regular process, and establish the truth in  
a legal manner.’—This explanation, however, has not been the usual one: Chrysostom, Calvin, and others, understanding  
the two or three witnesses, of St. Paul’s  
*two or three visits,* as establishing cither  
(1) the truth of the facts, or (2) the reality  
of his threats. But it is decisive against  
this interpretation, as Meyer remarks, that  
thus the sins committed *since the Apostle’s  
last visit* would remain altogether unnoticed.

**and three,** not for “*or  
three,*”—**two** (and in cases where only two  
can be had)**, and three** (where so many can  
be obtained): *‘two and three respectively.’*

**2.] I have forewarned you, and I  
now forewarn you, as** (I did) **when present the second time, so also** (I do) **now  
when absent.** It seems to me (see my  
Greek Test.) that this is the only natural  
way of taking the words.

**them  
which have sinned heretofore]** the same  
persons as are thus designated above,  
ch. xii. 21.

**all the rest of you]**who may not have actually sinned, but still  
require warning, on account of your own  
personal danger, connexion with those who  
have, &c.

**if I come again]** at my  
next coming. This was what he  
he was last there, and now repeats.

**3.]**‘This gives the reason why he will not spare:  
they required the exertion of discipline;  
and they challenged him to the proof of his  
apostolic authority.

**a proof of Christ]**‘The genitive is either objective, a proof of  
**Christ speaking in me,** i.e. ‘that Christ  
**speaks in me,**’—or subjective, ‘**a proof**  
**given by Christ speaking in me—**‘a token  
of my authority vouchsafed by Christ speaking in me.’ This latter meaning is more  
suited to what follows, where *Christ* becomes  
the *subject*. Such proof would be, the immediate execution, by divine power, of some  
punishment denounced by Paul’s word, as  
in Acts xiii. 11. The assertion tends to  
remind them of the danger of provoking  
Christ, who spoke by Paul.

**4.]** *Confirmation of the foregoing assertion.* **For  
indeed he was crucified** (as the source,—  
the conditional element,—by which His crucifixion became possible) **from weakness, yet  
He liveth by** (source,—source of His life)  
**the Power of God** (which raised Him from  
the dead, Rom. vi. 4; viii.11; Eph. i. 20;  
Phil. ii. 9). **For we also are weak in Him**  
(i.e. *in Him,* in our communion with and  
imitation of Christ, we, as He did, lay aside  
our power and spare you: we partake of  
His voluntary abnegation of power which  
we might have used. The context requires  
this explanation, and refutes that of Chrysostom and others, that for His sake we  
suffer persecution and dishonour), **but shall  
live** (exercise our apostolic authority, in  
contrast to the *weakness* above) **with Him**(as He now exercises His power in His  
glorified resurrection life) **from** (source) **the  
power of God [toward you]** (“*toward you*,”  
if genuine, may belong either to “*the  
power of God*,” or to “*we shall live*,”—  
“*we shall live with respect to you,*’ which  
agrees better with the parallelism, but not  
so well with the arrangement of the sentence. The sense seems to require the *latter*