the reference is to the occasion mentioned in Num. xvi. 41, where we read that "all the multitude murmured against Moses and Aaron, saying, You have slain the people of God."

The destroyer (*ὁλοθρευτής*) spoken of here is doubtless the same as the plague of Num. xvi, because Wis. (xviii. 25), referring to the same event, uses the same word (*ὁλοθρευτῶν*) that we have here.

11. The Apostle now tells his readers that the sins and consequent calamities that befell the Jews in the desert were types of what may happen to them, if they be not faithful.

The ends of the world. Better, "The close of the ages," i.e., the Christian dispensation, "the fulness of time" (Gal. iv. 4), which is not to be succeeded by any further religious dispensation, but will continue till the Second Coming of Christ. For similar expressions which refer to the Messianic or Christian era, see Eph. i. 10; Heb. ix. 26; 1 Peter i. 15; 1 John ii. 18; etc.

12. Wherefore he that thinketh himself to stand, let him take heed lest he fall.

13. Let no temptation take hold on you, but such as is human. And God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that which you are able: but will make also with temptation issue, that you may be able to bear it.

The Vulgate *in correptionem nostram* should be *in correptionem nostri*.

12. The conclusion from the foregoing is that, if what befell the Israelites is a figure of what may happen to us Christians, baptized in Christ and fed on His flesh and blood, we must be ever on our guard against over-confidence, lest, while thinking ourselves secure in God's favor, we lose His grace and fall away into sin, perhaps losing our souls.

Himself (Vulg., *se*) is not in the Greek, but is implied in the context.

No one, short of a special divine revelation, can be absolutely certain that he is in the state of grace (*Conc. Trid.*, Sess. VI. *De Justificatione*, cap. 9, 13).

13. Fearing that the faithful at Corinth may be discouraged at the picture just drawn of the calamities that befell the Jews, St. Paul now wishes to console and hearten them, assuring them that in all their temptations and trials God will never fail to give them sufficient help to overcome. In other words, their temptations in the past have been only **human**, i.e., tolerable; and God will continue to help them in the future.

Let no temptation, etc. Rather, according to nearly all of the Greek MSS., the Fathers, and most of the versions, "No temptation hath come upon you, but such as you could bear," i.e., the temptations of the Corinthians in the past have been bearable, with God's grace; and **God is faithful**, i.e., He can be trusted to continue in the future what He has done so far. By "temptation" is meant all that induces man to moral evil, and that may be the occasion of spiritual death.

But will make also, etc., God will give with the temptation also the way of escape, so that you may be victorious and overcome.

In the Vulgate *apprehendat* should be *apprehendit*, to agree with the best Greek MSS. and the best versions.

14. Wherefore, my dearly beloved, fly from the service of idols.

15. I speak as to wise men: judge ye yourselves what I say.

16. The chalice of benediction, which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? And the bread, which we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord?

THE FAITHFUL SHOULD ABSTAIN FROM TAKING PART IN THE SACRIFICIAL BANQUETS OF THE HEATHENS, 14-22a

14-22a. After the long digression begun with chapter ix regarding the necessity of self-denial and vigilance as indispensable to salvation, St. Paul now returns to the subject of not eating meats offered to idols, and gives some practical rules. First, he says, it is entirely wrong, as being indirect idolatry, for the faithful to take part in the public sacrificial banquets of the pagans. It must be plain to all that through the Eucharistic sacrifice the Christians are intimately united to Christ, just as the unfaithful Jews were united to their altars by their sacrifices. Wherefore, those who take part in pagan sacrifices are similarly joined to the demons to whom those banquets are offered. How perverse this is, to wish to be united at the same time to Christ and to the demons, everyone can see.

14. Returning now to the theme from which, by way of illustration, he had digressed in the beginning of chapter ix, the Apostle draws the practical conclusion that the service of idols must be shunned. Since the Israelites, in spite of the divine favors they enjoyed, were visited with terrible calamities on account of their sins, the Corinthians, while not losing confidence in God's goodness and abiding help, must be on their guard against exposing their souls to deadly peril.

15. The Apostle submits the matter of abstaining from pagan sacrifices to the judgment of the Corinthians, whose intelligence will surely see the reasonableness of what he has said and is about to prove.

16. This verse shows that Christians are united to the body and blood of Christ by partaking of the consecrated species of bread and wine. They are consequently "debarred from communion with any beings alien to Him; a communion into which, by the analogy of all sacrificial rites, we enter with the beings to whom such sacrifices are offered" (Lias).

The chalice of benediction, etc., i.e., the Eucharistic chalice, which we bless, i.e., which we as priests consecrate. If "we" here includes the body of the faithful, the meaning is that they, by their presence and assent, made the consecration pronounced by the priest their own; their assent was expressed by the response *Amen*. St. Paul speaks of the consecration as a *blessing*, because it was preceded by blessing, just as at the Last Supper (Matt. xxvi. 26). He could not mean, by mentioning only *blessing*, that there was no consecration, since he is speaking of a real banquet and a real sacrifice, against which he sets the heathen's sacrifice.

The communion, i.e., the *sharing in common* (*κοινωνία*) of the blood of Christ, by which we become intimately united to Christ. "The fact of this Eucharistic feeding upon Christ is adduced as the strongest reason why Christians cannot lawfully take part in idolatrous rites. The sense here is that Christ feeds His people with His flesh and blood, and that they participate in the same" (Lias).

And the bread, which we break, i.e., the bread which has been consecrated and made the body of Christ, is it not the partaking, etc., i.e., is it not a sharing in the body of the Lord?

And (Vulg., *et*) is not in the Greek here.

"The breaking of the bread," or "of bread" became, in consequence of our Lord's action at the Last Supper (Matt. xxvi. 26; Mark xiv. 22; Luke xxii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 24), a characteristic phrase to signify the Eucharistic celebration (Acts ii. 42, 46; xx. 7, 11; *Didache* XIV. etc.). If the chalice is mentioned first it is because the pagan rites, with which the Apostle is comparing the Christian rite, began with a libation (MacR.).

Since, therefore, the drinking of this consecrated chalice and the eating of this consecrated bread mean a partaking of and a sharing in the blood and the body of Christ, it is evident that Christ is really and substantially present in the Eucharist. Moreover, as the Apostle is contrasting table with table, i.e., altar with altar, and sacrifice with sacrifice, it is clear that he regarded the Eucharistic celebration as a true sacrifice (cf. *Conc. Trid.*, Sess. XXII, cap. 1).

17. For we, being many, are one bread, one body, all that partake of one bread.

Of the Lord (Vulg., *Domini*) should be "of Christ (*Christi*), as in the Greek.

17. As a result of the union which the partaking of the body and blood of the Lord established between Christ and Christians, the latter are intimately united among themselves; though individually many, they are all one in Christ.

There are two renderings of this verse: (a) "We, being many, are one bread, one body, for we all partake of the one bread"; or, "because (there is) one bread, we, though many, are one body, for we all," etc. The first translation is more in conformity with the context and is preferable.

All that partake, etc., i.e., all we who eat of the one Eucharistic bread are one mystical bread and one mystical body; in other words, since Christ is really present in this Eucharistic bread all we who eat of it are spiritually transformed in Christ, and are thus intimately united to Him and to one another. This could not be, if what we eat were ordinary bread; for in that case it would be converted into our individual substances, instead of we being converted into it. Hence St. Aug. said, personifying this Eucharistic bread: "Nor shalt thou change Me into Thee, as thou dost the food of thy flesh: but thou shalt be changed into Me." The real body of Christ in the Holy Eucharist is the food and consolidation of His mystical body, the Church (Eph. i. 23; v. 20; Col. ii. 19; 1 Cor. vi. 15) (Rick.).

The Apostle wishes to show the Corinthians that as the faithful, by partaking of the table of the Lord, are incorporated in Christ and closely united among one another, so those who partake of the table of idols and assist at idolatrous banquets become, to a certain extent, united to the idols and to those who adore them.

The unity with Christ's body which St. Paul makes characteristic of all those who eat the Eucharistic bread is a clear proof, not only of the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, but it is also a refutation of both consubstantiation and impanation; otherwise how could Christians in Ephesus, Corinth and elsewhere be said to partake of one bread while they were so far apart?

18. Behold Israel according to the flesh: are not they, that eat of the sacrifices, partakers of the altar?

19. What then? Do I say, that what is offered in sacrifice to idols, is anything; or, that the idol is anything?

To the inspired St. Paul and to the Christians alike the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist and transubstantiation are clearly truths accepted without question. This verse, however, does not prove transubstantiation, at least directly (against MacR.).

18. An illustration of the unity between a sacrifice or banquet and those who partake of it is now drawn from the sacrifices of the Jews.

Israel according to the flesh, i.e., the unconverted Jews who have descended from Abraham according to the flesh, but not according to the spirit (Rom. iv. 11; Gal. vi. 14, 16).

They, that eat of the sacrifices, etc. The reference is to the victims offered by the Jews in sacrifice, a portion of which was burnt on the altar, and the rest eaten by the offerers, or by the priests (1 Kings ii. 13-16; Lev. vii). Those who thus partook of a part of the victim sacrificed were considered to be closely united with the sacrifice and with the altar of sacrifice.

It is to be noted that the Apostle does not say that these Jews, by participating in their sacrifices and banquets, became united with God, as those who partake of the Eucharist are united to and become one with Christ (verses 16, 17). Could there be a clearer demonstration of the Apostle's belief in the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and of his consequent appreciation of the superiority of the Eucharistic sacrifice over the Jewish sacrifices?

19. St. Paul answers a possible difficulty. Some of his readers might think from what he has just been saying about the unity that is established between a sacrifice and those who partake of it, that **what is offered in sacrifice to idols** is in some way changed, so as to become harmful to those who eat it; **or that the idol** is a real being, having a real existence. This would go against what he has already said in viii. 4. But, as was stated there, the truth is that idols, such as Zeus, Aphrodite and the rest, do not, and never did exist; they are nothing, and so cannot

20. But the things which the heathens sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God. And I would not that you should be made partakers with devils.

21. You cannot drink the chalice of the Lord, and the chalice of devils: you cannot be partakers of the table of the Lord, and of the table of devils.

22. Do we provoke the Lord to jealousy? Are we stronger than he? All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient.

affect for better or for worse the meats or other things offered to them.

20, 21. If the idol was nothing, and if the thing offered to it was in nowise affected by the non-existing idol, where was the wrong in the heathens' sacrifices? It was this, (a) that their religious rites became so degrading and sinful that the *evil spirits* (*δαίμονια*) made use of them to corrupt and lead to moral ruin the benighted pagans who indulged in such false worship; (b) that oftentimes the evil spirits, by causing false signs and wonders, seem to have taken an actual personal part in those pagan rites; (c) that the supreme worship which is due to God alone was transferred to a creature.

Thus unconsciously perhaps, for the most part, the heathens were really serving the interests and wishes of the demons by their sacrifices; and those Christians who took part with them were trying to assist at the **table of the Lord**, i.e., at the Eucharistic sacrifice, and at the **table of devils**, the mortal enemies of the Lord.

The word *table* (*τραπέζα*) is used in the Old Testament (Mai. i. 7, 12; Ezech. xli. 22; xliv. 16) to signify the altar of the true God, and also the altar of idols (Isa. lxv. 1). Now this contrast of the table of the Lord with the table of devils would mean nothing, as Le Camus observes (*L'Oeuvre des Apôt.*, tom. III. p. 122), if the Eucharist, besides being a Sacrament, were not also a true sacrifice. Wherefore the Council of Trent (Sess. XXII. cap. 1, *De Sacrif. Missae*) has said that in these words the Apostle has not obscurely indicated that the celebration of the Eucharist is a true sacrifice.

22. Do we provoke, etc., i.e., do we wish to excite the jealousy of the Lord by taking part in pagan sacrificial banquets?

Are we stronger than he, so that we need not fear His wrath?

From these two questions the Corinthians should learn what

23. All things are lawful for me, but all things do not edify.

24. Let no man seek his own, but that which is another's.

terrible chastisements await them, if they cease not to offend Christ by their traffic with His enemies.

This whole passage (verses 15-22a) affords the clearest proof that the Eucharist is a true sacrifice. First of all, it is compared with the real sacrifices of the Jews and of the heathens, and secondly the whole force of the Apostle's reasoning requires that it be a real and true sacrifice. His argument is that as the Christian sacrificial banquet unites Christians with Christ, and as the Jewish banquets unite the Jews with their altar, so the heathen sacrifices unite their votaries with the demons. The argument would be meaningless, and would have been regarded as such by the Corinthians, unless it was generally understood by the Christians that they had a real sacrifice in connection with their "chalice" and "bread" (Cornely, MacR.).

IF THERE IS DANGER OF SCANDAL THE FAITHFUL SHOULD ABSTAIN,
EVEN AT A PRIVATE TABLE, FROM MEATS OFFERED TO IDOLS,
22b-33.

22b-33. The Apostle has just proved that it is altogether unlawful to take part in the public sacrifices of the pagans. Now he turns to the question of using in private banquets the meats that had been offered to idols; and he says that while these meats do not in reality differ from other foods, as already explained, still if there is danger of scandal they are not to be eaten. In all things, he exhorts, we should seek the glory of God.

22b, 23. All things are lawful, etc. See above, on vi. 12. The Apostle is speaking of all indifferent things, which, though lawful in themselves, sometimes are not expedient for the doer and do not edify the observer. "Saying they are not expedient, he alludes to injury to one's self, and saying they do not edify, he hints at scandal to the brother" (St. Chrys.).

For me (Vulg., *mihi*) after "lawful" in these two verses is not represented in the best MSS.

24. Let no man seek his own, etc., i.e., no one should seek his own good to the disregard and injury of his neighbor. The

25. Whatsoever is sold in the shambles, eat; asking no question for conscience' sake.

26. The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof.

27. If any of them that believe not, invite you, and you be willing to go; eat of anything that is set before you, asking no question for conscience' sake.

Apostle is referring to real scandal, which we are to avoid when our neighbor's welfare demands it (xiii. 5).

25, 26. **In the shambles**, i.e., in the market.

Asking no question, etc., i.e., the Christians should buy and eat anything they find for sale in the market, since the foods there sold are harmless, whether they have previously been offered to idols or not. And in order not to excite any scruples, they should not ask whether the foods have been so offered; neither should they yield to such interior scruples as would make inquiries necessary. They are free to eat anything because, as the Psalmist declared (Ps. xxiii. 1) **the earth**, etc., i.e., everything belongs to the Lord and nothing is unclean in itself, or of itself able to defile. Naturally the Apostle is speaking to those Christians who are well instructed and whose consciences are right (viii. 1 ff.). If it be asked how this advice can be made to harmonize with the decree of the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv. 23, 29), the answer given by Estius, Bisping, Cornely and others is that Achaia and Macedonia did not fall within the scope of that decree. The decree was intended only for those countries where there were many Jews, such as Antioch, Syria and Cilicia (Acts xv. 23). The decree of the Council was, after all, only a temporary measure, and perhaps at the writing of this Epistle it was not considered any longer necessary to abide by it.

In the Greek, verse 26 is joined to verse 25 by the conjunction *γάρ*, *because*, which shows that it is a proof of the direction given in verse 25.

27. If any of the faithful should be invited by their pagan relatives or friends to a private or ordinary banquet, they may go if they wish; and if they go, they should eat whatever is given them, asking no questions about where the food was procured, or whether it had previously been offered to idols, or the like, and this so as not to upset their consciences.

28. But if any man say: This has been sacrificed to idols, do not eat of it for his sake that told it, and for conscience' sake.

29. Conscience, I say, not thy own, but the other's. For why is my liberty judged by another man's conscience?

28. If any man say, i.e., if any fellow-Christian should say to you at the banquet, **this has been sacrificed** (τοῦτο ἱερόθυτόν ἐστιν, which is the best reading), i.e., this has been offered to an idol, do not eat it, for fear of leading your scrupulous brother to follow your example against his conscience, and thus to commit sin. Similarly, if one of your pagan friends or relatives should call your attention to the fact that the meat had been offered in sacrifice, do not eat it, because you may cause him to think you do not care about your own religion, and thus, instead of edifying him by your example or abstinence, you will scandalize him, and make him, who might otherwise later become a convert, persevere in his own erroneous religion.

The conjunction **ἐάν** which introduces this verse, as compared with **εἰ** at the beginning of the preceding verse, implies that the supposition here is far less likely to occur than the invitation spoken of there.

29. In verses 25, 27 the Apostle was speaking about the conscience of a well-instructed Christian, who knows that idols are nothing and that meat offered to them is not defiled. But here, as also in verse 28, it is the false and timid conscience of someone else that is in question; and it is only for the sake of this weak person that an enlightened Christian need abstain from eating certain things.

For why is my liberty, etc. The Apostle means that it is absurd to say that the conscience of an instructed Christian is to be judged as really wrong, and so condemned, just because the conscience of someone else thinks what that instructed Christian does is wrong. Why should one who is free be forced to think like one who is a slave? If, therefore, an enlightened Christian should abstain from eating things in themselves licit, it is not because his conscience tells him, contrary to fact, that those things are bad, but only for the sake of not giving scandal to his weaker neighbor. Apart from serious danger of scandal the lawful exercise of one's liberty must not be enslaved by others' scruples.

30. If I partake with thanksgiving, why am I evil spoken of for that for which I give thanks?

31. Therefore, whether you eat or drink, or whatsoever else you do, do all to the glory of God.

32. Be without offence to the Jews, and to the Gentiles, and to the church of God:

33. As I also in all things please all men, not seeking that which is profitable to myself, but to many, that they may be saved.

30. The sense of this verse, like that of the preceding one, seems to be: If I perform a good action, is that action made wrong in itself just because of the false judgment of someone else? The Apostle is alluding here to the custom among the Christians of saying grace before and after meals.

31. Concluding the subject of partaking of food offered to idols the Apostle now gives the general precept (Estius, Cornely, etc.) to all Christians of performing all their actions for the glory of God. Naturally this is to forbid all bad actions, such as the giving of scandal would be. St. Paul here commands that Christians should, at least virtually, direct everything they do to God's honor and glory. Some interpreters (a Lapide, Estius, Corn.) regard this precept, although affirmative in form, as negative in meaning; and they argue this from what is said in the following verse: we must not do anything which could impede the glory of God. Thomists, however, hold that the precept here given is affirmative, and that it is satisfied by a virtual implicit reference of all our actions.

32. **Be without**, etc., i.e., give no scandal or other offence to the unconverted **Jews**, to the **Gentiles** (literally, *to the Greeks*), nor to the **church of God**, i.e., to the faithful. Charity requires us to edify all, and to scandalize none.

33. The Apostle directs attention to his own conduct, which the faithful should imitate.

In all things, of an indifferent nature, he *tried to accommodate* (ἀπεύκω, used in the same sense in Rom. xv. 2; 1 Thess. ii. 4) himself to the needs and wishes of others in order to save as many as possible. The Christians, by imitating St. Paul in self-denial and self-sacrifice for others, will be imitating Christ who suffered all privations and sufferings, even death itself, for the salvation of men.

CHAPTER XI

WOMEN OUGHT TO VEIL THEIR HEADS IN CHURCH, 1-16

1. Be ye followers of me, as I also am of Christ.
2. Now I praise you, brethren, that in all things you are mindful of me: and keep my ordinances as I have delivered them to you.
3. But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God.

1-16. Passing from their domestic (vii. 1 ff.) and social duties (viii. 1 ff.), the Apostle now proceeds to treat of the religious life of the Corinthians. He has learned of certain abuses that have crept into their religious assemblies, the first of which regards the headdress of women. Ladies should not appear in church without a covering for their heads, (a) because of their inferiority to men, as shown by the history of creation (verses 2-12), and (b) because nature itself, as well as Apostolic approval, suggests that they should wear veils at the sacred services (verses 13-16).

1. This verse really belongs to the end of the last chapter, and concludes the argument there given.

2. I praise you, etc. Although some of the Christians at Corinth had been guilty of faults, the Church on the whole, was deserving of praise for their faithfulness to the Apostle's ordinances, i.e., to the doctrines and the liturgical rules and regulations he had given them. He proceeds now to give some further "ordinances" for the correction of abuses that have sprung up among the faithful, on account of which he cannot praise them (verse 17).

Brethren (Vulg., *fratres*) is according to D E F G, Old Latin, and Peshitto; B & A C omit.

3. In ancient times women in the East and among the Ionic Greeks were degraded to the condition of slaves. Christianity gradually did away with this state of servitude. But it seems that some of the ladies in Corinth were carrying their emancipa-

4. Every man praying or prophesying with his head covered, disgraceth his head.

5. But every woman praying or prophesying with her head not covered, disgraceth her head: for it is all one as if she were shaven.

tion too far by declaring their perfect equality with men, and, consequently, by appearing in church to pray and prophesy with uncovered heads. This was contrary to the Word of God (Gen. iii. 16; 1 Tim. ii. 12, 13), which requires women to be in subjection, both in society, and in the family.

Wherefore the Apostle, calling the Corinthians' attention to something on which he, it appears, had not yet instructed them, says, **I would have you know**, etc., i.e., in the external organization of the Church the order of authority is as follows: God, Christ, man, woman. God is over the Sacred Humanity of Christ whom He raised from the dead, and to whom He gave all power in heaven and in earth (xv. 24 ff.; Matt. xxviii. 18; Acts xx. 28); Christ is over man in the government of His Church, and man is over woman in external authority, although woman is equal to man in her internal and individual relation to Christ (verse 5).

Every man may mean only every Christian man (Cornely); or, more probably, every man, Christian or non-Christian, since all mankind, by Christ's assumption of human nature, has been subjected to the authority of Christ (MacR.).

Woman (γύνή) here is used in a general sense, embracing both the married and the unmarried.

4, 5. **Every man** praying, etc., i.e., every man who attends the public religious assemblies of the Christians, whether leading in the prayers and prophecies, or joining in them **disgraceth his head** by having it covered, because to appear with a covered head before God was to imitate the Grecian slaves who thus used to come before their masters. It is a disgrace for man to wear the emblem of slavery before his Lord, since Christ has made us all free (Gal. iii. 28).

On the other hand, the woman who prays or prophesies at the public liturgical assemblies with head **not covered**, **disgraceth her head**, because she thereby shows that she is the equal of man and has no earthly superior, and by so acting she loses that modesty which is her charm and her glory. Only women of evil life

6. For if a woman be not covered, let her be shorn. But if it be a shame to a woman to be shorn or made bald, let her cover her head.

7. The man indeed ought not to cover his head, because he is the image and glory of God; but the woman is the glory of the man.

were accustomed to appear in public among the Greeks with unveiled heads.

As if she were shaven. For a woman to have her head shaven has always and everywhere been considered shameful (Isa. iii. 17, 24). The Hebrews used to shave the head of a woman accused of adultery (Num. v. 18); and Tacitus (*Germ.* xix) says the Germans cut close the hair of an adulteress. The Romans shaved the heads of their dancing women, who were mostly harlots, and the Greeks did the same to their female slaves. A woman, therefore, who appeared at the public devotions of the Christians with head uncovered was acting, says St. Paul, like a slave and an adulteress.

It is to be noted that St. Paul is insisting here on women's heads being covered; he is not now considering whether it is right or wrong for them to prophesy. Later on (xiv. 34) he will utter his disapproval of women's performing such functions.

6. If a woman will cast aside the covering for her head, which is required by divine ordinance, let that also be taken away which nature has provided (St. Chrys.), namely, her hair, and thus she will be subjected to the ignominy of a slave and an adulteress, as explained in the preceding verse.

7. The Apostle now appeals to the story of creation to show that woman is inferior to man, and so ought to be subordinated to him. Man should not cover his head in the public religious assemblies of the faithful because that is a sign of subjection and inferiority; whereas he is by divine ordinance the glory of God and lord of the earth, having been created immediately in the image and likeness of God (Gen. i. 27; ii. 7). But woman ought to observe the contrary practice, since she was created only indirectly, that is, through man, to God's image and likeness, and is consequently subject to man (Gen. ii. 18) and the glory of man. All this, of course, regards only the exterior and physical condition of woman. Her spiritual part is not unlike that of man's; she has an intellect and a will, and is capable of grace and glory.

8. For the man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man.

9. For the man was not created for the woman, but the woman for the man.

10. Therefore ought the woman to have a power over her head, because of the angels.

11. But yet neither is the man without the woman, nor the woman without the man, in the Lord.

12. For as the woman is of the man, so also is the man by the woman: but all things of God.

8, 9. That woman is the glory of man, as man is the glory of God, is clear from the fact that woman was derived from man in her creation, and made for man (Gen. ii. 18, 21-23).

10. Since woman, by the law of her creation, is inferior to man, and ought consequently to be subject to him, she should **have a power over her head**, i.e., she should have a veil or covering on her head at public prayer, as a sign of the *power* (ἐξουσία) and authority which man has over her.

Because of the angels, i.e., women at the public Christian devotions ought to wear a veil in token of their modesty and submission, and also on account of the ministering angels who are present at the sacred functions of the faithful (iv. 9; Eph. iii. 10; Heb. i. 14), and who would be deeply grieved if women did not observe the modesty and appearance of submission which God desires of them (Gen. xlviii. 16; Tob. xii. 12; 2 Mac. iii. 25; Matt. xviii. 10; Luke i. 19; Apoc. viii. 13). Erasmus paraphrases this passage as follows: "If a woman has arrived at that pitch of shamelessness that she does not fear the eyes of men, let her at least cover her head on account of the angels who are present at your assemblies."

Another explanation, that by "angels" are meant the priests (Ambrosiaster) is very improbable. The opinion of Tertullian that there is question here of demons who might lust after the unveiled women, or incite men to do so, is to be rejected.

11, 12. The Apostle corrects a possible wrong inference from what he has just been saying about woman's inferiority and subjection to man. It must not be concluded from this that **in the Lord**, i.e., among Christians, woman is in a state of servitude with regard to man, as was the case too often among the pagans. Christianity has so vindicated the dignity of woman that

13. You yourselves judge: doth it become a woman, to pray unto God uncovered?

14. Doth not even nature itself teach you, that a man indeed, if he nourish his hair, it is a shame unto him?

15. But if a woman nourish her hair, it is a glory to her; for her hair is given to her for a covering.

16. But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, nor the church of God.

ordinarily she and man are mutually dependent, each needing the help of the other, and both sharing in the same means of grace and personal sanctification which Christ has bequeathed to His Church.

For as the woman is of the man, etc. There is a certain natural equality and dependence between man and woman; for whereas the latter in her creation was made from man, being drawn from Adam's rib, the former in the propagation of the human species is born of woman.

All things, i.e., all that I have said about man and woman are according to the ordinance of God.

13-15. At the time St. Paul wrote, it was the custom, among civilized peoples, for men to wear their hair short, and for women, on the contrary, to have long hair. Anything opposed to this was looked upon as a disgrace and a shame. The Apostle, therefore, now appeals to this universal practice, which seems to have had its origin in the natural fitness of things, and he asks the Christians to judge for themselves if it is not unbecoming in a woman to pray at the public devotions without some extra covering for her head, since at all other times she is supposed to wear her hair long as a covering provided for her by nature.

If a woman nourish her hair, etc. "The true glory of every creature of God is to fulfil the law of its being. Whatever helps woman to discharge the duties of modesty and submissiveness assigned to her by God is a glory to her" (Lias).

16. If any man seem, etc., i.e., if there is anyone at Corinth who is not convinced by what has been said against women appearing in church with uncovered head, we (*ἡμεῖς*), i.e., St. Paul and the other Apostles, have one final answer to give him, which is that the Apostles and the various Churches founded

by them do not recognize any such custom as would tolerate women to assist at the public religious assemblies of the faithful without a veil.

Church (Vulg., *ecclesia*) should be "churches" (*ecclesiae*), to correspond with the Greek.

THE APOSTLE CONDEMNS THE ABUSES AT CORINTH THAT WERE CONNECTED WITH THE LOVE-FEASTS AND WITH THE CELEBRATION OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST, 17-34

17-34. Besides the abuse of women's appearing at the religious assemblies of the faithful in Corinth with uncovered head, there were others of a far more serious nature, namely, those in connection with the love-feasts and with the celebration of the Holy Eucharist.

In imitation of our Lord, who instituted the Holy Eucharist in the evening, after the eating of the Paschal Supper, it seems that the early Christians also, at least in Corinth, held the Eucharistic celebration in the evening and accompanied it by a common supper or feast which, because it was intended to strengthen the bond of charity among the faithful, was called the Agape, or love-feast. The necessities of this supper or love-feast were contributed by those who could afford to bring something with them, and especially by the rich, who thus came to the assistance of the poor. Soon, however, abuses crept in. The poor were crowded out or prevented from getting their share of the supper, some drank to excess, and divisions and animosities were excited among the brethren. Naturally all this was a bad preparation for, and a great irreverence towards, the Eucharistic celebration which in Corinth at this time appears to have followed the common supper.

St. Paul, therefore, in this section of the present chapter sternly reproves the Corinthian abuses in connection with the love-feasts (verses 17-22); he recalls the fact and purpose of the institution of the Holy Eucharist (verses 23-26); he shows what preparation is required of him who would partake of this great Sacrament (verses 27-29); arguing from effects he points out that due preparation has been wanting in many of the Corinthian faithful

(verses 30-32); and finally, he lays down some practical rules to be observed at the love-feasts (verses 33, 34).

It is to be noted here that what has just been said, as well as what will be further said in the following verses with regard to the common meal which the faithful of Corinth were accustomed to take before the Eucharistic celebration when St. Paul wrote the present letter, refers, according to the opinion universally accepted, to the Agape. This traditional view of the Agape as a Christian feast is mainly traceable to what St. Paul says in the verses that follow. But Msgr. Batiffol (*Dict. de Théol. Cath.*, tom. I, col. 551-556) takes a very different view of the question. He holds that there is no trace of the Agape, as we here understand it, either in this Epistle or anywhere else, before the end of the second century, and that St. Paul in the following verses is condemning at most an attempt on the part of the Corinthians to introduce a common meal along with the Eucharistic celebration.

In trying to prove his opinion, however, we feel that Msgr. Batiffol has not done justice to the present passage of St. Paul. His analysis of the text almost entirely overlooks the force of verses 21 and 33, which, we believe, are nearly unintelligible, short of the explanation commonly given of the Agape. Having just condemned (verse 19) the dissensions among the Christians when they came together, the Apostle says in verses 20, 21: "When therefore you come together to the same place it is not to eat the Lord's supper (implying that previously it was otherwise); for at the repast each one *first takes* (προλαμβάνει) his own supper, and one is hungry, while another is overindulged." And then, after showing what an injury such actions are to the poor, and in particular what a bad preparation they make for the Eucharistic celebration which was supposed to follow, the Apostle concludes his instructions by saying in verse 33, "Wherefore, my brethren, when you come together for the repast, wait for one another."

It seems plain from these verses that St. Paul is not imposing a fast on the faithful before Communion. He is taking it for granted that the common meal before the celebration of the Eucharist is according to existing custom in Corinth, and there-

17. Now this I ordain: not praising you, that you come together not for the better, but for the worse.

18. For first of all I hear that when you come together in the church, there are schisms among you; and in part I believe it.

fore legitimate; but what he is condemning is the uncharitable and unbecoming manner in which this meal came to be held. In verse 21 he is complaining of the private, individual taking of this meal, with the result that some are overindulged while others are deprived; and in verse 33 he points out that these abuses can be corrected, not by giving up the practice of the common meal, but by *waiting for one another*. What meaning would these two verses convey if at Corinth there were no such thing as a common meal accompanying the Eucharistic celebration, or if St. Paul were resisting any attempt to establish such a custom?

In view of these remarks we see no sufficient reason for departing from the traditional explanation of the present passage.

17. Now this, namely, what I have just said about women veiling their heads in church. Such is the reference of "this," according to the best interpreters (St. Aug., St. Thomas, Corn., etc.); and the best reading of the verse is as follows: "Now commanding this (concerning women covering their heads) I do not praise (what I am going to speak about) that you come together not unto the better, but unto the worse."

Not praising you, etc., i.e., I do not praise you for the abuses that take place in your religious assemblies.

The first "you" in this verse ought to be omitted.

18. First. The Apostle begins with the first more serious abuse, which is in connection with the love-feast; the second grave abuse he begins to discuss in xii. 1.

I hear, etc., i.e., he learned it through the letter he had received.

In the church. Literally, "In church," i.e., in your religious assemblies, whether these took place in a building set apart for the purpose, or not. Most likely the Corinthians had no special buildings at so early a date which they called churches. In fact, it was very probably only about the third century that the name *church* was given to any building.

There are schisms, etc., i.e., divisions and dissensions. Schisms

19. For there must be also heresies: that they also, who are approved, may be made manifest among you.

20. When you come therefore together into one place, it is not now to eat the Lord's supper.

in a strict sense are not thought of here; neither are the various factions of the first part of the Epistle in question.

In ecclesiam of the Vulgate should be *in ecclesia*.

19. St. Paul says that he is prepared to believe the report that there are divisions among the Corinthians at their religious meetings, because he knows, from his acquaintance with human weakness and perversity, that even heresies, i.e., pertinacious denials of doctrine and ruptures in faith and with the authority of the Church, must also arise. If it is necessary (Matt. xviii. 7; Luke xvii. 1) that these more serious divisions should occur, it is not wonderful that among the faithful there should be divisions and misunderstandings, bad as these latter also are. The Apostle is speaking in general about heresies, and does not mean that any actually existed at Corinth.

Some authors (MacR., Rick., etc.) hold that "heresies" here means nothing more than *sects* or *factions*, since the Greek term, here used occurs in eight other places of the New Testament (Acts v. 17; xv. 5; xxvi. 5; xxiv. 5, 14; xxviii. 22; Gal. v. 20; 2 Peter ii. 1), and in six of these it means *sect*.

That they also, etc. "Also" should be omitted. The meaning is that God permits heresies in order to test and purify the faith of true Christians, as gold is tried, but not consumed by fire.

The second *et* of the Vulgate should be away.

20. It is not now, etc. Some say the meaning is: It is not possible or lawful to eat the Lord's Supper. But more probably the Apostle means that, while the Corinthians ostensibly came together for the purpose of showing mutual charity and celebrating the Holy Eucharist, their conduct was such that they violated the whole spirit of the Lord's Supper.

The Lord's supper doubtless embraces both the Agape (verses 21, 33) and the Eucharistic celebration (verse 23). It was a reproduction of our Lord's Last Supper, which consisted of the Paschal Supper and the reception of the Holy Eucharist.

Was it the common practice at that time to partake of the

21. For every one taketh before his own supper to eat. And one indeed is hungry and another is drunk.

love-feast before receiving Holy Communion? A definite answer to this question cannot be given. According to St. Chrysostom the offering and reception of the Eucharist preceded the Agape; according to others the reverse order was observed. It seems certain that at this early date there was no definite practice in the matter. For from Acts ii. 46; xx. 11 it appears that the "breaking of bread," i.e., the celebration of the Eucharist, occurred before the common meal; while from the present passage of St. Paul it is clear that, at Corinth at least, the same order was observed which our Lord made use of at the Last Supper (Cornely).

After some years, it appears, the love-feast was separated from the Eucharistic celebration, perhaps on account of abuses such as St. Paul is here condemning. The Eucharist was then celebrated in the morning. This was the case in Bithynia in the early part of the second century (Plin., *Ep.* 96 *ad Trajan.*). In the middle of the second century Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i. 67) describes the Eucharistic feast, but is silent about the Agape. Tertullian (*De Corona*, c. 3) speaks of the Eucharist as celebrated before daylight. The same author in describing the Agape, makes no reference to the Eucharist (*Apol.* 39).

When the general practice of fasting before receiving Holy Communion began we cannot determine with certainty. St. Aug. (*Ep.* cxviii., *ad Januar.*) thought it came down from the Apostles. But if this were so, it would be difficult to explain the contrary custom at Corinth in St. Paul's time and also the ruling of the 29th canon of the Third Council of Carthage (A.D. 397): *Ut sacramenta altaris nonnisi a jejunis hominibus celebretur, excepto uno die anniversario, quo cena Domini celebratur.* Sozomen, the historian, says there was no obligation in Egypt in the fifth century to receive Holy Communion fasting. Cf. MacR., h. 1.

21. That the religious celebrations of the Corinthians had become unlike the Lord's Last Supper, which they were supposed to reproduce, was evident from the way the faithful in their religious assemblies conducted themselves. Those who could afford it brought food and drink for the common meal, as was

22. What, have you not houses to eat and to drink in? Or despise ye the church of God; and put them to shame that have not? What shall I say to you? Do I praise you? In this I praise you not.

23. For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread,

24. And giving thanks, broke, and said: Take ye, and eat: this is my body, which shall be delivered for you: this do for the commemoration of me.

the proper custom, but they did not have a common meal of which all partook.

For every one, etc. Literally, "For in the eating every one taketh first his own," etc., i.e., all those who brought provisions ate them in private, and before all had assembled or distribution could be made, with the result that the poor were left **hungry**. And the rich, instead of helping to feed the poor, gave themselves to excessive drinking. It seems that the members of those cliques spoken of in verse 18 used to share their provisions together to the exclusion of those who belonged to a different clique, some of whom had no provisions.

Is drunk (*μεθύει*) is softened down by some commentators to signify something short of actual intoxication.

22. Indignant over these abuses the Apostle asks the Corinthians if they had not their own homes in which to hold their banquets without injury to the poor.

Despise ye the church of God, etc., i.e., do you despise the assembly of the faithful which is composed of rich and poor, all of whom are equal before God? It is an injury to the poor to exclude them as unworthy from a part in the common meal at the religious assemblies, and thus **put them to shame** by making more conspicuous their poverty. For such actions the Apostle cannot but blame those who are guilty.

Do I praise you? Better, "Shall I praise you?"

23, 24. St. Paul could not praise the Corinthians for their conduct at the Eucharistic celebration; for their behavior there was a gross profanation of a sacred banquet solemnly instituted by Christ Himself. In order that they may the better understand the gravity of their actions he starts here to recall to their minds what he had taught them when founding the Church at Corinth.

For I have received, etc. It is not entirely clear whether St.

Paul received from the Lord what follows by direct revelation or through others. But the emphatic use of the pronoun (*ἐγὼ γάρ*), together with what he says in ix. 1 and in Gal. i. 12, makes it almost certain that what he is about to say was vouchsafed to him from the Lord's own lips, perhaps during his three years' stay in Arabia (Gal. i. 17). He does not say "from the disciples of the Lord," but "from the Lord" (*ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου*.)

Which also I delivered unto you. He had made known to the Corinthians very exactly what had been revealed to him concerning the Blessed Eucharist. St. Paul's account agrees very closely with that given by his disciple St. Luke (Luke xxii. 19, 20), who had learned of this great event directly from the Apostle himself.

That the Lord Jesus, the same night, etc. St. Paul gives this circumstance to show the intimate connection between the Eucharist and the Passion of our Lord, and to set out more in relief the enormous ingratitude and irreverence of the Corinthians who dared to celebrate the august mysteries with so much laxity and neglect.

Took bread, etc., as recorded also in Matt. xxvi. 2-29; Mark xiv. 17-25; Luke xxii. 10-20.

Giving thanks (*εὐχαριστήσας*). The same expression is found in St. Luke's account of the Last Supper (Luke xxii. 19), and is equivalent to the "blessing" (*εὐλογήσας*) of Matt. xxvi. 26; Mark xiv. 22. The blessing contained thanksgiving for that which was blessed (Westm. Ver.), and hence our Lord both gave thanks and blessed the bread before the consecration.

Broke. Estius and others say the breaking of the bread was only after the consecration, as in the Mass. Some hold there were two breakings, one into larger pieces before the consecration, and one into smaller pieces afterwards.

The words **take ye, and eat** are not in any of the best MSS., and are omitted by the Fathers and many of the oldest versions. They were most likely inserted here by a copyist from Matt. xxvi. 26. Likewise the words **shall be delivered** (Vulg. *tradetur*), having only the Vulgate and Syriac versions with Theodoret in their favor, must be omitted. Somewhat better supported, but still insufficiently so is another reading, "which is

25. In like manner also the chalice, after he had supped, saying: This chalice is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as often as you shall drink, for the commemoration of me.

broken for you," κλάμενον (E F G K L P, Rec., Peshitto, and some copies of the Old Latin). Two Greek-Latin MSS. (*Codex Claromontanus* of the 6th cent., and the *Codex Sangermanensis* of the 9th cent.) render κλάμενον here by *frangitur*.

The best reading, therefore, of this passage in the four oldest and best MSS. (B & A C) is: "This is my body, which is for you" (τοῦτό μού ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν). The words, which is for you, i.e., which is given for you, taken in conjunction with the clearer words used with the chalice, point unmistakably to the sacrificial character of the Eucharistic celebration at the Last Supper.

This do for the commemoration of me. On this passage the Council of Trent (Sess. XXII. can. 2) says: "If anyone say that by the words, 'This do in remembrance of me,' Christ did not constitute His Apostles priests, or did not ordain that they and other priests should offer His body and blood, let him be anathema."

25. In like manner, etc. As He had done for the bread, so immediately afterwards He did for the chalice, i.e., He took it, gave thanks to the Father, blessed it, etc.

After he had supped, i.e., after the Paschal supper was in the main over. St. Luke speaks to the same effect, "after he had supped" (Luke xxii. 20). St. Matthew says, "While they were at supper" (Matt. xxvi. 26); and St. Mark has, "Whilst they were eating" (Mark xiv. 22). The expression, μετὰ τὸ δειπῆσαι, which occurs only in St. Paul and in St. Luke, was perhaps added to render more definite the vague indication of time conveyed by the ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν of Sts. Matt. and Mark (Cornely). Taking together all four accounts we can plainly see that the institution of the Blessed Eucharist took place while our Lord and the disciples were still at the supper table, but towards the end of the meal. Very probably the fourth sup of wine, which legally terminated the Jewish Paschal supper, was the one consecrated by the Saviour.

This chalice, etc., i.e., the contents of this chalice is "my

26. For as often as you shall eat this bread, and drink the chalice, you shall shew the death of the Lord, until he come,

blood," as directly stated in Matt. xxvi. 28, and in Mark xiv. 24: "This is my blood."

The new testament in my blood, i.e., the contents of this chalice is the seal or ratification of the New Covenant through my blood. The reference is clearly to the words of Moses (Exod. xxiv. 8) who, after he had read the book of the covenant and the people had promised to observe it, sprinkled them with sacrificial blood saying, "Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you." In like manner Christ's sacrificial blood, which the disciples drank, is the seal of the New Covenant. As in the case of Moses there was present real sacrificial blood which had been offered in sacrifice, so at the Last Supper there was present real blood—the blood of Christ, which was being offered in sacrifice for the sins of the world (Heb. viii. 8; Jer. xxxi. 31-34).

This do ye . . . for the commemoration of me. These words, in connection with the chalice, are found only in St. Paul. They emphasize the commission given to the Apostles and show the purpose of the Eucharistic celebration.

This, i.e., the whole action which Christ had just performed in changing bread and wine into His body and blood and in giving the sacred species to others for their spiritual nourishment, this the Apostles and their successors were to repeat and continue till the Second Coming of the Lord at the end of the world, as St. Paul indicates in the following verse.

26. The Apostle now shows what the celebration of the Eucharistic banquet was intended to commemorate or recall. The words **eat**, **drink**, and **shew** are all in the present tense in the original.

You shall shew the death of the Lord. The Eucharist is the commemorative sacrifice of the death of Christ, and this death is mystically signified by the separate consecrations of the two distinct elements of bread and wine.

Until he come, i.e., until Christ comes at the end of the world. This proves that the Eucharistic sacrifice is to be continued till the end of time, and, since sacrifice requires a priest, it also proves that our Lord ordained the Apostles priests at the Last

27. Therefore whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord.

28. But let a man prove himself: and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of the chalice.

Supper, and at the same time empowered them to provide their successors to the end.

27. From the real presence of Christ's body and blood under the Eucharistic species St. Paul deduces the momentous conclusion that **whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice**, i.e., any one who receives our Lord's body and blood under either species **unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord**, i.e., shall be guilty of an outrage, grave or slight, according to his condition, against the flesh and blood of Christ. It is a proof of the total presence of Christ under either species that the Apostle says **whosoever shall eat, or drink**, etc. (ἅ πινῃ, with B & A C D E F G, Vulg., Peshitto, etc.), **shall be guilty of both** the body and the blood of the Lord. "Many Protestant translators, including those of the A. V., have evaded the force of the *or*, from a fear lest they should thereby be countenancing the denial of the Cup to the laity" (Lias).

Further, it is a proof of our Lord's Real Presence in the Eucharist that St. Paul says the unworthy communicant is guilty of the *body and blood of Christ*. How could these words be true if the Eucharist were only a figure or a sign of Christ's flesh and blood? Who would say that to show irreverence, however great, to a king's picture or statue would make the offender guilty of the body and blood of the king? Such language would be ridiculous in its absurdity.

28. In order to avoid an unworthy Communion the Apostle now says, **let a man prove himself**, i.e., let each one before communicating carefully examine his conscience to see whether he is in proper spiritual condition to receive so great a Sacrament. The Council of Trent (Sess. XIII. cap. 7) says on this subject: "The custom of the Church declares that such *proving* is necessary, as that no one conscious to himself of mortal sin, however contrite he may think himself, ought to approach the Holy Eucharist without previous sacramental confession."

That bread should be "the bread"; in the Vulgate *illo* should be omitted.

29. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord.

30. Therefore are there many infirm and weak among you, and many sleep.

31. But if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged.

32. But whilst we are judged, we are chastised by the Lord, that we be not condemned with this world.

29. This verse brings out still more clearly the thought of verse 27. The words **unworthily** and **of the Lord** are not in the four oldest MSS.; but they are found in D E F G, Vulg., Peshitto, which, together with the sense of the verse in itself and from the context, make the meaning clear: **He that eateth and drinketh** without distinguishing the body (from other food), **eateth and drinketh judgment to himself**. The implication here, as in verse 27, seems to be that the unworthy, or non-discerning communicant, is guilty of mortal sin, although one guilty of lesser sins would also be liable to *judgment*, i.e., to chastisement, if he did not duly prepare himself before receiving Holy Communion.

In the Vulgate *indigne* and *Domini* should probably be omitted.

30. **Therefore**, i.e., because you Corinthians have not communicated with devout dispositions you have been visited with many afflictions, such as sickness, death, and the like. Many of you are **infirm** (*ἀσθενεῖς*), i.e., ill, and **weak** (*ἄρρωστοι*), i.e., in poor physical condition, and **many sleep**, (*κοιμῶνται*), i.e., many of you have been taken away by premature death. The word employed for "sleep" here is used to signify the death of those who are finally saved in ten other places of the New Testament. These temporal chastisements visited for unworthy Communion on those who had died in the Lord could mean that the unworthiness was due only to venial sins, or to mortal sins and sacrilegious Communion which had been repented of before death.

31. Here the Apostle tells the Corinthians that if they would be more careful to examine and purify their consciences before Communion and do penance for their past sins they would not be visited with so many temporal sufferings and punishments. He includes himself in the first person plural to soften the rebuke he is giving the faithful.

32. A word of consolation is added now. St. Paul tells the faithful that if the Lord chastises them in the present life for

33. Wherefore, my brethren, when you come together to eat, wait for one another.

34. If any man be hungry, let him eat at home; that you come not together unto judgment. And the rest I will set in order, when I come.

their sins of irreverence toward the Holy Eucharist, it is only for the purpose of leading them to repentance and to the avoidance of further sins, so that they may escape eternal condemnation with this wicked world.

This verse, which is evidently addressed to those who are among the saved, is a proof that the term "sleep" of verse 30 refers to the dead that are saved.

33, 34. Referring again to the abuses connected with the Agape, the Apostle urges the Corinthians, when they assemble for their love-feasts and the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, to have their meal in common. Let them wait to eat, until all are present, so that the rich may not overindulge themselves, nor the poor be deprived of their portion.

If some get so hungry that they cannot wait for the common meal, they should take something at home beforehand; so that they may **come together**, i.e., to the assembly, with spiritual profit, and not **unto judgment**, i.e., not to their spiritual ruin and condemnation. The love-feast was not instituted to satisfy hunger, but to nourish charity among the faithful; and likewise, the religious assemblies of the Christians were not the places to have profane banquets, but were for the purpose of celebrating the Holy Eucharist.

And the rest, etc., i.e., the Apostle will complete his instructions to the faithful at Corinth when he arrives there in person; he will supplement his written word by oral teaching: "from which it is evident," says St. Thomas on this verse, "that the Church has many things from the direction of the Apostles which are not found in Sacred Scripture."

CHAPTER XII

This and the two following chapters are of unusual importance to us, inasmuch as they afford at least a partial view of a very rich phase of the life of the early Christians which is unknown and obscure, not only to our present generation, but was also to St. John Chrysostom and his age.

In the preceding chapter St. Paul treated of certain abuses which had been allowed to creep into the religious assemblies of the faithful at Corinth. The first (xi. 2-16) had to do with the disgraceful practice of women taking part in the public devotions of the Church with uncovered head, and the second more serious abuse (xi. 17-34) concerned the love-feasts and the celebration of the Eucharistic banquet. The Apostle now turns his attention to another grave matter in connection with the Corinthian religious assemblies, namely, the misuse on the part of the faithful of those spiritual gifts which were intended for the profit of others than the possessors of them, and which are commonly called *gratiae gratis datae*. In the present chapter (verses 1-30) he discusses the origin and utility of these gifts. Then, to correct the error of the Corinthians, who, in their vanity and pride, put the possession and use of such gifts above everything else, he eulogizes charity and shows it to be far superior to all other spiritual endowments (xii. 31-xiii. 13). Next, because the Corinthians had neglected prophecy for the more showy gift of tongues, the Apostle proves that it is more excellent to prophesy than to speak with tongues (xiv. 1-25). The Apostle terminates his remarks on these subjects by laying down certain practical rules for the use of spiritual gifts in the public devotions of the Corinthians (xiv. 26-40).

In the first years of the Church these abundant visible outpourings of the Holy Spirit were needed to water the plant of faith; but when once the faith had taken strong root in the world, and had grown, like the mustard-seed, to spread its branches far and wide, there was no longer need of these extraordinary visible

1. Now concerning spiritual things, my brethren, I would not have you ignorant.

2. You know that when you were heathens, you went to dumb idols, according as you were led.

manifestations of the divine authority that was behind it and that gave it meaning and sanction. Cf. Cornely, h. 1.

THE NATURE, ORIGIN AND PURPOSE OF SPIRITUAL GIFTS, I-II

I-II. Before their conversion the faithful were blind, without understanding; and they were led away to dumb idols who could give them no instruction in religious matters. But now they have criterions by which to test these things, and they can tell whether those appearing to be endowed with extraordinary gifts have received real powers from God or not. And if one really possesses any of these *freely given graces*, St. Paul would have the faithful understand that such gifts are to be used for the spiritual benefit of those in the Church who have not been favored with them.

1. **Now** (δε). This adversative connective shows, in opposition to the last clause of the preceding chapter, that St. Paul considered the necessity of instruction on spiritual gifts too imperative to be left until he would visit the Corinthians and impart to them oral directions and enlightenment.

Spiritual things (πνευματικῶν), i.e., spiritual gifts, which are called by theologians, *gratiae gratis datae*, as opposed to *gratia sanctificans* or *gratum faciens*. The latter, like the gifts of the Holy Ghost, is for the spiritual benefit of those who possess it; while the former are bestowed on certain individuals, not for their own sanctification, but for the spiritual advantage of others in the Church (Rom. xii. 6). These transient spiritual gifts are bestowed quite independently of the merit or personal sanctity of those who receive them. This the Corinthians did not understand.

2. **You know**, etc. The majority of the faithful of Corinth were of Gentile origin, as this verse proves, and St. Paul reminds them of their ignorant condition as pagans. They **went to dumb idols**, who were unable to instruct them in spiritual matters, as they **were led** by the devil (x. 19 ff.; Eph. ii. 2), or by evil custom.

3. Wherefore I give you to understand, that no man, speaking by the Spirit of God, saith Anathema to Jesus. And no man can say the Lord Jesus, but by the Holy Ghost.

4. Now there are diversities of graces, but the same Spirit;

5. And there are diversities of ministries, but the same Lord;

6. And there are diversities of operations, but the same God, who worketh all in all.

That when (ὅτι ὅτε). This is the best reading, although with it something like ἥτε ἀπαγόμενοι must be supplied to make the sentence grammatically complete. Westcott and Hort read: ὅτι ποτέ, *that once*, but this is a mere conjecture to avoid a main sentence without a verb. The sense is not altered in either reading.

3. Wherefore. This most probably goes back to the ignorance mentioned in verse 1. Verse 2, then, is parenthetical.

I give you to understand, i.e., he lays down a general rule by which the Corinthians may judge whether a fact which seems extraordinary really comes from God. No one who curses Jesus is speaking under the influence of the Holy Ghost, while he who confesses that Christ is God does so, as a rule, because he is moved by God's Holy Spirit.

That no man, speaking, etc., i.e., no one speaking with tongues, by the Spirit of God, i.e., under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, saith Anathema, etc., i.e., curses Jesus, or declares that Jesus is accursed of God. Anyone who denies or doubts the Divinity, humanity, mission, doctrine or the like, of Christ, cannot be moved by God's Spirit; and consequently all extraordinary phenomena that may proceed from such a one must be ascribed to diabolical influences.

On the other hand, no one can say the Lord Jesus, i.e., can confess that Christ is the Lord of all things, and therefore God, but by the Holy Ghost, i.e., except he be influenced by divine inspiration (Matt. xvi. 17). The faithful, then, are to be guided in their interpretation of extraordinary phenomena on the part of individuals by this general rule: If any extraordinary effect is directed against the faith of Christ, and tries to do away with Christ's doctrine, it is to be considered as coming from diabolical sources; but if, on the contrary, it promotes the faith and love of Christ, it is to be judged as proceeding from the Holy Ghost.

7. And the manifestation of the spirit is given to every man unto profit.

4-6. The pagans believed that various gifts were to be attributed to different gods; for example, wisdom to one, power to another, and so on. Lest the faithful should be guilty of a similar absurdity regarding the gifts bestowed on them St. Paul tells them, (a) that while **there are diversities of graces**, i.e., different gifts bestowed on different persons, they all proceed from the same Holy Spirit; (b) that while **there are diversities of ministries**, i.e., different ministers, such as Apostles, bishops, priests and the like, in the Church, they all depend on the same divine Lord and Mediator, Jesus Christ, who is head of the whole Church; (c) that while **there are diversities of operations**, i.e., various marvelous effects, such as cures, conversions and the like, produced by the different ecclesiastical ministers according to their varied gifts, all are due to the one God, the Father, who, as the first cause of all things, **worketh all in all**, i.e., moves all creatures to their actions, and coöperates with the operations of all (cf. St. Thomas, h. 1.).

In these three verses we have an explicit mention of the Three Persons of the Blessed Trinity. They are introduced to emphasize the argument, beginning with the Holy Ghost, and leading us step by step to the one source of all (Estius).

The interpretation just given of these verses, which, in the main, is that of St. Thomas and Fr. Cornely, seems to us most correct; but there are other authorities who explain them somewhat differently. The **graces**, they say, mean the gifts possessed by different individuals; the **ministries**, or ministrations (*διακονιῶν*) are the services rendered by those who possessed those gifts; and the **operations** refer to the effects, or results of the services of those who possessed the gifts. Cf. MacR., h. 1.

7. And the manifestation, etc., i.e., the manifestation which the Spirit produces, the spiritual gifts just spoken of. These gifts not only proceed from the same Spirit, but are ordained to the same end, namely, to the advantage and utility of the Church.

8-10. The enumeration of the gifts of the Spirit in these verses was not intended to be complete, since in verse 28, Rom. xii. 6-8, and Eph. iv. 11 different accounts occur. There is much disagreement among interpreters as to the nature and classifi-

8. To one indeed, by the Spirit, is given the word of wisdom: and to another, the word of knowledge, according to the same Spirit;

9. To another, faith in the same Spirit; to another, the grace of healing in one Spirit;

10. To another, the working of miracles; to another, prophecy; to another, the discerning of spirits: to another, diverse kinds of tongues; to another, interpretation of speeches.

cation of these various gifts of the Spirit. See Cornely, h. l.; Le Camus, *L'Œuvre des Apôt.*, tom. I. pp. 20 ff.; tom. II. pp. 147 ff.; Prat, *La Théol. de Saint Paul*, tom. I. pp. 175 ff.; Fouard, *Saint Paul, Ses Miss.*, 10^a ed. p. 209; etc.

8. The word of wisdom means an understanding of the deeper mysteries and truths of faith, such as was possessed especially by the Apostles, together with the faculty of explaining them in a clear and convincing manner to others.

The word of knowledge is an understanding of the ordinary truths of religion, coupled with the ability to explain them by the use of rational arguments, illustrations and the like. Knowledge is the gift possessed in particular by Doctors of Theology. With the Corinthians these gifts were not the result of study, but of the extraordinary "manifestation of the spirit" (verse 7).

9. Faith does not mean the theological virtue which all must possess to be saved, but that special faith which can move mountains (Matt. xxi. 21) and work other miracles. It was this faith that the Apostles asked for, saying: "Increase our faith" (Luke xvii. 5).

The grace of healing, such as was possessed by St. Peter, whose shadow delivered the sick from their infirmities (Acts v. 15), and by St. Paul, whose handkerchiefs and aprons dispelled diseases and evil spirits from the bodies of the infirm (Acts xix. 12).

10. The working of miracles (*ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων*), i.e., the power of producing more extraordinary effects, such as raising the dead (cf. Matt. vii. 22; xi. 20 where *δύναμις* is also used in the sense of miracle).

Prophecy, i.e., the gift, not only of foretelling the future, but of so speaking under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost as to instruct, edify and move the faithful by exhortation (xiv. 3).

The discerning of spirits, i.e., the faculty of distinguishing the

11. But all these things one and the same Spirit worketh, dividing to every one according as he wilt.

12. For as the body is one, and hath many members; and all the members of the body, whereas they are many, yet are one body, so also is Christ.

works of the Holy Ghost from those that come from Satan or from mere human agencies (xiv. 29).

Diverse kinds of tongues, i.e., the gift not only to preach, but especially to pray and speak in strange languages.

Interpretation of speeches, i.e., the power of interpreting those who praised God in strange tongues. The Apostle speaks at length in chapter xiv about these last gifts.

11. All these gifts that have just been mentioned, so different from one another, are due, not to the merits or sanctity of those who possess them, but to the one Holy Spirit who freely distributes them to whom He wishes, according to the needs of the Church.

THE UNITY OF CHRIST'S MYSTICAL BODY, 12-30

12-30. St. Paul now illustrates how the different members of the Church, with their various gifts are all one, as parts of the one mystical body of which Christ is the head. As the human body is one, in spite of its various members, and as its vital spirit is one, although manifesting itself differently through different members, so it is with the mystical body of Christ, of which He is the Head and His Holy Spirit the soul.

If, therefore, all the spiritual gifts possessed by the different members of the Church come from the same divine source and are intended for the same lofty purpose, which is the good of the Church, those who have the more humble gifts ought to be contented, not envying those who are more highly endowed (verses 12-20); and, contrariwise, those who have been more especially favored must not look down upon or despise their less fortunate brethren (verses 21-30).

12. **So also is Christ.** Literally, "So also Christ." On this passage, where we might expect the word "Church" to be in the place of the term "Christ," St. Chrysostom remarks: "As head and body are one man, so, says the Apostle, the Church and Christ are one; wherefore he puts *Christ* instead of *the Church*."

13. For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether bond or free; and in one Spirit we have all been made to drink.

14. For the body also is not one member, but many.

15. If the foot should say, because I am not the hand, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body?

16. And if the ear should say, because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body?

17. If the whole body were the eye, where would be the hearing? If the whole were hearing, where would be the smelling?

18. But now God hath set the members every one of them in the body as it hath pleased him.

19. And if they all were one member, where would be the body?

20. But now there are many members indeed, yet one body.

13. St. Paul now proves that the faithful are all one. All have been regenerated by means of the same Baptism, operating in virtue of the same Holy Spirit, and all are incorporated in the same Jesus Christ, so that they form one mystical body, vivified by Christ's Holy Spirit. All former differences of religion, race, or condition of life have thus been obliterated.

We have all been made to drink, i.e., all the faithful have participated in the effusion of gifts, some ordinary, some extraordinary, which the one Holy Spirit has poured out on them in the Sacrament of Confirmation. Here St. Chrysostom says: "He seems to me now to speak of that descent of the Holy Ghost which is after Baptism, and before the reception of the (Eucharistic) mysteries" (cited by Rick.). In the early days of the Church Confirmation was administered immediately after Baptism, as in the Greek Church still (cf. Prat, *La Théol. de Saint Paul*, tom. II. p. 379).

Gentiles (Vulg., *gentiles*) is "Greeks" in the MSS.

14. In verse 12 the analogy was drawn between the oneness of the human body and that of Christ's mystical body, the Church, and it was shown to be complete. In verse 13 it was proved that the Church is one. Therefore the conclusion now follows that the human body is one, although its parts and members are many.

15-20. The relation of the different members of the human body to the whole are now indicated, leaving it to be understood that similar relations exist among the faithful with regard to

21. And the eye cannot say to the hand: I need not thy help; nor again the head to the feet: I have no need of you.

22. Yea, much more those that seem to be the more feeble members of the body, are more necessary.

their common mystical body, the Church. The Apostle observes (a) that the greater or lesser nobility of a member of the human body does not make it more or less a part of the body; and (b) that the variety which exists between the different members is necessary for the perfection and harmony of the whole. Because the foot performs less noble functions than the hand, or the ear than the eye, it does not follow that the foot and the ear are not a part of the body, as well as the hand and the eye. Therefore, those who have received more simple spiritual gifts must not thence think they are not a part of the Church. Moreover, the needs of the human body are many. But if all the members had the same function, if all "were the eye," for example, how could the various necessities of the whole be satisfied? Or if all the members were equal, "where would be the body?" since each member has to perform a different function. The diversity of the members is, therefore, according to the will of God, both in the human body and in Christ's mystical body; whence it follows that he who is not content with the gifts he has received acts contrary to the will of God.

21, 22. St. Paul in the preceding verses has been arguing that those Christians whose special spiritual endowments were of a lower order ought, nevertheless, to be satisfied with their necessary part and functions in the mystical body of Christ. In the following verses (21-30) he wishes to repress pride and contempt in those who were more highly favored toward those of humbler gifts. The human body and its members continue to be the means of illustrating what goes on in the Church.

The nobler members of the body, such as the eye with regard to the hand, or the hand with regard to the feet, cannot disdain the need of the lower member which it must have. Nay more, certain members of the body, like the heart, brain and stomach, while of far greater delicacy than certain others, are really *more necessary* (*μᾶλλον*, meaning *more*).

Some think that the Apostle is still speaking in verse 22 of

23. And such as we think to be the less honourable members of the body, about these we put more abundant honour; and those that are our uncomely parts, have more abundant comeliness.

24. But our comely parts have no need: but God hath tempered the body together, giving to that which wanted the more abundant honour,

25. That there might be no schism in the body; but the members might be mutually careful one for another.

26. And if one member suffer anything, all the members suffer with it; or if one member glory all the members rejoice with it.

27. Now you are the body of Christ, and members of member.

the outer organs, and that by the **more feeble members** he means the more delicate, such as the eye.

23. The less honourable members (Vulg., *ignobilia membra*) doubtless refers to such as the feet, the legs and the like; while the **uncomely parts** (Vulg., *inhonesta*) are those of which St. Thomas says: *Dicuntur autem membra aliqua inhonesta in sanctis non propter aliquam peccati turpitudinem, sed propter inobedientiam membrorum genitalium subsecutam ex peccato originali*. Therefore we think **more abundant honour** means more clothing, and likewise **more abundant comeliness** means more covering.

24. But our comely parts, such as the face, the hands and the like, have no need of external covering. This clause really belongs to the preceding verse.

But God hath tempered, etc., i.e., God has so arranged the various parts of the human body that men by natural instinct are led to give **more abundant honour**, i.e., more clothing to some of its parts than to others.

25, 26. God has wisely provided for the care of the different members of the human organism, in order that they may all perform their respective functions and work in beautiful harmony. Hence it is that the various parts share in one another's pain or pleasure, and that some of the less honorable parts can least be dispensed with. So it is in society and in the Church; often those members who perform the lowest functions are the most indispensable to the welfare of the whole.

Anything (Vulg., *quid*) in verse 26 should be omitted, as wanting in the Greek MSS.

27. What has been said of the human body is now applied to Christ's mystical body, the Church, where also there is one unifying vital principle, but different members. **You are the**

28. And God indeed hath set some in the church; first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly doctors; after that miracles; then the graces of healings, helps, governments, kinds of tongues, interpretations of speeches.

body of Christ, i.e., the faithful taken together constitute the body of the Church.

Members of member, i.e., the faithful are mutually dependent on one another; or (according to a better Greek reading, given below), taken severally, they are the members of the Church.

The Vulgate, *et membra de membro* represents the Greek reading καὶ μέλη ἐκ μέλους; but the best Greek has καὶ μέλη ἐκ μέρους, *et membra ex parte*, i.e., taken together you are the body of Christ, but taken singly or individually, you are His members.

28. Although the members of the Church constitute one body, if taken together, they are distinct, with various offices and functions, if considered severally. The Apostle now speaks of some of the extraordinary gifts and powers that were bestowed on different individuals in the Church. There is no question here of the ordinary functions of the various grades in the hierarchy, that is, of bishops, priests and the like; but only of those classes that possessed certain extraordinary powers, such as prophecy. Surely οὗς μὲν was intended to be followed by οὗς δέ, but the construction is broken by πρῶτον.

Hath set. Literally, "Hath placed."

In the Vulgate and in our version nine gifts are enumerated here, as in verses 8-10, above; but the Greek text and the old Latin versions contain only eight, **interpretations of speeches** being omitted.

The church, i.e., the Church in general, not only the Corinthian Church.

Apostles, i.e., those endowed with extraordinary powers for preaching the Gospel to unbelievers in new parts of the world.

Prophets, . . . doctors. See above, on verses 8-10. The first three classes are named here in the order of their dignity. Prophets, as such, always spoke under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost; whereas doctors, although especially instructed and assisted by the Holy Spirit, made use of their natural knowledge in their exposition of doctrine.

Miracles . . . the graces of healings. See above, on verses 8-10.

29. Are all apostles? Are all prophets? Are all doctors?

30. Are all workers of miracles? Have all the grace of healing? Do all speak with tongues? Do all interpret?

31. But be zealous for the better gifts. And I shew unto you yet a more excellent way.

Helps, i.e., persons having extraordinary powers for looking after and assisting the poor, the sick and the destitute.

Governments, i.e., those gifted for the exercise of authority over external affairs in the Church.

Kinds of tongues. See above, on verse 10. The Apostle mentions this gift last probably to show the Corinthians that it was not so important as they had thought.

Interpretations of speeches (Vulg., *interpretationes sermonum*) should be omitted here.

29, 30. Although the most of these extraordinary graces were generally found in different individuals, it sometimes happened that several of them were possessed by the same person. Nevertheless, the Apostle is referring in these verses to the general rule, according to which the different gifts were variously distributed among the members of the Church. The conclusion is that all should be contented with the graces which God has been pleased to bestow upon them, not envying one another, not despising one another.

31. While St. Paul admonished the Corinthians to be satisfied with the gifts they had, he did not mean to forbid them to strive for higher perfection; rather, he desired this. But in order to attain to greater excellence and the more perfect state, it is necessary to enter upon and learn the way of charity, the only road to true perfection. Accordingly, before going into a more exhaustive consideration of those gifts which the Corinthians erroneously sought above everything, the Apostle unfolds to them (xii. 31-xiii. 13) the treasures of charity, without which all other endowments can profit them nothing. The present verse, therefore, serves as a transition from this to the following chapter.

The Corinthians are encouraged to seek the **better gifts** (τὰ κρείττονα, as in the Rec., with D E F G, Old Latin and Vulg.), i.e., the gifts that were really more useful for themselves and for the Church, although not so showy. A better reading of the

above phrase has, "greater gifts" (τὰ μέγιστα, as in B & A C), i.e., gifts of a higher order than those he has been speaking about, and which he will discuss at length in chapter xiv; these "greater gifts" are faith, hope and especially charity.

CHAPTER XIII

OTHER GIFTS ARE OF NO ACCOUNT WITHOUT CHARITY, 1-3

1. If I speak with the tongues of men, and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal.

2. And if I should have prophecy and should know all mysteries, and all knowledge, and if I should have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing.

1-3. In these verses St. Paul treats of the necessity of charity; in verses 4-7 he portrays its exalted qualities; and finally, in the last section, verses 8-13, he shows that charity outlasts all other virtues.

It was very shortsighted and foolish in the Corinthians to be seeking so ardently the extraordinary gifts of tongues, of prophecy, and of faith, while neglecting, in their hot pursuit of them, the very foundation of them all, that without which they all were as nothing, namely, charity.

1. If I speak. Literally, "Even if I were to speak."

The charity of this chapter is that supernatural virtue by which we love God above all things for His own sake, and our neighbor as ourselves for God's sake. It is either identical with sanctifying grace, or inseparable from it. The Apostle begins by comparing it with the gift of tongues, because the Corinthians esteemed the latter so highly. He tells them that if they could speak the languages of all men, and knew the mysterious modes of intercommunication which the angels have, it would be of no use to them without charity: they would be like **sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal**, i.e., of some little use perhaps to others, but of no real profit to themselves, so far as eternal life is concerned.

As (Vulg., *velut*) is not in the Greek.

2. Charity is now compared with four other gifts,—prophecy,

3. And if I should distribute all my goods to feed the poor, and if I should deliver my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing.

wisdom, knowledge and faith. See on xii. 8-10. If one should possess all these extraordinary gifts and powers, and still be without the love and grace of God, he is nothing in the sight of heaven.

3. Here the Apostle compares charity with those gifts, such as "healings," "helps," and the like (xii. 28), which have mercy towards others for their object. Endowed with these extraordinary graces one might be willing to give all he possessed to relieve the distresses of others, he might be ready to cast himself into flames to save his neighbor; but all such heroic acts would profit their doer nothing toward life eternal without the supernatural virtue of charity.

The reading *ἵνα καυθήσομαι* or *καυθήσωμαι*, "that I may be burned," has the majority of MSS. and the versions in its favor. But the three oldest MSS. give: *καυχήσωμαι*, "that I may glory." The latter reading, however, is out of harmony with the context and with the argument of St. Paul, because it introduces a bad motive for the heroic actions performed, and this alone would vitiate them, independently of the absence of charity. But St. Paul is supposing the actions to be good, to be extraordinary, yet of no worth in the supernatural order, simply on account of a want of charity in their author.

There is more probably no question in this verse, of one's suffering martyrdom (against Estius), because martyrdom always confers sanctifying grace, and therefore charity; whereas St. Paul is here supposing the absence of charity. It is better, then, to hold with Cornely that there is here question of death endured for some natural motive.

THE QUALITIES OF CHARITY, 4-7

4-7. A striking difference between charity and the extraordinary gifts which the Corinthians prized is this, that it alone suffices for eternal life, while they are supernaturally of no avail without charity. The reason is that charity is the root and life-

4. Charity is patient, is kind: charity envieth not, dealeth not perversely; is not puffed up;

5. Is not ambitious, seeketh not her own; is not provoked to anger, thinketh no evil;

6. Rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth with the truth;

7. Beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things.

giving principle of all the other virtues. In order that we may better understand the nature of this exalted gift, St. Paul now describes its characteristics and actual fruits,—both negative and positive. If the qualities enumerated seem to pertain directly only to the neighbor, it is (a) because the love of God is presupposed, as included in charity towards the neighbor; and (b) because there was more need of insisting on the love of one's neighbor.

4. **Charity is patient**, i.e., it endures evils without complaint or anger.

Is kind, i.e., is useful in helping others.

Charity envieth not, i.e., is not offended or saddened at the good or success of others.

Charity dealeth not perversely, better, "is not boastful," "is not pretentious" (οὐ περπερεύεται) in words and actions.

Is not puffed up, i.e., is not proud or boastful in thought.

5. **Is not ambitious**. Better, "Behaveth not amiss" (οὐκ ἀσχημονεῖ).

Seeketh not her own, to the detriment and disregard of others.

Is not provoked to anger for injuries received.

Thinketh no evil, i.e., does not take account of the evils she suffers and put them down against the evil-doer; she bears no malice.

6. **Rejoiceth not in iniquity**, i.e., is not pleased with the evil others do.

With the truth, i.e., with the virtue and goodness that appear in others.

7. **Beareth**, etc. (στέγει,) i.e., tolerates and excuses all the defects and faults of one's neighbor.

Believeth . . . hopeth . . . endureth, i.e., according to the Greek Fathers, charity believes only good things about one's neighbor, so far as possible, hopes for the best concerning him, and bears

8. Charity never falleth away: whether prophecies shall be made void, or tongues shall cease, or knowledge shall be destroyed.

9. For we know in part, and we prophesy in part.

10. But when that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away.

11. When I was a child, I spoke as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child. But, when I became a man, I put away the things of a child.

patiently all the evils that come from men. St. Aug. and St. Thomas, however, think the meaning is that charity believes all that God has revealed, hopes for all that He has promised, and endures with patience the fulfillment of His promises.

CHARITY OUTLASTS ALL OTHER GIFTS, 8-13

8-13. Not only is charity the root and soul of all other virtues, but it endures forever. From their very imperfection charismata must cease, while charity abides even after hope has vanished and faith has given way to vision.

8. The Apostle now contrasts the durability of prophecies, of tongues, and of knowledge with that of charity. The former, he says, must cease either during this life, or at its close; whereas the latter will last throughout eternity.

There is no question in this verse of charity or grace being inadmissible in this life. Such a stupid heresy of the Reformers is clearly refuted by the Apostle in ix. 27. Cf. *Conc. Trid.*, Sess. VI., cap. XV. can. 27.

9, 10. The reason is now given why charismatic gifts will cease hereafter, but charity will remain; namely, charisms, such as wisdom, knowledge and prophecy, like earthly knowledge also, are possessed only in part, i.e., they are imperfect, incomplete, because they suppose and depend on faith; but faith by its very nature is obscure. But when faith yields to vision in the life to come, then those gifts which have depended on it will also pass away. Charity, it is true, will be more perfect in heaven, but it will remain specifically the same.

Perfect refers to the vision of God hereafter in which we shall see and know all things.

11. The imperfection of faith and of present knowledge, as compared with charity and the vision of God, is here beautifully

12. We see now through a glass in a dark manner; but then face to face. Now I know in part; but then I shall know even as I am known.

13. And now there remain faith, hope, and charity, these three: but the greatest of these is charity.

illustrated by the difference between childhood and perfect maturity.

12. By another striking illustration the same truth is enforced; and while the Apostle has been speaking of charismatic knowledge, commentators are generally agreed that he now includes all our present knowledge of divine things.

We see now, etc. Better, "For now we see," etc. (*βλέπομεν γάρ*), i.e., in the present life we do not know God directly, as He is in Himself, but only through the medium of creatures or of revelation, which, like a dim mirror, reflect the divine perfections only incompletely.

A glass, etc., means a mirror, which in ancient times was made of brass or polished steel, and, unlike our modern looking-glasses, reflected the object only dimly and imperfectly.

In a dark manner, i.e., obscurely, both because our knowledge of God is not immediate, and because our minds cannot now penetrate and understand with perfection the great mysteries which God has revealed to us (cf. Num. xii. 6-8).

But then, i.e., in the blessedness of heaven, we shall see God **face to face**, i.e., clearly and distinctly as He is in Himself.

Now I know in part, etc., i.e., in this present life I know only imperfectly, in an indirect and obscure manner; **but then**, i.e., in heaven, I shall know God and divine things immediately and perfectly, as God will know me. St. Paul does not mean that our knowledge of God will be equal to His understanding of us, but only that it will be similar; it will be direct and perfect in its kind.

13. But this happy state is reserved for the life to come.

Now, i.e., in the present life, **there remain**, etc. The Apostle insists on the permanent necessity in this life of the theological virtues, as contrasted with the transient character and utility of the charisms. **Faith, hope, and charity** are the very foundation of the Christian life; and hence they are far superior to those extraordinary gifts, such as, tongues and prophecy, which serve

only a passing need in the Church. But of these three theological virtues charity is the most excellent, because, while faith gives place to vision (2 Cor. v. 7) and hope to possession (Rom. viii. 24), charity remains throughout eternity.

Protestant commentators hold generally that faith and hope, as well as charity, remain in the future life; but this is opposed to St. Paul's plain teaching in 2 Cor. v. 7 and in Rom. viii. 24, just cited.

CHAPTER XIV

1. Follow after charity, be zealous for spiritual gifts; but rather that you may prophesy.

By his glorious tribute to charity the Apostle tried indirectly to withdraw the Corinthians from their inordinate desire for charisms. But even in their pursuit of these special gifts they were greatly mistaken in that they considered the ability to speak with tongues more excellent than prophecy, which they regarded as little above ordinary preaching. The aim of the present chapter is to correct this error and to show that prophecy is in every way more useful than speaking with tongues.

PROPHECY IS SUPERIOR TO THE GIFT OF TONGUES, 1-6

1-6. After eulogizing charity in the preceding chapter the Apostle now adds a final word, exhorting the faithful to strive for its possession. If they have this most excellent virtue, it is not forbidden them to be zealous also for gifts more unusual, though less perfect. But in seeking these latter, they should desire rather to prophesy than to speak strange tongues, for prophecy is more useful to the faithful.

1. **Spiritual gifts** are those mentioned in xii. 8-10.

Prophecy. The gift of prophecy in the early Church consisted not only in foretelling the future, but also, and especially in the ability extemporaneously to preach and exhort the faithful under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. Although prophecy is here compared only with the gift of tongues, it seems the Apostle rated it above all other charisms.

2. For he that speaketh in a tongue, speaketh not unto men, but unto God: for no man heareth. Yet by the Spirit he speaketh mysteries.

2. **Speaketh in a tongue**, i.e., in a strange language unknown to him before, and which neither the speaker, nor the hearer for the most part understood. The gift of tongues is frequently mentioned in the New Testament. In Mark xvi. 17 there is question of speaking "with new tongues"; and in Acts ii. 4; x. 46; xix. 6; and in 1 Cor. xii-xiv "tongues" are spoken of in different ways. There are various opinions regarding the nature of this gift. (a) Some Rationalists think it consisted in certain inarticulate and unintelligible sounds and cries uttered in a state of enthusiasm. But such an explanation is directly contrary to the obvious meaning of those passages of Scripture in which this gift is mentioned, and also to the manner in which it was regarded by those who heard the strange tongues on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii. 6 ff.). (b) Bisping and others believe it gave the faculty of speaking in the primitive language of our first parents. But if this were so, we could not explain the clear declarations of Scripture about *divers tongues*, and *new tongues*. (c) We hold, therefore, the common view that the gift in question meant the ability to speak in one or more foreign languages unknown to the speaker before, and for the most part unintelligible both to himself and to those who heard him. Thus on the day of Pentecost the languages spoken by the Apostles were not understood by any except those to whom they were native (Acts ii. 8, 11). In Corinth it seems the strange tongues were not understood by any who heard them, nor as a rule by those who spoke them. Hence there was always need of an interpreter, or of the gift of interpretation on the part of the speaker.

Speaketh not unto men, etc. This shows that the gift of tongues was not for preaching and teaching, but for praying to God.

No man heareth, i.e., no one understood the strange language.

By the Spirit, i.e., with his soul and heart stimulated to utterance, although he would not understand. Since the article is not used with "spirit" in the Greek, it is better to understand the reference to be to the mind rather than to the Holy Ghost,

3. But he that prophesieth, speaketh to men unto edification, and exhortation, and comfort.

4. He that speaketh in a tongue, edifieth himself: but he that prophesieth, edifieth the church.

5. And I would have you all to speak with tongues, but rather to prophesy. For greater is he that prophesieth, than he that speaketh with tongues: unless perhaps he interpret, that the church may receive edification.

as some think, and hence the term should not be written with a capital either in Latin or in English.

Mysteries, i.e., truths hidden by reason both of their nature and of the language in which they were expressed.

3. Very different from the gift of tongues, which was unintelligible, apart from interpretation, both to speaker and hearer, was the gift of prophecy, which was understood by all and useful to all. Through prophecy the speaker *edified* the faithful by exciting them to good endeavors; he *exhorted* them to fervor and zeal; he *comforted* them in their temptations and difficulties in pursuing virtue.

It is clear that prophecy here does not so much refer to foretelling the future and revealing secrets, as to the special power of instructing, exhorting and comforting the faithful.

4. **He that speaketh** in a strange language, which neither he nor his hearers understand, **edifieth himself**, not because he necessarily understands what he is saying, but because he knows he is praising God and speaking to God in prayer, and in consequence his faith and love are stimulated and increased; but he does not help others who do not know what he is saying.

He that prophesieth, on the contrary, helps not only himself, but the **church**, i.e., the assembly of the faithful who hear him. See on xii. 10, 28. Prophecy therefore is superior to the gift of tongues.

Dei of the Vulgate is not represented in the best Greek MSS.

5. The Apostle does not wish to be understood as despising the gift of tongues, which is very good in itself, but he would have the faithful seek rather to prophecy because that is more useful. "That which is useful only to the one who does it, is less than that which is useful also to others" (St. Thomas).

To prophesy. Literally, "That ye should prophesy."

Interpret. The power of interpreting the gift of tongues was

6. But now, brethren, if I come to you speaking with tongues, what shall I profit you, unless I speak to you either in revelation, or in knowledge, or in prophecy, or in doctrine.

7. Even things without life that give sound, whether pipe or harp, except they give a distinction of sounds, how shall it be known what is piped or harped?

8. For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?

9. So likewise you, except you utter by the tongue plain speech, how shall it be known what is said? For you shall be speaking into the air.

distinct from that gift, although both were sometimes united in the same person.

6. If I **come**, etc. To show the inutility of speaking with tongues the Apostle refers to himself as an illustration. He asks the faithful of Corinth what profit he could be to them on his forthcoming visit, if he should speak to them only in a strange language which they could not understand. It is evident that, if he is going to be useful to them when he comes, he must speak **either in revelation**, i.e., as a prophet, communicating to them what he has received through revelation; or **in knowledge**, i.e., as a doctor explaining doctrine.

Modern authorities are agreed that there is question here of only two charisms, **prophecy** and **doctrine**, being regarded only as external manifestations of what is possessed internally through revelation and knowledge.

THE GIFT OF TONGUES IS NOT USEFUL TO THE FAITHFUL WITHOUT THE GIFT OF INTERPRETATION, 7-20

7-20. By examples drawn from two musical instruments and from the daily use of language St. Paul now shows the uselessness of the gift of tongues, so far as the faithful in general are concerned. If, therefore, one has this gift, he should pray that he may also receive the power of interpreting what he says to others.

7-9. The necessity of intelligible language for purposes of utility is illustrated even by inanimate things. If a musical instrument, like the **pipe or harp**, gives only a confusion of sounds, makes only noise, who can perceive any melody or meaning in its music? It would not, in fact, be music at all. Likewise if

10. There are, for example, so many kinds of tongues in this world; and none is without voice.

11. If then I know not the power of the voice, I shall be to him to whom I speak a barbarian; and he that speaketh, a barbarian to me.

12. So you also, forasmuch as you are zealous of spirits, seek to abound unto the edifying of the church.

13. And therefore he that speaketh by a tongue, let him pray that he may interpret.

14. For if I pray in a tongue, my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is without fruit.

the trumpet gives not a distinct and intelligible sound, how shall the soldier, who waits upon its signal, know whether to prepare for battle or not? The same rule holds with regard to the gift of tongues. Unless one speaks in such a way as to be understood by others, he can be of no verbal profit to them, he may as well speak to the winds.

To the battle (verse 8) should be "for battle," as in the Greek.

10, 11. Another example is drawn from the use of foreign languages. The Apostle says there is a certain number of different languages in the world, none of which is without its own determined signification. But if one knows not **the power of the voice**, i.e., the meaning of the language, he will be a barbarian, etc., i.e., he will be making only unintelligible sounds. The ancients called everyone who did not understand their own language, or who spoke a language they did not understand, a barbarian.

12. The practical conclusion for the Corinthians then, is that since they are anxious to possess spiritual gifts, they should try to abound in those which especially contribute to the edification of the Church, such as prophecy.

Spirits means the gifts of the Spirit.

13. Since, therefore, the gift of tongues by itself does not edify or help the Church, he who has it ought to pray that he may also **obtain** the gift of interpreting his language. A less probable meaning of **let him pray**, etc., is that he should pray in a language which he already understands and can thus interpret to others.

14. If the gift of interpretation were joined to that of tongues, the latter would be more useful not only to others, but also to its

15. What is it then? I will pray with the spirit, I will pray also with the understanding; I will sing with the spirit, I will sing also with the understanding.

16. Else if thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that holdeth the place of the unlearned say, Amen, to thy blessing? because he knoweth not what thou sayest.

possessor. For if one prays in a strange language which he does not understand, his **spirit**, i.e., his soul with its affections, indeed, prays under the impulse of the Holy Ghost; but his **understanding**, i.e., his mind and human faculties, do not grasp the meaning of his prayer and of the words he is using.

15. **What is it then?** i.e., what are we to conclude from the foregoing? This, that we should try to have not only the gift of speaking strange languages, but also the further gift of interpreting them. Thus we shall be able to pray both affectively and understandingly.

There is no argument here against the use of Latin by the Church in her liturgy, or by nuns in the recitation of their office. For very wise reasons the Church has adopted a uniform and unchangeable language for her liturgy, and the faithful through their prayer books, as also the nuns in their office books, are supplied with vernacular translations of everything that is said in Latin.

16. A further argument is now given against the gift of tongues taken alone. If in the public religious assemblies of the faithful anyone, under the impulse of the Holy Ghost, shall **bless with the spirit**, i.e., shall praise God in an unintelligible language, how shall the unofficial person who is assisting the speaker be able to give the proper response to what he does not understand?

If thou shalt bless (εὐλογῆσθης, with Rec., F G, Vulg., and most copies of Old Latin). Better, "If thou bless" (εὐλογῇς, with B & A D E).

Unlearned (ἰδιώτης) means ordinarily a private person as opposed to one holding a public office, or an unskilled person as opposed to one having technical knowledge (Acts iv. 13; 2 Cor. xi. 6). The meaning here is one who unofficially represented the listeners in responding to the prayers of the person speaking in a tongue (Estius).

17. For thou indeed givest thanks well, but the other is not edified.
 18. I thank my God I speak with all your tongues.
 19. But in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I may instruct others also; than ten thousand words in a tongue.
 20. Brethren, do not become children in sense: but in malice be children, and in sense be perfect.

Amen. Literally, "The Amen," i.e., the response to prayers, meaning: *So be it*, or *So it is*. Justin Martyr (c. 150 A.D.) says this response was used in answer to the Eucharistic prayer in his day.

Thy blessing. Literally, "Thy thanksgiving," i.e., your prayer.

17. **Thou indeed givest thanks well**, etc., i.e., he who speaks with the strange language prays worthily to God, but **the other**, i.e., his neighbor, is not helped because he does not understand.

18, 19. To show his readers that he does not despise the gift of tongues, St. Paul now says he thanks God that he speaks in a tongue more than all of them. Literally, the best Greek is: "I thank God, I speak in a tongue more than you all" (γλώσση λαλῶ, with **Σ Δ Ε Φ Γ**, Old Latin, and Vulg. against γλώσσais λαλῶ of B and Peshitto). Nevertheless, he adds that **in the church**, i.e., in the religious assemblies of the faithful, he prefers to speak five words which he and his hearers understand than ten thousand words which, while they would edify himself, would not be understood by the faithful, and so would not edify or help them.

20. Closing now what he has said about the inutility of tongues for the faithful, the Apostle exhorts the Corinthians not to be **children in sense** (ταῖς φρεσίν), i.e., *in mind and intelligence*, but to become **perfect** (τέλειοι), i.e., *full grown* men and women, who are not carried away by showy things like the gift of tongues, but prize rather things of greater usefulness like the gift of prophecy. If they wish to be children in any respect, he tells them, let it be in regard to malice and sin, as our Lord Himself commanded (Matt. xviii. 3).

21. In the law it is written: In other tongues and other lips I will **speak to** this people; and neither so will they hear me, saith the Lord.

22. Wherefore tongues are for a sign, not to believers, but to unbelievers; but prophecies, not to unbelievers, but to believers.

PROPHECY IS MORE USEFUL THAN TONGUES ALSO FOR UNBELIEVERS,
21-25

21-25. While it is true that tongues are a sign for unbelievers, yet even for them prophecy is more excellent.

21. **The law** here means the entire Old Testament, as in Rom. iii. 19; Gal. iii. 23, 24; iv. 5; John x. 34; xii. 34, etc. The particular reference is to Isaias xxviii. 11, 12, cited freely, but more according to the Hebrew than the LXX.

In other tongues, etc. Literally and directly the Prophet is foretelling the coming of the Assyrian conquerors whose barbarous and unknown language the Jews should be constrained to listen to in punishment for having mocked at the utterances of the Prophets and complained of their obscurity (Rick.).

And neither so will they hear. Better, "And even so they shall not," etc. The Prophet also foretells that the Jews will not be moved to repentance by this punishment, but will persevere in their incredulity.

Now these incredulous Israelites were a type of the unbelievers of the Christian era who would not be converted in spite of God's efforts, through the gift of tongues, to lead them to the faith; and the Assyrians were a type of those who in Corinth had the gift of tongues for the purpose of converting the unbelievers. Therefore, concludes the Apostle, just as the unbelieving Jews were not converted to repentance for their sins by the strange language of the Assyrians, so neither will the unbelieving pagans be converted to Christianity by listening to those who speak with strange tongues.

St. Paul deviates considerably from the text of Isaias, as we have it both in the Hebrew and in the LXX, but he is summing up, under divine inspiration, what the Prophet means, and applying it to the question in hand.

22. There are two explanations of this verse: (a) The gift of tongues is bestowed principally to excite the attention and curi-

23. If therefore the whole church come together into one place, and all speak with tongues, and there come in unlearned persons or infidels, will they not say that you are mad?

24. But if all prophesy, and there come in one that believeth not, or an unlearned person, he is convinced of all, he is judged of all.

25. The secrets of his heart are made manifest; and so, falling down on his face, he will adore God, affirming that God is among you indeed.

osity of unbelievers, and thus lead them to embrace the faith; prophecy, on the contrary, is primarily for the purpose of instructing, exhorting and comforting the faithful (Le Camus, Van Steenkiste, etc.). (b) The gift of tongues is a sign, i.e., an extraordinary and miraculous phenomenon to unbelievers, inasmuch as it makes manifest their infidelity, without, however, effecting their conversion. As the faithless Hebrews of the time of Isaias were unmoved by the strange tongues of the Assyrians whom God sent to them, so in the time of our Lord the incredulous Jews who heard the strange tongues of the Apostles on the day of Pentecost, instead of being thereby drawn to the faith, rather calumniated the Apostles, saying they were full of wine (Acts ii. 13, 14). The Apostle is not saying that the gift of tongues was not at times useful to the faithful (verse 4), but only that it was not primarily intended for the conversion of unbelievers. Prophecy, however, is a sign by which God approves, confirms and manifests the faith of believers, and which, when directed to unbelievers, leads them to conversion (Cornely, Brassac, etc.). This latter explanation is more in agreement with the following verse, which says that the gift of tongues rather caused unbelievers to deride and despise the faithful.

23. In this and the two following verses it is shown that prophecy is more useful than tongues even for unbelievers. The Apostle says here that if the whole local assembly of the faithful be gathered together, all speaking to God in tongues at the same time, and unlearned persons (*ιδιωται*), i.e., catechumens, persons not yet well instructed in the faith, or strangers, who had not before witnessed such an extraordinary phenomenon, or unbelievers were to come in, they would think the faithful beside themselves. The context shows that *ιδιωται* has not the same meaning here as in verse 16.

24, 25. If all prophesy, i.e., if all exhort and instruct together.

26. How is it then, brethren? When you come together, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a revelation, hath a tongue, hath an interpretation: let all things be done to edification.

27. If any speak with a tongue, let it be by two, or at the most by three, and in course, and let one interpret.

28. But if there be no interpreter, let him hold his peace in the church, and speak to himself and to God.

Probably this was done in different sections of the assembly so that there was no confusion.

Unlearned person, i.e., one not yet well instructed in the faith, or a strange Christian who had never before heard speaking with tongues (verse 23).

He is convinced, i.e., he is constrained to admit his sinfulness by force of the preaching of all; **he is judged**, i.e., he is induced to recognize the vanity of the excuses by which he formerly tried to justify himself. Thus the **secrets of his heart**, i.e., his half-hidden, half-forgotten sins, are brought vividly before his mind, so that, moved by sorrow and sentiments of repentance, he falls on his face, adoring God and proclaiming that God *is really in the preachers* (ἐν ὑμῖν) and speaking through them.

PRACTICAL DIRECTIONS FOR THE PUBLIC USE OF CHARISMS, 26-40

26-40. As the Apostle terminated his discussions on idol-worship and the love-feasts with certain practical rules which he wished to be observed (x. 14-xi. 1; xi. 33 ff.), so now, passing from the theoretical doctrine of charisms to practice, he instructs the Corinthians how they should make use of their gifts of tongues and of prophecy in the public assemblies of the faithful for the good of the Church.

26. **How is it then**, etc. Better, "What is it then," i.e., what are we to conclude from what has been said about tongues and prophecy? How are you to exercise these gifts in public?

Every one of you, i.e., all of you who have some special gift. Different ones had different gifts, as we see here. Some had a **psalm**, i.e., an original spiritual canticle with which to praise God, as the Blessed Virgin uttered the *Magnificat*, and Zachary, the *Benedictus*. St. Paul has not mentioned this gift before. Others had **doctrine**, i.e., "the word of knowledge" (xii. 8), which was

29. And let the prophets speak, two or three; and let the rest judge.

30. But if anything be revealed to another sitting, let the first hold his peace.

31. For you may all prophesy one by one; that all may learn, and all may be exhorted:

proper to Doctors; others again had a **revelation**, i.e., prophecy; still others had **tongues** and **interpretation**. All of these, the Apostle says, should be used for the purpose of edifying, 27, 28. After the general rule just given touching all charisms the Apostle now speaks in particular about tongues. If, in the public assemblies of the faithful there are present some who can speak with tongues, two or three of them may make public use of their gift, not together but in turn, provided there be present also an interpreter. If they have no interpreter, the gift of tongues must not be used except in private, for personal edification and communion with God (verse 4).

The church refers to the public assembly of the faithful, not to a building.

29. **The prophets**, etc., i.e., two or three of those who pretend to have the gift of prophecy, may also speak in the public assemblies; while **the rest**, i.e., they who have the gift of discerning spirits (xii. 10), should judge whether those who prophesy are real or false prophets.

30. From this verse it is clear that the prophets spoke one at a time, and that standing. If, while one was speaking, something were revealed by the Holy Ghost to another nearby, the first should draw his discourse to a close in favor of the other who wanted to speak.

31. **You may all prophesy**, i.e., all who have the gift of prophecy may exercise it, one after another, two or three at each assembly (verse 29), so that **all may learn**, i.e., so that all the faithful may have a chance to be instructed and consoled by those whose speaking is most useful to them individually. The prophets, like ordinary preachers, appealed differently to different individuals; and St. Paul is anxious that all the faithful may derive the utmost personal profit from the prophecies delivered to them.

Exhortentur of the Vulgate is to be understood in a passive sense.

32. And the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets.

33. For God is not the God of dissension, but of peace; as also I teach in all the churches of the saints.

34. Let women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted them to speak, but to be subject, as also the law saith.

32. The Apostle forestalls a difficulty against what he said in verse 30. Because the prophets spoke under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, they might say that they should not be interrupted in their discourses. In reply to this St. Paul says **the spirits of the prophets**, i.e., the gift of prophecy with which the prophets were endowed, was **subject** to them; they could exercise it or not at will. Hence there was no reason why they should not stop talking when requested.

33. Another reason why a prophet should desist from discoursing when another wished to speak was that discord and dissension might be avoided. God is the author and lover of peace and harmony (Rom. xv. 33), and in bestowing His various gifts He desires not to frustrate, but to promote these blessings.

As also, etc. Most editions and versions of the Bible join this final clause to the preceding words, and so the older interpreters understood the meaning to be: "I teach in all the churches that God is the God of peace" (Rom. xv. 33; Philip. iv. 9). But this opinion seems unlikely. In the first place, there appears to be little reason for telling the Corinthians that he taught everywhere such an obvious truth as this; and secondly, the phrase **I teach** is not in the best MSS. Hence nearly all modern commentators join the above clause to the following verse, and make it read: "As in all the churches of the saints, let women keep silent," etc. (Cornely, Bisping, Beelen, Van Steenkiste, etc.). The Vulgate follows the first opinion.

34. St. Paul here forbids women to speak publicly in the church, that is, to take public part in the solemn functions of the Church. A discharge of such offices implies a certain preëminence and superiority which does not belong to women, since by nature they ought to be subject to man, as the Law (Gen. iii. 16) requires.

It would seem from xi. 4, 5 that the Apostle implied that women might sometimes prophesy in the public religious assem-

35. But if they would learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home. For it is a shame for a woman to speak in the church.

36. Or did the word of God come out from you? or came it only unto you?

37. If any seem to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him know the things that I write to you, that they are the commandments of the Lord.

blies, provided they were veiled; but from the present passage, as well as 1 Tim. ii. 12, where he forbids women "to teach" in church, it must be concluded that in chapter xi he was speaking about all the women who attended the public church services and joined in the prayers and prophecies by a union of spirit, and by answering *Amen* (MacR.).

To be subject, is according to the infinitive reading *ὑποτάσσεσθαι* (D F G, Old Latin and Vulg.); but the imperative, "Let them be subject" (*ὑποτασσέσθωσαν*), is read in the three oldest MSS.

35. If women do not understand something that is said in church, they must not publicly seek an explanation there, but wait until they return home, and there interrogate their husbands. If unmarried women desire enlightenment and instruction, let them ask their fathers or brothers at home. The same reason holds for all, which is that it is unbecoming a woman's modesty to speak publicly in the church.

36. Perhaps the Corinthians would attempt to justify their abuses by saying they were following the practice of their Church; but St. Paul reminds them that they are not the mother, or the only Church in Christendom, and that, therefore, they must conform to the discipline and practice of the more ancient Church of the Apostles and first Christians.

37. The Apostle now tells the Corinthians that there is divine authority behind the precepts and rules he has been giving them. If any one **seem to be**, etc., i.e., thinks he has the gift of prophecy, or any other spiritual gift, he ought to know that what I write to you is according to the will of God. From this it is clear that St. Paul was conscious of the fact that he was speaking in the name of God and with the authority of Christ Himself (Rom. xii. 3; 1 Cor. ii. 10-16; vii. 40; 2 Cor. xiii. 3; 1 John iv. 6).

Commandments. The best authorities (B & A) read the singular "commandment"; others of less weight (D E F G) omit the term altogether; the Rec., Vulg., and Peshitto have the plural, as here.

38. But if any man know not, he shall not be known.

39. Wherefore, brethren, be zealous to prophesy: and forbid not to speak with tongues.

40. But let all things be done decently, and according to order.

38. **Know not**, i.e., will not recognize that what I have said comes from God, **he shall not be known** (*ἀγνοεῖται*, with **8 A D F G** and *Vulg.*), i.e., he shall not be recognized by God as a prophet or as having any supernatural gift; or, "let him remain not knowing" (*ἀγνοείτω*, with **B E** and *Peshitto*), i.e., let him continue in his wilful ignorance.

39, 40. Summing up what he has said about prophecy and the gift of tongues the Apostle encourages the brethren at Corinth to be zealous for the former, which especially edifies the Church, and not to forbid the latter, which also, in its degree, contributes to edification, in particular when united with the gift of interpretation. In general he desires all things to be done in a becoming manner (alluding to what he said about women not speaking in church) and in proper order (alluding to what he said in regard to speaking with tongues and prophesying one after another).

CHAPTER XV

The final problem discussed by the Apostle in this Epistle concerns the resurrection of the just, and indirectly of all the dead. It was doubtless among the other questions submitted to him by the Church of Corinth, but it is answered last because of its paramount importance, its unusual difficulty, and its far-reaching consequences.

The resurrection of the body had been denied by the Sadducees among the Jews (*Matt. xxii. 23 ff.*), it had been ridiculed by the pagans to whom St. Paul preached in Athens (*Acts xvii. 18, 32*), had been explained allegorically by certain Christians (*2 Tim. ii. 17*), and had been regarded as impossible and absurd by some of the Corinthians who were imbued with false philosophical notions (verses 12, 29). Those Christians who denied the resurrection of the body very probably denied also, or at least

doubted, the immortality of the soul. About the Resurrection of our Lord, however, it seems there was no special doubt at Corinth. The facts concerning it which had already been made known to the faithful needed only to be restated to evoke a general admission of, and an unshaken faith in it. Hence the Apostle begins to prove the reality of our future resurrection, first by an appeal to the Resurrection of Christ (verses 1-28), and then by referring to a practice of some of the faithful and to the lives of the Apostles (verses 29-34). The fact of the resurrection being established, its mode and the qualities of the resurrection body are next described (verses 35-58).

If it be objected that the argumentation of St. Paul at times (verses 30-32) seems to prove directly the immortality of the soul, and only indirectly the resurrection of the body, this is doubtless due to the fact that to the Corinthians, as to the Jews generally, the two questions formed but one in reality; the whole man, body and soul, was either living or dead hereafter. Thus perhaps St. Paul had explained the matter when preaching to them. Of course there were some among the Greek philosophers, like Plato and his school, who admitted the immortality of the soul, while rejecting the very thought of corporal resurrection (*Phaedo*, 114 C; cf. Seneca, *Ad Marcum* xxiv. 4). These philosophers regarded matter as the source of all evil, as a thing essentially alien to the Divine, and the only barrier between the soul and the Absolute Good. Immortality, therefore, for them meant entire freedom from the body and its evil influences. Hence the doctrine of the resurrection of the body was at first the chief stumbling-block to many of the pagans.

Again we must note that St. Paul proves explicitly only the resurrection of the just, although the general resurrection is referred to in a passing way (verse 26), and is taken for granted as positively declared in other passages of Scripture and in Christian tradition (Matt. xxv. 32, 33, 41; Acts xxiv. 15; John v. 18 ff.). Cf. Cornely, h. l.; Sales, h. l.; Coghlan, *St. Paul*, p. 154).

1. Now I make known unto you, brethren, the gospel which I preached to you, which also you have received, and wherein you stand;

2. By which also you are saved, if you hold fast after what manner I preached unto you, unless you have believed in vain.

3. For I delivered unto you first of all, which I also received: how that Christ died for our sins, according to the scriptures:

4. And that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day, according to the scriptures:

CHRIST HAS RISEN FROM THE DEAD, I-II

I-II. Lest the Corinthians might think that he was proclaiming a new doctrine, St. Paul first reminds them that the Resurrection of Christ was one of the chief teachings which he delivered to them when founding their Church. It was a doctrine confirmed by the unanimous testimony of the first Apostles, and made certain by numerous apparitions of the Risen Lord to a great variety of other witnesses. To the Apostle himself the Saviour had also finally appeared, so that the preaching of all the Apostles and the faith of all Christians might be one and the same in regard to this fundamental truth.

1, 2. I make known (*γνωρίζω*), i.e., I recall to your minds what I have already preached to you, which also you **have received**, i.e., have believed, and **wherein you stand**, i.e., which you have retained till now: **by which also you are saved**, i.e., in which you are being saved, and shall be saved eternally, if you **hold fast**, etc., i.e., if you retain, without addition or subtraction, the teaching I have given you. The reference is to all the doctrines, and in particular to that of the resurrection, which he explained to the Corinthians when founding their Church.

Unless you have believed in vain, i.e., unless there is no foundation for your faith.

3, 4. First of all, i.e., first in order of time, because first in importance. The Apostles were accustomed to begin their preaching with the death and Resurrection of Christ (Acts ii. 22 ff.; x. 4 ff.; xiii. 29 ff.; xvii. 18, 31).

Which I also received by direct revelation from Christ Himself (xi. 23; Gal. i. 11-19).

Died . . . according to the scriptures. Christ's death for our

5. And that he was seen by Cephas, and after that by the eleven.

6. Then was he seen by more than five hundred brethren at once: of whom many remain until this present, and some are fallen asleep.

sins had been foretold by Isaias (Isa. liii; cf. Gen. xxii; Deut. ix. 24-26; Zach. xii. 10).

Was buried. The aorist ἐτάφη expresses the single act. The burial of our Lord is explicitly mentioned here, as also in the four Gospels, to show the reality both of His death and of His Resurrection.

He rose. Literally, "Hath risen" (ἐγήγερται). Whereas the aorist was used to express the single act of our Lord's burial, the perfect is employed here to denote His continued existence after His Resurrection.

The third day. This circumstance is insisted upon in the various accounts of the Resurrection of our Lord, (a) because He had foretold that He would rise on the third day, and (b) because such a length of time was a proof that the Saviour was really dead.

According to the scriptures, Ps. xv. 10; Isa. liii. 10; Jonas ii. 10; Matt. xii. 40; xvi. 4, etc.

5. The apparitions of the Risen Lord were convincing proofs of the truth of His Resurrection. He was seen by **Cephas**, i.e., by St. Peter, as St. Luke tells us (Luke xxiv. 34); and afterwards by **the eleven**, i.e., by the whole Apostolic group, except Thomas, on the evening of the Resurrection (John xx. 19 ff.; Luke xxiv. 36).

For "eleven" (Vulg., *undecim*) the best MSS. and many versions have "twelve." Even without Judas the Apostolic college was called by its usual name, "the twelve."

6. **Five hundred brethren.** This is probably the apparition recorded in Matt. xxviii. 16-20, where the "eleven disciples" are explicitly mentioned, and some others are referred to as doubting. It is generally believed that these doubters were among the five hundred here alluded to by St. Paul, as it is very unlikely that any of the Apostles doubted after the appearance of our Lord to the eleven eight days after the Resurrection (John xx. 28, 29).

Of whom many. Better, "Most of whom" (ἐξ ὧν οἱ πλείονες).

7. After that, he was seen by James, then by all the apostles.

8. And last of all, he was seen also by me, as by one born out of due time.

9. For I am the least of the apostles, who am not worthy to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God.

What a convincing proof of the reality of the Resurrection that most of five hundred eyewitnesses were still living around A.D. 58!

Fallen asleep, i.e., have died in the Lord and are awaiting the resurrection.

7. **James**, i.e., James the Less, Bishop of Jerusalem (Matt. xiii. 55; Mark xv. 40; Gal. i. 19). St. Paul could hardly be referring to James the Greater who was long dead (Acts xii. 2) when he preached at Corinth and when this Epistle was written. The apparition here mentioned is not recorded elsewhere in Scripture.

Then by all the apostles. If St. Paul is relating the apparitions in chronological order, as he appears to be, and if the apparition of verse 5 was the same as that recorded in Matt. xxviii. 16-20, we must take the present one to be that which occurred at the Ascension (Luke xxiv. 50; Acts i. 9), as most interpreters think, or some other private manifestation just before the Ascension, of which we have no record.

8. St. Paul adds his own ocular testimony to that of the other Apostles. He saw the Risen Lord, when on the way to Damascus he was suddenly thrown to the ground and converted to the Apostolic life (Acts ix. 3 ff.; xvii. 27 ff., etc.).

As by one born, etc., i.e., by one who was spiritually immature, unformed, and unprepared to see Christ and be an Apostle. The older Apostles, including Matthias (Acts i. 21, 22), had been trained and developed in the school of Christ while the Saviour was yet on earth.

If the other manifestations of the Risen Lord which are recorded in the Gospels are omitted here, it is not because they were unknown to the Apostle, but because those given would have most weight with the Corinthians.

9. Another reason why St. Paul considered himself only as an abortive Apostle, unworthy to be named or classed with the rest, was because he had been a persecutor of the faithful (cf. Eph. iii. 8; 1 Tim. i. 12-16).

10. But by the grace of God, I am what I am; and his grace in me hath not been void, but I have laboured more abundantly than all they: yet not I, but the grace of God with me:

11. For whether I, or they, so we preach, and so you have believed.

10. In spite of what was just said St. Paul is **by the grace of God**, i.e., by the special grace of his Apostolate, what he is, namely, a true Apostle; and this grace has **not been void**, i.e., without fruit, in him, for he has **laboured more abundantly**, in preaching the Gospel to the Gentiles, than any other of the Apostles, or, perhaps, than all of them put together.

Yet not I, etc. Lest anyone should think him boasting, St. Paul immediately adds that his Apostolic fruitfulness has been due to the grace of God, with which he has coöperated.

Grace in this verse means the special grace of Apostleship (Eph. iii. 8; Gal. i. 15, 16; Rom. xv. 15, 16), not sanctifying grace.

11. After the digression of verses 9, 10 concerning his own Apostolate, St. Paul returns to his theme of giving evidence for the Resurrection of Christ, and concludes that he, the least of the Apostles, as well as **they**, i.e., the older Apostles, **preach** the same doctrine of the Resurrection, which the Corinthians **have believed** without hesitation.

THE NECESSITY OF BELIEVING IN THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST,

12-20a

12-20a. Before coming to the main theme of the present chapter, which is the resurrection of the just, and of all the dead, St. Paul wishes still further to strengthen and enlighten the belief of the Corinthians in Christ's glorious Resurrection, for it is upon this latter that he will base his great argument for the truth of the former. Therefore, after having cited in the preceding section what he considers to be the best witnesses for our Saviour's corporal Resurrection, he proceeds now to show the dire consequences that would necessarily follow if Christ were not truly risen. In such an event both the preaching of the Apostles and the faith of Christians would be without foundation. Wherefore, he concludes, we must accept the Resurrection of Christ.

12. Now if Christ be preached, that he arose again from the dead, how do some among you say, that there is no resurrection of the dead?

13. But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then Christ is not risen again.

14. And if Christ be not risen again, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain.

15. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God: because we have given testimony against God, that he hath raised up Christ; whom he hath not raised up if the dead rise not again.

12, 13. These verses show that some among the Corinthians denied the resurrection of the dead, but they imply that those same sceptics believed that Christ was truly risen; otherwise St. Paul's argument here would avail nothing against those who thought corporal resurrection was absurd and impossible (against MacR.). If they admitted, as seems evident, that Christ was risen, then it is possible for others to rise; and since the faithful form one mystical body of which Christ is the head (vi. 15; xii. 27), their resurrection must naturally follow upon His. It is unseemly that the head should live without the body. Moreover, Christians, by reason of their union and fellowship with Christ, have become the adopted children of God, having a right to share in Christ's inheritance and in the glory and honor, of body as well as soul, which is His. Thus the admitted Resurrection of Christ makes necessary the further admission that His members will also rise.

If it be objected that this argument proves only the resurrection of the just, of Christians who are united with Christ, we may reply with St. Chrysostom and St. Thomas that St. Paul was writing to, and arguing against those among the faithful of Corinth who denied the resurrection, but who did not consider that they thereby ceased to be Christians, united to Christ.

14, 15. Terrible consequences would follow, if Christ were not risen again. (a) Both the preaching of the Apostles and the faith of their converts would be **vain**, i.e., without foundation, because Christ pointed to His Resurrection as the supreme proof of His Divinity and Messiahship (Matt. xii. 38 ff.; John ii. 18 ff.); and if He be not truly risen, then we must conclude that He was a false prophet and has deceived both preachers and believers, and that there is no reason for either the Gospel or **faith**.

16. For if the dead rise not again, neither is Christ risen again.

17. And if Christ be not risen again, your faith is vain, for you are yet in your sins.

18. Then they also that are fallen asleep in Christ, are perished.

19. If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men **most** miserable.

The Apostles always proved the divine origin and authority of their preaching by appealing to the Resurrection of Jesus, holding that God would not have raised Him from the dead had He not been all He claimed to be, and had His doctrine not been true (Acts i. 22; ii. 24, 32; iii. 15, 21; iv. 10, 33; v. 30; x. 37; xvii. 31; Rom. i. 4; iv. 24, etc.).

(b) The Apostles would be **false witnesses of God**, because they have attributed to Him something He never did, namely, the raising of Christ from the grave. And if it is an evil thing falsely to attribute something of grave moment to another human being, what a serious offence it would be to bear similar false witness to God!

Again, both in verse 14 and in verse 15 should be omitted, as not represented in the Greek.

16. For if the dead, etc., a solemn repetition of the conclusion stated above, in verse 13, from which still further evils would result.

Again in this and in the following verse should be away.

17, 18. **Your faith is vain**, i.e., useless to you, for you could not be redeemed and freed from your sins by an impostor who claimed to be the true Messiah and Saviour of the world.

Then they also, etc. In the event that Christ is not truly risen, then those that died believing in Him and hoping for the remission of their sins through His redeeming merits, have died with their sins still upon them and are lost forever.

19. If Christ is not risen from the dead, faith in Him is not only useless for the living and the dead, but it is also a great detriment to Christians. If all our faith in Christ does for us is to give us in the present life a groundless hope of something false, causing us to deny ourselves many things which unbelievers enjoy, and bringing upon us numberless persecutions, then indeed we are of all men *more to be pitied* (ἐλεεινότεροι) than others.

20. But now Christ is risen from the dead, the first-fruits of them that sleep:

21. For by a man came death, and by a man the resurrection of the dead.

22. And as in Adam all die, so also in Christ all shall be made alive.

20a. But all these terrible consequences that have just been described are false, because Christ is truly **risen from the dead**, and neither our preaching nor your faith is vain.

CHRIST'S RESURRECTION INCLUDES THE RESURRECTION OF ALL MEN,
20b-28

20b-28. The Resurrection of Christ is connected with that of others as the first-fruits are connected with those that follow, which they precede in order of time and dignity (St. Thomas). As the spiritual death of Adam involved the physical and spiritual death of all his descendants, so the corporal Resurrection of our Lord involves the corporal resurrection of all the just. After He shall have conquered all the enemies of God and man, Christ, the representative man, will assume for Himself and for all the faithful the position which befits Him as man, that God may be all in all.

20b. **The first-fruits, etc.** Christ was the first man to rise from the dead, but He is only the "first-fruits," which shows there will be other fruits of the same kind. He is the model and pattern according to which all the just will rise. As the first-fruits of the harvest suppose the harvest, so the Resurrection of Jesus implies the harvest of the general resurrection of all the saved. The earth is the vast field in which our bodies like seed are planted, and since the first-fruits have already appeared, we can hope that soon the harvest will come.

Others, like Lazarus, who were called back to life before the Resurrection of Christ, were not raised to immortal life. Even those whom St. Matthew (Matt. xxvii. 52 ff.) speaks of as having come forth from their graves at the time of the crucifixion did not rise till after Christ had risen, and it is not certain that they did not die again.

21, 22. These verses show how Christ is the first-fruits of the dead. There exists the same relation between our Lord's Resurrection and that of the just, as between the death of Adam and

23. But every one in his own order: the first-fruits Christ, then they that are of Christ, who have believed in his coming.

24. Afterwards the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God and the Father, when he shall have brought to nought all principality, and power, and virtue.

that of his descendants. As Adam was the father of fallen humanity, so Christ is the Father of regenerated humanity. By one man human nature was corrupted and despoiled of its gift of immortality, and so it was becoming that by one other man human nature should be restored, in the resurrection of the body, to its primitive state and dignity. Therefore, as all those who are born of Adam are condemned to death, so all they who are reborn in Christ shall be regenerated unto immortal life for body as well as soul.

So also in Christ, etc. Most modern interpreters, like Cornely, Le Camus, Bisping, etc., understand these words to refer only to the just, because there is question, they say, only of a glorious and immortal resurrection like that of Christ's. Others, however, hold with St. Thomas that the Apostle is speaking of the resurrection of all,—of the good to a life of glory, of the bad to an existence of misery and shame (John v. 28 ff.; Dan. xii. 2).

Came of verse 21 is not represented in the Greek, although it is to be understood.

23. All shall rise again, but each in his own order of time and according to his dignity. Christ has risen first, preceding all others in time and dignity, and becoming the model of the resurrection of all the saved. Then they that are of Christ, i.e., the just, shall rise at His second coming (1 Thess. iv. 15).

Who have believed (Vulg., *qui crediderunt*) should be omitted, as wanting in all the best MSS. and in the early editions of the Vulg.

24. **Afterwards the end**, i.e., after the resurrection shall come the end of the present world, the present order of things (Matt. xxiv. 14; Mark xiii. 7; Luke xxi. 9), which shall be replaced by "a new heaven and a new earth" (Apoc. xxi. 1).

When he, i.e., when Christ, the Redeemer, shall have delivered up, better, "shall hand over" (*παράδιδω*, pres. subj., according to the best MSS., instead of *παράδω*, the aorist subj.), **the kingdom**,

25. For he must reign, until he hath put all his enemies under his feet.

26. And the enemy death shall be destroyed last: For he hath put all things under his feet. And whereas he saith,

27. All things are put under him; undoubtedly, he is excepted, who put all things under him.

i.e., the Messianic Kingdom of the Church Militant, to **God the Father**, who as Creator is Lord of all creatures. Although as God Christ is also Creator and equal to the Father, as man He is in a particular way the Lord of the Messianic Kingdom, the Church, which He has purchased with His blood. It is the militant part of this Messianic Kingdom which Christ as man is here said to hand over to His Father at the end of the world, as a conqueror hands over to his sovereign the fruits of the victory he has won. Obviously Christ as God will not cease to reign equally with the Father and the Holy Ghost after the victory is won. But He will not surrender to His Father the Church Militant, until it is in peace, that is, until He has vanquished and brought to nothing all the enemies of God, demons and evil men, who have opposed and persecuted His Church.

Principality . . . power . . . virtue, i.e., all rule, authority and power that is opposed to God and Christ's Kingdom, the Church.

25. **For he must reign**, etc., i.e., according to the decrees of God, Christ must govern and guide His Church, combat His enemies, and help the faithful, until He has triumphed over all the adversaries of His Kingdom, as was foretold in Psalm cix. 1. In the Psalm it is God the Father who is represented as saying to Christ: "Sit at my right hand, until," etc., but the Apostle is here plainly alluding to this Psalm and applying it to Christ, whose rule over the Church Militant will cease when the struggle finally gives way to victory. Of Christ's eternal reign with the Father and the Holy Ghost in the Church Triumphant (Luke i. 32, 33; Dan. vii. 14) there is no question here.

26, 27. Now St. Paul alludes to Psalm viii. 8 to show that in the resurrection **death** will be the last enemy to be destroyed. Literally the Psalm refers to man in the state of innocence, who was lord over visible creation; but in a mystical sense it points to the perfect man, Jesus Christ, the head of the human race.

Death is called the last enemy because, by retaining the bodies

28. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then the Son also himself shall be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.

of mankind in the dust of the earth, it does an injury to the elect and keeps back their complete happiness after all other enemies have been rendered powerless. Christ, by His Resurrection, has thus conquered death in His own case, but the victory over this dread enemy will not be complete until the bodies of all the dead shall have been reclaimed in the general resurrection.

The resurrection of all the dead, good and bad, is argued from this verse, because if the triumph over death is to be complete, the bodies of all the dead must rise again.

And whereas he saith. These words should be connected with verse 27, as in the Greek. A better translation would be: "When he shall have said" (*ὅταν δὲ εἴπῃ*), i.e., when God the Father shall say at the end of the world that all things have been subjected to the Son, we must not understand the Father Himself to be included among the things subjected. Some interpreters supply *αὐτός* from the last sentence, and understand Christ to be announcing the subjugation of all things to Him to whom it is owing (*Lias*).

28. **And when all things, etc., i.e.,** when all the enemies of the Church Militant shall have been conquered by Christ and the general resurrection takes place, **then the Son, etc., i.e.,** then Christ also, as man, **shall subject Himself, together with His redeemed Kingdom, the multitude of the elect, to His Father, without, however, forfeiting His own Kingship over His adoring subjects.**

As man Christ has always, from the first moment of the Incarnation, been subject to and less than the Father, His humanity has been less than His Divinity, and less than the Holy Ghost; but in the resurrection when, together with the elect, His victorious army, He gives Himself over to the Father, His subjection will be greater in its extension and fulness (cf. Rick.).

That God may be all in all. The purpose of this final and universal subjection of Christ and His elect to the Father is that in the Church Triumphant God the Father may be recognized and glorified as the Lord of all, and as the author and primal

29. Otherwise what shall they do that are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not again at all? why are they then baptized for them?

source of all the blessings conferred upon Christ Himself, and through Christ upon the Church and the body of the elect; and that thus He may be all in all, i.e., may reign perfectly over all, rendering all perfectly and consummately happy.

A CONFIRMATION OF FUTURE RESURRECTION, 29-34

29-34. After having given the authoritative teaching in regard to the resurrection St. Paul adds, by way of confirmation, two further considerations, one drawn from the practice of some of the faithful, and the other from the labors and trials of the Apostles. A brief exhortation then terminates his proofs of this momentous doctrine.

29. In the supposition that there is no resurrection of the dead, why, asks St. Paul, do some of the Corinthians receive Baptism for their friends and relatives who died without it? The Apostle is assuming that such a practice had in view the future resurrection of the body.

What was this Baptism for the dead? Many widely different explanations have been given, but by far the most reasonable and the most common is the following: In the time of St. Paul, when a catechumen died without Baptism, it was customary for a friend or relative to have the ceremony performed upon himself on behalf of the dead person, thus publicly affirming, by a symbolic action, that his departed friend or relative had died in union with the Church and was awaiting a glorious resurrection. This is the explanation of Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* v. 10; *De Resurr.* xxviii) and is adopted by the majority of modern exegetes, such as Bisping, Van Steenkiste, Le Camus, Cornely, MacRory, Rickaby, etc. The Apostle simply refers to this practice, which must have been well known to the Corinthians, without approving or condemning it. Although erroneous, it was perhaps tolerated in the early Church until heretics began to attribute to it the efficacy of real Baptism. Cf. Vacant, *Baptême des morts*, in *Dict. de la Bible*; Cornely, h. 1.

30. Why also are we in danger every hour?

31. I die daily, I protest by your glory, brethren, which I have in Christ Jesus our Lord.

32. If (according to man) I fought with beasts at Ephesus, what doth it profit me, if the dead rise not again? Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we shall die.

Again of this verse should be omitted.

30. If the dead rise not again, then to what purpose are all the sufferings and persecutions endured by the Apostles and by the faithful? If there is no resurrection, all should try to avoid harm and suffering, and get as much as possible out of this present life.

We refers primarily, at least, to the Apostles, who were in constant danger of punishment, prison, and death itself, on account of their faith and the doctrines they preached. This and the two following verses seem directly to prove immortality, and only indirectly the resurrection of the body, unless we say that the danger, persecutions and trials to which the Apostle alludes were occasioned only or chiefly by their preaching the resurrection. This supposition, however, is very improbable, as it is quite evident that the allusion is to sufferings sustained for being a Christian, and for believing and preaching all the doctrines for which Christianity stands. Therefore we hold that these three verses are proofs primarily of immortality, and only secondarily of the resurrection. We must observe, however, with St. Thomas (on verse 19) that if the resurrection of the body be denied it is difficult to maintain the immortality of the soul, because without the body the soul is in an unnatural, and therefore unenduring state.

31. I die daily, i.e., every day St. Paul, like the other Apostles, was in danger of death for his faith and his preaching (Rom. viii. 36).

I protest, etc. The Apostle solemnly affirms by the pride he feels in the Corinthian Church, which he founded in Christ Jesus, that he is truly exposed to death every day of his life. Why all this, if there is no future life and no resurrection?

32. If (according to man), etc. There should be no parentheses here. The meaning is: If for merely human motives, without a hope of future life and a consequent glorious resurrection, St.

33. Be not seduced: Evil communications corrupt good manners.

Paul on account of his preaching was exposed to wild beasts at Ephesus, what profit, what advantage was there in his action? He was exposing himself to death for no purpose, if the dead rise not again.

I fought with beasts, etc. The word *ἰθνησιμάχησα* used here by St. Paul, with its derivatives, became a technical expression for men contending with wild beasts in the amphitheatre. A metaphorical sense, however, is given it in the present instance by nearly all modern interpreters; and this for the following reasons: (a) St. Paul's actual fighting with wild beasts is not mentioned by St. Luke, who speaks at considerable length of the Apostle's sojourn at Ephesus (Acts xix. 1; xx. 1); (b) nor does St. Paul speak of such an experience when enumerating the various kinds of perils and sufferings to which he had been exposed for the sake of the Gospel (2 Cor. xi. 23); (c) it would be difficult to account for such treatment of a Roman citizen (Acts xxii. 26). The expression, therefore, must refer to the bitter opposition sustained by the Apostle from the Jews and his other enemies during his two years at Ephesus (Acts xix. 1 ff.; xx. 19; 2 Tim. iv. 17). St. Ignatius of Antioch, writing to the Romans (*Ad Rom.* 5), employs the very same word in a metaphorical sense: "All the way from Syria to Rome I have to fight with beasts, bound as I am to ten leopards, that is, a file of soldiers."

What doth it profit me. In Greek the interrogation point is after this clause, and not after the one that follows, as in our version and in the Vulgate. The quotation is from Isaiah xxii. 13, where the Jews are represented as scoffing at God's threats to destroy them. The Apostle, by alluding to these words from the Prophet, is only expressing the conclusion which would commonly be drawn from a denial of the resurrection; "for himself it was recompense enough that his action was pleasing to God" (St. Chrys.).

Again should be away, and we shall die (Vulg., *moriemur*) should be in the present tense.

33. Be not seduced, i.e., by those who say there is no resurrection.

34. Awake, ye just, and sin not. For some have not the knowledge of God, I speak it to your shame.

35. But some man will say: How do the dead rise again? or with what manner of body shall they come?

Evil communications, etc. This is a line from the play *Thais* of the Athenian comedian Menander (320 B.C.), which in the time of St. Paul had doubtless become a proverbial expression. The meaning here is that false doctrines, such as the denial of the resurrection, corrupt one's morals and manner of life.

34. The Apostle now exhorts those Christians who had permitted themselves to be seduced to return to their previous state of justice and right living.

Awake. The meaning of the Greek imperative, *ἐκνήψατε*, is that they should awake from their sleep of intoxication and come to themselves again.

Ye just. Literally, "Righteously" (*δικαίως*). The meaning is: Awake, (a) as you ought; or (b) to what is right and just; or (c) so as to become just. St. Paul is bidding those seduced Corinthians to rouse themselves from their erroneous notions to a state of justice and righteousness.

For some, etc., i.e., those who say there is no resurrection of the dead are like the Pharisees whom our Lord rebuked for their ignorance of divine things (Matt. xxii. 29), they **have not the knowledge of God.**

In the Vulgate *justi* would better be *juste* or *ad justitiam*.

HOW THE BODY WILL RISE; THE QUALITIES OF THE RISEN BODY, 35-58

35-58. The fact of the resurrection being established, the Apostle now goes on to describe how it will take place. He first shows, by illustrations drawn from what takes place in the natural order of the world around us, that the risen body will be indeed the same body that was buried, but vested with vastly different qualities (verses 35-50). The manner of the resurrection, the transition from the present to the future life, and the effects of the resurrection are next discussed (verses 51-58).

35. The resurrection of the body was a hard doctrine, a stumbling-block to many of the Christians, as it had been before

36. Senseless man, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die first.

37. And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not the body that shall be; but bare grain, as of wheat, or of some of the rest.

to some among the Jews (cf. Matt. xxii. 23-33). It was difficult to see how it could come to pass. Wherefore St. Paul now begins to explain the nature of the resurrection body and the process whereby the body that is buried is brought back to life.

Again and or are not represented in the Greek, and **shall they come** (Vulg., *venient*) should be in the present tense, "are they coming?"

36. **Senseless man.** Literally, "O man without understanding." As in the vegetable world the seed that is planted must **die first**, i.e., must go into dissolution and lose the form it has before it can burst forth into new life, so in like manner the human body, passing through the process of death, will rise to a new and more beautiful life; as dissolution and corruption do not make a return of life impossible to the seed, so neither do the death and corruption of the body make its resurrection impossible. Our Lord also said: "Unless the grain of wheat falling into the ground die, itself remaineth alone," etc. (John xii. 24, 25).

37. Although the risen body will be essentially the same as the body that was laid in the grave, it shall be endowed with new and more excellent qualities, just as the wheat and the corn are more wonderfully clothed than the bare grain from which they spring. The identity of the body does not depend upon its material particles, which are in continual flux during this life, and are completely renewed every few years; but upon the soul or form which is the principle of physical life and continuity.

"As the body of Jesus after His Resurrection was endowed with many strange and new qualities (John xx. 19, 26), so as often to be unrecognized by His disciples (Luke xxiv. 16, 31, 37; John xx. 14; xxi. 4), though yet it was the same body (Luke xxiv. 39, 40; John xx. 20, 27); so we learn that the body we sow in the grave is **not the body that shall be**, but that the resurrection body—the spiritual body, as St. Paul calls it—while it exhibits visible and unequivocal signs of its connection with the

38. But God giveth it a body as he will: and to every seed its proper body.

39. All flesh is not the same flesh: but one is the flesh of men, another of beasts, another of birds, another of fishes.

40. And there are bodies celestial, and bodies terrestrial: but, one is the glory of the celestial, and another of the terrestrial.

body out of which it has arisen, will be possessed of many wondrous faculties which are denied to us here" (Lias).

38. **God giveth . . . as he will.** Better, "God giveth . . . as he hath willed" (*ἡθέλησεν*). The use of the aorist points back to the creation when God established the laws of nature, according to which every seed unfolds into a particular determinate body with the qualities which befit its state. Hence the body that is planted in the grave will unfold in the resurrection into a new form, endowed with new qualities according to the will of God and the consequent laws that govern its nature. The body was made to be the instrument and companion of the soul, and therefore it was also designed that the body should ultimately share the eternal destiny of the soul. In this life certain accidents and qualities appear in the body, corresponding to its earthly condition; but in the resurrection, like the seed that has unfolded into its new existence, the body will be clothed with qualities unknown to it now.

The *vult* of the Vulgate should be *voluit*.

39. The principle which has just been applied to plant nature is now applied to the animal kingdom. That God should make a resurrection body, differing in qualities from our present bodies, ought not to cause any more surprise or doubt than do the different varieties and forms of bodily life (*σάρξ*) which we behold in men, beasts, birds and fish. If God can produce the latter, why can He not make also the former?

Flesh (*σάρξ*) before **of men** is not in any of the best MSS., nor in the Old Latin or Vulgate, but is plainly understood; on the contrary, it is expressed before **birds** in most of the best MSS., but is omitted there by A. Rec., Vulgate and Peshitto.

40. The same principle is now extended to the heavenly bodies. Since God can make bodies differing as widely as do the sun, moon and stars, on the one hand, and the animals and plants, on the other, who will say that it is impossible for Him to make still another, namely, a resurrection body?

41. One is the glory of the sun, another the glory of the moon, and another the glory of the stars. For star differeth from star in glory.

42. So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption, it shall rise in incorruption.

43. It is sown in dishonour, it shall rise in glory. It is sown in weakness, it shall rise in power.

The *ἐτέρα*, *another*, of this verse, as distinguished from the *ἄλλη*, *another*, of the following verse, shows the wide difference there is between the heavenly and the earthly bodies about which the Apostle has been speaking: it is a difference in kind; while the various heavenly bodies of the following verse are the same in kind but different in degree.

41. Even among the heavenly bodies themselves there is a great variety, one star differing from another in beauty and excellence. It is not strange or impossible, therefore, that there should be a resurrection body different and more excellent than our earthly body. Indirectly also this argument proves that among the risen bodies of the just there will be a vast variety according to their respective merits. There will be hereafter *splendor dispar; coelum commune* (St. Aug.).

42. In this and the two following verses the Apostle digresses somewhat to enumerate certain qualities which shall be common to all glorified bodies, distinguishing them from mortal bodies. Our present body is sown in corruption, etc., i.e., the mortal body that is buried in the earth and given over to corruption, shall rise free from death and from everything that tends to death; it will be impassible.

It shall rise (Vulg., *surget*) in this and in the two following verses should be in the present tense, according to the Greek.

43. It is sown in dishonour, etc., i.e., the mortal body throughout its life is a prey to innumerable miseries, and especially when planted in the grave it becomes subject to corruption with all the revolting and dishonoring accompaniments of the latter; but it shall rise in glory, shining as the sun in the kingdom of heaven (Matt. xiii. 43).

It is sown in weakness, etc. The mortal body is at all times a weak and imperfect instrument of the soul, slow to act and easily fatigued, constantly requiring food and rest to repair its wasted strength; but in the resurrection it will possess the gift

44. It is sown a natural body, it shall rise a spiritual body. If there be a natural body, there is also a spiritual body, as it is written:

45. The first man Adam was made into a living soul; the last Adam into a quickening spirit.

of *agility*, making it the strong, swift and perfect instrument of the soul.

44. **A natural body.** Our present bodies are called "natural," or "animal," because they are subject to the laws and conditions of animal life, such as vegetation, generation, nutrition and the like; but after the resurrection they will no longer need these material aids that serve a present and temporary purpose. Then they shall be **spiritual**, i.e., entirely subject to the needs and wishes of the glorified soul. This does not mean that the risen body ceases to be material, but that it is freed from those conditions and functions which serve only a temporal end and which make it the imperfect instrument of the glorified spirit. The endowment by which the body thus partakes of the nature of the soul, while not losing its material character, is called the gift of *subtlety*.

If there be a natural body, etc. From the existence of a natural body accommodated to the needs of man's animal life, the Apostle concludes the existence of a spiritual body suited to the conditions and needs of the soul's glorified life. The body was created to be the instrument of the soul, and therefore the conditions of its existence should vary according to the different states of the soul.

As it is written. Better, "Even so it is written" (the Vulg. should read: *Sic et scriptum est*). These words are connected with the following verse in Greek. The Apostle is going to cite a passage of the Old Testament (Gen. ii. 7), to prove what he has just said about the existence of a natural and of a spiritual body.

45. The Apostle's argument here is that there should be two bodies, one natural or animal, and one spiritual, because mankind has two heads, from whom respectively they derive a different life. From **the first man Adam**, who, in virtue of his origin, abstracting from his elevation to the supernatural order to which he had no claim, had only a *natural*, or *animal* body, mankind could derive only natural bodies having the animal qualities mentioned above, in verses 41-43. But from **the last Adam**,

46. Yet that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; afterwards that which is spiritual.

47. The first man was of the earth, earthly: the second man, from heaven, heavenly.

Jesus Christ, the head and author of regenerated humanity (Rom. v. 14), whose soul was at all times essentially spiritual and life-giving, being filled from the first moment of its existence with the fulness of the graces of the Holy Ghost, and whose body at the Resurrection was allowed to manifest the glorious qualities which always belonged to it by reason of the Hypostatic Union of the divine and human natures,—from such a spiritual head the mystical members can inherit only a supernatural and spiritual body. St. Paul is considering Christ's spirit as it was at the Resurrection in particular; for it was then that the risen Christ possessed the fulness, not only of grace, but of glory, and that He became in a special manner the communicating principle of grace and glory, for body as well as soul, to the members of His mystical body.

It is true that Adam from the beginning was elevated to the supernatural order, that his soul before the fall was endowed with habitual grace and with many other spiritual gifts, and that, had he not sinned, his natural body would have been transformed into a spiritual and immortal body; but St. Paul is not at present considering any of these endowments. He is confining himself to what was essentially and naturally due to Adam as a creature, and to what consequently could be inherited from him in the natural order by his descendants.

A living soul is a Hebraism signifying a being that has a soul.

A quickening spirit, or "life-giving spirit," means a being having a spirit that gives life to itself and to others. Therefore, as we inherit our natural body from the first Adam, so we shall inherit our supernatural or spiritual body from Christ, the second Adam.

46. According to the plan of divine Providence the natural or animal body precedes the supernatural or spiritual body. "Even in the order of nature we see that in one and the same being the imperfect precedes the perfect" (St. Thomas).

47. The first man, etc., i.e., Adam, the first head of the human race, had a body that was earthly in its origin, having been made

48. Such as is the earthly, such also are the earthly: and such as is the heavenly, such also are they that are heavenly.

49. Therefore as we have borne the image of the earthly, let us bear also the image of the heavenly.

50. Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot possess the kingdom of God: neither shall corruption possess incorruption.

from the dust of the earth (Gen. ii. 7); it was therefore naturally subject to disease, death and corruption. But the second man, i.e., Christ, the second head of the human race, was from heaven because, as a Divine Person, He was the true Son of God, co-existing eternally with the Father; and in time He took a human body, being "made of a woman" (Gal. iv. 4).

The word **heavenly** (Vulg., *coelestis*) is wanting in all MSS. except two of inferior authority (F G). Some authorities (Rec. with A and Peshitto) insert "the Lord" before **from heaven**.

48. The first and the second Adam have bequeathed to their descendants bodies like their own respectively. The first had a mortal and earthly body, and so all his children have inherited bodies that are destined to death and corruption. But the heavenly Adam will give to all His spiritual descendants a body like His own, heavenly, immortal, glorious.

49. As we have borne, etc., i.e., before our Baptism we bore the image of the earthly man, that is, a body subject to corruption and death; but now let us bear, etc., i.e., let us become spiritual and lead a holy life, so that in the resurrection we may deserve to have a heavenly and glorified body conformable to the divine image, the risen body of Christ.

It is disputed whether this verse is hortatory or declarative. The great weight of authority is in favor of the former (*φορέσωμεν, let us bear*), rather than the latter (*φορέσομεν, we shall bear*).

Therefore (Vulg., *igitur*) at the beginning of the verse should be replaced by "And," *et*, in accordance with all the Greek MSS.

50. The Apostle now instructs his readers that a real change must take place in our bodies before they can enter heaven. Substantially they shall remain the same, but their qualities must be changed completely.

Flesh and blood cannot possess, etc., i.e., the earthly, natural, corruptible body which we have inherited from the first Adam cannot enter into heaven and eternal beatitude.

51. Behold, I tell you a mystery. We shall all indeed rise again: but we shall not all be changed.

Corruption, i.e., a corruptible body, destined for corruption and dissolution.

Possess incorruption, i.e., inherit incorruptible life.

In the Vulgate *possunt* (with A C D E F G) should be *potest* according to the two oldest MSS.

51. Coming now to describe the way the dead shall rise at the end of the world, the Apostle first solves a difficulty that might arise out of the preceding verse, namely, if our corruptible bodies cannot inherit incorruptible life, what about the just who will be living when Christ appears on the last day? In reply the Apostle says: **I tell you a mystery**, i.e., a truth of revelation, which human means could not discover (1 Thess. iv. 14). What is this mystery? It is that the just who are living at the Second Coming of Christ shall not die, but shall be suddenly changed from their corruptible to an incorruptible and glorious state.

This interpretation is (a) according to the best reading of the second part of this verse; (b) it is in harmony with the context, verses 50 and 52, and with the whole drift of St. Paul's argument; (c) it agrees with the explanation of the same doctrine given by St. Paul elsewhere (1 Thess. iv. 15-17; 2 Cor. v. 1-9; 2 Tim. iv. 1), and with the teaching of St. Peter on the subject (1 Peter iv. 5); (d) it alone gives to **mystery** the proper and obvious meaning of that term; (e) it finds approval in the words of the Creed, "He shall come to judge the living and the dead"; (f) it has the support of practically all the Greek Fathers, and of all modern exegetes.

There is no "mystery" in St. Paul's mind about the dead, good or bad, rising again. Neither is there any sense in: **We shall not all be changed** of this verse, and **in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye**, etc., of the following verse. In fact, **we shall not be changed** here is in direct contradiction with the words, **we shall be changed** of the next verse.

The reading, therefore, of the second part of this verse, which is found in our version, in the *Codex Bezae*, and in the Vulgate, and which was commonly accepted by all the Latin Fathers and Latin versions from the time of Tertullian, must be rejected as

erroneous for the reasons given above. The Council of Trent, in making the Vulgate the official version of the Church, was well aware that it contained some wrong readings; but when these are of minor importance, or can receive a correct interpretation from other parallel passages of Scripture, as in the present instance, there is no difficulty. Moreover, the Council approved of all the parts of the original Vulgate, "as they were wont to be read in the Catholic Church"; but the East never read this verse as it is in the Vulgate. "If the Vulgate in the present passage were interpreted to mean that all the just without exception are to rise from the dead at the last day, it would not merely contradict the inspired text and the Creeds, but would be hopelessly at variance with itself" (Lattey, in *Westm. Ver.*).

The reading, therefore, of the second part of this verse which is adopted by all modern scholars, Catholic and non-Catholic, and which has the support of the Greek MSS. B E K L P, of practically all cursives, and of most versions, is: "We shall not all sleep (die), but we shall all be changed." A rival reading of \aleph C F G and of the cursive no. 17, if read without punctuation, might have the same meaning, thus: πάντες κοιμηθησόμεθα οὐ πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα, "we shall all sleep (die) not but we shall all be changed." Generally, however, this reading is understood to agree with that of the Vulgate, and is given as follows: "We shall all sleep (die), but we shall not all be changed."

While it is practically certain that the reading of this verse which we have adopted is the only correct one, it must be admitted that the Vulgate reading, taken by itself, can receive an orthodox explanation. Thus, **we shall all indeed rise again** may be taken to refer to mankind as a whole, without including the few that will be alive at the end (cf. Titus i. 12, 13; Heb. ix. 27). In like manner, the words, **we shall not all be changed** can mean that all the dead shall not be glorified.

It is objected against the above interpretation (a) that verse 22 of this chapter, Rom. v. 12, and Heb. ix. 27 seem to say that *all men must die*; (b) that St. Paul seemed to expect to be still alive when Christ would come. Answer: (a) Even though all men do not actually die, still there is in them all the liability to death, but the penalty can be taken away by God (St. Thomas, *Summa*,

52. In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trumpet: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall rise again incorruptible: and we shall be changed.

53. For this corruptible must put on incorruption; and this mortal must put on immortality.

54. And when this mortal hath put on immortality, then shall come to pass the saying that is written: Death is swallowed up in victory.

1^a 2^{ae}, qu. 81, a. 3, ad 3). (b) St. Paul did not really believe or mean to teach that the end of the world was at hand in his time. Doubtless he had no revelation on this subject. If here he associates himself with those who are to be alive at the last day, he elsewhere (vi. 14; 2 Cor. iv. 14) speaks of being among those who are to be raised up from the dead at that time. Hence he seems to have been uncertain about the time of the Lord's coming.

52. **In a moment**, etc. These words indicate the swiftness with which the dead shall be called from their graves and the bodies of the living just glorified at the last day.

The last trumpet, i.e., the last sign by which the living and the dead shall be summoned to judgment. Perhaps it will be the voice of Christ (John v. 28), or the voice of an archangel (1 Thess. iv. 15), or some other signal from on high. The expression, "trumpet," is metaphorical, being borrowed from the instrument used by the Jews to convoke their religious assemblies (Num. x. 2-10).

The dead shall rise again incorruptible, i.e., the just shall rise clothed with glorified bodies.

We shall be changed, i.e., the just who are alive at the last day shall not die as others do, but shall pass in the twinkling of an eye from their mortal to an immortal and glorious state.

53. The Apostle again insists upon the necessity of the transformation already spoken of in verse 50. The just who are in their graves must put on incorruptible bodies, and those who are still living must exchange their mortal frames for immortal and glorified bodies.

54. Most authorities repeat here both clauses of the preceding verse. The Vulgate reading in this place, however, is found in the Sinaitic MS. and in some other versions. When the transformation spoken of in the preceding verse is effected, then shall come the complete triumph of Christ over death.

55. O death, where is thy victory? O death, where is thy sting?

56. Now the sting of death is sin: and the power of sin is the law.

57. But thanks be to God, who hath given us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.

58. Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast and unmoveable; always abounding in the work of the Lord, knowing that your labour is not in vain in the Lord.

Death is swallowed up, etc. The Apostle is referring to Isaias xxv. 8, where the Hebrew reads: "He (Jehovah) hath swallowed up death forever." The Prophet is announcing that in the heavenly Jerusalem there shall be no more death, or pain, or the like; and St. Paul, slightly modifying the same words, proclaims the victory of Christ in the Resurrection over death and its consequences (Gen. iii. 19).

In the LXX this passage of Isaias is very obscure: "Death having prevailed swallowed up" (*κατέπιεν ὁ θάνατος ἰσχύος*). With the resurrection, death, the last enemy of man, shall be defeated and life shall triumph in all its glory.

55. At the thought of the final triumph over death the Apostle bursts forth in a hymn of exultation, freely citing the Septuagint of Osee xiii. 14. Literally, the Prophet was foretelling the restoration of Israel, which was a figure of the redemption of Christ.

Where is thy victory over the dead who are risen again from their graves? Where now is the sting of thy cruel dominion over them?

56. **The sting of death is sin**, i.e., death wounds us, like a poisonous serpent, through sin. The reference is to original sin by which death first stung and poisoned our race. And the Mosaic Law which was later given only served, by its numerous regulations and prohibitions, to stir up and strengthen the baneful consequences of original sin (cf. Rom. iv. 5 ff.; v. 13; vii. 7-11).

57. What the Law could not do, Christ our Lord has done for us. By His death He has conquered both sin and death, satisfying for our transgressions and delivering us from bondage.

Who hath given (Vulg., *qui dedit*). The Greek has the present tense, which better expresses the victory already begun, although its completion is reserved for the resurrection.

58. The Apostle concludes with a brief practical exhortation to the faithful to steadfastness and zeal because of their faith in a glorious resurrection.

In the work of the Lord, i.e., in all good works, performed by command and with the aid of our Saviour. Some think the work of the Lord means the propagation of the faith (xvi. 10).

Knowing that, etc. The Christians should always be mindful of the reward that is in store for them, being assured that whatever good they perform in union with Christ shall not have been done in vain.

These closing words of St. Paul show very clearly how lawful and commendable it is for us to seek a reward for the good we do.

CHAPTER XVI

This chapter forms the conclusion of the present Epistle. See *Introduction*, viii. 3.

THE COLLECTION FOR THE POOR IN JERUSALEM, AND THE APOSTLE'S FORTHCOMING VISIT TO CORINTH, 1-9

1. Now concerning the collections that are made for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, so do ye also.

1-9. In concluding his letter to the Corinthians St. Paul, according to his frequent practice, adds a few counsels and directions to his usual greeting and final benediction. He begins here by describing the way in which the collection for the faithful in Jerusalem should be made (verses 1-4); and he hopes it will be completed and ready to be dispatched upon his arrival in Corinth soon after Pentecost (verses 5-9).

1. **The collections.** The singular is used in the Greek (τῆς λογίας). The way the Apostle begins to speak of this matter, "concerning," etc., shows that it was among other things on which the Corinthians had sought his advice (vii. 1, 25; viii. 1; xii. 1).

For the saints, i.e., for the poor among the faithful of Jerusalem. St. Paul had spoken to the Corinthians on this subject in a previous letter which is now lost (v. 9), and it is mentioned again in 2 Cor. viii, ix and in Rom. xv. 26.

2. On the first day of the week let every one of you put apart with himself, laying up what it shall well please him; that when I come, the collections be not then to be made.

3. And when I shall be with you, whomsoever you shall approve by letters, them will I send to carry your grace to Jerusalem.

4. And if it be meet that I also go, they shall go with me.

When Paul and Barnabas went forth to convert the Gentiles, they promised to be mindful of the poor in the Holy City (Gal. ii. 9 ff.). As we know from Josephus, Palestine was very much disorganized at this time. This circumstance, together with the fact that the Christians were at all times objects of special hate and persecution, made their poverty and destitution such that systematic efforts had to be exerted on their behalf throughout the Gentile Churches.

We know nothing about the particulars of the Galatian collection here referred to.

The *collectis* of the Vulgate should be singular, to agree with the Greek.

2. On the first day, etc. Better, "Every first day of the week" (*κατὰ μίαν σαββάτον*), i.e., every Sunday, which, as we know also from Acts xx. 7; Apoc. i. 10, had been already substituted for the Sabbath. It is certain that the Christians from the beginning kept Sunday holy, instead of the Sabbath, in honor of our Lord's Resurrection. The first explicit evidence, however, which we have that Sunday was called the Lord's day is in Apoc. i. 10.

What it shall well please him. Literally, "To the extent in which he may be prosperous," i.e., as much as he can afford. St. Paul wanted the Christians thus freely to put aside what they could afford every Sunday, so that upon his arrival the entire collection might be finished and ready to send away.

3. Whomsoever, etc. To remove all suspicion on the part of his adversaries the Apostle will let the Corinthians choose their own delegates to represent them in carrying their collection to Jerusalem.

By letters, i.e., whomsoever the Corinthians shall approve as delegates St. Paul will send with commendatory letters to the Christians in Jerusalem.

4. If it be meet, etc., i.e., if the collection be a large one (Estius); or, if it seem good to you (MacR.). St. Paul is will-

5. Now I will come to you, when I shall have passed through Macedonia. For I shall pass through Macedonia.

6. And with you perhaps I shall abide, or even spend the winter: that you may bring me on my way whithersoever I shall go.

7. For I will not see you now by the way, for I trust that I shall abide with you some time, if the Lord permit.

ing to accompany the Corinthian delegates all the way to Jerusalem, if this is desirable. Cf. Rom. xv. 23; Acts xx. 1-6.

From 2 Cor. viii, ix we gather that the collection promised to be very generous, and from Acts xx, xxi we see that St. Paul did go to Jerusalem.

5. I will come to you, as he had already promised (iv. 19; xi. 34; xiv. 6).

Through Macedonia. As we learn from 2 Cor. i. 15, 16, St. Paul had first intended to go directly from Ephesus to Corinth, and thence to Macedonia; but conditions in the Corinthian Church were such that he was obliged to change his plan (2 Cor. i. 23). This change of plan was afterwards made use of by his enemies in an attempt to show that he was fickle and lacking in decision (2 Cor. i. 17).

I shall pass through, etc. Literally, "I am passing through," etc. This seems to indicate that the Apostle did not intend to stay long in Macedonia.

6. To show his affection for the Corinthians and to compensate for his deferred visit, St. Paul now says he will prolong his stay among them when he arrives. He was writing this letter around Paschal time, and intended to remain at Ephesus until Pentecost (verse 8). Then he would go to Macedonia, arriving in Corinth sometime in the autumn, perhaps to tarry until spring.

That you may bring me, etc. (προπέμψητε), i.e., that they fit him out with the things necessary for his journey, wherever that may be. It was only from a Church that he especially loved and trusted that the Apostle would thus seek help.

7. **Now by the way.** He means that his coming visit will not be a hurried one, as it would be if he passed through Corinth on his way to Macedonia. This verse seems strongly to support the view that St. Paul had made a flying visit to Corinth, but it does not require it.

8. But I will tarry at Ephesus until Pentecost.

9. For a great door and evident is opened unto me: and many adversaries.

10. Now if Timothy come, see that he be with you without fear, for he worketh the work of the Lord, as I also do.

8. I will tarry (ἐπιμενῶ), i.e., I will stay on. This shows that he intended to remain at Ephesus until Pentecost, nearly two months more. We know, however (Acts xix. 25), that the Apostle was obliged to leave Ephesus sooner than he had planned.

9. The reason why St. Paul wished to tarry at Ephesus for some two months longer was because there was offered him there a great opportunity of preaching the Gospel with much fruit, and of opposing his adversaries with success (Acts xix. 19 ff.).

Great . . . evident, i.e., a *great* and *effectual* opening for good.

PARTICULAR RECOMMENDATIONS, 10-18

10-18. As soon as St. Paul had received news of the troubles at Corinth he sent Erastus and Timothy to Macedonia (Acts xix. 22), giving the latter instructions to go thence to Corinth for the purpose of putting in order the disturbances there (iv. 17). Meanwhile, having been more correctly informed of the gravity of the situation by special legates who had come to him from Corinth, the Apostle immediately wrote the present letter, in which, as we see here, he recommended to the faithful the young disciple who would soon be among them.

10. If **Timothy come**. This seems to indicate that St. Paul had some doubt about Timothy's going to Corinth. The Apostle had sent him to Macedonia first, and perhaps the situation there demanded more of his time and attention than had been anticipated. At any rate, this letter was written after Timothy had departed for Macedonia, probably because there was reason to fear that he might not reach Corinth at all, or that he might arrive there too late.

Without fear, i.e., that you respect him and make his stay among you as easy as possible. Timothy was young (1 Tim. iv. 12), and perhaps somewhat lacking in courage (1 Tim. v. 21-23;

11. Let no man therefore despise him, but conduct ye him on his way in peace: that he may come to me. For I look for him with the brethren.

12. And touching our brother Apollo, I give you to understand, that I much entreated him to come unto you with the brethren: and indeed it was not his will at all to come at this time. But he will come when he shall have leisure.

13. Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, do manfully, and be strengthened.

14. Let all your things be done in charity.

2 Tim. i. 6-8; ii. 1, 3, 15; iv. 1, 2); and yet he was by no means to be despised, for he was doing the work of the Lord, i.e., preaching the Gospel, like St. Paul himself.

11. I look for him, etc., i.e., St. Paul was awaiting at Ephesus the return of Timothy with Erastus, and probably some others who had gone with them to Macedonia (Acts xix. 22). The meaning is not that Paul and the brethren at Ephesus were expecting Timothy alone.

12. To show that he was in no wise envious of Apollo or opposed to the great Alexandrian's again visiting the Corinthians, St. Paul now makes it plain that he had endeavored to get him to pay them another visit. Apollo declined for the time being, probably not wishing to visit the Corinthians while there existed any special faction devoted to him to the detriment of the Church as a whole (iii. 4-6).

I give you to understand (Vulg., *vobis notum facio*) should be omitted, to agree with the Greek.

The brethren, who were very likely the bearers of this letter.

13. The mention of Apollo brought back to the Apostle's mind the factions at Corinth, so bitterly condemned in the first part of this letter. He, therefore, exhorts the faithful to be on their guard against the evils which imperil the unity and peace of their Church. Let them stand fast in the faith which has been preached to them, by which alone they shall be strengthened so as successfully to resist and overcome their adversaries.

14. Let all your things, etc., i.e., let all you do be done in charity. This virtue of charity is at all times necessary, but the Corinthians had special need of it, as was evident from the abuses and disorders that had grown up among them. The Apostle is giving a counsel here, not a precept (St. Chrys. and others, against Estius and many more).

15. And I beseech you, brethren, you know the house of Stephanas, and of Fortunatus, and of Achaicus, that they are the first-fruits of Achaia, and have dedicated themselves to the ministry of the saints:

16. That you also be subject to such, and to every one that worketh with us, and laboureth.

17. And I rejoice in the presence of Stephanas, and Fortunatus, and Achaicus, because that which was wanting on your part, they have supplied.

18. For they have refreshed both my spirit and yours. Know them, therefore, that are such.

15. The Apostle now speaks of the delegates who had brought to him the Corinthians' letter and were probably to be the bearers of his reply. The best MSS. omit all mention in this verse of Fortunatus and Achaicus. Hence the household of Stephanas are the first-fruits of Achaia, i.e., the first of that province to embrace the faith (i. 16). Stephanas and his family had dedicated themselves to works of charity among the faithful. Some think Stephanas was a priest of the Corinthian Church.

The first phrase here, *And I beseech you, brethren*, is doubtless to be joined to verse 16, making the remainder of the present verse a parenthesis.

In the Vulgate *et Fortunati, et Achaici* should be omitted.

16. That you also be subject, etc. This is the thing to which the Apostle started in the beginning of the preceding verse to exhort the Corinthians. His counsel is that they should show great respect and gratitude to such generous and holy benefactors as Stephanas and his family. There is most probably no question here of the submission and obedience which subjects are bound to show to superiors.

To every one that, etc. Better, "to every one that helps and coöperates."

17. Fortunatus and Achaicus are not mentioned elsewhere in the New Testament. It is the common opinion that they, with Stephanas, brought to St. Paul the letter of the Corinthians and also carried back the reply to it, this present letter.

That which was wanting, etc., i.e., the lack of you, the void occasioned by your absence. The Apostle is rejoiced by the presence of these Corinthian legates who, in a way, make up for the absence of all the other faithful whom he would love to see; he wishes he could see all, but in these three he is reminded of all.

18. They have refreshed, etc. These legates, by carrying the

19. The churches of Asia salute you. Aquila and Priscilla salute you much in the Lord, with the church that is in their house, with whom I also lodge.

20. All the brethren salute you. Salute one another with a holy kiss.

Corinthians' letter to St. Paul, had done a welcome service both to them and to him.

Know them, therefore, etc., i.e., to such as render such valuable services as these legates have done special respect and recognition are due.

GREETINGS AND APOSTOLIC BLESSING, 19-24

19-24. During St. Paul's three years' stay in Ephesus, the capital of Proconsular Asia, the Gospel had spread throughout the whole province and Christian communities were established everywhere. Knowing, therefore, the ties of charity by which the faithful of Asia and of Ephesus were bound to those of Corinth, the Apostle, before giving his final blessing, sends the salutations of all the faithful.

19. **The churches of Asia**, i.e., the Christian communities of Proconsular Asia, the Roman province that lay along the western coast of Asia Minor with Ephesus as its capital (cf. Acts xix. 10).

Aquila and Priscilla, who had contributed so much to the foundation of the Church at Corinth. See on Rom. xvi. 3, 4; cf. Acts xviii. 1 ff.

In the Lord, i.e., out of charity and regard for their common faith.

The church . . . in their house. Both at Rome and at Ephesus the house of Aquila and Priscilla served as a meeting-place of the faithful for religious purposes (Rom. xvi. 3-5). As yet there were most likely no special buildings set aside for Christian worship anywhere.

With whom I also lodge. These words, and their equivalents in the Vulgate here, should be omitted as wanting in all the best MSS. and versions.

20. **All the brethren**, i.e., all the other faithful of Ephesus besides those that met at the house of Aquila and Priscilla.

A holy kiss. The kiss of peace was once a prominent feature in the religious assemblies of the Christians (Rom. xvi. 16; 2

21. The salutation of me Paul, with my own hand.

22. If any man love not our Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema, mar-anatha.

23. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you.

24. My charity be with you all in Christ Jesus. Amen.

Cor. xiii. 12; I Thess. v. 26; I Peter v. 14), but it was restricted at an early date to the members of the same sex (*Const. Apost.* ii. 57; viii. 11).

21. **With my own hand.** The Apostle had dictated this Epistle to an amanuensis, as was his custom (Rom. xvi. 22), but now he writes his own salutation as a guarantee of the authenticity and genuineness of the letter (2 Thess. ii. 2; iii. 17).

22. **Love** (φιλῆ), i.e., with a personal and special affection.

Anathema. See on Rom. ix. 3.

Maranatha. This is a combination of two Aramaic words, *Marana tha*, which mean "Our Lord, come." Probably the meaning is that the Lord should come to judge the world and put into execution the sentence of condemnation merited by those who do not love Jesus. This Aramaic expression was perhaps a liturgical invocation in common use among the Apostles and their converts, like *alleluia* or *hosanna* with us (*Didache* 10; *Const. Apost.* vii. 26).

23. **The grace**, etc. See on Rom. xvi. 24; cf. 2 Cor. xiii. 13; Gal. vi. 18, etc.

24. **My charity**, etc. By these closing words, "the Apostle shows that he has written, not from anger or indignation, but from the care he has for them, since after so great an accusation he does not turn away from them, but loves and esteems them" (St. Chrys.).

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS

INTRODUCTION

I. The Occasion and Purpose of this Letter. Although the present Epistle is the only extant source from which we may gather the events and causes that called it forth, scholars find in the information which it affords reasons for two opposing conclusions. All are agreed that it immediately followed upon knowledge communicated to St. Paul in Macedonia regarding conditions in Corinth (2 Cor. ii. 12, 13; vii. 6). But what in particular was it among the faithful there, reported by Titus, that gave rise to this Epistle? Was it the reception of First Corinthians, or of a letter subsequent to First Corinthians? Certainly whatever Paul had written thither had much to do with the situation as observed and reported by Titus.

The opinion universally accepted until recently held that this second Epistle was occasioned by information brought to St. Paul from Corinth, perhaps by Timothy first (1 Cor. iv. 17; xvi. 10) but later certainly by Titus (2 Cor. vii. 6), shortly after the Corinthians had received our first canonical letter. In recent years, however, the opinion has been gaining adherents which believes that the present letter was occasioned by the report that followed a letter written by St. Paul to the faithful of Corinth after their reception of First Corinthians. According to this latter opinion, then, St. Paul addressed four Epistles to the Corinthians: (a) that mentioned in 1 Cor. v. 9, which has been lost; (b) our First Corinthians; (c) this intermediate Epistle, which has also been lost; (d) our Second Corinthians.

1. Patrons of the first opinion explain as follows: St. Paul sent Timothy and Erastus to Macedonia and Corinth (Acts xix. 22; 1 Cor. iv. 17; xvi. 10) shortly before he dispatched our first ca-

nonical letter. Whether Timothy ever reached Corinth or not, we do not know. If he did, his arrival there likely took place about the same time that First Corinthians was received. At any rate, St. Paul, perhaps fearing for the certainty, or for the success, of Timothy's visit to Corinth, soon sent Titus thither with instructions to take account of conditions among the Corinthians, to observe the effect of the letter recently sent them, and to report to him at Troas (2 Cor. ii. 12, 13; xii. 18). The Apostle was intending to remain at Ephesus until Pentecost (1 Cor. xvi. 8), but the unexpected tumult stirred up by Demetrius (Acts xix. 23) caused him to hasten his departure. Arriving at Troas earlier than he had calculated and not finding Titus there, he went immediately to Macedonia (2 Cor. ii. 13). Shortly the envoy arrived, and gave the Apostle a complete account of conditions and affairs at Corinth. The report was, on the whole, consoling (2 Cor. vii. 6). The letter had been well received and had produced salutary results, causing many of the faithful to feel real sorrow for their misdeeds and to grieve for having offended the Apostle, whose authority they now admitted without question (2 Cor. vii. 7 ff.). They had expelled the incestuous man from their number, thus bringing him to repentance; and now they asked St. Paul how they should conduct themselves towards this repentant sinner (2 Cor. ii. 5 ff.).

But Titus also had something unpleasant to report. There were still in the Corinthian community those who refused to acknowledge St. Paul's Apostolic authority. While his letter had saddened some of the faithful unto repentance, it had turned others against him and had greatly aroused the fury of his enemies, who now seemed to belong to the faction of the Judaizers, but who pretended to be Apostles of a very superior order (2 Cor. xi. 5; xii. 11). They redoubled their bitter attacks on St. Paul, accusing him of fickleness and vacillation (2 Cor. i. 15-17), and of commending himself because no one else had recommended or would recommend him (2 Cor. iii. 1, 2). They said his preaching was most obscure and full of veiled meanings (2 Cor. iv. 2, 3); when present he was grovelling in his humility, but when absent he was full of pride and arrogance (2 Cor. x. 1, 2); his appearance was weak and insignificant (2 Cor. x. 10);

he acted like a fool, an insane man (2 Cor. xi. 1, 16); he was too proud, or too uncertain of the reality and truth of his Apostolate, to accept support from the faithful (2 Cor. xi. 16-21); his pretended visions and revelations were only the ravings of his own disordered brain and imagination (2 Cor. xii. 1-10); he was a nobody (2 Cor. xii. 11); he was crafty, a deceiver full of guile (2 Cor. xii. 16-18); and he seemed to realize that he was a self-appointed, untimely Apostle (1 Cor. xv. 8, 9). Titus had further to report that the collection for the poor Christians in Jerusalem was not making sufficient progress (2 Cor. viii. 1 ff.), and that there was grave danger of a new outbreak of dissension and trouble (2 Cor. xii. 20, 21; xiii. 1-10).

These tidings, partly pleasing and partly saddening, announced by Titus to Paul in Macedonia were, according to the first opinion explained above, the occasion of the present Epistle. The Apostle wished, first of all, to express his satisfaction that so many of the faithful were now true to him, to explain why he had written the previous letter, and to give definite instructions for the collection in behalf of the poor of Jerusalem. Secondly, he wished to reply to the attacks of his adversaries, and thus to establish, on a final and unshaken basis, his Apostolic authority.

2. The opinion which is more popular to-day gives a different explanation of the cause which was chiefly responsible for the information that provoked our Second Corinthians. The effect of our first canonical Epistle to the Corinthians seems to have been disappointing. Paul's authority and influence at Corinth appeared to be waning. The letter which he had hoped would promote a spirit of peace and harmony between the various factions, while doing some good, stirred up among his enemies a new and violent storm. His excommunication of the incestuous man (1 Cor. v. 1-13) had so enraged the Judaizers that Timothy, who had been sent to Corinth (1 Cor. xvi. 10), was unable to handle the situation, and so returned to Ephesus, bringing to Paul a sad report of the state of affairs. Straightway the Apostle set out for Corinth in person (2 Cor. xii. 14). Upon arriving there his reception was very humiliating. Being unprepossessing in appearance and inelegant in speech he availed but little by his presence against his powerful enemies (2 Cor. x. 10). On the

contrary, he seems to have sustained some severe public insult or injury (2 Cor. ii. 4-11; vii. 12). In affliction and sorrow of spirit he therefore returned to Ephesus; but from there he soon addressed to the Corinthians a letter so terrible in its tone and contents that he afterwards repented having written it (2 Cor. ii. 4; vii. 8). Anxious to learn the effect of this letter he sent Titus to Corinth, perhaps as bearer of the letter, with instructions to observe effects and investigate matters, and report to him at Troas. As said above, the Apostle was obliged to leave Ephesus sooner than he had first planned, and so met Titus in Macedonia, before the latter could arrive at Troas (2 Cor. ii. 13). The tidings brought by Titus relative to the general situation, and in particular with regard to the effect of this severe letter sent by St. Paul, occasioned the writing of 2 Corinthians, which, according to this opinion, was in reality the fourth Epistle addressed to the Church of Corinth. The force of this opinion depends upon the establishment of three points: (a) that St. Paul visited Corinth before leaving Ephesus; (b) that a letter intervened between our First and Second Corinthians; (c) that the offender of 2 Cor. ii. 5 ff. was other than the incestuous man of 1 Cor. v. 1 ff.

(a) That St. Paul paid the Corinthians an unexpected visit before writing our present letter seems certain from his own words. He says he will not come to them again in sorrow (2 Cor. ii. 1). But his first visit to them, when he came as a stranger to announce the glad tidings of the Gospel, was surely not in sorrow; it must have been in great joy, with high anticipations of the harvest he would reap there. Again he says: "Behold, now the third time I am ready to come to you" (2 Cor. xii. 14); "this is the third time I am coming to you" (2 Cor. xiii. 1). If this second visit to Corinth had preceded the writing of First Corinthians, as some have suggested, there would certainly be some mention of it in that Epistle; but such a thing is not even hinted in that letter.

(b) To the supporters of this second hypothesis it seems that the terms used by St. Paul in 2 Cor. relative to the Epistle that had immediately preceded it cannot be applied to 1 Cor., and hence they must refer to an intermediate letter. Referring

to that letter the Apostle says (2 Cor. ii. 4) that he wrote it "out of much affliction, and anguish of heart, and with many tears," etc. He not only flayed his adversaries, but he delivered, as it were, an ultimatum to the faithful themselves that he might test their spirit (2 Cor. ii. 9; vii. 11). The letter was so severe that he was afterwards sorry he had sent it (2 Cor. vii. 8). Such passages as these, as well as those of vii. 12; x. 1, 9, 10, can only with greatest difficulty be made applicable to First Corinthians; they postulate an intermediate letter. This conclusion is made still more likely when we reflect that St. Paul could hardly have sent Titus to Corinth where he was unknown without some letter of recommendation, some sign of authorization. Influenced by the force of these arguments some scholars have gone so far as to say that the last part of our Second Corinthians (x-xiii. 10) constitute that intermediate Epistle, or at least a part of it. This, however, we cannot well admit, although there is doubtless a very sudden break in the continuity of thought at x. 1, and the tone of the following chapters is very different. We must remember that this letter throughout is one of many different, swiftly changing and contrary moods.

The defenders of the first opinion, explained above, say that the expressions of rebuke, denunciation and sorrow alluded to in the passages just cited from 2 Cor. can find their explanation in certain sections of our first canonical letter. The severe words referred to as addressed to the Corinthians, they maintain, are found in 1 Cor. iv. 18-21; v. 1, 2; vi. 8; xi. 17-22; while others, which the Apostle's enemies regarded as proud and arrogant, are in 1 Cor. ii. 16; iv. 1; ix. 1; xiv. 8; xv. 8.

(c) The references in 2 Cor. ii. 5-11 to some offender cannot very well apply to the incestuous man. They seem rather to refer to some bitter member of the Judaizing party. It does not appear at all likely that the "indignation," the "fear," the "revenge," etc., of 2 Cor. vii. 11, 12 could refer to what is said of the incestuous person of 1 Cor. v. 1 ff. In 2 Cor. vii. 12 the Apostle seems to be utterly careless of the destiny of the transgressor: "I wrote to you . . . not for his sake that did the wrong . . . but to manifest our carefulness that we have for you"; whereas in 1 Cor. v. 5 he says that his action against the

offender was in order that his "spirit may be saved in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ." Against the traditional view, then, it would seem that the great transgressor of 2 Cor. 5-11 was not the incestuous man of 1 Cor. v. 1, but some outrageous and personal opponent of the Apostle himself.

No matter which of the two hypotheses just exposed we prefer, it still remains true that St. Paul wrote our Second Corinthians in response to information given him by Titus in Macedonia upon the latter's return from Corinth. The Apostle expresses his satisfaction at the good tidings reported, but turns all the fire and force of his wrath upon those who were trying to destroy his Apostolic authority and his work.

II. Date and Place of Writing. The first Epistle was written at Ephesus in the spring of perhaps the year 57. Around Pentecost of the same year St. Paul left Ephesus (1 Cor. xvi. 8) and went to Troas. Not finding Titus there he passed over to Macedonia where he was soon met by Titus and informed of the conditions in Corinth (2 Cor. ii. 12, 13; vii. 5, 6). It was there in Macedonia, perhaps at Philippi, as the Vatican MS. and the Peshitto version indicate, that this letter was written probably some time in the autumn of the same year 57. This would allow about four or five months between the writing of the First and Second Epistles. At least so much time would seem to be necessary for the developments that took place at Corinth after the reception of the first letter. But if we accept the second opinion explained above, which to many now seems more probable, a longer period would be required between our first and our second canonical Epistle. Enough time would have to be granted for the intervening visit of St. Paul to Corinth, for the intermediate letter which is supposed to have followed upon that visit, and for the ensuing developments in the Corinthian Church. Probably, therefore, this second letter was not written before the first part of the year 58.

The bearer of the Epistle was perhaps Titus, accompanied by those companions who were to assist in organizing the collection for the poor of Jerusalem (2 Cor. viii. 16-24). Who the brother was, "whose praise is in the gospel through all the churches" (2 Cor. viii. 18), we do not know. Perhaps it was Barnabas, or Silas, or Luke, or Mark. Likewise we do not know

who is meant in verse 22 of the same chapter by the brother who had been "proved diligent in many things." Probably the reference is to Timothy, or Apollo, or Sosthenes, or St. Luke.

III. Authenticity and Integrity of Second Corinthians.

(a) *Authenticity.* That St. Paul was the author of this Epistle is admitted not only by all Catholic scholars, but also by the vast majority of non-Catholic authorities. It is true that external witnesses for its genuineness are somewhat later than for the First Epistle, but from the middle of the second century we find abundant testimonies in its favor. The supposed allusions to it in the writings of Clement of Rome and of St. Ignatius are too vague and uncertain to be of any great value. In Polycarp, however, there are passages which seem clearly to prove that he was familiar with this letter, as well as First Corinthians. "He that raised Him from the dead will raise us also" (Poly., *Ad Philip.* ii. 2) is evidently a quotation from 2 Cor. iv. 14. Also "providing always for that which is honourable in the sight of God and of men" (Poly., *op. cit.* vi. 1) is very much like 2 Cor. viii. 21. Again, "among whom the blessed Paul laboured," etc. (Poly., *op. cit.* xi. 3) doubtless refers to 2 Cor. iii. 2. St. Irenaeus explicitly cites our Epistle several times (*Adv. Haer.* iv; xxviii. 3; xix. 1 and iii, vii. 1; v, iii. 1; xiii. 4). Sometimes this is done by name: "The Apostle says in the second epistle to the Corinthians" (*op. cit.* iv, xxviii. 3); "in the second to the Corinthians saying" (*op. cit.* v, iii. 1), after which he quotes from 2 Cor. ii, iii, iv, v, xiii. Clement of Alex. quotes this letter more than forty times (cf. *Strom.* iv. 16), and Tertullian over seventy times (cf. *Adv. Marc.* v, xi, xii; *de Pud.* xiii). St. Cyprian quotes from every chapter of it, excepting i and x. The Epistle was known to the heretic Basilides, and Marcion included it in his own canon. It is also found in the Muratorian Fragment.

Many other authorities might be cited, but the above are some of the principal ones.

The internal evidence in favor of the authorship of this Epistle is as strong as it could be. First of all here we see the personality, the style, and the peculiar characteristics of St. Paul plainly stamped on every page. Here we find expressed in a very high degree his entire devotedness to the cause of Christ, his intense love for his children in the faith, his burning zeal and that fire of temperament which are so peculiar to the great Apostle. "In

its individuality of style, intensity of feeling, inimitable expression of the writer's idiosyncrasy, it may be said to stand at the head of all the Pauline Epistles, Galatians not excepted" (Robertson, in *Hastings Dict. of the Bible*, I. p. 491). Furthermore, so numerous and evident are the similarities between this letter and the Acts of the Apostles and other letters of St. Paul, especially First Corinthians, Romans and Galatians, that no critic could, without stultifying himself, pretend to deny that the author of all these Epistles was one and the same. This Second Epistle is, in fact, the natural and logical sequel to First Corinthians, either directly or indirectly. The conditions and evils which occasioned the first letter had simply increased and developed at the time when this one was deemed necessary.

(b) *Integrity*. That this letter with all its parts was written by St. Paul is, therefore, so universally admitted as to remove all question thereof. As we have seen, both the internal and the external evidence in this regard is overwhelming. And until modern times the integrity of the Epistle has been quite as certain as its authenticity, so far as external evidence goes. All MSS., versions and Fathers are for the entirety of our Epistle as we have it. But some recent scholars, looking carefully into the contents of the letter, have concluded that it contains portions of two or more Epistles, joined together at a very early date, perhaps by some copyist. This conclusion was first drawn by Semler (†1791), but was little heeded until Hausrath of Heidelberg published a pamphlet in 1870 on "The Four Chapter Epistle of St. Paul." Since that time two portions of the letter especially (vi. 14-vii. 1 and x-xiii.) have been suspected by many authorities of belonging to some other letter or letters of St. Paul. The reason for regarding the first section (vi. 14-vii. 1) as out of place are, (a) because it seems to interrupt the natural flow of the letter, and (b) because vi. 13 joins so well with vii. 2. Of the authors who hold that this portion does not belong to our present letter some (like Hausrath, McGiffert, Pfeiderer, etc.) think it is a fragment of some other Pauline letter that has been inserted here; while others (such as Sabatier, Hilgenfeld, etc.) believe it to be a part of the letter mentioned in 1 Cor. v. 9. But the reasons given for this opinion are of little weight, and are against all textual evidence: The section is found here in

all MSS. How could a fragment of one roll get inserted into the middle of another roll? (Plum.). Many letters and chapters of books contain abrupt paragraphs which do not fit in smoothly with the rest, but no one would therefore necessarily conclude that they are out of place. Moreover, the exhortation of vi. 14 ff. follows not unnaturally on what is said in v. 10 and vi. 1, 2.

The case with x-xiii is not so easily settled. In the first part of the letter (i. 12-vii. 16) St. Paul defends himself against his enemies, in the second part (viii. 1-ix. 15) he speaks about the collection for the poor in Jerusalem. Then suddenly in chapter x, without any apparent reason, he opens fire anew on his enemies. The commencement of the chapter is like the beginning of a letter: "Now I Paul myself beseech you," etc. (2 Cor. x. 1). The reasons, therefore, that have led many scholars to regard this section (x-xiii) as not belonging to 2 Cor. are mainly the notable differences between what is said here and in the first part of the Epistle. For example, here he fears that when he arrives among them he will find them guilty of all kinds of sins and vices (xii. 20); there he recognizes the abundance of their faith and charity (viii. 7). Here he speaks with harshness and violence (xiii. 1-10); there he is so full of sweetness as to feel almost obliged to apologize for it (ii. 4; vii. 8).

But notwithstanding these and other marked differences between the first and last parts of this Epistle there seems to be hardly sufficient reason for denying the integrity of the letter. If we take what seems to us probably a more correct view of the matter, we shall find that the last chapters follow pretty naturally upon those that precede.

In the first part of the Epistle the Apostle is speaking more directly to that portion of the Corinthian community which has remained faithful to him, or at least has returned to him; and to these he explains, in calm and moderate language, the events and circumstances that have occasioned the misunderstanding between him and them. But toward the end of the letter, while still addressing the whole Church, he is speaking of his determined enemies, and therefore he uses more vigorous language and takes occasion to show his adversaries how superior to them he really is. The last part appears to suppose the first part and could not very well have been written before it, at least in its

entirety. There seems to be a rather necessary and natural connection between the two. For instance, we find the same ideas expressed in i. 15 and x. 14; in ii. 2; vii. 9 and xiii. 10; in iii. 1; v. 12 and x. 18; xi. 16. Verses 11-13 of chapter xiii. are evidently addressed to the readers of the first chapters, whom they presuppose. And even within the last section (x-xiii) a marked distinction is made at times between different readers. Some are addressed in terms of affection (xi. 2, 11; xii. 19), while others are objects of extreme severity (xi. 4, 13, 21).

We are well aware that opponents of the integrity of the Epistle point to a great number of passages in Chapters i-ix which, they say, suppose the previous writing of many things contained in the last four chapters. Thus they tell us that 2 Cor. i. 23, "To spare you, I came not any more to Corinth," etc., and 2 Cor. ii. 1, "I determined this with myself, not to come to you again in sorrow," find their natural explanation only in 2 Cor. x-xiii, where it is explicitly stated, "If I come again, I will not spare" (2 Cor. xiii. 2). Also 2 Cor. ii. 4, "Out of much affliction, and anguish of heart I wrote to you with many tears," cannot be understood aside from reference to the affliction and anguish that are expressed in 2 Cor. x-xiii, which, therefore, must have been written beforehand. Again 2 Cor. iii. 1 says, "Do we begin again to commend ourselves?" and 2 Cor. v. 12, "We commend not ourselves again to you," etc. Now when do we find St. Paul commending himself, except in the closing chapters of 2 Cor., where there is question of "boasting" seventeen different times? Likewise 2 Cor. vii. 8, 9, "Although I made you sorrowful by my epistle," etc., does not apply to 1 Cor., but is very natural if referred to the last chapters of 2 Cor. Furthermore, in 2 Cor. vii. 15 St. Paul, speaking of the report made to him by Titus, upon the latter's return from Corinth, says, "He remembereth the obedience of you all," etc. How, we are asked, can this be made to harmonize with 2 Cor. x. 6, where the Apostle says he is "in readiness to revenge all disobedience," etc., unless the latter was written before the former?

Finally, to sum up, we are asked how it is possible that St. Paul, in the same letter, could speak with so much confidence and approval in the first nine chapters, and then with such dis-

trust and fear in the closing chapters. For example, "In faith you stand" (i. 23); "my joy is the joy of you all" (ii. 3); "You are the epistle of Christ" (iii. 3); "great is my glorying for you" (vii. 4); "your zeal for me" (vii. 7); "in all things you have shewed yourselves to be undefiled in the matter" (vii. 11); "remembering the obedience of you all" (vii. 15); "I rejoice that in all things I have confidence in you" (vii. 16); "in all things you abound in faith, and word, and knowledge, and all carefulness," etc. (viii. 7). And after all these commendations to say towards the end: "I fear lest perhaps when I come, I shall not find you such as I would, and that I shall be found by you such as you would not. Lest perhaps contentions, envyings, animosities, dissensions, detractions, whisperings, swellings, seditions, be among you. Lest again, when I come, God humble me among you: and I mourn many of them that sinned before, and have not done penance for the uncleanness and fornication and lasciviousness, that they have committed" (xii. 20, 21). To speak at the close of a letter so harshly, and in tones so contrary to what has preceded in the first part is, we are reminded, an incongruity and a want of tact which can hardly be supposed in St. Paul.

These are some of the passages cited and some of the arguments adduced by those who think the last four chapters of our Epistle preceded, in time, the writing of the other chapters. But in view of what we have said above we are not convinced that there is sufficient reason for departing from the traditional position regarding the integrity of this letter. St. Paul in the closing chapters was speaking of his inveterate enemies, and it would be only natural if there he repeated many things he had already said in the severe intermediate letter written previously from Ephesus. It is to this intermediate letter, now lost, that the above passages from 2 Cor. i-ix doubtless refer. Cf. Jacquier, in *Dict. de la Bible*, tom. ii, col. 1000 ff.

IV. Characteristics and Style. In no other letter of St. Paul have we such a variety of thoughts and feelings as in Second Corinthians. It is one continuous alternation of "joy and depression, anxiety and hope, trust and resentment, anger and love" (Weizsacker). At one time we see the Apostle's eyes flash

with indignation, then fill with tears; at one time he lifts his head with dignity and independence, then bows down with sorrow and humility; now he is flushed with righteous anger, now pale with anxiety; first he moves with might and vehemence against his enemies, then he gives way to tenderness and love for his children in the faith. "The letter exhibits a tumult of contending emotions. Wounded affection, joy, self-respect, hatred of self-assertion, consciousness of the authority and the importance of his ministry, scorn of his opponents, toss themselves like waves on the troubled sea of his mind. . . . Strong language . . . figurative expressions, abrupt turns, phrases seized and flung at his assailants, words made up, iterated, played upon, mark this Epistle far more than any other of the Apostle's letters" (Davies).

This is the most personal of all the Apostle's writings. Here we learn how much he suffered for the Gospel; how he was beaten, shipwrecked, and in perils; how he labored, fasted, and prayed (xi. 24 ff.). Here also we are told of the marvelous divine favors that were accorded him, how he was rapt into the third heaven to hear unearthly words which mortal man is not allowed to utter (xii. 2 ff.). In this Epistle we see the Apostle's "ardent love for Jesus Christ, his sense of personal weakness, his pride in his Apostolic authority, his contempt of temporal sufferings, his faith in the eternal, his anxiety for the poor, his tender love for his spiritual children, his burning indignation with those who sought to corrupt them, his withering sarcasm, his fearless courage, his melting compassion" (MacRory).

The style is in keeping with the thought. In the first part it is generally calm and peaceful, but vehement and polemical to an extreme degree in the four closing chapters. The language, like the thought, is like "a river which sometimes flows in a gentle stream, sometimes rushes as a torrent bearing all before it, sometimes spreads out like a placid lake, sometimes loses itself, as it were, in the sand, and breaks out in its fulness at some unexpected place" (Erasmus). On the whole it is doubtless true that "the style of this Epistle has not been so universally admired as that of the first. The Greek is rough. The account and the reasoning are often involved and broken, and there is a lack

of ease and smoothness throughout. The thoughts, as beautiful in general as in the First Epistle, are not so well expressed; there is not one passage which in loftiness of eloquence equals the first letter. Nevertheless, in spite of the faults of the language, the eloquence of this Second Epistle is powerful. The intensity of the contending sentiments under the influence of which it was written has broken the rhythm and the arrangement of the phrases, but it gives an impression of life and of power which a more polished diction would be unable to do. One feels at each phrase that the writer is speaking from the bottom of his heart, of that heart on which Corinth is inscribed" (Plummer).

V. Relation Between First and Second Corinthians. From what has been said above it is clear that the first letter was much more carefully done than the second. The latter was written in a hurry, and under high tension of thought and feeling, and hence is lacking, not only in the grace and polish, but also in the orderly arrangement of the former. In the second letter there is such a jumble of emotions, passions and feelings that, turning to it from the first letter, "one feels like passing from a park with paths intersecting but easily discernible into a pathless or tractless forest" (Schmiedel). In this letter St. Paul is concerned only with his personal defense and the collection for the poor in Jerusalem; whereas First Corinthians treats a larger number of topics of varied and great importance than perhaps any of the Pauline Epistles. As no other book of the New Testament tells us so much about the inside history and practices of the early Church as First Corinthians, so there is no book that gives us such a concrete and personal view of the character of St. Paul as Second Corinthians. In the one we behold the internal activities of the great Christian society, in the other the internal working of the ardent soul of the great Apostle.

VI. Division and Analysis. Besides an Introduction and Conclusion, this Epistle contains three distinct parts: (a) A defense of the Apostle; (b) an exhortation regarding the collection for the poor in Jerusalem; (c) proofs of St. Paul's Apostolic authority.

I. The Introduction (i. 1-11) contains (a) the salutations of St. Paul and Timothy to the Church of Corinth (i. 1, 2); (b)

acts of thanksgiving for consolations received in the midst of afflictions (i. 3-10); (c) a request that the Corinthians will lend their prayers (i. 11).

2. The First Part (i. 12-vii. 16) is a general apology for the Apostle's life. St. Paul defends himself against the accusation of inconstancy and fickleness, in particular with regard to his intended visit to Corinth (i. 12-17), and shows that his firmness of purpose is based on the faithfulness of God and the grace of the Holy Spirit (i. 18-22). He explains the reason for his change of plan to go directly from Ephesus to Corinth (i. 23-ii. 17).

The Apostle's enemies had accused him of arrogance and pride, because he spoke with authority and at times alluded to himself. This he did only on account of the greatness of the ministry committed to him. He says that he is in need of no recommendation to the Corinthians; they are his commendation (iii. 1-3). His trust is in God, who has made him a minister of the New Testament (iii. 4-6). The Apostolic ministry is far superior to that of the Mosaic Law, and gives the right to speak with liberty and authority (iii. 7-18). Having this higher ministry the Apostle speaks with assurance and clarity; there is no obscurity in his Gospel, except for those who are blind, because he preaches only Jesus Christ (iv. 1-6). Apostles must be prepared to suffer (iv. 7-12), but in their trials they are sustained by the hope of the resurrection (iv. 13-18). Borne up by this glorious hope St. Paul seeks only to please Jesus Christ, his future Judge (v. 1-10). It is the fear of the judgment of God that makes him defend himself (v. 11-13); it is his love of Christ that moves him to seek, not his own interest, but only the glory of God (v. 14-21). His conduct has been in imitation of Christ (vi. 1-10). The Corinthians are exhorted to avoid the vices of the pagans (vi. 11-vii. 1). St. Paul protests his affection for them; he has joy over the good effects of his letter (vii. 2-16).

3. The Second Part (viii-ix. 15) treats of the collection for the poor in Jerusalem. The Apostle reminds the Corinthians of the generosity of the faithful of Macedonia (viii. 1-5). He sends Titus to take their gifts which, because of their many virtues, he is sure will be bountiful (viii. 6, 7). Remembering Christ, who became poor for their sakes, the Corinthians will give will-

ingly and generously according to their means (viii. 8-15). St. Paul recommends to them Titus and two others, who are charged with making the collection (viii. 16-24). The faithful of Corinth ought to give liberally, first, because the Macedonians who are coming with the Apostle understand that they are generous (ix. 1-5), and secondly because of the great reward attached to almsdeeds (ix. 6-15).

4. The Third Part (x. 1-xiii. 10) contains the Apostle's personal defense of his Apostolate against his inveterate opponents, the Judaizers. He knows how to conquer all his adversaries (x. 1-6), and at his forthcoming visit he will vindicate in person the Apostolic authority in which he glories (x. 7-11). He will not imitate those who glorify themselves, for he is glorified by God and his own labors (x. 12-16); it is God who must praise and recommend (x. 17, 18).

The Apostle affirms his superiority to his adversaries. He asks to be borne with while he commends himself and his labors (xi. 1-6). His disinterestedness among the Corinthians is proved by the fact that he refused recompense for his spiritual work (xi. 7-15). He again begs to be excused if, like his enemies, he glorifies himself (xi. 16-21); like them, he is a Jew, a servant of Christ (xi. 22, 23); but he has suffered much more than they for his Apostolic ministry (xi. 24-33). He has enjoyed marvelous visions and revelations wherein he might glory (xii. 1-5), but he prefers to glory only in his infirmities (xii. 6-10). If he has had thus to commend himself, it is because the Corinthians have not defended him as they should have done (xii. 11-18). He is not trying to justify himself before the Corinthians; he is speaking before God for their edification, so that they may not be found back in their former sins when he comes to them (xii. 19-21). Upon his third visit he will be severe against those who are found impenitent (xiii. 1-6), and he writes these things as a warning, hoping severity may not be necessary (xiii. 7-10).

5. The Conclusion (xiii. 11-13) consists of a brief exhortation (xiii. 11), mutual salutations (xiii. 12), and an Apostolic Benediction (xiii. 13). We may observe here that there are some authors who make the conclusion of this Epistle begin at xii. 19 (cf. Coghlan, *St. Paul*, p. 164).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

CATHOLIC COMMENTARIES ON SECOND CORINTHIANS

Greek Fathers: St. John Chrysostom, *Thirty Homilies* (Migne, P. G. tom. LXI, col. 381-1610); St. Cyril of Alex., *Fragmenta ex catenis collecta* (P. G. tom. LXXIV, col. 915-951); Theodoret, *Interpretatio* (P. G. tom. LXXXII, col. 376-460); Œcumenius, *Comment.* (P. G. tom. CXVIII, col. 909-1088); Theophylact, *Explanatio* (P. G. tom. CXXIV, col. 795-952).

Latin Fathers: Ambrosiaster, *Commentarius* (Migne, P. L. tom. XXX, col. 771-806); Primarius Adrum., *Commentaria* (P. L. tom. LXVIII, col. 553-584); Sedulius Scotus, *Collectanea* (P. L. tom. CIII, col. 161-182); Walafrid Strabo, *Glossa ordinaria* (P. L. tom. CXIV, col. 551-570).

Later and Recent Commentators: St. Thomas Aquinas, *Commentarius* (Paris, 1880); Cajetan, *Literalis expositio* (Rome, 1529); Ganacius, *Brevissima scholia* (Paris, 1543); Salmeron, *Commentarii* (Cologne, 1614); Estius, *Commentarius* (Douai, 1614); Cornelius a Lapide, *Commentarius* (Antwerp, 1614); Noel Alexander, *Commentarius literalis* (Naples, 1741); Calmet, *Commentaire* (Paris, 1707); Bisping (*Erkl. des zweit. Br. an die Kor.* (Münster, 1863); Maier, *Kommentar über den zweiten Brief an die Korinther* (Freiburg, 1865); MacEvilly, *An Exposition of the Epistles of St. Paul* (3rd ed., Dublin, 1875); Cornely, *Comment. in S. Pauli alteram ad Corinth. epistolam* (Paris, 1892, 1909); Rickaby, *Notes on St. Paul* (London, 1905); Toussaint, *Lettres aux Thess., aux Galat., aux Corinth.* (Paris, 1910); Sales, in *La Sacra Bibbia*, vol. II. (Turin, 1914); MacRory, *The Epistles of St. Paul* (Dublin, 1915); Lattey and Keating, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, in *The Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures* (London, 1920).

NON-CATHOLIC COMMENTARIES

Some of the best non-Catholic commentators on the present Epistle are as follows: Emmerling, Charles, *Epistola Pauli ad Corinthios posterior* (Leipzig, 1823); Osiander, E., *Kommentar über den zweiten Brief Pauli an die Korinther* (Stuttgart, 1858); Klöpfer, A., *Kommentar über das zweite Sendschreiben des Ap. Paulus an die Gemeinde zu Korinth* (Berlin, 1874); Plumptre, *Commentary on Second Corinthians* (London, 1881); Waite, in *Speaker's Comment. on The Second Ep. to the Corinthians* (London, 1881); Farrar, *Pulpit Comment. on The Second Ep. to the Corinthians* (London, 1883); Beet, A., *Commentary on The Epistles to the Corinthians* (London, 1885); Lightfoot, *Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul* (London, 1904); Plummer, *The Second Ep. of Paul The Apostle to the Corinthians* (Cambridge, 1903).

The Second Epistle to the Corinthians

CHAPTER I

THE APOSTOLIC GREETING, I, 2

I. Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, and Timothy our brother: to the church of God that is at Corinth, with all the saints that are in all Achaia:

I, 2. As in the previous letter so here, St. Paul begins by an assertion of his Apostolic authority and divine commission. Timothy, his faithful companion and fellow-laborer in preaching the Gospel (1 Cor. xvi. 10; Rom. xvi. 21), is associated in the writing of this Epistle because, since the Apostle is going to speak much of himself and defend his life and actions against his adversaries, he could have no better witness than Timothy, and no one who was more highly esteemed by the Corinthians. Here too, all the faithful, not only of Corinth, but of the whole Roman Province of Achaia, are addressed.

I. Paul, an apostle, etc. See on Rom. i. 1.

Of Jesus Christ (Vulg., *Jesu Christi*) is according to A D G K; whereas B & M P read, "Of Christ Jesus."

Our brother. Literally, "The brother," i.e., not only a fellow-Christian, but a co-laborer in preaching the Gospel. In five other Epistles (Philip., Col., 1 and 2 Thess. and Philem.) Timothy is similarly associated with St. Paul.

With all the saints, etc., i.e., this letter is addressed to Corinth, and also to all the other Christian communities of Achaia. Unlike Galatians, however, this was not a circular Epistle. It embraced the outlying Churches of Achaia only so far as they shared the disorders and opinions of the central Church at Corinth.

Achaia was a distinct Roman Province including the Pelopon-

2. Grace unto you and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.

3. Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies, and the God of all comfort.

4. Who comforteth us in all our tribulation; that we also may be able to comfort them who are in all distress, by the exhortation wherewith we also are exhorted by God.

nesus and north Greece as far as Macedonia. Corinth was its capital.

2. See on Rom. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 3.

THANKSGIVING FOR RECENT BENEFITS, 3-11

3-11. The Apostle has lately passed through dire perils, for deliverance from which he now thanks God, especially since his trials and his safe escape from them have been ordained to the ultimate good and comfort of his dear ones in the faith. It was by their prayers that he was assisted in time of danger, and he trusts to their devout coöperation for deliverance from similar circumstances in the future.

3. The Apostle now thanks God the Father for the mercy and comfort which he, Timothy, and perhaps other fellow-laborers (verse 19) have experienced in their trials and toils.

The God and Father (ὁ θεὸς καὶ Πατήρ). The one article for the two names shows that they both refer to the one Divine Person. The Father is called the **God of our Lord Jesus Christ**, just as the Saviour Himself said: "I ascend to my Father and your Father, my God and your God" (John xx. 17).

The Father of mercies, etc., i.e., the merciful Father who is the source of all consolation (Eph. ii. 4).

4. God comforts St. Paul, Timothy and their fellow-workers in the ministry, in order that they in turn may comfort the faithful in their afflictions.

Distress represents the same word in Greek (θλίψις) as **tribulation**; and likewise **comfort** and **comforteth** render the same Greek terms as **exhortation** and **exhorted**. The same variation between our version and the Vulgate, on the one hand, and the Greek text, on the other, occurs again in verse 6.

5. For as the sufferings of Christ abound in us: so also by Christ doth our comfort abound.

6. Now whether we be in tribulation, it is for your exhortation and salvation: or whether we be comforted, it is for your consolation: or whether we be exhorted, it is for your exhortation and salvation, which worketh the enduring of the same sufferings which we also suffer.

7. That our hope for you may be steadfast: knowing that as **you are partakers** of the sufferings, so shall you be also of the consolation.

The *et . . . et* of the Vulgate here are not in the Greek.

5. If the sufferings of the Apostles were extraordinary, their consolations were correspondingly great.

The sufferings of Christ, i.e., the sufferings which Christ bore for the diffusion of the Gospel and the salvation of souls, and which are continued in the members of His mystical body (Col. i. 24). There is no thought here of Christ now suffering in glory.

6. The Apostle wishes to say now that whatever happens to him and his fellow-workers for Christ—whether it be joy or sorrow, comfort or affliction, it is all ordained for the good of the faithful. Their afflictions beget patience, and their comfort inspires hope in the goodness of God.

The text of this verse causes much confusion. In the first place the Vulgate clause, *sive exhortamur pro vestra exhortatione et salute* must be omitted as a repetition of the last part of the first clause. The corresponding words in our version, **or whether we be exhorted, it is for your exhortation and salvation** must likewise be omitted.

This done, there are two principal readings of the verse: (a) "Now whether we be in tribulation, it is for your consolation and salvation, which is wrought out in the endurance of the same sufferings which we also suffer; or whether we be comforted it is for your consolation, knowing that," etc. (as in versè 7) (B D F G K L); (b) "Now whether we be in tribulation, it is for your comfort and salvation; or whether we be comforted, it is for your comfort, which worketh in the endurance of the same sufferings that we also suffer" (X A C M P). The latter reading is more like the Vulgate and is preferable.

The Vulgate, *quae operatur tolerantiam* should be *quae operatur in tolerantia*.

7. The Apostle expresses his unwavering hope that as the

8. For we would not have you ignorant, brethren, of our tribulation, which came to us in Asia, that we were pressed out of measure above our strength, so that we were weary even of life.

9. But we had in ourselves the answer of death, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God who raiseth the dead.

Corinthians bear their afflictions courageously they may also experience much comfort and consolation.

That our hope, etc. (Vulg., *Ut spes nostra*, etc.) should be "And our hope," etc. This clause is transferred by the Vatican MS. and many other authorities to the middle of the preceding verse, but such placing is against the best internal and external evidence. It is true that the participle knowing is without an antecedent, but this is not uncommon in St. Paul.

8. A particular instance of great suffering endured by St. Paul, and perhaps by Timothy, in Asia is now recalled to the minds of the Corinthians. What was this terrible affliction? Since it seemed to be well known to the Corinthians, it was probably the report of the rebellion in Corinth against the Apostle's authority. It overwhelmed him with grief. Now this could hardly be said of the uproar caused by Demetrius at Ephesus (Acts xix. 23), for Timothy was not there at that time (Acts xix. 22). Neither could we easily suppose it to have been some mere private distress caused by sickness, shipwreck or the like.

In Asia, i.e., in the Roman Province of Asia, which consisted of the coastlands of Asia Minor on the Aegean Sea, of which Ephesus was the capital.

That we were pressed, etc., i.e., exceedingly above our strength, so that we were weary, etc., i.e., so that we despaired even of life. The Apostle is saying that his affliction was more than his *natural* strength could support, but which he was able to bear by the grace of God (1 Cor. x. 13).

9. So great was the affliction of St. Paul and Timothy that they felt sure they must die, if left to their own strength. This extremity of suffering was given them that they might learn to trust in God who is able to raise the dead to life, and so, *a fortiori*, can rescue from death (Rom. iv. 17).

But (ἀλλά) is not adversative here; it confirms what was said before and should be translated, "Nay."

10. Who hath delivered and doth deliver us out of so great dangers: in whom we trust that he will yet also deliver us.

11. You helping withal in prayer for us: that for this gift obtained for us, by the means of many persons, thanks may be given by many in our behalf.

The answer of death, i.e., the sentence, the judgment, the expectation of death (St. Chrys.).

10. So great dangers. More literally, "So great a death." The danger was naturally tantamount to death.

That he will yet also, etc. This shows that the same situation might occur again, which is against the supposition that the affliction in question was caused by the uproar of the silversmiths (Acts xix. 23).

And doth deliver (Vulg., *et eruit* with F G K L) would better be "and will deliver," *et eruet* (B 8 C).

11. The Apostle is confident that in future the help of God will not be wanting to him, because he trusts in the prayers of all the faithful, and of the Corinthians in particular.

That for this gift, etc. The meaning is: That from many persons (*faces*) thanks may be given on our behalf for the gift obtained for us through the prayers of many. St. Paul desires many prayers to be offered for him and his companions, so that when the favor is obtained God may be honored by the thanksgiving of many.

THE REASON FOR THE APOSTLE'S CONFIDENCE OF BEING HELPED IN FUTURE BY THE PRAYERS OF THE CORINTHIANS, 12-14

12-14. There has been a mutual sharing of benefits between St. Paul and the Corinthians: the good things which he experienced, like the evils that he suffered, have both turned to the welfare of the faithful; while he, in turn, has been assisted by their prayers in rising above his afflictions. And he is confident that they will continue to help in the future as in the past. This confidence is grounded on the testimony of his conscience that when with them he always acted with the utmost sincerity and candor, and he firmly trusts they will find that same spirit of sincerity in this letter, and that they will continue to acknowledge

12. For our glory is this, the testimony of our conscience, that in simplicity of heart and sincerity of God, and not in carnal wisdom, but in the grace of God, we have conversed in this world: and more abundantly towards you.

that they have reason to glory in him and his helpers as their Apostles, while he and his co-workers will rejoice in them as in their spiritual children when Christ comes in judgment.

This section leads up to the first part of the body of the Epistle in which the Apostle gives a general defense of his Apostolic life. The Judaizers at Corinth as in other places sought by defaming the Apostle, to destroy his Apostolic authority, and thus remove the great obstacle to the spread of their errors. They said he was a weak and inconstant man who was always changing his mind and plans, that he was proud and full of conceit, that he forced people to accept his doctrines by constant threats, and so on. Such reports as these naturally made some, if not many, of the faithful suspicious of St. Paul. But when the Apostle learned of conditions at Corinth he lost no time in refuting these calumnies of his adversaries, so that when he would later arrive there the situation might not demand severity. Therefore in the first part of the present Epistle (i. 12-vii. 16) he is chiefly at pains to disprove accusations of fickleness and inconstancy (i. 15-ii. 17); to show that he was not guilty of pride and arrogance (iii. 1-iv. 6); and finally, by laying bare his motives in preaching and by explaining the reasons that impelled him in the exercise of his ministry, to foil all the efforts of his enemies (iv. 7-vi. 10). The Apostle terminates this part of his letter with an affectionate exhortation to the faithful to entertain towards him the same tender love which he has always cherished for them (vi. 11-vii. 16).

12. **For our glory is this**, etc., i.e., the reason for glorying in the future help of the prayers of the Corinthians is founded on the testimony of his conscience that, while he and his companions were doing the work of God among them, they were at all times moved by candor and sincerity.

In simplicity. This is according to D F L, the Vulgate, Old Latin, and Syriac versions; but the best Greek MSS. read: "In holiness" (*ἐν ἁγιότητι*), and this reading has been adopted by all modern critics.

13. For we write no other things to you, than what you have read and known. And I hope that you shall know unto the end:

14. As also you have known us in part, that we are your glory, as you also are ours, in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Sincerity of God, i.e., the sincerity that comes from God, God-given sincerity.

Carnal wisdom is here set over against "simplicity" (holiness) and sincerity, and means the product of hypocrisy and duplicity; it is not to be confounded with the "wisdom of this world" (1 Cor. ii. 5, 6).

In the grace of God, i.e., moved by the grace of God.

We have conversed, etc., i.e., St. Paul and his co-workers have everywhere in their preaching been moved in simplicity and candor by God's grace, but more especially so at Corinth, where they refused even the support to which they were entitled (xi. 7-9; 1 Cor. ix. 1-15).

Of heart (Vulg., *cordis*) should be omitted.

13, 14. **You have read and known.** Better, "You read and even acknowledge." The meaning is that he is not writing anything in this Epistle which the Corinthians do not already know from his life and conduct when among them, and from the other letters he has sent them and which they have.

And I hope, etc. This clause should be separated from what follows in verse 14 by a comma only. The Apostle is not quite certain, but he hopes the Corinthians will continue to the end of their lives, even to the end of the world, to acknowledge, as **in part**, i.e., as some of them have already done, that he and his companions, as Apostles, are their glory, while they are his glory, as his spiritual children, in the day of judgment.

ST. PAUL REFUTES THE CALUMNY OF HIS ADVERSARIES THAT HE IS
FICKLE AND INCONSISTENT, 15-22

15-22. The Judaizers who sought to destroy the Apostle's authority and work at Corinth charged him, among other things, with fickleness and instability, and they gave as an instance his change of plan regarding his visit to Corinth from Ephesus. Against these calumniators he now asserts the consistency of

15. And in this confidence I had a mind to come to you before, that you might have a second grace:

16. And to pass by you into Macedonia, and again from Macedonia to come to you, and by you to be brought on my way towards Judea.

17. Whereas then I was thus minded, did I use lightness? Or, the things that I purpose, do I purpose according to the flesh, that there should be with me, It is and It is not?

his teaching, which is based on the truthfulness of God Himself, and upon the special character as Apostles with which God has consecrated him and his companions for their ministerial labors and duties.

15, 16. **In this confidence**, etc., i.e., in view of the Apostle's firm belief in the mutual reasons for glorying which existed between the Corinthians and himself, he had at first planned to go directly from Ephesus to Corinth, then to Macedonia, and finally back to Corinth again; and it seems he had made known this plan, or a part of it, to the faithful at Corinth, perhaps through the letter, now lost, which he first sent them (1 Cor. v. 9). When, therefore, he told them in 1 Cor. xvi. 5 ff. that he had made other arrangements and would go first to Macedonia and then come to Corinth, his enemies seized upon this change to accuse him of lightmindedness and inconsistency.

A second grace (δευτέραν χάριν with \aleph A C D, rather than *δευτέραν χαράν* with B \aleph_s L P), i.e., a second joy and a spiritual favor. The first joy would be on his way to Macedonia, the second on his return from there. Some, with Estius, hold that the first "grace" was when St. Paul first preached the Gospel at Corinth, and that consequently the "second grace" here would have been his second visit there. But this view would be against the very probable opinion that the Apostle paid a hurried visit to Corinth between the writing of our First and Second Corinthians (see *Introduction*, i).

Towards Judea, whither he was to carry the collection for the poor Christians of Palestine.

17. **Did I use lightness?** i.e., did I change my mind out of mere fickleness? That he did not is shown by the fact that his resolutions are not made according to human considerations and passions, but according to the illumination and direction of the Holy Ghost. If he did not go directly from Ephesus to Corinth,

18. But God is faithful, for our preaching which was to you, was not, It is, and It is not.

19. For the Son of God, Jesus Christ, who was preached among you by us, by me, and Sylvanus, and Timothy, was not, It is and It is not, but, It is, was in him.

it was because the Spirit restrained him, as had happened before, when he and Silas attempted to go into Bithynia (Acts xvi. 7).

That I purpose. The change here from the past to the present tense draws attention to the Apostle's general conduct.

That there should be, etc. Better, "So that with me it is now 'Yea, yea,' and now 'Nay, nay.'" i.e., that he should resolve to do a thing while at the same time having the intention not to do it.

Both in the English and in the Vulgate here the affirmation and the negation should be repeated twice to agree with the Greek.

18. Digressing for a moment from the question of his visit to Corinth St. Paul insists upon the consistency of his teaching in general.

God is faithful. This may mean that he calls God, as by an oath, to witness the truth of what he is saying (cf. xi. 10; Rom. xiv. 11); or, more likely, that "God is faithful to His promises; He had promised to send you preachers of truth, and therefore since I am sent to you, our preaching is not 'Yes and No,' i.e., there is no falsity in it" (St. Thomas).

Our preaching . . . was not. Better, "Our preaching . . . is not" (B & A C D F G P), i.e., all the promises and preaching of the Apostle and his companions are reliable and consistent.

The Vulgate *qui fuit* and *in illo* are not represented in the Greek.

19. In this and the three following verses St. Paul is proving the faithfulness and consistency of his promises and of his preaching at all times. His argument is: "Just as the Son of God whom we preached to you was faithful to God's promises (verse 19), since through Him were fulfilled all the promises of God (verse 20), so we ministers of that faithful Christ, having been confirmed and anointed by God (verse 21) and sealed with the pledge of His Spirit (verse 22), are also faithful to our promises and consistent in our preaching."

20. For all the promises of God are in him. It is; therefore also by him, amen to God, unto our glory.

21. Now he that confirmeth us with you in Christ, and that hath anointed us, is God:

The Son of God, etc., whom we preached to you, and who, as God, is truth and immutability itself, was not fickle and unfaithful, but, on the contrary, was the fulfillment of all God's promises to men.

Silvanus was doubtless the same as Silas (Acts xv. 40; xvi. 1 ff.), who, together with Paul and Timothy, had labored in the foundation of the Church in Corinth (Acts xviii. 5).

20. The last words of the preceding verse are now explained.

For all the promises, etc. Better, "For how many soever are the promises," etc., i.e., all the Messianic promises made by God to the Patriarchs and Prophets (vii. 1; Rom. ix. 4; Gal. iii. 16-21; Heb. vi. 12; vii. 6; xi. 13, etc.) are verified and fulfilled in Christ.

Therefore also by him. Better, "Wherefore also through him" (διὸ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ, with B N A C F P). The meaning is that since through Christ have been fulfilled all the Messianic promises, through Him also is made possible the *Amen* by which the fulfillment of those promises is acknowledged. The Apostle is alluding to the practice on the part of the faithful of saying *Amen* in response to the prayers of the priest in the public religious assemblies (1 Cor. xiv. 16).

To God, unto our glory. Better, "To God's glory through us." The sense is that the acknowledgment of the fulfillment of God's promises, as preached by Paul and his companions (which is expressed by the word *Amen*), redounds to the glory of God.

The *nostram* of the Vulgate should be *per nos*.

21. As Christ, whom the Apostles have announced, is unchangeable, so is their preaching of Him, and this by a special spiritual anointing which they have received from God.

Confirmeth us, i.e., renders us Apostles firm and unchangeable in teaching the doctrines of revelation to the faithful. The words **with you** imply that the faithful also received from God the firmness and stability with which they retained the doctrines preached to them.

Hath anointed us, i.e., has especially called us to preach the

22. Who also hath sealed us, and given the pledge of the Spirit in our hearts.

23. But I call God to witness upon my soul, that to spare you, I came not any more to Corinth: not because we exercise dominion over your faith: but we are helpers of your joy: for in faith you stand.

Gospel, and has given us the graces necessary to discharge this high office. The word *χρίω*, from which the name *Christ* is derived, is used only four times in the New Testament, and in each instance of our Saviour (Luke iv. 18; Acts iv. 27; x. 38; Heb. i. 9). Therefore the anointing here spoken of must mean that Paul and his companions were especially called to preach the Gospel and perform their ministry. The reference is not to the Sacrament of Confirmation, nor to Baptism, which is received by all the faithful, but more properly to ordination, since God was the anointer and the purpose of the anointing was to enable the Apostles to discharge the spiritual duties of their ministry. In the Old Testament kings, priests, and prophets were anointed before undertaking their offices (1 Kings ix. 16; Exod. xl. 13).

22. **Hath sealed us.** Not only did God anoint and consecrate Paul and his companions for the work of preaching the Gospel, but He also stamped upon them, as it were, the seal of His divine authority and sanction by giving them the power of miracles, and by enriching them with the various gifts of the Holy Ghost. These gifts were a pledge and an earnest of the still more precious endowments reserved for them in the life to come.

The pledge of the Spirit. The sense is that the Holy Ghost dwelling in the hearts of the Apostles was an earnest of the still greater gifts awaiting them hereafter.

THE REASON WHY ST. PAUL CHANGED HIS PLAN, 23

23. After having proved the firmness and consistency of his promises and preaching the Apostle now returns to the subject of verse 17, and explains why he did not go directly from Ephesus to Corinth as he had planned.

Upon my soul, etc. He calls God to witness against his soul, meaning that God should destroy it, if he is not telling the truth when he says that the reason why he did not come to Corinth as first planned was in order to spare the Corinthians. The con-

dition of the Church there was so bad that the Apostle could not at the time have gone thither without using great severity, and hence he preferred to remain away till later. But even in this he was not acting "according to the flesh": he was acting under the guidance of the Spirit, as in Acts xvi. 7 (St. Chrys.).

I came not any more (οὐκέτι ἦλθον). The Apostle here seems to be repeating the complaint of the Corinthians, who regretted that he "came not any more to Corinth." He means to say that he did not pay the visit alluded to in verse 15 above. This statement does not interfere with the very probable opinion which holds that St. Paul paid a short and painful visit to Corinth after writing 1 Cor. (2 Cor. xii. 14, 21; xiii. 1), because that painful visit was not of the nature, duration or extent of the one alluded to in verse 15 above, and promised very likely in the lost letter to the Corinthians of which there is question in 1 Cor. v. 9.

Not because we exercise, etc. Better, "Not that we exercise," etc. Having just spoken of *sparing* the Corinthians the Apostle now explains his meaning. He does not want the faithful to think that he and his companions desire to tyrannize over their faith, using despotic methods with them: rather he wishes to promote their joy in believing; and since, on account of their factions and disorders he could not do this, he preferred to remain away. As regards their faith they were not in need of correction, but they were at fault in other matters (Theod.).

CHAPTER II

ST. PAUL CONTINUES TO VINDICATE HIS ACTIONS AGAINST THE CHARGE OF LIGHTNESS, 1-4

1-4. The vindication begun in ii. 15 is continued here. The reason the Apostle did not pay the Corinthians the visit which he had intended and which they desired was because their disorders were such that another visit from him would be to their sorrow, and not to their joy. Hence he preferred to write to them.

1. But I determined this with myself, not to come to you again in sorrow.
2. For if I make you sorrowful, who is he then that can make me glad, but the same who is made sorrowful by me?
3. And I wrote this same to you; that I may not, when I come, have sorrow upon sorrow, from them of whom I ought to rejoice: having confidence in you all, that my joy is the joy of you all.
4. For out of much affliction and anguish of heart, I wrote to you with many tears: not that you should be made sorrowful: but that you might know the charity I have more abundantly towards you.

1. **Not to come to you again, etc.** Better, "*Not again in sorrow to come to you*" (B \times A C D F G), i.e., he would not pay them a second sorrowful visit. This implies that he had already come to them in sorrow, which certainly could not refer to the first time he visited Corinth and founded the Church with great success and reason for joy (Acts xviii. 1 ff.). That the Apostle here refers to a second visit to Corinth, which must have occurred after writing 1 Cor., is further confirmed by xii. 14; xiii. 1, where he speaks of his coming visit as the *third*.

2. Here the Apostle tenderly observes that if he comes to Corinth bringing pain to the faithful, there will be no one else there who can give joy to him; if his visit must cause them sorrow, they will not be in a condition to contribute to his joy, and they alone can give him joy. The singular δ λυπούμενος sums up the Corinthian Church as one individual (Plum.).

3. **I wrote this, etc.** Comparing this passage with vii. 8 we see that there must be a reference here to some Epistle previous to the present one.

This can refer back to the determination of verse 1, or, more probably, to the severe rebuke which he had been obliged to send before, and to which allusion is made in verse 4. Now since the language of this and the following verse cannot well be applied to 1 Cor., we must conclude that the Apostle is referring to what he said in the lost letter written between 1 and 2 Cor. He wrote that severe Epistle that the Corinthians might correct their disorders before he should arrive, and thus make his visit one of joy.

To you (Vulg., *vobis* after *scripsi*) should be omitted according to the best authorities.

4. Here again the reference seems plainly to be to a letter more severe than our First Corinthians.

5. And if any one have caused grief, he hath not grieved me; but in part, that I may not burden you all.

I wrote to you, etc., i.e., in the lost letter between 1 and 2 Cor. The Apostle's purpose in writing was not to cause sorrow, but to show the greatness of his charity for the faithful, whose disorders he would not be so cruel as to condone, but whose feelings he would spare by writing rather than by appearing before them in person. He wanted to correct them, but with as little pain as possible.

The *in vobis* of the Vulgate should be *in vos*, or *erga vos*.

ST. PAUL DEFENDS HIS TREATMENT OF THE GRIEVOUS OFFENDER, 5-11

5-11. According to the traditional opinion, followed by Cornely, MacRory and most Catholic exegetes, St. Paul is speaking in this section of the incestuous man of 1 Cor. v. 1-8. But Le Camus, Lemonnyer and many other recent interpreters believe that the present passage and vii. 8-12 refer to some other offender of whom we know nothing outside this letter, and who in some way gave particular offence to St. Paul. In favor of this latter opinion it is argued (a) that the language of the present passage is too mild to refer to a crime so heinous as incest; (b) that if the incestuous man is meant here, his crime was even greater than represented in 1 Cor. v. 1; for, since vii. 12 and this passage are the same, it would follow that the incestuous man married his father's wife while his father was still living—a crime which we can hardly imagine the Corinthians would have tolerated for a moment; (c) in 1 Cor. v. 1 ff. the Apostle is resenting a stain on the whole Church, whereas here the offence seems to be rather an individual affair. These arguments, however, are not entirely convincing. At any rate, St. Paul is now urging charity toward a repentant sinner. The obedience of the faithful has been manifest before in punishing crime, and now it will not be wanting in granting pardon. The Apostle, therefore, promises to ratify their decision.

5. The sense is that the offender referred to has not only grieved St. Paul, but in a measure all the faithful. The conditional

6. To him who is such a one, this rebuke is sufficient, which is given by many:

7. So that on the contrary, you should rather forgive him and comfort him, lest perhaps such a one be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow.

8. Wherefore, I beseech you, that you would confirm your charity towards him.

form, if any one, etc., is used to spare the feelings of the repentant sinner.

But in part, etc. Better, "But in measure (not to be too severe with him) all of you." The offender has grieved the whole Church, although ἀπὸ μέρους may imply that some of the Christians were not pained. This could apply to the incestuous man, or to the other offender.

6. **To him who is, etc.** The meaning is: The punishment he has received from many is sufficient for one who has committed such a crime. St. Paul had ordered the excommunication of the incestuous man (1 Cor. v. 1, 13), and if the reference here is to him, the faithful are now told that they may resume friendly relations with him.

By many. This may imply that many were present when the sentence was pronounced, or that a minority of the Christians were not satisfied with the penalty. Did they think it insufficient or too severe? Since the context implies that this minority were devoted to St. Paul, it would seem that they regarded the penalty as inadequate. This interpretation is made very probable by what follows.

7. **On the contrary, etc., i.e.,** instead of continuing the punishment of the repentant sinner, or wishing that he had received a severer penalty, the faithful ought now to forgive him and comfort him, lest a continuation of severity do more harm than good. The ecclesiastical superiors removed the excommunication, and the Corinthian Church is told to exercise its power of remitting the punishment which still might be exacted, thereby showing that the Church has power to grant indulgences, or a remission of the debt of temporal punishment due to God. For if the pardon of the Church did not avail before God, the sinner would be released from temporal punishment only to be reserved for punishment afterwards in purgatory (cf. MacR., h. l.).

8. **Confirm your charity, etc.** "Your" should be omitted. The

9. For to this end also did I write, that I may know the experiment of you, whether you be obedient in all things.

10. And to whom you have pardoned anything, I also. For, what I have pardoned, if I have pardoned anything, for your sakes have I done it in the person of Christ.

11. That we be not overreached by Satan. For we are not ignorant of his devices.

sense is given by Theodoret: "Unite the member to the body, add the sheep to the fold, show him warm affection." How the faithful are to do this is not stated. Although a legal term, *κυρῶσαι*, to *ratify*, perhaps does not mean that a formal decree is suggested.

9. **Did I write.** As in verse 3, the reference here seems to be to the lost letter which was written between 1 and 2 Cor., rather than to our First Corinthians. In that former letter St. Paul put to test the obedience of the Corinthians by requesting that they punish the sinner, and now he again tries them by asking that they receive back their repentant brother. He wants to see if the faithful are **obedient in all things**.

10. The Apostle tells the Corinthians not to hesitate to forgive the sinner, because he will ratify their action. **Have pardoned** should be present, "pardon" (*χαρίζεσθε*).

What I have pardoned. Very probably the Apostle means here that he has already forgiven the sinner in question, and that the Corinthians need not hesitate, therefore, in forgiving him also. It is possible that some other pardon is referred to, such as the remission of the punishment he had intended to inflict by handing the guilty man over to the power of Satan (1 Cor. v. 3-5).

If I have pardoned, etc. The conditional form here, as in verse 5, is merely a mild way of stating the fact; no doubt is implied.

In the person of Christ, i.e., with the authority of Christ (Estius), or in the presence and with the approval of Christ (Cornely). In forgiving the offender St. Paul did not act merely to please the faithful.

The *donastis* of the Vulgate should be *donatis*.

11. The purpose St. Paul had in pardoning the sinner was to defeat the machinations of Satan who might make use of severe punishment to tempt the offender to despair.

We, i.e., St. Paul and the Corinthian Christians, must not allow

12. And when I was come to Troas for the gospel of Christ, and a door was opened unto me in the Lord,

13. I had no rest in my spirit, because I found not Titus my brother; but bidding them farewell, I went into Macedonia.

our efforts for good to be turned to evil by the low devices of the wicked one.

We are not ignorant, etc. St. Paul and the faithful knew from Scripture that Satan could draw evil out of good, as of old he had tempted Eve to sin under the guise of good (Gen. iii. 4, 5).

ST. PAUL THANKS GOD BY WHOM HE IS APPROVED AS A SINCERE
APOSTLE AND MINISTER OF CHRIST, 12-17

12-17. Speaking in verse 4 of his great sorrow and anguish of heart the Apostle was led to digress (verses 5-11) into speaking about the cause of his pain; but now he returns to the thought of the first part of the chapter. It was his great charity for the Corinthians that caused him to defer his visit and change his plan to go to them. After writing to them he sent Titus to Corinth, hoping to meet him later at Troas and receive his report of Corinthian conditions. Titus finally returned and the two met in Macedonia. St. Paul was delighted at the good news, and thanked God, who throughout his ministry had been so faithful to him, giving his labors everywhere divine assistance and approval.

12, 13. To Troas. Troas was the name of a district and of a town on the northwest coast of Asia Minor. The town is referred to here. St. Paul had arranged to meet Titus returning from Corinth at Troas, but having been himself obliged to leave Ephesus earlier than was expected (Acts xix. 23), he arrived at Troas before the appointed time and did not find his ambassador there. So anxious was the Apostle about the effect of his letter and the mission of Titus to Corinth that, though he found an excellent opening for preaching the Gospel at Troas, he pressed on across the Aegean Sea into Macedonia, in order to meet Titus sooner.

For the gospel of Christ, i.e., for preaching the Gospel. On a previous occasion St. Paul had preached at Troas (Acts xvi. 8).

No rest in my spirit. Better, "No relief for my spirit." The

14. Now thanks be to God, who always maketh us to triumph in Christ Jesus, and manifesteth the odour of his knowledge by us in every place.

15. For we are the good odour of Christ unto God, in them that are saved, and in them that perish.

Apostle's mind was in a state of extreme anxiety and tension, and so he could not tarry at Troas. The opportunity here was not so pressing as the crisis at Corinth. There was danger in delay.

My brother, i.e., my fellow-worker in preaching the Gospel. Titus was afterwards made Bishop of Crete (Titus i. 5), and St. Paul addressed one of his last Epistles to him.

14. **Now thanks be to God**, etc. The Greek is much stronger and marks the transition more emphatically: *Τῷ δὲ θεῷ χάρις*. So relieved and exhilarated was St. Paul by the news learned through Titus that he burst out into thanksgiving for God's great mercies to him in preaching the Gospel, which have caused his labors and those of his companions to issue in triumph everywhere.

Maketh us to triumph. This is the sense commonly given to *θριαμβεύω* here, but in the only other passage of the New Testament where it occurs (Col. ii. 15) and in classical Greek it means "to lead in triumph."

In Christ Jesus, i.e., by means of Christ's help.

Jesus is not in the Greek.

The odour of his knowledge, i.e., the knowledge of God in Christ, diffused by the Apostles and their followers in every part of the world. God is revealed in Christ, and this revelation was preached everywhere by the Apostles. The preaching of the Apostles and their co-workers is represented as a sweet perfume ascending from earth to heaven.

In the Vulgate *Jesu* should be omitted.

15. **We are the good odour**, etc., i.e., the Apostles were the sweet fragrance of Christ unto God at all times. They were this also to those among men who were ready to welcome the revelation of Christ, namely, to those **that are saved**, i.e., to those that are in the way of salvation (Luke xiii. 23; Acts ii. 47; 1 Cor. i. 18); and to **them that perish**, i.e., to those who are in the way of perdition (iv. 3; 1 Cor. i. 18; 2 Thess. ii. 10).

16. To the one indeed the odour of death unto death: but to the others the odour of life unto life. And for these things who is so sufficient?

17. For we are not as many, adulterating the word of God; but with sincerity, but as from God, before God, in Christ we speak.

16. **Of death . . . of life.** The best MSS. read: ἐκ θανάτου . . . ἐκ ζωῆς. The preaching of the Apostles is a source of spiritual life to those who are willing to receive it and put it into practice; but to those who refuse it, or fail to conform their lives to its requirements, it occasions spiritual ruin. The true preachers of the Gospel are, like their divine Master, "set for the fall, and for the resurrection of many in Israel" (Luke ii. 34).

Who is so sufficient? "So" should be omitted. If the preaching of the Apostles is so tremendous, being an occasion of life to some and of death to others, who of himself and with his own strength is capable of undertaking it. St. Paul is emphasizing the responsibility of the Apostolate preparatory to an inquiry into his own Apostolic office and a vindication of his own conduct.

The tam of the Vulgate should be omitted.

17. Unlike certain teachers, as in Corinth, who mixed false doctrines with the Gospel teaching, or degraded that teaching by seeking money through it, St. Paul and his companions preached **with sincerity**, as sent and inspired by God, and as laboring in God's presence and with His approval through the grace given them as members and ministers of Christ (cf. v. 17; Rom. xvi. 10).

Many (οἱ πολλοί, with B 8 A C K, rather than οἱ λοιποί, with D F G L, Syr., Arm.) cannot mean the majority here, at least as regards the Church at large. The reference is doubtless to the Judaizers who were scattered about in Corinth and other places.

CHAPTER III

TO THE ACCUSATION OF ARROGANCE ST. PAUL OPPOSES THE MINISTRY
COMMITTED TO HIM, 1-6

1. Do we begin again to commend ourselves? Or do we need (as some do) epistles of commendation to you, or from you?

1-6. Often the Apostle had felt it necessary to speak to the Corinthians about himself and his authority. His enemies had made use of this to accuse him of boasting and arrogance, and thus tried to lead away the neophytes from one who, as they said, had to praise himself to get a following. Having, therefore, in the closing verses of the preceding chapter again spoken of himself and his ministry he is reminded of the sneer of his adversaries, and he consequently now, before going on with his general apology, takes occasion to tell his readers that he is in no need of self-recommendation, since the faithful themselves are his testimonial. If he speaks with assurance and authority it is because he has been divinely constituted a minister of the New Testament.

1. **Do we begin again**, etc. This implies that the Apostle had already been accused of self-recommendation. Perhaps the reference is to such passages as 1 Cor. ii. 16; iii. 10; iv. 9-16; ix. 1-5, 15-22, etc., which might lead to such accusations. If x-xiii is a part, or contains portions of the lost letter between 1 and 2 Cor. the "again" here is easily understood; for in those chapters the Apostle felt constrained to indulge considerably in what his enemies called boasting.

Or do we need, etc., i.e., are St. Paul and his companions who founded the Corinthian Church in need of recommendation to, or by the faithful there? Does a father need recommendation to his own children? If a preacher who has not founded, or taken part in founding, a Christian community comes to them, letters of recommendation are indeed necessary (Acts xv. 25-27; xviii. 27; 1 Cor. xvi. 10, 11); but it is not so with the founder and spiritual father.

2. You are our epistle, written in our hearts, which is known and read by all men:

3. Being manifested, that you are the epistle of Christ, ministered by us, and written not with ink, but with the spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in the fleshy tables of the heart.

4. And such confidence we have, through Christ, towards God.

From you implies that the Judaizers got the Corinthians to give them commendatory letters.

2. The Corinthians themselves were to St. Paul and Timothy something far better than an ordinary letter of recommendation; they were the Apostle's letter, written not with ink on perishable papyrus, but in lasting characters of love and affection on immortal souls.

Read by all men, i.e., all men could see the ties of affection that existed between St. Paul and the Corinthian faithful. This statement is rendered more literally true by the civil and social prominence of Corinth.

3. **Being manifested**, etc., i.e., it is widely known that the Corinthian faithful were converted by Christ, through the grace of the Holy Ghost and the ministry of St. Paul and his companions. Christ, therefore, is the principal author of the Apostle's letter of commendation, because it was His word and the grace of His Holy Spirit that brought the Corinthians to the faith.

With the spirit, etc. Christ, by the Spirit of the living and life-giving God, wrote on the hearts of the Corinthians through the preaching of the Apostles, a knowledge of the truths of faith which has been so fruitful in virtue and sanctity of life that it is entirely evident that the human agents of that divine message were true and genuine Apostles.

Tables of stone is a reference to the Ten Commandments which were written in the desert, on two stone tables (Exod. xxxi. 18; xxxii. 15, 16).

In the fleshy tables of the heart. Better, "On tables (that are) hearts of flesh." The Vulgate *cordis* should be *cordibus*, according to the best Greek.

4. **And such confidence**, etc. The Apostle means to say that his confidence that the faith of the Corinthians is a sure testimony of the validity of his Apostleship is felt even when he puts himself in the presence of God. His assurance did not come from

5. Not that we are sufficient to think anything of ourselves, as of ourselves: but our sufficiency is from God.

6. Who also hath made us fit ministers of the new testament, not in the letter, but in the spirit. For the letter killeth, but the spirit quickeneth.

his own merits or personal ability, but **through** the grace of Christ.

5. The preceding verse is now better explained. St. Paul means to say that solely of our natural strength and ability it is not possible that we should be able even to **think**, much less to wish or to do, anything supernaturally good and meritorious of life eternal. For the beginning, as well as the completion, of each and every salutary act we need the grace of God; and such is the doctrine of the Church against the Pelagians, who denied all need of grace, and against the Semi-pelagians, who denied the necessity of grace for the beginning of a salutary act (cf. St. Aug., *De dono persever.* 13; *De predest. sanct.* 2; *cont. duas epis. Pel.* 8, etc.; St. Thomas, h. 1.; Counc. of Orange, can. 7).

The words of **ourselves, as of ourselves** are to be connected with **not that we are sufficient**. Our whole sufficiency in supernatural things is from God, as from its primary and principal cause.

We are sufficient (Vulg., *sufficientes simus*) should be "we were sufficient," *sufficientes essemus*, according to the best MSS.

6. The Apostle and his companions have not only received all their supernatural sufficiency from God, but by Him also have they been enriched with the gifts necessary to be **fit**, i.e., competent, ministers of the New Covenant of grace established between God and man by Jesus Christ (Jer. xxxi. 31 ff.; Heb. viii. 8; ix. 15).

Not in the letter, etc. "He has been urging the superiority of his own claims on their affection and obedience to those of his Judaizing opponents. He now points to the boundless superiority of the *dispensation of which he is the minister* to that which the Judaizers represent" (Plummer). The latter represent the Old Covenant, which was founded on the written law, indicating, indeed, the good to be done and the evil to be avoided, but without giving the necessary grace to fulfil its mandates. The New Covenant, on the contrary, which is the law of the Spirit, gives

7. Now if the ministration of death, engraven with letters upon stones, was glorious; so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses, for the glory of his countenance, which is made void:

8. How shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather in glory?

9. For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more the ministration of justice aboundeth in glory.

all the help required to observe its precepts. See on Rom. iv. 15; v. 20; vii. 7; viii. 2, 3.

THE MINISTRY OF THE APOSTLES IS SUPERIOR TO THAT OF MOSES, 7-II

7-II. Greater glory is due to the ministry of the New Covenant than to that of the Old, because of the superior excellence of the former as compared with the latter. The Old Law consisted of letters written on stones and led to spiritual death, while the New Testament gave the Holy Ghost and spiritual life; the Old Law was unto condemnation, the New unto justification; the former was transitory, the latter is eternal in its duration.

7, 8. If the ministration of death, etc., i.e., if the ministry performed by Moses in giving the Israelites the Law, which was written on tables of stone and led to death (verse 6) was glorious, i.e., was accompanied by a glorious manifestation which so shone in the face of Moses that the recipients of that Law could not steadfastly look upon his countenance (Exod. xxxiv. 29-35), how much more glorious is the ministry of the Apostles through whom is given to us the Holy Ghost and the supernatural gifts of grace and glory?

Which is made void. However dazzling the glory that accompanied the giving of the Law of Moses, it was only temporary; whereas the glory of the New Testament ministry is permanent and shall never fade. The glory on the face of Moses was only transitory, symbolical of the transitory character of his ministry and of the Law he gave.

9. The Old Testament ministry is called one of condemnation, because the Old Law was an occasion of sin, and thus provoked the anger and condemnation of God. See on Rom. vii. 8-II. The New Law, on the contrary, is a ministration of justice, i.e., of justification, because through it are given the Holy Ghost, sanctifying grace and glory. See on Rom. i. 17; iii. 23; Gal. iii. 13.

10. For even that which was glorious in this part was not glorified, by reason of the glory that excelleth.

11. For if that which is done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is in glory.

12. Having therefore such hope, we use much confidence:

Be (Vulg., *est*) should be *was* (*fuit*), as the sense requires. The Vulgate *in gloria* would better be *gloria*, to agree with *δόξῃ* (with B & A C).

10. So superior is the glory attaching to the New Testament ministry over that of the Old Covenant that by comparison the latter was not glorious at all; the glory of the one entirely obscures the glory of the other.

That which was glorious, i.e., the Old Law, its ministers, and ministrations.

In this part. The meaning seems to be that the Old Covenant has been deprived of its glory *in this respect*, that something more glorious has appeared.

11. Although glorious in its giving, the Old Dispensation and its ministry have come to naught, because they had only a transitory purpose, namely, to lead to Christ (Gal. iii. 24). If, therefore, glory accompanied such a ministry, in spite of its passing character, how much more glorious is the ministry of the New Law which is enduring.

THE SUPERIORITY OF THE GOSPEL DISPENSATION GIVES ITS MINISTERS RIGHT TO SPEAK WITH BOLDNESS AND AUTHORITY, 12-18

12-18. The hope of greater glory which belongs to the New Testament ministry, and which, though already come, is to continue and develop, gives the Apostles confidence and assurance in announcing the Gospel clearly and openly. To explain and enforce this St. Paul contrasts the Jews who, not recognizing Christ, do not grasp the meaning of their own Old Testament, with the Christians who plainly understand Christ and are transformed into His glorious image.

12. **Such hope** of one day enjoying the fulness of the glory which belongs to the New Testament ministry. "Christianity was young and undeveloped when this was written: we have

13. And not as Moses put a veil upon his face, that the children of Israel might not steadfastly look on the face of that which is made void.

14. But their senses were made dull. For, until this present day, the self-same veil, in the reading of the old testament, remaineth not taken away (because in Christ it is made void).

seen its maturity and the fulfillment of the Apostle's hope" (Rick.).

Confidence. Better, "Boldness of speech" (*παρρησία* —from *πᾶν* and *ῥῆσις*). "We preach everywhere, hiding nothing, but speaking plainly, nor are we afraid of wounding your eyes, as Moses dazzled the eyes of the Jews" (St. Chrys.). The Apostle is hinting at the comparative silences of the Old Testament, e.g., as to the resurrection and eternal life (Plum.).

13. And not as Moses put a veil, etc. The meaning is that the Apostles do not cover their faces as Moses did. From the Hebrew and the Septuagint of Exod. xxxiv. 29 ff. it appears that Moses when communicating with God had no covering on his face, and that when he came forth and spoke to the people his face was likewise unveiled until he had finished speaking to them; then he again covered his face so that the Israelites might not see the fading of the brightness from his countenance. The passing of the splendor from the face of Moses was a symbol of the transitory nature of the Old Covenant (Exod. xxxiv. 33), and God did not wish to reveal this feature of the Law to the Jews of the time. "There was an excuse, then, for their not seeing that the Old Covenant was transient; it was different now after God had revealed the fact through the Prophets and declared it openly through the Apostles" (MacR.).

Look on the face should be "look on the *end*," namely, the fading away of the brightness of Moses' face. All the Greek MSS., except A, and all the Greek and Latin Fathers read "end" (*τέλος*) here in place of "face."

Of that which is made void, i.e., the fading away of the brightness from Moses' face, which was a symbol of the transient character of the Old Testament.

The in faciem of the Vulgate should be *in finem*.

14. Although the Apostles wear no veil, but speak openly and plainly of Christ, the Jews do not understand, because their

15. But even until this day, when Moses is read, the veil is upon their heart.

16. But when they shall be converted to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away.

senses, i.e., their minds, are blinded through their own fault. Little by little, through the Prophets, God lifted the veil which hung over the face of the Law, so that the Jews could have perceived the nature of the Old Dispensation, which was intended to lead them to Christ (Gal. iii. 24); but, influenced by the devil (iv. 4), they willingly closed their eyes and their hearts to the light and warmth of the Gospel (Isa. vi. 8 ff.; Acts xxviii. 25 ff.).

Until this present day the Old Testament continues to be a veiled book to the Jews, because just as they could not perceive the vanishing glory of the face of Moses, so now, of their own choice, are they unable to understand the transitory nature of the Scriptures which they read.

The selfsame veil means that the symbolism of the veil is the same, namely, the inability to see that which was passing. The Jews read their Scriptures, but the veil hangs over what they read because they will not believe in Christ through whom alone their darkness can be lifted: in Christ it (the veil) is made void, i.e., is done away with.

15. **When Moses is read.** The meaning is that even when St. Paul wrote this letter a veil hung over the hearts of the Jews, as a people, while they heard read every Sabbath in their synagogues the Old Testament Scriptures. The Jews remained insensible to the truth, because they kept their powers of perceiving truth covered.

Moses here stands for the entire Old Testament, because the Prophets were read every Sabbath, as well as the Law.

16. **But when they shall be converted,** etc. According to the Greek MSS. and Fathers, and the older Latin editions this verse should read: "But when he turneth to the Lord, the veil is taken away." The Apostle is alluding to Exod. xxxiv. 34, where it is said that Moses removed his veil, when he turned to converse with the Lord. The action of Moses is allegorically applied to the Jews who shall be enlightened, when they shall have turned to the Lord.

17. Now the Lord is a Spirit. And where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.

18. But we all beholding the glory of the Lord with open face, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, as by the Spirit of the Lord.

The auferetur of the Vulgate should be aufertur.

17. The first clause here reads as follows in Greek: "Now the Lord is the Spirit," i.e., the Holy Ghost is the Lord, a Divine Person (St. Chrys., Theod., etc.); or Christ (verse 16), to whom the Jews, typified by Moses, are to turn, is the Spirit, i.e., is the Holy Ghost mentioned above, in verses 6, 8, the life and principle of the New Law, inasmuch as the Holy Ghost is the Spirit of Christ, or, inasmuch as Christ and the Holy Ghost have the same divine nature (Bisping, Maier, etc.); or **the Lord** here does not mean Christ, but God, the quickening Spirit of the New Covenant (verse 6), in contradistinction to the letter of the Old (Cornely). But it is difficult to see how *κύριος* here can mean Yahweh, to whom the Jews as a people had always turned. There seems rather to be question of Christ to whom they refused to turn. When, therefore, the Jews shall have turned from the letter of the Law which killeth to the Spirit of the Gospel which quickeneth, the blindness of their minds shall disappear, and they shall be freed from the servitude which now enslaves them.

There is liberty, i.e., from the bondage of the Law, from its ceremonial precepts. The Spirit makes us children of God (Rom. viii. 14 ff.) and free "by the freedom wherewith Christ has made us free" (Gal. iv. 31).

This verse is a proof of the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, as all the Greek Fathers argue.

18. **We are beholding**, etc., i.e., unlike the Jews whose faces are veiled, all we Christians through our faith reflect, with uncovered countenance as in a mirror, the glory of the Lord resplendent in Holy Scripture, and especially in the Gospel, and are continually being transformed into the divine image we behold, because through faith and charity we receive a new form which renders us sons of God and brothers of Christ, and therefore conformable to the image of the Son of God (Rom. viii. 29).

From glory to glory, i.e., the process of transformation is

gradual, from one stage to another, from lesser to greater glory (cf. Rom. i. 17).

As by the Spirit of the Lord. The Greek here may be rendered in many ways. Perhaps one of the best is: "As by the Spirit who is the Lord"; and the meaning is that by the influence of the Spirit, the Holy Ghost, Christians are step by step made similar to the glorified image of Christ, and consequently of God (iv. 4).

CHAPTER IV

THE APOSTLE HAS EXERCISED HIS MINISTRY WITH SINCERITY AND FRANKNESS BECAUSE OF ITS EXALTED CHARACTER, I-6

1. Therefore, seeing we have this ministration, according as we have obtained mercy, we faint not;

2. But we renounce the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor adulterating the word of God; but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience, in the sight of God.

I-6. The subject of the preceding chapter is continued in this section, which might well have been made a part of that chapter. What the Apostle has already said about the sublimity of the Gospel ministry and the confidence with which its preachers speak is more than sufficient to refute the calumny that he spoke with arrogance. Consequently he terminates this subject by repeating that he has preached the Gospel clearly, openly, and without timidity; and if some think his preaching is obscure, it is because their minds are blinded by Satan. As for himself, he is the servant of Christ and is trying to spread the light which has been divinely bestowed on him.

1. Since, as just said in the preceding chapter, the Christian **ministration**, i.e., the preaching of the Gospel, is of such an exalted character, **we**, i.e., St. Paul and his companions, in obedience to a gracious and gratuitous call from God, preach without fear or hesitation.

As we have obtained mercy should be connected with what precedes.

2. **Of dishonesty**, i.e., *of shame* (αἰσχύνῃς). The Apostle is re-

3. And if our gospel be also hid, it is hid to them that are lost,

4. In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of unbelievers, that the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God, should not shine unto them.

ferring to everything in conduct and preaching that shame would naturally hide, and also to the policy of concealing the Gospel truth through shame of the folly of the cross (1 Cor. i. 18, 21; Rom. i. 16).

Craftiness means unscrupulous conduct and underhand practices, which were made use of by the false teachers in order to win over the Corinthians.

Nor adulterating, etc., i.e., not corrupting the Gospel with erroneous teachings. From all things of this kind the Apostles kept aloof; manifesting, on the contrary, the truths of the Gospel in such a way that they commended themselves to every man of conscience, and this in the sight of God.

3, 4. A difficulty occurs here. If the Gospel is so openly preached, how does it continue veiled to so many? There are two reasons for this: (a) The perversity of the will of those who, of their own choice, shut their eyes to the light of the Gospel (iii. 13), preferring to go the way of perdition (1 Cor. i. 18); and (b) the devil, who blinds the minds and hardens the hearts of his votaries, turning their eyes to earthly things.

The god of this world, i.e., of this *age* (*aiōnos*), namely, Satan whom our Lord called "the prince of this world" (John xii. 31; xiv. 30; xvi. 11), and whom St. Paul elsewhere designates as "the prince of the power of the air" (Eph. ii. 2). Satan is called the god of this wicked age, in so far as it lives according to his maxims, obeys and serves him; and he, in turn, blinds the minds of his unbelieving followers, leading them away from the faith by his evil suggestions, so that the light of the Gospel, whose object is the glory of Christ, does not shine unto them.

Christ is the image of God, (a) on account of the identity of nature between Himself and the Father; (b) because He is generated by the Father; (c) because He is equal to the Father (St. Thomas). Cf. Col. i. 15; Heb. i. 3.

The glory of Christ is, then, the glory of God, which, being contemplated in the Gospel, has the power of transforming souls

5. For we preach not ourselves, but Jesus Christ our Lord; and ourselves your servants through Jesus.

6. For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God, in the face of Christ Jesus.

into its own likeness (iii. 18). God, therefore, is the supreme source of the Gospel; the Gospel is the revelation of the Messiah, the Son of God, and the Son in turn is the revelation of the Father (John xiv. 7 ff.).

In the Vulgate *Deus* should be written with a small *d*.

5. This verse is closely connected with the preceding one. The Apostles do not seek their own advantage in their preaching; they preach Jesus Christ as Lord, i.e., as the Saviour and Master of all men, regarding themselves only as servants of the faithful for Christ's sake.

We may read **Jesus Christ** with \aleph A C D, Old Lat., Goth.; or "Christ Jesus" with B H K L, Copt., Arm.

Through Jesus. Better, "For Jesus' sake" (with B D F G).

Our (Vulg., *nostrum*) should be omitted.

6. The best supported reading here is: "For God who said, 'Out of darkness light shall shine,' is he that hath shone in our hearts for the illumination of the knowledge," etc. The radical reason why the Apostles preach Jesus Christ, and not themselves, is because such is the will of God, who in the beginning of the world made light shine out of darkness, and who through Christ has made the light of faith shine in the hearts of the Apostles in order that, through their preaching, they might enlighten the world with a knowledge of the glory of God, as it was revealed in the *person* of Christ, i.e., in His Divinity, His actions, His doctrine, etc.

In the face of Christ is doubtless an allusion to the "face of Moses" (iii. 7), with which Christ's face is contrasted; but the meaning seems to point rather to the *person* of Christ, who was the revelation of the glory of the Father.

THE CONTRAST BETWEEN THE SUBLIMITY OF THE APOSTLES' MINISTRY
AND THE INFIRMITY OF THEIR LIVES, 7-12

7. But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency may be of the power of God, and not of us.

8. In all things we suffer tribulation, but are not distressed; we are straitened, but are not destitute;

9. We suffer persecution, but are not forsaken; we are cast down, but we perish not:

7-12. St. Paul has described very clearly the excellence of the Apostolic ministry. This is now understood. But how reconcile the discharge of such exalted functions as fall to the lot of Christian ministers with the weakness and abject misery of the lives of the Apostles? Looking at the lowly condition of St. Paul and his companions, their adversaries could easily make a case against them by telling their converts not to believe them and not to follow them, seeing that they were abandoned and rejected of God. The Apostle, therefore, anticipates this objection by showing that God chose weak instruments (a) to make it plain that the power of the Gospel was not from men, but from Himself; and (b) to render the Apostles more like to Christ whose death and Resurrection they exemplified and preached for the life and salvation of the faithful.

7. **This treasure**, i.e., the exalted office of the Christian ministry.

In earthen vessels, i.e., in fragile vessels made of clay. The allusion is not only to man's body, but especially to his weak human nature, as is clear from verse 8. God chose weak instruments to spread His Gospel, in order to make it plain that the efficacy of their preaching and the excellence of their message were due to Him, and not to themselves.

8. Five illustrations of the contrast between the "treasure" and the "earthen vessels" now follow (verses 8-11).

In all things we suffer, etc. More literally, "Pressed on every side, but not crushed"; "perplexed, but not unto despairing." The participles in Greek look back to *ἔχομεν*, *we have*, of verse 7.

9. **We suffer persecution**, etc. Better, "Pursued, but not deserted," by God so as to be captured by enemies; "struck down (as in battle), but not destroyed."

10. Always bearing about in our body the mortification of Jesus, that the life also of Jesus may be made manifest in our bodies.

11. For we who live are always delivered unto death for Jesus' sake; that the life also of Jesus may be made manifest in our mortal flesh.

12. So then death worketh in us, but life in you.

10. The divine purpose of the Apostles' suffering is now explained. By their continual tortures and exposure to death the Apostles represented and, in a sense, repeated the sufferings of Christ, in order that their many deliverances might be a proof of the life of the risen Jesus whose rescuing power was thus manifested in them. Like Christ's Resurrection, the Apostles were witnesses to the truth of the Gospel, for they showed that Jesus is still alive and able to save (Plum.).

The mortification of Jesus means the dying, or putting to death of Jesus, although *νέκρωσις* is used elsewhere in the New Testament only once (Rom. iv. 19), and then to describe the "deadness" of Sara's womb.

11. The thought of the preceding verse is brought out more clearly.

We who live, etc., i.e., we the living, are constantly exposed to death, although constantly rescued by the living Christ. God wishes the lives of the Apostles to be such in order that now, while on earth, they may manifest in their mortal bodies the life, i.e., the triumph of Jesus who died and is risen again for us.

12. The Apostles were continually exposed to death for their preaching, but they were sustained by the living Jesus to work for the spiritual life and salvation of the faithful. "The Corinthian Church enjoyed the fruit of supernatural life, gathered for it by the Apostles' perils" (Rick.).

THE APOSTLES WERE COMFORTED IN THEIR TRIBULATIONS BY THE HOPE OF A GLORIOUS RESURRECTION, 13-18

13-18. Having explained the purpose of God in permitting the sufferings of the Apostles, St. Paul now speaks of the end the Apostles themselves had in view in the exercise of their difficult ministry. In spite of the constant menace of death they ceased not to preach the Gospel, knowing that a glorious resur-

13. But having the same spirit of faith, as it is written: I believed, for which cause I have spoken; we also believe, for which cause we speak also:

14. Knowing that he who raised up Jesus, will raise us up also with Jesus, and place us with you.

rection awaited them and their converts, that God's glory was promoted by their labors, and that an eternal reward would be given in exchange for their transitory sufferings.

13. The Apostle wishes to say that the same trust and confidence in God sustains him and his companions in their tribulations which sustained the Psalmist in his desolation and sorrow. As the Psalmist *spoke* in consequence of his faith in the divine promises, so the Apostles fearlessly *preach* because of the same faith. St. Paul quotes the LXX of Psalm cxv. 1, which in form only differs from the Hebrew: "I believed, for I must speak." The Psalmist believed that God would deliver him from the death, tears, and dangers spoken of in Ps. cxiv, which in Hebrew is the first part of Ps. cxv, and therefore he *spoke* the Psalm of thanksgiving of which the first verse is given here. The Apostles believed that God would never forsake them, and therefore they *spoke* the Gospel truths.

14. Who raised up Jesus. Better, "Who raised up the Lord Jesus" (with Ⲙ C D F G K L P). In their sufferings the Apostles are encouraged by the hope that as God raised Jesus, their Head, from the grave, so He will one day raise them from the dead and unite them and their converts with their divine Chieftain.

With Jesus, rather than "through Jesus," according to the best MSS. The preposition "with" indicates not time, but the unity of all the faithful in and with Christ.

And place us, etc., i.e., will place us Apostles with you alive in the kingdom of God. For this same use of παραστήσει, see Acts i. 3; ix. 41.

The Apostle here, as in v. 1-8, speaks as if he did not expect to be alive at the Second Coming of Christ; whereas in 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52, he spoke as though he might live to see that event. This shows that he had no revelation in the matter: he knew "not the day nor the hour" (Matt. xxv. 13).

Jesus (Vulg., *Jesum*) in the first part of the verse should be preceded by "Lord" (*Dominum*), as in the best MSS.

15. For all things are for your sakes; that the grace abounding through many, may abound in thanksgiving unto the glory of God.

16. For which cause we faint not; but though our outward man is corrupted, yet the inward man is renewed day by day.

17. For that which is at present momentary and light of our tribulation, worketh for us above measure exceedingly an eternal weight of glory.

15. **For** (γάρ) looks back to the last words of the preceding verse. The prominence given the faithful there, with whom he hoped to be associated in heaven, reminds the Apostles here that all his labors, sufferings, trials, etc., as well as his deliverances, have been for their sakes, that they may have life (verse 12), and that **the grace**, i.e., the divine help, granted to him in answer to their prayers, may call forth their thanksgiving, thus giving glory to God. The glory of God was, therefore, the ultimate end of all the labors and sufferings of the Apostles.

16. **For which cause**, etc., i.e., since all their trials and labors are for the good of the faithful and the glory of God, the Apostles **faint not** (verse 1), i.e., never lose courage. And although their bodies, again and again rescued from destruction and death, are gradually *wasting away*, their souls and spiritual faculties grow stronger every day in view of the rewards awaiting them hereafter (verse 17).

17. **For that which is at present momentary**, etc. Better "For our present light affliction," etc. "Our" before "present" is omitted by B and St. Chrysostom.

The reason why the soul and the spiritual nature are continually renewed in the midst of tribulations is the greatness of the reward expected. Repeating the thought of Rom. viii. 18 the Apostle, by three striking contrasts, shows how great is the reward of suffering for God.

Present is contrasted with **eternal**, **light** with **weight**, **tribulation** with **glory**.

Momentary (Vulg., *momentaneum*) is not in the best MSS.

Above measure exceedingly shows how far the reward surpasses what is performed. God punishes less than we deserve, and rewards more than we merit (St. Thomas).

This verse is a proof that the good works of the just are meritorious of eternal life (*Conc. Trid.*, Sess. VI. cap. 16).

18. While we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen. For the things which are seen, are temporal; but the things which are not seen, are eternal.

18. The Apostles hope to have part in the rewards just described because they do not seek the passing things of this world, such as riches, pleasure, glory and the like, but the lasting goods of the world above that is not seen with bodily eyes.

CHAPTER V

AGAIN ASSERTING HIS HOPE OF A GLORIOUS RESURRECTION ST. PAUL
SAYS HE SEEKS ONLY TO PLEASE CHRIST, HIS FUTURE JUDGE, 1-10

1. For we know, if our earthly house of this habitation be dissolved, that we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in heaven.

1-10. The closing subject of the last chapter is continued through this section. These verses are, in reality, a part of the previous chapter and would better be joined to it. St. Paul has just been saying that the unhesitating hope of a future glorious resurrection is the stay of the Apostles in their sufferings and tribulations. This he again asserts and confirms by the certitude of the glorious transmutation of those whom Christ at His coming will find still living. Neither do the Apostles refuse death, since that will bring their souls home to Christ. Hence St. Paul and his companions, in the discharge of their Apostolic functions, strive only to please Christ, their judge, who will reward everyone according to his merits.

1. For (γάρ) shows the close connection with what precedes.

We know, etc., i.e., the Apostles and all Christians (verse 4) were confident, through faith, that the dissolution of their mortal bodies meant only a passing to a higher state of existence.

House of this habitation. Literally "Tent-dwelling" (οικία τοῦ σκηνῶν), i.e., a dwelling that has only a transitory existence. "The camp-life of the Israelites in the wilderness, as commemorated by the annual feast of Tabernacles, was a ready and appropriate symbol of man's transitory life on earth" (Lightfoot).

2. For in this also we groan, desiring to be clothed upon with our habitation that is from heaven.

3. Yet so, that we be found clothed, not naked.

We have. The present tense indicates the certainty of the fact, and also that the just, already by faith, are in possession of their glorified state.

A building of God, etc., i.e., a spiritual habitation from God of unending duration. The reference is to the glorified body, to which the soul will be joined at the end of the world, and which, together with the soul, will not dwell on earth, but in heaven.

2. St. Paul now confirms the certainty of the future resurrection by the desire which the Apostles and all the just have of clothing themselves with their glorified bodies without passing through death. Such an eager longing God will not permit to be in every way vain (verse 5).

In this (ἐν τούτῳ) may mean "for this reason"; or, more likely, "in this tent," in which we now live, **we groan** (Rom. viii. 19 ff.), **desiring to take on the resurrection body over our natural body**, and so escape death. This shows that the glorified body will be essentially the same as our present body, although endowed with surpassing gifts.

Habitation (οἰκῆριον) here is a permanent dwelling-place, unlike the transitory habitation (σκήνος) of verse 1.

From heaven, i.e., heavenly, spiritual (1 Cor. xv. 49).

3. This verse is an explanation of the latter half of verse 2. It is intended to make clear what will be required in order that **we be clothed upon**, i.e., that we be able to put on our glorified bodies over our mortal ones, without losing the latter. For this it will be necessary that we be clothed (γυμνοί), **not naked**, i.e., that we be still alive, with our mortal bodies, at the Second Coming of Christ. The dead who shall have lost their bodies at the Second Advent shall be clothed anew, but it cannot be said that they shall be "clothed upon." This is the most probable explanation of a very difficult verse. For various other, but less likely, explanations see Cornely, h. l.; MacR., h. l.

Yet so. Better, "If only," or "if indeed" (ἄ γε with \aleph C K L P, or $\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\rho$ with B D F G; the two terms are sometimes interchanged

4. For we also, who are in this tabernacle, do groan, being burthened; because we would not be unclothed, but clothed upon, that that which is mortal may be swallowed up by life.

5. Now he that maketh us for this very thing, is God, who hath given us the pledge of the Spirit.

6. Therefore having always confidence, knowing that, while we are in the body, we are absent from the Lord.

in meaning), i.e., we can "be clothed upon," if indeed we shall be still living with our present bodies.

4. After the parenthetical explanation given in verse 3, the Apostle returns to the thought of verse 2.

We also, etc., i.e., we Christians, living in our material dwellings, do groan, i.e., long to be free from our mortal bodies (Rom. viii. 23); and yet we are **burthened**, i.e., oppressed with the fear of death, **because** we do not want to pass through death to resurrection, but rather from this present life to a higher, immortal existence, so that our bodies may not go into corruption, but be transformed from a perishable into an imperishable state (ii. 7; 1 Cor. xv. 54).

5. **Now.** Better, "But" (δέ), which implies the introduction of a surprising truth, namely, the realization of the wish in verse 4, which shall be fulfilled in those who are alive at the Second Coming; or, perhaps, the possession of a glorified body by all the just (verse 1).

That maketh us. Rather, "That made us," at our creation, and especially at our regeneration through Baptism.

This very thing refers to what is mortal being absorbed by life (verse 4), or to the glorification of the body (verse 1). As an earnest of the realization of these blessings God has given the faithful at their conversion His Holy Spirit and special gifts (cf. Rom. viii. 15-17, 23; Eph. i. 14; iv. 30).

6. The thought begun here, and broken by the parenthesis of verse 7, is completed in verse 8: **Having always confidence . . . we are confident**, etc.

The Apostle now begins to sum up the results of faith in future glorification of both body and soul. Confident of the glory that awaits them hereafter, and knowing that presence in the body is an impediment to the realization of their glorious union with Christ, St. Paul and his companions are willing to suffer death,

7. (For we walk by faith, and not by sight.)

8. But we are confident, and have a good will to be absent rather from the body, and to be present with the Lord.

9. And therefore we labour, whether absent or present, to please him.

10. For we must all be manifested before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the proper things of the body, according as he hath done, whether it be good or evil.

much as they loathe it (verse 4), if this be necessary "to be present with the Lord" (verse 8), that is, if Christ does not come during their life-time and transform their mortal bodies without death.

7. It might be objected against the Apostle that the just are already united to Christ by faith. Wherefore he observes that in this world we have, through faith, only an indirect and imperfect knowledge of God, whereas we long for direct vision and complete union with Him (1 Cor. xiii. 12).

8. See above, on verse 6. The Apostles were hoping that Christ might come during their mortal lives, and thus they would be glorified without passing through the portals of death. But if Christ was not to come, then welcome death, so that they might be at home **with the Lord**. This verse affords a clear proof that purified souls immediately after death are admitted to the vision of God (St. Thomas, h. 1.; Denz. *Ench.* 11th ed., no. 693).

9. The one supreme aim of the Apostle's life and labors was to please Christ and have the divine approval. This secured, it made little difference after all whether the day of judgment found him **present**, i.e., still living in the body, or **absent**, i.e., separated from his body by death. It is clear from this verse that St. Paul had no revelation regarding the time of the Second Advent.

10. The importance of striving above all things and at all times to please Christ is seen in this that, whether living or dead at the time of the Second Coming, all men must appear before the tribunal of Christ to be judged according to what they have done while in the body.

We must all, etc., i.e., all men, even children who die before the use of reason, must appear in the General Judgment. Sinless children will be present then, "not to be judged, but to see the

11. Knowing therefore the fear of the Lord, we use persuasion to men; but to God we are manifest. And I trust also that in your consciences we are manifest.

12. We commend not ourselves again to you, but give you occasion to glory in our behalf; that you may have somewhat to answer them who glory in face and not in heart.

glory of the Judge, in order that both the mercy and justice of God may be manifested in their case" (St. Thomas).

The proper things, etc., should be: "The things done in the body," according to the Greek.

According as he hath done. This shows that we are to be judged hereafter according to our *works*, and not alone according to our faith, as the Protestants teach.

In the Vulgate *propria corporis* should be *ea quae per corpus (gessit)*.

WHY THE APOSTLE HAS WRITTEN THIS DEFENCE OF HIMSELF, 11-13

11-13. Having spoken so plainly of the lofty motives which guide his life and actions the Apostle might suspect that his enemies would again accuse him of boasting (cf. iii. 1). But he has written thus, not to commend himself, but that the faithful may understand him and may know how to reply to those who calumniate him. He and his companions have labored only for the faithful and for God.

11. The fear of the Lord, i.e., the fear inspired by the thought of the judgment to come.

We use persuasion to men, etc. The Apostle means that he and his companions had to use persuasion to convince men of their integrity, and thus further the work of the Gospel; but to God their sincerity was manifest. He trusts that the Corinthians have ceased to mistrust him, at least in their consciences, if not always in their actions, and that they now see him as God sees him.

12. We commend not ourselves again, etc. Better, "We are not again commending ourselves to you." From what the Apostle has just been saying the Corinthians must not think him boastful again (iii. 1); for what he has said was only for the purpose of giving them something to use against the false teach-

13. For whether we be transported in mind, it is to God; or whether we be sober, it is for you.

14. For the charity of Christ presseth us: judging this, that if one died for all, then all were dead.

ers, who glory in face, etc., i.e., who have the appearance of Apostolic virtues without the reality (Cornely), who boast of their exclusive privileges, their descent from Abraham, and the like, but are seriously wanting in the interior graces of true Apostles.

13. For whether we be transported in mind. Better, "For whether we were beside ourselves" (εἴτε γὰρ ἐξέστημεν), i.e., whether you thought we were mad when we spoke of our graces and privileges, it was for God's glory; or whether you think we are at other times in our right mind, it is for your spiritual welfare. Whatever the Apostles did was for God's glory and for the benefit of the Corinthians.

ST. PAUL AND HIS FELLOW-WORKERS ARE MOVED AND DIRECTED BY LOVE OF CHRIST, 14-21

14-21. After saying that the Apostles direct all their actions to the glory of God and the good of souls, St. Paul indicates more specifically the moving power of the Apostolic life, namely, the love of Christ, who, by His example in dying for all men, invites all to embrace a new life, in which they shall live for Him alone who alone died for them. The Apostles are living this new life, and hence they now judge all things by the standard of faith. This grace they have received from the Father, who has not only reconciled them to Himself, but has also called them to the Apostolic ministry; they are ministers of Christ for the purpose of leading all men to Christ, who was made *sin* that we might be made *just*.

14. The charity of Christ, i.e., the love Christ has towards us (Rom. v. 5, 8).

Presseth (συνέχει), i.e., *restricts* us from turning to objects other than the service of God and of our neighbor. And the reason for this is that since Christ died for all men, for the salvation of all, therefore all have died in Him, i.e., have participated in His

15. And Christ died for all; that they also, who live, may not now live to themselves, but unto him who died for them, and rose again.

16. Wherefore henceforth, we know no man according to the flesh. And if we have known Christ according to the flesh; but now we know him so no longer.

death, sharing in its merits, so far as Christ is concerned. The death of Christ is considered equivalent to the death of all men, as a substitute for that of all.

That if one died for all. Better, "That one died for all."

Then all were dead. Better, "Then all died" (*ἀπέθανον*), i.e., all participated in Christ's death, Christ having died vicariously for all. This is by far the most probable interpretation of this passage. See on Rom. vi. 2 ff.

In the Vulgate *quoniam si* should be simply *quod*.

15. **Christ should be omitted.** The verse is closely connected with the preceding. Christ died for all, that all, having shared in His death, should now die to themselves, and live to Him in the new life of grace begun at Baptism.

They also, who live. This more probably refers to those who live the life of grace; not to all men on earth.

And rose again. See on Rom. iv. 25; v. 9, 10.

In the Vulgate *Christus* should be omitted.

16. The connection between this verse and what precedes is very close and intelligible, although some have thought that it breaks the argument, and must therefore be a subsequent insertion. There is no doubt about its authenticity. Since Christians should live now only for Christ and for others in Him, it follows that the Apostles **henceforth**, i.e., from their conversion, when they began to live the new, spiritual life, looked upon and judged men, not according to human standards and natural considerations, but according to the standards of faith and the life of grace.

And if we have known Christ, etc. Better, "Even if (*εἰ καὶ* with B & D) we have known Christ," i.e., if before our conversion we considered Christ as a mere man, even as an impostor, it is not so any longer: now we recognize Him as the true Son of God, as the Lord and Saviour of all. There is no question in this verse of a personal acquaintance between St. Paul and Christ while our Lord was on earth.

17. If then any be in Christ a new creature, the old things are passed away, behold all things are made new.

18. But all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Christ; and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation.

19. For God indeed was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself, not imputing to them their sins; and he hath placed in us the word of reconciliation.

20. For Christ therefore we are ambassadors, God as it were exhorting by us. For Christ, we beseech you, be reconciled to God.

17. The change in the Apostles, which the preceding verse describes, is now extended to all Christians. If any man be in Christ, through Baptism, he has become a new creature, morally and spiritually (Rom. vi. 6; Eph. ii. 10, 15; Col. iii, 9, 10).

The old things, etc., i.e., unregenerate man with his perverse inclinations and sins, are passed away, i.e., no longer exist.

They are made new, i.e., the whole man belongs to a new order.

All things (Vulg., *omnia*) should be omitted, according to the best Greek.

18. This great change and complete renovation is from God, the Father, who sent His Son into the world to redeem us Christians and reconcile us to Himself by means of the sacrifice of the cross, and who has given to us, i.e., to us Apostles, the appointment of continuing the work of Christ. That the first us of this verse refers to all men is clear from the world of verse 19; and that the second us means the Apostles is also clear from in us of verse 19.

19. The thought of the preceding verse is amplified and explained.

For God indeed. Better, "God, as it were" (*ὡς ὅτι θεός*). God was reconciling the world to Himself in Christ, i.e., through Christ, in virtue of Christ's merits, (a) by wiping out men's sins, for which Christ atoned (1 Cor. vi. 11; Col. i. 14, 22), and (b) by confiding to the Apostles the office of preaching the Gospel, of administering the Sacraments, etc.

In the Vulgate *quoniam quidem* would better be *ut quod* (Estius).

20. In consequence of the ministry confided to the Apostles they were ambassadors of Christ, announcing in the name of Christ the message of the Father to the world.

21. Him, who knew no sin, he hath made sin for us, that we might be made the justice of God in him.

We beseech you, etc., to be converted to God, implying that some of his readers were in need of reconciliation with God.

21. To move those who were in need of repentance the Apostle recalls how much God has done for men. In order that we might be redeemed from our sins and justified, God **hath made**, etc., i.e., has treated His only Son, who was sinless, as if He were sin itself (Rom. viii. 3); "He suffered Him to be condemned as a sinner, and to die as one accursed" (St. Chrys.). It is improbable that the meaning here is that Christ was made a *victim* for sin, as is clear from the antithesis between sin and justice; Christ was made a sinner as far as this was consistent with His entire sanctity, i.e., He took upon Himself our sins (Isa. liii. 6) and suffered for them (MacR.).

Be made the justice, i.e., be justified, **in him**, i.e., by reason of our union with Him, who is our head. Our sins were external to Christ, who nevertheless suffered for them; but the **justice of God**, i.e., real internal sanctity, is communicated to us through the merits of Christ (1 Cor. vi. 11; Col. i. 14, 22).

CHAPTER VI

THE APOSTLES IN THEIR MANNER OF LIFE IMITATE THE EXAMPLE OF
CHRIST, 1-10

1-10. In verse 20 of the preceding chapter St. Paul had exhorted the Corinthians, especially those who were not yet Christians, to be reconciled to God. He now extends that exhortation directly to the faithful who, while they have received God's friendship, must be careful not to lose it, if they wish to be saved. They have before them the life of the Apostles, who, in their way of living, in the virtues they practice, and in the vicissitudes they encounter, never allow themselves to be disturbed or moved from their faithfulness.

1. And we helping do exhort you, that you receive not the grace of God in vain.

2. For he saith: In an accepted time have I heard thee; and in the day of salvation have I helped thee. Behold, now is the acceptable time; behold, now is the day of salvation.

3. Giving no offence to any man, that our ministry be not blamed:

4. But in all things let us exhibit ourselves as the ministers of God, in much patience, in tribulations, in necessities, in distresses,

5. In stripes, in prisons, in seditions, in labours, in watchings, in fastings,

1. And we helping, etc. Better, "But we co-operating" (*συνεργοῦντες δέ*), i.e., we Apostles, working together with God (v. 20), do exhort, i.e., do entreat, that you remember your obligation of being faithful to the grace which God has given you in converting you from paganism to Christianity.

2. This verse is parenthetical. Citing the LXX of Isaias xlix. 8 the Apostle now gives a reason why the Corinthians should heed his exhortation without delay.

For he saith, i.e., God says in Isaias, etc. The Prophet represents God as addressing His Servant, the Messiah, and through Him His people, assuring Him that His prayers and labors for the salvation of mankind have been heard. Commenting briefly on the words quoted, the Apostle says that the Messianic time spoken of by the Prophet has come, and that therefore everyone should profit by the graces now given, because, if they are abused, there will be no hope of salvation, since another Messiah shall not come. "We must labor now, while still the eleventh hour is left" (St. Chrys.).

3. After the parenthesis in verse 2 the thought goes back to verse 1, and giving no offence, etc., follows immediately upon we helping, etc. (verse 1). Hence the sense is: The Apostles, St. Paul and his companions, give no offence in anything (*ἐν μηδενί*), i.e., they avoid everything in the exercise of their ministry, and in their dealings with men, that might bring any blemish on their profession and thus keep people from the Gospel. If a preacher of the Gospel leads a life that is out of harmony with his preaching, he gives occasion to men of despising the sacred ministry.

That our ministry. Better, "That the ministry," etc.

The *nemini* of the Vulgate should be *in nullo*.

4, 5. But in all things let us exhibit, etc., should be, according

6. In chastity, in knowledge, in long-suffering, in sweetness, in the Holy Ghost, in charity unfeigned,

7. In the word of truth, in the power of God; by the armour of justice on the right hand and on the left;

to the Greek: "But in everything commending ourselves," etc. St. Paul is continuing the description of the Apostles' conduct, as in verses 1 and 3.

Ministers (Vulg., *ministros*) is nominative in Greek (*διακονοί*), agreeing with the subject of the clause, (*we*) *commending*, etc., and the sense is: The Apostles, as ministers of God, commending themselves in much patience, etc.

In much patience, etc., i.e., *by much patience*, the preposition *ἐν* being used to indicate instrumentality. Nine classes of things which tried the patience of the Apostles are now mentioned in these two verses; the first three are general, the others particular. Of the last six, three came unsought from without, three are voluntarily assumed.

Tribulations . . . necessities . . . distresses, i.e., a gradation of evils, increasing in pressure.

Stripes refers to the scourgings or beatings of xi. 23-25; Acts xvi. 23.

Prisons. We are told of only one imprisonment of St. Paul previous to this letter, and that was at Philippi, but there must have been others (xi. 23).

In seditions, i.e., in tumults (Acts xix. 23 ff.).

In labours, etc. The Apostle now mentions three classes of troubles which were voluntarily undertaken. **Labours**, i.e., things that cause weariness and fatigue; **watchings**, i.e., things interfering with sleep, such as traveling, praying, anxiety and the like; **fastings**, i.e., voluntary abstinences from food and drink. For other New Testament references to fasting and its lawfulness, see xi. 27; Matt. iv. 2; ix. 15; Acts xiii. 3; xiv. 22.

6, 7. From the ways in which patience was especially exercised the Apostle now passes to nine other practices by which he and his companions commended themselves and their ministry.

In chastity, i.e., in general purity of soul and holiness of life.

In knowledge, i.e., in the wisdom of the Gospel, or in the practice of religious truth, or in prudence.

8. By honour and dishonour, by evil report and good report; as deceivers, and yet true; as unknown, and yet known;

9. As dying, and behold we live; as chastised, and not killed;

10. As sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; as needy, yet enriching **many**; as having nothing, and possessing all things.

In long-suffering, i.e., in forbearance of injuries.

In sweetness, i.e., in kindness towards others.

In the Holy Ghost. This likely means that the Holy Spirit is the source of the foregoing virtues, and He is mentioned, like the "power of God" below, as the closing member of a series.

The word of truth perhaps does not refer to the Gospel, but to the general sincerity of the Apostles' utterances.

The power of God, i.e., the special divine assistance which accompanied the whole Apostolic ministry, and which was particularly manifested in the miracles of the Apostles.

By the armour of justice, etc. The preposition changes here from *ἐν* to *διὰ*. The Apostle probably means that he and his companions made use of all the weapons of justice, or of righteousness, having **on the right hand** weapons of offence, i.e., virtues by which justice is promoted, and **on the left** weapons of defense, i.e., virtues by which justice is maintained.

8-10. In a series of antitheses St. Paul now shows how, under all conditions of life, he and his companions conducted themselves as became their high office and ministry. No external condition could make them unfaithful to their duty. When they were *honored* by God, they were not puffed up; when *dishonored* by their enemies, they were not discouraged. In their practice of virtue they were not influenced by *reports bad* or *good*. Although called **deceivers** by their enemies, they ever spoke the *truth*; although they were said to be **unknown** and insignificant teachers, they were **known** throughout the Church (1 Cor. xiii. 12; xiv. 38). While they were always in a *dying* state, i.e., exposed to death (iv. 10, 11), they were constantly being *revived* spiritually; while they were **chastised**, i.e., chastened by God, they were preserved from death (iv. 8 ff.). Their enemies regarded them as **sorrowful**, but they were in reality filled with joy (Acts v. 41 ff.). They were derided as paupers and beggars, but they were all the while enriched with the treasures of grace (1 Cor. i. 5; cf. Mark x. 27-30).

THE CORINTHIANS OUGHT TO IMITATE THE CHARITY OF THE APOSTLE,
AVOIDING THE VICES OF THE PAGANS, 11-18

11. Our mouth is open to you, O ye Corinthians, our heart is enlarged.

12. You are not straitened in us, but in your own bowels you are straitened.

13. But having the same recompense, (I speak as to my children), be you also enlarged.

11-18. St. Paul now begs the Corinthians to exhibit towards him the great love which he has shown them. And since charity is proved by deeds, he admonishes them to shun the vices of paganism, so repugnant to the sanctity of Christianity. They who have God for their father ought to keep themselves clean from all defilement.

11. Before giving the severe admonition that follows in verses 14-18, the Apostle explains (verses 11-13) why he has spoken so freely to the Corinthians (verses 3-10) of the labors and sufferings of himself and his companions. It is because he loves them. His **heart is enlarged** towards them, and he speaks freely and frankly, as a friend to a friend. In spite of their treatment of him, his heart goes out to them.

O ye Corinthians is simply "Corinthians" in Greek. This is the only place in which he addresses them by name (cf. Gal. iii. 1; Philip. iv. 15).

12. **You are not straitened in us**, but in **your**, etc., i.e., there is plenty of room for you in my big heart; but in your heart there is no room for me; you are too full of suspicion and resentment.

Bowels here includes the heart, lungs and liver, rather than the bowels proper. The expressions **heart** and **bowels** both meant the seat of the affections (Plum.).

13. **Having** is not in the Greek. The sense of the verse is: By way of exchange . . . let your heart also be enlarged, i.e., reciprocate my love for you.

My children. The term here employed, τέκνα, is more affectionate than υἱοί. Children should love their parents. The Apostle now returns to the thought of verse 1, and he tells the Corinthians practically how they can prove their fidelity to God and their love towards himself.

14. Bear not the yoke with unbelievers. For what participation hath justice with injustice? Or what fellowship hath light with darkness?

15. And what concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what part hath the faithful with the unbeliever?

16. And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? For you are the temple of the living God; as God saith: I will dwell in them, and walk among them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people.

In the Vulgate habentes should be omitted.

14. Verses 14-18-vii. 1 are regarded by some Rationalists as an interpolation, or as belonging to a lost letter of St. Paul's. See *Introduction*, iii.

Bear not the yoke. Rather, "Bear not *unequal yoke*" (ἑτεροζυγοῦντες). There is an allusion here to Deut. xxii. 10, where it is forbidden to yoke animals of a different kind: "Thou shalt not plough with an ox and an ass together." The Apostle means that believers and unbelievers belong to different classes, and should not, therefore, have fellowship, one with the other; that is, Christian justice, i.e., righteousness (δικαιοσύνη), should not be mingled with pagan injustice, i.e., iniquity or lawlessness (ἀνομία); neither should light, i.e., the teachings of Christianity, be joined to the darkness, i.e., the ignorance, of paganism.

In the Vulgate jugum should be modified by inaequale, to agree with the Greek.

15. Belial is usually read *Beliar*. It is a Hebrew word meaning, primarily, *uselessness* or *worthlessness*; its secondary meaning is *extreme wickedness*. Thus it was understood in the Old Testament (Deut. xiii. 13; Nahum i. 15; Job xxxiv. 18); but toward the dawn of the Christian era it came to be a designation for Satan. So the Fathers commonly interpret it.

16. The Apostle now says that Christians are the temple of God, and that they therefore should not suffer themselves to be profaned and desecrated by heathen vices and profanations.

You are the temple, etc., should be "We are the temple," etc., according to the best MSS.

To prove that Christians are the temple of God St. Paul quotes the LXX of Lev. xxvi. 12 with slight variation, and with a recollection of Ezech. xxxvii. 27. The words quoted were originally spoken of God's dwelling among the Israelites in the Tabernacle (Exod. xl. 34), but the divine dwelling is far more perfect among

17. Wherefore, Go out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing:

18. And I will receive you; and I will be a Father to you; and you shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty.

Christians (1 Cor. iii. 16; vi. 19; Eph. ii. 21). The Apostle is emphasizing God's fidelity to His Christian people.

The Vulgate *vos estis* should read *nos sumus*, in accordance with the best Greek.

17. Wherefore, Go out, etc. The meaning is that Christians must be separated at once and decisively from the corrupt practices and lives of the heathen. The quotation is freely from the LXX of Isa. lii. 11, which literally was an exhortation to the Jews to leave Babylon as soon as the captivity was ended, and to hold themselves aloof from the contamination of paganism.

18. This verse appears to be a combination of several passages of the Old Testament. The substance of it is found in Jer. xxxii. 37, 38; xxxi. 9; Deut. xiv. 1, 2; xxxii. 6, 9. The Apostle is pointing out God's fatherly care of all the faithful. The mention of **daughters** shows how all-embracing is this divine solicitude, and is especially intended to give woman, so degraded at Corinth, her proper and dignified place in the Christian family.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION OF THE PRECEDING EXHORTATION, I

1. Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all defilement of the flesh and of the spirit, perfecting sanctification in the fear of God.

1. As heirs to the glorious **promises** just mentioned (vi. 16-18) Christians should cleanse themselves from every kind of **defilement of the flesh and of the spirit**, i.e., they should be free from all impurity, gluttony, pride, idolatry and the like (1 Cor. vii. 34), in order to perfect the sanctification begun in Baptism.

In the fear of God. Christians cannot avoid sins of the flesh and of the spirit, neither can they attain to perfect holiness of

2. Receive us. We have injured no man, we have corrupted no man, we have overreached no man.

3. I speak not this to your condemnation. For we have said before, that you are in our hearts, to die together, and to live together.

life, unless they have a salutary fear of God. "Love begets security, which sometimes causes negligence, but he who fears is always solicitous" (St. Thomas).

THE APOSTLE'S AFFECTION FOR THE CORINTHIANS, 2-7

2-7. St. Paul now returns to the appeal of vi. 13, that the Corinthians should show towards him the charity which he has manifested towards them. To stimulate them in this matter he recalls his past love and faithfulness in their regard, the solicitude he felt in Macedonia for their salvation, and the comfort he experienced at the report which Titus gave him of them. All this shows how dear they have been and are to his heart.

2. **Receive us.** Rather, "Make room for us" (χωρήσατε ἡμᾶς) in your hearts (cf. Matt. xix. 11, 12). The reason why the Corinthians ought to open their hearts to the Apostle is given forthwith: he has done them no wrong.

We have injured no man in the exercise of our ministry, **we have corrupted no man** by teaching false doctrine, **we have overreached no man** by seeking to enrich ourselves in the preaching of the Gospel. The Apostle is doubtless hinting at the accusations made against him at Corinth, and perhaps also at the practices of the false teachers.

3. **I speak not this**, etc. Literally, "I speak not to condemn you." The Apostle is not blaming anyone, but only defending himself.

We have said before, etc. Rather, "I said before," etc. He had expressed his deep affection for the Corinthians before (i. 6; iii. 2; iv. 12; vi. 11, 12).

To die together, etc., probably means that he is willing to share either death or life with them; or that neither death nor life can separate them from the love of his heart.

In the Vulgate *praediximus* should be *praedixi*, and *vestram* should be omitted.

4. Great is my confidence for you, great is my glorying for you. I am filled with comfort: I exceedingly abound with joy in all our tribulation.

5. For also when we were come into Macedonia, our flesh had no rest, but we suffered all tribulation; combats without, fears within.

6. But God, who comforteth the humble, comforted us by the coming of Titus.

7. And not by his coming only, but also by the consolation, wherewith he was comforted in you, relating to us your desire, your mourning, your zeal for me, so that I rejoiced the more.

4. **Confidence** means rather "boldness of speech" (*παρρησία*), as in iii. 12.

Glorying, i.e., boasting. The Apostle perhaps means to say that he is very frank in dealing with the Corinthians, and full of boasting when speaking to others about them; or that he has such *confidence* in them that he gives way to external boasting in their regard.

I am filled with comfort, etc., i.e., the good news brought from Corinth by Titus filled the Apostle with comfort and joy in spite of all his tribulations at the time. What some of these tribulations were he now proceeds to indicate.

5. In order to explain the situation in which the good news brought by Titus found him, St. Paul now takes up the narrative broken off at ii. 13. Having come to Troas from Ephesus sooner than was originally planned the Apostle did not find Titus there, as had been arranged. So anxious was he to meet his legate and learn of Corinthian conditions that he tarried not at Troas, but went immediately to Macedonia. Even there, however, he had no rest, suffering **combats without**, i.e., external opposition, perhaps from the Jews, pagans, and false brethren; and **fears within**, i.e., mental distress, caused by his uncertainty of the Corinthian situation, and probably also by the hostility around him.

6. **The humble**, i.e., the *low-spirited* (*ταπεινός*), those cast down by sorrow, depression and the like, but who trust in God (1 Peter v. 5).

The coming of Titus from Corinth, whither St. Paul had dispatched him to observe the effects of the previous letter.

7. St. Paul was rejoiced not only by the arrival of Titus, but especially by the comfort he manifested in telling of Corinthian conditions.

8. For although I made you sorrowful by my epistle, I do not repent; and if I did repent, seeing that the same epistle (although but for a time) did make you sorrowful;

Your desire, i.e., the desire of the Corinthians for the Apostle's coming visit.

Your mourning, i.e., for the sorrow they had caused St. Paul.

Your zeal, etc., i.e., their earnest defense of the Apostle against his adversaries.

So that I rejoiced the more, i.e., the comfort manifested by Titus in giving his report, as well as the nature of that report, rejoiced St. Paul more than the meeting with him.

CONSOLATION AT THE RESULTS OF THE PRECEDING LETTER AND AT THE JOY OF TITUS, 8-16

8-16. St. Paul knew that his recent letter had caused the Corinthians great sorrow; nevertheless he says that this salutary sadness is now the cause of greater joy. Their sorrow was not of a worldly kind, but according to God, as is evident from the fruits it has borne. This was the end the Apostle had in view when he wrote that severe letter, and therefore he is now comforted. The joy experienced by Titus among the Corinthians has also added to the Apostle's comfort, and has justified all that he had said to his envoy in their praise. Titus loves them much, and the Apostle trusts them in everything.

8. **By my epistle**. Literally, "In the letter," i.e., in the letter he wrote. This again (cf. ii. 3, 4, 9) seems to be an allusion to the lost letter of severity which was written after 1 Cor., because it is very hard to see anything in our First Corinthians that could have caused the Apostle so much sorrow and regret as he expresses in this verse and in the other passages of this Epistle just referred to.

The punctuation and connection of clauses in this verse, as well as the reading of the last clause of it, cause not a little confusion. If we put a full stop after the first clause and a comma after the last, perhaps our English version has the best rendering of the verse, thus: "For although I made you sorrowful by my epistle, I do not repent. And if I did repent, seeing that the

9. Now I am glad: not because you were made sorrowful; but because you were made sorrowful unto penance. For you were made sorrowful according to God, that you might suffer damage by us in nothing.

10. For the sorrow that is according to God worketh penance, steadfast unto salvation; but the sorrow of the world worketh death.

11. For behold this selfsame thing, that you were made sorrowful according to God, how great carefulness it worketh in you; yea defence, yea indignation, yea fear, yea desire, yea zeal, yea revenge: in all things you have shewed yourselves to be undefiled in the matter.

same epistle (although but for a time) did make you sorrowful, now I am glad," etc. (verse 9). This rendering agrees almost exactly with that of Lachmann, Tisch., W. H., Cornely, MacR., Rick., etc. It gives very good sense, and hence the Vulgate ought likely to be corrected so as to agree with it.

I do not repent, now that I learn through Titus how much good the letter produced. Before meeting his legate and learning from him the fruits of his severe letter, St. Paul did **repent** having sent it.

9. According to God, i.e., according to the will of God (Rom. viii. 27), as God would have you sorrowful, namely, unto spiritual profit.

Might suffer damage, etc., i.e., by our silence and neglect. It was God's will that the Corinthians should suffer a passing temporal sorrow in order to escape eternal loss.

10. The salutary effect of sorrow according to God is now explained. Such sorrow springs from the love of God and produces penance steadfast, etc., i.e., penance that is *not repented of* (*ἀμεταμέλητον*), but endures unto salvation.

Steadfast (Vulg., *stabilem*) is therefore to be connected with penance, and not with salvation, for it is absurd to speak of regretting or repenting of salvation (against MacR.).

The sorrow of the world, i.e., sorrow that comes from worldly considerations and from an attachment to earthly things without regard for God. Sorrow of this kind leads to eternal death, while spiritual sorrow tends to eternal life.

11. The Corinthians are a definite illustration of the good results of sorrow that is according to God. What great carefulness, i.e., earnestness (*σπουδήν*) it wrought in them, as opposed to their previous indifference and neglect in not punishing the

12. Wherefore although I wrote to you, it was not for his sake that did the wrong, nor for him that suffered it; but to manifest our carefulness that we have for you.

13. Before God: therefore we were comforted. But in our consolation, we did the more abundantly rejoice for the joy of Titus, because his spirit was refreshed by you all.

offender. It produced a **defence**, i.e., a clearing of themselves (*ἀπολογίαν*) before Titus, and so indirectly before St. Paul, of any sympathy with the sinner (ii. 5). It caused indignation at his crime; it caused **fear** of the Apostle's punishment, **desire**, i.e., a longing, for his visit, **zeal**, i.e., a wish to punish the offender, and **revenge**, i.e., an actual avenging of the crime of the offender.

In all things, etc., i.e., in all these ways just mentioned you have shown yourselves to be guiltless in the matter of the sinful man. That the offender referred to here and in ii. 5 was the incestuous man of 1 Cor. v. 1 ff. is by no means certain, or even probable for those who hold the hypothesis of a lost letter between 1 and 2 Cor. The phrase *ἀγνοὺς εἶναι τῷ πράγματι* means nothing more than "to be guiltless of an unpleasant affair."

The first **you** (Vulg., *vos*) of this verse is not in the best MSS.; and hence the first part of the verse should read: "For behold, this very fact of being made sorrowful according to God, how great," etc.

12. **Although I wrote to you**, etc. The painful letter written between 1 and 2 Cor. is again referred to, according to the modern opinion, which seems more probable to us. It was not so much for the sake of the offender (ii. 5), nor for the sake of the one who suffered the offence, namely, St. Paul himself, in the opinion we adopt, that the severe letter was written; but to **manifest**, etc., i.e., to show *our* zeal and solicitude for your spiritual welfare; or, according to an equally good reading, to make manifest among you in the sight of God the earnestness and zeal you have for us.

13. **Before God**. These words belong to the preceding verse, and should be followed by a full stop. They show the sincerity of the Apostle's solicitude for the Corinthians, and the great consolation he experienced at the good report of Titus. But besides the comfort of meeting Titus, he experienced a special joy at seeing his legate so full of gladness. Titus had gone to

14. And if I have boasted anything to him of you, I have not been put to shame; but as we have spoken all things to you in truth, so also our boasting that was made to Titus is found a truth.

15. And his bowels are more abundantly towards you; remembering the obedience of you all, how with fear and trembling you received him.

16. I rejoice that in all things I have confidence in you.

Corinth distressed in spirit, not knowing what he might encounter there, but to his surprise, he was and is refreshed and rejoiced by the docility and loyalty of all the Corinthians.

By you all, i.e., by the majority that inflicted the punishment on the offender (ii. 5), and also by that ultra-loyal minority that thought the punishment inflicted should have been greater (see on ii. 6).

14. And if. Rather, "For if" (ὅτι εἰ). The Apostle explains why he rejoiced. He has praised the Corinthians to Titus, and now Titus has seen that the praise was deserved.

As we have spoken all things to you, etc., i.e., both when speaking to them, and when speaking about them the Apostle is found to be true, i.e., sincere.

15. His bowels are, etc., i.e., his affections go out to you. This shows the good effect produced in Titus. The affection of his heart goes out to the Corinthians as he recalls their docility and obedience, which were manifested in the fear and trembling with which they greeted him and were ready to do all that he desired. The Apostle regards as done to himself what was done to his legate.

The *in vobis* of the Vulgate should be *erga vos*, to agree with the Greek.

16. The Apostle's closing words are calculated to conciliate the Corinthians towards Titus and towards himself, and form a fitting introduction to the plea for charity which is made in the next two chapters. Shortly he will send Titus back to Corinth to look after the collection for the poor in Jerusalem (viii. 6), and he is encouraged (θαρρῶ) to trust the Corinthians in everything.

Here ends the first main division of this Epistle.

CHAPTER VIII

THE COLLECTION AT CORINTH FOR THE POOR IN JERUSALEM, 1-15

1-15. In the second main part of this Epistle (viii-ix), which begins here, St. Paul discusses a difficult question, but with great tact and dexterity of language. He was deeply concerned with the collection for the poor of the Holy City to be made at Corinth, first, because the need was pressing. But there were also other considerations which weighed upon him in this matter. A generous collection at Corinth would not only be a special sign of unity between that Gentile Church and their Jewish brethren so far away, but it would also be an outstanding proof that the Apostle's own authority had been thoroughly rehabilitated where but recently it had been questioned. Furthermore, how would his lingering adversaries at Corinth and his opponents at Jerusalem regard this collection?

These were some of the considerations which made St. Paul proceed cautiously with the subject in hand. He begins, therefore, by citing the example set by the Macedonian Churches. It was the great success of the collection there that moved him to send Titus to collect among the Corinthians; and he is sure that the faithful of Achaia are not less zealous than their poor neighbors, nor less mindful of the great truth that Christ became poor that they might be enriched. They who were among the first to begin the collection (viii. 10; ix. 2) will not fail to complete it according to their means.

In 1 Cor. xvi. 1-3 the Apostle had already spoken of this collection, and later, in his Epistle to the Romans (Rom. xv. 26, 27), he again returns to it. From St. Luke (Acts xxiv. 17) we know that the proceeds of the collection were finally taken to Jerusalem by St. Paul himself

1. Now we make known unto you, brethren, the grace of God, that hath been given in the churches of Macedonia.

2. That in much experience of tribulation, they have had abundance of joy; and their very deep poverty hath abounded unto the riches of their simplicity.

3. For according to their power (I bear them witness), and beyond their power, they were willing.

4. With much entreaty begging of us the grace and communication of the ministry that is done toward the saints.

5. And not as we hoped, but they gave their own selves first to the Lord, then to us by the will of God:

1. Now (δέ) marks the transition to another topic, as does also brethren (ἀδελφοί). The Apostle assumes a more serious tone.

The grace of God, i.e., the effect of the grace of God, which was manifested in the liberality of the Macedonian Christians.

The churches of Macedonia which were at Philippi (Acts xvi. 12), Thessalonica (Acts xvii. 1), and Berea (Acts xvii. 10).

2. The meaning here is that, though tried by many afflictions, the Macedonians experienced so much spiritual joy, and appreciated so keenly the needs of the poor from their own *abject poverty* (ἡ κατὰ βάθους πτωχεία), that they made a generous contribution with a *simplicity*, i.e., a *single-mindedness* (ἀπλότης), which considers only the necessities of others and the glory of God. There are two reasons assigned for the single-minded generosity of the Macedonians, namely, their spiritual joy and their own experience of dire poverty.

3-5. These three verses make one sentence in Greek. The meaning is that the Macedonians were not only willing to contribute to the collection, but they gladly gave beyond their means; and more than this, they earnestly entreated the Apostles that they might be allowed to share in the almsgiving to the poor in Jerusalem. Their generosity and willingness exceeded all expectations. And not only did they give beyond their means, but they put their own lives and persons at the disposal, first of Christ, then of His Apostles, being moved by the will, i.e., by the grace of God.

The grace and communication, etc., i.e., the favor to share in helping the poor Christians of Jerusalem.

6. Insomuch, that we desired Titus, that as he had begun, so also he would finish among you this same grace.

7. That as in all things you abound in faith, and word, and knowledge, and all carefulness; moreover also in your charity towards us, so in this grace also you may abound.

8. I speak not as commanding; but by the carefulness of others, approving also the good disposition of your charity.

6. **Insomuch, that, etc.** Better, "So much so that," etc., i.e., the generosity of the Macedonians was so great that Paul and Timothy were encouraged to send Titus to Corinth to complete the collection which he had begun there earlier. On a previous occasion Titus had been sent to Corinth to start the collection. Perhaps it was the visit from which he had just returned, and which is again referred to in xii. 18. It is, however, thought more probable by certain scholars that the present verse and xii. 18 refer to a visit by Titus to Corinth prior to the sending of the painful letter and the consequent visit to observe its effects. They rightly observe that a mission to quiet a revolt could not well be associated with one to collect money.

This same grace, i.e., grace of contributing towards the poor.

7. Beginning his exhortation to the Corinthians (verses 7-15) the Apostle reminds them of their **faith**, their **knowledge**, their **charity**, etc., and he says if they so excel in these virtues, they ought also to be conspicuous for their liberality towards the poor.

Faith means the theological virtue by which we believe God's revelation.

Word . . . knowledge. See on I Cor. i. 5.

Carefulness, i.e., *earnestness* (σπουδή) in the practice of their faith.

In your charity towards us. Better, "In the charity you have from us," i.e., in the charity we have awakened in you.

So in this, etc. (ὥτα καὶ ἐν, κ. τ. λ.). The ὥτα here is perhaps imperative in meaning, as in I Cor. vii. 29; Eph. v. 33; Gal. ii. 10, etc., and the sense is: Since you abound in those other virtues, *see that you* abound also in **this grace** of giving to the poor.

8. The Apostle observes that he is not commanding the faithful, but only reminding them of the **carefulness of others**, i.e., of the earnestness of the Macedonians, and is thus **approving**, i.e.,

9. For you know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that being rich he became poor, for your sakes; that through his poverty you might be rich.

10. And herein I give my advice; for this is profitable for you, who have begun not only to do, but also to be willing, a year ago.

11. Now therefore perform ye it also in deed; that as your mind is forward to be willing, so it may be also to perform, out of that which you have.

testing, the good disposition, etc., i.e., the sincerity of their love.

The *ingenium* of the Vulgate is likely a copyist's error for *ingenium* (Gr., *γνήσιον*, *sincerity*).

9. It was not necessary to command those to be generous who knew, as did the Corinthians, how our Lord Jesus Christ left the riches of heaven and the bosom of His Eternal Father (John xvi. 28; xvii. 5) and became poor (Matt. viii. 20), in order that they might be made rich with the "unsearchable riches of Christ" (Eph. iii. 8). If Christ made such a great sacrifice for the Corinthians, surely they will make a sacrifice for their poor brethren.

This verse offers a very clear proof of the Divinity of Christ.

10. My advice, i.e., my counsel (verse 8).

For this is profitable, i.e., to complete the collection begun before will enrich them with many spiritual blessings. Only counsel is needed for those who are both willing and have already begun.

Have begun to do (*ποιῆσαι*) refers to the readiness with which the Corinthians on a former occasion began the collection, but which was soon broken up by dissensions and party strifes.

To be willing (*θέλειν*) expresses the disposition still abiding in the present to carry on the work begun previously.

A year ago can hardly mean that twelve months had intervened since the writing of 1 Cor. xvi. 2, because that Epistle was written in the spring, and 2 Cor. followed very probably in the succeeding autumn. Perhaps the collection had been decided on sometime before 1 Cor. xvi. 2 was written; or St. Paul might have been reckoning according to the Macedonian year which, like the Jewish civil year may have begun in autumn. In this latter supposition a year ago would mean *last year*.

11. Knowing their abiding dispositions to help, St. Paul now tells the Corinthians to carry their wishes into effect and complete the collection according to their means. He does not ask them to go beyond their means, as did the Macedonians (verse 3).

12. For if the will be forward, it is accepted according to that which a man hath, not according to that which he hath not.

13. For I mean not that others should be eased, and you burthened, but by an equality.

14. In this present time let your abundance supply their want, that their abundance also may supply your want, that there may be an equality.

15. As it is written: He that had much, had nothing over; and he that had little, had no want.

12. If the will be forward, etc., i.e., if the readiness be there, a man's alms are acceptable to God according to his means; God does not require one to give more than he can afford. It is the disposition with which one gives, more than what is given, that counts before the Lord (Mark xii. 41 ff.; Luke xxi. 2 ff.).

13. The meaning here is that St. Paul does not wish the poor in Jerusalem to be relieved by impoverishing the Corinthians, but that there should be some sort of equality between the one and the other. The implication is that the faithful of Corinth were in good circumstances as compared with those of the Holy City.

14. There are two interpretations of the second part of this verse; namely, that the Palestinian Christians were to give the Corinthians present spiritual help in return for material assistance, and so establish equality among them (Cornely, MacR., Sales, Rick., and most Catholics); or that sometime in the future, when the Corinthians are in temporal need the faithful of Palestine will come to their aid with material means and thus compensate them for what they are now asked to give (Maier, Rambaud, Plummer and most non-Catholics). An argument for the latter opinion might be gathered from the following verse, which gives an instance of equality in material things.

15. The Apostle now cites a passage from Exod. xvi. 18, according to the LXX, which in this instance agrees with the Hebrew, to illustrate how there should be equality in temporal goods among the Christians, just as of old God so distributed the manna in the desert that all had what was necessary, superfluities being made to supply needs. Those who gathered more manna than others had not in the end more than they needed, while the others had all that they required.

THE OFFICIALS WHO ARE COMMISSIONED TO COMPLETE THE
COLLECTION AT CORINTH, 16-24

16. And thanks be to God, who hath given the same carefulness for you in the heart of Titus.

17. For indeed he accepted the exhortation; but being more careful, of his own will he went unto you.

18. We have sent also with him the brother, whose praise is in the gospel through all the churches.

16-24. After his exhortation to the Corinthians regarding the collection to be completed among them, St. Paul recommends those officials who have been appointed to terminate the work. Titus, who had begun the collection, and who loves the Corinthians so much, is not in need of any recommendation. And as regards the two delegates who are to assist him, one was a trusted helper in the Macedonian collection, and the other has proved himself most faithful in many important charges, and is very well disposed towards the Corinthians. Hence all three deserve to be received most cordially by the faithful.

16. The Apostle thanks God that Titus is inspired with the same deep interest and zeal for the Corinthians which he himself has for them. This earnestness and solicitude Titus has not only in his words and actions, but also in his heart.

17. The exhortation, i.e., the Apostle's exhortation to go and complete the collection.

More careful, i.e., very much in earnest.

He went (ἔξῃλθεν). This is the epistolary aorist, referring to the time when the Corinthians would read this letter. So anxious was Titus to go and complete the collection that he did not need the Apostle's exhortation, but of his own accord went for this purpose to Corinth, most probably carrying with him this present letter.

18. We have sent. Again the epistolary aorist.

The brother means a fellow-Christian and companion of St. Paul and Titus. Who this "brother" was we do not know. St. Chrysostom thought he was Barnabas or Luke; St. Jerome and Origen said he was Luke; others have conjectured Mark, Silas, Sopater, Aristarchus, or Secundus (Acts xix. 29; xx. 4; xxvii. 2).

19. And not that only, but he was also ordained by the churches companion of our travels, for this grace, which is administered by us, to the glory of the Lord, and our determined will:

20. Avoiding this, lest any man should blame us in this abundance which is administered by us.

21. For we forecast what may be good not only before God, but also before men.

In the gospel means in preaching the Gospel. There is no reference to St. Luke's Gospel, which was not written at the time, nor to any other written Gospel.

19. The meaning is that the "brother" just spoken of was not only widely praised for his work in preaching the Gospel, but also had been appointed by the Churches, probably of Macedonia, to accompany St. Paul in his journey to Jerusalem with the alms for the poor.

Was ordained, i.e., *appointed*. The word χειροτονεῖν in classical Greek means *to elect by show of hands*, but in later ecclesiastical Greek it was the ordinary word used to signify sacramental ordination by imposition of hands. In this latter sense it is employed in Acts xiv. 22, the only other place in which it occurs in the New Testament. Here, however, the term probably retains its original meaning, since it is said, "he was ordained by the churches."

This grace, i.e., this charitable work of making the collection and conveying it to the poor.

Which is administered, etc., i.e., which is discharged by us Apostles to promote the glory of God and to manifest our own ready will (τὴν προθυμίαν ἡμῶν) to help the poor.

20. **Avoiding this**, etc. Verse 19 is almost parenthetical, and the connection now goes back to "we have sent" of verse 18. The meaning is that the Apostle is sending the "brother" to assist Titus with the collection so that all suspicion of any fraud on his part may be removed.

This abundance refers to the collection, and indirectly suggests to the Corinthians to make it a generous one.

21. St. Paul means to say that he is at pains not only to be honest in the sight of God, but also to appear so before men. This is why he had reliable helpers, and witnesses for the work of the collection.

22. And we have sent with them our brother also, whom we have often proved diligent in many things; but now much more diligent, with much confidence in you,

23. Either for Titus, who is my companion and fellow labourer towards you, or our brethren, the apostles of the churches, the glory of Christ.

24. Wherefore shew ye to them, in the sight of the churches, the evidence of your charity, and of our boasting on your behalf.

The verse is a quotation from the LXX of Prov. iii. 4. Cf. Rom. xii. 17; Matt. v. 16.

22. **Our brother.** This is the third delegate, who is to assist Titus and "the brother" (verse 18). It is also uncertain who this **brother**, i.e., fellow-Christian and companion of the Apostle, was. Surely he was not St. Paul's own brother, but some other tried and trusted co-worker who had great interest in the Corinthians, and in whom, consequently, they would have great confidence. Some authorities refer **much confidence** back to "we have sent" (verse 18), and in that connection it would be St. Paul who had much confidence in the Corinthians (Estius). The previous view is preferable.

23. Some things have to be supplied here. The sense is: If there be question of Titus, he is my companion and fellow-worker among you; and as to our brethren (verses 18, 22), they are the Apostles of the Churches, **the glory of Christ**. The term **apostles** here has its original and literal meaning of *those sent* as messengers or legates. There is no implication that these messengers enjoyed Apostolic dignity equal to that of St. Paul or the twelve.

The glory of Christ means that these legates honored and glorified Christ by their holy lives and zealous labors.

Who (Vulg., *qui*) after Titus is not in the Greek.

24. The Apostle tells the Corinthians to give the delegates of the Churches of Macedonia, who are coming to them, a proof of their charity, and of the good reputation he has given them.

In the sight of, etc. The meaning is that the respect shown to those delegates will be respect shown to the Church from which they come.

In the Vulgate, *quae est* should be omitted, and *gloriae* should be *gloriationis*, to agree with the Greek.

CHAPTER IX

THE COLLECTION OUGHT TO BE MADE PROMPTLY, 1-5

1. For concerning the ministry, that is done towards the saints, it is superfluous for me to write unto you.

2. For I know your forward mind: for which I boast of you to the Macedonians. That Achaia also is ready from the year past, and your emulation hath provoked very many.

3. Now I have sent the brethren, that the thing which we boast of concerning you, be not made void in this behalf, that (as I have said) you may be ready:

1-5. After commending the delegates who are to make the collection at Corinth, St. Paul urges that what the faithful have to give should be collected soon. He himself, perhaps accompanied by some Macedonians, will visit them shortly, and if the alms are gathered before that event, they will not be made ashamed by the presence of their generous neighbors; the reputation they have will be sustained.

1. The Apostle has just been speaking of the collectors who are going to Corinth, and now he turns to the collection itself. But it is superfluous to commend that, as he will show in the following verse.

The ministry, i.e., the alms for the poor in Jerusalem.

2. There should be only a comma after **Macedonians**.

Also (Vulg., *et*) should be omitted. The sense is: I know your eagerness, of which I boast about you to the Macedonians, that Achaia has been prepared, etc.

Is ready, i.e., *has been prepared* (παρεσκεύασται), i.e., was begun.

From the year past. See on viii. 10.

Your emulation hath provoked, etc., i.e., "your zeal has stimulated very many" (the reading of B N C P); or the emulation created by you has provoked very many (the reading of D F G K L).

3. **I have sent**, is the epistolary aorist, as in viii. 17, 18, 22. The Apostle is sending Titus and his two companions so that the praise he has bestowed on the charity of the Corinthians

4. Lest, when the Macedonians shall come with me, and find you unprepared, we (not to say ye) should be ashamed in this matter.

5. Therefore I thought it necessary to desire the brethren that they would go to you before, and prepare this blessing before promised, to be ready, so as a blessing, not as covetousness.

may not be disproved by facts in regard to the collection, but that they may be in readiness to give. Parentheses here and in the Vulgate are needless.

4. The reason is assigned why the collection ought to be completed promptly.

Lest, when, etc. Better, "Lest if (any) Macedonians," etc. (ἐὰν ἔλθωσιν, κ. τ. λ.).

We . . . should be ashamed, at seeing the facts contrary to the praise we have given your charity.

In this matter. Rather, "In regard to this confidence," i.e., the confidence the Apostle has reposed in the Corinthians.

5. **Would go to you before,** i.e., that the three delegates would go to Corinth in advance of St. Paul.

This blessing, i.e., the collection for the Palestinians. The collection is here called a "blessing" (εὐλογία), because contributed willingly (St. Chrys.).

As a blessing, not as, etc., i.e., as a generous, willing gift, and not as an *extortion* (πλεονεξίαν). The Apostle wishes the collection to be a free and liberal gift of the Corinthians, and not an extortion of the collectors.

EXHORTATION TO GENEROSITY, 6-15

6-15. The Apostle is sending his delegates to Corinth beforehand, in order that the collection may be completed in advance of his own arrival; and yet he hopes haste may not in any way interfere with the generosity and willingness of the Corinthians. Accordingly, before closing this topic, he takes occasion briefly to exhort the faithful to give freely and generously, in view of their future recompense. God will reward their charity with greater benefits, both temporal and spiritual, because their bounty will not only relieve the necessities of those who receive of it, but will also glorify God. Wherefore the Apostle concludes with an act of thanksgiving to the heavenly Father.

6. Now this I say: He who soweth sparingly, shall also reap sparingly: and he who soweth in blessings, shall also reap blessings.

7. Every one as he hath determined in his heart, not with sadness, or of necessity: For God loveth a cheerful giver.

8. And God is able to make all grace abound in you; that ye always, having all sufficiency in all things, may abound in every good work,

9. As it is written: He hath dispersed abroad, he hath given to the poor: his justice remaineth for ever.

6. St. Paul now tells the Corinthians that as the harvest corresponds to the sowing, so their reward will be in proportion to their generosity in giving: he who gives little will receive little; he that gives much will likewise receive much. The reward, then, will be according to the work performed, as the doctrine of merit teaches.

7. The alms must be given joyously.

As he hath determined. The Corinthians had already shown a willingness to make the collection (v. 2; viii. 10 ff.), and St. Paul supposes that each one has fixed what he intends to give. Therefore let him give what he has determined, **not with sadness**, i.e., regretfully, or **of necessity**, i.e., unwillingly. To enforce his words the Apostle quotes the LXX of Prov. xxii. 8, which literally runs as follows: "God loveth a man cheerful and a giver." These words are an addition in the LXX; they are not in the Hebrew or in the Vulgate of Prov. A similar sentence is found in Eccus. xxxv. 11.

8. St. Paul now begins to speak of the fruits of almsgiving. He who gives in charity ought not to fear want in his own case; for God is able to make him always abound in temporal blessings, so that he can take part in every work of beneficence.

All grace means here chiefly earthly blessings, but the term is so comprehensive as to include also spiritual goods.

Sufficiency, i.e., the wherewith to help others.

9. The Apostle confirms what he has just said by citing the LXX of Psalm cxi. 9. The just man *scatters* his gifts as the sower his grain, and **his justice remaineth**, etc., i.e., the *remembrance* of his good deeds will never be forgotten: his reward will await him hereafter. This is the most probable meaning of *justice* (*δικαιοσύνη*) here.

The *saeculi* of the Vulgate is not in the *Greek*.

10. And he that ministereth seed to the sower, will both give you bread to eat, and will multiply your seed, and increase the growth of the fruits of your justice:

11. That being enriched in all things, you may abound unto all simplicity, which worketh through us thanksgiving to God.

12. Because the administration of this office doth not only supply the want of the saints, but aboundeth also by many thanksgivings in the Lord,

10. St. Paul now proves from a fact of experience that God will provide "sufficiency" (verse 8) for him who gives in charity.

And he that ministereth, etc. Better, "And he that ministereth seed to the sower and bread to eat, will also provide and multiply your seed," etc. These words are a quotation from *Isaias* lv. 10. What the Prophet says of the rain from heaven, St. Paul applies to God's ordinary Providence, which not only will enable the charitable man to give, but will also increase his temporal possessions, the fruits of his justice, i.e., the reward of his virtue.

11. That . . . you may abound (Vulg., *ut . . . abundetis*) is not represented in the Greek, which has simply: "Ye being enriched in all things unto all simplicity," etc. The meaning of the verse is: "Your singleness of heart, your absence of all secondary and selfish motives, provides us with the means of alleviating the distresses of others, and thus elicits from them thanks to God out of the fulness of a grateful heart" (Lias).

12. From this verse to the end of the chapter St. Paul is considering the results of the collection, when finally made and distributed among the poor in Jerusalem.

The administration (*διακονία*), i.e., the performance on the part of the Corinthians of this office (*λειτουργίας*) i.e., of this public service of almsgiving, not only satisfies the wants of the poor in Jerusalem, but is the cause on the part of the recipients of bountiful thanksgiving to God.

Religious terms are used here to express offices of charity. Thus *διακονα* is a religious word from which *deacon* is derived; and *λειτουργία* among the Jews meant priestly ministrations (*Luke* i. 23; *Heb.* viii. 6; ix. 21), among Christians it was used of public worship generally but especially of the Eucharist (*Acts* xiii. 2; *Rom.* xv. 16; *Philip.* ii. 17, 20, 25, 30; etc.).

The Vulgate *in domino* should be simply *Deo* (*τῷ θεῷ*).

13. By the proof of this ministry, glorifying God for the obedience of your confession unto the gospel of Christ, and for the simplicity of your communicating unto them, and unto all.

14. And in their praying for you, being desirous of you, because of the excellent grace of God in you.

15. Thanks be to God for his unspeakable gift.

13. This verse explains why the recipients of the bounty give thanks, namely, because the collection is a proof of Corinthian loyalty to the Gospel, and of Corinthian generosity in giving. The Palestinians had somewhat doubted the loyalty and adhesion to the Gospel of Gentile converts, but in this collection they would have an answer to their misgivings, and they would glorify God as a result.

The simplicity of your communicating, i.e., the generosity of your contributions.

14. The construction is uncertain. Perhaps the meaning is best secured by taking *αὐτῶν ἐπιποθούντων* as a genitive absolute, thus giving the following sense: They glorify God for your faith in the Gospel and your liberality in giving (verse 13), while they themselves through prayer intercede for you, and yearn for you, on account of the excellent grace of God, i.e., the grace of Christian faith and charity which is manifest in your exceeding liberality towards them. The Apostle is speaking as if the collection were completed and distributed.

15. The unspeakable gift is the grace of Christian faith and charity, spoken of in the preceding verse. Foreseeing the good effects which this grace in the Corinthians will have, how it will relieve the distresses of his poor countrymen, how it will unite Jewish and Gentile Christians, and the like, the Apostle concludes this second main portion of his letter with an act of profound thanksgiving to God, the Author of all good.

CHAPTER X

ST. PAUL ASKS HIS ADVERSARIES TO SPARE HIM THE NECESSITY OF
USING HIS POWERS AGAINST THEM, 1-6

1. Now I Paul myself beseech you, by the mildness and modesty of Christ, who in presence indeed am lowly among you, but being absent, am bold toward you.

1-6. In the first main division of the present letter (i. 12-vii. 16) St. Paul gave a general apology for his life and actions; and in the second portion (viii. 1-ix. 15) he treated of the collection to be made in Corinth for the poor Christians of Jerusalem. These matters being sufficiently dealt with for the understanding and appreciation of those who were well disposed toward him, the Apostle now turns his attention, in the third part of the body of his letter (xi. 1-xiii. 10), to his inveterate enemies, the Judaizers, and defends his personal life with a vigor and energy which can be felt even by those hardened adversaries. See *Introd.*, iii (b). In the first place he begs them (x. 1-6) to mend their ways, so that when he arrives among them he may not be forced to call upon the spiritual powers which God has given him.

1. Now I Paul myself, etc. The original is much more emphatic: *Αὐτὸς δὲ ἐγὼ Παῦλος*. Putting *αὐτὸς*, *myself*, at the beginning does not mean that St. Paul now ceased to dictate and began to write. It probably is intended to indicate the introduction of personal matters, or to emphasize that he himself is the person accused and attacked by his adversaries.

Mildness and modesty, etc., i.e., the meekness and gentleness of Christ. Out of regard for these beautiful virtues of our Lord, which the Apostle wishes to imitate, he asks his adversaries not to force him to call into play the opposite virtues.

Am lowly, i.e., mean, contemptible. This is what his enemies had said about him.

Confido in vobis of the Vulgate ought to be *audax sum in vos*, to express the bad sense intended here.

2. But I beseech you, that I may not be bold when I am present, with that confidence wherewith I am thought to be bold, against some, who reckon us as if we walked according to the flesh.

3. For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war according to the flesh.

4. For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty to God unto the pulling down of fortifications, destroying counsels,

5. And every height that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every understanding unto the obedience of Christ;

2. **But I beseech you**, etc. Better, "But I pray" (δέομαι δέ), etc. The preceding verse is now completed with a strengthened appeal, "I pray." The Apostle begs that his enemies may not compel him to use against them, when he comes, some of that boldness which they say is characteristic of him when absent.

Against some. The Apostle does not wish all to feel the weight of his authority, but only those who accuse him of living and acting **according to the flesh**, i.e., according to carnal and worldly principles. See on Rom. viii. 4, 5.

3. Here St. Paul says that while it is true that he and his companions are mortal men, living in their bodies, they do not by any means **war according to the flesh**, i.e., they do not discharge their ministry according to human and carnal standards and ways. The flesh is a temporary abode (ἐν); it is not a law (κατὰ) with the Apostles.

4, 5. He now calls attention to the arms he and his companions make use of in the exercise of their ministry. Their weapons are not **carnal**, i.e., weak, human; **but mighty to God**, i.e., powerful before God, or in the service of God (τῷ θεῷ). These spiritual arms were all special gifts which the Apostles had received from God to enable them worthily to discharge their ministry, and to pull down the **fortifications**, i.e., the obstacles, and to destroy the **counsels** (λογισμούς), i.e., evil designs, of men against the preaching and propagation of the Gospel.

Every height, etc., i.e., we destroy and overthrow all pride of human spirits that seeks to hinder or corrupt the Gospel, the true knowledge of God; and we bring into subjection **every understanding**, etc., i.e., all the designs and workings of the natural reason that are opposed to the Gospel, making all obedient to the faith of Christ. True faith consists not only in the assent of the intellect, but also in the submission of the will to

6. And having in readiness to revenge all disobedience, when your obedience shall be fulfilled.

7. See the things that are according to outward appearance. If any man trust to himself, that he is Christ's, let him think this again with himself, that as he is Christ's, so are we also.

God's revelation. The evidence for faith is not sufficient to force the intellect, but the will freely determines to move the intellect to accept revelation and give its assent.

Verse 5 should begin with **destroying counsels**. **Destroying**, i.e., *overthrowing* (καθαίρουvτες), looks back to "we walking" (περπατοῦvτες) of verse 3.

6. **Having in readiness**, etc., i.e., being in readiness, etc. The Apostle will allow time for all the Christians at Corinth to be led "unto the obedience of Christ" and His teachings, but after that he is ready to punish all who remain disobedient. He implies that his readers are or soon will be obedient, and hence severe measures will not be necessary.

WHEN THE APOSTLE ARRIVES IN CORINTH HE WILL BE PREPARED TO ACT SEVERELY, 7-II

7-II. From what St. Paul has just said about the spiritual weapons with which he is armed, it is plain that he is not to be despised. His enemies have underestimated his powers and his determination, saying that he was terrible when absent, but cringing when present. He therefore warns his readers not to mistake his threats. Since he is not less a minister of Christ than others who boast of that dignity, he could have said more about his authority than he has done. And if he has boasted of his authority in his letters, he will do so in person when he comes.

7. **See** (βλέπετε). Whether the verb here is imperative, interrogative, or merely declarative is uncertain. Probably it is merely declarative, "You look." The Apostle means to say that his adversaries look merely at things external, they consider only outward appearances, and hence they thought he was weak and cowardly, not like a true Apostle. But he cautions them to reflect that, if anyone considers himself a minister of Christ, he must not overlook the fact that Paul and Timothy are also equally ministers of Christ and preachers of the Gospel.

8. For if also I should boast somewhat more of our power, which the Lord hath given us unto edification, and not for your destruction, I should not be ashamed.

9. But that I may not be thought as it were to terrify you by epistles,

10. (For his epistles indeed, say they, are weighty and strong; but his bodily presence is weak, and his speech contemptible).

11. Let such a one think this, that such as we are in word by epistles, when absent, such also we will be indeed when present.

8. The Apostle has just said that he is at least as much a minister of Christ as his enemies; and he now observes that if he should choose to boast that he is even more, which he will shortly do (xi. 23 ff.; xii. 11, 12), his contention will not be found without reason and truth; and hence he will **not be ashamed**, i.e., he will not be shown to be a pretending impostor.

Also (Vulg., *et* before *si amplius*) should most probably be omitted.

9. This verse may depend on the preceding one, and if so, some such expression as, "I say this"; or, "I will not make any further claims, that I may not be thought," etc., is to be supplied. Such a connection seems very probable, especially in view of the fact that but (Vulg., *autem*) at the beginning is likely not genuine. However, it makes very good sense to regard this verse as a protasis, of which verse 11 is the apodasis, verse 10 being taken as parenthetical.

This is the only place in the New Testament where *ὡς ἄν* is followed by an infinitive. Perhaps the two words should be united, *ὡσαύτῃ*, giving the sense of the Latin *quasi*.

By epistles. The plural doubtless refers to the several letters that had preceded this one to Corinth, namely, First Corinthians, the lost letter of 1 Cor. v. 9, and the lost severe letter between 1 and 2 Cor.

10. **Say they** (*φασίν*). The weight of authority is in favor of *φησίν*, *it is said*; but in either case we should most probably not understand a particular individual, but an indefinite expression referring to the Apostle's critics.

His speech contemptible, i.e., of no account, lacking in polish and elegance.

11. The Apostle warns that when he comes, there will be no lack of correspondence and consistency between his letters and

12. For we dare not match, or compare ourselves with some, that commend themselves; but we measure ourselves by ourselves, and compare ourselves with ourselves.

his actions; his vigor in the one will not be found greater than in the other.

We will be is not in the Greek; but it, or something equivalent is to be understood.

The *absentes* of the Vulgate agrees with *sumus* and not with *epistolae*.

THE APOSTLE'S GLORYING IS NOT LIKE THAT OF HIS CRITICS, 12-18

12-18. The reason why the Apostle can speak of boasting, as well by his presence as by his letters, is that he glories in the Lord, without exceeding the limits of the province committed to him by God. He and Timothy, therefore, unlike their opponents who commend themselves, will glory only in the work which God has entrusted to them, which work includes the Corinthians. If then he glories concerning them, he is not boasting of other men's labors. Moreover, he hopes to extend his preaching farther west, and thus have more converts in whom to glory. Those who glory, should not do so on the strength of other men's labors. Let him who glories, glory in the Lord, as if commended by the Lord Himself who gives success to one's work.

12. Match. Better, "class," "number with" (ἐνκρίναι). The Apostle is ironically referring to his enemies.

But we measure, etc. Our version, like the Vulgate, has perhaps missed the meaning here, because it has failed to take account of the words οὐ συνῴσιν, *they do not understand*, which occur in nearly all the MSS. and in the citations of many of the Fathers. Hence the clause should read: "They measure themselves by themselves, and compare themselves with themselves, and (so) they do not understand." The general sense is: "They make fools of themselves, measuring themselves by their own standards" (Rick.).

The reading of our version and of the Vulgate here is doubtless explained by the fact that several MSS. and Fathers omit

13. But we will not glory beyond our measure; but according to the measure of the rule, which God hath measured to us, a measure to reach even unto you.

14. For we stretch not ourselves beyond our measure, as if we reached not unto you. For we are come as far as to you in the gospel of Christ.

15. Not glorying beyond measure in other men's labours; but having hope of your increasing faith, to be magnified in you according to our rule abundantly;

16. Yea, unto those places that are beyond you, to preach the gospel, not to glory in another man's rule, in those things that are made ready to our hand.

not only the two final words of this verse, but also the two opening words of verse 13, **But we**. In this way the second clause of the present verse could easily refer to St. Paul and Timothy, and would read: "But we, measuring ourselves by ourselves, etc., will not glory beyond our measure."

13. Which God hath measured to us, i.e., the measure God has assigned to us (*οὗ ἐμέρισεν ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς μέτρον*). This is the best reading, and the verse should run: "But we will not boast beyond our measure, but within the measure of our commission, the measure God hath assigned to us, to reach even unto you." Unlike his adversaries, the Apostle would not glory, except in his own labors, but those labors included the Corinthians. He was the divinely appointed Apostle of the Gentiles (Acts ix. 15; xxii. 21; Gal. ii. 7-9; Eph. iii. 7, 8), and hence his preaching and labors were directed by the Holy Ghost (Acts xvi. 6-9).

14. Here the Apostle simply says that if he glories in the Corinthians, it is because he has a right to do so, since they fall within his province, and since he first brought the Gospel to them. The punctuation of the verse is uncertain. Some put an interrogation point after the first half ending with **unto you**; more probably there should be only a comma or semi-colon. It is also doubtful whether *ἐφθάσαμεν* should retain its original meaning, "we came *first*"; or, "we came as far as," Corinth. It seems more natural to understand the Apostle to mean that he was the *first* to bring the Gospel to the Corinthians.

15, 16. These two verses form but one sentence in Greek, and consequently should not be separated by a full stop. The Apostle is referring to his opponents at Corinth who have obtruded themselves into the field of his own labors and commis-

17. But he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.

18. For not he who commendeth himself, is approved, but he, whom God commendeth.

sion, and he says literally: "Not boasting beyond our measure in other men's labors, but having hope that, as your faith increaseth, we shall be magnified in you according to the province allotted to us, so as to preach the Gospel to places that are beyond you, and not to boast of things already done in another man's province."

Your increasing faith. An increase of faith at Corinth would be a help in spreading the Gospel to others, and thus through the Corinthians the Apostle's labors would be increased. Doubtless St. Paul was thinking of Rome and Spain.

Things . . . made ready, etc., i.e., places already evangelized.

17. See on 1 Cor. i. 31. In glorying only of the work done in the field assigned to him by God St. Paul does not mean that the credit of his labors is due to himself, but only to God who gave him the work and enabled him to perform it. The only right way to glory, therefore, is in the Lord, and this is St. Paul's rule (cf. 1 Cor. xv. 10; Rom. xv. 17-19; Gal. ii. 8; Eph. iii. 7).

18. Here the Apostle says for the benefit of his adversaries, the false teachers, that he who commends himself, instead of giving all glory and credit to God, is not **approved**, i.e., tried, genuine; whereas he whom God commends, as happened in his own case in being divinely called, is reliable and solid and true.

CHAPTER XI

ST. PAUL ASKS PARDON FOR SPEAKING IN HIS OWN PRAISE, 1-6

1-6. After having forcefully vindicated his Apostolic authority against his adversaries the Apostle now draws a comparison between himself and them for the sake of refuting them more completely. He shows how far superior to them he really is, and how unworthy they are of the esteem and authority they have enjoyed among the Corinthians. Beginning, therefore, to praise himself he asks the indulgence of the faithful and explains

1. Would to God you could bear with some little of my folly: but do bear with me.

2. For I am jealous of you with the jealousy of God. For I have espoused you to one husband that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ.

his reasons. In speaking of himself he seeks only the good of his converts who are exposed to the danger of being led into error. He has a right, however, to glory because he is in nowise inferior, at least in knowledge, to his opponents who extol themselves so excessively.

1. St. Paul asks the toleration of his readers while he indulges in **some little . . . folly**, literally, "in a little bit of foolishness," i.e., self-praise. His adversaries have praised themselves to an extreme degree, but he will say only a little in his own behalf.

Do bear (*ἀνέχεσθε*) may be indicative or imperative. If indicative, as the Greek Fathers think, the Apostle corrects what he has just spoken of as an impossible wish: "Would to God you could . . . but indeed *you do* bear," etc. More probably the imperative is correct, as appears from the following verse, where a reason is assigned for the petition.

2. **I am jealous.** So ardent and elevated is the Apostle's feeling for the Corinthians that he is sure they will bear with him in his folly; for in praising himself he is not seeking his own glory, but only their salvation and security against seduction.

With the jealousy of God, i.e., the jealousy or zeal which St. Paul entertained for the Corinthians was similar to that which God had for the people of Israel, and which He now has for Christians. Like a father or friend of the bridegroom (John iii. 29), the Apostle had espoused the Corinthian Church **to one husband**, i.e., to Christ, through faith and Baptism, and he hoped to present her on the day of judgment as a **chaste virgin**, i.e., as free from corruption in faith, to her heavenly Spouse.

This verse, like verses 13-17 of chapter X, is a clear proof that the Apostle is addressing the whole Corinthian Church, and not the disloyal faction only. This, however, does not mean that the third part of the Epistle (x-xiii. 10) was not intended chiefly for the Apostle's adversaries. Those who were guilty knew to whom his words applied.

3. But I fear lest, as the serpent seduced Eve by his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted, and fall from the simplicity that is in Christ.

4. For if he that cometh preacheth another Christ, whom we have not preached; or if you receive another Spirit, whom you have not received; or another gospel which you have not received; you might well bear with him.

3. **As the serpent seduced Eve.** See Gen. iii. 1-6. The Church of Corinth, as a second Eve, is espoused to Christ, the second Adam (1 Cor. xv. 45). She must beware lest, like Eve, she listen to the voice of the same tempter, who ever lieth in wait to deceive, and so lose the privileges she was destined to enjoy (Lias).

The simplicity, etc., should read, as in the best MSS., "The simplicity *and the purity* (καὶ τῆς ἀγνότητος) that is towards Christ," i.e., the simple and pure teachings of the faith of Christ. A local Church, like that of Corinth, might fall away from the pure faith of Christ, but the universal Church can never fail (Matt. xvi. 18).

So (Vulg., *ita*) is not in the best MSS.

4. This verse has received many explanations, of which we give the two most natural and probable. (a) **If he that cometh** to you as a teacher, could preach **another Christ**, literally, "another Jesus," different from that whom we have preached to you, or if at his preaching you could **receive another Spirit** and other gifts superior to those received at our preaching, or if he could announce to you **another gospel** more sublime than that which we have announced, **you might well bear with him**, i.e., listen to and follow him. Such, however, is not the case, since there is only one Jesus, only one Spirit and only one Gospel (xi. 5; Gal. i. 6-9). Therefore you have abandoned without reason our teaching, to go after false teachers.

He that cometh (ὁ ἐρχόμενος) does not mean a particular individual, but refers to a class of intruders, namely, the Judaizers.

This is the older interpretation of the present verse. But modern scholars give another explanation. (b) **I**, says the Apostle (verse 3), have good reason to fear for you; for if a false apostle comes to you and preaches a different doctrine about Christ from that preached by me, or tells you that the converts of the other Apostles have received gifts superior to yours, or teaches that the Gospel announced by the other Apostles contains conditions

5. For I suppose that I have done nothing less than the great apostles.

6. For although I be rude in speech, yet not in knowledge; but in all things we have been made manifest to you.

of salvation other than those I have announced, you *have borne* (ἀνείχεσθε, as in **8 D G K L M P**) with him *finely* (καλῶς). The past tense is used, *you have borne*, to indicate that such a condition did exist, but not now any longer. We prefer the first interpretation.

5. If the false teachers had really been superior to St. Paul and had preached a more sublime Gospel, the Corinthians would have had reason to bear with them. But such was not the case. St. Paul affirms that he is not in the least inferior to them in any way.

In this interpretation, which harmonizes with the first explanation of the preceding verse, **great apostles** is used ironically, as of those who would be great, or were considered great. If the expression "great apostles" be referred to the twelve, this verse agrees rather with the second interpretation of the preceding verse. It is doubtful if there is here any reference to the older Apostles, Peter, James and John; but if there is, the Apostle is referring to his spiritual gifts and right to preach, and not to any authority to govern the Church as a whole.

6. Here the reference is plainly to the false teachers, who perhaps were more polished and elegant in their use of language than was St. Paul, but who were by no means his superior in knowledge (1 Cor. i. 5). The Apostle speaks modestly; but it may be that he is referring to what his opponents say about his speech, without admitting that they are right. Perhaps he wishes to allow that he is not a polished orator (1 Cor. ii. 1, 4).

That St. Paul is not inferior to any in knowledge of heavenly truths the Corinthians themselves are witnesses, because in **all things**, i.e., in all his actions and dealings with them, he has been **made manifest**, i.e., has been frank and open.

THE APOSTLE GLORIES THAT HE HAS PREACHED THE GOSPEL
DISINTERESTEDLY, 7-15

7-15. Although St. Paul had a right to temporal support from the faithful, he willingly surrendered this for the sake of greater

7. Or did I commit a fault, humbling myself, that you might be exalted? Because I preached unto you the gospel of God freely?

8. I have taken from other churches, receiving wages of them for your ministry.

9. And, when I was present with you, and wanted, I was chargeable to no man: for that which was wanting to me, the brethren supplied who came from Macedonia; and in all things I have kept myself from being burthen-some to you, and so I will keep myself.

reward and greater success in his preaching (1 Cor. ix. 1-18). The false teachers, however, observed the contrary practice. They not only took support from the faithful, but they pointed to St. Paul's way of acting as unbecoming an Apostle and as a sign that he was not a true Apostle. Beginning, therefore, to show, not only his equality with his adversaries, but his vast superiority to them, the Apostle recalls first to the Corinthians the integrity of his life among them. He then goes on to say that he will continue to preach the Gospel gratis in Achaia, so that his enemies will not be able to boast at least this equality with him; they are not true Apostles anyway, but ministers of Satan.

7. The Apostle now asks if he was blameworthy in working for his support at his own humble handicraft (1 Cor. iv. 12; Acts xviii. 3), in order to be of no expense to the faithful while preaching the Gospel to them.

That you might be exalted, i.e., that you might be raised from the depths of paganism to the sanctity of faith and grace, and to the dignity of Christianity.

8. Here St. Paul says that, in addition to working with his own hands while at Corinth, he *took*, literally, *robbed* (ἐσύλῃσα), **from other churches**, i.e., he allowed the Churches of Macedonia to give him more than they could well afford towards helping his work among the Corinthians. Thus his mission to Achaia was supported partly by his own labor, partly by assistance received from Macedonia.

For your ministry, i.e., for my work among you.

9. **Wanted**, i.e., he was in want.

The brethren, i.e., Silas and Timothy (Acts xviii. 1, 5).

And so I will keep myself shows the Apostle's approval of his past practice and his determination to continue it for the future in Achaia.

10. The truth of Christ is in me, that this glorying shall not be broken off in me in the regions of Achaia.

11. Wherefore? Because I love you not? God knoweth it.

12. But what I do, that I will do, that I may cut off the occasion from them that desire occasion, that wherein they glory, they may be found even as we.

13. For such false apostles are deceitful workmen, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ.

14. And no wonder: for Satan himself transformeth himself into an angel of light.

15. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers be transformed as the ministers of justice, whose end shall be according to their works.

10. The Apostle appeals to his own sincerity, which is grounded on the truth of Christ within him, that he will never permit anything to hinder, literally, *block* (*φραγῆσεται*), his boasting that he was not a temporal burden to the faithful of Achaia.

11. St. Paul's enemies had likely said that he did not accept temporal assistance from the Corinthians because he did not like them well enough to wish to be under obligations to them. The truth was that he wished them to understand that his ministry among them was one of love, and not of earthly gain. This God knew.

12. **Wherein they glory.** The false teachers took remuneration for their labors (verse 20; 1 Cor. ix. 12), and apparently gloried in it, or in the amount they received, thinking their collections were a sign of approval on the part of the faithful. "They would gladly have had St. Paul for an example to quote and a rival to meet on this ground; and that is the occasion which he says he is resolved to cut off" (Rick.).

13. **For such false,** etc. Better, "For such men as these are false apostles, deceitful workers, disguising themselves as apostles of Christ."

14. It is not wonderful that the false teachers can simulate the actions and preaching of true Apostles, because even Satan, the prince of darkness (Luke xxii. 53; Col. i. 13; Eph. vi. 12), can, with God's permission, transform himself into an angel of light, i.e., can appear to be a good angel, for the purpose of seducing men.

15. **His ministers,** i.e., the false teachers, the Judaizers, who were champions of the Law, which St. Paul declared was abrogated.

16. I say again, (let no man think me to be foolish, otherwise take me as one foolish, that I also may glory a little).

17. That which I speak, I speak not according to God, but as it were in foolishness, in this matter of glorying.

Ministers of justice, i.e., the true Apostles who, through the preaching of the Gospel, enabled men to become just and holy in God's sight. The false teachers may deceive men, but God in the end will deal with them according to their evil lives and works.

ST. PAUL GLORIES IN HIS APOSTOLIC LABORS AND IN HIS TRIBULATIONS, 16-33

The Apostle passes now from the severe condemnation just uttered against his adversaries to a further commendation of his own life and labors. Again (cf. verse 1), therefore, he craves the indulgence of his readers to hear him patiently, although he may seem to speak foolishly. He is simply forced to boast of himself because of the boasting of others and the toleration that has been given them. If those others can boast, then he also can boast. They glory in their Jewish origin, but he too is of the seed of Abraham; they vaunt their dignity as ministers of Christ, but he more than they is a minister of Christ. His greater sufferings and labors in behalf of the Gospel and the Churches are witnesses to his life and character.

16. There should be no parentheses here, as all the Greek and Latin Fathers admit. The Apostle is repeating the thought of verse 1, and hence he says, I say again. The meaning is: "I repeat it, let no one think me foolish; but even if you do (εἰ δὲ μῆγε), then bear with me as foolish, that I too (as well as my adversaries) may boast a little. The verse should be followed by a period.

17. The Apostle admits that what he is about to say in his own favor is not according to "the Lord" (κύριον), i.e., is not in agreement with the *general rule* of our Lord, who enjoined humility and condemned self-praise in His disciples (Matt. vi. 1-6; Luke xvii. 10; xviii. 11-14). But that this general rule does not apply in the present instance, when self-praise is needed to counteract the bad influence of his enemies (xii. 11), is clearly implied in the

18. Seeing that many glory according to the flesh, I will glory also.

19. For you gladly suffer the foolish; whereas yourselves are wise.

20. For you suffer if a man bring you into bondage, if a man devour you, if a man take from you, if a man be lifted up, if a man strike you on the face.

qualification, **as it were**, which the Apostle immediately adds. If the self-praise that follows were really unjustified then indeed it would be **foolishness** and "not according to the Lord"; but St. Paul has just said in the preceding verse that he is not **foolish**, even though his readers may think him so. Therefore, there can be no doubt about the rightfulness of speaking his own praises here, nor, consequently, of the inspiration of his words.

God (Vulg., *Deum*) should be "the Lord," *Dominum*; and *gloriae* of the Vulgate should be *gloriationis*.

18. A first reason for his self-praise is given.

Many (πολλοί) seems to include more than the false teachers alone.

According to the flesh, i.e., in exterior, worldly things, such as, birth, wealth, learning, circumcision, Hebrew parentage and the like (St. Chrys.). In these things the false teachers gloried.

I will glory also. The Apostle will show his readers that these things were not wanting to him either.

19. Another reason why he has a right to glory is furnished by the conduct of the Corinthians toward the false teachers, whose **foolishness** in praising themselves they **gladly suffer**. Of course they were enabled to do this, the Apostle sarcastically observes, because they were so **wise**. It is a characteristic of wisdom to be tolerant of foolishness.

20. So extraordinary was the wisdom of the Corinthians that they tolerated far worse things than folly. They put up with tyranny, with extortion, with craftiness, with arrogance, with violence and insult from their seducers. Surely they can bear with the Apostle's foolishness.

Bondage likely refers to the yoke of the Law which the false teachers were trying to impose.

Devour you, i.e., exact large remunerations for their services (cf. Mark xii. 40; Luke xx. 47).

Take from you, i.e., ensnare you, by preaching the Gospel for fraud and personal gain (ii. 17; iv. 2; xii. 16).

21. I speak according to dishonour, as if we had been weak in this part. Wherein if any man dare (I speak foolishly), I dare also.

22. They are Hebrews: so am I. They are Israelites: so am I. They are the seed of Abraham: so am I.

23. They are the ministers of Christ (I speak as one less wise): I am more; in many more labours, in prisons more frequently, in stripes above measure, in deaths often.

If a man be lifted up, i.e., uplifteth himself, by extolling his descent from Abraham.

If a man strike you, etc., i.e., treat you outrageously (Mark xiv. 65; Acts xxiii. 2).

21. The Apostle sarcastically admits that he and his companions were inferior to the Judaizers in certain respects, such as, in bringing the Corinthians into bondage, in robbing them, and the like. With biting sarcasm he confesses his dishonour, i.e., his disgrace, in being so weak in matters like these.

Wherein if any man, etc. Rather, "Wherein any man dare," etc. Casting aside all sarcasm now St. Paul says that if there is question of real boldness, at any time, or on the part of any person, he also is bold. He thus asserts his equality with any of his enemies, although his humility makes him call this assertion foolish.

The words in this part (Vulg., *in hac parte*) are not represented in the best MSS.

22. To show that he is in nowise inferior to his adversaries St. Paul now takes up the various points which they, no doubt, had been urging in their own favor. They were Hebrews, i.e., descendants of the Hebrew race (Gen. xi. 14 ff.); they were Israelites, i.e., from among the chosen people of God (Exod. xix. 5, 6; Rom. ix. 4); they were of the seed of Abraham, to whom the Messianic promises had been made (Rom. ix. 5, 7, 8; Gal. iii. 16). To all these distinctions the Apostle asserts his equal claim.

23. The false teachers had boasted that they were in a special sense ministers of Christ, but St. Paul affirms that he is much more so. They pretended to be *διάκονοι χριστοῦ*, but he was so in reality.

I speak as one less wise. Literally, "I speak as one beside

24. Of the Jews five times did I receive forty stripes, save one.

25. Thrice was I beaten with rods, once I was stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day I was in the depth of the sea.

himself." He apologizes for language which his readers may think extravagant.

The Apostle's greater labors and sufferings are a proof of his superior claims. He labored more abundantly, he was imprisoned more frequently, he was scourged more often, he was exposed to death on more occasions.

St. Paul does not mean his words to be taken in a relative sense, as if implying that his opponents had *labored*, were *imprisoned*, had been *scourged*, etc., but that he had done and suffered more: his words here express an absolute, and not merely a relative excess.

One instance of imprisonment before this Epistle is given in Acts xvi. 23 ff.; but Clement of Rome (1 Cor. v) speaks of seven in all. From the Acts and the Epistles we know definitely of only four: the one at Philippi, one at Caesarea, and two in Rome.

24. The Apostle here and in the following verse gives some examples of his sufferings and exposure to death. He was scourged five times by the Jews. Each scourging consisted, according to law, of forty stripes (Deut. xxv. 3); but in order not to exceed the number the Jews usually administered only thirty-nine, thirteen on the bare breast, and thirteen on each shoulder. The scourge was made of leather thongs. Sometimes these severe floggings resulted in death.

Of these scourgings of the Apostle by the Jews we have no other record.

25. Beating with rods was a Roman form of punishment, and there was no legal limit to the number of blows. Only one of these beatings of St. Paul has been recorded by St. Luke in the Acts (Acts xvi. 22, 23). Our Lord was scourged according to the Roman method (John xix. 1).

Stoned, at Lystra (Acts xiv. 18).

Thrice I suffered shipwreck. We have no other record of this. The shipwreck on the way to Rome was several years later (Acts xxvii. 41 ff.).

A day (*νυχθήμερον*) means a full day of twenty-four hours.

26. In journeying often, in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils from my own nation, in perils from the Gentiles, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils from false brethren.

27. In labour and painfulness, in much watchings, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness.

28. Besides those things which are without: my daily instance, the solicitude for all the churches.

I was. Literally, "I have passed" (*πεποίηκα*), as in Acts xx. 3.

The depth of the sea (*ἐν τῷ βυθῷ*). Better, "In the sea." The term *βυθός* means *the deep*, the sea. We know nothing further of this incident, but perhaps Theodoret gives the right explanation: "The hull of the vessel went to pieces, and all night and day I spent, being carried hither and thither by the waves." He was likely clinging to pieces of the wreckage.

26. The general meaning is that St. Paul was often in divers perils throughout his journeyings. Much of the countries through which he passed, especially in Asia Minor (Strabo) was beset with robbers. Waters. Literally, "rivers." Bridges and ferries were rare in those times, and floods were frequent.

False brethren doubtless refers chiefly to the Judaizers (Gal. ii. 4).

27. He now enumerates a number of sufferings which resulted from his poverty.

Labour and painfulness very probably refer to earning his own living by manual work (1 Thess. ii. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 8).

Fastings coming immediately after hunger and thirst which must have been involuntary afflictions, doubtless means "fastings" freely suffered.

In cold and nakedness, as when robbed, cast into prison, and drenched by floods, storms and the like.

28. Those things which are without (*τῶν παρεκτός*). This is a strange expression. *Παρεκτός* occurs elsewhere only in Matt. v. 32; Acts xxvi. 29, where it has the sense of exception. The meaning here, then, is perhaps: "things left unmentioned" (St. Chrys., and other Greeks). St. Paul, therefore, is speaking of three classes of sufferings: those which he has mentioned, those which he omits, and those which he is about to mention (Plum.).

My daily instance, i.e., that which daily presses upon me. This seems to be the meaning of *ἐπίστασις*, the best Greek reading here,

29. Who is weak, and I am not weak? Who is scandalized, and I am not on fire?

30. If I must needs glory, I will glory of the things that concern my infirmity.

31. The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is blessed for ever, knoweth that I lie not.

32. At Damascus, the governor of the nation under Aretas the king, guarded the city of the Damascenes, to apprehend me.

followed by *μοί*. In classical Greek *ἐπίστασις* means *a halt, a stopping for rest* (Xen., *Anab.* II. iv. 26). The Apostle is referring to the ceaseless daily appeals for help, advice, decision in difficulties and the like, made to him by the faithful (Cornely, Bisping, etc.).

The solicitude, etc., his watchful care of all the Churches which he has founded.

All (*πασῶν*) might even embrace other Churches than those founded by St. Paul, but certainly can not mean that he had supreme jurisdiction over all Christendom.

29. Two illustrations are now given of the Apostle's solicitude for the Churches. New converts were sometimes naturally weak in faith, conduct or the like (1 Cor. viii. 10, 13), and St. Paul made their trials his own in order to strengthen them. Some, too, were easily scandalized, i.e., led into sin by others' example, and this gave the ardent Apostle intense pain (1 Cor. xii. 26). We have to determine the exact meaning of *πυροῦμαι*, *I am on fire*, from the context, which here is in favor of keen pain rather than of indignation, although the latter is not excluded.

30. The present verse is closely connected with what has preceded (verses 23-29) and with what follows, and it refers to both. Since his adversaries, by their own conduct, force the Apostle to boast, he will not glory, as they do, in his birth, prosperity, ancestry, or the like, but rather in his infirmities.

31. Lest his readers may be growing doubtful of all he has said and is going to say, the Apostle now solemnly swears by the Father Almighty that what he is saying is true.

The God and Father, etc. See on 1 Cor. xv. 24.

Who is blessed for ever refers to the Father.

Our (Vulg., *nostri*) and "Christ" (Vulg., *Christi*) are not represented in the best Greek MSS.

32. In this and in the following verse we have an example of

those abrupt transitions so characteristic of this letter. To say that they are therefore a gloss and are to be omitted, as some Rationalists do, is absurd. Perhaps the Apostle's enemies had pointed to his flight from Damascus and to his visions (xii. 1) as proofs that he was both a coward and a mad man, and this would explain why he takes up those two incidents.

Damascus . . . the city of the Damascenes (Acts ix. 23-25), the capital of Syria, goes back to the days of Abraham (Gen. xiv. 15) and was founded by Uz, grandson of Sem (Josephus, *Antiq.* L. vi. 4). It is situated at the eastern foot of the Anti-Libanus on the high road of commerce between Egypt and Upper Syria and between Tyre and the Far East.

The governor, etc. Literally, "The ethnarch of Aretas the king." Aretas IV was King of Arabia Nabataea 9 B.C. to 40 A.D., with Petra as his capital. His daughter was married to Herod Antipas, and was afterwards divorced by Herod for the sake of a marriage with Herodias (Mark vi. 17). How Damascus was subject to the Arab King shortly after St. Paul's conversion is not easy to explain; for Syria was a Roman province from some time before the Christian era until 33 A.D., as is proved by the fact that Damascene coins from 30 B.C. to 33 A.D. bear the name of Augustus or of Tiberius. These coins are wanting from 34 to 62 A.D., but after 62 we have them with Nero's name.

We know from Josephus (*Antiq.* xviii. 4, 5) that Herod Antipas and Aretas became bad friends when Herod divorced the latter's daughter in order to marry Herodias, and that in a battle over some frontier disputes around 32 A.D. Aretas completely defeated Herod. A few years later, in 37 A.D., Caligula became Emperor. He disliked Antipas, and perhaps showed his antipathy by giving Damascus over to his enemy Aretas. This would explain how the latter was governor of that city when St. Paul had to fly from it.

Guarded the city, etc. St. Luke (Acts ix. 24) says that the Jews "watched the gates day and night, that they might kill him," but this is no contradiction of the present passage. Since it was the Jews who moved the ethnarch to persecute St. Paul they would naturally watch the gates of the city together with Aretas' guards because they had determined to kill the Apostle (Acts xxiii. 12).

33. And through a window in a basket was I let down by the wall, and so escaped his hands.

33. This same incident is narrated in Acts ix. 23-25.

A window. Literally, "an aperture" (*θυρίς*). An opening in the wall around the city of Damascus is still shown as the place.

The flight from Damascus probably took place after St. Paul's return from Arabia (Gal. i. 17). If St. Luke seems to make it follow soon after the Apostle's conversion, it is because he omits explicit mention of the retirement to Arabia, although he leaves room for it (cf. Acts ix. 19).

CHAPTER XII

THE APOSTLE GLORIES IN HIS HEAVENLY GIFTS, 1-10

1. If I must glory (it is not expedient indeed): but I will come to the visions and revelations of the Lord.

1-10. St. Paul has just proved that he far excels his enemies in the way he has exercised his Apostolic ministry and in the tribulations he has suffered for the Gospel. But in a third particular he has still more surpassed them, namely, in the extraordinary gifts with which he has been favored by God. For the sake, therefore, of giving greater proof of his divine commission, and incidentally to confound his adversaries further, he now speaks of his visions and revelations. He might give many instances, but he prefers, out of humility, to give only one, which, however, is a very striking one. It is more pleasing to him to rejoice in his infirmities and to be judged by his labors and preaching, than to glory in his visions. And since it has pleased God to visit him with heavy crosses, lest he should be puffed up by the magnitude of his revelations, he will glory in his infirmities by which he merits the divine assistance.

1. Of the various readings of this verse the following is the most likely: "I must needs glory (*καυχᾶσθαι δεῖ*): it is not indeed expedient, but I will come to visions," etc. The first clause is also written by good authorities with an interrogation: "Must

2. I know a man in Christ above fourteen years ago (whether in the body, I know not, or out of the body, I know not; God knoweth), such a one caught up to the third heaven.

I needs glory?" The Apostle is forced to glory, although he knows that glorying as a rule is not good.

Visions and revelations may refer here to the same manifestations, although they are by no means to be identified, generally speaking. A vision usually takes place in a state of ecstasy or of rapture, and the one favored with it does not always understand the meaning of the things he sees. A revelation, on the contrary, always implies the unfolding of some truth in such a way that he to whom it is accorded not only sees, but understands the meaning of what he sees. Revelation, therefore, includes vision, but vision does not necessarily imply revelation (St. Thomas, h. l.).

If (Vulg., *si*) should be omitted.

2. **A man**, i.e., St. Paul himself. Humility leads him to speak in the third person.

In Christ, i.e., a Christian, one united to Christ by faith and Baptism.

Above fourteen years, i.e., fourteen years previous to the time he was writing, which would be around 43-44 A.D., if this Epistle was written around 57-58 A.D. **Above** is not expressed in the Greek.

Whether in the body, etc. St. Paul is certain of the fact of his having been transferred to heaven, but where his body was he does not know. Perhaps his soul was entirely separated from his body and transferred to heaven; or it may be that he was transferred both body and soul into heaven, or that while remaining in the body he was altogether abstracted from the senses. At any rate, it is certain that his senses had no part in the vision.

The third heaven doubtless means the abode of the blessed; but what is intended by **third** is only a conjecture. The Jews were accustomed to distinguish three heavens, of which the first was our atmosphere, the second the region of the stars, and the third the dwelling-place of the Almighty, where God is seen as He is in Himself. Probably St. Paul was accommodating himself to this mode of speaking, in order to say that he was in the actual presence of God.

3. And I know such a man (whether in the body, or out of the body, I know not: God knoweth):

4. That he was caught up into paradise, and heard secret words, which it is not granted to man to utter.

5. For such a one I will glory; but for myself I will glory nothing, but in my infirmities.

3, 4. Some authorities, with Irenaeus, Tertullian, Gregory the Great, and many others think there is question here of another event entirely distinct from the preceding one. They say that St. Paul was elevated "to the third heaven, and thence to paradise" (Clement of Alex., *Strom.* v. 12). In this opinion "the third heaven" could not mean the presence of God, or, at least, not the actual enjoyment of that presence. The majority of exegetes, however, hold with St. Aug. and St. Thomas that the Apostle is speaking here and in the preceding verse of one and the same event, and that "paradise" is mentioned to express the delights which the Apostle experienced in the third heaven.

Paradise means literally a *place of delights*. Jewish ideas regarding it were not always uniform. Sometimes they applied it to the "Garden of Eden"; sometimes to the abode of the righteous below the earth; sometimes to heaven, the abode of blessed spirits with God. The last is certainly the meaning given the term here.

Secret words, i.e., unutterable words, things which the Apostle could speak, but which *it was not lawful to speak* (Vulg.). St. Aug., St. Thomas, and many others teach that St. Paul actually saw God and the divine essence at this time.

That the present incident is not to be identified with that of Acts xxii. 17 ff. is clear (a) from the fact that there no word is said about being caught up to heaven, while we are told what the Lord said to Paul; and (b) from the fact that the incident of Acts took place much earlier than the present one, that is, soon after the Apostle's conversion.

5. St. Paul speaks of himself at present as of two persons, not only out of humility, but also because "he who was caught up to the third heaven and heard unspeakable words is a different Paul from him who says, "Of such a one I will glory" (Origen). "He speaks of a divided experience, of two selves, two Pauls: one Paul in the third heaven, enjoying the Beatific Vision;

6. For though I should have a mind to glory, I shall not be foolish; for I will say the truth. But I forbear, lest any man should think of me above that which he seeth in me, or anything he heareth from me.

7. And lest the greatness of the revelations should exalt me, there was given me a sting of my flesh, an angel of Satan, to buffet me.

another yet on earth, struggling, tempted, tried, and buffeted by Satan" (Robertson). Regarding this latter Paul he will not glory, save in his infirmities.

6. For though I should have, etc. Better, "For if I should wish," etc. It is not certain whether *ἐὰν γὰρ θελήσω* is aorist subjunctive or future indicative. The Apostle means that if he should choose to boast about revelations which he has had, and which he has a right to disclose, he would not be foolish, because he would be telling what is true; but he abstains from doing so lest any should get a more exalted idea of him than their experience of his conduct and preaching would warrant: he prefers to be judged by his life and teaching, not by what he can truly tell of his privileges.

Anything (Vulg., *aliquid*) is omitted in the best Greek MSS.

7. The text and the punctuation are uncertain here, but the general meaning is plain: Lest the Apostle should become proud on account of the extraordinary revelations granted him, there was given him some unusual bodily suffering of a very humiliating nature. Literally the verse should go somewhat as follows: "And by reason of the exceeding greatness of the revelations—wherefore, that I should not be lifted up over much, there was given me a thorn in the flesh," etc. The Apostle begins with the revelations, then suddenly breaks off with *διό, wherefore* (with B & A G). He is doubtless referring to the revelations, just spoken of, which he could truthfully disclose.

There was given me by God (St. Aug.) through the instrumentality of Satan. Naturally Satan's purpose in afflicting the Apostle was not the same as God's: God intended the repression of pride; Satan had some evil end in view.

A sting of my flesh. Literally, "A thorn in (or for) my flesh." The word for "thorn" (*σκόλοψ*) here occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. It is found four times in the LXX (Num. xxxiii. 55; Ezech. xxviii. 24; Osee ii. 6; Ecclus. xliii. 19), and always means a "thorn" or "splinter." "There is no doubt that

8. For which thing thrice I besought the Lord, that it might depart from me.

9. And he said to me: My grace is sufficient for thee: for power is made perfect in infirmity. Gladly therefore will I glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may dwell in me.

the Alexandrian use of σκόλοψ for 'thorn' is here intended" (Field, *Otium Norvicense*, III. p. 115). The idea conveyed is one of acute pain, looking back perhaps to Num. xxxiii. 55. Of course the expression is metaphorical; and hence what does the Apostle mean? The explanations have been many and various, but all, both ancient and modern, agree in this, that there is question of *physical* suffering of some kind. It is not certain, however, that the present passage and Gal. iv. 13, 14 refer to the same ἀσθένεια, although this is commonly assumed.

That the "thorn" (Vulg., *stimulus*) here spoken of does not refer to temptations against purity, as most modern ascetical writers and many modern commentators believe, is proved beyond question by the following considerations: (a) Such a view was held by no Greek Father, nor by any Latin Father of the first six centuries; (b) St. Paul is speaking of something extraordinary, personal and permanent, which cannot be said of temptations to impurity; (c) he could not speak of *glorying* (verse 9), or of *taking pleasure* (verse 10) in carnal temptations. The "thorn in the flesh," therefore, doubtless refers to some chronic physical malady, such as epilepsy, malarial fever, acute ophthalmia, or the like (St. Basil, St. Greg. Naz., St. Aug., St. Thomas, Cajetan, Corn., Le Camus, Light., Ramsay, Farrar, Plum., etc.).

An angel, etc., i.e., a messenger of Satan. The Apostle calls his malady a messenger or instrument of the devil very likely because it was inflicted by the evil one, with God's permission, however.

To buffet me. Literally, "In order that he may buffet me" (ἵνα με κολαφίζῃ). The present tense is used to show the continual recurrence of the attack (St. Chrys.).

8. **For which thing**, i.e., concerning this foe, i.e., the messenger of Satan, **thrice I besought**, i.e., the Apostle asked **the Lord**, i.e., Christ (verse 9) three times to be delivered from his affliction before he received the divine reply.

9. **And he said**. Literally, "And he hath said." The use of the perfect implies that the force of the reply continues.

10. For which cause I please myself in my infirmities, in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses, for Christ. For when I am weak, then am I powerful.

My grace, etc. The request was refused, but something better was given, namely, grace, by which he could merit a supernatural reward.

Power, i.e., strength (*δύναμις*), namely, of Christ. The power of God is most perfectly realized and appreciated when human strength is wanting, i.e., when weak human agents are made use of to accomplish great results.

Gladly therefore. Literally, "Most gladly therefore." He means that he will most gladly glory in his infirmities rather than ask to be relieved from them, so that the power of Christ, sustaining and giving triumph by His grace, may continue with him. Thus the Apostle's chronic illness would cause a continuous manifestation of divine power in him (MacR.).

10. For which cause, i.e., because the power of Christ is continually manifested in his infirmities the Apostle is content with all his sufferings.

For Christ. The Apostle not only endures his afflictions and trials, but he takes pleasure in them for Christ's sake. It is when he himself is weak and unequal to the task before him that the strength of Christ's grace is particularly manifested, helping him to accomplish what would naturally be impossible.

THE SILENCE OF THE CORINTHIANS HAS COMPELLED ST. PAUL TO BOAST, 11-18

11-18. How distasteful to the Apostle it was to boast of his labors and of his divine gifts we are constantly reminded by the frequent apologies he makes for so doing. The fact of the matter is that he has been forced to glory by the silence of the Corinthians in not defending him against the calumnies of his adversaries. His deeds among them were a proof that he was a genuine Apostle. The only thing they could complain about was his refusal to accept anything from them; but this same policy he will continue on his forthcoming visit, being solicitous only for the welfare of their souls. They know that neither he nor his disciples have imposed on them.

11. I am become foolish: you have compelled me. For I ought to have been commended by you: for I have no way come short of them that are above measure apostles, although I be nothing.

12. Yet the signs of my apostleship have been wrought on you, in all patience, in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds.

13. For what is there that you have had less than the other churches, but that I myself was not burthensome to you? Pardon me this injury.

11. Foolish. Reflecting on all he has been saying in his own praise St. Paul admits that he has been acting foolishly; not that his glorying was in reality folly (cf. verse 6; xi. 16), but only that it seemed so. In not defending him against his adversaries the Corinthians have forced him to boast. And they are inexcusable in their neglect, because he was in no way inferior to his enemies when he preached at Corinth.

Above measure apostles. See on xi. 5.

Although I be nothing. These words are most probably to be connected with what precedes. The Apostle considered equality with his adversaries to be mere nothing.

12. Yet the signs, etc. Better, "Indeed, the signs," etc. That St. Paul is not inferior to his enemies is placed beyond doubt by the way in which the Church of Corinth was founded.

The signs, or characteristic notes, of true Apostleship, i.e., the visible proofs of the mission of a true Apostle, were wrought by St. Paul among the Corinthians. The first of these signs was **patience** in bearing all things rather than come short of the mission entrusted to him (vi. 4; xi. 23 ff.); secondly there were the **signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds, i.e., the various miracles, which God wrought through him in confirmation of his preaching at Corinth.** All of St. Paul's great Epistles bear witness to the miracles he worked to confirm his doctrine. "It is simply impossible that evidence of this kind for the special purpose for which it is adduced should be otherwise than true. It is given quite incidentally; it is not didactic, i.e., it is no part of an argument the object of which is to produce a belief in miracles; it refers to notorious matter of fact, to fact equally notorious for St. Paul himself and for those to whom he is writing; it shews that he could appeal to it without fear of being challenged" (Sanday).

13. Another reason why the Corinthians should have defended the Apostle was that they had been witnesses and recipients of

14. Behold now the third time I am ready to come to you; and I will not be burthensome unto you. For I seek not the things that are yours, but you. For neither ought the children to lay up for the parents, but the parents for the children.

15. But I most gladly will spend and be spent myself for your souls; although loving you more, I be loved less.

16. But be it so: I did not burthen you: but being crafty, I caught you by guile.

17. Did I overreach you by any of them whom I sent to you?

the same benefits as other Churches. He had exercised even greater regard for them by not burdening them with his support, but since they have been induced by his enemies to consider this as an injury done them, he sarcastically asks pardon for it. That he is speaking in sarcasm is clear from the following verse where he says he will continue this injury of taking nothing for his support.

14. Irony now gives place to earnest affection. Being their spiritual father St. Paul will continue not to seek the temporal goods of the Corinthians, but themselves.

Behold now the third time, etc. Better, "Behold this is the third time," etc. In view of xiii. 1 this can only mean that the forthcoming visit to Corinth would be his third. See on ii. 1; *Introduction*, i.

That St. Luke does not mention St. Paul's second visit "in sorrow" (ii. 1) to the Corinthians is no more to be wondered at than his failure to speak of the Apostle's visit to Arabia (Acts ix. 20-26; cf. Gal. i. 17).

15. So great is his affection for the Corinthians that he is willing to spend all he has, including his life, for their souls. This he will gladly do, in spite of their want of affection for him.

Some critics make the second clause here independent, and read it interrogatively: "If I love you more abundantly, am I to be loved the less?"

16. The Apostle makes his adversaries speak. They will say: "Granted that you yourself did not take money from us, yet you were cunning enough to get it out of us through your legates. You did not burden us, but you got others to do so."

17. This verse makes it clear that St. Paul had already sent several of his disciples to Corinth.

Overreach you, by extorting money from you.

18. I desired Titus, and I sent with him a brother. Did Titus overreach you? Did we not walk with the same spirit? did we not in the same steps?

19. Of old, think you that we excuse ourselves to you? We speak before God in Christ; but all things, my dearly beloved, for your edification.

20. For I fear lest perhaps when I come I shall not find you such as I would, and that I shall be found by you such as you would not. Lest perhaps contentions, envyings, animosities, dissensions, detractions, whisperings, swellings, seditions, be among you.

18. What mission of Titus is referred to here? Perhaps we shall encounter fewest difficulties if we suppose three visits of Titus to Corinth: (a) an earlier one in which he and a brother, literally, "the brother," started the collection for the poor in Jerusalem, to which the present passage and viii. 6 seem to allude; (b) the visit following the painful letter (ii. 13; vii. 6, 13); (c) the visit on which he and two brethren were to complete the collection (viii. 6, 17, 18, 22).

Did we not walk, etc., i.e., were we not the same in spirit and outward conduct?

THE CORINTHIANS ARE NOT THE JUDGES OF THE APOSTLES, 19-21

19-21. At times St. Paul speaks to the Corinthians as if he were on trial before them, as if they were his judges (x. 7; xi. 1, etc.); but here he gives them to understand that such is not the case. It does not pertain to children to judge their father. Only God is the judge of the Apostles. He writes these things for their edification, that they may correct their vices.

19. Some authorities understand the conclusion of the Epistle to begin with this verse. But see *Introduction* vi. 5.

Of old (παλαι). A less probable reading has πάλιν, *again*. The meaning, according to the better reading, is "All this time are you thinking that we are defending ourselves to you?" The sentence may be interrogative or declarative. The answer to it is: "No, for we speak before God, i.e., God is our judge" (1 Cor. iv. 3), and in Christ, i.e., as ministers of Christ, to whom we are most intimately united. Therefore, in writing as we do, we seek not to excuse ourselves, but only to edify you, that you be not scandalized in us (Rick.), but that, on the contrary, you be strengthened in faith and grace.

20. The reason he has seen fit to defend himself with a view

21. Lest again, when I come, God humble me among you: and I mourn many of them that sinned before, and have not done penance for the uncleanness, and fornication, and lasciviousness, that they have committed.

to their edification is now explained. It is because they are still so deficient in the first elements of the Christian life. He greatly fears that when he arrives both he and the Corinthians will be unpleasantly disappointed. Such surely will be the case if he finds among them factions and party spirits, together with all the evils that follow a wilful lack of unity.

Among you (Vulg., *inter vos*) is not in the Greek.

21. The Apostle's fears are aggravated by the thought that when he comes he may find that his previous admonitions against impurity have not been heeded, and that many of the Corinthians have lapsed back into their former pagan uncleannesses. It would thus be a great humiliation to him to have to mourn over those who saddened him on his previous visit by not repenting and doing penance for their sins. It would likewise be a grievous pain to him to see many of those **that sinned before**, i.e., before their conversion, or before his second visit, or before his previous letter, back in their sins.

Have not done penance, etc. This shows that, besides amendment of life, penance is necessary for those who have sinned (Estius).

CHAPTER XIII

THE APOSTLE WILL COME AS A SEVERE JUDGE AGAINST THOSE WHO
WILL NOT BE CORRECTED, 1-6

1. Behold, this is the third time I am coming to you. In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word stand.

1-6. In verse 20 of the preceding chapter St. Paul expressed the fear that when he would come to Corinth he might be found other than he would like. Following up this thought he now says explicitly that he will be severe on those who by their impenitence provoke him. He therefore exhorts them beforehand to examine into their lives, because he will exercise his authority.

1. **The third time**, etc., doubtless implies that he had visited

2. I have told before, and foretell, as present, and now absent, to them that sinned before, and to all the rest, that if I come again, I will not spare.

3. Do you seek a proof of Christ that speaketh in me, who towards you is not weak, but is mighty in you?

Corinth twice before. All suggestions about *intentions* to come, or *being willing* to come, or *letters being counted as visits*, are unnatural and may be safely set aside (Plum.). See on ii. 1; xii. 14, 21.

In the mouth, etc., is a substantial quotation from the LXX of Deut. xix. 15, which speaks of two *and* three, whereas the Hebrew has *two or three witnesses*. In the MSS. *and* (B A D F G) is preferred to *or* (K, Vulg., Aug.). The Apostle means that he will proceed against the guilty in a strictly legal manner (Matt. xviii. 16; John viii. 17). St. Chrysostom, Theodoret, and others have thought that the witnesses here spoken of mean the Apostle's visits to Corinth, but this is very improbable. St. Paul would hardly refer to the Law in such an equivocal manner.

Behold (Vulg., *Ecce*) is most probably not genuine.

2. According to the best Greek reading "the second time" (δεύτερον) should be inserted after **as present**. The sense is: I have warned before, when present the second time, and now, being absent, I warn again them that sinned before, and all similar sinners, that if I come again, etc.

To them that sinned before, i.e., before the Apostle's second visit.

All the rest refers to those who have fallen into sin since that visit.

In the Vulgate *secundo* should be inserted after *ut praesens*, to agree with the best Greek.

3. **Do you seek**, etc. This interrogative form is in the Vulgate also, and makes good sense; but the best Greek reading has *since*, or *seeing that*, which gives a different meaning: Since you seek a proof of Christ speaking in me, I cannot spare, but am rather forced to show my power as an Apostle, and to make it plain that Christ speaks through me with power and authority (xii. 12; 1 Cor. xi. 30). The verse is to be closely connected with the preceding.

For ἐπεὶ Origen and Theodoret sometimes read εἰ (Vulg., *an*) sometimes ἤ.

4. For although he was crucified through weakness, yet he liveth by the power of God. For we also are weak in him: but we shall live with him by the power of God towards you.

5. Try your own selves if you be in the faith; prove ye yourselves. Know you not your own selves, that Christ Jesus is in you, unless perhaps you be reprobates?

4. For although, etc. This translation supposes the reading of *αὐ* after *γὰρ*; but there is more authority for the omission of *αὐ*. The meaning of the better reading is: For he was indeed crucified through weakness, etc. In either case the sense is practically the same.

Through weakness, i.e., inasmuch as He took a weak and mortal nature, He willingly suffered and died; and yet that self-same nature now liveth by the power of God a glorious and immortal life. The ministers of Christ participate in His weakness and in His power as God, i.e., in His glorious and risen life. Hence they suffer and are condemned to death for His sake (iv. 10, 11), but in them are also revealed the life and the power of God, and they are made the judges of the faithful.

We shall live, etc., refers not to the future life beyond the grave, but to the Apostle's vigorous action in dealing later with the Corinthians.

The *in vobis* of the Vulgate should be *in vos*.

5. Here the Apostle says that the Corinthians, instead of seeking a proof of Christ speaking in him (verse 3), ought rather to be testing and proving themselves, to see whether they are in the faith, and whether Christ is in their hearts.

In the faith, i.e., if you have a living faith. There is question of the theological virtue of faith, and that enlivened by charity, otherwise their faith would be no certain proof that Christ was in them or even among them (MacR.). St. Chrysostom thinks the faith of miracles (1 Cor. xii. 9) is meant, but that is improbable for the reason just given.

Unless perhaps, etc. Since *δοκιμάζετε*, *prove ye*, is here used, as generally, in a good sense, with the expectation that the result will be one of approval, St. Paul seems to imply that the majority of the Corinthians are in the state of grace; but he apparently has doubt regarding some of them who, being unable to stand the test and bear the proof, will be found to be reprobates

6. But I trust that you shall know that we are not reprobates.

7. Now we pray God, that you may do no evil, not that we may appear approved, but that you may do that which is good, and that we may be as reprobates.

8. For we can do nothing against the truth; but for the truth.

(ἀδόκιμοι), i.e., without a living faith. The reprobation of the unpredestined is not in question here.

6. Whatever may be the outcome of the examination which the Corinthians are advised to give themselves, St. Paul expects that they will at least find out that Christ is with him and his companions, enabling them to exercise their power and authority as true Apostles. If need be, he will take severe measures when he arrives.

ST. PAUL HOPES HE WILL NOT BE FORCED TO USE HIS AUTHORITY AGAINST THE CORINTHIANS, 7-10

7-10. By the threat of the preceding section the Apostle had in mind only to avert the necessity of using severity upon his arrival in Corinth. He therefore now asks God by His grace to turn the faithful from evil ways, because he much prefers to find them abounding in all good, rather than to have the occasion of exercising his authority. The purpose of writing this letter has also been to move them to penance, and thus to obviate the need of severity when he comes.

7. **Not that we may appear approved**, etc. Better, "Not wishing that we be shown approved." The Apostle prays God that he and his companions may have no occasion to exercise and prove their authority among the Corinthians. He much prefers to be suspected of lacking the power of Christ to punish. It is more important in his judgment that they should do no evil than that he should "appear approved" by showing his authority, although this may cause some to regard him and his companions as **reprobates**, i.e., unproved, and therefore without the power of Christ.

8. If the Corinthians are free from evil the Apostles will be disarmed; for they have no power to oppose good, but evil only.

Truth means moral rectitude.

9. For we rejoice that we are weak, and you are strong. This also we pray for, your perfection.

10. Therefore I write these things, being absent, that, being present, I may not deal more severely, according to the power which the Lord hath given me unto edification, and not unto destruction.

11. For the rest, brethren, rejoice, be perfect, take exhortation, be of one mind, have peace; and the God of peace and of love shall be with you.

9. **That we are weak.** Rather, "When (*ὅταν*) we are weak," i.e., the Apostles rejoiced when there was no occasion for showing their power and authority, owing to the strong and fervent faith of the Corinthians. Instead of desiring a chance to display their authority the Apostles rather prayed for the **perfection** of the faithful, which would make all exercise of authority needless.

The *quoniam* of the Vulgate should be *quum* or *quando*.

10. The purpose of this letter, or of the last four chapters of it, is again (cf. xii. 19) indicated, namely, that the Corinthians may amend and perfect their lives before he arrives among them in person. The Apostle does not want to use his God-given power for **destruction**, i.e., in punishing, but for **edification**, i.e., for building up the kingdom of God on earth.

CLOSING EXHORTATION, SALUTATION AND SOLEMN BENEDICTION, 11-13

11-13. In a short time the Apostle expects to visit Corinth, and hence only a few words are required to terminate this letter. Following the severity that has preceded in the last four chapters some brief expression of kindness now will dispose the faithful to proper dispositions.

11. **Rejoice** (*χαίρετε*), i.e., have a holy joy in your belonging to Christ (1 Thess. v. 16).

Be perfect, i.e., correct your faults.

Take exhortation. Rather, "Be comforted," in spite of the troubles in your Church.

Be of one mind, etc., i.e., keep aloof from parties and divisions.

And the God of peace, etc. The inverse order is found in the best Greek: "And the God of love and peace," etc. The connection with the two preceding exhortations is very close: "Be of one mind, and the God of love shall be with you; have peace, and the God of peace shall be with you" (Plum.).

12. Salute one another with a holy kiss. All the saints salute you.

13. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the charity of God, and the communication of the Holy Ghost be with you all. Amen.

12. **Salute one another**, etc. See on Rom. xvi. 16; 1 Cor. xvi. 20.

All the saints, i.e., all the Christians in the place from which St. Paul was writing this letter. The place is Macedonia, perhaps at Philippi, for all who hold the integrity of 2 Cor.; but Ephesus, for those who believe this verse to be a part of the severe letter written between 1 and 2 Cor.

13. This verse contains the fullest and most instructive of the benedictions found in St. Paul's letters. The blessing here given is extended to all the Corinthians and embraces everything necessary for them, namely, "the grace of Christ, by which we are justified and saved; the charity of God the Father, by which we are united to Him; and the communication of the Holy Spirit, distributing to us His divine gifts" (St. Thomas). The only blessing which rivals this one in St. Paul is that found at the close of Ephesians. Perhaps the Apostle felt that the Corinthian Church, by reason of its dissensions and strifes, was in particular need of a more complete benediction.

The Greek Fathers frequently appealed to this verse against the various Anti-Trinitarian heretics. The familiarity with which St. Paul here refers to the three Persons of the Blessed Trinity shows that even at so early a date the faithful, who were far removed from the older centres of Christian thought and teaching, were well acquainted with the doctrine of three Persons in one divine nature. Of course, it was expressed in the baptismal formula (Matt. xxviii. 19), and was therefore one of the first doctrines to be taught.

The **Amen** is wanting in the best MSS.

THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS

INTRODUCTION

I. Galatia and the Galatians. The original Galatians were the inhabitants of the country lying between Bithynia on the north, Pontus and Cappadocia on the east, Lycaonia on the south, and Phrygia on the west; this country was called Galatia Proper, or North Galatia. Its principal cities were Ancyra, Pessinus and Tavium.

The Galatians were sprung from Gallic or Celtic tribes that migrated east from the west and north of Europe in the third century B.C. These were called *Celtae* by the colonists at Marseilles, *Galatae* by the Greeks, and *Galli* by the Romans (cf. Hayes, *Paul and His Epistles*, p. 280). Passing over the Alps into Italy they sacked Rome in 390 B.C., crossed the Danube and invaded Macedonia and Greece in 279 B.C., and finally penetrated into Asia Minor, and settled in the mountainous districts which thenceforth bore their name. Here they held undisputed sway for nearly a century. They were divided into three tribes: the Trocmi or Trogmi in the east with Tavium as their centre and capital, the Tectosages in the central part of the country with Ancyra as their capital, and the Tolistobogii or Tolistoboi in the west around Pessinus. They were a warlike people, and so harassed their neighbors that they became the terror of all Asia Minor. After many varying successes they were finally driven back and confined to their own country around 234 B.C. by Attalus I, King of Pergamos. At length in 189 B.C. they were attacked and conquered by the Romans under Manlius Vulso. The Romans, however, permitted them to be governed by their own princes up to about 25 B.C., when they were made a part of the Roman Province of Galatia.

Thus in the time of St. Paul the Roman Province of Galatia included Galatia Proper, a part of Phrygia, Pisidia, Lycaonia, Pontus and Paphlagonia. While Ancyra was the official capital of the Province, Antioch was a secondary and military centre, having a more important and strategic location. The cities which St. Paul visited on his first missionary journey—Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe—were all in the southern part of the Roman Province of Galatia.

The inhabitants of North Galatia or Galatia Proper were a mixed race, composed of the Celtic invaders of the third century B.C. and a large population of Phrygians, interspersed with Greeks and perhaps a few Jews, who had possessed the country before the invasion by the Celts. The people of South Galatia were Greco-Phrygians who had coalesced with large colonies of Romans and Jews.

II. The Galatians of the Epistle. From what has just been said the question is naturally asked,—to whom did St. Paul address his letter, to the people of North or to those of South Galatia? In reply we can only say that the question is so difficult, and the arguments for the two theories advanced are so weighty, that a solution of the problem, with our present available knowledge, must be regarded as impossible. Up to the early part of the nineteenth century it was very generally believed that the Epistle to the Galatians was addressed to the Christians of Galatia Proper; but since that time very able authorities have been convinced that it was written to the converts of South Galatia, whom St. Paul and Barnabas evangelized on their first missionary journey. Among the patrons of this latter, or South Galatian Theory, are Cornely, Le Camus, Lemonnyer, Zahn, Ramsay, Sanday, O. Holtzmann and many other noted authorities. The other, or North Galatian Theory, is the older and traditional view, which was held by all the Fathers and by scholars generally down to the last century. Prof. Steinmann and Fr. Lagrange have adopted this opinion, and among non-Catholics it has been embraced by such illustrious scholars as Lightfoot, Weiss, Lipsius, H. J. Holtzmann, Jülicher and many more. Although in our Commentary on The Acts of the Apostles we preferred the South Galatian Theory, we have been induced

by further investigation to subjoin here the leading arguments for each theory and leave the student to judge for himself.

Arguments for the South Galatian Theory:

(a) St. Luke, in the book of Acts, gives us a full account of the founding of the Churches in South Galatia, but has not a word to say about any Churches in North Galatia, unless this be implied in the single sentence of Acts xvi. 6. His silence on this latter point is hard to explain, if the all-important Epistle to the Galatians was addressed to the Christians of Galatia Proper.

(b) Our Epistle is dealing with one of the most momentous questions in the early Church, namely, the relations of the converted Gentiles to the Mosaic observances; and, in the South Galatian Theory, it is addressed to Churches of whose existence and importance we have ample knowledge: whereas in the other Theory we have the same great questions discussed in writing to Churches about which, aside from this Epistle, we know nothing, and whose very existence is seriously questioned.

(c) While the author of Acts calls places by their popular names, St. Paul is accustomed to designate them by their official Roman titles, as, for example, *Asia*, *Macedonia*, *Achaia*, and the like. Since, therefore, Roman Galatia had, for seventy-five years prior to the Apostle's missionary labors, included the cities of Lycaonia and Pisidia, which he evangelized on his first journey, it would be only in keeping with his custom to call the Churches of these cities *Galatian*: it would be quite singular if he meant by this term Churches of that northern country which had formerly been independent of Rome.

(d) The Epistle (ii. i, 9, 13) makes several references to Barnabas as if he were well known to its readers. Now we know from Acts xiii-xiv that Barnabas took an active part with St. Paul in founding the Churches of South Galatia. If St. Paul established any Churches in North Galatia at all, it was when accompanied by Silas on his second missionary journey; but Silas is not mentioned in the Epistle.

(e) In Acts xviii. 23 it is said that St. Paul, after spending some time in Antioch, "went through the country of Galatia and Phrygia, in order, confirming all the disciples." If this refers to

North Galatia only, the Apostle failed to visit and confirm the very important disciples of South Galatia, or else St. Luke has passed over in silence such an impressive event—suppositions that are difficult to entertain.

(f) In North Galatia the Jews were very few, if there were any at all; but we know from Acts xiii. 43, xiv. 1, and from non-Biblical writings and inscriptions that there was a considerable number of Jews in South Galatia. Furthermore, the Judaizers would more easily find their way to South than to the remoter North Galatia. The Epistle shows plainly that there were not a few Jews in the community addressed (iii. 27-29), and that many of them were well acquainted with Jewish modes of exposition (iv. 22-31).

(g) In Acts xiv. 10 we read that the Lycaonians said of Paul and Barnabas: "The gods are come down to us in the likeness of men." This is quite in harmony with Gal. iv. 14: "You . . . received me as an angel of God."

(h) In Acts xx. 4, when St. Paul was setting out for Jerusalem with the collection for the faithful in the Holy City, we find with him various representatives of the different Churches that had contributed to the collection; Timothy and Gaius of Derbe are mentioned as representing South Galatia. Where are the deputies of the North Galatian Churches, if such Churches existed?

Arguments for the North Galatian Theory:

(a) If St. Luke in the book of Acts is silent about the founding of Churches in North Galatia, that proves nothing, in view of his complete silence regarding so many other notable events and experiences in St. Paul's life. The book of Acts is also silent about the Apostle's visit to Arabia, mentioned in this Epistle (i. 17); it omits all record of the mission work in Syria and Cilicia (Gal. i. 21); it says nothing about the troubles in the Corinthian Churches which drew from the Apostle two letters to the Corinthians; it gives no account of the labors in Illyricum and Dalmatia (Rom. xv. 19; 2 Tim. iv. 10), nor of the establishment of the Church at Colossae to which the Apostle addressed an Epistle.

(b) It is admitted that St. Luke, in Acts, uses the popular names for Galatia and other places; but it is by no means certain

that St. Paul did not do the same. For example, *Dalmatia* (2 Tim. iv. 10) was not an official name for a province till A.D. 70; *Arabia* is doubtless only a geographical term in Gal. iv. 25; *Spain* and *Judea* are doubtful.

(c) St. Paul, in the Epistle to the Galatians, speaks as if he were nearly, if not entirely, alone in the founding of their Churches (i. 8, 9; iv. 11-20). This can hardly be explained if he was writing to the South Galatians, among whom Barnabas had labored so faithfully and equally with the Apostle. If Barnabas is mentioned in this Epistle (ii. 1, 9, 13), this proves nothing in favor of the South Galatian Theory, for he is also mentioned in the Epistles to the Corinthians and Colossians (1 Cor. ix. 6; Col. iv. 10), and we know that he had nothing to do with the founding of those Churches, and was known to them only by reputation.

(d) In Gal. iv. 13 St. Paul seems to say that his preaching the Gospel to the Galatians was occasioned by some infirmity or illness of body. This physical disability caused the Apostle to stay some time among them, and he made use of the opportunity to preach the Gospel to them. In spite of his illness, which apparently affected his eyes (iv. 14, 15), the Galatians received him "as an angel of God," and would have plucked out their own eyes and given them to him, had that been possible. All this seems essentially different from the account given in Acts xiii-xiv of the founding of the Churches of Southern Galatia.

(e) It is not at all certain that Timothy and Gaius, in bringing their contributions to St. Paul for the poor in Jerusalem, were representatives of South Galatia. Timothy, and perhaps also Gaius, had been with the Apostle for some time, and probably had come from Macedonia as delegates from some other Church, like that of Corinth or Philippi. Moreover, it would seem highly improbable that a collection, either from North or South Galatia, would have been sent so far around when it could have been sent much more easily and safely by direct route to Jerusalem. Again, if no delegate is mentioned as representing the North Galatian Churches, we are not to wonder, because the list given by St. Paul does not represent all his Churches. There is no one spoken of as coming from Corinth, Philippi, or Achaia.

(f) St. Luke in Acts xvi. 6 and xviii. 23 is speaking of St. Paul's visits to the country of North Galatia. In the first passage, St. Paul with Silas, on his second missionary journey, had passed through the South Galatian country visited on the first journey, and was intending to enter Asia; but, having been prevented by the Holy Ghost, they turned northward and went through *τὴν φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν*. This was the occasion of the founding of the Churches in North Galatia. On his third missionary journey the Apostle "went through in order *τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ φρυγίαν* confirming all the disciples" (Acts xviii. 23). In both of these passages *φρυγία* is doubtless a substantive, and so also is *Γαλατικὴ*, since both are defining a common term, *χώρα*. Moreover, *ἡ Γαλατικὴ χώρα* is evidently a country lying eastward of *φρυγία*.

(g) As said above, the North Galatian Theory was held by all the Fathers, and by exegetes and scholars generally, down to the nineteenth century.

The arguments respectively outlined in favor of the two opposing theories are sufficient, we think, to give the student a clear idea of the controversy, and to show how insoluble, with our present knowledge, the question really is. Great authorities are aligned against each other; but it is consoling to know that the vital problems discussed in the Epistle are quite above the dispute regarding the people addressed.

III. Composition of the Galatian Church. Whether the Epistle to the Galatians was addressed to the inhabitants of North or to those of South Galatia, the question is properly asked whether its readers were Gentiles or Jews, or both; and, if both, in what proportion were each. That Gentiles were addressed is evident from v. 2, 3; vi. 12, 13; iv. 8; iii. 28, 29, where St. Paul is warning the Galatians against circumcision, and reminding them of their former worship of idols, but of their present equality with the Jews and all others before God. It is not circumcision, but faith in Christ that justifies (v. 2); if they be Christ's, they belong to the true posterity of Abraham and are heirs of the promise made to Abraham (iii. 29): this is the whole argument of the Epistle, and it shows that the majority of its readers must have been Gentile Christians. However, there were also Jews

and proselytes among those addressed, as appears from ii. 15; iii. 13, 23, 25, 28; iv. 3. This is further manifest from the fact that the doctrinal argument of the Epistle is based on the authority of Scripture, and from the consequent familiarity with the Old Testament which the Apostle supposes in his readers. With the exception of the Epistle to the Romans, this letter has a greater proportion of Old Testament references than any other of St. Paul's Epistles. While, therefore, the majority of the readers of this letter were of pagan origin, there were also a number of Jews among those addressed.

IV. The Occasion and Purpose of the Epistle. The Epistle to the Galatians was occasioned by the advent among them of Judaizers who were teaching, contrary to the doctrines taught by St. Paul, that for salvation it was necessary to be circumcised and to conform to the Mosaic observances (Gal. iii. 1-iv. 31). St. Paul had founded the Galatian Churches himself (i. 8, 9), and the faithful there had received him "as an angel of God, even as Jesus Christ," in spite of the disgusting malady from which he was suffering at the time (iv. 13, 14); they were willing to pluck out their eyes for him (iv. 15). And his ministry among them had borne remarkable fruit: they had received the Holy Spirit (iii. 2); miracles had been worked (iii. 5); God had sent the Spirit of His Son into their hearts (iv. 6); and all had gone well with them (v. 7). But after the Apostle's second visit to these converts he learned, perhaps by letter or by special delegates sent to him, that the Judaizers were attempting much harm to them and had in part succeeded. Those false teachers had come down from Jerusalem, or Antioch, perhaps, and, pretending to have special sanction from the authorities of the Church in the Holy City, they essayed to subvert the teaching of St. Paul and to introduce another "gospel" (i. 9). Their method was to enforce their doctrine, first by undermining the authority of the Apostle. They told the Galatians that the authority and commission of the twelve was unquestionable, that they had been chosen by Christ, had lived with Christ, had been taught by Him, had received the Holy Ghost at Pentecost—all of which were facts universally known and admitted. But as to Paul, it was doubted whether he was an Apostle at all. If he was, did not his commission come

from men (Gal. i. 1, 12)? Hands had been laid on him at Antioch and he had been sent out to preach (Acts xiii. 3), but his authorization seemed to be only human and to rest on his own testimony (ii. 7-9). Hence it was not strange if his teaching differed widely in many respects from that of Christ and the other Apostles.

Was not the preaching of this Paul subjected to examination at the Council of Jerusalem (Gal. ii. 1-10)? Did not St. Peter openly disagree with him at Antioch (Gal. ii. 11-15)? His practice was to please all men for the sake of success; he sought the favor of men, and so taught circumcision or uncircumcision as circumstances demanded (Gal. i. 10; v. 11). He disregarded the sacredness of the Mosaic Law and circumcision, although these were an external sign of God's covenant with man and are necessary, if we wish to enjoy participation in the blessings of the Messianic Kingdom (Gal. iv. 10; v. 2; vi. 12). To deny this was to put in doubt the truth of the divine promises, to open the way to unbridled vice, and consequently to imperil the whole work of Christianity.

The arguments of these Judaizers were very specious, being grounded, as it seemed, on the Old Testament and on the practices of Christ and the older Apostles. Was the gospel of Paul really the true one? was it complete? Even if salvation depended on faith in Christ, were not circumcision and the Mosaic observances necessary conditions? Had the Law an eternal, or only a transitory value, being replaced by the New Covenant of which Christ was the author and initiator? These were the questions that perplexed the Galatians and shook their faith in Paul (i. 6). His preaching had fascinated them, but now their advance had been checked (v. 7); they were on the point of accepting another gospel (i. 6), and there was danger that they who had begun with the works of the spirit, would terminate with those of the flesh (iii. 3). Already they were observing "days, and months, and times, and years" (iv. 10); and their desire seemed to be to place themselves entirely "under the law" (iv. 21).

Such were the difficulties that confronted St. Paul in Galatia, and the problems which called for solution. The situation was serious, but not entirely desperate (v. 10). It does not seem that

the faithful had yet yielded to circumcision (v. 2), nor that their entire number had been troubled. Nevertheless, such was the gravity of their condition that St. Paul was stirred with deepest anxiety and would have given much to be with them (iv. 20). In the absence of such a possibility he took up his pen and wrote to them this rigorous defense of his person and his doctrine, establishing: (a) the divine origin of his teaching and authority; (b) that justification is not through the Law, but through faith in Jesus Christ crucified and risen again; (c) that consequently the Law had only a transitory office, the termination of which, however, by no means lets down the barriers to sin and vice, since the Christian is guided henceforth by the law of charity.

V. Time and Place of Writing. Just when and where this letter was written is not entirely certain; opinions have been greatly divided from the early centuries. Marcion, according to St. Epiphanius (*Haer.* xlii. 9), thought Galatians was the first of St. Paul's Epistles. St. Chrysostom (*In Rom. hom.* I) believed it to have been written before Romans toward the end of the third missionary journey. Theodoret (*Com in Ep. Pauli Praef.*), St. Jerome (*In Gal.* iv. 20; vi. 11), and others are of the opinion that it was composed at Rome during St. Paul's first captivity there. The MSS. B K L P with some cursives, the two Syriac and the Coptic versions have the subscription ἀπὸ Ρώμης. The belief that the Epistle was written from Rome has also been held by some recent scholars, like Koehler and Halmer, on account of the passages iv. 20 and vi. 17, where there seems to be reference to some restraint imposed upon the Apostle; and also on account of the allusion to Roman law terms in iv. 2 and iii. 20. It is next to certain, however, that, had St. Paul been a captive at Rome or elsewhere during the writing of this letter, he would have stated it very clearly and definitely, as Zahn rightly remarks (*Introd. to The New Test.*, I. p. 140). Zahn, like Marcion, puts Galatians first of all St. Paul's Epistles in point of time. Le Camus, Weber and *The Westminster Version of Holy Scripture*, among Catholics, also take this view. Cornely, Hausrath and Pfeleiderer place its composition shortly after the Council of Jerusalem. Meyer, Lipsius and Holtzmann say it was written at Ephesus during the third missionary journey. Bleek and Lightfoot believe it was

composed at Corinth after the three years' sojourn at Ephesus, while Lagrange thinks it was written in the latter city about the year 54. Ramsay and Dr. Weber (Cath.) put its composition at Antioch before the Council of Jerusalem. This opinion is advanced to obviate certain apparent difficulties arising from Gal. ii and Acts xv. The two visits to Galatia are the visit to Derbe and back, in this opinion.

Naturally the time and place of writing assigned to this Epistle depend mainly upon the theory which one adopts regarding its readers. Many understand from Gal. ii. 1-10 that the letter was written after the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv); and from Gal. i. 8, 9; iv. 13 it appears quite certain that it came after a second visit to the Galatian Churches. Moreover, "so soon" (*τάχως*) of i. 6 is cited by some authorities to show that the composition of the Epistle was very soon after the Apostle's second visit to the Galatians. When, therefore, was this second visit, so soon after which the Galatians became an object of anxiety to the Apostle? For those who hold the South Galatian Theory it was the visit spoken of in Acts xvi. 6, during St. Paul's second missionary journey, the first visit being recounted in Acts xiii-xiv; and the place of writing was perhaps Troas, or more probably Corinth around 53 A.D. (Cornely, Zahn).

For those critics who hold the North Galatian Theory the first visit to the Galatians is that recorded in Acts xvi. 6; and the second, that mentioned in Acts xviii. 23, during the third missionary journey. Because of the close resemblances of ideas and often of language between the Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians and Galatians, the patrons of this latter theory believe that Galatians was written about the same time as those other letters, and therefore at Ephesus between 54 and 57 A.D., or at Corinth in 57-58.

To account for the undeniable similarity between Galatians, Corinthians and Romans—a similarity in ideas, and often also in expressions—it seems altogether natural to believe that they were composed while the Apostle was in more or less of the same frame of mind, although this period could easily, and most likely did, extend over several years. For resemblances between Galatians and Corinthians compare Gal. i. 6 with 2 Cor. xi. 4; Gal. vi. 15

with 2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. iii. 13 with 2 Cor. v. 21; Gal. vi. 7 with 2 Cor. ix. 6. For resemblances between Galatians and Romans compare Gal. ii. 16 with Rom. iii. 20; Gal. iii. 6 with Rom. iv. 3; Gal. iii. 19 with Rom. vi; Gal. v. 17 with Rom. vii. 15-23; Gal. iv. 5-7 with Rom. viii. 14-17; Gal. v. 14 with Rom. xiii. 9, etc., etc. There are at least twenty parallel passages between Galatians and Romans. Of course the situation in the Corinthian Church was much the same as that in the Galatian, as we learn especially from Second Corinthians; there were the same attacks on the Apostle's authority, and the same adversaries, the Judaizers. This would explain much of the likeness in thought and words between Galatians and Corinthians. But it cannot be said that the situations in Rome and Galatia were the same, and hence it would seem that the resemblance between the Epistles to these two Churches must be accounted for chiefly by the nearness of the years in which they were written, although this period very probably extended over four or five years.

The difference between Romans and Galatians have inclined some critics to believe that there was a development in the Apostle's doctrine, that he did not have a complete and definite idea of his Gospel until after his controversy with the Judaizers. In Galatians, they say, we have an elementary exposition of his theology, but in Romans a full and profound development of his whole system of doctrine. It is doubtless true that Romans is an elaboration of the teachings of Galatians, but this by no means argues that St. Paul only gradually became aware of the full import of his Gospel. The Epistle to the Galatians was a letter of circumstances, and the Apostle adapted his teaching to the situation before him, replying mainly to the attacks of his enemies. In the Epistle to the Romans he unfolded the main features of his whole Gospel, so that the faithful in the Eternal City might know what he had been teaching to other Gentiles, might recognize the identity of his Gospel with that which they had received already, and might be prepared to welcome his visit. Writing to the Romans St. Paul was in a state of mind far more tranquil than when he wrote to the Galatians. This appears from the entire tone of the two letters. In the latter Epistle the polemic is ardent and personal, in the former the argument, while force-

ful and overpowering in its logic, is calm and peaceful; the Epistle to the Galatians is a defense of doctrines that are questioned and in danger, the Epistle to the Romans is a quiet but powerful exposition of truths already known and accepted without hesitation; to the Galatians the Apostle's thesis is mainly negative, that justification is not from the Law and its works, while to the Romans it is positive, namely, that salvation is through faith in Christ independent of the Law.

VI. Authenticity and Canonicity. The authenticity of the Epistle to the Galatians is admitted by all antiquity. In modern times doubt was first cast upon it by an Englishman named Evanson (1792), and in the last century a number of critics, especially of the German rationalistic schools, have questioned its genuineness. But the objections of recent Rationalists are of little weight when compared with the unbroken tradition of the Church from the earliest times.

Although St. Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* iii. 7, 2) is the first to quote the Epistle by name and attribute it to St. Paul, it is certain that the letter was well known and made use of by ecclesiastical writers before Irenaeus. Polycarp and Clement of Rome use passages in their writings that are found only in Galatians, or seem undoubtedly to allude to the Epistle (Compare Polycarp, *Ad Philippi.* vi with Gal. vi. 7; ix. 2 with Gal. ii. 2; iii. 2 with Gal. iv. 26. Compare Clem. of Rome *Ep.* 1 Cor. ii. 1 with Gal. iii. 16; 1 Cor. xlix. 6 with Gal. i. 4). St. Justin Martyr (*Dial. with Trypho* XCV) cites the same passages of Deut. xxvii. 26, xxi. 23 which St. Paul has used in Gal. iii. 10, 13; and in his *First Apology* (c. LIII) he uses Isa. liv. 1 as St. Paul does in Gal. iv. 27. The Epistle to the Galatians is found in the Muratorian Canon, and in the Old Latin and Syriac versions. That it was known in the African Church is clear from Tertullian (*De Praescrip.* vi. 23; *Adv. Mar.* v. 2, 4), and from Clement of Alex. (*Strom.* iii. 15). Even the heretics of the second century, like Marcion and Valentine, did not think of questioning the authorship of this Epistle (Cf. Tertull. *Adv. Marc.* v. 2; Iren. *Adv. Haer.* i. 3, 5).

Since, therefore, the Epistle to the Galatians was known and recognized by the Apostolic Fathers and early ecclesiastical writers, and since it is found in the Muratorian and other Canons

and in the old versions of the Bible, as well as in the best and oldest MSS. we have, there is no reason for doubting in the least its authenticity and canonicity.

These external arguments are enforced by the contents of the Epistle. As said above, there is a very marked similarity between the doctrine and style of this letter and the doctrine and style of Romans and Corinthians, which are universally regarded as having St. Paul as their author. Moreover, the teachings which this Epistle embodies and the circumstances amid which it must have been written seem to point unmistakably to the years that closely followed the discussions at Antioch about the reception of the pagans into the community of Christians, the Council of Jerusalem, where that discussion was settled, and the years that just preceded, or followed, the composition of Second Corinthians. At Antioch the question was raised and bitterly disputed whether the Gentile converts should not first be circumcised and subjected to the Mosaic observances before being admitted on an equal footing with the Jewish Christians (Acts xv. 1, 2). This discussion Paul and Barnabas carried to Jerusalem where it was definitely decided in favor of the Gentiles by a Council of the Church (Acts xv. 2-29). The decision of the Council was promulgated at Antioch, and all seemed well for a time; but it was not very long, as we know from the Epistles to the Corinthians, before certain Judaizers of Pharisaical tendencies were moved with hatred against St. Paul, the Apostle of the Gentiles and the champion of the Gentiles' cause. They began to follow up his work and belittle his Apostolic authority, his character, his teachings, etc., in order that they might again insist on their own views and doctrines. It was a situation like this in Galatia that called forth the present Epistle, and to which the Epistle perfectly corresponds. It would be absurd to suppose a writer subsequent to St. Paul's time, or other than St. Paul himself, to be discussing in a letter questions that were entirely settled in the Apostle's life-time, and in which he alone could be the person involved. The whole contents, therefore, of the Epistle to the Galatians correspond to the circumstances and conditions of history and doctrine which are only to be found in St. Paul's time and in connection with the Apostle himself.

VII. The Importance of the Epistle; its Style. The Epistle to the Galatians is of great importance, as well for the doctrines which it supposes to be thoroughly understood and admitted in the early Church, as for its positive teachings. It implies that the Galatians were entirely familiar with the doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation and Divinity of Christ, the Redemption, Grace, Baptism and the like. The Apostle's teaching on these fundamental truths seems never to have been questioned; neither do his readers ever appear to require an explanation of them. This shows that these truths were not only well understood and accepted, but also that St. Paul's teaching regarding them was in perfect conformity with the common teaching of the other Apostles. The positive value of the letter lies in its direct teaching with respect to the fundamental truth of justification through faith in Christ, the abrogation of the Mosaic observances, the consequent liberty of the Gospel and in the biographical data which it furnishes concerning the Apostle, his preparation for the Apostolate, the source of his knowledge of Christianity, his authority, the conformity of his questioned doctrines with those of the other Apostles, and the like.

Unlike the Epistle to the Romans, which is calmly expository in the main, this letter is chiefly apologetical in form and vehemence throughout. The style is distinctly Pauline. Being deeply moved by the situation he is combating and filled with righteous indignation the Apostle rushes on, like a mighty torrent, caring not for unfinished phrases, jolting omissions or grammatical mistakes, so long as he is able to give undoubted and unmistakable expression to his feelings. In numerous passages the resemblance to his other Epistles is so marked as to compel a recognition of the identity of the author; and yet the sudden changes and transitions of thought and expression, the unexpected ruptures and unevenness of language, the bursts of anger towards his enemies, often swiftly alternating with tenderest words of sympathy for those that were well disposed,—all features so characteristic of St. Paul, make it impossible that anyone could have forged this letter by imitating any other of the Apostle's writings.

VIII. Division and Analysis. There are three general divisions in the Epistle to the Galatians: the Introduction, the Body

and the Conclusion. The Body of the letter likewise falls into three parts, consisting of two chapters each.

In the Introduction or Prologue (i. 1-10) the Apostle, in his own name and on behalf of those who are with him, salutes the Galatians, announcing his divine vocation, and wishing them peace from God the Father and from the Lord Jesus Christ (verses 1-5). Next he expresses his great surprise that the Galatians are so soon seduced (verse 6). Forthwith he utters his denunciation against those who have troubled and upset them (verses 7-9). Finally, the Apostle declares that he speaks as he does because he wishes to please God rather than men (verse 10).

The First Part of the Epistle (i. 11-ii. 21) is apologetic, containing the Apostle's defense of himself. To begin with, he gives his readers to understand that his Apostolate is not of human origin, declaring that he has not received his revelation from man but from Jesus Christ (i. 11, 12). And this he proves, first from the fact that up to the day when God revealed His Son to him, he was a zealous Pharisee and a persecutor of the Christians (i. 13-16); whereas, straightway upon receiving his divine call, without going up to Jerusalem or taking counsel with anyone, he retired into Arabia, returning later to Damascus (i. 17). A second proof to the same effect is clear from this, that not till after three years did he see any of the other Apostles, and then only Peter and James for a brief visit in the Holy City (i. 18-20), after which he went to Syria and Cicilia, being unknown to the faithful of Judea who, nevertheless, having heard of his conversion, glorified God on his account (i. 21-24).

After proving the divine origin of his Gospel the Apostle goes on (ii. 1-21) to show that his teaching is in perfect harmony with that of the other Apostles. This also is evident from two facts. (a) After fourteen years, at the Council of Jerusalem, he explained his whole Gospel to the Apostles and the entire Church, and, in spite of certain false brethren who raised some objections to him, the Apostles that were in highest esteem, seeing that to Paul had been entrusted the Gospel to the uncircumcised, gave him the right hand of fellowship, asking only that he be mindful of his poor brethren in the faith and succor their needs (ii. 1-10. (b) Later on, at Antioch, when Peter, fearing to offend the

Jews, failed to regulate his conduct according to the common teaching of the Church, St. Paul rebuked him for his inconsistency, and the Prince of the Apostles recognized the rightfulness and truth of the position taken by his great confrère (ii. 11-21).

The Second, or Dogmatic Part of the Epistle (iii. 1-v. 12) discusses the great doctrine of justification, which, as the Apostle shows, is not from the Law, but from faith in Jesus Christ.

His teaching on this subject he proves (a) by an appeal to the experience of the Galatians themselves. Was it not through faith, rather than by the works of the Law, that they had received the Holy Spirit (iii. 1-5)? (b) He invokes the authority of Scripture. Do not the Scriptures prove that justification comes by faith? It was thus that Abraham was justified, and all those who believe as he did are his children and are blessed with their faithful father (iii. 6-9). As for the Law, it brought not benediction, but a curse upon all those who endeavored to fulfil its works; whereas the Scriptures attest that "the just man liveth by faith," and hence all those who will have part in the promised blessings must seek them through faith in Christ Jesus and not through the Law (iii. 10-14).

The promise made to Abraham was not annulled by the promulgation of the Law over four hundred years later (iii. 15-18). The Law was only a simple guide which was supposed to lead the Jews to Christ (iii. 19-24), but which thereupon was to cease (iii. 25-29). As long as the Jews were under the Law, they were as children under a tutor, differing nothing from servants; but when Christ came, they were delivered from the slavery of their state and made the adopted sons of God, and, as such, heirs also through God (iv. 1-7).

Reminding the Galatians of their privileged condition the Apostle now exhorts them to prize their freedom, and not to be deceived by false teachers into forfeiting all their blessings (iv. 8-20). Then by an allegory, based on the two sons of Abraham, he illustrates, on the one hand, the inutility of the Law, and on the other, the glorious state of the children of faith (iv. 21-30). Certain practical conditions for the Galatians are then deduced from the principles laid down (iv. 31-v. 12). (a) The Apostle

warns his readers that if they submit to circumcision and put themselves again under the Law, they thereby divest themselves of Christ and His grace and are bound to the observance of the whole Law (v. 1-5). In Christ nothing avails except faith that works by charity (v. 6). (b) A severe judgment is reserved for those seducers who have upset and troubled the otherwise happy Galatians (v. 7-12).

The Third or Moral Part of the Epistle (v. 13-vi. 10) contains practical recommendations and counsels for the Christian life. In Christianity the Galatians will find complete satisfaction for all their generous religious instincts which are now inclining them towards the observance of the Law. (a) Let those who have been freed from the tyranny of the Law not abuse their liberty, but let them show charity, one towards another (v. 13-15). They should live according to the spirit, avoiding the lusts and works of the flesh (v. 16-25). (b) Let vainglory and pride be shunned (v. 26-vi. 6), and let charity be practiced toward all men, and especially toward those who are of the household of the faith (vi. 7-10).

The Conclusion (vi. 11-18) of this letter is a recapitulation and a summing up of the polemical and doctrinal parts before discussed (vi. 11-15), followed by a declaration of peace to the children of faith, a prayer, and a blessing (vi. 16-18).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

CATHOLIC COMMENTARIES ON GALATIANS

Greek Fathers: St. John Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Epist. ad Galatas* (Migne, P. G. tom. LXI, col. 610-682); Theodoret, *Interpretatio* (P. G. tom. LXXXII, col. 459-504); St. Cyril of Alex., *Fragmenta explicationis* (P. G. tom. LXXIV, col. 916); Theodor of Mopsuestia, *Commentaire sur les Epîtres de Saint Paul*, in Pitra, *Spicilegium solesmense*, vol. I, p. 49; Æcumenius, *Commentarius* (P. G. tom. CXVIII, col. 1093-1168); Theophylact, *Explanatio* (P. G. tom. CXXIV, col. 951-1032); St. John Damascene, *Loci Selecti* (P. G. tom. XCV, col. 775-832).

Latin Fathers: Victorinus, *Libri Duo in Ep. ad Galat.* (Migne, P. L., tom. VIII, col. 1145-1198); Ambrosiaster, *Commentarius* (P. L. tom. XVII, col. 805-821); St. Jerome, *Com. in Ep. ad Galat., libri tres* (P. L. tom. XXVI, col. 307-438); St. Augustine, *Epistolae ad Galatas expositionis liber unus* (P. L. tom. XXXV, col. 2105-2147); Pelagius, *Commentarius* (P. L. tom. XXX, col. 337-372); Sedulius Scotus, *Collectanea* (P. L. tom. CIII, col. 181-194).

Later and Recent Commentators: St. Thomas Aquinas, *Commentarius* (Paris, 1880); Cardinal Cajetan, *Literalis expositio* (Rome, 1529); Bisping, *Erklärung des Briefes an die Galater* (Münster, 1863); Palmieri, *Com. in Ep. ad Galatas* (Gulpen, 1886); Cornely, *Com. in Ep. ad Galatas* (Paris, 1892); Belser, *Die Selbstvertheidigung des Heiligen Paulus im Galaterbriefe*, in *Biblische Studien*, I. 3 (Freiburg in B., 1896); Lemonnyer, *Epîtres de Saint Paul* (Paris, 1905); Rickaby, *Notes on St. Paul* (London, 1905); Toussaint, *Epîtres de Saint Paul* (Paris, 1910); Sales, in *La Sacra Bibbia*, vol. II (Turin, 1914); Lagrange, *Épître aux Galates* (Paris, 1918); Keogh, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, in *The Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures* (London, 1920).

NON-CATHOLIC COMMENTARIES

Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistle to The Galatians* (London, 1865, 1892); Seiffert, *Der Brief an die Galater*, in Meyer's *Collection of Commentaries* (Göttingen, 1880, 1899); Lipsius, *Hand Kommentar zum Neuen Testament . . . , Zweiter Band, Zweite Abtheilung, Briefe an die Galater, Römer, Philipper* (2nd ed., Freiburg in B., 1892); Ramsay, *A Historical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians* (London, 1900); Lietzmann, in *Handbuch zum Neuen Test.* (Tübingen, 1906); Zahn, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater* (2nd ed., Leipzig, 1907); Bousset, in *Die Schriften des Neuen Test.*, edited by J. Weiss, vol. II, *Der Brief an die Galater* (Göttingen, 1908); Williams, L., *The Epistle of St. Paul the Apostle to the Galatians* (Cambridge, 1911, 1914); Loisy, A., *L'Épître aux Galates* (Paris, 1916).

The Epistle to the Galatians

CHAPTER I

SALUTATION, 1-5

1. Paul, an apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead,

1-5. With his accustomed greeting St. Paul opens this letter to the Galatians, but there is noticeable an absence of the usual warmth and praise which characterize the beginnings of most of his Epistles: here it is simply, "Paul, an Apostle, . . . and the brethren . . . to the churches of Galatia." At once there is manifested the tension which soon finds its full outlet in the body of the letter; for he begins by proclaiming his Apostolic authority and its divine origin, which the Judaizers had denied. Setting aside all useless and merely pleasing words he plunges immediately into his subject, asserting that he has been sent by no other authority and sanction than that of Jesus Christ and God the Father. If he wishes his readers "grace and peace," it is because he cannot well dispense with such a formality, and also because he desires to remind the Galatians of the source of this grace and peace, which is only God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ, the blessings of whose redemption they have not appreciated as they ought.

1. Paul. See on Rom. i. 1.

An apostle, in the strict sense of the term, equal to the twelve. The purpose of the Apostolate was to bear witness to the Resurrection of Christ (Acts i. 16-22; iv. 33).

Not of men, i.e., human agencies were not the source of his authority.

Neither by man, i.e., he was not authorized by men, as were the deacons (Acts vi. 5) or Timothy (1 Tim. iv. 14). The

2. And all the brethren who are with me, to the churches of Galatia.

Apostles all received their commission directly from Christ, whereas their lawful successors have ever since been sent by proper ecclesiastical authority, as priests are consecrated and commissioned by bishops.

But by Jesus Christ, etc. St. Paul here designates the real and only source of his Apostolic authority, which is proximately and immediately Christ, and ultimately God the Father. From man he received only episcopal consecration (Acts xiii. 2, 3).

He says *διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, because he regards Christ as the divine Mediator between himself and the Father; he omits *ἀπό* before *θεοῦ πατρός*, so as not to separate Jesus from His Father (Lagr.).

Who raised him, etc. Christ as man was raised from the dead by God the Father; and the Apostles were especially commissioned to preach Jesus and the Resurrection (Acts xvii. 18).

2. **All the brethren, etc., i.e.,** all his companions at the time of writing this letter. Who these were depends on the date of the Epistle. St. Paul includes his companions in his salutation most likely out of custom, rather than to give weight to his authority (cf. 1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1; Philip. i. 1; Col. i. 1; 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1).

To the churches, etc., i.e., to all the Galatian Churches, without distinction, which shows they were all guilty of the same errors, or inclination to error. The word "church" (*ἐκκλησία*) literally means "an assembly called out" for some special purpose. The Jews applied it to their religious assemblies (Deut. xxxi. 30; Mich. ii. 5; Acts vii. 38). Likewise the Christians used the term sometimes to designate an assembly gathered for worship (1 Cor. xiv. 28, 34); sometimes a group of the faithful that met in a particular house (Col. iv. 15; Philem. 2), or that belonged to one town or district (1 Cor. i. 2; xvi. 1, 19; Acts ix. 31; etc.); sometimes the whole body of the faithful (Matt. xvi. 18; Col. i. 18, 24).

Whether St. Paul was addressing the northern or southern Galatians is disputed. See *Introduction*, ii.

The coldness of the Apostle's greetings here are in striking

3. Grace be to you, and peace from God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ.

4. Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present wicked world, according to the will of God and our Father:

5. To whom is glory for ever and ever. Amen.

contrast with his usual warmth (cf. Rom. i. 17; 1 Cor. i. 2; 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1).

3. **Grace be to you**, etc. See on Rom. i. 7. According to his custom, and out of his great charity for the erring Galatians the Apostle wishes them the grace and fear of God which they have not prized as they should.

4. St. Paul now reminds his readers that their deliverance from sin and from the curse that formerly enslaved them is due, not to the Mosaic Law and its ceremonies, but to Jesus Christ, who gave Himself up to death for them and for all mankind: Christ in obedience to the will of His Father (John iii. 16; Philip. ii. 8), died for our sins that we might live.

This present wicked world. With the Redemption commenced the reign of freedom from the slavery of sin which till then had gripped the entire world. But although the death of Christ broke the dominion of Satan over us, "this present world," as contrasted with our future immortal existence, will always be "wicked," (a) because of the sins which men continue freely to commit, in spite of the blessings of Christ's Redemption; (b) because of the ceaseless war which Satan will ever wage against Christ and His Militant Church (John xv. 19; Rom. viii. 7).

According to the will, etc. This shows that the Redemption was expressly designed and planned by God.

The Vulgate reading, *pro peccatis* supposes the Greek *ὑπὲρ* rather than *περὶ*, *τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν*, and is perhaps preferable.

5. **Is glory.** The Greek has the article, *ἡ*, before *δόξα*, which indicates the glory that is due to God and which the Judaizers have tried to take from Him by minimizing His benefits.

This is the only place where a doxology occurs in the salutation, and St. Paul inserts it here instead of rendering thanks to God for his readers.

ST. PAUL UPBRAIDS HIS READERS AND REBUKES THEIR SEDUCERS, 6-10

6. I wonder that you are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ, unto another gospel.

7. Which is not another, only there are some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ.

6-10. Dispensing with all oratory and circumlocutions St. Paul goes straight to his point. There is only one Gospel of Christ, that, namely, which he himself delivered to the Galatians. To add to or subtract from it, after the manner of the Judaizers, is to destroy it. He pronounces a curse against the enemies of the Gospel, declaring that, as Christ's servant, he is concerned about pleasing Him only.

6, 7. **So soon** does not mean that the Galatians fell away shortly after their conversion; it has reference rather to the ease and suddenness with which they yielded to false doctrines when they heard them. To have fallen away soon after conversion would have been more or less excusable; but to have lived and practiced their faith for some time, and then, upon the first temptation, to be willing to give it up was indeed reprehensible.

Removed (μετατίθεσθε). Better, "On the verge of changing." The use of the present shows that the Apostle did not consider their change complete.

From him, etc., i.e., from the heavenly Father, to whom St. Paul uniformly attributes the call to the faith (Rom. viii. 29 ff.; 1 Cor. i. 9; 1 Thess. ii. 12; etc.).

Into the grace, etc. Better, "In the grace," etc. (ἐν χάριτι χριστοῦ), i.e., through the grace of Christ. The call is from the Father, but through the Son (St. Chrys.).

Another gospel. Literally, "A different gospel," i.e., a pretended gospel, or no gospel at all, because it contained a serious doctrinal error.

Which is not another, etc. There is only one true Gospel of Christ, although there were certain preachers of a false gospel among the Galatians.

Would pervert. The purpose of the Judaizers was to change completely the **gospel of Christ**, i.e., the Gospel preached and delivered by Christ (Zahn), or the Gospel that gives the true conception of Christ (Lagr.).

8. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema.

9. As we said before, so now I say again: If any one preach to you a gospel, besides that which you have received, let him be anathema.

10. For do I now persuade men, or God? Or do I seek to please men? If I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ.

8. **We**, i.e., Paul and his companions.

Besides. Better, "Contrary to" (*παρά*).

That which, etc., refers to the Gospel Paul had preached on his first and second visits to the faithful of Galatia.

Anathema, i.e., accursed, excluded from the Kingdom of God. See on Rom. ix. 3. This curse of Paul was revocable upon repentance.

9. **As we said before**, etc. St. Paul reminds his readers of the warning he and his companions had given them on a previous occasion, perhaps on his second visit, against possible perils and false teachings which, if not at that time threatening, might disturb them later.

10. Feeling that his words so far have been harsh St. Paul observes that there is question now of pleasing, not man, but God. The word *now* (*ἄρτι*) does not imply that formerly, before his conversion, he tried to please men; for even when persecuting the Christians he was moved by zeal for God, and not by a desire to please men, albeit his conduct then was agreeable to the Jews. The Judaizers had said that he sought to persuade, only to win favor. The verb *πειθω* has the sense of the Latin *suadeo*, and so means *to seek the favor of*. The Apostle now asks his readers to judge for themselves whose favor he is seeking, whether the favor of God, or that of men. If he were trying to please men, he would be preaching Judaism, and thus would not be what in truth he is, the servant of Christ.

THE FIRST, OR APOLOGETIC PART OF THE EPISTLE, i. 11-ii. 21

From the foregoing verses it is clear that two questions confront the Galatians: (a) The Gospel of Christ preached by Paul; (b) the so-called gospel preached by the Judaizers. The truth and reliability of the doctrines delivered turn on the authority and commission of the preacher. Claiming to have the Gospel of the

11. For I give you to understand, brethren, that the gospel which was preached by me is not according to man.

Apostles at Jerusalem, which had been given to the twelve by Christ Himself, the Judaizers taught that St. Paul was only a delegate of the real Apostles, and that, having been unfaithful to his charge, he had preached a different gospel from that practiced at Jerusalem.

Against these contentions St. Paul responds, (a) that his Gospel has been revealed to him directly by Christ Himself, by whom also he has been appointed the Apostle of the Gentiles without the intervention of any man (i. 11-24); (b) that his Gospel is not opposed to that of the older Apostles, having received their express approval (ii. 1-10); (c) far from having adulterated the Gospel teaching, he has maintained its purity and integrity, even against some lesser concessions of St. Peter himself (ii. 11-21).

ST. PAUL'S GOSPEL IS NOT HUMAN, BUT DIVINE IN ITS ORIGIN, 11-24

11-24. To begin with, St. Paul maintains against his enemies, first in a negative (verse 11), then in a positive way (verse 12) that his Gospel is from God. In proof of this he recalls, in the first place his conduct before his conversion, when, out of zeal for Judaism, he had bitterly persecuted the Church of Christ (verses 13, 14). But when it pleased God to give him his call to be the Apostle of the Gentiles, his whole attitude was immediately changed and he straightway retired from the company of men to prepare for his mission (verses 15-17). After three years, out of respect for the head of the Church, he paid a visit to Jerusalem, but his relations with Peter and the other Apostles in no wise altered the character of his mission which he had received directly from Jesus Christ (verses 18-21). Finally, the praise given his labors in Syria and Cilicia by the churches of Judea, to which he was unknown except by reputation, was the surest proof that his mission among the Gentiles was regarded as the work of God, and that he who but lately had been the fiercest foe of the faithful of Judea had now, by the grace of God, become a duly recognized and zealous Apostle of Christ (verses 22-24).

11. I give you to understand (γρῶπιζω), introduces a matter of serious moment (cf. 1 Cor. xii. 3; xv. 1; 2 Cor. viii. 1).

12. For neither did I receive it of man, nor did I learn it; but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.

13. For you have heard of my conversation in time past in the Jews' religion: how that, beyond measure, I persecuted the church of God, and wasted it.

The gospel, i.e., the doctrine preached by Paul to the Galatians.

Not according to man, i.e., not after a human standard, not human in its nature or condition.

12. St. Paul is here not considering so much the character, whether natural or supernatural, of the revelation he had received; he is insisting mainly on the fact that it came to him by revelation on the part of God (Acts ix. 5 ff.; xxvi. 13 ff.). A divine doctrine could indeed be handed on by men, as is the case with subsequent preachers of the Gospel; but St. Paul, like the other Apostles, like Moses and the Prophets before them, enjoyed a far higher dignity than that of a simple repeater and transmitter of revelation: he had received his doctrine directly from Jesus Christ.

The doctrine thus received by Paul, according to Cornely, embraced the whole preaching of Christianity, the mysteries of the life, Passion and Resurrection of Christ. Doubtless, however, the general principles of Christ's teachings were known to him before from the Apostolic preaching; it was these doctrines that he was opposing when converted, the spiritual meaning of which was unfolded to him after his conversion by the Saviour Himself (Lagr.).

13. **You have heard**, probably from the mouth of St. Paul himself and his companions when he first preached to the Galatians, or perhaps from the story told them by his enemies who would try to show thereby that Paul was inconsistent and self-contradictory in his preaching.

My conversation, i.e., my former life and practice.

The Jews' religion, i.e., the cause of Judaism, considered as a religion.

The church of God, which St. Paul identifies with the infant Christian community, and which, as taking the place of ancient Israel, he persecuted **beyond measure**, i.e., more than any other of the Jews.

14. And I made progress in the Jews' religion above many of my equals in my own nation, being more abundantly zealous for the traditions of my fathers.

15. But when it pleased him, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace,

16. To reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the Gentiles, immediately I condescended not to flesh and blood.

14. The Apostle here tells us that, because of his special zeal for the traditions, i.e., the explanatory additions to the written Law handed down from age to age by his Jewish ancestors, he made more progress than many of the young men of his time. In truth he could have said with less of modesty that his progress was more than that of *all* his contemporaries.

These traditions which Paul, like the other Pharisees, regarded as sacred as the Law itself, were supposed to be a national tradition which had come down hand in hand with the Torah. Now is it at all probable that such a zealous Pharisee as Paul was could by any natural means have suddenly become a fervent Christian and preacher of the Gospel?

15. Whereas before his conversion Paul had been dependent on the Law and the traditions of the ancients, afterwards he received his doctrine independently of any man, directly from God by divine revelation. Before he was born it pleased God to set him apart, to choose and predestine him for a special mission to be carried out at the time appointed by divine decree.

From my mother's womb means, as the context shows, before his birth (Isa. vii. 16; xlix. 1).

Called me, i.e., to Christianity and to the Apostolate at the same time (Acts ix. 1 ff.; xxvi. 10 ff.) by means of a special and efficacious grace.

16. **To reveal his Son to me**, i.e., to make known to me the exalted mysteries of the Son of God. According to Lightfoot the revelation was made through St. Paul to others, but the natural meaning of *ἐν ἐμοί* here is that Paul realized interiorly, in his soul, the call of verse 15 (Lagr., Cornely). That there were at the time also external manifestations of this revelation is clear from the account given of it by St. Paul in Acts ix. 15 ff. and xxvi. 10 ff.; but the Apostle is now concerned only with its internal effects on his soul.

17. Neither went I to Jerusalem, to the apostles who were before me: but I went into Arabia, and again I returned to Damascus.

Among the Gentiles. St. Paul's special mission was to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles, but this seems not to have been entirely plain to him from the beginning, since he first preached to the Jews. Gradually the great purpose of his call and the full meaning of his vision on the way to Damascus became clear to him (Acts ix. 15).

Immediately I condescended, etc. This means that, following upon his vision on the way to Damascus, St. Paul at once understood, without the aid of human counsel, what he was to do, so clear and definite were the divine communications he had received. The Apostle is here not insisting so much on the prompt obedience he showed to his call, as upon the divine origin of his Apostolate; hence **immediately** (εὐθέως) directly governs the two negative clauses that follow it, and not **I went** (ἀπῆλθον), as Lightfoot thinks.

Flesh and blood, i.e., any human beings. He is bringing out the contrast between Christ who, through revelation, spoke to him, and mortal, ignorant men whom he did not consult.

17. It might have been expected that if the Apostle did not seek counsel from others, he would at least go up to Jerusalem to confer with those who had preceded him in the Apostolate; but so clear and certain were his call and his revelations that he did not do so. Without much delay (Acts ix. 19-21) he retired into **Arabia**, i.e., into the vast country south-east of Palestine, stretching at that time from the Euphrates to the Red Sea, and ruled over by Aretas IV from 9 B.C. to 40 A.D. This retirement into Arabia, where there was surely no one who could instruct him, is another proof that St. Paul did not take counsel with men or receive his Gospel from them.

What did the Apostle do in Arabia? According to Cornely, Lightfoot and others, he gave himself to meditation and prayer; according to the Fathers, he also preached there. This latter opinion would show more than the former the independence of St. Paul's Gospel, and is in greater conformity with the text and with the Apostle's temperament (Lagr.). Whether he visited Mt. Sinai or not is disputed.

18. Then, after three years, I went to Jerusalem, to see Peter, and I tarried with him fifteen days.

19. But other of the apostles I saw none, saving James the brother of the Lord.

In our previous work on the Acts of the Apostles (Acts ix. 19) we discussed the omission by St. Luke of this retirement into Arabia.

18. **Then** (*ἔπειτα*), i.e., after having returned to Damascus and preached there for some time.

After three years, i.e., from the time of his conversion, so that three years elapsed before he met any other of the Apostles who could instruct him. These years were spent partly at Damascus, partly in Arabia.

To see (*ἰστορήσαι*) signifies more than is indicated by the English phrase; it means to make the acquaintance of an important person, or to visit places of renown for the purpose of paying them homage or respect. Hence this visit of Paul to Peter was out of respect for the head of the primitive Church, as all the Fathers have understood.

Fifteen days, i.e., for only a short visit, not long enough to be instructed in the teachings of the Gospel (cf. Acts ix. 26-30). From the phrase, **I tarried** (*ἐπέμεινα*), i.e., "I prolonged my stay," it would seem that Paul remained longer with Peter than he had intended,—another proof that he did not go up to Jerusalem to learn his Gospel.

19. **Saving James**, *εἰ μὴ Ἰάκωβον*. This phrase causes a difficulty. Some, like Zahn, understand it to imply that St. Paul did not consider James to be an Apostle in the strict sense of the term. Catholic critics of the present day are agreed that the meaning is not, "only James," but, "save James," thus holding that St. Paul did acknowledge James as a real Apostle. In speaking of the Apostle's first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion St. Luke says (Acts ix. 27) that "Barnabas brought him to the apostles" who, according to the present verse, must have been Peter and James. It is evident, however, that St. Paul on this visit was chiefly interested in seeing Peter, but this is only because he recognized Peter as the head of the Apostolic group and of the infant Church.

20. Now the things which I write to you, behold, before God, I lie not.

21. Afterwards I came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia.

22. And I was unknown by face to the churches of Judea, which were in Christ:

23. But they had heard only: He, who persecuted us in times past, doth now preach the faith which once he impugned:

The brother, etc., i.e., the son of Alpheus (Luke vi. 15), the cousin of our Lord. His father was Cleophas (Clopas) or Alpheus, and his mother was the sister of the Blessed Virgin (Theodoret).

20. This verse shows that St. Paul considered it a matter of prime importance to insist that what he had just said about his independence of the twelve was absolutely true. Naturally what he goes on to say is not less true, and further enforces the independence of his Gospel.

21. **Afterwards**. Better, "Then" (*ἔπειτα*), marking the completion of one event and the opening of another. Instead of remaining near the other Apostles he went far away to Syria and Cilicia.

From Acts ix. 29 ff. we know that the Apostle, being persecuted at Jerusalem by the Hellenistic Jews, was obliged to flee. He was conducted to Caesarea, and thence went to Tarsus in Cilicia, where later he was sought by Barnabas (Acts xi. 25 ff.). In the present verse the Apostle is doubtless referring to his mission with Barnabas in and about Antioch, the metropolis of Syria (Acts xi. 25-30). Syria is mentioned first in this verse, contrary to the order of Acts ix. 25 and xi. 30, perhaps because it was closer to Jerusalem—about which he had just been speaking, or because it was politically and commercially more important than Cilicia.

22. **I was unknown**, etc., i.e., to the churches in Judea outside of Jerusalem. That he was known to some extent in the Holy City is evident from verse 18 here, and from Acts ix. 28, 29. He is distinguishing Judea from Jerusalem at present, as he does in Acts xxvi. 20. Neither is there any contradiction between Acts xxvi. 20 and the present verse, for the time of his preaching in "all the country of Judea" is not determined.

23. **They had heard**, i.e., the faithful of the Churches in Judea had heard from the Christians in Jerusalem, or from Christian travellers, of Paul's conversion and zealous labors.

24. And they glorified God in me.

The faith, i.e., the doctrines professed by the faithful, the teachings of the Gospel of Christ.

24. The Apostle is here contrasting the attitude of his enemies towards him with that of the Christians of Judea. While the former criticized him, the latter found in him cause for continually glorifying God.

In me, i.e., on account of the fruits of the grace of God which were manifest in my life and actions.

CHAPTER II

THE APOSTLE AGAIN VISITS JERUSALEM; HIS INDEPENDENCE IS FULLY RECOGNIZED AND HIS GOSPEL THOROUGHLY APPROVED BY THE OTHER APOSTLES, I-10

1. Then, after fourteen years, I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, taking Titus also with me.

I-10. Having shown the divine origin of his Gospel and Apostolic authority the Apostle goes on now to refute another argument of his enemies, namely, that he had not the approval of the twelve. After fourteen years, moved by divine revelation, he paid another visit to Jerusalem, accompanied by Barnabas, his co-worker, and Titus, his attendant. While there a statement of his whole Gospel and preaching was laid before the other Apostles and met with their entire and wholehearted approval, in spite of certain objections raised by some false brethren who were secretly brought in to spy on him.

1. Then (*ἐπειτα*), as in i. 18 and 21, indicates the occurrence of some new and notable event. The labors in Syria and Cilicia are succeeded by a journey to Jerusalem.

After fourteen years, i.e., fourteen years from the first visit to Jerusalem mentioned in i. 18, and therefore seventeen years after his conversion, or around 49-51 A.D., the time of the Council of Jerusalem (St. Jerome, St. Chrys., Cornely, Lagrange, Zahn, etc.). Ramsay, Loisy and some others believe the date is from St. Paul's conversion, and so eleven years after the visit of i. 18.

2. And I went up according to revelation; and communicated to them the gospel, which I preach among the Gentiles, but apart to them who seemed to be some thing: lest perhaps I should run, or had run in vain.

The present visit is doubtless to be identified with that of Acts xv. 2 ff., and not with the previous one of Acts xi. 29, 30. Reasons for this opinion are: (a) The chief persons are the same in both instances, namely, Paul and Barnabas, Peter and James; (b) the same question is presented for discussion, i.e., whether Gentile converts should be subjected to the Mosaic observances; (c) the outcome is the same, which was perfect agreement between Paul and the other Apostles, and the decision that the Gentiles were free; (d) the visit of Acts xi. 29, 30 occurred before the death of Herod Agrippa I in 44 A.D. Now the visit of the present verse was at least fourteen, and more probably seventeen years after St. Paul's conversion. To identify these two visits, therefore, would mean pushing the Apostle's conversion back to 28 of 30 A.D., which is plainly inadmissible.

If St. Paul passes over here the visit to Jerusalem recorded in Acts xi. 29, 30, it is because that visit had nothing to do with showing his approval by the other Apostles—the question before him at present. The visit of Acts xi. 29, 30 took place about the time of the martyrdom of St. James the Greater, 43-44 A.D.; St. Peter was in prison or had fled, and the rest of the Apostles were most probably scattered. At all events, it seems clear from Acts xi. 30 that St. Paul saw none of the Apostles on that occasion, and hence a mention of it here would be to no purpose.

With Barnabas. St. Paul mentions Barnabas who, as being a Jewish Christian, was an unimpeachable witness of what took place at Jerusalem during his meeting with the other Apostles.

Titus is also spoken of, because, being a Gentile by birth, and uncircumcised, he would illustrate the rightfulness of Paul's practice of not circumcising converts from paganism.

2. **And I went up.** Better, "Now I went up," etc. To show that this journey to Jerusalem was not the result of any doubt on his part St. Paul says that he was prompted to undertake it by divine **revelation**. This is not contrary to Acts xv. 2, where St. Luke says that Paul was sent by the Church at Antioch; for, in the first place, the decision of the Church could have coincided

with the manifestation of the divine will made to Paul, and secondly, it is possible that the revelation was made not to Paul alone, but to the whole Church.

Communicated to. Better, "I laid before" (*ἀνεθέμην*).

Them, i.e., the faithful of Jerusalem. Whether this explanation of his preaching was made first in a general way to all the faithful (Acts xv. 4, 5), and then more particularly to those who were in authority (Acts xv. 6), St. Paul does not state here; he is concerned at present only with proving that when he explained his Gospel, it was approved by all.

The gospel, which I preach, etc., i.e., that the Gentiles need not be circumcised and made to conform to the Mosaic observances in order to be saved.

But apart to. Better, "In particular, however, before," etc. (*κατ' ἰδίαν δέ*), i.e., he laid his Gospel especially and privately before those in authority.

Then who seemed, etc., i.e., those who are held in esteem, recognized leaders (*οἱ δοκοῦντες*). The reference is most likely to Peter, James and John. Cornely thinks the "apostles and ancients" (bishops) of Acts xv. 6 are here referred to. That St. Paul's words are free from all irony and disrespect is evident from his well-known regard for the Apostles.

Lest perhaps I should run, etc. St. Paul wishes to say that he laid his Gospel before the supreme authority in the Church for approval, not because he had any personal doubt about it, but in order to guard his future, as well as his past labors against the attacks of his enemies. He submitted his preaching to the Apostles "not that he might learn anything himself, but that he might show his opponents that he had not run in vain" (St. Chrys.).

Doubtless, also, St. Paul wished to forestall any possible uneasiness on the part of his superiors. For the greater success of his work he wanted to unite to his private inspirations the approval of the lawful external authority of the Church. "Neither was he able to learn anything from them, since he had been instructed by God; but, for the sake of concord and peace, it was the will of God (that he should submit his Gospel), in order that suspicion and scruples on the part of his brethren and co-Apostles should

3. But neither Titus, who was with me, being a Gentile, was compelled to be circumcised.

4. But because of false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privately to spy our liberty, which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into servitude.

be removed, and that his work among the Gentiles should be furthered by the knowledge that his Gospel agreed with the Apostles' " (Ambrosiaster).

3-5. The case of Titus is a proof that St. Paul's preaching was not in vain. Not only did the Apostles approve his Gospel, but, in spite of strong pressure that was brought to bear by the Judaizers, they held that it was not necessary for Titus, although a Gentile, to be circumcised.

3. **Who was with me**, i.e., who was present as Paul's companion in the Holy City—an uncircumcised convert from paganism among the circumcised Jewish Christians! This was to make the case as strong as it could possibly be. It is to misunderstand both the context and the argument of St. Paul to argue, as some have done, that **was compelled** (*ἡναγκάσθη*) implies that Titus was indeed circumcised, as a matter of prudence and considerateness on the part of St. Paul, even though there was no compulsory action to this end. Verse 5 is a complete refutation of any such interpretation. How could Paul have yielded to the demands of false brethren at Jerusalem, and then ask the Galatians resolutely to resist similar false teachers?

Gentile (Vulg., *gentilis*) is "Greek" in the MSS.

4. **But because.** According to the common opinion this verse shows the reason why Titus was not circumcised, and why the Apostles in Council decided authoritatively against circumcision for Gentiles: it was because false brethren tried to force their point in making this Mosaic rite a necessity for salvation. If it had been only a question of yielding to the sensibilities in minor matters of some well-disposed Christians, Titus would have been circumcised, as was the case with Timothy; but in their attempt to make circumcision necessary for salvation the fanatical Judaizers moved the Apostles to take a firm and definite stand against such a doctrine. According to Lagrange and others, verse 4 is only explanatory of verse 3; it gives the reason why the case of Titus is spoken of in this letter.

5. To whom we yielded not by subjection, no not for an hour, that the truth of the gospel might continue with you.

False brethren, i.e., Jewish Christians whom, on account of their animosity towards Gentile converts and their failure to seek salvation in Christ only, St. Paul could not regard as real brethren.

Unawares brought in, i.e., these Judaizers had stealthily entered the Christian Church, probably through the influence and action of other Christians who, like themselves, were over-zealous for the Mosaic observances, and who regarded Christianity as a continuation of the Law. Where these false brethren entered the Church, whether at Jerusalem or in Syria, is not certain; but it seems most conformable to the context to say it was in Jerusalem. There they had perhaps observed St. Paul and his companions, who had come from afar and had likely attracted attention as a party of strangers.

To spy. These Judaizers were anxious to find some flaws or weak points in St. Paul's preaching, and for this purpose they frequented his assemblies.

Our liberty, etc., i.e., our freedom from the Mosaic observances which has been given by Jesus Christ (verse 19). "As spies enter a city for the purpose of opposing and betraying it to others, so these Judaizers came among the Christians with the aim and intention of reducing them by sly methods to a state of Jewish servitude" (St. Chrys.).

5. A full stop should not separate this verse from the preceding one. The Apostle here assures us that he and his companions, especially Barnabas, refused to yield to the Judaizers even for a moment.

We, i.e., St. Paul, Barnabas, and those who were with them at the time of the attack by the Judaizers.

An hour, i.e., a moment, an instant (cf. 2 Cor. vii. 8; Philem. 15; John v. 35).

The truth of the gospel, i.e., the teachings revealed in the Gospel by Christ, unadulterated by any false doctrines, like those of the Judaizers.

6. But of them who seemed to be some thing, (what they were some time, it is nothing to me, God accepteth not the person of man), for to me they that seemed to be some thing added nothing.

With you, i.e., with the Galatians and all true Christians. To have yielded in the case of Titus would have imperiled the integrity of the Gospel truths for all the faithful.

When this conflict with the Judaizers and the consequent decision of the Council of Jerusalem took place St. Paul had not yet visited North Galatia. Hence patrons of the South Galatian Theory say that the "with you" of the present verse is a clear proof that the Apostle was addressing the Galatian Churches which he had previously established in Lycaonia and Pisidia. This conclusion, however, does not necessarily follow, because St. Paul's victory and the decision of the Council were on behalf of all future, as well as past converts.

6. After the digression about the case of Titus (verses 3-5) the Apostle returns to the thought of verse 2. He wants to say that, although he conferred privately with the other Apostles, they added nothing to his Gospel and gave him no new information. But the warmth of his feelings again asserts itself; and, having begun his sentence in the passive voice, he interjects several parenthetical thoughts, and terminates the sentence in the active. His parenthetical remarks are called forth by the thought that his readers might think that he should have taken more account of the authority of the older Apostles, who had lived so long with Christ and who were esteemed so highly at the Council of Jerusalem.

Of them who seemed, etc. See on verse 2.

What they were, etc., i.e., however highly they were esteemed at the Council of Jerusalem (Lagrange), or however great their privilege of having lived with Jesus (Lightfoot), this is of no present consequence to St. Paul; for **God accepteth not**, etc., i.e., God does not regard external conditions or appearances, but the internal man—what a person is in reality (cf. 2 Cor. v. 16; Rom. ii. 11). The inference is that the twelve enjoy no greater *real* privileges and dignity before God than does St. Paul himself. At any rate, the other Apostles added nothing to St. Paul's

7. But contrariwise, when they had seen that to me was committed the gospel of the uncircumcision, as to Peter was that of the circumcision.

8. (For he who wrought in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, wrought in me also among the Gentiles).

Gospel and teaching, and complete accord reigned between him and them.

7. Far from interfering in any way with St. Paul's teaching the other Apostles saw from the explanations he had given that he enjoyed in every way equal authority to preach and equal soundness of doctrine with themselves. They understood that as their chief work at that time was among the Jews, so St. Paul's was among the Gentiles. The Apostle does not wish to say that his vocation had been to preach exclusively among the Gentiles (Acts xiii. 43; Rom. ix. 3), nor that St. Peter, who had opened the Church to the Gentiles, was to remain always with the Jews. Our Lord was the "minister of circumcision" (Rom. xv. 8), and yet His Church was to extend to all nations.

If St. Peter alone is cited as charged with preaching among the Jews, this is on account of his prominence as head of the Church. There is no more thought of questioning the vocation of the rest of the Apostles to work among the Jews than there is of questioning the vocation of Barnabas to work among the Gentiles. St. Paul is not thinking of setting up two Churches, or two governments in the Church, any more than he is contending for two Gospels. He is maintaining only that his office of preaching the Gospel to the Gentiles is of the same nature as that of Peter among the Hebrews. Neither is there any thought in his mind of arrogating to himself equal authority with Peter in the Church as a whole. There is question of two Apostolates, two missions, and not of two Churches, two governments in the Church, or two chiefs in authority (Lagr., Loisy).

Was committed. Better, "Has been entrusted." The use of the perfect tense suggests permanent charge.

8. This verse is a parenthetical explanation of the preceding one. The subject is God, understood. Just as God, through His grace, had given to Peter a fruitful mission among the Jews, so had He in like manner given Paul a commission among the Gentiles.

9. And when they had known the grace that was given to me, James and Cephas and John, who seemed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship: that we should go unto the Gentiles, and they unto the circumcision:

10. Only that we should be mindful of the poor: which same thing also I was careful to do.

9. The thought of verse 7 is resumed.

Had known. Better, "Recognizing" (*γινώτες*), i.e., having reflected and understood that special graces had been given to Paul for his Gentile labors James, Peter and John, who, when this letter was written, were still regarded as the pillars of the Church, gave to St. Paul and Barnabas their right hands as tokens of entire approval.

James, i.e., the "brother of the Lord" (i. 19), the first Bishop of Jerusalem. James, the son of Zebedee, had been dead for some years, and so there could be no doubt as to who was meant. If James is here mentioned first, it is because the Judaizers appealed especially to his authority. In certain MSS. Peter is put first, but this is doubtless a correction for the sake of emphasizing the primacy of St. Peter.

Cephas is the Aramaic name by which Peter was called among the Jews.

Who seemed, i.e., who were esteemed (verse 2) as pillars or chief authorities in the Church; Peter was the foundation, the others were as pillars.

The right hands of fellowship means solemn approval; it was solemnly agreed that both Jew and Gentile converts were on a common level, and were to form one Church. The phrase does not imply that before there had been any discord or disagreement.

St. Paul is telling the Galatians just what took place at the Council of Jerusalem, how his doctrines and methods among the Gentiles were approved. It is farthest from his thought to wish to say that it was there decided that the other Apostles were ever to confine their ministry to the Jews. At the very time he was writing he knew, in the case of St. Peter, that the facts were otherwise.

10. St. Paul had succored the poor of Palestine before this request was made, as we know from Acts xi. 29, 30; and that he

11. But when Cephas was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed.

was mindful of them afterwards is clear from 1 Cor. xvi. 3; 2 Cor. ix. 1 ff.; Rom. xv. 26, 27; Acts xxiv. 17. He says I was careful, etc., in the singular, because Barnabas left him shortly after the Council of Jerusalem.

AT ANTIOCH ST. PAUL DEFENDS THE INTEGRITY OF THE GOSPEL AND
INSISTS UPON THE UNIFORMITY AGREED UPON AT THE COUNCIL
OF JERUSALEM, 11-14

11-14. The incident at Antioch is a striking illustration of St. Paul's insistence on the true character of the Gospel, which was one for all men, Jews and Gentiles. At first when Peter came there he ate with the Gentiles, but later, upon the arrival of some Jews sent by James, he withdrew from the Gentiles. His example was followed by the rest of the Jewish Christians at Antioch, and finally even by Barnabas. Seeing this weakness and inconsistency on the part of Peter and the harm that was resulting, St. Paul, in the presence of all, rebuked Peter, accusing him of morally forcing the Gentile Christians to conform to Jewish practices.

11. When Cephas was come, etc. When this visit took place and why it was made, we cannot determine exactly. But since Paul and Barnabas were most probably never together after the time mentioned in Acts xv. 35-40, which was soon after the Council of Jerusalem, it seems next to certain that St. Peter came to Antioch at that time to visit the Church there, of which, according to tradition (Euseb., *Chron.*), he had been the founder.

Some commentators find it very difficult to explain how Peter and Barnabas, so soon after the Council of Jerusalem, could have exhibited such extraordinary weakness and disregarded the decisions so generously and unanimously arrived at during the Council. One reply is that the Council had decided, as a matter of *doctrine*, that the Gentile converts were not obliged to be circumcised, but that in *practice* the Jewish Christians could abstain from eating with their Gentile brethren (Steinmann). But the toleration of a practice contrary to doctrine solemnly agreed upon is hardly admissible. Again, it has been said that St. Peter, by his action,

surrendered no principle, but was guided by prudence and opportunism; he thought it was too soon to disregard the sensibilities of the Jewish converts, and that to do so would only antagonize and bitterly offend them without sufficient reason (Hort). This solution leaves out of account the serious effect which such reasoning and such a mode of acting would have had on the many Gentile Christians of Antioch who, till then, had been treated on terms of perfect equality with Jewish converts; and such action would, moreover, have sanctioned the existence of two groups, socially unequal, in the Church. A third explanation would place this whole incident before the Council of Jerusalem (Williams). This, we are told, (a) agrees with St. Paul's reference to Peter's previous life (verse 14); (b) it explains the similarity between those who **came from James** (verse 12) and those who "came down from Judea" (Acts xv. 1); (c) it helps us to understand the controversy described in Acts xv. 1, 2; (d) it makes easier the explanation of the readiness with which Peter and Barnabas withdrew from the Gentiles upon the appearance of the Jews. A fourth opinion says that the Cephas of this incident was not St. Peter, but one of the seventy-two disciples of our Lord (Clement of Alex.). Finally, some of the Fathers have inclined to the view that the whole affair had been previously agreed upon between St. Peter and St. Paul as a means of impressing on the Jewish Christians the necessity of treating their Gentile brethren on terms of equality (Origen, St. Chrys., Theodoret). However well these last three opinions would explain certain difficulties, they must be rejected as out of harmony with the uniform tradition of the Church and with the context.

To the face, i.e., openly and publicly (verse 14).

To be blamed, i.e., was culpable. The words and action of St. Paul show that he regarded St. Peter as his superior; so secure is he in the approval of his Gospel that he does not hesitate to reprove the head of the Church, when there is question of deviating from the recognized and authorized teaching. St. Paul's part in resisting the head of the Church for his unbecoming conduct was no more out of place than was the part taken by St. Catherine of Siena against Pope Gregory for living in Avignon (Rick.).

12. For before that some came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them who were of the circumcision.

13. And to his dissimulation the rest of the Jews consented, so that Barnabas also was led by them into that dissimulation.

12. Why James sent these messengers to Antioch we do not know. Perhaps it was to collect alms for the poor at home. In Jerusalem these emissaries had been accustomed to practice the Mosaic observances, which, for Jews, had not been prohibited by the Council. Moreover, they knew that St. Peter, whom they regarded as their leader, had never failed to observe the Law when with them in the Holy City.

He did eat, i.e., he was accustomed to eat. The use of the imperfect, *συνήθειεν* shows that Peter's practice of eating with the Gentiles had continued for some time. He had opened the Church to the Gentiles, had clearly understood that there was to be no distinction between Jewish and Gentile converts (Acts x. 1 ff.; xi. 1 ff.; etc.), and as before at Caesarea, so now at Antioch he ate with the Gentiles all kinds of food. The only trouble was that when at Jerusalem he seems to have accommodated himself to Jewish practices out of sympathy for his fellow-countrymen.

He withdrew. The verb here is also in the imperfect, and thus signifies that his changed attitude had continued for a considerable time.

Fearing them, i.e., fearing to scandalize his fellow-Jews from Jerusalem who had been used to his observing the Law like themselves, and who, if he continued to eat with the Gentiles in their presence and under their observation, might lose the faith altogether (St. Chrys.).

13. So great was the authority and influence of St. Peter that his conduct, in separating himself from the Gentile Christians, was soon followed by the Jewish converts of Antioch, who had long before given up the Mosaic observances. Even Barnabas, who had been St. Paul's companion in converting the Gentiles, and who at the Council of Jerusalem had so fully accepted the decisions there given, was also finally led by the example of St. Peter and the Jewish converts to separate himself from the Gentiles. St. Paul stood alone. Rightly incensed at the weakness

14. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly unto the truth of the gospel, I said to Cephas before them all: If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the Gentiles, and not as the Jews do, how dost thou compel the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?

of St. Peter in particular he made up his mind energetically to interfere.

Although St. Peter's conduct, as well as that of those who imitated his action, was contrary to inner convictions, the expression *τῇ ὑποκρίσει* must not be understood in the evil sense of hypocrisy. Peter's weakness led him and the others into dissimulation and pretense.

14. **Walked not uprightly.** The literal meaning is that they did not walk *straightly* (*ὀρθοποδοῦσιν* from *ὀρθος*, *straight*, and *ποὺς*, *foot*), but deviated from the right path of the Gospel teaching.

The truth of the gospel was the rule according to which they were supposed to act, and that truth proclaimed freedom from the Mosaic observances. St. Paul rebuked Peter, not for error in doctrine, but for the weak inconsistency of acting contrary to admitted principle. *Conversacionis fuit vitium, non praedicationis* (Tertull.).

Before them all, i.e., probably when both the Gentile and Jewish Christians were having a reunion, which would show that they had not ceased entirely to come together at certain intervals, perhaps for the Agape or love-feast (1 Cor. xi. 20 ff.).

"All," however, may refer to St. Peter, Barnabas and the other Jews who, by Peter's conduct, had been led into dissimulation.

If thou, being a Jew, etc., i.e., Peter, who was a Jew by birth and training, freely consented and ate with the Gentile Christians at Antioch until after the arrival of those messengers from James. Then, for fear of offending his fellow-countrymen, he changed and conformed to Jewish observances, thereby morally *compelling* the Gentile converts to do likewise. The word **compel** (*ἀναγκάζεις*) means nothing more than moral constraint, but it serves to show how powerful was the example and authority of St. Peter in the early Church. Although the faithful of Antioch had been instructed by St. Paul, they did not hesitate to follow St. Peter, whom they regarded as the head of the Church.

To live as do the Jews, i.e., to conform to the Mosaic observ-

15. We by nature are Jews, and not of the Gentile sinners.

ances. This shows that the Gentile converts at Antioch were exceedingly troubled. No one would have wondered to see the Christians from Jerusalem practicing Mosaic observances, for the Council had left them free in this matter; but to see the Jewish converts of Antioch going back to their old practices was nothing else than a disavowal of their conduct and an admission that the Law still obliged.

The assent given by St. Peter to St. Paul's correction clearly proves that he thoroughly recognized the truth and correctness of the Apostle's words.

JEWISH CONVERTS MUST NOT RETURN TO THE LAW, 15-21

15-21. It is a question among scholars whether this section is the substance of St. Paul's discourse to the Jewish Christians at Antioch, or whether it was rather a summing-up of his principles to the Galatians. The common opinion of the Fathers, which alone seems to be in harmony with the context, maintains that this discourse was given at Antioch, and that St. Paul has reproduced here only the substance of it. After reproving St. Peter, the Apostle directed his words to all present (verse 14), having in mind not only Peter, Barnabas and the Jewish Christians, who were well disposed, but also, and in particular, most likely those Judaizers of Antioch who were in favor of subjecting all Gentile converts to circumcision and the Mosaic observances. St. Peter's conduct gave the occasion to St. Paul of showing how foolish and inconsistent it was to have sought justice in Jesus Christ, and thereafter to pretend to seek it in the Law.

St. Paul gives the substance of that discourse in this letter, first to show the Galatians how inflexible he was in principle; and secondly, to convince them that if it was wrong for Jewish Christians to seek justice in the Law, how much worse it was for Gentile converts (Lagr.).

15. **We by nature are Jews**, i.e., St. Paul, St. Peter, Barnabas and the rest of verse 14 were Jews by birth, enjoying, through the privileges granted by special revelation to their race, an atmosphere of moral purity which set them apart from the Gen-

16. But knowing that man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ; we also believe in Christ Jesus, that we may be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: because by the works of the law no flesh shall be justified.

17. But if while we seek to be justified in Christ, we ourselves also are found sinners; is Christ then the minister of sin? God forbid.

tiles, whose origin had been so much less favored (Rom. ii. 17 ff.; iii. 1 ff.; ix. 4 ff.). This statement is a proof that the Apostle was not addressing the Galatians, who were of Gentile origin.

16. **Knowing** (εἰδότες) refers to St. Paul and St. Peter, as also does **we** (ἡμεῖς) further along. Peter and Paul before their conversion were, like all other good Jews, most zealous for the Law and its observance; but afterwards they became thoroughly aware of the fact that justification was not to be obtained through the works prescribed by the Law, but only through faith in Jesus Christ. The **works of the Law** here in question were its ceremonial precepts, such as circumcision, clean and unclean meats, etc., and not its moral precepts, the Ten Commandments; these latter have always been obligatory on all men.

Is not justified (οὐ δικαιούται), i.e., is not now, in this present life, justified, *except* (ἐὰν μὴ) through active faith in Christ, the exclusive means of justification.

No flesh shall be justified, a quotation from Psalm cxlii. 2. The meaning is enduring, namely, that no one can *ever* be justified by the works, i.e., the ceremonial precepts of the Law, as was long ago foretold by the Psalmist. See on Rom. iii. 20, 27, 30.

Jesus Christ should be "Christ Jesus," as in the Greek.

17. This verse is very difficult, and is explained in different ways. We give first what seems to be the more probable solution.

The two preceding verses give the reasons why St. Paul, or any Jewish Christian, abandoned the Law for the faith of Christ, namely, that he might obtain justification. But a difficulty may here present itself: Is it not sinful to leave the Law? do we not become sinners by seeking to be justified in Christ, thus abandoning the Law? If so, Christ is the cause of sin to us, and we have become sinners like the Gentiles (verse 15). The inference is rejected as a blasphemy. The conclusion, then, is that it cannot

18. For if I build up again the things which I have destroyed, I make myself a prevaricator.

19. For I, through the law, am dead to the law, that I may live to God: with Christ I am nailed to the cross.

be wrong to leave the Law; rather a return to it would be sinful (verse 18) (Lagr., Light., etc.).

Another explanation is as follows: If we, Jews by birth, while seeking to be justified through faith in Christ, are also found guilty of some sins, do you hold Christ responsible for that? Is He the cause of our sins because He has induced us to give up the Law? Most certainly not. We are to be blamed, because we are building up again the things we had before destroyed through virtuous living (verse 18).

18. The Apostle seems to say that if, after abandoning the Law in order to seek justification in Christ, one returns to its practice, one becomes a transgressor of the positive law (*παράβατον*) and will of God which has pointed out that justification is to be obtained only through faith in Christ. Cornely holds that to return to the Law is to transgress the Law itself, which by its very nature was intended to lead to Christ. According to other scholars, St. Paul means to say: If, after having abandoned the Law, I return again to its observance, I show by my action that I realize that I am a transgressor for having left the Law; my own act convicts me. St. Peter is not at all included in this condemnation, since he had no intention of reëstablishing the authority of the Law as a principle (Lagr.).

With this verse St. Paul begins again to speak in the singular, (a) perhaps because he does not wish directly to include others in his supposition of doing wrong; or (b) because, having reproduced for his Galatian readers his discussion concerning Jewish converts, he returns more directly to his own personal case.

19. According to Cornely's understanding of the preceding verse the meaning here is that, since the Law was intended to lead to Christ, it became useless and dead, or one became dead to it, when one had obtained Christ, i.e., had received Baptism. Hence of its own nature and intention the Law had its term, and one became, as it were, dead to it, in order to be able to live to God in virtue of one's union with Christ through faith and love.

20. And I live, now not I; but Christ liveth in me. And that I live now in the flesh: I live in the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and delivered himself for me.

St. Chrysostom and others say that the Law, by its numerous commands and exactions, which it did not give the necessary help to fulfil, brought its subjects to a state of moral and spiritual death. The consequence was that man was forced, by the very burden and inadequacy of the Law, to seek refuge in God Himself through Christ, who gives not only commands and precepts, but help to carry them out (Rom. vii. 7 ff.).

With Christ I am nailed, etc., i.e., St. Paul and every good Christian, by virtue of his union with Christ through faith and Baptism, is dead to the Law, from the malediction of which (iii. 13, 14, Rom. vii. 9, 10) Christ by His death on the cross has delivered us (iii. 10, 13).

20. **I live**. Although dead to the Law, St. Paul says he is living a new and more abundant life with Christ (Rom. vi. 4; 2 Cor. v. 15). Through the Law came death; through faith in Christ, full and overflowing life.

Now not I, i.e., in this new life it is not I, the old natural man, that live; but a new and elevated man, transformed by the grace of Christ. This new life is a supernatural existence, as contrasted with the former natural and physical life. The meaning is not that St. Paul has lost his personality, but that the influence of Christ is now dominant in him.

And that I live now, i.e., this new supernatural life which, since my conversion, I live with Christ, I have not attained to by the works of the Law; but through faith in the Son of God who loved me, and gave Himself up to death for my salvation (i. 4; John iii. 16; xv. 13). It is evident from the context that this life of faith which Paul is now leading is animated by charity towards the Son of God who so loved him. What the Apostle says here of himself is proportionately true of all devout Christians. He is thus reminding the Galatians of Christ's love for them individually, hoping thereby to draw them back to Christian faithfulness.

Now (*νῦν*) does not mean the present, as opposed to the future life, but the life of St. Paul since his conversion. Neither does

21. I cast not away the grace of God. For if justice be by the law, then Christ died in vain.

in the flesh (ἐν σαρκί) signify a life of concupiscence as opposed to the life of the spirit, but simply the physical life of which we must take account, since leading a spiritual life does not entirely absorb and transform our physical existence (Lagr.).

21. A return to the Law would mean to cast away that spiritual life which is given only through Christianity. If one seeks justification and sanctity in the Law, being persuaded that they can be found there, then for such surely Christ died in vain, i.e., for *naught*, because He died in order to procure for us that justification which the works of the Law were unable to give (Rom. iii. 21 ff.).

These final words of the Apostle were directed against the Judaizers who were trying to lead the Galatians away from the true Gospel. For such as they Christ died in vain. There is no thought here of St. Peter, who was in perfect agreement with Paul that justification was only through faith in Christ.

CHAPTER III

THE SECOND, OR DOGMATIC PART OF THE EPISTLE, iii-1-v. 12

Since Christ was the fulfillment of the promise made to Abraham, and since the entire revelation of the Old Testament was a preparation for, and a leading up to Christ, it could most reasonably occur to the Galatians that the ancient Scriptures, including the Law of Moses, were sacred, and that the Gospel, with its perfect revelation, had grown out of them, like the fruit out of the vine. Would it not follow, then, that the observance of the Law was necessary to salvation also for Christians, and that thus only is justification to be obtained?

It is beyond doubt that the Gentiles were partakers of the salvation foreshadowed in the Old Testament, but as heirs of the promise and blessing made to Abraham long centuries before the Law was given. The Law was only an intermediate measure for the Jewish people, a special help to lead them to Christ and to the fruition of those blessings which were promised to the father

1. O senseless Galatians, who hath bewitched you that you should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been set forth, crucified among you?

of their race. To return to the Law after having found Christ would be to go backwards; it would be to give up the end and return to a particular means which were intended for a particular people.

St. Paul, therefore, after having reviewed the history of his divine call and mission, and having shown the conformity of his Gospel with that of the other Apostles, passes on now, in the second part of his letter, to prove that the doctrine and fact of justification are not dependent on the works of the Law, but only on faith in Jesus Christ (iii. 1-v. 12). See *Introduction*, viii.

THE IMPORTANCE OF FAITH AS THE MEANS OF JUSTIFICATION SHOULD
BE EVIDENT TO THE GALATIANS FROM THEIR OWN PERSONAL
EXPERIENCE, 1-5

1-5. The Apostle had just said (ii. 21) that to seek salvation through the Law was to render null the death of Christ; and reflecting now on the situation in Galatia, where there was imminent danger of an attempt to do this very thing, he breaks forth in holy indignation, exclaiming, "O senseless Galatians, who hath bewitched you?" He asks if Christ crucified, whom he had preached to them, was not power and charm enough to keep them from error, and if their own experience in receiving the Holy Spirit through faith, independently of the Law, was not sufficient proof that their justification was from faith and not from the Law.

1. Senseless, i.e., dull of mind, slow to penetrate the mystery of Christianity and to perceive things of deep spirituality.

Galatians. See *Introduction*, ii.

Hath bewitched you, i.e., has cast about you a spell or charm, thus inducing you to turn your eyes away from the crucified Christ and fix them upon the doctrine of the Judaizers.

St. Chrysostom, Theodoret and other Greek Fathers have understood in "bewitched" (ἐβάρκασεν) an allusion to the "evil eye" of folk-lore, especially in Babylon and Assyria. But in both the Old and the New Testaments it usually has the meaning of

2. This only would I learn of you: Did you receive the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?

3. Are you so foolish, that, whereas you began in the Spirit, you would now be made perfect by the flesh?

"envy." St. Jerome understands the term in the sense of fascination that is exercised on children.

That you should not obey the truth. These words are wanting in the best MSS. and in some versions. As St. Jerome observed, they are doubtless a gloss from v. 7.

Before whose eyes, etc. So vivid, so definite had been the preaching of St. Paul to the Galatians that Christ crucified was made to appear before their very eyes as if actually existing in the flesh. Such a picture ought never to fade from their minds, and should ever protect them against attractions of a contrary sort.

Set forth, i.e., pictured, depicted (*προεγράφη*). The literal meaning is to *placard, post in public*; or, as the Greek Fathers think, to *paint*.

Among you (Vulg., *in vobis*) is not found in the best MSS. It was added in the Received Text. Some of the Latin Fathers, following the old Latin version, read *proscriptus*, instead of *praescriptus*. This is difficult to understand unless we add *et*, thus: *proscriptus est, et in vobis crucifixus*, "(Christ) condemned anew and crucified among you."

2. To bring out more plainly the folly of their conduct St. Paul reminds the Galatians of their own experience. They themselves know that their reception of the Holy Spirit, with His sanctifying grace, His manifest special gifts (verse 5), was when they received by faith the truths of Christ crucified which had been preached to them, and not by the observing of the Law which they, as Gentiles, did not know.

The hearing of faith (*ἀκοή πίστεως*) means the *hearing* which led to faith and was accompanied by faith.

Works are here contrasted with *hearing*; and *law* with *faith*, i.e., *believing*. That Christ was the object of their faith and belief is evident (cf. ii. 16 ff.).

3. St. Paul reduces the conduct of the Galatians to an absurdity. They would go from the law of grace and liberty to that of works

4. Have you suffered so great things in vain? If it be yet in vain.

5. He therefore who giveth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you; doth he do it by the works of the law, or by the hearing of the faith? and slavery; they would begin with the Holy Spirit, and attain to their end and perfection by the flesh (St. Chrys., Cornely).

The Spirit means the Holy Ghost, the principle of the new life of grace, whom the Galatians had received with faith (verse 2).

Flesh stands for Judaism, which was embraced through circumcision. In the one there is the action of the Spirit; in the other, the use of certain corporal rites. Spirit and flesh are the respective characteristics of Christianity and Judaism (Theodoret, Lagr.).

The *spiritu* of the Vulgate ought to be capitalized, because there is question of the Holy Ghost.

4. **Have you suffered**, etc. Can it be that the Galatians, who had suffered so many persecutions for their faith, would now be so foolish as to lose all the merit and reward of their trials by renouncing the Gospel and going back to Judaism? What these sufferings were we do not know, since no record of them has come down to us. We have in Acts (xiii. 50; xiv. 2, 5, 6) accounts of persecutions endured by the Lycaonians, but this does not prove the identity of the Lycaonians and the Galatians.

In vain, i.e., to no purpose, without hope of reward, which would certainly be the case if the Galatians renounced the Gospel.

If it be yet in vain (εἰ γε καὶ εἰκῇ), i.e., "If indeed it be to no purpose." St. Paul is not expressing apprehension, but the hope that the Galatians will not have suffered to no purpose (Theodoret, Cornely, Light., Zahn, etc.). This interpretation corresponds to the Galatian situation, where apostasy was menacing rather than actually committed. But εἰ γε with καί usually means, "If, as I believe," or "if, as I fear"; and this is the sense in which it is here understood by Lagrange, Lipsius and Sieffert.

Some theologians draw from the last phrase of this verse an argument for the reviviscence, through Penance, of merits lost by mortal sin. However sound or weak the inference from this text might otherwise be, it is rendered of little value by the fact that it is not at all certain that the Galatians had actually turned from Christ.

5. The Apostle returns to the question proposed in verse 2.

6. As it is written: Abraham believed God, and it was reputed to him unto justice.

7. Know ye therefore, that they who are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham.

Giveth to you . . . worketh. These verbs, in the present tense, show that the situation among the Galatians was not altogether hopeless; some, doubtless, had gone farther than others. The gifts of the Spirit here referred to were experienced internally, in the souls of the faithful, such as, science, wisdom, etc. (1 Cor. xii. 6 ff.); whereas **miracles** (*δυνάμεις*) were exterior manifestations of the Spirit within, such as, prophecy, the gifts of tongues, and the like (1 Cor. xii. 10). All these gifts, internal and external, had been received through faith, independently of the works of the Law.

The *in vobis* of the Vulgate (Gr., *ἐν ὑμῖν*) means **among you**.

THE SCRIPTURES PROVE THAT ABRAHAM WAS JUSTIFIED BY FAITH, 6-9

6-9. This section was rejected by Marcion on account of his opposition to the Old Testament; it showed too plainly against his heretical views that the principle of salvation is the same both in the Old and in the New Testaments (cf. St. Jerome here; Tertull., *Adv. Marc.* v. 3).

The Judaizers taught that in order to have part in the blessings promised to Abraham and his posterity, it was necessary for the Gentile converts to establish, through circumcision, that filial relationship with the father of their race by which they could really be called the children of Abraham. They erred, as St. Paul now points out, in not understanding that Abraham's justification was through faith, and that consequently the faithful are truly his sons and heirs of the blessings promised him.

6. See on Rom. iv. 3 ff.

It is written (Vulg., *scriptum est*) is not represented in the Greek.

7. The Apostle here concludes that, since Abraham was justified by faith and not by works, they are his sons (*υἱοί*) who imitate his faith.

Know ye (*γινώσκετε*) can be imperative or indicative. St. Jerome understood it as indicative.

They who are of faith, etc., i.e., those who make faith the

8. And the scripture, foreseeing, that God justifieth the Gentiles by faith, told unto Abraham before: In thee shall all nations be blessed.

9. Therefore they that are of faith, shall be blessed with faithful Abraham.

principle of their religious life and activities. Faith is here contrasted with the ceremonial works of the Law (verse 10).

The same, i.e., these only (οὗτοι) in an exclusive sense.

Are the children (υἱοί), i.e., enjoy the real sonship with all its privileges. The Jews thought physical relationship with Abraham was sufficient to establish also spiritual sonship.

8. **The scripture, foreseeing.** Better, "The Scripture foresaw." Scripture is personified, because of the personality of God behind it. The meaning is that the Holy Ghost, the author of Scripture, foresaw before the Law was given that God the Father had determined to justify the Gentiles by faith. Of this truth the Galatians had had actual personal experience, and were therefore a confirmation; it was through faith that they had obtained the grace of Christianity.

Told unto, i.e., "announced the good news" (προεκηγγερίσατο) to Abraham. This announcement was really the beginning of the Gospel.

In thee, i.e., in thy person.

All nations, i.e., all those who shall imitate the faith of Abraham. The quotation is a fusion of Gen. xii. 3 and xviii. 18, perhaps in order to emphasize the fact that the pagans were to participate in the blessings of Abraham. See on Rom. iv. 1.

9. **Therefore.** Better, "And so," or "So that" (ὥστε).

Shall be blessed. Better, "Are blessed."

A conclusion is drawn from what has been said. As the Gentiles, at the time of the promise made to Abraham, were blessed in his person, so now, in consequence of their faith, are they blessed **with faithful Abraham**. This blessing could not come to the Gentiles because they were his natural children, nor again because they had received circumcision; therefore only because they imitated his faith.

THE LAW BROUGHT A CURSE, INSTEAD OF A BLESSING; FAITH BRINGS
THE BLESSING OF THE SPIRIT, 10-14

10. For as many as are of the works of the law, are under a curse. For it is written: Cursed is every one, that abideth not in all things, which are written in the book of the law to do them.

10-14. After having proved that the blessings of Abraham have come to the Galatians through faith the Apostle now shows first, that neither blessing nor justification, but only a curse, could come through the Law; and then, that Christ, by becoming a curse for our sakes, has extended the blessings of Abraham to the Gentiles, in order that we may, through faith, receive the promise of the Spirit. Verse 13 is a return to the thought of verse 10, and verse 14 ("by faith") looks back to verses 11 and 12.

10. Far from giving a part in the blessings of Abraham the Law brought a curse upon those who, without grace, tried to fulfil it. This is proved by a citation from the Law itself (Deut. xxvii. 26).

As many as, etc., i.e., all, whether Jews or Christians, who think that their salvation is not to be obtained by faith, but through the fulfillment of the **works of the law**, such as, circumcision, the observance of the Sabbath and the like, **are under a curse**, i.e., in a state of permanent hostility to God, simply because they cannot, without the grace that comes through faith in Christ, keep the commandments and precepts of the Law.

St. Paul is not saying that no one could keep the precepts of the Law, but only that the Law itself, independently of God's grace, gave no help for the fulfillment of its commands. The Law pointed out what should be done and what should be avoided, and in so doing, without at the same time giving any help towards keeping its mandates, it only multiplied transgressions. Those, therefore, who trusted in the Law only, put themselves in a perilous position.

The citation of Deut. is according to the LXX, and is in conformity with the Hebrew, except for **every one** ($\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$) and **in all things** ($\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu$), whose equivalents are not in the Hebrew, although St. Jerome thinks originally they were there. He suspects the Jews to have omitted the second ($\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu$), so as not to

11. But that in the law no man is justified with God, it is manifest: because the just man liveth by faith.

12. But the law is not of faith: but, He that doth those things, shall live in them.

13. Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written: Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree:

be under a curse in case they were not able to observe the whole Law.

11. The meaning of this verse is that no one is rendered really and truly just before God in virtue of the Law. True justice in the sight of God comes only through faith.

In the law. The Greek is *ἐν νόμῳ*, without the article, but the Jewish Law is clearly meant, as elsewhere in this Epistle.

Because the just man, etc. See on Rom. i. 17.

12. The last words of the preceding verse form the major of a syllogism; in the present verse we have the minor; the conclusion is in verse 10 above.

The law is not of faith, i.e., the Law, as such, has not the same nature as faith; faith is concerned primarily with internal dispositions, while the Law regards only external acts. "The precepts of the Law are not concerned with things to be believed, but with things to be done" (St. Thomas).

He that doth, etc. This citation is a free rendering of the Hebrew of Lev. xviii. 5. It means that he who keeps the Law shall live; but St. Paul's point is that this keeping of the Law is impossible without some further help which the Law itself could not provide. The just of the Old Testament were not justified by the Law, but through their faith in the Messiah to come. It was this faith that procured for them the grace necessary to keep the precepts of the Law. See on Rom. x. 5.

Very probably the Judaizers had used the above text to prove to the Galatians the necessity of observing the Law, but St. Paul turns it against his adversaries, taking it for granted that his readers will understand that the Jews did not and could not observe the Law by virtue of any help that it afforded them.

13. What the Law could not do Christ, dying on the cross, has accomplished. He redeemed us, i.e., us Jews, from the malediction under which we lived by reason of the Law. "Us" could not include the pagans, because they were not under the curse

14. That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Christ Jesus: that we may receive the promise of the Spirit by faith.

of the Law; but the liberation of the Jews who became Christians brought about the diffusion of the blessing among the Gentiles (Cornely).

Hath redeemed, i.e., has satisfied for our sins by the pouring out of His blood on the cross. Here there is question of being ransomed from the curse of the Law.

Being made a curse, etc., i.e., He took upon Himself all the maledictions of the Law in order to liberate those who were under the Law; He put Himself in the place of the enslaved that He might free them, becoming Himself an object of malediction for their sakes. Christ was an object of malediction, inasmuch as upon Him the fury of God's wrath was poured out, not because of any personal wrong, but as bearing the sins of the whole world.

For it is written. St. Paul cites as an illustration the text of Deut. xxi. 23, which shows that Christ, having been a victim for sin, incurred also the curse of sin. The Law declared him cursed by God who hung on a tree; and Christ was nailed to the wood of the tree. The citation is made freely according to the LXX, which has *ὑπὸ θεοῦ* after *ἐπικατάρατος* as in the Hebrew.

Crucifixion was not a Jewish form of execution, and was resorted to only in rare cases (Num. xxv. 4). The dead body of a criminal was sometimes raised on a cross as a deterrent against crime, but it had to be taken down the same day, lest, being a thing accursed of God (Deut. xxi. 23), it should pollute the land.

14. This shows the end for which Christ suffered on the cross, namely, that the blessings promised to Abraham, i.e., justification by faith and all the Messianic gifts, might come to the Gentiles as well as the Jews, and that **we**, i.e., the Jews, might **receive the promise of the Spirit**, i.e., all the gifts of the Holy Ghost which make us sons of God and heirs of heaven.

Through Christ Jesus. Better, "In Jesus Christ," the Redeemer, who ransomed the Jews, and in and through whom both Jews and Gentiles are united and receive the gifts of the Spirit.

By faith, and not by the works of the Law.

THE RELATION OF THE PROMISE TO THE LAW; THE LATTER DID NOT
ANNUL THE FORMER, 15-18

15. Brethren (I speak after the manner of man), yet a man's testament, if it be confirmed, no man despiseth, nor addeth to it.

16. To Abraham were the promises made and to his seed. He saith not, And to his seeds, as of many: but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ.

15-18. St. Paul illustrates the inviolability of the promise made to Abraham by an allusion to a human custom. No one adds to or takes from a man's will when once it is ratified. Likewise, the covenant made by God with Abraham cannot be annulled by the Law which was given four hundred and thirty years later.

15. **Brethren.** St. Paul speaks now with the affection of a master for his disciples, and not as in verse 1.

After the manner of man, i.e., according to human custom and practice; or, according to the relation of man to man. The Apostle uses human terms and methods to illustrate and explain the ways of God.

Testament, i.e., a *will*, or solemn *disposition*. This is the sense of *διαθήκη* in classic Greek, in inscriptions and papyri (Cornely, Lagr.). Some object to the word *will* as connoting death, which *διαθήκη* does not necessarily include; hence these scholars translate, "deed of gift" (Williams). Others prefer to give the term the meaning of *covenant* or *contract*, in which sense it is used in the LXX to signify the alliance between God and Israel. Doubtless *disposition* comes nearest the Apostle's meaning, since he is speaking of the great *disposition* made by God which regulates all His dealings with Abraham and his descendants.

If it be confirmed, etc. Better, "When it hath been ratified," i.e., officially recognized by proper public authority. The disposition of property by a testator was regarded by the Romans as radically emanating from the power of the State, and consequently as inviolable when enacted according to required legal form; no one could add to or subtract from it in any way.

16. This verse is really the minor premise of a syllogism, of which the major is in the preceding verse, and the conclusion in the verse that follows. A testator's disposition of his property is

17. Now this I say, that the testament which was confirmed by God, the law which was made after four hundred and thirty years, doth not disannul, to make the promise of no effect.

sacred and inviolable; but to Abraham and his issue God made the promises, after the manner of a last will or testament; therefore nothing can interfere with those promises.

The promises. The plural is used because the promise, which had the character of a last will or testament, was not only renewed to Isaac and Jacob, but was several times addressed to Abraham himself (Gen. xii. 7; xiii. 15; xv. 18; xvii. 7-10; xxii. 16 ff.; xxiv. 7). The Apostle is directly alluding to the promise found in Gen. xiii. 15; xvii. 8: "All the land that thou beholdest, I will give to thee and to thy seed," etc. These words, in their proper sense, refer to the land of Canaan, the country of Palestine, which God promised as an eternal inheritance to Abraham and his descendants, and which St. Paul is here taking in a spiritual sense, as signifying the Messianic Kingdom, the Church of Christ here below and the Kingdom of Heaven hereafter. Hence the Apostle is here speaking of a spiritual inheritance to which the spiritual descendants of Abraham are heirs. But all of Abraham's spiritual descendants are summed up in one person who was Christ, to whom, as to their head, all Christians are united through faith and charity, forming one mystical body (iii. 28; I Cor. xii. 12).

His seed, i.e., his issue.

He saith not, i.e., God, who spoke to Abraham, saith not.

To his seeds, etc. In order to show the unity between Christ and the faithful, God, when making the promise, made use of a collective word in the singular, indicating unity rather than plurality. The promise was given to Abraham and his *issue*, i.e., Christ; and hence none can have part in this inheritance except *in* Christ, i.e., as united to Christ by faith and love.

The Vulgate should have *autem* after Abraham at the beginning of the verse to represent the $\delta\epsilon$ of the best Greek MSS., and thus connect this verse with the preceding.

17. The argument of the two preceding verses is concluded.

The testament or disposition made by God to Abraham, and ratified by God with an oath (Gen. xxii. 16; Heb. vi. 17, 18) long

18. For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise. But God gave it to Abraham by promise.

centuries before the Law was given, and independently of it, is not rendered void by the promulgation of the latter.

The addition of "in Christ" after "God," which is found in some MSS., is a gloss.

Four hundred and thirty years. This is the period of time allowed by Paul between the making of the promise and the giving of the Law. The statement, while causing a difficulty, does not interfere with the Apostle's argument given above. It is generally supposed that about 200 years elapsed between the promise made to Abraham and the entrance of the Israelites into Egypt; and on this supposition St. Paul should have said 630 years. Different explanations are given of the difficulty.

(a) The chronology of this verse is practically that of the Septuagint of Exod. xii. 40, of the Samaritan Pentateuch, and of Josephus (*Antiq.* ii. 15, 2), which authorities allow 430 years between the entrance of Abraham into Canaan and the departure of the Jews from Egypt. (b) St. Paul is counting from the last renewal of the promise, which was made to Jacob (Gen. xlv. 3, 4), and the giving of the Law, i.e., he is speaking of the period during which the Jews were in Egypt, which, according to the Hebrew of Exod. xii. 40, was 430 years.

18. See on Rom. iv. 13-16. So radically different are the Law and the promise that it is impossible for the inheritance pledged in the "testament" to come from the former without ceasing altogether to be from the latter. But the inheritance is of promise, and therefore not of the Law.

The inheritance originally and directly meant the land of Canaan, but is here used in a purely spiritual sense, as embracing all the blessings of which Christ is the source; of these spiritual gifts the land of Canaan was a figure and a type.

Be of the law, i.e., if the inheritance be the reward of observing the Law, **it is no more of promise**, i.e., it is no longer a gratuitous gift of God. Since, therefore, the blessings and gifts of which Christ is the source are entirely gratuitous, depending on no condition, it is clear that they are not the result of observing the Law.

THE LAW WAS GIVEN TO THE JEWS AS A GUIDE TO CHRIST, 19-24

19. Why then was the law? It was set because of transgressions, until the seed should come, to whom he made the promise, being ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator.

19-24. Although the Law was powerless to alter the promise in any way, yet it was a divine institution and in nowise opposed to the promise. It was given as a protection to the Jews, and as a moral guide to lead them to Christ.

19. **Why then**, etc., i.e., what was the purpose of the Law? what end had God in view when He gave it?

It was set because, etc., i.e., the Law *was added to* (προσέτεθη) the promise, not as a codicil to modify a testament, but as a temporary disposition to repress and restrain sins, and, by the revelations it made to the Jews of their weakness and sinfulness, to make them long for the grace and help of the Redeemer (St. Chrys., St. Jerome, etc.). The Law was good in itself, but it revealed to man his many sins and infirmities without giving him the grace and help he needed to overcome his evil nature and perform his duties (Rom. vii. 7). Thus indirectly the Law multiplied transgressions and increased man's sins (Rom. iv. 13-15; vii. 7-13; 1 Cor. xv. 56, etc.).

Until the seed, etc., i.e., the Law was only transitory, serving as a teacher and guide until the coming of Christ and the establishment of His Kingdom, the Church (verse 16).

To whom he made the promise. Better, "To whom the promise was made."

Being ordained, etc., i.e., the Law was not, like the promise, given directly by God, but indirectly, through angels first (Acts vii. 53; Heb. ii. 2), and then through Moses, who was the **mediator** between God and the Jewish people (1 Tim. ii. 5; Heb. viii. 6; ix. 15; xii. 24). There was a Jewish tradition, based on Deut. xxxiii. 2 (cf. Acts vii. 53; Heb. ii. 2, where this tradition is presupposed), that angels had a part in making the Law of Moses.

In the hand refers to the reception of the tables of the Law into the hands of Moses (Exod. xxxi. 15).

In showing the transitoriness of the Law and the indirectness

20. Now a mediator is not of one: but God is one.

21. Was the law then against the promises of God? God forbid. For if there had been a law given which could give life, verily justice should have been by the law.

with which it was given St. Paul is calling attention to its inferiority as compared with the promise. The promise was given directly by God to Abraham. The giving of the Law, on the contrary, was performed by angels on behalf of God, and by Moses on behalf of the people.

20. **A mediator is not of one**, i.e., where there is a mediator there are at least two parties who are brought together by the mediator. This was the case in the giving of the Mosaic Law, which was a bilateral contract between God and the Jewish people. In virtue of this contract God promised to give blessings to the people; and they, in turn, pledged themselves to the observance of the precepts of the Law (Deut. v. 25). The blessings of the Law were therefore dependent upon the observance of the Law (verse 12).

But God is one. In the promise, on the contrary, God acted alone, and in accordance with the unity of His nature, without the assistance of a mediator. Accordingly He obligated Himself, independently of any condition, to confer the blessings of the promise. Hence the Law is able neither to nullify the promise, nor to act as a substitute for it. Such seems to be the most probable explanation of this difficult verse, of which, it is said, some 430 interpretations have been given. Cf. Cornely, Lagrange, h. 1.

If it be objected that even in the promise there is a mediator, namely, Christ, we reply that St. Paul is here regarding Christ as God, as a Divine Person who is God. It is true that in 1 Tim. ii. 5, the Apostle speaks of Christ as the "mediator" between God and man, but there, as his words indicate, he is considering our Lord's humanity.

21. A difficulty arises. What is to be concluded from the two preceding verses? If the giving of the Law has increased and multiplied transgressions (verse 19), and if for salvation it has imposed an onerous condition (the obligation of observing its precepts), which was not required in the promise (verse 20), does it not follow that the Law is opposed to the promise of God

22. But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise, by the faith of Jesus Christ, might be given to them that believe.

23. But before the faith came, we were kept under the law shut up, unto that faith which was to be revealed.

which contained a blessing to be given gratuitously and absolutely?

God forbid. The inference is manifestly false.

For if, etc., i.e., "if a law had ever been given" (εἰ γάρ ἐδόθη νόμος) which of itself **could give** the life of grace and glory, then **in reality** (ὄντως) such a law would have been the principle of a justice which St. Paul considers the starting-point of a life of grace and glory (Rom. v. 10). In such a case faith would have been useless, because salvation would not be a gratuitous gift, but a reward deserved. But it was not so, as appears from the following verse.

22. But the scripture. Contrary to the supposition of the preceding verse the entire Old Testament, including the Law, i.e., various texts and passages throughout the Old Testament, show that all men, Jews as well as Gentiles, were held as enslaved by the tyranny of sin. See on Rom. iii. 10-20. This proves how powerless the Law was of itself to give spiritual life to its subjects; it only enslaved and imprisoned them.

That the promise, etc. The Law, and the Scripture in general, prove that all mankind were under sin, in order that the inheritance promised to Abraham might be given to all who believe, i.e., to all who seek salvation, not through the works of the Law, but in union with Christ, through faith and love.

St. Paul is not saying that none of those who had the Law attained salvation, but only that the external Law did not secure to the individual internal morality and justice (Loisy). Those of the Old Dispensation who were justified obtained their justification by imitating the faith of their forefather Abraham.

23. Before the faith came, i.e., before the advent of Christ, the author and object of our faith, we, i.e., the Jewish Christians, were by means of the precepts, threats and promises of the Law kept . . . shut up, as prisoners and captives, against the danger of idolatry and the other pagan vices that surrounded us. The various precepts and restrictions of the Law acted as a wall to

24. Wherefore the law was our pedagogue in Christ, that we might be justified by faith.

the Israelites, as a hedge, to protect them from the sins of the heathen (St. Chrys., Theodoret).

Unto that faith, etc. The tyranny and severity of the Law was for the good of the Jews. Its purpose was, by preserving the revelation given, by keeping alive the Messianic hope, and by making manifest the impotency of unassisted nature to attain to the perfection it required, to prepare its subjects for that fulness of faith which was to be revealed in Christ, and which in the souls of the faithful would be a new régime, opposed to the Law (Lagr.).

24. The conclusion now follows clearly and naturally. To change the metaphor from the idea of a jailer to that of an instructor and tutor St. Paul now says, **the law was our pedagogue**, literally, "child-leader" (*παιδαγωγός*). In Greek and Roman households the pedagogue was a faithful slave charged chiefly with the moral and disciplinary protection of the young children; and in this sense the term is here applied to the Law. The Law instructed and disciplined the Jews, showing them by its restraints and prohibitions what sin really was, but affording them no help to avoid or escape from it. This desperate situation of slavery produced by the Law, together with the impotency of reason to liberate from sin, forced mankind, as it were, to have recourse to faith in Christ that they **might be justified**.

In Christ (*εἰς Χριστόν*) marks the term or end which God the Father had in view as the Messiah and Redeemer of His people enslaved by the Law. Therefore the Law led to Christ, the Redeemer, rather than to Christ the Teacher and Doctor (Lagr.).

CHRISTIANS, UNITED TO CHRIST BY FAITH, ARE THE TRUE DESCENDANTS OF ABRAHAM, AND THE HEIRS ACCORDING TO THE PROMISE,
25-29

25-29. With the coming of Christ the services of the pedagogue ceased. Now all, Jews and Gentiles, who believe, are sons of God in Jesus Christ, united to Christ by faith and Baptism; and, as thus united, the Galatians are also, as He is, the seed of Abraham, and consequently heirs of the inheritance promised to Abraham.

25. But after the faith is come, we are no longer under a pedagogue.

26. For you are all the children of God by faith, in Christ Jesus.

27. For as many of you as have been baptized in Christ, have put on Christ.

25. This verse marks the conclusion of what has preceded, and at the same time introduces an account of the privileges which the Galatians enjoy.

After the faith, etc., i.e., after Christ has come.

26. **For** (γάρ) introduces the reason why all, Jews and Gentiles, are no longer under a pedagogue, namely, because all are now sons of God, of mature age, with full rights, united by faith to Christ, the perfect man.

It is disputed whether the words **in Christ Jesus** should be joined with **children of God** or with **faith**. The former is preferred by Cornely: "You are the children of God in Christ Jesus," i.e., through your union with Christ Jesus, to whom you are united by faith and love. The second construction appeals to Lagrange as more natural, according to the order of the words. "It is very true," he says, "that we become sons of God through union with Christ, but this union commences with faith, and thence produces its effect."

27. Those who in the preceding verse join "Christ Jesus" with "children of God" explain the present verse as follows: You are sons of God as being united with Christ, and you are united with Christ because you have put Him on in Baptism. Those who unite "Christ Jesus" with "faith" see in this verse a proof of the divine filiation: You are the sons of God through faith, because by Baptism, an act of faith, you have put on Christ. In both explanations it is understood that Christ is the Son of God. Cf. Lagrange, h. l.

This dignity of sonship, this union with Christ, has been effected by Baptism, the exterior and logical conclusion of faith. To put on Christ means to assume the character of Christ, to clothe one's self with Christ's dispositions and qualities. The purpose of the metaphor here is to express a most intimate union, in virtue of which Christians really become participants in the sonship of God with the full rights and privileges of sons. By putting on Christ "you are brought to one kindred and one

28. There is neither Jew nor Greek: there is neither bond nor free: there is neither male nor female. For you are all one in Christ Jesus.

29. And if you be Christ's, then are you the seed of Abraham, heirs according to the promise.

form with Him (Christ). . . . You have all one form, one impress, that of Christ" (St. Chrys.); "You are made of the same form with the Son of God. . . . Being then made partakers of Christ, you are rightly called other Christs" (St. Cyril of Jer.).

28. Since all those who have received Baptism have put on Christ, that is, are united to Him in a most intimate manner, it follows that there is no longer any distinction between Jew and Gentile, bond or free, male or female; religiously no differences exist, national or social, but all form one moral and mystical body with Christ their head.

The Vulgate *unum* is *εἰς* in Greek, meaning *one man* in Christ Jesus.

29. The conclusion is clear and definite: If all are united as in one man with Christ, then all are heirs to the inheritance promised to Abraham and his seed, Christ. In other words: You are all members of Christ (verses 27, 28); but to Christ through Abraham were the promises made (verse 16); therefore these promises extend to you and to you alone (Sales).

CHAPTER IV

UNDER THE LAW THE JEWS WERE, LIKE MINORS, IN AN INFERIOR POSITION; BUT CHRIST'S COMING HAS MADE THEM ADOPTED SONS OF GOD WITH FULL RIGHTS TO THE INHERITANCE, 1-7

1-7. St. Paul here returns to the discussion broken off at iii. 25, namely, the opposition between the promise and the Law. Already he has likened the former to a testament and the latter to a pedagogue; and now he asks what was the condition of mankind during the period that intervened between the giving of the promise and its realization. The answer is that, until the coming of Christ, the Jews, although in reality sons and heirs to the inheritance, were like minors, under guardians and stew-

1. Now I say, as long as the heir is a child, he differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all;
2. But is under tutors and governors until the time appointed by the father:
3. So we also, when we were children, were serving under the elements of the world.

ards, enslaved by the elementary rules that pertained to things merely external. And if such was the inferior state of the Jews, how much worse was that of the Gentiles! All, therefore, Jews and Gentiles, were, like children who had lost their father, waiting for the expiration of the time of their minority and the entrance upon the possession of their inheritance. And when the fulness of the time fixed by the Father arrived, God sent His Son, that He might redeem those in bondage, making through His grace all believers to become His adopted sons and thus heirs of the promised inheritance.

1. As long as the Jews were under the tutelage of the Law they were like young children, minors, who were heirs indeed to the inheritance bequeathed them by their Father, but, so far as regarded the free use and disposition of their inheritance, differing nothing from servants who have no right to the property.

The figure supposes the father to be dead, but St. Paul is making only a comparison, and every comparison is imperfect.

2. **Tutors**, i.e., guardians, if the father is supposed to be dead.

Governors (*οἰκονόμους*), i.e., administrators, as of property, whether material or spiritual; here, perhaps, the term simply means *attendants*. The plural, **tutors** and **governors**, is used to signify the various guardians and attendants appointed by the father at the same time, or, more probably, in succession.

Until the time, etc. In Roman Law ordinarily a minor was under a *tutor* till fourteen, and under a *curator* till twenty-five (cf. Ramsay, *Gal.*, p. 392). See Lagrange, h. l.

3. Application of the foregoing comparison is now made. See on verse 1.

We, i.e., St. Paul and the Jewish Christians only (St. Chrys., Theod., St. Thomas, Cornely, etc.). Others say there is question here of Gentile, as well as Jewish converts, (a) because, instead of speaking of the Law, St. Paul here uses terms that apply to both Jews and Gentiles ("elements of the world"), and (b)

4. But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent his Son, made of a woman, made under the law:

because, according to the Apostle's uniform teaching, carnal descendance from Abraham gave no right to the inheritance which was promised to those who would have faith like Abraham (Lagr., Light., Bousset, etc.).

When . . . children, i.e., before the coming of Christ and the Gospel, when mankind were all in a state of infancy and helplessness described above.

Elements of the world. The meaning is the same as in Col. ii. 8, 20, namely, the elementary principles of natural conduct, such as the religious laws and rites of the Jews, and the various ceremonies of the heathen, all of which inspired fear and servitude, rather than love and a sense of freedom which have come with the Gospel (St. Jerome, Lagr., Light., etc.). The phrase does not mean (a) the four material elements of the ancients: water, fire, earth and air (against Zahn, Toussaint); nor (b) the celestial bodies (against Bousset, Lipsius); nor (c) spiritual beings, such as angels, directing heavenly bodies and physical elements (against Loisy).

4. With the coming of Christ all was changed regarding our relations with God.

The fulness of time, i.e., the time fixed from eternity by the Eternal Father when the servitude and fear of the Law should give way to the liberty and love of the Gospel. There is no hint here of what brought about this fulness of time.

God sent his son (ἐξαπέστειλεν). The compound of the verb in Greek indicates close union between the Father and the Son, and consequently the eternal preëxistence of the latter, one in nature with the Father (John i. 1 ff.; x. 30). The word "son" also implies the eternal procession of the Second Person from the Father (John iii. 16; viii. 42).

Made of a woman, i.e., born of a woman with our human nature, and under the Mosaic Law, like other Jews. St. Paul wishes to show here the abasement of the Son of God who took upon Himself our human nature and subjected Himself to the Law. There does not seem to be any proof in the present passage of our Lord's virginal conception (Lagr.).

5. That he might redeem them who were under the law: that we might receive the adoption of sons.

6. And because you are sons, God hath sent the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying: Abba, Father.

7. Therefore now he is not a servant, but a son. And if a son, an heir also through God.

The reading *γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός* is that of all the best MSS.

5. Here we have stated the purpose of the Son's supernatural mission in this world: He was born under the Law **that he might redeem them**, i.e., the Jews, who were under the law; He was born of a woman that, by assuming our nature, He might become our brother, and thus elevate us all to the dignity of adopted sons of God.

We refers to all believers, Jews and Gentiles.

Might receive (*ἀπολάβωμεν*), as a right conferred by God Himself.

6. **Because you are**, etc., i.e., as a proof that you Galatians, pagans as well as Jews, are now adopted sons of the Father **God hath sent**, etc. The connective *ὅτι* is probably demonstrative rather than causal.

The Spirit, etc., i.e., the Holy Ghost, who, as sent by the Father, is distinct from Him, and as the Spirit of the Son, is distinct also from the Son. This text affords a proof that the Holy Ghost proceeds alike from the Father and the Son.

Your hearts should be "our hearts," as in the Greek.

Crying is attributed to the Holy Spirit in the hearts of the faithful.

Abba, Father is expressive of deepest feeling. This was perhaps a consecrated formula handed down from our Lord's prayer in the Garden of Gethsemani (Mark xiv. 36). The Jews were a bilingual people in the time of Christ, and this would explain why our Lord should use the two synonymous terms (*Abba*, *ὁ πατήρ*) in His prayer. However, see on Rom. viii. 15.

The *vestra* of the Vulgate should be *nostra*, in conformity with the Greek.

7. The conclusion is now drawn that if, as has been proved above, the Galatians are adopted sons of God, they have the rights of sons, and so are heirs to the inheritance through God's goodness and mercy.

8. But then indeed, not knowing God, you served them, who, by nature, are not gods.

9. But now, after that you have known God, or rather are known by God: how turn you again to the weak and needy elements, which you desire to serve again?

10. You observe days, and months, and times, and years.

He is should be changed to the second person singular, "thou art," to agree with the best Greek. This address is very intimate and personal (cf. vi. 1; Rom. xii. 20, 21; 1 Cor. iv. 7).

The *est* of the Vulgate should be *es*.

THE GALATIANS MUST NOT RETURN TO SLAVERY, 8-11

8-11. Before their conversion the Galatians were slaves to material things, not knowing God; but since, how different has been their state? Would they put themselves back into religious slavery, without their former excuse of ignorance? The address is now more directly to the Gentiles.

8. Then, i.e., in your former condition as pagans.

Not knowing God, i.e., being ignorant of the one true God; the Creator of all things.

You served, i.e., *you were enslaved to* (ἐδουλεύσατε) them who were in reality no gods at all, but to whom in your worship you gave the place of gods. See on Rom. i. 18-23.

9. But now, etc., i.e., after your conversion, when you have come to have a more perfect knowledge (γινόντες, which indicates a progress from the εἰδόντες of the preceding verse) of God; and further, after having been known by Him, i.e., having been the object of His graces and benefits (1 Cor. viii. 3): how turn you again, etc. This last phrase, with the verb in the present and the use of again, shows that the Galatians were already on the wrong road.

Elements. See above, on verse 3. These former rites and practices are called weak because unable to justify and lead man to salvation; and needy, because, at best, they were only shadows and figures of future realities (Heb. vii. 18; x. 1). The Apostle is warning the Galatians against submission to the Mosaic Law, which would mean a return to servitude.

10. St. Paul here enumerates some of the Jewish practices which the Galatians are already observing.

11. I am afraid of you, lest perhaps I have laboured in vain among you.

12. Be ye as I, because I also am as you: brethren, I beseech you: you have not injured me at all.

Days, i.e., Sabbaths.

Months, i.e., the observance of the new moon, the first month (*Nisan*), the seventh month (*Tisri*).

Times, i.e., the feasts of Pasch, Pentecost, Tabernacles.

Years, i.e., the sabbatical and jubilee years. They commenced with their general Jewish observances, which would not be offensive to converts from paganism, intending gradually to introduce all, or at least the most distinctive of the Mosaic practices.

11. I am afraid, etc., i.e., I fear you, or for you (Lagr.). The Apostle fears that his labors among the Galatians may not, after all, be unto their eternal salvation; if for the servitude of paganism, from which he liberated them, they substitute the servitude of the Mosaic Law.

ST. PAUL APPEALS TO THE GALATIANS IN VIRTUE OF HIS LABORS
AMONG THEM AND THEIR TENDER TREATMENT OF HIM, 12-20

12-20. The Galatians are exhorted to imitate the Apostle who first preached to them, and who in turn was loved so much by them. At that time they had reason to despise him, because of his physical infirmity, but they received him, on the contrary, as an angel of God, even as Christ Himself. They were ready to pluck out their eyes for him. Wherefore have they changed? was it because he told them the truth? The false teachers are more flattering, but for an evil purpose. He warns them to be on their guard against these evil-doers, and tells them that for their sakes he is again undergoing the pangs of motherhood. He wishes he were with them, so as to soften by his presence any harshness there may lurk in his words.

12. **Be ye as I**, etc., i.e., become like me, free from the Law, a true son of God, not caring for the Mosaic observances.

Because I also am as you, i.e., I became like you, that is, after my conversion I became as free from the Law as if, like you, I had been born in paganism. This is the interpretation of Cornely, Lightfoot and others. Perhaps it is better to explain with Lagrange: Become like me, i.e., totally devoted to Christ, living His

13. And you know how through infirmity of the flesh, I preached the gospel to you heretofore: and your temptation in my flesh,

14. You despised not, nor rejected: but received me as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus.

15. Where is then your blessedness? For I bear you witness, that, if it could be done, you would have plucked out your own eyes, and would have given them to me.

life (1 Cor. iv. 16), as I became all things to you, as far as this was permissible.

You have not injured, etc., i.e., you have not done me any personal injury, especially when I was among you, and therefore I feel free to plead with you. Probably, however, there is reference here to some recent unpleasant happening (Lagr.), or to some expression used by the Galatians in a letter to St. Paul protesting that they had done him no harm (Ramsay).

13, 14. **You know** (οἶδατε δέ) would seem to imply the contrary of any supposed wrong the Galatians had done St. Paul.

Infirmity, according to Cornely and the majority of the Fathers, means the persecutions and trials experienced by the Apostle in founding the Galatian Churches. But ἀσθένεια could hardly signify a persecution, although it might be the result of one; and διὰ ἀσθένειαν seems to exclude the whole idea of persecution. Hence modern interpreters are mostly inclined to understand the word to indicate some illness of body, such as epilepsy (Lightfoot), malaria or fever (Ramsay). Whatever its nature, it seems to have affected St. Paul's eyes (verse 15), and to have been the occasion of his preaching the Gospel to the Galatians.

Heretofore, i.e., formerly, or better, "the first time" (cf. Heb. iv. 6; vii. 27). This shows that he had visited the Galatians twice before. If he was addressing South Galatia, the first visit was that of Acts xiii. 14-xiv. 23; and the second that of Acts xvi. 1-5; if he was writing to North Galatia the two visits were those of Acts xvi. 6 and xviii. 23.

Your temptation in my flesh belongs to verse 14 in the Greek. The Apostle's malady was a trial to the faith of the Galatians, and might have driven them from him and the Gospel had they not been so well disposed. Far from despising his illness or rejecting him they received him as if he were an angel, or even Christ Himself.

15. **Blessedness** (μακαρισμός) means rather, "self-congratula-

16. Am I then become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?

17. They are zealous in you regard not well: but they would exclude you, that you might be zealous for them.

tion." The Galatians congratulated themselves on the happy circumstance of Paul's stay with them.

I bear you witness. He recalls to their minds how much they loved him.

You would have plucked out, etc. This may mean that the Galatians were willing, had it been possible, to cure the Apostle's eyes by giving him their own; or that they loved him to such an extent as to be willing to give the dearest parts of their bodies for him, were it necessary. Such strong affection is said to be characteristic of the people of Galatia Proper.

16. Your enemy, i.e., your enemy in the active sense of having done you harm, perhaps on his second visit to them.

The truth is interpreted by St. Chrys., Cornely and Loisy as the simple preaching of the Gospel. The Galatians were grieved at Paul because, in not preaching to them the necessity of observing the Law, he had deprived them of what they now regarded as a great blessing (Loisy). But this interpretation is rejected by Lagrange, who believes that after the first preaching among them, when they loved him so much, the Apostle, perhaps on his second visit, told the Galatians some further truths which caused them offence.

The *inimicus vobis* of the Vulgate should be *inimicus vester*, to correspond with the active meaning of ἐχθρός. St. Paul did not hate the Galatians, as his enemies claimed.

17. They are zealous, etc., i.e., they are courting you, taking a warm interest in you, thus contrasting themselves with the inimical picture they have given you of me; but for no good purpose.

They would exclude you, i.e., they would separate you from your true friends, Paul and his companions; or, more probably, they would shut you out from the Christian community, and so from salvation, if you did not conform to their views. The reference is undoubtedly to the Judaizers, although St. Paul does not name them.

That you might, etc. Better, "that you may court them to

18. But be zealous for that which is good in a good thing always: and not only when I am present with you.

19. My little children, of whom I am in labour again, until Christ be formed in you.

20. And I would willingly be present with you now, and change my voice: because I am ashamed for you.

the exclusion of all others." The form ζηλοῦτε is doubtless indicative, whereas we should have the subjunctive here, following the causal ἵνα.

18. Be zealous, etc., should not be imperative. According to most MSS. and the Fathers the Greek reading is ζηλοῦσθαι, an infinitive passive. The more probable sense of the passage is: "It is good for you to be courted always," whether by me or by anyone else, provided it is done in a good way. St. Paul wishes to say that he does not object to anyone taking interest in the Galatians in his absence, so long as this is done in a proper manner and with a good motive. The implication is that the Judaizers are not doing this, and hence the Apostle gives way to a sudden burst of affection in the following verse, which, consequently, should be separated from the present verse by a comma only.

The Vulgate imperative, *aemulamini* would better be the infinitive *aemulari*.

19. My little children (τεκνία μου). Only here does this diminutive appear in St. Paul, and this explains the more common, but less probable reading of some of the MSS. τέκνα μου. The more tender term corresponds better to the present state of the Apostle's mind. He is regarding the Galatians through the eyes of a tender mother who with much labor and suffering gave them Christian birth, and who now would again suffer the same pangs to keep them from perversion.

Until Christ be formed, etc. This proves that the situation was grave. If the Galatians had only adopted a part of the Jewish Law, or if only some among them had adopted it, they had lost the true form of Christianity, because by their action they showed that they did not regard Christ as entirely sufficient for them and as the only principle of their spiritual life (Lagr.).

20. St. Paul wishes he could be with the Galatians so as to know better their circumstances and situation, and thus be able

21. Tell me, you that desire to be under the law, have you not read the law?

to help them more; and also that by his voice he might soften what may seem harsh and unkind in his written words.

I am ashamed, etc. Better, "I do not know what to make of you," "I do not understand exactly enough your situation." He is embarrassed to know just what to say, whereas, if he were present, he could change his voice according to the circumstances.

CHRISTIANITY IS A NEW DISPOSITION REPLACING THE OLD ONE, 21-30

21-30. The greatest argument for the observance of the Law was, from the Jewish standpoint, that the Scripture itself seemed to declare it to be a perpetual ordinance. St. Paul has already refuted this error in a general way by showing that the Law was only a guide, a pedagogue, with a temporary mission. But now, in order to turn against the Judaizers their own argument, he draws from Scripture a proof that the Law was not intended in the designs of God to be an enduring provision. A first, imperfect disposition engendering servitude, it was to be followed by another which would be perfect, making us children of the promise and sons of God.

21. The Galatians were desiring to be under the Law. Very well, says St. Paul, let us see what the Law itself contains. In the history of Sara and Agar he finds the Old and the New Covenants illustrated. The former resembles the Church, because she was the mother of the free-born; while the latter is like Judaism, a mother of the enslaved. Like Sara the Church was long sterile, but it is now fecund and assured of blessings. On the contrary, Judaism, a religion of fear and servitude, is to receive from God the same treatment which He gave to the son of the bondwoman; it is to be excluded from the inheritance. Those, therefore, who go back to the Law will likewise fail to inherit the promised blessings.

Whatever may seem the force of his argument for us, we must admit that it was conclusive for the Galatians; they understood it.

Under the law. The article is absent in the Greek, but the

22. For it is written that Abraham had two sons: the one by a bondwoman, and the other by a freewoman.

23. But he who was of the bondwoman, was born according to the flesh: but he of the freewoman was by promise.

24. Which things are said by an allegory. For these are the two testaments. The one from mount Sina, engendering unto bondage; which is Agar:

Mosaic Law is doubtless meant. The reference could be to the whole Old Testament, but is more to the Pentateuch in particular.

Have you not read. Better, "Do you not hear," i.e., have you not understood the deeper meaning, the typical signification of that part of Scripture which gives the history of Abraham?

22. **Two sons**, namely, Ismael by the bondwoman Agar, and Isaac by the freewoman Sara.

Bondwoman (*παιδίσκης*) means "maid servant," "slave," in the New Testament. Cf. Gen. xvi. 15; xxi. 2.

23. **But he**, i.e., Ismael, **was born according**, etc., i.e., according to the ordinary laws of nature: **but he**, i.e., Isaac, **was by promise**, i.e., was born in virtue of the promise. Isaac's birth was miraculous inasmuch as, owing to the advanced age of Abraham and the sterility of Sara, it would have been physically impossible without a divine intervention.

There are then two differences between the two sons of Abraham: Ismael was of a slave and according to the flesh; Isaac was of a freewoman and in virtue of the promise. Cf. Gen. xvii. 16, 19; xviii. 10.

24. **Which things are said**, etc., i.e., those circumstances concerning the two sons of Abraham have, besides their historical and literal sense, a spiritual meaning, which the Apostle is now going to point out.

For these, i.e., these two women, Agar and Sara.

Are, i.e., represent **two testaments**, i.e., two covenants. The first was from Mt. Sinai, where it was contracted between God and Israel.

Engendering, i.e., bring forth unto bondage, i.e., for obedience to the Law.

Which is Agar, i.e., Agar was the type of the first covenant, because like it she brought forth unto bondage.

25. For Sina is a mountain in Arabia, which hath affinity to that Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children.

25. The Apostle now shows the relation between Agar and Sinai, thus emphasizing the fact that Agar represents the Old Covenant.

For Sina is a mountain, etc. There are several different readings of this phrase. The most important variation is in the omission or inclusion of the term *Agar* before Sinai. It is omitted by the Sinaitic and several other important MSS. (C F G), by many versions and a number of the Fathers. For its inclusion we have, besides the Vatican and Alexandrian MSS., a few others (D K L P), most of the cursives, and several versions and Fathers. The authorities are therefore fairly well divided. According to the first reading, which seems by far the more probable, because the more natural, we have as follows: "For Mount Sinai is in Arabia." The Apostle is basing his argument upon the typical meaning of the condition of the two women, and consequently he makes the slave a type of the covenant contracted on Sinai, which supposes subjection. But that slave was Agar, the mother of Ismael, from whom sprang the principal tribe of the Arabs. St. Paul names her now to remind that Mount Sinai, being situated in Arabia, is appropriately connected with the allegory of Agar, the mother of the Arabs. Moreover her name is the same as that of the important Arab tribes mentioned in the Bible (Ps. lxxxiii. 6; 1 Paralip. v. 19). In her flight (Gen. xvi. 6 ff.) she betook herself into the desert that led to Sinai. These facts explain perfectly how St. Paul found a connection between Agar and Mount Sinai, and he draws attention to the meaning of the coincidence, namely, that Agar the slave is a fitting representation of the alliance that was entered into on Mount Sinai in the desert of Arabia (Lagr.).

The second and less probable reading, "For Agar is Mount Sinai in Arabia," is explained by saying, with St. Chrysostom, that Agar is the name which the Arabs have always given to Mount Sinai.

Which refers back to Agar, and consequently 25a must be regarded as parenthetical.

Hath affinity, i.e., is in the same class with that Jerusalem which

26. But that Jerusalem, which is above, is free: which is our mother.

27. For it is written: Rejoice, thou barren, that bearest not: break forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for many are the children of the desolate, more than of her that hath a husband.

is now the centre of Judaism, subject to the servitude imposed by the law.

Bondage means the slavery of the Law.

Children are those living in the Holy City under the yoke of the Mosaic Law.

In the Vulgate *qui conjunctus est* supposes Mount Sinai to be the subject of *συνοραχῇ δέ*, instead of Agar, as explained above. If this were correct, then the mountain would also be the subject of *et servit*. Therefore the Vulgate should read: *congruit autem, servit enim* (Lagr.).

26. In contrast to "the one" (covenant) of verse 24 we should expect St. Paul here to speak of the other covenant; but instead he takes up the contrast to the present Jerusalem, and speaks of the Jerusalem above. By **above** he does not mean only the Church Triumphant, for he says she is **our mother**, i.e., the mother of us Christians living yet on earth. And this Jerusalem is **free**, i.e., not subject to the Law; she is the Kingdom of God, governed by God's Holy Spirit.

27. St. Paul now cites the LXX of Isaias (liv. 1) to prove that the fecundity of the **Jerusalem which is above**, i.e., of the Messianic Kingdom, was foretold by the Prophet and miraculously ordained by God. Literally the Prophet's words refer to the earthly Jerusalem which, although bereft of her inhabitants during the Babylonian captivity, would one day be more populous than ever. But spiritually the reference is to the heavenly Jerusalem, the Messianic Kingdom, which, born at the time of the promise made to Abraham (Cornely), or existing only in the designs of God (Lagr.), remained sterile, until the death of Christ, when her children became far more numerous than were the children of the earthly city.

Agar was a fitting type of the old Jerusalem, of the Synagogue; as Sara was of the Messianic Kingdom, the Church of Christ. And this the Prophet seems to have had in mind; for a few chapters ahead (li. 1 ff.) he had invited the Jews to imitate the faith

28. Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise.

29. But as then he, that was born according to the flesh, persecuted him that was after the spirit; so also it is now.

of Abraham and Sara, whose children they were. St. Paul makes the application more definite.

The words **barren, break forth, desolate** refer literally to Jerusalem during the captivity (or to Sara, in the Apostle's application); but spiritually to the reign of Christ and His Church. She **that hath a husband** in the Prophet's literal meaning referred to Jerusalem before the captivity (as applied by St. Paul, to Agar); spiritually the reference is to the Old Covenant, the Synagogue, which had the Law as a husband.

28. This verse is a conclusion from what has preceded.

We, i.e., we Christians, both Gentile and Jewish, having embraced the faith, are children of the free woman, of the Jerusalem that is above, typified in Sara. Like Isaac we are born of promise and heirs to the inheritance promised to Abraham; we are therefore free, and in nowise subject to the Law, of which Agar, the slave, was a figure.

The Vulgate *nos . . . sumus* does not represent the reading *ὑμεῖς ἵστέ* of some of the best MSS., which would seem more natural in St. Paul addressing the Galatians who were forgetting their dignity as Christians.

29. But (*ἀλλά*) here shows the sharp contrast to what might naturally have been expected; for as Ismael persecuted Isaac, so the Judaizers now persecuted St. Paul and the other faithful Christians.

Then, i.e., when Ismael and Isaac were actually living.

He, that was born, etc., i.e., Ismael.

Persecuted. What this persecution consisted in we do not know. In Gen. xxi. 9, 10 we read that the son of Agar played with Isaac, and from Sara's indignation, as well as from Jewish tradition, we gather that there was something offensive, something of mockery, in that playing, which St. Paul here regards as a persecution. At any rate, history tells us that the Ismaelites were the bitter foes of the descendants of Isaac (cf. Ps. lxxxii. 7; 1 Paralip. v. 10, 19).

Him that was after the spirit, i.e., Isaac, whose conception

30. But what saith the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son; for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the free-woman.

and birth were due to the miraculous intervention of the Spirit of God in virtue of the promise made by God to Abraham.

So . . . it is now. The allusion is to the persecutions sustained by St. Paul and the faithful Christians at the hands of the Judiazers.

30. St. Paul here cites Gen. xxi. 10, according to the LXX, as illustrative of what should be the action of the Galatians against their false teachers. As Sara told Abraham to cast out the slave woman with her son—which Abraham did, so should the faithful of Galatia put away the enslaving Judaizers with their Mosaic observances. If they fail to do this, they and their leaders shall be cut off from the inheritance, i.e., from the Messianic benefits, just as Agar and her son Ismael were cut off.

The words of Sara are cited by St. Paul as Scripture, because they were approved by God, as the obedient action of Abraham shows.

The Apostle's conclusion is definite and practical for the Galatians: they must put out the false teachers.

PRACTICAL CONCLUSIONS ARE NOW DEDUCED FROM THE PRINCIPLES
LAID DOWN, IV. 31-V. 12

In commencing the new section with iv. 31 we are following the division made by Bousset, Lagrange and Zahn. The recurrence of the word **freedom** joins it with what precedes, as a result with its sources. Many critics see in iv. 31 the last word of the allegory illustrating the two alliances, rather than the beginning of a practical conclusion. But the allegory was really concluded in verse 28, and is presupposed in verses 29, 30. It seems better then to regard 31 as the point of transition between what has preceded and the section that now follows (Lagr.).

IV. 31-V. 12. In the first place the Galatians must make their choice, either of the whole Law without Christ, or of the faith of Christ accompanied by charity without the Law. If they choose the Law, they must renounce Christ; if they wish to be Christians, then the Law must be abandoned (iv. 31-v. 6). Hav-

31. So then, brethren, we are not the children of the bondwoman, but of the free: by the freedom wherewith Christ has made us free.

ing pointed out the dangers to which they are exposed, St. Paul next warns the Galatians to beware of false leaders who are courting a just and severe chastisement (v. 7-12).

31. So then (ὁὖ). Better, "Hence," or "consequently." The general principle of the whole Epistle is here resumed under the color of the allegory, and the practical result of our being Christians is restated, namely, that we are free **by the freedom wherewith Christ has made us free**, i.e., we are sons of the free woman and enjoy a freedom which we owe to Christ, the author of our liberty. This is the reading of the Vulgate, and the easiest for this clause. In the best MSS., however, and according to the Greek Fathers, this final clause of the present verse belongs to the first verse of the following chapter, and the meaning is probably: "Christ has liberated us for freedom, in order that we may be and may remain free"; or, if we join "stand" to "freedom," we shall have: "Stand firm to the freedom wherewith Christ has made us free."

CHAPTER V

1. Stand fast, and be not held again under the yoke of bondage.

2. Behold, I Paul tell you, that if you be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing.

1. **Stand fast**, i.e., in the liberty of the Gospel, as opposed to the slavery of your former condition in paganism and under the Law.

2. **I Paul**, as an Apostle, as an Israelite of the race of Abraham, and of the tribe of Benjamin (Rom. xi. 1), who, in times past, was an ardent defender of Jewish traditions (Gal. i. 14), and who, consequently, should not be suspected, as a Gentile convert might be, of prejudice against the Jews and the Law.

If you be circumcised, i.e., if you receive circumcision, thinking it a *necessary means* of salvation, then **Christ shall profit you nothing**, because you do not regard Him as entirely sufficient for you, and so deprive yourselves of the grace and friendship

3. And I testify again to every man circumcising himself, that he is a debtor to do the whole law.

4. You are made void of Christ, you who are justified in the law: you are fallen from grace.

5. For we in spirit, by faith, wait for the hope of justice.

of Him alone who redeemed you and is able to save (cf. Lagr., h. l.).

St. Paul's precise language here shows that the Judaizers were insisting on circumcision, not as something merely desirable, but as essential to salvation.

3. This and the following verse repeat and amplify the thought of verse 2. If circumcision be necessary for salvation, then so is the entire Mosaic Law; and they who thus put themselves under the Law, by that very fact deprive themselves of Christ and His benefits.

Again may refer to what was said in the preceding verse, or to what St. Paul had taught the Galatians on his second visit to them.

Circumcising himself. Better, "Permitting himself to be circumcised," i.e., he who is circumcised after Baptism. Circumcision was a public and a solemn engagement to fulfil the whole Law—a thing impossible, as we have seen, to man unassisted by grace. It seems probable that the Judaizers had not made it clear to the Galatians that the reception of circumcision included the obligation of observing the whole Law.

4. **You are made void**, etc. Better, "You are cut off from Christ as useless, you that would be justified by the law," etc. From these words it seems pretty certain that the situation among the Galatians, while grave, had not come to the worst.

Are justified, i.e., would be justified (*δικαιοῦσθε* conative).

5. **For we**, i.e., as for us Christians.

In spirit, i.e., in the Holy Ghost, according to the Greek Fathers; but, according to the majority of the Latin Fathers, in the spirit as opposed to the flesh, the principle of the Christian life. The distinction is not very marked, since the interior spirit and principles of good actions is a participation of the divine Spirit (cf. Rom. viii. 14 ff.).

"Spirit" here is not to be joined with "by faith," as if it meant the Holy Ghost who is given in consequence of faith. The spirit

6. For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision: but faith that worketh by charity.

7. You did run well; who hath hindered you, that you should not obey the truth?

is the moving force or energy of the soul; while faith is the habit which, giving internal conviction of mind regarding supernatural truths, forms the basis of the Christian life.

By faith, i.e., by virtue of faith.

Wait for, i.e., look forward to with intense longing and security (*ἀπεδεχόμεθα*). Cf. Rom. viii. 19, 23.

Justice does not mean justification, which is already supposed by St. Paul as the entrance to the Christian life; nor does it signify an increase of grace and holiness. We have here the subjective genitive (*δικαιοσύνης*), and so **hope of justice** means the hope which proceeds from justice. Never in St. Paul do we find justice used as a synonym of eternal life (Lagr.).

6. **For** introduces the reasons which make firm our hope. To have been a Jew or a pagan is of no account in **Christ Jesus**, i.e., in the Christian life, which is a life united to Christ, and animated by His Spirit.

But faith that worketh, etc., i.e., faith, the basis of Christian life, *moved*, or *energized*, by charity or love of God, which shows itself in the performance of good works and in the keeping of the Commandments. These words bridge over the gulf which seems to separate the language of St. Paul and that of St. James. Both assert a principle of practical energy, as opposed to a barren, inactive theory (Lightfoot). *Ἐνεργουμένη* is considered passive by the Greek Fathers, but middle by all the Latins except Tertullian. In its passive sense it is perhaps more favorable to the doctrine of faith animated by charity, as by its form; but even in the middle voice it is by no means opposed to the Catholic doctrine, which never held that faith is constituted by charity.

7-12. The Galatians began so well; but someone has turned them, at least to a degree, away from the truth. Who is responsible for this change? There is still hope that they will not be lost entirely. Severe judgment awaits their seducers.

7. **You did run well**, i.e., you were doing finely in the Christian life. The metaphor in "run" refers to the contests in the race-courses among the Greeks. Cf. I Cor. ix. 24.

8. This persuasion is not from him that calleth you.

9. A little leaven corrupteth the whole lump.

10. I have confidence in you in the Lord: that you will not be of another mind: but he that troubleth you, shall bear the judgment, whosoever he be.

11. And I, brethren, if I yet preach circumcision, why do I yet suffer persecution? Then is the scandal of the cross made void.

Who hath hindered you, i.e., who has got in your way. The allusion is still to the race-course.

The truth. The article is wanting in Greek, but the reference without doubt is to the Gospel.

8. **This persuasion**, i.e., not to obey the truth (verse 7), to believe that circumcision is necessary for salvation, as the false teachers have told you.

Is not from him, etc., i.e., not from the Eternal Father (i. 6) who called you to the Christian faith, but is rather from the evil one working through the Judaizers.

9. **A little leaven**, i.e., a bad influence, even though small, will lead to total disaster, to accepting all the doctrines of the Judaizers. **Leaven** here may mean one point of false doctrine from the Judaizers (St. Chrys., Théoph., etc.); or those Galatians who had been already seduced, including the agitators themselves (Theod., St. Jerome, St. Aug., etc.). The latter opinion seems the more probable.

Leaven is usually in Scripture a symbol of evil influence, except in Matt. xiii. 33 and Luke xiii. 20 ff., where as a parable, it illustrates the Kingdom of God.

10. **In you**, i.e., as a body of the Church in Galatia. St. Paul firmly trusts the majority of the Christians there.

In the Lord, the source of all his hope and confidence, in whom the majority of the Galatians are securely united.

That you will not be. An expression purposely vague, since Paul does not know exactly what to think about the situation (iv. 20).

He that troubleth, etc., i. e., the leader of the disorder, whoever he was.

The judgment, i.e., the punishment suited to his offence.

11. **And I**, etc. Better, "But I," etc., in contrast to the false leader who was seducing them. St. Paul is not concerned with what his enemies say about him. What this was is not clear.

12. I would they were even cut off, who trouble you.

The Fathers think the Judaizers were saying that Paul himself was in favor of circumcision, basing their contention perhaps on the fact that he had circumcised Timothy (Acts xvi. 3). This was, indeed, no argument, because Timothy had been circumcised not as a matter of necessity, but only as an expedient to further the preaching of the Gospel among those of Jewish origin.

If I yet preach, etc. This may mean, "If I *again* preach," etc., alluding to the case of Timothy, or to some few similar instances, perhaps, which in reality were not a preaching of circumcision at all. More probably St. Paul, in the above phrase, is referring to the calumny of the Judaizers who falsely said he still preached circumcision. To refute such a calumny he asks why, then do the Jews persecute him for not practicing the Law, for preaching rather its abrogation (Acts xvi. 16 ff.; xvii. 5 ff.; xviii. 6, 9 ff.; xxi. 28).

Then is the scandal, etc. If Paul still preaches the necessity of circumcision, as his enemies say, then there is no reason why he should be enduring persecution for preaching the contrary; then the cross of Christ, as a means of salvation so scandalous to the Jews, is done away with. The supposition is so plainly false and absurd. The Jews found the cross a "scandal," a "stumbling block" (1 Cor. i. 23), chiefly because it removed the obligation of the Law.

12. The sense of this verse is expressed very well by St. Thomas, h. l., following the interpretation of all the Fathers: "*Utinam non solum circumcidantur, sed totaliter castrentur.*" The Apostle ironically wishes that those fanatical Judaizers, who are troubling the Galatians, would not only insist upon circumcision but upon complete castration, if this would please them better, thus imitating the heathen fanatics who practiced such mutilations in honor of the goddess Cybele. The Galatians could understand very well what St. Paul was saying here, because Pessinus, one of the principal towns of Galatia, was the home of the worship of Cybele (Light.).

Cut off. The verb used is ἀποκόψονται, and the literal meaning is that they would make themselves eunuchs. St. Augustine thinks the Apostle "is wishing they would become eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven"; and St. Jerome sees in St. Paul's words

13. For you, brethren, have been called unto liberty: only make not liberty an occasion to the flesh, but by charity of the spirit serve one another.

here "less of anger against the adversaries than of love for the Church of God."

Who trouble you, i.e., who are causing confusion and disorder among you.

St. Paul's argument is that the adoption of Judaism would be for the Gentile converts a return to paganism, or at least one step towards such a return (Lagr.).

THE THIRD OR MORAL PART OF THE EPISTLE, V. 13-vi. 10

Supposing that the inclination of the Galatians towards the Law was in part due to their strong religious impulses and instincts, St. Paul would now show them that in Christianity they will find complete satisfaction for all their devout cravings. Two things are, however, necessary: charity and self-restraint or life by the spirit. They are freed from the Law of Moses, but this does not mean license or an abuse of liberty. They must live, not according to the flesh, but according to the spirit, altogether opposing anything and everything that savors of pagan sensuality.

LIBERATION FROM THE LAW DOES NOT FREE ONE FROM THE OBLIGATION OF CHARITY, V. 13-15

13-15. The Galatians were called to freedom, but they must not abuse their happy state. Rather, let them seek that higher servitude which consists in serving one another; for charity is the fulfillment of the Law.

13. St. Paul in this verse wishes to define the liberty which Christ has purchased for us and which is referred to in v. 1.

Unto liberty, i.e., freedom from the ceremonial observances of the Mosaic Law, as well as the temporal penalties by which that Law gave sanction to its moral precepts. The Galatians, like all Christians, were called to Christianity that they might live in freedom; but they must not make their liberty an occasion or pretext to indulge the flesh, i.e., the lower tendencies and instincts of corrupt human nature (cf. Rom. viii. 4 ff.), always disposed to satisfy itself in self-seeking and egoism. To such a spirit the

14. For all the law is fulfilled in one word: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.

15. But if you bite and devour one another: take heed you be not consumed one of another.

16. I say then, walk in the spirit, and you shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh.

Apostle opposes *charity*, and tells his readers to be *servants* (δουλεύετε) one of another.

The words of the spirit (Vulg., *Spiritus*) are not found in the best MSS. They are doubtless a gloss added to the text to make it clear that the charity in question is the supernatural virtue by which we love God first, and our neighbor for God's sake.

14. All the law, i.e., the whole Law with all its precepts. The Galatians were anxious to receive circumcision in order to fulfil the Law, but charity fulfils every law, human and divine. The moral life is regulated by the Decalogue, and the Decalogue is summed up in the love of one's neighbor. St. Paul here, as in Rom. xiii. 8-10, is presupposing the love of God as the foundation of the whole Christian life.

15. St. Paul warns the Galatians that if, like wild beasts, they bite and tear one another asunder, they will completely ruin their Christian community. He refers to their religious disputes and dissensions which seem to have engendered real hatred among them. Perhaps the Apostle is referring to disorders which will develop, if they do not be careful to check beginnings, although St. Chrysostom thinks he is speaking of conditions actually existing at the time.

THE WORKS OF THE FLESH AND THE FRUITS OF THE SPIRIT, 16-26

16-26. The Apostle tells the Galatians that their disputes and contentions are signs that they are living according to the flesh. The flesh and its lower instincts are contrary to life by the spirit. If we walk by the latter, we shall not obey the former; neither shall we be under the Law. The opposition between the flesh and the spirit is manifest from the works of the one and the fruits of the other.

16. See on Rom. viii. 4, 5. St. Paul now commences to explain what is meant by liberty, spoken of in verse 13.

17. For the flesh lusteth against the spirit: and the spirit against the flesh; for these are contrary one to another: so that you do not the things that you would.

18. But if you are led by the spirit, you are not under the law.

The spirit. The reference here is perhaps not immediately to the Holy Ghost, but rather to the life of grace in man. "By the flesh he (the Apostle) means the inclination of the mind to the worse; by the spirit, the indwelling grace" (Theodoret).

Lusts is singular in Greek; it means the depraved inclinations of the lower nature.

The *Spiritus* of the Vulgate should be *spiritus*; and *desideria* should be *desiderium*, to agree with the Greek.

17. This verse is not a summary of Rom. vii. 15 ff., as Protestant scholars contend. In Romans there is question of man's natural faculties and powers prior to faith and Baptism; while here, faith is presupposed, and grace is active in the soul. Concupiscence is not extinguished by Baptism, and hence even in the life of grace the lower nature more or less constantly rises against the spiritual principle in man.

So that, etc. The *iva* here is not easy to explain. It is taken by Cornely in a final sense, as if Paul wished to show that in each case the choice depends on one's own will. Lagrange finds this explanation very good, except that it is almost diametrically contrary to the Greek text of the present verse. Therefore he prefers to give *iva* a consecutive meaning, since there is question of a result or consequence. Hence the sense would be: Man does not do what, according to simple velleity, he would like to do. If he follows the spirit, he has only velleity of the flesh; contrariwise, if he obeys the flesh, he has only an inefficacious wish to follow the spirit. In either case man does not yield to his inclinations in their entirety.

18. If the Christian is guided by the principle of his higher life, by grace, which is superadded to his rational nature, he is no longer under the Law, but is an adopted son of God.

If you are led, etc., i.e., if you live according to the life of grace which you have received in Baptism, you are nowise under the terrors, the threats, and the penalties of the Law. Here, as in the preceding verse, **spirit** means *grace* rather than the Holy Ghost.

19. Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are fornication, uncleanness, immodesty, luxury,

20. Idolatry, witchcraft, enmities, contentions, emulations, wraths, quarrels, dissensions, sects,

21. Envies, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like. Of the which I foretell you, as I have foretold to you, that they who do such things shall not obtain the kingdom of God.

19. Now (δε) is explicative, not adversative. It is not difficult to determine whether we are living according to the spirit or according to the flesh; for the works of the latter (verses 19-21), as well as the fruits of the former (verses 22, 23), are manifest, and this without the aid of the Law to make us aware of them.

In verses 19-21 we have the vices of the flesh reduced to four classes: (a) Sins of luxury; (b) sins of false worship; (c) violations of charity; (d) intemperance. Similar catalogues of vices are given elsewhere by St. Paul, although not always in the same order (cf. Rom. i. 29, 30; 1 Cor. v. 10; vi. 10; 2 Cor. xii. 20, 21; Eph. v. 3-5).

Fornication, i.e., unlawful carnal intercourse with women, especially with prostitutes.

Uncleanness, i.e., general moral impurity, embracing sins against nature.

Immodesty, i.e., open shamelessness, or shameless sensuality.

Luxury (Vulg., *luxuria*) is not in the Greek.

20. Errors in religion are mentioned first.

Idolatry, i.e., the heathen worship of the images of the gods. The Christians were often exposed to the danger of participating in this sin which was one of the most important functions in the celebration of municipal and imperial feasts.

Witchcraft (*φαρμακεία*), i.e., magic and sorcery, which, although prohibited by the official religious and civil law, were very much practiced among the people in private.

Sins against charity are now enumerated.

Enmities (*ἐχθραί*). The plural occurs only here in the New Testament.

Quarrels, i.e., *parties* (*ἐριθείναι*), contending for place and power.

21. The enumeration of the vices of the flesh is here terminated with two sins against temperance (cf. Rom. xiii. 13).

Of the which I foretell, etc., i.e., of which I warn you, before

22. But the fruit of the Spirit is, charity, joy, peace, patience, benignity, goodness, longanimity,

23. Mildness, faith, modesty, continency, chastity. Against such there is no law.

24. And they that are Christ's, have crucified their flesh, with the vices and concupiscences.

the judgment of God comes upon you. St. Paul is referring to his personal instructions to the Galatians, as well as to his present warning.

22, 23. To the works of the flesh St. Paul now opposes the fruits of the spirit. He calls them by the singular *fruit* to show that all supernatural virtues are united in the one Christian virtue of charity. The Clementine Vulgate enumerates twelve fruits of the spirit, while in the Greek there are only nine.

Patience, modesty and chastity are omitted from the Greek list because they are double renderings of *μακροθυμία*, *πραΰτης*, and *ἐγκράτεια* respectively. The Latin enumeration in conformity with the Greek would be as follows: *caritas, gaudium, pax, longanimitas, benignitas, bonitas, fides, mansuetudo, continentia*. St. Jerome has the same enumeration, but with a different order.

Charity is the first fruit of the Holy Ghost, and consequently also of a soul in the state of grace.

Peace with God, with one's own conscience, and with one's neighbor. Charity, joy and peace are more interior to the soul, and nourish those exterior virtues which have to do with the neighbor and the external world.

Faith here does not mean the theological virtue, but rather *fidelity*, or *confidence* towards others.

Continency is the virtue opposed to the vices of voluptuousness and intemperance.

Against such, etc., i.e., those who practice the above virtues are not under the Mosaic or any other law.

24. **They that are Christ's, etc.** Literally, "They that are of Christ Jesus," i.e., those who have received Baptism have, by their moral and mystical union with the crucified Saviour, placed **their flesh**, i.e., their inordinate tendencies, passions and vices, as it were, in a state of death, whereby they are enabled to inaugurate the life of the spirit. It is sin that is dead; the flesh, i.e.,

25. If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit.

26. Let us not be made desirous of vainglory, provoking one another, envying one another.

concupiscence, which remains after sin, continues to war against the spirit (verse 17). Cf. Rom. vi. 2 ff.

Vices (*παθήματα*), i.e., the passions, as sources of evil desires.

25. A practical conclusion is now drawn. It is not enough to have received the principle of a holy life; we must live a holy life. Our lives must be regulated and directed not by the Law, but by the spirit.

26. This verse is regarded by some as a last word of counsel relative to life by the spirit; by others, as an introduction to what follows. Those who live by the spirit will be led to right conduct in their relations towards others.

The thought here goes back to that of verse 15. There, however, the feeling is stronger.

Let us, etc. The Apostle includes himself in their temptation, doubtless out of humility and in order to conciliate his readers.

Provoking, etc., i.e., challenging one another.

Envying, etc., i.e., rivaling one another.

CHAPTER VI

HOW WE SHOULD EXERCISE OUR ZEAL FOR OTHERS, 1-6

1. Brethren, and if a man be overtaken in any fault, you, who are spiritual, instruct such a one in the spirit of meekness, considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted.

1-6. St. Paul now shows the Galatians how they are to regulate their conduct toward others. They should correct with meekness those who err, should help to carry others' burdens, should be on their guard against self-deception, should let their own deeds speak for them, and give material assistance to those who have instructed them.

1. Life by the spirit is not an impeccable existence; and hence the Apostle tells the Christians that if one of their number should out of frailty commit some fault, they ought with kindness and humility to instruct him.

2. Bear ye one another's burdens; and so you shall fulfil the law of Christ.

3. For if any man think himself to be some thing, whereas he is nothing, he deceiveth himself.

4. But let every one prove his own work, and so he shall have glory in himself only, and not in another.

Be overtaken, i.e., be surprised by sin, yielding to it through weakness.

You, who are spiritual, etc. This is addressed to all the Christians, whose conscience testifies to them that they are living spiritual lives.

Instruct, i.e., *correct*, render perfect again.

Thyself. The change from plural to singular is calculated to emphasize the need of personal vigilance and sympathy in correcting others.

2. Having spoken of sympathetic correction and of common weakness in the preceding verse St. Paul now exhorts to further help.

Bear ye (*βαρύνετε*), i.e., help to carry **one another's burdens**. By **burdens** here are meant moral defects, or the inclinations that lead to, and the remorse that follows such defects. To bear with others' defects and faults is to practice charity, and this means to fulfil the whole law of Christ, because all precepts are reducible to charity (v. 14).

3. This verse can be connected with verse 1, but in that case verse 2 would be a parenthesis. St. Jerome shows the connection between verses 2 and 3: "He who refuses to bear the burdens of another doubtless thinks that he has no need of being assisted himself, in which he deceives himself."

He is nothing, if joined with what precedes, means: "Although he is nothing"; but if with what follows, the meaning is: "Because he is nothing."

He deceiveth, etc., i.e., "he deceives his own mind" (St. Jerome), because he attributes to his own efforts and merits what really belongs to God. Pride makes one blind, unmerciful and uncharitable.

4. **But let**, etc. In place of deceiving one's self, let each one examine himself by something external and objective, by **his own work**, i.e., his own life and actions; then he will see what he is in reality. If he discovers something good, as is possible, he **will**

5. For every one shall bear his own burden.

6. And let him that is instructed in the word communicate to him that instructeth him, in all good things.

have reason within himself for rejoicing moderately, and not by comparing himself with another whom he considers beneath him. This is the explanation of St. Chrysostom, which seems to agree perfectly with the text.

5. To explain how this verse is not out of harmony with verse 2 Cornely, following some of the Fathers, thinks there is question here of bearing one's personal responsibilities before the judgment-seat of God; whereas in verse 2 there was question of helping to bear the burdens of this present life. Fr. Lagrange, however, thinks the thought of the judgment is not in the context; and he consequently explains this verse by saying that the burden (*φορτίον*) which each one must bear is the performance of the duty imposed on each one in verse 2.

6. After having spoken in verses 1-5 of the duties imposed by charity on those who are spiritual, St. Paul now turns his attention to the duty incumbent on those who have received the blessings of instruction in the Gospel; and he recommends that these latter divide (*κοινωνείτω*) with their instructors something of their temporal goods and possessions (Cornely, Lagr., Light., Zahn, etc.). It is the uniform teaching of St. Paul that the disciple ought to give temporal aid to him from whom he has received spiritual assistance (cf. 1 Cor. ix. 11; 2 Cor. xi. 7 ff.; 1 Thess. ii. 6, 9; Philip. iv. 10 ff.; 1 Tim. v. 17, 18).

That is instructed in the word. Better, "That is being instructed in the word," i.e., in the Gospel.

In all good things, i.e., the disciple should give a part of his temporal goods to his instructor. He who preaches the Gospel has the right to live by the Gospel (1 Cor. ix. 7-14; 1 Thess. v. 12, 13). For the use of *ἀγαθά* in the sense of temporal assistance see Luke xii. 18, 19; xvi. 25.

WE MUST DO GOOD IN VIEW OF THE JUDGMENT TO COME, 7-10

7-10. As a last and supreme motive why the Galatians should be zealous and instant in good of every kind St. Paul reminds them

7. Be not deceived, God is not mocked.

8. For what things a man shall sow, those also shall he reap. For he that soweth in his flesh, of the flesh also shall reap corruption. But he that soweth in the spirit, of the spirit shall reap life everlasting.

9. And in doing good, let us not fail. For in due time we shall reap, not failing.

of the judgment to come. Reflection on this salutary truth will give weight and fuller meaning to all the advice he has given them.

7. Some scholars connect this verse and its severe warning with what has been said in the preceding verse regarding the duty of giving temporal assistance in exchange for spiritual benefits. But since that duty, while certain, is after all not of the most serious nature and not the most definite and precise, it would seem that the grave admonition of the present verse has reference rather to the obligation of living a Christian life in general, of living by the spirit and not according to the flesh. To profess Christianity, and yet obey the lusts and promptings of the lower nature is surely to mock God, and to prepare for one's self a terrible judgment.

8. This verse is explanatory of the preceding one. The harvest depends chiefly upon the kind of seed that is sown and upon the soil in which it is sown. If one sows in the flesh, then he must expect the corruption which alone the flesh can produce; but if, in the spirit, i.e., if one performs good works which proceed from the grace of God in his soul, he will reap as his harvest life everlasting. This verse is a proof that good works done in and through grace can merit eternal life as their recompense.

Spirit here does not mean the Holy Ghost, but *grace*, the supernatural principle of the spiritual life.

9. There is question here of perseverance in doing good, in performing those acts and deeds that proceed from God's grace in the soul.

Let us not fail, i.e., let us not grow weary or faint-hearted, for at the time appointed by the Master of the field we shall reap our eternal harvest, provided we persevere.

The Greek Fathers give a peculiar interpretation to *not failing*, namely, that the reaping of the heavenly harvest will be without lassitude or fatigue.

10. Therefore, whilst we have time, let us work good to all men, but especially to those who are of the household of the faith.

11. See what a letter I have written to you with my own hand.

12. For as many as desire to please in the flesh, they constrain you to be circumcised, only that they may not suffer the persecution of the cross of Christ.

10. The practical conclusion now drawn is that during the present life we should try to do as much good as possible (Cornely, Light.) to all the world, but in particular to those of the faith of Christ. Christians are considered as members of the household of God.

CONCLUSION OF THE EPISTLE, 11-18

11-18. Taking the pen of his secretary into his own hand St. Paul gives some final and solemn counsels to the Galatians, summing up the polemical and doctrinal parts of the Epistle (verses 11-15), auguring peace to those who will follow his rule (verse 16), uttering a prayer of confidence in the final triumph of his labors (verse 17), and wishing the Galatians an affectionate farewell (verse 18).

11. **See what a letter.** Better, "See with what large letters." This is the usual sense of *πηλίκους*. The word *γράμμασιν* in the dative plural cannot signify anything but the character or dimensions of the letters; the reference is not to the Epistle or letter he has written (Lagr.). St. Paul writes this autograph himself with large letters because of the importance of these final words, and to set out in relief again his authority.

I have written to you. Literally, "I have written to you with large letters." See the arrangement of the words in the Greek text. *Ἐγραψα* is doubtless the epistolary aorist, since it refers only to the autograph.

12. **As many as.** These words refer to the false teachers.

In the flesh, i.e., among men (St. Chrys.), or in a worldly way, or according to the flesh and an earthly standard.

They constrain, i.e., they are putting pressure on you.

Only that. The motive behind the actions of the Judaizers was to avoid being persecuted as believers in a crucified Messiah whose death meant the redemption of mankind and the abroga-

13. For neither they themselves who are circumcised, keep the law; but they will have you to be circumcised, that they may glory in your flesh.

14. But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ; by whom the world is crucified to me, and I to the world.

15. For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.

tion of the Law. The uncircumcised Christians were exposed to the hate and persecution not only of the pagans, but especially of the Jews.

13. A proof that the false teachers are not sincere is that they themselves do not keep the Law.

They themselves, etc., i.e., the Judaizers, did not observe the whole Law, but only as much of it as seemed to their advantage. The reason these false Christians wanted others to be circumcised was on account of their preference for Judaism and for their own nation, and also in order to be esteemed by the Jewish chiefs; they wanted to insist that circumcision, the distinctive mark of Judaism, was necessary for salvation, and hence something very much to their credit.

14. St. Paul aspires to something far higher than the fleshy mark of circumcision wherein to glory; this is mere human glory. He will glory in nothing, save the cross of his crucified Saviour, the one true source of justification and salvation. To the Jews the cross was a sign of ignominy and malediction, but to the Christians it was the cause of salvation and the chief object of the preaching of St. Paul and the other Apostles (Acts ii. 22, 26, 38; 1 Cor. ii. 2; 2 Cor. iv. 8, etc.).

By whom. Better, "Whereby" ($\delta\iota' \omicron\upsilon$). The Greek Fathers make $\delta\iota' \omicron\upsilon$ refer to *cross* rather than to *Christ*, and this seems to agree better with the context. The cross is the means, the instrument of redemption, through which, by reason of his union with Christ crucified, the Apostle is dead to the world, that is, to the reign of sin (1 Cor. i. 20; 2 Cor. iv. 4; Eph. ii. 2), and the world is dead to him (ii. 20); in other words, all ties between him and the wicked world are broken.

The *per quem* of the Vulgate supposes *Christ* as the antecedent of $\delta\iota' \omicron\upsilon$.

15. This verse contains the same thought as v. 6. In the new order of things, which has been established by means of the

16. And whosoever shall follow this rule, peace on them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God.

17. From henceforth let no man be troublesome to me; for I bear the marks of the Lord Jesus in my body.

cross of Christ, circumcision or uncircumcision, as pertaining to this carnal world, avails nothing; the only thing that counts is **a new creature** (cf. 2 Cor. v. 17; Rom. i. 25; Heb. iv. 13), i.e., elevation to the supernatural state of grace by which we become adopted sons of God and heirs of heaven.

In Christ Jesus (Vulg., *in Christo Jesu*), though well supported, is doubtless to be omitted here, as coming from v. 6.

Euthalius in the fifth century, Syncellus in the eighth century, and Photius in the ninth century said that this verse was quoted from the apocryphal work called, *The Assumption of Moses*; but in the only portion of this latter work which has come down to us, and which appeared around 7 A.D., this passage does not occur. The apocryphal work in which it is found is of a later date, and doubtless borrowed the passage from our Epistle.

16. **This rule**, i.e., of glorying only in the cross of Christ (verse 14), and of being a new creature (verse 15). Those who follow such a rule will enjoy peace in union with Christ, and will experience God's mercy as the source of their present peace and of their ultimate salvation.

The Israel of God, i.e., the real Israel, all true Christians, whether of Jewish or Gentile origin, as opposed to the merely carnal descendants of Abraham.

17. **From henceforth**, i.e., for the future (*τοῦ λοιποῦ*), let no one trouble the Apostle about his doctrine, his Apostolate or the like. If anyone say that he is not a true servant of Christ, the refutation of such a calumny is found in the sufferings and **marks** of persecution which he bears on his body as a proof of his dependence on and of his fidelity to his Master (2 Cor. xi. 23-25; Acts xiv. 18). The allusion in *στίγματα* is to the marks with which masters used to brand their slaves as an indication of proprietorship, or to the sacred signs that were set on persons or things under the protection of a god or goddess as a mark of their consecration to the deity. St. Paul is the property of his divine Master, he is consecrated to Him, and therefore is above

18. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit, brethren. Amen.

all the troubles and molestations of a lower order. There is no question here of such *stigmata* as were imprinted on St. Francis of Assisi.

18. The Apostle terminates his letter with an affectionate salutation. He calls the Galatians by the tender term of **brethren** to show that notwithstanding their mistakes and unfaithfulness, he loves them and wishes them well. The mention of **spirit** seems to be a last reminder of the great theme of the whole letter, namely, that true life lies not in the flesh, or fleshy practices, but in the spirit, that is, in the life of grace.

All personal greetings are absent from the close of this Epistle, perhaps because, like the Epistle to the Ephesians, it was intended to be a circular letter to several towns.

INDEX

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>Abba, Father, 128, 630.</p> <p>Abraham, 68, 72, 76, 109, 145, 176, 188, 191, 545, 549, 610, 619, 624, 637, 658.</p> <p>Abstinence, 218.</p> <p>Achaia, 230, 262, 363, 443, 541, 569.</p> <p>Achaicus, 443.</p> <p>Adam, 86, 88, 91, 93, 98, 109, 420, 431.</p> <p>Afflictions, temporal, 83.</p> <p>Agape, 371, 374, 382.</p> <p>Agar, 636.</p> <p>Agility, of the resurrection body, 431.</p> <p>Almsgiving, 522, 528.</p> <p>Alpheus, 593.</p> <p>Ambrosiaster, 597.</p> <p>Amen, 405, 472.</p> <p>Ampliatius, 236.</p> <p>Anathema, 144, 385, 445.</p> <p>Andronicus, 235.</p> <p>Antinomians, the, 313.</p> <p>Antioch, 363, 566, 602.</p> <p>Antiochus Epiphanes, 141.</p> <p>Antipas, 549.</p> <p>Apelles, 236.</p> <p>Aphrodite, 247, 354, 360.</p> <p>Apollo, 249, 267, 289, 294, 345, 442, 453.</p> <p>Apostle, meaning of the term, 24, 392, 525.</p> <p>Apostles, false, 543.</p> <p>Apostles, the, 72, 287, 300, 414, 425, 473, 492, 503, 558.</p> <p>— — commissioned by Christ, 584.</p> | <p>Apostles, the, life of, 105.</p> <p>— — ministry of the, 485.</p> <p>— — ordained priests by our Lord, 379.</p> <p>— — patience of, 507.</p> <p>— — poverty of, 493.</p> <p>— — preaching of, 296, 481.</p> <p>— — reward of, 494, 496.</p> <p>— — right to support of, 344.</p> <p>— — successors of, 584.</p> <p>— — suffering of, 494, 496.</p> <p>— — support of by pious ladies, 342.</p> <p>— — trials of, 506.</p> <p>Aquila, and Prisca, 233, 248, 444.</p> <p>Arabia, 550, 568, 591.</p> <p>Arabs, 638.</p> <p>Aretas, 549.</p> <p>Aristarchus, 523.</p> <p>Aristobolus, 237.</p> <p>Asia, 235, 444, 466, 567.</p> <p>Assyria, 611.</p> <p>Assyrians, 406.</p> <p>Athens, 277.</p> <p>Attalus I, 565.</p> <p>Augustus, 549.</p> <p>Baal, 178.</p> <p>Babylon, 511, 611.</p> <p>Baius, 47.</p> <p>Banquets, pagan, 363.</p> <p>Baptism, 95, 100, 105, 107, 114, 316, 352, 389, 433, 499, 503, 511, 626.</p> <p>— effects of, 314, 651.</p> <p>— for the dead, 424.</p> |
|---|---|

- Baptism, in the early Church, 96.
 —significance of by immersion, 96.
 Barbarian, meaning of the term, 403.
 Barnabas, 344, 439, 523, 566, 595, 598, 600.
 Basilides, 453.
 Batiffol, 372.
 Belial, 510.
 Benedictus, the, 408.
 Benjamin, 176.
 Berea, 519.
 Bithynia, 375, 471.
 Body, the, of Adam, 432.
 ——— of man, 389, 430.
 ——— glorified, 498.
 ——— qualities of, in the resurrection, 427.
 ——— resurrection of, 133.
 Bread, the Eucharistic, 359.
 Caesarea, 546, 593.
 Caius, 242.
 Caligula, 549.
 Called, the, to Christianity, 136.
 Canaan, 75, 621.
 Calvin, 157.
 Carthage, Third Council of, 375.
 Catechumens, 407, 424.
 Celibacy, 318.
 Cenchrae, 232.
 Cephas, 251, 267, 290, 294, 343, 415, 601.
 Chalice, Eucharistic, the, 358.
 Charismata, the, 197.
 Charisms, 397, 399, 402, 408.
 Charity, 200, 208, 220, 394, 648, 651.
 Charity, of God, 83.
 Chloe, 248, 252, 266.
 Christ, 26, 29, 81, 86, 123, 297, 353, 358, 422, 491.
 —death of, 99, 503.
 —derivation of the name, 473.
 Christ, Divinity of, 146, 385, 423, 489, 521, 629.
 —Incarnation of, the, 122, 423.
 —Judge, the, 141.
 —Lord, the, 386, 422, 492.
 —love of, 141, 502.
 —man, the, 122, 423.
 —Messiah, the, 492, 506, 627.
 —nature, human, of, 629.
 —natures, two, 26.
 —Paschal Lamb, the, 307.
 —Passion of, the, 107.
 —person, His, 492.
 —preëxistence of, 26.
 —presence of, in the Eucharist, 358, 380.
 —Redeemer, the, 62, 80, 82, 86, 89, 91, 98, 106, 221, 437, 505, 585, 617.
 —Resurrection of, the, 26, 80, 97, 215, 413, 495.
 —sacrifice of, the, 365.
 —Saviour, the, 84, 168, 170, 504.
 —second Adam, the, 89, 98, 432.
 —Second Coming of, the, 84, 190, 210, 264, 379, 434, 495, 498, 500.
 —Son of God, the, 26, 281, 314, 492, 503, 505.
 —sufferings of, the, 465.
 —unity with the faithful, 620.
 Christian, body of, the, 317.
 —duties of, 195, 212, 365.
 Christianity, 509, 636.
 Christians, 356, 657.
 —conduct toward others, 652.
 —freedom of, 642.
 —unity of, 359, 626.
 Church, the, 198, 262, 309, 373, 388, 422.
 ——— building, the, 373.
 ——— meaning of the term, 409, 584.
 ——— Militant, 422.
 ——— order of authority of the, 367.

- Church, the Roman, 212.
 — successor of the Synagogue, 352.
 — Triumphant, 422, 639.
 — unity of the, 389.
 Cicero, 304.
 Cilicia, 363, 593.
 Circumcision, 52, 53, 74, 222, 615, 642, 648, 657.
 Clement of Alex., 343, 453.
 Cleophas, 593.
 Collection, for the poor in Jerusalem, 438, 518.
 — Galatian, 439.
 Commandments, the Ten, 101, 483, 607, 648.
 Communion, unworthy, 380.
 Concupiscence, 95, 100, 111.
 Confirmation, Sacrament of, the, 389.
 Conscience, the, of a Christian, 364.
 Constancy, 83.
 Conversion, of unbelievers, 407.
 Corinth, 246, 442, 464, 470, 513, 522, 536, 569.
 — factions at, 250.
 — foundation of Church at, 248.
 — St. Paul's visit to, 440.
 Corinthians, the, 286, 311, 509.
 — divine gifts of, 264.
 — Epistle to, lost, 475.
 — factions among, 266.
 — First Epistle to, authenticity and canonicity, 254.
 — — — — date and place of writing of, 253.
 — — — — division and analysis of, 257.
 — — — — doctrinal importance of, 256.
 — — — — occasion and purpose of, 250.
 — — — — style and language of, 255.
 Corinthians, the, fornication among, 314.
 — heresies among, 374.
 — preference of preachers, 294.
 — schisms among, 373.
 — sinners among, 308.
 — Second Epistle to, authenticity and integrity of, 453.
 — — — — characteristics and style of, 457.
 — — — — date and place of writing of, 452.
 — — — — division and analysis of, 459.
 — — — — occasion and purpose of, 447.
 — — relation to 1 Cor., 458.
 Cornely, 113, 312, 608.
 Covenant, the New and the Old, 484.
 Creature, hope of deliverance, 132.
 Creed, the, 434.
 Crispus, 248.
 Cross, the, 657.
 — power of, 270.
 Curse, the, of the Mosaic Law, 616.
 Cybele, 646.
 Cynic philosophers, 41.
 Cyprus, 24.
 Dalmatia, 568.
 Damascus, 549, 591.
 David, 56, 71.
 Davies, 458.
 Deaconesses, 233.
 Death, 467.
 — by Adam, 87.
 — spiritual, 112, 114.
 — — and temporal, 94.
 — to sin, 96.
 Decalogue, the, 648.
 Deluge, the, 112.
 Demetrius, 448, 466.
 Derbe, 566, 568.

- Devil, the, 491.
Domitilla, 236.
- Eden, garden of, III, 552.
Edomites, 150.
Egypt, 352.
Elias, 177.
Epenetus, 235.
Ephesus, 247, 252, 266, 440, 448,
466, 470, 479, 513.
— St. Paul's stay in, 444.
Erastus, 242, 248, 441, 447, 458.
Esau, 147.
Eucharist, Holy, the, 352, 371, 377,
529.
— — — institution of, 377.
— — — real presence of Christ in,
360, 380.
— — — true sacrifice, a, 362.
Euthalius, 658.
Eve, 112, 479, 539.
- Faith, 31, 33, 83, 133, 644.
— in Christ, 34.
— gift of, 387.
— gifts of, 197.
— virtue of, 398, 407, 520, 561,
611.
- Fast, before Communion, 372, 375.
Fasting, 507.
Feasts, Jewish, 214.
Flesh, of man, the, 117.
Flesh works of, the, 126, 648.
Fornication, 314, 320.
Fortitude, 83.
Fortunatus, 443.
Fruits, of the spirit, 648.
- Gaius, 248, 568.
Galatia, 565.
— composition of Church at, 570.
Galatians, the, 565.
— — affection of, for St. Paul,
634.
— — conversion of, 631.
- Galatians, the, freedom from Mo-
saic Law, 647.
— — St. Paul's rebuke to, 586.
— — seduction of, 644.
— Epistle to, authenticity and ca-
nonicity, 576.
— — — division and analysis, 578.
— — — importance and style, 578.
— — — occasion and purpose, 571.
— — — time and place of writing,
573.
- Gallio, 249.
Gamaliel, 237.
Games, the Isthmian, 349.
Garden, the, of Eden, III, 552.
General Resurrection, the, 184.
Gentiles, the, 34, 58, 61, 160, 226,
417, 439, 596, 604, 610,
615, 628, 631.
— — conversion of, 190.
— — salvation of, 47.
— — sins of, 42.
- Gift, the, of tongues, 134, 394.
Gifts, the, of the Holy Ghost, 386,
392, 395.
- Glory, future, 83.
God, 138, 140.
— charity of, the, 139, 142.
— Father, the, 129, 222, 422, 464,
548.
— fidelity of, the, 265, 511.
— Gentiles' conception of, 37.
— grace of, the, 282.
— Judge, the, 216.
— justice of, the, 56, 64, 156, 191.
— mercy of, the, 154, 192.
— natural knowledge of, the, 35.
— omnipotence of, the, 79.
— promises of, the, 472.
— providence of, the, 140, 344, 529.
— science of, the, 135.
— ways of, the, 272.
— wisdom of, the, 155, 193, 272,
285.
— wrath of, the, 158.

- Good works, 66, 496.
 Gospel, the, 226, 244, 270, 272, 506,
 525, 532, 537, 629.
 ——— and the Mosaic Law, 102.
 ——— preached by St. Paul, 587.
 ——— preachers of the, 288.
 ——— preaching of the, 277, 490.
 Grace, 29, 94, 104, 127, 153, 395,
 484, 519.
 — in St. Paul, 417.
 — life of, 649.
 — sanctifying, 394.
 Grafting, on trees, 186.
 Greco-Romans, moral code of the,
 41.
 Greece, vices of, 39.
 Greeks, 31.

 Hebrews, the, 407, 545.
 ——— sins of, 39, 354.
 Healing, grace of, 387.
 Heresies, 374.
 Hermas, 240.
 Herod Agrippa, 595.
 — Antipas, 549.
 Herodian, 237.
 Herodias, 549.
 Holy Ghost, the, 83, 125, 134, 226,
 278, 282, 293, 303, 314,
 317, 385, 389, 404, 473,
 483, 485, 489, 508, 536,
 612, 630, 643.
 ———— Divinity of, 282.
 ———— gifts of, 614.
 Hope, 133.
 Humility, 298.
 Hypostatic Union, 432.

 Iconium, 566.
 Idiots, sinlessness of, 88.
 Idol, 38.
 Idolatry, 37, 51, 57, 384.
 Idols, meats offered to, 334.
 — sacrifices to, 360.
 — service of, 357.

 Illyricum, 228, 568.
 Incestuous man, the, 303, 516.
 Indulgences, 477.
 Infants, sinlessness of, 88, 89.
 Interpretation, private, of the
 Scriptures, 285.
 Isaac, 78, 145, 148, 191, 620, 637.
 Isaias, 161, 164, 173, 190, 271, 282,
 294, 437, 506, 639.
 Ishmael, 148, 637.
 Israel, 147, 175, 179, 185, 437.
 — the real, 658.
 Israelites, 145, 147, 406, 545.

 Jacob, 145, 151, 191, 620.
 James, 592, 595, 601, 605.
 — the Greater, 416.
 — the Less, 343, 416.
 Jason, 242.
 Jerusalem, 227, 229, 438, 568, 593,
 598, 638.
 — collection for the poor of, 438,
 518.
 — Council of, 363, 601.
 Jew, meaning of the term, 50.
 Jews, the, 32, 58, 160, 271, 348,
 488, 627, 657.
 ——— advantages over Gentiles, 55.
 ——— chosen people, 54.
 ——— errors of, 50.
 ——— incredulity of, 56, 146, 190,
 406.
 ——— love of money, their, 51.
 ——— Messianic hope of, 131.
 ——— patience of God with, 44.
 ——— rejection by God, 143.
 Joel, 171.
 Joseph, 343.
 Josephus, 439, 549, 621.
 Jude, 343.
 Judea, 470, 593.
 Judaism, 128, 589, 636, 639, 647.
 Judaizers, 231, 241, 250, 267, 448,
 468, 484, 531, 539, 542, 545, 547,
 568, 586, 598, 617, 646, 656.

- Judgment, the, 655.
 — basis of, 44.
 — of the Lord, 297.
 — final, of the world, 311.
 — general, 291, 500.
 — meaning of, 91.
 Julia, 240.
 Junias, 235.
 Justice, 276.
 — imputed, 71.
 — servitude of, 103.
 Justification, 31, 75, 86, 94, 125.
 — by Christ, 92.
 — fruits of, 81, 105, 120.
 — gift of God, a, 61, 66, 71.
 — meaning of, 91.
 — universality of, 72.
 Justin Martyr, 375, 405.
 Kingdom, Messianic, 422.
 Kiss, sign of charity, a, 240.
 Knowledge, gift of, 387.
 — meaning of the term, 263.
 Lagrange, 109.
 Last Judgment, 34.
 Latin, use of in the Church, 405.
 Last Supper, the, 378.
 Lattey, 435.
 Law, Mosaic, the, 46, 53, 55, 61,
 67, 72, 88, 93, 101, 106,
 110, 115, 116, 128, 163,
 213, 313, 410, 437, 485,
 489, 542, 560, 572, 585,
 590, 606, 616, 622, 628,
 631, 635, 641, 647.
 — — — curse of the, 616.
 — — — guide to Christ, 622.
 — — — liberation from, 105.
 — — — occasion of new sins, 108.
 — natural, 46, 52, 629.
 — — judgment according to, 48.
 — — sins against, 88.
 — Roman, 129.
 Lazarus, 420.
 Leaven, 306, 645.
 Lias, 357, 370.
 Life, eternal, 45, 94.
 — of grace, 649.
 Lightfoot, 497.
 Lord's Supper, the, 374.
 Love-feast, 371.
 Lucius, 242.
 Lucius Mummius, 246.
 Lusters, meaning of the term, 649.
 Luther, doctrine of faith and im-
 puted justice of, 102.
 Lutherans, 69.
 Lycaonia, 567.
 Lycaonians, the, 613.
 Lystra, 566.
 Macedonia, 230, 302, 363, 440, 447,
 464, 470, 479, 564, 567.
 — Churches of, 541.
 Macedonians, 520.
 — collection among the, 519.
 MacRory, 458, 487.
 Magnificat, the, 408.
 Malachy, 150.
 Man, body, the resurrection of,
 133.
 — descended from Adam, 90.
 — flesh of, 117, 124.
 — glory, future, of, 130.
 — head, covered, of, 367.
 — hope of deliverance, 133.
 — judgment of, 297.
 — life with Christ, 99.
 — member of Christ, 127.
 — reason of, 117.
 — resurrection of, 97, 412.
 — sinfulness of, 58, 112.
 — sinful nature, from Adam, 98.
 — sins of, 93.
 — union with Christ, 129.
 Manicheans, heresy of, 146.
 Manlius Vulso, 565.
 Manna, 352.
 Maranatha, meaning of, 445.
 Marcion, 109, 453, 614.

- Marriage, 318, 333.
 — indissolubility of, 107, 322.
 — law of, 106, 107.
 Martyrdom, 395.
 Mary, 235.
 Matthias, the Apostle, 416.
 Meats, in the Jewish Law, 217.
 — offered to idols, 363.
 Merit, doctrine of, 528.
 Messiah, the, 145, 147, 224, 228, 273, 656.
 Messianic promises, 472.
 — prophecies, 55.
 Menander, 427.
 Minor, in Roman Law, 628.
 Miracles, working of, 387.
 Moab, daughters of, 354.
 Moses, 88, 93, 112, 115, 154, 168, 174, 379, 485, 487, 591, 622.
 Mt. Sinai, 591, 637.
 Muratorian Fragment, 453.
 Mysteries, of the Gospel, 280.

 Narcissus, 237.
 Nereus, 240.
 Nestorius, heresy of, 146.
 New Dispensation, the, 170.
 New Testament, the, 25.
 Nisan, 632.
 Noe, 109.
 North Galatia, 566.
 North Galatian Theory, 568.

 Obedience, to civil authority, 205.
 Onanism, 39.
 Orange, Second Council of, 299.
 Ordination, 473.
 Origen, 122, 189, 552.
 Osee, 160.
 Our Father, the, 134.
 Old Testament, the, 25, 624.
 Ovid, 111, 116.

 Paganism, 506, 509.
 Pagans, 128, 385, 412.

 Palestine, 439, 601.
 Paul, the name, 24.
 Paradise, 552.
 Patience, virtue of, 83.
 Patriarchs, the, 185, 188, 191, 472.
 Pederasty, 39.
 Pelagians, the, 47, 299, 484.
 — semi-, the, 299, 484.
 Penance, 613.
 Pentateuch, the, 637.
 Pentecost, day of, the, 400, 407.
 Persis, 237.
 Pessinus, 646.
 Petra, 549.
 Pharaoh, 151, 154.
 Pharisees, the, 219, 590.
 Philippi, 452, 519, 546, 569.
 Phoebe, 232.
 Photius, 658.
 Phrygia, 568.
 Pisidia, 567.
 Plato, 413.
 Pliny, the younger, 233.
 Plummer, 459, 484, 563.
 Polycarp, 453.
 Poseidon, 247.
 Prayer, 134.
 Preachers, of the Gospel, 272, 294.
 Preaching, 171.
 — false, 293.
 Predestination, to glory, 137.
 Priesthood, institution of the, 379.
 Prisca, and Aquila, 233, 248, 444.
 Prophecy, 387, 392, 399.
 Prophets, the, 406, 409, 472, 488.
 — meaning of the term, 25.
 Protestantism, modern, 45.
 Psalmist, the, 495.
 Purgatory, 477.

 Quartus, 243.
 Quietism, 45.

 Race-suicide, 39.
 Rationalists, 146, 400, 511, 549.

- Real presence, in the Eucharist, 360.
- Reason, of man, 117.
- Rebecca, 149.
- Redemption, the, 278, 585.
- Reformers, the, heresy of, 397.
- Resurrection, the, of the body, 427.
- General, 184, 423.
- hope of a, 497.
- Revelation, divine, 284.
- Revenge, 204.
- Robertson, 454, 553.
- Rock, spiritual, 353.
- Roman Church, composition of the, 4.
- origin of the, 1.
- Romans, 565.
- Epistle to the, authenticity of, 9.
- division and contents, 19.
- inscription, or salutation, 23.
- integrity of, 12.
- language and style, 16.
- purpose of, 8.
- theological importance, 17.
- time and place of writing, 8.
- Rome, 546.
- Rufus, 237.
- Sabbath, the, 439.
- Sacraments, the seven, 101.
- Sacrifice, the, of the Eucharist, 358, 361.
- Sacrifices, Jewish, 360.
- pagan, 357.
- of Greek athletes, 350.
- to idols, 360.
- Sadducees, 412.
- St. Augustine, 211, 646.
- St. Catherine of Siena, 603.
- St. Chrysostom, 135, 137, 139, 247, 354, 375, 383, 388, 445, 487, 505, 506, 598, 609.
- St. Cyprian, 453.
- St. Cyril of Jerusalem, 627.
- St. Francis of Assisi, 659.
- St. Ignatius of Antioch, 426.
- St. Irenaeus, 453.
- St. Jerome, 646.
- St. Luke, 453, 523, 557, 567, 595.
- St. Mark, 237, 523.
- St. Paul, 183, 232, 294, 426, 566.
- affection for the Corinthians, 301, 512, 557.
- authority over Christians, 309.
- Apostle, the, 226, 261, 341, 417, 583.
- Apostleship of, 555, 600.
- appeal to Corinthians, 531.
- to Galatians, 632.
- boasting of, 535, 555.
- call to preach, 28, 31.
- calumny of, by enemies, 469.
- conversion of, 416.
- disinterest of, in preaching, 540.
- doctrine of, 589, 596.
- efforts and sacrifices of, 349.
- example of, 340.
- founder of Corinthian Church, 289.
- glory of, 657.
- glorying of, 347, 535, 550.
- Gospel of, 49, 599, 603.
- illness of, 553, 633.
- judge of the Corinthians, 559.
- love of Christ, 609.
- marks of, 658.
- mission of, 591.
- persecution of the Church, 589.
- persecutor of the faithful, 416.
- preaching of, 228, 270, 277, 286, 348, 470, 602, 604.
- revelation of God to, 590.
- self-praise, 543.
- apology for, 537.
- self-vindication, 473.

- St. Paul, solicitude for the Corinthians, 538.
 — sufferings of, 466, 546, 553, 555.
 — temporal support of, 541.
 — — refusal of, 301, 341, 348.
 — thanksgiving to God, 465.
 — threat to the Corinthians, 562.
 — vision of, 553.
 — visits to Jerusalem, 592, 594.
 St. Peter, 2, 250, 267, 415, 434, 592, 595, 600, 604.
 St. Stephen, 1.
 St. Thomas, 146, 206, 208, 299, 311, 316, 381, 382, 401, 471, 501, 512, 646.
 Salvation, 61, 115, 139, 168, 243.
 Sanday, 556.
 Sara, 78, 149, 494, 636.
 Satan, 240, 305, 320, 388, 479, 491, 510, 541, 553, 585.
 Scandal, 364.
 — in eating, 338.
 Schechinah, the 145.
 Schism, in the Corinthian Church, 373.
 Schmiedel, 459.
 Scripture, the, 22, 615, 624.
 Secundus, 523.
 Semipelagians, the, 299.
 Sem, 549.
 Semites, sins of the, 39.
 Sennacherib, 271.
 Sergius Paulus, 24.
 Silas, 248, 471, 523, 541, 567.
 Silvanus, 472.
 Sin, 94, 100, 110, 115, 343, 437.
 — against the natural law, 88.
 — cause of spiritual death, 113.
 — Gentiles', 37.
 — — punishment for, 41.
 — meaning of the term, 100.
 — original, 86, 93, 103, 115, 437.
 — punishment of, 56, 58.
 — servitude of, 98.
 Sina, 638.
 Slaves, Christian, 327.
 Soden, 126.
 Sopater, 242, 523.
 Sosipater, 242.
 Sorrow, spiritual and worldly, 515.
 Sosthenes, 261, 453.
 Soul, glorification of the, 499.
 — immortality of the, 413.
 Souls, purified, 500.
 South Galatian theory, 567, 599.
 Sozomen, 375.
 Spain, 229.
 Spirit, of the soul, the, 127, 643, 649, 655, 659.
 — — fruits of the, 648.
 Stachys, 236.
 Stephanas, 235, 248, 443.
 Sterilization, unnecessary, 39.
 Stigmata, of St. Francis, 659.
 Stoic philosophers, the, 41.
 Subtlety, of the resurrection body, 431.
 Suffering, with Christ, 130.
 — reward of, for God, 496.
 Sufferings, of this life, 135.
 Sunday, the Lord's day, 439.
 Syncellus, 658.
 Syria, 363, 593, 598.
 Tabernacle, among the Jews and Christians, 510.
 Tabernacles, feast of, the, 497.
 Tarsus, 24.
 Tavius, 565.
 Teachers, false, 491.
 Tectosages, 565.
 Tertius, 242.
 Tertullian, 375, 424, 605.
 Testament, the New, 25.
 — the Old, 488.
 Thais, 427.
 Theodoret, 547.
 Thessalonica, 519.
 Thomas, 415.
 Timothy, 241, 248, 302, 441, 447,

- 453, 466, 472, 520, 533, 535, 541,
 549, 568, 583, 597, 646.
 Tisri, 632.
 Titus, 448, 479, 513, 516, 520, 523,
 525, 558, 583, 597, 599.
 — Justus, 248.
 Tolistobogii, 565.
 Tongues, gift of, the, 134, 388, 399.
 Torah, the, 590.
 Transubstantiation, 360.
 Trinity, the Blessed, 564.
 Troas, 448, 479, 513.
 Trocmi, 565.
 Trogmi, 565.
 Tryphena and Tryphosa, 237.
 Urbanus, 236.
 Uz, 549.
 Valentine, heresy of, 146.
 Van Steenkiste, 309.
 Vices, the, of the flesh, 650.
 Virgin, the Blessed, 88, 408.
 Virginitv, 328.
 Vulgate, the, 435.
 Williams, 619.
 Woman, conduct of in church,
 410.
 — dignity of, 369, 511.
 — head, shaven, of, 368.
 — — veiled, of, 366.
 — inferiority of, 367.
 — modesty of, 369.
 — position of, in the Church, 366.
 Works, the, of the flesh, 648.
 — — of the Mosaic Law, 616.
 — good, 496.
 — judgment by, 501.
 World, the material, 131.
 Yahweh, 171, 216, 222, 489.
 Zachary, 408, 601.
 Zebedee, 601.
 Zeus, 360.

Date Due

1 JUL 1	[REDACTED]		
FEB 28 '57	[REDACTED]		
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]		
APR 1 '68	[REDACTED]		
DEC 5	[REDACTED]		
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]		
JUL 1	[REDACTED]		
APR 1 '68	[REDACTED]		
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]		
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]		
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]		
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]		
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]		
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]		
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]		
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]		
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]		
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]		
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]		
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]		
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]		
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]		



BS2650 .C156 v.1
The epistles of St. Paul : with

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00073 8734