important one); **but** (contrast, as in ch. ii.  
12, to the suppressed but imagined opposite  
case) **if any man knoweth not how to preside  
over his own house** (shews, by his children  
being insubordinate, that he has no skill  
in domestic government)**, how shall he**  
(this future includes ‘*how can he,*’ but  
goes beyond it—appealing, not to the man’s  
power, which conditions his success, but to  
the resulting matter of fact, which will be  
sure to substantiate his failure) **take charge  
of the church of God** (“he who knows  
not how to administer small things, how  
can he be entrusted with the charge of  
better and divine things?” Theodoret)**?**

**6.]** (The negative characteristics are  
resumed) **Not a novice** (a new convert. An  
objection has been raised to this precept,  
that it could hardly find place in the apostolic church, where all were *new converts.*It has been answered, that in Crete this  
might be so, and therefore such a precept  
would be out of place in the epistle to  
Titus, but the Ephesian church had been  
many years established. But it has been  
again rejoined to this, that the precepts are  
perfectly general, not of particular application. The real reply is to be found, partly  
by narrowing the range of the meaning of  
a new *convert,* partly in assigning a later  
date to these Epistles than is commonly  
held. The case here contemplated is that  
of one *very recently* converted. To ordain  
such a person to the ministry would, for the  
reason here assigned, be most unadvisable.  
But we cannot imagine that such period  
need be extended at the most to more than  
three or four years, in cases of men of full  
age who became Christians; and surely  
such a condition might be fulfilled by any  
of the Pauline churches, supposing this  
Epistle to bear any thing like the date  
which I have assigned to it in the Introd.  
§ ii.)**, lest being besotted with pride** (the  
word used is derived from a substantive signifying *smoke* or *steam*; and hence metaphorically, the pother which a man’s pride  
raises about him so that he cannot see himself or others as they are. Hence the verb,  
which is used only in this metaphorical  
sense, means to be thus blinded, or bewildered, with pride or self-conceit) **he fall into  
the judgment of the devil** (these last words  
are ambiguous. **Is of the devil** [1] the  
genitive objective, ‘*the judgment into which  
the devil fell*,’—or [2] the genitive subjective, ‘*the judgment which is wrought by the  
devil?’* [1] is held by Chrysostom and  
many others ancient and modern [“into the  
same condemnation which came on *him* for  
his madness,” Chrysostom]. [2] is held by  
Ambrose and others. Matthies says, “Ifa  
Christian church-overseer allowed himself to  
be involved in a charge of pride, the adversary (i.e., in the concrete, living men, his  
instruments) might by it have reason as  
well for the accusation of the individual as  
for inculpation of the congregation: compare ch. v. 14, Eph. iv. 27.” In deciding  
between the above, one question must first  
be answered: are we obliged to preserve  
the same character of the genitive in verses  
6 and 7? because, if so, we must manifestly  
take [2]: for the words there [see below]  
cannot bear any other meaning than ‘*the*  
[reproach and] *snare which the devil lays.*’  
This question must be answered, not by any  
mere consideration of uniformity, but by  
careful enquiry into the import of the substantive **judgment**. I conceive we cannot  
understand it here otherwise than as a  
*condemnatory sentence.* This being so, it  
must be remembered that it is not the  
prerogative of the *devil* to *judge* or to  
*condemn,* and that sense [2] is by this  
negatived. From the use of the decisive  
word **judgment**, I infer that it cannot be  
an act of the adversary which is here  
spoken of, but an act in which “*the ruler  
of this world* **has been judged.”** Then as  
to uniformity with ver. 7, I should not be  
disposed to make much account of it. For  
one who so loved similarity of external  
phrase, even where different meanings were  
to be conveyed, as St. Paul, to use the  
genitives in “*judgment of the devil*,” and  
“*snare of the devil*,” in these different  
meanings, is surely nothing which need  
cause surprise:—**of the devil** is common to  
both: the devil’s condemnation, and the  
devil's snare, are both alike alien from the  
Christian, in whom, as in his divine Master,