“He hints that they were in trouble.”  
Chrysostom.

**9. with Onesimus**]  
There can hardly be a doubt [compare  
ver. 17 with Philem. 2, 10 ff.] that this  
is the Onesimus of the Epistle to Philemon, **one of you**] Most probably, a  
native of your town.

**10—14.**] *Various greetings from brethren.*

**10.**] Aristarchus was a Thessalonian (Acts xx. 4), first mentioned Acts  
xix. 29, as dragged into the theatre at  
Ephesus during the tumult, together with  
Gaius, both being “*fellow-travellers of  
Paul*.” He accompanied Paul to Asia  
(ib. xx. 4), and was with him in the  
voyage to Rome (xxvii. 2). In Philem. 24,  
he sends greeting, with Marcus, Demas,  
and Lucas, as here, On **fellow-prisoner**  
Meyer suggests an idea, which may without  
any straining of probability be adopted,  
and which would explain why Aristarchus  
is here “*fellow-servant*,” and in Philem. 23,  
“*fellow-prisoner*,” whereas Epaphras is  
here, ch. i. 7, merely a “*fellow-prisoner*,”  
and in Philem. 23, a “*fellow-worker*.”  
His view is, that the Apostle’s friends  
may have voluntarily shared his imprisonment by turns: and that Aristarchus may  
have been his fellow-prisoner when he  
wrote this Epistle, Epaphras when he  
wrote that to Philemon. “*Fellow-prisoner*” belongs to the same image of  
*warfare*, as “f*ellow-soldier*,” Phil. ii.  
25; Philem. 2. **Mark**] can hardly  
he other than John Mark, compare Acts xii.  
12, 25, who accompanied Paul and Barnabas in part of their first missionary  
journey, and because he turned back from  
them at Perga (ib. xiii. 13; xv. 38), was the subject of dispute between them on  
their second journey. That he was also  
the Evangelist, is matter of pure tradition, but not therefore to be rejected.  
**cousin**] not ‘*sister’s son*:’—this is a mistake, or at all events, as has been suggested,  
an obsolete way of expressing the relation  
which we know as *cousin*. **touching  
whom** .. .] What these commands were,  
must be left in entire uncertainty. They  
had been sent previous to the writing of  
our Epistle, but from, or by whom, we  
know not. They concerned Marcus, not  
Barnabas: and one can hardly help connecting them, associated as they are with  
*the command following*, with the dispute  
of Acts xv. 38. It is very possible, that  
in consequence of the rejection of John  
Mark on that occasion by St. Paul, the  
Pauline portion of the churches may have  
looked upon him with suspicion.

**11. Jesus, which is called Justus**] Entirely unknown to us. A Justus is mentioned Acts  
xviii. 7, as an inhabitant of Corinth, and a  
proselyte : but there is no further reason  
to identify the two. The surname Justus  
was common among the Jews: see for  
example, Acts i. 23. **These alone who  
are of the circumcision** (this leaves untouched the fact that there were other  
*fellow-workers*, not of the circumcision,  
who had been a comfort to him. The  
Judaistic teachers were for the most part  
in opposition to St. Paul: compare his  
complaint, Phil. i. 15, 17) **are my fellow-workers towards the kingdom of God,  
men that proved** (i.e. *inasmuch as they  
proved*. The past tense alludes to some  
event recently passed: to what precisely,