expression, *“the spirit of error.”* The  
spirits are none other than the spirits of  
evil, tempting, energizing in, seducing,  
those who are described, just as *the Spirit*directs and dwells in those who abide in  
the faith), **and teachings of demons** (doctrines taught by, suggested by, evil spirits :  
compare James iii. 15. Two wrong interpretations have been given: (1) understanding the genitive as objective, *‘teach-  
tings concerning dæmons ;*’ so Mede and  
Heydenreich, which latter calls the term  
‘a characteristic designation of the EsseneGnostic false teachers, who had so much to say of the higher spirit-world, of the æons,  
&c.:’—but against the context, in which  
there is no vestige of allusion to idolatry  
[notwithstanding all that is alleged by  
Mede], but only to a false and hypocritical  
asceticism: (2) applying the agency to the  
false teachers, who would seduce the persons under description ; but this is without example harsh and improbable) ; **in the** (following in the ...., in giving the element,  
in which: see below) **hypocrisy of those  
who speak lies; of men branded** (with the  
foul marks of moral crime: a form of expression often found in secular writers. The verb used in the Greek is properly to  
burn in a mark with a branding-instrument of hot iron. The idea seems to be, as Ellicott explains it, that ‘ they knew the  
brand they bore, and yet, with a show of  
outward sanctity, they strove to beguile  
and seduce others, and make them as bad  
as themselves’) on their **own conscience**  
(these false teachers are not only the organs of foul spirits, but are themselves  
hypocritical liars, with *their own* consciences seared by crime); **forbidding to marry** (this description has been thought  
by some to fit the Jewish sects of Essenes  
and Therapeutæ, who abstained from marriage. But the abstinence by and by mentioned seems too general to suit the idea  
that they were Jews [see below]: besides  
that the Epistle does not describe them as  
*present—*but as to *come* in after times),  
(**commanding**) (not expressed in the original. See a like ellipsis, in which a second but logically necessary verb is omitted, and  
must be supplied from the context,—in ch.  
ii. 12; 1 Cor. xiv. 34) **to abstain from meats**  
(compare Col. ii. 16. It does not appear  
here from what sort of food this abstinence  
would be enjoined: but probably the eating of flesh is alluded to. Eusebius quotes  
from Irenæus [i. 28] a description of men  
who called themselves Abstainers, or Temperance men, who preached celibacy and abstinence from eating flesh, These seem  
to be the persons here pointed at: and  
though the announcement of their success  
in after time is prophetic, we may fairly  
suppose that the seeds of their teaching  
were being sown as the Apostle wrote. The  
existence of gnosticism in its earlier form  
is certainly implied in ch. vi. 20: and in 2  
Tim. ii. 17, 18, we find that denial of the  
resurrection which characterized all the  
varieties of subsequent gnosticism. See  
the whole subject discussed in the Introd.  
ch. vi. § i. 12 ff.), **which God created unto  
participation with thanksgiving for those  
who believe and have [received the]  
(full) knowledge of the truth.** This last  
description of the worthy partakers of  
God’s bounties is Well explained by Calvin,  
saying that though pours forth His  
bounties on the just and unjust, it is only  
the faithful who are truly restored to that  
inheritance of the world which Adam had,  
but lost. On the words, **with thanksgiving,** see 1 Cor. x. 30: and below on  
ver. 4.

**4,5.**] *Reason for the above  
assertion.* **Because** (**because** is more the  
objective,**—for**, which follows, the subjective causal particle: **because** introduces  
that which rests on a patent fact, as here  
on a Scripture quotation, —for, that which