to, but in **all**. **in glory**] To be connected with **shall fully supply**: not with  
**his riches in glory**: not, *gloriously*, as  
many Commentators, which is weak and  
flat in the extreme: but **glory** is the instrument and element by and in which  
‘all your need’ will be supplied: in **glory**:  
but not only at the coming of Christ, but  
in the whole glorious imparting to you of  
the unsearchable riches of Christ, begun  
and carried on here, and completed at that  
day. **in Christ Jesus**] And this filling  
(or, ‘this glory’) is, consists, and finds its  
sphere and element, **in Christ Jesus**.

**20.**] The contemplation both of the Christian reward, of which he has been speaking, and of the glorious completion of all  
God’s dealings at the great day,—and the  
close of his Epistle,—suggests this ascription of praise. **But**—however  
rich you may be in good works, however strong I may be by Christ to bear  
all things,—not to us, but to our God and  
Father be the glory. On the expression  
rendered **for ever and ever**, see note,  
Eph. iii. 21.

**21—23.**] GREETING AND FINAL BENEDICTION.

**21.**] He greets **every**  
individual **saint**. The singular has love  
and affection, and should not be lost, as  
in Conybeare’s translation, “*all God’s  
people.*” **in Christ Jesus**] belongs  
more probably to **salute**,—see Rom. xvi.  
22; 1 Cor. xvi. 19,—than to “*saint*,” as in ch, i. 1, where, as Meyer observes, the  
expression has a diplomatic formality,  
whereas here there is no reason for so  
formal an adjunct. **The brethren  
which are with me**] These must, on  
account of the next verse, have been his  
closer friends, perhaps his colleagues in the  
ministry, such as Aristarchus, Epaphras,  
Demas, Timotheus. But there has arisen  
a question, how to reconcile this with ch.  
ii, 20? And it may be answered, that the  
lack of *oneness of mind* there predicated of  
his companions, did not exclude them from  
the title “*brethren*,” nor from sending  
greeting to the Philippians: see also ch. i.  
14.

**22**. **All the saints**] i.e., all the  
Christians here. **they that are of  
Cæsar’s household**] These perhaps were  
slaves belonging to the (technically so  
called) *familia* (i.e. all attached to the  
palace, including slaves and every dependant) of Nero, who had been con-  
verted by intercourse with St. Paul,  
probably at this time a prisoner in the  
pretorian barracks (see ch. i. 13, note)  
attached to the palace. This is much  
more likely, than that any of the actual  
*family* of Nero should have embraced  
Christianity. The reason of these being  
specified is not plain: the connexion perhaps between a *colony*, and some of the  
imperial household, might account for it.

**23.**] Sce Gal. vi. 18.