offences, he says **the God of peace** that he  
might encourage them to expect liberation  
from these persons.” Chrysostom: and so  
most Commentators. De Wette prefers  
taking **the God of peace** more generally.  
as ‘the God of *salvation*,’ and the usage  
of the expression (see references) seems to  
favour this. **shall bruise Satan** is a  
similitude from Gen. iii. 15. It does not  
express any *wish*, but a prophetic assurance,  
and encouragement in bearing up against  
all adversaries, that it would not be long  
before the great Adversary himself would  
be bruised under their feet. **The  
grace, &c.**] It appears as if the Epistle  
was intended to conclude with this usual  
benediction, but the Apostle found occasion  
to add more. This he does also in other  
Epistles: see1 Cor. xvi. 23, 24; similarly Phil.  
iv. 20, and vv. 21—23 after the doxology,  
—2 Thess. iii. 16, 17, 18:—1 Tim. vi. 16,  
17 ff.:—2 Tim. iv. 18, 19 ff.

**21—24.**] GREETINGS FROM VARIOUS PERSONS.

**21.**] Lucius must not be mistaken  
for Lucas (or Lucanus),—but was probably Lucius of Cyrene, Acts xiii. 1, see note  
there—Jason *may* be the same who is  
mentioned Acts xvii. 5, as the host of Paul  
and Silas at Thessalonica.—A ‘*Sopater*  
(son) *of Pyrrhus of Berea*’ occurs Acts  
xx. 4, but it is quite uncertain whether  
this Sosipater is the same person. **my  
Kinsmen**, see above, ver. 7. These persons  
may have been Jews; but we cannot tell  
whether the expression may not be used  
in a wider sense.

**22.**| There is nothing strange (as Olshausen supposes) in this  
salutation being inserted in the first person.  
It would be natural enough that Tertius  
the amanuensis, inserting the words, should  
change the form into the first person, and  
afterwards proceed from the dictation of  
the Apostle as before. Some suppose him  
to have done this on transcribing the  
Epistle.—Tholuck notices this irregularity  
as a corroboration of the genuineness of  
the chapter. On the supposed identity of  
Tertius with Silas, see note on Acts xv. 22.

**23.**] Gaius is mentioned 1 Cor. i.  
14, as having been baptized by St. Paul.  
**The host of the whole Church** probably  
implies that the assemblies of the church  
were held in his house :—or perhaps, that  
his hospitality to Christians was universal.  
—Erastus, holding this office, can hardly  
have been the same who was with the  
Apostle in Ephesus, Acts xix. 22. It is  
more probable that the Erastus of 2 Tim.  
iv. 20 is identical with this than with that  
other. **our brother**] See 1 Cor. i. 1:  
one among the brethren. The rest have  
been specified by their services or offices.

**24.**] *The benediction repeated*;  
see above on ver 20.

**25—27.**] CONCLUDING DOXOLOGY. The  
genuineness of this doxology and its position in the Epistle have been much questioned. From the external evidence, which  
may be seen in the various readings in my  
Greek Test., it is plain that *its genuineness*as a part of the Epistle *is placed beyond  
all reasonable doubt*.  
This unusual character of the position  
and diction of this doxology las been  
used as an internal argument against the  
genuineness of the portion. St. Paul never  
elsewhere ends with such a doxology. His  
doxologies, when he does use such, are