§ 1] FOR WHAT READERS, &c. [ntropvction.   
 Galatia and Phrygia, “confirming all the disciples :” in which journey   
 he could not have omitted the Colossians, had there been a Church   
 there.   
 3. In opposition to the above conclusion, there as been a strong   
 current of opinion that the Church at Colosse was founded by St. Paul.   
 Theodoret seems to be the first who took this view. His argument is   
 founded mainly on what I believe to be a misapprehension of ch. ii. 1,   
 and also on a partial quotation of Acts xviii. 23, from which he infers   
 that the Apostle must have visited Colosse in that journey, adducing   
 the words, “he went through the country of Phrygia and Galatia,” but   
 without the additional clause “confirming all the disciples.”   
 4. The same position was taken up and very elaborately defended by   
 Lardner. His arguments are chiefly these:   
 1) The improbability that the Apostle should have been twice in   
 Phrygia, and not have visited its principal cities.   
 2) The Apostle’s assurance of the fruitful state of the Colossian   
 Church, ch. i. 6, 28: ii. 6, 7.   
 8) The kind of mention which is made of Epaphras, shewing him not   
 to have been their first instructor: laying stress on the “even as ye   
 also learned” (the also is not in any of our oldest authorities) in   
 ch. i. 7, and imagining that the recommendations of him at ch. i. 7, 8,   
 iv. 12, 18, were sent to prevent his being in ill odour with them for   
 having brought a report of their state to St. Paul,—and that they are   
 inconsistent with the idea of his having founded their Church.   
 4) He contends that the Apostle does in effect say that he had   
 himself dispensed the Gospel to them, ch. i. 21—25.   
 5) He dwells on the difference (as noted by Chrysostom in his Pref.   
 to Romans, but not with this view) between St. Paul’s way of address-   
 ing the Romans and Colossians on the same subject, Rom. xiv. 1, 2;   
 Col. ii. 20—23; and infers that as the Romans were not his own converts,   
 the Colossians must have been.   
 6) From ch. ii. 6, 7, and similar passages as presupposing his own   
 foundership of their Church.   
 7) “If Epaphras was sent to Rome by the Colossians to enquire after   
 Paul’s welfare, as may be concluded from ch. iv. 7, 8, that token of   
 respect for the Apostle is a good argument of personal acquaintance.   
 And it is allowed, that he had brought St. Paul a particular account of   
 the state of affairs in this Church. Which is another argument that   
 they were his converts.”   
 8) Ch. i. 8, “who declared unto us your love in the Spirit,” is   
 “another good proof of personal acquaintance.”   
 9) Ch. iii. 16, as shewing that the Colossians were endowed with   
 spiritual gifts, which they could have received only from an Apostle.   
 10) From ch. ii. 1, 2, interpreting it as Theodoret above.   
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