

THE  
PULPIT COMMENTARY,

EDITED BY THE  
VERY REV. H. D. M. SPENCE, D.D.,  
DEAN OF GLOUCESTER;

AND BY THE  
REV. JOSEPH S. EXELL, M.A.

---

GALATIANS.

*Exposition*

BY THE REV. PREBENDARY E. HUXTABLE, M.A.,  
LATE SUB-DEAN OF WELLS AND VICE-PRINCIPAL OF WELLS THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE.

*Homiletics*

BY REV. PROFESSOR T. CROSKERY, D.D.

*Homilies by Various Authors.*

REV. W. F. ADENEY, M.A.                      REV. R. M. EDGAR, M.A.  
REV. R. FINLAYSON, B.A.

*NEW EDITION.*

FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY

LONDON AND NEW YORK

1907

# THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE GALATIANS.

---

## INTRODUCTION.

---

### GALATIA.

GALATIA was a tract of country lying on the northward part of that elevated tableland which forms the central portion of the great peninsula we call Asia Minor. On the south, those uplands rest upon the long range of the Taurian Mountains running more or less parallel with the coast. On the north, they are upreared, first by the Olympus range, which, commencing in the neighbourhood of Prusa (now *Brusa*), pursue a generally eastward direction, until, after being pierced by the river *Ancharias* (*Akaria*), which rises in those highlands, they are continued by the *Aladag* and *Ulgaz* Mountains as far as the *Halys* (*Kizil-Irmak*). Anciently these lands were to a considerable extent occupied by the Phrygians, then deemed, according to Homer ('*Iliad*,' iii. 185—190), one of the finest races of mankind. But in the earlier part of the third century before Christ, hordes of Gauls, after a detachment of their hosts had been repulsed in an attempt to swarm into Greece, had managed to cross the Hellespont (B.C. 279), and had poured themselves upon the western districts of Asia Minor, carrying havoc and rapine in every direction. With the details of their ensuing history we need not trouble ourselves. It is sufficient to remark that at length these wild tribes got bounded in within the limits of that country to which they gave their own name, being a district which they had wrested from its former Phrygian occupants. In the year B.C. 189 they were conquered by the Roman general, Cn. Manlius Vulso. The Romans, however, found it advisable to allow them for a long time to remain to a considerable degree independent, under princes of their own. One of these was the Deiotarus whose name is familiar to the readers of Cicero as a friend and a useful ally of his when Proconsul of Cilicia, and as afterwards defended by him, in his '*Oratio pro Rege Deiotaro*,' when arraigned before Julius Cæsar on the charge of attempting to assassinate him. This Deiotarus,

B.C. 65, first united the Galatians under one sovereign. On the death of a successor of his, Amyntas, B.C. 25, Galatia, with the addition of some neighbouring districts, was constituted into a Roman province under a governor.

In consequence of this it came to pass that the term *Galatia* is used in a wider and in a narrower sense. It sometimes designates the country properly so called; sometimes, the Roman province made up of this Galatia and other districts added thereto, which were different at different times. At the period we are now concerned with, these additional districts were Lycaonia, Isauria, and a portion of Pisidia; all lying to the south-west and south of Galatia proper. If the term as used by St. Paul denotes the country which was coextensive with the Roman province of that name, we might reckon the Churches of Antioch of Pisidia (now *Yalobatch*), as well as those of Iconium (*Konieh*), Derbe, and Lystra, cities of Lycaonia, as among "the Churches of Galatia." This hypothesis, however, is shown by Bishop Lightfoot ('Galatians: the Churches of Galatia'), as well as by others, to be untenable. It is the prevailing opinion of critics, and may be confidently assumed as the fact, that the word "Galatia" is used by the apostle with reference to this country in its stricter and more proper sense.

At this time the Galatians were divided into three septs. (1) The Troemi, occupying the easternmost position, on the right bank of the Halys, their capital being Tavium. Not far beyond their eastern border lay Comana (now *Tokat*), consecrated by being the sleeping-place of St. Chrysostom and of Henry Martyn. (2) Next came the Tectosages, whose capital city, Ancyra (*Angora*), the capital also of the Roman province, lay a little north of the very midmost part of the peninsula of Asia Minor; it was famous in ancient times, as it is now, for the soft camlet fabrics woven from the fine hair of its goats. (3) Westernmost were situated the Tolistoboi, or Tolistobogii, whose capital, Pessinus, situated south-westward from Ancyra, lay under Mount Dindymus, and was world-famed as being the chief centre of the worship of Cybele, the mother of the gods; "Dindymene" (Horace); "cui Dindyma curæ" (Virgil); the worship the report of which was blazed abroad everywhere by reason of the hideous self-mutilation of some of its priests, "Galli," or "Corybantes," and for the frenzy of its devotees, excited by hautboys and bronzen timbrels ("Corybantia æra").

It has been stated that the Gauls gave the district which they occupied their own name. In explanation of this, we must observe that *Galat* is the form under which the name, which in Latin is *Gall*, commonly appears in Greek authors after the time of Herodotus, in whose 'Histories' it appears as *Kelt*. The *Galliæ* of Europe, both Cisalpine (*Lombardy*) and France, were each of them by the Greeks called *Galatia*. In fact, the "Galatia" now before us was a third *Gaul*. It is to be further observed that when St. Paul, writing at the close of his life from Rome, tells Timothy (2 Tim.

iv. 10) that Crescens was gone to Galatia, the word was commonly, and perhaps rightly, taken by Greek commentators, as referring to a European Gaul, and not to that in Asia Minor. *Galat* has very much the appearance of being the very word *Kelt* slightly varied in its utterance; but it is not quite certain that it is so; it may rather be the case (Bishop Lightfoot thinks) that *Galat* and *Kelt* were diverging forms of the same word, applied to different branches of the Celtic race. It has been surmised that both exhibit the same root as *Gall*, with a Celtic suffix.

It is interesting to observe that the Gauls embosomed in Asia Minor retained with "Celtic tenacity" their own original tongue to so great an extent that their language is declared by Jerome, in the Introduction to his Commentary on the Epistles, to be in his own time, which was more than three centuries later than St. Paul, very much the same (*eadem fere*) as he had heard spoken by the Gauls at Trèves. They used, however, the Greek language as well, for which reason they were at times called by the Romans Gallo-Græci. Indeed, the Greek tongue, which under the empire got to be used even in Rome itself more customarily than Latin, was in vogue, as Jerome likewise observes, all over the East. They were thus bilinguals at least—not a few also, no doubt, being acquainted with the language of their Roman masters as well. Such was beyond question the case of many of the countries subject to the Roman empire (comp. John xix. 20). Thus when Paul and Barnabas were visiting the neighbouring country of Lycaonia, they no doubt addressed the people in Greek, assured of being understood by them; while they themselves failed to catch the import of the cries uttered by the Lycaonian populace, who in their excitement reverted quite naturally to their own more native speech (Acts xiv. 11—14).

*The Galatic Land.* It is noticeable that St. Luke does not use the word "Galatia" at all. He twice finds occasion to specify the district, and in both instances he names it "the Galatic Land" (Acts xvi. 6; xviii. 23). No doubt he found this designation of it already in use, though no instance of its occurrence elsewhere has been produced, and chose to employ it in preference to "Galatia," in order to make it more immediately obvious to the Roman readers to whom he was addressing his narrative, that it was not the entire Roman province of the name that he was now referring to. So also then he uses the term "Phrygia" in both cases in close connection with "the Galatic Land," there being no Roman province so called. He thus conjoins the two, as being linked together by a certain measure of identity in their populations; for in all probability not a few of the original Phrygian inhabitants still dwelt in the country, though now forming a stratum of population subordinate to that of their Gallic conquerors. At all events, "the Galatic" had originally formed a part of the country of the Phrygians.

## RELIGION OF THE GALATIANS.

The Gallic invaders do not appear to have at once adopted the worship of Cybele; for when, in the third generation after the conquest, they were attacked by the Romans, the Phrygian priests of Cybele met the Roman general, clad in the robes of their office, and chanting wild strains of prophecy, in which they announced to him that the goddess approved of his enterprise, and would make him the master of the country (Lightfoot, quoting Livy, xxxviii. 18; Polybius, xxii. 20). Perhaps this prediction had later the effect of making the Gauls, through its accomplishment, more ready to submit to the claims made on behalf of the goddess to their homage. At all events, they appear subsequently to have embraced her worship most cordially. The fervid fanaticism of her rites would naturally present a great attraction to the temperament of a people so excitable as they were. Among the inscriptions found at Pessinus, as also at Comana (*Tokat*), there are several, Bishop Lightfoot observes, specifying priests of Cybele by names which are evidently Gaulish. Her worship lingered long in this its old home: the Emperor Julian found it still subsisting there, and tried hard to revive this, as well as other Gentile cults, into renewed vigour. The Galatians, however, served other gods as well (ch. iv. 8). At Tavium the principal object of worship was a colossal bronze statue of Zeus. At Ancyra there was a magnificent temple of Augustus in white marble, still subsisting in ruins. As their Lycaonian neighbours recognized Hermes as one of their divinities as well as Zeus, we may well believe that his cult also was accepted by these Gauls; both were adopted from the Phrygians, the former possessors of the soil, together with probably much, at least, of their other idolatrous worship. As being a less civilized race than that which they dispossessed, they might have been on that account the more ready to lend an ear to their religious teaching, especially since these idolatrous cults were very commonly localized, and consequently claimed to be taken on by the new-comers along with the places to which they were attached. They had besides brought with them forms of religious or idolatrous observance of their own, which, after the manner of idolaters, they would more or less amalgamate with those others; but of these we know nothing.

## JEWS IN GALATIA.

Amongst these idolatrous nations there was scattered far and wide a large diffusion of Jews, forming, in respect to the spread of the gospel, a most important element of the population. In addition to circumstances tending, here as elsewhere, to their diffusion, it appears that there were some which in Asia Minor were especially operative. Antiochus the Great, King of Syria, before he was compelled towards the close of his long reign to give way in the year B.C. 191 before the advancing power of Rome, held sway over a wide belt of country reaching from the shores of the Ægean

right across the continent as far as beyond Babylon. And we learn from Josephus ('Ant.,' xii. 3, 4) that this king, with a view to the consolidation of his power, ordered his general Zeuxis to remove two thousand Jewish families from Mesopotamia and Babylon into Lydia and Phrygia, and to locate them "in the castles and places most convenient;" at the same time securing to them the free exercise of their religion, making them grants of land for building homes and for husbandry, and conferring various immunities indicative of his confidence in their loyalty to his government. If this scheme was fully carried out, it would infer the implantation in those countries of a population of not less than ten thousand people. Some of these could hardly fail of becoming established in Galatia. It is, indeed, quite supposable that the disquiets in these parts of his dominions which, as he tells Zeuxis, led him to adopt this measure, had their origin in part in the turbulent spirit of the Gauls recently settled in Asia Minor or still roving about unsettled. At all events, these Jewish settlements in "Phrygia" would become nuclei, sending forth ramifications which would quickly spread in districts so fertile as Galatia was. That Jews did abound in the Galatic region in particular is evinced by another fact recorded by Josephus ('Ant.,' xvi. 6, 2), who tells that by Augustus's command a copy of an address which he had received from the Jews, together with a decree of his issued in consequence of it, which ensured to them protection in their religious observances, was inscribed upon a pillar in his temple at Ancyra, the capital of the province. Accordingly, we find in the history of the Acts abundant proofs of the great influence which the Jews were able to exercise in all these parts of Asia Minor of whose evangelization St. Luke has given any details; and the like may be presumed to have been the case in other places his references to which are only brief and allusive. The important influence of the Jewish population of "those parts" (Acts xvi. 3) is further shown by the circumstance that, in consideration thereof, St. Paul at Lystra or Iconium thought it advisable to circumcise Timothy to facilitate his evangelizing work.

*Roman roads.* The spreading abroad of the now commercial people of the Jews was favoured by the accommodation which the Roman government provided for easier locomotion, in the roads it built intersecting these countries of Asia Minor in all directions, and they are particularized (we are told) in the Itineraries, and some of them are still in existence. These passed through Gordium, formerly the capital city of Phrygia, and still in those days an important centre of traffic, lying on the north-western frontier of Galatia, and went out by Tavium, another important centre of commerce on the eastern side. These roads had no doubt much to do with the direction of the course which St. Paul took in his three great journeyings in Asia Minor. On this subject the reader is referred to the interesting and highly illustrative chapters in Conybeare and Howson's work on St. Paul, in which Dean Howson follows up the apostle's travels in those countries (ch. vi.—viii.).

*The Jewish tincture of the Epistle.* Attention has been drawn by Dr. Jowett and others to the especially Jewish character which in this Epistle marks St. Paul's reasonings and style of illustration. And this has been supposed to favour an inference which has been deduced from ch. iv. 9, that the persons he addresses were to a great degree actually Jews. This inference, however, itself rests, as I venture to think, upon a mistaken view of the apostle's meaning in that passage (see note, *in loc.*); while further he expressly affirms, in the immediately preceding verse, that the Churchmen he is writing to had before their conversion been in bondage to gods which were really no gods. Moreover, that they were Gentiles is clearly implied in ch. ii. 5, "That the truth of the gospel might continue with you," and is rendered certain by their not having been circumcised, but only solicited to receive circumcision (ch. v. 2, 3; vi. 12). The Jewish tincture which St. Paul feels at liberty to give to his discourse admits of being more satisfactorily explained by other considerations, which have not, so far as I have observed, been sufficiently taken into account.

The method which the apostle uniformly pursued in his work of evangelizing the heathen, that is, by addressing in each place "the Jew first," was both justified and recommended for his adoption by the consideration that Jewish converts might be expected to supply the most ready and, when genuine believers, the most reliable instruments for the religious guidance in the first instance of the newly formed Churches. The new economy was professedly based upon the old, being in fact its proper and its all along designed development; so that "the scribe disciplined to the kingdom of heaven" stood in a position, relatively to other Christians, pre-eminently favourable for being qualified to instruct his brethren drawn from the Gentiles: out of his already well-filled treasure he could bring forth things old as well as new (Matt. xiii. 52). The "old things" were familiar to his hand, and when illuminated and more completely vitalized by combination with the new, were immediately available for the most effective enforcement of the doctrine of Christ.

*First presbyters mostly Jewish converts.* We read in the Acts that when Barnabas and Paul, retracing their steps homewards, visited Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch of Pisidia, confirming the souls of the disciples, they appointed for them elders in every Church (Acts xiv. 21—23). We read this at first with some surprise; how was it possible that communities composed of converts so recently made, and after the small amount of Christian instruction which was all they could have possibly received, should be able to supply men qualified to take the lead in teaching as well as in practical guidance? Having in view bodies of converts in the present day gathered in by our own missionaries, for example in India or in China, it strikes our minds that the appointment to the presbyteral office of neophytes so recent would seem to be a measure which, if unavoidable, would, however, be fraught with great hazard. But our embarrassment is greatly relieved when we recall to mind the converts from the synagogue. Here were men

—Apollos, for example—who from their earliest years had been familiar with those sacred writings which were able, as St. Paul reminds Timothy, to make men wise unto salvation through faith in Christ Jesus; so that when the way of God had been carefully expounded to them, they would find themselves, under the Spirit's guidance, thoroughly equipped, as in fact Apollos proved himself, as men of God for every work of the ministry (2 Tim. iii. 16, 17). We cannot help feeling persuaded that it was in the main from this rank of converts that those presbyters were chosen. And obviously the same consideration applies to those who had been appointed to "teach in the Word" the members of the several Galatian Churches (ch. vi. 6). They too, we may confidently assume, were in most or many cases converts from the synagogue.

*The Old Testament the only Scriptures, and handled after the methods of Jewish schools.* Further, we must bear in mind that now and for some time later the only Scriptures which Sunday by Sunday furnished those sacred readings, which in the Christian assemblies, after the model of the sabbath services of the synagogue, formed the basis of expository comment and of exhortation, were the same as those referred to by the apostle in the passage just above cited, that is to say, they were the Scriptures of the Old Testament. In these their teachers searched for and found, and by these they delighted to illustrate, those truths relative to our Lord's personal history, which were embodied in the brief summary of Christian faith instilled into the mind of the Church (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4, "According to the Scriptures"). The histories of the Old Testament, its prophecies, its devotional utterances, the precepts of the Mosaic Law itself as illustrative of spiritual principles (1 Cor. ix. 9), were, we feel certain, each successive Lord's day presented to the view of the Christian brotherhood, by men of originally Jewish culture, but adding to that culture, and so qualifying it, the all-important elements of the truth of the gospel. Now, it is obvious to suppose that, in the hands of such teachers, the *methods* of Biblical comment and illustration would to a very great extent be the same as they had been familiar with previously to their conversion, from their rabbinical education in the Jewish schools and from the synagogue preaching.

It is, of course, not meant that these readings and expositions of the Old Testament constituted the whole of the service, or of even the public addresses, on the Lord's day. Without importing into our conception of the Church life of just this time the features which mark it in the portraiture given fifty years later by Pliny, in his celebrated letter addressed to the emperor from Bithynia, we are able, however, to form some notion of its nature from glimpses afforded by the Acts and the Epistles. And forming our judgment from these, we cannot doubt that the Holy Eucharist was celebrated at least every Sunday, and probably oftener; that more or less in connection with this, the feast called Love (*Agapé*) was held, furnishing opportunity for religious converse; also that "psalms and hymns and spiritual songs" were sung or chanted (Eph. v. 19). Moreover, those



who had gifts of prophesying and of speaking in tongues had opportunity given them of employing their gifts for the good of their brethren (1 Cor. xiv.); and prayers were offered up which all could take part in or express sympathy with. Thus the reading and expounding of the Old Testament Scriptures by no means formed the whole or even, perhaps, the main part of the business of these fraternal assemblies. But neither, again, need we suppose that the reading of those Scriptures with instruction founded upon them was confined, as it perhaps was in the synagogue (Acts xv. 21), to one day in the week. In those days of early religious fervour, and of thirst for the "spiritual milk which was without guile," meetings for social worship and mutual instruction were, we may well believe, held from day to day and from house to house, at which there would be going on a perpetual repeating and inculcating of the ideas and words of Scripture, with still the same Jewish tincture in the mode of expression and of illustration.

*This had been going on now for some years.* Now, when the apostle wrote this letter of his to the Galatians, this instilling into the minds of the Gentile converts of Christian truths clothed in the garb of Jewish thought had been going on, in some at least of the Galatian Churches, for not less than five or six years. By which time these disciples, with the quickness and vivacity of intelligence which then, as Cæsar tells us, characterized the Gallic temperament, even as they do now, must have imbibed so much of Jewish theological thought Christianized as would qualify them readily to apprehend and assimilate any such trains of thought and reasoning as those which we find in this Epistle. Their case was different from that of the Thessalonian believers when the apostle wrote his two letters to them: these last were not yet prepared to receive instruction couched in those forms—their conversion from heathenism was too recent; and accordingly in those two Epistles we do not find it. But the Galatian converts stood in a different position, as did also the Roman Christians (Rom. vii. 1), and the Corinthian (1 Cor. x. 1, 11, and *passim*), and those to whom was sent the encyclical letter which we know as the Epistle to the Ephesians (Eph. iv. 2; v. 30; vi. 2); all these, though mainly Gentiles, were become, by the time those letters were sent to them, familiar with the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and could be addressed as being so.

#### CHURCHES OF GALATIA.

In Galatia there does not appear to have been any one city which St. Paul made his head-quarters for evangelistic work in any such way as in Asia he made Ephesus his head-quarters, and in Achaia Corinth. We have no mention of Pessinus, or of Ancyra, or of Tavium. The Epistle is addressed to "the Churches of Galatia," as if there were a number of such Churches, no one of which, perhaps, contained so large a body of members as to give it a distinguishing pre-eminence among the rest. In those days, in

countries over which Christianity was extensively diffused, each considerable town, or village even, had its own several "Church" presided over by presbyters of its own, and in organization independent of the others. We read, for example, of "the Churches of Galatia," "the Churches of Macedonia," and "the Churches of Judæa," but never of (say) "the Church of Galatia," or "the Church of Judæa," or the like. At the same time, no city, however large its entire population, or however numerous the believers dwelling in it, is spoken of as having more than one Church; for example, there was only one Church at Corinth, only one at Antioch in Syria, only one even in Jerusalem, although in this last city, as St. James told St. Paul (Acts xxi. 20), there were "tens of thousands" (*μυριάδες*) of believers. Three centuries later, as we learn from Bingham ('*Antiquities*,' ii. xii. 2), in the peninsula now called Asia Minor, "not much larger" (the author says) "than the Isle of Great Britain," there were, "as appears from the ancient *Notitiæ* of the Church," four hundred "bishops," some of them in towns of quite small size. Now, whatever may be thought of the sense of the word "bishop" in the days of the apostles (cf. Phil. i. 1), there can be no question that, in the fourth century, each several "bishop" betokened a separate Church presided over by him. There were, then, in the fourth century, four hundred Churches in Asia Minor. Considering the size of Galatia, a considerable number of these may be supposed to have appertained to this district, some of them from the days of St. Paul.

*History of the Galatian Churches as gathered from the Epistles.* Of the previous history of these Churches, as also of their subsequent history in the apostolic age, our information is extremely slight. The only particulars which we possess relative to the evangelization of this region are drawn from the Epistle itself. In the fourth chapter the apostle reminds his converts that his preaching the gospel to them at "the former time" (ver. 13) was occasioned by a bodily illness. But whether he means that it was illness that led to his coming among them, or that befalling him whilst already there it necessitated a longer stay than he would otherwise have made, is not quite clear. But the former seems the more probable interpretation. The great salubrity of the northern part of this great inland plateau of which Galatia formed a part is well known (see note on the passage). Next, the apostle makes most grateful acknowledgment of the quite extraordinary enthusiasm of personal attachment which the Galatian converts had then evinced towards him (see ch. iv. 14, 15, and notes). He also adverts, in ch. iii. 2, 5, to their receiving the Spirit, and to the Spirit being supplied to them—expressions which show that in their case, as was indeed very generally the case when the apostle himself first brought the gospel to a new neighbourhood, its testimony had been sealed by the impartation of charisms. Further, the form of expression in ch. iv. 13, "the former time (*τὸ πρότερον*)," implies that there had been another visit afterwards before the writing of the Epistle, and probably only one other. That there had been in this second visit a palpable diminution in the fervour of personal

attachment which had so gladdened his heart in his first visit, is not necessarily implied in the manner in which he expresses himself; for the phrase, "the former time," qualifies no more than the reference to his illness; but since three or four years had intervened, such a change was hardly to be wondered at, especially when we consider the changeableness which is the reverse side to the Celt's enthusiasm in his friendships; though St. Paul, who held the love of his disciples so dear, would naturally feel pained and disappointed if their reception of him then really did show any coldness. The reference which, shortly *after* the writing of this Epistle (as I venture to think), the apostle made to these Churches in 1 Cor. xvi. 1 will have to be considered more fully further on.

*Their history as gathered from the Acts.* Comparing with these indications that which we find bearing upon the subject in the Acts, written probably four or five years later than the Epistle, we find, in perfect accordance so far as it goes with the Epistle, mention made by St. Luke of two visits paid by St. Paul to "the Galatic Land." The first took place in the early part of that great missionary journey which the apostle, after his separation from Barnabas, made in company with Silas. Starting from Antioch, he first visited the Churches already subsisting in Syria and Cilicia. Then going, as appears most likely, through the passes in the Taurus which were called the Cilician Gates (see Conybeare and Howson), most probably in the spring of A.D. 51, the two holy evangelists came to Derbe, Lystra, and Iconium. In this neighbourhood the apostle adopted Timothy into companionship with them in the work. They then "went on their way through the cities [apparently those of Lycaonia and Pisidia], delivering unto them the decrees for to keep, which had been ordained by the apostles and the elders which were at Jerusalem" (Acts xv. 41—xvi. 4). The lapse of some time seems indicated by the manner of expression in Acts xvi. 5, "So the Churches [apparently of the parts just now referred to] were strengthened in the faith and increased in number daily." The sacred historian then adds, "And they went through Phrygia and the Galatic Land, having been forbidden of the Holy Ghost to speak the word in Asia [that is, the Roman province so called]; . . . and came over against Mysia." That is all that St. Luke says about Galatia here. Evidently his main interest in recording this whole journey lies in that introduction of the gospel into Europe which in especial it was designed by Heaven to effect—a subject which occupies his entire attention from this point down to the eighteenth verse of ch. xviii. Hastening on, therefore, to that most especially interesting part of this narrative, he abridges the earlier part of it into the brief statement which has now been cited.

In Acts xviii., beginning from ver. 22, St. Luke proceeds to relate some particulars of another great missionary journey made by the apostle. He is not now accompanied by Silas, but appears to have Timothy with him, together with, no doubt, other associates in the holy enterprise. After "saluting the Church" of Jerusalem, probably in the year A.D. 53 or 54,

“he went down to Antioch; and having spent some time there, he went forth, going through in order the Galatic Land and Phrygia, stablishing all the disciples.” Then, after an interesting parenthesis respecting Apollos, the historian adds (Acts xix. 1), “Paul having passed through the upper country [that is, the upland plateau in the northern part of which the Galatic Land and Phrygia were situated], came to Ephesus.” At Ephesus, as we learn from vers. 8 and 10, he spent upwards of two years, spreading the knowledge of the gospel far and wide in the province of Asia; after which he crossed the sea to visit the Churches previously founded by him in Europe.

#### DATE OF THE APOSTLE'S LEAVING EPHESUS.

In the reference which St. Luke here (Acts xviii. 23) makes to the “Galatic Land,” we observe that, mentioning it as before in conjunction with Phrygia, he now reverses the order in which the two districts are named. This suggests the impression that the apostle approached those countries by a different route from before, one which brought him into the Galatic first. This would be the case if he had ascended the plateau from its eastern or Cappadocian side. A few years later there were believers in Cappadocia so numerous as to call for especial mention by St. Peter in the greeting of his first letter: “To the sojourners of the dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia.” Before starting for that long continuance in the West which probably he had already in view, St. Paul appears to have been anxious to secure in the first instance, so far as he might, ground already occupied. That he made a point of doing this is shown, both by the words, “stablishing all the disciples,” and the phrase “going through *in order* (καθ'εξῆς);” both expressions point to centres of converts already formed. After completing the visitation of the Churches in the Galatic and Phrygia, he probably inspected also the stations of Christian work dotted over other portions of “the upper country”—for example, in Lycaonia and Pisidia—before descending to the lowlands to reach Ephesus. Now, when we consider that this extended tour from Antioch to Ephesus by a circuitous route, involving also frequent detours as well as frequent stoppages necessary in the prosecution of his evangelistic work, means a journey of not much less than a thousand miles, for the most part probably on foot—the traveller a man of by no means robust health, one subject to attacks of illness—we can hardly suppose but that the greater part of a year at the very least must have elapsed from the time of his leaving Jerusalem before he reached the capital of “Asia.” If so, then supposing the visit to Jerusalem to have been A.D. 53 or 54, it was probably not till the spring of 57, perhaps not till the spring of 58 (comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 8), that the apostle left Ephesus for Macedonia.

## WHAT LED TO THE WRITING OF THE EPISTLE.

The manner in which the Epistle opens makes it clear that the apostle addressed himself to the writing of it under the impulse of strong emotion, excited by tidings from Galatia which he had newly received. He had learnt to his grief and astonishment that they were giving heed to certain who would fain "turn the doctrine of the gospel of Christ into its clean contrary," and yielding themselves to their direction.

*The seducers probably not strangers, but Churchmen of Galatia itself.* Who the seducers were the apostle nowhere explicitly states. We read in the Acts (xv. 1) that the Judaizing trouble at Antioch, which occasioned the important conference held at Jerusalem, had originated with "certain men coming down from Judæa." And in the Epistle itself (ch. ii. 12) St. Paul refers to the coming to Antioch of "certain from James" as having, again in that city, led to serious embarrassments indirectly connected with the same great Judaistic controversy. This has suggested to many the surmise that the fomenters of the movement in Galatia, which was manifestly of a Judaizing character, had likewise come from Jerusalem or from Judæa, and some have considered that the apostle's reference in the Epistle to such persons having been the cause of the second trouble at Antioch was a significant though veiled allusion to a similar cause of likewise the Galatian trouble. The existence of this shade of allusion is, however, purely hypothetical, having no ground in what is really written. That "the troublers" had come from Judæa or from any other place out of Galatia is a conjecture both ungrounded and unnecessary. No hint of this is given in any one of the several references which the apostle makes to them: none in ch. i. 7, nor in ch. iii. 1, nor in ch. iv. 17, nor in ch. v. 10—12, nor in ch. vi. 12, 13. The words (in ch. v. 10), "He that troubleth you shall bear his judgment whosoever he be," appear to hint a certain eminence of position held by one or more of these mischievous teachers; and possibly this is also alluded to in the words (in ch. i. 8), "Though we or an angel from heaven preach a different gospel," etc.; but the requirement of either passage is amply met by the supposition that one, or more than one, of the Galatian elders or deacons themselves had committed the offence. This would be only in accordance with what we read in Acts xx. 30, where the apostle warns the Ephesian elders that from among their own selves should men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away the disciples after them. Possibly it may have been this very experience of his, then quite recent, in respect to the Galatian elders, which, together with probably other experiences of a similar kind, prompted that utterance of warning at Miletus. The intimation in ch. v. 12, that it might be a very good thing if those who were unsettling them would even inflict *apocopé* upon themselves, seems far more appropriate and possible on the supposition that they were Galatians who had fellow-countrymen among the priests of Pessinus, than on the supposition that they were persons belonging to other lands. But most

especially the apostle's words in ch. vi. 12, 13 favour the belief that the trouble originated with certain who were themselves Galatians. They are spoken of as "undergoing circumcision" (*περιτεμνόμενοι*: see note; the competing reading, *περιτεμνημένοι*, comes to the same result: they had evidently not been circumcised until they engaged in this movement); moreover, they have no real care for the Law themselves, but only wish to save themselves from the risk of being persecuted—persecuted, that is, through the instigation of Jewish neighbours;—a description wholly inapplicable to persons coming from James or from Judæa.

*The features of the noxious movement.* The mischievous movement, then, appears to have originated with certain Gentile members of these Churches, who had loosened the hold which they had once appeared to have on the fundamental truth, that faith in Christ is the alone and the sufficient ground of justification before God, and were blindly and, so to speak, flounderingly casting about for other means of obtaining justification. The means they were grasping at consisted in obedience to certain selected prescriptions of the ceremonial Law. That they did not mean the adoption of the entire ceremonial institute is shown by ch. v. 3. They had plainly not got to that as yet. Circumcision was indeed being seriously talked about (ch. v. 2), and the passage in ch. vi. 13 favours the belief that some of those most forward in the movement had already made a beginning of submitting to the rite in their own persons. It is distinctly stated that, under their leading, Galatian Churchmen were toying with the observance of "days, and months, and seasons, and years" (ch. iv. 10), with a sort of ignorant but solemn pedantic earnestness which must have been piteous to witness. In what sort of doctrinal statement they formulated their "strange gospel" does not appear. One thing, however, is clear—by some means or other they were instilling the sentiment that faith in Christ needed, in order to completely justify, to be supplemented by some degree of conformity to the ceremonial Law given through Moses. That such was the spirit of their teaching is apparent from the teaching which St. Paul puts forward for the purpose of counteracting it; for to that end he insists upon these two theses—that faith in Christ Jesus is the sole ground on which any, whether Jews or Gentiles, are made sons of God; and that the ceremonial Law was a purely pedagogic and provisional institution, for which there is no longer any place at all in the relations between God and his people. The genius of the movement is also illustrated by the apostle's relating the incident of St. Peter's misguided action at Antioch, and the reasoning by which he himself openly convicted his error. For the mention of this incident would have been irrelevant if it had not involved as its basis the emergence of a similar mode of thought and feeling. The similarity consisted in the fact that Cephas was treating those Gentile believers who did not conform to the ceremonial Law as if they were not standing on the like footing of acceptableness with believers who *were* conforming thereto—the very misapprehension which was now working in the minds of these Galatians, both the

misleaders and the misled. Since on that occasion at Antioch Cephas had most certainly not enunciated in words the doctrine that faith without ceremonial observances was insufficient for gaining acceptance, but only appeared by his actions to be teaching it, it may be surmised that perhaps neither did these Galatian subverters of the gospel *in words* preach their "strange gospel," but simply preached it by their actions; namely, by themselves practising, and by encouraging others to practise, certain Mosaistic observances; by studiously vaunting and glorying in such practices; and by discountenancing and putting out of the pale of fraternal fellowship those who kept aloof from such Mosaism. They perhaps did not directly disown Christ as their Hope of acceptance, but they were turning elsewhere for comfort and joy. Such movements of thought and feeling, especially when embodying themselves in distinguishing badges of outward ceremonial action, are apt in general to be very catching with unwary and unstable souls; and we need, in particular, not wonder that among people of Celtic warmth, fickleness, and impetuosity of temperament, it should have spread with great rapidity from Church to Church, as it seems to have done.

*The attitude of the disevangelized party towards St. Paul.* No tendency of the kind now described could be followed out by any without its rending them away more or less consciously from the guidance of St. Paul. It may, in fact, be considered in no small degree probable that the open detaching of themselves in the eyes of the Jews from discipleship to Paul was, with some of the ringleaders in the movement, one of the objects directly aimed at. It is in this way, as is explained in the notes on the passage, that the otherwise enigmatical statement in ch. vi. 12 meets with its satisfactory interpretation. They therefore allowed themselves to speak detractingly of his apostolic mission: an *apostle* of some sort, they said, he might be; but no such apostle as Cephas was; an authority attached to his leadership of infinitely less account than attached to James, the Lord's brother; there were scores and scores of *apostles* going about, with quite as much claim to be listened to. If any showed themselves unwilling to renounce one who had once been so highly esteemed and loved, they were plied with other considerations. Paul himself, they said, was aiming at the introduction of the adopting of circumcision by his disciples, in the end, when circumstances were ripe for it (ch. v. 11, on which see note): when among Jews, who indeed was more of a Jew than Paul? and then again, let them look at his circumcising Timothy! If any would fain hold fast by Paul, very likely they would, after all, find themselves to be not running counter to his real feelings and purposes, though it might be perhaps something like forcing his hand, if they took the bold step of at once being circumcised. At all events, they might with some plausibility, though certainly with utter falsity, pretend that nothing would be more pleasing to James and the other venerable pillars of the holy mother Church of Jerusalem.

*Comparison of Galatian with Colossian and later defection.* With much

obscurity hanging about the precise nature of the perversion which St. Paul is encountering in this Epistle, thus much is certain: like certain members of another Church in that peninsula four or five years later, they no longer were "holding fast the Head;" "vainly puffed up by their fleshly mind," they were urging their brethren to "subject themselves to ordinances," arbitrarily selected, of outward observances; hoping to find in these mere "shadows" that satisfaction for the requirements of man's sinful soul which was to be found only in Christ (Col. ii. 16—23). Theosophic speculations, such as were rife at Colossæ, are not, however, spoken of by St. Paul in connection with Galatia. In the next two or three centuries a great number of incongruous and monstrous forms of religious teaching and practice flourished with rank luxuriance in the peninsula of Asia Minor, Galatia holding a sad pre-eminence, as well as in neighbouring countries to the east and south-east; schemes of heresy evolved out of endlessly varied intermixtures of cabalistic Judaism and Oriental theosophy with elements of Christian doctrine. The Epistle to the Colossians and the pastoral letters afford indications of some such as already emergent; but the prophetic spirit gave the apostle forebodings of far worse than these to come. If the Head were not held fast, there would be no security against the incursion very quickly of the direst delusions. With trembling anxiety, therefore, the apostle hastens to check at once any tendency to depart from the gospel once for all proclaimed to the world.

*The apostle distinguishes the deceivers from the deceived.* The apostle makes a distinguishable difference between the seducers and their victims. The latter he warns—with stern severity, indeed, but with severity alternating with expressions of yearning affectionateness—that they are falling away from the God who called them to be in the grace of Christ; that they are foolishly yielding themselves to illusive spells; that they are on the eve of falling from grace; that they are being driven away from country and home; that the mother of us all is demanding that the sons of the bond-woman—and such they are becoming—shall be cast out. But those who are subverting the gospel he denounces as anathema; they shall bear their judgment, whosoever they be; as witting maligners of Christ's servants they deserve no better fate than to rank with priests of devils; practising the works of heresy, they shall not inherit the kingdom of God.

#### THE EFFECT PRODUCED BY THE LETTER.

We have no direct evidence to show what consequences ensued from the sending of this letter. It would be hard to believe that it failed of success. Indeed, its preservation to be enrolled among the volumes of the sacred canon would seem to be of itself evidence that it had proved its effectiveness as an arrow of the Messiah's quiver sharp in the heart of his enemies whereby the people had fallen under him. But the present writer ventures to think that the fact that it was successful may be come at in an indirect way.



The apostle, in both of his letters to the Corinthians, mentions, and in the Second especially urges, that a collection should be made on behalf of the poor of Judæa. In the former letter he writes thus: "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I gave order to the Churches of Galatia, so also do ye. Upon the first day of the week let each one of you lay by him in store, as he may prosper, that no collections be made when I come. And when I arrive," etc. (1 Cor. xvi. 1—3). Now, when was it that he had thus given order to the Churches of Galatia?

In the present Epistle he adverts to the relief of the poor of Judæa as a matter which he was wont to make an especial point of promoting. In the second chapter, when giving an account of the recognition which at Jerusalem "those accounted to be pillars" had accorded to himself and Barnabas as ministers of the gospel to the Gentiles, he adds (ver. 10), "Only they would that we should remember the poor; the very thing this which I was even of myself zealous to do." But he makes neither directly nor indirectly any request to the Galatians, that *they* should make a collection for the poor of Judæa. Again, in the sixth chapter he enjoins upon them that they should share with their teachers whatever good things they themselves possess; adding, as if addressing persons who were proving themselves backward in the practice of this duty, a solemn and affecting exhortation to works of beneficence, both towards men in general and especially towards such as are of Faith's household. But here, again, there is no word respecting any collection for the Judæan poor.

In the Second Epistle which he sent to the Corinthians he informs them that he had told the Churches of Macedonia, from whose midst he was then writing, that "Achaia had been prepared for a year past" (2 Cor. ix. 2; viii. 10). This statement needs not to be insisted upon as 'one of literal exactness; neither the apostle himself as is evident, nor the Macedonian brethren to whom that was said, would be likely to regard it as other than an utterance of warm feeling, expressing rather the speaker's general *sensation* of the length of the interval than the result of an exact retrospect. If six or eight months had elapsed since the brethren in Achaia had signified their hearty response to the apostle's proposal to them to make such a collection, the apostle might now, in the sanguineness of his heart, have spoken to those then about him in the way that he here describes. That signification of their hearty response to his application had been coeval probably with their sending to ask him, as 1 Cor. xvi. 1 implies that they had done, in what way he wished them to set about making and forwarding the collection. Now, an interval of (say) eight months would bring us back to the closing portion of his stay at Ephesus. When from Ephesus he signified to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xvi. 8) that he purposed continuing in that city till Pentecost, he was probably writing about the time of Easter (1 Cor. v. 7); and some such interval seems required for the important work which he then anticipated to be lying before him there (1 Cor. xvi. 9). I would next put it to the reader, whether, in pondering 1 Cor. xvi. 2, he

does not feel a certain air of freshness and recency hanging about the fact alluded to in the words, "as I gave order to the Churches of Galatia"—whether the apostle does not mean something like this, "The other day I received from the Churches of Galatia a similar request that I would state to *them* in what manner I wished this business of the collection to be managed, and the reply which I made to them I now make to you."

This is, at all events, the impression which the words convey to my own mind. If it be a just impression, then, taking into account the entire absence in this Epistle to the Galatians of any reference to a proposal of such a collection having been up to that time made to them, the following interpretation of the whole circumstances would seem a coherent and probable one.

Towards the close of the apostle's long abode at Ephesus, but some while before he wrote his First Epistle to the Corinthians, he had formed the plan, after he had visited the Churches in Macedonia and Achaia, of taking a journey to Jerusalem; and having this before him, he wished to set on foot a collection for the poor in Judæa among the Gentile Churches of which he had the oversight in Asia Minor and Europe, the proceeds of which should be taken by himself or by "apostles" of the Churches accompanying himself, when he repaired to the Jewish capital.

This plan was in his mind when that painful account reached him of the wavering allegiance of his Galatian converts to the gospel, which made it necessary to write this letter. With such a danger threatening the vital interests of the Christian cause in that region, it did not seem seasonable to directly moot the question of a collection just then; their attachment to the gospel and to himself as its apostle needed to be re-established in the first instance; not until this had been effected could he hope for a satisfactory response on their part to an appeal of his for a charitable contribution to be forwarded in connection with himself. He refrains, therefore, from asking them in his letter for a contribution. But having, as it were by the way, told them of the request which James, Cephas, and John had made to him that he would remember their poor, and having added how greatly he himself was concerned to do so, he contents himself for the present with taking occasion, from the niggardliness with which they assisted their teaching ministers, to insist emphatically upon the evil consequences to themselves of sowing only to their own selfish gratification, and upon the blessed reward which awaits a persistent course of beneficence; and there leaves it. If the confidence, which he tells them he felt towards them in the Lord that they would after all prove faithful to the gospel, were realized, the hints which he had let fall tending towards the appeal he desired to make would be sure of themselves to bear fruit; they would at any rate pave the way for making it. Meanwhile he must wait in anxious hope for the result, which at present was a matter of infinitely greater importance, of their return to a cordial faith in Christ Jesus.

How deeply the suspense affected him we may in some degree imagine

from the account which he has himself given in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians of the anxiety with which he had awaited Titus's return, when he had despatched him to Corinth to ascertain the effect produced by his first letter, and of the unspeakable relief with which he had heard of their eager and impassioned submission to his remonstrances concerning the incestuous offender (2 Cor. ii. 12, 13; vii. 4-16).

Weeks and weeks would he have to wait before the return of his messengers to Galatia. Who these were we know not, but our minds naturally glance at Timothy, who probably was of Iconium, and Gaius of Derbe, both places in the adjoining district of Lycaonia; also at Luke, of perhaps Antioch; for these with others were in St. Paul's company in this journey (Acts xx. 4); at Titus, too, the reliable messenger later on under somewhat similar circumstances to Corinth. Naturally the apostle would send his letter by one qualified to help forward its effect by wise, faithful, and strong-hearted words of his own. But time would have to be allowed for his letter to do its proper work after it reached Galatia; for it was not one single congregation, but a number of detached Churches, these perhaps not situated very near together, in which the evil leaven had been working; and Galatia was a long way off from Ephesus, Ancyra (*Angora*), the principal city, being as the crow flies three or four hundred miles distant.

We cannot doubt, however, that the period of anxious expectation was ended by the receipt of joyful tidings. What he wrote some months later, on the occasion of Titus's return from Corinth, was (very supposably) dictated by the very remembrance of this happy hour. "Thanks be unto God, which *always* leadeth us in triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest through us the savour of his knowledge *in every place*" (2 Cor. ii. 14). The drooping faith of the Galatians in Christ Jesus their Lord had been revived; they had shaken off the "bewitchment" which had dimmed their view of his all-sufficient grace and had lured them away to the vanities of Judaizing ceremonialism. Breaking with those who had misled them, their personal attachment to the apostle had reasserted itself with even a measure of its former Celtic enthusiasm. And now their cry was what they could do to testify to their Lord and Saviour the sincerity of their repentance and devotion to him; what also to convince their wise and loving father in the gospel that his confidence towards them in the Lord had not been misplaced. For one thing he had incidentally, but perhaps significantly, alluded in his letter to his anxious desire to assist his needy brethren in Judæa. Gladly would they take part in this. In what way would he advise them to make the collection of their contribution? And how should they forward it to Judæa when made?

In some such way as this, it may with probability be surmised, had the apostle been led to give to the Galatian Churches those directions which he, soon after as I think, repeated in his First Epistle to the Corinthians,

## DATE OF THE EPISTLE.

If the above reasonings, from data which are confessedly in some degree problematical, appear, however, to be on the whole approvable, then we arrive at the result that the entire business of the Galatian trouble had been brought to a satisfactory conclusion before the apostle despatched his first letter to the Corinthians. This, as was above stated, he did probably about the Easter-tide of either the year 57 or the year 58. We may, therefore, assume it to be probable that the Epistle to the Galatians was written some time in the winter months preceding that Easter, possibly as late as in the preceding January.

As the Epistle was written after St. Paul had visited Galatia a second time (ch. iv. 13), we are constrained to assign it to this third great journey of his; for it would be doing great violence to the probabilities of the case not to identify the two visits which the language of the Epistle presupposes with the two which are mentioned in the Acts.

An earlier time in the journey has been assumed by some on the ground that the words, "so quickly," in ch. i. 6 mean, "so soon after you were called," or "so soon after I left you." But the phrase probably means simply, "so quickly upon being tempted." See note *in loc.*

The cast of thought and language in this Epistle has so marked an affinity to that in the two Epistles to the Corinthians and the Epistle to the Romans that the critical instinct protests loudly against a longer interval being interposed between its composition and that of any of the other three than the consideration of other kinds of evidence renders necessary.

If we suppose that the Galatian letter was written three or four months before the Easter-tide on which, in great probability, the apostle wrote his first Epistle to the Corinthians, then, since we know that the following Easter-tide found him at Philippi (Acts xx. 6), after leaving Corinth, from which he had despatched his letter to the Romans, it follows that the whole noble quaternion was issued forth to the Church within little more than one year.

It has been shown by Bishop Lightfoot that the comparison of the manner in which identical topics are discussed in these letters severally makes probable, by this branch of internal evidence, the fact, which is attested also so far as the Epistles to the Corinthians are concerned by references contained in them to matters of personal history, that the Roman letter was written the latest of the four. That this is so is due to the character worn by the Epistle to the Romans, as being rather a calm and deliberate treatise, than a letter properly so called evoked by the exigency of particular emergencies.

But this method of argument appears to the present writer to become extremely precarious when it is pushed further than this, for determining the position in point of time of the Galatian Epistle relatively to the two Epistles to the Corinthians. The strife which St. Paul, just at this juncture

of his ministerial career, that is to say, during his third great missionary journey, was called to wage incessantly and strenuously wherever he went with Judaizers, with opponents or corrupters of the doctrine of our free justification through faith in Christ, and with impugners of his own properly apostolical authority, would inevitably have led to the formation in his mind, long before he left Ephesus, of a stock, so to speak, of considerations, phrases, and probative texts, ready to be severally produced in ever-varying grouping, and with varying degrees of fulness in the propounding of them, according to the changing mood of the writer or the shifting entourage of circumstances. There is no ground for imagining that we have in Galatians, or in 1 Corinthians, or in 2 Corinthians, any more than in Romans, tokens of the *earliest* presentment to his mind of any of these objects of thought. On the contrary, they must in all reason be assumed to have been each one of them a good while before quite familiar to his consciousness.

#### OBJECT AND CONTENTS OF THE EPISTLE.

The apostle's object in the Epistle is to recall the Galatians to the gospel which they had at the first received from himself—the unchangeable gospel of justification by the free grace of God, simply through faith in Christ, and not by deeds of the Law. To this end he finds it necessary to make it clear that he had received from Christ, and from no *man*, alike his function as apostle and the message which, as such, he had to deliver,—two points inseparably intertwined.

[This was necessary because, in the earlier part of his ministry in Asia Minor, when acting with Barnabas, and even again when acting with Silas, he had borne the function of an *apostle from men*; whereas in the present stage of his ministry he had been compelled openly to assert, what had all along been the fact, that he was an apostle delegated immediately from Christ, without in this respect any human intermeditation at all. On these two points, namely, the two distinct senses of the word “apostle,” and the circumstances now leading St. Paul to openly assert his apostleship in the higher sense, the reader is referred to the two dissertations which close the Introduction.]

The first chapter is taken up with the proof of the two points above indicated; the second with their illustration.

Ch. i. 1—5. The greeting—clearly distinguished in this respect from the greeting in his two earlier Epistles, those to the Thessalonians—insists upon his apostleship as being of the highest character, while it also devoutly and adoringly holds forth to view the redemptive work of Christ, the great remedy, as the apostle feels, for the evils which he has now to encounter.

Vers. 6—10. “The gospel ye received from me is unchangeable; when in your midst, I told you, and now repeat it, that he that perverts its main essence, whatever his station, must expect nothing less than destruction as an accursed thing.”

Vers. 11, 12. “For I received it directly from God.”

Vers. 13, 14. “It was no part of my early education; I was then an eager Judaist, persecuting the disciples of this gospel.”

Vers. 15—17. “And after God had revealed it to me, I had recourse to no human creature for instruction, but forthwith gave myself to its proclamation.”

Vers. 18—24. “Three years after, not earlier, wishing to acquaint myself with Cephas, I visited him at Jerusalem, and was his guest a fortnight; but saw no other

of the apostles, except James, the Lord's brother, be accounted as such. After that I was discharging the work of my ministry in Syria and Cilicia, having been all the while, from the first, personally unknown to the Churches of Judæa; they only were hearing of me that, without any communication with them, I was preaching the gospel."

Ch. ii. 1—10. Here St. Paul, with reference to the relations which he held to the other apostles, brings out the fact, that when he went to Jerusalem for the purpose in part of comparing his statement of the gospel with that which was presented by "those of reputation," particularly on matters bearing upon the position of Gentile believers towards the Law, what he heard from them in no way modified the doctrine which he taught; they, however, in the most public and marked manner, recognized its truth, recognizing likewise his ministry to the Gentiles as co-ordinate with theirs to the circumcision.

Vers. 11—21. The apostle then draws attention to a remarkable occasion, on which he had made good, to the approval of the Church at Antioch, his position as an apostle compared with that of Cephas, and had by reasoning vindicated his teaching on a matter closely relevant to his present controversy with the Galatians, showing that conformity with the Law of Moses inferred no superiority in a believer, and its neglect no inferiority, for that the cross of Christ had for God's people annihilated the Law. "I identify myself," he had then said, "with the crucified Christ: his death to the Law is my death to the Law; his life in righteousness and joy is my life therein too."

Ch. iii. 1—14. With this thought fresh on his mind, the apostle next addresses himself directly to the case of the Galatians. "Ye too have beheld Christ crucified, and yet now—! Is there witchcraft at work? Tell me, through what received ye the Spirit? Was it not through faith simply resting in the Redeemer? And now are ye perfecting, forsooth, the work of the Spirit by mere carnality? Ye suffered bravely the evils which Jewish bigotry brought upon you because ye would have none of the Law: will you now stultify that confessorship? Your own experience of the outflowing of spiritual gifts and of Divine blessing (ver. 9) was in connection with simple faith in Christ; ye were thus proved to be justified, as Abraham was, by faith. No such blessing comes ever through ceremonial works of the Law; the Law works only a curse; it plainly tells you so; tells you so that ye may find blessing in Christ who bore its curse on our behalf."

Vers. 15—18. "The promise solemnly given to Abraham and his seed, of blessing to come to all nations through Christ, cannot be set aside by the Law given hundreds of years later."

Vers. 19—23. "No doubt the Law had a function divinely assigned to it; but its subordinate position was shown in the very mode of its communication, being given as to beings kept at a distance from God, and making their sin fast till faith should be revealed."

Vers. 24—29. "The Law was our childhood's keeper, till faith should come. Now faith is come, we are become sons of God having put on Christ. Ye Gentiles are Christ's, and thus Abraham's seed, and, according to the promise, heirs of blessing."

Ch. iv. 1—7. The apostle here resumes the position of ch. iii. 24, of the Law being the custodian of God's people's childhood. "We were then treated as mere children, no way our own masters, under the A, B, C, of a worldly religion. But now, through the incarnation and redemption of God's Son, we are made sons in enjoyment of our inheritance; and, what proves our sonship, God has poured into our hearts the joyous free-hearted Spirit of adoption."

Vers. 8—11. "In those days, we at any rate were God's worshippers; but as for you, ye were idolaters: and yet ye, of God's free choice and constraining grace adopted

in among his people, must needs be setting *yourselves*, forsooth, in opposition to his appointments, and must be going back again to that miserable A, B, C, with your '*days, and months, and seasons, and years*'!"

Vers. 12—20. Here follows a passage broken into small bits by strong emotion. Earnest entreaty; earnest assurances that *he* had no quarrel with them,—he had too tender a remembrance of *their* affectionate love to him for *that*: could they suppose *him* to be other than loving to *them*? Others, who were paying them court, had no such tender care for their welfare as he. "O my darling children," he cries, "my soul is in travail for you, that *Christ* may be formed within you, not the Law! Would I knew how best to deal with you!"

Vers. 21—31. Casting about for some line of thought to get hold of them, the apostle bethinks himself of the story of Sarah and Isaac in connection with Hagar and Ishmael, as presenting a kind of allegorical prediction of the two covenants; portraying the supernal Jerusalem and freedom and secure joy on the one side, and Sinai and servitude and imminent expulsion on the other.

Ch. v. 1—4. This leads on to the warning. "We now are free: do not again get held in a yoke of slavery; else ye will find yourselves, as Ishmael, dis severed from Christ and fallen from grace."

Vers. 5—12. Disjointed sentences follow, intermingling terse statements of sweetest doctrine with bewailment of the sad interruption in their once happy career; warning against the contagion of evil; confident hope that they *will* not disappoint his wishes; threatening of judgment upon their troublers; indignant refutation of those men's slanders touching himself; an outflashing wish that they would just make manifest what they really were by self-aversion.

Vers. 13—24. The summary in the first verse, "Ye have been made free men," is here repeated, to form a new starting-point for exhortation conceived in a calmer and more equable mood, and embodying a beautiful contrast between the flesh and its works, and the Spirit and its fruits.

Ver. 25—ch. vi. 10. Warning against vain-glory and combativeness. Exhortation to cultivate mutual tolerance and helpfulness; one's own improvement in place of censoriousness; liberality in maintaining their teachers; diligence to sow, not to one's own flesh, but to the Spirit; perseverance in beneficence.

Ch. vi. 11—18. *Conclusion*. "Those who wish you circumcised do not care about the Law, but only to curry favour with the Jews and escape persecution. But my sole boast is the cross of Christ; and in Christ circumcision and uncircumcision are nothing, renewal of heart everything: joy be with those who feel and act by this rule! Let none dare to harass me any more; for Jesus' marks upon me evidence his presence with me. The Lord be with you, brethren!"

#### LITERATURE.

The literature available on this Epistle is very copious. Among the most helpful may be mentioned the following:—Chrysostom; Jerome; Theodoret; Calvin's 'Commentarius'; Estius, 'In Epistolas'; Cornelius à Lapide; Grotius (in Poli Synopsis); Bengel's 'Gnomon'; Rückert's 'Commentar'; Windischmann's 'Erklärung'; De Wette's 'Handbuch'; Meyer's 'Kommentar'; Bishop Ellicott's 'Critical and Grammatical Commentary'; Bishop Lightfoot's 'Epistle to the Galatians'; Dean Howson, in 'Conybeare and Howson' and in the 'Speaker's Commentary'; Archdeacon Farrar's 'Life and Work of St. Paul.' No student should forget to use Luther's 'Commentarius,' which he fondly and proudly called his 'Catherine de Bora.'

## DISSERTATION I.

## THE IMPORT OF THE TERM "APOSTLE" AS APPLIED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

*The use of the word "apostle" before it was adopted by Christ.* The Greek word ἀπόστολος, of which *apostle* is the Anglicized transliteration, is employed by classical authors to describe a person only in the Ionic Greek of Herodotus—in whose histories it occurs twice (i. 21; v. 38)—in the sense of "envoy," "commissioned messenger." In the Attic form of the language the word is of not unfrequent occurrence, but always with a different meaning; never denoting an individual person, but only "a naval expeditionary force" (Liddell and Scott, 'Lexicon'). In the Greek used among the Jews, the sense of the word as employed by Herodotus, but not, so far as critics have observed, found in any intermediate writer, reappears afresh. Thus in 1 Kings xiv. 6 ("I am sent to thee with hard tidings") we have in the Alexandrine text of the Septuagint, Ἐγὼ εἰμι ἀπόστολος πρὸς σε σκληρός, "I am a hard apostle unto thee." Symmachus, the Jewish translator in the second century of our era, used ἀποστόλους to render the Hebrew word *tsirim* in Isa. xviii. 2, where the Septuagint gives a different rendering of the Hebrew word, though in three other passages (Isa. lvii. 9; Prov. xiii. 17; xxv. 13) rendering it either "ambassador" (πρεσβυτής) or "messenger" (ἄγγελος). It appears from different statements cited by Bishop Lightfoot, in his important remarks "On the Name and Office of an Apostle" ('Galatians,' pp. 92—101), that, at least subsequently to the destruction of Jerusalem, the Jews used the term to designate persons employed to convey circular letters despatched by their authorities; and, in particular, that they so termed the members of a sort of council attending upon their patriarch, assisting him in his deliberations, conveying his orders to Jews at a distance, and collecting of these their contributions to religious objects (Eusebius, 'Montf. Coll. Nov.,' ii. 425; Jerome, 'Comm. ad Gal.,' i. 1; Cod. Theodos. xvi. 'Tit.,' viii. 14; Julian, 'Epist.,' 25; Epiphanius, 'Hæres.,' pp. 128, 134). Now, as we cannot suppose that the Jewish authorities would have chosen to borrow the term from the usage of those whom they regarded as abhorred Nazarene heretics, we are led to infer that Christ, in thus designating the twelve, applied for his purpose a word which was already in vogue among the Jews, and used by them in a signification more or less cognate to that which he himself had in view in his own application of the term.

This conclusion is confirmed by the consideration that, in the Epistle to the Hebrews (iii. 1, 2), the writer, whether St. Paul or one writing under St. Paul's suggestion, applies the term "apostle" to Christ in such a connection as to warrant the belief that he does so as viewing Christ as standing parallel with Moses; leading us on to the further surmise that the Jewish theologians were themselves wont thus to designate Moses himself. That they were accustomed to do so seems probable enough when we consider how frequently the verb ἀποστέλλω is used in the Septuagint Version of the earlier chapters of Exodus with reference to Moses' mission, and compare our Lord's words respecting himself in John xvii. 18.

The review of the confessedly very scanty materials which are at hand relative to the use of the term extrinsically to its application in the Christian Church, brings us to the following as probable conclusions:—

1. That at the period near the commencement of the Christian era it was current as designating an individual person, only in the Greek spoken by the Jews.



2. That the Jews employed it exclusively to designate persons deputed by some eminent authority, and not to describe a mere ordinary messenger.

3. That it was applied exclusively to persons whose mission related to matters connected with religion; so that the term was invested in the minds of those who used it with sacred associations.

In the *New Testament* two kinds of delegation principally denoted by the term. The evidence furnished by all the passages in the New Testament in which the word "apostle" occurs, seems to make good the following statements: that, apart from that application of the term to the Lord Jesus Christ which we have in the Hebrews, it is used in these books with reference to two kinds of delegation only: the one being that which was imparted immediately by Christ himself, without human intervention,—this being the higher kind of apostleship; the other, that which was received from a Church or from Church officials, appointing the recipient to the discharge of some function relating to sacred things.

These two different kinds of delegation constituted two forms of apostleship, which were quite distinct from each other, and operative in, so to speak, different planes of action. Cases, however, might occur in which an apostle of the former class was delegated by a Church to execute a specific commission when the commission thus received would constitute him an apostle of the second class. In such a case the delegate would be an "apostle" in both senses, the two senses still continuing distinct.

*Apostles delegated immediately by Christ.* The only individuals assigned in Scripture to the higher form of apostleship are (1) the "twelve disciples," or "the twelve," who appear so prominently in the Gospels, who, having been elected, and expressly named "apostles" (Luke vi. 13) by our Lord himself early in the course of his earthly ministry, were (with the exception of Judas) confirmed by him afresh in their apostleship (Acts i. 2) after his resurrection; (2) St. Matthias, likewise chosen by Christ himself to fill the place among the twelve vacated by Judas's fall, on one of the ten days following next after his ascension; and (3) St. Paul.

We need not hesitate to assign Matthias to the class of those appointed to be apostles by Christ himself. For they surely misconstrue the narrative relative to Matthias in the first chapter of the Acts, who find therein an election by the eleven themselves of a new twelfth member of their body. For, on the contrary, the eleven appear in the record to have shown themselves especially careful to recognize the fact that it appertained to Christ himself, both to "choose" which of the two disciples, who alone were by their antecedents qualified to be witnesses with themselves of the Lord's resurrection, was the one that, according to the prediction of the psalm, was to "take Judas's office;" and also to "show" to them which it was that he did choose. The *κλήροι* were used for the lot, not for voting. The judgment of the Church respecting this appointment is incidentally shown by Acts ii. 14; vi. 2; for the *twelve* must have included Matthias. "The appointment, being directly Divine, superseded the laying on of hands" (Bishop Jacobson, on Acts i. 26, in 'Speaker's Commentary;,' whose rendering, however, of *συνκατεψηφισθη* by the words, "by vote numbered," is very questionable; the *ψηφος* in the verb being here merely a counting and not a voting pebble).

The characteristics of these apostles may be described as being in the main the following:—

1. They were witnesses of Christ's resurrection, having seen him alive after his passion.

2. They were the chief depositaries of the truths of the gospel, which were imparted to them, either from the lips of Christ himself or through his teaching Spirit, to form Christ's message through them to the world. By them, either themselves personally

or mediately through men standing connected with them and recognized by them, was this gospel to be proclaimed, and the Church community which was founded upon this gospel to be organized and established.

3. They were gifted with an accumulation of miraculous powers, which both were their credentials as Christ's delegates, and enabled them for the discharge of their function.

4. They were the only human beings stately empowered to impart miraculous gifts to other men.

5. They alone of men wielded the rarely exercised miraculous power of inflicting the discipline of bodily suffering, which apparently on one occasion (Acts v.) included the infliction of death.

To them, in short, was assigned an altogether unique position in the kingdom of God—a position which Christ mystically described as a "kingship," in the exercise of which they sat upon thrones, judging the mystical twelve tribes of Israel; and which, in another form of symbol, constituted them the "foundation" on which the Church was built—the "twelve foundations" of the city "New Jerusalem."

In no other persons were these great characteristics seen united as they were united in them: "none dared to join himself unto them," as possessing like supereminent prerogatives. Portions of the offices and of the supernatural gifts which were clustered together in their persons were, it is true, by the Holy Spirit distributed "according to his will" among members of the Church, for its primary establishment and for its permanent life and regulation; and the apostolic function, elevated as it was, was still homogeneous with the character and function of the entire Christian community: nevertheless, the "glorious company of the apostles" stand in the history of the Church unique and alone. Having been "given" for the one specific purpose of founding the Church and fixing the faith which was then "once for all delivered unto the saints," their function, after the analogy of the earthly work of Christ himself, neither needed nor was designed to be perpetuated through successors, whether in one line or in several. In its very *idea* the apostolate was essentially provisional and intransmissible.

*Apostles delegated by the Church.* Passing on for the present from that higher application of the term "apostle," in which it was used to denote one who received his apostolic commission direct from Christ himself without any human intermediation, we have to consider another application of the term which was in vogue in the Christian Church; for we have to observe that, among Christians, the word was frequently applied to messengers proceeding upon some religious errand with credentials of a public mission from this or that Church.

*Use of the word "apostle" in 2 Cor. viii. 23; Phil. ii. 25.* This fact is disguised in the Authorized Version by the word *ἀπόστολος* being twice rendered "messengers" (2 Cor. viii. 23; Phil. ii. 25)—a rendering which removes from the eyes of the English reader an application of the term "apostle" which supplies a valuable clue for the determination of several questions relative to this subject.

*The apostles Andronicus and Junias.* With the two passages last referred to, in respect to both of which there can be no manner of doubt as to the import of the term, we have probably to group some others. In approaching the consideration of these, however, we are confessedly proceeding to ground more or less open to debate.

In Rom. xvi. 7 St. Paul writes, "Salute Andronicus and Junias [or, 'Junia'], my kinsmen [*i.e.* most probably, 'my fellow-Israelites'] and my fellow-prisoners, men such as are of note among the apostles (*οἱ τινὲς εἰσὶν ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις*), who also were in Christ before I was." The noun "Junias" may with probability be taken as a

contraction of "Junias." If the nominative of the proper noun is "Junia," as some suppose, then the two persons may be conceived of as bearing a similar relation to each other and to the Church, to that borne by Aquila and Priscilla, just before mentioned by St. Paul.

The chief point of discussion, however, in relation to this passage lies in the words, "of note [or, 'distinction'] among the apostles." Their most obvious sense is that they were apostles distinguished among others who were such; the form of expression being like "blessed among women," "among those born of women none greater," etc.; and this view is confirmed by its being the interpretation which was without hesitation adopted by the Greek commentators. But the difficulty of explaining how Andronicus and Junias could have been "apostles," both perplexed ancient interpreters, leading some of them to the very improbable surmise that they were two of the seventy sent forth by the Lord—a surmise which would make the following clause very lame and superfluous—and has induced some modern critics of eminence to take the clause differently, viz. as pointing to the estimate formed by the twelve apostles of these two disciples. In confirmation of this latter view, reference is made to two passages in Euripides ('Hippol.' 103; 'Hec.' 379), in which the phrase, *ἐπίσημος ἐν βροτοῖς*, occurs, in the former with reference to a goddess who could not be reckoned among "mortals."

The difficulty, however, found in the more obvious interpretation disappears if we consider that, when a person had been commissioned by a Church as its delegate, and especially if so commissioned more than once, the circumstance would naturally attach to him a special title to respect among the brethren, in consequence of which he might, even after his envoyship had been discharged, still continue to be so styled. Thus high priests who had been deposed from their office still continued to bear the title of high priest. At least, we need not hesitate to admit that St. Paul might use the words in question in the sense of "men distinguished among those messengers that Churches are wont to depute to brethren living elsewhere."

It is very supposable that Andronicus and Junias had been themselves deputed by the Church at Jerusalem to visit Jewish believers in Rome, converted when visiting Jerusalem. Compare the *ἐπιδημοῦντες Ῥωμαῖοι*, "sojourners from Rome," spoken of in Acts ii. 10. Such a supposition, when we take into our view the delicate position which St. Paul himself held towards the ruling minds of the Jerusalemite Church, would seem to accord well with the respectfulness which he so studiously evinces. The term "fellow-captives" does not necessarily infer any personal relations previously subsisting between these two "apostles" and himself; it may denote, no more than that, they having like himself suffered imprisonment, in the service of Christ, he was desirous of testifying at once the sympathy and the respect which on that account he felt towards them.

The passage viewed in this aspect serves to illustrate the manner in which the office of Church envoy was in those days regarded. In particular it transpires from it that the title of "apostle" was a highly honorific one. This tincture of sentiment colouring it and distinguishing it from the more commonplace designation of *ἄγγελος*, messenger, may perhaps be discerned even in the two instances in which it occurs in Herodotus. But at any rate this certainly appears to have been the case when the term as denoting a messenger came to be revived in the later Greek; the fact that its use in this sense was in some degree an archaism very possibly helping to invest it with a certain air of respectfulness; and it may very supposably have been on this account that it was considered the fitting designation to appropriate to persons receiving a commission relative to sacred things.

At all events, in actual fact, not only is this the sense in which alone it is applied in

our sacred books, but its honorific complexion is also in most instances quite distinctly recognizable.

Very clearly may we feel this to be the case in the passage which I before had occasion to cite from the Hebrews (iii. 1). For both must it have seemed to the writer of that Epistle that the designation of "Apostle" was in itself one which it was not unmeet to apply to Christ the Son of God, and also we see it there placed side by side with the title of "High Priest," to the Jewish mind the most exalted of all human functionaries. The considerate reader also of the passages, 2 Cor. viii. 23; Phil. ii. 25; Rom. xvi. 7, cannot but feel that St. Paul regarded it as being a highly honourable distinction among Christians that one should be thought worthy of being an "apostle of a Church."

*The pseudo-apostles at Corinth.* An important illustration of the position held in the Church by those who in this secondary sense were named "apostles," is supplied by the manner in which St. Paul, in the tenth and two following chapters of his Second Epistle to the Corinthians, treats of certain persons who had come among those brethren in this character.

These particular persons, it appears, were "Hebrews" and "Israelites," belonging, that is, to the highest class of Jewish purists, and had come to Corinth bearing credentials of their apostolic mission in the form of "commendatory letters" (2 Cor. iii. 1). This makes it appear a highly probable supposition that they had been sent forth by the Church of Jerusalem, like certain persons referred to in Gal. ii. 12 as having come to Antioch "from James," who through their Israelite prejudices exercised so noxious an influence in the Antiochian Church. This supposition helps to explain their taking so much upon them, backed as they would be by the "Cephas" party and perhaps the "Christ" party in the Corinthian Church. These men St. Paul describes as "sham apostles, treacherous workmen, disguising themselves as apostles of Christ (*ψευδαπόστολοι, έργάται δόλιοι, μετασχηματιζόμενοι εἰς ἀπαστόλους Χριστοῦ*)" (2 Cor. xi. 13). These expressions do not at all warrant the idea that they had not really received the commission which they professed they had received. The apostle writes here in the same sense as he does in ch. ii. 4, where he describes certain persons in the Church of Jerusalem as "sham brethren, unwarrantably brought in, who had unwarrantably come in to spy out our liberty (*τοῖς παρεισδύκτους ψευδαδέλφους, οἵτινες παρεισήλθον κατασκοπήσαι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῶν*);" who, however, no doubt, really were brethren, that is, outwardly members of the Christian brotherhood; only, their inward habits of feeling and thinking were altogether incongruous with their external position as professed believers in Christ. In like manner, we may confidently assume that these *pseudo-apostles* also really were "apostles;" but teaching as they did a different gospel from that which the Corinthians had received from Christ through St. Paul, a falsified gospel which was an inspiration of Satan, and being therefore in reality "ministers of Satan," thwarting Christ's work in Corinth instead of furthering it, their spirit and their mode of action gave the *lie* to their assumed character of being "apostles" in Christ's Church; they were "pseudo-apostles."

Coming, then, as we must believe, to Corinth as "apostles," we learn that they claimed from the brethren there in that character an extravagant amount of deference and of shows of respect, far beyond what St. Paul had himself ever thought of claiming; exacting from them in particular, as is clear from several intimations dropped by the apostle, payment in no moderate measure for their ministerial service. All this is directly pointed at in the words, "Ye bear with a man, if he reduceth you to the condition of slaves, if he eateth you up, if he catcheth you as his prey, if he uplifteth himself, if he smiteth you on the face" (2 Cor. xi. 20). Their enormous exaggeration of their importance as "apostles" suggests to the indignant and disgusted Paul, smarting at the wrong done to his own beloved disciples, the use, two several times (2 Cor. xi. 5;

xii. 11), of that phrase of withering scorn, "Those who are so *super-excessively* apostles (τοὺς ὑπερ-λίαν ἀποστόλους)." It seems strange, by the way, that many interpreters, including even Chrysostom, should have supposed that St. Paul is in these words referring to some of the twelve. In these three chapters the writer's mind appears altogether absorbed by the antagonism between himself and the pseudo-apostles; to none of the venerated twelve does he in these chapters make the slightest reference.

*The professed function of these pseudo-apostles.* It appears to be a form of (professedly) evangelistic agency which is indicated in these chapters as exercised by the "apostles" spoken of—a kind of agency which, in those ages, was undoubtedly much employed by the Church. At times "apostles" were delegated and sent forth by Churches for the discharge of other functions; for example, Epaphroditus appears to have been despatched by the Philippians as "their apostle," to bear to St. Paul a practical expression of their sympathy with him in his imprisonment. The "apostles" mentioned in the eighth chapter of this Epistle to Corinth (ver. 23) were deputed to be treasurers of the alms collected among Gentile Churches for the poor in the Churches of Judæa. But the specific business of the "apostles" now under consideration, as well as very supposably that of Andronicus and Junias mentioned above, seems to have been, at least in part, of a missionary character.

St. Paul seems to have in view such as being the professed and legitimate calling of those pseudo-apostles, when he censures them as he allusively does, as "glorying beyond the measure assigned to them" (2 Cor. x. 15); that is to say, exercising their ministry in a field of labour already occupied by another apostle—an apostle owning a higher mission than theirs in any case could be. Instead of evincing the respect due to him, viewed even as a fellow-worker of their own class of apostleship, they had rudely and insolently sought to thrust him aside in the estimation of the Corinthian Church, in order to make room for themselves; nay—and this touched the inmost feeling of his soul far more than any disrespect shown to himself personally—they sought to thrust aside the gospel which he had delivered to that Church, in order to make room for a gospel which they were themselves bringing. And the gospel wherewith they would fain have replaced his was in some way or other a vitiated gospel: they had in some way tampered with the proper message entrusted to the evangelist, as is implied by his expressions in 2 Cor. ii. 17 and iv. 2—"corrupting," "handling deceitfully the Word of God." What was the precise form of the adulteration is nowhere clearly indicated, neither in these three chapters of direct encounter with these adversaries, nor in that earlier part of the Epistle which is so pervaded by the consciousness of their presence and by *indirect* reference to them. We can only surmise; but, considering all the conditions of the case, the surmise appears more than merely probable, that they aimed ultimately at modifying both the faith and the religious policy of the Corinthian Church after the same lines of reactionary Judaizing, as those men worked upon, who are so sternly censured in the second chapter of the Galatians.

But however, both the existence and the distinguishing character of that pseudo-apostleship which is here presented to our view reveal to us both the existence and the legitimate character of a genuine form of apostleship which this other simulated.

*Those pseudo-apostles called themselves "apostles of Christ;" "ministers of Christ."* We must not overlook the emphasis and persistency with which these impugnors of St. Paul's position connected their own official character with Christ. They said they "were Christ's" (2 Cor. x. 7); "ministers of Christ" (2 Cor. xi. 23); and, what is of especial interest for us, as will be shortly seen in our present inquiry, that they were "apostles of Christ" (2 Cor. xi. 13). Let us look more closely at these several particulars.

1. In claiming to be regarded as "being Christ's"—that is, as "belonging to Christ,"

as this genitive means in 1 Cor. iii. 23 and in Mark ix. 41—the next verse shows that they did not refer subjectively to their own spiritual devotion to Christ, nor to their being as individual believers accepted with Christ, but to their official character as men acting in Christ's employ, and in their office authorized by him. Compare the expression, "We are God's fellow-workmen," in 1 Cor. iii. 9, which appears to mean "joint workmen with each other in God's employ."

2. When, again, they affirmed that they were "ministers of Christ," on the one hand the word *διδάσκει*, in its technical sense, points to work of public service in the Church; but on the other, as connected with the genitive *Χριστοῦ*, it also expresses the relation of servanthip to Christ. So that we have again here the notion of, so to speak, employees of Christ ready to go about such offices of service as he appoints them to. The phrase, however, does not imply any such personal intercourse as that, for example, which subsisted between Christ while upon earth and his apostles or other disciples then attendant upon him; for we find it applied to persons who never saw our Lord, as Timothy and Epaphras (1 Tim. iv. 6; Col. i. 7). The attendantship denoted is of a spiritual kind, being a ministry in the Church, which is Christ's body. But while this was their outward guise, they were, St. Paul intimates (2 Cor. xi. 15), in reality Satan's "ministers," not Christ's.

3. This sense of "ministers of Christ" serves to illustrate the meaning in which they claimed the designation of "apostles of Christ." As the phrase, "minister of Christ," expresses a relation to him similar to that which an employee bears to his employer, so the phrase, "apostle of Christ," seems to denote a relation to him analogous to that which an apostle bore to him that delegated him.<sup>1</sup> According to this construction of the designation, these men would seem to have laid claim to having been in some sense delegated by Christ. But we have no need to suppose, in this case, any more than with reference to the title "ministers of Christ," that they claimed any immediate personal relation to our Lord similar to that held by the twelve, but only that spiritual ecclesiastical relation to him which *they* may be deemed to hold whom his Church, acting in his Name and under his guidance, has commissioned for the particular work in which they are engaged.

*The honourableness of a Church apostle's function.* The cases which have been now discussed have brought to light the fact that, besides the twelve commissioned directly by Christ in person, there were, in the infancy of the Church, persons who received the name of "apostles" in consequence of being despatched by some public body in the Christian community for the execution of some trust connected with the Christian cause, and that, amongst other forms of sacred business entrusted to them, one was that of spreading the gospel.

The degree of estimation which the title, in general an honourable one, conferred upon its bearer would naturally rise with the dignity of the service which he was commissioned to discharge. If an "apostle" whose business related simply to the collection and custody of alms, or to the conveyance to a venerated father in Christ of an affectionate contribution to his needs, appeared in the eyes of his brethren invested with a certain measure of dignity by reason of the public confidence thus reposed in him, much

<sup>1</sup> It is possible to understand the genitive as used like the genitive *θεοῦ* in the clause above cited, "We are God's fellow-workers," that is, "in God's employ." Taken thus, the phrase, "apostles of Christ," might mean "Church apostles," belonging to Christ, employed by Christ, as other Church officers are. But such a construction would seem somewhat harsh in itself and hardly warranted by usage; at least we do not find similar designations applied to other Church officers—no such designation, for example, as "a bishop," or "an elder," or "an evangelist," "of Christ."

more would this be the case when he had been set apart for a no less responsible function than that of conveying to men the message of the gospel and of propagating the Church. In such a case the designation of "apostle" inferred among Christians a twofold distinction, as it also carried along with it a claim to his maintenance by his converts.

*Fictitious honourableness.* As has been seen, it was a distinction so significant as to be capable of being abused for purposes of vain-glory, or insubordination, or even cupidity for gain.

The fact also that the office of public envoy was styled by the same title as had been by Christ himself assigned to the twelve, would hardly fail of attaching to those who bore it an additional halo of respect. The twelve disciples were "apostles of Christ;" and they too were "apostles of Christ." Although it would be quite clear, upon a closer inspection of the circumstances, that the predicate was not really identical in the two cases, and that the element of dignity accruing from the supposition that it was identical was a fictitious one, it may nevertheless have often imposed on the unwary, and Church apostles over-greedy of honour may at times have not been too scrupulous to make an unfair use of this implement of imposture. That the "pseudo-apostles" at Corinth were not too scrupulous to do so seems almost suggested by what St. Paul says of these "guileful workers" in the thirteenth verse of the eleventh chapter. They certainly, at any rate, demanded that they should be deemed quite as much apostles as St. Paul was, and even more certainly so.

*Probable cause of the disuse of the title "apostles" in the Church.* It may here be remarked, by the way, that in all probability this liability on the part of the unwary to misconceive the relative character of the two apostolates, and the opportunity thus offered to unprincipled bearers of the apostolic title for imposing on their brethren, by each of which causes the distinctive pre-eminence in the kingdom of God owned by those who were apostles in the higher sense was infringed upon and their authority impaired, led to the early and total discontinuance in the Church of the use of the term as applied to those who were Church apostles only. The last occurrence<sup>1</sup> of

<sup>1</sup> Since these words were written, there has come to light and been given to the world by Bryennius, Metropolitan of Nicomedia, a tract in Greek of the early Church which perhaps qualifies their import. This tract is entitled, 'Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles.' It is, in effect, a brief manual of moral instruction, and of directions as to the administration of the two sacraments, and a few other matters of Church regulation, closing with a solemn reference to the second coming. The precise date of its composition is being debated; but it certainly was compiled very early, and not improbably before the end of the first century. In this manual, directions are given in chapter xi. as to the treatment of "apostles." The twelve are not mentioned or referred to, except in the title heading the tract. The passage is as follows: "Whosoever shall come and teach you all the things before mentioned, receive ye him. . . . As to the apostles and prophets, according to the rule laid down in the gospel, so do ye. Let every apostle coming to you be received as the Lord; and he shall not remain a single day [only], but if there be need a second also; but if he remain three, he is a sham prophet (*ψευδοπροφήτης*). Let the prophet when he goes forth receive nothing but a loaf of bread [to last him] till he reach his lodging for the night; but if he asks for money, he is a sham prophet." Then follow directions respecting "prophets." It is obvious, I think, that the apostles here spoken of answer exactly to the account above given, founded upon indications supplied by the New Testament, of itinerant missionaries of the gospel, holding or professing to hold a Church commission. The title given to them appears to seal beyond question the extremely early date of the book; while, on the other hand, the directions given for their treatment corroborate most strongly what has been above written respecting the "apostles" of 2 Corinthians and of Rev. ii. 3.

the title as thus applied is probably that found in the message to the Ephesian Church in Rev. ii. 3: "Thou canst not bear evil men, and didst try them who say they are apostles [that is, authenticated envoys of Christ's own Church], and are not, and didst find them false."

*St. Luke's applying the term "apostles" to Barnabas and Paul.* The considerations above adduced relative to a secondary form of apostolate engaged in evangelistic labour enable us to understand, what otherwise appears a puzzling phenomenon—the use by St. Luke on two occasions of the designation "apostles" with reference to Barnabas and Paul. Both passages are found in the fourteenth chapter of the Acts. In ver. 4 we read, "The population of the city [Iconium] was divided; and some sided with the Jews, and some with the apostles." And in ver. 14, the Lycaonians of Lystra being about to offer sacrifices to them as gods, "When the apostles, Barnabas and Paul, heard of it, they rent their garments," etc.

Now, very often in the Acts does St. Luke introduce the term "apostles," but not in one instance is there any reason for our understanding the term otherwise than as reciting the twelve or some of the twelve; while in most of these passages the sequence of the narrative makes it absolutely *certain* that it is the twelve that he has in his mind.

On the other hand, on no other occasion except in the two passages just cited does St. Luke give this designation either to St. Barnabas or, which is yet more remarkable, even to St. Paul.

Further, nowhere else in the New Testament is Barnabas so styled. Though in several passages he is presented as holding a position closely *proximate* to those who were apostles in the highest sense, yet nowhere is he called an apostle.

*Delegation of Barnabas and Paul from Antioch.* In reading this section of St. Luke's narrative comprised in the thirteenth and fourteenth chapters, which records the evangelizing journey made by Barnabas and Paul in company, we cannot fail to be struck with the especial stress which the writer lays upon the circumstance that this journey was undertaken in obedience to an express commission which was given them "by the Holy Spirit," through the prophets and teachers and the brethren at Antioch—a commission apparently "setting them apart" for this particular act of service. So we read in vers. 2—4, "As they [Barnabas, Symeon Niger, Lucius of Cyrene, Manaen Herod's foster-brother, and Saul] ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them [to wit, by inwardly moving their own souls thereto]. Then, when they had fasted and prayed and laid their hands on them, they let them depart. So they, being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, went down to Seleucia," etc. In conjunction with this account of their first being sent forth on this journey, we have to notice the terms in which its conclusion is described. We read in Acts xiv. 26 thus: "And thence they sailed to Antioch, from whence they had been committed [or, 'delivered over'] to the grace of God for the work which they had completed." Viewing these last words, "for the work which they had completed (*εις τὸ ἔργον ὃ ἐπλήρωσαν*)," with those in Acts xiii. 2, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them (*ἀφορίσατε . . . εἰς τὸ ἔργον ὃ προσκέκλημαι αὐτούς*)," we are led to infer that the laying on of hands mentioned in Acts xiii. 3 had respect, not to an investing of these two servants of Christ with any permanent position in the Church, but simply to a commending of them to the Divine grace in the evangelistic journey on which they were sent forth. This particular engagement took them probably a year, or a year and a half, to fulfil. On their return to Antioch, however, it was at an end, and they were then free to revert to the course of ministerial work with which they had been



previously occupied: "They tarried no little time *with the disciples*," taken up, that is to say, with the ministering as before among the Antiochian believers (Acts xiv. 28; xv. 35).

All this, making it clear, as it does, that the sacred historian has very distinctly present to his mind the character of special envoys sent forth upon a specific mission, as then borne by Barnabas and Paul, renders it also in the highest degree probable that when, in Acts xiv. 4, 14, he makes use of the word ἀπόστολοι, in reciting their personality, he does so with reference to this especial envoyship.

*The Church envoyship of Barnabas and Paul.* St. Barnabas and St. Paul, then, are presented here in the character of envoys of the Church. And if, in reference to this procedure in the Divine government of the Church in subjecting St. Paul, who had received immediately from Christ himself the grace of apostleship, to this inferior form of delegation received at the hands of men, we may, without incurring the charge of irreverence or presumption, venture to interpret its motive or purpose, it may be said that, in his going forth with St. Barnabas upon the business of forming new branches of the Christian community, it was expedient and even necessary, with a view to the maintenance of the visible organic connection of these new communities with the apostolic Church, that their founders should bear the character thus assigned to them of apostles issuing from the already subsisting Christian body.

Their apostolate wore an especially sacred character. Not only did it issue from the Church of God sanctified in Christ Jesus; not only was it conferred for the discharge of an eminently sacred function; but it was, further, a direct emanation from the Holy Spirit, declaring his will by direct extraordinary revelation. This circumstance exalted this instance of Church apostleship to an especial eminency above ordinary cases of sacred envoyship; in fact, it raised it to a position of dignity closely approximating to that kingly form of apostleship held by the twelve.

*Their Church apostleship involved subsequent obligation.* It transpires from the subsequent narrative of the Acts that, although St. Barnabas and St. Paul had "fulfilled the work" for which they had been designated when they returned to Antioch and gave in their report to the Church expressly convened to receive it, they nevertheless regarded themselves as still holding an especial relation to its results. For on their return to Antioch from a journey to Jerusalem, on which they had been despatched with other brethren to confer with "the apostles" and the mother Church on the Christian position held by uncircumcised believers, we find (Acts xv. 36) St. Paul proposing to his late co-missionary that they should start afresh on a journey of visitation, comprising the round of cities in which, in their former expedition, they had preached the Word of the Lord, to see how their new converts fared.

*Anti-Hellenic prejudice lingering in the mind of Barnabas.* We cannot wonder that they should feel this to be a business especially incumbent upon them. Who should so naturally care for the estate of those brethren as they, their fathers, who through the gospel had begotten them? We perceive, however, that St. Paul was the one who both the most quickly recognized and the most heartily carried out this inward, and no doubt Heaven-prompted, yearning of spiritual fatherhood towards those uncircumcised converts. Loving and ingeniously evangelical as St. Barnabas had heretofore proved himself to be, as, for example, most notably when he first came down to Antioch and so frankly and gladly welcomed the work of grace in the hearts of Gentiles (Acts xi. 23), yet, just about this time—a time so fraught with heart-searching conflict for men born and bred in the bosom of Mosaism—his behaviour, as glanced at in ch. ii., proved that he had not been yet able to disenthral his spirit out and out from all remains of Judaistic prejudice. In general the maxim holds good that the

leaven of truth, however frankly it may have been admitted into the soul, still requires time for the full modification of former habits of thought and feeling; and this, we may suppose, was the case with St. Barnabas; nay, perhaps, even with St. Peter himself.

It was not St. Barnabas, then, but St. Paul, who was the first to propose their undertaking this work of visitation. And it may be further surmised that, when St. Barnabas insisted upon their being again accompanied by Mark, his doing so was not altogether prompted by the partialities of kinsmanship, as has been so commonly supposed, but was quite as much due to the same secret bias of feeling in favour of the more Mosaistically minded of his brethren, as not long before had warped his behaviour when he "was carried away with Peter's dissimulation." St. Luke's narrative says nothing whatever of the relationship, but merely recites, as St. Paul's objection to Mark, that his conduct in their former journey had proved him not the fit man to share in their work of evangelizing the Gentiles; for that, as soon as ever they had begun to throw themselves into that work in Asia Minor, he had at once left them.

*What, in St. Paul's view, disqualified Mark for accompanying them.* What was the precise reason for Mark's then leaving them is not stated, either here or in the foregoing passage in the history (Acts xiii. 13) which refers to this incident. Conjecture has ascribed it to deficiency in courage, or to unsteadiness of character, or even to home-sickness. When, however, we take into account the general complexion of Church affairs at this time, and the very determined manner in which St. Paul resisted St. Barnabas's proposal to take him with them, it seems more probable that the contention hinged upon the burning question of the hour—that question the right decision of which St. Paul regarded, and justly regarded, as a matter of most vital importance, namely, how the Church was practically to carry out the principle of the absolute indifference of circumcision in respect to a Christian's status among his fellow-believers. The most probable solution seems to be that Mark had relinquished the enterprise of evangelizing Gentiles before, and in St. Paul's estimation was unfit to be a fellow-worker now with men going forth on the highly responsible business of authoritatively organizing Gentile Churches, because, though no doubt accepting the truth that a man is justified by faith in Christ alone without conforming to the ceremonial Law, he nevertheless, like the vast majority of Jewish believers, had not as yet been able to wholly divest his mind of those feelings of antipathy to an uncircumcised person (*ἀποβουρίαν ἔχοντι*, Acts xi. 3) which were inwrought as it were into the very texture of the Jewish character. If this was the case with Mark, there would be great cause to fear that, in moving about amongst Churches of which Gentiles formed the predominant element, he might evince, as Barnabas himself his patron had lately permitted himself to do, a more cordial sympathy with the Jewish or with Judaizing members than with their Gentile brethren standing upon their gospel liberty.

It was not enough that the great principles of evangelical doctrine should be acknowledged or taught. Apart from correct doctrinal teaching, it was of absolute necessity that those newly won disciples should be able to feel the presence, on the part of those coming among them as shepherds of their souls, of a genuine hearty brotherly kindness towards themselves, a caring for *their* welfare and their enjoyment of Church fellowship, and their sensibilities even, as great as for those of any high-caste Hebrew who might be found amongst them. This was what St. Paul saw to be required here; an acceptance, not constrained and reluctant, but cordial, thorough-going, and even joyous, of the maxim that in Christ Jesus there was neither Jew nor Gentile, neither circumcision nor uncircumcision; and the uncompromising manner in which, even to the rending asunder for a while of a most precious friendship, he insisted upon

the rejection of Mark as a fellow-labourer in the work before them, is best accounted for on the supposition that he could not as yet discern in the young man this complete emancipation from the prejudices of a Jew.

*Separation of Barnabas and Paul.* After the painful rupture which ensued between the two holy men, the blame of which, so far as we are able to judge, lay altogether on the side of Barnabas, the latter, recognizing the present call of duty to which St. Paul had drawn his attention, undertook one portion of the proposed tour of visitation, sailing away with Mark to Cyprus. This island, far more densely peopled then than now, was not only their native country, or at least St. Barnabas's, but also opened before them an ample and congenial sphere of labour in a population of which Jews formed a very large if not even a preponderant proportion. An agreement appears to have been come to that St. Paul should himself undertake the remaining part of the service. Accordingly, adopting Silas for his fellow-worker, he embarked on the extensive, laborious, and perilous enterprise of retraversing the ground already twice gone over in Asia Minor, being no doubt prepared further to go on elsewhere, whithersoever the Spirit of Christ should lead them. St. Luke, significantly silent as to any similar circumstance attending St. Barnabas's departure, adds, "Paul set forth, commended to the grace of the Lord by the brethren."

*St. Paul and St. Barnabas repeatedly appointed Church envoys.* The character of (Church-commissioned) "apostle," which had before been stamped upon Paul's personality when sent forth with Barnabas, might, apart from this special fresh commendation of him to the Divine grace in the work now before him, have been considered to be still clinging to him when going forth with Silas; for the work was the proper and indeed necessary continuation of that for which he had been set apart in conjunction with Barnabas. At all events, that renewed commendation by the brethren implied the renewing of the stamp of apostleship upon St. Paul, as it also imparted the like character to Silas.

On four several occasions before this had St. Paul received in the Church either a commission or a recognizing attestation which would of itself, according to the usage of the time, entitle him to the appellation of "apostle;" and on each occasion in conjunction with Barnabas.

1. When sent up from Antioch "to the elders" at Jerusalem with a contribution for the needs of the Christian poor of Judæa (Acts xi. 30; xii. 25).

2. When, upon a special sacred designation for the function by the Holy Spirit, they were sent forth in company upon their evangelizing tour in Asia Minor (Acts xiii., xiv.), when the appellation of "apostles" is expressly assigned to them by the historian.

3. When they, in conjunction with certain other brethren, were despatched to Jerusalem by the Antiochian Christians to confer with the apostles and elders on the question of the necessity of circumcision (Acts xv. 2).

4. When they were commissioned by the apostles and elders, acting with the expressed concurrence of the whole Church of Jerusalem, to bear, in conjunction with "Judas Barsabas and Silas, leading men among the brethren," to the Gentile converts of "Antioch and in Syria and Cilicia," that important letter, the Magna Charta of the Gentile Church, by which the Church "and the Holy Ghost" solemnly guaranteed the freedom of Gentile believers from the Mosaic Law.

With reference to what passed on the important occasion of that conference at Jerusalem we have further to note the following words which St. Paul wrote to the Galatians some years later: "James [the Lord's brother, head ruler of the Church of Jerusalem] and Cephas and John [the chiefest of the twelve apostles], who are recog-

nized as being pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of partnership, that we should go to [or, 'work for'] the Gentiles, and they to the circumcision" (ch. ii. 9).

This public formal act of the "pillars" of Christ's Church both metropolitan and universal, embodied in the shaking of hands in the presence (no doubt) of a general meeting of apostles, elders, and brethren, conferred upon St. Paul and likewise, no doubt, upon St. Barnabas, the Church's commission to be envoys of the gospel to the Gentiles in permanence; for ministrations, not limited, as on that former occasion at Antioch, to some one special work of service, but indefinitely and without limitation.

Thenceforward, wherever in the Gentile world St. Paul went bearing the gospel—and the like holds true no doubt also of Barnabas—he came as a formally authorized apostle of the Church, and therefore also, the Church being Christ's body and his vicegerent as herald of salvation to the world, as an "apostle of Christ." This apostleship, let me again observe, was not identical, but ran parallel with that which St. Paul had held from the beginning of his Christian life, received from Christ himself with no human intervention.

That the title, "apostles of Christ," was borne by men who patently and (no doubt) confessedly by themselves had received no such immediate appointment from Christ in person as the twelve and St. Paul had received, has already been made clear from 2 Cor. xi. 13 (see above, p. xxix.).

St. Barnabas had yet earlier than the first of the four occasions above recited received a like apostolical commission; namely, from "the Church" at Jerusalem, when he was sent down to Antioch with authority to inquire upon the spot into the real ground of the tidings, then felt at Jerusalem to be so astounding, that "the hand of the Lord" had there been effecting the conversion of Gentiles [*Ἑλληνας*, not *Ἑλληνιστῶν*], owning no connection with the synagogue (Acts xi. 20—22).

That first arrival of St. Barnabas at Antioch was followed by his making that city his principal place of abode for a long continuance; at an early period of which he went over to Tarsus to engage Saul's co-operation with him in the building up of that highly important community of Gentile converts then rapidly forming in Antioch.

Though we are unable to define what was the precise ecclesiastical status held by St. Barnabas during that time in the Antiochian Church, we cannot doubt he occupied a very prominent position in it; looked up to and revered and exercising by weight of opinion a leading influence in its affairs, not merely on the ground of his eminent ministerial gifts and of his noble personal character, but also as having come there in the capacity of an *apostle*, delegated by no less an authority than the mother Church of Christendom and the twelve apostles, who as yet were still making Jerusalem their head-quarters.

*St. Barnabas's partial deflection to anti-Hellenism.* The "sweet reasonableness" which would seem to have been a natural constituent of Barnabas's character, elevated by the hallowing influences of the Holy Spirit, had in his case very greatly softened the strict formalism and narrow-mindedness which still attached to Jewish believers in general, and especially to the Pharisean section of them. In liberality of sentiment, in large-hearted candour, in love of the human race in general, he proved himself on various occasions to be far ahead of the great mass of his believing fellow-countrymen.

Nevertheless, the character of *apostle* from Jerusalem, in which he had in the first instance come among the Antiochians, and which, as we have seen, was again and again anew bestowed on him, formed a tie strongly linking him, in his ministerial work at Antioch, to the Jerusalemite Church. In consequence of his sustaining this character, brethren of the circumcision coming down from the capital would naturally resort to him, would attach themselves to his immediate society, would expect to receive from

him countenance and support. Thus, so to speak, clustering around him, they would be likely, especially would they be likely if they were old associates of his at Jerusalem or high in Church estimation at home, to bring to bear upon his mind, with reference to the relations between the circumcision and the uncircumcision, an influence which would be antagonistic in its tendency to the influence, for example, of St. Paul and of others who heartily accepted and carried out into practice the principle of the absolute indifference in Christ Jesus of all such outward distinctions. Their influence would tend likewise to neutralize the effect which, but for this, the habit of brotherly association day by day, both in the Church and in private, with spiritually minded Gentile believers, could hardly have failed to produce, in dispelling from his spirit any still lingering remains of the old anti-Hellenic prejudice.

It is in this frequent association as an *apostle* of the Jerusalemite Church with the members of that Church from time to time visiting Antioch, that we may probably find the explanation of certain portions of St. Barnabas's behaviour subsequently to his return with St. Paul from the conference at Jerusalem, which, after what we are told of his previous history, appear both so painful and so disappointing. The chord of Judaistic sensibility, which else might have slept silent in his soul; and by continued inaction in time have perished altogether, was, by that no doubt often recurring intercourse with rigorous Mosaisms from the capital, kept alive and vibrating. It was a perilous thing for even this "grey-haired saint," this hitherto "surest guide," to permit himself thus to toy with "the old leaven of malignity." For thus it came to pass that on a certain occasion, when men standing well with James had come down from Jerusalem, the Gentile brethren became aware, to their astonishment and indignant grief, that Barnabas, their revered and confided-in teacher Barnabas, was allowing himself to be so far overmastered by the treacherous inward sympathy with Judaical bigotry as at length to think it shame to be seen by those visitors familiarly consorting as heretofore with the uncircumcision, brethren in Christ though they were,—so far, in fact, overmastered, as to be seen, in the wake of, alas! Cephas, slinking back from that former brotherly association with them which, however, had only embodied in palpable action faith in the great cardinal truth of the gospel. Well was it for them both, and well also for the Christian cause at Antioch, that the fearless, whole-hearted Paul was at hand to unveil to their own selves the unfaithfulness which they were showing to their real inward convictions, and by public rebuke check its hurtful contagion.

*Apostleship of Silas.* We have now seen that the title of "apostles," in that lower sense of the term in which it denoted Church envoys, was justly applicable both to St. Paul and to St. Barnabas, and also in fact was in that sense given to them.

We have next to consider the case of Silas. When he went forth sharing St. Paul's labours in that second great missionary journey of his recorded in the Acts, did he share with him likewise the right to the title of "apostle" in the sense now assigned to the word? and was the term in this sense actually used of him?

The answer to these questions is in part contained in the particulars relative to Silas which have been already noted. But it will be convenient to gather all the facts of his case together under one view.

The high position which, prior to the conference at Jerusalem, Silas held among the Churchmen of Jerusalem is distinctly attested by St. Luke (Acts xv. 12), when he designates Judas and Silas as "men taking a lead (*ἡγούμενους*) among the brethren."

At the conference itself the two men were selected and delegated to bear the missive then agreed upon to "the Gentile brethren in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia," and were at the same time directed to corroborate its statements by word of mouth. With Judas Barsabas we have no further concern; after this mission he is altogether lost to

our view. But of Silas it may be remarked that, while staying at Antioch as his headquarters, and while moving about, as to carry out the business entrusted to him he no doubt did, both, in company with Paul and apart from him, among the Christians in those parts, in Syria and Cilicia in general as well as in the capital, he would be acting all along in the capacity of a delegated envoy, "apostle," of the Jerusalem conference, wearing a character which St. Paul would thus become accustomed to regard as shared by him with himself.

And here we observe another particular mentioned by St. Luke, enhancing the consideration with which Silas, with Judas Barsabas, would be regarded among Christians. He speaks of them as "being themselves also prophets," whose earnest and diligent exhortation, he tells us, proved of great benefit to the Antiochian believers (Acts xv. 32).

After discharging this commission, Silas and Judas returned to Jerusalem to those who had sent them forth upon it (*πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστέλλαντας αὐτούς*, L. T. Tr. Rev., instead of the words, *πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους* of Textus Receptus; the same editors expunge ver. 34, *Ἐδοξε δὲ τῷ Σίλῃ ἐπιμεῖναι αὐτοῦ*). Later, however, we find Silas again at Antioch; at least, when St. Paul, then apparently at Antioch, desired a companion for his second journey therefrom, he "selected" Silas to be the one to go with him.

All this proves the high estimation in which Silas was held by the brethren, both at Jerusalem and at Antioch. He would naturally appear to them as a man well fitted to move side by side with Paul, whose peculiar calling as an "apostle" in the higher sense was a fact as yet but imperfectly disclosed to the Church. At the same time, St. Luke's expression (ver. 40), *ἐπιλεγόμενος Σίλαν*, indicates a certain subordination as marking his position in relation to St. Paul—an inference which is confirmed by the manner in which St. Luke proceeds to narrate the commencement of the expedition; for he employs the singular number in the verbs found in Acts xv. 40 down to xvi. 3, writing also *ὄν αὐτῷ*, not *ὄν αὐτοῖς*, in Acts xvi. 3, furnishing a marked contrast with the plural number which he uniformly employs in narrating St. Paul's journey with Barnabas.

On the other hand, we cannot doubt that Timothy, whom St. Paul attached to the party, and also Luke himself, who was about this time (cf. *ἐπητήσαμεν*, Acts xvi. 10) likewise enlisted in the service, and perhaps others, were as truly *ὑπηρέται* as Mark had been, helping in evangelistic work under Paul's direction, and in training for a "better degree" (1 Tim. iii. 10) to be attained by-and-by; Timothy, however, as it should seem, holding among these subordinate workers the chief place.

Nevertheless, it is evident that Silas held in the party a higher position altogether than any of these last-named subordinates; and when at their starting from Antioch Paul was "delivered over (*παραδοθείς*) to the grace of the Lord by the brethren," we cannot doubt that this solemn and formal act of commendation embraced with St. Paul his coadjutor Silas as well; and that, as Barnabas and Paul when going forth on the former journey, so now Paul and Silas when going forth on this, went as alike "apostles," and sealed, we may also feel assured, with the like Divine sanction as Barnabas and Paul had been when they had been "sent forth by the Holy Ghost" (Acts xiii. 2, 4).

The particulars now alleged relative to Silas's close association with St. Paul and to acts of delegation or recognition whereby the Church connected them together as its authorized agents, sufficiently evince, not only that it would be perfectly justifiable, but also that it would be extremely natural and obvious, for St. Paul, when he had occasion to speak of the ministerial office exercised by himself and Silas in conjunction, to describe it, and, if need were, to argue upon it, as a ministry exercised by "apostles" or by "apostles of Christ" (see above, p. xxxv.)

And we are able to adduce an instance of St. Paul's actually doing this, namely, in what we read in 1 Thess. ii. 5, 6.

"*Paul and Silvanus and Timotheus.*" We shall, however, be better prepared for entering into the spirit of what St. Paul writes in 1 Thess. ii. 5, 6 when we have taken note of certain particulars in the account which St. Luke gives us in the Acts (xvii.) of that very sojourn at Thessalonica which the apostle is there speaking of.

It appears from St. Luke's narrative that, although St. Paul certainly throughout that great second missionary expedition occupied the position of chief and director among his fellow-travellers, being in fact named alone as agent, both, as already mentioned, at its commencement and at its close (Acts xviii. 7—22) when Silas is no longer mentioned—very conceivably, during St. Paul's eighteen months' sojourn at Corinth, Silas had gone elsewhere—yet in respect to that earlier part of the time which was spent in Macedonia and Achaia, and which we are now concerned with, Silas appears very prominent in the story, both as sharing in the ill treatment which St. Paul underwent at Philippi (Acts xvi. 19—40), and also as being closely at his side at Thessalonica, both in evangelistic labours as indicated by the wording of the statement, "consorted with Paul and Silas," in Acts xvii. 4, and in exposure to the danger of suffering further persecution (*ibid.*, vers. 5—10).<sup>1</sup>

However it may have been elsewhere, here in Macedonia, so closely were Paul and Silas associated with each other, both in doing and in suffering, that the Thessalonian converts must inevitably have entertained sentiments towards them of equal or almost equal reverence and love, regarding both the one and the other of them as alike their tender, faithful, self-denying foster-fathers in the faith, and feeling assured that both would have been alike well-pleased to impart to them, not the gospel of God only, but also their own souls, so dear had they been to those two fathers of theirs in the gospel.

<sup>1</sup> There is no just ground for supposing that Luke regarded the stay at Thessalonica as bounded by that period of three weeks during which the "apostles" sought to win the Jews to the faith. The narrative may be construed as taking at the commencement of ver. 5 a fresh departure, prior to which there is no difficulty in our supposing even a considerable interval to have elapsed since the last of those three sabbaths which it has spoken of.

In comparing the history with the Epistles, we cannot but be struck by the fact that the history makes no mention of any Gentiles being converted at Thessalonica except such as were already connected with the synagogue as *σεβόμενοι Ἕλληνες*, whilst the First Epistle describes those whom it addresses as having, in consequence of the "entering in" of the writer and his companions, "turned unto God from idols" (1 Thess. i. 9). But the comparison brings out another fact, which enables us to explain the former. The First Epistle makes the reader feel that the writer and his companions had been a much longer time in intercourse with the Thessalonian converts than the history tells us of, and this impression is confirmed by the circumstance mentioned in the Epistle to the Philippians (iv. 17), that, while St. Paul was at Thessalonica, the Philippians had on two several occasions "sent unto his need," the two towns being about one hundred miles apart. St. Luke's narrative, from some cause or other, takes up only two detached portions of the whole sojourn—the first, portion relating to the very partial acceptance of the gospel by the synagogue at its commencement; the other, which in its substance links itself on to the former, to its abrupt termination through the hostile practices of those Jews who did not believe. As this fierce outburst of Jewish hostility was dictated by anti-Hellenic bigotry (1 Thess. ii. 15, 16); and is best accounted for by the two "apostles" having devoted themselves so mainly and so successfully to the uncircumcision, we thus gain further corroborative evidence out of St. Luke's own narrative for a prolonged interval devoted to the evangelization of the Gentiles in Thessalonica. The narrative of the history is *incomplete*, as it often proves to be; but it is not *antagonistic* to the Epistle.

(1 Thess. ii. 7—11). Timothy, no doubt, took his part in the work as is shown by such passages as Acts xvii. 14 and 1 Thess. iii. 2; but nowhere is Timothy spoken of in this section of the history as standing on a level with them in ministerial position, or involved in like sufferings, or as threatened by the like dangers.

These considerations are sufficient to explain the manner in which St. Paul commences the two Epistles which he despatched to the Thessalonians from Corinth not long after he commenced his eighteen months' sojourn in that city. Both these letters begin with the same words: "Paul and Silvanus and Timotheus, to the Church of the Thessalonians in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ: Grace to you and peace," etc. The facts above, adduced show that it was impossible for him, when writing to these particular converts, to speak of himself as an apostle in a different sense from that in which Silas might also have been so designated; impossible for him to write, for example, thus: "Paul, apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, and Silvanus and Timotheus our brethren," after the style of the letters to the Corinthians or of the letter to the Romans. For it would have worn the appearance of breaking asunder before the eyes of those affectionate converts that complete co-partnership in which we feel sure they were wont to regard Silas as associated with Paul. There was, indeed, *no need* for him, when addressing disciples so attached and docile as these new converts of Thessalonica, to introduce any such emphatic asseveration of his own distinctive peculiar apostolical authority. This was proved to be necessary later, when he was addressing Churches where his authority was either actually impugned, as at Corinth, or dimly perceived, as at Rome. But at present this was not required, neither would it have been suitable.

Further, it may be that as yet the time had not arrived when the Divine guidance, under which he habitually and consciously acted, should prompt him to openly assert that high commissionship of his setting him on a level with the sacred twelve, which some five years later we find him so unflinchingly asserting in the next group of letters. Things were, it is true, gradually preparing for its open declaration to the world. His position was becoming more and more ascendant in the Church; his relative importance, as being of all the chiefest herald of the gospel to the Gentiles, was growing more and more marked; the conditions of environing circumstances hitherto veiling his magnificent vocation were rapidly falling away from around him. But the hour, we may believe, though fast approaching, was not yet—the hour in which he was to be divinely impelled to announce himself an "apostle" in that supreme sense in which Christ himself used the term, when giving it to his chosen twelve.

*St. Paul speaks of Silas and Timothy as apostles with himself.* We are now, as I apprehend, in a position for understanding the manner in which St. Paul applies the term "apostles" in 1 Thess. ii. 5, 6.

The whole passage is as follows:—"For neither at any time did we resort to any word of fawning, as ye know, nor to any pretext veiling designs of avarice: God is witness! nor sought distinction on the part of men whether with you or with others [literally, 'from you or from others'], though as Christ's apostles we might, if we had so willed, have taken a burdensome position with you."

St. Paul is apparently rebutting certain calumnious aspersions with which, as he with no doubt good reason surmised, certain persons at Thessalonica, whether unbelieving Jews or mocking Gentiles, were disposed to assail himself or his fellow-workers.

St. Paul was wont, by means of the probably ill-paid and dirty work of making tent-curtains of coarse Sicilian fabric, to earn money for the purpose of paying his own personal expenses, and sometimes those of his subordinate companions. This is evidenced, in reference to this second journey of his, besides what we read in these two Epistles (1 Thess. ii. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 8, 9), by Acts xviii. 3; 2 Cor. xi. 9; in reference



to his first journey taken with Barnabas, by 1 Cor. ix. 6, 15; in reference to the third, by Acts xx. 34; 2 Cor. xi. 10, xii. 14.

Nor is this statement contravened by the fact that, in this very first visit of his to Thessalonica to which he is here referring, he received gifts pressed upon his acceptance by generous converts left behind at Philippi (Phil. iv. 15—17). These were extraordinary expressions of loving sympathy with his evangelistic work (Phil. i. 5, 7), the declining of which would not only have been mortifying to the kind hearts of those from whom they came, but also have tended to deprive them of their Divine reward (Phil. iv. 17). But these were extraordinary benefactions, more resembling "missionary donations" than the payment of a stipend to a pastor by those to whom he is ministering.

It appears most probable that St. Paul, in the second of the two verses now before us, is referring to this particular habit of self-denial, for the following reasons:—

1. In four other instances he uses derivatives of *βάρος* with reference to burdening converts with his maintenance; viz. *ἐπιβαρῆσαι*, 1 Thess. ii. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 8; *κατεβάρησα*, 2 Cor. xii. 16; *ἀβαρῆ*, 2 Cor. xi. 14. Compare also the use of *καταναρκῆσαι*, 2 Cor. xi. 9, xii. 13, 14.

2. In ver. 9 he expressly says, "Working night and day, that we might not burden (*ἐπιβαρῆσαι*) any one of you," apparently to illustrate the very statement of ver. 6. This remark is not neutralized by the interposition of vers. 7, 8. For those verses, stating as they do the absoluteness of his tender, self-devoting love as like that which a nursing mother shows to her offspring, present the exact contrast of that disposition to assert his own rights which, if he had required or even permitted them to maintain him, they might have surmised to be actuating him. These very verses, therefore, form a perfectly germane introduction to the statement of ver. 9, connecting it with ver. 6 as its elucidation.

3. The words *ἀπ' ἑλλων* (ver. 6) point in the same direction. These *ἕλλοι* are not Christian converts in other places; for St. Paul's relations with them have nothing to do with the matter in hand: they are rather the unbelieving world in Thessalonica itself. St. Paul refers to his foregoing that position of respectability (*δόξα*) which to people in general he would have seemed to hold, if he had appeared to them to be no *χειρουργός* or *βάνανσος*, no vulgar mechanic, but a man possessed of leisure enabling him to devote himself to occupations of a purely intellectual or spiritual character. The sedulous toil which he devoted to a mere mechanical employment, especially an employment so repulsive as that of tent-making, was in reality a *self-abasement*; and so he expressly describes it in 2 Cor. xi. 7 (*ἐμᾶντων ταπεινῶν*). Whatever certain schools of Gentile philosophy might theorize, or whatever the maxims of Jewish rabbins might inculcate (see e.g. Dr. Farrar, 'St. Paul,' vol. i. p. 23), for him to be continually drudging as he did at a mere mechanical employment was a forfeiture of social rank, depressing him low down among the base ones of the world. Wherever St. Paul refers to this particular of his conduct, we must bear in mind this element of its character, its self-degradingness. We must not suppose that all that he is thinking of in such passages was the strain of supererogatory toil which he imposed upon himself.

We may paraphrase this sixth verse thus: "Neither did we lay ourselves out to stand well in men's eyes in a worldly sense; neither in relation to you, by impressing you with respectful regard for our position and by enforcing our claim to be lifted by your contributions above worldly cares; nor in relation to those around, by wishing to appear above the need to have recourse to sordid occupations and free to live a life consecrated to higher engagements: and yet, as Christ's apostles, this is what we were fully entitled to do; coming to you in that capacity, we should have been fully

authorized to stand upon our dignity, and to throw the burden of our maintenance entirely upon you."<sup>1</sup>

Now, there are two distinct propositions implied in the last clause of this verse, namely, that Christ's apostles were entitled to claim maintenance at the hands of those who received their teaching; and that the persons recited by the pronoun "we" were apostles of Christ.

With respect to the latter proposition, it is supposed by some that St. Paul, in the phrase, "apostles of Christ," was at bottom pointing to his own individual person as "apostle" in the highest sense of the term; and that he was led to use the plural pronoun "we" in applying thereto this lofty predicate, partly by an instinctive shrinking from egotism and self-obtrusion, and partly by a gracious and sympathetic brotherly kindness which would fain share predicates, which in actual truth were applicable only to himself, with those who in Christ's service were closely associated with him.

There can be no doubt that St. Paul does sometimes thus write. It is impossible, for instance, to understand in any other sense much that we read in the long passage, 2 Cor. iv. 7—vi. 10.

But this method of interpretation cannot be satisfactorily applied in the present case.

It is difficult to imagine how it could be possible for St. Paul to use the plural number, "Christ's apostles," if he alone of the party was an "apostle of Christ" in that sense in which the term is supposed to be used. As well might a colonel, when speaking of himself in conjunction with even the highest subordinate officers of his regiment, extend to them the title of "colonels in her Majesty's army."

Besides, there is nothing to warrant the notion that it was any peculiar prerogative of those who in the highest sense of the designation were "apostles of Christ" to expect to be maintained by their converts. The seventy, who never, so far as appears, were styled "apostles," were yet authorized by Christ to consider themselves, while discharging the service he had enjoined upon them, as entitled to the benefit of the maxim, "The workman deserves his wages" (Luke x. 7); and the apostle himself, in 1 Tim. v. 17, 18, puts it among the fundamental maxims of Church order, that those who labour in speaking and teaching had a claim to be paid by the Church. So also we read in 1 Cor. ix. 7—14.

These considerations warrant the conclusion that St. Paul, in the passage under consideration, uses the term "apostles" in the same sense as that in which it has been above shown (pp. xxxi., xxxii.) to be used by St. Luke in Acts xiv. 4, 14, and in which the designation, "apostles of Christ," is employed by St. Paul in 2 Cor. xi. 5 (comp. p. xxix.); that is, he uses the expression with reference to the delegation or authorization which both he and Silas had received, not only from the Antiochian Church, but also from the supreme leadership of the mother Church at Jerusalem.

*Timothy regarded in the light of a Church envoy.* The case of Timothy, however, claims to be here considered.

The addition of Timothy's name in the greeting prefixed to both the Epistles to the Thessalonians—"Paul and Silvanus and Timotheus"—may possibly not of itself prove a particularly close partnership in official standing between the three persons named;

<sup>1</sup> In the apostle's mind there was an affinity between the two words, *δόξα* and *βάρος*—an affinity so close as to lead him (2 Cor. iv. 17) to construct the strange phrase, *βάρος δόξης*. This association of ideas was doubtless due to the fact that in the Hebrew *כבד* denotes both *heavy* and *glorious*. It is very supposable that the apostle uses the words *ἐπιβαρῆσαι, καταβαρῆσαι, ἀβαρῆ*, in the passages cited above as comprising, each in one word, the double sense of *burdening* others in supporting one's own *dignity*.

since we have, in the greeting of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, "Paul, called to be an apostle of Jesus Christ through the will of God, and Sosthenes our brother," where certainly such close partnership cannot be assumed. Nevertheless, the conjunction of the three names, with no words interposed to mark distinction in office, may be fairly alleged as looking in that direction, if other evidence can be adduced favouring that view. And such, I venture to think, there is.

St. Paul, in his third journey, writing to the Corinthians with reference certainly to that same second journey with which we are now concerned, expresses himself thus: "For the Son of God, Jesus Christ, who was preached among you by us, by me and Silvanus and Timotheus, was not yea and nay" (2 Cor. i. 19). This manner of speaking raises Timotheus from any such position of a mere "attendant (*ἀπηρέτης*)," whether upon Paul himself or upon Paul and Silas in conjunction, as Mark had held with relation to Paul and Barnabas in the first journey, and assigns to him an independent footing, more or less co-ordinate, by the side of the other two preachers of the Son of God—a footing at least so far independent and co-ordinate that the portraiture which he had given of the Lord Jesus Christ could be referred to as additional to and corroborative of that given by Paul and by Silvanus.

May it not, then, be the case that when, in the passage more immediately under consideration (1 Thess. ii. 6), he says, "We might as Christ's apostles have taken a position burdensome to you," he refers to the "Paul and Silvanus and Timotheus" from whom the Epistle professes to come, as being all three apostles of Christ?

An affirmative answer to this query is favoured by the references to Timotheus which we meet with in the Epistle to the Philippians. In ii. 22 St. Paul says of him, "Ye know the proving of him [i.e. what, when put to the proof, he was found to be], that as a son to his father [*q.d.* like father, like child] he with me served (*ἐδούλευσε*) for the furtherance of the gospel;" served, that is, the Lord Jesus; for that the person whom Timotheus is described as doing service to was Christ and not the Apostle Paul, is not only evinced by the very form of the expression, *ὄν ἐμὸν ἐδούλευσε*, but also by the superscription of the Epistle, "Paul and Timotheus, servants (*δούλοι*) of Christ Jesus to all the saints," etc. The Epistle to the Philippians, it is true, dates several years later than even the third journey, and perhaps seven or eight years later than the Epistles to the Thessalonians; but the "proving" of which the Philippians were cognizant may be probably conceived as commencing from the time when Timotheus accompanied St. Paul on his first coming into Macedonia with Silas, though continuing through that time also of the third journey when, as we know, St. Paul, being at Ephesus, despatched him on a mission to Corinth, visiting the Churches of Macedonia on the way (1 Cor. xvi. 10; Acts xix. 22). The passage shows that from the commencement of this period St. Paul regarded Timothy, not as a personal attendant waiting upon himself, but as a fellow-bondservant with himself of Christ, working, as he told the Corinthians (1 Cor. xvi. 10), the work of the Lord, that is, the work on which the Lord was employing him, even as he himself did. As Paul himself, so also Timotheus, owned a sacred commission which St. Paul felt himself bound to recognize and revere.

In the Acts no account is given, either of any Divine call summoning Timotheus to a ministerial function, or of any other circumstances attending his appointment to such an office. All that St. Luke states is that Paul, in this second journey of his, found, in

*Δούλοι Χριστοῦ* is palpably not a predicate of mere discipleship, as in 1 Cor. vii. 22; Eph. vi. 6. The phrase here, as it almost always appears to do, designates an official character (comp. Rom. i. 1; ch. i. 10; Col. iv. 12; 2 Tim. ii. 24; Titus i. 1; Jas. i. 1; 2 Pet. i. 1; Jude 1).

the parts near Derbe and Lystra, a "disciple named Timotheus"—a convert, it should seem, won in the former missionary journey with Barnabas—"who was very highly spoken of by the brethren at Lystra and Iconium;" that, "he conceived the wish (*ἠθέλησεν*) that he should go forth with him," sharing the sacred enterprise on which he and Silas were already engaged; and further, that to qualify him for dealing to greater advantage with Jews, "he took and circumcised him."

We need, however, feel no surprise that we find here no particulars of either call or special designation, such as are found in Acts xiii. 1—3 with relation to Paul and Barnabas, neither does the omission tend to discredit the idea that there were such. It would not fall within the scope of the sacred historian's purpose to furnish such details with respect to the various persons who were called to share St. Paul's labours—Aristarchus, Titus, Demas, Trophimus, and others, including Luke himself. The circumcision of Timotheus is mentioned, not on his account, but as illustrative of St. Paul's own methods of action.

*Timothy's ordination.* Nevertheless, in the letters which, a good many years later as it would seem, St. Paul had occasion to write to Timotheus, we do find indications of circumstances attending his first susception of the office which he held in the Church, such as serve in some measure to explain those respectful references to that office which we have just been considering.

When the apostle wrote those letters, he had appointed him to a highly important and responsible post at Ephesus; in fact, to exercise for a while the like supremacy in the regulation of Church affairs in that neighbourhood as St. Paul himself would have exercised had he been there. Timotheus, as many indications show, was remarkable for sensitiveness and for the modesty of his temperament—modesty, perhaps, amounting to even an excessive measure of self-diffidence; and he shrank from the heavy responsibility imposed upon him. It was partly to combat this extreme self-distrust, and not only to direct him how to conduct himself in his new position, that St. Paul was now writing to him.

With the former object in view, he tells him (1 Tim. i. 18) that, in entrusting him with this important charge, he was only following out those inspired intimations of the Divine will concerning him "which had led the way to him (*κατὰ τὰς προαγούσας ἐπί σε προφητείας*);" that is, as is suggested by the comparison of Acts xiii. 2, which had in the first instance led the eldership of the neighbourhood and St. Paul himself to solemnly set him apart for the work of an evangelist. The apostle himself feels, and enjoins it upon Timotheus to feel, that the "prophesying" which first suggested that long-ago consecration for his work furnished a topic of strong encouragement; so much did he feel this, that he brings it forward again in 1 Tim. iv. 14, where he likewise refers to it as the means of the "charism" being bestowed which was in him. "Neglect not," he says, "the gift that is in thee, which was given to thee through prophesying in conjunction with the laying on of the hands of the eldership."

For the like purpose of encouragement, he twice refers to the "charism," or "the charism of God," which on that occasion had been conferred upon him. The medium of its bestowment, he reminds him in one passage (2 Tim. i. 6), was the laying on of his hands; and how efficacious the laying on of his hands was wont to be, when he used it in the solemn exercise of his supreme apostolical office, was a matter which Timotheus had had abundant opportunity for observing. The "gift" verily was "in him," a holy fire steadily deposited in his breast, sure to kindle up into living flames, mightily effectual if only stirred and fanned by being faithfully made use of. In the other passage (1 Tim. iv. 14), in place of this reference to the laying on of his hands, and without specifying the proximate medium of the bestowment at all, he reminds

him that the gift was conferred in conjunction with (*μετὰ*, not *σὺν*) the laying on of the hands of the eldership.<sup>1</sup> This last circumstance of the sacred rite illustrated the high character of the commission then entrusted to him. It marked him out, in fact, as being in that ministration on which he was then going forth, an apostle of the Church, and so an "apostle of Christ." The eldership, by laying *their* hands upon him, in the solemn hour in which, before many witnesses (1 Tim. vi. 12), he was set apart for the service of an evangelist, set to their seal of the Church's formal authorization in its discharge.<sup>2</sup>

We are thus brought to the conclusion that when St. Paul says to the Thessalonians, "We might have been burdensome as Christ's apostles," he speaks of both Silvanus and Timotheus as standing in conjunction with himself.

Thus had all three been delegated by authoritative exponents of the Church's practical judgment to go forth into the world to proclaim the gospel and to propagate the Church.

*Different Church officers specified in Eph. iv. 11.* In the passage of the Ephesians (iv. 11) in which St. Paul illustrates, with reference to the ascended Lord, the psalmist's words, "He gave gifts unto men," he writes, "He it was that 'gave' some to be apostles, some to be prophets, some to be evangelists, some to be shepherds and teachers." Viewed as spiritually called forth and endowed by Christ as the world's Benefactor, Paul was himself an "apostle" in that supreme sense in which the word is there used, standing by the side of the august twelve; Silvanus was a "prophet" (Acts xv. 32), Timotheus an "evangelist" (2 Tim. iv. 5). Viewed as parts of the visible Church, they were likewise the Church's accredited messengers and agents.

*St. Paul's reserve respecting his holding the higher form of apostleship in the earlier years of his ministry.* Up to this time, that is, up to the latter part of St. Paul's first journey into Europe, there is reason to doubt whether that Divine direction under which he habitually acted had led him openly and distinctly to announce and insist upon the office of supreme apostleship with which in actual fact Christ had from the first endowed him. So far as can be discovered, he had hitherto acquiesced in his being regarded as an apostle in the like sense as that in which St. Barnabas was an apostle, or Silas, or even Timotheus; namely, as an apostle of Christ because he was an apostle of Christ's Church, delegated and sent forth either by some particular Christian community or by leading representatives of the Christian body. It is true that at the very commencement of his ministry, immediately after his conversion, as we learn from this Epistle to the Galatians (i.), he acted more independently; for he proceeded at once to act upon the commission which he had received immediately from Christ, preaching the gospel which he had likewise received immediately from Christ, without waiting for any ecclesiastical delegation whatever. But later, at the

<sup>1</sup> Nowhere are charisms said to be conferred by presbyters. Apostles only, in that supreme sense of the word in which it applied only to the twelve and to St. Paul, appear capable of conferring them by the laying on of hands.

<sup>2</sup> Timotheus's function is defined as being that of "an evangelist" by the apostle himself (2 Tim. iv. 5). This was a distinct order of ministrants, as appears from Eph. iv. 11; Acts xxi. 8; but the precise limits of their office are not now determinable. In the main it should seem to have been that of missionaries, to propagate the gospel; including, at least occasionally, as we may judge from the so-called pastoral Epistles, the organizing superintendence of nascent Churches, involving the appointment of "bishops" and "deacons." Timotheus's work at Ephesus, as well as that of Titus in Crete, was probably that of an evangelist discharging an occasional service in that neighbourhood, rather than that of a permanently located bishop.

time when in the Acts the method of his ministerial agency begins to be more clearly portrayed to us, we perceive him, first, brought into ministerial activity at Antioch by Barnabas, who himself had been deputed from Jerusalem to visit the Gentile converts in that city and had gone across from that place to Tarsus for the purpose of enlisting his co-operation in that field of labour; then, delegated from Antioch with Barnabas, whose name stands the foremost of the two in the history ("Barnabas and Saul," in this order) both now and for some way onwards, to convey to Jerusalem a contribution for the poor of the brethren in Judæa; then, delegated from Antioch, in conjunction again with Barnabas, to go forth upon a far-extended evangelistic journey; then, deputed once more from Antioch with Barnabas ("Paul and Barnabas" now) and others to go to Jerusalem to consult the apostles and elders on the question of circumcising Gentile believers; then, returning from Jerusalem in company with other delegates, to convey to the Churches of Syria and Cilicia the Jerusalem rescript on that subject, at which time the high attestation of the apostles and leading brethren at Jerusalem had been accorded to his own ministerial work as well as to that of Barnabas; and, lastly, embarking upon another extended evangelistic expedition which brought him at length into Europe, where, in an Epistle to the Thessalonians, he designated himself and Silas and Timotheus in conjunction as "apostles of Christ."

These facts betoken that hitherto, neither in the Church was St. Paul regarded as invested with the like supreme form of apostleship as that which attached to the twelve, nor was he himself wont to insist upon the assertion that he was so invested.

But when we come to the group of four letters which, after an interval of some five years or more since the date of the two addressed to the Thessalonians, St. Paul in the latter part of the last-named journey despatched to the Galatians, to the Corinthians, and to the Romans, we have to note in these a new tone in speaking of his apostleship; an intense, solemn assertion of a peculiar kind of spiritual dignity; evidently an antagonistic assertion, one called forth by the new form, or at least by the new vehemence, of the opposition by which he found himself confronted.

In respect to this last-mentioned point, we observe that, in those two earlier letters of his, addressed to the Thessalonians, he had spoken of bitter hostility and of thence accruing persecution. But these had come upon him mainly from outside the Christian body, from unbelieving Gentiles and yet more from unbelieving Jews. There is in these letters only one reference to difficulties thrown in his path from within—a reference by no means explicit, yet with what we know otherwise not hard to explain. The "absurd and bad men" from whom in 2 Thess. iii. 2 he asks the Thessalonians to pray that he may be delivered, were in all probability Christians; for the clause which he adds, "for all have not faith," would seem a pointless truism unless written of a class of persons among whom men would be entitled to expect to find faith. Already, then, in those days St. Paul had found himself hampered in his work, and even perhaps personally imperilled, by "sham brethren," who really were "bad" men as well as "absurd;" that is to say, men still unweaned from their sins (cf. Phil. iii. 18), and moreover possessed with sentiments and predilections altogether "incongruous with their position" as Christian believers. We may safely identify in the persons thus described professed Christians of a kindred character with those whom, not long before he thus wrote, he had had to contend with at Antioch and at Jerusalem (ch. ii. 4).

At that time, however, the evil had not grown to the formidable dimensions which it afterwards assumed. But now, in the four letters of this later era, St. Paul is seen in the very thickest of the conflict with such false brethren. The reactionary party in the Church, which sought to neutralize the properly evangelical element of the gospel and to bring Christians back to the bondage more or less of Judaical ceremonialism, was

raising its head in every direction. And those who formed it, finding in St. Paul their most effectual and most uncompromising opponent, set themselves to undermine his influence in every possible way. They calumniated his moral character, personal and ministerial, and they decried his apostolical authority.

This latter point is that with which we are now principally concerned.

By this juncture of circumstances, St. Paul was compelled, acting no doubt under the direction of his Master, to openly proclaim, and in the strongest possible manner maintain, his properly apostolical commission; that is, to proclaim and to insist upon the fact that he held a commission, received independently of any human agency, from the ascended Lord, himself appearing to him in personal presence and conferring it upon him—a commission which put him upon a level with the revered band of the twelve; while he had it also to affirm—and this was a point of even greater moment than the other, one to which that other owed, in fact, all its own importance—that the gospel which he was sent to preach was likewise, as well as his commission, received, not from men, but by direct communication from heaven.

But this is a subject the importance of which calls for a more specific discussion to be devoted to it.

## DISSERTATION II.

THE CIRCUMSTANCES WHICH AT THIS TIME LED ST. PAUL DISTINCTLY AND PUBLICLY TO ANNOUNCE TO THE CHURCH HIS PROPERLY APOSTOLIC COMMISSION.

*The religion of Christ essentially untrammelled by outward forms of manifestation.* Among the most distinctively evangelical elements of the gospel may be ranked the two following, forming, in fact, its great preparation and qualification for becoming the universal religion of mankind:—

1. That faith in Christ, apart from any definite ceremonial performances, unless so far as the two simple ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper may be so regarded, constitutes the alone condition of justification and sonship with God.

2. That the "worship of God in spirit," apart from any definite rigid form of outward ceremony or observance, is everywhere his true and acceptable service, however varying may be the outward form in which from time to time it is clothed.

*The narrowing of Christ's religion by insistence upon certain forms.* But the spirit of ceremonial formalism, which is the natural outcome of the unregenerated heart when it comes into contact with the subject of religion, proves itself in all ages unable to satisfy itself with principles so purely spiritual as these; their bare spirituality makes them intolerable. The "natural man" sets himself accordingly to qualify them to his taste by superadding, in fact substituting, the injunction upon the conscience of some species or other of fixed outward forms or ordinances, in attention to which his soul can take refuge from the haunting idea of the need of a spiritual religiousness for which it has no inclination, while he has, however, the comfort of knowing himself not neglectful of religion altogether. The forms or ordinances selected will soon come to be regarded, not as mere seemly external concomitants of worship or of the religious life—in which view, if appropriate in their character and used with a prudent appreciation

of their true value, forms and ordinances, though of merely human devising, may be both necessary and edifying—but as essential, and as in themselves efficacious, for making the worship or the life acceptable or more acceptable to God. In consequence, in the eyes of those who embrace them, such fellow-Christians as go along with them in their observance are to be welcomed as indeed brethren; while they who do not, however truly believers in Christ, and though even confessed to be believers in him, are nevertheless regarded as out of the pale of *their* brotherly recognition and sympathy. The Divine injunction, “What God hath cleansed call not thou unclean,” falls upon their ears unheeded. The Word of God must be made void to make room for the keeping of the commandments of men.

The selection of the particular forms and ordinances to be insisted upon is evermore shifting and variable. Being as it is, the child of mere carnal self-will, “will-worship” (*ἰθελοθρησκεία*), as St. Paul brands it with being, it takes now and here one shape, then and there a different one. We gather out of the Epistles of the New Testament that, as early as in the apostolic age, it was continually changing its aspect.

*The narrowing of Christ's religion by Judaizing forms.* One branch of this corruption of the faith, the one which we are now more particularly concerned with, engendered by the habits of thought which were deeply ingrained in the minds of the Jewish people, assumed the Judaizing or Levitical type.

In its earliest while at the same time its most thorough-going manifestations, coeval, in fact, with the very first coming into being of the Gentile Church, it laid down the principle that circumcision and the keeping of the Law of Moses were essential conditions of salvation—essential even in the case of *Gentile* believers. No believer was to be recognized as a brother who did not order himself according to this rule.

It is obvious how hurtful, not to say fatal, the operation of this dogma, if established in the Church, must have proved. It would have darkened the believer's sense of his adoption; it would have set upon the neck of the Gentile Church a galling yoke of outward ceremony; it would have clogged or even arrested the progress of the gospel among mankind. Accordingly, Paul, in concert with Barnabas, offered it the most strenuous resistance; and at Jerusalem itself, being backed by the weighty support of Cephas and of James, they succeeded in inflicting upon this extreme embodiment of ceremonial formalism the check of a public and authoritative rebuke.

*Hard for Jewish believers to unlearn their Jewish particularism.* The tendency, however, which originated it was too congenial to the soil of Jewish sentiment for its roots and fibres not to live on underground, ever ready to sprout forth afresh. True, when the question was put plainly and point-blank to the Jewish believer's Christian consciousness, it could not refuse to acknowledge it to be true that faith in Christ did avail of itself to deliver a man, whether Jew or Gentile, from all spiritual pollutedness, and to present him clean and unrebukable both before God and before man. But the leaven of Christ's Word could not instantaneously permeate and transmute the inmost spirit of even his sincerest disciples through and through; the truth needed time, with apostles themselves it needed time, before it could modify into full conformity with itself habits of thinking and feeling which they had received from their forefathers, and had hitherto cherished as the precious heirloom of their race. And if there was much that even the best-instructed and more spiritually minded among them found it hard both to learn and to unlearn, what was to be expected from those Jewish converts—and no doubt there were many such—whose conversion was only half sincere, or who had joined the brethren from some kind of superficial or half-worldly impulse, which left the inner core of their convictions and sensibilities untouched? These might not dare to openly gainsay the teaching of the “apostles and elders;” but how should they in



their very inmost heart believe and feel that their circumcision and all their careful observance of Mosaic ceremonies and rites—ceremonies and rites which were designed to separate them, as in fact they did markedly separate them, from other races—inferred, after all, in the new economy no real distinction, and that in Christ Jesus there was neither circumcision nor uncircumcision, neither Jew nor Greek? With the large bulk of the Jewish brethren in Judæa this posture of feeling cannot be assumed to have existed: Pharisees they had many of them been before their conversion, and Pharisees in heart they continued still.

*Circumstances favouring the spread of the leaven of Judaizing.* And wherever they went they would be, of course, ready to propagate in other Christian communities these noxious sentiments of theirs, and abundant opportunity would offer to them for doing this. The Jews in the then existing state of things were, as a people, especially migratory in their habits, and moreover many of the Jewish believers had first heard the gospel through their having come from a perhaps far distant home to Jerusalem on a brief occasional visit.

We must also bear in mind that throughout the provinces of the Roman empire it was the synagogue of each locality that commonly furnished the first nucleus of believers; and with respect to not a few of these first converts everywhere, similar observations would apply to those above made with particular reference to professedly believing Jews in Palestine.

Now, it is obvious that, in a congregation of Gentile converts but lately sunk in the idolatry and religious ignorance of heathenism, a Christian Jew, as having been trained from infancy in the worship of the one true God and in the knowledge of those Holy Scriptures out of which the gospel itself sprang, especially if he came from Jerusalem the first cradle of the faith, where he had been in contact with those who had known the Lord Jesus himself upon earth, would be naturally felt entitled to especial consideration when speaking of matters relating to Judaism and Christianity.

We cannot wonder, therefore, at finding that, far and wide among the ancient Churches of the Gentiles, Judaizing corruptions of the gospel were early broached, and but too readily found acceptance. The degree in which the statement of evangelical truth was vitiated, as also the degree in which the actual practice of Judaical observances was introduced, would vary in different localities; but the tendency was showing itself in all directions, and, wherever it appeared, it would be the signal for division and strife.

*The widespread and eager controversy ensuing thereupon.* And the strife was just at this time at its fiercest. Judaizing corruptions of Christian faith and doctrine were on all sides confronting and being confronted by those who insisted upon the truth as it is in Jesus. These latter maintained that in no case, whether of Gentile or of Jew, had the observance of Levitical ordinances anything whatever to do with the sinner's justification before God; and further—as a corollary of this general truth which was just now of essential importance—that not only was the Gentile believer free from the obligation of conforming in any respect to the ceremonial laws of the Jews in order to his justification before God, but that also this his complete justification before God through faith in Christ, apart from any such ceremonial observance, claimed to be openly and practically recognized by Jewish believers, by the latter frankly and cordially fraternizing with the Gentile as standing, through their mutual union in Christ, on a perfectly equal footing with themselves of acceptableness and brotherhood.

*St. Paul the foremost asserter of Gentile freedom and equality.* And the chief champion of all, of evangelical orthodoxy, was St. Paul. He it was that had persistently grappled with the evil when first showing its front at Antioch and then at Jerusalem; not single-handed, as we know, yet we cannot doubt the main inspiring genius of the truth's

advocacy; and he had drawn forth from the Christian consciousness of the twelve apostles and of James and of the elders and general body of the Jerusalemite believers, that letter of theirs registered in the Acts of the Apostles, which has been not inaptly styled the Magna Charta of the Gentile Church's freedom. Not long after again, as he himself has informed us, he had been called to grapple with the mischief, and secure the fruit of the preceding victory, at the second great capital of the then Christendom, the principal home and head-quarters of Gentile disciples. A Barnabas and even a Peter might somewhat hesitate and falter, and did; but Paul, never. What he was at Jerusalem and then again at Antioch, that, as we have good reason to believe, in every such emergency he proved himself still to be—the ever-watchful, keenly discerning, intrepid, uncompromising guardian of the freedom of Christ's people. He himself knew, and the Gentile Churches knew, and the Judaizing troublers of those Churches knew, that "he was set for the defence of the gospel." *Those* loved and rejoiced in their protector; *these* feared their invincible adversary, and hated him.

*Animosity of the Jews against St. Paul.* For this unceasing vigilant antagonism which he offered to the Judaizing influences at work in the Church, replete as it was with blessing to believers in Christ in all ages whose freedom from ceremonial bondage he was the Lord's "chosen vessel" to convey to them, rounded in untold suffering upon himself. He was already before the peculiar abhorrence of the Jews who did not believe because, through the transforming grace of God, from being the bitter blasphemer and persecutor of Christ, he had suddenly stood forth before the world as his devoted and ardent minister. No other apostle, no other preacher of the faith, was regarded by his fellow-Jews with any such feelings of rancorous animosity as already on this account fastened on the renegade Saul.

And now the Israelite mind found with St. Paul another cause of offence. The position which, as a teacher of his Church, Christ had set him to take up in reference to the ceremonial law, was one which it was very easy to misconstrue, and with much colour of plausibility to misrepresent. It was in this way that the first martyr Stephen had perished, stoned to death as one who "blasphemed Moses and God," by the unbelieving Jews, and to all appearance misunderstood and forsaken by his Christian brethren themselves (Acts viii. 2). Very similar to Stephen's experience was now the experience of Paul. The description of his doctrine, taking no doubt its origin in his vigorous antagonism to the Judaizers, which was current among the Jews, not only among those who did not believe in Christ, but also among the Christian Jews themselves, was that he set himself to persuade the Jews of the dispersion to "apostatize from Moses," and to abandon the practice both of circumcision and the Levitical customs in general (Acts xxi. 21). Race prejudice, but especially the prejudice of religious partisanship, is wont to be alike unscrupulous and cruel; and the apostle became the object of unceasing malignant obloquy and detraction.

*Jewish and Judaizing brethren ready to gainsay St. Paul's apostleship.* Not only was his personal character assailed with accusations of insincerity, two-facedness, and wilful perversion of the truth from interested motives—accusations which, as is shown by his frequent references to them in his letters, affected his mind with the keenest pain—but in particular also the authenticity of his call to teach was impugned. Why should he be listened to? His doctrine was palpably not the doctrine of James nor the doctrine of Cephas. *They* did not set themselves to cry down circumcision and the observance of the customs as *he* did! What he really wished you to believe it might be hard perhaps to exactly determine; he said one thing at one time and to one set of hearers, and something quite different at another time and with other surroundings; for he had "a yea and a nay" ever on the tip of his tongue, ready to use whichever of the

two his occasions at the moment made the more convenient. But whatever his doctrine really was, it came with no authority. Such apostleship as he had at all came at last from Jerusalem, and Jerusalem disowned him! Such was the tenor of the wildest form of oppugnancy which confronted him.

*St. Paul obliged to assert openly his highest apostolic authority.* It had become necessary, therefore, now that he should openly proclaim that supreme form of apostleship with which Christ had invested him. This had not been considered so essential at an earlier stage of his ministry. Four or five years ago, for example, when, in company with Silas, he first visited Greece, at which time he wrote his two letters to the Thessalonians, he had been content to still rank as one who shared his apostolical character with a Silas or even a Timotheus. But the force and malignity of Judaistic oppugnancy had now risen to such a pitch as to make it necessary, in the interests of truth and for the protection of the Gentile Churches, that he should distinctly and emphatically declare to the world, not only the message which Christ had entrusted him with, but also his peculiar commission for the delivery of that message. And this he was doing, not out of his own mind or in pursuance of a judgment which he had himself formed as to what he ought to do, but under the sanction and no doubt immediate direction of Christ; for he held it in his power, if need arose and according as occasion required, to sustain his assertion that he was endowed with this highest form of apostleship by the signal manifestation of "the signs of an apostle," both in the conferring upon obedient disciples of phenomenally miraculous gifts, and also in the infliction on obstinate gainsayers of the truth of supernatural chastisement.

The statements now made, the reader, no doubt, will at once recognize as fully borne out by the contents of the contemporaneous Epistles to the Corinthians, particularly those of the Second, which is, in fact, mainly devoted to conflicts called forth by the Judaizing movement, though not so much occupied as the Epistle to the Galatians by the discussion of the Judaistic controversy itself.

Such was the position of affairs which drew forth from St. Paul the full public announcement which he here makes of his properly apostolic office. It is probably the very first that he made in an epistolary writing, and it serves to connect the Epistle to the Galatians in point of subject very closely with the two Epistles to the Corinthians. In fact, we may in this respect regard this Epistle as in a measure introductory to those other two, as well as to that which was addressed to the Romans, which was no doubt the latest portion of this great epistolary quaternion.

*In Galatia St. Paul's doctrine impugned rather than his apostleship.* We have, however, to observe that we do not owe the definite and emphatic announcement which St. Paul here makes of his proper apostolate, especially or principally to assaults made in Galatia directly upon his position as an apostle. The fact that such assaults were already beginning to be made there is indeed not improbable in itself, and appears to be not obscurely indicated by the tone of the very first sentence. But the absence of further distinct reference in the Epistle to this particular form of oppugnancy is of itself a proof that it is not this which the apostle now feels to be his direct and chief concern. What in the Churches of Galatia furnished the chief occasion for this apologetic statement was rather their incipient abandonment of the gospel which he had preached among them. That which he felt to be here the most important fact was that the message was impugned which he had brought them from Christ himself, not that his authorization as an apostle to bring it was, viewed by itself, assailed. His present chief object, to which his assertion of his apostleship is only subsidiary, is to make it distinctly felt that the message was indeed Christ's very own, and that therefore, in revolting against *that*, they were revolting from Christ.

# THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE GALATIANS.

## EXPOSITION.

### CHAPTER I.

Vers. 1—5.—*The introductory greeting.* The style of this greeting, compared with those found in St. Paul's other Epistles, gives indications of his having addressed himself to the composition of the letter under strong perturbation of feeling. This transpires in the abruptness with which, at the very outset, he at once sweeps aside, as it were, out of his path, a slur cast upon his apostolic commission, in protesting that he was "apostle, not from man nor through a man." It appears again in that impetuous negligence of exact precision of language, with which the mention of "God the Father" is conjoined with that of "Jesus Christ" under the one preposition "through," as the *medium* through which his apostleship had been conferred upon him. We cannot help receiving the impression that the apostle had only just before received that intelligence from Galatia which called forth from him the letter, and that he set himself to its composition while the strong emotions which the tidings had produced were still fresh in his mind. That these emotions were those of indignant grief and displeasure is likewise evident. He will not, indeed, withhold the salutation which in all Christian and ministerial courtesy was due from him in addressing what, notwithstanding all, were still Churches of Christ. But all such expressions of affectionate feeling he does withhold, and all such sympathetic reference to matters and individuals of personal interest, as in almost every other Epistle he is seen indulging himself in, and which are not even then found wanting, when, as in the case of the Corinthians, he has occasion to administer much and strong rebuke. No such sympathetic reference, we observe, is found here. As soon as he has penned the salutation, itself singularly cold in respect

GALATIANS.

to those he is addressing, he at once proceeds, in ver. 6, to assail his readers with words of indignant reproach.

Ver. 1.—Paul, an apostle (Παῦλος ἀπόστολος); *Paul, apostle.* The designation of "apostle," as here appropriated by St. Paul in explanation of his right to authoritatively address those he was writing to, points to a function with which he was permanently invested, and which placed him in a relation to these Galatian Churches which no other apostle ever occupied. Some years later, indeed, when St. Peter had occasion to address these same Churches, together with others in neighbouring countries, he likewise felt himself authorized to do it on the score of his apostolical character ("Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ," 1 Pet. i. 1); but there is nothing to show that St. Peter had any personal relations with them at present. Under these circumstances, it is perhaps best in translation to prefix no article at all before "apostle." This designation of himself as "apostle" St. Paul subjoined to his name in almost all of his Epistles subsequent to the two addressed to the Thessalonians. The only exceptions are those to the Philippians and to Philemon, in writing to whom there was less occasion for introducing it. He had now, in the third of his three great journeys recorded in the Acts, assumed openly in the Church the position of an apostle in the highest sense. In several of these Epistles (1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1; Eph. i. 1; Col. i. 1; 2 Tim. i. 1), to the designation of apostle, St. Paul adds the words, "through (διὰ) the will of God;" *i.e.* by means of an express volition of God explicitly revealed. In what way God had revealed this to be his will is clearly intimated in this letter to the Galatians, in which the words, "through Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead," which take the place of the formula, "through the will of God,"

found elsewhere, indicate that it was through Jesus Christ raised from the dead that this particular volition of God was declared and brought to effect. The formula referred to, "through the will of God," was apparently introduced with the view of confronting those who were disposed to question his right to claim this supreme form of apostleship, with the ægis of Divine authorization: they had God to reckon with. The like is the purport of the substituted words in 1 Tim. i. 1, "According to the commandment of God our Saviour, and Christ Jesus our Hope." Not of men, neither by man (οὐκ ἂν ἀνθρώπων, οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου); not from men, neither through a man. The preposition "from" (ἀπὸ) points to the primary fountain of the delegation referred to; "through" (διὰ) to the medium through which it was conveyed. The necessity for this twofold negation arose from the fact that the word "apostle," as I have had occasion fully to set forth elsewhere, was frequently among Christians applied to messengers deputed by Churches, or, probably, even by some important representative officer in the Church, whether on a mission for the propagation of the gospel or for the discharge at some distant place of matters of business connected with the Christian cause. St. Paul had himself frequently served in this lower form of apostleship, both as commissioned by the Church to carry abroad the message of the gospel, and also as deputed to go to and fro between Churches on errands of charity or for the settlement of controversies. In either case he as well as others acting in the like capacity, would very naturally and properly be spoken of as an "apostle" by others, as we actually find him to have been; as also he would appear to have been ready on this same account so to designate himself.<sup>1</sup> That he was an "apostle" in this sense none probably would have been minded to dispute. Why should they? His having, even repeatedly, held this kind of subordinate commission did not of itself give him a greater importance than attached to many others who had held the same. Neither did it invest his statements of religious truth with a higher sanction than theirs. This last was the point which, in St. Paul's own estimation, gave the question of the real nature of his apostleship its whole significance. Was he a commissioned envoy

of men, deputed to convey to others a message of theirs? or was he an envoy commissioned immediately by Christ to convey to the world a message which likewise was received immediately from Christ? Those who disputed his statements of religious doctrine might admit that he had been deputed to preach the gospel by Christian Churches or by eminently representative leaders of the Church, while they nevertheless asserted that he had misrepresented, or perhaps misapprehended, the message entrusted to him. At all events, they would be at liberty to affirm that the statements he made in delivering his message were subject to an appeal on the part of his hearers to the human authorities who had delegated him. If he owed alike his commission and his message to (say) the Church of Antioch, or to the Church at Jerusalem, or to the twelve, or to James the Lord's brother, or to other leaders whomsoever of the venerable mother Church, then it followed that he was to be held amenable to their overruling judgment in the discharge of this apostleship of his. What he taught had no force if this higher court of appeal withheld its sanction. Now, this touched no mere problematical contingency, but was a practical issue which, just at this time, was one of even vital importance. It had an intimate connection with the fierce antagonism of contending parties in the Church, then waged over the dying body of the Levitical Law. St. Paul's mission as an apostle is most reasonably considered to date from the time when, as he states in his defence before King Agrippa (Acts xxvi. 16, 17), the Lord Jesus said to him, "To this end have I appeared unto thee, to appoint thee a minister and a witness [ὑπηρέτην καὶ μάρτυρα: comp. αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται, Luke i. 2 and Acts i. 2, 3, 8, 22] both of the things wherein thou hast seen me, and of the things wherein I will appear unto thee; delivering thee from the people [λαοῦ, sc. Israel], and from the Gentiles, unto whom I myself send thee [eis oὓς ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω σε: thus L. T. Tr. Rev.; the Textus Receptus reads eis oὓν νῦν σε ἀποστέλλω]" (comp. Acts xxii. 14, 15; 1 Cor. ix. 1). But though his appointment was in reality coeval with his conversion, it was only in course of time and by slow degrees that his properly apostolic function became signalized to the consciousness of the Church. Nevertheless, there is no reason for doubting that to his own consciousness his vocation as apostle was clearly manifested from the very first. The prompt and independent manner in which he at once set himself to preach the gospel, which itself, he tells the Galatians in this chapter, he had received immediately from heaven, betokens his having this consciousness.

<sup>1</sup> For the proof of these statements, the reader is referred to the following passages:—Phil. ii. 25; 2 Cor. viii. 23; Rom. xvi. 7; 2 Cor. xi. 5, 13; xii. 11; Rev. ii. 2; Acts xiv. 4, 14; 1 Thess. ii. 7; and to the discussion of the import and bearing of them severally, in the essay on "Apostles" found in the Introduction.

The time and the manner in which the fact was to become manifest to others he would seem, in a spirit of compliant obedience, to have left to the ordering of his Master. But by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead (ἀλλὰ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ Θεοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν); but through Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead. The conjunction "neither" (οὐδὲ), which comes before δι' ἀνθρώπου, marks the clause it introduces as containing a distinctly different negation from the preceding, and shows that the preposition "through" is used in contradistinction to the "from" (ἀπὸ) of the foregoing clause in its proper sense of denoting the instrument or medium through which an act is done. St. Paul affirms that there was no human instrumentality or intermediation whatever at work in the act of delegation which constituted him an apostle. This affirmation places him in this respect precisely on a level with the twelve; perhaps in making it he has an eye to this. The notion has been frequently broached that the apostleship which St. Paul made claim to was conveyed to him at Antioch through the brethren who there, under the direction of the Holy Spirit, formally set him apart, together with Barnabas, for the missionary enterprise which they forthwith entered upon (Acts xiii. 1-3). But words could scarcely have been selected which should more decisively negative any such notion than those do which St. Paul here makes use of. One form of apostleship was no doubt then conferred upon Barnabas and Paul; but it was not the apostleship of which he is now thinking (see essay on "Apostles," pp. xxxi., xxxii.). In defining the precise import and bearing of the expression, δι' ἀνθρώπου, "through a man," we may compare it with its use in 1 Cor. xv. 21, "Since δι' ἀνθρώπου came death, δι' ἀνθρώπου came also the resurrection of the dead;" where in the second clause the word "man," employed to reiterate the Lord Jesus, contemplates that aspect of his twofold being which places him as "the second Man" (1 Cor. xv. 47) in correlation to Adam, "the first Man." Similarly, the parallel with Adam again in Rom. v. 12, 15 leads the apostle to adopt the expression, "the one Man Jesus Christ" (cf. also *ibid.* 19). In 1 Tim. ii. 5, "There is one God, one Mediator also between God and men, himself Man [or, 'a man'], Christ Jesus," our Lord's manhood, in accordance with the requirement of the context, is put forward as a bond of connection linking him with every human creature alike. These passages present Christ in the character simply of a human being. But in the passage before us the apostle at first sight appears to imply that, because he was

an apostle through the agency of Jesus Christ, he was not an apostle through the agency of a human being; thus negating, apparently, the manhood of Christ, at least as viewed in his present glorified condition. The inference, however, is plainly contradicted by both 1 Cor. xv. 21 and 1 Tim. ii. 5; for the former passage points in "the second Man" to the "Lord from heaven," while the other refers to him as permanent "Mediator between God and men," both, therefore, speaking of Jesus in his present glorified condition. To obviate this difficulty some have proposed to take the "but" (ἀλλὰ), not as *adversative*, but as *exceptive*. But there is no justification for this—not even Mark ix. 8 (see Winer's 'Gram. N. T.,' 53, 10, 1 b). A less precarious solution is arrived at by gathering out of the context the precise shade of meaning in which the word "man" is here used. Christ is indeed "Man," and his true manhood is the sense required in the two passages above cited; but he is also more than man; and it is those qualities of his being and of his state of existence which distinguish him from mere men, which the context shows to be now present to the apostle's mind. For the phrase, "through a man," is not contrasted by the words, "through Jesus Christ," alone, but by the whole clause, "through Jesus Christ, and God the Father who raised him from the dead." That is to say, in penning the former phrase, the apostle indicates by the word "man" one invested with the ordinary qualities of an earthly human condition; whereas the "Jesus Christ" through whom Heaven sent forth Saul as an apostle to the Gentiles was Jesus Christ blended with, inconceivably near to, God the Father, one with him; his oneness with him not veiled, as it was when he was upon earth, though really subsisting even then (John x. 30), but to all the universe manifested—manifested visibly to us upon earth by the resurrection of his body; in the spiritual, as yet *now* to us invisible world, by that sitting down on the right hand of God which was the implied sequel and climax of his resurrection. The strong sense which the apostle has of the unspeakably intimate conjunction subsisting since his resurrection, between Jesus Christ viewed in his whole incarnate being and God the Father, explains how it comes to pass that the two august Names are combined together under one single preposition, "through Jesus Christ, and God the Father." We shall have to notice the same phenomenon in ver. 3 in the apostle's formula of greeting prayer, "Grace to you and peace from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ;" on which see the note. We have the same conception of Christ's personality

consequent upon his resurrection in the apostle's words relative to his apostolic appointment in Rom. i. 4, 5; where the Jesus Christ through whom "he had received grace and apostleship," in contrast with his merely human condition as "of the seed of David according to the flesh," is described as "him who was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness by the resurrection of the dead." The clause, "who raised him from the dead," has a twofold bearing upon the point in hand. 1. It supplies an answer to the objection which may be believed to have been made to Paul's claim to be regarded as an apostle sent forth by Jesus Christ, by those who said, "You have never seen Christ or been taught by him, like those whom he himself named apostles." The answer is, "You might object so if Jesus were no more than a dead man; but he is not that: he is a living Man raised from the dead by the Father; and as such I have myself seen him (cf. 1 Cor. ix. 1); and he it was that in his own person, and through no intervention of human agency, gave me both the commission to preach and the gospel which I was to preach" (see below, vers. 11, 12). 2. It connects the action of God the Father with that of Jesus Christ in appointing Paul to be an apostle; for the things which Christ did when raised from the dead and glorified with himself (John xvii. 5) by the Father must obviously have been done from, with, and in God the Father. It would unduly narrow the *pragmatism* of the clause if we limited it to either of the two purposes above indicated; both were probably in the mind of St. Paul in adding it. The immediate context gives no warrant for our supposing, as many have done, that the apostle has just here other truths in view as involved in the fact of our Lord's resurrection; such *e.g.* as he has himself indicated in Rom. iv. 24, 25; vi.; Col. iii. 1. However cogent and closely relevant some of these inferences might have been with respect to the subjects treated of in this Epistle, the Epistle itself, as a matter of fact, makes no other reference whatever to that great event, whether directly or indirectly. Should δὲ ἀνθρώπου be rendered "through man," the noun understood *generically*, as *e.g.* Ps. lvi. 1 (Septuagint), or "through a man," pointing to one individual being? It is not very material; but perhaps the second rendering is recommended by the consideration that, if the apostle had meant still to write generically, he would have repeated the plural noun already employed. Indeed, it may be thought a preferable rendering in the other passages above cited. The transition from the plural noun to the singular, as is noted by Bishop Lightfoot and

others, "suggested itself in anticipation of the clause, 'through Jesus Christ,' which was to follow." In the expression, "God the Father," the addition of the words, "the Father," was not necessary for the indication of the Person meant, any more than in 1 Pet. i. 21, "Believers in God which raised him from the dead," or in numberless other passages where the term, "God" regularly designates the First Person in the blessed Trinity. It would be an incomplete paraphrase to explain it either as "God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," or as "God our Father." It is rather, "God the primary Author and supreme Orderer of all things," or, as in the Creed, "God the Father Almighty." It is best illustrated by the apostle's words in 1 Cor. viii. 6, "To us there is one God, the Father, of whom [*i.e.* out of whom, ἐξ οὗ] are all things, and we unto him;" and in Rom. xi. 36, "Of him, and through him, and unto him, are all things." The apostle adds the term in order to make the designation of the supreme God, who is the Source of his apostleship, the more august and impressive.

Ver. 2.—And all the brethren which are with me (καὶ οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ πάντες ἀδελφοί); and the brethren which are with me, one and all. The ordinary unaccentuated collocation of πάντες would be, πάντες οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ ἀδελφοί. Its position here, where, perhaps, it was thrust in by a kind of after-thought, marks it as emphatic; there is not one of those about him who does not feel the like grief and indignation as himself in reference to the news just now received. We have a similar collocation in Rom. xvi. 15. Πάντες would be marked as emphatic also if placed last, as in 1 Cor. vii. 17; xiii. 2; xv. 7; Titus iii. 15. Our attention is arrested by the absence of any name. A number of persons are named by St. Luke in the Acts (xviii. 18—xx. 5), and by the apostle himself in his Epistles to the Corinthians and to the Romans, as about his person at different times during the latter part of his third journey; and it does not seem very likely that not one was now with him of those who had accompanied him, either in the first or in the second of his two visits in Galatia. The most probable way of explaining the entire suppression of names is by reference to the present mood of the writer; he is too indignant at the behaviour of the Galatian Churchmen to weave into his greeting any such thread of mutual personal interest. It is enough to intimate that all about him felt as he did. Unto the Churches of Galatia (ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατίας). The dry coldness of tone with which this is written will be best understood by the reader upon his comparing the apostle's manner in his other letters, in all of which he is found adding

some words marking the high dignity which attached to the communities he is addressing. He is too much displeased to do this now. The plurality of the Galatian Churches, each of them apparently forming a distinct organization, is expressed again in 1 Cor. xvi. 1, "As I gave order to the Churches of Galatia;" and agrees very well with what we read in Acts xviii. 23, "Went through the region of Galatia and Phrygia in order (*καθεστῆς*), establishing all the disciples." The leaven of Judaizing, whether imported by visitants from other regions or originating within these Churches themselves, appears to have been working very extensively among these communities, and not in one or two of them only. If the latter had been the case, the apostle would not have involved the collective Churches in the like censure, but, as in the case of Colossæ, compared with the "Ephesians," have singled out for warning those actually peccant. This fact, of the general diffusion among them of one particular taint, warrants the belief that certain persons had been at the pains of going about among these Churches to propagate it. Who these persons were, or where they came from, there is nothing to show. It has, indeed, been assumed by many that, like those disturbers of the Antiochian Church mentioned in Acts xv. 1 and ch. ii. 12, they had come from Judæa, or rather Jerusalem. But the Epistle gives no hint of this in respect to the Galatian Churches. What the apostle writes in ch. vi. 12, 13 points rather to the surmise that this particular distraction was caused by some Churchmen of their own, who had given themselves to this heretical proselytizing in order to truckle to non-Christian Jews living in their neighbourhood. Compare the apostle's foreboding respecting the future of the Ephesian Church, in Acts xx. 30. (See note on ch. vi. 12, 13.)

Ver. 3.—Grace be to you and peace (*χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη*); grace to you and peace. Here, as often, we have combined the form of salutation prevalent among Greeks, *χαλεῖν* (found in its unaltered form in Jas. i. 1, "wishing joy"), Christianized into *χάρις*, grace, which denotes the outpouring of Divine benignity in all such spiritual blessings as sinful creatures need; and the Hebrew greeting, *shalôm*, which in its transformation into *εἰρήνη* may be supposed to have dropped in its Christianized signification some of its originally comprehensive meaning, which comprised all "health and wealth" as well as "peace," and to have generally expressed the more limited idea of that calm sense of reconciliation and that perfect security against evil which constitute the peculiar happiness of a soul which believes in Christ. It is nevertheless conceivable that *εἰρήνη*, as used in Hellenistic Greek, may at times have

widened the sense proper to it in ordinary Greek into the more comprehensive import of the *shalôm*, which it was regularly employed to represent. From God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ (*ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*). These words regularly form a part in the apostle's formula of greeting. With slight variations they are found in all his Epistles, except, perhaps, the First to the Thessalonians, where, though read in the *Textus Receptus*, they are omitted by recent editors. "Our" is added to "Father" in at least seven of St. Paul's Epistles (Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon). This warrants the belief that, when as in 1 Timothy, Titus, and here, he wrote "God the Father," he most probably did so with reference to God's fatherly relation to the members of Christ's Church. Tregelles and the margin of the revised Greek text, in fact, read *ἡμῶν* after *πατρὸς* here, omitting it after *Κυρίου*. Uniformly in this formula of greeting we find only one preposition, "from" (*ἀπὸ*), before the two names, "God" and "Jesus Christ;" as in the first verse in this Epistle there is only one preposition, "through," before "Jesus Christ" and "God." The apostle, looking upwards, discerns, as St. Stephen did, in the ineffable glory, the supreme God in whom he recognizes "our Father," and with him Jesus Christ, "our Lord;" that is, our Master, Head, Mediator, "through whom are all things, and we through him." Grace and peace coming down from heaven, must come from God our Father and Jesus Christ our Lord. From the very nature of the case it is obvious that the blessings referred to come to us through Christ, though also "from" him; as also that St. Paul's delegation as apostle, spoken of in the first verse, originated from a volition and appointment of God the Father, as well as was brought about "through" the ordering of his providence. But in each case the preposition used by the apostle preserves its proper force, not to be confused by our thrusting into it another notion not just then in the writer's view.

Ver. 4.—Who gave himself (*τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν*). This is the strongest imaginable description of what Christ did to redeem us. The phrase occurs in 1 Macc. vi. 44, with reference to the Eleazar who rushed upon certain death to kill the elephant which was carrying the king, Antiochus: "He gave himself (*ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν*) to save his people." It is applied to Christ also in Titus ii. 14, "Who gave himself for us;" and 1 Tim. ii. 6, "Who gave himself a ransom for all." In the next chapter, ver. 20, the apostle writes, "Who loved me, and gave himself up (*παράδοντας ἑαυτὸν*) for me." Similarly, St. Paul writes



in Rom. viii. 32, "He that spared not [i.e. 'kept not back'] his own Son, but gave him up (*παρέδωκεν αὐτόν*) for us all." The addition, in Matt. xxvi. 45, of the words, "into the hands of sinners," and our Lord's utterance in Luke xxii. 53, "This is your hour, and the power of darkness," help to illustrate the exceedingly pregnant expression now before us. For our sins (*ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν*). This is the reading of the Textus Receptus, retained by the Revisers. On the other hand, L. T. Tr., for *ὑπὲρ*, substitute *περὶ*. These two prepositions *ὑπὲρ* and *περὶ* ara, in this relation as well as in some others, used indifferently. If we follow the reading of Rec. L. T. Tr. Rev. (for very often the manuscripts oscillate between the two), we have *ὑπὲρ* in 1 Cor. xv. 3, "Died for our sins;" Heb. vii. 27, "To offer up sacrifices, first for his own sins, and then for the sins of the people;" Heb. ix. 7, "Blood, which he offereth for himself, and for the ignorances of the people." On the other hand, we find in the same authorities *περὶ* in Rom. viii. 3, "Sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin;" Heb. v. 3, "As for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins" (where, however, the Receptus has *ὑπὲρ* in the last clause, "for sins"); Heb. x. 6, "Whole burnt offerings, and sacrifices for sin;" Heb. x. 18, "No more offering for sin;" 1 John ii. 2, 10, "Propitiation for our sins;" 1 Pet. iii. 18, "Died [or, 'suffered'] for (*περὶ*) sins, the righteous (for *ὑπὲρ*) the unrighteous." The last passage (1 Pet. iii. 18) suggests the remark that *ὑπὲρ* is the more appropriate word before persons, and *περὶ* before "sins." We find, however, that, in the Septuagint, in the Pentateuch *περὶ* is used also before persons as it is in Heb. v. 3; thus: Lev. v. 18, "The priest shall make atonement for (*περὶ*) him concerning (*περὶ*) his ignorance;" in both cases rendering the Hebrew *al*. So Lev. iv. 20, 26, 31, 35; Numb. viii. 12. On the other hand, in Exod. xxxii. 30 we have "I will go up unto the Lord, that I may make atonement for (*περὶ*, *ὑ'ad*) your sin." The truth seems to be that *ὑπὲρ*, which is more properly "on behalf of," oftendnotes "for," equivalent to "on account of;" as e.g. Ps. xxxix. 11, Septuagint, "rebukes for sin;" Eph. v. 20, "Giving thanks always for all things;" Rom. xv. 9, "Glorify God for his mercy." And this sense passes into "concerning," "with reference to;" as 2 Cor. i. 8, "I would not have you ignorant concerning our affliction;" 2 Cor. viii. 23, "Whether any inquire about Titus." On the other hand, *περὶ*, which more properly denotes "concerning," "with reference to," passes into the sense of "on account of;" as Luke ix. 37, "Praise God for all the mighty works;" John x. 33, "For a good work we stone thee not, but for blasphemy;" 1 Cor. i. 4, "I thank my God . . . concerning you;" 1

Thess. i. 2, "We give thanks to God for you all;" Rom. i. 8, "I thank my God for [Receptus, *ὑπὲρ*] you all." The use of *περὶ* in the verse before us, and in the similar passages above cited, no doubt followed its use in the phrase *περὶ ἁμαρτίας*, which in the LXX. so commonly describes the "sin offering" of the Levitical institute. This phrase sometimes represents what in the Hebrew text is the simple noun (*chattāth*) "sin," put for "sin offering;" as e.g. Lev. vii. 37, "This is the law of the burnt offering, of the meat offering, and of the sin offering (*chattāth*)," etc. (*οὗτος ὁ νόμος τῶν δλοκαντωμάτων, καὶ θυσίας, καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας*, etc.). Sometimes it represents the same Hebrew noun preceded by the preposition *al*, for: "For the sin of such or such a one (*περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ δεῖνα*);" as e.g. Lev. v. 35, where the LXX. has, "The priest shall make atonement for him for the sin which he hath sinned (*ἐξιδάσεται περὶ αὐτοῦ ὁ ἱερεὺς περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἣν ἥμαρτε*)." The precise force of *περὶ* in this phrase was probably "on account of sin," or "having reference to sin;" senses of *περὶ* which, as has been seen, are borne by *ὑπὲρ* as well. This view of the force of these two prepositions, as employed in this relation, seems to the present writer more satisfactory than that which refers it to the notion of protection, "on behalf of" or "for the good of" some one; though it must unquestionably be allowed that this is a notion which they both of them frequently convey. To this latter notion, indeed, we must in all probability refer the use of *ὑπὲρ* in ch. ii. 20, "Gave himself up for me," as well as in 1 Pet. iii. 18, "for the unrighteous;" Luke xxii. 19, 20, "Given for you," "Poured out for you," and the like; and also that of *περὶ* in Matt. xxvi. 28, "Shed for many;" John xvii. 9, "I pray for them;" Col. iv. 3, "Praying for us." The result of this inquiry into the *usus loquendi* with reference to these prepositions appears to be this: in what manner the death of Christ affected our condition in those respects in which that condition was antecedently qualified by our sins, neither *ὑπὲρ* nor *περὶ* as prefixed to the noun "sins" enables us precisely to determine, further than as it recalls for illustration the "sin offering" of the Law. For the more complete development of the idea intended to be conveyed, we must look to other references made in Scripture to the subject, such as e.g. 2 Cor. v. 21; ch. iii. 13; 1 Pet. i. 19. Thus much, however, we may confidently assume: both *ὑπὲρ* and *περὶ* as so applied do alike warrant us in concluding, not only that it was because of our sins that Christ behaved to die, but also that his death is efficacious for the complete removal of those evils which accrue to us from our sins. That he might deliver us from this present

evil world (*ὅπως ἐξέλθῃται ἡμῶς ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστώτος πονηροῦ*). Such is the reading of L. T. Tr. Rev.; while the Textus Receptus has *ὅπως ἐξέλθῃται ἡμῶς ἐκ τοῦ ἐνεστώτος αἰῶνος πονηροῦ*); that he might deliver us out of the present world, evil that it is. The verb *ἐξαιρέομαι*, originally "take out," renders the Hebrew *hitztzil* in 1 Sam. iv. 8 and Jer. i. 8 in the sense of "deliver;" it points to "the present state" as one of helpless misery or danger. Compare the use of the verb, Acts vii. 10, 34; xii. 11; it is equivalent to *ῥεσθαι*, as found in Col. i. 13 and Luke i. 74. The participle "present" or "subsisting," *ἐνεστώς*, is found in explicit contrast with the participle "to come," *μέλλον*, Rom. viii. 38, "Nor things present nor things to come;" and 1 Cor. iii. 22. We are, therefore, naturally led to suppose that the apostle means to contrast the "world" here referred to with a "world to come;" which latter is mentioned in Heb. vi. 5, and seems synonymous with the "world [literally, 'inhabited earth'] to come," *οἰκουμένη μέλλουσα*, of Heb. ii. 5. Compare our Lord's words in Matt. xii. 32, "Neither in this world nor in that which is to come," and his contrast of "this world" with "that world" in Luke xx. 34, 35. The Greek word here employed, *αἰὼν*, like *kosmos*, is used with varying shades of meaning. The two nouns, used interchangeably in 1 Cor. iii. 18, 19 are, however, not altogether equivalent. The former originally denotes a mode of time; the latter, a mode of space. In particular, *αἰὼν* is never used in the Greek Testament to denote "mankind," as *kosmos* not unfrequently is by all its writers. In the Syriac Version, *'olmo* represents both *αἰὼν* and *kosmos* in all their senses, with a slight variation in its form to represent *αἰὼν* in Eph. ii. 2, "The course (*αἰὼν*) of this world (*kosmos*)," as if it were "The worldliness of this world." Probably the same word *'olmo*, in the Chaldean-Hebrew language current amongst the Palestinian Jews, was the term employed by them in all those connections in which either *αἰὼν* or *kosmos* would have been used by them if speaking in Hellenistic Greek; for it is to the Hellenistic dialect of the Greek language that both words as so employed belong. We never find *αἰὼν* at all in any of St. John's writings, except in the phrases, *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* or *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*, denoting "for ever." In other significations, when other writers of the New Testament might have used *αἰὼν*, St. John always puts *kosmos*. The word *αἰὼν*, denoting a cycle of time, is used also to signify a material world, as Heb. i. 2; and, in particular, the state of things found existing in that cycle of time; and this as viewed in various aspects. In Luke xx. 34, 35 "this *αἰὼν*" contrasts the present state, as one of mortality and successive reproduction, with "that *αἰὼν*," viewed

as one of immortality, in which processes of reproduction are found no more. But in Luke xvi. 8 "the children of this *αἰὼν*" are those who live after the world-loving, sinful fashion which characterizes mankind in general in contrast with "the children of light," who have been enlightened to recognize their relation to a spiritual world. In St. Paul, "the present *αἰὼν*" denotes the entire moral and spiritual state of mankind viewed in the aspect in which he contemplated it—a state wrapped in spiritual "darkness," pervaded by ungodliness and general immorality, and dominated by Satan; as Bengel puts it, "tota œconomia peccati sub potestate Satanae" (Eph. ii. 2; iv. 18; 2 Cor. iv. 4); a state from which Christians ought to study to get wholly weaned in all their moral and spiritual habits (Rom. xii. 2; Eph. iv. 22—24). In St. John, the phrases, "the world (*kosmos*)," or "this world" are frequently employed to express the same idea; as e.g. John xii. 31; xvi. 11; 1 John ii. 15, 16; v. 19. Out of this "power, empire, of darkness," in which by nature apart from Christ's grace all men are hopelessly enthralled; out of the grasp, inextricable by any efforts of their own, with which Satan holds them,—the apostle recognizes Christ as alone able to "rescue" us; and even him only able to "rescue" us by virtue of his atoning sacrifice of himself. Thus, in an eminently just application of the verb, he is said to "redeem" (*λυτροῦσθαι*) them from all iniquity, which expression includes, not only the idea of his paying down a ransom for their emancipation, but also the thought that, by the power of his grace, he makes the ransom effectual for the actual moral and spiritual deliverance, one by one, of those who believe in him: "He purifies them a people of his very own, devoted to good works" (Titus ii. 14). The position in the Greek of the epithet "evil," standing in a peculiar manner without the article after "this present world" (*τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστώτος πονηροῦ*), is discussed both by Bishop Ellicott and by Bishop Lightfoot in their respective Commentaries on the Epistle; the latter of whom takes it as equivalent to "with all its evils." It seems to the present writer that the syntax of the clause groups it with Eph. ii. 11, "That which is called circumcision, in the flesh, made [or, 'done'] with hands (*τῆς λεγομένης περιτομῆς ἐν σαρκὶ χειροποιητοῦ*)," where *ἐν σαρκὶ χειροποιητοῦ* has no article, because it is a logical adjunct: the circumcision "which is made in the flesh with hands," is of course no real circumcision (cf. Rom. ii. fn.), and therefore is only one so "called." So in the present passage the epithet "evil" is a logical adjunct: the state of the world being an "evil state," craved Christ's redemption,

and this fact should make that redemption welcome to us. Similarly, in 1 Pet. i. 18 the epithet "handed from your fathers (*παρπαροδοσού*)," added after "your vain manner of life," is a logical adjunct: the fact that it was ancient and traditional gave it so strong a hold upon them as to crave the intervention of a no ordinary ransom to redeem them from it. With the turn of thought, which according to this view is indicated by the epithet *πονηρού* having been added to the noun without the article, agrees likewise the emphatic position of the verb *ἐξέλθαι* at the head of the sentence. Christ gave his own very self for this end, that he might deliver us out of this wretched state of things to which we belonged. But the reactionary movement now showing itself among the Galatians would inevitably, the apostle feels (see ch. v. 4), have the effect of making void this redeeming work of Christ, and of involving them afresh in their original misery. If we adhere to the reading in the Textus Receptus, *τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος αἰῶνος πονηροῦ*, we had best, perhaps, accept Winer's proposal ('Gram. N. T.,' § 20, 1 a), and explain the absence of the article by supposing *αἰὼν πονηρὸς* as forming one notion, as in the case of *βρώμα πνευματικὸν* and *πόμα πν.* in the Textus Receptus of 1 Cor. x. 3. But this reading, though grammatically it runs more smoothly than the other, is on that very account the less likely to have been the original one, and seems greatly to blunt the significance of the adjective. May we not detect in this epithet "evil" the sound of a sigh, drawn from the apostle's heart by this fresh worry and disappointment now cropping up for him and for all who cared for the success of the gospel? His feeling seems to be—Oh the weary evilness of this present state! When will it be brought to an end by the appearing of that blissful hope? (comp. 2 Cor. v. 4). According to the will of God and our Father (*κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν*); according to the will of our God and Father. It is, perhaps, of no great consequence whether we understand this clause as pointing to the whole preceding sentence, "Who gave himself . . . world," or to the last clause of it, "That he might deliver . . . world." But the former is the more probable construction: (1) there is no reason for restricting it to the last words; (2) it is in perfect accordance with the apostle's usual reference of Christ's coming into the world and dying for us to the Father's appointment, that he should here too be understood as referring to this work of delivering grace also. The feeling apparently underlies these words of the apostle, that the Judaizing which he has now before his eyes was both setting itself in opposition to the supreme

ordering of "our God"—and his sovereign "will" who of us shall dare to contravene?—and also thwarting the operation of his fatherly loving-kindness. For the lack of filial confidence in God's love to us, and the slavish ceremonialism which characterized Judaical legalism, were both of them adjuncts of the unspiritual mind still in bondage to "the flesh" (cf. Rom. vii. and viii.), and therefore part and parcel of "this present world." Comp. ch. iii. 3; iv. 3, 8—10; and Col. ii. 20, "Why, as living in the world, do ye subject yourselves to ordinances, Handle not," etc.? As Professor Jowett observes, in this case as well as in the Epistle to the Romans, "The salutation is the poem of the whole Epistle." The expression, "our God and Father," is pathetic; it is an outcome of the deep complacency with which the apostle cherishes the assurance of God's fatherly love given us in the gospel—a sentiment of complacency stimulated into increased fervency by antagonism to the spiritual mischief confronting him. *Of our God and Father.* So Revised Version. This rendering appears decidedly preferable to that given by the Authorized Version, "of God and our Father," though grammatically this latter is confessedly not inadmissible. The like remark applies to all the other passages in the New Testament in which *Θεὸς καὶ Πατὴρ* is found followed by a genitive; namely, by *πάντων* (Eph. iv. 6); by *ἡμῶν* as in the passage before us (1 Thess. i. 3; iii. 11, 13; Phil. iv. 20); by *τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* (Rom. xv. 6; Eph. i. 3; Col. i. 3; 2 Cor. i. 3; 1 Pet. i. 3); by *τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ* (2 Cor. xi. 31 [L. T. Tr. Rev.; Receptus has *τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*]; and by *αὐτοῦ* (Rev. i. 6).

Ver. 5.—To whom be glory for ever and ever. *Amen* (*Ὡ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν*). This doxology is not introduced as merely a reverential closing up of the greeting, before the writer hastens on to the subsequent words of rebuke. It is rather an indignant tender of homage to the Most High, flashing forth from a loyal, filial heart; confronting and seeking, so far as it thus may, to redress the wrong done to "our God and Father" by the Judaizing spirit uprearing itself among the Galatians. It is similar in tone to the indignant doxology in Rom. i. 25. This view of its origin explains the fact that, as connected with a greeting, such doxology is found only in this of all St. Paul's Epistles. The indignation which pervades the tone of the whole passage favours the suppletion of *ἔστω* rather than of *ἔστιν*. Perhaps, indeed, *ἔστω* is in general the more natural suppletion. In 1 Pet. iv. 11, where *ἔστιν* is added by the writer, we have not so much a direct

ascription of praise as an affirmation that to God belongs or is *due* the glory of our performing our several duties with reference to this end. In like manner in the (most probably interpolated) doxology at the close of the Lord's prayer in Matt. vi. 13, "For thine is the kingdom," etc., the *ascription* of praise is not so much expressed as implied. Viewed in themselves, the words simply state the truth which constitutes the ground for our addressing to "our Father" our praises and our petitions. The article is most commonly prefixed to *δοξα* in such ascriptions of praise, whether *δοξα* stands alone, as Rom. xi. 36; xvi. 27; Eph. iii. 21; Phil. iv. 20; 2 Tim. iv. 18; Heb. xiii. 21; 2 Pet. iii. 18; or in conjunction with other nouns, as 1 Pet. iv. 11; Rev. i. 6; vii. 12. It is wanting in Luke ii. 14; xix. 38; 1 Tim. i. 17; Jude 25. When the article is added it marks the noun as expressing its notion viewed absolutely, in its entirety or universality: *q.d.* "Whatever glory is to be ascribed anywhere, be it ascribed to him." Thus ἡ *δοξα* is equivalent to "all glory." For ever and ever; literally, into the *aiōns* of the *aiōns*; apparently a form of expression adopted to denote intensification or superlativeness, like "holy of holies" (cf. Winer, 'Gram. N. T.,' § 36, 2). It is used where especial intensity is wished to be added to the notion of long undetermined duration; as Rev. xiv. 11; xv. 7; xxii. 5, etc. The same notion is expressed, only with not the same passionate earnestness, by the phrase, "into the *aiōns*," in Luke i. 33; Rom. i. 25; ix. 5; xi. 36, etc.; and by "into the *aiōn*," in Matt. xxi. 19; John vi. 51, 58, etc. Possibly there is a reference of contrast to "this present *aiōn*" of ver. 4. This, however, is doubtful; for in ver. 4 *aiōn* points to a particular condition of affairs subsisting in this *aiōn*, rather than to a mere mode of duration, which latter is alone in view here. The like observation applies to Eph. ii. 2 compared with ver. 7.

Ver. 6.—It is unnecessary again to remark on the disturbance of mind indicated by the abruptness with which the apostle plunges into the language of reproof. It cannot fail to strike every careful reader. I marvel (*θαυμάζω*); I do marvel. The verb is used here with reference to something disappointing, something felt to be painful as well as strange. So Mark vi. 6 with reference to the unbelief of the Nazarenes. It is unjust to the apostle to take this "I do marvel" of his as a mere artifice of politic address: though unquestionably, as Chrysostom and Luther have well noted, it does soften his rebuke. The apostle was genuinely surprised; for he had had so much reason for thinking well of them (comp. ch. iii. 1; iv. 14, 15; v. 7). How could

converts, once so cordial and affectionate, have possibly been so misled? As he reflects on the case, whatever feeling of resentment mingled with his surprise turns off upon the pseudo-evangelists misleading them; and accordingly it is upon these that his anathema is pronounced, not upon them at all (cf. ch. v. 9, 12). They, indeed, by listening to the false teaching, were in danger of falling from grace; but this he rather compassionates than angrily denounces. That ye are so soon removed (*ὅτι ὄντα ταχέως μεταριθεσθε*); *that ye are so quickly falling away*. This "quickly" has been taken by many as meaning "so soon after ye were called," and as consequently furnishing some ground for determining the time of the writing of the Epistle. But the comparison of the use of the same adverb (*ταχέως*) in 2 Thess. ii. 2, "Be not quickly shaken;" and in 1 Tim. v. 22, "Lay hands hastily on no man," suggests rather the meaning, "so quickly upon being solicited thereto." The verb *μεταριθεσθαι*, to transfer one's self to a different course of thinking, acting, partisanship (cf. Liddell and Scott, 'Lexicon'), is used both in an unfavourable and in a good sense. Thus 2 Macc. vii. 24, *Μεταθέμενον ἀπὸ τῶν πατρῶν νόμον*: "If he would give over following the laws of his country;" Appian, 'Bell. Mithr.,' 41: "Falling away, going over, from (ἀπὸ) Archelaus to Sylla;" Jamblich, 'Protrept.,' 17, "Change from (ἀπὸ) a restless and profligate mode of life to an orderly one." The verb, being in the present tense, and not in the aorist or the perfect, suggests the idea of an action in its commencing stage, and not yet fully consummated; as Chrysostom observes: "That is, 'I do not yet believe nor suppose that the delusion has got to be complete'—the language of one who will fain win them back." From him that called you into the *grace* of Christ (*ἀπὸ τοῦ καλέσαντος ὑμᾶς ἐν χάριτι Χριστοῦ*); from him that called you to be in the *grace* of Christ. The phrase, "he that called you," recites the personality of "our God and Father," spoken of in vers. 3, 4. The calling of man into the kingdom of God is habitually ascribed by St. Paul to the First Person in the Trinity (cf. ver. 15; Rom. viii. 30; ix. 24, 25; 1 Cor. i. 9; vii. 15, 17; 1 Thess. ii. 12; 2 Thess. ii. 14; 2 Tim. i. 9). God's name is omitted, as in ver. 15 (where it is wanting in the more recent texts), and ch. ii. 8, "For he that wrought for Peter." The apostle impressively, even startlingly, describes their defection from the truth of the gospel as no other than a defection from God himself; similarly to the strain of language pursued in Heb. iii. 12—15. "The *grace* of Christ" recites the state of acceptance with God into which Christians are brought by Christ through faith in him. So ch. v. 4, "Fauler

away from grace;" Rom. v. 2, "Through whom we have also had our access by faith into this grace wherein we stand." The genitive, "of Christ," denotes the Author, as in "the peace of God" (Phil. iv. 7); "righteousness of God" (Rom. i. 17; iii. 21, etc.). There is a pathos in the word "grace," as referring to the sweet gentleness of Christ's yoke as contrasted with the yoke of ceremonialism which the Galatians were so foolishly hankering after. The construction, "Called you in the grace of Christ," is similar to "Called us in peace" (1 Cor. vii. 15); "Ye were called in one hope of your calling" (Eph. iv. 4); "Called us . . . in sanctification" (1 Thess. iv. 7). The verb "call," implying as it does the bringing into a certain state, suggests the sense here given to the clause, in preference to our taking it as meaning "called you by the grace of Christ." Unto another gospel (*eis ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον*); *unto another* (or, a new) sort of gospel. The adjective *ἕτερον*, as contrasted with *ἄλλο* used in the next verse, appears to intimate the changed quality of the object, its strange new-fangled character. The adjective does sometimes take this shade of meaning. Thus 1 Cor. xiv. 21, *Ἐν ἑτερογλώσσοις καὶ ἐν χεῖρα ἑτέροις*, "By men of strange tongues, and by lips of strangers;" 2 Cor. xi. 4, *Πνεῦμα ἕτερον . . . εὐαγγέλιον ἕτερον*, "Different spirit . . . different gospel;" 1 Tim. i. 3, *Ἐτεροδιδασκαλεῖν*, "Teach a different doctrine." The reader will find a brief but instructive description of the difference at times observable between *ἕτερον* and *ἄλλο*s in Bishop Lightfoot's note on the passage; who cites the Septuagint rendering in Exod. i. 8 of the Hebrew "new king," which it gives *βασιλεὺς ἕτερος*; and a passage in Xenophon's *Cyropædia*, viii. 3, 8, "If you accuse me . . . another time when I serve you . . . you will find me (*ἑτέρῳ διακόνῳ*) another sort of attendant." The phrase, "another sort of gospel," so far as giving the new form of doctrine the title of "gospel" at all, is paradoxical and sarcastic. The paradox is corrected in what follows. The substantive, "gospel," is borrowed, not without a tinge of irony, from the pretensions of the innovators; they, of course, would be ready to designate their mangled form of Christian doctrine as still "the gospel." The epithet which the apostle adds gives his own view of its character.

Ver. 7.—Which is not another (*ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο*). Already, in these very words, the apostle means to assert that essential unalterableness of the gospel, which, with solemn emphasis, he in the two following verses more fully affirms. Thus much seems plain. But, owing probably to the impassioned eagerness of the moment, he here, as not unfrequently elsewhere from the like cause,

expresses himself in language, the grammatical analysis of which is obscure and in some degree uncertain. For (1) the relative "which" may be taken as reciting the term "gospel" only, that is, the gospel which is properly so called; in which case we may read the sentence thus: "But the gospel is not [never can be] other"—other, i.e. than it is as already preached to you; (2) the relative may recite the "other [or, 'new'] sort of gospel" of ver. 6; and then we should have "But this other-fashioned gospel is not another gospel really," or, "is not the real gospel reappearing in another form." The former method presents undoubtedly, of the two, the harsher way of construing; but constructions as harsh do occasionally present themselves in the apostle's style when writing under strong emotion. The exact analysis, however, is merely a matter of grammatical nicety; the substance of the thought is quite clear. But there be (*εἰ μὴ . . . εἰσὶν*); *only there are*. This construction, of *εἰ μὴ* followed by a finite verb, is found also in Mark vi. 5, *Εἰ μὴ . . . ἑθεράπευσε*, "Save that . . . he healed them." The force of *εἰ μὴ*, "except," in this passage as well as in some others, may be described as *partially exceptive*; that is, it denotes an exception taken, not to the entire foregoing sentence, but to part of it only. Thus in Luke iv. 27, "There were many lepers in Israel . . . and none of them was cleansed, save Naaman the Syrian:" where the pronoun "them" recites the "lepers in Israel," but the "save" refers to "lepers" only; Rev. ix. 4, "That they should not hurt the grass, neither any green thing, neither any tree, save the men who," etc.: where the "save" points back only to the words, "that they should not hurt;" so again Rev. xxi. 27, "Save they which are written in the Lamb's book of life," points back only to the words, "there shall in no wise enter into it." In all such cases the rendering "only" or "but only" would exhibit just the amount of exception which appears intended. In the present instance the most probable explanation is this: the gospel can never be other than it is; except that among (i.e. only among) those who proclaim it (i.e. profess to proclaim it) there are some who so misrepresent its import as to completely reverse its character. There be some that trouble you (*τινὲς εἰσὶν οἱ ταρασσόντες ὑμᾶς*); *there are certain who are disquieting you*. The form of expression is the same as in Col. ii. 8, "Take heed lest there shall be any one that maketh spoil of you." The sentence as it stands differs from the supposable substitute, "certain persons are disquieting you," by directing attention more to the persons referred to than merely to their action viewed in itself; it marks them out as

meriting strong censure, or (in Col., *loc. cit.*) as persons to be carefully guarded against. Who these troublers were and where they came from is uncertain (see note on ver. 2). The verb *ταράσσειν* frequently means "to alarm" or "disquiet," as Matt. ii. 3; xiv. 26; Luke i. 12; xxiv. 38; John xiv. 1; 1 Pet. iii. 14. And this is probably the sense in which it is used here and in the similar passages, ch. v. 10; Acts xv. 24. It describes the action of those who came to believers reposing in a sense of acceptance with God through Christ; and filled their minds with uneasiness and apprehension, by telling them that they were not safe as they were, but must do something else if they wished to really possess the Divine favour. Others, however, connect the verb with the notion of civil disturbance, as in Acts xvii. 8, and thus with raising seditions and shaking men's allegiance, in conformity with the metaphor of *μετατρέθειν* in ver. 6. And would pervert the gospel of Christ (*καὶ θέλοντες μεταστρέψαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ*); and would *fairly* turn into its clean contrary the gospel of Christ. The verb *μεταστρέφειν* is an appropriate one to use with reference to such a misrepresentation of the gospel as the one now in the apostle's view; for this converted it from a doctrine of emancipation into a doctrine of renewed bondage (comp. ch. v. 1—4). So the verb is used in the only other passages in which it is found in the New Testament, Acts ii. 20, "The sun shall be turned into darkness;" Jas. iv. 9, "Let your laughter be turned into mourning." So in Sirach xi. 31, "Turning good things into evil." Liddell and Scott ('Lexicon') cite *μεταστρέφας* = "contrariwise," Plato, 'Gorg.', 456, E; 'Rep.', 587, D. In the phrase *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, the addition of the genitive, "of Christ," with the twofold article, marks the words with a stately emphasis. It was no less than THE GOSPEL OF CHRIST that these men were tampering with. "The gospel of Christ" means here the gospel of which Christ is the Author, as in "the gospel of God" (Rom. i. 1), and which he had sent forth his apostles to proclaim. The peculiar emphasis and the connection forbid our taking the genitive as denoting merely the subject-matter.

Ver. 8.—But though we (*ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐὰν ἡμεῖς*); but even if we ourselves. This "but" (*ἀλλὰ*) is strongly adversative. What those disturbers of the believer's peace would have been fain to do was a thing impossible. Heaven's gospel *could* not be thus changed. And the attempt to thus change it, being in effect to fight against God, merited God's curse. In the plural "we" the apostle intends principally his own self. A shrinking from unnecessary self-obtrusion, and tender respectful sympathy with his ministerial

brethren, prompt him not unfrequently to veil his own individuality by associating in this way with himself those who were wont to share more or less in his evangelistic labours and sufferings, although in reality what he says may apply principally to himself and only in a very modified measure to them. A signal instance of this is furnished by that whole passage in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians, which begins with the fourth chapter and goes on down to the eleventh verse of the sixth. Nevertheless, we should in all such cases imperfectly represent the spirit of his words, if we were to substitute the singular pronoun "I." In the present instance individuals of the evangelizing party which were wont to accompany him had, no doubt, been fellow-workers with him also in Galatia, and are therefore here inclusively referred to. Compare the plural and the singular verbs in the next verse. The introduction of this reference to himself and his fellow-workers, as well as that to "an angel from heaven," seems meant to make his readers feel that this was no question of distinguished personality, as if it mattered *who* it was that taught a different doctrine; whether (suppose) it were a James or a Cephas, for those revered names were often used to cloak the designs of Judaizers; or whether it was one of the Galatian Churchmen themselves especially looked up to (cf. ch. v. 10 and note). An anathema was his due, whoever he might be. In the manner of its introduction we cannot fail to recognize an underlying consciousness on the writer's part of the highly distinguished position which he himself held; but there is present the consciousness too that he was nothing more than the mere organ or channel of Christ's teaching; from that teaching he himself may not swerve without justly incurring the "woe" which he told the Corinthians he should have to fear in case he preached not the gospel (1 Cor. ix. 16). Or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you (*ἢ ἄγγελος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ εὐαγγελίζῃται ὑμῖν παρ' ἃ εὐηγγελισάμεθα ὑμῖν*); or if an angel from heaven should set himself to preach unto you a gospel other than that we preached unto you. The construction of the entire sentence displays in the Greek a broken character not quite so apparent in our Authorized Version. The verb "should preach a gospel" is in the singular number (*εὐαγγελίζῃται*); neglecting the "we," it attaches itself to "an angel from heaven," which latter, as being the higher, absorbs the previously named subject altogether, standing as sole subject, both in the hypothetical clause and in the concluding one, "let him be anathema." It is, of course, apparent that, if the sentence of anathema would in the

supposed case be the only proper one to pronounce upon "an angel from heaven," it most certainly fastens upon any human being guilty of the same offence. The "angel from heaven" is like the "second man from heaven" in 1 Cor. xv. 47; the phrase, "from heaven," denoting both coming down out of heaven and also the higher sphere of being to which the person spoken of appertains. Comp. also John iii. 31, "He that is from earth . . . he that is from heaven." The force of the preposition *παρὰ* in *εὐαγγελίζηται παρ' ἡμῶν* may be illustrated by its use in 1 Cor. iii. 11, "Other foundation can no man lay than (*παρὰ*) that which is laid;" where it points to a new foundation, not to be by the side of, but to supersede, the former one. Taken thus, it would seem to follow up the before expressed notion of "another gospel" superseding, setting aside, the true gospel. This sense of the preposition readily passes on to that of "contrary to," which is profusely illustrated by Liddell and Scott ('Lexicon,' *in verb. παρὰ*, c. I. i. 4, b), and which we have in Acts xviii. 13, "Worship God *contrary* to the Law [of Moses];" Rom. xvi. 17, "Causing the divisions . . . *contrary* to the doctrine which ye learned;" Rom. i. 26, "use which is *against* nature." It cannot be doubted that the apostle is here thinking of a (pretended) gospel which was incompatible with the true one, and not of merely additional elements of Christian doctrine which should take their place alongside of those which they had already received. Additional information, we may be sure, was quite as necessary or desirable for the Galatians as it was for either the Corinthians or the "Hebrews;" neither of whom had as yet, as was intimated to them (1 Cor. iii. 2; Heb. v. 12; vi. 1), been fed with "solid food," but only with "milk," and whom it behoved to "go on to fuller maturity" of knowledge. The point in the apostle's view was this: what he had himself taught them was, *so far*, certainly true and to be depended upon, and could not without treason against Christ be set aside or superseded or essentially qualified; whereas the teaching which was now being foisted upon their previous convictions *did* infringe upon what he had taught them, seriously and even fundamentally. The tenor of the whole Epistle shows what were the especial features of this gospel which were now in question. The present question concerned the "good news" that God, through the cross of Christ, had emancipated his servants from bondage to ceremonialism; that God adopted them as simply believing in Christ to be his sons in full possession of his fatherly love; and that by the Holy Spirit he endued them with the consciousness of this adoption. There has been at

times much discussion as to the bearing of the passage before us upon our controversy with Romanists respecting tradition. If what has been above stated is just, it follows that these words of the apostle forbid our adding, *on any ground whatever*, to the dogma or Church practice sanctioned by Scripture, any such dogma or Church practice as would transform or essentially modify the former, but, on the other hand, the addition of dogma or Church practice which is not out of harmony with that sanctioned by Scripture, these words do not forbid. Let him be accursed (*ἀνάθεμα ἔστω*); let him be anathema, that is, a thing doomed to destruction. The word *ἀνάθεμα* is originally identical with *ἀνάθημα* (*anathēma*), a thing devoted, which in Luke xxi. 5 is rendered "offering;" but in Hellenistic Greek the former diverges from the latter by being ordinarily applied to "a thing devoted to destruction." In all languages it sometimes occurs that a word, one and the same originally, diverges into two slightly differing forms, used severally to express different phases of the original notion. Archbishop Trench, in his 'Study of Words,' p. 156, referred to by Bishop Lightfoot in his note on this passage, instances "cant" and "chant," "human" and "humane," and others. In the LXX. *anathēma* is used to render the Hebrew word *cherem*, which in our Authorized Version is translated "cursed" or "accursed thing." Living things that were *cherem* were to be put to death; inanimate objects that were *cherem* were to be destroyed. Thus in Deut. xiii. directions are given as to what was to be done in the case of an Israelite city which should have given itself to idolatry: the inhabitants and the cattle thereof were to be smitten with the edge of the sword; and the spoil of the city was to be brought together and burned, and the city itself "to be a heap for ever, never to be built again." And then (ver. 18), "There shall cleave nought of the cursed [or, 'devoted'] thing (*cherem, ἀνάθεμα*) to thine hand." Similarly, in Deut. vii. 26, of the idols and the silver or gold on them, of the Canaanites, "Thou shalt not take it unto thee, neither shalt thou bring an abomination unto thine house, lest thou be a cursed thing ['be *cherem*,' or 'be *anathema*,' *ἐση ἀνάθεμα*] like it; but thou shalt utterly detest it, and thou shalt utterly abhor it; for it is a cursed thing (*ἀνάθεμα ἔστω*)." See also *ibid.*, vers. 23—25; Lev. xxvii. 28, 29; Josh. vi. 17, "The city shall be accursed [or, 'devoted'; *cherem, ἀνάθεμα*], and all that are therein; only Rahab the harlot shall live;" Josh. vii. 1, 12. In the New Testament *anathēma* occurs in four other passages. 1. 1 Cor. xii. 3, "No man speaking in the Spirit of God saith, Jesus is anathema."

Here the apostle, no doubt, refers to the manner in which the unbelieving Jews allowed themselves, already then, to speak of our Lord. Clearly they meant thereby more than merely "excommunicate," which palliated sense some have endeavoured to give to "anathema;" they cannot be supposed to have intended less than an object which merited that utter extinction to which he who was *cherem* was under the Law doomed: their blaspheming thought, no doubt, taking into its view not this world only, but that also which is to come. 2. Rom. ix. 3, "I could pray that I myself were anathema from Christ for my brethren's sake." The reader naturally casts about to find some qualification to give to an utterance which seems at first sight to express a wish such as one who loved Christ so ardently as Paul did could not possibly have entertained. Yet the words, "anathema from Christ," can mean nothing less than being separated from Christ by a curse consigning him to perdition. The desiderated qualification must be sought in the phrase, "I could pray;" this renders an imperfect verb (*πῶχθμι*), which expresses a turn of thought similar to that denoted in the (*ἤθελον*), "I could wish," of ch. iv. 20, on which see note. In each case the tense betokens a mere glance (so to speak) of wish which is instantly withdrawn. 3. 1 Cor. xvi. 22, "If any man loveth not the Lord, let him be anathema." Here, too, the notion of Church-excommunication, whether by formal exclusion or by the withdrawal of brotherly recognition, is not satisfactory. The Israelite notion of being anathema, *cherem*, points to a no mere negation, but to a condition of positive accursedness linked with exposure to utter destruction. Moreover the apostle refers to a man's interior sentiments with respect to Christ—a matter not within the cognisance of human judgments. Who can in many cases, or perhaps in any, determine whether another loves Christ or not? It is in truth a warning against a soul's disloyalty to the Lord Jesus, clothing itself in the form of an execration—an execration which, it is true, is an impetuous flashing forth of the apostle's own flaming sense of what is due to Christ from every human being, but which is nowise chargeable with extravagance. Its perfect justness, as well as the verification which awaits it in the future judgment, is evinced, as by other considerations, so also by our Lord's own words in Matt. xxv. 41—46. 4. Acts xxiii. 14, "We have bound ourselves under a great curse;" literally, "We have anathematized [or, 'solemnly bound'] ourselves with anathema (*ἀναθέματι ἀνεθεματίσαμεν ἑαυτούς*)." They had said, no doubt, some such words

as these: "May we be anathema if we taste aught till we have killed Paul!" with which we may conjoin Mark xiv. 71, "He began to pronounce a curse (*ἀναθεματίσει*) and to swear"—not, to be sure, pronouncing, a curse upon Jesus, but wishing himself to be anathema if he knew that Man. There can be little doubt that the anathema in both these cases involved a reference to eternal perdition. That no less is intended by the term in the present verse and, therefore, also in that next to it, is further proved by reference to the hypothetical "angel from heaven" who should be found preaching a different gospel. Being anathema must involve for such a one excision from the kingdom of light, together with whatever destruction properly attends thereupon. What, it will be asked, is the precise force of the "let him be," both here and in 1 Cor. xvi. 22? It cannot denote less than a complacent satisfied acquiescence. The apostle-prophet not only foresees that, at the final judgment, such will be the doom of the wilful perverter of the gospel, but foresees it with a mind at one with the Judge who shall pronounce it; he can himself desire, he does desire, no other. It is his loyal sympathy with Christ as Saviour, as caring for the souls of men, that prompts him to proclaim aloud for the warning of the false teachers themselves as well as for the warning of those inclined to hearken to their false teaching, his own solemn *Amen* to the terrible sentence awaiting them. But if so, why not allow the imperative its full force, and understand the utterance as an imperative? It is granted that the apostle was apt at times to be carried away by the fervid impetuosity of his feelings, even when writing, to the utterance of words which in calmer mood he would be ready to a certain extent to retract. We have a clear example of such retraction in 1 Cor. vi. 4, 5 (see note below on ch. v. 12). But, in the case before us, that the vehemence of the apostle's language is a deliberate vehemence, and no mere momentary outburst of excited feeling, is proved by the solemn measured iteration in the next verse. And if we suppose, what seems to be most probable, that that verse refers to a similar denunciation uttered among the Galatians a good while before, the proof is all the stronger, that his language is no sudden exorbitancy of passionate emotion, but expresses an abiding sentiment. We are to remember that it is the very substance of the gospel which the apostle feels to be assailed. The gospel, he knew, both by inspired insight and by his own experience, to be "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." Of this gospel Christ had himself declared that "he that believed it should



he saved, and he that disbelieved it should be condemned" (Mark xvi. 16). Wherein does "being anathema" differ from "being condemned"? And if the disbelieving "shall be condemned," can a less guiltiness be supposed to attach to one who not only disbelieved the gospel himself, but was also plucking it out of the hearts of others and pulning off upon them instead a false gospel which was no salvation? "But could St. Paul, being such a lover of souls as he was, imprecate a doom of perdition to fall upon any soul of man?" Absolutely, we may say he could not; but conditionally, he might, and that in perfect consistency with his usual habits of feeling—conditionally, on the supposition, that is, that the sin was not repented of and forsaken. It was his very love of souls that would impel him thus to speak, not only on behalf of the souls which the bringer-in of a false doctrine might destroy, but on behalf of the deceiver's own self. He pronounces the doom in order to deter and thus save. We have to remember, too, that the apostle is not, at the dictate of his own passionate zeal for the truth, constituting either a new sin or a new measure of penalty. He simply, as prophet and apostle, utters forth the mind of him who is Lawgiver and Judge. This last consideration suggests the limits within which only can the apostle's action in this matter be regarded as an example for imitation. It is lawful to us to recite, as the Church of England speaks in her Communion Office, "the general sentences of God's cursing against impenitent sinners gathered out of Scripture"—and by "general sentences" we are to understand sentences pronounced upon *classes* of offenders, not sentences upon individual persons, to whom we may conjecture them to be applicable. It is lawful also to us individually and right, that we should add to the utterance of each sentence our hearty "Amen," and thus take part with God and his Law, not only against sins committed by our neighbours, but most especially and above all against wilful transgressions of our own. But beyond this, none who are *not special organs of inspiration* may venture to go, whether acting individually or in any corporate capacity. An anathema is a bolt of doom such as the Almighty alone can fashion or make operative; and we are invading the Divine prerogative and working mischief and peril for ourselves if, on the one hand, we venture to enlarge and make more specific than he has done his "general sentences of cursing," or, on the other, dilute the force of these solemn warnings of his, and treat them with disregard.

Ver. 9.—As we said before, so say I now again (ὡς προεῖρήκαμεν, καὶ ἄρτι πάλιν λέγω);

as we have said before, now also (or, and as now) I am saying again. The complexion of the sentence, especially in the Greek, a good deal resembles that in 2 Cor. xiii. 2, "I have said beforehand, and I do say beforehand (προεῖρηκα καὶ προλέγω), as when I was present the second time, so now being absent." In this latter passage, the perfect, "I have said beforehand," points to the time indicated in the words, "as when I was present the second time." The resemblance between the two passages, notwithstanding the somewhat different senses in which the verb (προλέγειν) is used in them, suggests the view that here likewise in the first clause the verb refers to some former occasion on which the apostle was personally present with those he is writing to. The Greek verb (προλέγειν), "say before," is sometimes equivalent to "forewarn," as 1 Thess. iv. 6; ch. v. 21; and 2 Cor. xiii. 2 (twice). Sometimes it means "say on a former occasion," as 1 Cor. vii. 3, and most probably here. The first clause has by some been supposed to refer to the preceding verse. But recent critics generally agree in feeling that both the verb "we have said before" and the adverb "now" suggest the sense of a wider interval of time. The use of the verb in 2 Cor. vii. 3 has been cited on behalf of the other view. But even if the somewhat doubtful idea be admitted that 2 Cor. vii. 3 points back to the twelfth verse of the preceding chapter, it would still fail to furnish an adequate parallel. For not only is it parted from the earlier passage by the number of verses which intervene, but also by a succession of varying moods of feeling and diverse styles of address. Account has to be taken of the change of number between "we have said before" and "I am saying again." The only probable explanation is that the "we" recites the same persons as in the words "we preached" in ver. 8; whereas Paul, as now writing (probably) with his own hand, presents himself individually as reiterating that solemn affirmation. The words, "now also I am saying again," as marking a time contrasted with that earlier one referred to, contemplate the asseveration made in the eighth verse as well as in this. In the "now" the apostle indicates, not so much the moment of his *writing*, as the just then subsisting juncture of circumstances in Galatia, which called for the renewal of his commination. Its earlier utterance referred to may have occurred either in the second visit to Galatia, mentioned in Acts xviii. 23, or in the first, mentioned in Acts xvi. 6. When taking leave of his disciples on either occasion he may have been led to thus emphatically insist upon the sacred, inviolable character of the gospel, by his observa-

tion on the one hand of the fickleness and impressionableness which characterized this people, and on the other by the frequency with which perversions of Christian doctrine were already seen to be infesting the Churches. Compare also the apostle's warning to the Ephesians (Acts xx. 28—31). If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed (*εἰ τις ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελίζεται παρ' ἃ παρελάβετε, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω*); if any man is preaching unto you a gospel other than that which ye received, let him be anathema. The verbal variations in these words, as compared with those in ver. 8, are slight. One, however, deserves attention: "If any one is preaching" compared with "If . . . an angel should . . . preach." By this change in the form of making the supposition, the denunciation seems to come down out of the region of bare hypothesis to that of, perhaps, present reality. If so, the thunder of the apostle's anathema would be felt by his readers approaching nearer and nearer to the head of some particular individual among themselves, towards whom their eyes would at once be directed with the feeling that it was, perhaps, his doom that the apostle was now pronouncing. The construction in the Greek of the verb "preach the gospel" (*εὐαγγελίζομαι*), with the accusative of the person to whom the message is brought, is found also in Acts xiii. 32; xiv. 21. In sense there seems to be no appreciable difference between this construction of the verb and that with the dative as found in the preceding verse and often.

Ver. 10.—For do I now (*ἄρτι γάρ*); for at this hour. This "for" points back either to the fact of the apostle's having now so solemnly pronounced afresh the awful anathema which at some former time he had uttered; or which, in effect, is nearly the same thing, to the tone of feeling which he in so doing evinced, and to his method of apostolic action which he therein exemplified. The adverb *ἄρτι*, as used in the New Testament, is distinguished from the more common "now" (*νῦν*), as denoting that space of time which is most closely present. This shade of meaning is conspicuous, e.g. in the "Suffer it to be so just now" of Matt. iii. 15, that is, during that brief, quickly vanishing moment in which the Messiah was by Divine appointment to appear subordinate in position to his forerunner. So Matt. xxvi. 53, "Thinkest thou that I cannot beseech my Father, and he shall (*ἄρτι*) at this very moment send me more than twelve legions of angels?" John xvi. 12, "Ye cannot bear them (*ἄρτι*) just now;" in a very short while they would be enabled to bear them. 1 Cor. xiii. 12, "Just now (*ἄρτι*) we see in a mirror, darkly;" words

written under a vivid sense of how brief the interval is which separates the present state of things from that of the life to come. 1 Pet. i. 8, "On whom, though just now (*ἄρτι*) ye see him not"—another outcome of the same feeling. Similarly, in 1 Cor. iv. 13; viii. 7, *ἕως ἄρτι* means "until this very hour;" and, on the other side of the point of time indicated *ἀπ' ἄρτι* is "from this very hour" in Matt. xxvi. 64; John i. 52. Many have supposed that the apostle is speaking of certain characteristics of his present course of behaviour as a believer and a servant of Christ, viewed in contrast with the life which he had once lived when an ardent disciple of Judaism. But the narrowly restrictive form of the adverb resists this interpretation. He could hardly with this reference in view have used the phrase "just now," or "at this very hour," of a tenor of life which he had been pursuing for now more than twenty years. Some eminent critics (Alford, Ellicott, Lightfoot, Sanday) take this *ἄρτι* as pointing to the style of language which the apostle is "just now" adopting: "Now, when I use such uncompromising language;" or, "There! is that the language of a man-pleaser? *Now* do I," etc. It is an objection to this view that it gives the adverb a somewhat diverse sense to that which it bears in ver. 9; for whereas in ver. 9 *ἄρτι* points to the circumstances of the present hour as prompting the apostle to the utterance of his anathema, according to the view referred to it here points to the present hour as exhibiting the apostle himself in a certain aspect. It is more obvious, and indeed gives the present use of the adverb more force, to take it in both verses with the like reference. In both the apostle refers to the present hour as a juncture in which he felt that it had become necessary to depart from his customary manner of using a winning style of address. At other times he will persuade and please; just now he cannot. Persuade men, or God? or do I seek to please men? (*ἀνθρώπους πείθω ἢ τὸν Θεόν; ἢ ζητῶ ἀνθρώποις ἀρέσκειν*); do I persuade men or God? or do I seek to please men? Expositors have endeavoured to establish, as one sense of the Greek verb rendered "persuade," that of "making So-and-so one's friend." No doubt it often means to prevail, or endeavour to prevail, upon others, by coaxing, persuasion, bribery, or anyhow, to go along with you in some particular course of thinking or acting indicated by the context; but it can nowhere be shown to mean, when standing alone, "to win So-and-so's friendship." In Acts xiii. 20, "Having persuaded Blastus" means "Having got Blastus to concur with them." Similarly, Matt. xxviii. 14, "We will persuade him," and 2 Macc. iv. 45, "With a view to

persuade the king." The verb is used here, as in 2 Cor. v. 11, "Knowing the fear of the Lord, we persuade men." In that passage the apostle states it to be his practice to make use of all means of persuasion in order to induce men to accept the gospel message (comp. *ibid.*, vi. 1, "Working together with him, we intreat also that we receive not the grace of God in vain"). He was not content with merely, as an ambassador, delivering the message and there leaving the matter; but made it his anxious concern to gain for the message acceptance, by the use of arguments addressed to the reason, and appeals addressed to the feelings, by putting himself, as it were, by the side of those he was addressing as one who sympathized to a large extent with their ways of thought, for the purpose of conducting them onward to concurrence with more perfect views. Among many examples which might be cited, illustrating his skill in persuasion, it will suffice to refer to the manner in which he dealt with the Athenians, with the Jews when speaking to them from the stairs, with King Agrippa (Acts xvii. 22—31; xxii. 1—21; xxvi. 2, 3, 26, 27), and to his Epistle to Philemon. Another feature, closely connected with the one now mentioned, and here likewise referred to, is the care which the apostle took to "please men;" such a care as produced a manner towards his fellow-men far exceeding the courtesy and shows of respectful consideration which the law of charity ordinarily prescribes. For example, instead of thrusting forward into notice, as the spirit of unsympathetic pride naturally prompts us to do, the points on which he differed from others, and in reference to which he *knew* himself to be standing on higher ground than they, he chose rather to make prominent any points of agreement which he could find already subsisting, conciliating their candid interest by thus fraternally putting himself on a level with them. If this did not suffice for the purpose of enlisting their sympathies on behalf of himself and his views, he did not hesitate, in matters morally indifferent, to mortify and snub his own tastes, and forego the dissenting judgments of his own superior enlightenment, "to buffet his body," as he expresses himself in 1 Cor. ix. 27, "and bring it into bondage," by following, however distasteful to himself, such practices as should get those whose spiritual improvement he was seeking, to feel, so to speak, comfortably at home with himself. In writing to the Corinthians the apostle in one passage (1 Cor. ix. 19—23) dwells at some length upon this feature of his ministerial conduct, not ashamed of it, but manifestly glorying in it as a triumph of Christ's grace in his soul. Presently after, at the

close of the following chapter, he distinctly propounds himself, as in this respect a Christ-like pattern, for their imitation, "Even [he writes] as I please all men in all things, not seeking mine own profit, but the profit of the many, that they may be saved: be ye imitators of me, even as I also am of Christ." Both of these strongly marked features of his ministerial character were liable to be misunderstood, and by his detractors could be easily misconstrued as grave faults. He was, in fact, accused of speciousness and insincerity, of double-faced dealings, of simulation and dissimulation. We can easily understand how readily such accusations would be set on foot, and how colourable they could be made to appear. That they painfully affected the apostle's mind is evidenced by the frequency of the references he makes to them, and by the earnestness and deep pathos of feeling which not seldom mark those references. It is to such sinister criticism that he alludes, when in 2 Cor. v. 11, cited above, after saying, "we persuade men," he adds, "but we are become manifest unto God," meaning that, though he did make a habit of laying himself out to persuade, yet the entire sincerity of his action, however misconstrued by men, was patent to the Divine eye (comp. 2 Cor. i. 12). Now, we have reason to believe that the apostle had been apprised, or at least that he suspected, that in Galatia also such misrepresentation of these characteristics of his ministry was rife. The Epistle supplies at least one token of such having probably been the case. We gather from ch. v. 11 that he had been said to be still "preaching circumcision." They who said this did so apparently in the sense that his having hitherto kept back this point of his doctrine in preaching to *them* was only an artifice of "persuasion;" that, in order to prevail upon them to accept the Christian faith, he had thought it expedient not at first to press upon them the observances of Judaism, while nevertheless he knew them to be necessary and was prepared by-and-by to insist upon their being attended to. St. Paul is conscious, therefore, of the existence on the part of some of the Galatian Churchmen of unfriendly suspicions with regard to his straightforwardness and uprightness. It is this stinging consciousness that occasions both the substance and the sharp abrupt tone of what he here says. The substance of the verse may be paraphrased thus: "I have written decisively and sternly; for at such a critical juncture as the present is it men that I can make it my business to 'persuade,' as they sneeringly but not untruly say I love to do? or is it God that I care, so to speak, to persuade, to wit of my

fidelity to the gospel which he has committed to my trust? They scoffingly say I love to 'please men;' and I thank God I have been wont to 'please men' to the very utmost of my power for their good; but is it my work just now to be pleasing men by ways of sweet tenderness and forbearance? If at this time I were still laying myself out to 'please men,' these men, to wit, who are making havoc of the gospel message, and you who are ignorantly listening to them, —then were I no true servant of Christ." The interrogative form into which the apostle's language suddenly breaks is apparently, here also as in 2 Cor. iii. 1, due to his that moment bethinking himself of those malicious censurers of him. We have here an example of the form of sentences which the grammarians call *zeugma*; that is to say, "God" is named in conjunction with "men," as an object to the action of the verb "persuade," whereas this verb, suitable enough with relation to men, can only by a strain upon its proper sense be employed with relation to God. The sentence would possibly have expressed what appears to have been the apostle's real meaning with less ruggedness, but certainly with less intensity, if its second clause had been (perhaps), "or commend myself to God's approval? (ἢ συνιστάνω ἑμαυτὸν τῷ Θεῷ;)." (For other instances of *zeugma*, see Luke i. 64; 1 Cor. iii. 2.) The addition of the article before *θεῶν*, while it is wanting before *ἀνθρώπων*, gives the noun a more grandiose tone, as if it were, "Do I persuade men or God?" For if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ (εἰ ἔτι ἀνθρώποις ἡρεσκον, Χριστοῦ δούλος οὐκ ἔν ἤκην); if I still were pleasing men, I were no servant (Greek, *bondservant*) of Christ's. The received text of the Greek has "For if I still (εἰ γὰρ ἔτι);" but the "for" is omitted by recent editors. It makes no difference in the sense whether we retain it or not, for, retaining the "for," we should have to understand before it, "I trow not," or the like. The word "bondservant" here expresses the official relation of a Christian minister, one especially at his Divine Owner's beck and call. So Rom. i. 1; Phil. i. 1; 2 Tim. ii. 24; Titus i. 1; Jas. i. 1; 2 Pet. i. 1. The apostle means, "I were no servant of Christ in spirit and reality, whatever I might call myself." A good many expositors suppose the "still" to be said with reference to the time before the apostle's conversion: "I were no apostle or Christian at all." But (1) there is no indication either in this passage or anywhere that the apostle regarded his life before his conversion as characterized by the desire to please men; (2) with the sense thus given to it, the thought, as Meyer observes, seems exces-

GALATIANS.

sively tame; (3) as thus explained, it would not harmonize with the apostle's explicit and repeated declaration that, in the discharge of his high office, he did make a point of pleasing men.

Ver. 11.—But I certify you, brethren (γνωρίζω δὲ [L. Δ. γνωρίζω γὰρ] ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί); now (or, for) I make known unto you, brethren. The external evidence, as well as the judgment of critics, is so evenly divided between the two readings, *γνωρίζω δὲ* and *γνωρίζω γὰρ*, that the decision as to which is to be preferred seems to lie with exegesis rather than with *diplomatic* criticism. On the one hand, the fact that the gospel which the apostle had delivered to the Galatians came to him by a direct revelation from Christ, would be properly viewed as a reason for regarding it as sacred and inviolable. Viewed thus, the reading, "now I make known to you," appears justified as introducing a plea warranting the anathema of vers. 8, 9. On the other hand, there is a difference of tone perceptible between the previous context, which is strongly marked, as we have seen, by intense excitement of feeling, and the passage which commences with this verse. The relaxation in the latter of the stern, indignant severity of the former is indicated (1) by the phrase, "I make known unto you," which, as well as the equivalent phrase, "I would not have you ignorant (οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν)," is with the apostle a customary prelude to a context of deliberate and measured statement; (2) by the introduction of the word "brethren," even though, perhaps, holding the position in the sentence which it does here, this compellation has not the same pathetic affectionateness as marks it when heading a sentence; and (3) by the strain of quiet narration which the apostle now enters upon. This change in the tone is somewhat adverse to the supposition that the two passages were, as originally written, linked together by the closely connective "for." It suggests to the careful reader the feeling that, after the apostle had somewhat relieved his spirit of the indignant excitement with which he at first addressed himself to the writing of the letter, he laid down his pen at the end of the tenth verse, which had introduced a topic of thought that threatened to lead him aside from his present business; and, after pausing to reflect how he had best proceed, resumed his work with the purpose of calmly showing, from the very circumstances of his personal history, that the gospel which the Galatians had received from him had solely a Divine origin. This view of the passage likewise favours the reading, "Now I make known to you." For the conjunction *δὲ* has here that simply *metabatic* or *transitory* sense which it

often bears when the writer is passing on to a fresh section of discourse. Thus, in particular, the conjunction is found with "I make known (*γνωρίζω*)," in 1 Cor. xv. 7; 2 Cor. viii. 1; and with "I would not have you ignorant," in Rom. i. 13; 1 Thess. iv. 13; 1 Cor. xii. 1. In fact, the direct purpose of the succeeding exposition would seem to be, not precisely so much to make good the particular point that the gospel which the apostle taught was sacred and inviolable, as to show that it was certainly true, and on that ground not to be departed from. The verb *γνωρίζω* cannot mean "draw attention to" or "remind you." Its only sense is "make known." Its employment here appears to indicate a feeling on the apostle's part that the point referred to had, perhaps, not as yet been made definitely clear to those, or at least to some of those, whom he was addressing. That the gospel which was preached of me (*τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ, ὅτι*); touching the gospel which was preached by me, that it. In the Greek, the noun "the gospel" is the accusative governed by "make known;" while in fact the *object* contemplated by the verb is, not the gospel itself in general, but certain circumstances relating to it expressed and implied in the following clause: "that it is not after man's fashion." This kind of construction is of frequent occurrence in Greek authors. Analogous examples are found in ver. 13 of this chapter, and 1 Cor. iii. 20; xv. 15; xvi. 15. The aorist tense of *εὐαγγελισθὲν* points to the same time as was referred to in "called you" (ver. 6) and "we preached" (ver. 8), which are both in the same tense. Is not after man (*οὐκ ἔστι κατὰ ἄνθρωπον*); is not after the fashion of man; that is, "is not to be estimated as a merely human thing." The clause does not immediately describe the origin of the gospel, which point is distinctly brought out in the next sentence; but rather the character which attaches to it in consequence of its origin. The sense of the phrase, "according to man," is illustrated by its use in 1 Cor. ix. 8, "Do I speak these things after the manner of men (*κατὰ ἄνθρωπον*)?" i.e. "according to merely human principles of action." 1 Cor. iii. 3, "Walk after the manner of men." On the other hand, in 2 Cor. vii. 10, "godly sorrow," literally, "the grief which is according to God," is a grief such as God inspires and approves; and in Eph. iv. 24, "The new man, which after God [literally, "according to God"] hath been created," is "created in conformity with God's model or approval." The present tense "is" marks the permanent character attaching to Paul's gospel; it was "the faith once for all (*ἄρα*) delivered to the saints" (Jude 3).

Ver. 12.—For I neither received it of

man, neither was I taught it (*οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγὼ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου παρέλαβον αὐτὸ, οὔτε ἐδιδάχθην*); for neither at the hand of man did I myself receive it or was taught it. The "for" introduces a consideration fortifying the foregoing affirmation, that the apostle's gospel was not in its characteristic complexion human; it was no wonder that it was not; for neither was it human in its origin. The "neither" (*οὐδὲ*) points forward to the whole subsequent clause, "at the hand of men did I myself receive it." In a similar manner does "for neither" (*οὐδὲ γὰρ*) point to the whole subsequent clause in John v. 22; viii. 42; Acts iv. 34. The *ἐγὼ* ("I myself") is inserted in the Greek, as contrasting the preacher with those to whom the gospel had been preached (ver. 11), in the same way as it is inserted in 1 Cor. xi. 23, "I myself received (*ἐγὼ παρέλαβον*) of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you." Some expositors (as Meyer, Alford) connect the "for neither" with the pronoun "I myself" only; as if the meaning were, "For neither did I, any more than Cephas or James, receive the gospel from men." This restriction of the "neither" to the noun or pronoun only which follows, is grammatically, of course, not inadmissible (comp. John vii. 5). But there is nothing in the immediate context to suggest the idea that the writer is just now thinking of the other apostles, and the sentence is perfectly clear without our introducing it. It is quite clear that the apostle means in the words *οὔτε ἐδιδάχθην* to affirm that man did not teach him the gospel any more than deliver it to him. But the verb "was taught," taken by itself, does not convey the idea of merely human instruction, being used continually in the Gospels of our Lord's teaching, and John xiv. 26 of the "teaching" of the Holy Spirit. We must, therefore, conclude that the passive verb "I was taught it" is, in the writer's intention, conjoined with the active verb "I received it," as both alike depending upon the first words in the sentence, "at the hand of man." If so, we have here another instance of the use of the figure *zeugma* (see above on ver. 10); for while the preposition *παρὰ* is used in its proper sense, when, as here, it is connected with *παρέλαβον*, it is only in a strained, *improper* sense that it could be employed, like *ὑπὸ*, with a passive verb, to simply denote the agent. Some difficulty is felt in determining in what way the writer regards the notion of "receiving the gospel" as distinguishable from that of "being taught it." It is possible that the latter is added merely, as Bishop Lightfoot supposes, to explain and enforce the former. But another view is deserving of consideration. We may suppose "the gospel" to be

regarded, in the one case, as a kind of objective creed or form of doctrine, "received" by a man on its being put before him, in consideration of the authority with which it comes invested, as a whole and so to speak *en bloc*, before ever its details have been definitely grasped by him. But in addition to this, and subsequently to this, this same gospel may be regarded as brought within the range of the recipient's distinguishing consciousness, by means of a "teacher" from without, whether Divine or human, instilling into his mind successively the various several truths which compose it. Now, it was conceivable that the apostle may, in the sense above supposed, have "received" the gospel direct from God or from Christ, while, however, man may to a large extent have been the "teaching" instrument, through which its truths were brought home to his understanding. But in the present passage St. Paul affirms that in actual fact man had no more to do with his reception of the gospel in the latter sense than in the former. And this affirmation tallies closely with what we read in the sixteenth verse of this chapter, and again with the sixth verse of the next chapter, both of which passages were written, no doubt, with an eye to the very notion respecting the source of his knowledge of the gospel which he is here concerned to negative. Textual critics differ among themselves whether *οὐτε* ("nor") or *οὐδέ* ("nor yet") should be read before *ἐδιδάχθη*. The only difference is that "nor yet" would of the two the more clearly mark a distinction subsisting between the notions expressed by the two preceding verbs. If we acquiesce in the reading of the received text, which is "nor," then, since the negative has been already expressed, the idiom of our language would here suppress the negative in "nor," and substitute the simple "or." But (*ἀλλὰ*); *but only*. The strongly adversative sense which marks this form of "but" requires that in thought we supply after it the words, "I received it and was taught it;" for which, in translating, we may put, as an adequate substitute, the word "only." Bishop Wordsworth translates this *ἀλλὰ* "except," citing in justification Matt. xx. 23. But the grammatical construction of that passage is not sufficiently clear to justify us in giving to *ἀλλὰ* a sense which does not appear conformable with its ordinary usage. The apostle, then, affirms that it was not from or by man that he had received the gospel or been taught it. From whom, then, does he mean that he had received and by whom been taught it? Are we to say, God the Father? or, Jesus Christ? Just at present, it should seem, the apostle is not concerned definitely or contradis-

tingtively to present to view either one of these Divine personalities. As has been remarked above with reference to the words in ver. 3, "from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ," the two conceptions appear blended together to the apostle's view, when he thinks of the Source from which spiritual gifts accrue to us. His immediate purpose is to assert that his gospel was in its origin Divine, and not human. For this it is enough to say that it came to him "through the revelation of Jesus Christ." But in preparation for the discussion of these words, it may be here remarked that the supreme agency of God the Father, as in all else, so also in particular in the communication to the world of the gospel, is an idea very distinctly put forth in a great many passages of the New Testament, and is in fact the dominant representation. As examples of this, we may refer to Col. i. 26, 27; Eph. i. 9; 2 Cor. v. 18, 20; Heb. i. 2. "The words" which "the Son spake" were those which "he had heard of the Father," as were also those which the promised Paraclete was to "speak." The first verse of the Book of the Revelation furnishes a striking illustration of this truth. It runs thus: "The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave him to show unto his servants, even the things which must shortly come to pass: and he [i.e. Jesus Christ] sent and signified it by his angel unto his servant John." Of course, the verse refers to that disclosure of future events which forms the subject-matter of the particular book which it prefaces. Nevertheless, what is written here is no exceptional statement, but one simply exemplary; it is true in this particular reference, just because it is true also with reference to the whole of that disclosure of spiritual facts which through the gospel is made known to the Church. By the revelation of Jesus Christ (*δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*); through the revelation of Jesus Christ. This genitive clause, "of Jesus Christ," has by most interpreters been understood *subjectively*; that is, as denoting the subject or agent implied in the verbal noun "revelation;" in other words, they suppose St. Paul herein presents Jesus Christ as having revealed to him the gospel. This does indeed appear to be the meaning of the phrase, "the revelation of Jesus Christ" in Rev. i. 1, just now referred to. Taken thus, the words put before us explicitly the agency of only Christ in the revelation spoken of, leaving the agency of God without specific reference. None the less, however, does even in this case the thought of God's agency naturally recur to our minds as implied in connection with the mention of Jesus Christ, even as in the first verse of the chapter where it is ex-

explicitly named therewith. But we have to observe that in every other passage in which the Apostle Paul uses a genitive with the noun "revelation" (*ἀποκάλυψις*), the genitive denotes the object which is revealed. These are Rom. ii. 5, "Revelation of the righteous judgment of God;" viii. 19, "Revelation of the sons of God;" xvi. 25, "Revelation of the mystery;" and the passages in which he designates our Lord's second coming as "his revelation;" 1 Cor. i. 7; 2 Thess. i. 7; with which comp. 1 Pet. i. 7, 13; iv. 13. That in these five last passages the genitive is objective and not subjective, if it could otherwise be called in question, is indicated by the circumstance that in 1 Tim. vi. 14, 15, where the apostle uses the word "appearing" (*ἐπιφάνεια*) instead of "revelation," he adds, "which in its own times he shall show who is the blessed and only Potentate," etc., manifestly meaning the Father. One other passage remains to be mentioned, namely, 2 Cor. xii. 1, "visions and revelations of the Lord," which many critics take as meaning "vouchsafed by the Lord," and which in consequence is commonly referred to in support of a similar interpretation of the passage now before us. But it may be questioned whether the apostle does not there denote by "visions" (*ὄρασις*) a somewhat different class of spiritual phenomena from those denoted by "revelations of the Lord;" by the former intending such visions as those, e.g. in which he seemed to himself to be transported into Paradise, or into the third heaven; and by the latter, appearances vouchsafed to him of the Lord Jesus in personal presence. These latter, it is true, might be also styled "visions" (*ὄρασις*), as, in fact, the most important of them all is styled in the speech before Agrippa (Acts xxvi. 19); whilst on the other hand, the former may be justly supposed to be included under the term "revelations," as employed presently after in ver. 7. But the addition, "of the Lord," has at least much more point, if we assume the above-stated discrimination to have been intended between the two classes of phenomena; if, indeed, it is not a quite superfluous adjunct on the other view; for the "visions and revelations" referred to would be, of course, conceived of as coming from "the Lord," without the apostle's saying so. Instead of being available in support of the subjective view of the genitive before us, the passage 2 Cor. xii. 1 rather favours the other interpretation. And this interpretation of the words, "of Jesus Christ," as objective is favoured by the subsequent context. For comparing this twelfth verse with the five verses which follow, we observe that in this verse the apostle affirms that his gospel was not

human in its character, because that he had not received it from man nor been taught it by man, but only "through the revelation of Jesus Christ." Then in the five verses which follow, to make this affirmation good, he states that up to the time of his conversion he had been wholly averse to the Christian doctrine and intensely devoted to Pharisean Judaism, and that when God, calling him by his grace, "revealed his Son in him that he might preach him among the Gentiles," he applied to no human being for mental direction, but kept himself aloof from even those who were apostles before him. Now, in setting the statement of ver. 12 over against the professedly illustrative statement which follows, we observe that "the revelation of Jesus Christ" in the former occupies precisely the same position in the line of thought which in the latter is held by "God's revealing his Son in him;" for the apostle attributes his possession of the truth of the gospel in the one to "the revelation of Jesus Christ," and in the other to God's revealing his Son in him, and in each case to nothing else. Surely it follows "that the revelation of Jesus Christ" which gives him the gospel in the one case, is identical with "God's revealing his Son in him" which gives him the gospel in the other. Thus both the sense in which the genitive is ordinarily found when joined with the word "revelation," and the guidance of the context, concur in determining for the genitive in the present case the objective sense. This interpretation seems at first sight to labour under the inconvenience that, so construed, the sentence lacks the clearly expressed antitheton to the foregoing noun "man," which we might naturally expect to find. But in reality the required antithesis is quite distinctly though implicitly indicated in the very term "revelation;" for this essentially carries with it the notion of an agency not merely superhuman, but Divine. It would be an altogether contracted and indeed erroneous view of this "revelation" to suppose that it means no more than the manifestation to Saul's bodily senses of the personal presence and glory of Christ. Beyond question this was of itself sufficient to convince Saul of the truth that Jesus, though once crucified, was now both living and highly exalted in the supersensuous world, and by consequence to furnish the necessary basis for further discoveries of truth. But more was required than the mere bodily sight of the glorified Jesus. This might confound and crush down his antagonism, but would not of itself impart converting and healing faith. Men might "see" and yet "not believe" (John vi. 36). There was required also the true and just perception of the relation which

this exalted Jesus bore to individual human souls, in particular to Saul's own soul; and further, of the relation which he bore to the dispensations of God as dealing with his people, and as dealing with mankind at large;—a perception of these things which would then only be true and just when accompanied with a duly appreciative, satisfying, adoring sense of the infinite excellency of what was thus disclosed to him, and of its perfect adaptation to the wants of man as sinful. In short, this "revelation" to Saul "of Jesus Christ" involved that spiritual transformation which, in 2 Cor. iv. 6, the apostle describes in the following words: "It is God, that said, Light shall shine out of darkness, who shined in our hearts, to give the light [or, illumination] of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." For in that passage, though in the form in which he clothes his thought he speaks as if conjoining others with himself, it appears almost certain that he is describing there, as further on in vers. 7—12, his own personal experiences (see beginning of note on ver. 8), and also that he is describing that first introduction into his own understanding and heart of the truths of the gospel, which qualified him thenceforward to fulfil his mission to proclaim it. This appears confessedly to have been in a very marked degree a *miracle*—a moral and spiritual *miracle*. In truth, the new birth of a human soul into the kingdom of God (John iii. 8) must ever be such, coming we know not how. What, however, seems to distinguish this case from most others, even from that of those previously called to be apostles, is the rapidity with which was formed in Saul the mind of "an apostle of the Gentiles"—a mind, that is, distinctly and unhaltingly conscious of the "mystery" which in Eph. iii. 3 he says "was by revelation made known to him," the hitherto kept back "secret" of God's love in Christ to all the world, Gentile and Jew alike; of God's readiness and purpose to embrace and bless with all spiritual blessings, without any reference now to Mosaism, every human creature that simply repented and believed in Jesus Christ. As the proclamation to the world of this "mystery" was to be his great and pre-eminently distinguishing function, so at the very first he became fitted and qualified for its discharge by its impartation to his soul, not through slow processes of thought and reasoning, but by an inward manifestation of the Christ, the suddenness and vividness of which corresponded in no small degree to the suddenness and vividness of that outward manifestation of the Christ which was simultaneously made to his corporeal sense. This presents itself to us as, in the moral and spiritual sphere

of our being, a miracle; and as such the apostle himself manifestly regarded it. It is hard to believe but that he would have repudiated with high disdain (1 Cor. ii. 15) any attempt to solve the marvellousness of the phenomenon in the alembic of rational explanation; any theory which should find the phenomenon to be satisfactorily accounted for by these or those conditions of his foregoing psychological history. These last may have prepared a favourable field of development; but he knew for a surety that the product itself was no natural offspring of any spontaneous operations of his own mind. The very phrase in the verse before us, "the *revelation* of Jesus Christ," as well as the comparison which in 2 Cor. iv. 6 he draws between his spiritual transformation and the supernatural operation of the Almighty's fiat, "Let there be light," plainly shows that he would have refused to allow the cause discoverable anywhere else save in the unexplainable operations of sovereign, almighty grace. And in all prudence we should be content to be herein not wiser than he.

Ver. 13.—*For ye have heard* (ἤκούσατε γάρ). This "for" introduces the whole statement which follows down to the end of the chapter; for the entire section is written with the view of substantiating the assertion in ver. 12, that he had not received the gospel which he preached from man, but solely through illumination imparted immediately from heaven. "Ye have heard," i.e. have been told; as Acts xi. 1; John iv. 1, and often. "I am only stating what ye have already been apprised of, when I tell you of," etc. That the aorist tense of the Greek word does not limit the expression to any one communication, such e.g. as one made by the apostle himself, is shown by the use of this very aorist in Matt. v. 21, 33, etc.; Luke iv. 23; John xii. 34; Eph. iii. 2; iv. 21; 2 Tim. i. 13; Jas. v. 11. The apostle appears to have been himself in the habit of frequently telling the wondrous story of what he once had been and of the change wrought upon him. We have instances of his doing this in full detail in his speech from the stairs, and in his defence before Agrippa (Acts xxiii. 1—16; xxvi.), and with less fulness in Phil. iii. 4—8; 1 Cor. xv. 8, 9. It is therefore quite supposable that he had himself said as much also in Galatia. We observe, however, that the apostle does not say, "heard from me," as he might have done if he had himself been their informant; and, further, that the effect of the words, "ye have heard," does not, in point of construction at least, of necessity extend beyond the fourteenth verse. We are therefore at liberty to surmise that what he here refers to as having been told them relates simply



to his life before his conversion; and that the accounts which they had received of it had come through unfriendly informants. These may have been either unbelieving Jews or Judaizing Christians, who wished by these statements to disparage the apostle's character as one who, if he really was not dishonest, was at all events capable of passing from one extreme of sentiments to their direct opposite with the utmost suddenness and levity, and therefore was not a man entitled to be regarded with confidence. Of my conversation in time past in the Jews' religion (τὴν ἐμὴν ἠναστροφήν ποτε ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ); of my manner of life formerly in Judaism. "The manner in which I once behaved myself as devoted to Judaism." The ποτε belongs to the action denoted in the verbal noun ἠναστροφήν, like ἡ τῆς Τροίας ἄλωσις τὸ δεύτερον, cited by Meyer from Plato ('Legg.' iii. 685, D). ἠναστροφή, conversatio, which occurs repeatedly in the New Testament, is generally rendered "conversation" in Authorized Version (Eph. iv. 22; 1 Pet. i. 18; iv. 12; Heb. xiii. 7). "Judaism" means "the religious life of a Jew," which distinctively was Mosaism. It occurs in 2 Macc. ii. 21; xiv. 38; 4 Macc. iv. 16. Ignatius ('Ad Magn.,' 8) speaks of "not living according to Judaism," as in *ibid.*, 10, he uses the word "Christianism." St. Paul has the verb "Judaize" below, ch. ii. 14. On the objective accusative ἠναστροφήν as defined by the following clause, "how that," etc., see note on εὐαγγελίον in ver. 11. How that beyond measure I persecuted the Church of God (ὅτι καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἐδίωκον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ); how that beyond measure I was persecuting the Church of God. The imperfect "was persecuting," as well as the following, "was making havoc and was advancing," points to what he was doing when God interposed in the manner described in vers. 15, 16. Compare the use of the aorist ἐδίωξα in 1 Cor. xv. 9, where no such simultaneity required to be indicated. "Beyond measure" or "superlatively" (καθ' ὑπερβολὴν) was, at least about this time, a favourite phrase with St. Paul. A less eager pen might have written "exceedingly" (σφόδρα). Cf. Rom. vii. 13; 1 Cor. xii. 31; 2 Cor. i. 8; iv. 7, 17; xii. 7. "Of God." This is added to "the Church" with pathos of strong self-condemnation, as it is also in 1 Cor. xv. 9. The apostle feels now that his violence against the Church was a kind of sacrilege. The sentiment is an echo of Christ's words to him, "Why persecutest thou me?" And wasted it (καὶ ἐπόρθουν αὐτήν); and making havoc of it. The Greek verb (κρθεῖν) used again in this relation below, ver. 23, is similarly employed also in Acts ix. 21, "made havoc of those who called upon this Name." The verb properly denotes

"devastate," "harry;" and in classical Greek is used with reference to towns, countries, and the like, being applied to persons only in the poetical style (Liddell and Scott). In the New Testament it is used only in relation to Saul's persecution, apparently marking its deadly effectiveness as well as Saul's determination if possible to extirpate the faith and its adherents. The *expugnabam* of the Vulgate would seem a fair equivalent.

Ver. 14.—And profited in the Jews' religion (καὶ προέκοπτον ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ); and was going forward in Judaism; that is, was going on further and further in Judaism. The Greek verb (προέκοπτεν) "to make way," "advance," is found also Luke ii. 52; Rom. xiii. 12; 2 Tim. ii. 16; iii. 9, 13. "In Judaism," i.e. in the sentiments and practices of Judaism. The particular kind of Judaism which he has in view was the Pharisean form of Mosaism. "A Pharisee and son of a Pharisee," a high-caste "Hebrew sprung of Hebrews" (Acts xxiii. 6; Phil. iii. 5), Saul had thrown himself upon the study and observance, not only of all the rites and ceremonies prescribed in the written Law, but also of the doctrines, rites, and ceremonies which rabbinical teaching and tradition added thereto; outvying in strictness those who were the strictest; never satisfied without adopting whatever fresh observances the authority of a Pharisean rabbin might commend to his regard. Above many my equals in mine own nation (ὐπὲρ πολλοῦς συνηλικιώτας ἐν τῷ γένει μου). "Above," beyond; the same Greek preposition as in Acts xxvi. 13; Philem. 16, 21; Heb. iv. 12. Συνηλικιώτης, synonymous with συνηλίς, used in the Septuagint of Dan. i. 10, is equivalent to ἡλικιώτης or ἡλίξ, the σύν being prefixed merely to make the notion of parity more emphatic. Saul was then "a young man" (Acts vii. 58); and the reference which he here makes to "coevals" of his, as sharing in his Judaistic enthusiasm, but outstripped by him therein, seems to point to the rising up at that time of a party, "a young Jewry," as we might nowadays style it, especially espoused by the more youthful "Hebrews," which devoted itself to the revival and consolidation of Pharisean Judaism in its most advanced form. We may conceive of them as actuated by antagonism, alike to the *Gentilizing* spirit of the Herodians; to the rigid bare form of Mosaism cherished by the Sadducees which rejected that development of spiritual doctrine which for many generations had been going on in many pious and thoughtful minds; and finally, and perhaps most specially of all, to the now but rapidly spreading sect of the "Nazarenes." "In my nation." The apostle says "my," as

conscious of the presence of the Gentiles to whom he is writing. For the like reason he uses the singular possessive pronoun, "my people (τὸ ἔθνος μου)" in his address to Felix, and in his defence before Agrippa, this king sitting only as an assessor by compliment at the side of the heathen governor (Acts xxiv. 17; xxvi. 4). Elsewhere also St. Paul uses the word (γένος) "nation" to denote the Jewish people (Phil. iii. 5; 2 Cor. xi. 26), whence also he employs the phrase, "my kinsman" (συγγένης μου), when addressing Gentiles to denote a fellow-Jew in contrast to Gentiles (Rom. ix. 3; xvi. 7, 21). In the present passage, "among my countrymen" may be accepted as a near equivalent; only the classification which the word "countrymen" presupposes is founded on relation to *country*, whereas γένος denotes a blood connection, comprising Jews of whatever country. Being more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of my fathers (περισσότερως ζηλωτῆς ὑπάρχων τῶν πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων). The strong adverb here used, "more excessively" (περισσότερως), which frequently occurs in St. Paul's ardent style, always retains its proper comparative sense; as e.g. 2 Cor. vii. 15; xi. 23; xii. 15. It means, therefore, "more excessively than they." The word ζηλωτῆς, rendered "zealous," followed by the genitive "of the traditions," has much the same meaning as in the phrases, "zealous of spirits [or, spiritual gifts];" "zealous of good works;" "zealous of the Law" (1 Cor. xiv. 12; Titus ii. 14; Acts xxi. 20); in all which passages it is rendered in the Authorized Version as here. Its meaning is illustrated by the use of the verb from which it is derived in 1 Cor. xiv. 1, "Desire earnestly spiritual gifts," and 1 Cor. xiv. 39, "Desire earnestly to prophesy;" denoting, as it should seem, "admire and long to possess;" "aspire after" (see below, the notes on ch. iv. 17, 18). The clause may be paraphrased, "With more excessive fervency than they, affecting [or, being devoted to] the traditions of my fathers." The only remaining passage in the New Testament in which the Greek word occurs as an adjective is Acts xxii. 3 (ζηλωτῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ), "zealous towards God" (Authorized Version), "zealous for God" (Revised Version); where the sense is probably still that of fervent devotion, but implying also a palliating reference to the intense zeal which the Jews were then showing in vindicating the honour of God against a supposed insult. "Zeal towards" an object implies also a "zeal for it;" in other words, fervent attachment and devotion has also an outward-looking aspect of resentment and resistance against any who are regarded as disposed to assail what we love.

And this latter element of thought, the vindicatory, is frequently the more prominent of the two, in the use of the word "zeal" and its derivatives, in the Hellenistical Greek of both the LXX. and the New Testament; while in some cases it is not clear which for the moment is the most in the speaker's mind. The latter, no doubt, forms the principal notion of the name "Zealot" as applied in the closing decades of the Jewish commonwealth to a fanatical party, who felt they had a special vocation to vindicate the honour of God and his service by deeds of rancorous violence; to which party probably at one time belonged the Simon who in Luke vi. 15 is styled "Zelotes," a word, no doubt, synonymous with the Chaldaic word "Cananean" found in Matt. x. 4 and Mark iii. 18. In the phrase, "the traditions of my fathers," the apostle has been supposed by some critics to allude to the circumstance that he was "the son of a Pharisee;" thus making it equivalent to "the traditions of my family." But the context shows that he is thinking of traditions observed likewise by those "coevals" of his to whom he refers; the "fathers," therefore, are the forefathers of the nation, equivalent to the "elders," in the phrase current among the Jews, "the tradition of the elders" (Matt. xv. 2). Comp. 1 Pet. i. 18, "Your vain manner of life (πατροπαραδότου) handed down from your fathers." In the possessive pronoun "my" the apostle still speaks of himself as a born Jew, in contradistinction to Gentiles such as he was addressing. If he had been addressing Jews, he would probably have written "our," or omitted the pronoun altogether, as in Acts xxii. 3; xxiv. 14; xxviii. 17. There seems to be a tone of *mimesis* in the phrase: *q.d.* "The traditions which I proudly and fondly cherished as those of my fathers." The adjective rendered "of the fathers" marks them as those who had transmitted (παρέδοσαν) those traditions (παραδόσεις), not merely those who had possessed them. It has been questioned whether this phrase, "paternal traditions," includes those transmitted religious maxims and observances which the Mosaic Law itself prescribed. Probably it does. The "customs which [the Jews said] Moses delivered (παρέδωκεν) to us" (Acts vi. 14), as they appertained to "the fathers" (πατῆρα, Acts xxviii. 17), might also be justly designated as "the traditions of our fathers." At the same time, the apostle would hardly have written as he here has done, if he had had these alone in his view; he would rather have introduced the venerable name of "the Law." The expression appears chosen as comprehending, together with the prescriptions of the original Law, those

transmitted maxims and usages also which are described in the Gospels (cf. Matt. v.; xv.; xxiii.; Mark vii.) as things said "by" or "to" them of old time, or as "the traditions of the elders;" the particular instances of such which are specified in the Gospels being only samples taken out of a very large class (Mark vii. 4). Our Lord himself, it is true, made a distinction between these two classes of religious doctrines or observances, rebuking specifically many of the latter class, and discountenancing the whole class in general when enforced on men's consciences as a religious obligation; in contrast with "the Word of God," these, he insisted, were "commandments" or "traditions of men" (Mark vii. 7—13). But a Judaist would hardly have been disposed to make the same distinction. Rather, it would be the habit of his mind to blend and confound the two together as forming one entire system of formal religion; regarding those of the latter class simply as explanatory of the former, or as a fitting suppletion required to give to the former due coherency and entireness. He would be disposed to consider that portion of the whole tradition which in reality was of purely human device as invested with the like obligatoriness as that other portion which could truly plead the sanction of Divine authorization. It is plain that this was the case with those Judaists with whom, in the Gospels, our Lord is seen contending. And in all the references which St. Paul makes to Judaism, whether as part of his own former life, or as confronted by him in his apostolic agency, nowhere, either, is he found making any distinction between the two certainly distinguishable elements which composed it. There were, however, different schools of thought in Judaistic traditionalism, some stricter, some more lax. We must, therefore, further define our view of the particular branch of "paternal traditions" which the apostle here refers to by remembering that, as he said in his speech from the stairs (Acts xxii. 3), he had been "instructed according to the *strict* manner of the Law of their fathers;" trained, that is, to construe the requirements of the Law as these were interpreted by the strictest of all the schools; as he said before Agrippa, "After the strictest sect of our religion I lived a Pharisee" (Acts xxvi. 5). Here the inquiry presents itself—In what way does the substance of these two verses (13, 14) help to bear out the apostle's statement in ver. 12, that the gospel which he preached was altogether derived from God's own immediate revelation to himself? The whole complexion of the passage shows that the point which the apostle is here concerned to indicate relates to the posture of his own

spirit at the time of his first receiving the gospel. The Saul of those days, he says, was animated by the sentiment of bitter hostility to the faith; by a stern resolve—the dictate, as he thought, of conscience—if possible to extirpate the Church. Was it supposable that a mind possessed with such an abhorrence of the Nazarenes was nevertheless accessible to voices and teachings coming to him out of their society? Again, an earnestly religious man according to his lights, Saul's spirit was absorbed by devotion to Judaism—to the eager carrying out in practice, and to the vindication, of those modes of religious life which the revered and fondly cherished traditions of his people recommended to him. Was it credible that he could for a moment have given a favourable hearing to statements, whether of matters of fact or of religious belief, which proceeded from a sect of *latitudinarians* such as these, whose teacher had notoriously been foremost both in trampling down the fences of Pharisaism in his own practice and in loudly denouncing alike its principles and its representatives? Why, anything which those men could have said would to his view be at once self-condemned because simply of the quarter from which it issued. It may be objected that words which he had heard, we may confidently believe, from the martyr Stephen, who, in the controversy between Judaism and Christianity, may be regarded as *in a certain degree* Paul's own forerunner, and very supposably from many another confessor of the faith of less enlightenment than St. Stephen, though at the time repelled from his acceptance through his all-absorbing Pharisaism, may nevertheless have deposited (in his mind pregnant seeds of thought and instruction afterwards to be fully developed. To this objection it appears a sufficient reply that the gospel of the grace of God to all mankind, untrammelled by any Judaical restriction whatever, which was the gospel entrusted to St. Paul, and which at this present hour of conflict in Galatia he was more specifically concerned to maintain, had at the time of his conversion been as yet most imperfectly disclosed even to the most advanced disciples of the faith. This more perfectly developed form of the gospel it was not possible that he should have heretofore heard from any Christian martyr or from any Christian teacher; for at that time it was still a *mystery*, not patent as yet to the eyes of even apostles themselves (see Eph. iii. 1—7).

Ver. 15.—But when it pleased God (*ὅτε δὲ εὐδόκησεν ὁ Θεός*); and when it was the good pleasure of God. The Authorized Version and the Revised Version have "but when." To determine the exact force here

of the conjunction δέ, we must consider how the sentence it introduces stands related to what precedes. The main underlying thought of vers. 13, 14 was that the habit of the apostle's mind before his conversion was such as wholly to preclude the notion of his having known the gospel up to that hour. The main thought pervading vers. 15—17, and indeed pursued to the end of the chapter, is that, after he had received from God himself the knowledge of the gospel, he had had no occasion to have recourse to any mortal man, apostle or other, for the purpose of further instruction therein. It follows that the conjunction connecting the two sentences is not *adversative*, as it would, of course, be taken if God's dealings with him, described in vers. 15, 16, were the main point of this new paragraph, but is simply the sign of the writer's passing on to *another* thought—not one contrasted with the preceding, but merely additional. As examples of the use of δέ as *continuative* and not *adversative*, comp. Luke xii. 11, 16; xiii. 6, 10; xv. 11; Acts ix. 8, 10; xii. 10, 13; Rom. ii. 3; 1 Cor. xvi. 15, 17. It may be represented in English by "and" or "and again." In the reading of the Greek text it is not certain whether we ought not to omit the word "God" (δ θεός). If it is a gloss which has crept into the text, it is unquestionably a just gloss. Similar omissions of the Divine Name, as Bishop Lightfoot observes, are frequent in St. Paul (see ch. I. 6; ii. 8; Rom. viii. 11; Phil. i. 6). The verb εὐδοκεῖν properly expresses complacency; as e.g. Matt. iii. 17, "In whom I am well pleased;" and often. And this notion may be commonly traced in its use even when followed, as here, by an infinitive. Thus in 1 Thess. ii. 8, "It would have been a pleasure to us to impart," etc.; in 1 Thess. iii. 1, "It was painful to us to be left alone, but under the circumstances we gladly chose to be so." When applied, as here, to God, the notion of the pleasure which he takes in acts of beneficence must not be lost sight of; "Was graciously pleased;" comp. Luke xii. 32, "It is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." In Eph. i. 5 the noun "good pleasure" points to the act of "predestination" spoken of as (if we may venture so to speak of God) a volition of his heart and not of merely his regulative wisdom. The apostle seems led to use the word here by the complacency and joy which he himself felt in having been made the recipient of this "revelation;" those sentiments of his own bosom are, to his view, a reflection of the Divine complacency in imparting it. At the same time, the reader must be conscious of the deep sense, in fact the supremely prevailing sense, which the apostle has just here, that the imparting of

the revelation spoken of was the fruit solely of a Divine volition triumphing over extreme wickedness and infatuation on his own part. Compare, in this respect also, the passage Eph. i. 5, just cited. It is this feeling which prompts the introduction of the deeply emotional parenthesis consisting of the two next clauses of the verse. **Who separated me from my mother's womb** (δ ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου); *who set me apart from my mother's womb*. The verb ἀφορίζω, set apart, separate, which is found used in other relations in Lev. xx. 26 (LXX.); Matt. xiii. 49; xxv. 32; Acts xix. 9; ch. ii. 12, is employed here with an implied reference to a specific office or work. Such a reference is explicitly added in Acts xiii. 2, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them;" and in Rom. i. 1, "Separated unto the gospel of God." There is this distinction, however, between the "setting apart" of the present passage and that of Acts xiii. 2, that, whereas in the latter it was one actually realized, here it is in the Divine predestination only, which last seems to be nearly the sense of the words, "whereunto I have called them," in the Acts. In Rom. i. 1 the verb probably includes both senses. "From my mother's womb" means "from the time that I was as yet unborn;" not perhaps exactly "ever since my birth," as Judg. xvi. 17; Matt. xix. 12; Acts iii. 2; xiv. 8; comp. rather Luke i. 15, as illustrated by ver. 41. The addition of these words is designed to mark the purely arbitrary character of this predestination. Comp. Rom. ix. 11, "The children being not yet born, neither having done anything good or bad, that the purpose of God according to election might stand." Viewed thus, the clause appears as an utterance of adoring humility on the part of the apostle, combined, however, with the strongest possible assertion of the Divine origin of his mission. A similar statement of God's arbitrary selection of a particular human being for a particular function is found in Isa. xlix. 1, "The Lord hath called me from the womb; from the bowels of my mother hath he made mention of my name;" *ibid.*, ver. 5, "That formed me from the womb to be his servant;" and again, with yet more striking resemblance, in Jer. i. 5, "Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations (προφήτην εἰς ἔθνη)." It is difficult not to believe that this conviction of the apostle concerning himself as an object of God's predestinating purpose, and perhaps even the form of its expression—for compare the words in the next verse, "That I might preach him among the Gentiles (ἔθνεσιν)"—was very mainly derived from the Lord's words to

Jeremiah, applied by the Spirit to his own particular case (comp. Acts ix. 15). The apostle feels that all the while that he had been pursuing that career of persecuting impiety and passionate Pharisaism, the Almighty had kept his eye upon him as his predestined apostle, and been waiting for the fitting hour when to summon him forth to his work. And called me by his grace (καὶ καλέσας με διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ). As the "setting apart" mentioned in the previous clause unquestionably was a "setting apart" for the apostolic office, it might seem convenient to understand the "calling" likewise as a calling to be an apostle. So most probably we are to take the words κλητὸς ἀπόστολος in Rom. i. 1 as meaning "called to be an apostle;" and in Heb. v. 4 the verb "called" is used of one called to be a priest. But the prevailing sense of "being called," in St. Paul's writings, refers to the bringing of the soul to Christ and into his kingdom; and in this definite reference the apostle uses the verb no less than twenty-four times, three of them in this Epistle (i. 6; v. 8, 13). And this, the regular use of the term, is quite in place here. It was quite natural that the writer, after so vividly portraying his former life when unregenerate, should now distinctly advert to the moral transformation which by Divine grace he had been the subject of. The word "grace" denotes God's freely expanding unmerited goodness, not as existing in himself, but as energizing upon men. This is made clear by the introduction of the preposition (διὰ) "through" or "by." It is that "grace" whose "reigning" power the apostle so exultingly extols in Rom. v. 15—21 (comp. Eph. ii. 5, "By grace have ye been saved"). The notion of mercy shown to the utterly undeserving is a prominent element of the word, connected as it is here with the description of the writer's former wickedness (comp. the use of the verb "obtained mercy" (ἠλέηθη) in 1 Tim. i. 13, 16). This clause, together with the preceding one, is not to be taken as a part of the historical statement in conjunction with the next verse, as if tracing the successive steps of the transaction, but as a periphrastic designation of Almighty God adapted to the circumstances of the case. The one article prefixed in the Greek to the two combined clauses shows this. We need not, therefore, perplex ourselves to determine the relation in point of time which the Divine acts here indicated bear to that described in the verse which follows. The tone of the verse is in a measure apologetic, rebutting the prejudice which, we may be sure, did in the view of many accrue to the writer from what he once had been. Thus: "Nevertheless, God had all along, even from the dawn of his being, set him apart to be

his apostle; God, by a marvellous exercise of goodness, had called him forth out of that evil state to be his own; unworthy, no doubt, he had proved himself to be of such mercy; but what God's grace had made him, that he was; for who should dare to contravene his hand (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 8—10)?"

Ver. 16.—To reveal his Son in me (ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί). The rendering "in me," i.e. "in my soul," or, in the idiom of the New Testament, "in my heart," is quite borne out by the use of the same preposition in numerous passages; e.g. John ii. 25, "Knew what was in man;" John iv. 14, "Shall become in him a well;" Col. i. 27, "Christ in you the Hope of glory;" Rom. vii. 17, 20, "Sin which dwelleth in me;" Rom. viii. 9, "The Spirit of God dwelleth in you;" Rom. viii. 10, "Christ in you;" Phil. ii. 13, "God which worketh in you" (comp. also Eph. iii. 20; Col. i. 29). Chrysostom writes, "But why does he say, 'To reveal his Son in me,' and not 'to me'? It is to signify that he had not only been instructed in the faith by words, but that he was richly endowed with the Spirit; and that the revelation had enlightened his whole soul, and that he had Christ speaking within him" ("Comment. in Gal.'). This exposition tallies remarkably with the description which the apostle in 2 Cor. iv. 6 gives of the process by which he had received the "treasure" of the gospel: "Seeing it is God, that said, Light shall shine out of darkness, who shined in our hearts, to give the light [or, illumination] of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." The "veil" which, while he was yet in Judaism, "had been upon his heart," was taken away; "with face unveiled" he was enabled to "behold, as in a mirror, the glory of the Lord" (2 Cor. iii. 15—18). This account of his spiritual illumination, written near about the same time as the passage before us, shows the manner in which at that time the transaction presented itself to his mind. This revelation of God's Son to him involved, we may feel certain, the revelation of him, in the relations which, as the once crucified and now exalted Christ, he bears to all mankind, Gentiles as well as Jews, and in the relations which he bears to his Church. "Christ Jesus" was then (to use the apostle's words in 1 Cor. i. 30) "made unto him Wisdom from God, both Righteousness and Sanctification and Redemption;" and what Christ was then of God made to be to Paul himself, that also, as the joyful recipient of the revelation at the same time learnt, Christ was through the recipient's own preaching of the Word to be of God made to all who should receive his message. The view of the passage above given

is required by the tenor of the context. If it is not admitted, there is nothing in the whole passage to make good the apostle's affirmation, in ver. 12, that he had received the gospel, not from man, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ. If after the analogy of such passages as 1 Tim. i. 16, "That in me as chief might Jesus Christ show forth all his long-suffering;" Rom. ix. 17, "That I might show in thee my power;" 1 Cor. iv. 6, "That in us ye might learn;"—we were to take the present clause to mean "To reveal to men the wonderful grace of his Son by what he did *in my case*," the words would merely point to Christ's mercy shown to him as a sinner; they would supply no statement of the fact of the apostle's having been furnished with the knowledge necessary in order that he might show the glad tidings of him among the Gentiles. In other words, the clause would neither satisfy the requirement of ver. 12 nor that of the dependent clause which follows. If, again, after the analogy of the words, "Ye seek a proof of Christ that speaketh in me," in 2 Cor. xiii. 3, taking this to mean "Christ that speaketh by me;" or if the words in Acts xvii. 31, "He will judge the world in righteousness by [Greek, 'in'] the Man whom he hath ordained," we propose to understand the meaning to be "Reveal his Son by me," *i. e.* by my preaching, we are met by the objection that the clause would anticipate the thought expressed by the following words: "That I might show the glad tidings of him among the Gentiles," which, however, stand as expressing their dependent *consequence*. Here the important question arises how the reference which the apostle here makes to the revelation of Jesus Christ made "in him" stands related to the accounts repeatedly given in the Acts of the personal sight of the Lord Jesus accorded to him at his conversion—accounts which are confirmed in the Epistles by the apostle's own words in 1 Cor. ix. 1, "Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?" To harmonize the two, some have been led to do violence to the phrase, "reveal in me," so as to make it in some way or other to mean "reveal to me," and thus render it possible to make the words refer to that personal manifestation made to Saul's bodily senses. Others have had recourse to the yet more violent and indeed utterly destructive expedient of inferring from this phrase that the revelation of Christ made to the apostle at his conversion was altogether and exclusively spiritual; and that the spiritual sight of our Lord had been so realizing and vivid as to have been even mistaken by the apostle himself for a manifestation actually made to his senses. We are relieved of

the necessity of adopting either of these methods of criticism by the consideration that, in the course of the argument which the apostle is now pursuing, there is nothing to lead him to speak at all of the outward circumstances accompanying his conversion. All that he now has occasion to refer to is the fact that at that time God Almighty did himself give to his soul so clear a view of his Son as qualified him at once to preach the gospel to the Gentiles; so clear that, not needing further illumination, he had in fact sought none of any mortal man. This is all that the line of argument requires the apostle now to refer to. A reference to the actual personal sight which he then had of the Lord Jesus would in no way have served his purpose. Such reference would not have even involved by inference, much less have definitely stated, the point which he now is concerned to state. This point is, plainly, the communication to his soul of the full knowledge of the gospel, and nothing else; and accordingly it is this alone that he now makes mention of. It has been questioned at what precise juncture in the narrative of the ninth chapter of the Acts the revelation here spoken of should be supposed to have taken place. Our Lord's personal manifestation of himself to Saul on his road to Damascus, involving as it did the complete instantaneous overthrow of all his previous views, relative alike to "Jesus of Nazareth" and to the idea of the expected "Messiah," must have been an all-important preparation for that full disclosure of the truth to his soul which is here indicated; but there is no sufficient reason for identifying the one with the other. The history of the Acts (xiii. 18) and the Epistles (1 Cor. xi. 23; 2 Cor. xii. 1, 8) make mention of several occasions on which our Lord appears to have shown himself to St. Paul and made important communications to him; and the incidental manner in which these have come to be mentioned suggests the belief that they may have been only a few out of many similar instances, others of which have lain unmentioned. There may very supposably have been such taking place (we will say) presently after Saul's baptism, and pointed forward to by our Lord in his words to Ananias, "I will show him how many things he must suffer for my Name's sake" (Acts ix. 16). It is very possible that we do not commonly bear enough in mind how little, in fact, it is that the record tells us of this most interesting event; and, in particular, that we do not adequately realize the frequency and the intimate character of the communications to which this "choice instrument (*σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς*)" of Divine teaching would seem to have been admitted by

his Master. And who (we may further ask) may venture to determine what part the Lord Jesus took personally, that is, by personal intercourse, in the process of illumination of which the apostle here declares himself to have been the subject, or how much of it was effected by the agency of the Third Person of the holy Trinity, co-operating with the intense action of Saul's own earnest, questioning, light-imploing mind, especially during those three days spoken of in Acts ix. 9? "For, behold, he prayeth!" (Acts ix. 11, 12). It seems only reasonable to believe that the revelation of his Son which (the apostle says) God vouchsafed to him, preceded his very first public appearance in the synagogues of Damascus as an evangelist, and that this revelation was not deferred, as some imagine it was, until after his withdrawal into Arabia. Indeed, that it did precede it appears to be conclusively established by the statement of the verse now before us and the next following; for the course of action described by the writer, both negatively and affirmatively, in the words beginning with, "I consulted not," is represented as ensuing "immediately" upon the "revelation in him of God's Son." That the locality where this revelation was made was Damascus or its vicinity is indicated by the words, "I returned to Damascus," in ver. 17. This circumstance betokens the consciousness in the writer's mind that the story of his conversion was not unknown to his readers. That I might preach him among the heathen (*ἵνα εὐαγγελίζωμαι αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσσιν*); that I might show the glad tidings of him among the Gentiles. In this instance, as well as perhaps in some others, the Authorized Version falls somewhat short of representing the exact force of the verb *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι* by rendering it "preach," which more nearly answers to *κηρύσσω*. In Luke viii. 1, where in the Greek we have the two verbs together (*κηρύσσω καὶ εὐαγγελίζομαι*), our translators were compelled to use another term; and accordingly they render *εὐαγγελίζομαι*, "showing [Revised Version, 'bringing'] the glad tidings of [the kingdom of God];" which shade of thought was what the evangelist intended to suggest. The verb surely always retains some tinge of its original element of "glad tidings," though this may often have been more or less attenuated, as in the case of the word *εὐαγγέλιον*, gospel, itself, by its becoming a set term. In the present instance, the apostle's posture of feeling at the time when the "joyful tidings" were first brought home to his own heart seems to suggest a return, at least here, to the original import of the word. The present tense of the Greek verb (*εὐαγγελίζωμαι*) points to the continuous

character of the service; as if it were, "That I should be a shower-forth of the glad tidings." The orist would have recited the entire service as one whole. "Among the Gentiles." Dean Howson very justly observes, "We should mark how emphatic in all accounts of the conversion is the reference to his work among the Gentiles. Thus, 'The Gentiles, unto whom now I send thee, to open their eyes and to turn them from darkness to light,' are named by Christ himself in the first communication from heaven (Acts xxvi. 17, 18). To Ananias the direction is given, 'Go thy way: for he is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my Name before the Gentiles [and kings, and the children of Israel]'. . . . To which we may properly add what was said to him at Jerusalem, when he first went thither from Damascus, 'Depart; for I will send thee far off to the Gentiles' (Acts xxii. 21)" ('Speaker's Commentary,' *in loc.*). Immediately (*εὐθέως*). The construction of the sentence imperatively requires us to connect this adverb with the two affirmative clauses which the writer adds to the two negative ones which he first interposes, and not with these two negative clauses alone, while, however, its import is felt to attach itself to these also. The turn of thought seems to be this: "I felt at once that I needed not to advise with any mortal man; no, not even with the older apostles; and accordingly I abstained from doing so; I immediately went away into Arabia, and then forthwith came back to Damascus." I conferred not (*οὐ προσεβόημι*); I consulted not. The use of the Greek verb constructed with a dative as meaning "advise with," "seek counsel in personal intercourse with," is well illustrated by several passages cited by the critics: Diod. Sic., xvii. 116, "Consulting the soothsayers concerning the sign;" Lucian, 'Jup. Trag,' § 1, "Consult with me; take me as your adviser in business;" Chrysippus (sp. in Suidas, *sub verb. νεοτρός*), "Consulting a dream-interpreter." Bengel takes the preposition *πρὸς* in the compound verb as meaning "further, i.e. the Divine revelation was enough for me." But the instances just cited of the use of the verb render this doubtful. On this point, see Ellicott's 'Commentary,' *in loc.* In ch. ii. 6 the verb requires to be taken differently (see note). With flesh and blood (*σὰρκα καὶ αἵματι*). The phrase, "flesh and blood," occurs in four other places in the New Testament: (1) 1 Cor. xv. 50, "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption;" (2) Heb. ii. 14, "Since the children are sharers in flesh and blood [the Revised Greek text reads 'blood and flesh'], he also himself in like manner

partook of the same;" (3) Eph. vi. 12, "Our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against . . . the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places;" (4) Matt. xvi. 17, "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." In the first two of these passages the phrase denotes the bodily nature of men viewed as subject to mortality; which is the turn of thought also in Eccclus. xiv. 18, where the human race is styled a "generation of flesh and blood." In the other two it denotes human beings themselves, described by their material nature, but with reference to their comparative inefficiency as viewed alongside, in (3) with purely spiritual agents; in (4) with God. In precisely the same way as in the last-cited passage, the apostle uses the phrase here. Knowing that God had himself revealed in him his Son, in order that he should proclaim him among the Gentiles, he at that crisis of action felt any reference for teaching or practical direction to mere men to be in his case altogether unnecessary. As the next clause specifies the older apostles, who are mentioned as being at that time at Jerusalem, it may be that the phrase, "flesh and blood," in its most immediate scope, contemplates believers or elders (for probably there already were Christian elders there) of Damascus. Ananias is the only Damascene believer named in the history, though it speaks of others (Acts ix. 19); he was a man of remarkably high estimation even amongst the unbelieving Jews (Acts xxii. 12), and he had been honoured by Christ with a special vision, and sent by Christ on a special mission to Saul. If Saul had felt it to be incumbent upon him to advise with any servant of Christ, whether as to what he should believe or as to what he should do, surely to Ananias he would naturally have looked. But not even to an Ananias would Saul refer for guidance at this juncture. The sense which has frequently been given to the phrase, "flesh and blood," as meaning "the dictates of one's own fleshy nature," is neither favoured by its use in any other passage (although "the flesh," standing alone, might have admitted of such an interpretation), nor is it in any way suggested by the tenor of the context. The apostle is here dealing solely with his relations to other men.

Ver. 17.—Neither went I up to Jerusalem (οὐδὲ ἀνῆλθον [L. A. ἀπῆλθον] εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα); neither went I up (or, away). This "neither" negatives one particular instance of the general notion of "consulting flesh and blood," in reference to which an exception might else have not unnaturally been supposed likely. It forms a sort of climax to

the negative. So Rom. ix. 16, "Not of him that willeth, neither of him that runneth." It is uncertain whether "went up" or "went away" is the true reading of the Greek text. If the latter, the verb is repeated after the following "but" (ἀλλὰ), as Rom. viii. 15, "Ye have received;" Heb. xii. 18, 22, "Ye are come." To them which were apostles before me (πρὸς τοὺς πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἀποστόλους). For this "before me," comp. Rom. xvi. 7. Every reader must feel the consciousness of official parity with the twelve which transpires in this expression of St. Paul's. The like consciousness is apparent in 1 Cor. xv. 5—11, strongly as the writer there expresses his sense of comparative personal unworthiness. Why, it may be asked, does the apostle thus particularly refer to the "apostles before him"? The probable answer seems to be, for the purpose of more forcibly illustrating the assured conviction, which from the very first he entertained, of the sufficiency and Divine authority of the gospel which he had already received. But I went into Arabia (ἀλλ' ἀπῆλθον εἰς Ἀραβίαν); but I went away into Arabia. It is impossible to determine what was the precise locality to which St. Paul then went. "Arabia" was in those days a geographical term of very wide significance. Damascus itself appertained to Arabia; so Justin Martyr writes ("Dial. c. Tryph.", 305, A) "that Damascus was of the Arabian country (τῆς Ἀραβικῆς γῆς), and is, even though now [probably, Bishop Lightfoot suggests, by Hadrian's arrangement of those provinces] it has been assigned to what is called the Syrophenician country, none even of you are able to deny." So Tertullian, 'Adv. Mare,' iii. 13; 'Adv. Judæos,' 9. At the time of St. Paul's abode at Damascus the city was subject to an "ethnarch of Aretas" (2 Cor. xi. 32); and "Aretas," the King of Petra, is in the case of several successive princes, styled "the King of the Arabians" (2 Macc. v. 8; Josephus, 'Ant.,' xiv. 1, 4; 'Bell. Jud.,' i. 6, 2; 'Ant.,' xvi. 10, 8, 9). The apostle's words may, therefore, describe a withdrawal into some district, whether inhabited or uninhabited, not far distant from Damascus. On the other hand, in ch. iv. 25, the apostle refers to "Arabia" in connection with Mount Sinai; so that Arabia Petraea may possibly have been the country visited. And here the imagination is tempted by recollections of Moses and the giving of the Law, and of Elijah, to indulge in speculations with reference to the especial appropriateness of that vicinity for being Saul's place of sojourn at this crisis of spiritual illumination and call to apostleship. But all this is conjectural: there is no solid ground whatever for our believing that it was thither that his steps were at this season directed. And we



cannot but recollect, with reference to the Lord Jesus, that when, after his baptism, "the Spirit drove him forth into the wilderness," with a view, as we may in all reverence believe, to his preparing himself for his high ministry as the Christ, no one imagines that it was into the wilderness of Sinai that he was led. And this suggests the remark that, at this particular juncture in especial, Saul's movements were directed by heavenly guidance. This we seem warranted to infer from our Lord's words to him, "Rise, and enter into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do" (Acts ix. 6). At such a season, indeed, the unceasing cry of his whole soul—a cry surely not unresponded to—must have been, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" For further description of the geographical question, see Conybeare and Howson, ch. iii.; 'Dictionary of the Bible,' articles "Arabia" and "Aretas;" Lightfoot's 'Galatians: Excursus,' pp. 87—92, 6th edit. And returned again unto Damascus (καὶ πάλιν ὑπέστρεψα εἰς Δαμασκόν). That is, "without going elsewhere or to any place where I could meet with men who could be my instructors in the gospel." This must be supposed to be implied; otherwise the narrative would be illusive. As above stated, the "immediately" appears intended to qualify this clause as well as the preceding. The evidential value of this reference to Damascus, by implication indicated as the scene of his previously mentioned conversion, is strikingly illustrated by Paley in his 'Horæ Paulinæ' (Galatians), cited by Dean Howson, *in loc.* "A casual expression at the end, and an expression brought in for a different purpose, alone fixes it to have been at Damascus. Nothing can be more like simplicity and undesignedness than this." At the risk of repeating some remarks already made, I venture to propose the following as a just paraphrase of the whole passage, beginning with ver. 12. "My gospel which ye are swerving from I did not in any degree receive from men, but solely through the revelation of Jesus Christ which God himself made to me. It is evident that before I knew Christ, during the time that I was persecuting God's own Church with fanatical fury, my whole heart and soul devoted to the strictest Judaism of the Pharisees, I was removed poles asunder from all possible sympathetic contact with this doctrine. That God's love was ready to embrace every believer in Christ, whether obeying Moses' Law or not obeying it,—this was a truth that in those days could not possibly have gained access to my mind. And after this, when God graciously illuminated my soul with the sight of his Son, in order that I might become the joyful herald of

his grace to the Gentiles, to no mortal man, whether at Damascus or elsewhere, did I apply for further light; neither did I even repair to Jerusalem to seek instruction from Christ's own [former apostles: I at once departed in a direction which took me where I was still far away [or, perhaps, 'which took me further and further away'] from Jerusalem, into Arabia: and who should teach me this doctrine in Arabia? And then, forthwith, I came back straight to Damascus, Damascus being my first appointed sphere of labour."

Ver. 18.—Then after three years (εἴρηκα μετὰ τρία ἔτη). The apostle's object is to illustrate the independent source of his doctrine as not derived from men. This he does here by indicating how long an interval elapsed after he first was made acquainted with it before he ever got to even know Peter. By this he gives his readers to feel how strongly assured from the very first was his conviction of the sufficiency and certain truth of those views of the "gospel" which had been divinely communicated to him. The obvious inference from this view of the writer's present purpose is that, in his reckoning of time, the *terminus a quo* in this verse is the era of "God's revealing his Son in him," which in effect was that of his conversion. There are two modes of computing time employed in the New Testament—the inclusive and the non-inclusive. According to the former, just as "after three days" in Matt. xxvii. 63 and Mark viii. 31, means in fact "on the next day after but one;" so in the present instance, "after three years" may denote a not greater interval than "in the next year after but one." Compare the "by the space of three years" (τριετίαν) of Acts xx. 31, taken in conjunction with "for the space of two years" of Acts xix. 10. On the other hand, according to the non-inclusive way exemplified in the "after six days" of Matt. xvii. 1; Mark ix. 2 (compared with the "about eight days" of Luke ix. 28), the interval denoted may have been no less than three whole years. Since it is to the interest of the apostle's argument to mark the interval at its greatest, the reader will probably be of opinion that, if St. Paul had had in his mind a space of time which was not in reality less than three years, he would have used a form of expression more clearly marking this, and not one which might be easily taken as meaning less; and therefore that the phrase, "after three years" means in reality no more than "in the year after the next; not before." I went up to Jerusalem (ἀνῆλθον εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα). The apostle writes "went up" with a Jew's instinctive feeling of Jerusalem being the capital and centre of his nation and its

religion; a feeling which would be all the stronger through the consciousness that it was as yet the capital and centre also of Christendom itself. To see Peter (Ἰσορῆσαι Κηφᾶν [Receptus, Πέτρον]); to acquaint myself with Cephas. As the Greek verb here used—which is found nowhere else in the New Testament, and not found at all in the Septuagint—has been often misunderstood, it seems desirable to give a somewhat full account of the manner in which it is employed in other writers. The verb ἰστορεῖν, derived, through ἴστωρ or ἰστωρ, knowing, learned, from the conjectural root εἶδω, in the older Greek most commonly means "inquire of some one about some person or thing," and is constructed like ἐπερωτᾶν and other verbs of questioning. Thus, Eurip., 'Phæn.,' 621, Ὡς τί μ' ἰστορεῖς τόδε; "Ask me this question;" Soph., ('Ed. Tyr.,' 1156, Ὁν οὗτος ἰστορεῖ, "Whom this man is inquiring about." So in Herod., ii. 19. But sometimes, still in the older Greek, it means simply "knowing" or "personally knowing," with no associated notion of asking questions; as e.g. Æsch., 'Pers.,' 454, Κακῶς τὸ μέλλον ἰστορᾶν, "Ill apprised of the future;" 'Eum.,' 455, Πατέρα δ' ἰστορεῖς καλῶς, "My father thou knowest well." In the later Greek it frequently denotes personally acquainting one's self with some object, whether a person or a thing. Here again, as in its use just exemplified from Æschylus, the notion of asking questions is altogether absent. Thus, Josephus, 'Bell. Jud.,' vi. 1, 8, Ἀνήρ, ὃν ἐγὼ κατ' ἐκείνον ἰστόρησα τὸν πρότερον, "When I got personally to know;" 'Ant.,' viii. 2, 5, Ἰστόρησα γὰρ τινα Ἐλεάζαρον, "I have in person seen Eleazar, releasing demoniacs," etc.; 'Ant.,' i. 11, 4, Ἰστόρηκα δ' αὐτήν, "I have myself been and seen it (i.e. the pillar of salt);" Plutarch, 'Thes.,' 30, Τὴν χώραν ἰστορῆσαι, "See, inspect the country;" 'Pomp.,' 40, Ἰστορῆσαι τὴν πόλιν, "See, or inspect the city." The result of this evidence is that, in all probability, the apostle means that he went up to Jerusalem to acquaint himself with Cephas. That in the present instance the verb was not at all meant to suggest the notion of questioning, either directly or by implication, though no doubt in the older form of the language it often means questioning, appears from two considerations: (1) The words, "I went to question Cephas," with no indication added, either specific or general, of the matters to be inquired about, would present a very bald and imperfect sentence; (2) it would seem strangely incongruous that the apostle, just when concerned to give point to his affirmation that he received not his gospel from men, but fully and completely from God, should tell his readers that two or three years after his conversion he went

up to Jerusalem to make inquiries of Cephas. Neither would the general use of the verb warrant us in understanding St. Paul to say that his object in making this journey was to "see Cephas" in that sense in which we sometimes employ the English verb, to denote a friendly visit; nor again would it justify us in interpreting it to mean "to put myself on a footing of acquaintanceship and friendship with him." No instance has been adduced in which the word has either of these two turns of meaning. Its import in the present instance appears to be this: St. Paul was hearing continually in all quarters a variety of statements respecting Cephas, the leader of the apostles, Cephas's doctrine, Cephas's manner of conduct both personal and ministerial,—statements, we may be sure, not always agreeing together. He knew the great importance of Cephas's position in the Church, not only with reference to the Jewish section of it with which that apostle was the most immediately associated, but also with reference to Gentile believers, he having been first of all the apostles divinely commissioned to open the door to the Gentiles. For the prudent shaping, then, of his own course in the prosecution of his ministry as apostle, it was of deep moment for St. Paul that he should have a more exact understanding of Cephas's personality, and of Cephas's principles of conduct in dealing both with Jews and Gentiles, than he could possibly gain from mere hearsay. He therefore resolved, most assuredly under Divine guidance, himself to repair to Jerusalem, to apprise himself by personal observation and intercourse of the true character of this most highly gifted and most influential leader of Jewish Christendom. Thus much, and so far as I can perceive no more than this, does the usage of the verb in the Greek of the time warrant us in finding in St. Paul's use of it in the present passage. And this view of it is confirmed by its singular appropriateness, when thus understood, to the connection in which it stands. No term could have more significantly implied the feeling which the writer entertained of the independence of his own position as a messenger of Christ to the world. Cephas's own self, he intimates, was the object which he sought by that journey to get to know. That is, there is not the faintest suggestion in the phrase employed of his having felt his own knowledge of the gospel to be imperfect, and that he wished to confer with Peter for the purpose of integrating his views. While, however, with the apostle the ruling motive in taking that journey may be supposed to have been as now stated, we are still at liberty to surmise that there were other accessory inducements. If

St. Paul felt that it was urgently needful for him, in the prosecution of his great mission, to know Cephas well, he could not but have also felt that it was of importance for the success of the great cause that Cephas should by personal intercourse be enabled to appreciate more certainly and distinctly than was otherwise possible what manner of man Saul himself now was, and should begin to recognize the gifts and calling which their common Lord had conferred upon him. Further, it is impossible not to believe that Saul would welcome with joy the opportunity which this visit would afford him of obtaining, from the lips of one who was a very principal eye-witness and minister in the matter discoursed on, more precise and more reliable accounts than it is probable he had as yet received, of many particulars appertaining to Christ's sojourn upon earth. And what a story Cephas had to tell him! With what ravishment of listening attention would Saul drink in at his lips the marvels of that Divine life and death, which it had been his privilege so closely to observe! And, on the other side, what joy on earth had the elder apostle greater than that of pouring into a truly sympathetic bosom those precious treasures of reminiscence. His two Epistles, written long after, evince clearly the profound, sweet complacency with which his mind was wont to dwell upon them. If, in Plato's immortal 'Phædo,' a disciple of the martyred Socrates, when invited by a fellow-disciple, who by accident had not been at Athens at the time, to tell him the particulars of his master's death, would comply with alacrity, "for that to him nothing ever was so sweet as to be remembering Socrates, whether telling of him himself or hearing another do it" (ii. iii. 5, 'Bekk'), how much more might not Cephas feel thus in transmitting to his attentive auditor those leaves of the tree of life which are for the healing of the nations! Nor can we doubt that Cephas would rehearse to him the particulars of the Lord's dealings with his own individual spirit: his own first interview with its then mysterious word, "Thou shalt be called Cephas!" the summons, "Follow me;" the restoration to health of his fever-stricken wife's mother; the miraculous draught of fishes, with the outcry, "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man!" and the gracious response, "Fear not; from henceforth thou shalt catch men;" the walking on the sea, with its "Lord, save me!" the confession of his faith, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," with the presently ensuing shrinking from the predicted cross, and the merited rebuke, "Get thee behind me, Satan!" the beatifying sight of the Transfiguration; the confident "Though

all should deny thee, yet will I never deny thee," so soon rebuked by the triple denial, and the Lord's glance of reproving love; the appearing of the risen Christ to him individually on Easter Day; the morning scene by the margin of the Sea of Tiberias, with its triple confession of love and its triple charge; the closing scene on Mount Olivet; his wondrously blessed discourse on the day of Pentecost; his great work again with Cornelius, so full of interest for the newly constituted apostle of the Gentiles now hearing it. The story, told, we may be sure, with quivering lips, with streaming eyes, with features kindling with a rapture of holy, heavenly joy, unfolded a marvellous record of the redeeming Master's love and wisdom and power in dealing with that human soul; a Saviour's work, such as might even in some respects match that which Saul had himself to record. And this no doubt mutual interchange of spiritual experience would reveal each to the other, so as they never could else have been revealed. Saul had come thither for the purpose of acquainting himself with Cephas's personality; he went away knowing something of the weaknesses of his temperament, as well as able to love and admire his loyalty of soul and straightforwardness in action, his zeal, the warmth, the impetuosity even, of his affections, his tender entire devotion to his Lord. It is interesting in this relation to remark that when, in writing to the Corinthians, St. Paul recites historical proofs of Christ's resurrection, the five appearances of the risen Christ specified by him which were antecedent to the one vouchsafed to himself, are those which he was likely to have been told of on the occasion of this visit, when, as he states, he saw, together with Cephas, also James the Lord's brother. Of those five appearances, that to "James" the Lord's brother in all probability is not mentioned in the Gospels at all; that to St. Peter only in the way of most cursory allusion by the Pauline evangelist St. Luke. It would seem as if thus early was stamped on St. Paul's mind a form of historical recital available for customary use ever after. The certain truth of these appearances he then got to be assured of through personal testimony borne to himself by Peter and by James. And abode with him fifteen days (*καὶ ἐπέμεινα πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡμέρας δεκαπέντε*); and I tarried with him fifteen days. The use of the preposition here rendered "with" is illustrated by 1 Cor. xvi. 6, 7; Matt. xiii. 56; John i. 1; 1 Thess. iii. 4; 2 Thess. ii. 5. Since in the midst of a populous city the propinquity and (probably) association expressed by the preposition is referred to the one individual Cephas, the phrase, "I

tarried with him," is with the greatest probability taken to indicate a sojourn at St. Peter's house. Else, why did not St. Paul write, "I tarried in Jerusalem"? And this circumstance the apostle, as it should seem, indicates, with a latent reference to its significance. The fact was significant in various ways. It testified most openly and emphatically to a wondrous transformation in the mutual sentiments with which the two men regarded one another. It was but a short while ago, only some two or three years more or less, that Saul was viewed by St. Peter with repugnance and dread, as the bitter and influential persecutor of that flock of Christ which the Lord had so pointedly committed especially to *his* affectionate tendence. Even personally on his own behalf Peter "must have feared him, perhaps even have hidden himself from him, when he forced his way into Christian homes" (Dr. Farrar, 'Life of St. Paul,' vol. i. p. 231). Only quite lately had the scattered members of the Church ceased to fear fresh onslaughts of the persecution which Saul had so eagerly pressed forward, and begun once more to openly assemble at Jerusalem. Yet now there were here to be seen, on the one side Cephas, forgivingly, affectionately welcoming Saul to his house; and on the other, the late scornful and hostile Pharisee submitting to be beheld to Cephas for hospitality! to Cephas for public recognition as a brother in Christ! That it was with a lively recollection of that newborn mutual brotherliness that the apostle penned this brief record of his visit to Cephas, dry and colourless matter-of-fact as it at first seems, we cannot doubt when we look back upon the highly coloured picture of his previous animosity against the Church of God, and his intense Pharisaism, and also observe that immediately after he brings directly into view the sentiments of wonder and adoring gratitude to God with which the Churches of Judæa beheld the change which had taken place in him. His mind is too intent upon the pressing business of the hour to allow itself in melting mood to loiter upon mere reminiscences of the past; it takes in, nevertheless, with however rapid a glance, the remembrance of those days; how strange, and withal how affecting, his position had then been felt to be! We are not, however, to suppose that St. Paul devoted this most noteworthy fortnight altogether, or perhaps even principally, to fraternal intercourse with Cephas and James and the other newly found brethren in Christ residing in the capital. We learn from the history of the Acts that, after the misgiving, which not unnaturally had been at first felt by even the leaders of the Christian community, as to the reality of his conversion to the faith, had been

GALATIANS.

overcome through the interposition of the generous-hearted Barnabas, his ardent zeal thrust him forth without delay upon giving public proof of his consecration to the cause of Christ. He owed it to that cause that, in the place where he had so grievously and publicly sinned against it, he should try what he could to undo, if only he might, the mischief which when last at Jerusalem he had but too well succeeded in effecting. For this end he addressed himself to that very portion of the population amongst whom in those days of sin his hostility had been so conspicuously shown. He sought out the Hellenist Jews, whom he had then been so active in hounding on to their assault upon the holy Stephen, eagerly striving now by exhortation and argument to win them to believe. The endeavour was, however, fruitless. The evil which he had wrought in the past it was not given him in this field to repair. Christ himself, appearing in vision, warned him to desist. Earnestly he entreated to be permitted thus to plead for him; but his Master peremptorily commanded him to leave the city. "Depart quickly: they will not receive of thee testimony concerning me" (Acts xxii. 18). The wish was natural, and to his honour; but it was not for this that his steps had been directed to Jerusalem. He should work for Christ extensively elsewhere, and not ineffectually; but here he was forbidden to stay. The eager, and for himself fearless, champion obeys, curbing his resolute spirit to compliance with the arrangements which the brethren at Jerusalem made for his safe transmission to Cæsarea, from whence he sailed for Tarsus (Acts ix.).

Ver. 19.—But other of the apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother (*ἕτερον δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων οὐκ εἶδον, εἰ μὴ Ἰάκωβον τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ Κυρίου*); but no one besides of the apostles saw I, unless it were James the Lord's brother. The words, "unless it were," are here proposed as a rendering of *εἰ μὴ*, as betokening a certain degree of hesitancy on the apostle's part as to the perfect justness of the exception which he makes. The reason of this will appear if we consider that "James the Lord's brother" was not really one of the apostles; but nevertheless, through the position which he held in the Church of Jerusalem, and through various circumstances attaching to him, stood in general estimation so near to the revered twelve, that St. Paul felt he was required, in connection with his present statement, to make this reference to him, when affirming so solemnly that Cephas was the only apostle that he then saw. For a fuller discussion of the personality of "James the Lord's brother," the reader is referred

D

to the additional note at the end of this chapter. How it came about that St. Peter was the only one of the twelve that St. Paul then saw, there are no certain grounds for determining. The intimation in Acts viii. 1 that, in the persecution which ensued upon the martyrdom of Stephen, the apostles still remained at Jerusalem when they of the Church there were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judæa and Samaria, relates to a period two or three years previous. The state of things was no doubt now quite different; the Church had come together again; but the apostles may for the most part have been absent in the country, engaged in their apostolic labours, as St. Peter himself is soon after described as being (cf. Acts ix. 31, 32). The surmise that this was the cause appears more probable than the view which supposes them to have continued distrustful, now that the two great leaders, Cephas and James, had been won over to frankly and publicly recognize the new convert. A difficulty has been thought to result from a comparison of these words of St. Paul with St. Luke's statement in Acts ix. 15, 16, that Barnabas took and brought him to "the apostles," and that he "was with them" going in and out at Jerusalem. That he was not with them for long was a fact not unknown to St. Luke, as we may gather from what we read in Acts xxii. 18. There is, therefore, no discrepancy in that respect between the two representations. But is there no discrepancy between St. Luke's mention of "the apostles" as then admitting Paul into partnership with them in public work, and St. Paul's so emphatically affirming that it was Cephas alone of the apostles that he saw? We must acknowledge that there is—the same kind and the same amount of discrepancy as *e.g.* obtains between St. Matthew saying that those who were crucified with Jesus reviled him, and St. Luke specifying that one did so, but that the other rebuked him. In all such cases, the more vague and general statement must in all fairness be accepted, but with the modification supplied by the one which is the more particular and definite. It seems to the present writer that there is a way of quite naturally accounting for the form in which St. Luke states the circumstances. It is as follows. St. Paul had been two years in imprisonment at Rome when St. Luke compiled the Acts; that is, St. Luke wrote the book about A.D. 63 or 64, twenty-two or twenty-three years after St. Paul made his first visit of his to Jerusalem. Barnabas appears in the story as a disciple (Acts iv., *fin.*) some years apparently before even the conversion of Saul. Considering, therefore, the lapse of time, it would seem a not at all improbable supposition that, when the Acts

was written, he was no longer alive. And the tone in which he is spoken of in the book, whose author, as we know, was in close association with St. Paul, and no doubt both drew from the apostle's inspiration many of the particulars he relates and reflected his feelings, is generally so kindly and respectful as to accord well with the supposition of Barnabas's decease, and even of his then recent decease. The pensive, touching reference to his character in xi. 24, introduced in the narrative in so unwonted a manner as it is, betokens this. Carefully does the historian indicate, that Barnabas was the now convert's sponsor with the at first distrustful brethren at Jerusalem; also that it was he that went and fetched Saul from his distant retirement at Tarsus to co-operate with him at Antioch; also that he linked him to himself in the eleemosynary journey to Jerusalem, and again under Divine direction in their great evangelistic tour in Asia Minor,—in both of which expeditions Barnabas at the first appears as the leading figure of the two; after which comes the mournful disruption recorded at the close of the fifteenth chapter, the last reference to Barnabas in the Acts.<sup>1</sup> That, however, this interruption of their brotherly attachment did not last long is shown by the respectful and sympathetic manner in which St. Paul, in writing to the Corinthians (ix.), six or seven years after, speaks of the oneness in sentiment subsisting between Barnabas and himself in labouring for the gospel at their own charges. Since the time that St. Paul sent that letter to the Corinthians as well as this to the Galatians, some five years had elapsed when St. Luke wrote the Book of the Acts. All these considerations taken together agree perfectly well with the conception that Luke had heard his master, perhaps repeatedly, make pensive reference to his old relations with Barnabas now gone to his rest. "When the apostles at Jerusalem," he might say, "looked upon me coldly and distrustfully, he it was that took me by the hand [the reader will note the pathos in the expression, ἐπιλαβόμενος αὐτὸν ἡγάγε] and led me into their presence,

<sup>1</sup> In respect to this particular incident, we perhaps may consider that St. Paul, in accordance with his customary self-abnegation, is willing himself to seem in his disciple's narrative to have shared the charge of "sharp contention" with the older disciple, though the latter, being clearly in the wrong as to the main question, may not unreasonably, in view of the entire position, be supposed to have been the one to whom in reality the censure of bitterness in the conduct of the dispute, principally at least, if not even entirely, attached.

and told them what the Lord had done with me!" What more natural than that Luke had heard Paul speaking thus, Barnabas's dear venerated form looming in the far past before the apostle's view as the principal object just then of reminiscence, the surrounding figures in the scene more indefinitely realized! But when, years before this, the apostle, Barnabas being still alive, had been writing to the Galatians, and with solemn carefulness as speaking in the sight of God, had set himself agonistically to state the facts in their very exactness, of course there would result a precision which in those tender reminiscences uttered to his bosom associate was not to be looked for.

Ver. 20.—Now the things which I write unto you (& δὲ γράφω ὑμῖν); now as to the things which I am writing to you. The looseness in the Greek of the connection of this clause with the words which follow is similar to what we find in the case of the clause, ταῦτα & θεωρεῖτε, in Luke xxi. 6. The particular things meant are those which are affirmed in vers. 15—19 and to the end of the chapter; points which the Galatians would hardly have become apprised of except upon the apostle's own testimony. What preceded in vers. 13, 14 they had become acquainted with before, on the testimony of others ("Ye have heard," ver. 13). Behold, before God, I lie not (ἰδοὺ, ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἔτι οὐ ψεύδομαι); behold, before God, verily I lie not. The use here of ἔτι, which in "verily" is paraphrased rather than translated, in this as well as in several other passages of solemn asseveration (2 Cor. i. 18; xi. 10; possibly Rom. ix. 2), savours strongly of Hebraism, being very probably identical with its use for ἔ, the Hebrew "that," in the Septuagint, e.g. in Isa. xlix. 18, Ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει Κύριος, ἔτι πάντας αὐτοὺς ὡς κόσμον ἐνόησεν. So in St. Paul's inexact citation in Rom. xiv. 11. On this use of the Hebrew conjunction, see Gesenius, 'Thes.,' p. 678, B, 1, a, who observes that in such cases there is an evident ellipsis of some such verb as "I protest," "I swear." The apostle was frequently led by the gainsaying of adversaries vitally affecting his official or personal character, to have recourse to forms of the most solemn asseveration. In addition to the passages cited above, see 2 Cor. i. 23; xi. 31; Rom. i. 9; Phil. i. 8; 1 Thess. ii. 5; 1 Tim. ii. 7. If, as Alford in effect observes, a report had been spread among the Galatians that, after his conversion, he had spent years at Jerusalem, receiving instruction in the faith at the hands of the apostles, the facts which he has now stated would have seemed to his readers so astoundingly in contradiction to the impression which they had received, as to require a strong confirmatory asseveration. "In the

present case," as Professor Jowett remarks, "it is a matter of life and death to the apostle to prove his independence of the twelve." And his independence of them is strongly evinced by the fact that, for several years of his Christian life, during all which he was preaching the same gospel as he now preached, he had not even seen any of them except Peter and James the Lord's brother (if James could be reckoned as an apostle), and these only during a short visit of a fortnight at Jerusalem some three years after his conversion.

Ver. 21.—Afterwards I came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia (ἔπειτα ἦλθον εἰς τὰ κλίματα τῆς Συρίας καὶ τῆς Κιλικίας); then I came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia. St. Luke tells us (Acts ix. 30) that "the brethren brought him down to Cæsarea, and sent him forth to Tarsus." The verb "brought down" of itself indicates that the Cæsarea here mentioned was Cæsarea Stratonis, the seaport of Jerusalem, and not Cæsarea Philippi towards Damascus (see Bishop Lightfoot on Gal. i. 21). When, later, Barnabas required Saul's help at Antioch, it was to Tarsus that he went to seek him. It is, therefore, probable that, in mentioning "Syria" with "Cilicia" as containing "regions" (cf. Rom. xv. 23; 2 Cor. xi. 10) in which, after this departure from Jerusalem, he was actively engaged in ministerial work, he is thinking of the northern part of Syria, as in "Cilicia" he is thinking of the eastern portion of Cilicia about Tarsus; northern Syria and eastern Cilicia having a great geographical affinity (see Conybeare and Howson, vol. i. pp. 26, 130). It thus appears that the Epistle is in perfect harmony with the Acts. To the apostle's labours during this period that he was making Tarsus his head-quarters, was most probably due in no small measure the founding of the Churches in Syria, and especially in Cilicia, which are referred to in Acts xv. 23, 41.

Vers. 22—24.—It is somewhat difficult to determine, and when determined to make evident in translation, the precise flexure in the intonation (so to speak) of these verses. So far as the present writer can see, it is this: the δὲ in ver. 22 is slightly adversative to the foregoing sentence; as if it were, "During that time the people of Syria and Cilicia saw a great deal of me, but the Churches of Judæa did not see me at all." The δὲ in ver. 23 introduces a contrast to the foregoing "unknown by face;" as if it were, "They knew me not by face, but only by report." The rendering to be now given will endeavour to represent this view of the whole passage.

Ver. 22.—And was unknown by face (ἤμην δὲ ἀγνωσόμενος τῷ προσώπῳ); but I was all the while unknown by face. The dative

τῷ προσώπῳ. "by face," or "in person," marks (see Winor, 'Gram. N. T.,' § 31, 6, α) the sphere to which a wider term is restricted, as τὰς φρεσίν (1 Cor. xiv. 20). Its addition prepares the reader for the subsequent intimation that, though unknown by personal presentment, he was not unknown by repute (comp. 1 Thess. ii. 17, Προσώπῳ ὀ καρδίᾳ). The widened form of the verb, ἤμην ἀγνοούμενος, instead of ἤγνοούμην, intimates the long-continued period, represented by the words "all the while" in our rendering, for which the statement held good; which observation applies also to the ἀκούοντες ἦσαν of ver. 23. The word "still," introduced in the Revised Version, imports, as I humbly venture to think, an idea not actually expressed in the Greek. The apostle states no more than that the Churches of Judæa had at that time no opportunity of coming to know him personally. There is no ἔτι. They had, that is (for this is what seems intended), no opportunity of knowing him in his new character as a disciple of Christ. Whether or not they had known him in the terrible aspect of an unrelenting persecutor, is a matter which for the present lies out of the field of view. The period to which the apostle means this remark of his to apply may be assumed to be the whole time between his conversion and the close of this stay of his in "Syria and Cilicia." This, as we learn from the Acts, terminated with Barnabas's fetching him to join him in his work at Antioch. After this he did become known to the disciples of Judæa. **Unto the Churches of Judæa which were in Christ** (ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Ἰουδαίας ταῖς ἐν Χριστῷ). This honorific form of designation, "which were in Christ," breathes a feeling on the part of the apostle of reverential respect for those Churches, as already organized communities vitally united to Christ, while he was as yet only beginning his Christian life (comp. Rom. xvi. 7, "Who were also in Christ before me"). This ceremonious respectfulness is the more in place, inasmuch as the apostle had reason to know that the doctrinal position which he felt himself set to defend, in reference to obedience to the Mosaic Law, was generally distasteful to Jewish believers. Grateful is it, however, to his own feelings to recollect, and now thus publicly to recognize, the kindness and devout thankfulness which in those early days of his Christian career they had evinced with reference to him (see note on ver. 24). At the same time, his entire independence of the whole Jewish community when first beginning to preach is plainly indicated. It was from no Judæan Church any more than from Jerusalem and its apostles and elders that he

derived the gospel which he had then and ever since been proclaiming. If we take the bearing of the clause, "which were in Christ," as above proposed, we have no need of Gemenius's remark, endorsed by various critics, including Alford and even Bishop Lightfoot, that it was added to distinguish the ἐκκλησίαι of Christians from synagogues of non-Christian Jews. Indeed, the remark is itself open to grave exception. It is true that ἐκκλησία in the singular number is used of the whole Israelite community antecedently to the Christian dispensation; but it is never found either in the New Testament or in the Septuagint to denote, as συναγωγή does, an organized collection of Israelites as such, dwelling in a particular neighbourhood, in the way that it is applied to an organized collection of Christians in a neighbourhood; neither is the noun ever applied to Israelites as such in the plural number. The term ἐκκλησίαι would, of course, be taken to mean Christian Churches and no other.

Ver. 23.—**But they had heard only** (μόνον δὲ ἀκούοντες ἦσαν); **and they only from time to time heard say.** They did not see him in person, but only heard about him. The dilated imperfect, ἀκούοντες ἦσαν, applying to the whole space of time here referred to, suggests the insertion in the translation of the words, "from time to time." The ἔτι is inserted after the Greek idiom in introducing the very words spoken in *oratio directa*, as in Matt. vii. 23; Mark ii. 1; John i. 40; iv. 1, etc. **That he which persecuted us in times past** (ὅτι ὁ διώκων ἡμᾶς ποτε); **he that once was persecuting us.** The διώκων is in the præter-imperfect participle, of which we have examples in Τυφλάδης ὢν, ἔργι βλέπων, John ix. 25; Οἱ ποτε ὄντες Eph. ii. 13; Τὸ πρότερον ὄντα βλάσφημον, 1 Tim. i. 13. **Now preacheth the faith which once he destroyed** (νῦν εὐαγγελίζεται τὴν πίστιν ἣν ποτε ἐπόρθει); **now preacheth the faith which once he was making havoc of.** The use of the term "faith" is the same as in Acts vi. 7, "Were obedient to the faith," which is equivalent to the "obeying the gospel" mentioned Rom. x. 16. The *object* to the verb εὐαγγελίζομαι is always something which is announced, never a thing which is required (cf. e.g. Luke ii. 10; Acts v. 42; x. 36; Eph. ii. 17; iii. 8); so that "faith" here cannot mean the faith which men are to render to Jesus, but the doctrine which they are to believe, to wit, that Jesus is Christ the Saviour. We have here the early beginnings of that objective sense in which afterwards the word got to be so commonly used in the Church to denote the Christian doctrine (see Bishop Lightfoot's essay 'Galatians,' pp. 154—158). In the second clause, "which he was sometime

making havoc of," the "faith" is identified with the Church which held it (comp. ver. 13). We may heartily accept Estius's comment, cited by Meyer, "Quia Christi fidelibus fidem extorquere nitentur," while we still think it intolerably harsh to understand "faith," as Meyer does, in a subjective sense.

Ver. 24.—And they glorified God in me (*καὶ εὐλόγησαν ἐν ἐμοὶ τὸν Θεόν*); and they were glorifying God in me; that is, for what they recognized as God's work in me and through me; in my own conversion, and in my effective ministering of the gospel to others. The *ἐν* denotes the sphere in which they found occasion for praising God. Instances of a somewhat similar use of the preposition are 1 Cor. iv. 2, *Ζητεῖται ἐν τοῖς οἰκονόμοις*: ver. 6, *ἵνα ἐν ἡμῖν μάθητε*: ix. 15, *ἵνα οὕτως γένηται ἐν ἐμοί*. The sentence is not essential to the line of thought in vers. 21—23. The apostle was probably prompted to add it by the complacency which he felt in the interest and sympathy which in those days the Jewish Churches showed towards him—sentiments which afterwards faded too much away into those of suspicion and alienation (comp. Acts xxi. 21). He rejoices to remember, and he will have the Galatian Churchmen know, that once the believers of the circumcision were proud of him, and were satisfied that he was preaching the true gospel of Christ. And his preaching was the same now as it had been then.

#### ADDITIONAL NOTES.

Ver. 17.—*The purpose of St. Paul's journey into Arabia.* The paraphrase given above in the Exposition explains why it is that the apostle mentions his going into Arabia. It is because, at that juncture, he left Damascus to go nowhere else, and because this was a country where there was no man to teach him the gospel. It explains, I say, why St. Paul mentions the journey into Arabia; the journey itself it does not explain. But this is a point which now claims consideration. 1. By ancient commentators it was generally supposed that the apostle hastened into Arabia in order at once to begin "preaching the Son of God among Gentiles," in conformity with the Divine purpose in calling him to be an apostle, stated in ver. 16. To this view there are three objections. (1) If this had been his object in taking that journey, the apostle might have been expected to have added to the statement, "I went away into Arabia," some hint of such evangelizing work, e.g. "preaching the Lord Jesus," or the like. Such an addition would have told most forcibly for his argument, as showing, by his proceeding at once to preach the gospel which he had received from God, that he had con-

sidered himself as already then equipped with the requisite knowledge. (2) The apostle had no occasion to hasten away into Arabia to find Gentiles to evangelize. Damascus itself was a Gentile city, in which Jews, though forming so numerous a settlement there as to have more than one synagogue (Acts ix. 2), were, however, only alien dwellers. (3) It appears doubtful whether it was the Divine will that St. Paul should exercise his ministry among Gentiles immediately and in the first instance. In narrations of his ministerial work, especially in its earlier stages, whether as related by St. Luke or as sketched by St. Paul himself (see Acts ix. 20—22; xxvi. 20), the apostle is exhibited as addressing himself in the first instance to Jews and to those Gentiles who were found attaching themselves to the Jewish worship, and only subsequently turning to the uncircumcision. 2. A different view has found acceptance with most recent expositors, namely, that he went away into Arabia with the view of withdrawing himself from all human society; alike breaking himself off from his old Pharisean associates among the non-believing Jews, and detaching himself even from those Christian Jews who had been constrained to own him as "brother" (Acts ix. 17); in order that, by uninterrupted devotion to prayer, by meditation and study of the Holy Scriptures unbiassed by any extraneous human influences, and, above all, by laying himself open to supernatural communications from the Lord Jesus, and to the informing operation upon his soul of the Holy Spirit, he might win his way into more perfect at-oneness with the facts, principles, and schemes of life, all hitherto so strange to him, which had been just now presented to his soul. It will readily occur to the reader's mind how analogous such a feature in St. Paul's history would appear to that six weeks' retirement of the Lord Jesus himself which intervened between his baptism and his entrance upon his public ministry, to which reference was made above. If, in the case of the guiltless and holy One, such a period of devout seclusion was deemed meet, how much more was it meet, and even above all things necessary, in the case of one both in nature weak and sinful, and with habits of thought and feeling up to that hour so alien to the work to which he was now being summoned! The apostle's statement would doubtless have been more clearly suggestive of this view if he had written, "I went away into the wildernesses of Arabia." But if the paraphrase above offered interprets his tenor of thought justly, it did not lie within his present scope that he should indicate the purpose of his journey at all; it sufficed



that he should specify the locality as being one which withdrew him away from all who might have been supposed his possible instructors in the gospel. Moreover, this view furnishes the most satisfactory explanation of any that has been offered, of the omission of this particular in St. Luke's history. Such a retreat from the world needs not to be supposed to have been long protracted. The wonderful vivacity and quick versatility which characterized both the intellect and the feelings of the apostle rendered him capable under the Divine grace of a spiritual transformation vastly more rapid than with most men would have been possible. A period of (say) forty days, such as that during which Moses, Elijah, and the Lord Jesus were severally withdrawn from human association, in order to be brought into closer communication with the spiritual world, may perhaps have sufficed in this case also. And as the word "immediately" shows that the departure into Arabia was the first course of proceeding adopted by the apostle after his illumination, it is a highly probable supposition that it took place directly after his baptism, mentioned Acts ix. 19. Upon returning to Damascus, he would naturally at once attach himself, in the way that St. Luke in the verse just cited makes mention of, to the society of the "disciples" among the Jews, and proceed without delay in the synagogues to "proclaim Jesus, that he is the Son of God" (Acts ix. 20). Such being the conditions of the case, it is quite supposable that St. Luke, though perhaps aware of this journey into Arabia, might not have felt that there was any occasion for referring to it; not only because it occupied so brief a space of time, but also because it formed no part of that public life of St. Paul which was the historian's proper concern. He was not likely to have never known of it, seeing that it had been stated in this Epistle.

Ver. 19.—"*James the Lord's brother.*" This verse has been the subject of much discussion. Many have considered the turn of expression used by the apostle to imply that the James here spoken of was himself one of the original apostolic body to which Cephas belonged. And from this it has further been inferred that the passage favours the notion that "James the Lord's brother" was identical with "James the son of Alphæus"—the word "brother" being interpreted to mean "near kinsman," and taken in the present case to describe one conceived to have been in reality a first cousin. But there are so many serious difficulties and precarious assumptions attaching to this theory, that students of the sacred history have of late shown an un-

willingness to acquiesce in the above-mentioned identification. They are struck by observing that, so far as has been shown, the notion that "James the Lord's brother" was in reality only his cousin was never heard of in the Church till it was broached by Jerome very near the end of the fourth century (A.D. 392); and further, that in the New Testament the term "brothers," when used to describe family relationship, is always used in its usual and obvious sense of persons who were regarded as being children of the same father or of the same mother. When mention is made of James (the son of Zebedee) being the brother of John, or of Andrew being the brother of Simon Peter, the reader never stops to consider whether they might not have been cousins, but at once assumes that they were brothers in the ordinary acceptance of the term. In reference to the case now before us, some in ancient times, as for example Helvidius—against whom Jerome wrote the controversial treatise in which the theory of cousinship is first found stated and argued for—and some also quite recently, have supposed "the Lord's brothers" to have been later children of his mother Mary, born of her union with Joseph. But, apart from any repugnance that has been felt to this view which has its origin in sentiments of pious reverence, not to speak of mariolatrous fanaticism, there is another hypothesis which seems to fit much better in with all the circumstances, namely, that which regards our "Lord's brothers" as children of his adoptive father Joseph, whom everybody regarded as *his* father—children born to Joseph in a former marriage. This view has been proved to have been, with only doubtful exceptions,<sup>1</sup> the one generally accepted in the early Church for more than three centuries (see Bishop Lightfoot, 'Galatians,' Dissertation ii., "The Brethren of the Lord"). This is scarcely the place for discussing at length the details of the critical controversy. I cannot, however, forbear drawing attention to one aspect of the question, which, so far as I am aware, has not been sufficiently considered. For the purpose of the present Commentary it has the recommendation of involving no subtleties of disputable interpretation, but of making its appeal at once to the common instincts of human feeling. We have the

<sup>1</sup> Bishop Lightfoot is inclined to concede Tertullian to the supporters of the Helvidian hypothesis. The present writer, however, ventures to demur to even this exception. Tertullian's words do not seem to him to require the interpretation thus put upon them (see Georgi's 'Tertullianus Redivivus,' vol. iii. pp. 427—429).

express testimony of St. John (vii. 5) that, down to within a few months of our Lord's death, "his brothers did not believe on him." In the history of the Acts, indeed, immediately after the Ascension, we find them associated with that innermost circle of believers who, with the eleven, were devoutly waiting for "the Promise of the Father." But on the eve of the Feast of Tabernacles in the previous autumn, they had not as yet professed themselves to be Jesus' disciples. This statement of St. John's is made of them as a body. No hint is given of any exception, either by St. John or by the Synoptists (Matt. xii. 46; Mark iii. 21, 31; Luke viii. 19). Ingenious combinations of various extremely questionable premises would fain interpolate into the evangelist's statement at least one exception; but none presents itself upon the face of the story. There the brethren of the Lord stand before us as unitedly holding aloof, and as even inclined to treat his claims with derision (John vii. 3, 4, 8; comp. Mark iii. 21). Which of those two hypotheses which we are now comparing with each other, as to the nature of their brothership to our Lord, is the one which the better agrees with this unquestionable fact? Let us first consider the one which supposes his brothers and his sisters to have formed an elder branch of Joseph's family born of a former marriage. There *must* have been at least six in number living at the time of our Lord's ministry (Mark vi. 3), and there *may* have been more than six then; and there *may*, again, have well been some others besides, then deceased. It is therefore probable that some of them—James, for example, the eldest apparently of the brothers—were adolescent, or even quite grown up at the time of their father's second marriage. Judging from the ordinary experience of human households, what would seem likely to have been the attitude of feeling animating this whole group of brothers and sisters, and in particular animating James—who would, of course, take the place of their representative and domestic champion, and who is shown in the Acts and by his own Epistle to have been a person of singularly grave, taciturn, and magisterial temperament—both towards their probably youthful stepmother from the time of her marriage with their father, and towards the Lord Jesus himself during the period of his boyhood, youth, and early manhood? May it not be probably assumed that it was apt to be at least unsympathetic—reserved? We know from the "Fear not" of the Divine message recorded Matt. i. 20, that the circumstances attending on our adorable Lord's incarnation well-nigh proved a stumbling-block even to the just-minded, pious,

Heaven-directed Joseph. Is it conceivable that, in so small a town as Nazareth, misjudging gossip did not make itself during those months only too busy with a theme, the real character of which men could not possibly understand, and which yet was so sure to attract attention—distressfully busy, both for the holy Virgin herself and for her affianced husband? And would none of that malign whispering percolate to the ears of the older members of Joseph's family, depositing in their minds almost ineradicable seeds of prejudice against their stepmother and against her offspring? Shame and sorrow invested our Redeemer's decease *from* the world; shame and sorrow overclouded also even his entrance into it; by the necessity of the case, all, whether old or young, who after the flesh were then brought into close connection with him, were also brought into fires of temptation, out of which only much especial interposing grace could rescue them unscathed. At all events, the new brother whom Joseph's already numerous family were called upon to accept must have been to their feeling, no own brother of theirs; *his* mother was not *their* mother. This was a super-engrafted scion, half alien to the original stock to which *they* belonged. In ordinary domestic experience is not this usually of itself a source of jealousy and estrangement? We can well believe that, in course of time, the beauty of their stepmother's character would be certain to win their esteem and their confidence. And that it really did so seems betokened by what we read in the evangelical history some thirty years after their father's union with Mary, when he had himself, for some while apparently, departed this life; the mother and the brethren of Jesus, though not as yet knit together by mutual faith in him, are, however, seen acting in unison, as if swayed by their mutual feeling of family connection (see John ii. 12; Mark iii. 31). It is, however, questionable whether the stainless purity and the exalted moral excellence which characterized their stepmother's Son would in an equal degree draw their hearts to *him*. Of old, Joseph the son of the patriarch Jacob was isolated from his elder half-brothers by the very virtues which exalted him. They hated him, if in part for certain other causes of offence, yet no doubt mainly for this, that they felt that in moral quality he was not of them. But the contrast which obtained between the moral being of the Lord Jesus and his adoptive half-brothers must have been incomparably greater than that which made Joseph the "separated from his brethren." *He* was altogether "holy and harmless," and therefore altogether "separate from sinners." True,

his human nature and his human life touched theirs in a thousand ways; but none the less must they have been conscious that, in moral and spiritual temperament, he was not one of themselves. Must not this consciousness have been a source of inward annoyance?—of an annoyance all the more fretting because they would, of course, be so wholly unable to understand how it was that such a difference obtained? Would not they too be not seldom “moved with envy” against this new Joseph? In intellectual gifts, and especially in the faculty of moral judgment and spiritual intuition, the youthful Jesus was, in the judgment of all around, and doubtless to his brethren’s own consciousness, incomparably their superior. Could such superiority have been acquiesced in by them easily and patiently in the case of one so much their junior, who in fact was at the best only half their brother? His views and conceptions of religious truth when he was twelve years old were such as astonished the doctors of the Law at Jerusalem; we therefore cannot but feel sure that, even in those earlier years of his life, his thoughts and reasonings were wont to move amongst the intensely loved revelations of God’s Word with a freedom wholly alien to *their* habits of mind; neither shackled by Judaical legalism, nor regardful of rabbinical hair-splitting, nor disposed to respect the traditions and dicta of the elders. To the James and the Jude, whose natural mental physiognomy, though in its now renewed Christianized aspect, is conspicuous to us in their Epistles, the strain of religious thinking and utterance which we may reverently believe to have been familiar with the youthful Redeemer must in the days of their as yet carnal and unripened religiousness have seemed alike repugnant and unintelligible. Granted, however, that they could neither appreciate nor comprehend, yet, as being so much older in years, they may well have deemed themselves authorized, by virtue of their domestic relation, to censure and rebuke. And supposing that they did undertake by argument to gainsay words of his which more especially offended them, how could it have been possible for them to stand their ground in encounter with One who in after years was seen in the supreme arena of the nation, confuting and putting to silence, and sternly rebuking, the most powerful reasoners in Jerusalem itself? Had he no occasion in those youthful days to employ against *them* similar implements of both intellectual and moral correction? And since they would not submit to be taught by him, would they not perforce *resent* their defeat? Under conditions such as these, is it not quite easy to imagine that, when the hour came for Jesus

to be manifested to Israel, it found James and his brothers altogether unprepared to attach themselves to him as disciples; that they would be much more ready to stand aloof from him as at least an enthusiast—nay, by-and-by to openly pronounce, as in fact they did, that he must have gone clean out of his mind? This commends itself to our acceptance as a perfectly self-coherent hypothesis. Let us next turn our attention to the other interpretation of the relation, namely, that the brethren of the Lord were his own uterine brothers. A moment’s reflection shows how different the conditions would have been. On the supposition that they were his younger brothers, sons of his mother, then we may consider that, from their earliest years, they had been trained, and would naturally be disposed, to regard him with the profound deference which in a Jewish household was instinctively accorded to the firstborn. This natural sentiment of deference we must in all reason believe to have been intensified by their consciousness of his extraordinary mental gifts, both intellectual and moral, as well as by the estimation couched to him by all around; while this sentiment would be sweetened in its tone by their sense of the fairness and the affectionateness with which he had always treated them, even when, as elder brother, and especially after their father’s death, he may have had occasion to control or reprove them. The high estimation with which their neighbours as well as their common mother regarded him would, *in this case*, have been no occasion of offence or jealousy; he being in blood-relationship one of their very selves, *their* representative, respect shown to him would have been rather a cause for pride: who (they would feel) *should* be so loved and honoured as their dear Jeshua? With such habits of willing affectionate deference, might it not be reasonably expected that, when he issued forth as the religious Teacher of his countrymen, his brethren would be found among his most cordial adherents? In that lower sense in which we are wont to employ the expression with reference to one another, they had always believed in him; they knew and therefore loved him too well not to do so: would it not have seemed strange if this constant attitude of their minds towards him had not now at least helped them forwards towards that higher faith which the evangelist denotes by the term? But they, one and all, did *not* believe in him! The moral probability, that is, the probability founded upon the consideration of the natural effect of environing circumstances upon human character and action, affords an argument in favour of the former hypothesis which, to the present writer,

appears of exceeding great weight, and in fact decisive. James *must* have been a son of our Lord's adoptive father. But if the person here cited by the name of James was our Lord's brother in the sense now given, he could not have been one of the twelve. How, then, are we to account for his being mentioned in this passage in a way which certainly does, *primâ facie*, favour the supposition that he *was* an apostle? A solution has been sought in the consideration that, in various places in the New Testament, the designation of "apostle" is applied to others besides those who were apostles in the highest sense. There were in truth apostles in a secondary sense; in that sense of ecclesiastical delegates which the reader will find discussed in the dissertation on the subject of "Apostles," in the Introduction. But this will not help us here. For (1) James the Lord's brother cannot be shown to have been an apostle in this secondary sense. (2) On the other hand, Barnabas both was such and is so designated (see p. xxxi., *seqq.*). And Barnabas not only was at Jerusalem at the time here referred to by St. Paul, but was the very person that introduced Saul to "the apostles" as a true convert (Acts ix. 27). The following seems to the present writer a more satisfactory explanation:—From the time of the Ascension, the "brethren of the Lord" held, in the general estimation of believers, a position peculiar to themselves. This is evidenced by the manner in which, in Acts i. 14, St. Luke refers to them. After enumerating the eleven apostles by their names, he connects with them, as forming with them an interior circle of disciples, "women"—wives, we may suppose, or near relatives of apostles, perhaps also some other most zealous female associates with the sacred body—"and Mary the mother of Jesus, and his brethren." Further on in the history, in the account given in the fifteenth chapter of the conference of "the apostles and elders," the manner in which James, the eldest of those brothers, is presented to the reader when assuming the initiative in proposing the final decision, gives the impression, which has been almost universally acquiesced in, that he spoke as a presiding officer would speak who felt it his place authoritatively to state the judgment which he anticipated the meeting would adopt. This impression tallies perfectly with the tradition of Church history—a tradition which there is nothing in the New Testament to discountenance, but much to confirm—that James was the presiding elder or bishop of the Church of Jerusalem. That he should by general consent have been called to occupy this position was very natural. He was distinguished by venerable

family connection, being not only through his father a descendant of David's royal lineage, but also the eldest "brother" of the Lord Christ. He had been especially honoured by Christ's appearing to him singly after his resurrection. In personal character he is shown by his Epistle, as well as otherwise, as a man singularly remarkable for gravity, for habits of devotion, for intense single-minded earnestness, for magisterial prophet-like decisiveness of intellect; while, lastly, he was fitted by strictness of Mosaic observance to be eminently acceptable to the Israelitish sentiments of the members of this particular Church. Altogether, it seems perfectly natural that he should have been called to preside in it; to be, at least in effect, "Bishop of Jerusalem," whether this particular title of "bishop," as afterwards currently understood, was in his lifetime accorded to him or not. At all events, it had then come to pass, and probably in the way now described had come to pass, that "James and Cephas and John" were recognized as being "pillars" of Christendom. The conference just referred to took place, it is true, some eleven years after that first visit of St. Paul's to Jerusalem which he is here speaking of. In the account, however, given in the twelfth chapter of the Acts, of events occurring six or eight years before the conference (the precise dates of these events are assigned differently by different chronologers), and only three or four years, possibly less, after this visit, we have an indication afforded us that James held this leading representative position even then. We are told that St. Peter, on the night of his miraculous release from prison, in view of himself withdrawing for a time from the neighbourhood, bade the believers whom he found assembled at the house of John Mark's mother, to "announce these tidings to James and the brethren." This putting forward of his name, coupled with what we read further on, gives us a glimpse of James the Lord's brother as even then a foremost figure in the rulership of the believers of Jerusalem—the very foremost figure, it should seem, among Christians next to the august twelve. Such being James's position, we can understand how it was that St. Paul felt that, though his having seen James was not precisely the same thing as seeing another apostle, yet it was tantamount thereto in its bearing upon the autobiographical statement which he is now making, and that therefore it was a fact that as much required to be taken account of as if he had actually been an apostle. If he had said, "Other than Cephas saw I of the apostles none," without mentioning James, the statement, though in strict literalness

true, would none the less have conveyed a false impression, and been as an argument illusive. He therefore, as a sort of after-thought—for the sentence without the addition is grammatically already complete—adds the words, “unless it were James the Lord’s brother.” Attention was drawn above, in the note on ver. 7, to the occasional use of  $\epsilon\iota\ \mu\eta$  as “partially exceptive.” It is in this way only that St. James is here by implication grouped with the apostles. He shared certain qualities attaching to them which were so relative to the matter in hand that the writer could not in this reference pass him by without mention. It is in a somewhat similar way that “the brethren of the Lord” are grouped with apostles in 1 Cor. ix. 5. One remark more on the words, “the Lord’s brother.” They have been commonly supposed to have been added for the purpose simply of making it clear what particular individual among several bearing the name of “James” the writer is referring to. This view of their bearing seems open to question. There was only one man whom the recital of the name “James” would naturally and of course at

once recall to the minds of St. Paul’s Gentile readers—the prominent leading figure in the Israelite Church at Jerusalem. Accordingly we find that when elsewhere St. Paul has occasion to refer to him, he feels no need of appending a defining description, but simply gives the name. So ch. ii. 9, 12; 1 Cor. xv. 7. Similarly, St. Luke, when referring to plainly the same person, not once in the Acts thinks it necessary to explain what James it is that he is speaking of (see Acts xii. 17; xv. 13; xxi. 18). He adds a further description of the individual intended, only when it is not the Lord’s brother, as in Acts xii. 2. Similarly also Jude, in his Epistle, when marking his own personality and therewith his claim to attention, designates himself as “Jude the brother of James,” taking it for granted that his readers would understand what James was meant. St. Paul’s purpose in adding the words seems rather to be this: he wishes to indicate why this James, not being an apostle, yet needs to be here brought forward at all. Viewed in this light, the clause tells against the supposition of his being one of the twelve rather than in its favour.

### HOMILETICS.

Ver. 1.—*The inspired authority of the apostle.* The first line of the Epistle is designed to settle the question of his authority and independence as a teacher of the Church. The truth of the gospel, as he phrases it (ch. ii. 5), was involved in this merely personal question.

I. THE NECESSITY FOR VINDICATING HIS AUTHORITY. Emissaries of the Judaistic party, who had obtained access to the Galatian Churches, sought to undermine his doctrine by denying or minimizing his apostleship. They limited the term “apostle” almost exclusively to the twelve, and were thus enabled to assert (1) that he was not an apostle in the highest sense, as he was not a personal disciple of Jesus Christ, and therefore could not claim the inspiration of those on whom he breathed the Holy Ghost (John xx. 22); (2) that, in any case, he stood in official subordination to the twelve, and was not, therefore, to be followed where he diverged from their teaching; and (3) that the proceedings at Antioch (Acts xiii. 1, 2) necessarily implied that he received alike his commission and his gospel from man.

II. HIS COMMISSION AT ONCE ORIGINAL AND DIVINE. “An apostle, not from men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father, who raised him from the dead.” 1. *He was a true apostle.* He emphatically asserts his independent apostleship, placing his official title in the very forefront of his Epistle. He affirms that he was an apostle before he had any intercourse with the twelve (ch. i. 17, 18), and that on three different occasions the apostles recognized his full apostolic standing (ch. i. 18, 19; ii. 9, 10; ii. 11—21). He was, therefore, no delegate of the twelve, and had no secondary or intermediate place of authority under them. He was, as he described himself to the Corinthians, “a called apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God.” 2. *His commission was not “from (ἀπὸ) men, nor by (διὰ) man.”* The false teachers might have suggested that the proceedings at Antioch implied a purely human commission. But he had been called to the apostleship long before his designation at Antioch to a special missionary work (Acts xxvi. 16—20). His calling was neither that of Matthias nor of Barnabas. He was called neither by a body of men nor by an individual representing the authority of such a body. 3. *His commission was entirely Divine.* “By Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead.” (1) *It was by Jesus Christ;* for his commission

dated from the day of his conversion on the road to Damascus. "The Gentiles, unto whom now I send thee" (Acts xxvi. 17). He speaks elsewhere of his having seen the Lord, as a token of his apostleship (1 Cor. ix. 1). He was directly and immediately called by Jesus Christ. (2) *It was by "God the Father, who raised him from the dead"*—acting in and through Christ; the reference to the resurrection making it plain that Jesus could call him, though he had not called him when he called the twelve, and that the apostleship was one of the gracious gifts conferred upon the Church by the ascended Redeemer (Eph. iv. 11). Thus the apostle was not self-called to his high office, and does not even now refer to the source of his calling from vanity or self-assertion, but from a supreme regard to the welfare of his converts.

Ver. 2.—*The apostle's companions in the gospel.* "And all the brethren which are with me." It was after his manner to associate brethren with him in the inscriptions of his Epistles.

I. WHO WERE THESE BRETHREN? 1. *They were not the Christian people among whom he resided*; for it was his habit to distinguish between "the brethren which are with me" and "the saints" (Phil. iv. 21, 22). Besides, in that case he would rather have spoken of the brethren as the persons with whom he was. 2. *They were his colleagues in gospel work and gospel travel*, including probably Timothy and Titus, who had accompanied him in his first visit to Galatia, and who had rejoined him there (Acts xviii. 5), and perhaps Erastus, Trophimus, and others. 3. *They were very numerous.* If the Epistle was written during the apostle's three months' visit to Corinth, toward the close of A.D. 57, he was now accompanied by a larger number of brethren than at almost any other time.

II. WHY DOES HE IDENTIFY THESE BRETHREN WITH HIMSELF IN THE EPISTLE? 1. *The concurrence of such brethren as Timothy and Silas*, with whom the Galatians were personally acquainted, might have the effect of conciliating their affection and abating the bitterness of their opposition. 2. *His emphatic reference to "all the brethren" seems to show that there was no singularity in his views*; that he was supported by the best and the wisest of the Church's leaders, and that the Galatians, by repudiating Pauline teaching, were really severing themselves from the recognized guides of visible Christianity.

Ver. 2.—*The Churches of Galatia.* Probably in the towns of Ancyra, Pessinus, and Tavium. It is interesting to mark that we have not in the New Testament a single name of a place or person, scarcely a single incident of any kind, connected with the apostle's preaching in Galatia. He had paid two visits to Galatia before this time.

I. THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE GALATIAN CHURCHES. The members belonged, as their name signifies, to the Celtic race, and differed in character and habits from all the other nations to whom Epistles were addressed. "It is the Celtic blood which gives a distinctive colour to the Galatian character." We hardly needed the authority of Cæsar to know that instability of character was the chief difficulty in dealing with the Galatians, and that they were prone to all sorts of ritualistic observances. Thus they received the apostle with true Celtic heartiness at his first visit; they "received him as an angel of God, even as Christ." The Church was mainly Gentile, but gathered round a nucleus of Jewish converts. The fact that this Epistle was addressed to Churches over so extensive a tract of country would imply the wide prevalence of the Judaistic heresy. Yet the apostasy was as yet only in its incipient stage. It is a characteristic fact that false teachers never appear except in Churches already established. They seldom attempt the conversion of either Jew or Gentile, thus carefully avoiding persecution; but wherever they scent a work of grace from afar, they gather in eager haste to pervert the gospel of Christ.

II. THOUGH THE GALATIAN CHURCHES WERE IN ERROR, THEY WERE STILL TRUE CHURCHES OF CHRIST. They were not guilty of idolatry or of total apostasy, but they were stained by serious doctrinal corruptions and grave moral disorders. Yet the apostle owns them as true Churches of Christ. The lesson is a rebuke to the unchurching spirit so often manifest in Christian history.

III. THE APOSTLE'S ADDRESS TO THEM WAS CHARACTERISTIC. He addresses them simply as "Churches of Galatia," without one word of commendation or familiar

greeting or kindly remembrance, such as we find in his addresses to other Churches. He does not address them as "faithful brethren," as "the saints in Christ Jesus." There is something suggestive in this method of prefacing the Epistle. He ends it with a perceptible softening of tone, his last word being "brethren."

Ver. 3.—*The apostolic benediction.* "Grace to you and peace from God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ." This benediction is a proof of the hearty love of the apostle, as well as a mark of his unswerving loyalty to the doctrine of salvation by Christ only.

I. THE BLESSINGS WISHED FOR. "Grace and peace." Nearly twenty times in Scripture are these two graces linked together, but never so significantly as at present, when the Galatians manifested a disposition to return to the Law with its terrors and disquietudes. 1. *Grace is free, undeserved love manifesting itself in a free gift.* (Rom. v. 15.) It is the foundation of our redemption. It is also an operation of that free love in our hearts—grace, quickening, sanctifying, comforting, strengthening. It is the first blessing the apostle asks for; it is what we all need; it is but the beginning of blessings innumerable. 2. *Peace is not peace with God* (Rom. v. 1), *but the peace that springs from it.* The true order of blessing and experience is not peace and grace, but grace and peace. Grace is the root of peace; peace is the inner comfort that springs from grace. The apostle desires that the Galatians may not only share in Divine grace, but possess the assurance of it. Without peace, thousands are unhappy, and the desire of it causes many a pagan to bear labour and pain in the vain effort to enjoy it. The worldly man longs for peace without grace. But the two are inseparably linked. Without it there is no progress in religion, and no real test of the value of a man's religion. Luther says, "Grace releaseth sin, and peace maketh the conscience quiet. The two fiends that torment us are sin and conscience." Another says, "If you have peace, you are rich without money; if you have it not, you are poor with millions."

II. THE SOURCE OF THESE BLESSINGS. "From God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ"—from God the Father as Fountain, and Jesus Christ as the Channel of conveyance to us. The highest blessings of the gospel, as well as the appointment to apostolic office, spring alike from Father and Son. They are here both associated as objects of Divine worship, and as the sources of spiritual blessing. This proves Christ's Deity. "The living fountain of grace which ever flowed and never ebbd in the bosom of our God has been gloriously opened to a thirsty world in the bleeding side of Christ."

Vers. 4, 5.—*The sum and substance of the Epistle.* He here declares the true ground of acceptance with God which the Galatians practically ignored by their system of legalism.

I. MARK THE SELF-OBULATION OF CHRIST. "Who gave himself for our sins." Our Redeemer was not killed by the hand of violence, though "by lawless hands" he was crucified and slain; he spontaneously offered himself, and his offering was not the impulse of mere excited feeling. The expression, "gave himself," always points to the free surrender of his life (1 Tim. ii. 6; Titus i. 14; Matt. xx. 28). It accords with his own language, "I lay down my life of myself" (John x. 17); "How am I straitened till it be accomplished!" The Father is elsewhere described as providing the sacrifice, and delivering him up for us all (Rom. viii. 32), but the text describes his own priestly act in accordance "with the Father's will." It is needless to say that the phrase does not point to his incarnation, but to his death.

II. THE RELATION BETWEEN HIS DEATH AND OUR SINS. "Who gave himself for our sins." Some divines connect Christ's death, not with the pardon of sin, but with our deliverance from its power. They regard sin as a disease rather than as an offence, a calamity rather than a crime against God; they represent the difficulty as not on God's side, but on man's, so that forgiveness is sure to follow upon spiritual recovery. In other words, they place life first and pardon next, basing our acceptance, not upon Christ's death, but upon the possession of the Divine life. The Bible sense is that "his blood was shed for the remission of sins." The life is regarded as the effect or reward of the Crucifixion. There is a direct causal connection between Christ's death and the pardon of our sins. The reason why he gave himself is here assigned. Our sins were the procuring cause of his death. This is the plain teaching of Isa. liii. 5; Rom. iv. 25;

1 Cor. xv. 3; 1 Pet. iii. 18. Besides, it would be tautology for the apostle to refer here to mere human improvement, since the design of the sacrifice is to accomplish this very improvement, as we see by the terminating clause. It would be absurd to confound the means and the end, the cause with the effect.

III. THE ETHICAL RESULT OF THE SACRIFICE. "That he might deliver us from this present evil world." This shows the truly sanctifying result of Christ's death. This marks out the gospel as an instrument of emancipation from a state of bondage. It strikes the key-note of the Epistle. As the oblation is perfect, so the deliverance secured by it is perfect; there is, therefore, no compatibility between obedience to the Mosaic Law and faith in Jesus Christ. The deliverance is from "this present evil world;" not from the Jewish dispensation, which is nowhere called evil in itself, though it became so through a grave misapplication of its principles—besides, the Gentiles had not by Christianity been delivered from it; nor is it deliverance in the sense of an abandonment of our place and duty in the world; but it is the world as it is, without religion, under curse, transitory, corrupt, and doomed. It was deliverance from the corrupt course of this world which was under bondage to gods (2 Cor. iv. 4), from that world which was crucified to Paul and he to it (ch. vi. 14). It is deliverance from the power of that world which has its threefold seductiveness "in the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life." Thus provision is made in the atonement for the sanctification as well as the justification of sinners. Christ is become to us "Sanctification" as well as "Righteousness."

IV. THE ORIGIN OF THE WHOLE WORK OF CHRIST. "By the will of God the Father." It was the Father's appointed work. It was an act of obedience on Christ's part to his Father's will. "For this cause came I into the world, that I might do the will of my Father." Christ's sacrifice was thus in no sense a human plan, nor dependent upon man's obedience; it was the effect of the commanded will of our Father wishing to win back his lost children. Therefore let us not attempt to overturn or neutralize the system of grace by our legal obedience.

V. THE DOXOLOGY. "To whom be the glory for ever and ever. Amen." 1. The glory of salvation being due, not to man, but God, for its initiation, for its execution, for its bestowal, it becomes our duty to give him glory in all our worship and in all our duties (1 Cor. x. 31). 2. The doxology is an implied reproof of the Galatians for attempting to divide the work of salvation between God and man. 3. The praises of the redeemed, though begun on earth, will continue through all eternity.

Ver. 6.—*The sad defection of the Galatians.* The apostle enters at once upon the business in hand, and calls them to account for their incipient apostasy.

I. MARK THE APOSTLE'S SORROWFUL SURPRISE. "I marvel that ye are so quickly turning away from him who called you in the grace of Christ unto a different gospel." The Celtic heartiness with which they received him at the first, "as an angel of God, even as Christ," might well excite his wonder at their rapid defection. He understood human nature, but there was something in their conduct which baffled ordinary calculations. His surprise is tinged with sorrow, disappointment, perhaps the least touch of anger, and has, unhappily, to occupy the place usually assigned in his Epistles to thanksgivings for the gifts and graces of his converts. Yet there is a tender and cautious tone in the rebuke, as if to imply that his indignation was directed rather against their seducers than against themselves. It does not exclude the idea that they might yet be recovered from their error.

II. THE RAPIDITY OF THE DEFECTION. "Ye are so quickly turning away." So soon after their conversion, or so soon after their hearty reception of him (ch. iv. 14, 15). How fickle and changeable the Celtic temper! Cæsar says, "The Gauls for the most part affect new things." "Giddy-headed hearers have *religionem ephemeram*, are whirled about by every wind of doctrine, being "constant only in their inconstancy" (Trappe). "They had itching ears; they had heaped to themselves teachers according to their own lusts" (2 Tim. iv. 3); that is, they liked to taste the humour of teachers who would not disturb them in their sinful ways, and used "feigned words (*πλαστοίς λόγοις*)," rather, words fashioned so as to suit the humour of their disciples. There are men who "by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple" (Rom. xvi. 18). And the devil is always at hand to corrupt from the



simplicity that is in Christ (2 Cor. xi. 3). The Galatians had begun to grow weary of sound doctrine—perhaps from the rooted enmity of the carnal mind to spiritual things, and error once received into a mind that has departed from the freshness of first love, takes firmer root than truth, because it is more in affinity with our lower moods. Besides, there is something in error to recommend it to the curiosity, or pride, or superstition of unstable natures.

III. THE SERIOUS ASPECT OF THE DEFECTION. It was not only in its incipency, as the apostle signifies, but it was in real process of development. It had a double aspect. 1. *It was defection from a person.* "From him who called you." This was not the apostle himself, for he does not usually give prominence to his own labours, but rather ascribes the successes of the gospel to the grace and Spirit of God. It was a defection from God the Father, to whom the calling is uniformly ascribed (Rom. viii. 30; ix. 24; 1 Cor. i. 9). As such, the apostasy had all the character of ingratitude. But this apostasy, in its completed aspect, is a crucifying of Christ afresh, a fresh immolation of the Redeemer. 2. *It was defection from the system of grace.* They were called "into the grace of Christ." They had their standing in the dispensation of grace: for the call of God works only in that sphere (Rom. v. 15), and the Judaist emissaries sinned by attempting to draw them off from their true standing-ground (Rom. v. 2). Thus the Galatians made a double mistake, pregnant with the worst results—they forgot that conversion is God's work, not man's, and that the covenant under which the blessing is realized is not of works, but of grace.

IV. THE "TERMINUS AD QUEM" OF THE DEFECTION. "To a different gospel." The apostle does not concede that the Jewish teachers taught the gospel, even in a perverted form, though it might be called a gospel by its teachers. Luther says, "No heretic ever cometh under the title of errors or of the devil." The apostle's phrase, *ἕτερον*, points to a difference in kind which is not involved in *ἄλλο*. The gospel, in fact, lost its true character by the perverting additions of the Judaists.

V. THE DANGER OF APOSTASY. The forcible language of the apostle implies the fearful risks involved in the perversions of the false teachers. Of all falls those of apostates are the most melancholy. They fall from a great height of privilege. They lose all their past pains and sacrifices in the cause of religion. They deliberately part with all the hopes of mercy and glory in the world to come.

Ver. 7.—*The true character of the perverters.* The apostle says that the "different gospel" to which they were verging was really not another (*ἄλλο*)—not a second gospel. He abruptly corrects his phraseology so as to forbid the idea of the possibility of another gospel. There is only one gospel—"the gospel of Christ." The gospel of the Judaists, though it formally accepted Christianity, revealed a different way of justification. If it is a gospel at all, it is only in this sense, that it is an attempt to pervert the gospel of Christ. The passage suggests—

L THAT THE PERVERTERS WERE WELL-KNOWN PERSONS. "Certain persons." The allusion is not to their fewness or their insignificance. He speaks of them in this manner without conferring any celebrity upon them, or exciting personal animosity against them. They may well rest in oblivion.

II IT SUGGESTS TWO CHARACTERISTIC QUALITIES IN THEIR CAREER. 1. *Their unsettling influence.* "They trouble you." They disturbed the minds of quiet and honest Christians by unhinging doubts. They disturbed the peace of Churches by the cleavage of new doctrines. They created schisms and rivalries that led to the weakening of Christian love, and ultimately made way for Christians "biting and devouring one another" (ch. v. 15). 2. *Their downright perversions of the gospel.* "They would pervert the gospel of Christ. So far as the Galatians were concerned, it had not become a case of actual perversion. But there could be no doubt about the tendency of the Judaist teaching. It was a reversal of the gospel, not merely by mingling law and gospel, but by practically neutralizing all the merit of Christ which is the great characteristic fact of the gospel.

Vers. 8, 9.—*The apostle's anathemas.* The severity of these sentences is directed against the Judaizing teachers, not against the Galatians, whom he evidently regards as influenced by others. There is great mildness in his method of reproving the Gala-

tians. The apostle first puts a hypothetical case, applicable to himself and his colleagues in the gospel, even to angels in heaven, and then he deals with an assumption of fact—fact that had actually occurred and was now occurring—that a gospel had been preached different from that they had already received, and, in both cases, he ends with an anathema.

I. HERESY IS A VERY SERIOUS THING. It has power to damn the soul. It is a sin against God, against the soul, against the truth, against the Church, against the world. It is the habit of modern times to regard error in religious matters as in no way endangering the salvation of man. A flippant infidelity denies that a man is responsible for his beliefs. There is a spirit abroad that leads men to think that everybody is right, that nobody is wrong, that nothing but an evil life will bring retribution hereafter. By men of this spirit the apostle would be regarded as cruelly illiberal and narrow. Yet we must hold that there are fundamental doctrines in religion which are essential to salvation. The apostle regarded heresy as a serious thing when he attached a curse to it. And if the anathema would fall upon an apostle like himself, or upon an angel from heaven, it would be much more likely to fall upon men neither apostles nor angels.

II. THE CHURCH HAS NO POWER TO ADD DOCTRINES TO THE GOSPEL OF CHRIST. It is bound to discover the whole truth contained in the gospel, to exhibit it in all its relations, and to adapt it to the various exigencies of human speculation and the various needs of men. But it has no power or authority to invent a new doctrine. Thus the apostle condemns the Church of Rome in decreeing new articles of faith, not only not found in Scripture, but altogether inconsistent with it. The gospel will tolerate no rival; it will allow no alien elements; it will admit no additions that would undermine its essential principles. All things necessary to salvation are to be found in the Word of God.

III. APOSTLES ARE NOT ABOVE THE GOSPEL. The false teachers may have sheltered themselves under the authority of great names, probably the apostles at Jerusalem. But not even an apostle may publish anything contrary to the truth of the gospel. Even an angel in heaven, representing the highest created authority, dare not oppose the gospel. There is a disposition sometimes to excuse the heresies of zealous teachers on the ground of their great zeal or their pretension to godliness. But the truth is not to be measured by any standard of mere human excellence. We must always remember that Satan can at times transform himself into an angel of light. Think of the fearful responsibility of a teacher! We must hold hard by the truth of the gospel if we would not imperil the souls of men or diminish the comforts of believers.

IV. THE APOSTLE'S ANATHEMA. It is not to be traced to personal annoyance at men who slighted or denied his authority as an apostle; for he was willing to involve himself in the curse if he taught anything wrong. This anathema was not excommunication; for an angel could not be affected by such a thing; but the very curse of the living God. Whence, then, did the apostle derive the authority to pronounce it? God only can inflict it. The apostle did it by the same authority that sent him to preach the gospel—the authority of that Lord who has the keys of hell and death.

Ver. 10.—*The apostle's explanation of his severity.* "For do I now conciliate men, or God? or do I seek to please men?" Let them judge after his anathemas whether he would make concessions to please or conciliate the Judaists.

I. IT IS WRONG TO BE MEN-PLEASERS. Perhaps the apostle had been charged by his enemies with a too accommodating spirit in being a Gentile to Gentiles and a Jew to Jews. He says, "I please all men in all things" (1 Cor. x. 33); but this referred to circumstances in which he sought "the profit of men that they might be saved," and in which there was no principle involved. The true principle is, "Let every one please his neighbour for his good to edification; for even Christ pleased not himself." But corrupt men-pleasing is that sinful complaisance to the humours and prejudices of men which sacrifices truth, righteousness, and honour. This sentence of the apostle is a rebuke to time-serving ministers who attenuate the claims of the gospel or conceal its doctrines to avert the displeasure or catch the applause of their hearers.

II. THE SERVICE OF CHRIST DEMANDS A COMPLETE INDEPENDENCE. "For if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ." The friendship of men would be dearly bought at the cost of the Lord's friendship. "No man can serve two masters."

To Christ he owes obedience, reverence, diligence, faithfulness; for he bore the "brands of his slavery." Therefore his subjection to him implied the rejection of all human authority in matters of faith. Yet it was not inconsistent with his being "a Jew to Jews," and "all things to all men," so long as he refused to compromise the truth of the gospel. The teacher who gives evidence that he pleases God rather than men, gives evidence likewise that his teaching is just and pure.

Vers. 11, 12.—*The true origin of the apostle's gospel.* Here he begins the apologetic portion of his Epistle, vindicating his independent apostolic authority. The phrase with which he prefaces his statement, "I declare unto you, brethren," is at once solemn and emphatic, as if he could allow of no misunderstanding affecting "the truth of the gospel," and is a sign that, in spite of their aberrations, the Galatians are still dear to him. He calls them "brethren" after his first grave censure, as if he indulged the hope of winning them back to the truth.

I. HIS GOSPEL WAS NOT HUMAN IN ITS CHARACTER. "The gospel which was preached of me is not after man." He refers here, not to its origin, but to its character. 1. *It is not discoverable by man.* Human reasoning or human intuition could not have discovered its facts, its truths, its blessings. 2. *It is not constructed on the principles or ideas of human wisdom,* which is carnal in its instincts, and therefore it is a "foolishness to the Greeks" of speculative thought. 3. *It is unchangeable in its great principles;* unlike the systems of men, which are constantly varying with the spirit of each age.

II. HIS GOSPEL WAS NOT HUMAN IN ITS ORIGIN. "For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it." 1. *He did not receive it from man, any more than the twelve.* Men receive most of their knowledge from one another, yet he was no more man-taught than Peter, or James, or John. He received exactly what they received—he by apocalyptic communications, they by personal communications in the days of Christ's life. 2. *He was not taught the gospel by man, much less by any apostle.* In that case the fact of his agreement with the other apostles proved that his knowledge of Divine truth was in no sense derivative. It might be urged that Ananias gave the apostle full instructions at his baptism. But there is no evidence that Ananias gave him any instructions; his errand was that Saul should receive his sight and receive the Holy Ghost. Saul had, in fact, before this time, received his instructions on the way to Damascus (Acts xxvi. 15—18). 3. *In matters of religious moment especially affecting the foundation of a sinner's hopes, human teaching, human traditions, and human authority, are of slight importance.*

III. HIS GOSPEL CAME TO HIM BY DIVINE REVELATION. His gospel was not human, but Divine, for he received it by revelation of the Lord Jesus Christ. It had, therefore, a Christly origin. The revelation is not to be identified with the visions of 2 Cor. xii., nor with the appearance of the Lord to him in Acts xxii. 18, nor with the period of the sojourn in Arabia; but with the appearance of Christ, as the Son of God, on the way to Damascus, as "the fundamental central illumination," which was followed by a progressive development. The apostle might, therefore, well describe his gospel as not of man. We know nothing of the mode of the Divine communications; the actual results are contained in the writings of the apostle. Thus it was that he spoke of "his gospel," which exhibited, as no other inspired writer did, "the mystery hid from generations," which forms the distinguishing glory of the Ephesian and Colossian Epistles. He sees in the gospel a Divine plan of salvation, whose centre is Christ, and whose end is the revelation of God's glorious perfection (Rom. xi. 36). The revelation from Christ was thus a revelation of Christ. He was at once the Source and Subject of it.

Vers. 13, 14.—*A retrospect of his career as a Jew.* This would be the best proof that he had not received his gospel from man.

I. HIS ENMITY TO THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. "I was beyond measure persecuting the Church of God, and destroying it." His past career was notorious. "He persecuted unto death" (Acts xxii. 4), "beyond measure"—by no feeble or spasmodic effort, limited to one spot, but by a persistent scheme of violence wrought with a fierce energy that knew no weariness. He could not then have been learning the gospel of the very saints he was hunting to death; there could be no possible association between the

persecutor and his victims that would allow of his learning the gospel. On the contrary, at this time he cherished the strongest prejudices and the fiercest hatred against Christianity.

II. HIS INTENSE ZEAL FOR THE JEWISH RELIGION. He could appeal to the Galatians themselves as having once heard "of his conversation in time past in Judaism," and how he "was making progress in Judaism above many of his contemporaries in his own nation, being more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of his fathers." 1. *His zeal was manifest in his earnest study of Judaism.* He studied it under Gamaliel, with the best advantages of instruction, and he excelled many of the young Pharisees of his own age in the ardour and in the results of his studies. He could not have made progress without study. 2. *It was still more manifest in his extraordinary devotion to the traditions of his fathers.* This was the natural token of an enthusiastic Pharisaism. "He was a Pharisee, and the son of a Pharisee" (Acts xxiii. 6). (1) The traditions in question were not the Mosaic Law, but the interpretations of that Law, which found their true place afterwards in the Mishna. They were, in a word, "the traditions of the elders," which our Lord so severely condemned. They were traditions, strong in the letter, weak in the spirit, strict in trifles, lax in weighty matters. They made void the Law on some of the plainest questions of duty. So is it with Roman Catholics in the matter of their traditions, which are either opposed to Scripture or unnecessary additions to it. (2) It is not unnatural to find unconverted men very zealous for ancestral traditions; more concerned, in fact, that they should be found to come from the Fathers than from God. Zeal of this sort is often strong in proportion to its ignorance of the truth. The zeal of his countrymen the apostle readily concedes, but charges it with being "a zeal not according to knowledge" (Rom. x. 2). It is in such an atmosphere that the persecutor is bred. (3) Zeal is not religion. Good intentions will never make anything really good with God. Zeal can never make the false true, nor justify any in persecuting the truth. Christians ought to imitate the zeal of false teachers, and to manifest its pureness by jealousy for God's honour, by abundance of labours, and by ardent love to Christ.

III. A BELIEVER OUGHT NOT TO BE ASHAMED TO CONFESS HIS SINS. The apostle makes an almost remorseful confession of his crimes against the Church of God. Once and again the dark recollection of his mad violence against the saints comes up in the midst of his grateful remembrances of God's forgiving mercy. But all that wild persecution only too clearly proved how little he was indebted to apostle or saint for the gospel he gave to the Galatians.

Vers. 15, 16.—*After his conversion he took no counsel with men as to his doctrine or career.* The apostle is most emphatic in asserting his independence of man. Mark—

I. HIS HIGH DESTINATION FROM BIRTH. "Who separated me from my mother's womb." Here is an instance of prevenient grace. From his very birth, and therefore before he could have any impulses or ideas of his own, God destined him to apostleship, no matter how wayward or inconsistent may have been the career of his youth. Looking back now upon his full history, we can see the marks of that momentous "separation." We see the working of prevenient, formative, restraining, preparatory grace. We see it: 1. In the *splendid intellect* with which he was endowed. God did verily prepare this large brain to be touched in his own time with heavenly fire. 2. In his *education*. He was a pure Jew, not half Greek, half Jew, but thoroughly versed in all the traditions of the Jews, and so trained in rabbinical traditions that he could afterwards thoroughly understand and confront the Judaist spirit everywhere, while he was led through inward struggles and fightings out of the darkness of Judaism into the full light of the gospel. 3. In his *thoroughness of character*. He could be nothing by halves; as a sinner, he was the very chief of sinners. Conversion made no change in his temperament and in the force of his character.

II. HIS CALL TO GRACE AND APOSTLESHIP. "And called me by his grace." In evident allusion to the scene on the way to Damascus. The call of the Redeemer was in the same moment a call to conversion and to apostleship (Rom. i. 5). That call was not on the ground of his Pharisaic strictness and fastings and prayers, much less on the ground of his mad violence as a persecutor. It had its origin wholly in grace. It was of grace, not of works.

III. THE REVELATION OF GOD'S SON IN THE APOSTLE. "It pleased God to reveal his Son in me." 1. *Revelation is here opposed to the method of patient and prolonged study.* 2. *The gospel is a revelation of the Son in his person, life, death, resurrection, and ascension.* It reveals him to poor sinners as "Wisdom, Righteousness, Sanctification, and Redemption." 3. *It is a revelation in individual lives.* "In me." God revealed his Son to Paul and in Paul as "the Hope of glory," showed him what is "the riches of the glory of this mystery." It was a wonderful thing that the apostle should have all his fixed ideas unbinged in a moment, all his deeply rooted prejudices destroyed, and the most comprehensive views of a singularly glorious system established in his soul, not by a process of gradual inquiry or slow conviction, but instantaneously by the revelation of the Son in him. It was this revelation which enabled him ever afterwards to hold forth the Son as the one transcendently glorious and loving Redeemer.

IV. THE DESIGN OF THIS REVELATION. "That I might preach him among the Gentiles." 1. *It was not for his own individual salvation,* but that he might be able to make known to others what had been so graciously conveyed to himself. 2. *It was the Son who was to be preached to the Gentiles,* not the Law, or circumcision, or holy days; not the righteousness of works, but "the righteousness of faith." This was the true scope of his apostleship.

V. THE MOVING CAUSE ALIKE OF CALL AND REVELATION—THE GOOD PLEASURE OF GOD. "It pleased God." We see in his career, first and last, the sole agency of God, and therefore there could be no dependence upon man or self for either call or apostleship.

VI. THE PROMPTNESS AND INDEPENDENT ACTION OF THE APOSTLE AFTER HIS CALL. "Immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood." He took no counsel with mortal man; he did not take the usual methods of men in determining their conduct in critical cases; therefore there was no reason for the Judaists to affirm that, after he had received his revelation, it underwent modification at the hands of men. There are times for thoughtful and even prolonged consideration, but where God's will is perfectly clear there is no need to consult man. Our first duty to Christ is a prompt obedience.

Vers. 17—24.—*Proofs of his entirely independent course after conversion.* The apostle adduces three or four separate facts to prove his independence of the apostles and of Judaic influence.

I. HIS FIRST JOURNEY AFTER HIS CONVERSION WAS NOT TO JERUSALEM. "Neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before me." It was very necessary for him to show that he received no instructions from the apostles at the commencement of his ministry, for the Judaists were saying to the Galatians, "Ye are the disciples of the apostles; so is Paul; therefore he has no superiority over us." But he did not go to Jerusalem to rehearse his experience or to receive either instruction or authority from them. When he did go, it was not by command of the apostles, but entirely of his own accord. In his reference to them he sets himself strictly by their side, conceding to them no superiority except upon this one point of priority of calling—they were "apostles before me."

II. HIS FIRST ACT AFTER CONVERSION WAS HIS WITHDRAWAL INTO ARABIA. "But I went into Arabia." 1. *This fact showed that he had at once placed himself completely beyond the reach of human influence.* It was a proof of his statement that he did not confer with flesh and blood. 2. *His retirement to Arabia—that is, to the Sinaitic peninsula—was evidently for the purpose of solitary communion with God.* There would be a natural yearning, after such a scene as broke his life into two widely sundered parts, to be for a time alone with God, that he might receive in his heart the healing of those wounds which the hand of Divine mercy had inflicted, as well as to learn by revelation the glories of the gospel which was entrusted to him for promulgation among the Gentiles. 3. *This mysterious pause at the beginning of his career lasted a considerable time.* It is not possible to say whether it was the whole of three years; for the text merely asserts it was three years from the date of his conversion till his first visit to Jerusalem, and we know that after his conversion he stayed a few days (*ἡμέρας τινάς*) with the disciples at Damascus, and returned again from Arabia to Damascus. Yet it is probable that he was the most part of three years in Arabia, as a sort of substitute, we may suppose, for the three years' personal training of the other apostles under Christ.

This period of lonely thought and meditation was as prolific of mighty results as the year's solitude of Luther in the Wartburg, or as the imprisonment of Huss in the castle on the Rhine.

III. HIS FIRST APPEARANCE IN PUBLIC LIFE AFTER THE ARABIAN SECLUSION WAS NOT AT JERUSALEM, BUT AT DAMASCUS. "I went into Arabia, and returned again unto Damascus." It was natural that his career as an apostle should begin at the scene of his gracious call, and nowhere else. That ancient city, with its unbroken history of four thousand years, standing on the great road of communication between Eastern and Western Asia, was a fitting starting-point for the career of one who was to embrace both East and West in the amplitude of his apostolic labours.

IV. HIS FIRST VISIT TO JERUSALEM AFTER HIS CONVERSION. "Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter, and abode with him fifteen days." For three years, at least, his course was perfectly independent; but his stay was so exceedingly short that there were few opportunities for his receiving instruction from the apostles. He did not see the twelve apostles, only Peter, and James the Lord's brother. The other apostles were probably absent at the time. He naturally sought the acquaintance of Peter, because he was the oldest and most distinguished of the apostles—one, in fact, of "the pillars" (ch. ii. 9); but the language of Paul does not imply that he went to consult him or to receive instruction or authority in regard to his work, but rather, we may suppose, that the two apostles might come to an understanding with regard to the future spheres of their apostolic labour. Peter could influence him but slightly in the matter of Gentile liberty, for he was not himself very clear or decided on the subject. In fact, Peter was not at this time (Acts ix. 29) very clear about a commission to the Gentiles at all. The apostle's interview with James, who was supposed to represent a strongly Judaic tendency, could not be supposed to bias him in favour of Gentile liberty. The fortnight's sojourn in Jerusalem was long enough to enable Peter to know Paul and to ascertain the true character of his gospel. But the visit was abruptly ended by a plot against the apostle's life (Acts ix. 29) and by a vision from heaven (Acts xxii. 17—21).

V. HIS NEXT MOVEMENT CARRIED HIM FAR FROM JERUSALEM. "Afterwards I came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia." This shows how he left Palestine altogether and passed beyond the reach of Judæan influence. There were Churches in these Cilician and Syrian regions at a subsequent period; probably founded by the apostle at this very time (Acts xv. 23, 41).

VI. HE WAS PERSONALLY UNKNOWN TO THE JUDEAN CHURCHES, AND ONLY KNOWN BY FAME AS A CONVERTED PERSECUTOR. "And was unknown by face unto the Churches of Judæa which were in Christ. But they had heard only, That he which persecuted us in times past now preacheth the faith which he was once destroying. And they glorified God in me." 1. *He was a stranger to the Judæan Churches*; for, in travelling from Damascus to Jerusalem, after his Arabian seclusion, he visited none of the Churches by the way, but went straight to the metropolis. Then he was so suddenly hurried away from the city that he had no time to become known to the Judæan Churches, while, in any case, he may have thought that, as the destined apostle of the Gentiles, his way did not lie through the Churches of the Jews. He must have become well known to them if he had stood in very intimate relations with the apostles. 2. *Yet he was not a stranger by character and repute*; for the Judæan Churches had already heard of his conversion with joy. (1) The conversion of Saul the persecutor was a widely known event. "They kept hearing." Christian love made it impossible that they should be indifferent to anything that concerned so remarkable a man. (2) It is the duty of Christians, not only to receive a converted persecutor, but to glorify God "in him;" (a) because his talents were no longer perverted to evil; (b) because they were now employed to build up the faith he was once trying to extinguish in blood; (c) because nothing but God's grace could *change* the career of one who was pre-eminently "a blasphemer, and persecutor, and injurious." (3) The conversion of Paul—what an event to the world, to the Church, to theology! (4) The grateful joy of the Judæan Churches over such a conversion was a rebuke to Judaists who aimed to destroy his influence and undermine his authority.

VII. MARK THE SOLEMN ASSEVERATION OF THE APOSTLE AS TO THESE FACTS. "But as to what I write unto you, behold, before God, I lie not." 1. *The necessity for*

such a strong declaration shows how unscrupulous were the calumnies of his Judaist enemies. As there could be no witness to most of the facts hereinbefore recited, he can only appeal direct to God. 2. The passage shows that swearing is not forbidden in *Matt. v. 34, Jas. v. 12.* 3. As there are exigencies in life to justify a direct appeal to God, it is well that we should be able truthfully to call God to witness upon our conduct.—T. C.

### HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

Vers. 1—5.—*The gospel of self-sacrifice.* In sending an Epistle to an apostate people, Paul does not indulge in unmeaning compliments. These Celts in Asia had been showing some of their proverbial fickleness, and going back from the doctrine of justification by faith to a *ritualism* whose development must be self-righteousness. It is needful for their recovery from apostasy that the authority of the apostle and the truth of the gospel should be put before them in unmistakable terms. Hence we find Paul plunging at once into the needful expositions of his own apostleship and of the gospel of Christ with which as an apostle he was charged. In this salutation we have the following lessons distinctly taught:—

I. PAUL'S APOSTLESHIP WAS RECEIVED DIRECTLY FROM JESUS CHRIST. (Ver. 1.) Doubtless he had merely human hands laid upon his head at Antioch (*Acts xiii. 3*), but the imposition of the hands of the brethren was not the conveyance of authority, but simply the *recognition* of authority as already conveyed. The "ordination" at Antioch was the recognition by the Church of authority and mission already conveyed by the Lord to the apostle. Accordingly in this instance before us Paul claims an apostleship directly from the hands of Christ. He was an apostle "not from men, neither through man, but through Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead" (Revised Version). No intermediate hands conveyed the authority to him; he was conscious of having received it directly from the fountain-head. This gave him confidence consequently in dealing with the Judaizing teachers. It mattered not to him what parade of authority these teachers made; he stood as a rock upon his own commission with all its hallowed associations. And should this not instruct every true teacher as to the source of his authority? It is a mistake to imagine that men can do more than recognize God-given authority. It is from Christ directly we must each receive our office. Church officers, in putting their *imprimatur* upon any of us, merely recognize a Divine work which they believe on due evidence to be already there.

II. THE DESIRE OF THE APOSTLE FOR THE GALATIANS' WELFARE. (Vers. 2, 3.) The deep longing of Paul and those associated with him in his captivity for these apostate Galatians was that *grace* and *peace* from God the Father and from Christ might be theirs. "Grace," the gratuitous, undeserved favour which wells forth from the Divine heart, when it is received into the sinner's soul, produces "peace which passeth all understanding." It was this blessed experience Paul desired for the Galatians. They may have traduced his office and his character, but this did not prevent him entertaining the deep desire that into "paths of peace" they, like himself, should be led. And indeed we cannot wish people better than that grace and peace from heaven should be theirs. To live in the felt favour of God, to realize that it is at the same time quite undeserved, produces a peace and a humility of spirit beyond all price!

III. THE GOSPEL PAUL PREACHED WAS THAT OF THE SELF-SACRIFICE OF CHRIST. (Ver. 4.) Jesus, he asserts, "gave himself for our sins." The foundation of the gospel is self-sacrifice. But we must always remember that self-sacrifice, if for the merest trifle, may be moral madness. In self-sacrifice as such there is no necessary virtue. A man may lose his life in an utterly unworthy cause. Hence the necessity for the self-sacrifice of Christ must be made out before its real virtue is established. This necessity appears when we consider that it was "for our sins" he gave himself. For if our sins had been removed at some meaner cost than the blood of the Son of God, we should be disposed to say that sin is after all a light thing in God's sight, a mere *bagatelle* to him. But inasmuch as it required such a sacrifice to take away sin, its

enormity is made manifest to all. Christ laid down his life, then, in a noble cause. Surely to take away sin, to remove from human hearts their heavy burdens, to bestow on men peace and deliverance from all fear, was a worthy object in self-sacrifice. We stand before the cross, therefore, believing that the sacrifice upon it is of infinite value and efficacy. He was no martyr by mistake as he died upon the tree, but the most glorious of all heroes.

IV. CHRIST'S AIM IN SELF-SACRIFICE WAS OUR DELIVERANCE FROM THIS PRESENT EVIL WORLD. (Ver. 4.) The world is the totality of tendencies which oppose themselves to God. To love such a world is incompatible with love to God the Father (1 John ii. 15). It is, moreover, made up of "the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life" (1 John ii. 16). Now, it is to this world that the ritualist falls a prey. This was the danger of the Galatians. The revival of rites and ceremonies, which had been fulfilled and therefore done away in Christ, pandered to the lust of the eyes and to the pride of life. Hence Paul proclaims at the outset that one purpose of the gospel of self-sacrifice is to deliver its recipients from the power of this present evil world which is constantly trying to bring us into bondage. The religion of Christ is freedom. He means to deliver us from bondage. It is our own fault if we are not delivered.

V. THE FINAL END OF THE GOSPEL IS ALWAYS THE GLORY OF THE FATHER. (Ver. 5.) Hence the doxology with which the apostolic desire closes. It is with doxologies that the dispensation of grace must end. Heaven itself is the concentration of the doxologies which have been gathering upon earth; the full concert after the terrestrial rehearsals. And it is here that the safety of the whole dispensation may be seen; for if the glory of some imperfect being were contemplated, his designs would of necessity run contrary in many cases to the real good of others. But God the Father is so perfect that his glory always consists with the *real* good of all his creatures. Doubtless some of his creatures will not believe this, and will insist on suspecting and hating his designs. In consequence they must be exposed to his righteous indignation. But this is quite compatible with the fact that the Divine glory and the real good of all are meant to harmonize. Happy will it be for us if we join in the rehearsals of his glory here, and are promoted to the chorus full-orbed and like the sound of many waters above. But even should we insist on discord, our own discomfort alone shall be secured; discords can, we know, be so wedded to harmony as to swell and not diminish the effect of the full orchestra. And God will secure his glory even in our poor despite.—R. M. E.

Vers. 6—10.—*Paul's intolerance of any other gospel.* After the usual apostolic greeting, Paul proceeds, not to congratulate or compliment the Galatians in any way, but to reprimand them for turning away from the gospel to ritualism. Their idea of salvation through becoming Jews was subversive of the gospel of grace, and so the apostle shows himself intolerant of the false doctrine which was so mischievous. So sure is he of his position that he does not hesitate to denounce with the curse of God any, be they men or angels, who would preach a different gospel from that gospel of Christ's self-sacrifice which he preached. Moreover, if they imagined that to be popular he would trifle with principle, he gave them to understand that he would never, to propitiate public opinion, violate in the least degree his obligation as the slave of Christ.

I. IT IS MARVELLOUS HOW ATTRACTIVE RITUALISM IS TO FICKLE MINDS. (Ver. 6.) Now, by ritualism we mean a plan of salvation by rites and ceremonies. The principle is the same whether the rites and ceremonies are Jewish or mediæval. It is a substitute for the gospel of *grace*. Now, Paul marvelled that these Celts in Asia so speedily turned away from the gospel of grace to a gospel of ritual. He wondered at their fickleness. And yet, when we consider the *sensationalism* which underlies every ritualistic system, we can understand the hold it has upon those constitutionally fickle. Whatever is showy, palpable, and helpful to self-esteem and pride secures the homage of shallow minds. But the sad aspect of this tendency is that it removes souls from God. Every rite and ceremony which is interposed as essential between man and God creates a sense of distance between those whom the gospel would bring nigh. Instead of ritualism tending to intensify communion with God, it can only intensify the *superstitious* feeling which puts souls at a distance from him.



II. RITUALISM IS A PERVERSION OF THE GOSPEL. (Ver. 7.) For Paul would not admit that the ritualism imported by the Judaizers into Galatia was another gospel; in his view it was no gospel, but a perversion of it. For if I am told I can be saved only by becoming a Jew, by being circumcised, and keeping the Old Testament ritual, and that I cannot be saved by faith alone, I am deprived of the glad tidings which Christ's gospel gives, and projected upon a path of real self-righteousness. It is the same with modern ritualism. Salvation by ceremonies is the antithesis of salvation by grace. It is a perversion of God's good news to man and must result in disappointment.

III. WE OUGHT, LIKE PAUL, TO BE SO SURE OF THE GOSPEL WE PROCLAIM AS TO BE INTOLERANT OF ANY OTHER. (Ver. 8.) Paul had got such a grasp of the gospel of grace, the self-sacrifice of Christ was so sure and so sufficient a foundation for man's hope, that he could not tolerate any other message. Even should he himself change his views in the course of years and come to Galatia with another gospel, or should an angel from heaven with an aureole of light proclaim another gospel than the one Paul had at first proclaimed, then is the apostle ready to call down upon his perverted self or the perverted angel the curse of God. Now, this intolerant side of truth really springs from the sure grasp we have of it. It is inseparable from intense conviction. Of course, it is quite distinct from the intolerance which dictates persecution. Paul would not persecute; but he would leave the perverts in the hands of God that he might deal with them. Persecution is devoting men to the curse of men; the true intolerance contents itself with leaving the offenders in the hands of a holy and just God.

IV. THE BEING WHO MISLEADS HIS FELLOWS ABOUT SALVATION DESERVES THE CURSE OF GOD. (Ver. 9.) Paul has not been rashly betrayed into intolerance of spirit. He had expressed himself to the same effect on a previous occasion, probably during his second visit to Galatia (Acts xviii. 23). He is now prepared to stick to his anathema. He feels in his heart of hearts that the person who trifles with the eternal interests of others and proclaims a false method of salvation deserves the Divine curse. The gospel Paul had preached was the gospel of free grace. No simpler terms of pardon and acceptance can be imagined than are offered in the gospel; it is only devil's work which those persons manage to perform who complicate salvation with rites and ceremonies, making it less easy than God intends. Having regard, then, to the eternal interests at stake, it must be admitted that the deceiver of souls deserves the curse of Heaven. How solemn a responsibility it is to guide men to God! How clear and unmistakable should the plan of salvation be made! How deep the guilt and how dire the doom of those who pervert the gospel!

V. THE SLAVE OF CHRIST WILL NOT BE THE SLAVE OF PUBLIC OPINION. (Ver. 10.) Paul was undoubtedly a man of great breadth of view and sympathy. It was a principle with him to please his neighbour for his good to edification (Rom. xv. 2). He was ready to become all things to all men in the hope of saving some (1 Cor. ix. 22; x. 33). And the Judaizers thought that this pleasing of men on Paul's part would lead him to accept of their ritualism and give up his gospel if their policy was once thoroughly popular. In short, their notion was that Paul was so enamoured of popularity that he would bow to public opinion at all hazards. Now, this is what he repudiates in this last verse. "Do I now," he asks, "win over to myself men or God? Or am I seeking to be an object of man's good will? No; and there is a decisive reason against any such efforts. If I were still pleasing men, if I had not resigned the hope of human favour and of human approval, I should not be the slave of Christ." This leads us into the wide subject of our attitude towards public opinion. Now, our danger undoubtedly is in over-estimating it. Our safety lies in being slaves to Christ. His opinion is to be our one simple concern, and public opinion may coincide with or differ from his, but we must hold firmly by our obligations to the one Master, and all other things will range themselves rightly around us. The uncompromising slave of Christ will be found to be after all the most considerate servant of men.—R. M. E.

Vers. 11—24.—*Paul's personal grasp of the gospel.* Paul, as we have seen, is so certain of the gospel of grace being the only gospel for sinful men, that he is prepared to pronounce an anathema on all who preach any other gospel. Lest it might be

supposed that he took up this intolerant position rashly, he now proceeds to give us a short autobiography, in which he shows how he had received the gospel, and what a hold it had upon him. Let us notice the salient points in this narrative.

I. HIS LIFE AS A JEW. (Vers. 13, 14.) Paul, before his conversion, was the most zealous persecutor of Christianity. A strict Pharisee, he added to his self-righteousness an uncommon zeal for the old religion, and hesitated not to persecute to the death those who had embraced the new. He was zealous, but not according to knowledge.

II. THE REVELATION OF JESUS TO HIM AND IN HIM. (Vers. 11, 12, 15, 16.) It was Jesus himself who undertook Saul's conversion. There was no intermediate instrument. On the way to Damascus Jesus appeared to him in dazzling, overwhelming radiance, and compelled the persecutor to recognize, not only his existence, but his sovereign authority. That manifestation of Jesus to him revolutionized his life. Henceforth he could have no doubt regarding the reign of Jesus Christ. This was the revelation of Jesus to him—the historic interview which made Paul's career so different and so glorious. But next there was the revelation of Jesus *in* Paul. This was by the Holy Spirit entering into him and giving him Christ's mind, Christ's heart, Christ's compassions, so that Paul became a revelation of Christ to other men. Henceforward he was a "Christophor," carrying Christ in him, not only as his Hope of glory, but as his animating, regulating, ruling power. Paul was from that hour "possessed," but it was by the Spirit of Christ. His personality became a new centre of spiritual force and power.

III. THUS POSSESSED BY JESUS, HE BECAME INDEPENDENT OF MEN. (Vers. 16, 17.) Now, this independence of Paul had two sides. 1. He became independent of popular opinion. "Immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood." Now, it must have been very trying to surrender all his hopes as a Jew. The fact is, he was the foremost man of his nation just when Jesus converted him. The nation would gladly have followed his leadership. There was no man who had so much weight and force of character as Saul. To renounce all these hopes, and the friendships of his early years, and to face the world a lonely man was trying. Yet he was enabled by God's grace to do so. He made no truce with flesh and blood, but renounced all for Christ. 2. He felt independent of apostolic recognition. He never thought of hurrying off to Jerusalem to stand an examination at the hands of the apostles, and receive their *imprimatur*. He dealt at first hand with the Fountain of authority. Hence he passed to Arabia soon after his conversion, and in the solitudes of the desert, in the places associated with such master spirits as Moses, Elijah, and Christ, he communed with Christ, and pondered and laid the foundations of his theology. He called no man master; he felt that he had but one Master, and he was Christ. Now, this independence of character is what we should all seek. It can only be secured when we have renounced self-confidence and betaken ourselves to the feet of our Lord. There at the fountain of life and power we can rise up our own masters and his faithful servants, prepared to do battle, if need be, against the world.

IV. PAUL'S INTERVIEW AT JERUSALEM WITH CEPHAS AND JAMES. (Vers. 18, 19.) While Paul was properly independent in spirit, this does not imply that he was in any way morose or unsocial. His internment in Arabia, his earnest study of the whole plan of the gospel, only made him long for an interview with Cephas, the recognized leader at Jerusalem. Hence he passed from solitude to society, and had an interview of fifteen days with the apostle of the circumcision. James, who had ministerial oversight of the Jerusalem Church, shared his society too. It must have been a blessed meeting between the two mighty apostles. The meeting of two generals before some important campaign was never so momentous in its consequences as the meeting of these two humble men, Saul and Cephas. They were set upon the conquest for Christ of the world. Now, we have every reason to believe that the interview was simply one for conference. It was not that Saul might receive any authority from the hands either of Cephas or of James. He had his authority directly from Christ.

V. HIS EVANGELISTIC WORK. (Vers. 20—24.) Perhaps through mutual agreement with Peter, Paul leaves Jerusalem and Judæa and confines himself to the districts beyond. Syria and Cilicia, territories beyond the bounds of Palestine proper, where the apostles were operating, were selected by the apostle to the Gentiles for his first evangelistic efforts. He did not seek the acquaintance of the Churches in Judæa. He

kept to his own province. They heard gladly that the arch-persecutor had become a chief preacher of the once despised faith. They accordingly praised God for the monument of his mercy he had raised up in Paul. But his knowledge of the gospel and his authority in proclaiming it were not, he wishes these Galatians to understand, derived from men. We should surely learn from this autobiography of Paul the secret of personal independence and power. It consists in going to the sources themselves. If we refuse to depend upon men and depend on the Lord only, we shall secure a grasp of his holy gospel and an efficiency in proclaiming it which are impossible otherwise. What the world needs now is what it needed then—men pervaded like Paul by the Spirit of Christ, and so radiating the true ideas about Christ all around.—R. M. E.

Vers. 1—5.—*Introduction.* The tone of this Epistle is decidedly controversial. In the first and second chapters the writer establishes against Judaistic assailants his apostolic authority. This, however, is only subsidiary to his main design, which is in the third and fourth chapters, as an accredited servant of God, to establish the gospel of Christ, or justification by faith against Judaism (a different gospel), or justification by the works of the Law. The fifth and sixth chapters may be said to contain the application. There is thus the same central thought in this Epistle that there is in the Epistle to the Romans. Here there is the thought as it flashed out against Judaism as it threatened the very existence of Christianity in a very interesting circle of Churches, and while the writer's feelings were still keen. In the later Epistle there is the thought as it shaped itself against Judaism, when there was time to look at it calmly and in its widest aspects. It is worthy of being remembered that an *historical* interest attaches to this Epistle. The Romanism with which Luther was confronted bore a striking resemblance to Judaism. On that account he was led to make a special study of this Epistle. "The Epistle to the Galatians," he said, "is my Epistle. I have betrothed myself to it; it is my wife."

I. ADDRESS. 1. *The writer.* "Paul, an apostle (not from men, neither through man, but through Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead)," Paul's apostleship was not without relation to men. It was directed to men, and intended for their benefit. His appointment to office was announced to him by a man (Ananias). But the authority under which the appointment was made was not derived from men. Nor was it through man as the *medium* that it was communicated. It was communicated *through Jesus Christ*. The Lord said by Ananias, "He is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my Name before the Gentiles and kings, and the children of Israel." When afterwards he essayed to preach the gospel at Jerusalem, he was overruled. While praying in the temple he fell into a trance, and saw *Jesus, who said* unto him, "Depart; for I will send thee forth far hence unto the Gentiles." The authority under which Paul acted as apostle was ultimately derived from God. That is not the form in which it is put here. For the same preposition is used in connection with God as with Christ, as if God were in himself both the *Medium* and the Source of authority. And, in keeping with that view, one of the forms in which Ananias announced to Paul his appointment to apostleship was this: "*The God of our fathers* hath appointed thee to know his will, and to see the Righteous One, and to hear a voice from his mouth." Authority was communicated to Paul only through God as the *Father*, i.e. as acting through his Son Jesus Christ. This great Agent the Father *raised from the dead*. In the corresponding place in Romans the raising of Christ is also introduced: "Declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness by the resurrection of the dead; even Jesus Christ our Lord, through whom we received grace and apostleship." The thought there is that, as divinely attested in his resurrection, he could appoint to apostleship. The further thought is suggested here that, as raised, he could appoint *him* to apostleship. He was not among those who received appointment from Christ when he was in flesh; but the risen Christ had appeared to him, and, without any elective body of men coming between, without any action of the Church as in the election of Matthias, had *immediately* appointed him to apostleship. 2. *Those associated with him.* "And all the brethren which are with me." However high ground Paul took as to his apostleship, that did not separate him from his brethren. He even courted their Christian sympathy and support. He was open with his companions in travel, and divulged to them his thoughts, read to them his letters. On this occasion

he could say that they were at one with him. In the whole of his warm remonstrance against giving way to Judaism, there was not one expression which they wished him to tone down. 3. *The Churches addressed.* "Unto the Churches of Galatia." At the dawn of history the home of the Celtic race, known to the Greeks as Galatians, and to the Romans as Gauls, was the continent west of the Rhine, with these adjoining islands. In their migrations hordes of Celts poured into Italy. They also followed the course of the Danube, turning southward into Greece. Three tribes of them, crossing the Hellespont, after wide devastations, were confined in the heart of Asia Minor. The tract of country which they occupied, about two hundred miles in length, and watered by the Halys, was called after them Galatia (land of the Celts). The head towns of the three tribes were Tavium, Pessinus, and Ancyra. The original inhabitants were Phrygians, and in later times there were additions of Romans and of Greeks and also of Jews. But the predominant element was Celtic, and the Celtic language was spoken along with Greek. To peoples, then, with more or less of a Celtic origin this Epistle to the Celts is invested with special interest. Paul came into contact with this new race in his second missionary tour. There is a singular meagreness of information regarding his visit. All that is recorded is that, being overruled as to his intended route, he passed through the region of Phrygia and Galatia. As meagrely it is said, in connection with his third missionary tour, that he passed through the same region in order, establishing all the disciples. The result of his evangelizing was the formation of several Churches. They are (as was pointed out by Chrysostom) addressed here without title. What there is of characterization is thrown into the salutation.

II. SALUTATION. Notwithstanding what he refuses to them at the present juncture, he heartily wishes them well. 1. *Blessing invoked.* "Grace to you and peace." He invokes *grace* on them, or the bestowment of the Divine favour, not because of merit in them, but because of merit obtained for them. As the result of grace, he invokes *peace*, or the absence of inward misgiving, and as far as possible the absence also of disturbing influences from without, Judaism included. 2. *From whom invoked.* "From God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ." *He first invokes blessing from God the Father.* He goes to the very fountain-head. The fatherhood of God is the ultimate reason for our being blessed. It is impossible to go higher than that. Where is there hope for the child who disobeys his father's command? The hope lies in what the father is. He naturally pities his child, and desires to bless him. So where is there hope for us in our state of disobedience? The hope lies in what God is. He is the Fountain of all fatherly feeling. As the Father, he was moved with compassion toward us, and desired to bless us notwithstanding all our unworthiness. It was the fatherly feeling that moved to redemption. It is the fatherly feeling that moves to bless in connection with redemption. This, then, is the height to which we must lift up our eyes, from whence cometh help. *He also invokes blessing from our Lord Jesus Christ.* As the Father was formerly bound with Christ by the preposition "through," so now Christ is bound with the Father by the preposition "from." Such freedom is significant. He who is the *Channel* is also the *Source* of blessing. He is Jesus, the higher Joshua, who saves his people from their *sins*. It was through him that effect was given to the fatherly feeling in God, and that the Father approaches man with blessing. He is the Christ who was *anointed* of God for this end. He is our Lord, as the successful Accomplisher of salvation placed over the house of God, to whom it belongs to dispense blessing. It is to him, then, as sovereign Dispenser of blessing that we must look. *Central truth made prominent by being thrown into the salutation.* "Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us out of this present evil world, according to the will of our God and Father." The language has evidently a sacrificial colouring. The worshipper came with his sins before God. The oblation he presented to God was an animal. With his sins taken over, the animal paid the penalty in its death. So the oblation which Christ presented to God was *himself*. With our sins taken over, he *really and fully* suffered the desert of them in his death, especially in the hiding of the Father's countenance. What gave this *self-oblation* infinite value was the dignity of the Sufferer; and also his perfect trust in God, and all-absorbing love for men, and never-failing hope for their salvation in the mysterious forsaking which made trial of him. The object with which Christ gave himself was, not only that he might deliver us from the *guilt* of sin, but also that he

might deliver us from the *manifestation* of sin in *this present evil world*. This world is thought of, not as it might have been, but as it *actually* is. It might have been a good world; it is instead an evil world. Its evil character consists, not only in its opposing itself in its opinions and practices to men's good, but especially in its opposing itself to God. It is a world that, in its wickedness, forgets God, casts off God. "The Lord shall not see;" "What is the Almighty, that we should serve him?" Now, Christ died that we might be delivered from this tyrannous world, and introduced into the liberty, if not at once of a perfect form of society, yet of a personal condition, and Church condition too, in which God has something of the place to which he is entitled. And all this is to be thought of as *according to the will of our God and Father*. The Father has the *primacy* throughout. It was in his will that salvation *originated*. It was his will that was *carried out* by Christ. "Then said I, Lo, I come: in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do *thy will*, O my God: yea, thy Law is within my heart." The *outcome* is the doing of the Father's will by man as it is by the angels.

III. DOXOLOGY. "To whom be the glory for ever and ever. 'Amen.'" The foundation of the ascription of glory to God is the glory displayed by God in salvation. There was a glorious display of wisdom in the planning of salvation. There was a glorious display of justice in the satisfaction made for sin. There was a glorious display of power in the overcoming of sin. There was especially a glorious display of love in its overflowing on sinners. In view of such a display it becomes us to ascribe glory to God. We cannot take it to ourselves. Our language must ever be, "Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us." In what God has done for our salvation there will be found subject for our doxologies to the ages of ages. To every ascription of glory it becomes us to add our "Amen." May our "Amen" become ever deeper, and may the circle of such "Amens" evermore increase.—R. F.

Vers. 6—10.—*Occasion of the Epistle*. I. THE APOSTLE EXPRESSES AMAZEMENT AT THE CHANGED BEARING OF THE GALATIANS TOWARDS THE GOSPEL. "I marvel that ye are so quickly removing from him that called you in the grace of Christ unto a different gospel; which is not another gospel: only there are some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ." Only in this Epistle are wanting prefatory words of acknowledgment. In the case of the Corinthians he has words of warm acknowledgment, because, notwithstanding irregularities, they were in the main attached to the gospel. But all of attachment to the gospel that the apostle had formerly been thankful for in the Galatians was now so *endangered* that he can only approach them with a feeling of utter amazement. 1. *The fundamental nature of the change*. They were removing from him that called them in the grace of Christ unto a different gospel. If *this* was a different gospel, then we have a description of the gospel of Christ going before. It is *the grace of Christ*. It is the good offer of pardon and salvation, not on the ground of our merits, but purely on the ground of the sacrifice and merits of Christ. That gospel had been preached in Galatia, and in and by it God had called them unto himself, unto fellowship with himself, unto holiness and happiness. But now they were moving away from him that called them in that gospel unto a different gospel. The difference was that it was no more the pure grace of Christ, but a mixture of grace and works. Their departure from the gospel was not completed, the process was still going on; but it was so fundamental a departure that the apostle marvels at their guilt. 2. *The suddenness of the change*. They were removing *so quickly* from him that called them in the gospel unto a different gospel. From the point of their being called up to the present point, their Christian career had certainly been short. But that does not seem sufficient by itself to account for the abruptness with which the apostle breaks in here. God had called them in the gospel, and they had continued in the gospel up to a certain point. From the experience of his second visit, and from information received, he was thinking hopefully of them; when all at once he is informed of apostasy in rapid progress. They were acting with characteristic *Gallic mobility*. Fickleness is the name applied to it, when the form is evil. A Gallic tribe might be to all appearance contented and prosperous, when, suddenly impelled by the love of change, it would move away to another locality. "Almost all the Gauls," says Cæsar, in his account of his Gallic wars, "are given to

change." The Galatians themselves were a striking example of this love of change. This characteristic would be in favour of their reception of the gospel at the first. But would they not as easily move away from the gospel? In view of Gallic mobility, the apostle of Christ needed to be as vigorous as the Roman captain was. 3. *The unsatisfactoriness of the change.* He had said "different gospel" with a certain accommodation. It professed to be a gospel, and he objected to it that it was *another kind* of gospel. That, however, might seem to contain an admission by him, which he does not wish to make, of there being many gospels, among which a *selection* might be made. So he hastens to deny that this other kind is a *second* gospel. He lets it be known that there is only *one* gospel of Christ. What was being palmed upon them was only *misnamed* gospel. It was not improving the gospel to add circumcision to it. It was only perverting it, making it no more the gospel of Christ. And this perversion was being palmed upon them by men who had not their real good at heart, whose real character was that of troublers, harassers. They would put upon them a *yoke* which Christians did not need to bear. And they were men who followed in the track of the preachers of the gospel to break the unity of the Christian communities.

II. THE APOSTLE PRONOUNCES AN ANATHEMA ON PERVERTERS OF THE GOSPEL. "But though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema." Anathema is a thing devoted to destruction, or on which a curse is laid. An animal laid on the altar was anathema, *i.e.* doomed to death. Christ was anathema for us, *i.e.* given over, and the curse of God fell on him. *He supposes two cases: it is implied that they are not actual. The first is the case of a genuine preacher of the gospel—himself or any of his associates.* He (others assisting) had preached the gospel among the Galatians. He had been the instrument of God in their conversion and in forming them into Churches. He had given them many proofs of his earnestness. If he—which God forbid!—should be so far left to himself as to turn his back on his previous history as a Christian teacher, if he should profess to have got new light, if he should say that they could be saved on any other ground than the grace of Christ,—then (protecting their liberty even against himself, and protecting the interests of Christ) his feeling with regard to himself, acting in the way supposed, would be, "Let him be anathema." *The second is the case of an angel from heaven.* This calls up an image of extraordinary saintliness, greater than that of any of the best men, who are all compassed about with infirmity. What an influence is here supposed to back up a message! If an angel should come among them, fresh from the presence of God, with the atmosphere of heaven around him; if by the saintliness of his life he should succeed in establishing himself beyond all parallel in their affection and confidence; if in this position he should teach that they could be saved on any other ground than the grace of Christ;—then (protecting their liberty, and protecting the interests of Christ) he would say, "Let him be accursed." It might seem that this is asseveration made strong as strong can be; but its strength is yet added to. *Reaffirmation of a former anathema.* "As we have said before, so say I now again, If any man preacheth unto you any gospel other than that which ye received, let him be anathema." At a former time (it may have been on the occasion of his second visit) others had joined with him in pronouncing an anathema which only differs from the foregoing in three minor particulars. 1. *It is put in the most general form.* "If any man." 2. *An actual case is supposed.* "If any man preacheth." Wherever they had the opportunity, Judaizing teachers were doing what is denounced. 3. *They had affixed their seal to the gospel.* It had not only been preached to them, but also received by them. They had from their own experience of it known what it was. The anathema in this form the apostle for himself reaffirms. Being substantially the same as the foregoing, it is thus brought about that a threefold anathema is uttered against perverters of the gospel. *Nor is there anything in this inconsistent with good feeling.* Let us suppose that one man has in his power the lives of a thousand persons. By applying a match he may be able to throw away all these valuable lives. Better far that he himself should perish than that by his wickedness a thousand persons should perish. It was not dissimilar in the case of the Galatians. A good work had been going on among them. By the preaching of the gospel many had been brought to the Saviour. If the good

work went on, many more, from time to time, would be added to their number. But if these perverters of the gospel succeeded, then all that good work would be spoiled. Better far that they themselves should be wrecked in their interests than that by them hundreds should be wrecked in their interests. There is a solemn warning here to all perverters of the gospel, of whom there are not a few in our day. The curse of God rests on the man who would displace the grace of Christ as the sole ground of a sinner's salvation.

III. THE APOSTLE TURNS HIS USE OF STRONG LANGUAGE INTO AN ARGUMENT AGAINST HIS BEING A MAN-PLEASER. "For am I now persuading men, or God? or am I seeking to please men? if I were still pleasing men, I should not be a servant of Christ." His opponents warned men against his persuasive powers. He could make the Jews believe one thing and the Gentiles another. He could prove that circumcision was right and that circumcision was wrong, as it suited him. Against this charge he here, by the way, points the Galatians to the strong language which he has just used, and has not used for the first time. Could it be said in view of that language that he was making it his highest object to persuade men, *i.e.* without reference to truth, without reference to Divine ends? Was he not rather making it his highest object to persuade God, *i.e.* so to speak to men as to have the Divine judgment in his favour? His opponents said more widely that he was a man-pleaser, that he sought by unworthy methods to ingratiate himself into men's favour. The strong language he had used could not be construed into man-pleasing. He had got beyond human good will in becoming a servant of Christ. And as a servant of Christ he had known not a little of what it is to want the good opinion and good will of men.—R. F.

Vers. 11—24.—*Position.* "For I make known to you, brethren, as touching the gospel which was preached by me." To the remarkable outburst of feeling with which the apostle approaches the Galatians, succeeds affectionate, calm statement. He addresses them now as brethren. His object in writing to them is not to excommunicate them, but to bring them back from their error. Against the misrepresentations of the Judaists he wishes to make known to them as his brethren his exact position, touching the gospel which was preached by him. The gospel points to a system of *ideas* by which men are to be enlightened. It also points to a number of *institutions* by which men are to be moulded. It principally points to a *method* by which men are to be saved. Paul was not simply an utterer of thoughts, nor a setter-up of institutions, but he was in the first place a proclaimer of the way of salvation. He preached with a view to his hearers taking action in a matter of infinite moment. *Threefold exclusion of man from connection with the gospel as preached by the apostle.* 1. *He did not preach a man-made gospel.* "That it is not after man." If a division of the realm is disaffected, measures must be adopted to cope with the disaffection. Such measures may be described as after man; they are the result of human counsels. There cannot be claimed for them perfection. The gospel is not after man; it has not been devised by a man or by a body of men. It is free from imperfections that attach to human methods. 2. *The gospel was not delivered to him any more than to the other apostles by man.* "Neither did I receive it from man." There is not particularized the supposition of it being his own invention. We may conclude, therefore, against that being the form which the representation against him took. On the supposition of it not being a human invention, this exclusion relates to the mode of delivery. The *I* is emphatic. *He did not receive it, any more than the other apostles received it from man.* 3. *He was no pupil of the apostles.* "Nor was I taught it." On the supposition of it being no human invention he did not receive it in a particular form, which may therefore be concluded to be the form which the representation against him took. He was not taught it,—*by whom* is left indefinite. As it is unqualified, part of the idea must be that he was not taught it by the apostles. The exclusion then comes to this in the end, that he was no pupil of the apostles. *What is included in the gospel as preached by the apostle.* "But it came to me through revelation of Jesus Christ." On this too the former language, by its indefiniteness, has a bearing. The twelve enjoyed three years of teaching under Christ on earth. It was true that he was not taught in that way. The substitute for such teaching, apart from subsequent meditation, was that he was supernaturally furnished by Jesus Christ

with the contents of the gospel. *Historical proof to show that he was no pupil of the apostles.*

I. THE JUDAISTIC PERIOD OF HIS LIFE. "For ye have heard of my manner of life in time past in the Jews' religion." He recalls the fact that they had heard, viz. from his own mouth, when he was with them, of his manner of life in Judaism. This Judaism was a good thing in its right *conception* and *time*. There were human adjuncts of it which were not good. It was intended that Judaism should be carried up into Christianity. To adhere to it, then, after Christianity had come, was to go against the Divine intention. This was what Paul did. 1. *Outstanding feature of his Judaism.* "How that beyond measure I persecuted the Church of God, and made havoc of it." The Church of Christ is named, from his later point of view, the Church of God. He now realizes it as the painful element in his guilt, that he persecuted the Church of God. He was beyond measure a persecutor. It would appear, from the language which is used in one place, that at his instance Christians were put to death: "He persecuted this Way unto the death." As a consequence, he made havoc of the Church. He had put the Church at Jerusalem into confusion, and he was on his way to exterminate, if he could, the Church at Damascus. 2. *Spirit by which he was animated in Judaism.* "And I advanced in the Jews' religion beyond many of mine own age among my countrymen, being more exceedingly zealous for the traditions of my fathers." He was brought up in a Hebrew home in Tarsus. Amid Gentile influences he would feel free in the world of Hebrew memories and hopes. We can think of him as showing forwardness beyond many of his own age while yet at the Hebrew school. The strong impression of his forwardness may have led to his being sent on to Jerusalem for wider opportunity. In the city of his fathers there was everything that was fitted to excite his youthful imagination, to fire his youthful enthusiasm. At the feet of Gamaliel he would come to a more intelligent appreciation of the *traditions of his fathers*, i.e. of the Law, with its historical accompaniments, and especially with its traditional interpretations. Here, too, we can think of him as showing forwardness beyond many of those who were receiving instruction along with him. While yet a young man he seems to have become a member of the Sanhedrim, or assembly of *elders*. For it is recorded of him that he *gave his vote* for the death of Stephen. Where he was during our Lord's ministry we have not the means of knowing. But in the subsequent development of events he very soon appears as a chief actor. It was here that he showed forwardness in Judaism beyond many of his own age among his countrymen, being more exceedingly zealous for the traditions of his fathers. He was zealous beyond his own master, Gamaliel, who, against manifestations of zeal, advised that, if Christianity were not of God, it would come to nought. There was this to be said for Paul, that he had a keen perception of the situation. He saw that Judaism, which he mistakenly but fondly cherished, was threatened at vital points by the forces which were at work in Christianity. He saw that, with its doctrine of a Messiah in heaven and the Holy Spirit from heaven, with the patient bearing of its adherents, and with the progress it was making, it was formidable. Either Judaism must destroy it or it would destroy Judaism. Therefore he was exceedingly zealous beyond many for Judaism.

II. THE CRISIS OF HIS LIFE. 1. *His predestination to apostleship.* "But when it was the good pleasure of God, who separated me, even from my mother's womb." This is the only mention that Paul makes of his mother. We can believe that the kind of mother he had was connected with his separation to apostleship. He was separated from his birth. Being separated so early, there is precluded the supposition of human agency, his own or that of others. The separation was the act of God. 2. *His call to apostleship.* "And called me through his grace." This was on the road to Damascus. It was through no meritorious doing of his own, but evidently through Divine grace. He was engaged at the time in the *persecution of Jesus*. He had a vivid impression of a Jesus who was dead and buried, whom his disciples spoke of as alive, who was so strongly moving their hearts as to make him fear for Judaism. But now, by a supernatural intervention, he got a vivid impression of Jesus as the *Messiah*. In the actual appearance of Jesus the *fact* was given him in a way which, notwithstanding all his prejudices against it, he could not deny that he was risen and living. And making a total surrender, from that moment the authority of Christ was laid on him. 3. *His qualification for apostleship.* "To reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among



the Gentiles." In connection with his call there was given the fact of the Messiahship of Jesus, but there was also needed the expansion of its meaning. So it was the good pleasure of God, not only to give him an outward appearance, but an inward revelation. The revelation of God's Son here is to be identified with the revelation of Jesus Christ in the twelfth verse. It probably succeeded, as it was based on, the appearance of Jesus. It was not a natural excogitation, but a supernatural communication to his mind of the great truths about Christ. It was this, that he might be fitted for preaching Christ among the Gentiles.

III. THE PERIOD FOLLOWING THE CRISIS OF HIS LIFE. "Immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood: neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before me: but I went away into Arabia; and again I returned unto Damascus." So *satisfying* were the communications made to him by God that he needed nothing from man. Immediately (made emphatic by position) he conferred not with flesh and blood; neither went he up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles (as though he needed to get authority or instruction from them); but he went away into Arabia. The retirement is mentioned to show that, during a most important period, he kept away from Jerusalem. His first attempts at Damascus seem to have convinced him of the need of lengthened preparation for his work. In silent communion with God he sought what the other apostles got in a three years' course of training under Christ. He had to adjust himself to the new situation; he had to recast his thoughts. The contents of the gospel, which had been supernaturally communicated to him, had in a natural way to be examined and inwrought with his own thoughts. The facts connected with the earthly manifestation of Christ had to be gone over and assigned their place in his thoughts. If we are to suppose him drawn to the scene of the giving of the Law (as is suggested in the fourth chapter), he would be helped thereby to read the old in the light of the new. He had withal to brace his own soul in the new truth against all contingencies connected with his work. After his retirement he returned to the Christian circle at Damascus, only, however, to be compelled to leave it after a brief experience of preaching.

IV. THE PERIOD OF HIS FIRST VISIT TO JERUSALEM. Four facts to which he attached importance as showing that his independence was not compromised by this visit were these. 1. *He did not visit Jerusalem till three years after his conversion.* "Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem." He was converted at the age of thirty. At that time his powers had been matured. He had been accustomed to look closely into the nature, drift, causes, worth of things. Three years of his application would suffice to achieve his independence as a Christian thinker, so that it could not be disturbed even by Peter. 2. *He visited Jerusalem then to make the acquaintance of Peter.* "To visit Cephas." It was not of purpose that he kept away from Jerusalem. It was simply that, in the satisfying call and communications, he felt no need to draw to the senior apostles. He freely recognized the work done by Peter, and, when the opportunity offered, he was moved to pay him a brotherly visit. Beyond that his visit had not significance. 3. *His visit extended over no more than fifteen days.* "And tarried with him fifteen days." As his object was to visit Peter, he stayed with him. He recalls the precise length of his stay. He had not set that as the limit beforehand. But he had to make a hurried escape from Jerusalem. And he recalls it now as a singular providence, inasmuch as it took away the appearance of his being a pupil of the Apostle Peter. 4. *His visit brought him into contact only with one man of note besides Peter.* "But other of the apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother." James was labouring with Peter in Jerusalem; the other apostles were labouring elsewhere. This James was not of the number of the twelve. The reason for mentioning him is that, though not an apostle (in the strict sense which is necessary for the argument here), he was the Lord's brother. He was brother in the sense of having the same mother as our Lord. The perpetual virginity of Mary is not to be thought of. Our feelings are no more shocked in thinking of James as her son than in thinking of her as the wife of Joseph. The difficulty is that our Lord at the last committed his mother to the care of the Apostle John. But the difficulty to a large extent remains on the supposition of James being only her stepson. Why pass over one who in that relation (whatever he was at the time) had the making of such a man in him? The conclusion to be come to is, not that James was no son of Mary, but that we are left in ignorance of the reason of

his being passed over. *Attestation of the foregoing facts.* "Now touching the things which I write unto you, behold, before God, I lie not." The language approaches to oath-taking. The facts were so important, as affecting his independence as an apostle, that he gives them his most solemn attestation.

V. THE PERIOD FOLLOWING HIS FIRST VISIT TO JERUSALEM. 1. *Unknown by face unto the Churches of Judæa.* "Then I came unto the regions of Syria and Cilicia. And I was still unknown by face unto the Churches of Judæa which were in Christ." So far from being *sent out* by the twelve, the sphere of his labour during this period was far away in Syria and Cilicia. If we are to understand the Churches of Judæa as distinguished from the Church of Jerusalem, it does not exclude visits by Paul to Jerusalem during the period in question. And it appears that there was one visit by Paul during this period, viz. with contributions for the relief of the brethren in Judæa. The reason for its not being mentioned here is that it was aside from his purpose. It was a visit connected with his work in Syria and Cilicia. It did not affect his relations to the twelve; for it was during a time of persecution, when he only came into contact with the elders, and would have to make a speedy departure. It was still true that he was unknown by face unto the Christian communities of Judæa. 2. *What they heard say.* "But they only heard say, He that once persecuted us now preacheth the faith of which he once made havoc; and they glorified God in me." It was only in this way that they had knowledge of Paul. The great condition of salvation is used as an equivalent for the religion of Christ. It shows how largely faith bulked in Paul's preaching. The Churches of Judæa (and they were under the influence of the Church of Jerusalem) ascribed glory to God on account of the marvellous transformation wrought on Paul. It showed the good feeling of the twelve towards Paul, so different from the feeling of the Judaists. And it showed also how these Churches rose above Paul to God.—R. F.

Ver. 1.—*Apostolic authority.* St. Paul opens the Epistle to the Galatians with an unusual assertion of his own authority. Generally he describes himself as "the bond-servant" of Jesus Christ, and addresses his converts with affectionate gentleness. But something almost stern marks the beginning of this Epistle, and indeed characterizes the whole of it; and the writer at the outset sets forth the highest claims of apostolic rank. This was necessary because disloyalty to the authority of St. Paul had been used as one of the strongest encouragements for unfaithfulness to the fundamental principles of Christianity. It is very difficult to know when self-assertion is a duty, and more difficult to perform the duty with modesty. Yet there are occasions—for most of us rare occasions—when the cause of truth and righteousness requires the firm, dignified claim of one's lawful position. This is perfectly consistent with unselfishness and humility if the motive is some interest outside ourselves. Herein is the important point, namely, that the self-assertion is not to be for our own honour, but for the glory of God, or the good of man, or the maintenance of right.

I. THE APOSTOLIC AUTHORITY IS CONFERRED. It does not originate in the man who possesses it. He is "one sent," a messenger, a missionary, an ambassador. As the prophet is the man who "speaks for" God, the Divine spokesman, so the apostle is he who is sent by his Lord, the messenger of Christ. Thus the apostolic authority is very different from that of the philosopher which depends entirely on his own intellectual powers, and that of the religious founder which grows out of the man's own spiritual ideas, and all purely personal authority. It is derived from the authority of Christ. Natural gifts can no more make a man an apostle than they can give a free-lance the right to command a national army.

II. THE APOSTOLIC AUTHORITY IS INDEPENDENT OF HUMAN INFLUENCES. 1. It is not derived from a *human origin*. It is not "of men." No man and no body of men can create an apostle. To attempt such a creation is to put forth forged credentials; it is like the act of a man who engraves his own notes and passes them in currency as though they had been issued by a bank. 2. It is not derived through a *human medium*. It is not "through man." Matthias was thought to be appointed by God since he was chosen by lot after prayer for Divine guidance; but he certainly received his apostleship, such as it was, through men, for the election of him was arranged by the Church (Acts i. 23—26). This was not the case with St. Paul. The highest authority is independent of all ecclesiastical arrangements and of all official management.

III. THE APOSTOLIC AUTHORITY COMES DIRECT FROM CHRIST AND GOD. The sovereign commissions his own ministers. The office derives its high influence from this origin. 1. It is from *God*. Therefore the apostle is divinely inspired. The Church order that he establishes and the doctrinal truth that he preaches have both claims upon our reverence, because they come through him from God. 2. It is also from *Christ*. It is "through" Christ as being received immediately from him, but it is also "through" God, for no distinction is here to be made. Christ, however, is personally concerned. The apostle is a Christian officer. His work is not to serve the general religion of faith in God and providence and natural revelation, but to promote the special faith of the gospel.

IV. THE APOSTOLIC AUTHORITY IS DEPENDENT ON THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST. God is named as "the Father, who raised him from the dead." St. Paul alone of all the apostles received his commission in the first instance from the risen Christ. But the other apostles were also especially endowed and sent forth by Christ after the resurrection (Matt. xxviii. 16—20). Apart from the importance that attaches itself in many ways to the resurrection of Christ as the proof of his victory, the assurance of our future, etc., there is this particular point here of significance that Christ still lives, that the apostle is not merely faithful to a memory, but serves a living Lord, that he is not the successor of Christ, but the servant who carries out the fresh mandates of the living and reigning King.—W. F. A.

Vers. 3, 4.—*Christ's sacrifice for our deliverance.* The salutation is more than a kindly expression of good will; it is a true benediction based on the grand assurance of grace and peace that grows out of a right understanding of the sacrifice of Christ. St. Paul describes the bearings of that wonderful sacrifice in order to give support to his benediction. But it is clear that he does this with great fulness and distinctness for a further purpose. He wishes at the outset to set forth the fundamental principles of that gospel which the Galatians are forsaking for "a different gospel, which is not another gospel." We have here, then, St. Paul's compendium of the gospel which, for force and terseness, will even bear comparison with St. John's—the most perfect of all compendiums of the gospel (John iii. 16). The two do not cover exactly the same ground, for the gospel is so large that no sentence can comprehend even its leading truths, and so many-sided that no two minds can see it in the same light. Consider the main points of the one now before us.

I. CHRIST VOLUNTARILY SACRIFICED HIMSELF. In the passage just referred to St. John tells us how God gave his only begotten Son on our behalf. Now St. Paul reminds us that Christ also freely gave himself. It was of his own will, subject also to the will of his Father, that he lived a life of humiliation. He could have escaped the cross by abandoning his mission. He went right on to death clearly knowing what was before him, able to deliver himself at the last by calling legions of angels to his aid (Matt. xxvi. 53), yet willingly submitting to death. The self-sacrifice of Christ was distinct from suicide in the fact that he did not seek death, and only met it in the course necessary for the carrying out of his life's mission. It is important to bear in mind that the essence of the sacrifice of Christ lies in this conscious, willing surrender of himself. It is not the mere tortures he suffered, nor the bare fact of his death that gives a value to his endurance. If he had died of a natural disease after bearing worse pain he could have made no atonement thereby. The willing "obedience unto death" gives a sacrificial value to his death. 1. This only could be a "satisfaction" to God. 2. This only could be a *claim upon our faith and love*.

II. THE OCCASION OF THE SACRIFICE WAS OUR SINS. We cannot say that God would not have become incarnate if man had not fallen. But if the happy event at Bethlehem would still have taken place, the awful tragedy at Calvary would have been spared. It is not only that the sin of the world directly caused the rejection and killing of Christ; his submission to death was occasioned by sin; it was to save us from the power and curse of sin. 1. Sin alienated us from God and occasioned the need of a *reconciling sacrifice*. 2. Sin cast us into bondage and created the necessity for a *redeeming ransom*.

III. THE OBJECT OF THE SACRIFICE WAS TO DELIVER US FROM THE PRESENT EVIL WORLD. 1. It was not to deliver us from *God*, as false notions of the atonement have

almost suggested, but the very opposite, *i.e.* to deliver us from that which is most opposed to God. 2. It was not primarily to deliver us from *the future evil world*, from the pains and penalties of sin there to be endured. A most degrading view of redemption is that which regards it as having little effect on our life now—as chiefly a means of escape from future suffering. 3. It was essentially deliverance from *the dominion of the evil present*, of our own bad habits, of the corrupt customs of the age.

IV. THE DELIVERANCE THUS EFFECTED WAS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE WILL OF GOD. 1. The *object* was in accordance with the will of God. He was the first to desire the deliverance of his poor lost children. When they are delivered they are brought out of conflict into harmony with his will. 2. The *method* of the deliverance was also in agreement with God's will. It was God's will to send his Son. What Christ did was accepted by God as well-pleasing in his sight. The whole sacrifice of Christ was an obedience and submission to God's will. Herein lay its value (Heb. x. 9, 10). The fact is here declared by St. Paul. He offers no theory to account for it. Theories of the atonement are after-growths of theology, and valuable as some of them may be, they are not of essential importance. The fact is the one ground for our faith.—W. F. A.

Ver. 8.—*The duty of intolerance.* The frightful excesses of unchristian intolerance that disgrace the history of the Church have led to a revulsion of feeling in which indifference is honoured with the name of charity. The advocate of any kind of intolerance is regarded with aversion as a bigot and a persecutor. But the duty of intolerance at the right and necessary time needs to be more clearly discerned.

I. THE GROUNDS OF THE DUTY OF INTOLERANCE. 1. *The exclusive claims of the gospel.* There is but one gospel; a rival is a counterfeit. There is room for but one; a rival is a usurper. For: (1) The gospel of Christ is a declaration of facts, and facts once accomplished cannot vary; it is a revelation of truth, and truth is intolerant of error; the highest truth, too, is one. (2) The gospel of Christ is the most perfect satisfaction of our needs. Another gospel could not be a better one, for this is all we want. Nothing can be better than forgiveness and eternal life through faith in Christ. (3) The gospel of Christ is the only possible gospel. God would not sacrifice his Son to death if redemption were to be obtained at a less cost. The gospel is the expression of the love and will of God. As such it is the eternal voice of an immutable Being. 2. *The honour of Christ.* He who proposes another gospel than that of Christ crucified and Christ risen, directly insults the Name of our Lord. Loyalty to Christ compels intolerance for all enmity to him. That is no true Christian charity which has no regard for the rights of the Lord, who should have the first claim upon our love. 3. *The good of men.* The gospel offers the highest blessings to men in the greatest need. It is the one anchor of hope to the despairing, the one comfort to the miserable, the one salvation for the lost. If it be true, we cannot permit so precious a boon to be lost through the usurpation of a false gospel. The charity that would do this is like that which would allow multitudes of sick people to perish through the maltreatment of a quack, rather than be so unkind to him as to show the least intolerance of his delusions.

II. THE LIMITS OF THE DUTY OF INTOLERANCE. 1. *The rights of the gospel, not the claims of the preacher.* St. Paul has just been asserting his claims. Here, however, he entirely subordinates them to his message. Intolerance commonly springs from personal jealousy or party spirit, and therefore it is generally so evil a thing. We are not to be intolerant for ourselves, only for the truth. The truth is infinitely more important than the teacher. The rank, the character, the ability of the man should count for nothing if he is unfaithful to the Christian truth. 2. *The gospel itself, not minor accessories.* (1) Great liberty must be left in regard to details, both because these often lie on debatable ground and because they are less important than charity. There is a point beyond which more harm will be done in disturbing the peace of the Church and wounding our fellow-Christians than good in establishing minor truths against all opposition. (2) Account also must be taken of varying views of the gospel. Even the apostles did not state it in the same words; Peter and Paul, John and James thus vary, though with unbroken loyalty to the central truth as it is in Jesus. Language, habits of thought, aspects of truth from different standpoints necessarily present great variety. Let us see that we do not condemn a man for his clothes.

3. *Spiritual intolerance, not physical persecution.* St. Paul pronounces a curse on the enemy of the gospel. But he does not draw the sword upon him. He leaves him with God. There if he have erred, he will be rightly judged. We have no excuse, then, for the exercise of violence against those whom we regard as the enemies of Christ, but only for bold testimony against their errors—leaving all else in the hands of God.

In conclusion, see that (1) we receive the one true gospel, and (2) faithfully declare it, and (3) firmly resist manifest perversions of it.—W. F. A.

Vers. 15, 16.—*The destiny, call, and mission of St. Paul.* I. **THE DESTINY.** St. Paul feels that from his birth he was set apart for the great apostolic work of his later years. 1. *There is a destiny in every life.* God has his purpose of calling us into being. 2. This destiny is *determined for us*, not by us. We do not choose the circumstances in which we are born, nor our own gifts and dispositions. We can with difficulty escape from our surroundings, and we can never escape from ourselves. Whether a man will see the light as a prince in a palace, or as a beggar under a hedge, is entirely beyond his control, and it is equally impossible for him to determine whether he will have the genius of Newton or the inanity of an idiot. Yet how largely do these differences effect a man's necessary future! 3. We may be long *unconscious* of our destiny. St. Paul never dreamed of his while he sat at the feet of Gamaliel nor while he was harrying the Christians. It is a secret of providence gradually revealed. 4. It is our duty to *work out our destiny* by voluntary obedience to the will of God revealed in it when once it is revealed to us. To resist it is to kick against the pricks. We can do this, for, though set apart for a work, we may refuse to follow it by our free-will, but at our great cost.

II. **THE CALL.** In the Acts of the Apostles the external details of the call of St. Paul are described; here he gives us only the internal experience. He only could give this, and this was the really important thing. The flashing light, the arrested journey, the audible voice, the blindness, were all accessories. The one important thing was the inward voice that brought conviction to the heart of the man. Every apostle needed a call from Christ to constitute him such. But every Christian has some Divine call. We have not the miracle to convey the call, and we do not want it. By the manifest claims that present themselves to us, by the discovery of our own powers and opportunities of service, by the promptings of our conscience, Christ calls us to our life's work. To see a work for Christ needing to be done, and to be able to do it, is a providential call to undertake it. It is a disastrous superstition that keeps us back while we wait for a more articulate voice. God's will is manifest in the indication of what is right. To know God's will is to be called to his service.

III. **THE MISSION.** 1. *Its object.* The revelation of Christ. St. Paul was to make Christ known. He was not to spread his own religious notions, but only to reveal Christ. He was not to teach a doctrinal Christianity so much as to show Christ himself. This was to be done, not only by his words, but also by his life. He was so to live Christ that men should see Christ in him. Thus Christ was to be revealed in him. Before he could preach Christ in words he must have the revelation of Christ in his own person. If we do not reveal Christ by our lives, all our words will count for little, being belied by our glaringly inconsistent conduct. If we act like Christ, the silent influence of our living will be the most clear and powerful setting forth of Christ. 2. *The scope of the mission.* St. Paul was to preach Christ among the Gentiles. His own special gospel was the message that God's grace in Christ extended to the whole world. It was not for his own sake nor even for the glory of Christ alone that he was called to his great mission. The highest missions are unselfish and beneficent. We are all called in some way to minister to others. We can do it in no way better than by revealing Christ to them in our actions as well as in our words.—W. F. A.

Ver. 24.—*God glorified in man.* I. **THE CHURCH SHOULD HEARTILY WELCOME NEW CONVERTS.** St. Paul proves conclusively that he obtained neither his Christian faith nor his apostleship from the Church at Jerusalem. But in doing so he gives little ground for the view of those who hold that he was in direct antagonism to that Church. On the contrary, he distinctly asserts that the Jewish Christians welcomed him and praised God for his conversion. This was an act of large-hearted confidence. 1. It

shows a genuine Christian spirit to honour ungrudgingly a spiritual work in which we have taken no part. There is always a temptation to slight such work and to regard the fruits of it with suspicion. 2. The beauty of Christian charity is also seen in the warm welcome of one who had been an enemy. The persecutor preaches what he had opposed. That is enough for the Church at Jerusalem. If we had more faith in such conversions we should encourage them more readily. 3. The breadth of this charity is still further noticeable in readiness to welcome as a brother a man whose views and habits differ from our own. From the first St. Paul's Christianity must have borne a different colour from that of St. James. But the common faith in Christ united them.

II. THE GLORY OF CHRISTIAN GRACES IS DUE TO GOD. They are "graces" and gifts, not attainments which a man acquires for himself. The wonderful change of the zealous persecutor of Christianity into the equally zealous preacher is wholly attributed to God. It is not St. Paul who is glorified by the Church at Jerusalem. We make the mistake of unduly praising the character of a saint without recognizing sufficiently the source of his saintliness, or we make the equally foolish error of honouring the preacher for the fruit of teaching which would never have been reaped but for the Divine power of which the man was only the conductor.

III. GOD'S GLOBE IS NOWHERE SHOWN MORE RICHLY THAN IN THE WORK OF CHRISTIAN GRACE. It flashes from the face of nature, glowing in the broad heavens, smiling on the beautiful earth. It breaks out through the course of history in grand indications of providential justice and mercy. It gleams in wonderful truths revealed to the eyes of seers who speak it forth in articulate prophecy. Above all, it shines most brightly in the life and person of Christ. But as Christ is full of grace and truth, every Christian has some measure of the same blessings, and according to his measure manifests the glory of them. God may be glorified in a man. Man often dishonours God. He may also reveal God's glory. Just as the brightness of the sun is not seen in its beauty till it is reflected from earth, or sea, or sky, the glory of God must be shown on some object. Shining on the face of a Christian, it is revealed. It is well to recognize this. Our religion is too selfish, and therefore it is too gloomy. We often pray when we should be praising. We seek good things for ourselves unceasingly when we should be losing ourselves in the contemplation of the glory of God. We cannot add to that glory; yet we may and should glorify God by joyously declaring the works of his grace.—W. F. A.

## EXPOSITION.

### CHAPTER II.

In the preceding chapter, St. Paul has been concerned to make clear the position that neither the gospel which he preached nor the commission which he held was derived from the older apostles; the history of the first years of his ministry showed this. The apostle is now addressing himself to a different subject; he wishes to show that his gospel, though not derived from the older apostles, had, however, while recognized as standing on an independent footing, received the sanction of their approval. This being his object, he had no occasion to refer in any way to visits which he may have made to Jerusalem between the one mentioned in ch. i. 18 and the one here referred to. The tenor of his argument, therefore, so far, does not of itself

determine whether this visit was either the one mentioned in Acts xi. 30; xii. 25, or the one described in Acts xv., or possibly some other not recorded. That, however, it was in reality that of Acts xv. rather than that of Acts xi., xii., hardly admits of a doubt, if we compare the circumstances here related with those which marked the condition of Church affairs at Jerusalem on the two occasions severally as described by St. Luke. The imprisonment of St. Peter and the whole state of distress presented to us in Acts xii. make it well-nigh inconceivable that any such incidents should have then occurred as St. Paul here speaks of; while, on the other hand, the question agitated on the occasion described in Acts xv. corresponds precisely in character with the mutual relations here described as subsisting between St. Paul and the be-

hevers of the circumcision with their leaders. What St. Paul here relates fits in very naturally into the circumstances related in Acts xv., though the situation is looked at from different points of view. "I went up again," he says; not, "I went up a second time." (For a more complete discussion of this question, see Conybeare and Howson, vol. i., appendix on 'The Chronology of Gal. ii.:' Bishop Lightfoot, additional notes after Gal. ii. 10; and Dean Howson in 'Speaker's Commentary,' New Testament, vol. iii. p. 510.)

The chapter falls into two sections. Of these, viewed in their leading purport, the first (vers. 1—10) exhibits the recognition formally accorded to St. Paul's gospel and work by the highest authorities of the Church of the circumcision; the second (vers. 11—21) displays in a very striking light the independence and co-ordinateness of his position when standing face to face with the very chiefest of the apostles. But while these seem to be their leading objects, we find the apostle weaving in, after his manner, trenchant references to other matters relevant to the main purpose of the Epistle, and even enlarging upon them.

Ver. 1.—Then fourteen years after (*ἔπειτα διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν*); then after a space of fourteen years. Reckoned from when? Many think from the visit mentioned in ch. i. 18; others, from the time of his conversion. At first sight, the former seems the more obvious view; but fuller consideration determines for the latter. The apostle lays stress upon the interval being so long; as if it were, "It was not less than fourteen years after, that a conference took place between me and the older apostles relative to the gospel which I preach; during all which time I was preaching it on a footing independent of them." There appears no other motive than this for his specifying the number of years. This being so, the specification would naturally at once include the whole period during which he had been so engaged, and not leave it to the reader to add the two or three years which had elapsed before the visit mentioned ch. i. 18. I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas (*πάλιν ἀνέβην εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα μετὰ Βαρνάβαν*). It is questionable whether this "again" covers the clause "with Barnabas," or not. We assume with confidence that this visit to Jerusalem is the one described in Acts xv. We know, therefore, that there had been at least one journey to Jerusalem previously taken by

St. Paul in conjunction with Barnabas, viz. that of Acts xi., xii. We know also that he had been in close association with Barnabas in that first visit to Jerusalem mentioned above in ch. i. 18 (comp. Acts ix. 27); it is very possible that they had then come up in company. Now, so affecting was the interest for St. Paul with which both these visits were fraught, the one on his own account, the other on account of the distress then suffered by the Church, that we may feel certain that, in the careful review he is now taking of the past, both of them would most vividly recur to his recollection; so vividly that it is quite conceivable that he was writing to the Galatians of his "going again to Jerusalem with Barnabas," with allusion to those two former visits, though he has not before named Barnabas's name in connection with that one which alone he has spoken of. If this view is not admitted, we must suppose a comma present after "Jerusalem." And took Titus with me also; or rather, perhaps, and took in our company also Titus (*συμπαράλαβὸν καὶ Τίτον*). The *ὄν* in *συμπαράλαβὸν* seems to allude to the others whom Paul and Barnabas, as mentioned in Acts xv. 2, took with them on that journey. So also in Acts xiii. 25 and xv. 37; for in these two passages we are not to suppose that John Mark is named as being their sole companion, but rather that he is specified only in preparation for what has afterwards to be told concerning him. In Acts xv. 39 *παράλαβόντα* without the *ὄν* simply indicates that Mark was with Barnabas, without reference to others who may or may not have been with them. The singular number of the participle, *συμπαράλαβὸν*, appears to indicate a certain footing of independent action which St. Paul had by this time gained for himself, even when viewed in relation to Barnabas: Paul himself attached Titus to the company. At any rate, it needs to be noted that St. Paul speaks of himself as simply "going up with Barnabas," not as "taking Barnabas with him;" for it would be a misconception alike of the import of the words before us, and of the relative position as yet outwardly obtaining in public action between the two men, to think of Paul as the leader and chief organizer of the accompanying party and of Barnabas as subordinate to him. The higher apostolate of Paul was at that time only in process of manifestation, not as yet fully realized in the Church (see Introduction, Dissertation II.). Nothing is known of the antecedents of Titus, save that he was a "Greek" (ver. 3), both his parents apparently being Gentiles, and that St. Paul, in designating him in the Epistle addressed to him (i. 4), as his "true child" (*γνήσιον τέκνον*), seems to mark him

out as a convert of his own; while the manner in which he is here named to the Galatians suggests the surmise that he was no stranger to themselves. The apostle may be supposed to have secured his being appointed by the Antiochian Church to be one of the deputation to Jerusalem, both that he might be a representative of the Church of the uncircumcision, and on account of his great moral fitness to take part in the delicate and critical business then on foot. About the time the apostle wrote this letter to the Galatians, he was much employed by him, being entrusted with missions, which, like that earlier one, required especial firmness and discretion tempered with truly Christian sentiment (cf. 2 Cor. ii. 13; vii. 6, 13—15; viii. 16, 22; xii. 18. See Mr. Phillott's article on "Titus" in Smith's 'Dictionary of the Bible').

Ver. 2.—And I went up by revelation; or, and I went up in accordance with a revelation (*ἀνέβην δὲ κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν*). The form of sentence in the Greek is similar to that (e.g.) in John xxi. 1; Rom. iii. 22; Jas. i. 6: a word of the preceding context is taken up afresh for the purpose of being qualified or explained. Revelations were frequently made to the apostle, both to communicate important truths (Eph. iii. 3) and to direct or encourage his proceedings. They appear to have been made in different ways: as, through dreams or visions (Acts xvi. 9, 10; xviii. 9; xxii. 18—21; xxvii. 23); through prophets (Acts xiii. 2; xxi. 11); often, no doubt, through a strong impulse borne in upon his spirit, prompting him to, or debarring him from, some particular line of conduct (Acts xvi. 6, 7). The journey now in question being that recorded by St. Luke (Acts xv., *init.*), we have to observe that St. Luke ascribes his going to a decision come to by the brethren at Antioch (Acts xv. 2). But there is no discrepancy here. It is an obvious supposition, that the apostle, taking into consideration, perhaps, the prejudice entertained against him at Jerusalem, not only, as Christ had himself intimated to him, by the unbelieving Jews (Acts xxii. 18), but, as James later on confessed, by even the members of the Church itself (Acts xxi. 21; comp. on both points, Rom. xvi. 31), felt at first some hesitation in accepting the commission; was ho by going likely to forward their views?—but that his hesitation was overruled by Christ himself, who in some way revealed to him that it was his will that he should go. Similarly, when visiting Jerusalem for the first time after his conversion, his hasty departure from the city is attributed by St. Luke to the care of the disciples for his safety (Acts ix. 25); whereas St. Paul, in his speech from the stairs, ascribes it to a "trance," in which the

Lord appearing to him bade him to depart thence without delay (Acts xxii. 17, 21). The two accounts in each instance are mutually supplementary, the one viewing the case historically from the outside, the other as an autobiographical reminiscence from within. The apostle's reason for thus pointedly mentioning the especial direction under which he took this journey, had evidently reference to its being the design of Christ, that thereby, together with other objects to be subserved by it, the doctrine and ministerial work of Paul should be sealed with the recognition of his first apostles and of his earliest Church—a result of prime necessity for the prosperous development of the whole Church; more important, perhaps, than even its more ostensible result as described by St. Luke. And communicated unto them (*καὶ ἀνέθεμην αὐτοῖς*); and I laid before them. The verb occurs in the New Testament besides only in Acts xxv. 14, where it means simply giving the king an account of Paul's case with the view apparently of getting his opinion upon it. In the present case St. Paul stated his doctrine to the persons referred to, with the view likewise of seeing what they would say; but certainly not with any intention of having it modified by their suggestions (cf. the use of *ἀνέθετο* in 2 Macc. iii. 9, which presents a curiously similar conjunction of particulars). By *them*, i.e. *those there*, are obviously meant, not the inhabitants in general, but the Christians of the place, though not immediately before mentioned. We have the like use of the pronoun in Acts xx. 2; 2 Cor. ii. 13. That gospel which I preach (*τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ κηρύσσω*). The present tense of the verb points to the whole period of his ministry up to the time at which he was writing. It is implied that his teaching had been the same all along. Elsewhere he styles it "my gospel" (Rom. ii. 16; xvi. 25; 2 Tim. ii. 8). Among the Gentiles (*ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι*); alluding to the complexion of his doctrine as bearing upon the acceptance of Gentiles before God simply upon their faith in Christ (of. Eph. iii. 1, 6, 8). But privately (*κατ' ἴδιον δέ*). The phrase, *κατ' ἴδιον*, occurs sixteen times besides in the New Testament, always in the sense of *privately, apart* (of. e.g. Mark iv. 34; vi. 31, 32; vii. 33; ix. 2, 23). To them which were of reputation (*τοῖς δοκοῦσι*); *them who were of repute*; men eminent in repute and position. The phrase, *οἱ δοκοῦντες*, was used in this sense both in classical Greek and in the later "common dialect" (Eurip., 'Hec.' 294; 'Heracl.' 897; 'Troad.' 617; 'Herodion,' vi. 1). There is no reason to suppose that there is any tone of disparagement in the phrase, as if the persons spoken of "seemed" to be more than they really were.



The apostle repeats this participle thrice in the following context—once (ver. 6), as here, absolutely; and twice (vers. 6, 9) with an infinitive. This harping upon *δοκούντες* suggests a surmise that St. Paul's gainsayers in Galatia had been fond of using the expression to designate the persons referred to in disparagement of himself as a man comparatively of no mark. Compare the almost mocking reiteration of "superlatively chief apostles," in 2 Cor. xi. 5 and xii. 11, referring to "pseudo-apostles." In order to determine who were the persons the apostle thus distinguishes, we naturally refer to St. Luke's account of the circumstances. St. Luke, then, seems to speak of three several meetings held on this occasion. The first (in ver. 4) when Paul and Barnabas, with their fellow-deputies, were "received by the Church and the apostles and the elders;" when "they [Paul and Barnabas] declared what great things God had done in co-operation with them." It cannot have been then that St. Paul gave this exposition of his gospel. But certain of the Pharisees who had joined the Church began loudly to insist upon the necessity of Gentile converts being circumcised and conforming to the Law. Whether it was at this first meeting itself that this took place, or subsequently, at all events "the apostles and the elders" judged it to be undesirable that the matter should be further discussed in so large an assemblage of the circumcision, before, in the calmer atmosphere of a private conference, they had themselves considered what course it would be best to adopt. Accordingly, St. Luke tells us (ver. 6), "the apostles and the elders came together to see about this matter." "After much discussion had taken place," which upon a question so closely touching the Jew's national sensibilities must even in this more select body have been fraught with no ordinary excitement, the rising passions of controversy were stilled by Peter; he recalled the story of Cornelius, and founding thereupon, he warned his hearers, that by imposing, as many perhaps even of those then present were wishful to do, the intolerable yoke of Mosaism upon the neck of the Gentile disciples, they ran the risk of contravening and provoking God; for after all (he significantly reminded them), their own hope of salvation, as well as the hope of Gentile believers, was that they would be saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus. Thereupon the "whole company" (*πλήθος*, in ver. 12, is used by St. Luke in the same way as in his Gospel (xxiii. 1) when speaking of the Sanhedrin; the eldership of the very large Church of Jerusalem must of itself, without the doubtful addition of elders from Judæan towns, have formed a considerable body) listened

with hushed and respectful attention to Paul and Barnabas, while they gave a detailed account of what great signs and wonders God had wrought amongst the Gentiles through them. After this, upon James's proposition, "the apostles and the elders" came to the resolution that, in conjunction with the whole Church, they would choose and depute certain members of their community to convey to the Gentile brethren a certain letter, which very probably (of. as to diction, vers. 17, 23, with Jas. ii. 7; i. 1) James himself, as presiding in their meeting, with the concurrence of the apostles and the elders, drew up. The words, "with the whole Church," coming in here for the first time since ver. 4, indicate a third meeting, in which the general body of believers was prevailed upon to concur in the measures before agreed upon in the second more private meeting. According to the more approved reading of ver. 23 (omitting the *καὶ* before *ἀπέλαφον*), the letter issues from "the apostles and the elder brethren" alone, as these also were the persons with whom (ver. 2) the deputation from Antioch had been sent to confer. Now, upon the review of all the circumstances as now stated, the second of these three meetings would seem to have presented just such an opportunity as would suit the design which St. Paul had formed, of expounding his teaching to the leading spirits in Jerusalem. When he and Barnabas were relating those signs and wonders by which the seal of Divine sanction had been put upon their ministry among the Gentiles, it was natural that Paul, here no doubt, as generally "the chief speaker," should tell their hearers with the utmost distinctness what that teaching was which Heaven had thus ratified; most especially that part of it which was so directly relevant to the practical question which was then in debate, and which is so emphatically set forth in the Epistles to the Galatians and the Romans—to wit, that all who believe in Christ are justified and have full peace and sonship with God without any works of Mosaic ceremonialism. This was precisely "the gospel" which here (ver. 2) he speaks of as "preached by him among the Gentiles." "The apostles and the elders" answer perfectly to the description of *οἱ δοκούντες*. For there is no reason for supposing that the *οἱ δοκούντες* of vers. 2 and 6, or the *οἱ δοκούντες εἶναι τ.* of ver. 6, represent exactly the same persons as the *οἱ δοκούντες στέλοι εἶναι* of ver. 9. These last are to be conceived of rather as representative of those larger bodies of men recited in the former three references—"James" representing the elders (for the present writer makes no question but that this James "the Lord's brother" was the presiding officer or Bishop of the

Church of Jerusalem, and not one of the twelve apostles), and "Cephas and John" representing the twelve, who may be believed to have been all of them at Jerusalem at this time, though these two, certainly the leading ones, are the only ones whose names there happened to be occasion for specifying. Lest by any means I should run, or had run, in vain (*μή πως εἰς κενὸν τρέχω ἢ ἔδραμον*). The comparison of 1 Thess. iii. 5 (*μή πως ἐπέλασεν ὑμᾶς ὁ πειράζων, καὶ εἰς κενὸν γένηται ὁ κόπος ἡμῶν*) shows that *τρέχω* is the subjunctive. The present tense, *lest I should be running*, points to the time of which he is writing and the time onward therefrom. In classical Greek it would have been *τρέχοιμι*. The use of the verb *τρέχω*, "run," "rush on," a favourite word with the apostle, well characterizes the zealous forward-speeding manner of his activity. "In vain;" to an empty result; for no good. He intimates that there had been a danger lest the fruits of his earnest work among the Gentiles, might through some cause get wrecked. That this is what he means is clear from 1 Thess. iii. 5 just cited; and not that there had been any fear lest he might himself have been somehow mistaking his way; most especially, not lest he had been at all mistaken in the doctrine which he taught, a thing which he does not for one moment imagine. His work *would* have been in danger of being spoilt if the Gentile Churches as planted by himself had been disowned or discountenanced by the mother Church, or if they had got split up into factious parties by the intervention, e.g. of persons coming "from James," telling them that they were not in a state of salvation. To guard against this danger, he was led by Christ himself to seek a formal recognition of his doctrine by the apostles and the elders of the Jerusalemite Church, and through them by that Church itself. As the rank-and-file of the Jewish believers at Jerusalem were even bigotedly attached to the Mosaic Law, and also regarded St. Paul himself with great suspicion, he might very easily have failed of gaining the recognition he required, if he had at once brought the matter before the general body. If their spiritual leaders had not first come forward in the cause of truth, it was but too probable that some fanatical Mosaists would have gained the ear of the multitude, and hurried them away in a course of headlong opposition to Paul and his teaching, from which it might have been very difficult afterwards to recall them.

Ver. 3.—But (*ἀλλ'*); and yet. "Though I explicitly stated to the leading men in the Church of Jerusalem what I taught respecting the relation of Gentile converts to circumcision and the Mosaic Law, yet in the end they, by their support, enabled us to

withstand the pressure which was for a while applied for getting Titus circumcised." Neither Titus, who was with me; being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised (*οὐδὲ Τίτος ὁ σὺν ἐμοί, Ἕλλην ὃν ἠγαγκάσθη περιτεμθῆναι*); not even was Titus who was with me, being a Greek, compelled to be circumcised. This, St. Paul intimates, was a crucial case. Titus was a Gentile pure; not (like Timothy) having one parent of Jewish extraction and therefore capable of being identified with the Jewish people, but Gentile-born of both parents. The clause, "who was with me," after ver. 1, was quite unnecessary for mere definition; in fact, it is not added for definition, but to mark the close association with an uncircumcised Gentile which the apostle openly displayed at Jerusalem. He took him with him, we may suppose, when he came before the Church at its public assemblies; when he appeared before the select meeting of the apostles and elders; when he joined the brethren in the agapæ and the Lord's Supper—occasions of fraternal communion, in which the presence of a "dog," "an uncircumcised Greek," would be tenfold obnoxious. We cannot, by the way, but marvel at St. Paul's great courage in thus acting. Not only was this paraded fellowship with Titus sure to give deep offence to the vast majority of his Christian brethren, but it might also well expose him to serious personal risks among the highly inflammable populace of the city. At Jerusalem his "soul was among lions." The two clauses, "who was with me, being a Greek," illustrate the "not even." Openly displayed as was Titus's companionship with St. Paul before the eyes of all the Jews, both believers and unbelievers, and Gentile as he was known to be, yet not even in his case was circumcision persistently insisted upon. The aorist tense of *ἠγαγκάσθη* is significant of the ultimate result; it implies that an attempt was made to get Titus to submit to the rite, but failed. We must observe that St. Paul does not write, "I was not compelled to circumcise Titus," but "Titus was not compelled to be circumcised." This appears to make a material difference. By putting it as he has done, the apostle intimates that it was to Titus himself that the pressure was applied. Titus was plied, we may suppose, with theological argument, with appeals to his brotherly sympathies, with appeals to his prudent care for public peace, with threats of social and religious excommunication, and with stern, indignant remonstrance. But sustained, as he all through knew himself to be, by at least St. Paul, if not also by his fellow-deputies, he through it all maintained his firm stand upon his liberty. The "we" of the *εἰς-μεν* in ver. 5,

no doubt, includes at least Titus. The question, however, arises—Who were they that for a while endeavoured to force circumcision upon Titus? The converts from the sect of the Pharisees, mentioned by St. Luke (Acts xv. 5), are naturally the first to occur to our minds. But the moulding of the sentence in the next verse discountenances this solution. We cannot help identifying the “false brethren” there spoken of with just those very Pharisean converts—men who had simply thrown the cloak of professed Christian discipleship over the old Pharisean legalism still wholly clung to. But if we suppose this, we cannot imagine that the writer would have said that Titus was not compelled to be circumcised “by reason of those false brethren,” if these had been the very persons alluded to as having tried to compel him. It is more probable that the persons alluded to were certain influential members of the Jewish Church, with a strong body, perhaps, of the elders of that Church, having possibly the concurrence even of James and of Cephas. James and the elders, on a later occasion (Acts xxi. 18—26), urged Paul himself to undertake the performance of certain Mosaical observances, with the view of conciliating the believers of Jerusalem. It is, therefore, quite supposable, at this earlier and as yet immature stage in the development of the practical application of the evangelical doctrine, that Titus was now being dealt with in a somewhat similar manner. But whoever they were that were doing it, it is plain that, in effect, they were working towards the same practical result as the most eager of the Mosaist legalists, only by a different mode of approach. Titus in particular was fastened upon for this assault, apparently because St. Paul had brought him with him as a crucial instance whereupon to try the general question.

Ver. 4.—And that because of false brethren unawares brought in (διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους); and that because of the false brethren without warrant brought in. The conjunction δὲ often is not adversative, but only introduces a fresh thought of a qualifying or explanatory character (comp. ἀέθην δὲ and κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ of ver. 2). The rendering of our English Version represents the connection with the preceding sentence quite correctly. The designation, “false brethren,” after the analogy of “false apostles,” “false prophets” (ψευδαπόστολοι, ψευδοπροφήται, 2 Cor. xi. 13; 2 Pet. ii. 1), were those who were not really brethren in Christ, but had superinduced the profession of such over a state of mind radically incompatible with it; not “children of God through faith in Christ Jesus,” but only

simulating faith in Christ; outwardly “baptized into Christ,” but not inwardly, and therefore not really. The loud demand which those false brethren were making, that all Gentile converts should be circumcised, was distinctly rested by them upon the principle that otherwise those converts were not qualified for sonship in God’s family or for admission to Church fellowship with, at any rate, the believing circumcision. This demand of theirs, made upon this pernicious principle, it was that had raised the present controversy, and had brought Paul and his fellow-deputies to Jerusalem. If, under such circumstances, Titus, with St. Paul’s concurrence, had consented to be circumcised, then, whatever the motive of his consenting, it would have seemed to those false brethren, and not to them only, but indeed to the Church at large, that all had agreed in recognizing the soundness of that principle of theirs that circumcision was indispensable for perfect Divine acceptance. This consideration, we may believe, Titus and St. Paul now urged upon those who, not themselves alleging that principle, nor even allowing it to be true, yet, on other grounds, were recommending and pressing for Titus’s circumcision. And the argument prevailed with them. They withdrew that pressure of theirs, and consented to leave Titus to stand there before the Church and the world, a claimant of full admission to all Christian fellowship while still in uncircumcision. It was those false brethren themselves, then, that made it impossible at the present juncture that those who held fast to the truth of the gospel should accept counsels of compromise or conciliation. In matters of indifference (ἀδιάφορα) there is a time for conciliation—this no one could ever be more ready to see and act upon than St. Paul; but there is also a time for the unbending assertion of truth, and the clamours of the false brethren made the present to be one of the latter kind. In that particular juncture of Church development, the doctrine itself of the absolute justification of men through faith in Christ was at stake. If Titus was not qualified for Christian fellowship by simply his faith in Christ, then neither was he qualified for acceptance with God by simply his faith. Without warrant brought in. In the compound verbal παρεισάκτους, the preposition παρὰ appears to point, not so much to the manner in which they had been brought in, as e.g. stealthily, craftily, as to the circumstance that they had no business to be brought in at all; they were an alien brood. The Greek glossologists, Hesychius, Photius, and Suidas, render it ἀλλότριος, i.e. alien. In 2 Pet. i. 1, παρεισάξουσιν αἰρέσεις ἀπωλείας,

reference is made to the alien character of the teaching spoken of. The apostle's feeling is that men who do not accept the truth that through faith in Christ we are justified, and through faith only, have no proper place in the Church of Christ (comp. ch. v. 4, 5). If the question be asked—Who brought them in? the parable of the tares suggests the answer—The devil (comp. 2 Cor. xi. 15; ii. 11). Who came in privily (*οἱτινες παρεισήλθον*); a set of men who without warrant came in. The preposition *παρὰ* in the verb has the same force as it has in *παρεισιδεῖσθαι*. So also in *παρεισέδυσαν* (Jude 4). To spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus (*κατασκοπήσαι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῶν ἣν ἔχομεν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*); to spy out that liberty of ours which, etc. These men had come into the Church prepared to detect and to regard with the keenest dislike anything, either in doctrine or in Church action, which would infringe upon their own legalism, and to wage war upon it. For this notion of hostile intent is strongly suggested by the verb "to spy out" (cf. 2 Kings x. 3; 1 Chron. xix. 3; and *κατασκοπεῦσαι* in Josh. ii. 2). The infinitive (of purpose), viewed in reference to the men themselves, can be understood only of their disposedness to make this use of their membership; for they can hardly be supposed to have entered into the Church for that definite object; but the apostle views them as emissaries of the great enemy; Satan's design thus to wage war with our gospel liberty (comp. 2 Cor. xi. 13, 15) is by a bold figure ascribed in this infinitive to his instruments. This liberty means the whole spirit of freedom which faith in Christ imparts to the Christian, including, for one thing, his emancipation from the yoke of ceremonialism, but containing also more. That they might bring us into bondage (*ἵνα ἡμῶς καταδουλώσωσιν* [*Receptus, καταδουλώσονται*]). The reading of six of the uncial manuscripts is *καταδουλώσονται*; of three, *-σωσιν*; of one, *-σονται*. The variation in the mood of the verb is immaterial; but for the construction of *ἵνα* (of purpose) with an indicative, though strange to the eye of the student of classical Greek, is not foreign to the writers of the New Testament; but the variation in the voice affects the sense. *καταδουλώσονται* would mean "bring into bondage to themselves," which most probably is not the writer's meaning; he apparently means rather, "deprive us of our liberty by enslaving us to the Law" (cf. ch. iv. 25; v. 1). The simple verb *δουλώω*, occurs repeatedly; the compound *καταδουλώω* here and in 2 Cor. xi. 20, intensifies the sense: *degrade us into slavery*.

Ver. 5.—To whom we gave place by subjection, not for an hour (*οἷς οὐδὲ πρὸς*

*ὥραν ἔταμεν*). To whom; i.e. to the false brethren; not the persons immediately referred to in ver. 3 as seeking to compel Titus to be circumcised. These last used advice and persuasion; the false brethren demanded with clamour (*δεδί*, Acts xv. 5). The phrase rendered for an hour occurs also John v. 35; 2 Cor. vii. 8; Philem. 15. There seems to be an underlying allusion to those occasions on which the apostle did, as he says, "to the Jews become as a Jew, to the weak, weak" (1 Cor. ix. 20, 22); but this he would not do when dealing with false brethren, whose aim was in effect to turn gospel freedom into legal slavery. We; I, Barnabas, Titus. The words *οἷς οὐδὲ* most certainly belong to the original text. Not merely does only one uncial manuscript omit them, but their omission would leave behind a sentence self-convicted of absurdity. For it would run thus: "But because of the false brethren without warrant brought in, a set of men who without warrant came in to spy out our liberty, that they might degrade us into slavery, we yielded for a season with subjection, that the truth of the gospel might lastingly abide with you;"—yielded, i.e. by circumcising Titus; for this is what this reading most probably supposes St. Paul to have done. In this sentence the vituperative description of the false brethren, so extended and so intensely emphatic, instead of being an implied argument in favour of the course of action which the apostle states he adopted, namely, concession to those men, both lacks all motive for its introduction here, and works wholly in favour of the opposite course, of resistance to their wishes. The only suitable and logical description of those for whose sake the concession would have been made would have been that they were brethren meaning well, but weak in the faith, who should, by concession for a season, be won over to more perfect accord with the gospel. (On this reading, see Alford, and the fuller discussion of it in Bishop Lightfoot, pp. 121—123.) By subjection (*τῇ ὑποταγῇ*): in the way of subjection. As *ὑποταγή* in the other passages in which it occurs means the habit or spirit of subjection, and never an act of submission (cf. 2 Cor. ix. 13; 1 Tim. ii. 11; iii. 4), it probably denotes here subjection of spirit to those who were so authoritatively laying upon us their injunctions. He might give way in a point of this kind in a spirit of brotherly concession; but he would bow to no man's imperative injunction. The article before *ὑποταγῇ* is the article before an abstract noun, as in *τῆς ἀγάπης* (ch. v. 13); *τῇ ἐλαφρίᾳ* (2 Cor. i. 17). That the truth of the gospel (*ἵνα ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*). The truth, the sure unadulterated doctrine,

which is embodied in the gospel, and is its very hinge and substance. The same phrase is found in Col. i. 5. The "truth" is that enunciated in ver. 16, and that it is the very essence of the gospel is declared Rom. i. 17. The refusal of Church fellowship to a believer of this gospel except he were circumcised, by just inference vitiated and, indeed, nullified the truth that faith in Christ is the sole and sufficient ground of justification. Might continue with you (*διαμένω πρὸς ὑμᾶς*). Might never cease to have its home with you, to be believingly entertained by you. *Διαμένω* is an intensified form of *μένω*. The preposition *πρὸς* is used as in ch. i. 18, where see note. It is possible that, as Alford observes, the Galatians may not specially have been in St. Paul's mind at that time, but only the Gentile Churches in general; and that for greater impressiveness he applies to the particular what was only shared by it in the general. It is, however, supposable that the cases of the several Churches which he had then lately founded with Barnabas were much in his thoughts at that time; for, as is shown by his numerous references to his specific intercessory prayer, his spirit was incessantly conversant with "all the Churches" (2 Cor. xi. 28); and he was anxiously cognizant of efforts made from the very first by legalizing Christians to pervert their faith. It is not certain that Acts xvi. 6 records the first occasion of his visiting the "Galatic country;" he may have been there and founded "the Churches of Galatia" before the occurrences described in Acts xv.; and the opinion is even held by many that Iconium and Derbe, belonging to the Roman province of Galatia, were two of "the Churches of Galatia" (see Introduction, p. 2).

Ver. 6.—But of these who seemed to be somewhat (*ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναι τι*); now from those who were reputed to be somewhat. The conjunction *δὲ* does not seem to be adversative here, but simply introductory of a new particular. The writer is about to introduce, which he does in the next five verses (6—10), a fresh illustration of the independent position, which in point both of doctrine and of ministerial footing he held in relation to the first apostles and to the heads of the Jerusalemite Church, and at the same time of the full recognition which in both respects these had accorded to him. The construction of this sentence, as it proceeds, is interrupted and changed. When St. Paul wrote, *from those who were reputed to be somewhat*, he would seem to have meant to add, "I received nothing fresh either in knowledge of the gospel or in authority as Christ's minister," or something to that effect; but in his indignant

parenthesis asserting his independence with respect to those whom his gainsayers in Galatia would seem to have pronounced his superiors, both in knowledge and in office, he loses sight of the beginning of the sentence, and begins it afresh in another form with the words (*ἐμοὶ γὰρ οἱ δοκούντες*), *for they who were of repute*, etc. *Reputed to be somewhat*; that is, thought highly of. The phrase is of frequent occurrence, both in Greek and in Latin authors. It is obvious that he refers to the twelve and the leaders of the mother Church of Jerusalem. **Whatever they were**, it maketh no matter to me (*ὅποιοι ποτε ἦσαν, οὐδὲν μοι διαφέρει*); *of what sort they at any time were maketh no matter to me*. The *ὅποιοι* (of what sort) is suggested by the preceding *τι* (somewhat), and the *ἦσαν* (they were) by the *δοκούντων* (reputed); from those reputed to be somewhat whatever they really were. The comparison of the usage of *ὅποιος* in other passages (Acts xxvi. 29; 1 Cor. iii. 18; 1 Thess. i. 9; Jas. i. 24) hardly favours the specific interpretation, "how great." In respect to the *ποτέ*, in a classical author, as Bishop Lightfoot observes, we should have no hesitation in taking it as equivalent to *cunque*. But the word occurs in the New Testament in thirty-one other places, and in not one is it *cunque*, but always the adverb of time, either "sometime," "in time past," as above, ch. i. 13, 23; John ix. 13; or "any time," as 1 Cor. ix. 7; 1 Thess. ii. 5. The latter shade of meaning seems the more appropriate here. The *any time*, though not to be limited to, would, however, cover the time when the twelve were in personal attendance upon our Lord—a circumstance which St. Paul's detractors were no doubt wont to hold up as a mark of distinction not possessed by him. It seems best to take of *what sort* as dependent upon the following words, *maketh no matter to me*. This last clause is not exactly equivalent to "I care not," as if it were an almost supercilious waving aside of the consideration; it is rather a grave assertion of a matter of fact. Whatever were the gifts of knowledge and spiritual insight which the twelve or other heads of the Jerusalemite Church possessed, or whatever their ministerial privileges or authority, whether derived from personal intercourse with the Lord Jesus when upon earth or in any other way, Paul's knowledge of the gospel and Paul's apostolic authority were neither of them at all affected by them. Now, at the time that he is writing this Epistle, he was just the same in respect to the possession of the essential truth of the gospel and to his apostolic authority as if he had had no intercourse with the spiritual rulers of the Jewish Church. **God accepteth no man's person**

(πρόσωπον Θεὸς ἀνθρώπου οὐ λαμβάνει). The order of the words in the Greek throws especial emphasis upon "person:" *person of man God accepteth not*; that is, it is never on account of his person that God accepteth a man. This phrase, "accept a man's person," is of frequent occurrence in the Bible. In the New Testament it is always used in a bad sense, which in the Old is by no means the case. This difference is due, as Bishop Lightfoot observes, to the secondary sense of *actor's mask* attaching to the Greek noun, the actor on the Greek stage, as also on the Roman, being wont to wear a mask suited to the character in which he appeared; whence also πρόσωπον got to signify this character itself. The corresponding technical term among the Romans was *persona*, a word never used of the natural face, as πρόσωπον was. This explains the adoption of this last term in its Anglicized form by our English translators in the phrase now before us. With the like metaphorical application of the idea as that which was so common among the Romans, the word "person" seemed well fitted to denote the part, or certain accessories of the part, which a man plays on the stage, so to speak, of human life, in contradistinction to his more interior and essential character. The phrase denotes accepting a man, for example, for his worldly rank or position, for his office, for his nationality, even for his Church status (see Jas. ii. 1, 9; Acts x. 34; 1 Pet. i. 17). The special adjuncts of a man's *person* referred to in the present passage are those of the outward call aforesaid to be apostles and personal attendants upon the Lord Jesus while upon earth, and, in the case of St. James the Lord's brother, personal relationship to him. And St. Paul means to intimate that *his* knowledge of Divine truth and *his* ministerial fidelity and efficiency might be as real and as great, if God's will were so, as the knowledge and ministerial fidelity and efficiency of the twelve and St. James, whom his gainsayers were honouring so far above him merely for their *person's* sake. God made no such difference between him and them, but wrought with him just as much. For they who seemed to be somewhat in conference added nothing to me (ἐμοὶ γὰρ οἱ δοκοῦντες οὐδὲν προσάθευτο); for to me they who were of *repute* in conference added nothing. The verb προσάθευτο, as it stands here, appears related to the ἀνθέμνη of ver. 2. I laid before them my gospel; they imparted to me nothing fresh (πρός). Thus Chrysostom and Theodoret. In ch. i. 16, where the same verb occurs (see note), there is nothing to accentuate the πρόσ, as there is here. The "for" appears related to the foregoing clause. That God does not respect man

for his person was evidenced by the fact that Paul's knowledge of the gospel was already so complete and his work was so honoured by God, that those whose *person* seemed to many so markedly superior to his, found that all they had to do was to frankly recognize his teaching as already adequate and complete, and his work as standing on a perfectly equal footing with their own.

Ver. 7.—But contrariwise (ἀλλὰ τοῦναντίον); as 2 Cor. ii. 7; 1 Pet. iii. 9. This "contrariwise" is illustrated by the foregoing note. When they saw (ἰδόντες); when they got to see. This implies that the fact was new to them. A few of them, no doubt, were apprised of it previously, Cephas in particular (see ch. i. 18 and note); but the majority of that assemblage of apostles and elders knew Paul chiefly by hearsay, and hearsay not always the most friendly to him. The three named in the next verse are to be conceived of as acting as they did in order to give expression to this newly awakened feeling of the general body, and not merely to their own individual judgment. That the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter (ὅτι πεπιστευμαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας, καθὼς Πέτρος τῆς περιτομῆς); that I had been put in trust of the gospel . . . as Peter of that of, etc. The perfect present πεπιστευμαι, viewed from the time of their seeing it. So the present ὀρθοδοῦσιν in ver. 14, and μένει in John i. 40. The perfect is used and not the aorist (cf. Rom. iii. 2), as marking the then still continuing holding of the trust, and also perhaps, as implying the continuing identity of the doctrine preached. (For the construction of the accusative εὐαγγέλιον after πεπιστευμαι, comp. 1 Thess. ii. 4; 1 Tim. i. 11.) Gospel of the uncircumcision. The word "gospel" is frequently used by St. Paul to denote, not so much the substance of its doctrine as the business of proclaiming it (comp. Rom. i. 1, 9; xv. 19; 1 Cor. ix. 14, 18; 2 Cor. ii. 12); and thus the gospel of the uncircumcision does not indicate any diversity in the doctrine communicated to the uncircumcision from that communicated to the Jews, but simply a diversity in the sphere of its proclamation. Ἀκροβυστία denotes the class of the uncircumcised in contrast to περιτομή, that of the circumcised, as in Rom. iii. 30. As Peter of that of the circumcision. This distinction between the spheres of work entrusted severally to the two apostles held good of them only as viewed in the main in either case; for as St. Peter was, in fact, the first who opened the gospel to the Gentiles, and afterwards, towards the close of his work, cared for the welfare of Gentile Chris-

tians by writing his two Epistles to them, so also St. Paul everywhere in his ministerial work addressed himself in the first instance to the Jews. Nevertheless, in the main, Peter was the head of the Church of the circumcised, Paul of that of the uncircumcised. But how completely the substance of Peter's doctrine was one with that of Paul's is strikingly evinced by his two Epistles (see 1 Pet. v. 12). It is difficult to feel that St. Paul could have written as he here does, if he was aware that St. Peter had been constituted by the Lord Jesus to be his own vicar upon earth, supreme over the whole Church and all its ministers.

Ver. 8.—For he that wrought effectually in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision (ὁ γὰρ ἐνεργήσας Πέτρῳ εἰς ἀποστολὴν τῆς περιτομῆς); he that had wrought on Peter's behalf for apostleship of the circumcision. In form, the sentence is an absolute statement of fact; but its bearing in the context would be fairly represented by rendering it *relatively*, "for that he who," etc.; for it was the *perception* of the fact here stated which led that assembly to the conviction that Paul had been entrusted with the apostleship of the uncircumcision. The dative Πέτρῳ can scarcely be governed, as the Authorized Version presupposes, by the preposition in ἐνεργήσας, this verb not being a separable compound; it is rather the *dativus commodi*, as in Prov. xxxi. 12, Ἐνεργεῖ τῷ ἀνθρῷ εἰς ἀγαθόν. When operation *in* a subject is meant, the preposition ἐν is added, as Eph. i. 20; ii. 2; ch. iii. 5. The worker is God, not Christ (comp. 1 Cor. xii. 6; Phil. ii. 13). God wrought on Peter's behalf for apostleship of the circumcision; that is, towards, in furtherance of, his work as their apostle, by constituting him their apostle, by making his ministry effectual in turning their hearts to Christ, and by miracles wrought by his hands, including the impartation through him of miraculous gifts to his converts; for such were "the signs of the apostle" (2 Cor. xii. 12). The same was mighty in me toward the Gentiles (ἐνέργησεν καὶ ἐμοὶ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη); had wrought also on my behalf towards the Gentiles. Comp. Acts xv. 12, "They hearkened unto Barnabas and Paul rehearsing what signs and wonders God had wrought (ἐποίησεν) among the Gentiles by them;" where likewise, as here, the aorist tense is used of action they were then looking back upon as past. The absence of Barnabas's name in this verse, though mentioned in the next, is significant. Barnabas was not an apostle in that highest sense of the term in which Paul was an apostle, and which alone he is now thinking of; although he was associated with Paul, both in ministerial work and in that lower form of apostleship which both had received

from men (comp. Acts xiv. 4, 14; and Dissertation I. in the Introduction).

Ver. 9.—And when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me (καὶ γινώσκτες τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι Ἰάκωβος καὶ Κηφᾶς καὶ Ἰωάννης, οἱ δοκοῦντες στῆλοι εἶναι); and perceiving of a certainty the grace that was given unto me, James and Cephas and John, those reputed to be pillars (gave). This is the order in which the words stand in the Greek, in which the participle γινώσκτες ("perceiving of a certainty") stands co-ordinate with the participle ἰδόντες ("when they saw") of ver. 7, so that this latter participle has "James, Cephas, and John" for its subject equally with the former, and vers. 7 and 9 appear as forming one sentence. The expression, "the grace that was given unto me," occurs also 1 Cor. iii. 10; Rom. xii. 3; xv. 15; in which passages, as well as here, it is used with a definite reference to the office of apostle having been conferred upon him together with the qualification and aid for its efficient discharge. This definite reference to a heavenly gift connected with his official character is prominent in the apostle's use of the word "grace," also in Rom. i. 5; 1 Cor. xv. 10; 2 Cor. xii. 9. The "grace that was given unto him," therefore, sums up the facts of his having been put in trust of the gospel of the uncircumcision, and of God's having wrought on his behalf in his discharge of that trust, which are presented in the two preceding verses. There is not much difference in the meaning of the participle γινώσκτες in this verse as compared with the participle ἰδόντες in ver. 7; for as we find the verb "seeing" used with reference to objects not discernible by the bodily sense but perceived only through the medium of evidencing facts, as in ver. 14 of this chapter, and in Luke ix. 47; xvii. 14; Matt. ix. 2; Acts xi. 23; xiv. 9; xvi. 19; so also the verb ἐγγινώσκω is sometimes used of perceiving, becoming apprised of, some fact, as Mark vi. 33; viii. 17; Luke ix. 11; John xii. 9, when there is no clear intention of emphasizing the idea of certain knowledge. Sometimes, however, it seems as if the writer had such intention, as in Mark viii. 17; xv. 45; Luke viii. 46; Phil. ii. 19; and probably it was in this more emphatic sense that the apostle here substituted "knowing" for the foregoing "seeing." "James, and Cephas, and John." This James is, no doubt, the same James as appears in Acts xv. holding so prominent and apparently presidential a position in the great meeting of vers. 6—21. The "James" of the old triumvirate of the Gospels, "Peter, James, and John," was now no more. This James, whose personality has been discussed above in note on ch. i. 19, is named first, before even

Cephas and John, though not an apostle, as being the leading "elder" (*bishop*, as such a functionary soon got to be designated) of the Church of Jerusalem; for in the classification of the component members of that meeting in Acts xv. 6, "the apostles and the elders," James must be assigned to the latter category. The twelve had no distinctive official connection with this particular Church more than with other Churches; and, therefore, in meetings held at Jerusalem, the presidential position would naturally be conceded, not to any one of the apostles, but to the man who was stately recognized as the superior "elder" of this particular community. St. John's name is not mentioned in Acts xv.; but in other places in St. Luke's history "Peter and John" are found acting in conjunction, and this in such a manner as to betoken their holding a very prominent place among the apostles (Acts iii. 1; iv. 13; viii. 14). The reason why these three are named, and none but these, is probably that on the occasion referred to these three alone—James as on behalf of the Church of Jerusalem, and Peter and John as on behalf of the twelve—stepped forward at the general request before the meeting, and formally all three clasped hands with Paul and Barnabas in token of their recognizing and ratifying their doctrine and ministry. In reference to the name "Cephas," it may be observed that St. Paul finds occasion to name this apostle nine times; in seven of these he writes, according to the best manuscripts, "Cephas" (1 Cor. i. 12; iii. 22; ix. 5; xv. 5; ch. i. 18; ii. 9, 14); in two, "Peter" (ch. ii. 7, 8). The Judaizers in the Church, whether at Corinth or in Galatia, in their morbid hankering after whatever was distinctively Jewish, were sure to affect the use of the Hebrew form; on which account, probably, St. Paul, in dealing with these men, is seen so frequently using this form himself. *Those reputed to be pillars.* The apostle's object in adding this clause is apparently, to indicate why these three, rather than any others, represented the rest in this act of formal proceeding, and at the same time to intimate to his Galatian readers the supreme character of the attestation thus afforded, both to that gospel of his which certain among the Galatians were now tampering with, and to his official character which those same persons were beginning to disparage. "Pillars." The apostle, years after, in writing to Timothy, speaks of its being the proper function of "the Church of the living God" that she should be "a pillar and settled basis (*ἰδρυμα*) of the truth," *i.e.* upholding the truth (1 Tim. iii. 15). This suggests to us his meaning in using the same figure here. These three men were by general consent looked up to

as especially steadfast upholders of the truth of the gospel or of the Christian cause. In Rev. iii. 12 the "pillar" seems thought of, not so much as upholding a superstructure as of something itself stationary, and also, perhaps, beautiful and glorious. Clement of Rome, in his Epistle to the Corinthians (§ 5), borrows the phrase with a more extensive application. The idea couched in the word "Cephas," *rock*, is so nearly identical with that of "settled basis," that the like affinity of ideas as led the apostle to connect "pillar" with the latter term in 1 Tim. iii. 15 may be supposed to have led him now to connect "pillar" with "Cephas" and his two illustrious brethren. They gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship (*ὁσπίας ἔθηκαν ἐμοὶ καὶ Βαρνάβᾳ κοινωμίας*); they each of them clasped each of us by the right hand, in token that they both did then, and would thereafter continue to, regard us, and we also them, as partners with one another in a common work. We meet with the phrases, "give right hands," "receive right hands," in 1 Macc. xi. 50, 52; xiii. 50, with reference, apparently, to the victor conceding, and the vanquished accepting, terms of peace to be ratified by the mutual clasp of right hands. This, however, is not precisely what is meant in the present case; there is no room here for the notion of reconciliation. Neither seems there intended a signification of love, such as the "kiss of love" would have afforded. This hand-clasp simply ratified by a palpable gesture the formal assurance between the two parties that they regarded each other as friendly partners in a common undertaking. That the use of this gesture in ratifying compact has been very common in all ages, is shown by the instances in Liddell and Scott's 'Lexicon' (*Δεξία*), and in Facciolati ('Dextra'), as well as by Bishop Lightfoot's note on the present passage. Its use among the Jews is attested, not only by the very phrase employed here and in the Maccabees, but by the phrases, "strike hands" and "give one's hand," in Job xvii. 3; Prov. vi. 1; Ezek. xvii. 18. Josephus's remark in 'Ant.,' xviii. ix. 3, on the unique inviolability which the Persians, Parthians, and other Oriental nations felt to attach to engagements thus ratified, by no means precludes the supposition that Jews used this gesture of guarantee, but only shows that it was not with them the most sacred of all forms of covenanting: they would, of course, regard an oath by the Name of God as affording a higher sanction. In the case now under consideration there was no "strife" between James, Cephas, and John, and Paul and Barnabas, which needed to be "ended" by "an oath:" the solemn and cordial mutual pressure of the right hand seems just the kind and measure



of form appropriate to the circumstances. That we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision (*ἵνα ἡμεῖς εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, αὐτοὶ δὲ εἰς τὴν περιτομήν*); literally, *that we unto (or, for) the Gentiles, and themselves unto (or, for) the circumcision*, without any verb. We have a very similar ellipsis of the verb in a carefully balanced antithesis, and before the same preposition *εἰς*, in Rom. v. 16 (comp. also 2 Cor. viii. 14). We may read it either thus, "should go unto," as in both the Authorized and the Revised Versions; or, "should be ministers for," taking the *εἰς* with the like shade of meaning, as in ver. 8. This distribution of the several provinces of work is shown by the subsequent practice on both sides (see note on ver. 7, *sub fin.*) to have been intended to be geographical rather than national; which understanding is also indicated by the mention in the next verse of "the poor" whom Paul and Barnabas were, notwithstanding this distribution, to bear in mind; they were the poor in Judæa, the province of James, Cephas, and John.

Ver. 10.—Only they would that we should remember the poor (*μόνον τῶν πτωχῶν ἡμνησενώμεν*); only, *that we should be mindful of the poor*, or perhaps, *their poor*; for the clause must be understood subjectively, as referred to the standpoint of those who "gave us the right hands of fellowship." (For the order of the words in the Greek, comp. 2 Cor. ii. 4; John xiii. 29.) If there is the ellipsis of any participle at all which needs to be supplied, which many critics suppose, though Meyer not unplausibly thinks otherwise, perhaps "stipulating" presents itself more readily than either "willing" or "requesting;" for this *ἵνα* depends as much upon the *δέκτας ἔθωκαν* as the preceding *ἵνα* does, and therefore seems to introduce something as much as that a part of the compact. What the apostle means is this: "In one respect only did this mutual compact of equal brotherly partnership leave us who were ministers of the Gentiles unfree in relation to the circumcision and their ministers; we consented to allow ourselves bound to be mindful of the duty of helping their poor. In all other respects, we were to still pursue the same plan of evangelization as we had been pursuing, with no modification of either our doctrine or Church practice; with no such modification, for example, as these false brethren were clamouring for." St. Paul's methods of work thus received the full sanction of the "pillars," being recognized by them as standing on the same level of truth and heavenly guidance as their own. The same which I also was forward to do (*ὃ καὶ ἐσοῦσα ἀπὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι*); *the very thing this which I was even of myself zealous to do*. The *καὶ* makes prominent the notion of

intense earnestness, which St. Paul is wont to express in the use of *σπουδάζω*, as well as of *σπουδῇ* and *σπουδαῖος*. He did not merely consent to bear in mind the poor of Judæa; apart from such stipulation, apart from regard to any request of James, Cephas, and John, it was a matter which of himself he regarded as one of very great importance, demanding his most earnest attention. The especial force of this verb *ἐσοῦσα* is evinced by Eph. iv. 3; 1 Thess. ii. 17; 2 Tim. ii. 15; and especially by 2 Cor. viii. 16, 17, in which the frame of mind it expresses is distinguished, as here, from that of mere willingness to consent to another person's request. The principal reason for making this matter so prominent lay, no doubt, in the great distress prevailing amongst the poor in Judæa, justifying the application of the principle stated in 2 Cor. viii. 14, 15 (see Stanley's note on 1 Cor. xvi. 1). But we can hardly err in supposing that, as a subsidiary motive, both the leaders of the Jewish Church and St. Paul himself were greatly influenced by the consideration that such practical manifestation of Christian sympathy would both evince, and help to cement, the unity with each other of the Jewish and Gentile Churches. It was this organic unity which constituted the obligation of rendering such assistance (comp. Rom. xv. 27 with Rom. xi. 17, 18). How perseveringly and how earnestly the apostle strove to aid the poor of the Jewish Churches both before and after the conference here spoken of, is seen in Acts xi. 29, 30; 1 Cor. xvi. 1 (where reference is made to collections in Galatia); 2 Cor. viii. ix.; Rom. xv. 25—27; Acts xxiv. 17. Since in this last cited passage it is only incidentally that St. Luke is led to mention the collection which St. Paul brought with him in that journey of his to Jerusalem recorded in Acts xxi. 17, it is quite supposable that he brought collections with him also in that former visit merely glanced at in Acts xviii. 23. We may surmise that St. Paul has a special purpose in mentioning to the Galatians this particular item of that important compact. In his First Epistle to the Corinthians, written at no long interval whether before or after the sending of this letter, he tells them (xvi. 1) that he had given order to the Churches of Galatia respecting the manner in which they should collect for this object. It seems the more probable supposition that those directions were not given until this letter had had the happy effect of restoring better relations between himself and them than he was able at present to reckon upon. Meanwhile, however, this historical reference would serve to prepare them in some measure for the appeal, when he should think it

prudent to make it (cf. Introduction, pp. xvi.—xviii.).

It is well to observe, in reference to this whole passage (vers. 6—10), the extent to which the apostle goes in identifying Barnabas's position with his own. Barnabas had laboured with himself as evangelizing "apostle" sent forth with himself from the Antiochian Church, and both before and after that missionary journey in the neighbourhood of Antioch itself. Accordingly he tells his readers that the "pillars" had without qualification recognized the work of them both and had fraternally greeted their further prosecution of it. But it is of himself alone that he speaks when he contrasts Cephas's apostleship of the circumcision with his own apostleship (for this is implied) to the Gentiles. The reason for this is that Barnabas was not an apostle in that other higher sense of the term in which Cephas and himself were (see Introduction, Dissertation I.). Again, when mentioning the stipulation which the "pillars" made, that we should be mindful of their poor, he does not add, "the very thing this which we were of ourselves resolved to do," but makes the observation with reference to himself only. This is explained by the unhappy rupture which St. Luke tells of as so soon after occurring between them—which account of St. Luke's finds thus here a latent confirmation. What we otherwise know of Barnabas's character leaves no room to doubt but that he too zealously set himself to carry out the stipulation in that separate sphere of work among Gentiles which, after the rupture, he engaged in. But this is no longer St. Paul's business, while relating facts falling under his own cognizance. And this consideration throws light upon the time of the action expressed by the aorist ἐπορεύσα: it does not mean, "I had already before been forward to do so;" for then he would not have left out Barnabas; but, "thenceforward in my whole subsequent career I zealously made it my business," the aorist embracing the whole in one view.

Further, our attention is arrested by the extreme importance and the pregnant significance of the incident here related. Here was one who, neither directly nor indirectly, owed to those who had been previously sent forth by Heaven as teachers of the gospel, either his conversion, or his knowledge of the Christian doctrine, or his mission to preach; but had nevertheless gone forth proclaiming what he affirmed to be Christ's gospel communicated to him by Divine revelation, gathering disciples to be baptized into Christ, and combining such disciples into Churches. In what relation did this doctrine of Paul and the Church

organizations which he was setting on foot in the Gentile world stand to the doctrine of the twelve and to the Church organizations framed by them in connection therewith at Jerusalem and in Judæa? These last were assumed to be from heaven; were those more recent phenomena, of doctrines taught and societies formed by Paul, in harmony with the previous ones? Unquestionably and glaringly there were important differences between the external religious life of the twelve and the Jewish believers, and the external religious life which Paul taught the Gentile Churches to adopt. The twelve and the Jewish Christians in general still practised in their daily life the usages of Mosaism, blending the use of such outward forms and ceremonies as appertained to Christian discipleship with those older habits of life preserved intact; in the Gentile Church as moulded by Paul the usages of Mosaism were altogether wanting. Was the seal of Heaven to be recognized as affixed to the Pauline doctrine and the Pauline Church life, as certainly as it was seen to be affixed to the doctrine of the twelve and the Judæo-Christian Church life? Yes. The verdict of the great leaders of the Jewish Church decided for the full recognition of the Pauline doctrine and the Pauline Church life as in root and essence identical with their own, and as equally with their own derived from heaven. It was a decision come to in the teeth of intense and deeply ingrained prejudices prompting to the adoption of a different conclusion; and must have been due to overpowering evidence leaving them no alternative, seconded we may believe by the secret swaying of their souls by the Holy Ghost. We cannot help reflecting (1) how disastrous the effects would have been of a decision of another kind; (2) how remarkably is here illustrated the essential oneness of the Christian life amidst most extreme diversity in its outward manifestation; and (3) what a strong attestation is afforded to the certain truth of the gospel, revealed to the world through two wholly distinct channels of communication, which yet concurred in delivering what was in reality one and the same message.

Ver. 11.—In the narrative which the apostle next proceeds to give, several points, we may suppose, were definitely meant by him to be intimated to his readers. Thus to those Gentile Galatians who were wavering in their attachment to himself and to the gospel which he had preached to them, he shows his claim to their firm affectionate adherence, on the ground of the steadfastness with which, as before at Jerusalem so now afresh in Antioch, he had successfully asserted their rights and their equal stand-

ing with Jewish believers, when these were assailed by "certain come from James." In contrast with his own unflinching championship of their cause, were here seen vacillation and inconsistency on the part of "Cephas;" were, then, any justified in exalting those "pillars, James and Cephas," as certain were disposed to do, for the sake of disparaging *him*? This experience at Antioch should lead them to regard with suspicion Jewish or Philo-Judaic brethren, who were setting themselves to tamper with the truth of the gospel. Crooked conduct was sure to accompany such darkening of the truth, as on that occasion was most palpably evinced in the case of even Barnabas, and was in open encounter before the whole Church exposed and rebuked. And, especially, there was the grand principle that the Law of Moses was for the Christian believer annihilated through the crucifixion of Christ; which principle he had then held aloft in the view of the Church, and here takes occasion to enlarge upon, because it was so directly relevant and helpful in respect to the trouble now springing up in Galatia. But when Peter was come to Antioch (*ὄτε δὲ ἦλθε Κηφᾶς [Receptus, Πέτρος] εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν*); but when Cephas came to Antioch. The reading *Κηφᾶς* for *Πέτρος* is generally accepted. The time at which this incident took place is in a measure determined, on the one side, by its being to all appearance after the visit to Jerusalem which has been previously spoken of, and, on the other, by the reference to Barnabas in ver. 13; that is, we are naturally led to assign it to that time of Paul's, and Barnabas's united labours at Antioch which is briefly indicated in Acts xv. 35. It can hardly have occurred subsequently to the rupture between them which St. Luke immediately after describes. The manner in which St. Peter's coming to Antioch is introduced seems to betoken that his coming thither was not felt to have been at all an extraordinary circumstance. It is open to us, and indeed obvious, to conjecture that the visit was made in the course of one of those journeyings of St. Peter "throughout all parts," of which *another*, taking place fourteen years or more previously, is mentioned in Acts ix. 33. As the "apostle of the circumcision," he was, we may reasonably suppose, in the habit of traversing, in company often with his wife (1 Cor. ix. 5), the whole of those districts of Palestine which were largely inhabited by Jews, and extending as far as Antioch itself, in the exercise of apostolic supervision over the Jewish converts. Quite supposably, this was not his first visit to this city. The lengthened continuance of his stay, which may be inferred from ver. 12, is thus

explained. It may be assumed that it was this exercise of apostolic superintendence that gave rise to the tradition, which gained early acceptance in the Church (Eusebius, 'Hist. Eccl.,' iii. 36), that Peter was the first Bishop of Antioch. His presence there now, while St. Paul was also there, found, probably, its analogy, twelve or fourteen years later, in the simultaneous presence of St. Peter and St. Paul at Rome; St. Peter being there also, we may suppose, in the discharge of his office as apostle of the circumcision. I withstood him to the face (*κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ ἀντίστην*). I seized an opportunity at a meeting of the brethren (ver. 14) of publicly confronting him as an adversary. It seems almost suggested that their spheres of work at Antioch, which was a very large city, were so far not identical that they were not commonly to be seen together. The verb *ἀντίστην*, "set myself to oppose him," expressing determined oppugnancy (2 Tim. iii. 8; Jas. iv. 7; 1 Pet. v. 9), strikes us the more, as coming so soon after the "gave us the right hands of fellowship" of ver. 7. His adopting this mode of recalling his straying brother instead of dealing with him in a more private manner, is indicated with an evidently intended pointedness. His course of proceeding was both justified and required by the public nature of St. Peter's offence, and by the necessity of promptly exposing and beating back the aggressions which Israelitish bigotry was always so ready to make upon the perfectly equal footing possessed by all believers, by virtue simply of their relation to Christ. Because he was to be blamed (*ὅτι κατεγνωσμένος ἦν*); because he stood condemned. The perfect passive verb is commonly felt to point, not so much to the censures of bystanders, as to the glaring wrongness of his conduct viewed in itself (comp. John iii. 18; Rom. xiv. 23). The rendering to be blamed, correct so far as it reaches, is inadequate in expressing the sense which St. Paul had of the gravity of St. Peter's offence. It is interesting to note the clear reference to this verse made in the second century by the Ebionite author of the 'Clementine Homilies,' who (Bishop Lightfoot observes, 'Galatians,' p. 61), writing in a spirit of bitter hostility to St. Paul, who is covertly attacked in the person of Simon Magus, represents St. Peter as addressing Simon thus: "Thou hast confronted and withstood me (*ἐναντίος ἀθέστηκάς μοι*). If thou hadst not been an adversary, thou wouldest not have calumniated and reviled my preaching. . . . If thou callest me condemned (*κατεγνωσμένον*), thou accusest God who revealed Christ to me" ('Hom.,' xvii. 19). Not only is this a testimony to the authenticity of the Epistle; it betokens also the

sore feeling which this narrative of St. Paul's and the manner of its diction left behind in the minds of a certain section of Jewish Christians.

**Ver. 12.—For before that certain came from James** (πρὸ τοῦ γὰρ ἰλθεῖν τινὰ ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου). Since the apostle writes "from James," and not "from Judæa" (as Acts xv. 1) or "from Jerusalem," the surmise suggests itself that these men had a mission from St. James. Alford's view appears probable, that St. James, while holding that the *Gentile* converts were not to have the observance of the Law forced upon them, did nevertheless consider that the Jewish believers were still bound to keep it. Possibly he had sent them to Antioch to remind the Jewish Christians of the city of their obligations in this respect. This would be in no way inconsistent with Acts xv. 19, where the emphatic words, "them which from the Gentiles turn to God," tacitly imply that the obligations of *Jewish* believers continued the same as before (comp. Acts xxi. 18—25). He did eat with the Gentiles (μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν συνήσθην). The Greek expression is no doubt equivalent to τοῖς ἔθνεσι συνήσθην (comp. Acts xi. 3; see Matt. xvii. 3 compared with Mark ix. 4). There appears to be no ground for restricting this "eating with" them to uniting with them at the agape or at the Lord's Supper. The words in Acts xi. 3, spoken some ten years before this, "Thou wentest in (εἰσῆλθες) to men still in their uncircumcision, and didst eat with them," pointed to a social participation of food rather than to one merely religious; though, it must be confessed, these two things were not as yet so sharply distinguished from each other as it was afterwards found necessary that they should be (1 Cor. xi. 34). While thus eating with Gentiles, St. Peter may well have fortified his mind with the thought, that the Lord Jesus had been wont to hold, not merely teaching converse, but social intercourse also, with persons whom "the scribes and the Pharisees" regarded as themselves unclean and by contact polluting (Luke v. 30; xv. 2; xix. 7). Christ, it is true, both himself observed the Law and taught his disciples to observe it. He wore "the border" (κράσπεδον) attached to his garment; but he did not wear the "border" unnecessarily "enlarged." On the contrary, the rabbinical exaggerations of legal prescriptions, inconsistent with charity or with reason, he was wont emphatically to repudiate (Matt. xxiii.; Mark vii. 1—13). **But when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself** (ὅτε δὲ ἦλθον, ὑπέστραλλε καὶ ἀφώριζεν αὐτοὺς); *but when they came, he began to shrink back and separate himself from them.* Ἐαυτὸν is governed by ὑπέστραλλει as well as by ἀφώριζεν, ὑπέστραλλεν αὐτοῦν

GALATIANS.

being equivalent to ὑπέστράλλετο, the use of which middle voice is illustrated by Acts xx. 27. The Gentile converts could not but perceive that his manner with them was less openly cordial than heretofore. He was no longer so ready to go to their houses. In public, he shrank from being seen with them on terms of frank and equal companionship. **Fearing them which were of the circumcision** (φοβούμενος τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς); *fearing the brethren drawn from the circumcision.* If the apostle had written φοβ. τὴν περιτομὴν, the expression would have taken in the not-believing Jews as well; whereas the preposition ἐκ, like ἀπὸ in Acts xv. 19, indicates the branch of mankind from which the converts had come (Acts x. 45; xi. 2; Col. iv. 11; Titus i. 10).

**Ver. 13.—And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him** (καὶ συνηκρίθησαν αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ Ἰουδαῖοι); *and the rest of the Jews dissembled likewise with him.* "The Jews," i.e. the Christian Jews who were at Antioch before these brethren "from James" arrived there, and who, as Cephas had done till their coming, associated quite frankly with the Gentile Christians. "Dissembled with him;" they as well as he acted in a manner which did not faithfully represent their own inward man. They were, in reality, convinced that Christ had made all those who believed in him alike righteous before God with themselves, and alike meet to be admitted to Christian fellowship. But now, by practically siding with those who treated their Gentile brethren as more or less unclean, not fit for them to associate with, they disguised their real sentiments from "fear" of forfeiting the confidence and good will of those narrow-minded Jews. The apostle brands their behaviour as "dissimulation" or "hypocrisy," because their motive was a deceitful one. They, though, no doubt, in a degree unconsciously, wished to make those newly arrived Jews suppose that they themselves did at bottom feel as they did as to a certain measure of uncleanness attaching even to the believing uncircumcision. Inasmuch that Barnabas also (ὥστε καὶ Βαρνάβας); *so that even Barnabas.* The last man from whom such conduct could have been expected! The expression shows how deeply the apostle felt Barnabas to have hitherto sympathized with himself with regard to Gentile believers; as, indeed, the history of the Acts proves, beginning with xi. 21—26 to xv. 12, 25. Further, the tone of this reference to him, written three or four years after the occasion spoken of, as well as of that which he makes in his First Epistle to the Corinthians (ix. 6), written at nearly the same time as this Epistle to the Galatians, shows in the most natural manner the high and cordial esteem

with which he then regarded him, notwithstanding the unhappy variance which sprang up between them soon after the circumstances here mentioned. Again, years later on, he commends Mark to the consideration of the Colossians (Col. iv. 10), as being a cousin of Barnabas's, this giving him a high title to their respect. Obviously, the disapproval which St. Paul so openly expressed at Antioch of the behaviour of St. Peter and those who acted as he did, Barnabas, it seems, being one of them, helps to explain the sharpness of his subsequent difference with Barnabas concerning Mark. If St. Paul now, so long after the occurrence, does not hesitate in calm relation to brand the conduct of the party with the stern censure of "hypocrisy," it is not likely that he denounced it with less severity at the time in the excitement of actual conflict. How sharply and unsparingly he could on occasion express himself, his Epistles elsewhere very abundantly exemplify; and such vehement censure, so publicly expressed, and, which made it so especially cutting, so justly deserved, might well leave a sore feeling in the mind of the whole Judaic party, including even Barnabas, making the latter but too ready to take umbrage when the apostle insisted, with apparently again so much justice, upon the want which Mark had evinced of thoroughgoing sympathy with the work of evangelizing the Gentiles. This last was, in fact, a continuation of the conflict waged with Cephas probably but a short while before. On this point the Acts and the Epistles sustain each other. Was carried away with their dissimulation (*συναπήχθη αὐτῶν τῇ ὑποκρίσει*); or, with the hypocrisy of them. The position of αὐτῶν ("of them") is emphatic. St. Paul means that, if it had not been for their hypocrisy, Barnabas would never have fallen into so grievous a mistake in conduct himself. The construction of the verb *συναπήγμαι* here is the same as in 2 Pet. iii. 17; the dative which follows in each case being governed by the *σὺν* in the verb: "their dissimulation" was as it were a mighty torrent which swept even Barnabas away with it.

Ver. 14. — But when I saw that they walked not uprightly (ἀλλ' ὅτε εἶδον ὅτι οὐκ ὀρθοποδοῦσι); but when I saw that they were not walking rightly. The strongly adverbative ἀλλὰ seems to imply: But I set myself to stem the mischief; comp. "withstood" (ver. 11). The precise force of ὀρθοποδεῖν is doubtful. The verb occurs nowhere else except in later writers, who, it is thought, borrowed it from this passage. Etymologically, according to the ambiguous meaning of ὀρθός—"straight," either vertically or horizontally—it may be either "walk up-

rightly," that is, "sincerely," which, however, is an unusual application of the notion of ὀρθότης; or, "walk straight onward," that is, "rightly." As the apostle is more concerned on behalf of the truth which he was contending for than on behalf of their sincerity or consistency, the latter seems the preferable view. Compare the force of the same adjective in ὀρθοβατεῖν, ὀρθοπραγεῖν, ὀρθοδρομεῖν, ὀρθοτομεῖν, etc. According to the truth of the gospel (πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου); with an eye to the truth of the gospel. Πρὸς, "with an eye towards," may refer to the truth of the gospel, either as a rule for one's direction (as in 2 Cor. v. 10, Πρὸς & ἐπραξεν) or as a thing to be forwarded (cf. Ἐπὲρ τῆς ἀληθείας, 2 Cor. xiii. 8). The same ambiguity attaches to the use of the preposition in Luke xii. 47. The "truth of the gospel," as in ver. 5, is the truth which the gospel embodies, with especial reference to the doctrine of justification by faith. Peter and Barnabas were acting in a manner which both was inconsistent with their holding of that truth, and contravened its advancement in the world. I said unto Peter (εἶπον τῷ Κηφᾶ [Receptus, Πέτρῳ]); I said to Cephas. Here again we are to read Cephas. Before them all (ἐμπροσθεν πάντων). At some general meeting of the Antiochian brethren. Both the expression and St. Paul's proceeding are illustrated by 1 Tim. v. 20, "Them who sin [sc. of the elders] reprove in the sight of all (ἐνώπιον πάντων ἑλεγχε)." If thou, being a Jew (εἰ σὺ, Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων); if thou, originally a Jew, as thou art. Ἰτάρχων, as distinguished from εἶν, denotes this, together with a reference to subsequent action starting from this foregoing condition. Compare, for example, its use in ch. i. 14; Phil. ii. 6. This distinctive shade of meaning is not always discernible. Livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews (θθνικῶς ζῆς καὶ οὐκ Ἰουδαϊκῶς); livest as do the Gentiles and not as the Jews. In what sense, and to what extent, were these words true of St. Peter? When, in the vision at Joppa, unclean animals together with clean were offered to him for food, he had answered, "Not so, Lord; for I have never eaten anything that is common and unclean." This shows that, up to that time, the personal teachings of Christ when he was upon earth had not relieved his mind of the sense that to use certain kinds of meat was for him an unlawful thing. The heavenly rejoinder, "What God hath cleansed, make not thou common," appears to have been understood by him with reference, at least in the first instance, to human beings (Acts x. 28). There seems to be no doubt that the habit of mind generated by long subjection to the Levitical Law,

producing repugnance to Gentiles as habitually using unclean meats, he brought with him when crossing Cornelius's threshold; and that it is quite supposable that, in "eating with Gentiles" while his visit to Cornelius continued, he had had no occasion to break through those barriers of restriction which the Law of itself imposed. But, on the other hand, it is also quite supposable that the answer made to him in the vision had, if not at once, at least later, led him on to the further conviction that God had now made all kinds of meat lawful for a Christian's use, although, when consorting, as in the main he had to do, with Jews, he would still bow to the Levitical restrictions. The Petrine Gospel of St. Mark appears, according to the now by many accepted reading of *καθαρίσων* in the text of vii. 19, to have stated that Christ in teaching, "Whatsoever from without goeth into the man, it cannot defile him," had said this, "making all meats clean." There is no question that in St. Paul's own view at that epoch of his ministry when he wrote this Epistle, "nothing," to use his own words, "is unclean of itself" (Rom. xiv. 14; 1 Cor. x. 23, 25); and we have no reason to doubt that he had "been in the Lord Jesus persuaded" of this long before,—at the very outset probably of his ministry. It is, therefore, not unlikely that this same persuasion of the real indifference of all kinds of meat had been by Christ instilled into St. Peter's mind as well. But if it were thus in respect to the use of meats, it would be thus also in reference to all other kinds of purely ceremonial restriction. Very shortly before these occurrences at Antioch, St. Peter had at Jerusalem openly and strongly expressed the feeling which he experienced, how intolerably galling were the restraints imposed by the Levitical, not to say by the rabbinical, ceremonialism; "a yoke," he said, "which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear"—language which seems to betoken a mind which had spiritually been set at liberty from the yoke. On the whole, the inference naturally suggested by St. Paul's words, "Thou livest as do the Gentiles, and not as do the Jews," commends itself as the true one; namely this—that St. Peter, not on that occasion only, but also on others, when thrown into contact with masses of Gentile converts, was wont to assert his Christian liberty; that, like as St. Paul did, so did he: while, on the one hand, to the Jews he became as a Jew, to them under the Law as under the Law, that he might gain the Jews, gain them that were under the Law, so also, on the other, to them that were without Law he became as without Law, that he might gain also them (1 Cor. ix. 20, 21). Why compellest thou the Gentiles

to live as do the Jews? (*πῶς [Receptus, τῷ τὰ ἔθνη ἀναγκάζεις Ἰουδαίειν*);. In place of *τί*, why, recent editions read, *πῶς*, how, which is a more emphatic interrogatory with a tinge of wonderment; as if it were, "How is it possible that—?" (so 1 Cor. xv. 12). The verb "Judaize" occurs in the Septuagint of Esth. viii. 17, "And many of the Gentiles had themselves circumcised and Judaized (*ἰουδαίουν*) by reason of their fear of the Jews." It is plainly equivalent to *ἰουδαίως ζῆν*. Compellest, *i.e.* settest thyself to compel. The "compulsion" applied by Cephas was a moral compulsion; he was, in effect, withholding from them Christian fellowship, unless they Judaized. Put into words, his conduct said this: "If you will Judaize, I will hold fellowship with you; if you will not, you are not qualified for full fraternal recognition from me." The withholding of Christian fraternization, short of formal Church excommunication such as 1 Cor. v. 3—5, is a powerful engine of Christian influence, the use of which is distinctly authorized and even commanded in Scripture (Rom. xvi. 17; 1 Cor. v. 11; 2 Thess. iii. 6, 14; 2 Tim. iii. 5; Titus iii. 10; 2 John 10), and may on occasion be employed by private Christians on their own responsibility. But its use, when not clearly justified, is not only a cruelty to our brethren, but an outrage upon what St. Paul here calls the truth of the gospel. It is at our peril that we grieve, by a cold or unbrotherly bearing towards him, one whom we have reason to believe God has "received" (Rom. xiv. 3; xv. 7). If God in Christ owns and loves him as a son, we ought to frankly own and love him as a brother.

Ver. 15.—We who are Jews by nature (*ἡμεῖς φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι*); *we being Jews by nature*; or, *we are Jews by nature*. In point of construction, it may be observed that, after *εἰδότες* in the next verse, recent editors concur in inserting *δέ*. With this correction of the text, we may either make this fifteenth verse a separate sentence, by supplying *ἐσμὲν*, "we are Jews by nature," etc., and begin the next verse with the words, "but yet, knowing that . . . even we believed," etc.; or we may supply in this verse "being," and, conjoining it with "knowing," take the two verses as forming one sentence; thus: "We being Jews . . . yet knowing that . . . even we believed," etc. For the general sense, it is quite immaterial which mode of construing we adopt. The Revisers have preferred the latter. The former makes the passage run more smoothly; but this, in construing St. Paul's writings, is by no means a consideration of weight. "We," that is, "I Paul, and thou Cephas," rather than "I Paul, and thou Cephas, with those who

are acting with thee;" for we read before, "I said unto Cephas," not "unto Cephas and the rest of the Jews." "By nature;" because we were Jews by birth. But the two expressions, "by nature" and "by birth," are not convertible terms, as is evident from ch. iv. 8 and Rom. ii. 14; the former covers wider ground than the latter. The prerogatives attaching to the natural position of a born Jew were higher than those which appertained to a circumcised proselyte. This is why he adds, "by nature." "Jews;" a term of honourable distinction, closely by its etymology connected in the mind of a Hebrew with the notion of "praise" (comp. Gen. ix. 8; Rom. ii. 29); a term, therefore, of theocratic vaunting (Rom. ii. 17). **And not sinners of the Gentiles** (καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἐθνῶν ἁμαρτωλοί); and not of the Gentiles sinners. The word "sinners" must be here taken, not in that purely moral acceptation in which all are "sinners," but in that mixed sense in which moral disapproval was largely tinged with the bigoted disdain which the theocratic Israelite felt for "the uncircumcised;" the Levitically purist Jew for them who, having no "Law" (νόμοι), wallowed in every kind of ceremonial pollution, "unclean," "dogs" (comp. Matt. xv. 37; Phil. iii. 2; Acts ii. 23). As a notion correlative to that of "Jews," the word is used by our Lord himself when he spoke of his being delivered into the hands of "sinners" (Matt. xxvi. 45; comp. Matt. xx. 19). As correlative to that of persons fit for the society of the righteous and Levitically holy, it is used by Christ and the evangelists in the phrase, "publicans and sinners," in which it is nearly equivalent to "outcasts." So the apostle uses it here. With an ironical *mimesis* of the tone of language which a self-righteous legalist loved to employ, he means in effect, "not come from among Gentiles, sinful outcasts." May not the apostle be imagined to have quite lately heard such phrases from the lips of some of those Pharisee-minded Christians to whom Cephas was unhappily now truckling? For the right appreciation of the train of thought which the apostle is now pursuing, it is important to observe that both Cephas and Paul had reason to regard themselves as having been, before they were justified, sinners in another sense of the deepest dye. St. Paul felt to the very end of his days that he had once been, and that therefore in himself he still was, a chief of sinners (ἁμαρτωλός, ὃν πρῶτος εἶμι ἐγώ); and surely the wickedness into which Cephas precipitated himself on the morning of his Lord's passion must have left ever after in his mind too a similar consciousness.

Ver. 16.—**Knowing** (εἰδότες δέ: see note on ver. 15); yet knowing. **That a man is not**

justified by the works of the Law (ὄτι οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου); or, by works of Law; or, by works of the Law. That is, works prescribed by the Law of Moses. The verb δικαιοῦται is in the present tense, because the apostle is stating a general principle. The sentence, Οὐ δικαιοῦται ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, if regard be had to the exact sense of the proposition ἐξ, may be supposed to mean "does not derive righteousness from works of the Law;" does not get to be justly regarded as holy, pure from guilt, approvable, in consequence of any things done in obedience to God's positive Law. The precise meaning and bearing of the aphorism will appear presently. But by the faith of Jesus Christ (ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ); but only through faith of Jesus Christ. 'Εὰν μὴ, like εἰ μὴ, properly means "except," "save;" but St. Paul would have betrayed his own position if he had allowed that "works of the Law" could ever have any part whatever in procuring justification. 'Εὰν μὴ must, therefore, be understood here in that partially exceptive sense remarked upon in the note on ch. i. 7 as frequently attaching to εἰ μὴ, that is, it means "but only." The apostle plainly intends to make the categorical affirmation that no man gains justification save through faith in Christ; οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος εἰ μὴ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. The variation of the proposition, διὰ in this clause for ἐκ in the preceding clause, we find again in Phil. iii. 9, "Not having a righteousness which is mine own, that which is (ἐκ νόμου) of the Law [i.e. derived from the Law], but that which is (διὰ πίστεως) through faith of Christ." That no real difference is here intended in the sense is shown by the use immediately after of ἐκ in the clause, ἵνα δικαιωθῶμεν ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ. For the apostle's present argument it is immaterial whether we are said to gain righteousness through faith or from it. As Bishop Lightfoot, however, observes, "Faith is, strictly speaking, only the means, not the source of justification. The one proposition (διὰ) excludes this latter notion, while the other (ἐκ) might imply it. Besides these, we meet also with ἐν πίστει (Phil. iii. 9), but never διὰ πίστιν, 'propter fidem,' which would involve [or, might perhaps suggest] a doctrinal error. Compare the careful language in the Latin of our Article XL, 'per fidem, non propter opera.'" The genitive Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ after πίστεως is paralleled by ἔχετε πίστιν Θεοῦ in Mark xi. 22, and by πίστεως αὐτοῦ in Eph. iii. 12. Possibly the genitive was preferred here to saying εἰς Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, as verbally presenting the sharper antithesis to ἔργων νόμου. Even we (καὶ ἡμεῖς); just as any sinful outcast of a Gentile would have to do. **Have believed in Jesus Christ** (εἰς Χριστόν

ἠησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν); *did* in *Christ Jesus believe*. The aorist of the verb points to the time of the first making Christ the object of trust. The changed order, in which our Lord's proper name and his official designation appear in this clause compared with the preceding, and which, somewhat strangely, is ignored in our Authorized Version, does not seem to have any real significance; such variation frequently occurs in St. Paul, as e.g. 1 Tim. i. 15, 16; 2 Tim. i. 8, 10; Eph. i. 1, 2. In the present instance it may have been dictated by the reversal of the order of the ideas, πιστεως and ἠησοῦ Χριστοῦ. That we might be justified by the faith of Christ (ἵνα δικαιώθωμεν ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ). Renouncing all thought of gaining righteousness by (or from) doing works of the Law, we fixed our faith upon Christ, in order to gain righteousness by (or from) believing in him. The form of expression does not determine the time when they expected to become righteous; but the whole complexion of the argument points to their justification following immediately upon their believing in Christ. That full recognition of fellow-believers, which is the hinge on which the discussion turns, presupposes their being already righteous through their faith. And not by the works of the Law (καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου). This is added *ex abundanti*, to clench more strongly the affirmation that works of the Law have no effect in making men righteous. For by the works of the Law shall no flesh be justified (διότι [or rather, ὅτι] οὐ δικαιώθησεται ἐξ ἔργων νόμου πᾶσα σὰρξ). This simply repeats the affirmation in the first clause of the verse, with only an intensified positiveness; the future tense, "shall be justified," expressing, not the time at which the act of justification takes place, but the absoluteness of the rule that no human being is to expect ever to be justified by works of the Law. In Rom. iii. 20 we have identically the same sentence with the addition of "in his sight." Instead, however, of the *διότι* found in that passage, many recent editors here give ὅτι, there being no more difference between *διότι* and ὅτι than between "because that" and "because." In both passages it looks as if the apostle meant to be understood as citing a *locus probativus*; and the addition of the words, "in his sight," in Romans indicates that the authoritative passage referred to is Ps. cxliii. 2, which in the Septuagint reads, Ὅτι οὐ δικαιώθησεται ἐνώπιόν σου πᾶς ἄνθρωπος. The clause, ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, added in both, is a comment of the apostle's own, founded as it should seem upon the case of the people of Israel, whom the psalmist manifestly included in his universal statement; those who had the Law yet lacked justification before God, every one; those even of them

who more or less were doing its works. This verse, viewed as a statement of the individual experience of the two apostles Peter and Paul themselves, is verified with respect to the latter by the accounts given in the Acts of his conversion. With respect to St. Peter, its verification is supplied to the reflective student of the Gospels by his realizing the process of feeling through which that apostle's mind passed in the several situations thus indicated: "This day thou shalt deny me thrice;" "He went out and wept bitterly;" "Go and tell his disciples and Peter, he goeth before you into Galilee;" "The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon;" "Simon, son of John, lovest thou me?" "They worshipped him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy." Further, the highly animated language with which, in their writings, each of these apostles—St. Paul, for instance, in the Romans (v. and viii.) and Ephesians, and St. Peter in several passages of his First Epistle—portrays the peace and exulting joy which Christ's disciples experience through faith in him, is evidently drawn from their own mental history. And this happy experience of theirs was, most palpably, in no degree whatever derived from works of the Law, but solely from the grace of Christ. As St. Peter had recently intimated at Jerusalem, *their hearts*, as truly as the hearts of their fellow-believers of the Gentiles, "God had cleansed" from the sense of guilt and pollutedness before him "by faith" (Acts xv. 9). It is necessary here to be quite clear as to the nature of those "works of the Law" which the apostle has now in his view. This is determined by the preceding context. The works of the Law now in question were those, the observance of which characterized a man's "living as do the Jews" and their non-observance a man's "living as do the Gentiles." It was the disregard of these works on the part of the Gentile believers which the Jewish Christians, whom St. Peter would fain stand well with, considered as disqualifying them from free association with themselves. So, again, when St. Peter was "living as do the Gentiles," he was viewed as setting at nought, not the moral precepts of the Law, but its positive ceremonial precepts only. It is the making that distinction between believers living as do the Gentiles and believers living as do the Jews, which Peter and the brethren from James were in effect making, that the apostle here sets himself so sternly to reprobate. It is with this view that he here asserts the principle that through faith in Christ a man is made righteous, and that through faith in Christ only can he be, these works having nothing whatever to do with it.



"You Cephas," he says, "and I were living as do the Jews; no unclean sinners of Gentiles were we! And both you and I have been made righteous. And how? Not through those works of the Law, but through believing in Christ Jesus. And these Gentile brethren, from whom you are now shrinking back as if they were not good enough for us to associate with,—they believe in Christ as truly as we do; they are therefore as truly righteous as we are. It is absurd for you to try to thrust upon them those works of the Law; by the works of the Law can neither they be made righteous nor yet we. So neither, on the other hand, by disregarding the works of the Law can either they or we be made sinners." This last position, that the neglect of the works of the Law does not disqualify a fellow-Christian for brotherly recognition, is plainly essential to his present argument. But this is true only of the neglect of the positive Levitical precepts of the Law; the neglect of its moral precepts does disqualify him (1 Cor. v. 11). Does it not seem a just inference from this course of argument, that no man whom we have reason to believe to be justified by faith in Christ is to be refused either Christian association or Church fellowship?

Ver. 17.—But if, while we seek to be justified by Christ (*εἰ δὲ ζητοῦντες δικαιωθῆναι ἐν Χριστῷ*); but if while seeking to be justified in Christ. The present participle, "while seeking," that is, "while we sought," is referred back to the time indicated in the words, "we believed," of the preceding verse—the time, that is, when, made aware that works of the Law could not justify, they, Cephas and Paul, severally set themselves to find righteousness in Christ. At that time they in heart utterly renounced the notion that "works of the Law" had any effect upon a man's standing before God; they saw that his doing them could not make him righteous, as well as that his not doing them would not make him a sinner (see Matt. xv. 10—20). This was an essential feature of their state of mind in seeking righteousness in Christ. They distinguished Levitical purity and pollution from spiritual and real. And the principle was not only embraced in their hearts, but, in course of time, it embodied itself also, as occasion served, in outward deed. They, both Paul and Cephas himself, were bold to "live after the manner of Gentiles" (ver. 14), and with Gentiles to freely associate. If this was wrong, it was most heinously wrong; for it would be nothing short of a presumptuous setting at naught of God's own Law by which they flagrantly proved themselves to be, in a fatal and damning sense, sinners. But it was by the gospel that they had

been led to think thus and to act thus; in other words, by Christ himself. Would it not, then, follow that Christ was a minister to them, not of righteousness, but of sin, of damning guilt? The participle "seeking" does not merely mark the time at which they were found to be sinners, but also and indeed much more, the course of conduct by which they proved themselves such. The words, "in Christ," are not equivalent to "through Christ," though the former idea includes the latter; the preposition is used in the same sense as in the sentences, "In God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ" (1 Thess. i. 1); "Of him are ye in Christ Jesus" (1 Cor. i. 30); "Sanctified in Christ Jesus" (1 Cor. i. 2). It denotes a state of intimate association, union, with Christ, involving justification by necessary consequence. Comp. Phil. iii. 9, "That I may be found in him, not having a righteousness of mine own, even that which is of the Law, but that which is through faith in Christ." We ourselves also are found sinners (*εὑρίθημεν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ*); we ourselves also were found sinners. The word "found" hints a certain measure of surprise (comp. Matt. i. 18; Acts viii. 40; Rom. vii. 21; 2 Cor. x. 12; xii. 20). Cephas was behaving now as if to his painful surprise he had found himself to have been previously acting in a most guilty manner. The word "sinners" appears to denote more than the state of ceremonial uncleanness incurred by violating the prescriptions of Levitical purity; indeed, it meant more even as used by thorough-going ceremonialists (as in ver. 15); it points to the gross outrage which would in the case supposed have been put upon the majesty of God's Law. In the next verse "transgressor" is used as a convertible term. "Ourselves also"—as truly as any Gentile of them all. There is a touch of sarcasm in the clause, having a covert reference to St. Peter having turned his back upon his Gentile brethren as unfit for him to associate with; he thereby was treating them as "sinners." Is therefore Christ the minister of sin? (*ἄρα Χριστὸς ἁμαρτίας διάκονος*); is Christ a minister of sin? *Ἄρα* is found in the New Testament besides only in Luke xviii. 8 and Acts viii. 30, in both which passages it simply propounds a question, without indicating whether the answer is expected to be negative or affirmative. So Soph., *Œd. T.*, *ἄρ' ἔφην κακός*; *ἄρ' οὐχὶ πᾶς ἄναγνος*; The inference here is so shocking that the apostle is unwilling to put it forward except as a question that might fairly be asked upon such premises. This gives the sentence a less repulsive tone than the reading, which, without an interrogative puts it thus: *Ἄρα Χριστὸς ἁμαρτίας διάκονος*. God forbid (*μή*)

γένειο). "Abhorred be the thought!" we both say; but (the apostle means his interlocutor to understand) since it cannot without horrid impiety be said that Christ was a minister to us of sin and not of righteousness, it follows of necessity that we did not sin against God when we set the works of the Law aside and sought righteousness in Christ alone without any respect had to them. The Greek phrase is one of several renderings which the Septuagint gives to the Hebrew word *chali'lah*, *ad profana*, which is frequently used interjectionally to relegate some thought to the category of what is utterly abhorrent and polluted. The Hebrew word is discussed fully in Gesenius's 'Thesaurus,' *in verb.* St. Paul uses the Greek phrase twice again in this Epistle (once absolutely, iii. 21, and once inwoven in a sentence, vi. 14); ten times absolutely in his Epistle to the Romans (iii. 4, 6, etc.). It occurs also Luke xx. 16. It is impossible to mend the vigorous rendering of our Authorized Version.

Ver. 18.—For if I build again the things which I destroyed (*εἰ γὰρ ἔκατέλυσα, ταῦτα πάλιν οἰκοδομῶ*); for if I am building up again the things which I pulled down. I make myself a transgressor (*παραβάτην ἑμαυτὸν συνίστημι* [or, *συνιστάνω*, another form of the same verb]); a transgressor is what I am showing my own self to be. I must be wrong one way or the other; if I am right now, I was wrong then; and from the very nature of the case now in hand, wrong exceedingly; no less than an absolute transgressor. This word "transgressor" denotes, not one who merely happens to break, perchance inadvertently, some precept of the Law, but one who, perhaps in consequence of even one act of wilful transgression, is to be regarded as trampling upon the authority of the Law altogether (comp. Rom. ii. 25, 27; Jas. ii. 9, 11, which are the only places of the New Testament in which the word occurs; it is therefore a full equivalent to the word "sinner" of ver. 17). The Greek verb *συνιστάνω*, "to put forward in a clear light," is used similarly in 2 Cor. vi. 4; vii. 11. It is much debated, and is certainly nowise clear, how far down in the chapter the rebuke addressed to St. Peter extends. If it does not reach to the end of the chapter, as some think it does, the break may be very well placed at the end of this verse. For this verse clearly relates to St. Peter, whether actually addressed to him or not; notwithstanding that the verbs are in the hypothetical first person singular, they cannot be taken as referred to St. Paul, not being at all applicable to his case. On the other hand, with the nineteenth verse the first person is plainly used by St. Paul with reference to his own self, which is indeed

marked by the emphatic *ἐγὼ* with which it opens.

Ver. 19.—For I through the Law am dead to the Law (*ἐγὼ γὰρ διὰ νόμου νόμος ἀπέθανον*); for I, for my part, through the Law died unto the Law. This *ἐγὼ* is not the hypothetical "I" of ver. 18, which in fact recites the personality of St. Peter, but is St. Paul himself in his own concrete historical personality. And the pronoun is in a measure antithetical; as if it were: for whatever may be your feeling, mine is this, that I," etc. The conjunction "for" points back to the whole passage (vers. 15—18), which has described the position to which St. Paul had himself been brought and on which he still now, when writing to the Galatians, is standing; he here justifies that description. "Through the Law;" through the Law's own procuring, through what the Law itself did, I was broken off from all connection with the Law. From the words, "I have been crucified with Christ," in the next verse, and from what we read in ch. iii. 13, most especially when taken in connection with the occurrences at Antioch which at any rate led to the present utterance, and with the hankering after Judaical ceremonialism in Galatia which occasioned the writing of this letter, we may with confidence draw the conclusion that St. Paul is thinking of the Law in its ceremonial aspect, that is, viewed as determining ceremonial purity and ceremonial pollution. He is here most immediately dealing with the question, whether Jewish believers could freely associate without defilement in God's sight with Gentile believers who according to the Levitical Law were unclean, and could partake of the like food with them. The notion of becoming dead to the Law through the cross of Christ has other aspects besides this, as is evinced by Rom. vii. 1—6; a fact which is indeed glanced at by the apostle even here; but of the several aspects presented by this one and the same many-faced truth, the one which he here more particularly refers to is that which it bore towards the Law as a ceremonial institute. That which the Law as a ceremonial institute did in relation to Christ was this—it pronounced him as crucified to be in the intensest degree ceremonially accursed and polluting; to be most absolutely *cherem*. But Christ in his death and resurrection-life is appointed by God to be the sinner's only and complete salvation. It follows that he who by faith and sacrament is made one with Christ, does, together with the spiritual life which he draws from Christ, partake also in the pollution and accursedness which the Law fastens upon *him*; he is by the Law bidden away: he can thenceforth have no connec-

tion with it,—the Law itself will have it so. "But (the apostle's feeling is) the Law may curse on as it will: I have life with God and in God nevertheless." This same aspect of the death of Christ as disconnecting believers from the Law viewed as a ceremonial institute, through the pollutedness which the Law attached to most especially that form of death, is referred to in Heb. xiii. 10—13. The phrase, "I died unto the Law," is similar to that of "being made dead to the Law" (θανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ), and being "discharged [or, 'delivered'] from the Law (κατηργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου)," which we have Rom. vii. 4, 6; though the particular aspect of the fact that the cross disconnects believers from the Law is not precisely the same in the two passages, since in the Romans the Law is viewed more in its character as a rule of moral and spiritual life (see Rom. vii. 7—23). That I might live unto God (ἵνα θεῶν ᾖ); that I might become alive unto God. It is not likely that ᾖ is a future indicative, although we have καταδουλώσουσιν after ἵνα in ver. 4, and the form ζήσομεν in Rom. vi. 2; for the future would most probably have been ἴσουςμαι, as in ch. iii. 11, 12; and Rom. i. 17; viii. 13; x. 5. It is more likely to be the subjunctive of the aorist ἔζησα, which, according to the now accepted reading of ἔζησεν for ἀνέστη καὶ ἀνέζησεν, we have in Rom. xiv. 9; where, as well as the ζήσομεν of 1 Thesa. v. 10, it means "become alive." In verbs denoting a state of being, the aorist frequently (though not necessarily) means coming into that state, as for example, ἐπτώχευσε, "became poor" (2 Cor. ix. 9). "Living unto God" here, as in Rom. vi. 10, does not so much denote any form of moral action towards God as that spiritual state towards aim out of which suitable moral action would subsequently flow. The apostle died to the Law, in order that through Christ he might come into that vital union with God in which he might both serve him and find happiness in him; this service to God and joy in God being the "fruit-bearing" in which the "life" is manifested (Rom. vii. 5, 6).

Ver. 20.—This verse brings out into fuller detail the several points bound up in the succinct statement of ver. 19. I am crucified with Christ (Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι); I have been crucified with Christ. I am on the cross, fastened thereto with Christ; the object, therefore, with him of the Law's abhorrence and anathema. If we ask, how and when he became thus blended with Christ in his crucifixion, we have the answer suggested by himself in Rom. vi. 3, 6, "Are ye ignorant, that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his

death?"—"that our old man was crucified with him?" It was by believing in Christ and being baptized into him; comp. ch. iii. 27, "All ye who were baptized into Christ did put on Christ"—words which have to be taken in connection with the reference to "faith in Christ" in ver. 26. The perfect tense of the verb συνεσταύρωμαι points to a continued state of being, following upon that decisive crisis of his life; the apostle images himself as still hanging on the cross with Christ, while also sharing in his resurrection-life; his "old man" is on the cross, while his spirit partakes in and is renewed by Christ's life in God (Rom. vi. 6, 8, 11). The pragmatism of the passage, however, that is, its relevancy to the subject discussed by him with St. Peter, consists in the twofold statement: (1) that the Law as a ceremonial institute has now nothing to do with him nor he with it, except as mutually proclaiming their entire disseverment the one from the other; and (2) that nevertheless, while thus wholly apart from the Law, he has life in God, as he further proceeds to declare. Nevertheless I live (ὡ δέ). Notwithstanding all the Law's anathema, I am alive unto God (comp. Rom. vi. 11), the object of his love, and an heir of his eternal life. With this exalted blessedness of mine the Law cannot in the slightest degree meddle, by any determination which it will fain propound of cleanness or uncleanness. No ceremonial pollution of its constituting can touch this my life. My own life and my fellow-believer's life in God is infinitely removed from the possibility of receiving taint of pollution through eating (say) of blood, or suet, or pork, or through touching a leper or the remains of a deceased man. Nothing of this kind can mar or stain my righteousness or my fellow-believer's righteousness. Both he and I, sharing in the like "life" and righteousness, rejoice and exult together; let the Law denounce us for unclean as loudly and as bitterly as it will. Nay, if I were to allow myself to be disquieted by any such denouncement of pollution, I should, in fact, be allowing myself to harbour misgivings and unbelief touching the very essence of the grace of Jesus Christ. Yet not I, but Christ liveth in me (οὐκ ἐγὼ, ἤν δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός); and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me. It was essential to the apostle's argument that he should assert himself to be, in spite of the Law's anathema, "alive," in the full possession of life in God; but he hastens to qualify this assertion by explaining how entirely he owes this life of his to Christ; and, in his eagerness to do this, he compresses the assertion and the qualification in one clause so closely together as, in a way not at all un-

usual with him, well-nigh to wreck the grammatical construction. A method, indeed, has been proposed by critics of disposing this clause with respect to the preceding in such a manner as to make the sentence run quite smoothly; thus: *Zō dē oūk ertei ēgō, ἥ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός*; that is, as given in the margin of the Revised English Version, "I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me." But not only does this method of construing altogether efface the apostle's assertion of his being alive notwithstanding the Law's malediction—an assertion which agrees so thoroughly with the defiant tone of the argument, but the abruptness of the construction as presented in the ordinary reading of the passage is its very recommendation; for such uncouthness of style is wont to show itself in St. Paul's more eager, impassioned passages. "No longer I;" as in those old days when I prided myself on being an especial favourite of Heaven, eminently righteous through meritorious doings of my own, through my punctilious observance in particular of all that the Law prescribes for gaining and maintaining ceremonial sanctity (comp. Phil. iii. 4, 6). "In those days it was I that was alive; it is not so now." The *ἐγὼ ἔζω*, "I was alive," of Rom. vii. 9, serves again as a perfect illustration of the *phraseology* of the present passage; only we have still to bear in mind that the apostle is at present contemplating the ceremonial aspect of his old life, rather than, as in the Romans, the moral; the two being no doubt, however, in his former Pharisee scheme of religion, essentially conjoined. The in-being of Christ is to be understood as blending in one the two notions, of Christ as the ground of our acceptableness before God and of our being alive unto God, and of Christ as the motive spring of true practical well-doing (Rom. viii. 10). The two things, though notionally distinct, cannot exist apart, but the former is the more prominent idea here. And the life which I now live in the flesh (*ὃ δὲ νῦν ᾧ ἐν σαρκί*). "Life" still denotes his spiritual state of being, and not his moral activity, though by inference involving this latter; as if it were "the life which I now possess." The construction of *ὃ ᾧ* is paralleled by the *ὃ ἀπέθανε*, "the death that he died, he died," and the *ὃ ἥ*, "the life that he liveth, he liveth," of Rom. vi. 10. "Now," as well as "no longer," stands in contrast with his old life in Judaism. But, on the other hand, "in the flesh," viewed in conjunction with (*ἐν πνεύματι*) "in faith," or "by faith," must be taken as in Phil. i. 22, that is, as contrasted with the future life; while we are in the flesh "we walk by faith, not by sight"

(2 Cor. v. 7). I live by the faith of the Son of God (*ἐν πίστει ᾧ τῆ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ*); I live by faith, the faith which is in the Son of God. By faith, not by works of the Levitical Law. It was by faith in Christ that I first became partaker of this life; it is by faith in Christ that I continue to partake of it; letting go my faith in Christ, I partake of the life no longer. The especial relevancy of this statement of the apostle's, whether with respect to the matters agitated at Antioch, or with respect to any such revival of Levitical notions of acceptableness with God as was now perplexing the Churchmen of Galatia, is the warning which it implicitly conveys that, to revert to Levitical notions of uncleanness or of righteousness, was to sin against faith in Christ, and therewith against the very essence of a Christian's spiritual life. It was the strong sense which the apostle had of the absolutely fatal tendency of such relapses towards Judaism that inspired the deep pathos which here tinges his language. Hence the magnificent title by which he recites Christ's personality, "the Son of God;" possessing as such an absolutely commanding claim to his people's adherence, which they dare not decline. Hence, too, the words which follow. Who loved me, and gave himself for me (*τοῦ ἀγαπήσαστός με, καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ*); who loved me, and gave himself up for me. Fain would the reader realize to his mind the fervid, thrilling tones and accent of voice in which the apostle, while uttering these words, would give vent to the sentiment which so powerfully swayed his whole life, and which he so vividly describes in writing to the Corinthians: "The love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that one died for all, therefore all died [namely, to all but him]; and he died for all, that they which live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto him who for their sakes died and rose again" (2 Cor. v. 14, 15). The same appropriation of Christ's love to his own individual self which the apostle here gives utterance to, "who loved me, and gave himself up for me," may every human creature also express in whom only is the faith which takes hold of his love. In fact, the apostle speaks thus for the very purpose of prompting every individual believer who hears him to feel and say the same. This, he indicates, should be their feeling just as much as his; a sentiment just as irresistibly regulative of their life. Why not? Do they not also owe to him all their hope on behalf of their souls? For the expression, "gave himself up," comp. ch. i. 4 and note. The Greek verb *παραδόντος* is distinguished from the simple *δόντος*, "gave

himself," by its bringing more distinctly into view the notion of Christ's giving himself over into the hands of those who sought his life.

Ver. 21.—I do not frustrate the grace of God (*οὐκ ἀθετῶ τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ*); I do not reject the grace of God. As I should be doing, if, instead of resting with "glorified" (1 Pet. i. 8) satisfaction in the fatherly love and complacency with which God regards me in Christ, I began to give anxious heed to what the Law prescribes touching things or persons clean or unclean, and to deem it possible and needful to secure acceptableness with God through works of ceremonial performance. If it were only for one single reason alone, I do not, I cannot, thus slight and set at nought the *state of grace* with all its attendant blessings into which God has in Christ Jesus brought me. The "grace of God" presents that entire notion of the kingdom of grace which the apostle sets forth, and on which he descends with such glowing animation, in the fifth chapter of his Epistle to the Romans. The term of itself stands in vivid contrast to that slavish, anxious, never assured working for acceptance, which characterized the Jewish legalist, and characterizes the legalist Christian as well. As the apostle does not write *ἐγὼ οὐκ ἀθετῶ*, which would mean, "I do not set aside, not I," he is not to be read as if just now emphasizing a *personal* contrast between himself, and either St. Peter or the Judaizers with whom St. Peter was then to outward appearance taking sides; he is at present simply winding up his recital of his remonstrance at Antioch with the one terse argument, with which he then justified his own position, and, as if with a sledge-hammer, at once demolished the position of the Judaizers. The verb *ἀθετῶ* means "reject," "turn from as from a thing unworthy of regard;" as in Mark vii. 9, "Ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your tradition;" Luke vii. 30, "The Pharisees and lawyers rejected for themselves the counsel of God;" 1 Thess. iv. 8, "He that rejecteth [our testimony touching this], rejecteth not man, but God;" Heb. x. 28, "A man that hath set at nought Moses' Law;" in which last passage it indicates, but without itself fully describing, a more aggressive disobedience. The rendering "made void," adopted by the Revisers, in the sense of "disannul," is doubtless fully authenticated by ch. iii. 15; 1 Tim. v. 12; Heb. ix. 18. Since even an apostle could not "disannul" the "grace of God" viewed in itself, this sense of the word, if adopted, would, as well as the perhaps questionable rendering of our Authorized Version, "frustrate," apply to the previous work of Divine grace wrought

upon the apostle's own soul. But the logical connection of the following clause is more easily shown by our reverting to the sense before given to the verb, which in the New Testament is the more usual one. For if righteousness come by the Law, then Christ is dead in vain (*εἰ γὰρ διὰ νόμου δικαιοσύνη, ἅρα Χριστὸς ἄδικαιον ἀπέθανεν*); for if through the Law is righteousness, then did Christ for nought die. This one reason is decisive. The sole reason why the Son of God came into the world to suffer death was to do away our sins and make us righteous with God. But if sin can be purged by the purifications of the Law, and cleanness before God is procurable by Levitical ceremonies, then there was no need for this; then the Crucifixion, for this one end ordained and from the beginning of time prepared for by the Father, and for this one end, of his own free choice gone forward to, brought about, and undergone by Christ himself, was a simply superfluous sacrifice. We might have been saved, nay, have perchance saved ourselves, without it. It is impossible to find in all Scripture a more decisive passage than this in proof both of the fact of the atonement and of its supreme importance in the Christian system. This is emphatically Christ's great work. Compared with this, all besides is either subsidiary or derivative. *Δωρεάν*, (as a mere gift,) "for nought;" that is, without cause, there being no call or just occasion for it; thus, John xv. 25, "They hated me without cause;" 1 Sam. xix. 5, Septuagint, "Slay David without a cause;" Ezek. vi. 10, Septuagint, "I have not said in vain that I would do this evil unto them;" Eccles. xxix. 6, "He hath got him an enemy without cause." The apostle adds nothing as to the effect of his remonstrance. It is impossible, however, to doubt that, so instant as it was with the power of the Holy Spirit, it proved successful, not only in the healing of the mischief which had begun to show itself in the Antiochian Church, but also in its effect upon St. Peter. Nothing has transpired of any later intercourse between the two apostles. But the thorough honesty which in the main was one of St. Peter's great characteristics, notwithstanding the perplexed action in which from time to time he got involved, through the warmth of his sympathetic affections and his sometimes too hasty impulsiveness, would be sure to make him pre-eminently tractable to the voice of a true-speaking and holy friend; and, moreover, in the present instance, St. Paul was appealing to sentiments which he had himself recently proved at Jerusalem to be deeply operative in his own bosom. How deeply operative, is further evinced in his own two Epistles, written some eight

or ten years later than this Epistle, and addressed also in part to the same Galatian Churches; in which he not only weaves into his language not a few expressions and turns of thought which have all the appearance of being borrowed from Epistles of St. Paul, but also in the second of them makes direct mention of those Epistles, speaking of them as standing on the footing of "the other Scriptures," and of their author as "our beloved brother Paul;" notwithstanding that one of those very writings contains the extremely plain-spoken account of that sad fall of his at Antioch, which we have here been considering. (On St. Paul's later relations with St. Barnabas, see above on ver. 13.)

#### ADDITIONAL NOTE.

Ver. 12.—*The Judaism of the earliest Pentecostal Church not rabbinical.* Any one who will be at the pains of reviewing the contents of the four Gospels with an eye to this particular subject, cannot fail to be struck by the frequency with which Christ in his own conduct placed himself in even the sharpest antagonism to the "traditions of the elders," and encouraged his disciples in likewise setting them at naught. And this he did in cases in which the contrast of his behaviour to the abject submission to those traditions paraded by the Pharisees must have been most striking, and have jarred, no doubt, very often even painfully, upon the ill-instructed religious sensibilities of those, who had grown up in the belief that to observe the traditions was both seemly and pious and to neglect them unseemly and schismatical. For example, in daily life, neither he nor his disciples would "baptize" themselves when coming home from the market, nor even apply lustral water to their hands before taking a meal, though *there* before their eyes stood the vessels filled with water which had been provided for the guests and which the other guests were punctual in using. It was not without significance that in his first miracle he withdrew the water which had been set apart for such lustrations from one use of it which he would pronounce to be utterly frivolous and vain, to apply it to one which should really be serviceable and beneficent. Again, many were the restrictions which the traditions imposed upon men's actions on the sabbath—restrictions which not only were additional to those enjoined by the Law, but also in many cases contravened the calls of mercy and benevolence. Such restrictions Christ very frequently, and in the most public and pointed manner, so as to directly challenge attention to what he did, broke through, and taught his disciples

to disregard; the Pharisees being repeatedly so enraged at these transgressions of the traditions as to endeavour in consequence to take his life. The fastings enjoined by the traditions, he and his disciples likewise offended the Pharisees by taking no account of. The traditions of especially one popular school of teaching allowed so great a facility of divorce as served to disguise a frightful excess of licentiousness, in which many of the Pharisees were themselves implicated; in opposition to which Christ was wont publicly to declare that connections formed after divorces not justified by adultery were themselves adulterous. Continually was the Lord warning his followers against the leaven of Pharisaism, to wit, its ostentation in religious observances; its laying so much stress upon the outward act, in neglect of the inward motive and the posture of the spirit; its draining away the forces of moral earnestness from the prosecution of justice, mercy, and truth, to squander them upon scrupulous and vigilant devotion to the veriest trifles of formalism; the consequent hollowness and hypocrisy of the religious character of its votaries; their love of money; their eagerness for social distinction; their cruelty to the poor amid all their ostentatious almsgiving; their hard-heartedness to the fallen; their intense, devilish hatred of real piety. All the four Gospels abound in indications of that antipathy to Pharisaism and traditionalism which Christ both entertained himself and was careful to instil into the minds of his disciples. It cannot, therefore, be questioned that the disciples who formed the first nucleus of the Christian community, especially the twelve and the brethren of the Lord, were animated by similar sentiments of anti-Pharisaism; and so also the Pentecostal Church at Jerusalem as moulded under their influence. The Law of Moses, no doubt, they continued to obey, as their Master had done—the Law of Moses, however, as construed in the more humane and spiritual sense put upon it by the Sermon on the Mount, and not as stiffened and hardened into intolerable cruelty by the rabbinism which the Pharisees insisted upon. Such, we may feel certain, had been the attitude of St. Peter's mind in reference to the Law when, years before at Joppa, he had received the summons to go and visit Cornelius at Cæsarea. It was with constraint put upon his own hitherto overished tastes that he submitted to the call; and when he entered the Gentile's house, the fibre of Israelitism in his soul is seen quivering, shrinking back from the step which he was compelled to take. "Ye yourselves know," he said to the company of uncircumcised men among whom he found himself, "that it is an

unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to join himself or to come unto one of another nation; and yet unto me hath God showed that I should not call any man common or unclean." It was painful to him as an Israelite and a Mosaitist; but God's declared will was leaving him no alternative. Now, whence had arisen those feelings of repulsion? Partly it was, no doubt, a kind of caste sentiment. It had been then more than two thousand years a traditional consciousness with the Hebrew race that their circumcision lifted them to a higher level than the rest of mankind stood upon; and the persuasion inspired them with a disdain of uncircumcised nations, which with the most had little or no admixture of really religious feeling, being felt by the idolatrous Ephraimites as well as by the less unfaithful children of Judah. With the more pious members of the nation, this repulsion from Gentiles was partly the outcome of their sense of the deep degradation, religious and moral, in which heathen nations were sunk, steeped as they were in idolatry; but their sense of this was greatly intensified by the moral effect of the separation from other nations enforced by the ceremonial law. This was effected partly by the distinction between clean and unclean animals, which, recognized in an elementary degree as early as the time of Noah, was made in the Levitical legislation a matter of very minutely definite prescription (Lev. xi.); and partly by the prohibition of eating either certain kinds of fat (Lev. iii. 17) or blood: to partake either of the flesh of an unclean animal, or of suet or blood, was emphatically declared by the Law, and by the long-inherited tradition of the nation had grown to be instinctively felt to be, "defilement" and "abomination." There is no ground for supposing that St. Peter's shrinking back from Gentiles as common or unclean was caused by rabbinism. Rabbinism, no doubt, added much to the bitterness of the repulsion with those who served the traditions; but even where there was no bondage owned to the dicta of the elders, repulsion from the contact of a Gentile was a powerful sentiment, having its roots deep in the instinctive sentiments of the Hebrew race and in the feelings instilled by the peremptory enactments of the Divine

Law. Now, however, in Cornelius's house, St. Peter does not allow his spirit to be dominated by sentiments such as these. God and Christ his Master were making it manifest, as in other ways, so especially by the astonishing illapse of the Holy Spirit into these believing hearers of the gospel message, that they *were* no longer unclean, and therefore he cannot possibly any longer treat them as unclean. He tarried with them certain days, and, according to the charge immediately after preferred against him and not denied, ate with them. That he partook of the same food as they, whether of a kind forbidden by the Mosaic Law or not, is not stated and is no necessary inference drawn from the circumstances. He would not, we may well believe, scruple now to recline at the same table with them; but it may be readily imagined that for a guest so highly revered, of whose Jewish sensibilities respecting food they could not be unaware, even if he or the six Jewish brethren who accompanied him from Joppa did not make a point of apprising them, the wealthy centurion and his family would be only too anxious to provide such food as both he and his fellow-visitors would find acceptable. Thus St. Peter might have "eaten bread" with the Gentiles, neither, on the one hand, himself breaking the Levitical Law by partaking of food which was forbidden to him as a child of the legal covenant, nor, on the other, declining to recognize the full acceptableness before God and the equal brotherhood in Christ of believers who were still in their uncircumcision. The caste feeling of proud disdain of uncircumcised men as men of an inferior grade, and the dread of ceremonial defilement from contact with those who were levitically unclean, dared no longer assert themselves, could, indeed, no longer be permitted to lodge in his bosom, in the face of the clear proof which had been afforded that the Almighty had in Christ adopted them as his own children equally with himself. Thus it appears that when at Antioch, at the time here referred to by St. Paul, Cephas was seen partaking of social meals in company with the Gentile converts, he was only acting in the same way as he had acted at Caesarea ten years before.

### HOMILETICS.

Vers. 1—5.—*The battle of Christian liberty fought over the case of Titus.* The apostle proceeds to show that, on his subsequent journey to Jerusalem, he maintained his independence, and was recognized by the other apostles as possessing equal authority with themselves.

I. HIS NEXT INTERVIEW WITH THE APOSTLES. "Then fourteen years after I went up

again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took Titus with me also." 1. *The period of this visit.* It was fourteen years from the date of his conversion—not from the date of his former visit to Jerusalem—for he seems always to view his conversion as the true starting-point of his career. The word "again" does not determine whether he here refers to the second or third visit. It was evidently his third visit; for the second was with alms, when he probably saw no apostle, for the gift of the Gentile Churches was sent to "the elders," not the apostles, "by the hands of Barnabas and Saul" (Acts xi. 30). There was no need to mention all his visits to Jerusalem, only those which gave him opportunities of intercourse with the apostles. This visit, then, was that of Acts xv., the period of the council of Jerusalem. 2. *His companions on this visit—Barnabas and Titus.* There was something significant in this companionship. Barnabas, a pure Jew, was the companion of the apostle in preaching freedom from the Law. He was one of the most beautiful characters in New Testament times, especially distinguished by the generosity of his disposition. Titus was a Gentile Christian, not even circumcised, and may have been sent to the council as the representative of Gentile Christians. The apostle took him there as an illustration of Christian liberty, for the council would be obliged to decide whether Titus was to be circumcised or not. Thus the apostle manifested the consistency of his doctrine and his practice. This is the first mention of Titus in Scripture; for the Galatian Epistle preceded the Second to the Corinthians, in which his name occurs in terms of high commendation. 3. *The interval between his visits to Jerusalem was filled with constant labours as an apostle.* He was engaged during all this period in independent labours, and therefore before the apostles could have had an opportunity of recognizing his work. During this time the apostles never thought of calling in question his free gospel. The Acts of the Apostles supply the history of his labours during this time (Acts xi. 26; xiii.; xiv. 28). 4. *His journey was taken "by revelation."* According to St. Luke, he was sent by the Church at Antioch (Acts xv. 2), and therefore was not summoned by the apostles to give an account of his gospel. But the revelation may have suggested the very action of the Church at Antioch, or it may, on the other hand, have confirmed it. The apostle was in any case assured of Divine guidance at a most critical epoch in Christian history.

II. HIS BOLD YET PRUDENT EXPOSITION OF HIS GOSPEL. "And I went up by revelation, and laid before them that gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but privately to them of reputation, lest by any means I might be running, or have run, in vain." 1. *His public exposition.* (1) It was addressed to the general body of Christians at Jerusalem, not to the apostles or elders exclusively; for he expounded the gospel "privately" to the apostles. (2) His gospel was that of justification by faith without circumcision. (3) It was a gospel which had not changed since the council; for he speaks of it as that which "I preach," not which "I preached." The conference, therefore, made no change upon it. 2. *His private exposition.* (1) It was addressed to the apostles—"to them of reputation," as Peter, James, and John are called in ver. 9. Not so called in any spirit of irony, but because it is as authorities their names came at all in question. Besides, one of them, James, was not an apostle. (2) Its object was to have a more thorough discussion, with a view to a mutual understanding in the interests of peace and the gospel. A private conversation admits of greater freedom and discursiveness in dealing with difficult or contested points. The apostle did not seek the testimony of men, as if the Word of God could not stand without it; but he knew that a cordial understanding with the apostles would add powerfully to the confirmation of the faith. If his gospel was approved by apostles, it would be clear of the charge of singularity, and would no longer be regarded as an invention of his own. He knew, besides, that, if the leading men could be gained over, the multitude would follow. He was anxious for the success of the gospel, "lest he should run in vain," for a misunderstanding at that critical moment might involve the loss of his past and future labours, by imperilling the free mode of his offering the gospel to the Gentiles. Grave differences of judgment among ministers of the gospel compromise alike its authority and its practical effect. (3) There is nothing here to justify a secret and underhand policy. The Church of Rome points to this case as favouring its doctrine of reserve. It is necessary to see, however, the utter groundlessness of this assertion. The apostle did not say one thing in private and another in public, but communicated, as he expressly



says, the same gospel on both occasions. Openly he expounded it to the Christians at Jerusalem, but entered into its doctrinal aspects more deeply in private.

III. THE APOSTLE'S VICTORY. "Titus was not compelled to be circumcised," Greek though he was. *The language implies that efforts had been made to this end, not by the apostles, however, but by "the false brethren."* But these efforts were defeated by the council. Had the council been of the opinion of the false brethren, Titus would have been compelled to be circumcised. 2. *Mark the firmness of the apostle.* "Not even Titus"—though he was brought into close contact with the Jews, and might therefore have taken a more conciliatory course toward them, especially in the great centre of Judaist influence—"was forced to be circumcised." If the apostle yielded at Jerusalem, he must yield everywhere else. Yet he allowed Timothy to be circumcised at Lystra, but that was a case of deference to the scruples of weak brethren. For the sake of gaining souls he will renounce liberty. But he will not allow the truth of the gospel to be sacrificed by men who say that circumcision is necessary to salvation. 3. *Mark the ground of the apostle's firmness.* "And this, because of false brethren insidiously brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ, that they might bring us into bondage." That is, he resisted the circumcision of Titus, because the false brethren would have taken advantage of the concession to bring the Gentiles into bondage to legal ceremonies. (1) *Who were the false brethren?* They were persons at Jerusalem, not at Antioch (2 Cor. xi. 26). They were brethren only by profession, and therefore more dangerous than open enemies. "Pharisees at heart, these spies and traitors assume the name and garb of believers." The apostles did not coincide with them. They must have been Judaizers. Yet all Judaizers were not necessarily false brethren; but these were Christians only in profession. (2) *Their furtive attitude.* They were "brought in insidiously," either into the ministry or into the membership of the Church. They had a standing somehow that entitled them to influence the usage or doctrine of the Church. False teachers always enter the Church in disguise (2 Pet. ii. 1). "These hell-scouts are skulking in every corner" (Trapp). The policy of such persons has nothing of Christian simplicity in it. (3) *Their design.* "To spy out our liberty which we have in Christ." Their work was "inspection for a sinister purpose." An impure intention was at the bottom of the movement. The liberty they threatened to destroy was not spiritual liberty in general, but that which was compromised by the demand of subjection to the ceremonial law. The liberty of believers was a present possession enjoyed by virtue of their union with Christ. 4. *The result of the apostle's firmness.* "To whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour." If he had done it once, Christian liberty would have been sacrificed. The characteristic truth of the gospel—justification by faith without the deeds of the Law—was now safe. It was to "remain steadfast" with the Gentiles. Thus truth and freedom were henceforth to go together.

Vers. 6—9.—*The apostle takes counsel with the other apostles on perfectly equal terms.* He is still asserting his apostolic independence.

I. HIS REBUKE OF THOSE WHO LEANED UPON AUTHORITY. "Those high in reputation; whatsoever they were, it maketh no difference to me: God respecteth no man's person." The apostle does not mean to disparage either the reputation or the authority of the other apostles. It was not his interest to do so, because it was important for him to show that he was even acknowledged by them. But the false brethren had unduly exalted the authority of the "pillar apostles," so as to establish a sort of papacy in the Church. He was, therefore, led to show that, in matters of faith, the authority of individuals has no weight; that we are bound to lean upon God, not upon men, even though they be persons of position and respectability. "God accepteth no man's person." He may employ whom he pleases to carry out his work, and can qualify them fully for the purpose. The Galatians were "respecters of persons," inasmuch as they depreciated the apostle, because the twelve were apostles before him and enjoyed the peculiar privilege of personal intercourse with the Lord on earth. The apostle declares, in fact, that God did not prefer James, or Cephas, or John to him, much less employ them to appoint him to apostolic office.

II. THE APOSTLES ADDED NOTHING TO HIS INFORMATION OR AUTHORITY BY THEIR ACTION AT THE CONFERENCE. "They who seemed to be somewhat added nothing to me."

He got nothing from them; they added nothing to his knowledge of the gospel: he received no new instructions; they were perfectly independent one of another. They did not interfere with the course he had hitherto pursued, much less question its rightness.

III. THE APOSTLES, ON THE CONTRARY, PRACTICALLY APPROVED HIS COURSE. "But contrariwise, when they saw that I was entrusted with the gospel of the uncircumcision, as the gospel of the circumcision was to Peter . . . they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship." 1. *They acknowledged his perfect equality with Peter.* (1) *As to apostolic commission.* "When they saw that I was entrusted with the gospel of the uncircumcision, as the gospel of the circumcision was to Peter." These words suggest: (a) That the gospel is a solemn trust. There are many human trusts from which men naturally shrink because of the risk, labour, and anxiety involved in their faithful discharge. Yet the apostle thanked God that the weightiest of all trusts had been committed to him who was "a blasphemer, a persecutor, and injurious" (1 Tim. i. 13). Still he could say, "Who is sufficient for these things?" (b) The gospel is one, though it may be addressed to different circles of hearers. It is not implied in the apostle's language that there were two separate gospels—one for the Jews, and another for the Gentiles; for both Peter and Paul, as we know by their discourses and their Epistles, were in complete harmony as to the way of a sinner's salvation. (c) The gospel was committed to Paul, not by Peter or any other apostle, but by God himself. (2) *As to apostolic success.* "For he that wrought effectually for Peter toward the apostleship of the circumcision, the same wrought for me toward the Gentiles." (a) The equal success of the two apostles. The false brethren boasted that Peter's gospel was most effectual in conversions, and that he himself was a mighty worker of miracles. The success of Paul was equally manifest. (b) The true source of success in both cases was God himself, who worked mightily in the two apostles (Phil. ii. 13; 1 Cor. xii. 6). All gifts, all adaptation, all power, come from him. Thus Divine appointment was signified equally in both cases by the effectual working of God. 2. *The apostles acknowledged his official status and prerogative by giving him the right hand of fellowship in respect of future labours.* "But when James, Cephas, and John, who have the reputation of being pillars, became aware of the grace that was given to me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship, that we should go to the heathen and they to the circumcision." They recognized him as a fellow-labourer, "for the grace given to him," both in respect to his success and his calling by grace to the apostleship. (1) *Mark the wisdom of a division of labour.* They made a sort of convention as to the limits of their future labours—a convention, however, which could not always be very strictly observed. Paul was, no doubt, mainly concerned with the Gentiles, but usually preached first to the Jews in all places that he visited. Peter and John resided in their later years among the Gentiles. But it was an arrangement, notwithstanding, that was well calculated to promote the growth of Christianity at a time of great friction between the Jewish and Gentile elements in the Christian Church. Peter could not have been universal bishop or pope, if he was the apostle of the circumcision; for he practically conceded to Paul the apostolate of the largest part of the world—the Gentile nations. (2) *The important bearing of this convention upon the position and authority of the apostle.* Those who so frankly entered into this arrangement "had the reputation of being pillars in the Church." They were so regarded even by the "false brethren" and the Judaists everywhere. Their act was therefore calculated to cut the ground from under the feet of the disaffected, who would see in it an approval of Paul's gospel. (a) The apostle does not call the three pillars apostles, but "those in reputation," for one of them, James the Lord's brother, was not an apostle. (b) Peter was not head of the Church, for he received exactly the same commission as Paul. Even James is mentioned here before Peter, evidently because of his permanent connection with the great centre of Jewish Christianity. It was very important for Paul to be able to quote James on his side. (c) The gospel does not stand upon the authority of one apostle, any more than of twelve. It is the gospel of God. (d) The conduct of the apostles in this whole transaction is worthy of general imitation. They first examined Paul's doctrine and listened with candour to his explanations, and then gave up their particular opinions when they became convinced of his Divine commission.

Ver. 10.—*The claims of the poor saints in Jerusalem.* “Only they asked us that we should remember the poor; which very thing I also was forward to do.” While they gave us the right hand of fellowship that we should go to the Gentiles, there was an agreement that we should remember the poor of the circumcision.

I. WHO WERE THE POOR? They were the poor saints in Judæa, not in Jerusalem merely (1 Cor. xvi. 1). Their poverty arose, probably, from “the spoiling of their goods,” so familiar in persecuting periods, as well as, perhaps, from forfeiting business relations with their own countrymen.

II. A COMMON AGREEMENT TO REMEMBER THEM. 1. *It is agreeable to mark this unity of feeling in the midst of controversy.* 2. *There ought to be no division with regard to the poor.* The dictates of humanity, the demands of duty, the claims of interest, alike enforce a due consideration of the poor, but especially of those who belong to the household of faith. 3. *A common object of charity ought to have a uniting effect on people separated by other interests or opinions.*

III. THE APOSTLE'S SPECIAL ANXIETY ON THEIR BEHALF. 1. *He would naturally desire to conciliate the Jews and destroy their anti-Gentile prejudices.* 2. *Yet his liberality was no token of dependence upon Jerusalem.* 3. *The prospect of ingratitude from the Jews would have no effect in repressing his charitable zeal on their behalf.* 4. *The apostle was more forward on their behalf than any other apostle.* How he fulfilled the engagement is abundantly manifest (1 Cor. xvi. 1; 2 Cor. viii.; Rom. xv. 26).

Vers. 11—14.—*The apostle's rebuke of Peter at Antioch.* There is no record of this scene elsewhere in Scripture. It is a further proof of the apostle's independence as well as of his devotion to Christian liberty.

I. CONSIDER THE CONDUCT OF PETER. 1. *The scene of this interview between Peter and Paul—Antioch.* It was a city on the Orontes, in Syria, the seat of the Macedonian empire in Asia, chiefly inhabited by Greeks, liberalized in thought by considerable culture. It was the second capital of Christianity, Jerusalem being the first, and held a prominent place as the centre of Gentile Christian life. What occurred here would have wide results. 2. *The time.* It occurred probably during the sojourn of Paul and Barnabas at Antioch, after the council of Jerusalem had settled the whole question of the relation between Jewish and Gentile Christians (Acts xv. 30—40). Peter's conduct was, therefore, all the more singular and indefensible, because it was so necessary to secure Christian liberty on the basis of the decrees. We cannot forget that, long before, the vision from heaven showed him the worthlessness of Jewish traditions (Acts x. 27). 3. *The circumstances.* “Before that certain came from James, he was eating with the Gentiles; but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them of the circumcision.” Those who came from James were not false brethren, nor even necessarily Judaic zealots, but certain persons whom he sent to Antioch, not to impose a yoke of ceremonies on the Gentiles, but to reassure Jewish Christians as to their right to observe the divinely appointed usages of their fathers, which the decrees of the Jerusalem council had done nothing to overthrow. The conduct of James was perfectly legitimate. Yet it is probable they pleaded that there was no warrant in the decision of the council for the freer intercourse with Gentile Christians which Peter had been practising. The Jewish Christians were still to “keep the customs,” and not to mix freely with the Gentiles (Acts xv. 19). When these persons came to Antioch, they found Peter eating with Gentiles as he had done before (Acts x.), disregarding the isolation established by Levitical laws. They found him, in fact, living as a Gentile, not as a Jew. Peter at once, through the influence of fear—probably the fear of losing his influence with the Jewish Christians—began to withdraw himself from the Gentiles, discontinuing his eating with them, without giving one word of explanation, and attaching himself to the Jewish Christians, as if the old distinctions of meats were still in force and still sacred in his eyes. It is not said that the “certain from James” reproached him with his laxity. It may have been, after all, an empty fear on his part. Yet it was a most extraordinary act of tergiversation on the part of one of the “pillars” of the Church. 4. *Its effects upon both Jews and Gentiles at Antioch.* It involved the Jewish Christians in the hypocrisy of Peter himself. “And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him”—even those very persons who rejoiced at the decision of the council (Acts xv. 31). The Jewish converts might be tempted to believe that the

Mosaic Law was still in force. "Even Barnabas was also carried away with their dissimulation." "Even Barnabas"—my fellow-labourer in missionary work, "a good man, full of the Holy Ghost and of faith," who once fought by my side the battle of Gentile liberty (Acts xv.), who had hazarded his life by my side (Acts xv. 16)—"was carried away" by the force of such a formidable example in opposition to his own judgment and conviction. This incident probably led to the separation of Barnabas from Paul (Acts xv. 39), for they never after appear together, though the affectionate relationship between the friends was never broken. But the effect upon the Gentile Christians at Antioch must have been something almost inconceivable. They would no more meet with their Jewish brethren at the Lord's Table. They were treated as unclean. Peter's conduct virtually condemned their liberty, and was an indirect attempt to bring them under the yoke of Jewish usages. "Why," says Paul, "compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?" The compulsion was exercised by the authority of his example; for the Gentile Christians could not know of his dissimulation, but would rather think he had changed his opinion upon the subject of the relation of the Gentiles to the gospel.

5. *The true character of Peter's action.* It was hypocrisy; for he acted against his better convictions, as if it were really wrong to eat with Gentiles. He concealed his real convictions. No voice had been louder at the council in protesting against the imposition of a yoke which "neither we nor our fathers were able to bear." He certainly did not "walk uprightly." 6. *Its true explanation.* This is to be found in Peter's character, which was one of unusual strength and of unusual weakness. He was that apostle who was the first to recognize and the first to draw back from great principles. He was the first to confess Christ and the first to deny him; the first to own Gentile liberty, the first to disown it. "The fear of man is often as authoritative as papal bulls and decrees."

II. THE REBUKE OF PAUL. "I withstood him to the face, because he was condemned." There was no controversy between the two apostles; there was no difference of opinion; it was only a case of indecision in acting up to one's unchanged convictions. Peter was self-condemned, for his conduct bore the broad mark of inconsistency. 1. *The rebuke was public.* Such a sin openly should be rebuked openly. It is a necessary and difficult and much-neglected duty, and ought always to be discharged in a loving temper, without vanity or haughtiness. Here it was administered before the assembled Church at Antioch, Jews and Gentiles; otherwise it would have failed to influence the Jewish converts. Its publicity was necessary, as it was essential in the circumstances to establish fixed principles for all coming time. 2. *The rebuke was fully justified.* (1) Peter was condemned by his own act. (2) The rebuke would prevent the Zealots from being hardened and confirmed in their error. The Judaists would be allowed to receive no encouragement from Peter's tergiversation. (3) The Galatians would receive a new lesson as to the relation of the gospel to the Law. They would be made to see what it was "to walk uprightly according to the truth of the gospel." 3. *It was meekly and piously received.* There is no record of Peter's answer. But there was no sharp contention between the apostles. It is pleasing to think that the rebuke did not sunder the friendship of the two good men. Years after Peter speaks of his rebuker as "our beloved brother Paul also" (2 Pet. iii. 15). 4. *The rebuke proves at least that Paul was on an equality with Peter.* If the rebuke had been administered by Peter to Paul, how we should have heard of Peter's primacy! Yet nothing said by Paul affects in the least the apostolic authority and dignity of Peter. It was not a case of error in doctrine, but of inconsistency in conduct. "Ministers may err and sin; follow them no further than they follow Christ."

Vers. 15, 16.—*The true way of salvation.* The apostle then proceeds to show that the way of salvation is not by the works of the Law at all, but in a quite different way. His words to Peter imply—

I. THE NECESSITY OF JUSTIFICATION FOR BOTH JEWS AND GENTILES. "We being Jews by nature, and not sinners from among the Gentiles." He tells the Judaists the Jews had some advantage over the Gentiles. Yet, after all, the Jews themselves, such as Paul and Peter, were obliged to renounce trust in Judaism and to find their justification in Christ Jesus. The apostle shows the necessity of justification elsewhere in the case of both Jews and Gentiles (Rom. i., ii.). "All the world is found guilty before God"

(Rom. iii. 19). The charge is abundantly proved, and the sentence has gone forth: "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the book of the Law to do them" (ch. iii. 10).

II. THE NATURE OF JUSTIFICATION. "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the Law, but by the faith of Christ." Its meaning is to declare a person to be just. It does not mean either to pardon or to make just. It is a strictly judicial act. Newman admits that it signifies, not "to make righteous," but "to pronounce righteous;" yet he says it includes the "making righteous" under its meaning. That is, the sense of the term is counting righteous, but the sense of the thing is "making righteous." This is to make nonsense of language. To say that it means "making righteous" is to make justification and sanctification the same thing. This Romish divines actually do; yet they regard sanctification, that is, infused or inherent righteousness, as the ground of justification. That is, sanctification is at once a part of justification and the ground of it. Can a thing be at once part of a thing, and at the same time the ground of a thing? The meaning of the term "justification" is fixed by its opposite, "condemnation," which is, not to make wicked, but to pronounce guilty. "He that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the just, even they both are abomination to the Lord" (Prov. xvii. 15). "If there be a controversy between men, and they come unto judgment, that the judge may judge them; then they shall justify the righteous, and condemn the wicked" (Deut. xxv. 1). "The judgment was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification of life" (Rom. v. 16). The term is thus forensic. Justification includes more than pardon, because: 1. *The very terms imply a difference.* To pardon is to waive the execution of the penal sanction of the Law. To justify is to declare that the demands of the Law are satisfied, not waived. Pardon is a sovereign act; justification, a judicial act. 2. *Pardon is remission of penalty, in the absence of a satisfaction.* It is not an act of justice. But justification proceeds on the ground of a satisfaction. One is the remission of punishment; the other is a declaration that there is no ground for the infliction of punishment. 3. *The apostle speaks of "the blessedness of the man to whom the Lord imputeth righteousness without works"* (Rom. iv. 6). To impute righteousness is to justify. To pardon a man is not to ascribe righteousness to him. 4. *The terms of Scripture require this distinction.* It would be unmeaning to say, "No flesh shall be pardoned by the works of the Law." Justification includes both pardon and acceptance with God. It includes a title to eternal life, and therefore is called "justification of life," and on account of it men are made heirs according to the hope of eternal life (Titus iii. 7). This is the "true grace of God in which we stand." God does more than pardon; he "imputeth righteousness without works." Christ is made "the righteousness of God" to us. We are "accepted in the Beloved." Yet the pardon and the acceptance are never separated. All who are pardoned are justified, and all who are justified are pardoned.

III. THE GROUND OF JUSTIFICATION. "A man is not justified by the works of the Law, but by the faith of Christ." 1. *It is not by the works of the Law.* (1) *Of what Law?* It is not the mere ceremonial law, though that was here prominently in question. (a) It is the whole Law—the Law in the sense in which the apostle's readers would understand it, that Law whose violation brings in the whole world guilty before God (Rom. iii. 19). (b) The apostle never contrasts the works of the ceremonial with the works of the moral law, as if to imply that we cannot be justified by the first class, but may by the second. The opposition is always between works in general and faith. (c) He excludes as inadequate to our justification those very "works of righteousness" (Titus iii. 5), that is, according to Romish theology, works done after regeneration, which may be regarded as possessing the highest order of excellence. He even excludes the works of a good man like Abraham, the father of the faithful (Rom. iv. 2). (d) The objection of Rom. vi. 1, that if works are not the ground of our justification, we may live in sin, supposes that good works of every sort are excluded from the ground of our justification. (2) *The works, then, of the whole Law of God are excluded.* Because Scripture repeatedly asserts the fact. We are not justified "by our own righteousness, which is of the Law" (Phil. iii. 9). (a) The Law demands perfect obedience, and no obedience at one time can atone for disobedience at another (ch. iii. 10, 21; v. 3). (b) If we are justified by works, Christ is dead in vain. There was no need for his death (ch. ii. 21; v. 4). (c) Our salvation would not in that case be of grace,

but of dobt (Rom. xi. 6). (d) It would give room for boasting, which is excluded by the law of faith (Rom. iii. 27). 2. *Our justification is by the faith of Christ.* There are two facts here set forth—faith and the object of faith. The faith that justifies is distinguished by its object, Jesus Christ. The two prepositions (*ἐκ* and *διὰ*), used in the passage are designed to mark, respectively, source or cause and instrument. (1) *Consider the relation of faith to our justification.* Strictly speaking, Scripture never says that faith justifies, but that we are justified by faith. (a) Faith is not the ground of our justification. Yet it is said, "Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for (*εἰς*) righteousness" (Rom. iv. 3). This does not mean that faith is the graciously admitted ground of justification. For: (a) We are never said to be justified on account of faith (*διὰ πίστιν*), but through (*διὰ*) faith or of (*ἐκ*) faith. (β) This view of the relation of faith to justification is not consistent with those passages which affirm that the ground of our justification is not anything in us or done by us; for faith is a work done by us, quite as much as prayer or repentance. (γ) It is not consistent with those passages which make Christ's merits, his blood, his death, his cross, the ground of our acceptance. Faith cannot, therefore, be at once the ground and the instrument of our justification. (δ) We are saved by the righteousness of another, but that righteousness is always distinguished from the faith that apprehends it (Rom. i. 17; Phil. iii. 8—11). Faith cannot, therefore, both be and not be that righteousness. (ε) The apostle, when he says that Abraham's faith "was counted to him for (*εἰς*) righteousness" or "as righteousness," meant merely to say that faith, not works, secured his salvation. The word *εἰς* is used in two senses—"instead of" and "with a view to," and Ellicott is of opinion that the idea of destination is here blended with that of simple predication. Thus if Abraham's faith is equivalent to righteousness in God's account, it is because it is designed to secure that righteousness. "It was not the act of believing which was reckoned to him as a righteous act, or on account of which perfect righteousness was laid to his charge, but the fact of his trusting God to perform his promise introduced him to the blessing promised" (Alford). (b) Faith is not the ground, but the instrument of our justification. It receives and apprehends Christ in his righteousness. We have proved that faith is merely the instrument of our justification when we have proved that the only ground of our acceptance with God is the finished work of Christ, and that the only grace by which we rely upon that work is faith. For there is a relation between justification and faith which does not exist between justification and every other grace. (2) *Consider Jesus Christ as the object of faith.* The Saviour appears in this passage under three names—Jesus Christ, Christ Jesus, and Christ; as if the apostle meant to emphasize at one time the loving humanity, at another the official work, at another simply the Saviour in whom Jew and Gentile alike have their meeting-place. The "faith of Christ" includes a reference alike to his person and his work. The emphatic phrase, "we believed upon Christ," shows that faith is not a mere intellectual belief, but an act of trust, in which the soul goes out to him as at once "Wisdom, Righteousness, Sanctification, and Redemption."

IV. THE KNOWLEDGE OF OUR JUSTIFICATION. "Knowing that we are justified." There is a twofold aspect of this knowledge. It is: 1. *Doctrinal.* The apostles, both Peter and Paul, understood the true doctrine of a sinner's justification, as we see by their discourses and their writings. 2. *Experimental.* They realized it in its blessed fruits. They had an assured sense of God's favour, and of all the blessings involved in it.

V. THE EFFECT OF OUR JUSTIFICATION. The only effect pertinent to the present discussion was the new relation of the justified sinner to the Law. In virtue of his union with Christ, he died to the Law. There was, therefore, no longer any question of his submission to legal observances, or to "the beggarly elements" of a forsaken Judaism.

Vers. 17—19.—*An objection met.* "For if, while we are seeking to be justified in Christ"—our union with Christ being the spring and fount of all our blessings—"we ourselves also"—as well as these Galatians who are sinners and Gentiles—"were found to be sinners, is Christ a minister of sin? God forbid!"

I. THE TRUE ATTITUDE OF ALL JUSTIFIED PERSONS IN RELATION TO SIN AND CHRIST. 1. *They renounce all legal righteousness,* such as the Judaists boast of, and reduce themselves to the level of Gentile "sinners." There is no difference between Jew and

Gentile at the first point of contact between the soul and the Saviour. They are alike guilty before God. 2. *They look for justification only in Christ.* They are pronounced just by God because they are in Christ. 3. *Because the Jewish Christians, in renouncing the Law, reduced themselves to the level of sinners like the Gentiles, Christ did not therefore become a minister of sin,* because that renunciation was carried out under his authority. Yet Peter seemed to say by his conduct that the renunciation was altogether wrong.

II. THE INCONSISTENCY OF PETER'S CONDUCT. "For if I build again"—as you, Peter, are proposing—"the very things which I destroyed, I am proving myself a transgressor." Because the work of legal reconstruction would imply that my work of demolition was wrong. You, Peter, prove by your conduct that your former setting aside of the Law was a transgression.

III. THE LAW WAS ITSELF DESIGNED TO MAKE WAY FOR SOMETHING BETTER THAN ITSELF. "For I through the Law died to the Law, that I might live unto God." 1. *The apostle's death to the Law.* "I died to the Law." The Law in question is the Mosaic Law. The apostle's readers could understand it in no other sense. This death came through "the body of Christ." "Ye also became dead to the Law by the body of Christ" (Rom. vii. 4). He bore its penalty, and was therefore no more under its curse; and therefore, as "I have been crucified with him" (ver. 20), so that his death is my death, I died to the Law in him. 2. *The Law itself led directly to that death.* "I through the Law died to the Law." Not merely because it was a schoolmaster to lead me to Christ or manifested its own helplessness to justify, but because it was through the Law that sin wrought death in me (Rom. vii. 8). The Law took action upon me as a sinner. It wrought its will upon Christ when it seized him and put him to death. But in that death the Law lost its dominion over him, and therefore over us. Thus Christ is shown to be the "end of the Law for righteousness." Thus the apostle might say to Peter that "in abandoning the Law he did but follow the leading of the Law itself." 3. *Death to the Law is followed by life to God as its great purpose.* "I died to the Law that I might live unto God." It is suggestive that this was the very end of Christ's death. "For in that he died, he died unto sin once; in that he liveth, he liveth unto God" (Rom. vi. 10). We are, therefore, to reckon ourselves "alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord." This death to the Law does not involve lawlessness or freedom from moral restraints; for in its very nature it involves "death" to that sin, which is the strength of the Law. As we live in Christ, and Christ lives in God, our life is wrapped up in God. Therefore we cannot "serve him any longer in the oldness of the letter, but in the newness of the Spirit"—"in the newness of life;" "bringing forth fruit unto God."

Ver. 20.—*Fellowship with Christ in his death and in his life.* "I have been crucified; nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." The apostle is showing how he died to the Law and became released from legal bondage; it was through his becoming a partaker of the death of Christ.

I. FELLOWSHIP WITH CHRIST IN HIS DEATH. "I have been crucified with Christ." 1. *Here is a true identity of position.* I was one with him under Law and in suffering and death, so that when he died I died with him. I died in him when he died as my surety, satisfying Divine justice for me. Thus baptism for me signifies "baptism unto his death" (Rom. vi. 4); "We are buried with him in baptism unto death." We are "planted in the likeness of his death." All this purports the interest of the believer in the merit of Christ's death. 2. *It is a position involving a threefold change of relation.* (1) "As crucified with Christ," I become dead to the Law, so that the Law shall no more become "an occasion of sin" (Rom. vii. 5, 6). (2) I become dead unto sin, and therefore no more the servant of sin (Rom. vi. 6—16). (3) I become dead to the world, and the world to me (ch. vi. 14).

II. FELLOWSHIP WITH CHRIST IN HIS LIFE. "Nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." This a mystery to the world. The apostle is dead and is yet alive. 1. *Our death with Christ involves our life with him.* "If we died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him" (Rom. vi. 8). It is thus we realize "the power of his resurrection" (Phil. iii. 10). Thus "we shall live with him by the power of God" (2 Cor. xiii. 4). 2. *It is not a life which has its root in the apostle*

himself. "Yet not I." We are by nature "dead" (Eph. ii. 1), and cannot quicken ourselves. Our life is no natural principle. Neither can we sustain this life nor prolong its existence. This fact explains at once the backslidings, the fears, and the unfruitfulness of believers. 3. *Christ is the very life of the soul.* "Christ liveth in me." (1) He is the substance as well as the source of that life. "Because I live ye shall live also" (John xiv. 19); "Christ, who is our life" (Col. iii. 4); "He that hath the Son hath life" (1 John v. 12). (2) This life is in virtue of a union with him produced by the Holy Spirit. Thus we become "one spirit" with him. (3) Christ is the cause of its continuance (Eph. iv. 15, 16; John xv. 1—8; vii. 48). 4. *The blessed fruits of this life.* (1) It is an absolutely secure life. The life is not in the believer's own keeping. (2) It involves a near relationship to Christ (John xv. 6). (3) It is the life at once of earth and of heaven. 5. *It is a life of which the apostle was fully conscious.* He does not say, "I am elected," or "I am justified," but "I live." He speaks the language of happy assurance. He knows he is spiritually alive. His confession is a rebuke to those who doubt the possibility of attaining to the "full assurance of hope."

Ver. 20.—*The nature and conditions of Christian life.* "The life which I now live in the flesh I live in the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me."

I. THE NATURE OF THIS LIFE. There is a mystery surrounding the origin of all life. There is mystery, too, in regeneration (John iii. 8). Yet spiritual life is due to the quickening power of the Holy Spirit, through the Word, "making all things new." The first effect of regeneration is faith; and the life thus begun is sustained by the indwelling of the same Spirit through all the stages of a sanctified experience, till it shares in the glorified life of the Redeemer in heaven.

II. THE CONDITION OF THIS LIFE—IT IS LIFE "IN THE FLESH." That is, in the body. All life—physical, intellectual, moral—is exposed to risk of some sort. Frost or lightning may blight flower or tree; disease may undermine animal life; madness may attack intellectual life. So Christian life is exposed to many risks, simply because it is life "in the flesh," that is, in a body with passions and appetites prone to evil, and in a world with many seductions that appeal to the senses. Yet we must not regard the body with ascetic aversion, as if it were the sole cause of the soul's embarrassments. It is God's wonderful workmanship; it is the temple of the Holy Ghost, to be kept free from defilement; and it is and ought to be the willing servant of the immortal spirit in all the various activities of Christian life.

III. THE MEDIUM OF CHRISTIAN LIFE—FAITH. Faith is not merely the instrument of our justification, but the root-principle of our life. It is the principle which maintains this life in its constant exercise. We "live by faith;" we "walk by faith;" we "stand by faith;" we "overcome by faith;" we are "sanctified by faith;" we are "kept by faith" through the power of God unto the final salvation. As the principle which unites the soul and the Saviour, it is the conduit which carries the mighty supplies of grace into the soul.

IV. THE EXTERNAL SUPPORT OR NURTURE OF THIS LIFE. "The Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." 1. *All life finds its nurture or support in sources external to itself, which it assimilates to its own inner growth.* So it is in the animal and the vegetable worlds. Thus the soul finds its support in the Bread of life who came down from heaven. It is not faith that supports this life. Faith is nothing apart from its object. 2. *It is not the Son of God merely who is the support of this life.* He might be only "Guide, Philosopher, and Friend," as in Socinian theology; but our life could find no adequate fulcrum or point of support in the Son of God thus regarded. The apostle emphasizes (1) the love and (2) the sacrifice of Christ, "who gave himself for me." He is not Saviour to me unless he is my High Priest, my Substitute, my Surety.

V. THE APOSTLE'S ASSURANCE OF HIS PERSONAL INTEREST IN CHRIST'S WORK. He does not use terms of generality, such as "he gave himself for us," but "for me." Thus he added assurance to his faith.

VI. THE LIFE IN QUESTION IS DESIGNED TO BE MANIFEST. It is life to be lived. "The life which I now live in the flesh." Life may be secret in its origin, but it comes forth into visible display. We cannot see the life of the tiny seed-grain cast by the husbandman into the ground, but it gradually makes its way to the surface through all obstacles. Thus our life is to be an open life. We are not to "hide our light under



a bushel;" we are not to bury our talent in the ground; but as "ye have received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in him." It is the duty of the saints to be witnesses to the Lord; it is their privilege to glorify him; it is their glory to reflect the image of his blessed character.

Ver. 21.—*No frustration of Divine grace in the apostle's teaching.* "I do not frustrate the grace of God; for if righteousness come by the Law, then Christ died without cause."

I. THE GRACE OF GOD IS THE TRUE SOURCE OF SALVATION. This grace was manifested in the death of Christ, and in the blessings derived to believers from their union with him. The apostle's trust in him only magnified the grace of God.

II. ITS FRUSTRATION WAS POSSIBLE ON PETER'S PRINCIPLES. If any attempt were made to put works in the place of faith, or to mix works with faith as a ground of justification, or to establish a system under which ceremonialism was made essential to salvation, the grace of God were effectively frustrated.

III. THE ULTIMATE PRINCIPLE INVOLVED IN THIS FRUSTRATION. "If righteousness come by the Law, then Christ died without cause." 1. *The righteousness in question is that by which a man becomes right with God.* A man might attain to this righteousness if he could keep or had kept the Law of God. But he has broken the Law and is under its curse. The righteousness must therefore be reached in another way. It comes "by faith," not "by the Law" (Phil. iii. 9). 2. *Christ's death is altogether unnecessary on the supposition of a righteousness by the Law.* Why should the Son of God have died to procure what a sinner can win for himself by his own personal obedience? This closes the argument in the most effective manner.

#### HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

Vers. 1—10.—*The apostolic conference.* Fourteen years elapsed between the first and second visits of Paul as apostle to Jerusalem. During this interval of severe work he had experienced the opposition of the Judaizers. He deemed it advisable, therefore, and was also impelled by the Spirit, to go up to have a conference with the apostles about the whole policy to be pursued in the Gentile mission. In the verses before us he relates what took place in connection with the conference. And here we learn—

I. HOW AGREEABLE TO THE MIND OF THE SPIRIT THE CONFERENCE OF BRETHREN IS. (Ver. 2.) For Paul went up with Barnabas and Titus "by revelation." The Spirit impelled him to confer with the apostles at Jerusalem, and to strengthen his own judgment by securing theirs. And in the conference he seems to have laid before them the gospel of free grace which for fourteen years he had been preaching among the Gentiles. His statement was an exposition of his message, how he had taught the Gentiles that they were to be justified by faith and not by ceremony. Moreover, he was careful to enter into conference only with those who were of reputation, whose judgment would command respect, and to insist on the conference being private and confidential. Now, there can be no question about the great value of such confidential interchanges of thought by brethren. Even when there is not much light shed upon the path of duty, as seems to have been the case here, there is yet the confirmation of the Lord's servants in the propriety of their course.

II. IN CONTENTION WITH OTHERS WE SHOULD HAVE CLEARLY BEFORE US THE INTERESTS OF THE GOSPEL. (Vers. 3—5.) Titus, who accompanied Paul to Jerusalem, had been Paul's companion in Galatia and in the mission tours of Asia Minor. He was a Greek, a Gentile therefore, as distinct from a Jew. He had not, like Timothy, any Jewish blood in his veins. When the Judaizers, therefore, urged that Titus should be circumcised, and so become a proselyte to Jewish ceremonials, Paul resisted the demand so determinedly that no circumcision of Titus ever took place. In doing so, Paul had the interests of truth clearly in view. Had he yielded to the clamour, the gospel would have ceased practically to be a power in Galatia. It would not have continued with them. It would have been said, on the contrary, that salvation does not come by faith alone, but by ceremony as well. It was the interests of the gospel which Paul had

clearly in view. It would be well if we had always so clear a view of the interests of truth in our contentions with others. It is to be feared we sometimes fight for our consistency and personal interests rather than for the gospel. We should suspect our motives until we see the gospel's interests clearly involved in our struggle.

III. A CONFERENCE MAY ADD NO FRESH LIGHT TO WHAT WE HAVE, BUT SIMPLY CONFIRM US IN OUR COURSE. (Ver. 6.) The apostle admits that the brethren at Jerusalem seemed to the Galatians to be most important judges of such matters as were brought before them.<sup>1</sup> He himself did not form the same extravagant opinion of their ability, for he felt assured that "God accepteth no man's person," and that he, as an apostle born out of due time, had as much light given to him for his work as those who were in Christ before him. Hence he states plainly that they imparted nothing to him in the conference. They simply confirmed him in the practice of Christian liberty. And this will often be the case in Christian conferences. It is not the fresh light they shed upon doctrine or duty, but mainly the confirmation they afford of lines of duty already taken up. This, however, ought not to be despised, but rather gratefully accepted as according to the will of God.

IV. THE IMPRIMATUR OF THE APOSTLES IS SIGNIFICANT. (Vers. 7—9.) It is to be observed that Paul never sought apostolic ordination. He and Barnabas were designated by the brethren at Antioch when about to proceed upon their first missionary journey (Acts xiii. 1—3). But he had never all these years sought for ordination at the hands of the apostles who were in office before him. At the end of fourteen years he gives in a report, and all that he receives from the apostles is "the right hand of fellowship." In this connection we may quote from the able book of the "American citizen" on 'The Philosophy of the Divine Operation.' He is contending for Paul, not Matthias, being the twelfth apostle. After showing Paul's superior marks of apostleship, he proceeds, "Ordination, where there is no Holy Spirit, is not scriptural ordination. The laying on of hands by men who do not possess the Spirit of Christ themselves is not consecration. Hence offices and interests imparted by men or Churches whose spirit is merely formal and secular have no Divine validity. The men appointed under such circumstances may be good and useful, as many of them are. Communications of grace from above may be granted them. But the seal of God is not in the act of ordination. And Paul, called of God, with only the right hand of fellowship given him by the apostles, does the work of God better than Matthias, ordained by non-spiritual administrators."

V. THE REMEMBRANCE OF THE POOR WAS ALWAYS TO CHARACTERIZE THE CHRISTIAN MISSION. (Ver. 10.) The apostles, in recognizing Paul's policy and mission among the Gentiles, merely reminded him of the care of the poor, which was to be a first note of the Christian mission. The gospel is preached to the poor; it charges itself with their care. It was with the gospel the obligation recognized by the "poor laws" arose. The care of the poor was not felt by other religious systems as it is by Christianity. And it is questionable if the poor are as well cared for by law as they would be if left to Christian love.<sup>2</sup> Now, there can be no doubt of this trait of Christianity being a most important evidence of its Divine origin. The care of the poor would never have become the commonplace it now seems to be had not Christianity charged itself with the enlightenment and the care of the poor (Matt. xi. 5). The Christian commune, the noble experiment which succeeded Pentecost, put for a time poverty outside the Church's pale (Acts iv. 34). But even when poverty is driven out of the Church, it will still exist in the world, and for the poor Christianity must provide. This is one of its great missions; the apostles, though poor themselves, nobly responded to the call and faced the problem; and so must we all in our spheres if we have aught of the apostolic spirit.—R. M. E.

Vers. 11—18.—*The apostolic strife at Antioch.* Passing from the Jerusalem conference, Paul next mentions the strife which Peter and he had at Antioch. Peter had

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Lightfoot on the use of the present, *οἱ δοκῶντες*, which the Authorized Version and even the Revised Version translate as a past.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. 'The Letters and other Writings of the late Edward Denison, M.P.,' *passim*; also 'The Houses of the London Poor,' by Octavia Hill; 'The Service of the Poor,' by Caroline Emelia Stephen; and of course Dr. Chalmers' 'Christian and Civic Economy.'

come down to see the work of God among the Gentiles. In his large-heartedness he had not only approved of it and rejoiced in it, but, laying aside all his Jewish prejudices, he had taken his seat at the table of the Gentiles, and had eaten whatever was placed before him. But certain "false brethren" having come round, and having urged the imperative necessity of ceremony, he yielded to his fears, withdrew from Gentile society, and lived in quarantine with the Judaizers. It would appear also that Barnabas was entrapped into similar vacillation; so that there was nothing for it but for Paul to stand up like a man and denounce Peter for his weakness. In doing so he was contending for the truth of the gospel. Let us look into the subject a little more closely.

I. CONSIDER PETER'S LIFE OF LIBERTY. (Ver. 12.) It was only right, and what we should expect, for Peter to throw aside his Jewish narrowness, the punctiliousness about meats and drinks, and to go in for brotherhood with the Gentiles at their feasts. Here we have the noble and big-hearted apostle acting upon his own better impulses. It is such liberty the gospel fosters. It is the foe of that narrowness which so often keeps men from uniting. It is the foe of that little-mindedness which keeps so many in estrangement. We cannot be broader in our sympathies or freer in our life than the gospel makes us. It can be easily shown that the so-called liberties beyond its sphere are real bondages.

II. CONSIDER PETER'S RETURN TO BONDAGE. (Vers. 12, 13.) When the Judaizers came down from Jerusalem, they were so positive about the necessity of the Jewish ceremonies and scrupulosities, as to put pressure upon the apostle; so that, taking counsel of his fears, he deliberately withdrew from Gentile society and shut himself up with the Jews. This was a sore fall. And so astute were these brethren in their dissimulation that Barnabas was also led away. It is well to see clearly how bondage sets in immediately on our abandoning principle and acting on the pressure of our fears. Men fancy that, when called upon to act on principle, they are forfeiting their liberty; but the truth is all the other way. The free are those who act upon the dictates of truth; the slaves are those who have surrendered principle because of pressure.

III. CONSIDER PAUL'S NOBLE REPRIMAND OF PETER. (Ver. 14.) It must have been a trial for Paul to take his stand against his senior both in years and in the apostolate. He must have appreciated the delicacy of his position in standing up against the conduct of the apostle of the circumcision. But he felt constrained to rebuke his brother as by his vacillating conduct traitorous to truth. And in no way can we testify so powerfully to truth as when we take the field, however reluctantly, against those we respect, and who are deservedly popular, but who have somehow erred in judgment upon some point of importance. It requires courage and firmness; but it always has its reward in the extension of truth and of God's kingdom.

IV. PAUL SHOWS THAT THE QUESTION OF JUSTIFICATION WAS REALLY INVOLVED IN PETER'S CONDUCT. (Vers. 15—17.) Peter had very properly, though a Jew, lived after the manner of Gentiles, and so manifested his Christian liberty. Why, asks Paul, does he now turn round and require Gentiles to live like Jews? Is it to be thus insinuated that ceremonies save men's souls? Is not this the vilest bondage? Is not the gospel, on the contrary, the embodiment of the truth that a man is not justified by the works of the Law, but by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ? If Jewish ceremonies are still necessary to justification, then the work of Jesus Christ, in which we are asked to trust, cannot be complete. Such ceremonialism is thus seen to be in conflict with the gospel of justification by faith alone. To tell men that ceremonies must save them is to turn them away from Christ as the object of trust to rites and ceremonies as the object. Am I to believe in the power of baptism and of the sacraments as administered by certain persons in order to salvation? or am I to trust my Saviour? The two methods of salvation are totally distinct, and it is fatal to confound them. The meaning of all such ceremonialism is to put souls upon a false track, so far as salvation is concerned. It is to translate man's justification from the true foundation in Christ's work to the rotten foundation of self-righteousness. Against this we must ever wage persistent war.

V. PAUL CONSEQUENTLY INSISTS ON THE SINFULNESS OF THE LEGAL SPIRIT. (Ver. 18.) For what we destroy in accepting the gospel is all trust in ceremonies as grounds of salvation. The works of the Law are seen to be no ground of trust for justification and salvation. If, then, after having destroyed the self-righteous and legal spirit, and fled

for refuge to Jesus as our Hope, we turn round like Peter to rebuild the edifice of self-righteousness and legalism, we are simply making ourselves transgressors. We are forfeiting our liberty and piling up fresh sin. Hence it is of the utmost moment that we should clearly and constantly recognize the sinfulness of the legal spirit. It robs Jesus of his rightful position as Saviour of mankind. It casts away the gospel and goes back for salvation to the Law, which can only condemn us; it makes the sacrifice of Jesus vain and only increases sin. Against all legalism, consequently, we must wage incessant war. Nothing is so derogatory to Jesus or destructive of men's souls. It is another gospel, but an utterly fallacious one. Unless Jesus has the whole credit of salvation, he will not be our Saviour. He must be all or nothing. "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ."—R. M. E.

Vers. 19—21.—*The death of legal hope the life of evangelical obedience.* Paul proceeds in the exposition of Peter's mistake to show that it is only when through the Law we die to all legal hope, we can live unto God. When legal hope has died within us, Christ has room to live and be the source of our spiritual energy.

I. CONSIDER THE DEATH OF LEGALISM. (Vers. 19, 20.) The idea of self-righteousness or Pharisaism was and is that we can *live* through the Law. But the more careful analysis of sin leads us to see that the Law can only condemn and slay us. The same experience became our Lord's when he became our Representative. Though obeying the Law in every particular, he found that, in consequence of our sin, for which he had made himself responsible, the Law demanded his death in addition to his obedience, or rather "his obedience even unto death." Not until he was crucified had he satisfied the demands of Law. In his crucifixion, therefore, he died to the Law. It had after that no more claim upon him. When he said on the cross, "It is finished," he died to the Law. Now, it is only when we enter into this purpose of the crucifixion, and die to all hope from the Law, that we are in a position to live unto God. "The death of legal hope" is "the life of evangelical obedience." The legalism must die within us before we get into the large place of new obedience. Among the many purposes of our Lord's death upon the cross, this was a prime one, viz. to wean us away from all idea of winning life by law-keeping, that we may gratefully receive it as the gift of free grace.

II. CONSIDER THE LIFE UNTO GOD. (Vers. 19, 20.) Though legal hope has died, so that Paul is "dead to the Law" like Christ in Joseph's tomb, he is at the same time enabled to "live unto God." In truth it is then that the life unto God begins. For life by the Law is life for self; whereas when we die to all legal hope, we are delivered from the self-life, and enabled to live the life of consecration to God. And when does this life of consecration to God come? By *inspiration* Christ comes and lives literally within us by his Spirit, so that we become in a real sense inspired persons. Consequently, Paul declares that it is not he himself who lives the consecrated life, but "Christ liveth in me." He abandoned himself to the Spirit of Christ, and thus made way for the life of consecration. Nothing is more important, then, than this self-abandonment to the Spirit of Christ, who is the Spirit of consecration. This is the holocaust of the Christian life, the abandonment of every faculty and power to the Divine fire, that all may rise in sublimity to heaven.

III. CONSIDER THE LAW OF THE NEW LIFE. (Ver. 20.) Paul has abandoned himself to the Spirit of Christ. His life becomes in consequence one of simple *dependence upon the Son of God*; or, as it is here put, "The life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God;" or, as the Revised Version has it, "And that *life* which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, *the faith* which is in the Son of God." The self-abandoned life is the life of constant dependence upon the Son of God. But this being so, the law of Christ's life necessarily becomes the law of the life of consecration. What, then, is the law of Christ's life? It is the law of *love* leading to *self-sacrifice*; for of the Son of God it is here said by Paul, "Who loved me, and gave himself for me." Christ, in consecrating himself to God, dedicated himself to our salvation. He became the voluntary victim; he died that we might be redeemed. Hence self-sacrifice is the law of the new life. Now, no other system but Christianity secures such self-abandonment and self-abnegation. The Hindu self-abandonment to Brahma, for example, is abandonment to a *desireless* condition. "He remains," it has been said, "stupidly still (immobile), his arms in air. Brahma is his death, and not his life." Again, Moham-

medan self-abandonment is crude fanaticism. "It is true," says the same writer, "that Allah does not kill all the faculties of the soul as Brahma does; but he renders them fatalistic, fanatic, and sanguinary. He is for his adorers the fire which consumes them, and not their life." The Jesuit, again, has a self-abandonment to the chief of his order at Rome; but in renouncing judgment, affections, will, and conscience to his superior, he allows his true life to be killed, and his obedience is only the galvanism of spiritual death.<sup>1</sup> It thus turns out that all other self-abandonments but that to Christ are counterfeits, and his only stands the test of experience. He rouses us to action, to intelligent self-sacrifice. He teaches us to "live not unto ourselves, but unto him who died for us, and rose again" (2 Cor. v. 15).

IV. IN THIS ARRANGEMENT THERE IS NO FRUSTRATION, BUT A MAGNIFYING OF THE GRACE OF GOD. (Ver. 21.) If righteousness came by ceremonialism, if ceremony were the secret of salvation, then assuredly the grace of God would be frustrated, and Christ have died in vain. If legal hopes are still legitimate, then the crucifixion of Christ was a mere martyrdom by mistake. On the other hand, when we have seen clearly, as Paul did, that the Law cannot save us, but must be given up as a ground of hope, then we gather round the cross of Christ, and we adore the devotion which thereby secured our salvation, and we magnify the grace of God. Legalism is the antithesis and frustration of Divine grace; whereas the life of consecration, which the death of all legalism secures, is the true exaltation of God's grace manifested in a crucified Saviour. Let us make sure, then, of the crucifixion of the legal spirit within us, and then the consecrated life which the contemplation of Christ crucified inspires shall be found to be the true way of magnifying the grace of God.—R. M. E.

Vers. 1—10.—*Period of third visit to Jerusalem.* Three preliminary points are mentioned. (1) *Time.* "Then after the space of fourteen years I went up again to Jerusalem." It is possible to date this from his conversion, but it is more natural and quite tenable to date it from the last-mentioned visit. If so, then we have seventeen important years, during which all the intercourse that Paul had with the senior apostles extended to fifteen days spent with Peter in Jerusalem. That, surely, was very little on which to found a representation of his being a pupil of these apostles, or one acting under their orders. (2) *Companions.* "With Barnabas, taking Titus also with me." The mention of Barnabas as his principal companion helps to identify the visit with that recorded in the fifteenth of the Acts. Titus also is brought in, as afterward to be referred to. Both may have been known to the Galatian Churches, and would be able to bear witness to the accuracy of his account of the conference. (3) *Impulse.* "And I went up by revelation." The impelling influence was a supernatural communication made to him, that it was his duty to go up to Jerusalem. It may have been with or against his own inclination. It was certainly conjoined with the action of the Gentile Churches. But what determined his action was no feeling of his own as of doubt about his teaching, or summons from Jerusalem to give an account of his teaching, but simply the intimation to him of the Divine will. *The private conference.* The great feature of the third visit was conference. There was the public conference, of which we have a record in the fifteenth of the Acts. But there seems to have been beforehand a private conference with the men of repute, which alone is mentioned here, as being that which affected the question of his independence as an apostle. (1) *Subject of conference.* "And I laid before them the gospel which I preach among the Gentiles." He laid not before some, but before all the Christians at Jerusalem, the gospel which he was still in the habit of preaching among the Gentiles. He made it a public enough matter that he preached justification by faith. He made it equally public that, as an inference from that, he taught that there was no necessity to impose circumcision on Gentile converts. (2) *Reason for private conference.* "But privately before them who were of repute, lest by any means I should be running, or had run, in vain." While courting publicity, he had a regard to prudence. The gospel he preached might have a strange sound to them at Jerusalem. He did not, therefore, in the first place lay it before the general body of Christians there. But he began by laying it privately before the three afterward mentioned, viz. James, Peter, and John. They had special qualifications for understanding what was to come up for public conference. And experiences, reasons,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. F. de Rougemont's 'La Vie Humaine,' pp. 96, 97.

nice points, could be gone into with them that could not so suitably be gone into at a public conference. They were, moreover, men of repute, men of leading, who might be expected to influence the others. If, then, he secured a good understanding with them, his course, both what it had been and what it might yet be, would have its full effect. Whereas, if for want of the proper means being used, he failed in securing a good understanding, he would really be impairing the effect of what he had done or might yet do. *Results of private conference as bearing on the question of independence—*

I. HE DID NOT YIELD ON THE QUESTION OF LIBERTY. 1. *No compulsion was used in the case of Titus.* "But not even Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised." This was a good case for trying the question of liberty. Timothy, who was after this circumcised in accommodation to Jewish feeling, was of half-Jewish extraction. Titus was of pure Gentile extraction. Was he, then, necessitated to circumcise Titus? No; it was a notorious fact that under the eye of the three, under the eye of the whole Church, he was allowed to go about Jerusalem with an uncircumcised Gentile convert as his recognized companion and assistant. That was not as though he had weakly yielded at the conference. It was, on the contrary, a signal triumph obtained for liberty. 2. *The reason of his taking so firm a stand was that it was made a question of liberty. Character of the false brethren.* "And that because of the false brethren privily brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage." They were false, men who had never really agreed to the terms of Christian membership. They had become connected with the society of Christians, not as genuine believers in the Lord Jesus Christ, but on *falsely* pretending faith. They climbed into the Christian fold by some other way than Christ. There were others in the background who prompted them to make a *false profession*. They acted as the tools of others for *illegitimate purposes*. *Espionage* was one purpose. They stole into the Christian camp, not because they had any delight in being there, but simply as *spies*. What they wished to spy out was the liberty enjoyed by the Gentile Christians, *i.e.* liberation from circumcision in the possession of Christ. More particularly it was the action of the Church in Jerusalem in view of the association of an uncircumcised Gentile convert with Paul. A further purpose was *bondage*. They spied out the liberty that they might have it as an object for their attack. Their tactics were to make a demand for the circumcision of Titus. Their success would have been the enslavement of Gentile Christians. *Stand made by Paul against the false brethren.* "To whom we gave place in the way of subjection, no, not for an hour; that the truth of the gospel might continue with you." It was a bold step, in the first place, to take Titus to Jerusalem. Feeling may have been stronger than he expected to find it. How was he to act? It would, no doubt, have been pleasing to many if he had seen his way to circumcise Titus. Under certain circumstances he might have been free to do it *in the way of accommodation*. But seeing that the false brethren, by the circumcision of Titus, meant the enslavement for ever of Gentile Christians, he gave place *in the way of subjection*, no, not for an hour. He acted thus decisively in the interests of all his Gentile constituents. And his successful resistance on this occasion, which some were now seeking to turn against him (as though he had then given in his submission to Peter and the rest), was really a triumph obtained for the Gentile Christians everywhere, for which particularly they, the Galatians, should show gratitude in the way of resisting the assaults of the Judaists on them. *Let the truth of the gospel—justification simply by faith—continue with them.*

II. HE PRESERVED HIS EQUALITY WITH THE THREE. 1. *They imparted nothing to him.* "But from those who were reputed to be somewhat (whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me; God accepteth not man's person)—they, I say, who were of repute imparted nothing to me." The construction with which the sentence commences is not carried out to the end. "From them of repute" would naturally be followed up by "I received nothing." But instead of that, after the parenthesis which is in three clauses, it is taken up in the form—"they of repute," which is followed by "imparted nothing to me." The three were reputed to be *somewhat*, and Paul does not mean to hint that this reputation was not deserved. What he has to do with is that their reputation should be thought to destroy his independence. He esteemed them, and he was glad to know of their being esteemed. In that respect their reputation did matter to him, but it mattered nothing for his independence. It is not upon reputation that

God proceeds in his choice or acknowledgment of instruments. And with all their reputation they imparted to him no additional authority or element in teaching, as superiors to an inferior. 2. *They recognized him.* *As having an independent trust.* "But contrariwise, when they saw that I had been entrusted with the gospel of the uncircumcision, even as Peter with the gospel of the circumcision (for he that wrought for Peter unto the apostleship of the circumcision wrought for me also unto the Gentiles)." Of the men of repute, he singles out Peter as the principal representative of the circumcision. He was entrusted with the gospel whose sphere was the circumcision; and he presented it, as may be seen from his address and Epistles, with a certain adaptation to the Jews. The burden of his early preaching was the great crime which the Jews had committed in crucifying their Messiah, and their duty to repent of that crime and to trust in Christ for salvation. When he writes to them as the Dispersion, he is still a Jew, in dwelling on the ancient glories of the race. His mind is imbued with the deliverances wrought for them, the majesty and sanctity of their temple, the sacred functions of the priesthood, the mystery of sacrifice, all receiving their fulfilment in the Christian manifestation. He is also a Jew in looking forward to a glorious future. His gospel points away to "the inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away;" "the salvation ready to be revealed in the last time;" "the appearing of Jesus Christ." *But Paul was on a parity with Peter.* He was entrusted with the gospel, whose sphere was the uncircumcision, and he presented it with a certain adaptation to the Gentiles. Not shunning Jewish imagery, he combined with it a certain free use of Gentile imagery. And it was specially given him to *preach*, what Peter indeed had learnt before him, that the Gentiles were to be admitted into the kingdom of God without being required to submit to circumcision. This parity of trust was made evident to the men of repute at Jerusalem. And the way in which it was made evident was this. It was evident that Peter was appointed to the apostleship of the circumcision by the abundant energy with which God supplied him for working among them. It was equally evident that Paul was appointed to the apostleship of the Gentiles by the abundant energy with which God supplied him for working among them. *As having such a trust by the display of grace toward him.* "And when they perceived the grace that was given unto me." The conclusion was forced home on them that he had an independent trust. When they compared that with their former knowledge of him, they could only ascribe it to grace. Their knowledge was now of him as a remarkable trophy of grace. 3. *They gave him formal recognition.* "James and Cephas and John, they who were reputed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship, that we should go unto the Gentiles, and they unto the circumcision." The three are now mentioned by name. The last mentioned is John, and it is remarkable that in this, the only mention of him by Paul, he is represented as doing a kindly act. Peter, who is called Cephas (which also means "rock"), has just had a wide sphere connected with him. James is here placed before him on the same ground on which he presided at the public conference, viz. as representative (not necessarily bishop) of the mother Church at Jerusalem. His taking the lead made the formal recognition of Paul the act of the Church: while the association of Peter and John with him gave it a wider significance. These three were had in estimation as pillars (stoops, supports), *i.e.* men upon whom (humanly speaking) the keeping up of the Church greatly depended. Their formal recognition extended to Barnabas. They recognized in what was not exclusively Eastern fashion (being rather universal), by each giving the right hand of fellowship. That in regard to which they expressed fellowship was the division of work—Gentile and Jewish—which is not to be understood with the greatest strictness. The fellowship they expressed amounted to giving Paul and Barnabas their hearty good wishes in their separate and co-ordinate sphere. 4. *They only recommended.* "Only they would that we should remember the poor; which very thing I was also zealous to do." There is a recognized ecclesiastical distinction between an *injunction* and a *recommendation*. The three did not, as ecclesiastical superiors, lay their authority upon Paul and Barnabas; they only, as brethren, made a request of them. The request chimed in with Paul's own habitual feeling. He speaks only for himself, his zeal extending beyond the time when he could speak for Barnabas, who shortly afterwards parted from him. Thus conclusively does he establish his independence. The matter of the

request was *remembering the poor*. It was a request that came very naturally from the three. They were connected with a poor Church. Intolerance, too, was more rife and keen in Palestine than elsewhere. And it would often be a perplexity to them—taking them to the throne of grace—how the poor under their charge were to be provided for. They therefore took occasion to commend them to these representatives of the Gentile Churches. It was a providential arrangement that the Jewish Christians were to some extent dependent for support on the Gentile Christians. It tended to call forth the charity of the latter and to counteract the narrowness of the former, and thus to promote unity. It is a peculiarly Christian thing to remember the poor. Christ has shown men to be equal irrespective of condition, in that he has died for all, and would have all raised to sonship. Having taught us to care for men's souls, he has taught us, as we could not otherwise so forcibly be taught, to care also for men's bodies. We are to show our affection for Christ in ministering to the wants of his poor. And we will show a tenderness even for the wants of those who are not with us in the same Christian bond.—R. F.

Vers. 11—21.—*Withstanding of Peter at Antioch*. “But when Cephas came to Antioch, I resisted him to the face.” From the public conference at Jerusalem, Paul and Barnabas went down to Antioch, where, it is said, they *tarried*. They separated after this stay. The visit of Peter to Antioch must be referred to this period, seeing Barnabas is mentioned as still with Paul. There was more than *resistance* made to Peter; there was the going up to him, meeting him face to face, and charging him with inconsistency. So significant was this, that three such Fathers as Origen, Chrysostom, and Jerome were only able to get over it by unwarrantably supposing it to be *simulated*. It was Paul himself who quoted the words, “Thou shalt not speak evil of a ruler of thy people.” He could not have borne himself thus to Peter if he had owed obedience to him as his ecclesiastical superior. But, having an independent sphere, and being specially entrusted with the liberty of the Gentile Christians, he had a right to speak freely. Nor was there impropriety in his bringing this incident forward here, although it reflected on Peter, seeing that it was necessary to put his independence beyond question, which had been called in question in the Galatian Churches.

I. HOW THE OCCASION DEMANDED HIS WITHSTANDING OF PETER. “Because he stood condemned.” He was condemned by his own conduct. Its inconsistency was so marked. 1. *Before the coming of certain from James, he mixed freely with the Gentile Christians*. “For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles.” It is difficult to say whether, or how far, James is involved by the introduction of his name here. There is no reason to suppose that he sent these men (especially as Peter was already on the spot) to raise the question of intercommunion in the Church at Antioch. He had been remarkably explicit on the question of circumcision at the public conference in Jerusalem. We can understand his not being thoroughly liberated from Jewish narrowness. And those men who used his name or came from under his influence may have been of a more timid type than he. The question related to *eating with the Gentiles*. This was forbidden under the old order of things, on the ground of its being a barrier against heathenism. But when Jews and Gentiles were both within the one Church, circumstances were changed. There was no need for the barrier being continued. But it was difficult for those who had been accustomed to the barrier to regard it as done away. The difficulty had been got over at Antioch, but it still existed to comers from Jerusalem. Peter had been broadened in his ideas, and when he came to Antioch he had no difficulty in entering into the free communion which had been established there. He lived as though he had been one of the Gentiles. He made no difference at private meals or at the public agapæ. To see a leader like Peter following such a course promised well for the interests of liberty. 2. *On the coming of certain from James, he gave way to fear*. “But when they came, he drew back and separated himself, fearing them that were of the circumcision.” He drew back until he occupied a separate position. The influence by which he was swayed from the course which he had been following was fear. His fear was occasioned by the coming of certain from James. The objects of his fear were *they of the circumcision*, i.e. Jewish Christians, especially at Jerusalem, with whom these comers from James would communicate. He was afraid of what they of the circumcision would say. We need not



be surprised at his being suddenly swayed from a noble course. It was of a piece with his nobly daring to walk on the water toward Christ, and then, when he looked on the troubled water, crying out in fear, "Lord, save me; I perish." It was of a piece with his drawing his sword in defence of his Master, and then, when questioned by the servants in the hall of the high priest, denying him three times, the third time with an oath. So he had made a noble vindication of his conduct on a former occasion, when taken to task for going in to the uncircumcised and eating with them. He was still acting under the same noble impulse when at first in Antioch he freely associated with the Gentile Christians. But when he saw certain from James, from no unbrotherly feeling toward Paul or toward the Gentile Christians, but, simply afraid of how it would affect him with them of the circumcision, he drew back and back until he placed a decided distance between him and the Gentile Christians. 3. *His dissimulation was followed.* "And the rest of the Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that even Barnabas was carried away with their dissimulation." Peter's conduct is characterized as dissimulation. That was the head and front of his offending. And a very serious offence it was. It was not that he was narrow-minded like the comers from James, but that he concealed his liberal sentiments. It was not that he had changed his mind, but that he acted as though he had changed his mind. This was serious, not only in itself, but in its consequences. For Peter held high position as an apostle. His influence would have carried the rest of the Jews forward in their free intercourse with the Gentiles. But when he dissembled, he carried the rest of the Jews with him in his dissimulation. Numbers carry influence as well as position. Even Barnabas got into the stream. He was a man of position. He had been under the influence of Paul, and with Paul had championed Gentile liberty at Jerusalem. But when the rest of the Jews dissembled with Peter, the consequence was (expressed, if not by "insomuch," by "carried") that he was carried away as by a stream. *Paul was equal to the occasion.* "But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel." The influence from James was not decided enough. Peter dissembled, the rest of the Jews followed, even Barnabas was carried off his feet, only Paul walked, as the expression here is, with straight feet,—the stream did not carry him away; for which the Church to all time is his debtor. He saw that they were not straight-footed, that they were being carried away and aside from the path of gospel liberty. He saw what was at stake, that it was really, as before, the enslavement of the Gentiles; and therefore, unawed by the reputation of Peter, unawed by the influence of numbers, unshaken by the desertion of Barnabas, he to the face withstood Peter.

II. THE WORDS WITH WHICH HE WITHSTOOD PETER. "I said unto Cephas before them all." It was not silent, dogged withstanding; it was *rational* withstanding. Paul had his reason, which he stated, not only promptly, but *publicly*. Peter's offence had been public, especially in its consequences. It was not a case, therefore, for consulting the feelings of the offender. There was public procedure to be counteracted. They all, as well as Peter, needed to be brought back to the truth of the gospel. And therefore what he said, he said, not behind Peter's back, nor to him in private, but to his face before them all. 1. *Peter was not acting fairly with the Gentiles.* "If thou, being a Jew, livest as do the Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, how compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?" Paul proceeds upon Peter's practice. He had been living up to that time in Antioch after Gentile fashion, *i.e.* in disregard of the law of meats, and not after Jewish fashion, *i.e.* showing regard to the law of meats. There was no consistency, therefore, in compelling the Gentiles to *Judaize*. That is the word which is in the Greek (distinct from the former mode of expression), and which ought to have been in the translation as guiding to the meaning. The force put upon the Gentiles was not the force of Peter's example, but the force or logic of Peter's position. It was not that Gentiles needed to be circumcised in order to have communion with Christ, which had been disclaimed at the public conference; but it was that they needed to be circumcised in order to have communion with Jewish Christians. In that respect it was putting the Gentiles to the necessity of Judaizing. 2. *Jews as well as Gentiles needed to believe on Christ in order to be justified.* "We being Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles, yet knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the Law, save through faith in Jesus Christ, even we believed on Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by faith in Christ and not by the works of the Law: because by the works

of the Law shall no flesh be justified." Three times is the word "justified" used here, three times are the works of the Law disclaimed as the ground of justification, and three times are we said to be justified by faith in Christ. Paul proceeds on the fact that they (and he includes himself) were Jews. The Gentiles were sinners (actually); hence the need for a barrier being raised against Gentilism. The Jews were privileged. There was much in the distinction, apart from the self-righteousness that might be put into it, and which Paul here meets with a touch of irony. But there was nothing in it for justification. To be justified is to be regarded as having met the requirements of Law. They, Jews, saw two things with regard to justification. They saw that a man is not justified by the works of the Law. The requirements of the Law are briefly that we love the Lord our God with all our soul, with all our strength, and with all our mind; and that we love our neighbours as ourselves. This love should be exhibited in our works. But, as they fall far short of such a standard, they are not the source out of which we can be justified. They saw also that a man is justified through faith in Jesus Christ. They saw where justification was not to be found; they, beyond that, saw where it was to be found. Not seeing it in themselves, in their own works, they saw it in Christ. He has met all the requirements of Law. His work can carry a favourable sentence. And we are justified by means of faith in him; not because of the nature or degree of our faith, but simply because of our faith bringing us into a relationship to Christ as our Surety, in which we are regarded as having met all the requirements of Law. Seeing these two things with regard to justification, they, Jews, acted upon them. They believed on Christ Jesus not otherwise than the Gentiles. They sought to be justified, not on the ground of their own works, but on the ground of Christ's work. They saw that works could not be the ground from their own Scriptures, in which they read, "By the works of the Law shall no flesh be justified."

3. *Paul repudiates an inference from Jews needing to take up the position of sinners along with Gentiles, in order to be justified in Christ.* "But if, while we sought to be justified in Christ, we ourselves also were found sinners, is Christ a minister of sin? God forbid." He is proceeding upon the former statement. They, Jews, were not justified by the works of the Law,—that was equivalent to their being found sinners. This name, jarring to the ear, had formerly been applied to the Gentiles. Were they, then, to be classed as sinners with the Gentiles in order to be justified in Christ? Was that not (some might say) making Christ a minister of sin? Such an inference with all his heart he repudiates. God forbid. It is no more making Christ a minister of sin than one who comes with the means of escape to a man who is unconsciously perishing is the minister of danger to him. The first ministry that man needs is the ministry of conviction. We must be roused out of our self-pleasing dreams to see that we are sinners. And Christ is doing us a loving service when, even in his offer of salvation, he convicts us of sins.

4. *He is rather proved the transgressor who builds up after pulling down.* "For if I build up again those things which I destroyed, I prove myself a transgressor." The connection is that, instead of Christ being the minister of sin, he himself would be proved the transgressor. While not using Peter's name, he puts Peter's case. Peter had pulled down, in becoming a Christian believer; he had abandoned Law-righteousness. Now he was building up again, in giving the Law a place for justification. If he, Paul, did that, he would be proved a transgressor. He would certainly be a transgressor between the time of his pulling it down and the time of his building it up again.

5. *His own experience carried him beyond the Law.* "For I through the Law died unto the Law, that I might live unto God." The Law was the instrument by which there was effected his death to the Law. It showed him to be a sinner, but that led to his seeing how the curse was removed, how all the claims of Law were for ever met; so that he became a dead man to the Law, placed for ever beyond its power. He was a dead man to the Law, that he might be a living man to God—in his having his covenant standing secured, but also in his having his being vitalized by God and drawn towards God.

6. *He presents in himself a threefold contrast.* (1) *Crucified, and yet he lives.* "I have been crucified with Christ; yet I live." The contrast has already been presented; here (if we adopt the punctuation, to which there is no decisive objection) it is made to stand out. How he became a dead man to the Law was by sharing death with Christ as his representative, even the particular form of death, viz. *crucifixion*. The contrast was startling (to the disciples and to the murderers) when Christ

presented himself alive after his crucifixion. "I am he that liveth, and was dead." This representation repeats the contrast in us. Nay, our crucifixion is carried down so that not in successive moments but in the same moment we share with Christ in his crucifixion and in his resurrection. (2) *Himself, and yet not himself.* "And yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me." The crucifixion has not been the annihilation of self; for it can still be said, "I live." It is he who, as a living man, stretches himself, who before was crucified. All the elements in the new life are ours as subsisting in us. But there has been the crucifixion of the old self. There is a rapidity in the thought—*No longer I.* It is no longer self that is the central principle of our life. That is a false, God-opposing self that has been, and is being, taken forth and crucified before our eyes. Away with self in the place that does not rightfully belong to it. A change has been made from wrong to right. It is Christ we have placed at the centre of our life; from which centre he rules the whole life, fills us with his own light, and strength, and peace, and joy, so that it is truly Christ living in us. (3) *A life in the flesh, and yet a life of faith.* "And that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself up for me." "We exist here in a double connection—first, with the transitory on one side; and, secondly, with the untransitory on the other. The sponge gets its food and life from the fluid, ever-moving waters of the sea; but it must be also fastened to some rock that does not move, and gives firm anchorage to it in the waters. The bird has wings connecting it with the air, and feet on which it takes the ground for rest or settles in firm hold on its perch for the sleep of the night. Trees get their feeding largely from the air, and the light in which their foliage so receptively spreads itself and their limbs so gracefully play; but they must have their roots also taking firm hold of the ground, by these to be localized and kept erect and steady in the storms. By such feeble analogies we conceive the double state of man, connected on one side with infinite mutabilities in things, and on the other with immutable ideas and truths and God." The great object with which our faith brings us into communion in the unseen world is here said to be the Son of God, who loved us and gave himself for us. And what we have to do in our life in the flesh is to draw our life from redeeming love. What we have to do amid our experience of sin is to appropriate redemption. And this we have to do, not once, but habitually. 7. *What his care was.* "I do not make void the grace of God: for if righteousness is through the Law, then Christ died for nought." His care was to magnify *the grace of God in the death of Christ.* He would not allow the Law to be sufficient for righteousness, because that would be to make void the grace of God in a way which was never to be thought of, viz. making the death of Christ superfluous. All make void the grace of God who live as though Christ had never died. Let us magnify the grace of God by regarding the death of Christ as all-sufficient for righteousness—taking it as our righteousness.—R. F.

Ver. 7.—*Diversities of administrations.* I. THE GOSPEL IS OFFERED TO MEN IN ALL CIRCUMSTANCES OF LIFE. It is for men of every race, practising all varieties of social habits, living in different stages of civilization, holding the utmost diversities of creed, viewing the gospel itself from many distinct standpoints. None are so privileged as not to need it—the circumcised want it. None are so neglected as to be excluded from it—the uncircumcised have it preached to them. In the breadth of Divine love God has so ordered it that means shall be found for spreading his grace in the various directions where it is needed.

II. DIFFERENT MEN ARE CALLED TO DIFFERENT FIELDS OF CHRISTIAN WORK. Division of labour is as valuable in the Church as in business. This principle is generally recognized in foreign missions. It would greatly economize work and money and save much unseemly strife if it were equally acknowledged at home. It is to the shame of the Church that so much of its efforts is spent in maintaining the rivalry of the sects and parties, while the great world lies neglected. If the labourers are few it is a scandal that they should be quarrelling for their rights on the little patch already cleared. We are too short-sighted. We should "lift up our eyes." There the fields white to the harvest would call us out to broader efforts.

III. THE VARIOUS FUNCTIONS OF CHRISTIAN WORK ARE DETERMINED BY THE VARIOUS GIFTS OF THE CHRISTIAN LABOURERS. St. Paul was most fitted for Gentiles, St. Peter for Jews. They wisely recognized their diversity of vocations. It is important to see

that we are in the right work. What is the best work for one man may be very unsuitable for another. We shall fail if we slavishly copy the most successful servants of Christ in a line that may not be ours. Butler could not organize a revival; nor could Wesley confute deism. We may be discouraged needlessly at our failure. Try some other work till the right work is discovered. The important point is to find our mission in our capacities rather than in our inclinations. We are not necessarily most fit for the work we like best. Still sympathy with a particular work is one great aid to success; only let us see that we do not confound this with self-will or ambition.

IV. DIVERSITY OF ADMINISTRATIONS IMPLIES NO DISCORD. Rather it is the best security for harmony. When all attempt the same work jealousy and rivalry spring up. If we differ naturally we are sure to come in conflict when trying to do the same thing. The ox and the ass are useful beasts, but bad yokefellows. The Apostles Paul and Peter could not have remained on friendly terms if they had kept to the same field. We should show friendship for those who are carrying on a different work from our own, recognizing them as fellow-servants with one Master.

V. THE SAME TRUTH AND GRACE ARE FOUND IN DIVERSITIES OF ADMINISTRATIONS. St. Paul and St. Peter preached essentially the same gospel. There is but one Christ and one narrow way. Diversity cannot go beyond the one gospel without becoming apostasy.—W. F. A.

Ver. 11.—*A bold rebuke.* There can be no doubt that this rebuke offered by one apostle to another was real and earnest, and not, as St. Jerome tried to maintain, a dramatic pretence. We have here, then, the startling spectacle of the two leading apostles in conflict. Yet it is plainly implied that they were not opposed in their general work. It was not their teaching nor their normal practice, but one particular act of weakness that occasioned the trouble.

I. APOSTLES ARE FALLIBLE. Plainly St. Peter was to blame. If St. Paul's view of the gospel were correct—as we must all now hold—St. Peter was wrong in ceasing to eat with Gentiles. But even if the view of the Jerusalem Church were correct, he was not the less to blame in first following the more liberal course, and then abandoning it out of deference to the party of James. He was clearly inconsistent, and it is evident that his inconsistency was not due to change of conviction, but only to culpable weakness. 1. If an apostle fail, who else will presume to be safe? 2. The "fear of man that bringeth a snare" is a fruitful source of temptation to many of the best men, especially in regard to sins against charity. We seem to be ashamed of our charity more than of any other grace, and yet it is the noblest and the most essentially Christian. 3. Distinguish between apostolic teaching and apostolic conduct. Neither in his preaching nor in his writing did St. Peter defend the course he pursued at Antioch. Inspiration for teaching does not imply faultlessness in action.

II. IT IS RIGHT TO REBUKE DANGEROUS FAULTS. St. Peter was the senior apostle, and it might seem presumptuous to oppose him. He was the foremost apostle, and opposition might endanger the peace of the Church. Many would let deference to years and rank and fear of painful discord prevent them from acting as St. Paul acted. But right is above all personal considerations. There are interests of the Church that may be ruined by a slavish fear of disturbing peace. The peace thus secured is a false peace. There are times when controversy in the Church is a duty of paramount importance. It may be the only security against fatal error. Yet, though then the least of evils, it is still an evil, and should not be undertaken without grave reason. 1. In the present instance the question was of vital importance. It cut at the root of the unity and brotherhood of the Church. If Christians could not eat together at the "agape," the simple but all-significant meal of the Christian family, the Church would be broken up. This was no light matter to be overlooked. It demanded even the contention of apostle with apostle. Let us see that the importance of the cause is sufficient to justify the painful consequences of a controversy before opening it up. 2. The question was of public interest. The fault of St. Peter was no secret, nor did it only concern himself. His powerful example affected others, till even St. Barnabas was led away. No private friendship can be pleaded in excuse for letting a public evil go unchecked. In such cases brother must oppose brother, though his heart bleeds at the necessity.

III. **REBUKE SHOULD BE OPEN AND DIRECTLY OFFERED TO THE OFFENDER.** St. Paul "withstood him to the face." It needed no little courage for the new and often-suspected apostle thus to challenge the first man in the Church. Few have such courage, and many only betake themselves to backbiting. If we have anything against a man, the right thing is to tell it him to his face. This is the only honourable course. It is due to him in fairness. It prevents misunderstanding, and often saves a long and widespread quarrel. Such a course escapes presumption if it is taken with an honest conviction that the conduct opposed is wrong, with a sincere desire to save others from the consequences of it, with all humility in regard to one's self as equally fallible and with great kindness and charity for the offender. Yet we are not all called to this work. It requires a Paul to rebuke a Peter wisely and well.—W. F. A.

Ver. 16.—*Justification by faith.* These words contain the pith and kernel of the Epistle. Occurring in historical narration, they strike the key-note of what is rather an expostulation and appeal to previous convictions than an original, calm argument, such as is the treatment of the same subject in the Epistle to the Romans. St. Paul says he convicted St. Peter of inconsistency in requiring Gentiles to Judaize, by reminding him that even they, Jews as they were, were not justified on account of works, but through faith in Christ. By an easy and natural transition this reminiscence is made the occasion for passing from the historical to the doctrinal part of the Epistle. That great truth which called forth the protest of apostle against apostle is the truth from which the Galatians, like the Christians at Antioch, are being lured away. It is of the essence of Christianity to them as it was to their sister Church, and as it will be to the Church in all ages.

I. **CHRISTIANITY BRINGS JUSTIFICATION.** What is justification? Some have understood it as "making righteous," others as "accounting righteous." It is plain that St. Paul does teach that real righteousness is obtained through faith (*e.g.* Rom. iii. 21). But it is equally plain that the natural rendering of such a passage as that now before us suggests the idea of treating or reckoning as righteous. The inference is that St. Paul used the expressions in both senses. And the inference from that is, not that he was confused in thought or consciously ambiguous, but that he saw a much closer connection between the two than Protestant theology, in revulsion from Romanism, has always made apparent. Justification is the immediate result of forgiveness. God cannot think a man to be other than he is; but he can act towards him better than he deserves, can treat a sinner as only a righteous man deserves to be treated. This is justification. Now, forgiveness is personal and moral. It is not mere remission of penalties. It is reconciliation and restitution. The justification which is the consequence is not a mere external thing. It sows the seed of positive righteousness by infusing the highest motive for it. If it did not do this it would be immoral. Justification is itself justified by its fruits. This great boon is the first grace of Christianity. Until we are forgiven and thus justified we cannot begin to serve God.

II. **CHRISTIANITY DECLARES THE FAILURE OF ATTEMPTING TO SECURE JUSTIFICATION THROUGH WORKS OF LAW.** All the world over men have been making frantic but futile efforts in this direction. A sickening sense of failure is the invariable result (Rom. vii. 24). It is like the vanishing of a nightmare to see that the whole attempt is a mistake, that God recognizes its impotence, and that he does not expect us to succeed in it. 1. *We cannot be justified through works of Law*, because if we do our best we are *unprofitable servants*, and have only done what we ought to have done. The slave whose whole time belongs to his master cannot earn anything by working overtime. Future obedience is simply obligatory on its own account; it cannot atone for past negligence. 2. *We cannot renew our own nature* by anything we do, seeing that we only work outwards from our nature. While the heart is corrupt the conduct cannot be justifying. 3. *There is no life in Law* to infuse power for holier service. Law restrains and represses; it cannot renew and inspire. Only love and grace can do that. 4. Nevertheless, *obedience to the principles of the Law is not superseded* by any other method of justification. It is the justified through faith, and they only, who truly obey the Law, delighting to do the will of God.

III. **CHRISTIANITY PROMISES JUSTIFICATION THROUGH FAITH IN CHRIST.** 1. Faith is the means of justification, not the grounds of it. We are not justified on account of

faith, but through faith. Faith is not, taken as itself, a virtue serving just as works of Law were supposed to serve. The one ground of forgiveness and renewal is the grace of God in Christ. Faith is the means of securing this, because it unites us to Christ. 2. This faith is *in Christ, not in a creed*. We may cast our thoughts about Christ into a creed. Yet what is necessary is not the understanding of and assent to any doctrines, but trust in a Person. 3. The faith is *active trust*. It is not only believing about Christ, but relying on him in conduct. For example, it is like, not only believing that a certain pillar-box belongs to the post-office, but also dropping one's letter into it. 4. It is trust to Christ in *all his relations*, and therefore as much the confidence in him as our Lord and Master that directly leads to obedience, as passive reliance on him as a Saviour for the forgiveness and renewal which we can never work out for ourselves.—W. F. A.

Ver. 19.—*Dying to Law and living to God*. Here is a history of man's experience with Law. At first the vision of Law crushes and terrifies. Then it works deliverance from the life that is wholly given up to it. This deliverance is not for antinomian licence, but for spiritual life in God.

I. WHAT IS IT TO DIE TO LAW? Law here is not merely the Mosaic code. It is generic. Every nation has more or less some conception of law. We all feel it in our conscience. To live for this, to toil simply to meet its requirements, to be gloomy and despondent at our failure, is to live to Law. This by no means implies perfect or even partial obedience to Law. It may go with absolute failure; it is never found resulting in the complete harmony of Law and conduct. Now, to die to Law is to be free from this galling yoke. It is to be liberated from the frightful vision of an obligation that is imperative and yet beyond our powers—the nightmare feeling that we must do what we cannot do. It is freedom, too, from the habit of living in regard to Law as the rule and motive of life.

II. HOW DOES LAW LEAD TO THIS RESULT? We can understand how the gospel does it by offering forgiveness and by calling us to a better method of holiness. But Law also strangles the life that dwells in it. 1. *It condemns our failure*, and so shows us that it is vain to attempt to live in it. 2. *It proves itself impotent to give us the means of fulfilling its requirements*. The longer we live in it the more do we see that such a life is fruitless. Thus we gradually cease to feel drawn to it. At length we confess our failure and abandon the attempt. The Law has then killed the life we had in it.

III. WHAT IS THE OBJECT OF THIS DEATH TO LAW? Regarded by itself it is a miserable disaster. Law points to righteousness. To cease to live in Law is to dismiss the discredited guide in the wilderness and to be left alone. By itself the result would be ruinous. But it is only permitted in order to clear the way for something better. We must not rest in freedom from Law. To be free from the obligation and free from the penalty, and to have no new and better life, would be the collapse and degradation of all moral order. That is a false and fatal gospel which consists only in the promise of such a result. The only reason for allowing it is to secure the new life in God. 1. *This means exchanging a blind submission to Law for a loving obedience to our Father in heaven*. 2. *It means abandoning the helpless command for the inspiration of a living presence*. This is the true Christian life. It is therefore no selfish salvation that is offered to us, but a life of self-dedication, a losing of self in God. Note that the Law does not lead to this result, nor does dying to the Law. Thus far only the way is prepared. The new life in God flows from the gospel of Christ.—W. F. A.

Ver. 20.—*Crucified with Christ*. St. Paul's Christianity was identification of the Christian with Christ. It was not merely believing a scheme of doctrine, nor following a certain course of devotion, nor accepting an offered grace. It was absolute union with Christ in spiritual experience. Nothing is more characteristic of the apostle than the way in which, in almost every Epistle, he describes the Christian life as going step by step with the life of Christ from the earthly humiliation and death to the heavenly triumph. Here the most essential elements of that experience are pointed out, and the secret of them declared.

I. THE ESSENTIAL CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE. 1. *Crucifixion with Christ*. This is no figure of speech, meaning only that, inasmuch as Christ died for us, we may be said to

have been crucified representatively in him. The passionate earnestness of St. Paul in describing his own spiritual renewal goes far beyond any such shallow conception. He is plainly describing what he really endured. (1) This is death. The old life is killed out. The passions, lusts, habits, and associations of the life in sin, self, and worldliness are mortified. Christianity is not simply educational. It is first of all militant—purging, scourging, killing. (2) This is crucifixion—a painful, violent death; for it is no light matter to destroy the life in sin, so full of pleasant attractions, and so deeply rooted in our inmost nature—and a judicial execution, wrought on us by the vindictive powers of our own treacherous passions when once we turn from them to faith in Christ. (3) This is a crucifixion with Christ. Our union with Christ necessitates this death of the old life and brings it about. The new wine bursts the old bottles. Conscience and Law fail to destroy the old life, though they reveal its hideous deformity. But when we come to Calvary and reach out to the dying Christ, entering into his experience by faith and vivid sympathy, the old self receives its mortal wounds. Then we can live the former life no longer. 2. *Christ living in us.* St. Paul feels that he has so given himself up to Christ that the ruling power in him is no longer self but Christ. This is true Christianity. (1) It is life. We die that we may live. We begin with mortifying the old life, but we do not continue to exist in a barren asceticism. New energies spring up from the grave of the old life. (2) This life is Christ's. It derives its power from Christ, it is swayed by the will of Christ, it seeks the ends of Christ, it breathes the spirit of Christ, it is lived in personal communion with Christ. Selfish aims and self-devised resources are gone, and in their place the grace of Christ is the inspiration, and the mind and will of Christ are the controlling influences of the new life. This is not a future possibility, but a present attainment. The life is now lived in the flesh.

II. THE SECRET OF THIS EXPERIENCE. 1. It is realized through *faith*. St. Paul lives "in faith." The power of Christ to destroy the old life and live himself in us depends on our faith in him, and is exercised just in proportion as we yield ourselves to him in trustful reliance and loyal obedience. No fate will make it ours, no mechanical influence will secure it. Intelligently, voluntarily, we must exercise faith in him to be joined to him in crucifixion and new life. Faith is always the greatest bond of union. 2. It is determined by the *love and sacrifice of Christ*. Here is the motive for our faith. The love of Christ constrains us. The gift of himself for us reveals and confirms his love and brings it home to our hearts. The explanation of the revolution in St. Paul's life, of the death of the persecutor, and the creation of the apostle, is his coming under the influence of these truths. To enjoy the same experience we must (1) fix our thoughts on the same great, wonderful love and sacrifice of Christ; and (2) appropriate them personally to ourselves. "He loved me," etc.—W. F. A.

Ver. 21.—*Grace frustrated.* I. IF WE SEEK FOR RIGHTEOUSNESS BY MEANS OF LAW WE MAKE NO USE OF THE GRACE OF GOD. Here are two rival methods for obtaining righteousness. The first is wide and various, by means of Law, any law—the Levitical system, ascetic discipline, rites of heathen mysteries, Stoic philosophy, our own attempts to conform to an outside rule. The second is specific, *the* grace of God, the grace shown in the gospel, the grace that comes through the sacrifice of Christ. These two methods are mutually exclusive. They run in opposite directions. The Judaizing party was trying to combine them. The Roman Catholics made the same attempt when they regarded justification as the result of works wrought by means of grace. But, though grace does lead us to conformity with Law, it can only do so in its own way by changing the heart and planting principles of righteousness, not by assisting the old servile effort to keep certain external ordinances. The old stage-coach can be of no assistance to the express train. By so much of the distance as you go by road you leave the rail and therefore lose ground. The mistake of neglecting grace for Law is (1) *foolish*, for we thus lose a help freely offered; (2) *ungrateful*, for we refuse the gift of God; and (3) *dangerous*, for we shall be to blame for the failure that could have been avoided had we not declined to avail ourselves of God's method of righteousness. All attempts, then, to increase holiness by monastic rules, regulations of a religious order, specific vows, or restraints of formal Church discipline are unchristian. The higher righteousness must be attained by the same means through which the first elements

were secured. Any other method is poorer and weaker. We begin with grace; we can never improve upon grace.

II. IF RIGHTEOUSNESS WERE ATTAINABLE BY MEANS OF LAW, CHRIST'S DEATH WOULD HAVE BEEN TO NO PURPOSE. 1. The method of Law was the *older* method. If this had been successful there would have been no need to add another. If the Old Testament were enough the New Testament need never have been produced. 2. The method of Law was the *less costly* method. We do not turn to more expensive methods if no superior advantage is to be gained by them. The new method is only possible at the greatest possible cost. The righteousness by Law required no special sacrifice. The righteousness by grace required the death of the Son of God. How much superior must God consider it to be willing to pay so heavy a price in order to secure it to us! We may be sure that, if by any easier way the same results could have been reached, God would have spared his own Son. Yet they who neglect this grace for the old method of Law proclaim by their actions that the great sacrifice was unnecessary. For themselves, too, they do make it a useless thing. This is the pathetic side of their error. Refusing to avail themselves of the grace of God, they bring it to pass that, as far as they are concerned, Christ died in vain.—W. F. A.

## EXPOSITION.

### CHAPTER III.

Ver. 1.—O foolish Galatians (*ὁ ἀνόητοι Γαλάται*). In thus apostrophizing them, the apostle brands their present behaviour, not any lack of intelligence on their part in general (comp. Luke xxiv. 25). "Foolish"—to allow yourselves to be thus robbed of your happiness. The transporting feeling of elevation and joy with which, in ch. ii. 19—21, the apostle describes himself as crucified with Christ to the Law, and as living in Christ and through Christ, makes him the more keenly sensible of the senseless folly shown by the Galatians in taking up the observance of the Law. Who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth? (*τίς ὑμᾶς ἐβάσκανε*; [Receptus adds, *τῆ ἀληθεία μὴ πειθεσθαι*]; *who in his envy did bewitch you?* With respect to the Greek text, there is now no doubt amongst editors that the words, *τῆ ἀληθεία μὴ πειθεσθαι*, "that ye should not obey the truth," are not genuine here, being in all probability foisted in from ver. 7. We have, therefore, to omit them and to read *ἐβάσκανεν* as before *ὁ*s. *Ἐβάσκανεν* is a remarkable word, and calls for comment. In common Greek, *βασκαίνω τινά*, to treat one with malignant words, means either to slander, belie, blacken character, or to cast upon him primarily *words* conveying baleful spells, and then, in later usage very frequently, baleful spells of any kind, and more especially spells from the "evil eye" (Aristotle, Plutarch); in the language of old English superstition, "forelook" or "overlook." Indeed, so closely did this last notion cling to the verb, as to have suggested to Greek grammarians for its etymology, *φάσει καίρειν*, "to kill with the eye." The more scientific etymologists of

recent days derive it from *βάζω, βάσκω*, speak; as if it were "to bespeak a man." The nouns *βάσκανος, βασκανία*, following the senses of the verb, express the ideas, either of envious detraction or of sorcery (see Schneider; Passow; Liddell and Scott). In the New Testament the word occurs only here. In the Septuagint we meet with it in Deut. xxviii. 54, where, for the words, "His eye shall be evil towards his brother," we have *βασκαίει τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ*, meaning apparently, "He shall grudge with his eye his brother;" and so again in ver. 56, the same phrase is used analogously of the tender woman, "She shall grudge with her eye her husband;" Eccles. xiv. 6, "There is not a worse man (*τοῦ βασκαίνοντος ἑαυτὸν*) than he that grudges his own self;" *ibid.* ver. 8, "Evil is (*ὁ βασκαίνων ὀφθαλμῷ*) he that grudgeth with his eye." In Scripture, both in the Old Testament and the New, and in the Apocrypha, the phrases, "the eye being evil," "the evil eye," following the Hebrew, always denote envy, ill nature, niggardliness (Deut. xv. 9; xxviii. 54, 56; Prov. xxiii. 6 [comp. Prov. xxii. 9, "a bountiful eye"]; Matt. xx. 15; Mark vii. 22). Nowhere either in the Scriptures or in the Apocrypha is there any reference to "forelooking," unless perchance the *με'ἄνευ*, Deut. xx. 10 (Authorized Version, "observer of times"), is etymologically connected with the Hebrew word for "eye," which, however, few critics suppose. Ignatius, 'Ad Rom.', 3, *οὐδέποτε ἐβασκάνετε οὐδένα, ἄλλους ἐδιδάξατε*, "never grudged any man." This Septuagintal use of the verb presents, as the reader will observe, a somewhat different shade of meaning to any of those cited above from the lexicons. Following, however, its guidance, we may



understand the apostle as here asking, "Whose ill-natured jealousy was it that did light upon you?" and as intending to convey these two ideas: (1) the envy of their once happy state which actuated the agent referred to; and, (2) by *implication*, the baleful effect wrought by the envier upon them. The sorist of the verb seems to point to a decisive result. He had, it is hinted, succeeded in his wish; he had robbed them of the blessedness which had excited his jealousy. In respect to the former idea, elsewhere (ch. iv. 17, "They would fain shut you out") the apostle ascribes the action of their misleaders to sinister designs against their well-being. It is, indeed, this thought that inspires the extreme severity of his language above in ch. ii. 4; the *βάσκανος*, of whom he here speaks, belonged to, or derived from, *them*. In short, the pathetic question here before us breathes the like indignation and vexation as that in ch. v. 7, "Ye were running on well: who did hinder you that ye should not obey the truth?"—the last words of which passage, though not admissible here in the text, would, however, if there, form a perfectly correct explanatory clause. The more distinctly to mark the effect actually produced by the envier, very many commentators have enwoven into their interpretation of *ἐβάσκανεν*, besides its Septuagintal sense, its other sense of blasting with some kind of charm: "The malignity," Chrysostom writes, "of a demon whose spirit [or, 'breath'] had blasted their prosperous estate." Great use has been made, in particular, by many, as, e.g. Jerome and, according to Estius, by Thomas Aquinas, of the superstition of the "evil eye," which, in the countries bordering on the Mediterranean, has in all ages been so rife. Bishop Lightfoot, in his interesting note on the passage, offers the following paraphrase: "Christ's death in vain? O ye senseless Gauls, what bewitchment is this? I placarded Christ crucified before your eyes. Ye suffered them to wander from this gracious proclamation of your King. They rested on the withering eye of the sorcerer. They yielded to the fascination and were riveted there. And the life of your souls has been drained out of you by that envious gaze." It may, however, be questioned whether the apostle would have recognized his own thought in this thorough-going application of the superstition of the "evil eye." It is doubtful whether he used the verb *ἐβάσκανεν* with reference to any species of sorcery at all; but if he did, he may have intended no more than this: "What envious ill-wisher has by some strange, inexplicable sorcery so wrought upon you? Or, *how* can I explain your behaviour, except that you have

been acting under some binding spell? Surely such folly is well-nigh inconceivable with men in free possession of their own souls." But (1) each of these two renderings of the passage is open to the objection that St. Paul, in writing *ἐβάσκανεν*, either might have intended to express by the word "envious grudging," according to its Septuagintal use, or he might have meant some kind of sorcery according to a common acceptance of the term, but could hardly have meant to convey both senses together. (2) The introduction of the supposition is inconvenient, not only because there could not have really been any such ingredient in the actual circumstances of the present case, but also because its mention would serve to excuse the folly of the Galatians, as indeed Chrysostom observes that it does, rather than to enhance its censure, which latter would have been more to the apostle's purpose. (3) It seems especially improbable that the apostle was thinking of the "evil eye" when we consider the entire absence of its mention in the sacred writings. Before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you? (*οἷς κατ' ὀφθαλμοῦς Ἰησοῦς Χριστοῦ προεγράφη, ἐν ὑμῖν ἐσταυρωμένος*); to whom, before your very eyes, Jesus Christ had been (literally, was) aforetime (or, openly) set forth crucified (among you)? The genuineness of the words, *ἐν ὑμῖν*, "among you," is very doubtful. The Revised Greek text omits them. The words, *κατ' ὀφθαλμοῦς*, "before your very eyes," are very pointed; for the Greek expression, comp. *κατὰ πρόσωπον* (ch. ii. 11), and Aristoph., "Ran," 625, *ἴνα σοι κατ' ὀφθαλμοῦς λέγῃ*, "that he may say it to your very face." The sense of *προεγράφη* is much disputed. It is not clear whether the *πρὸ* is the "before" of time or of place. Of the other passages in the New Testament in which this compound verb occurs, in Rom. xv. 4 twice, and Eph. iii. 3, *πρὸ* is certainly, and in Jude 4 probably, not so certainly (comp. 1 Macc. x. 36, "enrolled"), "before" of time. In the present passage a reference to the prophecies of the Old Testament seems out of place. It is far more suitable to the connection to suppose that the apostle is referring to his own preaching. Some commentators, retaining the words, *ἐν ὑμῖν*, connect them with *προεγράφη* in the sense of "in you," comparing "Christ in you" (Col. i. 27), and "written in your hearts" (2 Cor. iii. 2); and so render the words thus: "written of, or described, before in you." But such an expression, sufficiently awkward in itself, would further be very unsuitably introduced after the words, "before your very eyes." Supposing we take the *πρὸ* as of time, there is no satisfactory explanation of the *εἰργράφη*, if understood in the sense of

writing, there being no tablet (so to speak) suggested on which the writing could be conceived of as done. *γράφω*, it is true, means "describe" in John i. 45 and Rom. x. 5; but it is still a description in writing. We are, therefore, driven to assign to the verb the notion of portraying as in a painting, a sense which in Common Greek it certainly does sometimes bear, and which attaches to it in the *διαγράψω* of Ezek. iv. 1; viii. 10 (Septuagint). We thus gain the sense, "had before been set forth or portrayed;" before (that is) the envier assailed you. This same sense, of portraying rather than of writing, would be also the best to give to the verb, supposing the *πρὸ* to be understood as the "before" of place; which conception of the preposition Bishop Lightfoot contends for, urging the use of the verb *προγράφειν*, and the nouns *πρόγραμμα* and *προγραφή*, with reference to the placards on which public notices were given of political or other matters of business. When, however, we consider how partial the apostle is to verbs compounded with *πρὸ* of time, as is seen in his use of *προαιτιδομαι*, *προακούω*, *προμαρτάνω*, *προελπίζω*, *προεβόχομαι*, *προεπαγγέλλομαι*, *προετοιμάζω*, *προεπαγγέλιζομαι*, *προκαταγγέλλω*, *προκαταρτίζω*, *προκυρδομαι*, *προπάσχω*, not a few of which were probably compounded by himself as he wanted them, it appears highly probable that, to serve the present occasion, he here forms the compound *προγράφω* in the sense of "portraying before;" the compound not existing elsewhere in the same sense. He compares, then, the idea of Christ crucified, presented to his hearers in his preaching, to a portraiture, in which the Redeemer had been so vividly and with such striking effect exhibited to his converts, that it ought in all reason have for ever safeguarded their souls against all danger from teaching of an alien character. If the phrase, *ἐν ὑμῖν*, be retained, it appears best, with Chrysostom and many others, to understand it as meaning, that St. Paul had presented Christ crucified in such lively colours to their view, that they had, as it were, seen him hanging on the cross "in their very midst." The position of *ἐσταυρωμένος*, disconnected from *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός* and at the end of the sentence, gives it intense significance. What the idea of Christ crucified was to his own self, the apostle had just before declared; for him it at once had destroyed all spiritual connection with the ceremonial Law, the Law which bade the crucified One away from itself as accursed, and also by the infinite love to himself which he beheld manifested in Christ crucified for him, had bound him to him by spiritual ties both all-constraining and indissoluble. And such (he means) should have been the effect produced by

that idea upon *their* souls. What envier of their happiness in him could, then, possibly have torn them from him? This same portraiture of "Christ crucified" which he reminds the Galatians he had in those days presented to them, he also, as he tells the Corinthians (1 Cor. i. 23; ii. 2; 2 Cor. v. 20, 21), had been intent on holding up before the Greeks of Achaia; while, further, he intimates to the Romans, in his Epistle to them, how eager he was to come and at Rome also hold up Christ as him whom God had set forth to be a Propitiation, through faith, by his blood (Rom. i. 15, 16; iii. 25). Both to the Jew and to the Gentile, both to Greeks and to barbarians, both to wise and to unwise, this, emphatically *this*, was the alone and the sovereign salvation. This picturing forth of the crucified One, however, would hardly from Paul's lips concern itself much with the outward particulars of the passion; it might have been this, in a far greater degree, in St. Peter's presentment of it, who had been himself witness of those sufferings; but Paul, with his habits of thought, as we know them from his writings, who knew Christ as in the spirit rather than as in the flesh, would occupy himself more with the spiritual *idea* of the cross—its embodiment of perfect meekness and gentleness and self-sacrifice, of humility, of obedience to the Father's will, of love to all mankind, of especial care for his own, and its antagonism to the spirit of Levitical ceremonialism. "Such presentment," remarks Calvin, "as if in a picture, nay, as if actually crucified in the very midst of the hearers themselves, no eloquence, no artifice of rhetoric, can produce, unless that mighty working of the Spirit be assistant of which the apostle speaks in his two Epistles to the Corinthians (*e.g.* 1 Cor. ii. 4, 5, 13, 14; 2 Cor. iii. 3, 6). If any, therefore, would fain duly discharge the ministry of the gospel, let them learn not so much to apply eloquence and declamation, as to likewise so pierce into men's consciences that these may truly *feel* Christ crucified and the dropping upon them of his blood. Where the Church hath painters such as these, she very little needeth any more representations in wood and stone, that is, dead images, very little any paintings; and certainly among Christians the doors of the temples were not open for the reception of images and paintings until the shepherds either had grown dumb and become mere dolls, or else did say in the pulpit no more than just a few words, and these in so cold and perfunctory a manner that the power and efficacy of the gospel ministry was utterly extinct."

Ver. 2.—This only would I learn of you (*τοῦτο μόνον θέλω μαθεῖν ἀφ' ὑμῶν*); this

only would I learn from you. I need ask for nothing more to show that the Law is nothing to you, than that you should tell me this. Received ye the Spirit by the works of the Law? (ἐξ ἔργων νόμου τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐλάβετε;); was it in consequence of works of the Law that ye received the Spirit? I came amongst you as an apostle, preaching the gospel, and upon your baptism laying my hands upon you; and the Holy Spirit came down upon you, proving the reality of his presence both by signs and miracles and powers, and also by the love, joy, and peace with which your hearts were filled; sealing at once the truth of my doctrine and your own position individually as recognized heirs of the kingdom of God. You remember that time. Well, how was it then? Had there a word been then spoken touching meats or drinks, or washings of purification (besides your baptism into Christ), or circumcision, or care of ceremonial cleanness? Had you attended to any one point whatever of Levitical ordinance? Had either you or I cast one thought in that direction? The "works of the Law" here referred to must still be works of ceremonial performance, not those of moral obedience; for repentance, the practical breaking off from sin, the surrender of the soul to God and to Christ in faith and loyal obedience, the outward assuming of the character of God's servants, the purpose and inchoate performance of works meet for repentance,—these actings of compliance with the moral Law were there. The gift of the Spirit was evidenced by charisms plainly supernatural; but it comprised more than the bestowment of these. Or by the hearing of faith? (ἢ ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως;); or was it in consequence of the hearing of faith? The noun ἀκοή denotes sometimes (what is heard) "report," "rumour," as Matt. iv. 24; xxiv. 6; Rom. x. 16, 17; sometimes, especially in the plural, the organs or sense of hearing, as Mark vii. 35; Luke vii. 1; Acts xvii. 20; Heb. v. 11; 2 Tim. iv. 3, 4; sometimes the act of hearing, as Matt. xiii. 14; 1 Sam. xv. 22 (Septuagint). The last appears more suitable here than the first taken (as some take it) as describing the doctrine or message which they heard respecting faith; standing as ἀκοή does in contrast to "works" which would have been an acting of theirs, this likewise was most probably meant by the apostle subjectively of something appearing on their own part. "Were you not at once received into the kingdom of God and filled with joy in the Holy Spirit, immediately upon your believing acceptance of the gospel message?" With exquisite propriety, as Bengel observes, is hereby marked the nature of faith, not working, but receiving. This agrees also best with

the illustration which in ver. 6 the apostle gives of the phrase as introduced by him again in ver. 5.

Ver. 3.—Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh? (οὕτως ἀνόητοί ἐστε; ἐναρξάμενοι πνεύματι, νῦν σαρκὶ ἐπιτελείσθε); are ye so foolish? having begun with the Spirit, are ye now finishing with the flesh? Πνεύματι, as contrasted with σαρκί, means the element of spiritual existence (comp. the use of πνεῦμα in Rom. i. 4; 1 Pet. iii. 18) into which they had been brought at their conversion by the Holy Spirit's influence; including the spiritual sensibility and spiritual activity which had at first marked their Christian life, as e.g. joy in God in the sense of pardon, adoption (ch. iv. 6), love to God, affectionate attachment to their spiritual teacher (ch. iv. 14, 15), brotherly love among themselves: at that hour all their soul was praise, joy, love. Σαρκί denotes a lower, merely sensuous kind of religiousness, one busying itself with ceremonial performances, observance of days and festivals (ch. iv. 10), distinctions of meats, and other matters of ceremonial prescription; with petty strivings and disputings, of course, about such points, as if they really mattered at all; in which kind of religiousness the former tone of love, joy, sense of adoption, praise, had evaporated, leaving their souls dry, earthly (comp. "weak and beggarly rudiments," ch. iv. 9; and for the use of σάρξ, Heb. ix. 10). Perhaps the apostle includes also in his use of the term the loss of spiritual victory over sin. If in place of surrendering themselves to the leading of the Spirit (comp. ch. v. 18) they put themselves under the Law, then they fell back again under the power of the "flesh," which the Law could only command them to control, but could of itself give them no power to control (Rom. viii. 3). The Authorized Version, "begun in," is doubtless faulty, in taking πνεῦμα as governed by the ἐν of the compound verb. The two verbs ἐναρξομαι and ἐπιτελεῖν are balanced against each other in 2 Cor. viii. 6; Phil. i. 6. Ἐπιτελείσθε may be either a passive, as it is rendered in the Authorized Version, "Are ye made perfect," i.e. "Are ye seeking to be made perfect;" so the Revised Version, "Are ye now perfected;" or a middle verb, as ἐπιτελοῦμαι is often used in other writers, though nowhere in the New Testament or Septuagint. The latter seems the more suitable, with the understood suppletion of "your course" or "your estate," as in our English word "finishing." The apostle is partial to the deponent form of verbs.

Ver. 4.—Have ye suffered so many things in vain? if it be yet in vain (τοσαῦτα ἐπάθετε

εἰκῆ; εἴτε καὶ εἰκῆ); did ye suffer all those troubles for nought? if indeed really for nought. The ambiguity of *τοσαῦτα*, which means either "so many" or "so great," is preserved by the rendering *all those*. The Revisers put *so many* in the text, and "or so great" in the margin. In respect to *ἐνδύετε*, the leading of the context in which the verse is embedded might incline us to take the verb in the sense in which it frequently occurs in Greek writers, that of being subjects of such and such treatment, good as well as bad; as, for example, in Josephus, 'Ant.,' iii. 15, 1, "Ὅσα πάθοντες ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ πηλικῶν εὐεργεσιῶν μεταλαμβάντες, "What treatment having received from him [*sc.* God], and what huge benefits having partaken of"—the character of the treatment being sufficiently indicated by the context as being that of kindness. But it is a fatal objection to this view of the passage that, in the forty passages or more in which the verb *πάσχω* is used in the New Testament, it never is used of good treatment, but always of bad; and so also always in the Septuagint. We are, therefore, shut up to the sense of "suffering ills," and must endeavour to find, if we can, some circumstances marking the troubles referred to which might serve to explain the seemingly abrupt mention of them here. And the probable explanation is this: those sufferings were brought upon the Galatian converts, not only through the influence of Jews, but also in consequence of the bitter enmity with which the Jews regarded St. Paul, as bringing converts over from among the Gentiles to the service of the one true God apart from any regard to the ceremonial Law of Moses. That Jews in general did thus regard St. Paul is shown by the suspicion which even Christian Jews felt towards him (Acts xxi. 21). For this no doubt, it was that the Jews in Asia Minor persecuted him from city to city as they did, their animosity against him extending itself also to those who had attached themselves to him as his disciples. That it did extend itself to his disciples as such appears, as from the nature of the case, so also from Acts xiv. 22, "That through many tribulations we must enter into the kingdom of God;" as also it is evinced by the strongly indignant tone in which he speaks of the persecuting Jews in his two Epistles to the Thessalonians, written near the very time to which he here alludes (1 Thess. ii. 14—16; 2 Thess. i. 8, 9)—this indignation being best accounted for by the supposition that it was roused by his sympathy with the similarly originated sufferings of the Macedonian brethren to whom he was writing. That the troubles here referred to emanated from the hostility of Jewish legalists may

be further gathered from ch. v. 11; vi. 12 (on which see Exposition). Those Jewish legalists hated both St. Paul and his converts, because they alike walked in "the Spirit," that is, in the element of Christian spirituality emancipated from the bondage of the Law, and not in "the flesh" of Mosaic ceremonialism. Hence it is that the mention in ver. 3 of the Galatian brethren having "begun with the Spirit," leads him on to the thought of the sufferings which just on that very account had been brought upon them. "For nought." This adverb *εἰκῆ* sometimes means, prospectively, "to no good," as in ch. iv. 11, "bestowed labour upon you *in vain*," and probably in 1 Cor. xv. 2; sometimes, retrospectively, "for no just cause," as in Col. ii. 18, "vainly puffed up." The English phrase, "for nought," has just a similar ambiguity. The apostle may, therefore, mean either this—Did ye suffer all these troubles to reap after all no benefit from your suffering them, forfeiting as you do (ch. v. 4) the reward which you might else have expected from the great Retributor (2 Thess. i. 6, 7) through your forsaking that ground of faith on which ye then stood, if indeed ye have forsaken it? or this—Did ye provoke all that persecution without just cause?—if, indeed, there was no just cause as ye seem now to think. According to the former view, the Galatians were now nullifying the benefit which might have accrued to them from their former endurance of persecution; according to the latter, they were now stultifying their former conduct in provoking these persecutions. The first seems somewhat the easiest. Εἰ γὰρ, as in Col. i. 23. The concluding clause has been here regarded as a reaching forth of the apostle's soul towards the hope that better thoughts might yet prevail with the Galatian waverers, so that they would not lose the reward of having suffered for Christ—a hope which he thus glances at, if so be he might thus lure them to its realization. But another view of the words has commended itself to not a few eminent critics, namely, that the apostle glances at the darker prospect; as if he had said, "If it be, indeed, merely for nought, and not for far worse than that! By falling away from the gospel, ye not only lose the crown of confessorship: ye forfeit also your hope of your heavenly inheritance" (cf. ch. v. 4). The conjunction *καὶ* is, confessedly, sometimes almost equivalent to "merely," "only," as *e.g.* in Homer, 'Odyssey,' i. 58, 'Ἰέμενος καὶ κενὸν ἀποθρόσκοντα νόησαι ἥς γαίης, "Longing if only but to see the smoke leaping upward from his native land." But in the present case εἰ γὰρ does not so readily suggest the last proposed suppletion of thought as it does the other.

Ver. 5.—He therefore that ministereth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you (*ὁ οὖν ἐπιχορηγῶν ὑμῖν τὸ Πνεῦμα, καὶ ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν*); he then that supplieth to you the Spirit and worketh powers in you, or, miracles among you. The "then" marks the taking up afresh of the topic brought forward in ver. 2, with especial prominence given here to the miraculous manifestations of the Spirit's presence. The argumentative treatment of this topic of the gift of the Spirit was interrupted in vers. 3 and 4 by curt, strongly emotional interrogatories, darted forth upon the apostle's recollecting the animated spirituality which marked those early days of their discipleship. The impassioned desultoriness of his language here, together with its abrupt, niggardly wording, is paralleled by ch. iv. 10—20. Perhaps these features in the form of the composition were in part occasioned by the circumstance that he was writing this Epistle with his own hand and not through an amanuensis; such manual exertion being, it should seem, unusual with him, and from some cause even laborious and painful: and so from time to time he appears, as it were, laying down the pen, to rest, to quell emotion, to reflect. The compound verb *ἐπιχορηγεῖν*, supply, differs probably from the simple form *χορηγεῖν* only by indicating profusion in the supply; but this qualification of its meaning is too slight to be representable in translation. Besides 2 Pet. i. 5, 11, we find it in 2 Cor. ix. 10, "He that supplieth (*ὁ ἐπιχορηγῶν*) seed . . . shall supply (*χορηγήσει*) and multiply your seed for sowing;" Col. ii. 19, "From whom all the body . . . being supplied;" 1 Pet. iv. 11, "As of the strength which God supplieth." And with similar application the substantive "supply" (*ἐπιχορηγία*) in Phil. i. 19, "Supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ;" Eph. iv. 16, "Through every joint of the supply." These passages make it clear that "he that supplieth" is no other than God. And this conclusion is borne out by the comparing of the other clause, "worketh powers in you," with 1 Cor. xii. 6, "It is the same God (*ὁ ἐνεργῶν*) who worketh all in all" (referring to the *charismata*)—which passage shows that "powers" (*δυνάμεις*) are not "miracles" themselves as in Matt. vii. 22 and xi. 20, and often, but power to work miracles, the plural number pointing to the various forms of its manifestation, as in 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28, 29. The apostle uses the present participles *ἐπιχορηγῶν* and *ἐνεργῶν* as describing an agency which the Almighty was continually putting forth among believers in general, including the Galatian Churches themselves. Doeth he it by the works of the Law, or by the hearing of faith? (*ἐξ ἔργων νόμου ἢ ἐξ*

*ἀκοῆς πίστεως*;) in consequence of works of the Law or of the hearing of faith? With the sparingness of words above noted, the apostle barely jots down, so to speak, the substance of the interrogative dilemma, without filling in the form of the question. The suppletion would naturally be that of our version, "doeth he it." The substance of the argument apparently required no more than, as before, the question—Was it in consequence of works of the Law or of the hearing of faith that the Spirit and his wonder-working powers were received? But instead of putting it so, St. Paul interposes the personality of the great God himself as imparting these great gifts, making his sentence thereby the more stately and impressive: it is with God in the might of his working that these corrupters of the gospel have to reckon. The impartation of the Spirit and the charisms evidenced God's complacency in the recipients. On what was that complacency founded? on their earning it by ceremonial performances, or on their simply opening their hearts to receive his love? It was a question which the Galatian Churchmen might, if they would, see the answer to in experiences of their own. Among themselves these powers had appeared, and no doubt were still operative. "Well, then," says the apostle, "look and see: are they not operative in those only of you who had received them upon the mere acceptance of righteousness offered them through faith in Christ simply, without having given any heed to Mosaic ceremonialism? Have any of you received them after taking up with such ceremonialism?" The apostle, it will be observed—and the remark is one of no small importance—makes an appeal to simple matters of fact, founded upon his and their own familiar acquaintance with the facts, and defying contradiction. We may be sure, therefore, that the facts were as he indicates, however small the extent may be to which we, with our imperfect knowledge of the circumstances, are ourselves able to verify his statement. In some degree, however, we can. Besides the striking illustration afforded by what occurred in the house of Cornelius (Acts x. 44), we see that such *charismata* were bestowed, and in some instances, as, e.g. at Corinth, in exceeding great profusion, in the train of St. Paul's evangelizing ministrations; and how remote those ministrations were from the inculcation, or even the admission, among Gentile converts of Mosaic ceremonialism we know perfectly.

Ver. 6.—Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness (*καθὼς Ἄβραάμ ἐπίστευσε τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἠλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην*); was reckoned

unto him for righteousness. The answer to the question in the foregoing verse is so obvious that the apostle goes on as if that answer had been given, namely, that it was simply in consequence of the hearing of faith that God conferred on any the Holy Spirit and his powers. This, he now adds, was in exact conformity with what was recorded of Abraham; as soon as Abraham heard the promise made to him, "So shall thy seed be," he believed it, and by the hearing of faith was justified. The mutual correspondence of the two cases lay in this, that in imparting to those believers the Holy Spirit, God showed that they were in his favour, were justified people, simply because of their faith; even as Abraham was shown to be in his favour, having likewise by faith been justified. The apostle weaves into his sentence the very words of Gen. xv. 6, as they appear in the Septuagint, with scarcely any modification; the Septuagint reading thus: *Και ἐπίστευσεν Ἀβραμ τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην*. But in doing so he both himself feels, and will have his readers feel, that they are words of *Scripture* from which, as such, reliable conclusions might be drawn, as is shown by the next verse. In the Hebrew, however, the passage runs as in our Authorized Version, "He believed in the Lord, and he accounted it to him for righteousness." The words are quoted with substantially the like agreement with the Septuagint and divergence from the Hebrew also in Rom. iv. 3, and by St. James in his Epistle (ii. 23) (*ἐπίστευσε δὲ Ἀβραάμ*, etc.). "It was reckoned;" in the Hebrew, "he reckoned it;" "it," that is, his believing: God regarded it as imparting to him perfect acceptableness, his sins no longer disqualifying him for being an object of the Divine favour. It is of the greatest importance to take note what the kind of faith was which God reckoned to him for righteousness. It was not simply a persuasion that what God says must be true. As Calvin remarks, Cain might have a hundred times exercised faith in what God had said to him, without thereby receiving righteousness from God. The reason why Abraham was justified by believing was this: a promise had been given him by God of his fatherly goodness towards him; and this word of God's he embraced as certainty. The faith, therefore, which the apostle is thinking of is the faith which has respect to some word of God which is of such a sort that reliance upon it will enable a man to repose in God's love to him for time and for eternity. The reference to Abraham's case which St. Paul makes in such very brief terms he expands in the fourth chapter of his Epistle to the Romans to a considerable length, ending with these

words: "Now it was not written for his sake alone that it was reckoned to him [for righteousness]; but for our sake also, unto whom it shall be reckoned, who believe on him that raised Jesus our Lord from the dead, who was delivered up for our offences, and was raised for our justification." Christ's death and resurrection are God's word and guarantee to the whole human race, assuring us of his forgiveness and of his offer to us of eternal life. If we hear this word with faith, committing ourselves to his love, God on that ground at once justifies also us. It is evident that, in the apostle's view, the word "righteousness," as used in the recited passage of Genesis, does not mean "a righteous act,"—that is, that Abraham's believing God's promise was viewed by Heaven with approval; but complete acceptableness investing Abraham himself. In consideration of that exercise of faith God accounted him a righteous man. The Greek phrase, *ἐλογίσθη εἰς δικαιοσύνην*, "was reckoned for righteousness," i.e. reckoned as being righteousness, is similar to *λογίσθηαι εἰς οὐδέν*, "reckoned as nought" (Acts xix. 27); *εἰς περιτομὴν λογισθήσεται*, "reckoned for circumcision" (Rom. ii. 26); *λογίζεται εἰς σπέρμα*, "reckoned for a seed" (Rom. ix. 8). Are we to infer from these two verses, 5 and 6, that in the apostle's view all who received spiritual gifts were thereby proved to be, or to have been, justified persons and in enjoyment of the Divine favour? We can hardly think this. The phenomena disclosed to us in the two Epistles addressed to the Corinthians, as to the moral and spiritual behaviour of some at least of their body, tend to show that individuals possessed of charisms were found in some instances to make a very vain-glorious use of them, and needed to be reminded that the thaumaturgic gifts were of a fleeting character and of incomparably less value than qualities of moral goodness. Certainly Christ himself has told us that "many" will at the last be found to have been possessed of such miraculous gifts, whom nevertheless he "never knew." One of the very apostles was a Judas. Perhaps the solution is this: companies of men were dealt with in the diffusion of these gifts according as they were characterized, viewed each as a whole, though there might be individuals in each company imperfectly, very superficially, some perhaps not at all, animated by the sentiment generally prevailing in the body. If a community as a whole was pervaded extensively by a spirit of frank acceptance of the gospel doctrine and of pious devotion, its members brought by baptism into the "body which is Christ," the Holy Spirit made such a community his habitation (1 Cor. iii. 16, 17; vi. 19;

2 Cor. vi. 16). and diffused his gifts among its members diversely and to all appearance indiscriminately (1 Cor. xii. 13); at all events not in such wise discriminately as that degrees of personal holiness and acceptableness before God could at all be estimated as standing in proportion to the outward brilliancy of thaumaturgic gifts severally possessed.

Ver. 7.—**Know ye therefore** (*γινώσκετε ἕνα*); or, *ye perceive then*. Critics are divided between the two renderings, the imperative and the indicative, both here and Matt. xxiv. 43; 1 John ii. 29. In Luke x. 11 and Heb. xiii. 23 *γινώσκετε* is certainly imperative. The categorical imperative seems of the two the more suited to the apostle's impetuous temperament. The verb *γινώσκω*, like the Latin *nosco*, properly denotes "to come to know," "learn," "perceive," "get apprised;" *ἐγνώκα* or *ἔγνων*, like *novi*, having more properly the sense of "knowing." But this distinction does not always hold, as e.g. Rom. vii. 1. **That they which are of faith** (*οἱ ἐκ πίστεως*); *that the men of faith*; that is, who derive their position from faith, belong to faith, are above all things characterized by faith. Compare the expressions, *τοῖς ἐξ ἐριθείας*, "the men of factiousness," i.e. "factious men" (Rom. ii. 8); *τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ*, "the man of faith in Jesus," taking his stand thereupon (Rom. iii. 26). Closely affine to this usage of the preposition, if not quite the same, is, *ὁ ὢν ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας*, "that is of the truth" (John xviii. 37); *οἱ ἐκ νόμου*, "they which are of the Law" (Rom. iv. 14); *ἄσσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσὶν* (ver. 10 of this chapter). The same are the children of Abraham (*οὗτοί εἰσιν υἱοὶ Ἀβραάμ*); *these are sons of Abraham*. The form of expression is precisely the same as in Rom. viii. 14, "As many as are led by the Spirit of God (*οὗτοί εἰσιν υἱοὶ Θεοῦ*) these are sons of God." In both cases the absence of the article before *υἱοὶ* suggests the feeling that the apostle is simply stating a predicate of the class before defined, but not now affirming that this predicate is confined to that class, although, again in each case, he knew that it *was* so confined. Just here, what he is concerned to affirm is that the possession of faith is a complete and sufficient qualification for sonship to Abraham. There is, perhaps, a polemical reference to the teaching of certain in Galatia, that, to be sons of Abraham or interested in God's covenant with his people, it behoved men to be circumcised and to observe the ceremonial Law. This error would be satisfactorily met by the affirmation of the present verse, that the being believers, simply this, constitutes men sons of Abraham. In the tenth verse the apostle goes further, aggressively denying to those

who "were of the works of the Law" the possession at all of Abrahamic privilege. The class, "men of faith," did in fact include Jewish believers as well as Gentile; but just here, as seems probable from what is said in the next verse, the apostle has in view Gentile believers only. The writer's thoughts are hovering round that promise of God ("So shall thy seed be") which had been on that particular occasion the object of Abraham's faith. That this was the case we may infer from his citation of the words in Rom. iv. 18, the explanation of which had been prepared for by him in what he has said before in ver. 16, "To the end that the promise may be sure to all the seed: not to that only which is of the Law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all." It was this that led him to speak of being sons of Abraham. This train of thought is pursued further in the next two verses.

Ver. 8.—The substance of this verse, taken in conjunction with the next, is this: The announcement which the Scripture records as made to Abraham, that "in him all the nations should be blessed," that is, that by being like him in faith all nations should be blessed like him, did thus early preach to Abraham that which is the great cardinal truth of the gospel preached now: it proceeded upon a foresight of the fact now coming to pass, that by faith simply God would justify the Gentiles. As well as the Scripture quoted before from Gen. xv., so this announcement also ascertains to us the position that they that are of faith, and they alone, are blessed with the believing patriarch. Such appears to be the general scope of the passage; but the verbal details are not free from difficulty. **And the Scripture, foreseeing** (*προβιδοῦσα δὲ ἡ γραφή*); *and, again, the Scripture, foreseeing*. The conjunction *δὲ* indicates transition to another item of proof, as, e.g. in] Rom. ix. 27, *Ἡσαΐας δέ*. The word "Scripture" in 2 Pet. i. 20, "no prophecy of Scripture," certainly denotes the sacred writings as taken collectively, that is, what is frequently recited by the plural, *αἱ γραφαί*, "the Scriptures." So probably in Acts viii. 22, "the passage of Scripture." We are, therefore, warranted in supposing it possible, and being possible it is here also probable, that this is the sense in which the apostle now uses the term as well as in ver. 22, rather than as denoting, either the one particular passage cited or the particular book out of which it is taken. This view better suits the personification under which the Old Testament is here presented. This personification groups with that in Rom. ix. 17, "The Scripture saith unto Pharaoh, For this very purpose did I raise thee up." In both

cases the "Scripture" is put in place of the announcement which Scripture records as having been made, the Scripture itself being written after the time of both Abraham and Pharaoh, and not addressed to them. But here there is the additional feature, of foresight being attributed to Scripture—a foresight, not exactly of the Holy Spirit inspiring the Scripture, but of the Divine Being who, on the occasion referred to, was holding communication with Abraham; although, yet again, "the Scripture" seems in the words, "foreseeing that God would justify," etc., distinguished from "God." The sense, however, is clear; Scripture shows that, as early as the time of Abraham, a Divine intimation was given that God would, on the ground of faith simply, justify any human being throughout the world that should believe in him as Abraham did. Rabbinical scholars tell us that in those writings a citation from Scripture is frequently introduced with the words, "What sees the Scripture?" or, "What sees he [or, 'it']?" That God would justify the heathen through faith (*ὅτι ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοῖ τὰ ἔθνη ὁ Θεός*); that by (Greek, *out of*) faith would God justify the nations. The position of *ἐκ πίστεως* betokens that the apostle's point here is, not that God would justify the Gentiles, but that it was by faith that he would do so irrespectively of any fulfilment on their part of ceremonial observances. The tense of the present indicative *δικαιοῖ* is hardly to be explained thus: would justify as we now see he is doing. The usual effect of the *oratio obliqua* transfers the standpoint of time in *δικαιοῖ* to the time of the foresight, the present tense being put instead of the future (*δικαιώσει*), as intimating that God was, so to speak, even now preparing thus to justify, or, in the Divine estimate of spaces of time, was on the eve of thus justifying; analogously with the force of the present tense in the participles "given" and "poured out" (*διδόμενον, ἐκχυνόμενον*) in Luke xxii. 19, 20. The condition of mankind in the meanwhile is described in vers. 22, 23—shut up unto the faith that was to be revealed. A question arises as to the exact interpretation of the word *ἔθνη* as twice occurring in this verse. Does the apostle use it as the correlative to Jews, "Gentiles;" or without any such sense of contradistinction, "nations" including both Jews and Gentiles? In answer, we observe: (1) The great point in these verses (6—9) is, not the call of the Gentiles, but the efficacy of faith without Levitical ceremonialism, as summed up in the words of ver. 9. (2) The original passage which the apostle is now referring to is that in Gen. xii. 3, where the Septuagint, conformably with the Hebrew,

has *καὶ ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πάντα αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς*: in our Authorized Version, "And in thee shall all families [Hebrew, *mishpechôth*] of the earth be blessed:" only, through some cause or other, instead of "all families," he writes the words, "all nations" (*πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*), which we find in what was said by the Lord to the two angels (Gen. xviii. 18), *καὶ ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν αὐτῷ* [that is, Abraham] *πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς*: Authorized Version, "all the nations of the earth" (Gen. xxii. 18, and the promise to Isaac, Gen. xxvi. 4, are irrelevant to the point now under consideration). We, therefore, are warranted in assuming that, as *ἔθνη* might be used as coextensive with *φυλαί* ("families"), it really is here employed by the apostle with the same extension of application. We may add that, most certainly, the apostle utterly repudiated the notion that God justifies Gentiles on a different footing from that on which he justifies Jews: whether Jews or Gentiles, they only who are of faith are blessed with Abraham; and, whether Jews or Gentiles all who are of faith are blessed with him. Preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying (*προευγγέλισατο τῷ Ἀβραάμ, ὅτι*); preached the gospel beforehand unto Abraham, saying. Very striking and animated is the apostle's use of this word *προευγγέλισατο*, a compound verb, minted no doubt for the occasion out of his own ardent thought, though it is found also in his senior contemporary, Philo. It is plainly an allusion to the "gospel" now openly proclaimed to the world as having been "by anticipation" already then announced to Abraham, the Most High himself the herald; signifying also the joy which it brought to the patriarch, and (Chrysostom adds) his great desire for its accomplishment. The blessed and glorious gospel of the grace of God has been the thought of God in all ages. May we connect with this the mysterious passage in John viii. 56? In point of construction, the verb *εὐαγγελίζομαι* is nowhere else followed by *ὅτι*: but as it is sometimes found governing an accusative of the matter preached (Luke i. 19; ii. 10; Acts v. 42; viii. 12; Eph. ii. 17), there is no harshness in its construction with *ὅτι*, which we may here represent in English by "saying." In thee shall all nations be blessed (*ἐνευλογηθήσονται* [Receptus, *εὐλογηθήσονται*] *ἐν σοὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*). "In thee" as their type and pattern, in respect both to the "blessing" bestowed upon him and to the faith out of which his blessing sprang. The "blessing" consists of God's love and all the well-being which can flow from God's love; the form of well-being varying according to the believer's circumstances, whether in this life or in the life



to come; it receives its consummation with the final utterance, "Come, ye blessed (*εὐλογημένοι*) of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Into this condition of blessedness the sinful and guilty can only be brought through justification; but justification through Christ does of necessary consequence bring us into it. The compound form of the verb, *ἐνευλογηθήσονται*, added to *ἐν σοι*, forcibly indicates that moral inherency in Abraham, through our being in faith and obedience his spiritual offspring, whereby alone the blessing is attained and possessed. Chrysostom remarks, "If, then, those were Abraham's sons, not, who were related to him by blood, but who follow his faith, for this is the meaning of the words, 'In thee all nations,' it is plain that the Gentiles are brought into kindred with him." Augustine explains "in thee," similarly: "To wit, by imitation of his faith, by which he was justified even before the sacrament of circumcision." Luther writes, "In Abraham are we blessed, but in what Abraham? The believing Abraham, to wit; because if we are not in Abraham, we are under a curse rather, even if we were in Abraham according to the flesh." Calvin likewise: "These words beyond all doubt mean that all must become objects of blessing after Abraham's fashion; for he is the common pattern, nay rather, rule. But he by faith obtained blessing; therefore faith is for all the means."

Ver. 9.—So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham (*ὥστε οἱ ἐκ πίστεως, εὐλογούνται σὺν τῷ πιστῷ Ἀβραάμ*). "Are blessed;" are objects of benediction. The apostle gathers from the words cited in ver. 8 the two particulars, that there are who get to be blessed like Abraham and with him, and that it is by faith like Abraham's, without works of the Law, that they do so. He seems to have an eye to the sense of Divine benediction which the Galatians had themselves experienced, when upon their simply believing in Christ the Spirit's gifts had been poured forth upon them. The word "faithful" (*πιστῷ*) is inserted, *ex abundantia* almost, to mark the more explicitly and emphatically, the condition on which both Abraham and therefore others in him gain the blessing. This being "in Abraham," which is here predicated of all who gain justification and God's benediction, is analogous to the image of Gentiles, being by faith "grafted," and by faith abiding, in the "olive tree," which we have in Rom. xi. 17, 20. The verbal *πιστῶς* is generally passive, "one to be believed or trusted in," and so a man "of fidelity;" but it is also at times active, in the sense of "one who believes," as John xx. 27;

Acts x. 45; 2 Cor. vi. 15; Eph. i. 1; 1 Tim. iv. 10; v. 16; vi. 2 (so in *ἐπίστος*, John xx. 27; *δαλιόπιστος*, Matt. vi. 30). In consequence of this use of the term in Scripture, both *fidelis* in ecclesiastical Latin and "faithful" in English have often this signification.

Ver. 10.—For as many as are of the works of the Law are under the curse (*δοσι γὰρ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσὶν, ὑπὸ κατάραν εἰσὶν*); under a curse, or, under cursing. "For." The apostle is now making the clause in the preceding verse, "they who are of faith," the *limiting* description of those who "are blessed with faithful Abraham;"—I say, they who are of faith; for they who are of the works of the Law are in a very different case. In the phrase, "are of the works of the Law," the preposition "of" (*ἐκ*) has the same force as has been already noted in the phrase (ver. 9), "they who are of faith;" it signifies dependence upon, belonging to, taking position from; and it marks a moral posture of mind voluntarily assumed. The apostle in laying down the aphorism of the present passage has doubtless an eye to those of the Galatians who were moving for the adoption of circumcision and the ceremonies of the Levitical Law. Withdrawing from the category of those who were of faith, they were preparing to join those who were of the works of the Law. If their taking up with circumcision, and with these or those of the Levitical ordinances, was not mere childish trifling; if in serious and solemn earnest it meant anything, it meant this—that they looked to gain from these observances acceptableness before God, as performing works commanded by his Law given through Moses; but in that view they were bound to take the Law in its entirety, and do every work which it prescribed, ceremonial and moral alike; for all of it came invested with the like authority and as a part of that institution was alike binding (see ch. v. 3). Let them now consider well how in such circumstances their case would stand. That the "works of the Law" which stand foremost before the apostle's view in the present discussion are those of a ceremonial character is apparent from the tenor both of vers. 12—19 of the preceding chapter and of vers. 1—10 of the next. There is, indeed, generally this difference observable between the phase of the Law regarded in this Epistle, as compared with that which engages the apostle's thoughts when writing to the Romans: in the Romans the prominent notion of the spiritual condition of those under the Law is that they are in a state of guiltiness, condemnation, spiritual inability, unconquered sin; while in the Galatians the prominent notion of their condition is that

they are in a state of slavery, that the dispensation they are under is spiritually an enslaving one, a yoke of bondage (ch. iii. 24; iv. 1—3, 9, 24, 31; v. 1, 13). In the Romans the moral aspect of the Law is mostly in view; in this Epistle its ceremonial aspect. The consideration of these distinctive features marking this Epistle will perhaps prepare us the more readily to apprehend the particular shade of meaning with which the apostle uses the words, "are under cursing." He means, not precisely that a curse has already been definitely pronounced upon them so that they now stand there condemned, but that the *threatening* of a curse is always sounding in their ears, filling them with uneasiness, with constant apprehension that they shall themselves fall under it. The noun *κατάρα* is thus used for malediction, cursing, in Jas. iii. 9, 10, "Therewith bless we the Lord and Father; and therewith curse we men; . . . out of the same mouth cometh forth blessing and cursing (*εὐλογία καὶ κατάρα*);" Deut. xxvii. 13 (Septuagint), "These shall stand (*ἐπὶ τῆς κατάρας*) for the cursing upon Mount Ebal"—that is, for the denouncement of the several curses with which they were to threaten different classes of transgressors. As many, says the apostle, as are of the works of the Law are under a black cloud of malediction, which is ready to flash forth in lightning wrath upon every failure in obedience. And what man of them all can hope not to merit that inexorable lightning down of judgment? Supposing them to be ever so exact and punctual in their observance of those ordinances of the flesh which certain of those Galatian Churohmen are hankering after, how will it fare with them in respect to those other weightier precepts of the Law which require spiritual obedience? For one single example, how will they be able to render unflinching obedience to the commandment, Thou shalt not covet? Beyond question, the apostle writes with the sense which he has so fully developed in his Epistle to the Romans (iii. 9—20; vii. 7—24; viii. 3), that no one under the economy of the Law ever did, or ever could, continue in all things which were written in the Law to do them; and that therefore they that forsook the gospel of Christ to look to the Law for acceptance with God would beyond doubt become, nay, taken as they were at any moment had already become, each individual, the specific object of malediction, a child of cursing, a child of wrath (2 Pet. ii. 14; Eph. ii. 3; Rom. iv. 15). Nevertheless, his purpose just here may be presumed to be, not to affirm this, but rather to point to the miserable state of apprehensiveness and fear of instant wrath which they who were of the works of the Law

must needs be in bondage to. Most commentators, however, understand *κατάρα* as meaning, not "cursing" or uttering general sentences of cursing (*maledictio*), but "a curse" (*maledictum*), that is, a specific curse incurred already by each individual in consequence of his having of a certainty already sinned against some commandment of the Law; if not against some ceremonial commandment, at any rate against some moral precept. Whichever way we understand it, such (the apostle at all events means) was the condition into which those Judaizing Gentile converts were preparing to precipitate themselves. For it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the Law to do them (*γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι* [Receptus has *γὰρ* without *ὅτι*, which conjunction is according to the Greek usage introduced superfluously] *εὐκατάρατος πᾶς ὃς οὐκ ἐμμένει ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου, τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτά*). The Septuagint (Deut. xxvii. 26) has *εὐκατάρατος πᾶς ὃ* [this *ὃ* of doubtful genuineness] *ἄνθρωπος ὅστις οὐκ ἐμμένει [or ἐμμένει] ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς λόγοις τοῦ νόμου τούτου, τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτούς*. The Hebrew is correctly given in the Authorized Version, "Cursed be he that confirmeth not *all* the words of this Law to do them." The apostle, quoting the Septuagint apparently from memory, gives the general sense rather than the exact words. He that sins against a commandment, as (to use the Septuagint phrase) he does not "continue in" it, but departs from it, so also, he, as far as his action reaches, sets it aside or abrogates it instead of "confirming" it. The word "all," not found in our present Hebrew text, is stated by critics to be in the Samaritan as well as in the Septuagint. This is the last of the twelve several maledictions pronounced from Mount Ebal, and certainly includes in its scope the ceremonial as well as the moral precepts of the Law. But what did this malediction import? Certainly it expressed abhorrence—the Divine Author of the Law, and his ministers and people accepting, pronouncing, and ratifying the denunciation, all join in repudiating the offender, casting him out from among them with loathing: so much is clear. What practical effect was to be given to the malediction, even by men in this life, not to speak of the action of God hereafter in the life to come, is nowhere indicated; but all could see thus much—the offender, if dying unrepentant, would depart hence accursed of both man and God. The notion of guiltiness before God and accursedness incurred by transgression of merely ceremonial precepts has been so greatly effaced from men's consciousness by the teaching, direct and in-

direct, of Christ's gospel, that we find it hard to realize to our minds that there ever existed a posture of the spirit answering to such a notion, or, if such did exist, that it could be other than the fruit of an un-instructed, ill-trained state of the conscience. But it was not this, so long as the economy of Moses was in force. For these positive laws were laws of God, binding during his pleasure upon the conscience of every Israelite; and in proportion as an Israelite's consciousness of the existence of Jehovah and of his own covenant relation to Jehovah was real and vivid, in that proportion would he be careful, scrupulously careful even, in obeying those positive laws. He had, indeed, to duly estimate the comparative importance and obligation of positive and of moral precepts, especially when in actual practice they came into conflict, according to the principle laid down for example in Hosea vi. 6; but it was at his peril that he at any time neglected the former, though still less might he dare to neglect the latter. For every Israelite, as long as the Law continued in force, that which was said by Christ was strictly true, and in both clauses meant to be taken in solemn earnest, "These latter ought he to do, and not to leave the other undone" (Matt. xxiii. 23). It was, for instance, a matter of conscience for the truly conscientious Israelite to carefully purify himself from pollution incurred by contact with the dead, and to abstain from swine's flesh; he might not neglect such purifications or partake of such meat without breaking a commandment of God's, without therefore incurring God's displeasure; and it behoved him to feel that he could not, and in proportion to the sincerity and depth of his religious sentiment he did feel it. Now, even when Israelites lived in a world of their own, comparatively free from the presence of Gentiles, the observance of the Levitical Law must needs have been at times felt to be an irksome or even anxious obligation; but its irksomeness and anxiety must have been greatly increased when Gentiles were not merely brought into close contact with them, but were even their masters. St. Peter confessed how burdensome it was felt to be, when he pronounced it a yoke which neither they nor their fathers had been able to bear. The feeling of relief must therefore have been inexpressibly great when an Israelite could come to be assured that those positive laws had ceased to be obligatory; that even if from habit or from national or social sentiment he continued to observe them, yet his conscience was quite free to disregard them without fear of displeasing God; that God's covenanted mercy had no longer any reference whatever to such observances, and that he

might worship him acceptably, and hold joyful communion with him (say) in the Lord's Supper, though he had just before been handling a corpse without being since purified, or eating "unclean" meats, or working on the sabbath day. This relief the gospel brought; God's servants learnt with joy that they were righteous and accepted before him simply through faith in Christ without those "works of the Law." The curse was reversed. Now it ran thus: "Anathema be he who doth not wholly trust in Christ crucified for righteousness! Anathema be he who brings dead ordinances of the Law to darken his brethren's joy!"

Ver. 11.—But that no man is justified by the Law in the sight of God, it is evident (*ὅτι δὲ ἐν νόμῳ οὐδὲς δικαιοῦται παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ*); but that in the Law no man is justified with God, is evident. To "be justified" means to be brought out of a state of guiltiness and cursedness into a state of acceptance. The apostle, assuming that every one is guilty and under a curse, now shows that the Law offers no means of justification. "But." The apostle is meeting the notion that, though one who is of works of the Law is evermore threatened with a curse ready to light down upon him, and though the curse has been, as it cannot but have been, actually incurred, yet, by setting himself afresh to the endeavour and thenceforward continuing steadfast in all things written in the Law, he may thus win pardon and righteousness with God. To obviate this conception, without stopping to insist upon the fact that through indwelling sin no man possibly can continue in all the things written in the Law, he puts the notion aside by stating that this is not the method of justification which Scripture recognizes. This he shows by adducing that cardinal aporism of Habakkuk, by which, as it should seem, the apostle was wont to substantiate the doctrine of justification by faith (comp. Rom. i. 17; Heb. x. 38). The way in which the passage is here introduced, almost as an *obiter dictum*, and as if not needing a formal indication of its coming out of Scripture, suggests the feeling that the passage, as taken in the sense in which the apostle reads it, was one already familiar to his readers, no doubt through his own former teaching. When in the Acts (xiii. 39—41) we read that in the synagogue at the Pisidian Antioch, in close connection with the statement that through believing in Christ a man is justified, he cited another passage of Habakkuk (i. 5), denouncing unbelieving despisers, we cannot doubt that he had made good his statement about justification by alleging this same probative text. "In the Law;" that is, as being in the sphere and domain of the Law. Com-

pare the use of the same preposition: Rom. ii. 12, "As many as have sinned under [Greek, 'in'] the Law;" iii. 19, "It saith to them that are under [Greek, 'in'] the Law." An exactly parallel construction is found in Acts xiii. 39, "From all things from which ye could not by [Greek, 'in'] the Law be justified." They could not as being in the Law find therein any means of gaining acceptance. "Is justified with God;" comes to be accounted righteous with him. "With God;" not merely outwardly, Levitically, in the judgment of a Levitical priest—but inwardly and in reality, in God's estimation. The preposition "with" (*παρά*) is used similarly in Rom. ii. 13, "For not the hearers of the Law are righteous with God;" 1 Cor. ii. 19, "The wisdom of this world is foolishness with God." It is God himself that justifies the sinner (Rom. iii. 30; iv. 5); but the apostle does not write "is justified by God," because he is confronting the notion so natural to man, and above all, to the Judaizing legalist, that a man is to make himself righteous by doings—ceremonial or moral—of his own. For, The just shall live by faith (*ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται*); the righteous by faith shall live. The apostle is not weaving the prophet's words into his own sentence simply as aptly expressing his own thought, but is citing them probatively as words of Scripture; as if he had said, "As Scripture saith, The righteous," etc. The same is the case with the words introduced in the next verse out of Leviticus; so Rom. ix. 7. In Rom. xv. 3 and 1 Cor. ii. 9 the apostle inserts, "according as it is written," as in parenthesis, before adding the words of Scripture in such a way as to form a continuation of his own sentence. "The righteous by faith shall live;" that is, the righteous man shall draw his life from his faith. It is generally agreed upon by Hebrew scholars that in the original passage (Hab. ii. 4) the words, "by his faith" (or possibly, adopting another reading of the Hebrew text, "by my faith," that is, by faith in me) belong to "shall live," rather than to "the righteous" (see on this point Delitzsch on Heb. x. 38, and Canon Cook on Hab. ii. 4, in 'Speaker's Commentary'). And that St. Paul so understood it is made probable by the contrasted citation of "shall live in them" in the next verse. With this conjunction of the words, the passage suits the apostle's purpose perfectly; for if it is by or from his faith that the righteous man lives, then it is by or from his faith that he gets to be accepted by God as righteous. The "faith" spoken of is shown by the context in Habakkuk to mean such reliance upon God as is of a steadfast character, and not a mere fleeting or occasional acceptance of God's promises as true.

GALATIANS.

This is plainly the view of the passage which is taken by the Pauline writer of the Hebrews in x. 38.

Ver. 12.—And the Law is not of faith (*ὁ δὲ νόμος οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐκ πίστεως*); but the Law is not "by faith." This is closely connected with the latter part of the preceding verse, as forming another portion of the proof which is there introduced by "for." Ver. 11 should end with a semicolon, not with a full stop. The *δὲ* at the beginning of this verse is slightly adverbative, setting "the Law" in contrast with the notion of "living by or from faith." These words, "by or from faith" (*ἐκ πίστεως*), are borrowed from the preceding citation. We may paraphrase thus: The Law does not put forward as its characteristic principle, "by faith;" the characteristic principle of the Law is rather that which we read in the third book of Moses (xviii. 5), "The man who hath actually done them shall live by them." But, The man that doeth them shall live in them (*ἀλλ', ὁ ποιῶν αὐτὰ ἐνθρώπος ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς*; the word *ἐνθρώπος* is omitted by the recent editors, as having crept into the text from the Septuagint); but, He that doeth them shall live in them. The whole verse (Lev. xviii. 5) in the Authorized Version, following the Hebrew, stands thus: "And ye shall keep my statutes and my judgments: which if a man do, he shall live in them: I am the Lord." The Septuagint runs thus: "And ye shall keep [or, 'and keep ye'] all my statutes and all my judgments, and ye shall do them [or, 'and do ye them']: the man that doeth them shall live in them (*ὁ ποιῶν αὐτὰ ἐνθρώπος ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς*): I am the Lord your God." It thus appears that the pronoun "them" recites "my statutes and my judgments." But this the apostle is not at present particularly concerned to specify; his main point here is that the Law requires such and such things to be actually done, before it holds out the prospect of life to be gained thereby. Those under the Law were bound to render strict obedience to all its requirements, whether moral or ceremonial; and whosoever set aside any of whichever class was constituted by the Law a "transgressor" and a man "accused." As it stands in the passage of Leviticus referred to, the clause which is cited bears not so much the aspect of a promise as of a restrictive statement implying a threatening or warning, and is therefore in harmony with the commination quoted in ver. 10. The "doing" here, spoken of differs essentially from evangelical obedience. Comprising as it did in very large proportion the observance of the ceremonial prescriptions (*προστάγματα*) of the Law, it points to a course of conduct in which a man, striving to earn pardon and

K

acceptance by a meritorious life, had continually to be turning his eye, slavishly and under fear of the "curse" in case of failure, towards an external Law, whose detail of positive enactments, in addition to the regulation of his moral conduct and inward spirit, he was bound with scrupulous exactness to copy in his life. The spiritual obedience of "faith," on the other hand, evolves itself (in the apostle's view) freely and spontaneously from the inward teaching and prompting of God's Spirit, of which it is the natural product or "fruit" (ch. v. 22). Such are these two forms of religious life when viewed each in its idea. When, however, we compare the spiritual state of many even sincere believers in Christ, so far as we can estimate it, with the spiritual state of (say) the marvellous author of Ps. cxix. or of David and other pious Israelites, as disclosed in the exercises of pious feeling garnered in that same devotional book, we cannot fail to perceive that an Israelite under the Law might yet be not "of the works of the Law," but in no small degree qualified to teach the Christian believer himself, even in the life which is "of faith." "Shall live in them;" that is, shall find in them a fountain, as it were, of life. The Targums, Bishop Lightfoot observes, define the meaning of "living" by "life eternal."

Ver. 13.—Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law (Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου); Christ bought us off from the curse of the Law. The position of the word "Christ" in the Greek, heading the sentence, makes it emphatic—Christ; he alone; no means offered by the Law hath procured justification for the sinner. "Us;" not merely the Israelites after the flesh, who were visibly under the Law; but either all mankind, Gentiles as well as Israelites, being declared by the Law unclean and unholv, both ceremonially and morally, and thus under its curse (comp. "for us," 2 Cor. v. 21); or God's people, the children of Abraham, prospective as well as present (comp. John xi. 50—52 and ch. iv. 5). "Redeemed," or "bought us off." The same compound Greek verb occurs ch. iv. 5, "That he might redeem [buy off] them who were under the Law;" obviously, buy off from being under it. Another Greek verb, λυτρόω, ransom, is rendered "redeem" in Titus ii. 14; 1 Pet. i. 18; whence the compound verbal noun ἀπολύτρωσις, redemption, in Rom. iii. 24; viii. 23; 1 Cor. i. 30, etc. The apostle may be supposed to have preferred to use ἐξαγοράω here, as pointing more definitely to the price which the Redeemer paid; for in λυτρόω, redeem, this notion of a price paid often lies so far in the background as to leave the verb to denote simply "deliver." The un-

compounded verb ἀγοράω, buy, is found with reference to Christ's death in 1 Cor. vi. 20 and vii. 23, "Ye were bought with a price;" 2 Pet. ii. 1, "The Master that bought them;" Rev. v. 9, "Didst purchase unto God with thy blood." In the present passage it is not the blood of Christ, as in 1 Pet. i. 18, that is regarded as the purchase money,—for the notion of expiation with blood of sacrifice is not even glanced at; but rather, as the next words show, his taking upon him the accursedness and pollution which by the Law attached to every one crucified. "From the curse of the Law;" its cursing affects us no more. God's people are, in Christ, no longer, as they were before, subject to his disapproval or abhorrence, in consequence of transgressing the positive, ceremonial enactments of the Law of Moses. In respect to that class of transgressions, its cursing expended itself, and perished, upon the crucified body of the Son of God. Being made a curse for us (γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα); having become on our behalf a curse. The position of κατάρα makes it emphatic. The form of expression, "become a curse," instead of "become accursed," is chosen to mark the intense degree in which the Law's curse fastened upon the Lord Jesus. Compare the expression, "made him on our behalf sin," in 2 Cor. v. 21. Probably the form of expression was suggested to the apostle by that found in the Hebrew of the passage of Deuteronomy which he proceeds to cite (see next note but one). The preposition ὑπὲρ, "for," "on behalf of," may possibly mean "in place of," as (perhaps) in Philem. 13; but this idea would have been more distinctly expressed by ἀντὶ; and the strict notion of substitution is not necessary to the line of argument here pursued. For it is written (γέγραπται γάρ). But the more approved reading is ὅτι γέγραπται, because it is written; which more definitely marks the writer's purpose of vindicating the propriety of his using so strong an expression as "becoming a curse." Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree (ἐπικτάρατος πᾶς ὁ κρεμάμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου); or, upon wood (Deut. xxi. 23). The Septuagint has Κεκατηραμένος [or, Κατηραμένος] ὅνδ Θεοῦ πᾶς κρεμάμενος [or, πᾶς ὁ κρ.] ἐπὶ ξύλου, "Cursed by God is every one hanging on a tree." The Hebrew is qillath elohim talui, "a curse of God is he that is hanged." The words, "every one" and "on a tree," are additions made by the Septuagint; the latter expression, however, is found in the preceding clause, as also in the preceding verse; so that the sense is given rightly. The apostle departs from the Septuagintal rendering of the Hebrew phrase, "a curse of God," probably because he regarded the rendering as inno-

curate; for the phrase, "curse of God," is probably a strongly intensive form of expression, like "wrestlings of God," in Gen. xxx. 8 ("great wrestlings," Authorized Version). See note on "exceeding great city" (Hebrew, "a city great unto God") in Jonah iii. 3, in "Speaker's Commentary." According to this view, ἐμκατάρατος, in which the element ἐπι is intensive, is a just interpretation; while it also makes the clause more striking as an antithesis to the ἐμκατάρατος, etc., in ver. 10. We are, perhaps, justified in adding that it would not have exactly suited the apostle's purpose to admit the words, "by God;" for, though the Law pronounced the crucified Jesus a "curse," God, in the apostle's feeling, did not in this case ratify the Law's malediction. To understand the bearing of the verse rightly it is necessary to be quite clear as to the sense in which Christ is here said to have become a curse. The context shows that he became a curse simply by hanging upon a tree. No spiritual transaction, such as that of our guilt being laid upon him, comes into view here at all. It was simply the suspension upon a cross that imparted to him, in the eye of the Law, this character of accursedness, of extreme abhorrent defilement. In other words, the accursedness was the extreme of ceremonial pollutedness—ceremonial, with no admixture of guilt or spiritual pollution. It has, indeed, been attempted by critics, Jewish as well as Christian, as Bishop Lightfoot has shown, to justify this aphorism of the Law, by the plea that one thus punished might inferentially be supposed to have merited this form of execution by some especial enormity of guilt. But, plainly, such previous guiltiness might not have been present; the man crucified, or impaled, or hung might have suffered upon a false accusation. But though he had suffered unjustly, his being gibbeted would, notwithstanding his innocence, constitute him "a curse of God" all the same. Ceremonial pollutedness, as well as ceremonial purity, was altogether independent of moral considerations. And at present the line of thought which the apostle is following relates simply to questions of Levitical or ceremonial purity or defilement. Have Christian believers as such anything to do with these matters? This is the point at issue. The apostle proves that they have nothing to do with them, upon the ground that the crucifixion of Christ did away wholly with the ceremonial Law. It will only confuse the reader if he supposes that the apostle means here to embody the whole doctrine of Christ's sacrificial atonement; he is at present concerned with stating the relation which his passion bore to the Law.

The passage before us illustrates the meaning of the words in ch. ii. 19, "I through the Law died unto the Law:" he felt himself disconnected from the ceremonial Law, in consequence of that Law pronouncing Christ crucified "a curse of God." A question arises, how far the crucifixion of Christ, viewed in this particular aspect of its constituting him in the eye of the ceremonial Law an accursed thing, modified for those who believe on him the effect of the malediction which the Law pronounced upon such as violated its moral precepts. The following observations are offered for the reader's consideration. The Law given in the Pentateuch is uniformly spoken of in Scripture as forming one whole. Composed of precepts, some moral, some ceremonial, some partaking mixedly of both qualities, it constituted, however, one entire coherent system. If a part of it was destroyed, the whole Law as such itself perished. If so, then the cross of Christ, by annihilating its ceremonial enactments, shattered in pieces the whole legislation, so that the disciples of Christ are no longer at all under its dominion, or subjects jurisprudentially (so to speak) to its coercive punitive power. Yet its moral precepts, so far as they embodied the eternal principles of rectitude, would, so far, and because they do so, and not because they were part of the Law given through Moses, continue to express the will of God concerning us. Being, however, "letter" and not "spirit," they were always altogether inadequate expressions of that Divine will—a will which is spiritual, which is evermore changing its form and aspect towards each human soul, according to the ever-varying conditions of its spiritual position. The moral precepts of the Law are for us no more than types or figures, mere hints or suggestions of the spiritual duties which they refer to; they cannot be regarded as definitively regulative laws at all. Thus they appear to be treated by Christ and his apostles; as e.g. Matt. v. 21—37; 1 Cor. ix. 8—10; and it is in this light that the Church of England regards them, in reciting the Decalogue in her Pre-Communion Office. And, analogously, the curse which the Law pronounces upon those who set any of its precepts at nought, whether moral or ceremonial, may be regarded as a mere type, revealing, or rather giving a slightest most imperfect glimpse of, the wrath with which the Divine justice burns against wilful transgressors of the eternal Law; a hint or suggestion, again, and not its direct denouncement. God's people, however, by being through faith united to the crucified and risen Christ, become through his cross dead to the whole Law of Moses, both as regulative and as punitive,—freed from it absolutely; not,

however, to be without Law unto God; only, the Law they are now under is a spiritual Law, one conformable to the nature of that dispensation of life and of the Spirit, to which through the Risen One they belong. With this view it agrees that the execration which the Law pronounced upon the Son of God as crucified, and by pronouncing which the Law itself perished, is to be regarded as a most significant and impressive symbol of the *spiritual* import of our Lord's death. It pronounces to the universe that, for those who by faith are one with Christ, the wrath of Divine justice against them as sinners is quenched—quenched in the infinite, Divine love and righteousness of Christ.

Ver. 14.—Two results are here stated as having flowed from the abrogation of the Mosaic Law which was effected by the crucifixion of Jesus: one, the participation of Gentiles in "Abraham's blessing," to which they could not have been admitted as long as the Law was authorized to shut them out from God's covenant as unclean; the other, the impartation to God's people, upon their faith only, apart from acts of ceremonial obedience, of the promised gift of the Holy Spirit. Are these stated as *co-ordinate* results, in the same way as a repeated *ὅτι* ("in order that") introduces co-ordinate results in Rom. vii. 13; 2 Cor. ix. 2; Eph. vi. 19, 20? Or is the second a consequence of the first? In favour of the first view, it may be said that, in point of fact, Gentiles, as such, were not admitted into a participation in Abraham's blessing till some time after the day of Pentecost. But on the other hand, it may be urged (1) that, though not as yet actually admitted, yet in the Divine purpose, and in the ordering of the conditions of the case, they might have come in,—the door was open, though the threshold not actually crossed; and (2) that their admissibility may be supposed to have been in the Divine counsels the prerequisite condition of the Holy Spirit being imparted, it not being fitting that the Spirit should be given so long as the Law was, so to speak, standing there, authorized to debar from this, the most essential portion of "Abraham's blessing," any who were partakers of Abraham's blessing. In the three passages referred to as favouring the construing of the two clauses as co-ordinate, we have not as here two different results, but one and the same, only in the second clause more fully described. The second view seems, therefore, the more probable one. **That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ** (*ὅτι εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ἡ εὐλογία τοῦ Ἀβραάμ γίνεται ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*): so most recent editors read, in place of Ἰησοῦ

Χριστῷ); that upon "the nations" might come the blessing of Abraham in Christ Jesus. The phrase, *εἰς τὰ ἔθνη . . . γένηται*, is illustrated by the use of *γίνεσθαι εἰς*, "arrive at," or "acquire to," in Acts xxi. 17; xxv. 15; Rev. xvi. 2. For the preposition *εἰς* we may also comp. Rom. iii. 22, "Unto (*εἰς*) all and upon (*ἐν*) all." By *τὰ ἔθνη*, as the whole context shows, the apostle means in particular "the Gentiles," the non-Jews, as such. At the same time, the phrase is evidently used, as found ready at hand in the passage cited by him in ver. 8, "In thee shall all the nations (*ἔθνη*) be blessed," which passage also suggested the notion of "the blessing of Abraham." It had therein been foretold that all the nations should, by exercising the faith of Abraham, obtain the same blessing; and (says the apostle) we see now by what method the benefit has been brought to them. "In Christ Jesus;" not merely *by* him; the blessing is, so to speak, immanent in Christ, both procured by him and obtained by the nations through their coming by faith into union with him. Comp. Eph. i. 6, 7, "His grace which he freely bestowed upon us in the Beloved; in whom we have our redemption;" Col. ii. 10, "In him ye are made full;" and the like. "The blessing of Abraham." The expression, being drawn from the passages in Genesis in which the Lord assures Abraham that "he would bless him," and that "in him all nations should be blessed," must be taken to import the Divine good will and whatever benefits would therefrom result. Men arrive at this "benediction" by being justified; but justification is only the entrance into it, and not the whole blessing itself. It is styled *Abraham's* blessing, as having been emphatically declared to have been possessed by the patriarch, "the father" of all who should thereafter receive it. That we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith (*ὅτι τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ Πνεύματος λάβωμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως*). The pronoun "we" points, not to the Israelites as such, nor to Israelite believers in particular, but to those who were viewed as God's covenant people. These had hitherto been Abraham's natural seed only; and had also hitherto been under the Law. But the time had come when they were to receive the full "adoption of sons," and therewith the Spirit of God's Son (ch. iv. 5, 6); which, however, could not come to pass until the Law, "the yoke of slavery," had been cleared out of the way, opening the gate to God's benediction to all believers, whether Jews or Gentiles. The Law and the Spirit could not coexist. Where the Law had sway, there was tutelage (*παιδαγωγία*) and slavery. Such, it is true, was needed, so long as the Spirit was

not there; for moral beings, forming a people of God's, must be under *some* Law; and, if there was not a law written on the "fleshy tables of the heart" by God's Spirit, there behoved to be one embodied in an outward code of ordinances, which should coerce men's frowardness and keep them under discipline. But when this outward code had been taken out of the way, "nailed to Christ's cross," then the people of God could not be left without the Spirit—the Spirit of holiness, as well as, or rather, because also, the Spirit of adoption; which accordingly was forthwith imparted, the sole condition of the bestowment being their living obedient faith, felt and by baptism professed, in Christ and in God. Comp. Eph. iv. 13—18, as containing a full presentment of these facts relative to the introduction of the new covenant, and in the same order of sequence. Thus the apostle has triumphantly returned to the thesis from which he had started in the two first verses of the chapter—Christ crucified, and the receiving of the Spirit without works of the Law. "The promise of the Spirit" is the Spirit which had been promised; the word "promise" here denoting, not as in Heb. xi. 33, the word assuring a subsequent bestowment, but as in Luke xxiv. 49 and Heb. xi. 39, the bestowment itself. The apostle points not merely to such passages of the Old Testament as had definitely fore-announced the outpouring of God's Spirit (Joel ii. 38; Isa. xlv. 3; and the like), but the whole "kingdom of God," or "world to come," whose blessedness therewith came.

Ver. 15.—Brethren, I speak after the manner of men (*ἀδελφοί, κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λέγω*). "Brethren." The tone of indignant reproach with which the chapter opened has gradually subsided in the course of the apostle's argument; so that here he appeals to the Galatian Churchmen as "brethren;" as if to bespeak their candid attention to the consideration he is about to allege. "I speak after the manner of men." I say it as stating a principle commonly recognized in human life, in respect to contracts between man and man (see note on the phrase, ch. i. 11). In a similar manner, in Heb. vi. 16, 17 the writer refers to human methods of ratifying solemn engagements, in order to illustrate a course of proceeding on another occasion condescendingly adopted by God. Though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be (*when it hath been*) confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto (*ὁμοῦ ἀνθρώπου κεκυρωμένην διαθήκην οὐδεὶς ἀθετεῖ ἢ ἐπιδιατάσσειται*). The Authorized Version has thus happily rendered the *ὁμοῦ*, which is here transposed out of its logical position, as it is also in 1 Cor. xiv. 7, and as *ἐτι* is in Rom. v. 6.

The apostle's meaning is that, if even men are constrained by their sense of justice to abide by this rule, much more may the All-righteous One be expected to do so. This *a fortiori* suggestion (for St. Paul only hints this consideration by introducing the word *ὁμοῦ* without explicitly developing it) is similar to the *a fortiori* argument more explicitly stated by our Lord with reference to God's justice, in Luke xviii. 6, 7; and to his fatherliness, in Luke xi. 13. "Covenant." The word *διαθήκη*, properly "disposition," which, in classical Greek, generally means "will," "testament," is used in the Septuagint to render the Hebrew *berith*, covenant, in which sense it occurs once in Aristophanes, 'Aves,' 439; and it appears to denote "covenant" in all the thirty-three places in which it is found in the New Testament; for even Heb. ix. 17 can hardly be allowed to be an exception. Bishop Lightfoot observes that the Septuagint translators and the New Testament writers probably preferred *διαθήκη* to *συνθήκη*, the ordinary Greek word for "covenant," when speaking of a Divine dispensation, because, like "promise," it better expresses the free grace of God. Perhaps the terms appeared to them more suitable also in this application, because one of the parties to the engagement was no other than the supreme sovereign Disposer of all things. "Confirmed;" ratified; as it were, signed, sealed, and delivered. "No one;" meaning neither of the two covenanting parties. "Addeth thereto;" addeth any fresh condition, such as would clog the action of the previous engagement. The apostle adds this with reference to the supposition that the Law of Moses might have qualified the Abrahamic covenant by limiting its benefits to persons ceremonially clean.

Ver. 16.—Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made (*τῷ δὲ Ἀβραάμ ἐρρήθησαν [or, ἐρρέθησαν] αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι, καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ*); now to Abraham were the promises made (Greek, spoken) and to his seed. The question now to be determined is, who the parties were that were concerned in the covenant made with Abraham, and with respect to whom the principle just stated must be taken to apply. Of course, God is himself one of the two parties. This the apostle assumes without specific mention in this verse, though he refers to it in the next. On the other side, he discerns "Abraham and his seed;" for the form of the sentence, we feel, lays emphatic stress upon the latter copartner. He has in view, apparently, in part, the promise recorded in Gen. xiii. 15, "All the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever;" perhaps in part the vision related in Gen. xv., wherein (ver. 18) "the Lord



made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land," etc.; but most particularly, since on this occasion circumcision was appointed as the "sign of the covenant," the words in Gen. xvii. 7, 8, "I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee: and I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God." In the present connection the reference is not so obvious to the important promise in Gen. xxii. 17, 18, on which such stress is laid in Heb. vi. 13—18. These passages, in their primary and plain obvious sense, point to a covenant established by the Lord between himself on the one hand, and Abraham and Abraham's natural seed on the other; ratified on the persons of Abraham and his offspring by the seal of circumcision, and collating to them the gift of the land of Canaan. But the apostle teaches us to read these passages mystically: in place of Abraham's natural seed substituting "Christ," a spiritual seed; and in place of the land of Canaan substituting a spiritual inheritance. For "covenant," to which term the apostle reverts in the next verse, we have here "promises;" thus also in Heb. vii. 6, Abraham is described as "he that had the promises." He saith not, **And to seeds, as of many;** but **as of one, And to thy seed** (οὐ λέγει· Καὶ τοῖς σπέρμασιν, ὡς ἐπὶ πολλῶν· ἀλλ', ὡς ἐφ' ἑνός· Καὶ τῷ σπέρματι σου). The use of the preposition ἐνὶ with λέγει, as meaning "of," not found elsewhere in the New Testament, occurs repeatedly in Plato (see Ellicott and Alford, and Winer's 'Gram.,' 47, g). With "many" and "one," we are, of course, to supply "seeds" and "seed." It has been questioned whether such a form of expression as "to thy seeds" would have been possible in the Hebrew. Certainly we do not in the Hebrew Bible find a plural of the noun *zera'* when used for "offspring," but only when used for a grain of seed. But still, such a plural may not have been unknown to St. Paul in the Hebrew spoken in his time; for it occurs, De Wette tells us, in the Chaldee Paraphrast for "races" in Josh. vii. 14; Jer. xxxiii. 24; Gen. x. 18. Such a grammatical cavil to his observation, however, the apostle might well have brushed aside by giving his objector to understand that it was not upon a nicety of lingual criticism that he was taking his stand, but upon a fact which was not to be called in question; namely, that of the many branches of descendants owning Abraham as their progenitor, there was only

one contemplated by the Almighty as destined to inherit the promise. This principle of discrimination among several lines of descendants he has himself drawn marked attention to in Rom. ix. 7, 8, by quoting the words, "In Isaac shall thy seed be called," and adding the gloss, "That is, it is not the children of the flesh that are children of God; but the children of the promise are reckoned for a seed." And so here. Among Abraham's descendants one particular head of a race was beforehand selected in the counsels of God, whose issue alone should inherit. As the principle of discriminative predestination was applied with respect to the inheriting of the promises viewed in their secular meaning, so also was it applied with respect to the inheriting of them spiritually: to only one branch of Abraham's descendants did the Divine Disposer guarantee the promised grant; that which should originate from Abraham's great Descendant, Christ, and which was to be in him and by his name to be called. **Which is Christ** (ὅς ἐστὶ Χριστός); that is, which seed is Christ; the gender of the relative pronoun, which logically, as reciting a neuter noun, σπέρμα, should be neuter, being according to a very common usage of the language made masculine by the attraction of the predicate Χριστός. The word "seed" still retains its signification of a collective noun, and does not even here denote a single descendant—a sense which usage would not justify us in assigning to it; for even in Gen. iv. 25 *zera' acher* means "other offspring," and not "another offspring." The word "Christ" is itself employed by the apostle as a collective, as in 1 Cor. i. 13, "Christ is divided!" or, "Is Christ divided?" xii. 12, "As the body is one, and hath many members, . . . so also is Christ." It is usual in the Hebrew idiom to apply to a people the very name, unmodified, of the head from which they derive; as "Israel," "Jacob," "Ephraim," "Judah," and a large multitude of instances. It is certain from vers. 27—29 that St. Paul has in view those who are "in Christ" as being in and with him the "seed" to whom the "inheritance" was by that covenant given. Jesus, viewed in his own solitary personality, has no place in the apostle's present argument: he it was not that was to inherit the blessing, save only with, or rather in, that multitude of human beings for whose sake he is there at all. Perhaps it is on that account that his official title "Christ" is alone named, in preference to "Jesus" his appellation as an individual man. Having thus ascertained as definitely as we may what it is that the apostle here states, we are naturally led to consider on what grounds he is justified in

affixing to the passage or passages of the Old Testament which he refers to, the sense that he does; both as to the import of the gift which the covenant guaranteed to Abraham's seed, and as to the specific seed itself as being "Christ." The answer to such questioning is, for us, at once in a great measure determined by our belief in the claims which St. Paul makes to be regarded as an inspired teacher. With this belief, we do not wait first to ascertain that his exposition is warranted by linguistic or historical reasoning before we will give it our assent. We accept his exposition as one imparted to himself by heavenly teaching, and as the result of inspired spiritual insight gazing into the oracles of God. We refuse to regard it, as some would fain persuade us to do, as mere *midrash* of unscientific rabbinism. Perhaps, indeed, rabbinism itself in its better schools—and in such St. Paul had himself in his earlier years been trained—was often far more profound and scientific in its scriptural exegesis than many who have not been conversant with Jewish commentators are disposed to imagine. His exposition is, therefore, not at once and of course condemned, because, if indeed it be the fact, its *method* seems to bear upon it the brand of being rabbinical. Thus much is clear—its *substance* was beyond all question *not* drawn from rabbinism, but learnt from higher teaching. If at first it arouses in our minds a feeling of surprise, and even a degree of hesitation in accepting it as it lies there before us, we may have good grounds for suspecting that this is owing, not to our superior wisdom, but to the superficiality of the views which we are in the habit of taking of the histories and utterances found in the Old Testament. Fuller and clearer insight into the depths of inspired teaching will perhaps enable us by-and-by to grasp with a firmer hold than now the veritable reasonableness and certainty of this apostolic word, and to discern its coherency with other portions of revealed truth. Meanwhile it may conciliate our judgment to a more unflinching acceptance at once of what we here read, if we will consider how transcendently great is the glory of the personage whose Name is here attached to Abraham's spiritual seed, and how transcendent too is the corresponding glory of that economy of benediction which that august Being has brought in. The infinite grandeur of "God manifest in the flesh" imparts its magnificence both to the community which he graciously takes into union with him, and to the "kingdom of God" which through him they inherit. The glory of Christ fills the whole Church, which, resplendent therewith, eclipses into utter obscurity all other communities here-

tofore promised to be recipient of Divine blessing: those, feeble types of her, fade away at her coming, their glory and very being absorbed in hers. We need, then, not hesitate to believe that she with her Lord was from the beginning contemplated by the Almighty in the revelations of future benediction which he accorded to men, certainly with a view ultimately to this crowning dispensation; and that anterior dispensations of benediction were symbolically predictive of this.

Ver. 17.—**And this I say, that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ** (τοῦτο δὲ λέγω, διαθήκην προκεκυρωμένην ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ [Receptus adds, *eis Christόν*]); **and I say this: a covenant confirmed before of God.** We have here the application of the aphorism laid down in ver. 15. "And I say this;" that is, "And what I have to say is this." As God had already before made a solemn covenant with Abraham and his seed, the Law given so long after cannot have been intended to do away with it; fundamental principles of even human civil equity disallow of any such procedure. "Confirmed before." If the confirmation or ratification is to be distinguished as additional to the solemn announcement, we may find it either in the "seal" of circumcision (Rom. iv. 11), or in the oath "with which God interposed" (Heb. vi. 17) after the sacrifice of Isaac. The words *eis Christόν*, "with reference to Christ," are expunged from the text by most recent editors. If genuine, they would seem intended to emphasize that position of "Christ" (*i.e.* in effect his Church) as future copartner with Abraham, which has been already affirmed in the preceding verse. **The Law, which was four hundred and thirty years after** (ὁ μετὰ τετρακόσια καὶ τριάκοντα ἔτη [Receptus reads ἔτη before *τετρακόσια*, instead of here, with no difference to the sense] *γεγονώς νόμος*); **the Law, having come into existence four hundred and thirty years after.** This number of years the apostle finds in Exod. xii. 40, 41. In the Hebrew text of that passage this term of four hundred and thirty years defines the stay of the Israelites "in Egypt." But in the Septuagint, as well as in the Samaritan text, the term defines the sojourn of the Israelites ("themselves and their fathers" is, according to Tischendorf, added in the Alexandrian manuscript) "in the land of Egypt and in the land of Canaan." With the view presented by this Septuagintal version agrees a definite statement of Josephus ('Ant., ii. 15, 2), "They left Egypt. . . four hundred and thirty years after our forefather Abraham came into Canaan, but two hundred and fifteen years only after Jacob removed into Egypt." In two other passages, however ('Ant., ii. 9, 1;

'Bell. Jud.,' v. 9, 4), Josephus speaks of the affliction in Egypt as lasting "four hundred years;" probably following in this computation the period mentioned in the Divine communication recorded in Gen. xv. 13, and cited by St. Stephen (Acts vii. 6) in his defence. It is unnecessary here to attempt to determine the chronological question, which is one not free from difficulty. Our readers are referred to some valuable observations of Canon Cook's, in his note on Exod. xii. 40; who on apparently strong grounds considers that a longer period than two hundred and fifteen years must be allowed for the sojourn in Egypt (see, however, Mr. Reginald S. Poole's article, "Chronology," in 'Dictionary of the Bible,' vol. i. pp. 321, 322). If the Hebrew text of Exod. xii. 40 as we have it is correct, and if the Septuagintal version of it errs in including the sojourn of the patriarchs in Canaan in the there mentioned period of four hundred and thirty years, then the number of years which the apostle here specifies, counting apparently from Abraham's arrival in Canaan when he received the first of the promises cited above in the note on ver. 16, is less than he would have been justified in stating by the interval between Abraham's arrival in Canaan and Jacob's going down into Egypt. But, however, even if the apostle's mind adverted to this particular point at all, which may or may not have been the case, it plainly would not have been worth his while to surprise and perplex his readers by specifying a number of years different from that which they found in the Greek Bible, which both he and they were accustomed to use, even though the greater number would have in a slight degree added to the force of his argument. Cannot disannul (οὐκ ἀκυροῖ); doth not disannul. The present tense is used, because the apostle is describing the present position. That it should make the promise of none effect (εἰς τὸ καταργῆσαι τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν). The "covenant" is here to a certain degree distinguished from "the promise." The latter, being the fundamental and characteristic portion of the former, is brought prominently forward, for the purpose of illustrating the character of the Christian economy as being above all things one of grace and gratuitous bestowment. The feeling also, perhaps, underlies the words that with one of generous spirit—and who so large-hearted and munificent as God?—in proportion as a promise which he has given is large and spontaneous, and the expectation raised by it eager and joyous, in that proportion is it impossible for him to baulk the promisee of his hope. The "promise" was "To thee and to thy seed will I give this land;" the "covenant," that Jehovah would

be their God, and that they should recognise him as such.

Ver. 18.—For if the inheritance be of the Law, it is no more of promise (εἰ γὰρ ἐκ νόμου ἡ κληρονομία, οὐκ ἐστὶ ἐξ ἐπαγγελίας); for if from a Law the inheritance accrues, it accrues no longer from a promise. The two nouns "Law" and "promise" have no article, being regarded here in their several characteristic principles, which were not only diverse, but contrary. The Law says, "The man that doeth these things shall live by them;" and this while enforcing a great variety of minute positive principles by severe threats and penalties. The promise bestows of free grace without works. The promised bestowment is here styled "inheritance," because received by Abraham's seed as his heirs (see ver. 29 and ch. iv. 1). In the Old Testament it is a favourite designation of the land of Canaan; as e.g. in Ps. cv. 11. Here it relates to a spiritual possession. Οὐκ ἐστὶ seems preferred by editors of the text, when used logically, as if it were, It no longer appears to be (so Rom. vii. 17; xi. 6); whereas οὐκ ἐστὶ might be referred to a change which took place at the time when the Law was given. But God gave it to Abraham by promise (τῷ δὲ Ἀβραάμ δι' ἐπαγγελίας κειμήριστα δ Θεός); but God hath freely given it to Abraham by promise. The verb χαρίζομαι emphatically marks a gift as freely and lavishly bestowed (compare its use in Rom. viii. 32; 1 Cor. ii. 12). The perfect tense points to the now and evermore enduring effect of the promise. The position of δ Θεός is emphatic—God, no less than he! (comp. Rom. viii. 31). The march of this sentence, with which the apostle closes up this paragraph of the discussion, gives, as it stands in the Greek, the reader to feel the apostle's soul dilating with wonder and delight as he gives expression to the two notions—the gracious freeness of the gift, and the Divine personality of the Giver. The mention here of Abraham alone, without "his seed," is perhaps due to the apostle's sense of the long priority of this guaranteed bestowment to the giving of the Law. In appreciating the tone of the passage, we must not lose sight of the venerableness of this personage, the primordial father, not only of the Hebrew race, but of all believers in Christ to the end of the world.

Ver. 19.—Wherefore then serveth the Law? (τί οὖν δ νόμος); what then (or, why then) is the Law? The apostle is wont thus to introduce the statement of some objection or some question relative to the point in hand which requires consideration (cf. Rom. iii. 1; iv. 1). He wishes now to show that, while the Law was a Divine ordinance,

it was yet not intended to supersede the previously ratified covenant, but rather to prepare for its being completely carried out. It was added because of transgressions (*τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν προσετέθη*); on account of transgressions it was superadded. As *χάριν* denotes that so-and-so is done in consideration of this or that; this latter may be either some antecedent fact furnishing ground for subsequent action, as in 1 John iii. 12; Eph. iii. 1; Luke vii. 47, or some prospective result, which the action signified in the verb is intended to forward, as Jude 16. Here it intimates that the Law was given from a regard to men's sinful actions, with an implied contrast with the covenant of Christ's gospel, which was concerned with men's justification and benediction. The province of the Law is to expose sins, rebuke them, pronounce God's curse upon them, coerce and restrain them by the discipline of a system of outward rites and ceremonies. The office of the Law, as dealing with sinners as continuing sinful, while unable to make them new creatures, is indicated by St. Paul in 1 Tim. i. 9, where, after saying, "The Law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and unruly, for the ungodly and sinners," he proceeds to add a catalogue of offenders chargeable with the grossest form of criminality; which furnishes a most apt illustration of the word *παραβάσεις* ("transgressions") which he here uses, and which marks sins in their most wilful and most condemnable character. What was spiritually the outcome of the Law's action upon men's sinful nature, in making their "sin exceeding sinful," the apostle has vividly portrayed in the seventh chapter of the Romans. This last point, however, is probably not even glanced at here; and it is only by straining the sense of *χάριν* that some commentators, notably Meyer, find the apostle to be here stating that the Law was added for the behoof of transgressions, as it were in their interest, to increase and intensify them, as in Rom. v. 20, that the trespass might abound. This, however, is not naturally found in the present passage. All that the apostle here states is that the Law merely dealt with sins, having no function in relation to life and righteousness. The article before *παραβάσεων* indicates the whole class of objects referred to, as *e.g.* in *τοῖς ἀνθρώποις* (Heb. ix. 27). This "superadded" (*προσετέθη*) is not inconsistent with the *οὐδ' ἐπιδιατάσσεται*, "nor addeth thereto," of ver. 15; inasmuch as it points to a Divine ordinance, which stood, so to speak, in a different plane from the covenant of grace, and in no way interfered with it. Till the seed should come (*ἕχρις οὐ ἔλθη τὸ σπέρμα*). The form of expression indicates the purpose

of him who arranged it all, that the Law should last only so long, and was to come to an end when the seed came. To whom the promise was made (*ᾧ ἐπηγγέλται*); to whom the promise hath been made. The perfect tense of the verb, as in the case of *κεχώρισται*, in ver. 18, points to the still continuing validity of the promise. The "seed" is "Christ;" the historical Christ, indeed, but still viewed collectively as summing up in himself all who should be united to him. And it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator (*διαταγὰς δὲ ἀγγέλων, ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου*); being ordained through angels by the hand of a mediator. The verb "ordain" (*διατάσσειν*), being most commonly used for "command," "order," as Luke viii. 55; 1 Cor. vii. 17, is introduced in preference to *δοθεῖς* (comp. ver. 20 and John i. 17; vii. 19), as making more prominent the notion of imperative action on the part of the Divine Lawgiver. The whole passage is tinged with the feeling that the giving of the Law, as contrasted with the dispensation of the Messiah, was marked by distance, sternness, alienation. This is the meaning of the mention of "angels" as the medium of communication on the side of Heaven, and of "a mediator" as the selected medium of reception on the side of Israel (compare the contrast between the two dispensations in Heb. xii. 18—24). This representation of the Law as given through angels is unmistakably made again in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the words, "The word spoken through angels" (ii. 2), where also it is placed in the same contrast with the gospel as spoken by the Lord Jesus, which here is plainly implied, if indeed it is not expressly alluded to, in the enigmatic words, "but God is one," in the next verse. This view of the Law as communicated through the medium of angels is distinctly referred to by St. Stephen as the accepted belief of the Jewish theologians before whom he spoke: "Ye who received the Law as the ordinances of angels" (Acts vii. 53), where the phrase, *διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων*, forms a remarkable parallel to the words, *διαταγὰς δὲ ἀγγέλων*, now before us. The same view is put forth by Josephus ('Ant.,' xv. 5, 3), "We having learned the most excellent of our doctrines and the most holy part of our Law through angels from God." Such, then, was incontestably the current belief of the Jewish people, both Christian and non-Christian. The Hebrew theologians directed a great deal of attention upon the doctrine of angels, of which the "boundless genealogies" spoken of by St. Paul (1 Tim. i. 4; comp. Col. ii. 18) was certainly one diseased branch. We may without improbability suppose that their exegetical sagacity, not unaided by the

Spirit of God promised by him to his people upon their restoration from Captivity, detected the particular fact here indicated in Deut. xxxiii. 2; Ps. lxxviii. 17; Exod. xix. 16, 19. The countless hosts of his "saints" who attended upon the Lord on that occasion were not surely mere spectators; and to their intervention acting out the volitions of God might be most reasonably ascribed all the physical sights and sounds which gave to the giving of the Law its sensible awfulness (comp. 1 Thess. iv. 16). "They raised the fire and smoke; they shook and rent the rock; they framed the sound of the trumpet; they effected the articulate voices which conveyed the words of the Law to the ears of the people, and therein proclaimed and published the Law; whereby it became 'the word spoken by angels'" (Owen, 'Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews,' ii. 2). In the hand of a mediator (*ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου*); by the hand of a mediator. *Ἐν χειρὶ*, in or by the hand, is unquestionably a Hebraism, being in the Septuagint the ordinary literal rendering of the Hebrew *beyad*; see e.g. Numb. iv. 37, 45; which passages likewise show us whom the apostle means to designate as the mediator; in reference to which comp. also Deut. v. 5, "I stood between (*ἀνάμεσον*) the Lord and you at that time [i.e. at the giving of the Law], to show you the word of the Lord." So Philo ('Vit. Mos.,' 678) speaks of Moses as acting like a *μεσίτης καὶ διαλλάκτης*, "mediator and reconciler." Schöttgen ('Hor. Hebr.')

gives numerous examples from the rabbinical books of this application of the term "mediator" to Moses. This conception of Moses as a mediator seems implied also in the words, "Mediator of a better covenant" and "Mediator of a new covenant," which we have in Heb. viii. 6 and xii. 24, with reference to Christ. Evidently the mention of a mediator in the present passage is intended to point to the relations between the Lord and Israel as being those of distance and estrangement. If it be objected that the same inference would be deducible from the description of Christ as "Mediator between God and men," in 1 Tim. ii. 5, we have it to say, in answer, that Christ, being in his nature both God and man, not only mediates between God and man, having made atonement or reconciliation by his cross, but in his own being unites God and man, abolishing actually that state of mutual alienation which the mediation of Moses by figure implied but could not in reality do away. We, too, were enemies to God before we were reconciled by the death of his Son (Rom. v. 10); but now, being reconciled, we are at one with God in Christ; Christ's life in our nature both guaranteeing and effectuating our continued state of reconciliation with the

Father as well as our own spiritual and eternal life.

Ver. 20.—This verse, closing the short paragraph commencing the verse which precedes it, appears designed to mark the difference of the relations which subsisted between the Lord and Israel at the time of the giving of the Law, compared with those which subsist between God and Abraham's seed in the covenant of grace. Now a mediator is not a mediator of one (*ὁ δὲ μεσίτης ἑνὸς οὐκ ἔστω*). The article with *μεσίτης*, literally, "the mediator," marks the noun as a class noun, giving it the sense, "a mediator as such." Compare the use of the article in *τοῦ ἀποστόλου*, in "the signs of an apostle" (2 Cor. xii. 12); in *ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος*, "a good man" (Matt. xii. 25); in *ὁ ἐργάτης*, "the labourer is worthy of his hire" (Luke x. 7). The clause means this: a mediator implies the existence of more than one party, of two parties at least, for him to mediate between; of two parties not at one, but standing on such terms towards each other as make his intervention necessary. So far as it characterized the giving of the Law viewed in contrast with the establishment of the covenant of grace, the mediation of Moses, as has been already observed, did not put an end to the estrangement between the Lord and Israel: the estrangement went on throughout Moses' life; throughout, the Israelites stand marked with the brand of "transgression." The genitive *ἑνός*, of "one," is the same as the genitive in *μεσίτης Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων*, literally, "Mediator of God and men," in 1 Tim. ii. 5: it marks the party or parties towards whom the function of mediation is exercised; so that what the apostle here affirms is that there cannot be only one such party. But God is one (*ὁ δὲ Θεὸς εἷς ἔστω*). When we consider the number of interpretations given of this clause in connection with the preceding, which have literally been computed by hundreds (the reader will find a *spicilegium* of some sixty or eighty of them in Meyer), we may infer with certainty that the sense which the apostle intended to convey is not an obvious one—not one which lies near the surface. So much appears, however, in the highest degree probable, that he refers either to some disadvantageous circumstance attaching to the Law or to some advantageous circumstance attaching to the covenant of promise, and is viewing the two in contrast the one with the other. On these grounds the present writer has long since acquiesced in the view propounded by Windischmann in his Commentary on this Epistle, and which is accepted by Bishop Ellicott, that the unity here predicated of God is the oneness subsisting between the

Father and the Son. God is one in the Father and in his Son—Christ our Lord. The fact is now present to the apostle's mind, and is presently after stated by him (ch. iv. 4), that the Son has been "sent forth" by God to redeem us and make us sons, and has thus become the "Christ," that "Seed of Abraham" to which the promises had been made (ver. 29 of this chapter). Hereby the most perfect oneness is established between God and the heirs of the promise; for these are "clothed with Christ" (ver. 27) the Son of God; and he being one with the Father, they in and through him are really and permanently "reconciled into God," as the apostle writes in Col. i. 20. Compare our Lord's words in his intercessory prayer (John xvii. 21, 23), "That they all may be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us. I in them, and thou in me; that they may be perfected into one." That this sense lies deep down in the apostle's words and would not have readily been presented by them to the minds of his readers, forms no valid objection to this interpretation; for the history of the exegesis of the passage proves that this must have been the case with the sense which the apostle really designed to indicate, whatever that was. On the other hand, it is a sense which perfectly suits the requirement of the context; for it illustrates the superiority of the covenant of the promise to the covenant of the Law in the strongest manner possible. The nut has a very hard shell, but it yields a delicious kernel.

Ver. 21.—Is the Law then against the promises of God? (*ὁ οὖν νόμος κατὰ τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ*). "Against" (*κατὰ*), as ch. v. 23; Rom. viii. 31; Matt. xii. 30. Since the apostle has already (vers. 15—18) disposed of the notion that the Law may have superseded or essentially qualified the promise, this word "against" can hardly intend adverse action of that kind, but rather imports simply contrariety of spirit or purpose. This objection the apostle meets: by stating that the spirit and purpose of the Law were not contrary to the promises, inasmuch as the Law did not offer to interfere with the work which the promises were to do, but was designed to be auxiliary to their function by preparing the way for its discharge. God forbid (*μὴ γένοιτο*). The tone of abhorrence with which the apostle negatives the inference (see note on ch. ii. 17) is due, not so much to its mere unreasonableness, as to the almost blasphemous character which he feels to attach to the notion. To think that one unquestionable revelation of the faithful, unchangeable God can be contrary in spirit or purpose to another equally

unquestionable revelation of his! For if there had been a Law given which could have given life (*εἰ γὰρ ἐδόθη νόμος ὁ δυνάμενος ζωοποιῆσαι*); for if a Law had been given such as could make alive. The construction of the article in the phrase, *νόμος ὁ δυνάμενος*, is similar to that in *ἐθνη τὰ μὴ ἔχοντα* (Rom. ii. 14); *μάρτυσι τοῖς προκεχειροτονημένοις* (Acts x. 41). The noun is first put undetermined, a narrowing determination with the article being then added: "If [in the Law of Moses] had been given a Law such as," etc. By fastening attention upon the Law as unable "to make alive," the apostle marks its character as contrasted with the new covenant, the characteristic function of which is that of imparting a life-giving Spirit. The Law made men feel their sin, their spiritual incapacitation, "the body of death" which enthralled them (Rom. vii.); but the grace which should insil into their souls the life of love which they lacked, it had not to bestow. So far only reaches the unfavourable estimate of the Law's function given here: it was not "able to make alive." Verily righteousness should have been by the Law (*ὄντως ἐν ἐκ νόμου ἦν ἡ δικαιοσύνη*); in very deed then from the Law would have accrued righteousness. "In very deed then." But as the case now stands, it is a delusion to think it can, as the unbelieving Jews do, and as some of you seem minded to do. "ὄντως, as Luke xxiii. 47; 1 Cor. xiv. 25. If the Law could have quickened men with spiritual life it would have brought them justification. This is what the apostle here affirms. But why so? That in the economy of grace there is no justification without spiritual quickening, nor spiritual life without justification, we are clearly apprised by many passages of St. Paul's own writings, notably by Rom. viii. 1—10. The explanation, however, is probably this: in the apostle's view, the gift of the indwelling Spirit, to sanctify us and enable us for living a spiritual life, is conditioned by a state of acceptableness with God; until we have been brought into a state of grace, we are not qualified to receive this the supreme proof of Divine love. It is "because we are sons that God sends the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father" (ch. iv. 6). If, then, the Law can be supposed capable of imparting the Spirit of life, it must be supposed capable of antecedently imparting righteousness. The "inheritance" of Abraham's seed includes both, both accruing to them from faith. So far was the Law from having these gifts to bestow, that on the one hand, Moses' ministering of the Law to the people was a ministration of condemnation (2 Cor. iii. 6—9), and on the other, it brought quickening, indeed, but

not to the sinner's spirit, but to his sin (Rom. vii. 9), intensifying its malignity and working death (ibid., vers. 10—13). These views, so explicitly expressed by the apostle in the two nearly contemporaneous Epistles just cited, reveal to us what was in his mind when writing the words before us, and may be properly adduced to explain them.

Ver. 22.—But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin (ἀλλὰ συνέκλεισεν ἡ γραφή τὰ πάντα ὑπὸ ἁμαρτίαν); on the contrary, the Scripture hath shut it all up under sin. On the sense which the phrase, "the Scripture," sometimes bears, denoting the sacred writings collectively and not one particular passage, see note on ver. 8. Here, as in ver. 8, we feel ourselves at liberty not to limit the apostle's reference to one passage, as that cited in ch. ii. 16 or ver. 23 of this chapter, but to understand him as including in his scope the teaching of Holy Scripture in both these and other places; having probably in view some such general summary of the contents of God's Word as bearing upon the subject, as he has alleged in Rom. iii. It is highly probable that some such summary, very possibly this identical one with variations, he was wont frequently to employ, as he certainly had constant occasion to do, in reasoning with his fellow-Jews and others, in synagogues and elsewhere. As in ver. 8, so here, the term "Scripture" is so applied as to invest Scripture with a sort of personal agency, which in stricter propriety would be predicated of its Divine Author. We have, in fact, presented to us the action of God himself in his ordering of that older economy, and not merely the statement of Scripture describing the condition of things under it. "Shut it all up under sin;" leaving no loop-hole of escape. The sense of the verb is illustrated by its use in the Septuagint (Josh. vi. 1), "Jericho was (συγκεκλεισμένη) straitly shut up." God, in the appointments and revelations of the Law, found and pointedly left his people, so to speak, under the operation and overmastering of sin, providing for them therein, and as yet, no such outlet from either its condemnation or its power ("the law of sin," Romans) as he pursued in after times to open for them. The description stands in marked contrast with the blessed liberty predicated in the next chapter of the children of "Jerusalem which is above." This condition of things under the old economy is represented as being only a *provisional* ordering of the Divine Disposer, made with a view to a perfect manifestation of delivering goodness to come by-and-by. "Shut up . . . that," etc. We have a remarkable parallel to this twofold significance of

"shut up," both as present and as prospective, in Rom. xi. 32, "God hath shut up all men unto disobedience (συνέκλεισεν ὁ Θεὸς τοὺς πάντας εἰς ἀπειθεῖαν), that he might have mercy upon all;" where likewise the providential ordering of God is spoken of, and not the description of Scripture only. There we read τοὺς πάντας, here τὰ πάντα, with an evident propriety in the choice of gender; for there St. Paul is thinking of Jews and of Gentiles as severally coming under the operation of the Divine "shutting up;" here he is not thinking of varied personalities, but rather of the entire circumstances of men under the legal economy. That the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe (ἵνα ἡ ἐπαγγελία ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοθῇ τοῖς πιστεύουσι). The term "promise," as connected with the verb "might be given," denotes beyond doubt the thing promised, as in ver. 14, "the promise of the Spirit:" this is "the promise" meant here. Now, if we were to join the words, "by faith of Jesus Christ," with the noun "promise," we should have to understand the two together as meaning, "the promise which was made to Abraham because of his faith in Jesus Christ;" and this would be attended with a twofold inconvenience: (1) the term would have to be taken in two senses in the same sentence; it would first mean here, "the word of promise spoken to Abraham," and then, when immediately after taken with the verb "might be given," it would change its sense into that of "the thing promised;" (2) this method of construing the sentence would import a new thought, one which did not, so far as we know—it may have done so, perhaps, but there is no proof of it—belong to St. Paul's views of the subject; namely, that "Jesus Christ"—not merely "Christ," but "Jesus Christ," the historical Son of David—was believed in by Abraham. It appears safer, therefore, to connect the words, "by faith of Jesus Christ," with the verb; thus: "that the promise might by faith, as a consequence of faith, of Jesus Christ be given to them that believe." The apostle redoubles the mention of "faith" as the qualification for receiving the gift. "Faith! Faith! with none of your wretched works of ceremonialism!" Compare for this iteration of faith, vers. 2—7. He adds, "of Jesus Christ," to "by faith," to mark that the bestowment of the blessing was delayed till Christ should have actually come, to whose line amongst Abraham's posterity the promise had been made. The apostle intimates that the ulterior purpose which God had in view in then "shutting it all up under sin," the purpose which is described in this last sentence, was likewise signified by "Scrip-

ture," as well as the condition of comparative helplessness and condemnation, under which those subject to the Law were detained. The participle *τοῖς πιστευούσι* is either a class substantive (as Acts ii. 44; 1 Cor. xiv. 22), "to believers," or the present tense of the participle points to action contemporaneous with that expressed by the verb, "to them that should believe."

Ver. 23.—The feature which distinguishes this new paragraph (vers. 23, 24) from the preceding (vers. 21, 22) is the more distinct statement of the *pædagogic* function of the Law as preparatory to that economy of grace which was the ulterior purpose of the Lawgiver. In the meanwhile (the apostle here says) we were committed to the custody of the Law. But before faith came (*πρὸ τοῦ δὲ εἰσεῖν τὴν πίστιν*). The "but" is antithetic to the closing clause of ver. 22, from which it is taken up afresh the notion of faith, there spoken of as of old destined to become at the proper time the qualifier for the receiving of the promise. "Faith" denotes, not objectively, "the faith," that is, the gospel, as ch. i. 23, a sense in which it is seldom used, and which is repelled here by the whole context; but subjectively, the principle of belief in One who gives of mere grace. This, by a bold and surely jubilant figure of speech, is personified as "coming" for men's deliverance, while the "Law" is also personified as the stern custodian under whose charge till then men were detained. Compare the frequent references in the Psalms to "light," "truth," "righteousness," "word," etc., being "sent," "commanded," by the Lord, as if angels, despatched for the help of his saints (Ps. xliii. 3; xl. 11; lvii. 3; cvii. 20, etc.). We were kept under the Law, shut up (*ὕπὸ νόμον ἐφρουρούμεθα, συγκεκλεισμένοι* [*συγκλειόμενοι*, Revised Text; so, according to Sorivener, L. T. Tr.]); we were kept in ward under the Law, shut up. The "we" recites, not exactly Jewish Christians or Jews, except *per accidens*, but God's people. The verb *φρουρεῖν*, keep carefully guarded, is used with a prominent notion of protection in Phil. iv. 7; 1 Pet. i. 5; whilst in 2 Cor. xi. 32, as here, the more prominent idea is that of preventing egress. Comp. Rom. vii. 6, "The Law wherein we were holden (*κατεχόμεθα*)." So Wisd. xvii. 16, of Egyptians, in the plague of miraculous darkness, as it were imprisoned, unable to move, Ἐφρουρεῖτο εἰς τὴν αἰδῆρον εἰρκτὴν κατακλεισθεῖς, "Was kept in ward, having been shut up into the prison which had no iron bars." The reading *συγκλειόμενοι* or *συγκλειόμενοι*, although highly witnessed to by uncial manuscripts, appears to be accounted for by the reading in B, *συγκλειόμενοι* (very probably a clerical blunder for *συγκε-*

*κλειόμενοι*), which may have given it vogue. The perfect participle seems alone suitable to the passage, *q.d.* shut up for good and all. The present participle would require to be understood of the repression of a constantly repeated endeavour to escape (or, what?). As the verb *συνέκλεισεν* occurs in the preceding verse, *συγκεκλεισμένοι* takes the shade of meaning, "shut up as I said." Unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed (*εἰς τὴν μέλλουσαν πίστιν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι*). "Unto;" with reference to, with an eye to, the coming economy of free grace, to which they were then to be transferred. The same preposition (*εἰς*) is used in the same manner in the next verse, "unto Christ." In the words, *τὴν μέλλουσαν πίστιν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι*, we have the same form of sentence as in Rom. viii. 18, *Πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι*, "For the glory which shall hereafter be revealed." In both cases, the emphatic position of *μέλλουσαν* appears to indicate, not merely that the manifestation was future, but that the future would be sure to bring it; the predetermining purpose of God made it certain. "Revealed:" the principle of faith as accepting a gift bestowed of free grace, though not unknown to the pious of former ages (Rom. iii. 21)—for how in any age could one conscious of sin look for any gift at the hands of the Almighty except thus?—was destined, under the "gospel of the grace of God," to come forth into conspicuous prominence as the one supremely commanding element of religious sentiment.

Ver. 24.—Wherefore the Law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ (*ὥστε ὁ νόμος παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν γέγονεν εἰς Χριστόν*); wherefore the Law hath been the keeper of our childhood to keep us unto Christ. With St. Paul, *ὥστε*, so that, frequently is used to introduce a sentence which is not dependent in construction on the preceding words, but is one which makes a fresh departure as if with the adverbial conjunction "wherefore," or "so then." Thus ver. 9; ch. iv. 7; 2 Cor. iv. 12; v. 16; 1 Thess. iv. 18, in which last passage it is even followed by an imperative. *Γέγονεν* differs from *ἦν* or *ἐγένετο* by describing past action as ending in a result which still continues. The verb *γίγνεσθαι* frequently denotes "prove one's self," "act as" (comp. 1 Thess. ii. 7; Acts i. 16; vii. 52). The Law hath done with us (says the apostle) the work of a child's caretaker (*pædagogus*), with an eye to Christ, to whom we have now been handed over. (For the use of *εἰς*, see note on ver. 23.) *Pædagogus* has no equivalent in the English language; "pedagogue," "schoolmaster," "tutor," "guardian," are all inadequate, covering each one an arena of thought more or less quite different. "Tutor,"



as the masculine of "governess," comes perhaps nearest; but a tutor to a gentleman's children is generally an educated man, and often of like rank in life with those he is with; whereas a *pedagogue* was usually a slave—an element of thought probably very near to the apostle's consciousness in his present use of the term. In illustration of this and other points bearing upon this subject, the reader will be interested by a passage cited by Bishop Lightfoot out of Plato's 'Lysis' (p. 208, C). Socrates is questioning a young friend. "They let you have your own ruling of yourself: or do they *not* trust you with this, either?" "Trust me with it, indeed!" he said. "But as to this, who has the ruling of you?" "This man here," he said, "a *tutor*." "Being a slave, eb?" "But what of that?" said he; "yes; only, a slave of our own." "An awfully strange thing this," I said, "that you, freeman that you are, should be under the ruling of a slave. But further, what does this tutor of yours, as your ruler, do with you?" "He takes me," said he, "to a teacher's house, of course." "Do they rule you too, the teachers?" "Certainly, of course." "A mighty number it seems of masters and rulers does your father think proper to set over you." Teaching, except possibly of the very first rudiments, was not the *pedagogue's* business, but only the general care and superintendence of his charge—taking him to and back from his teachers' houses or the schools of physical training, looking after him in his play hours, and the like. In applying to the Law the figure of a *pedagogue*, the features which the apostle had in view were probably these: the childhood or non-age of those under its tutelage; their withdrawal from free parental intercourse; their degraded condition probably as being under servile management; the exercise over them of unsympathizing hardness (comp. 1 Cor. iv. 15, "Though ye have ten thousand *tutors* in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers"); coercive discipline; the rudimentary character of their instruction (this particular, however, is likewise of questionable application); the temporary and purely provisional nature of the condition under which they were placed; its termination in the full enjoyment of freedom and of participation in their father's inheritance. The clause, "unto Christ," can hardly mean "to bring us to Christ," tempting as this interpretation may seem, in view of the verbal constituent (*ἕως*) "bring" in *παδαγωγός*, and of the fact that it was one part of the duty of the child's keeper to take him to his school. For there are the following objections to taking it so: (1) The child-keeper's relation to his charge did not

end with his taking him to school, but continued on throughout his non-age; (2) the function of Christ is not viewed here as instruction; (3) if this construction had been in the apostle's view, he would have written *πρὸς Χριστόν* or *εἰς Χριστόν*, as in the *εἰς διδασκάλου* ("to the teacher's house") of the passage above cited from Plato. We must, therefore, understand the preposition as in the preceding verse, "with a view to." The next clause is the explanation. **That we might be justified by faith** (*ἵνα ἐκ νόμων δικαιωθῶμεν*); *in order that by faith we might get justified*. This clause is the most important part of the sentence. Not from the Law was to come righteousness; the Law was no more than introductory or preparatory; righteousness (once more the apostle reminds the Galatians) was to come to us as a free gift through Christ, upon simply our faith, the Law having now nothing to do with us. Hence the emphatic position of the words *ἐκ νόμων*. The apostle does not, in the present connection, make it his business to explain in what way the Law was preparatory, which he does in Rom. vii.; his purpose at present is to insist upon its purely provisional character. What we have here is a description of the relation of the Law to God's people viewed collectively; but we can hardly fail to be reminded, that this experience of the collective people of God very commonly finds its counterpart in respect to the ethical bearing of the Law in the experience of each individual believer. Only, we have still to bear in mind that the apostle is thinking of the Law just now more in its ceremonial aspect than its ethical.

Ver. 25.—**But after that faith is come** (*ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς πίστεως*); *but now that Faith hath come*; this white-robed, joy-bringing angel of deliverance! (see note on the words, in ver. 23, "before faith came"). **We are no longer under a schoolmaster** (*οὐκέτι ὑπὸ παιδαγωγῶν ἔσμεν*); *we are no longer under a keeper of our childhood*. When a child becomes of age, as determined by his father's arrangement, the *pedagogue's* function, of course, ceases; so also when we (God's collective people) become believers in Christ, we had reached the era appointed by our Father for our coming of age, and the Law lost all hold upon us. This triumphant conclusion is based upon the premiss that the Law was the *pedagogue* of God's people, and nothing more. This premiss is itself proved true to the apostle's conviction, by the very nature of the case.

Ver. 26.—**For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus** (*πάντες γὰρ υἱοὶ Θεοῦ ἐστέ διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*); *for sons of God are ye all through faith in*

*Christ Jesus.* "For;" that is, what is just affirmed (ver. 25) is true, because ye are "sons" and no longer "children." "Ye are;" in ver. 25 it is "we are." The whole course of the argument, however, shows that the persons recited by each of the personal pronouns are in effect the same, namely, the people of God; otherwise this verse would not furnish proof, as by the "for" it professes to do, of the statement of ver. 25. The change from "we" to "ye" has by some been explained as due to the writer's wish to preclude the supposition that the "we" in ver. 25 applied to Jewish believers only. A more satisfactory explanation is that he wishes to give the statement in vers. 22—25, which is general, a more trenchant force as applying to those whose spiritual difficulties he is now dealing with. In 1 Thess. v. 5, "Ye are all sons of light, and sons of the day: we are not of the night, nor of darkness," we have the converse transition. There likewise the persons recited are in effect the same; and the change of person in the pronoun, making the discourse, from exhortation addressed to others, pass into a form of cohortation applying to all Christians alike, including the writer himself, is dictated by the apostle's sympathetic kindness for especially his Thessalonian converts. "Ye are." The fact that faith is the sole and sufficient ground of qualification eliminates all those distinctions by which the Law has heretofore fenced off Gentiles, pronouncing them "separated as aliens," "strangers to the covenants," and "without God" (cf. Eph. ii. 12). In the sequel (ver. 28) the apostle passes on from the thought of this particular outward distinction of Jew and Gentile to the thought of all other purely external distinctions. "In Christ Jesus." It is debated whether this clause should be connected with "faith," as if it were *πιστεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*, the article being omitted, as in Col. i. 4; Eph. i. 15, and often; or with the words, "ye are sons of God," with a comma following the word "faith." Both modes of construing find in the sentence at last the same contents of thought; for each of the two propositions thus severally formed contains by implication the other. It probably suits the connection best to take the apostle as at once affirming that it is in Christ Jesus that we are God's sons through faith, rather than as leaving this to be inferred from the fact of our being sons through faith in Christ. "In Christ" is, with St. Paul, a very favourite form of indicating the channel through which the great blessings of the gospel are realized (cf. Eph. i. 3, 6, 7, 11; ii. 6, 7, 10, 13, 21, 22; iii. 12, etc.). "Sons of God." It is quite clear that the term "sons" (*υἱοί*) denotes those who have come into the full enjoyment, so far as the

present life is concerned, of the position which their birth had entitled them to; and that it stands in contrast with their earlier position when children in years under a *pedagogue*. The noun *υἱός*, son, itself, however, while it is never used as synonymous with *υἱῆσιος* to describe one as a child in years, yet, like *τέκνον*, child, does not ordinarily betoken more than simple relationship as the correlative with "father;" for which reason *υἱός* (as well as *τέκνον*) is used in such phrases as "children of disobedience," "of Israel," "of light," "of the day," "of the devil," "of perdition." In Heb. xii. 6—8 *υἱός* is applied in the case of one who is as yet under the discipline of the rod; but even there *υἱός* of itself immediately designates his filial relation only. St. Paul never uses the word *παῖς* at all, though he has *παῖδια* in 1 Cor. xiv. 20 for children in years, in place of the word *υἱῆσιος* which he ordinarily employs (Rom. ii. 20; 1 Cor. iii. 1; xiii. 11; Eph. iv. 14; Heb. v. 13), and which we find presently after in vers. 1 and 3 of the next chapter. The particular modification of meaning in which the apostle here uses the term is justified by the consideration which he presently puts forward, that a son of even an opulent or high-born parent, while a mere child, possesses no more freedom than if he were the child of any other person; his heirship or distinction of birth is for so long more or less veiled; it is not until he passes out of his nonage that he appears in his proper character.

Ver. 27.—**For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ** (*ὅσοι γὰρ εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε*); for all ye who were baptized into Christ. "For;" pointing back to the whole preceding verse, but especially to the words, "in Christ Jesus." "All ye who were baptized;" more literally, "ye, as many as were," etc. The rendering in our Authorized Version, "as many of you as have been baptized," allows of, if it does not suggest, the surmise that the apostle was aware of there being those among the Christians he was writing to who had not been "baptized into Christ." But the context proves the fallacy of this surmise; for the baptism of a part of their body, whatever its consequences to those particular individuals, would have furnished no proof of the foregoing statement, that "all" of those whom he was addressing were "sons of God." The class marked out by the *ὅσοι* is clearly coextensive with the "ye all" of ver. 26. The fact is that this *ὅσοι* marks out a distinct class, not taken out from amongst Christians, but from amongst mankind at large. As compared with *οἵτινες*, which the apostle might have written instead, it may be regarded as affirming with greater positiveness than *οἵτινες* would have done, that what is predi-

cated in the subsequent clause is predicated of every individual belonging to the class defined in this. It may be paraphrased thus: As surely as ever any one of you was baptized into Christ, so surely did he become clothed with Christ. Precisely the same considerations apply to the clause in Rom. vi. 3, "All we who were baptized (*ἄνθρωποι ἐβαπτισθημεν*) into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death." A similar paraphrase may be given in ver. 10 of this chapter: So surely as any are of the works of the Law, so surely are they under a curse; and in Rom. viii. 14, So surely as any are led by the Spirit of God, so surely are these sons of God. Below, in ch. vi. 16, "As many as shall walk by this rule," the *ἄνθρωποι* does mark out a class from among the general body of Christians, who were not all acting thus. So also Phil. iii. 15, "As many as be perfect." Were baptized into Christ (*εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτισθητε*). So Rom. vi. 3, "Baptized into Christ Jesus, baptized into his death." The question arises—What is the precise force of the preposition "into" as thus employed with relation to baptism? With the present passage we have to group the following: "Baptizing them into (*εἰς*) the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" (Matt. xxviii. 19); "Were all baptized into (*εἰς*) Moses in the cloud and in the sea" (1 Cor. x. 2); "In (*ἐν*) one Spirit were we all baptized into (*εἰς*) one body" (1 Cor. xii. 13), which statement, we must observe, is preceded by the apologue of a body with many members ending with "so also is Christ" (ver. 13). With reference to these passages we may observe that, since in 1 Cor. xii. 13 ("We were baptized into one body") the preposition retains its strict sense of "into," and since "Christ" is perpetually set forth as for Christians the sphere of their very existence, *in* whom they are that which distinctively they are, it is reasonable to conclude that, when the apostle here and in Rom. vi. 3 uses the expression, "baptized into Christ," he uses the preposition in its strict sense; that is, meaning that Christians are in their baptism brought into that union with, in-being in, Christ which constitutes their life. Nor does 1 Cor. x. 2, "were baptized into Moses" (where both the Authorized and the Revised Versions render, "unto," the latter adding in the margin, "Greek, into"), present any real objection to this view. For in comparing objects together, the apostle not unfrequently puts a very considerable strain upon a phrase when he wishes to bring the two several objects under one category, using it alike of that to which it is most strictly applicable, and of that to which it is not applicable strictly, but only in a very qualified sense. Compare, as a very noteworthy

instance of this, his application of the words (*κοινωνία, κοινωνός*), "communion," "having communion," in 1 Cor. x. 16—20 (Revised Version); in which the expression, "having communion with devils (*κοινωνός τῶν δαιμονίων γίνεσθαι*)," is, surely with considerable violence, applied to the case of persons eating things sacrificed to idols; but is applied thus by the apostle because he wishes to present a parallel to that real "communion of the blood, of the body, of Christ," which Christians are privileged to have in the Lord's Supper. Similarly, in vers. 2—4 of the same chapter, for the purpose of exhibiting a parallelism, he strains the expressions, "spiritual meat," "spiritual drink," justly and precisely applicable to the Lord's Supper, to apply them to the manna and water from the rock, the meat and drink of the Israelites in the wilderness, although the only justification of their being thus designated consists in their having been supernaturally supplied, and perhaps also that they had a typical meaning. We can thus, then, understand how, with reference to the other sacrament in ver. 2 of the same chapter, he strains the expression, "baptized into," justly descriptive of Christian baptism, by applying it to that quasi-immersion of the Israelites in passing "through the midst of the Red Sea and under the cloud," which he construes into a "baptism" which made them over to a sort of union with, in-being in, Moses, thenceforward their lawgiver and leader. The import of the expression, "baptized into Moses," is to be estimated in the light thrown upon it by the more certain import of the expression, "baptized into Christ;" not this latter to be explained down for the purpose of making it correspond with the other. This view of the clause before us helps us to understand the words in Matt. xxviii. 19, "Baptizing them into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" in the comprehension of which we are further assisted by the very remarkable, pregnant use sometimes made in the Old Testament of the word "Name," when it is employed to designate that presence of Divine power and grace which is the security of God's people and the confusion of their enemies (see Prov. xviii. 10; Ps. xx. 1, 7; lxxv. 1; Isa. xxx. 27, etc.). For the baptism which brings men "into Christ" brings them into the Name of the triune God as manifested to us in the gospel. Such an interpretation of these words approves itself fully with reference to their use in the supremely solemn hour of spirit-fraught utterance recorded in Matt. xxviii. 19; notwithstanding that in other passages, of plain historical narrative, such as Acts viii. 16 and xix. 5, it may be more natural to take the

preposition in the phrase, "baptize into the Name of Christ," in a lower and less determinate sense—either as "unto," "with reference to," or, which seems more probable, as pointing to that professed connection with Christ as his people ("Ye are Christ's," 1 Cor. iii. 23), into which the sacrament brings men. But this lower interpretation, if admitted in those passages, has no claim to dominate our minds when endeavouring to apprehend the full import of the passage now before us, and of Rom. vi. 3. In these the apostle is evidently penetrating into the inmost significance and operation of the rite; and therefore beyond question means to indicate its function, as verily blessed by God for the translation of its faithful recipients into vital union with Christ. For the just comprehension of the apostle's meaning, it is of the utmost consequence to note that he introduces this reference to baptism for the purpose of justifying his affirmation in ver. 26, that in Christ Jesus those whom he is addressing were all sons of God *through faith*. This consideration makes it clear that he viewed their baptism as connected with faith. If there was any reality in their action in it at all, if they were not acting an unreal part, their coming to baptism was an outcome of faith on their part in Christ. By voluntarily offering themselves to be baptized into his Name, they were consciously obeying his own instructions: they were manifesting their desire and their resolve to attach themselves to his discipleship and service; to be thenceforth people of his, as by him redeemed, and as expecting at his hands spiritual life here and perfected salvation hereafter. Therefore it was that they were in their baptism translated "into Christ;" their voluntary act of faith brought them under such operation of Divine grace as made the rite effectual for the transcendent change which the expression indicates; for it is abundantly apparent that a spiritual transition such as this cannot be wrought by a man's own volition or action, but only by the hand of God; as St. John testifies (John i. 13). **Have put on Christ** (*Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε*); *did put on Christ*. In Rom. xiii. 14 we find the imperative used, "Put ye on (*ἐνδύσασθε*) the Lord Jesus Christ." There the phrase has an ethical application, denoting the adoption of that whole system of habits which characterized the Lord Jesus, and presents in a more definite form that "putting on" of "the new man" which is insisted upon in Eph. iv. 24. This can hardly be its meaning here; rather it is to be regarded as a more determinate form of the notion of "being justified." The penitent convert, by that decisive action of his faith which by seeking "baptism into Christ"

GALATIANS,

put forth his hand to lay hold of the righteousness which is by faith, became invested with this particular form of "righteousness," namely, that very acceptableness, in the sight of God, which shone in Christ himself. In that hour God "made him acceptable in the Beloved" (cf. Eph. i. 6, *ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ*); endued this poor guilty creature with the loving-kindness with which he regarded his own Son. The middle voice of the Greek verb, though it denotes in Rom. xiii. 14 action of the Christian's own, is not to be so far pressed as to exclude the notion of our having in this case been subjected to the action of another. Comp. Luke xxiv. 49, "Until ye be clothed (*ἐνδύσθητε*) with power from on high;" 1 Cor. xv. 53, "This mortal must put on (*ἐνδύσασθαι*) immortality;" so 2 Cor. v. 3. It is the exclusive prerogative of God to justify the sinner; and therefore it must have been by him that the believer became clothed with Christ, not by himself, though it was by his own voluntary act that he came under this operation of the Divine grace. It is, perhaps, impossible more strongly to express the intense character (so to speak) which belongs to the righteousness which comes to us through faith in Christ, than by the form in which it is here exhibited. The apostle, however, in 2 Cor. v. 21, uses an expression which may be put by the side of it: "That we might become the righteousness of God in him." It is now clear how completely this verse makes good the affirmation in the preceding one. We have indeed been made sons of God in Christ Jesus if we have become clothed with Christ. For what other in this relation does the phrase, "sons of God," denote as applied to ourselves, than the intense love into the bosom of which God has received us? No higher degree of adoption to be sons is conceivable; though the complete *manifestation* of this adoption still remains in the future (Rom. viii. 19).

Ver. 28.—There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female (*οὐκ ἔστι Ἰουδαῖος οὐδὲ Ἕλληγ, οὐκ ἔστι δοῦλος οὐδὲ ἐλεύθερος, οὐκ ἔστι ἄρρεν καὶ θήλυ*); *there is no Jew here nor Gentile* (literally, *Greek*), *there is no bondman here nor freeman, there is not here male and female*. The word *ἐστίν*, occurring also in 1 Cor. vi. 5 (according to the now accepted reading); Jas. i. 17; Eccclus. xxxvii. 2; and very noticeably in Col. iii. 11, is probably (see Winer's 'Gram. N. T.', § 14, 2, 'Ann.') an adverbialized form of the preposition *ἐν*, of the same description as the thus accented *ἐν* and *ἐνι*. The prepositional element implies a somewhat indefinite indication of a sphere in which the statement of the clause holds good. The Revised

L

Version renders, "there can be," and Bishop Lightfoot, "there is no room for;" but *Ecclus.* xxxvii. 2 and *1 Cor.* vi. 5 do not much favour this particular modification. In *Col.* iii. 11 we have a very similar passage; there, after describing Christians as "having put on (*ἐνδυσάμενοι*) the new man, which is being renewed unto knowledge after the image of him that created him," the apostle adds, "Where there is not Gentile [*Greek*, 'Greek'] and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bondman, freeman; but Christ is all [literally, 'all things'] and in all." We may group with them also *1 Cor.* xii. 12, 13, "So also is Christ; for in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews, whether Gentiles [literally, 'Greeks'], whether bondmen, whether freemen." In all three of these passages we see the reference both to "Jew and Gentile" and to "bondman and freeman." The particular mention of these two forms of outward classification was suggested by the circumstances of the Christian Church generally at that time. Wherever the apostles went, they were sure to be confronted by questions and difficulties arising both from the one and from the other. In the kingdom of God were Jew and Gentile, were circumcised and uncircumcised, to stand on the same footing? Should believers as such be concerned to vary their treatment of one another or to modify their own condition from regard to these circumstances? Questionings of this description were being agitated everywhere, and most especially just now in the Galatian Churches. And, on the other point, the universal existence of slavery more or less throughout the civilized world would necessarily give occasion to a variety of questions relative to the position which bondmen should hold in the Christian community; how a bondman on becoming a Christian should stand, or what he should do, in respect to obedience to his owner or to seeking a change in his condition. St. Paul, in his Epistles, has briefly discussed some of these points, as in *1 Cor.* vii. 20—24; *Eph.* vi. 5—9. So often had the apostle occasion to affirm the perfect identity of Christian privilege possessed by all believers in Christ, that the statement would naturally mould itself into a sort of formula. In *Colossians* he varies the form by inserting "barbarian, Scythian;" degrees of national civilization made no difference. In place of this, he here adds the particular, that diversity of sex made no difference. We cannot tell what especial reason he had for introducing these modifications in writing to the *Colossians* and the *Galatians* respectively. Possibly he had none beyond

the pleasure which he felt in dilating on the large catholicity of the Divine grace. In the clause, *οὐκ ἐν ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ*, "there is here no male and female," the neuter is used (remarks Alford) as being the only gender which will express both. The change of form, "male and female," from "no Jew nor Gentile," "no bondman nor freeman," was perhaps suggested by the passage in *Gen.* i. 27 (*ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ*), "male and female created he them," which is quoted in *Matt.* xix. 4; *Mark* x. 6. If so, the clause may be regarded (as Bishop Lightfoot says) as forming a climax: "even the primeval distinction of male and female." But perhaps the change is simply made for the sake of variety; as in the way in which several of the classes are introduced in the *Colossians*. For ye are all one in Christ Jesus (*πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἰς ἓστὲ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*); for all ye are one and the same man in Christ Jesus. The pronoun *ὑμεῖς*, ye, is inserted to recite emphatically the qualification already expressed; as if it were, "ye being what ye are, believers baptized into Christ." The apostle's object here is not, as in *1 Cor.* xii. 13; *Col.* iii. 11—15, to exhort to the performance of certain mutual duties on the ground of the unity which in Christ is established among all believers, but to enforce the view that each individual's title to the inheritance is altogether irrespective of external distinctions, and is based entirely, in one case as well as in another, upon his being clothed with Christ. The word *εἰς* is "one and the same," as in *τὸ ἐν φρονούντες*, "of one mind" (*Phil.* ii. 2); and in *εἰς Θεοῦ, εἰς μεσίτης*, "One and the same God, one and the same Mediator" (*1 Tim.* ii. 5). So Chrysostom: "That is, we have all one form and one mould, even Christ's. What," he adds, "can be more awful than these words? He that was a Greek, or Jew, or bondman yesterday, carries about with him the form, not of an angel or archangel, but of the Lord of all, yea, displays in his own person the Christ." The distribution of the universal quality to each individual, so far as the grammar of the sentence is concerned, is imperfectly expressed. But the grammatical inadequacy of the verbal exposition is not greater than in *1 Cor.* vi. 5, "Decide (*ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ*) between his brethren," literally, "between his brother;" and in vers. 19, 20 of the same chapter, *σῶμα ὑμῶν*, "your body;" not "thy body," nor "your bodies." The apostle has in view the subjective application only of the principle here stated; each was to feel that, having the qualification which he has explained, he himself is a son of God and full inheritor, without casting about for any further qualification, as, for example, from

ceremonial Judaism. The principle plainly is pregnant with an objective application also; namely, as to the manner in which they were to estimate and treat each other and every baptized believer, notwithstanding any circumstances of extrinsic diversity whatever.

Ver. 29.—And if ye be Christ's (εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ); and if ye are Christ's. The δὲ simply marks a fresh stage in the argument, as e.g. Rom. viii. 17, εἰ δὲ τέκνα, καὶ κληρονόμοι. For the preceding verse is no digression, requiring us to render this δὲ "but," but simply an amplification of the notion of putting on Christ in ver. 27; and the present clause recites that previous conclusion, to serve for a premiss to a further conclusion. "Are Christ's;" comp. 1 Cor. iii. 23, "And ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's." This genitive here, as also there, denotes the closest and most intimate approximation conceivable, "Christ's own;" covering, in fact, the notion of being clothed with Christ; and expresses what that "one and the same man" is, which according to ver. 28 in Christ Jesus all had become. Comp. Titus ii. 14, λαὸν περιούσιον, "a people of his very own." Then are ye Abraham's seed (ἄρα τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ σπέρμα ἐστέ); then seed of Abraham are ye. "Ye," Gentiles though ye be. In ver. 7 the apostle has affirmed that they who are of faith are sons of Abraham; in ver. 10, that the promises were made to Abraham and "his seed, which is Christ." We have seen that in that ver. 16 "Christ" appears to mean that branch of Abraham's offspring which was, so to speak, to proceed from Christ and was to be called by his name. If, however, "Christ" be there taken to mean the individual Son of Abraham, Jesus, then those who believe in him and have been baptized into him are to be understood as

here affirmed to be "Abraham's seed," because, being clothed with Christ, they share his position. The same result is arrived at either way. And heirs according to the promise (καὶ [which word is rejected by recent editors] κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν κληρονόμοι); heirs in pursuance of a promise. "Heirs," not of Abraham, but of God; for the notion connects itself with that of the sonship to God, which has been predicated in ver. 26 of believers in Christ; and these two united conceptions form the topic of the first seven verses of the next chapter. This is in accordance with Rom. viii. 16, 17, "We are children of God; and if children, also heirs; heirs of God, joint-heirs with Christ." It goes upon the same lines of thought as the statement made above in ver. 16, that the promises were spoken, not to Abraham only, but also to his seed as well; the seed being conceived of by the apostle, not as inheriting from Abraham, but as holding an independent position of their own at his side. The benefits accruing to them have been styled "the inheritance" in ver. 18, which verse also serves to illustrate the spirit of the clause now before us, by affirming that the inheritance was a free gift of God conveyed by a promise, and not one to be either gained or made sure by obedience to a ceremonial law as the Galatians were in danger of supposing. The article is wanting before "promise" here, as it was also in ver. 18; because the apostle is not thinking immediately of the terms of the promise, but rather of its distinctive character as a promise, betokening a free gift of God. The inheritance is no doubt the adoption of sons, both in its firstfruits in this life and in its complete manifestation hereafter in the bliss and glory of heaven (cf. Rom. viii. 23, 30; 1 Pet. i. 4).

### HOMILETICS.

Ver. 1.—*Beginning of the polemic part of the Epistle.* The apostle has finished his task of self-vindication, and now proceeds in regular theological method to expound and defend the doctrine of justification by faith without the deeds of the Law. "O foolish Galatians! who bewitched you, . . . before whose eyes Jesus Christ was evidently set forth in you, crucified?"

I. THE APOSTLE'S SEVERE REPROOF. "O foolish Galatians! who bewitched you?" Reproof is allowable and necessary, especially when it is prompted by love to God and truth and by a tender interest in the welfare of men. 1. *He points to the "witcheries" of the false teachers* as the only way of accounting for the sudden and inexplicable change of sentiment in Galatia. There must have been some extraordinary power of delusion or of fascination at work to throw them so completely out of the line of Christian thought. Whether it was the witchery of logic or the witchery of sanctity, it was most effective in deluding the Galatians. 2. *The Galatians were "foolish" in yielding to such ensnaring delusions.* They were not answerable for the conduct of their deluders, but they showed an uncommon folly. The Celtic nature is quick, but unsteady. The change was a senseless one.

II. THE INEXCUSABLENESS OF THEIR CONDUCT. "Before whose eyes Jesus Christ was evidently set forth in you, crucified." The apostle refers to his own clear exhibition of gospel truth in Galatia, and especially to the individualizing distinctness with which the Redeemer was set before his converts as the only Hope of salvation. It was not only an exhibition, like a placard exhibited before their eyes, but it had its answering impression "within them." How, then, with such a view of Christ's person and work, could they have opened their minds to such destructive errors?

III. THE TRUE THEME OF THE GOSPEL—CHRIST CRUCIFIED. Naturalistic writers give us a Christ exalted far above the average altitude of men, but a man nevertheless; rationalistic writers give us a Christ as a leader of thought or as an example of self-sacrifice and sympathy. "We preach Christ crucified, to the Jews a stumbling-block, to the Greeks foolishness; but to them that are called, . . . Christ the Wisdom of God, and the Power of God." The death of Christ, as expressing the whole mystery of redemption, involved the whole matter in dispute. There could be no compatibility between Christ's cross and Jewish legalism. We can, therefore, well understand why the apostle resolved to know nothing in his preaching but Christ, and him crucified.

Vers. 2—5.—*The apostle's first argument in this controversy.* I. APPLICATION OF THE TEST OF EXPERIENCE. "Received ye the Spirit by the works of the Law, or by the hearing of faith?" He begins by a practical test, which can be easily settled by experience and history. He refers to the time of awakening grace and first love. They had "received the Spirit." 1. *He concedes that they were Christians*, though they were neither faithful, nor stable, nor sound. "The Holy Spirit is the characteristic possession of believers." "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." The reference may have been both to ordinary and extraordinary gifts of the Spirit. 2. *He concedes that they were conscious of the possession of the Spirit.* They had no occasion to ask him what he meant by their receiving the Spirit. Christian people ought to possess, not only a good hope through grace, but "a full assurance of hope."

II. THE RECEPTION OF THE SPIRIT POSSIBLE, NOT ON THE PRINCIPLE OF LAW, BUT OF GRACE. Though the Spirit was given under the Law, it was never given on a principle of Law, but it was under the gospel dispensation that it was given in Pentecostal power and abundance. No man ever yet received the Spirit, as the Author and Sustainer of the new life, by "the works of the Law," or by a course of obedience specially designed to work out salvation. Conspicuously, as to historic fact and inward experience, the Spirit was given to men in connection with the first promulgation of the "word of faith" at Pentecost. The Spirit was given "by the hearing of faith." "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God." Yet the hearing that brings faith with it is only possible through the Spirit's power, for many hear who do not believe, and therefore receive not the Spirit. There is no inconsistency here. We need the Spirit to enable us to believe, but the hearing is instrumentally necessary to our fuller reception of the Spirit. The apostle here, however, seems primarily to refer to the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, of which Peter spoke when he said that, after his preaching the Word, "the Holy Ghost fell upon them as upon us at the beginning" (Acts xi. 15).

III. THE DONATION OF THE SPIRIT IS NOT ON PRINCIPLE OF LAW, BUT OF GRACE "He that ministereth to you the Spirit and worketh miracles in you, doeth he it by the works of the Law, or by the hearing of faith?" He first spoke of the reception, now he speaks of the donation of the Spirit: he first referred to a particular point of time, namely, their conversion; he now speaks of the principle of God's continued action. It is God who ministers the Spirit—not the apostle—whether to work miracles of power or miracles of grace. But he does it, not on the principle of legal obedience, but on the principle of grace working through the instrumentality of the preached gospel. He is "the God of grace," who sent his Son, "full of grace and truth," to pour grace into innumerable hearts.

IV. THE FOLLY OF ATTEMPTING TO BEGIN ON ONE PRINCIPLE AND TO END ON ANOTHER. "Are ye so foolish? having begun with the Spirit, are ye now being completed with the flesh?" This is folly, for it is to reverse the natural order of things. The opposites here are not Christianity and Judaism, but the essential and vital principle of each. If we begin our life with the Spirit, it must reach its

maturity with the Spirit. The introduction of the flesh would be the annihilation of the Spirit. Judaism ministers to the sensuous element in our nature by making religion a thing of rites and ceremonies; but this is to go back upon all the progress we have made in life, light, and blessing.

V. **THE USELESSNESS OF THEIR PAST SUFFERINGS.** "Did ye suffer so many things in vain? if it be yet in vain." 1. *It is a sign of sincerity to suffer for our opinions.* There is no record in the Acts of a persecution in Galatia; but the Jewish element was strong enough there as elsewhere to resent by violence the contempt put upon their Law by the Gentiles being freed from it. There is a possible reference to these sufferings in the Epistle (ch. v. 11). 2. *You stultify all your past sufferings if you recede from the gospel.* All these sufferings represent so much wasted endurance or misery. 3. *The apostle's reluctance to think their sufferings were in vain.* "If it be yet in vain." He hopes better things of his converts. He knows that God keepeth the feet of his saints, so that they cannot altogether lose the things they have wrought.

Vers. 6—9.—*Second argument—the case of Abraham.* The natural answer to the previous question is "through the hearing of faith," and this as naturally suggests the case of "faithful Abraham." The Jews boasted of their relationship to Abraham, and therefore an example taken from his history would have special force.

I. **THE JUSTIFICATION OF ABRAHAM WAS NOT THROUGH CIRCUMCISION, BUT BY FAITH.** "Even as Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness." No exception could be made to these words, for they were the very words of Moses (Gen. xv. 6). The apostle dwells longer on the Old Testament, because the Judaists would naturally appeal to it. 1. *Abraham was not accepted for his virtues or his piety, or his circumcision, but because "he believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness"* (see homily on ch. ii. 16). His faith was accepted as righteousness, not as an act, for it had no merit in itself, but as a fact, for it was not by works, but by faith, he was accepted. His faith was the mere instrument of his justification, not the ground of it; for Scripture always represents it as being "through" faith or "of" faith, never on account of it. 2. *The transaction here referred to occurred hundreds of years before the Law was given on Sinai, and even some time before circumcision was appointed as a "seal of righteousness."* If he, therefore, could be justified without circumcision, and prior to it, how then could the Judaists insist on its necessity? Abraham was not circumcised in order to be justified, but circumcised because he was justified. 3. *The doctrine of the apostle was not, therefore, in any sense a novelty, as the Judaists might think. It was at least as old as Abraham.*

II. **THE TRUE CONCEPTION OF ABRAHAMIC SONSHIP.** "Know ye therefore that they who are of faith, the same are sons of Abraham." 1. *It is not Abraham's blood, but Abraham's faith, which establishes the connection between the patriarch and his descendants.* The Jews might say, "We have Abraham to our father;" and they might ask in surprise, "What profit, then, is there in circumcision?" They would imitate his circumcision rather than his faith. But the apostle says emphatically that the true sons are "they of faith," whose fundamental principle is faith. 2. *It is Christ who makes the nexus between Abraham and us.* We believe in Christ, who is Abraham's seed; therefore we are sons of Abraham. 3. *There is but one Church in the two dispensations.* Some modern sects hold that the Church is a New Testament organization, and that Old Testament saints have no part in it. How can this be, if we believers "are blessed with"—not apart from—"faithful Abraham" (ch. iii. 9)? The apostle shows how Abraham has the heirship, the sonship, the kingdom, the glory, on the ground of the promise. He did not, therefore, receive the promise only for his children. Take the promise of the Spirit from Abraham; we take it from ourselves. Is the father of the family to be excluded, and only the children to gain admission to the kingdom?

III. **THE PROOF FROM SCRIPTURE.** "Moreover, the Scripture, foreseeing that God justifies the heathen through faith, announced the good news beforehand to Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed." 1. *The exact import of the promise.* (1) The blessing is justification, which is opposed to the curse of which he presently speaks. But that includes a title to eternal life as well as pardon. (2) The unity of Abraham and his spiritual descendants. He is the root and the representative of his



seed. The unity is not that established by circumcision, but something far deeper. 2. *God had purposes of mercy toward the heathen.* These purposes included their justification on the same grounds as those which secured the acceptance of the Jews. The Jewish dispensation was particularistic, and was so far temporary and preparatory to a dispensation universalistic in its character. In Christ there was to be henceforth "neither Jew nor Gentile." 3. *The way of salvation is the same in both dispensations.* Old Testament saints were saved exactly like New Testament saints, by faith in "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." The Levitical system was in itself an evangelical representation of the true method of salvation. 4. *We see here the value of Scripture for proof, for confirmation, for comfort, through all ages.*

IV. COMMUNITY AS WELL AS UNITY IN THE BLESSING. "So then they which be of faith are blessed together with the faithful Abraham." 1. *The blessing.* It is the manifestation of Divine favour. The blessing and justification are regarded in the context as correlative terms. 2. *The community between Abraham and his seed.* (1) He is "faithful Abraham," because of the simplicity, strength, and activity of his faith. He manifested all these characteristics of faith in (a) his self-expatriation; (b) his readiness to sacrifice Isaac; (c) his warlike courage; (d) his self-abnegation in the case of Lot. (2) He is the "father of the faithful." There are but two properly representative men, the first and the second Adam; but Abraham holds a relation of his own, though not of a federal character, towards all who are his seed spiritually. He and they are blessed together. 3. *The ground of this community.* It is the promise of God, "In thee shall the nations of the earth be blessed," realized in course of time in the common faith of all who, whether Jew or Gentile, trust in one Redeemer, and find in him their true inheritance as joint-heirs with him.

Ver. 10.—*Third argument—the curse of the Law.* "For as many as are of the works of the Law are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the book of the Law to do them." The apostle is carried naturally by antithesis of thought from the blessing of faith to the curse of the Law.

I. THE CURSE. This is "the curse of the Law" of ver. 13, from which the Law itself cannot deliver men, for its function is to condemn. 1. *It is not the mere civil punishment inflicted on the Israelites for the transgression of the ceremonial or judicial Law.* The context shows that the curse is a far deeper thing, for the contrast is between wrath and blessing, condemnation and justification. Besides, the passage refers to Gentiles who could not be affected by the dispensational peculiarities of Judaism. 2. *The curse is the Divine sentence upon transgressors involving doom and shame, the loss of God, and separation from him (Isa. lix. 2).* The curse includes the penal sanction of the moral Law—a Law written in the hearts of Gentiles as it was delivered to Jews on tables of stone; so that Gentiles and Jews were alike under curse. It is a mistake, therefore, to regard the curse as the mere natural consequence of transgression, as disease is the consequence of debauchery; it is a penal evil.

II. THE RANGE OF THE CURSE. It extends to "as many as are of the works of the Law." A distinction is here necessary between being of the works of the Law and being under the Law. The Old Testament saints were under the Law, but they were not under curse, because, like Abraham, they "saw the day of Christ afar off." They "believed God, and it was counted to them for righteousness." They apprehended God's mercy and grace under the sacrificial forms of the Jewish economy. But the curse must necessarily descend upon "all who are of the works of the Law," because they have broken it and are still breaking it day by day.

III. HOW THE CURSE COMES INTO OPERATION. It is by a Divine sentence which pronounces the curse upon all transgressors of the Law. The curse here quoted is the last of the twelve curses pronounced by the Levites on Mount Ebal (Deut. xxvii. 28). The reference points to ethical, not ceremonial, requirements. 1. *The Law demands practical obedience.* It is not "hearers" of the Law, but "doers," who are in question. 2. *It demands a personal obedience.* "Every one." There is no room for a proxy or a mediator. 3. *It demands a perfect obedience;* for it covers "all the things written" in the Law. 4. *It must be a perpetual obedience.* "Cursed is every one that continueth not." The least failure involves the transgression of the whole Law (Jas. ii. 10). 5. *The effect of transgression is curse.* All the evil that is involved in that terrible

word. "Death and hell are the end of every sin, but not of every sinner." 6. *The Law still exists to curse transgressors.* It is not abrogated, though Judaism is no more.

**Vers. 11, 12.—Fourth argument—the inconsistency of Law and faith.** "But that no man is justified in the Law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, The just shall live by faith. But the Law is not of faith: but, The man that hath done these things shall live in them."

**I. JUSTIFICATION IS OUT OF THE SPHERE OF LAW.** 1. *Not because a perfect obedience would not bring justification,* for the fundamental principle of the Law is, "The man that hath done these things shall live in them" (Lev. xviii. 5). 2. *But because no one is able to obey the Law perfectly.* Thus salvation becomes impossible on the principle of Law.

**II. SCRIPTURE ASSERTS THE CONNECTION OF JUSTIFICATION WITH FAITH.** "The just shall live by faith." The apostle shows the Judaists how they misapprehended the doctrine of the Old Testament; for, several hundred years before Christ, the Prophet Habakkuk connects life eternal with faith. "The Law is not of faith;" it does not find its starting-point in faith; doing, not believing, is the demand of the Law; and it is in no sense or manner connected with faith.

**Vers. 13, 14.—Fifth argument—our salvation is by Christ made curse for us.** Two thoughts are here brought into contrast—the Law condemned us; Christ redeemed us: "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the Law, having become a curse for us."

**I. THE NATURE OF THE REDEMPTION.** He "redeemed us." 1. *This language does not countenance the theory that there was nothing in Christ's work but a mere deliverance from the power of sin.* That is certainly involved in his death; for he came to "redeem us from this present evil world" (ch. i. 4), and "to redeem us from all iniquity" (Titus ii. 14). 2. *Neither does it countenance the idea that Christ redeemed us by entering into union with man and living a sinless human life,* which is reproduced in us by means of fellowship with him. Neither of these theories makes any provision for the rectification of man's relation with God, which is only effected through Christ being made a curse for us.

**II. HOW CHRIST ACHIEVED THE REDEMPTION.** He "became a curse for us." This is an unfathomable thought. Yet let us try to interpret it in the light of Scripture. We are not redeemed by Christ's Divine doctrine, nor by his marvellous holiness of character, but by his entering into our very position before God, becoming "a curse for us." The Lord visited upon him what the Law awarded to us, and by that substitution our redemption was secured. We are not to suppose that the Son of God was less the object of Divine love at the very time that he was, in an official aspect as his righteous Servant, an object of Divine wrath. His Father always loved him. The assertion is made, first, that the curse of the Law rests upon transgressors; then, that we are liberated from that curse; then, that this result was achieved by Christ becoming a curse for us. The passage shows what Christ was in God's account, not what he was in the eyes of men who despised him.

**III. HOW HIS DEATH TOOK UPON IT THIS CHARACTER OF CURSE.** "For it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree" (Deut. xxi. 22, 23). The allusion here is not specially to Christ, but to a command that those executed by Jewish law should not remain hanging on the tree all night. It does not refer to death by crucifixion, which was not a Jewish punishment, but to the exposure of the body after death, on crosses or stakes. But how was such a person accursed? Not because he was hanged upon a tree, but he was hanged upon a tree because he was accursed. The apostle does not mean to attach the idea of shame to the mode of Christ's death; for he was not made a curse by his mere hanging on a tree, but he hung there because he was made a curse for us.

**IV. THE ULTIMATE DESIGN OF THE REDEMPTION.** "That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles in Christ." That is, the curse-bearing prepared the way for the blessing, which was henceforth to stream forth upon the whole world. 1. *The blessing was justification of life,* not mere temporal blessings, which were restricted to the Jews. 2. *It was to reach the Gentiles* "in Christ," who was made the curse for "us"—both "Jews and Gentiles"—not through the Law, which demands a perfect

obedience. 3. *It was designed for Gentiles as well as Jews.* The stream was destined to flow through Jews to the Gentiles, freed from all the limitations of the old dispensation.

V. THE RESULT OF THE BLESSING. "That we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith." There is here an obvious return to the question of the second verse, and a definite answer is now given to that question. It was not through the Law, but through faith, we realize the promise of the Spirit. This was the special subject of promise (Joel ii. 28; Acts i. 4, 2; Eph. i. 13). Our Lord has placed us in the dispensation of the Spirit, and has opened all blessings to men out of his cross and his tomb.

Ver. 15.—*A new line of argument—the relation between the covenant and the Law.* Up to this point the apostle has touched upon no point that we have not seen in the Epistle to the Romans. Now he breaks new ground. "Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; Though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto."

I. IT IS ALLOWABLE TO USE HUMAN ANALOGIES IN ENFORCEMENT OF DIVINE TRUTH. The phrase, "after the manner of men," has various significations in the apostle's writings, but he evidently means here that the human analogy is perfectly appropriate, and that that which is true of a mere human arrangement is *a fortiori* of an arrangement made by God.

II. THE CONDITIONS OF COVENANT-MAKING IN HUMAN LIFE. 1. *A covenant is an arrangement between two parties for mutual benefit, with an implied character of permanence.* It is designed to perpetuate a relation of some sort. 2. *The covenant stands in the integrity of all its provisions without either party having the power to annul it or to add fresh clauses, whether consistent or inconsistent with its provisions.*

III. IMPLICATION THAT WHAT IS TRUE OF A HUMAN COVENANT IS ESSENTIALLY INVOLVED IN THE IDEA OF A DIVINE COVENANT. It is irreversible and irrevocable, since it is a covenant established by oath. God swears and he will not repent. The Judaistic theory, however, under the form of a supplement, would really effect the entire abrogation of the covenant.

Ver. 16.—*The contents of the covenant and the parties to it.* "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made."

I. THE CONTENTS OF THE COVENANT. "The promises." They are elsewhere spoken of as "the promise." It was repeated several times. This promise carries the whole of salvation within it. It is elsewhere referred to as "the oath and the promise"—"the two immutable things in which it was impossible for God to lie"—for God confirmed the promise by an oath, and the promise is linked with the Melchisedec priesthood of Christ, and thus involves all that is involved in priesthood, that is, atonement and intercession. It is the promise that bears up the burden of the world's hope, for it is on the ground of it we have "fled for refuge to the hope set before us" (Heb. vi. 18, 19).

II. THE PARTIES TO THE COVENANT. These are—God on the one side; Abraham and his seed on the other. Not Abraham alone, but Abraham and his seed. "And he saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ." The seed was not the Jewish race, nor strictly the spiritual posterity of Abraham, but Christ himself, in whom the Jewish race found its embodiment and to whom the spiritual posterity was organically united. There is a distinction between Christ personal and Christ mystical, regarded as the second Adam, as the Head of the body. Thus we understand how the whole body of believers is expressly called "Christ" (1 Cor. xii. 12). They are "all one in Christ," and "if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed" (ch. v. 28, 29).

III. A NECESSARY CONCLUSION. If the seed is Christ, then the promise was not yet fulfilled, but awaiting fulfilment, when the Law was given. It could not, therefore, be disannulled by the Law, nor could the Law add fresh clauses to it.

Vers. 17, 18.—*The irreversibility of the covenant by the Law.* "This, however, I say, that the covenant that has been confirmed before in reference to Christ, the Law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, does not disannul, that it should do away with the promise."

**I. THE COVENANT ON ITS OWN INDEPENDENT FOUNDATION.** 1. *It stands irrevocable and indestructible because it has been confirmed by God, that is, by an oath; for, "Because he could swear by no greater, he swore by himself, saying, Surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee" (Heb. vi. 13, 14). This oath is to us the sure ground of hope.* 2. *It has exclusive relation to Christ regarded as the Head of the Church.* He sealed this covenant with his blood, and thus the "cup of blessing" in the Lord's Supper has become "the new covenant in his blood." All covenant blessings reach us by Christ through his Spirit. 3. *It stood for ages alone.* The Law came four hundred and thirty years after.

**II. THE INABILITY OF THE LAW TO AFFECT THE COVENANT.** 1. *The Law and the covenant proceed on two entirely different lines, and cannot therefore traverse each other's course.* 2. *The lateness of the Law, as an historic institute, leaves the covenant as it found it in the ages of its undisputed validity.* Therefore the Law cannot disannul the covenant so as to throw invalidity into the promise.

**III. THE INHERITANCE NOT POSSIBLE BY THE LAW, BUT BY THE PROMISE.** "For if the inheritance be of the Law, it is no more of promise; but God has given it to Abraham by promise." 1. *The inheritance covers more than the land of Canaan; it involves "the heirship of the world" (Rom. iv. 13); but it symbolizes the blessings of the Messiah's kingdom, and especially of that "better country" which was an object of wistful expectation to Abraham himself.* 2. *If the Law abrogates the covenant, the inheritance would in that case come of Law; but it is positively asserted that "God has given it"—the perfect tense marking the duration of the blessing—"to Abraham by promise."*

Vers. 19, 20.—*The use and nature of the Law.* "What then is the Law?" The apostle's reasoning seemed to make the Law a quite superfluous thing. In the eyes of the Judaists it was God's most glorious institute. It was necessary, therefore, to show its nature, office, and characteristics, and its relation to the covenant of promise. It was really inferior to the dispensation of grace on four grounds, which themselves explain its nature and use.

**I. THE LAW DISCOVERS SIN.** "It was superadded because of transgressions." 1. *It was not to check sin.* 2. *Nor to create sin.* 3. *But to discover it.* "By the Law is the knowledge of sin" (Rom. iii. 20). This discovery would necessarily multiply transgressions (Rom. v. 20), just as the introduction of light into a darkened room makes manifest the things that were before unseen. "I had not known sin but by the Law" (Rom. vii. 7). Many sins were not seen to be sins at all till the Law threw its intense light upon them. Thus the great service of the Law was to awaken conviction of sin in the heart and to make men feel their need of a Saviour. The ceremonial and the moral Law had equally this effect. The system of sacrifice had no meaning apart from the fact of sin. What a mistake, then, was that of the Judaists who imagined that the Law could give them a title to eternal life in virtue of their obedience to its commands!

**II. THE LAW WAS A TEMPORARY AND INTERMEDIATE DISPENSATION.** "It was superadded . . . till the seed shall have come to whom the promise has been made." This refers to the coming of Christ who is "the Seed." The apostle puts himself back to the time of giving the Law, and looks forward from that starting-point to the future incarnation. The Law was thus a mighty parenthesis coming in between Abraham's promise and the coming of the seed, and was specially preparative and disciplinary in relation to that future event. It was destined then to pass away as a dispensation, but the moral Law, which it held in its bosom, was to abide in its full integrity. That Law still exists in Christianity, with its old power of manifesting sin and carrying conviction to sinners so as to shut them up to Christ.

**III. THE LAW DID NOT COME DIRECT FROM GOD TO MAN, AS THE PROMISE CAME TO ABRAHAM, BUT THROUGH ANGELS BY A MEDIATOR.** "Being ordained through angels in the hand of a mediator." This is another point of inferiority. God gave the promise to Abraham immediately, not mediately by angels or through any intervention like that of Moses; unlike the Law, which was superadded through this double intervention. 1. *The share of angels in the giving of the Law.* (1) Evidence of Scripture on the subject. Stephen says in his speech that the Israelites received the Law "at the ordination of angels," or "according to the arrangements of angels" (Acts vii. 53). The Law is else-

where described as "the word spoken by angels" (Heb. ii. 2). Yet in the history of the giving of the Law there is no reference to angels, not even to their presence. In two passages their presence, but not their ministration, is referred to (Deut. xxxii. 2; Ps. lxxviii. 17). (2) As the Law is said to have been ordained by means of angels and "the word spoken by angels," it is probable that the angels made it audible to the people or were connected with the terrible phenomena which accompanied the giving of the Law. The angels came between God and the people (Ps. lxxviii. 17). (3) The presence of angels may have led in time to a perverted doctrine of angel-worship, against which the apostle warns the Colossians (Col. ii. 18). 2. *The share of Moses in the giving of the Law.* It was "ordained . . . in the hand of a mediator," who was Moses. He describes his own mediation: "I stood between you and the Lord at that time" (Deut. v. 5, 27). It was Moses who bore the tables of stone from God to the people. We are not to suppose that the reference is designed to mark the inferiority of the Law to the covenant of promise, which, too, had its Mediator, Jesus Christ the Lord. He is not contrasting the Law and the gospel, but the Law and the promise of Abraham; and he asserts that, while in the one case the angels and Moses had to do with its conveyance, God in the other case gave the promise without the intervention of either man or angel.

IV. THE LAW WAS DEPENDENT UPON CONDITIONS, THE PROMISE WAS ABSOLUTE. "Now, a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one." The very idea of mediation implies two parties, who are to be brought into some relation with each other through the intervention of a third person. In the case of the Law, there were two parties—God and the Jewish people. In the case of the promise, "God is one;" he is mediatorless—no one stands between him and Abraham, as Moses stood between God and the Israelites in the giving of the Law. There is a numerical contrast between "one" and "of one."

Vers. 21—25.—*The Law designed to be subservient to the promise.* Though the Law is inferior to the promise in the four points already suggested, it is not antagonistic to it.

I. THE LAW IS NOT ANTAGONISTIC TO THE PROMISE. "Is the Law against the promises of God? God forbid." 1. *The Law and the promise are equally of Divine origin—two distinct parts of the Divine plan,* each part with its own distinct purpose to be carried out inside the Divine plan. The distinction between them is not that the one is good and the other evil; for "the Law is good if a man use it lawfully," while the promise is self-evidently and essentially so. 2. *There would be antagonism if life came by the Law.* "For if there had been a Law given that could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the Law." In that case, the Law and the promise would have come into competition as two diverse methods of salvation. In the one case, salvation would have come "of debt;" in the other case, it actually comes "of grace." If life came by the Law, there would, in fact, be no room for free gift at all. 3. *The Law was absolutely incapable of giving life.* If it could have done so, it would have been chosen as the method of salvation, because, in that case, man had only to use his faculties to accomplish it, and the agony of the cross would never have been necessary. But the thing was impossible; salvation is a Divine work, and, if it comes at all, it must come from the quickening power of the Spirit. 4. *If life could have come by the Law, its result, which is righteousness, would have come in the same way.* But the apostle has closed up the way of righteousness through the Law by many strong texts.

II. THE TRUE EFFECT AND DESIGN OF THE LAW. "But the Scripture shut up all under sin, that the promise by faith in Christ might be given to them that believe." 1. *The Law shuts up men under sin.* The Scripture, rather than the Law, is here represented as doing it. It pronounces all to be guilty before God, but solely in virtue of the condemnation pronounced by the Law. The phrase here employed is very expressive. Men are, as it were, closed in, or shut up, on every side, with only one way of escape—with no way left open but that of faith. 2. *There is a gracious purpose in this legal incarceration.* "That the promise by faith in Christ might be given to them that believe." (1) The blessing—"the promise," with all it involves. (2) The channel of blessing—"faith." That is a precious conduit-pipe between the soul and the Saviour. (3) The source of blessing—"Jesus Christ." (4) The recipients—"them that believe." How evidently all blessing reaches us, not by the Law, but by grace!

III. THE JEWS IN WARD UNDER THE OLD DISPENSATION. "But before faith came, we

were kept under the Law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed."

1. *The old dispensation described as the age "before the faith."* (1) This does not mean that there was no faith in a Redeemer in pre-Christian ages. To say otherwise is to say that there was no salvation in those ages. The apostle shows elsewhere that Abraham was saved as Christians are now saved (Rom. iv.). (2) Pious Israelites lived "before the faith came," because "the faith in him as really existent, or as Jesus, came with himself into the world." 2. *The wardship of the Law in the old dispensation.* The apostle identifies himself with the whole body of believers under the old economy, and represents them as under the strict surveillance of a rigorous janitor, who held them firmly under the discipline of the Law, with the design, however, that the very severity of their bondage might lead them to look believingly for escape to the Lord Jesus Christ. 3. *The design of this wardship.* "Shut up under the Law unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed." There was thus a gracious purpose in the very Law which was thus seen not to be "against the promises of God." The Law still brings conviction of sin and shuts men up to the faith of Christ. It is not to be supposed "that the faith had not been revealed" from the earliest ages of the world—for Christ was the promised Seed to Adam—but there was a veil upon men's minds till it was rent in the death of Christ. The faith revealed in due time was the faith of Christ incarnate.

IV. *THE LAW OUR SCHOOLMASTER FOR CHRIST.* "Wherefore the Law has become our tutor for Christ, that we might be justified by faith." Thus we see how "Christ becomes the end of the Law for righteousness." 1. *The symbolic ritual of the Law pointed expressly to Christ.* "Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us." The sacrifices had no meaning apart from their typical relationship to Christ. The Epistle to the Hebrews is the best commentary on the Book of Leviticus. The Law with its sacrifices was always leading the Israelites to the "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." 2. *The moral Law was always leading to Christ;* for it revealed sin, which deserved God's mighty condemnation. 3. *The spiritual insufficiency of the Law was its constant preparation of the soul for the faith of Christ.*

Ver. 26.—*The blessing of adoption.* The apostle has already traced justification to faith, the inheritance to faith, life to faith; now he traces adoption to faith. Believers are not children of Abraham merely, but sons of God. It is clear, then, that they are no longer children "in need of a schoolmaster." "For ye are all"—both Jews and Gentiles—"sons of God by faith in Christ Jesus."

I. *THE FOUNDATION OF SONSHIP.* 1. *It originates in the distinguishing grace of God.* We "are predestinated to the adoption of children" (Eph. i. 4—6). 2. *It is based on the incarnation of the eternal Son,* who became the Son of man that his people might become the sons of God. The Father loves them in his Son, and looks upon them with the complacency with which he regards his Son. 3. *It is based on the mediatorial work of Christ;* for, as it is in Christ "we have redemption through his blood," so in him we "have obtained the inheritance." Besides, God has sent forth his Son "to redeem them that were under the Law, that we might receive the adoption of sons" (ch. iv. 4, 5).

II. *THE INSTRUMENT OF ADOPTION—FAITH.* We become "sons of God by faith in Christ Jesus" (John i. 12). It is clear, then, that we do not become sons of God by nature. 1. We are "by nature children of wrath." 2. We only become sons on believing.

III. *THE ADOPTION IS COMMON TO ALL BELIEVERS, WHETHER JEW OR GENTILE.* It is not enjoyed in a varying degree by believers, as some seem to think, as if God regarded them with varying degrees of affection. "Beloved, now are we the sons of God." The adoption carries with it Divine favour, discipline, training, tenderness, conformity to the image of God's Son.

IV. *IT IS A PRIVILEGE CONCERNING WHICH BELIEVERS ARE NOT LEFT IN DOUBT;* for we receive the witness of the Spirit that we are children of God (Rom. viii. 16).

Ver. 27.—*The import and obligations of baptism.* "For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ."

I. *THE IMPORT OF BAPTISM INTO CHRIST.* 1. *It declares our union with Christ.* We are baptized into his death, so far as we partake of its benefits, and are like him

separated from the world and sin. We are by baptism separated from sin and devoted to Christ. 2. *The text does not imply that all baptized persons have been baptized into Christ.* Calvin well remarks that the apostle treats of the sacraments from two points of view. When he is arguing with hypocrites, he declares the emptiness of the outward symbols and the folly of confiding in them. But in dealing with the case of believers, while he attributes no false splendour to the sacraments, he refers emphatically to the inward fact signified by the outward ceremony. There is no warrant in this passage for the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, because the very persons here referred to were regenerated before they were baptized. Baptism followed upon their profession of faith in Christ.

II. THE OBLIGATIONS OF BAPTISM. They did "put on Christ." Baptized into his death and buried with him in baptism, they rise with him into newness of life. They put on Christ like a cloak. The beauty of holiness is to be upon them, because they are "predestinated to the very image of Christ." The text is very expressive. 1. *Christ is put on for a complete covering.* Not merely as a girdle to the loins, but to enfold the whole manhood of believers. The idea is not that of protection from the coldness of an outside world, but that of the full adornment of Christian character. Believers are so to put on Christ that the world may see Christ in the believer himself. 2. *Christ is put on for a constant covering.* Not as a beautiful robe to be worn on high days and holidays, but on every day, in every scene of human life. 3. *While believers are here represented as having put on Christ at their baptism, it is quite consistent for the apostle to say, "Put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. xiii. 12), and "Put on the new man" (Eph. iv. 24).* They are two sides of one great truth, representing in the one case a change that was complete from the very beginning, and in the other a change that is incomplete, but in process of still further development.

Ver. 28.—*The unity of believers.* "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is not male and female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."

I. IT IS AN ORGANIC UNITY. Believers are "one body in Christ" (Rom. xii. 4, 5); "one man;" "one new man" (Eph. ii. 15). The unity in question is no ecclesiastical unity; for it joins together those who are ecclesiastically separated, and it connects together the believers of all generations. 1. *It has a sevenfold relationship.* "There is one body, and one Spirit, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one hope of your calling, one God and Father of all" (Eph. iv. 4—6). 2. *It is created in Christ by the Holy Spirit.* It is Christ, not the Spirit, who "hath made both one" (Eph. ii. 14); and we, "being many, are made one body in Christ" (Rom. xii. 5). But wherever the Spirit is there is union with Christ. The indwelling of the Spirit is therefore the bond of unity in the Church.

II. IT IS A UNITY WHICH OBLITERATES OR IGNORES MANY WORLDLY OR NATURAL DISTINCTIONS. All distinctions, whether of condition, or nature, or sex, are in Christ lost sight of or forgotten. 1. *National distinctions.* "There is neither Jew nor Greek." This distinction meant much in pre-Christian ages. The Jews were God's peculiar people, blessed with great privileges and prepared for great destinies. The Greeks, representing the Gentile world, stood apart from the Jews—"aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers to the covenants of promise" (Eph. ii. 12). But Jew and Greek stand on exactly the same footing in the kingdom of God, possessed of equal privilege, equally sons of God, and equally heirs of God. Christ broke down the middle wall of partition that severed them for ages, and made them one commonwealth. 2. *Distinctions of human station.* "There is neither bond nor free." Slaves were excluded from certain rites of heathen worship. But Christ takes the slave by the hand and places him in his kingdom side by side with the free man. The largest body of practical counsel in the apostolic Epistles is directed to slaves. 3. *The distinction of sex.* "There is not male and female." The apostle does not touch the original subordination of the woman to the man, which is a still existing fact (1 Tim. ii. 11—14), but shows how, religiously regarded, men and women are equal. Their relation to Christ does not destroy the old fact, but causes it to be lost sight of. How true it is that Christianity alone has elevated women, has created the sentiment which destroys slavery everywhere, and creates a better understanding among the nations of the world!

Ver. 29.—*The heirs.* “And if ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.” Mark how the apostle moves from point to point.

I. BELIEVERS ARE CHRIST’S POSSESSION. They are so: 1. By gift. “Thine they were, and thou gavest them me” (John xvii. 6). 2. By purchase. “Ye are bought with a price” (1 Cor. vi. 20). 3. By conquest. “The people shall be willing in the day of thy power” (Ps. cx. 3). 4. By their own self-surrender. They are “a living sacrifice.” They have “committed themselves to him” (2 Tim. i. 12).

II. CHRIST’S PEOPLE ARE ABRAHAM’S SEED. Christ himself is Abraham’s Seed (ver. 16), and therefore they, as one with him in the mystical union, are Abraham’s seed.

III. THE HEIRSHIP OF PROMISE. They became heirs, not by any legal observances, but according to the promise made to Abraham. 1. The inheritance is the only one worth having. 2. It is the only one that can be kept for ever. 3. It is, unlike earthly riches or honours, within everybody’s reach. 4. It is the duty of heirs to live according to their prospects, to walk worthy of a Father’s house, and to behave like a brother to brethren.

### HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

Vers. 1—14.—*The bewitchery of Law.* Paul, having stated his position as dead to the Law and inspired by Christ, goes on in the present paragraph to appeal to the Galatians to free themselves from the bewitching power of Law, and to yield themselves to the faith in a crucified and now risen Christ, which alone secures justification and its cognate blessings. And here we notice—

I. HOW LAW CAN COMPETE SUCCESSFULLY WITH A CRUCIFIED SAVIOUR FOR THE HOMAGE OF THOUGHTLESS HEARTS. (Ver. 1.) Paul here declares that two attractive powers had been presented to the Galatians—a crucified Christ in his own preaching, and the Law in the preaching of the Judaizers; and, to his amazement, the Law had so bewitched them as to lead them to look for salvation to Law-keeping instead of to the Saviour. And yet it only brings out the fact that there is in Law and self-righteousness a bewitchery which is continually leading souls back to bondage. It seems so natural to establish *some* claim by Law-keeping and ceremony that poor souls are from time to time falling into legal hope and its delusions. The superstition, which is abroad now, and leads so many to ceremonials for salvation, rests upon this foundation. It is the fascination of an evil eye which is upon the foolish votaries; they fancy they can save themselves by Law, and maintain their self-complacency and pride all the time. But it is delusion pure and simple.

II. ALL THAT LAW CAN REALLY DO FOR SINNERS IS TO CONDEMN THEM. (Vers. 10, 13.) The position taken up by Law is this—to condemn every one who falls short of *perfect* obedience. No *partial* obedience will be entertained for a moment. “Every one that continueth not in *all* things which are written in the book of the Law to do them,” is by the Law “cursed.” This tremendous deliverance ought to be the death of all “legal hope.” The soul who continues to hope in the Law, after such a definite utterance only proclaims his foolishness. *One* breach of Law is sufficient to secure the curse. The Law maintains its demand for perfect obedience, and, if this be not rendered, it can do nothing but condemn. It becomes the more amazing that any after this could be bewitched by Law. Surely if the Law can only curse sinners, the sooner we look for salvation in some other direction than Law, the better. And to go back to Law-keeping from grace, in hope of acceptance, is clear retrogression.

III. JUSTIFICATION AND ITS COGNATE BLESSINGS CAN ONLY COME BY FAITH. (Vers. 2—9, 12, 14.) The Law in the nature of things cannot justify sinners. It has no means of doing so. But God in his grace has provided a way of justification. It is through the merits of his Son. And here we must remember that *imputation of merit* is the commonest fact of experience. There is not one of us who does not get a start in life and a consideration extended to us which are due to the merits of others, a respected parent or some deeply interested friend. We are surrounded with a halo of glory by virtue of the character of others. Their character helps us to a position and opportunity we could not otherwise obtain. It may be called a mere association of ideas, but it is



strictly the passing of merit over from man to man. In the same way Jesus Christ has come into our world, allied himself with our sinful race, merited consideration and acceptance by obedience to Law, even as far as death, and this merit of the Divine Man passes over to believers. In the Father's sight, therefore, we are regarded as just, notwithstanding all our sin. We have been justified through faith. But besides, the believers obtain the Spirit to dwell within them, so that a process of sanctification is set up within them as soon as justification takes place. And the indwelling Spirit may manifest his presence and power in wonderful works, as appears to have been the case with these Galatians (ver. 5). So that Divine grace not only secures the justification of all who trust in Jesus, but their sanctification and spiritual power as well. Wondrous blessings are thus the outcome of Divine grace, and the heritage of those who believe. What a change from having to endure the curse of Law!

IV. ABRAHAM ILLUSTRATES THE BENEFIT OF FAITH IN GOD AS CONTRASTED WITH RELIANCE ON LAW. (Vers. 6—9.) The legalists claimed Abraham as their father. One would have supposed that Abraham had been the greatest ceremonialist of the early dispensation. But the truth is that Abraham was justified and accepted by simply believing God when he promised a world-wide blessing through Abraham's seed. The blessing came to the patriarch through simple trust in God. Those who hoped in Law-keeping, therefore, were not the true followers of Abraham. It was only those who trusted God for salvation and blessing who walked in the patriarch's footsteps. Consequently, all the ceremonialism which tried to shelter itself under the wings of Abraham was a simple imposition! The "merit-mongers," as Luther calls them in his 'Commentary,' have thus no pretence of countenance from the case of Abraham. It was to simple trust in God he owed his standing before him. How needful, then, it is for us to shake ourselves free from every remnant of self-righteousness, and to look simply and implicitly to Christ alone! It is by faith we stand and live. The Christ who became the curse for us by hanging on a tree, calls us to trust him for acceptance and inspiration; and in trusting him we find the promise amply redeemed.—R. M. E.

Vers. 15—22.—*The covenant of promise.* Having taken up the case of Abraham as illustrating the necessity of faith, Paul proceeds to state the Abrahamic covenant as one of promise. The Mosaic covenant, promulgated four hundred and thirty years after, could not, he argues, disannul the previous covenant. It must have a supplementary purpose; and this he shows to be to drive the souls who have been made hopeless by the Law into the arms of the "faithful Promiser." The following lessons are suggested:—

I. THE COVENANT OF PROMISE MADE WITH CHRIST AS SEED OF ABRAHAM. (Vers. 15, 16.) We are too prone to contemplate the promises of God out of their relation to Christ. No wonder that they then seem incredible. They are too good news to be true. But the exceeding great and precious promises are all yea and amen in Christ (2 Cor. i. 20); they are promises made to Christ and secured by his obedience; and consequently they ought not to seem at any time incredible. Now, when God spoke to Abraham of a universal blessing being given through the patriarch's "Seed," it never suggested to Abraham any idea of merit upon his part. He simply hoped upon God's word, which would be fulfilled in due season. The Seed would convey the blessing. The old man's hope rested upon his Seed, the Christ whom the ages would reveal. The Seed might be meritorious, but Abraham felt that he himself was not. In the humility of felt helplessness, therefore, he trusted God, and found pardon and acceptance and inspiration through his trust. It is just here we must all begin. The Lord Jesus deserves the fulfilment of all the promises. The covenant of grace made with him by the Father has received a fulfilment of its conditions so far as he was concerned; and so he can claim the promises as no more than his due. Their guarantee is in his obedience unto death.

II. THE SINAITIC LAW COULD NOT DISANNUL THE COVENANT OF PROMISE. (Vers. 17, 18.) Four hundred and thirty years elapsed and, lo, another covenant is made with the seed of Abraham. At Sinai, and through the mediation of Moses and of angels, a "fiery Law" went forth from Heaven, and the question Paul answers here is what effect this latter covenant had upon the former. He adduces the fact that legal documents when once perfected are not disannulled by subsequent ones. The later

documents must proceed upon the validity and power of the preceding. Hence the Mosaic Law could not render the Abrahamic covenant of promise null and void. It must consist with and supplement the preceding. The promise made to the seed of Abraham remained in force, notwithstanding the thunders of Mount Sinai. Nay, the thunders of Sinai were, as we shall next see, to incline the people to accept the previous promise. There was no antithesis between promise and Law; but Law came to incline the people to embrace the promise. There was something more venerable and more sacred even than the covenant at Sinai, and this was the promises made to Abraham in Canaan. These were the well-head of Jewish privileges. The Jews had not been called to law-keeping and self-righteousness, but to promises exceeding great and precious to be won by their Messiah. It was to faith, not to ceremony, that their system really summoned them.

III. THE PURPOSE OF THE LAW. (Vers. 19—22.) Was the Sinaitic covenant, then, a work of supererogation? By no means. It was a grand instrument, when rightly regarded, to drive sinners into a Saviour's arms. What did it require? Perfect obedience. Did the people at Mount Sinai fancy they could render it? Nay; the utterance of the ten commandments in the great and terrible tones convinced them that they could not stand up in their own strength before such a holy God. Hence their *fright* from the mount (Exod. xx. 18). Hence their cry for the mediation of Moses (ver. 19). In a word, the effect of the publication of the Law was to overwhelm the people with a sense of their sin. This is the purpose of the Law. It is not to feed man's hope of claiming life by law-keeping; it is, on the contrary, to kill that hope and send him to God's free grace that he may be saved by faith in the promises. The Law is to secure our despair of self that we may build all our hope on the Saviour. What, then, were the ceremonies of Judaism? They were embodiments of the promises. The Judaizers said, "We are to be saved by observing these ceremonies;" but the truth was that the ceremonies were enacted to make the promises emphatic and to lead sinners away from self-righteousness to God and his mercy. The ceremonial Law was a pictorial gospel, to keep up the hearts of those whom the moral Law had reduced to despair; but the false teachers made the ceremonies saving, and so ignored the gospel they embodied. May we be kept from all analogous mistakes!—R. M. E.

Vers. 23—29.—*The Law-school and the home-coming.* Paul, in the present section, pursues the thought of the purpose of Law. It is the tutor to convey certain lessons to the soul and to secure thereby the soul's return to the Father and the home. Let us look at the interesting line of thought thus given.

I. THE LAW-SCHOOL. (Vers. 23, 24.) The idea was once entertained that the Law, as *παιδαγωγός*, meant the slave who was entrusted with the guidance of the child to the school of Christ. But this notion is now abandoned, and, as the superior slaves were often entrusted with the education of the child to a certain age, the idea which is now accepted from this passage is that the soul goes to the school of the Law, and learns from the Law the lessons which fit it for coming home to Christ. Christ is not the Schoolmaster to whom Law leads the soul, but is the elder Brother of the Divine family to whom the lessons of the schoolmaster, the Law, leads the enlightened soul. The Law-school is an institution of great strictness and severity. Hence we are represented here as "kept in ward under the Law" (Revised Version). Like one of the great barracks which are called euphoniously "public schools," and where, as in public prisons, the youths are for some hours daily confined, and out of which they are thankful to escape; so the Mosaic Law is meant to be the severe training-school which will make us relish ever so much the freedom and comfort of home.

II. THE BURDEN OF ITS TEACHING. (Ver. 24.) The lesson of the Law is personal unworthiness, the impossibility of our ever saving ourselves. The more we study the ten commandments, the more we enter into the spirit and meaning of the moral Law, the deeper must be our conviction that we cannot keep it perfectly, and so must be liable to its penalties. But the Jews, instead of holding hard to the teaching of the *moral* Law, turned their back upon it and betook themselves to the *ceremonial* Law as their hope of life. Their notion was that, though they might neglect the weightier matters of the Law, such as judgment, mercy, and faith, they were perfectly safe so long as they tithed the mint, the anise, and the cummin (Matt. xxiii. 23). Instead of learn-

ing Law's lesson and being "shut up to faith," they mistook the lesson altogether and shut themselves up to ceremony. The Law was meant to defeat self-righteousness; the pupils allowed it to minister to self-righteousness. Instead of being shut up to faith, they remained in the school of Law for ever and never got home. Now, every well-conducted school impresses upon its pupils the desirability of their getting beyond its lessons and its confinement. The broad liberty of manhood and of home lies in supposed sunlight beyond it, and the school training encourages the vision. So with God's Law; it is designed to create a longing for the liberty in Christ and the larger opportunities that liberty implies.

III. THE HOME-COMING. (Vers. 25, 26.) If we learn the true lesson from the Law, we are carried by it to the feet of Christ, and we seek justification by trusting him. Faith is thus the home-coming of the soul; and undoubtedly no schoolboy ever came whistling so joyfully home, even when his home-coming was the final one, as the soul does which has learned to trust and love Christ. Then the sense of imprisonment and confinement gives place to a sense of freedom. As children of God in Christ Jesus, we rejoice in the abundant liberty of home. Our education is so far finished when we have learned to hope in our elder Brother only. Then do we know what it is to be "at home" with God. The prodigal son enjoyed himself greatly at the father's banquet, and so do all of us; for we are all prodigals by nature, when by faith and repentance we come home to God.

IV. UNITY IN CHRIST. (Vers. 27, 28.) The home-coming is attended by the entertainment of the Christian spirit. By that spirit all caste-distinctions die. Having put on Christ, we do not look contemptuously on any, but hopefully on all. The Jew and the Greek forget their national differences and separations; the bond and the free do not dwell despairingly or proudly on the accident of birth; the man does not tyrannize over the woman, and neither will the Christian woman, when she secures her rights, tyrannize over the man; but each and all will rejoice in their unity in Christ. Christ thus proves himself to be the unifying element in the human race. Coming near to each, he brings each near to all, and establishes around his person the brotherhood of man.

V. FAITH ALSO INTRODUCES SOULS TO THE PRIVILEGES OF THE ABRAHAMIC FAMILY. (Ver. 29.) Unquestionably the Jews were the heirs of magnificent promises. But is it carnal Jews that are to get them? is it men who are only descended from Abraham according to the flesh? Nay; Abraham has a spiritual seed, and all who are Christ's through faith become children of Abraham. Paul thus proclaims a chosen generation, whose fellowship may be entered by faith and not by circumcision, by the Christian spirit and not by Jewish ceremony. This is better than converting the world to Judaism, to convert it to Christ, and through relationship to Christ to count kindred with Abraham. "We are the circumcision," as he says to the Philippian converts, "who worship God in the spirit, who rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh" (Phil. iii. 3). The Law teaches us a precious lesson if it sends us for salvation to Christ, and enables us to find in fellowship with our Lord the privileges of the chosen people becoming ours.—R. M. E.

Vers. 1—14.—*Appeal to experience and Scripture.* I. FOOLISHNESS OF THE GALATIANS SHOWN FROM THEIR OWN EXPERIENCE. 1. *Expression of astonishment in view of their first impressions of the cross.* "O foolish Galatians, who did bewitch you, before whose eyes Jesus Christ was openly set forth crucified?" Paul's address to Peter concluded with his presenting the dreadful supposition of Christ having died for nought. He with that turns to the Galatians, and calls to their recollection the memorable impression which the first presentation of Christ crucified had made on their minds. There had been, as it were, a localization of the cross among them. Christ had been so presented to them that preacher and time and place were all forgotten. There on Galatian soil was the cross erected; there was the Holy One and the Just taken and nailed to the tree; there his blood flowed forth for the remission of sins. And they were deeply affected, as if the crucifixion scene had passed before their eyes. It is a blessed fact that the evil of our nature is not insuperable—that there is in the cross what can act on it like a spell. Even the greatest sinners have been arrested and entranced by the eye of the Crucified One. It is, on the other hand, a serious fact that

evil can be presented to us in a fascinating form. Here the Galatians are described as those who had been bewitched. It was as if some one had exerted an evil spell on them. His evil eye had rested on them and held them so that they could not see him by whose crucifixion they had formerly been so much affected. And the apostle wonders who it could be that had bewitched them. Who had been curious of the influence which the Crucified One had obtained over them? What false representations had he made? What flattering promises had he held out? Such a one had great guilt on his head; but they also were chargeable with foolishness in allowing themselves to be bewitched by him. The Galatians were by no means stupid; they were rather of quick perception. They had the strong emotional qualities of the Celtic nature; their temptation was sudden change of feeling. They were foolish in yielding to their temptation, in not subjecting their feelings to the guidance of reason, in not using the Divine helps against their being bewitched. And the apostle, in charging home foolishness on them, would have them recall what the cross had once been in their eyes, in order to break the present spell of evil. 2. *The one admission he asks of them in order to prove their foolishness.* "This only would I learn from you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the Law, or by the hearing of faith?" He felt that he had such a hold on them from their past experiences that he could have asked of them many admissions. With one, however, he will be content. This had reference to the reception of the Spirit. The gospel dispensation was the dispensation of the Spirit. It was by the sacrifice of Christ that the Spirit was really obtained. It was soon after the offering of that sacrifice that the Spirit was poured out, as though liberated from previous restraints. The great blessing, then, of that dispensation, obtained it by the works of the Law, or by the hearing of faith? The Law is to be understood in the sense of the Mosaic Law, which the Judaists sought to impose on Gentile Christians. The Law and faith are here placed in opposition. Works are the characteristic of the Law; hearing is the characteristic of faith. Was it, then, by Law-working that they had received the Spirit? When would it quantitatively and qualitatively have sufficed for their receiving the Spirit? Was it not the case, too, that the great majority of them in the Galatian Churches had not been under the Law? They had not been circumcised, and yet the Spirit had been received by them. Was it not, then, by the hearing which belongs to faith? They had not tediously to elaborate a Law-righteousness. They had not to work for a righteousness at all. They had simply to *hear* in connection with the preaching of the gospel. They had to listen to the proclamation of a righteousness elaborated for them. And while their faith was imperfect, and could not be in itself the ground of their justification, they had, as perfectly justified, received the Spirit. 3. *Two points in which their foolishness was shown at its height.* "Are ye so foolish?" (1). *They belied the beginning they had made.* "Having begun in the Spirit, are ye now perfected in the flesh?" They began by renouncing the flesh, by confessing that, with the weak elements in their nature, they never could arrive at perfection. In despair of the flesh, then, and in order to be delivered from its weakness, they cast themselves upon the Spirit. They called in Divine help against their sinful tendencies. This was the right beginning to make. And having thus begun, they should have gone on, in dependence on the help of the Spirit, toward perfection. But they were proving untrue to the beginning they had made. They were going back to the flesh which they professed to have left behind as a source of dependence. They were now saying that it, forsooth, with all its weakness, was able to bring about their perfection. (2) *They stultified their sufferings.* "Did ye suffer so many things in vain? if it be indeed in vain." It is to be inferred that they suffered persecution. They suffered many things, though of their sufferings we have no record. They suffered for Christ, and it may have been for liberty in him. That gave a noble character to their sufferings, and promised a glorious reward. But now, with their changed relation to Christ, those sufferings had lost their character. There was no longer a Christian halo around them. They were simply a *blunder*, what might have been avoided. They could not hope, then, for the reward of the Christian confessor or martyr. The apostle is, however, unwilling to believe that the matter has ended with them. In the words which he appends, "if it be indeed in vain," he not only leaves a loophole of doubt, but makes an appeal to them not to throw away that which they had nobly won. 4. *The one admission reverted to with special reference to the miraculous operations of the Spirit.* "He therefore

that supplieth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, doeth he it by the works of the Law, or by the hearing of faith?" It was God who supplied the Spirit to them. He especially supplied the power of working miracles. It is taken for granted that miracles were still being wrought in connection with the Galatian Churches. The miraculous operations of the Spirit are not more remarkable in themselves than his ordinary operations; but they were more exceptional. Being more easily appreciated, too, they were especially fitted to attract attention to Christianity, and to commend it to them that were outside. And as the Galatians had thrown doubt on their relation to Christianity, he very naturally meets them by making his appeal to the evidence of miracles. Did God give any token of his approval to those who were identified with the works of the Law—to the Judaizing teachers? Was there any exceptional power possessed by them? Did not God work miracles through those who were identified with the hearing of faith—through the preachers of the gospel? And was that not conclusive evidence that he was with them in their teaching?

II. THE CASE OF ABRAHAM WITH REFERENCE TO JUSTIFICATION. 1. *He was justified by faith. Scripture statement.* "Even as Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness." There could be no question regarding the high authority of Abraham's example. And the best way to deal with it was in connection with Scripture. What, then, was the Scripture account of Abraham's justification? In Gen. xv. 6 it is said, "He believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteousness." It is not "He was circumcised, and that was reckoned unto him for righteousness." There is no mention of his justification in connection with his circumcision. Indeed, he was justified before he was circumcised. Abraham's case, then, tells against justification by the works of the Law. On the other hand, he was a signal example of the hearing of faith. He heard God saying to him, "Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee;" and he went forth, leaving country and kindred and home, not knowing whither he went. He heard God saying that he should have a seed numerous as the stars of heaven, and it was his crediting this as God's word, though it conflicted with all human experience, that was reckoned unto him for righteousness. Again, he heard God commanding him to offer up the son of the promise, and, notwithstanding all the difficulties it involved, he acted upon what he heard. It is true that this was personal righteousness so far as it went. It was the right disposition towards God. Abraham approved himself before God by his faith, and by his works which evidenced his faith. But it is not said that *this* was his righteousness. It was not meritorious righteousness; it was simply faith grasping the Divine word which made him righteous. It was imperfect faith, and therefore could not be the ground of his justification. But the language is that "it was reckoned unto him for righteousness." Though his faith was not meritorious, was imperfect, it was reckoned unto him as though he had fulfilled the whole Law. From the moment of his hearing in faith he was fully justified.

*Inference.* "Know therefore that they which be of faith, the same are sons of Abraham." The contention of the Judaists would be that the keepers of the Law were the true sons of Abraham. The apostle regards this Scripture as a disproof of their position. Abraham was notably a believer. He heard God speaking to him on various occasions, and it was his humbly distrusting his own judgment and listening to the voice of God for which he was commended. It was, therefore, to be known, to be regarded as indisputable, that believers, those who have faith as the source of their life, and not those who are of the works of the Law, are the true sons of Abraham. 2. *The promise on which his faith rested. Scripture with preface.* "And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the Gentiles by faith, preached the gospel beforehand unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed." The Scripture is here put in place of the Author of Scripture, and foresight is ascribed to it which is properly to be ascribed to God. The foresight of God was shown in the form in which the promise was given. It had nothing of Jewish exclusiveness about it, but was suitable to gospel times. Indeed, it could be described as the gospel preached beforehand unto Abraham. The language recalls our Lord's words, "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it, and was glad." It was the promise of blessing without any restriction of contents. It was the promise of blessing to all nations. There was thus the same ring about it that there was about the angelic message when Jesus was

born: "Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people." And God, having in view the extension of the blessing to the Gentiles, promised it in Abraham. He did not promise it in Moses, who was identified with the Law; but he promised it in Abraham, who was characteristically a believer. The being in him points to Abraham, not only as a believer, but as holding the position of the father of believers. He was thus more than an example of the mode of justification. It was in him that the blessing was given, that the connection was formed between faith and justification. It is as his seed, or sons, that it is to be obtained by us. *General inference.* "So then they which be of faith are blessed with the faithful Abraham." He has already shown who the sons of Abraham are, viz. "they which be of faith." Founding, then, upon that, as well as upon what he has just quoted, his conclusion is that believers are sharers with Abraham in his blessing. He not only stood in the relation of father to believers: as a believer himself, he was blessed. He had especially the blessing of justification, which has been referred to. And along with him do all believers enjoy especially the blessing of justification. (1) *A curse lies on the workers of the Law.* "For as many as are of the works of the Law are under a curse." So far from enjoying the blessing, they are under the curse. Having laid down this proposition, he establishes it in the most conclusive manner. Even the form of the syllogism is apparent. *Major proposition.* "For it is written, Cursed is every one which continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the Law, to do them." The words are a quotation from Deut. xxvii. 26. They form the conclusion of the curses pronounced from Mount Ebal. The Law requires obedience to be rendered to it in every precept. And it requires obedience to all time. If a person kept all the precepts and transgressed only one, or if he transgressed one at last after having kept all for a lifetime, he would thereby be placed in a wrong relation to the Law, and would be subject to its curse, as really as though he had been a flagrant and lifelong transgressor. *All are cursed who do not render whole and continued obedience to the Law.* *Minor proposition.* "Now that no man is justified by the Law in the sight of God, is evident." Of the major proposition he did not need to offer any proof, because it is Scripture; but this minor proposition, in his singular love for proof, especially from Scripture, he will not assume. It therefore becomes the conclusion of another syllogism. *Major proposition of second syllogism.* "For, The righteous shall live by faith." This is cited from Hab. ii. 4, and is also cited in Rom. i. 17 and Heb. x. 38. The spirit of the Old Testament passage is given. The reference was to a season of danger from the Chaldeans. An announcement of deliverance was made in plain terms. "Behold," it is added, "his soul [either of the Chaldean or of the heedless Jew] which is lifted up is not upright in him;" i.e. priding himself in his own sufficiency, he was destitute of righteousness, and therefore it was to be presumed, from the theocratic standpoint, would perish; "but the just shall live by faith;" i.e. relying on promised help, he would be righteous, and thus obtain the theocratic blessing of deliverance. The New Testament bearing is obvious. Relying on Divine righteousness, he is righteous, and thus has title to life. Formally, what the apostle lays down here is that *none but believers are justified.* *Minor proposition of second syllogism.* "And the Law is not of faith; but, He that doeth them shall live in them." The principle of faith is reliance on the promise in order to obtain a title to life. The principle of the Law, as brought out in the quotation from Lev. xviii. 5, is reliance on our own doing of all the precepts in order to obtain a title to life. Thus *all doers must be excluded from the class of believers.* And thus, by formal proof, is the minor proposition of the first syllogism established, viz. No man is justified by the Law in the sight of God. And, it being established, the conclusion of that syllogism follows, which is given in the first clause of the tenth verse, "As many as are of the works of the Law are under a curse." (2) *How the blessing is enjoyed by believers. Redemption from the curse.* "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the Law, having become a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." The Jews (with whom Paul identifies himself) were under the curse of the Law for many precepts transgressed, and transgressed many times. They found a Redeemer from the curse in Christ, who redeemed them by becoming a curse for them, i.e. on their behalf, and, by implication at least, in their stead. The transference of the curse, as of sin, was quite familiar to the Jewish mind. He not only became cursed, but abstractly and more strongly he became a

curse; he became *the* receptacle of the curse of the Law. And in his great fondness for Scripture exhibited in the whole of this paragraph, the apostle points out that this was in accordance with words found in Deut. xxi. 23, "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." The words did not refer to crucifixion, which was not a Jewish mode of putting to death; but referred to the hanging of the body of a criminal on a tree after death as a public spectacle. The words were applicable to Christ, because he was made a public spectacle, not only in hanging on a tree, but in being nailed to a tree. The infamy which Christ was subjected to from men was a very subordinate element in his death. There was especially the wrath which he endured from God, the hiding of the Father's face from him as the Representative of sinners. This was the curse (all curses in one) by bearing which he became Redeemer. *Twofold aim of redemption. Extension of the blessing to the Gentiles.* "That upon the Gentiles might come the blessing of Abraham in Christ Jesus." The effect of the endurance of the curse was the opening of the blessing to the Gentiles. The Law, in its precepts and curse, no longer presented an obstacle. The whole meaning of the Law was realized; the whole curse of the Law was exhausted. So complete was the satisfaction rendered, that there could be no supplementing it by works of the Law. All that was needed was faith to receive the satisfaction presented in Christ, and not in the Law, for justification. Thus did the blessing attain its world-wide character, announced to Abraham. Gentiles had simply to believe, like Abraham, in order to be blessed in and with Abraham. *Reception of the Spirit.* "That we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith." Not only was there the extension of the blessing enjoyed among the Jews, which was eminently justification (as appears from the whole strain of this paragraph); but this extension was signalized by the sending of a richer blessing. This was the realization of the promise of the Spirit. In this the Jews were sharers. All alike were recipients of the Spirit, simply through faith. And thus the apostle, after a remarkable chain of arguments, comes back to the point from which he started.—R. F.

Vers. 15—22.—*Promise and Law.* From this point the apostle has a softened tone toward the Galatians. He deals with them now more in the way of instruction and counsel than of correction and rebuke.

I. THE PROMISE WAS NOT INVALIDATED BY THE LAW. 1. *Human analogy.* "Brethren, I speak after the manner of men: Though it be but a man's covenant, yet when it hath been confirmed, no one maketh it void, or addeth thereto." When the apostle professes to speak after the manner of men, he is not thinking of himself as having to come down from the spiritual standpoint, but of God as greater than man, and of his having to use a certain freedom in arguing as he does from a man's covenant to God's covenant. We are not to understand "covenant" in the sense of "testament." It is an engagement under which one comes to another with or without engagement on the part of that other. To be thoroughly valid a covenant must be confirmed. Testimony must be given that an engagement has been really and fully entered into. The signing of a legal document is a common mode of confirmation. We read frequently in old times of confirmation by oath. When a covenant has been confirmed, no one maketh it void or addeth thereto. Meyer says, "no third party;" but the language is applicable even to the person who comes under engagement. He is not free to set his engagement aside or to modify it by additions. It is different from the case of a testator while he is still living. In signing a will he has come under no engagement to any one, and is free to cancel it or to add a codicil. But when an engagement has been entered into it can neither be set aside nor modified by additions, but stands to be carried out to the letter. 2. *Two points to be taken into account in applying the analogy.* (1) *The covenant with Abraham was of the nature of a promise.* "Now to Abraham were the promises spoken." This brings down the general idea of covenant to a special kind. Promise is not a contracting for benefit and with conditions. In its purest form, as employed by the apostle, it is an engagement to bestow blessing, without conditions attached. It is here used in the plural number, not because distinct blessings were promised, but because the same blessing was repeatedly promised, with variety of form and circumstance. (2) *The covenant of promise was made, not only with Abraham, but included Christ.* "And to his seed. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many: but as of one,

And to thy seed, which is Christ." With resemblance in form to the rabbinical style of argument, this cannot be said to have anything of rabbinical feebleness. The point is, that the idea of plurality might have been brought out in the form given to the promise. It might have been said, "And to thy descendants," thus excluding reference to one in particular. Instead of that it was said, "And to thy seed," which is applicable, though not necessarily limited in application, to one. The apostle, having pointed this out, declares (does not argue) that there was an intended application to Christ. As he was the Seed of the woman, so also was he the Seed of Abraham. The bearing of the declaration is, that, Christ having been included in the promise, it had to be made good to him as well as to Abraham. 3. *Application of the analogy.* (1) *Position.* "Now this I say: A covenant confirmed beforehand by God, the Law, which came four hundred and thirty years after, doth not disannul, so as to make the promise of none effect." So far as God was concerned, the promise had full validity as soon as it was announced (Gen. xiii. 15). So far as Abraham was concerned, it was confirmed by the fire passing between the pieces of the sacrifice (Gen. xv. 17), and by oath (Gen. xxii. 18), and also by repetition (Gen. xvii. 8). It was also confirmed to the other patriarchs (Gen. xxvi. 4; xxviii. 4). That being the case, it could not be set aside by the Law, which was four hundred and thirty years later. If it had been a covenant *with conditions*, then it might have been inferred that, the conditions not having been complied with, the Law had been introduced. Thus the Law would virtually have displaced the covenant. But the apostle's position is that the covenant, being of the nature of promise, there could be no displacing of it by the Law. "So as to make the promise of none effect" comes in as qualifying the assertion. Whatever covenant the Law might have displaced, it could never displace a covenant of pure promise. (2) *Argument by which it is supported.* "For if the inheritance is of the Law, it is no more of promise: but God hath granted it to Abraham by promise." The blessing is described as the inheritance, which had a reference beyond the land of Canaan to the heavenly Canaan, and even to the whole earth, which is now to be regarded as the earthly Canaan. If the inheritance was associated with the Law, then it must never have been promised. For promise, according to the apostle's understanding of it, is engagement to bless without conditions. But the inheritance never could be associated with the Law. For it was authenticated that God freely promised it to Abraham. By this promise, then, to speak after the manner of men, God was bound. He was not in the position of a testator who could cancel or add fresh clauses. Nor was he in the position of one who had made a covenant with conditions which had not been complied with. But having given an unconditional promise, he could not under any circumstances withdraw it.

II. **FOUR POINTS IN WHICH THE LAW DIFFERED FROM THE PROMISE.** "What then is the Law?" 1. *It was additional to the promise.* "It was added because of transgressions." It was never intended to stand alone. It was simply intended to be an adjunct to the promise already given and still continuing in force. "It was added because of transgressions." There is not yet brought into view the purpose which the Law served with reference to transgressions, checking them, making them clear. It is simply indicated that the introduction of the Law was necessitated by the disposition to transgress. There is the same teaching here as by our Lord with regard to the law of divorce. It was not, he said, so from the beginning; but was necessitated by the hardness of men's hearts. So, with regard to the Law and its rigour, it was not so from the beginning. God began with promise; and it was only when it was not sufficiently responded to that the Law was introduced, not as a substitute, but as an addition to the promise. 2. *It was a temporary addition.* "Till the seed should come to whom the promise hath been made." As it was an after institution, so it was never intended to last. It had not the permanence which belonged to the promise. It had reference to the coming of the Seed to whom the promise had been made. That was the great reason of its existence. There is not yet brought into view the purpose which the Law served with reference to the coming Seed. It is simply indicated that it was so related to Christ that, when he came to receive the promise, it was necessarily done away as an institution. 3. *It was given mediately by God.* "And it was ordained through angels." The connection of the angels with the giving of the Law was prominent in Jewish tradition. It is remarkable that there is no mention of them in the historical account in Exodus. They are thus introduced in Deut. xxxiii. 2: "The Lord came from Sinai,



and rose up from Seir unto them: he shined forth from Mount Paran, and he came with ten thousand of his saints: from his right hand went a fiery law for them." The ten thousand of his holy ones were doubtless angels. So in Ps. lxxviii. 17 it is said, "The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels; the Lord is among them as in Sinai, in the holy place." This fact was so recognized among the Jews that Stephen could tell them that they had received the Law by the disposition of angels. Their connection with it was not confined to accompanying the Lord, or ordering the miraculous accompaniment. But the language in Hebrews—"the word spoken by angels"—taken along with the language here, points to them as the instruments employed by God in delivering the Law. This circumstance is introduced by the apostle here, in keeping with the context, not to glorify the Law, but to show that God stood at a distance from men in the giving of the Law. It was something which was in a manner foreign to him. Therefore, in giving it he did not come immediately into contact with men, but interposed angels on his side. 4. *It was mediately received by men.* "By the hand of a mediator." This was Moses. "I stood between the Lord and you." In the giving of the Law great stress was laid on the fact that the people were not fit to draw near to God to receive it from him. Therefore a mediator was interposed on man's side. *Added comment on double mediation.* "Now a mediator is not a mediator of one; but God is one." It is said that there have been as many as four hundred and thirty different interpretations of these words. If that speaks to extraordinary labour bestowed on the interpretation of the words, it also speaks to extraordinary misdirection of labour. It can be said that now there is substantial unanimity of interpretation. The first statement does not refer to Moses nor to Christ, but to a mediator generally; and means that a mediator implies two parties, between whom the mediation takes place. The second statement, that God is one, has often been taken to mean that God is one of the two parties, the children of Israel being the other party, which is pointless for the purpose of the argument. It means that God is mediatorless in the promise. In the Law, God kept at a distance, interposing mediators on his side and interposing also a mediator on man's side. But in the promise God came immediately into contact with Abraham, employing no mediator, but speaking to him as to a friend.

III. THE LAW WAS NOT ANTAGONISTIC TO THE PROMISE. "Is the Law then against the promises of God? God forbid." In keeping with what has been said, God identifies himself with the promises, and not with the Law. They were not, however, antagonistic. 1. *The Law did not supply the condition of the blessing.* "For if there had been a Law given which could make alive, verily righteousness would have been of the Law." In the case supposed (righteousness being of the Law, and so making alive), the Law would have been antagonistic to the promise. There would have been an antagonistic mode of justification. The blessing would have been put on the ground of obedience to the Law. The apostle repudiates that supposition, without any disparagement of the Mosaic Law. It had a perfectness of its own. If there had been a Law fitted to give life, he strongly asserts that would have been the Mosaic Law. It was raised above all mere human law. It presented an admirable idea of righteousness. That it did not actually effect righteousness was simply because that was impossible. 2. *The Scripture represented men as all shut up to the obtaining of the blessing simply by faith.* "Howbeit the Scripture hath shut up all things under sin, that the promise by faith in Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe." Scripture is not the Law, but rather that which holds Law and promise in harmony. The office ascribed to Scripture is peculiar. It has placed, not only all men but all things (man's surroundings) under sin as gaoler. In this imprisonment there was not finality. On the contrary, it was with the view of magnifying the promise. Not by doing the Law, but by believing the promise, is the blessing attained. As the promise was made good to Jesus Christ, and was thus identified with him, faith in him, as obtaining the blessing for us, has become the simple and all-sufficient principle of the religious life.—R. F.

Vers. 23—29.—*Before and after faith.* I. BEFORE FAITH CAME. "But before faith came." The faith which is here brought into prominence is that which was historically manifested when Christ came. Faith existed before Christianity, as is evident from the eleventh of Hebrews. There was trust in the Divine word. But the attitude toward Christ was that of expectancy. "We who had before hoped in Christ."

It had been faith along with the observance of the Mosaic Law. But when the gospel of salvation was preached, it was faith, pure and simple, on Christ. 1. *The state of God's people under the Law.* "We were kept in ward under the Law, shut up." They were wards of the Law. A strict watch was kept over them, as those who could not manage themselves. This went the length of their being in custody. (1) *There were manifold restrictions.* The limits were greatly narrowed within which they were free to act. Even their common life was encompassed with ceremonial regulations. However good these were, there was this to be said, that they were outwardly imposed. And they had the effect of multiplying the occasions of offence. They made many things sins which were not sins in themselves. There was thus a heavy pressure laid on the life. The moral Law, too, came in with its oppressive "Thou shalt not." (2) *There was the feeling of helplessness produced.* The Law represented the Divine requirement. As a revelation of what God required, it raised a very high ideal. God was to be loved with the whole soul, and a man's neighbour as himself. But at the same time, it did not bring with it *strength* for the attainment of this ideal. It, therefore, sometimes even stimulated the sinful life. It excited desires which it had not power to quell. And thus it worked towards despondency. (3) *There was the feeling of guilt produced.* The Law revealed what *ought* to have been attained; but, revealing at the same time the wide distance between the ideal raised and the actual attainment, instead of being a witness of its high ends as accomplished, it became an accuser. (4) *There were appeals to fears.* Its "Thou shalt not" was accompanied with a threat. There was a curse pronounced on the breaking of every one of its requirements. (5) *There was the feeling of condemnation produced.* The Law, in showing them their guilt, showed them also to be condemned sinners, actually lying under the curse. Thus the outcome of its working was the eliciting of the cry, "O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me out of the body of this death?" 2. *The goal intended for them.* "Unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed." It is to be remembered that the Law existed alongside of the promise, to which it was simply an addition. It is to be remembered, also, that the ceremonial part of the Law had promise largely mixed up with it, many of the types being really promises. And, so far as the promise was concerned, there could be, in the religious life of those times, a feeling of liberty in the enjoyment of forgiveness and in the hope of the attainment of their ideal. There was grace, too, in the heart of the Law. It was a disciplinary institution, preparatory to Christianity. It was with a view to the people of God being brought into a higher state, into the freer relation of faith, which was to be revealed when Christ came. *Illustration.* "So that the Law hath been our tutor to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith." The pedagogue (formerly translated "schoolmaster," now "tutor") was one who got his name from leading the child to school. He had the responsible office of superintending the education of the child, and also his morals and manners. He had strictly to regulate and watch over the employments and deportment of the child, and he was armed with the power of punishment. The pedagogic function is what belongs to every parent. He has himself or by deputy to educate his child, physically, intellectually, morally, and spiritually. The restrictions he has to lay on the employment of his time, thoughts, energies, are not agreeable to him, but they are with a view to his being of age. The Law is thus laid upon him that it may be ultimately within him, and that he may do that which is right and proper with no sense of bondage. The people of God were under the Law as under a pedagogue. They were treated as children, and had their duty minutely prescribed to them and their fears appealed to. This produced a sense of bondage, but it was that by-and-by they might the better welcome Christ and those higher influences he was to bring with him. The feeling of guilt and condemnation which the Law produced was that Christ might be longed for in his justifying merit to be received through faith.

II. NOW THAT FAITH IS COME. "But now that faith is come." 1. *Christian emancipation.* "We are no longer under a tutor." We are no longer under the discipline of the Mosaic institution. We do not need rules outwardly imposed on us, now that the higher Christian influences are operative in us. We are absolutely freed from the ceremonial Law, which received its fulfilment in Christ. The moral Law could never be called Mosaic, rather it was that round which the whole Mosaic institution was gathered. We are freed from it as the ground of our justification or condemnation. But

It is still needed to hold up before us higher ideas of righteousness. It is still needed to work in us deeper conviction of sin. It is still needed to keep us to the true source of our security. But what thus disciplines us, is the Law as it has received its highest exhibition in the cross of Christ. From it, as connected with the Mosaic institution, we are freed. 2. *Christian sonship.* (1) *The relation described.* "For ye are all sons of God." Gentiles as well as Jews are sons of God. We are not in the relation of slaves, without any feeling of freedom. Neither are we in the relation of servants, with such freedom as belongs to them. But we are in the freest relation of sons of God. Neither are we mere children, but we are sons that have come of age. That does not mean that we are to leave our Father's house. "The servant goeth away; the son abideth ever." We are independent, not in being liberated from our Father's control, but in having our Father's will so much within our heart that we act according to it without the need of rules being imposed on us. (2) *How the relation is formed.* "Through faith." *We are not sons of God by virtue of our living in a Christian land.* Multitudinism is alien to Christianity. We cannot be Christians merely in the mass. The state, whatever it has to do with religion, cannot relieve us of the responsibility of acting for ourselves. *We are not sons of God by virtue of our connection with godly parents.* There is a certain law of heredity in religion. "The unfeigned faith that is in thee; which dwelt first in thy grandmother Lois, and thy mother Eunice; and, I am persuaded, in thee also." The promise is to us and to our children; therefore there is encouragement to use the means. Still, all that parents can do is to act upon their children by good advice and example and prayer. They cannot relieve their children, any more than the state its subjects, of the responsibility of thinking and acting for themselves. *We are not sons of God by virtue of our having been baptized.* Baptism, as we shall presently see, is an important Christian rite. It should be attended with regenerating grace. Only, when there is no evidence of regeneration in the life, it is vain to be satisfied with baptism. It should be used simply as an argument for taking action in accordance with it. *We are not sons of God by virtue of our being members of a Christian Church.* There has been, in this case, examination by a representative of the Church, and admission has been granted; but this is not to be rested upon. Man is not the lord of our conscience. Every one must judge for himself as to the evidences of his being a child of God. And if he was not a child of God before admission, the fact of his admission will not make him one. He is just presumably what he was before. The Church has no magical virtue. It can assist men in becoming children of God, but it cannot do more than assist. And when Church connection does not benefit, it will certainly add to condemnation. *But we are sons of God through faith.* This is the instrument by which we become sons of God. We take action for ourselves. Our souls lay hold upon Christ. We place our dependence on his finished work, and we are not only justified, but are adopted into the family of God. (3) *Causal element in which our sonship subsists.* "In Christ Jesus." Christ alone can make us sons of God. Our rulers cannot make us sons of God. Our parents cannot make us sons of God. A rite like baptism cannot make us sons of God. Even the Church cannot make us sons of God. Christ alone can. He is not the means, but the *efficient cause*. It is in him that our sonship is originated and is maintained. (4) *Sign of our sonship.* "For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ." By insisting on faith the apostle has supplied a counteractive to superstitious ideas of baptism. But this shows how much importance he attached to it. Baptized into Christ, they did put on Christ. And from the connection it is to be understood that they so put on Christ in baptism as to stand in the same relation to God in which Christ stands to God. 3. *Christian equality.* (1) *What it is.* It sometimes matters very essentially in whose hands is the advocacy of a doctrine. In the hands of the communists, who have the modern intellectual activity without any hold upon the everlasting principles of religion, there is no more dangerous doctrine than that of equality. As used by them, it would lead to complete anarchy, disturbing altogether the present order and putting no stable order in its stead. It is already, in one or other of its phases, producing a feeling of insecurity among the supporters of old institutions, extending to that of monarchy. Paul, also, is an advocate of equality; but he was held by everlasting truth and love. And, in his hands, equality is a safe doctrine, which would indeed be the salvation of society, curing present canker and alienation, and

Introducing a blessed order such as would realize the golden age. *As men we are essentially equal.* "God hath made of one blood all nations of men that dwell upon the earth." We lay aside this and that and all the other unlikenesses, till we come to that which refuses to be taken away. And this, we say, is man, the same as to kind under all conditions. The apostle pointed to the everlasting common humanity, when he quoted to the Athenians the words, "For we are also his offspring." Adam, the source of humanity, is declared to be the son of God, *i.e.* by constitution. "Which was the son of Adam, which was the son of God." What Christianity does is, not to add a new element of sonship to our constitution, but to bring us back into the reality and forward into the full flood of this relationship. It is after establishing our sonship in Christ that Paul proceeds here to lay down his doctrine of Christian equality. And by it he means that, in regard to this most essential element, there are *no classes, no distinctions.* There are not some in the position of superiors and others in the position of inferiors, but all are placed on the same platform, and that the highest platform of sonship. All are sons of God, therefore all are equal. (2) *Specimens of earthly distinctions which are obliterated in Christ.* "There can be neither Jew nor Greek." The Greek is the weaker member in this coupling, but he was by no means to be despised. As there was greater natural inventiveness among the descendants of Cain than among the descendants of Seth, so there was greater intellectual force and culture among the Greeks than among the Jews. Not to speak of their art, their poetry, their philosophy, their language itself, slowly formed, was a magnificent product of mind. Significant of a widespread Greek influence, that language had mastered even the Jews. The mob at Jerusalem were prepared to hear a Greek oration from Paul, only they gave the more silence when he spoke in the Jewish vernacular. And, what was more, the Greek language was chosen by God as the medium of conveying the Christian revelation. And yet the Jew, thus inferior, was of more consequence than the Greek. In the wise purposes of God, which looked beyond one nation, the Jew was raised to very high religious privilege, and any Greek could only share in the same privilege by being naturalized as a Jew. But what was Jewish was at best only *external* and subject to removal, and was actually removed when the Divine purposes were matured. And now, in and through Christ, the universal Mediator, the Gentile is as near and dear to God as is the Jew. We are so much accustomed to the Gentile being in Christian privilege that it is more to the point now to say that the Jew is as near and dear to God as is the Gentile. Under Christianity there is no privileged nation. In Colossians it is said that there is neither barbarian nor Scythian in Christ. The Scythians were those who appeared barbarians to the barbarians. In Christ there is no barbarian far down in the scale of civilization. There is not even the Scythian, down at the very bottom and only too readily despised by the despised. Christ does not belong to the white skin; but even under the black skin and crisp hair and imperfect configuration there may be the same consciousness of sonship that the finest of Europeans has, in Christ. There is a common ground, upon which all peoples and nations and tribes can meet, deep down below all distinctions of colour and figure and civilization, which thus appear as unessential. "There can be neither bond nor free." There can be no greater diversity in social position than between the bondman and the freeman. It may be said to be infinite; for the freeman has rights—rights to bestow his labour where he thinks he can get most for it, rights to demand redress if he thinks himself injured, to be judged if he is complained of. But the bondman has no rights, being classed as a chattel. Cato, censor-general of morals, a Roman more virtuous than the Romans, gives written advice to the farmers "to sell worn-out iron implements, old slaves, sick slaves, and other odds and ends that have no further use on the farm!" But, though thus put out of the ranks and trampled upon by men, he could be conscious in his own mind of his rights as a man, and, what availed more, through the gospel of the grace of God preached to and received by him, he, a man, the equal at bottom of his master and of that master's master, the august Cæsar,—he could be ranked as a son of God, without any super-added badge of inferiority, as much a son of God as Paul himself. There is a most touching, most beautiful exemplification of this in Paul's brief Epistle to Philemon. Paul takes as much interest in Onesimus, a runaway slave, converted by him at Rome, as though he had been a noble born. He calls him his very heart, and, more than a servant, even a brother beloved to Philemon, both in the flesh and in the Lord. The

gap between men in respect of social standing, between the sovereign and the common subject of the realm, between the nobleman and the peasant, between the rich and the poor, between master and servant, sometimes so impresses us that we do not think of their being equal at all, they seem beings of a different order; but in Christ there is no difference; there is a great absolute equality before God, who is no respecter of persons, and the man with a Christian heart under a rough exterior is full brother to the Christian gentleman, and the servant-girl who loves her Bible is of as much account as her Christian mistress. Paul says to slaves, wanting to be set free, "For he that is called in the Lord, being a servant, is the Lord's freeman; likewise also he that is called, being free, is Christ's servant." It has been made out of this, not that there are no conditions in Christ, but, what also puts us on an equality, that all conditions are possessed in Christ. "If a man is a slave, he may be free in Christ. If free, he may have the joy of utter submission to an absolute master in Christ. If you and I are lonely, we may feel all the delights of society by union with him. If surrounded and distracted by companionship, and seeking for seclusion, we may get all the peace of perfect privacy in fellowship with him. If we are rich, and sometimes think that we were in a position of less temptation if we were poorer, we may find all the blessings for which we sometimes crave poverty in communion with him. If we are poor, and fancy that if we had a little more, just to lift us above the grinding, carking care of to-day, and the anxiety of to-morrow, we should be happier, we may find all tranquillity in him." "There can be no male and female." This distinction in sex has more foundation in nature than the distinction of men by nationality or by their social standing. "Male and female created he them." In the resurrection, the distinction, in its physical aspect, will have no place; but now it reigns, and forms an agreeable contrast in humanity. But it also disappears in the lower ground of a common sonship. There is daughterhood spoken of in that passage, "Ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty;" but generally it is a filial standing, without any distinction of sex; that is indicated. "And, after all, women are men. Their relation with God is an immediate one. They stand in exactly the same position with regard to him as man; and, in this supreme point of view, the equality of the sexes is perfect, as is that between the rich and the poor, the powerful and the weak. The two sexes are only the two forms, or two functions, of our common humanity, the members of which are all called to serve and glorify God, some as men, others as women. The service of God is the substance, the rest is only the mode or the accident. Now, we fully believe that God has made the woman for the man, in that he has dualized man, for whom it was not good to be alone, and who would have been alone in a moral sense, and in that sense more especially, with a being exactly similar and perfectly equal to himself; but we cannot, we must not, imagine that the whole feminine sex has been called out of nothingness into being, merely to complete the existence of individuals of the other sex. The proposition, "the woman was made for the man," has, therefore, for counterpoise and complement, another proposition—the woman has been created for herself, or, better still, "man and woman both have been created for God." *Inferences.* *We are to rejoice most in that wherein we are equal.* It is not external advantages or points of superiority over others that can afford any man the deepest, purest joy. If he is vain of these, and allows them prevalence in his thoughts, he will certainly forfeit his joy. When the seventy returned from their missionary tour, they were flushed with the joy of a new-found power over devils: "Lord, even the devils are subject unto us, through thy Name." Christ directed them to the true source of joy: "Notwithstanding in this rejoice not, that the spirits are subject unto you, but rather rejoice that your names are written in heaven." That God numbers us among his children—that is the humble, equalizing element in our joy. *It is not implied that inequalities are to be repudiated.* There are inequalities in the providence of God, mainly for purposes of trial; and we are not to find fault with them. "Brethren, let every man, wherein he is called, therein abide with God." The instance in point was the converted slave, who, when he came to the knowledge of Christ, was not to go away and demand a change of condition; but if it was the will of God that he should still remain in slavery, he was to abide therein with God, content to enjoy that freedom with which Christ had made him free. The same consideration might lead a man not to shirk, like Jonah, but to take a very high position, for which, perhaps, he had no natural liking, but to which he felt

that he was called by a higher will. But, whatever the position intended for us, we are to accept of it as an expression of the will of God; and, if we see the same will in the stations which others occupy, that will keep us right in the midst of inequalities. It has been remarked "that a great part of the duties of life are based, and must be, on the fact that men are unequal; some inferior, some superior; some elected to power and leadership, and some to homage and trust. Everything here will depend on how much of personal quality and soul-force different men may have for their endowments; how much reason, conscience, love, will, vision, music, science, and worship they have room for; and then it will be seen what precedences they are to yield, what deferences to pay, or what patronages to assume, what forward conditions to support. Thus far the true beauty of life will consist in a due observance of inequalities; every man consenting to be himself, and let everybody else be himself too, in his own true measure." *There are duties founded upon our equality as Christians.* "Whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only, in the name of a disciple, verily, I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward." One might perform the same little act from considerations of humanity, but it is the performing it from considerations of *discipleship* that receives the commendation of Christ. There is a whole tier of virtues rising up here, for which there is required the greatest delicacy, and which are really of the finest mould. They are such as will be suggested by the names, Christian courtesy, Christian consideration, and the like. Here is culture, accomplishment, for any Christian lady or Christian gentleman. There have none of us learned enough to show consideration all round the Christian circle because of sonship and equality in Christ. Some have a long, hard lesson to learn here, who, perhaps, little imagine it. The inequalities of Providence form their peculiar temptation. They naturally like to associate with persons of their own tastes and manners, and, perhaps, they are so accustomed to regard men because they are rich, because they are influential, that they cannot bring their minds to respect a man simply because he is a Christian. Now, how becoming it is that those who are unequally placed in providence should meet freely together on the ground of an equality in the Divine covenant! It would let the rich feel more potently that wealth and station and culture are on the outside; and it would let the poor see that honesty and piety are not confined to them. Whatever opportunities for meeting may be enjoyed in the common walks of life, there is a special meeting-ground afforded for all classes in the Church. Here the rich and the poor meet together; the Lord is the Maker of them all. The Church is the place where most of all we should be helped to understand and to feel the levelling influence of Christian love, and to value and to honour the Christian under all distinctions. *There is an equalizing process going on under Christian influences.* If we take the Jew and the Greek as bringing before us national distinctions, there is better feeling between nations than there once was. A Christian in a nation sees and feels that in Christ all nations are one, that there is a common salvation for them, and that the loss of one is really the loss of all. If there is a considerable body of Christians in each nation, especially known, in some degree, to one another, that will be the strongest counteractive to hostile feeling; and it will only be in seasons of great national excitement that these will be borne down, and, perhaps, themselves carried away, by the national impulse. Certainly, in calm moments there is a growing conviction that the true and best condition to be sought after is that which Christianity puts before us, and gives us reason to hope for—a brotherhood of nations, free from selfishness and intrigue, in which nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more. *The second distinction between bond and free in that particular form is very nearly obliterated.* Although Christianity did not preach revolution, did not incite to a rising of the slaves against their masters, yet it has led indirectly to the abolition of slavery. When it represented even slaves as some of them invested with the privileges of sonship in Christ, in the logic of events the conclusion was sure to follow, that their rights as men could not justly be withheld from them. The poor African race has been the last to know the elevating, equalizing power of Christianity; and some think that they may be gradually matured to be the equals of Europeans in civilization, having great capacities of vision, of song, and of worship. There will be an equalizing even in that which communists have an eye to—material condition. Only this is to be got at, not by any flashy communistic scheme, but by Christianity having more the moulding of the conditions of

trade and commerce, and also more the moulding of the individual character. *The last distinction between male and female* has been materially changed by Christianity. Her equality before God was a lever power which could not but raise woman out of that degradation into which man's sin had brought her. We see the process going on in India which has taken place in many nations, zenana agencies especially spreading influences which must eventually liberate. *The most real inequality is that which is produced by sin.* If we are equal in sonship, let us also be equal in fidelity. (3) *Ground of our Christian equality.* "For ye all are one man in Christ Jesus. And if ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise." It has already been implied that we are equal because of our sonship in Christ. That it may be placed beyond doubt, it is explicitly stated that we are equal because of what we are in Christ. And we are in Christ in such a way that, because he is Abraham's seed, we are Abraham's seed too. And, as Abraham's seed, we are heirs according to the tenor of the promise. This heirship he proceeds to connect with sonship. So that the teaching is that our equality is based on our sonship in Christ.—R. F.

**Ver. 1.—Bewitched.** Here, it is said, the doctrinal section of the Epistle begins, the preceding section being historical and the concluding section hortatory. But how unlike this is to a cold abstract theological argument the opening words clearly show. St. Paul cares little for mere speculations of divinity. His object is practical, personal, earnest. Thus he expostulates rather than argues, and appeals to experience for confirmation. He is not simply shocked at a heresy; he is grieved and hurt at the unfaithfulness, the weakness, the folly of his hearers. All error that leads us away from Christ is sad and shameful.

I. THE FIRST OBJECT OF THE TRUE PREACHER OF THE GOSPEL IS TO SET FORTH CHRIST CRUCIFIED. 1. He preaches *Christ*. Christ is Christianity. To know him is to know all. St. Paul was most anxious to make manifest the person and character and life of Christ. To demonstrate a system of doctrine or to expound a "plan of salvation" was not his method of preaching the gospel. Only show men Christ; that was enough. Even doctrinal errors would melt and vanish before that vision. 2. He preaches the *crucified* Christ. A crucified Christ was a King humiliated, a Lord slain; yet herein lay the essence of St. Paul's gospel. We see Christ, not only as a beautiful character, a great Teacher, or a wise Reformer; we see him dying—revealing thus his faithfulness, his purity, his love, suffering for us, sacrificed for us. 3. He preaches Christ by *setting him forth openly*. St. Paul says that Christ was "placarded" before the eyes of the Galatians. This suggests a vivid, pictorial style of language united to an energetic, almost dramatic, force of expression. The whole effort of the apostle was to make his hearers see Christ. No doubt the method was in some respects specially adapted to the Celtic excitability and the semi-barbarous condition of the Galatians, and was in form very different from the apostle's manner of speaking to the cultured Athenians on the Areopagus. Yet to the Greeks at Corinth he says he determined to know nothing among them "save Jesus Christ, and him crucified." It is to be feared that of late the pulpit has lost weight through abandoning descriptive for argumentative preaching, in deference to the supposed higher intelligence of the age, but in defiance of the natural disinclination of average men for reasoning and of their susceptibility to visual imagination. Whatever may be said as to the method of doing it, it is plain that what is most wanted for the man of culture, as much as for the illiterate man, is not to understand Christian theology, but to see Christ.

II. THEY WHO HAVE ONCE SEEN CHRIST CRUCIFIED SET FORTH OPENLY MUST BE "BEWITCHED" IF THEY EVER FORSAKE HIM. 1. They must have *seen* him. The vision by the hearer may be missed through no fault of the preacher. There must be the eyes to see. Cattle that see only the grass at their feet will not be impressed by the grandest scene of crag and moor. They who see Christ to any effect must see him spiritually, not merely as the crowd about the cross saw his bodily agony, but as St. Paul set forth the great, awful fact. 2. Such a vision of Christ will produce a *profound impression*. No one who saw the sea for the first time—really *saw* it—returned home the same man. There are sights that transform. Sinking deep into our hearts, they saturate our whole nature and haunt our memories for ever. Such is a true vision of Christ crucified. At the sight of the cross, Christian lost his burden, never to recover it. The

Divine majesty of sorrow and love that illumines this vision, once possessing a man's soul, should dwell with him for ever. 3. To forsake Christ after such a vision is only possible through some *strange malign influence*. St. Paul compares it to the blighting effect of the evil eye. To turn to the Lord from such a gracious sight as to a higher and better thing is indeed most unaccountable. If anything allures us from Christ after we have once truly seen him, it must be an irrational influence to which we weakly succumb, for no reasonable attraction can be greater than the power with which, when once lifted up before them, he draws all men to himself.—W. F. A.

Vers. 2—5.—*Going back*. In expostulating with the Galatians for forsaking grace for Law, St. Paul appeals to their own experience. He is not expounding the gospel for the first time to strangers; he is arguing with Christians who know its power. His argument applies to all who turn aside from the early life of faith and grace to any supposed improvement of human discipline. Their own experience rises up in condemnation of them. Three proofs of the foolishness of such a course are here given.

I. THIS COURSE REVERSES THE NATURAL ORDER OF PROGRESS. It is absurd to think of being perfected in the flesh after having begun in the Spirit. These two, the flesh and the Spirit, correspond in our experience to the two methods—by Law and by grace through faith. It is the weakness of Law that it is external, and governs only external acts, that it directs the flesh, the outer life, but infuses no inward spiritual life. Grace does not concern itself directly with such outward acts. It is a spiritual inspiration, and faith is a spiritual act. Now, the natural progress is from the outward to the inward. We see this in our personal experience. Children first learn to obey direct commands, and gradually learn principles of right conduct, until conscience takes the place of external authority. With the race the same progress holds good. Earlier forms of religion are more external. The latest is the most spiritual. To turn away from the spiritual is not merely to go back; it is to revert to a more improper method. Spiritual religion is the highest religion. Nothing can exceed the power of faith and love and inward grace. If these influences are slow in ripening the perfect character, it is absurd to think of hastening the result by reverting to weaker influences of Law and formal rules.

II. THIS COURSE STULTIFIES THE PAST ENDURANCE OF PERSECUTION. (Ver. 4.) St. Paul's allusion implies that the Galatians had been persecuted—as we know other Churches had been—at the instigation of the Jews. If the Jewish Law were the highest method of righteousness, persecution provoked by slighting or opposing it must have been endured for nothing. This was an *argumentum ad hominem*. We have to make sacrifices in other ways if we are faithful to spiritual religion. We are also appealed to by the memories of our fathers, who testified to spiritual liberty at the rack and the stake. When we play with the broken chains which they cast off, and even forge them afresh by submitting to the revival of old formalities and superstitions, the spirits of those martyred heroes of Protestantism rise up to rebuke us. Or does the most noble page of England's history describe only a huge, quixotic delusion?

III. THIS COURSE CONTRADICTS THE EVIDENCE AFFORDED BY THE POWER THAT FLOWS FROM SPIRITUAL GRACE. (Ver. 5.) St. Paul and other men endued with the Spirit wrought miracles. The most rigid follower of the Law could not do so. But more than power over material things grew out of the grace of the Spirit. The conquests of the gospel flowed from faith and spiritual gifts. The men of formal devotion never turned the world upside down. There is no fire in Law. The new creation of the world only follows spiritual activity. It is the work of the men of faith. "By their fruits ye shall know them." Whatever fascination there may be in religions of strict rules and rigid ordinances, we find that it is the free spiritual energy of unfettered souls that moves the hearts of others. This religion of faith and grace which possesses the most Divine power must be for us the highest and best.—W. F. A.

Vers. 6—9.—*The faith and blessing of Abraham*. Not only, says the apostle, did you begin the Christian life in faith, but even Abraham, whom the Jews reverence as their great exemplar, and whose heir they profess to be, even he was justified by faith; and therefore they who enjoy his blessing are the possessors of the same faith.



I. ABRAHAM WAS A MAN OF FAITH. He knew nothing of the Levitical Law. He walked by faith. His faith was not assent to a creed. Nor was it an intelligent conviction of any "plan of salvation" obtained by means of a miraculous foresight of the atonement to be accomplished many centuries later in the sacrifice of Christ. It was a grand, simple trust in God. It was shown in his forsaking the idols of his forefathers and worshipping the one spiritual God, in his leaving his home and going he knew not whither in obedience to a Divine voice, in his willingness to sacrifice his son, in his hope of a future inheritance. Such a faith is personal reliance, leading to active obedience and encouraged by confident anticipation. Abraham's faith is the model faith for us. For us faith is to rely upon Christ, to be loyal to Christ, to hope in Christ, and also to accept the fuller revelations of truth which Christ opens up to us as Abraham accepted the Divine voices vouchsafed to him. For the contents of faith will vary according to our light. The spirit of it, however, must be always the same.

II. ABRAHAM'S FAITH WAS RECKONED TO HIM FOR RIGHTEOUSNESS. The special point in Abraham's character was not his holiness, but his faith. God's favour flowed to him through this channel. It was the way through which he, though imperfect and sinful, as are all the sons of Adam, was called to the privileged place of a righteous man. This is recorded of him in the sacred history (Gen. xv. 6), and therefore should be admitted by all Jews. So much for St. Paul's special argument. For us the important lesson is that, if so famous a saint, living even under the older religion, was accepted through faith, how much more apparent is it that faith is necessary for us! The reasons for relying on faith are (1) *historical*—faith justified Abraham, therefore it will justify us; (2) *theological*—faith brings us into living fellowship with God, and so opens our hearts to receive the forgiveness that puts us in the position of righteous men; and (3) *moral*—faith is the security for the future growth of righteousness, with the first effort of faith the first seed-grace of righteousness is sown.

III. PARTICIPATION IN ABRAHAM'S FAITH IS THE CONDITION OF PARTICIPATION IN ABRAHAM'S BLESSING. Jews claimed the blessing by birthright. Jewish Christians offered it to the Gentiles on condition of their becoming as Jews. Both were wrong. Abraham received his blessing through his faith. It was necessarily conditioned by faith. Only men of faith could have it. Therefore Jews who lost faith lost the blessing. But all men of faith are spiritual sons of Abraham. Therefore all nations are blessed in Abraham just in proportion as they have a similar faith. Indeed, the finest legacy left by the patriarch was his faith. Canaan came and went. Spiritual blessings such as faith includes are eternal.—W. F. A.

Ver. 13.—*The curse of the Law and the curse of the cross.* I. THE LAW BRINGS A CURSE. It is not itself a curse, though it is a heavy burden. It was not sent for the purpose of injuring us, nor, rightly obeyed, would it cause any evil to fall upon us. It is the breach of the Law that is followed by the curse. But we have all broken the Law. So long, then, as we continue to live under the Law the curse hangs over us. Instead of hankering after a religion of Law, as the Galatians were doing, we should regard it with horror as for us sinners only a prelude to a fearful doom. The curse is the wrath of God, banishment from God, death.

II. CHRIST REDEEMS FROM THIS CURSE. This great truth implies three things. 1. Christians are *set free* from the curse of the Law, (1) by the free forgiveness that stays the curse from falling on those who have incurred it in transgressing the Law; and (2) by removal from the dominion of Law for the future, so that its requirements no longer apply, and principles of love resulting from grace have full sway. Obligations to righteousness are not thereby diminished, but increased; the motive for fulfilling them, however, is no longer the terror of a curse, but the spontaneous devotion of love. 2. This liberation is effected by *Christ*. We cannot fling off the yoke of Law nor dispel the curse. If done at all it must be done by One mightier than us. Hence the need of a Saviour. The gospel proclaims, not only deliverance, but a Christ who accomplishes it. 3. The deliverance is at a *cost*. It is redemption. The cost is Christ's endurance of a curse.

III. CHRIST SUFFERED THE CURSE OF THE CROSS. He was not cursed of God. It is significant that that expression is omitted in the quotation from the Old Testament

(see Deut. xxi. 23). We have no evidence of any mysterious spiritual curse falling upon Christ. On the contrary, we are told in what the curse consisted. It was the endurance of crucifixion itself. That was a death so cruel, so horrible, so full of shame, that to suffer it was to undergo a very curse. Christ was crucified, and therefore the curse fell upon him. Moreover, this curse is very directly connected with the breach of the Law by us. 1. Death is the *penalty* of transgression. Christ never deserved this penalty of violated Law, yet, being a man and mortal, he suffered the fate of fallen men. 2. It was *man's wickedness*, i.e. nothing else than man's violation of God's Law, that led to man's rejection of Christ and to Christ's death. The world flung its curse on Christ. By a wonderful act of infinite mercy that act of hellish wickedness is made the means through which the world is freed from the curse of its own sins.

IV. CHRIST'S ENDURANCE OF THE CURSE OF THE CROSS LIBERATES US FROM THE CURSE OF THE LAW. He freely endured the curse. He endured it for our sakes. He became "a curse for us." 1. His endurance of the curse gave *weight to his propitiatory sacrifice* of himself. This was the most extreme surrender of himself to God in meek submission. As our Representative, he thus obtained for us Divine favour and grace of forgiveness in answer to that most powerful intercession, the giving of himself to a death that was a very curse rather than abandon his saving work. 2. Christ's endurance of the curse for us is the grand *inducement for us* to leave the "beggarly elements" of Law and devote ourselves in faith and love to him who died for us.—W. F. A.

Ver. 17.—*The everlasting covenant.* I. DIVINE GRACE IS PLEDGED BY COVENANT. The grace here referred to is offered to Abraham and through him to all nations (Gen. xii. 1—3). Thus offered in covenant, it is (1) definitely *promised* by God, (2) with the confirmation of an *oath*, (3) on condition, however, of our *faith*. We are not left to speculate about the grace of God as a possibility; it is distinctly revealed. Nor are we in doubt as to its permanence; it is pledged for the future.

II. THE COVENANT OF DIVINE GRACE IS ETERNAL. 1. As a *revelation of truth* it is eternal. Truth does not vary with time. When once a genuine truth has been seen, no later knowledge of another truth can set it aside. The discovery of Australia did not invalidate the earlier discovery of America. 2. As a *declaration of God's will* it is eternal. God does not vacillate, like a fickle, capricious despot. He is constancy itself. What he wills now he wills for ever. 3. As a *pledge of God's honour* it is eternal. It is in infinite condescension to our weakness that God makes us a promise. We ought to be able to rely on his love and goodness alone. But since he has mercifully stooped to encourage us in our poor faith by promise and pledge, herein lies the greater assurance to us of his changeless grace.

III. THE COVENANT OF GRACE IS MORE ANCIENT THAN THE CURSE OF THE LAW. The Judaizers claim precedence for the Law over the gospel because of its greater antiquity. But St. Paul reminds them that the promise on which the gospel is founded is a still more ancient Divine word. Grace precedes wrath; love is anterior to Law. The first vision of God is a revelation of loving-kindness. The weight and dignity of hoary age are with the blessings of God's goodness. A shallow research discovers Law; dig deeper, penetrate further, and you find love.

IV. LATER DIVINE UTTERANCES MAY OBSCURE BUT CANNOT ABOLISH THE COVENANT OF GRACE. 1. They may *obscure* it. The severity of the Law appeared to hide the gracious promise to Abraham. Dark dispensations of Providence sometimes come between us and God's love. We cannot reconcile the harder with the more pleasing utterances of Scripture. Stern voices sometimes repel us when we are hungering for gentle voices to comfort. 2. Nevertheless, these later revelations do not *nullify* the earlier promises. The grace is still undiminished, though for a time it is beyond our gaze and grasp. Presently it will break out in more than its pristine splendour, as the sun shines more brightly than ever after it has been hidden by a brief summer shower. The purpose of grace both precedes and outlives the threatenings of Law. The flounders of Sinai are but an interlude between the promise of love at Bethel and its fulfilment at Bethlehem.—W. F. A.

Ver. 19.—*The object of the Law.* The Law, we are told, was "added because of transgressions." This cannot mean that it was instituted to restrain transgressions—

the normal object of Law—since that assertion would be opposed to the main drift of the apostle's argument; nor can it signify simply that the Law was added to reveal transgressions, or this would be more directly stated; nor certainly can it mean that the Law was intended to produce transgressions, to serve as an instrument of sin—a purpose which would be more diabolical than Divine. Probably St. Paul's meaning is that the Law was intended to convert sins into transgressions; *i.e.* to give to amorphous and almost unconscious wickedness a definite form, so that it could be seen, handled, chastised, and cured (Rom. vii. 8, 9).

I. SIN IS NATURALLY OBSCURE. It spreads through the soul as a rank malaria, felt in its evil effects, but not clearly seen and known. We feel ourselves to be ailing, but cannot lay our fingers upon the seat of the disease. Just in proportion to its internal character it is dangerous; yet in the same proportion it is vague and beyond our reach. It is darkness and death—things vast, shapeless, without definition, mere blank negations. Nothing is more erratic than an unenlightened conscience. A spiritually ignorant person cannot tell when he sins or how far his guilt extends. He is like a blind man groping among pathless wilds, stumbling and falling he knows not how or where.

II. LAW CONVERTS VAGUE SIN INTO DEFINITE TRANSGRESSION. It does not simply reveal the hidden sin, as the acid develops the photograph and as the daylight lays bare the ugly ruin. It gives to sin a new form and character, as the chemical re-agent precipitates a solution. It compels the diffused sinfulness to crystallize into sharply defined offences. The force of the tide is not seen till the wave breaks against the shore. The current of evil is strong, but unrecognized, till it meets a Law and dashes over it in wild assault. Sin lurks in our hearts and creeps through our lives as a formless spirit of evil. Then a Law is declared, "Thou shalt not steal," or, "Thou shalt not kill." Sin meeting this directly breaks the Law. Now, it is a clear offence, a definite, chargeable transgression, capable of being brought home to the criminal.

III. THIS CONVERSION OF SIN INTO TRANSGRESSION IS FOR OUR ULTIMATE GOOD. At first it looks cruel, if not immoral. It seems like God tempting us. But God does not send the inducement to sin. He only sends the forbidding Law, which gives form to the sin already present. 1. Thus Law becomes an *external conscience*. By means of it we know how far we have fallen. 2. It becomes an *occasion for the Divine chastisement* which we need in order to be brought to repentance. 3. It *prepares us to receive the gospel* by rousing us from the slumber of indifference, making us see how evil and how helpless we are, and so urging us to seek redemption from the curse of Law in the grace of Christ.—W. F. A.

Ver. 20.—*Direct communication with God.* The mediator here referred to is not Christ, but Moses, for St. Paul is describing the process through which the Law was given. This he contrasts with the direct flow of grace in the gospel. A mediator implies more than one party, and the gifts that come through mediation do not come immediately from the hand of the giver. But God is one person, and in Christ he immediately confers his grace upon us.

I. A RELIGION OF LAW SEPARATES US FROM DIRECT COMMUNION WITH GOD. The Levitical Law depended on an elaborate system of mediation. The Jew regarded it as given through angels. Moses received it for the people. When the Israelites saw the terrors of Sinai they shrank back and begged Moses to go alone for them into the presence of God, and thus they received the Divine message through their human leader (Exod. xx. 18, 19). Subsequently it was administered through the priesthood. The consequence was that the people were not admitted to the sanctuary. The penalty of relying on a human intercessor out of fear of God was separation from direct communion with Heaven. This penalty is still paid by those who pursue the same course. The magnifying of human priesthood and the elaboration of ceremonial religion by one school in the Church, and the over-dependence on human teaching and preaching of another school, put new mediators between us and God, and so separate us from the privileges of immediate Divine fellowship. The same result follows the slavish observance of rules and regulations laid down by the wisest and holiest of teachers. Those men come between us and God.

II. THE HIGHEST RELIGION CONSISTS IN DIRECT COMMUNION WITH GOD. "God is

one." When he speaks to us we have all that we need. Many advantages belong to this pure and lofty relation with God. 1. *Clear visions of truth.* Truth is no longer adulterated with human imaginations. 2. *The full efficacy of grace.* This is not weakened by the harsh and ugly additions of man's blundering attempts to improve his fellow-man. It flows clear and full in its own heavenly beauty. 3. *The blessedness of fellowship with God.* A religion of Law is irksome. There is no joy in obedience forced by constraint. But direct communion with God is itself the source of the deepest joy, and it makes all service glad, so that we delight to do the will of God.

III. THE GOSPEL BRINGS TO US THIS RELIGION OF DIRECT COMMUNION. It is true that Christ is a Mediator, but in quite another way from the mediation of Moses. Moses and all human mediators stand between us and God, so as to separate us from him and darken the vision of his glory by their human shadows. But Christ only comes between to bridge over the gulf that separates, to unite us to God, to be the mirror in which the presence of God is revealed; nay, to bring God to us, made manifest in the flesh. Thus in Christ we have immediate communication with God. Through him we not only know that God is spirit and must be worshipped in spirit and in truth, we also have grace thus to worship. In Christ God's grace directly flows to us with all its fresh, untainted purity and power. In Christ we have grace to enter through the rent veil to the holiest place, and to rest in the eternal light of God's near presence.—W. F. A.

Vers. 24, 25.—*The tutor.* The image of the Law as a tutor would apply directly to the condition of the Jews, to whom the Levitical system was given in their religious childhood in order to prepare them for the privileges of sonship which Christ was to confer. But what was true of them is more or less true of all of us. For the religious history of Israel is just an emphasized epitome of the religious history of the race. Through longer ages, by more obscure methods, in spite of more grievous lapses, God is educating mankind as he educated the Jews. Though in their case the process was hastened by the tropical heat of prophetic inspiration, and the results are portrayed in the clear light of a Scripture revelation, the method is still essentially the same. Law comes first and serves as the tutor till the gospel of Christ brings the liberty of manhood. Individually we pass through a similar education. The function of Law is here described. Law is a tutor.

I. THE TUTOR RESTRAINS AND CONTROLS HIS PUPIL. The tutor or *pædagogos* was not so much the teacher as the person to whom was entrusted the charge of the whole moral direction of the child. He had an almost absolute authority, such as English lads with the greater freedom allowed among us would resent as a galling yoke. A similar function pertained to the Jewish Law, and pertains to all law in so far as it comes into practical relations with our religious life. In particular note three characteristics common to the control of the tutor over his charge and the dominion of a religion of Law. 1. *Rigid orders.* The tutor would leave little to the discretion of his pupil, nor would he be likely to explain the reason for his mandates. So Law requires definite actions and affords little scope for the intelligent consideration of general principles and none for freedom of action upon them. 2. *Compulsion.* The tutor commands. He does not spare the rod. Law depends on threats and fear of punishment, or on hopes of reward, or at best on a stern sense of necessary obligation, and not on love and willing acquiescence. 3. *Restraints.* Probably the old tutor would check and repress rather than guide, encourage, and develop the natural disposition of his pupil. Law says, "Thou shalt not," with more emphasis than "Thou shalt."

II. THE TUTOR IS SUITED TO THE PERIOD OF CHILDHOOD. Much that entered into the stern old system of discipline was as unfitted to youth as to manhood, and we are beginning to see the advantages of a freer kind of education. Nevertheless, certain restraints are essential to the condition of childhood, and the relaxing of them must be most disastrous. The duty of implicit obedience must be learnt before it is possible to understand the principles of abstract morality. Conscience must be educated by Law. In the infancy of the race the pure spirituality of Christianity could not be perceived, and a lower, narrower religion was all that came within the grasp of men. There is a law enclosed within the gospel, and those who are spiritually too backward

to say, "The love of Christ constraineth me," are reminded that "whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap."

III. THE TUTOR PREPARES FOR THE TIME OF MANHOOD. If he does his work well he does not convert his pupil into a slave. By teaching the habit of obedience he prepares for a willing acquiescence in a higher will; by inculcating a certain course of action he lays the foundation for a character in harmony with it. This preparatory influence in education admits of wide application; e.g. the boy must first master the rules of arithmetic in order that he may subsequently comprehend the principles of mathematics, must take grammar as an introduction to philology, etc. Thus St. Paul gives no excuse for the Marcionite heresy, which rejects the Old Testament religion as a bad thing. He not only allows it to be good in its way, but the only thing possible in its time and a direct preparation for the later and freer religion. There is a continuity in history, there is a continuity in God's providential control of history, and there is a continuity in the growing stream of grace that flows through history. Christianity stands on the foundation of Judaism. The Old Testament is useful in preparing us for Christ. Nevertheless, it must not be forgotten that part of this efficacy is negative. The very failure of the Law and its increasing irksomeness prepare for Christ by making us feel the need and enjoy the liberty of his grace.

IV. THE TUTOR IS DISMISSED WHEN THE TIME OF MANHOOD ARRIVES. The tutor who was useful to the child will be a hindrance to the grown man. The submission which was dutiful in childhood becomes servile in manhood. The yoke of the Law is not the less a nuisance to the Christian because it was a necessity for the Jew. There is great skill in the apostle's argument, for, while showing that he was no enemy to the Law but appreciated its utility, he pointed out that that very utility involved its being superseded. Its purpose was important, but preparatory, to prepare for the gospel. The blossom must fall that the fruit may develop.—W. F. A.

Vers. 26—29.—*Sonship*. Liberated from the tutelage of Law through faith and on account of his union with Christ, the Christian is exalted into the condition of a free son of God and enjoys the large privileges of sonship.

I. THE CONDITION OF SONSHIP. God is the Father of all mankind, and all human creatures, even the most ignorant, the most degraded, and the most vicious are naturally God's children. The prodigal son is still a son and can think of "my father." Nevertheless, it is clear that St. Paul often speaks of a sonship that does not belong to all men—a sonship which is the Christian's peculiar condition and is not even shared by the Jew, a sonship which is not enjoyed by natural birth, but must be received by adoption, i.e. by a special act of Divine grace. What does this mean? 1. *Near relationship with God*. The son is most closely related to his father. But the disobedient child who forsakes his home is practically dead, for him practically the old relation is severed. It needs to be restored if he is to enjoy it again. The son, too, with St. Paul is not the young child in the nursery, but the older child admitted into the society of his father. The Jew was kept in the nursery separated from God by a "mediator" (ver. 19) and a "tutor" (ver. 24). The Christian is admitted into close fellowship with God. 2. *Liberty*. This is an idea always associated with St. Paul's description of sonship. The son is no longer the child "under guardians and stewards," who "differeth nothing from a bond-servant." He is a free man enjoying the confidence of his father. Such are Christians; to them the mind and will of God are revealed; they are free from restraints of formal Law; they are put in positions of trust.

II. THE ORIGIN OF SONSHIP. 1. *Through faith*. This is an important point in the apostle's argument. So long as we have not faith we remain in tutelage and at a distance from God. Faith breaks the yoke and brings us into the presence of God. Faith teaches us to realize that God is our Father and to trust him fearlessly, and so to take the position of sons. 2. *By union with Christ*. Christ is the Son of God. Yet he is not desirous of keeping his privileges to himself. On the contrary, he laboured and suffered that his people might share them. The baptized, that is to say, all of the Galatian people who accepted Christianity as a religion, had happily gone further and really entered into the spirit of it. They had since backslidden, but they were no hypocrites. Living Christianity is "putting on Christ," being clothed with the spirit

of Christ. They who do this through faith in Christ become one with him, and, as his brethren, become sons of his Father.

III. THE CONSEQUENCES OF SONSHIP. 1. *Universal brotherhood.* We are all one "in Christ Jesus." Here is the secret. The fraternity that sprang from the mere enthusiasm of philosophic philanthropy led to the guillotine. It is only union in Christ that secures true lasting union among men. As all colours melt into one common brilliancy under the rays of a very strong light, all distinctions vanish when Christ's presence is deeply felt. (1) National distinctions vanish. The old antagonism of Jew and Gentile disappears. Christianity now tends to blend nations. (2) Social distinctions vanish. Slaves are free in Christ. Free men are servants to Christ. The gospel is the enemy of all caste-feeling. (3) Even distinctions of sex count for nothing. This meant much in ancient times, when cruel injustice was done to women. Women are under eternal obligations to the gospel, which has freed them from an unworthy bondage and given them their true place in the world. 2. *The inheritance of ancient promises.* The son of a king is an heir. What shall be the inheritance of a Son of God? To him it is said, "All things are yours." The Jew cherished the promises as a hope. The Christian enjoys the fulfilment of the promises. As yet the fulfilment is but partial, though enough to be an earnest of better things to come for those sons of God who are being made "meet for the inheritance of the saints in light."—W. F. A.

## EXPOSITION.

### CHAPTER IV.

Ver. 1.—Now I say (λέγω δέ). A form of expression usual with the apostle when introducing a new statement designed either to explain or elucidate something before said (cf. ch. iii. 17; v. 16; Rom. xv. 8, according to the Received Text; 1 Cor. i. 12. So τοῦτο δέ φημι, 1 Cor. vii. 29; xv. 50). It is intended apparently to quicken attention: "Now I wish to say this." In the present case the apostle designs to throw further light upon the position taken in ch. iii. 24, that God's people, while under the Law, were under a bondage from which they have now been emancipated. Compare the somewhat similar process of illustration adopted in Rom. vii. 2—4. In both passages it is not a logical demonstration that is put forward, but an illustratively analogous case in human experience. A metaphor, though not strictly an argument, yet frequently helps the reader to an intuitive perception of the justness of the position laid down. That the heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all (ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ὁ κληρονόμος νηπίος ἐστίν, οὐδὲν διαφέρει δούλου, κύριος πάντων ὢν); so long as the heir is a child, he differeth nothing from a bond-servant, though he is lord of all. The article before κληρονόμος, heir, is the class article, as before μεσίτης, mediator (ch. iii. 20)—"an heir." In the word νηπίος the apostle evidently has in view one who as yet is in his nonage—as in English law phrase, "an infant." In Roman law language, *infans* is a child under seven, the period of minority reaching to twenty-five. In Attic Greek,

the correlate to one registered amongst "men" was a *παῖς*. It does not appear that the apostle means to use a technical legal expression. He contrasts *νηπίος* with *ἄνθρωπος* in 1 Cor. xiii. 11; Eph. iv. 13, 14. "Differeth nothing from a bond-servant;" i. e. is nothing better than a bond-servant, as Matt. vi. 26; x. 31; xii. 12. The verb *διαφέρειν* seems used only in the sense of your differing from another to your advantage, so that τὰ διαφέροντα are things that are more excellent. "Lord," "proprietor;" the title to the property inheres in him, though he is not yet fit to handle it.

Ver. 2.—But is under tutors and governors (ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ ἐπιτρόπων ἐστὶ καὶ οἰκονόμων); but is under guardians and stewards. *Ἐπιτροπος* is, in Greek, the proper designation of a minor's guardian; as, for example, is shown by Demosthenes's speeches against Aphobus, who had been his *ἐπίτροπος*. These speeches also show that the *ἐπίτροπος* was entrusted with the handling of the property of his ward. Yet, as *οἰκονόμος* more especially denotes one entrusted with the management of property, it should seem that St. Paul uses the former term with more especial reference to the guardian's control over the person of his ward. The ward has to do what the *ἐπίτροπος*, guardian, thinks proper, with no power of ordering his actions according to his own will; while, on the other hand, the youth is not able to appropriate or apply any of his property further than as the "steward" thinks right; between the two he is bound hand and foot to other people's control. The plural number of the two nouns indicates the rough and general

way in which the apostle means to sketch the case; speaking in a general way, one may describe a minor as subject to "guardians and stewards." Until the time appointed of the father (*ἔχρι τῆς προθεσμίας τοῦ πατρὸς*). The noun *προθεσμία*, properly an adjective, *ὡρα* or *ἡμέρα* being understood, is used very commonly to denote, either a determined period during which a thing is to be done or forborne, which is its most ordinary sense (see Reiske's 'Lexicon to Demosthenes'); or the further limit of such a period, whence Symmachus uses it to render the Hebrew word for "end" in Job xxviii. 3; or, lastly, a specified time at which a certain thing was to take place, as, for example, Josephus, 'Ant.' vii. 4, 7, "When the (*προθεσμία*) day appointed for the payment came." This last seems to be the meaning of the word here, though it admits of being taken in the second sense, as describing the limit of the child's period of nonage. The somewhat loosely constructed genitive, *τοῦ πατρὸς*, "of the father," may be compared either with the *διδασκαλῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ*, "taught of God" (John vi. 45), or, in a somewhat different application, "the chastening and admonition of the Lord" (Eph. vi. 4). In reference to the whole case as stated by the apostle, it has been asked—Is the father to be conceived of as dead, or as only gone out of the country, or how? It is sufficient to reply that "the point of the comparison"—to use Bishop Lightfoot's words—"lies, not in the circumstances of the father, but of the son;" and, further, that to supplement the description which the apostle gives by additional particulars not relevant for the purpose of the comparison would only tend to cloud our view of its actual import. In fact, any image taken from earthly things to illustrate things spiritual will inevitably, if completely filled out, be found to be in some respects halting. Another inquiry has engaged the attention of commentators, as to how far the particular circumstance, that the period of nonage is made dependent upon the father's appointment, can be shown to agree with actual usage as it then obtained. It would seem that no positive proof has hitherto been alleged that such an hypothesis was in strict conformity with either Greek or Roman or Hebrew law. And hence some have had recourse to the precarious and far-fetched supposition that St. Paul founds his thesis on Galatian usage, arguing that such would have been in accordance with that purely arbitrary control which, according to Cæsar ('Bell. Gall.,' vi. 19), a paterfamilias exercised over wife and children among the kindred tribes in Gaul. The scruple, however, now referred to arises from supposing that we know more about the facts than we really do know. So far as has been shown,

we cannot tell what was really the precise rule of procedure which, in the case described by the apostle, prevailed either in Judæa, or in Tarsus, or in Galatia; nor again from what region of actual experience St. Paul drew his illustration. We, therefore, have no possible right to say that the case which he supposes was not fairly supposable. On the contrary, when we reflect how open the apostle's mind was for taking note of facts about him, and how wide and varied his survey, we may safely rest assured that his supposed case was in reality framed in perfect accordance to the civil usage, to which the Galatians would understand him to refer. At the same time, it must be conceded that, amongst different modes of arranging a minor's case which actual usage permitted or may be imagined to have permitted, the apostle selected just that particular mode which would best suit his present immediate purpose.

Ver. 3.—Even so we (*οὕτω καὶ ἡμεῖς*); so we also. This "we" represents the same persons as before in ch. iii. 13, 24, 25 (see notes), namely, the people of God; a society preserving a continuous identity through successive stages of development, till now appearing as the Church of Christ. The plural pronoun recites, not individuals, but the community viewed as a whole, having the now subsisting "us" as its present representatives. Individually, Christians in general now, and many of those who then when the apostle wrote belonged to the Church, never were in the state of nonage or bondage here referred to. It is, however, notwithstanding this, quite supposable that St. Paul's account of the history of the whole society is in some degree tinted by the recollection of his own personal experiences. **When we were children** (*ὅτε ἦμεν νήπιοι*); that is, when we were in our nonage. The phrase is not meant to point to a state of immaturity in personal development, but simply to the period of our being withheld from the full possession of our inheritance. This is all that the course of thought now pursued requires; and we only create for ourselves superfluous embarrassment by carrying further the parallel between the figuring persons and the figured. The spiritual illumination enjoyed by the Christian Church, compared with that of the pre-Christian society, presents as great a contrast as that of a man's knowledge compared with a child's; but that is not the point here. **Were in bondage under the rudiments** (or, *rudiments*) **of the world** (*ὕπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἦμεν δεδουλωμένοι*); *were held in bondage under the rudiments of the world*; or, *were under the rudiments of the world brought into bond-service*. This latter way of construing, separating *ἡμεν* from the participle

*δεδουλωμένοι* to connect it with the words which precede, is recommended by the parallel, which the words, "were under the rudiments of the world," then present to the words, "is under guardians and stewards," in ver. 2; while the participle "brought into bond-service" reproduces the notion expressed by the words, "is no better than a bond-servant," of ver. 1. The participle "brought into bond-service," then, stands apart, in the same way as the participle "shut up" does in ch. iii. 23. This, however, is only a question of style; the substantial elements of thought remain the same in either way of construing. The Greek word *στοιχεῖα* calls for a few remarks, founded upon the illustration of its use given by Schneider in his 'Greek Lexicon.' From the primary sense of "stakes placed in a row," for example, to fasten nets upon, the term was applied to the letters of the alphabet as placed in rows, and thence to the primary constituents of speech; then to the primary constituents of all objects in nature, as, for example, the four "elements" (see 2 Pet. iii. 10, 12); and to the "rudiments" or first "elements" of any branch of knowledge. It is in this last sense that it occurs in Heb. v. 12, "What are the (*στοιχεῖα*) rudiments (of the beginning, or) of the first principles of the oracles of God" (on which compare the passage from Galen quoted by Alford at the place). This must be the meaning of the word here; it recites the rudimental instruction of children, as if the apostle had said, "under the A, B, C, of the world." This is evidently intended to describe the ceremonial Law; for in ver. 5 the phrase, "those under the Law," recites the same persons as are here described as "under the rudiments of the world;" as again the "weak and beggarly rudiments," in ver. 9, are surely the same sort of "rudiments" as are illustrated in ver. 10 by the words, "Ye observe days, and months, and seasons, and years." Since the Law under which the people of God were placed was God's own ordinance, we must infer that, when it is here designated as "the A, B, C, of the world," the genitive can neither denote the origin of these rudiments nor yet any qualification of moral pravity, but only the qualification of imperfection and inferiority; that is, it denotes the ceremonial institutions of the Law as appertaining to this earthly material sphere of existence, as contrasted with a higher spiritual sphere. Thus "the A, B, C, of the world" is an expression as nearly as possible identical with that of "carnal ordinances" (literally, *ordinances of the flesh*), used to describe the external ceremonialism of the Law in Heb. ix. 10; which phrase, like the one before us, is used with a full recognition, in the word "ordinances" (*δικαιώματα*), of the Law as of

Divine appointment, while the genitive "of the flesh" marks its comparative imperfection. They were, as Conybeare paraphrases, "their childhood's elementary lessons of outward things." This designation of Levitical ceremonies as being an "A, B, C," or "rudiments, of the world," appears to have become a set phrase with the apostle, who uses it again twice in the Colossians (ii. 8, 20), where he appears, if we may judge from the context, to have in view a (perhaps mongrel) form of Jewish ceremonialism which, with circumcision (mentioned in ver. 11), conjoined other "ordinances" (*δόγματα*) mentioned in vers. 14, 20, relating to meats and drinks and observance of times, illustrated in vers. 16, 21. This, he tells the Colossians, might have been all very well if they were still "living in the world" (ver. 20); but now they were risen with Christ!—with Christ, who had taken that "bond" (*χειρόγραφον*, ver. 14) out of the way; and therefore were called to care for higher things than such merely earthly ones as these. Some suppose that the apostle has reference to the religious ceremonialisms of the idolatrous Gentiles, as well as those of the Mosaic Law. These former ceremonialisms belonged, indeed, to "the world," both in the sense above pointed out and as tinged with the moral pravity characterizing the "present evil world" in general. But these cannot be here intended, forasmuch as it was not to such that God's people were by his ordinance subjected. The other rendering of *στοιχεῖα*—"elements"—which the Authorized Version puts into the text, but the Revised Version into the margin, was probably selected in deference to the view of most of the Fathers, who, as Meyer observes, took the Greek word in its physical sense: Augustine referring it to the heathen worship of the heavenly bodies and the other cults of nature; Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Ambrose to the new moons and sabbaths of the Jews, viewed as determined by the motions of the sun and moon; Jerome, however, interpreting it *rudimenta disciplinae*. On the other hand, in Col. ii. 8, 20, both of our Versions have "rudiments" in the text and "elements" in the margin; in 2 Pet. iii. 10, 12, "elements" only. "Brought into bond-service" (*δεδουλωμένοι*), namely, by the act of the supreme Father imposing upon us the yoke of his Law.

Ver. 4.—But when the fulness of the time was come (*ὅτε δὲ ἦλθε τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου*); but when the completion of the term (Greek, *time*) came. "The completion of the term" is the notion answering to "the time appointed of the father" in ver. 2. The "time" (*χρόνος*) here most probably corresponds to the period terminated by the *προθεσμία*: that is, it is the interval which



God ordained should first elapse. So Acts vii. 23, Ὡς δὲ ἐπληρώθη αὐτῷ τεσσαρακονταετῆς χρόνος, "When he was well-nigh forty years old;" literally, "When there was being completed to him a time of forty years" (comp. also Acts vii. 30; xxiv. 27; Luke xxi. 24; i. 57). The substantive (πλήρωμα) "completion" occurs in the same sense in Eph. i. 10, "Dispensation of the completion of the times." The apostle might apparently have written ὡς δὲ ἐπληρώθη ὁ χρόνος, "But when the term was completed;" but he prefers to express it in this particular form, as colouring the idea with a certain pathos of solemn joy at the arrival of a time so long expected, so fraught with blessing (compare the use of the verb "came" in ch. iii. 25). Why the supreme Disposer, the Father of his people, chose that particular era in the history of the human race for his children's passing into their majority is a deeply interesting subject of inquiry. Much has been said, as for example by Neander and Guericke in their Histories of the Church, and by Schaff in his History of the Apostolic Church, on the preparedness of the world at large at just that juncture for the reception of the gospel. It may, however, be questioned whether the apostle had this in his mind in the reference here made to the Divine *prothemia*. So far as appears, his view was fastened upon the history of the development of God's own people, which up to this time had been under the pedagogic custody of the Mosaic Law. Indeed, in just this context he does not even advert, as he may be supposed to have done in ch. iii. 24, to the effect produced by the Law in preparing God's own people for the gospel, but speaks only of the negative aspect of the legal economy; that is, of those features of "bondage," "powerlessness," and "poverty" which marked it as a state of oppression and helplessness. The training, probably implied in the reference to its "rudiments," stands back for the present out of view; the only notion which is actually brought prominently forward being the comparatively degraded condition in which the child-proprietor was for that while detained. God sent forth his Son (ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ). The terms here used require to be very closely considered: they are fraught with the very essence of the gospel. The compound verb ἐξαποστέλλω occurs in nine other places of the New Testament, all of them in St. Luke's Gospel and the Acts. In six of these (Luke i. 53; xx. 10, 11; Acts ix. 30; xvii. 14; xxii. 21) the ἐξ is well represented in our English Bible by "away." In the remaining three (Acts vii. 12; xi. 22; xii. 11)—"(Jacob) sent forth our fathers first;" "They sent forth Barnabas as far as to

Antioch;" "God hath sent forth his angel")—the preposition represented by "forth" expresses with more or less distinctness the idea that the person sent belonged intimately to the place or the society of the person who sent him. In no one passage is it without its appreciable value. The verb ἀποστέλλω, without this second propositional adjunct of ἐξ, is used, for example, in John xvii. 18, both of the Father sending the Son and of Christ sending his apostles "into the world," but without putting forward this indication of previous intimate connection. So the verb πέμπω is used in like manner of God sending his Son in Rom. viii. 3, and of the mission of the Holy Spirit in John xiv. 26. It was, no doubt, optional with the writer or speaker whether he would employ a verb denoting this particular shade of meaning present in the ἐξ or not; but we are not, therefore, at liberty to infer that, when he chooses to employ a verb which does denote it, he uses it without a distinct consciousness of its specific force. In the clause before us, therefore, as also in ver. 6, the writer must be assumed to have had in his mind at least the thought of heaven as the sphere of existence from which the Son and the Spirit were sent, as in Acts xii. 11 above cited, if not of some yet closer association with the Sender. The reference to a previously subsisting intimacy of being between the Sender and the Sent, which we trace here in the preposition ἐξ of the compound verb, is in Rom. viii. 3, where the verb employed is πέμψας, indicated in the emphatic reference implied in the pronoun *ἐαυτοῦ*, "sending his own Son." In endeavouring next to determine the import of the expression, "his Son," as here introduced, we are met by the surmise that the apostle may have written it *proleptically*, or by anticipation; that is, as describing, not what Christ was before he was sent forth, but the glory and acceptableness with the Almighty which marked him as the Messiah after his appearing in the world; for when, for example, in another place the apostle writes, "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners," he must be understood as expressing himself *proleptically*, designating the person who came into the world by the name and office which he bore as among men, and not as he was before he came. A *proleptic* designation is therefore conceivable. But this interpretation of the apostle's meaning is resisted by the tendency of the context in the kindred passage in Rom. viii. 3, "God sending his own Son *in the likeness of the flesh of sin*;" for those added words betoken very strongly that Christ was viewed by the apostle as having been God's Son before he appeared in the flesh. And such is the impression which a reader not preoccupied with other

Ideas would naturally receive also here. The conviction that this is what the apostle really intended is corroborated by references which he elsewhere makes to Christ's pre-*incarnate* existence and work; as, for example, in Phil. ii. 5, 6; Col. i. 15, 16; the latter of which passages, by describing "the Son of God's love" as "the Firstborn of every creature, because by him all things were created" (see Alford, and the 'Speaker's Commentary' on the passage), betokens that St. Paul regarded him as having been even then the "Son of God;" and this, too, in the sense of derivation from "the substance of the Father," "begotten" (as the Nicene Creed recites) "of his Father before all worlds." We may, therefore, reasonably believe that the Apostle Paul, whose views alone are now under consideration, recognized these two senses of the term, namely, the theological and the Christological, as inseparably blending into one when thus applied to the Lord Jesus; for we must allow that it appears alien to his manner of sentiment and of representation to suppose that he ever uses it in the purely theological sense only. In the view of the apostle Christ was the "Son of God," not only when appointed to be the Messiah, but also before he was "made to be of a woman." Indeed, it should seem that this conception of his person is just that which forms the basis for the subsequent statement that the object of his coming into the world was to procure the adoption of sons for us. *Made of a woman* (*γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός*); *made to be of a woman*. This, indeed, was probably the sense intended by King James's translators, when they followed Wickliffe and the Geneva Bible in rendering "made of a woman;" whilst Tyndale and Cranmer, followed by the Revisers of 1881, give "born of a woman." Just the same divergency of renderings appears in the same English translations in Rom. i. 3, "made of the seed of David (*γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβίδ*)," except that Tyndale has "begotten" instead of "born." The difference in sense is appreciable and important: "made" implies a previous state of existence, which "born" does not. So far as the present writer can find, wherever in the New Testament the Authorized Version has "born," we have in the Greek either *τεχθῆναι* or *γεννηθῆναι*: *γενέσθαι* never having this sense at all. As in ch. iii. 13 (*γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κάρα*), "Being made a curse for us," and in John i. 14 (*ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο*), "The Word was made flesh;" so here God's Son is described as "made to be of a woman," the phrase, "of a woman," being nearly identical in import with the word "flesh" in St. John, distinctly implying the fact of the Incarnation. The preposition "of" (*ἐκ*) denotes derivation of being, as when it is

found after the verb "to be" in John viii. 47, "He that is of God;" "Ye are not of God," pointing back to the claim which (ver. 41) the Jews had made that they had God for their Father. The construction of *γίγνομαι*, to come to be, with a preposition occurs frequently, as in Luke xxii. 44; Acts xxii. 17; Rom. xvi. 7; 2 Thess. ii. 7. There can be no doubt that *γενόμενον* must be taken in the next clause with the same meaning as here. *Made under the Law* (*γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμου*); that is, *made to be under the Law*. The "Law" here, as in the clause immediately after "those under the Law," indicates, not Law in general, but that particular law of tutorship and of domination over one as yet in the depressed condition of a minor, which the apostle has just before spoken of; that is, a law of ceremonies and of external cult. The article is wanting in the Greek, as in Rom. ii. 12, 23; ch. ii. 21; iii. 11, etc. We cannot be unconscious of a tone of pathos in the apostle's language, thus declaring that he who had before been no less august a being than God's Son, should in conformity with his Father's will have stooped to derive being "from a woman," as well as to become subject to such a Law of servitude as that of Moses was. In the second chapter of the Philippians we have a similar account of the Incarnation, in which, with similar pathos, the apostle remarks that he took upon him the form of a "bond-servant" (*δούλος*), being made to be in the like condition to that of men (*ἐν μορφῇ αὐτῶν ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος*); but in that passage the line of thought does not lead to a definite reference of his being made subject to the ceremonial Law. The apostle probably thinks of Christ as being made subject to the Law by his being circumcised—a child of Israelite parents, so long as he was uncircumcised, was repudiated by the Law as one not in the covenant. With reference to the preceding clause, "made of a woman," we are naturally led to inquire why this particular was specified. It does not appear to be essential to his argument, as the next clause certainly is. Probably it was added as marking one of the successive steps down which the Son of God descended to that subjection ("servitude," ver. 3) to the ceremonial Law which the apostle is most particularly concerned with. As in Phil. ii. he is exhibited, first as emptying himself; next, as taking upon him the form of a bond-servant by being made man; and then at length as brought to "the death of the cross;" so here, more briefly, he appears as "sent forth" from the bosom of the Father; next, as made "the son of a woman;" then as brought under the Law, to the end that (of course by the Crucifixion) he might buy off from under the Law those who were subject

thereto. If the apostle intended anything more definite by introducing this first clause, it may have been to glance at that fellowship with the whole human race, with all "born of woman" (*γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν*, Matt. xi. 11), into which God's own Son came by becoming himself "of a woman" (comp. 1 Tim. ii. 5). To refer to yet another point, we can fearlessly affirm that this sentence of the apostle is perfectly *consonant* with the belief in the writer's mind that our Lord was born of a *virgin-mother*, for a specified reference to this fact did not lie in his way just at present, and therefore is not to be desiderated. The only point for consideration in this respect is whether the expression employed does at all allude to it. Many have thought that it does. But when we consider that "one born of woman," *γεννητός γυναικός*, in Hebrew *yelūd ishah*, was a set phrase to denote a human creature (cf. Matt. xi. 11; Job xiv. 1; xv. 14; xxv. 4; xi. 12 [Septuagint]), with no particular reference to the woman except as the medium of our being introduced into the world, it has been with much probability judged by most recent critics that the clause shows no colouring of such allusion. Nevertheless, we distinctly recognize in it the sentiment expressed in the familiar verse of the ancient hymn: "Tu, ad liberandum susceptorum hominem, non horruisti virginis uterum;" else, why did not the apostle write *γενόμενον ἐν σπλνι ἢ γενόμενον ἑνὸς ἄρσενος*?

Ver. 5.—To redeem them that were under the Law (*ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμου ἐξαγοράσῃ*); that he might redeem (Greek, *buy off*) them which were under the Law. In what way Christ bought God's people off, not only from the curse, but also from the dominion of the Law, has been stated by the apostle above, at ch. iii. 13, "Christ bought us off (*Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν*) from the curse of the Law by being made on our behalf a curse" (see note). But why, in order to effect this object, was it prerequisite, as it is here implied that it was, that he should be himself "brought under the Law"? The directions which the Law in Dent. xxi. 22, 23 gave with respect to those "hanged on a tree" were apparently held by Joshua (Josh. viii. 29; x. 26, 27) to apply also to the case of persons so hanged who were not Israelites. If so, does it not follow (an objector may say) that Jesus, even if not an Israelite under the Law, would, however, by being crucified, have fallen under the curse of the Law, and thereby annihilated the Law for all who by faith should become partakers with him, whether Jews or Gentiles? why, then, should he have been brought under the Law? The objection is met by the consideration that, in order that Christ might

abrogate the Law by becoming subject to its curse, it was necessary that he should himself be perfectly acceptable to God, not only as being the eternal "Son of his love," but also in the entire completeness of his life as a man, and, therefore, by perfect obedience to the will of God as declared in the Law, under which it had pleased God to place his people. The Law, whatever the degradation which its ceremonial institute inferred for "the sons of God" subjected to it, was, nevertheless, for the time, God's manifest ordinance, to which all who sought to serve him were bound to submit themselves. They could not be righteous before him unless they walked in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless (Luke i. 6). That we might receive the adoption of sons (*ἵνα τὴν υἰοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν*); that is, that our adoptive sonship might be actually and in full measure made over to us. The "we" recites God's people; the same persons as those indicated by the preceding phrase, "those which were under the Law," which phrase was not meant to define one particular class among God's people, but to describe the condition in which God's people had been placed. Their Father had put them under the Law with the view of their being at his appointed time bought off from the Law and admitted to the full enjoyment of their filial privileges. This purpose of their Father, signified beforehand in the promises to Abraham, explains the article before *υἰοθεσίαν*: it was the adoptive sonship which had been guaranteed to them. Hence the use here of the verb *ἀπολάβωμεν*, instead of *λάβωμεν*: for the prepositional prefix of this compound verb has always its force; generally denoting our receiving a thing in some way due to us, answering to its force in the verb *ἀποδίδωμι*, repay; sometimes our receiving a thing in full measure (comp. Luke vi. 34, 35; xvi. 25; xviii. 30; xxiii. 41; Rom. i. 27; Col. iii. 24; 2 John 8). In Luke xv. 27 it is receiving *back* one lost. The second *ἵνα* is subordinate to the first; the deliverance of God's people from the Law was in order to their introduction into their complete state of sonship. The noun *υἰοθεσία* does not appear to occur in any Greek writer except St. Paul; though *θεῖος υἱός*, *υἱὸς θεός*, *υἰόθετος*, *ὁ κατὰ θεῖον πατήρ*, are found in various authors. After the analogy of other compound verbal nouns with a similar termination (*δρακμοσύνη*, *ἀγωνοθεσία*, *θεσμοθεσία*, etc.), it means first the act of adoption, as, perhaps, Rom. viii. 23; Eph. i. 5; and then, quite naturally, the consequent condition of the adopted child, as in Rom. viii. 15; ix. 4; and this seems its more prominent sense here. Rom. ix. 4 suggests the sur-

mise that the term had been in use before among Palestinian Jews, with reference to Israel's state under the theocracy, and that St. Paul borrowed it thence with reference to the Christian Church, in which it found a more complete realization.

Ver. 6.—**And because ye are sons** (*ὅτι υἱοὶ ἐστε υἱοί*). The apostle is adducing proof that God's people had actually received the adoption of sons; it was because it was so, that God had sent into their hearts the Holy Spirit, imparting that vivid consciousness of sonship which they enjoyed. The fact of the adoption must have been there, to qualify them to be recipients of this divinely inspired consciousness. The affirmation in Rom. viii. 16, "The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit that we are children of God," closely resembles our present passage; but it is not identical. We are not made sons (the apostle intimates) by the Spirit giving us the consciousness of sonship; but, having been previously made sons, the Spirit raises in our spirits sentiments answering to the filial relation already established. The position of the clause introduced by "because" is like that in I Cor. xii. 15, 16. The persons recited by the "ye" are still God's people; not the Galatian believers in particular, except as a portion of the whole Church of God. The apostle puts the thought in this form to bring the truth more strikingly home to their minds. This he does more closely still in the next verse by "thou." But that he has in view God's people as a whole is clear, not only from the whole strain of the context, but also from the phrase, "into our hearts," in the next clause. God hath sent forth (*ἐκπέστειλεν ὁ Θεός*); *God sent forth*. The tense indicates that the apostle does not refer to a sending forth of God's Spirit to each individual believer, parallel to that "sealing" which believers are stated to be subjects of in Eph. i. 13. This historic aorist, as it does in ver. 4, points to one particular emission—that by which the Comforter was sent forth to take up his dwelling in the Church as his temple through all time (John xiv. 16, 17; Acts i. 4, 5). **The Spirit of his Son.** The Spirit which "anointed" Jesus to be the *Christ*; which throughout animated the God-Man Jesus; which prompted him in full filial consciousness, himself in a certain critical hour with loud outcry (*μετὰ κραυγῆς ἰσχυρᾶς*, Heb. v. 7) to call out, "Abba, Father!" The phrase, "his Son," is ætiological; by it the apostle intimates that it was only congruous that the Spirit which had animated the whole life of the incarnate Son should be shed forth upon those who by faith become one with him, and should manifest his presence with them, as well as their

union with Christ, by outcome of sentiment similar to that which Christ had expressed. Since the sonship of Christ is here spoken of as if it were not merely antecedent, but also in some way preparatory to the sending forth of the Spirit, it best suits the connection to construe it, not, as in ver. 4, as that belonging to him in his preincarnate state of being, but as that which appertained to him after being "made to be of a woman," and in which his disciples might be considered as standing on a certain footing of parity with him. This harmonizes with the relation which in the Gospels and Acts the sending of the Spirit is represented as holding to his resurrection and ascension. The interpretation above given in one point presupposes the apostle's knowledge of the story of the agony in the garden, when, according to St. Mark (xiv. 36), Jesus himself used the words, "Abba, Father." This presupposition is warranted, not only by the probabilities of the case, but also by what we read in ch. v. 7 of the Epistle to the Hebrews, Pauline, certainly, if not actually St. Paul's. We have to add that the Gospels not only make repeated mention of our Lord as addressing the Supreme Being by the compellative of "Father," but also represent him as constantly speaking of God as bearing that relation both to himself and to his disciples. This mode of designating the Almighty was characteristic in the highest degree of Jesus, and up to that time, so far as appears in the Scriptures, unknown. The manner in which the apostle here speaks of the "sending forth" of the Spirit in close proximity to the mention of the "sending forth" of the Son, strongly favours the belief that he regarded the Spirit, as being also a personal agent. In Ps. civ. 30 we have in the Septuagint "Thou wilt send forth (*ἐκποστελεῖς*) thy Spirit, and they will be created." In Ps. xliv. 3 and lvii. 3 God is implored to "send forth [*ἐκποστελεῖς*, Septuagint] his light and his truth," "his mercy and his truth;" these being poetically personified as angelic messengers. **Into your hearts** (*εἰς τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν*). But this reading of the Textus Receptus is, by recent editors, replaced by the reading, *εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν*, *into our hearts*, the other reading being regarded as a correction designed to conform this clause with the words, "ye are sons," in the preceding one. In both cases the apostle has in his view the Church of God viewed generally. His putting "our" here instead of "your" was probably an outcome of his feeling of proud gladness in the thought of his own happy experience. A precisely similar change in the pronoun, attributable probably to the same cause, is observable in the remarkably analogous passage in Rom. viii.

15. "Ye received not the spirit of bondage again unto fear; but ye received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father." *Crying* (κράζοντες): *crying out aloud*. The word expressing loud utterance betokens in this case undoubting assurance. No faint whisper this of an inner consciousness, shy, reticent, because afraid to assure itself of so glorious, so blissful a relation; no hesitating half-hope; it is a strong, unwavering conviction, bold, though humbly bold, to thus address the all-holy Supreme himself. The "cry" is here attributed to the Spirit himself; in Rom. viii. 15 to believers, these being the Spirit's organs of utterance; presently after in the Romans, vers. 26, 27, the Spirit himself is said to "intercede with groanings which cannot be uttered, . . . according to the will of God." Analogously, in the Gospels, evil spirits in demoniacs at times are said to "cry out" (Mark i. 26; ix. 26), while in other passages the cry is attributed to the possessed person. *Abba, Father* (Αββᾶ, ὁ Πατήρ). In addition to Rom. viii. 15, just cited, the same remarkable words are found once only besides, in Mark xiv. 36, as uttered by our Lord in the garden. St. Luke (xxii. 42) gives only "Father" (Πάτερ); St. Matthew (xxvi. 39, 42), "my Father" (Πάτερ μου: in ver. 39, however, μου is omitted by Tischendorf, though he retains it in ver. 42). St. Matthew, by adding μου to Πάτερ here, which he does not add in xi. 25, 26, seems to indicate that the form of address which our Lord then employed bespoke more than usual of fervency or of intimacy of communion. According to Fürst ('Concordance'), "Abba," אבא, occurs frequently in the Targums "sensu proprio et honorifico;" in the Jerusalem Targum taking the form "Ibba," אבא. In consequence, we may assume, of the "honorific" complexion of this form of the word, it was in Chaldee the form usually employed in compellation, or for the vocative. The hypothesis that either the Divine Speaker, or the Evangelist Mark, or the Apostle Paul, added ὁ Πατήρ as an explanatory adjunct to the Aramaic "Abba," for the benefit of such as might need the explanation, is resisted (1) by the three-fold recurrence of the conjoined phrases in just the same form; (2) by the absence of any such intimation of a translation as we find given in other passages where an Aramaic word is explained, as in Mark v. 41; vii. 11, 34; John i. 38, 41, 42; xx. 16; Acts ix. 36; (3) by the addition of ὁ Πατήρ being made by St. Paul in the Romans, when writing with a glowing ardour of strong feeling wholly repugnant to the didactic calmness of a translational gloss: he does not pause to add such a gloss to "Maran atha" in 1 Cor. xvi. 22,

where it would seem to be much more called for. The apparently nominative form of ὁ Πατήρ lends no countenance to this view, as is shown by the comparison of Matt. xi. 26, *val*, ὁ Πατήρ: Luke viii. 54, ἡ παῖς, ἔγειρε: and in the Septuagint, Ps. viii. 1, 9, Κύριε ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν: Ps. vii. 1, Κύριε, ὁ Θεός μου. Another hypothesis that the twofold compellative was meant to intimate that God was now Father alike to Jewish believers and to Gentile, is wrecked upon its occurrence in St. Mark. The present writer ventures to surmise that the conjoined phrase originated thus: The Lord Jesus, being wont very commonly to substitute for the name "God" the designation of "Father," may be supposed to have used for this designation the word "Abba" as the honorific form of the Chaldaic noun for "father," in much the same way as the Jews regularly substituted the noun *Adonai*, an honorific form of *Adonim*, "lord," or "master," for the unutterable tetragrammaton, יהוה. Instead of *Adonai*, Christ (it may be supposed) customarily employed the word "Abba," as an almost *proper name* of the Supreme Being. When our Lord had occasion to apply the word "Father" as a *common noun* to God, whether in addressing him or in speaking of him, we may infer from the Peshito-Syriac Version of Mark xiv. 36 that he added another form of the same original noun "Abj," or "Obj," instead of or in addition to "Abba." The Πάτερ of Luke xxii. 42 may have been used to represent "Abba;" St. Matthew's Πάτερ μου to represent "Abj" or "Obj." The use of "Abba, ὁ Πατήρ" by believers, probably quite an exceptional use, was adopted, both as a conscious reminiscence of Christ's utterance in the garden—they, by conjoining themselves thus with their Lord, pleading, as it were, his Name as their warrant for claiming this filial relation with the Most High—and also as an intensely emphatic description of God's fatherhood, by conjoining together the almost *proper name* denoting his general fatherhood by which (supposably) Christ was used to designate God, and the *common noun* by which Christ's disciples had by him been taught to address him in prayer, and which embodied their sense of his especial fatherhood to those who serve him. The apostle is not to be understood as intimating that the Holy Spirit does actually produce in every heart in which he dwells the definite consciousness of sonship. It is enough for his purpose that the *nisus*, the endeavour and tendency of his spiritual operation, is in all cases in that direction, though through slackness on their own part so many Christians fail of conquering for themselves the full possession of their inheritance. But,

however, we need not (he implies) go back to Mosaic ceremonialism to seek *there* for our assured sonship. We *have* it already here—here, in Christ, and in the indwelling presence of his Spirit.

Ver. 7.—*Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son* (ὡστε οὐκ ἔτι ἐλ δούλος, ἀλλ' υἱός); so then, no longer art thou a bond-servant, but a son. ὡστε, properly “so that,” is frequently used by St. Paul for “so then” or “wherefore,” to state a final conclusion (cf. ver. 16, below; ch. iii. 24; Rom. vii. 4, etc.). It here marks the conclusion resulting from the statements of the preceding six verses, viz. of God having sent forth his Son to do away with the Law, subjection to which had marked the nonage of his people, and to raise them to their complete filial position, and of his then sending forth his Spirit into their hearts loudly protesting their sonship. “No longer art thou;” by this individualizing address the apostle strives to awaken each individual believer to the consciousness of the filial position belonging to him in particular. Believe it: in Christ Jesus, thou, thine own very self, art a son! The phrase, “no longer,” marks the position of God’s servant now, as compared with what it would have been before Christ had wrought his emancipating work and the Holy Spirit had been sent forth as the Spirit of adoption; then he would have still been a bond-servant; he is not that now. This abrupt singling out one individual as a sample of all the members of a class is an instance of the *δεινότης* of St. Paul’s style (comp. Rom. xi. 17; xii. 20; xiii. 4; xiv. 4; 1 Cor. iv. 7). The individual cited by the “thou” is neither a Gentile convert only nor a Jewish believer only; it is any member of God’s kingdom. “A son,” a member of God’s family, an *οἰκέτιος τοῦ Θεοῦ* (Eph. ii. 19), one free of all law of bondage and in full possession of a son’s privileges; no sinner, now, under his Father’s frown; but accepted, beloved, cherished, honoured with his Father’s confidence. And if a son, then an heir of God through Christ (εἰ δὲ υἱός, καὶ κληρονόμος διὰ Θεοῦ [Receptus, κληρονόμος Θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ]); and if a son, an heir also through God. So Rom. viii. 17, “And if children (τέκνα), heirs also; heirs of God, joint-heirs with Christ.” The inheritance here meant is the possession of every blessing which the theocratic kingdom entitles its members to look forward to. And the point of this added clause is that no further qualification is needed for our having a vested right in that inheritance, than that which is supplied by faith in Christ, uniting us to him and making us sharers with him; no such qualification, for example, as the Mosaicizing reactionaries insisted upon (see

Acts xv. 1); no observance of ceremonial rites, whether of the Law or of such freaks of heretical “will-worship” as are referred to in Col. ii. 23. Thy faith in Christ (says in effect the apostle) gives thee now for good and all an assured place in whatever inheritance God designs to give his people. The manuscripts and other authorities for the text present considerable variety in the reading of the last words of this clause. The reading adopted by L. T. Tr., Meyer, Alford, Lightfoot, and Hort and Westcott, namely, κληρονόμος διὰ Θεοῦ, is that found in the three oldest uncials, and presents a form of expression which was likely so greatly to surprise the copyist as to set him naturally upon the work of revision; whereas that of the Received Text, κληρονόμος Θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ, would have seemed to him so perfectly natural and easy that he would never have thought of altering it. The words, “heir through God,” taken in connection with the foregoing context, insist upon the especial appointment of the supreme God himself; his intervention displayed in the most conspicuous manner conceivable, through the incarnated Son and the sent-forth Spirit. The believer is here said to be a son and an heir “through God,” in the same sense as St. Paul affirms himself to be an apostle “through Jesus Christ and God the Father,” and “through the will of God” (ch. i. 1; 1 Cor. i. 1); for “of him and through him and unto him are all things,” and most manifestly so, the things composing the economy of grace which the gospel announces (Rom. xi. 36). The apostle has thus brought back his discourse to the same point which it had reached before in ch. iii. 29. The reader will do well to carefully compare this section of the Epistle (vers. 3—7) with Rom. vii. 25—viii. 4 and viii. 14—17. With great similarity in the forms of expression, the difference of the apostle’s object in the two Epistles is clearly discerned. *There* he is discoursing the more prominently of the believer’s emancipation from the controlling power of a sinful nature, which, under the Law, viewed under its moral aspect rather than its ceremonial, was rather fretted into yet more aggravated disobedience than quelled or overpowered. *Here* his subject is more prominently the believer’s emancipation from the thralldom of the Law’s ceremonialism, which in the present Epistle, relative to the troubles in the Galatian Churches, he has more occasion to deal with. Both the one deliverance, however, and the other was necessary for the believer’s full consciousness of adoptive sonship; and each was, in fact, involved in the other.

Ver. 8.—*Howbeit* (ἀλλὰ); a strongly adversative conjunction, belonging to the

whole sentence comprised in this and the next verse, which are closely welded together by the particles *μέν* and *δέ*. In contravention of God's work of grace just described, they were renouncing their sonship and making themselves slaves afresh. Then (*τότε μὲν*). The *μέν*, with its balancing *δέ*, here, as often is the case, unites together sentences not in their main substance strictly adverse to each other, but only in subordinate details contrasted, of which we have an exemplary instance in Rom. viii. 17, *Κληρονόμους μὲν Θεοῦ συγκαληρονόμους δὲ Χριστοῦ*. In such cases we have often no resource in English but to leave the *μέν* untranslated, as our Authorized Version commonly does; "indeed" or "truly," for example, would be more or less misleading. The truth is, the apostle in these two verses is heaping reproach upon the Galatian Judaizers; first, in this verse, for their former (guilty) ignorance of God and their idolatries, and then, in the next verse, for their slighting that blessed friendship with God which they owed only to his preventing grace. In dealing with Gentile Christians the apostle repeatedly is found referring to their former heathenism, for the purpose of enforcing humility or abashing presumption, as for example in Rom. xi. 17—25; xv. 8, 9; 1 Cor. xii. 2; Eph. ii. 11—13, 17. In the case of the Galatians his indignation prompts him to use a degree of outspoken severity which he was generally disposed to forbear employing. The "then" is not defined, as English readers might perhaps misconstrue the Authorized Version as intending, by the following clause, "not knowing God," which in that version is "when ye knew not God"—a construction of the words which the use of the participle would hardly warrant; rather the time referred to by the adverb is the time of which he has before been speaking, when God's people were under the pedagogy of the Law. This, though when compared with Christ's liberty a state of bondage, was, however (the apostle feels), a position of high advancement as compared with that of heathen idolaters. These last were "far off," while the Israelites were "nigh" (compare the passages just now referred to). During that time of legal pedagogy the Galatians and their forefathers, all in the apostle's view forming one class, were wallowing in the mire of heathenism. **When ye knew not God** (*οὐκ εἰδότες Θεόν*); *ye knew not God and, etc.* "Knowing not God" describes the condition of heathens also in 1 Thess. iv. 5, "Not in the passion of lust, even as the Gentiles which know not (*τὰ μὴ εἰδότες*) God;" 2 Thess. i. 8, "Rendering vengeance to them that know not (*τοῖς μὴ εἰδόσιν*) God." Both of these passages

favour the view that the apostle does not in the least intend in the present clause to *excuse* the idolatries which he goes on to speak of, but rather to describe a condition of godlessness which, as being positive rather than merely negative, inferred utter pravity and guiltiness. He uses *οὐκ* with the participle here, in place of the *μή* in the two passages cited from the Thessalonians, as intending to state an historical fact viewed absolutely—a seuse which is made clear in English by substituting an indicative verb for the participle. Ye did service unto (*ἐδουλεύσατε*); *serred*; devoted yourselves to. The verb is, perhaps, used here in that milder sense in which it frequently occurs; as in Matt. vi. 24; Luke xv. 29; xvi. 13; Acts xx. 19; Rom. vii. 6, 25; xiv. 18; 1 Thess. i. 9. The Revised Version, however, gives "were in bondage to" in the present instance, but "serve" in the passages now cited. The aorist, instead of an imperfect, describes the form of religious life which they then led as a whole. Them which by nature are no gods (*τοῖς φύσει μὴ ὄνσι θεοῖς*). The Textus Receptus has *τοῖς μὴ φύσει ὄνσι θεοῖς*, which would apparently mean "which are not gods by nature, but only in your imagination;" like "There be that are called gods," in 1 Cor. viii. 5—Zeus, Apollo, Here, etc., mere figments of imagination (comp. 1 Cor. viii. 4). The more approved reading suggests rather the idea that the objects they worshipped might not be non-existent, but were certainly not of a Divine nature; "by nature," that is, in the kind of being to which they belong (Eph. ii. 3; Wisd. xiii. 1, *μάταιοι φύσει*). The question may be asked—If they were not gods, what then were they? The apostle would probably have answered, "Demons;" for thus he writes to the Corinthians (1 Cor. x. 20): "The things which the Gentiles sacrifice they sacrifice to devils (*δαίμονις*), and not to God." Alford renders, "to gods which by nature exist not," etc.; but the more obvious sense of *ὄνσι* is that of a copula merely (comp. 2 Chron. xiii. 9, Septuagint, "He became a priest (*τῷ μὴ ὄντι θεῷ*)").

Ver. 9.—**But now** (*νῦν δέ*); *and now*. (See note on "then" in ver. 8). **After that ye have known God, or rather are known of God** (*γινώσκτες Θεόν, μᾶλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ Θεοῦ*); *after that ye have gotten to know God, or rather to be known of God*. Considering the interchangeable use of *γινώσκαι* or *ἐγνωσκίαι* and *εἰδέαι* in John viii. 55 and 2 Cor. v. 16, it seems precarious to make much distinction between them as applied to the knowledge of God. The former, however, is the verb more commonly used in this relation; by St. John, in his First Epistle, where so much is said of

knowing God, exclusively; although in other relations he, both in Epistle and Gospel, uses the two verbs interchangeably. The expression, "to know God," is one of profound pregnancy; denoting nothing less than that divinely imparted intuition of God, that consciousness of his actual being, viewed in his relation to ourselves, which is the result of truly "believing in him." Moreover, as it is knowing a personal Being, between whom and ourselves mutual action may be looked for, it implies a mutual conversancy between ourselves and him, as the term "acquaintance" (*of γνωστός τινος*), as used in Luke ii. 44 and xxiii. 49, naturally does. So that "having gotten to be known of God" is very nearly equivalent to having been by God brought to be, to speak it reverently, on terms of acquaintanceship with him; and this does indeed seem to be meant in 1 Cor. viii. 3. The Galatian believers had in very truth gotten to know God, if they had learnt to cry out unto him, "Abba, Father." And the remembrance of this happy experience of theirs, which he had, we may suppose, himself witnessed in the early days of their discipleship, prompts him to introduce the correction, "or rather to be known of God." Their having attained such a consciousness of sonship had been, as he writes, ver. 7, "through God;" he it was that had sent forth his Son that his people might receive the adoption of sons; he that had sent forth his Spirit into their hearts to give them the sense of sonship; he had shown that he knew, recognized them to be his (2 Tim. ii. 19), by gifting them with the blissful prerogative of knowing what he was to them. The correction of "knowing" by "being known" is analogous to that of "apprehend" by "being apprehended" in Phil. iii. 12. The pragmatic value of this correcting clause is to make the Galatians feel, not only what a wilful self-debasement it was on their part, but also what a slight put upon the Divine favours shown to them, that they should forwardly repudiate their filial standing to adopt afresh that servile standing out of which he had lifted his people. What was this but a high-handed contravening of God's own work, a frustration of his gospel? And this by them whom only the other day he had rescued from the misery and utter wickedness of idolatry! **How turn ye again;** or, *back* (*πὼς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν*); *how turn ye back again.* An abrupt change from the form of sentence which the foregoing words naturally prepared us for; which might have been such as we should have by simply omitting the "how." As if it were, "After having gotten to be known of God, ye are turning back again—how can

ye?—to the weak," etc. This "how," as in ch. ii. 14, is simply a question of remonstrance; not expecting an answer, it bids the person addressed consider the amazing unseemliness of his proceeding (so Matt. xxii. 12; comp. also 1 Tim. iii. 5; 1 John iii. 17). The verb *ἐπιστρέφειν* frequently denotes "turning back" (Matt. x. 13; xii. 44; 2 Pet. ii. 22; Luke viii. 55). **To the weak and beggarly elements** (*ἐπὶ τὰ ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα*); the mere elementary lessons, the A, B, C (see ver. 4, and note), which can do nothing for you and have nothing to give you. The description is relative rather than absolute. The horn-book, useful enough for the mere child, is of no use whatever to the grown-up lad who has left school. In Heb. vii. 18 mention is made of "the weakness and unprofitableness" of the Levitical Law relative to the expiation of sin; which is not precisely the aspect of the Law which is here under view. The word "beggarly" was probably in the writer's mind contrasted with "the unsearchable riches of Christ" (Eph. iii. 8). **Whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?** (*οἷς πάλιν ἐνωθεν δουλεῦν θέλετε*); *whereunto ye desire to be in bondage over again?* The verb *δουλεῦν* is here, differently from ver. 8, contrasted with the condition of a son enjoying his full independence (see ver. 25 and ch. v. 1). It would be an insufferable constraint and degradation to the full-grown son to be set to con over and repeat the lessons of the infant school. *Ἄνωθεν*, afresh, over again, intensifies *πάλιν* by adding the notion of making a fresh start from the commencing-point of the course indicated. The application of these words, together especially with the phrase, "turn back again," in the preceding clause, to the case of the Galatian converts from idolatrous heathenism, has suggested to many minds the idea that St. Paul groups the ceremonialism of heathen worship with that of the Mosaic Law. Bishop Lightfoot in particular has here a valuable note, in which, with his usual learning and breadth of view, he shows how the former might in its ritualistic element have subserved the purpose of a disciplinary training for a better religion. Such a view might be regarded as not altogether out of harmony with the apostle's spirit as evinced in his discourses to the Lycaonians and the Athenians (Acts xiv. 15—17; xvii. 22—31). But though in his wide sympatheticalness he might, if discoursing with heathens, have sought thus to win them to a better faith, he is hardly just now in a mood for any such sympathetic tolerance. He is much too indignant at the behaviour of these Galatian revolvers to allow that their



former religious ceremonies could have been good enough to be admitted to group with those of the Law of Moses: he has just before adverted to their former heathenism for the very purpose of (so to speak) setting them down—a purpose which would be a good deal defeated by his referring to that cult of theirs as in any respect standing on a level with the cult of the Hebrews. Indeed, it may be doubted whether, at the utmost limit to which he would at any time have allowed himself to go, in the “economy” which he unquestionably was used to employ in dealing with souls, he would, however, have gone so far as to class the divinely appointed ordinances of Israel, the training-school of God’s own children, with the ritual of demon-inspired worships. It is much easier to suppose that the apostle identifies the Galatian Churchmen with God’s own people, with whom they were now in fact *συνφυτοί*, blended in corporal identity with them. God’s children had heretofore been in bondage to the A, B, C, of the Law, but were so no longer; if any of those who were now God’s children took it in hand to observe that Law, then were they, though not in their individual identity, yet in their corporate identity, turning *back again* to the A, B, C, from which they had been emancipated. The former experience of Israel was *their* experience, as the “fathers” of Israel were their fathers (1 Cor. x. 1); which experience they were now setting themselves to renew.

Ver. 10.—Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years (*ἡμέρας παρατηρεῖσθε, καὶ μῆνας, καὶ καιροὺς, καὶ ἐνιαυτοὺς*); *days ye are intent on observing, and months, and seasons, and years.* In the compound verb *παρατηρεῖν*, the prepositional prefix, which often denotes “amiss,” seems rather, from the sense of “at one’s side,” to give the verb the shade of close, intent observation. This may be shown by the circumstances to be of an insidious character; thus the active *παρατηρεῖν* in Mark iii. 2; Luke vi. 7; xiv. 1; Acts ix. 24, and the middle *παρατηρούμαι*, with no apparent difference of sense, in Luke xx. 20. Josephus uses the verb of “keeping the sabbath days” (*Ant.*, iii. 5, 8), and the noun *παρατήρησις τῶν νομίμων*, for “observance of the things which are according to the laws” (*Ant.*, viii. 3, 9). The accumulation of nouns with the reiterated “and,” furnishing another example of the *δευδότης* of St. Paul’s style, betokens a scornfully impatient mimesis. These reactionaries were full of festival-observing pedantry—“days,” “new moons,” “festivals,” “holy years,” being always on their lips. The meaning of the first three of the nouns is partially suggested by Col. ii. 16, “Let no man judge

you . . . in respect of a feast day, or a new moon, or a sabbath day (*ἐορτῆς, νομμηνας, σαββάτων*);” in which passage, we may observe, there is a similar tone of half-mocking mimesis; where the same ideas are apparently presented, but in a reverse order. Comp. also 2 Chron. viii. 13, “Offering according to the commandment of Moses, on the sabbaths, and on the new moons, and on the solemn feasts, three times in the year, even in the feast of unleavened bread, and in the feast of weeks, and in the feast of tabernacles.” The “days,” then, in the present passage, we may suppose, are the sabbath days, together perhaps with the two fast days every week which the Jewish tradition prescribed (Luko xviii. 12). The “months” point to the new moons, the observance of which might occasion to these Gentiles considerable scope for discussion in adjusting themselves to the Jewish calendar, different no doubt from the calendar they had been hitherto used to. The “seasons” would be the annual festivals and fasts of the Jews, not only the three prescribed by the Levitical Law, but also certain others added by tradition, as the Feasts of Purim and of Dedication. So far we appear to be on tolerably sure ground. The fourth item, “years,” may refer either to the sabbatical year (Lev. xxv. 2—7), which at any rate latterly the Jews had got to pay much attention to (1 Macc. vi. 49, 53; Josephus, *Ant.*, xiv. 10, 6; also xiv. 16, 2; Tacitus, *Hist.*, v. 4); or possibly the jubilee years, one such fiftieth year, it might be, falling about this time due. Bengel (*Gnomon*) supposes that a sabbatical year might be being held A.D. 48, to which date he assigns this Epistle; while Wieseler (*Chron. Synops.*, p. 204, etc., referred to by Bishop Lightfoot) offers a similar conjecture for the year A.D. 54 autumn to A.D. 55 autumn. Very striking is the impatience which the apostle manifests in overhearing as it were the eager discussions occupying the attention of these foolish Galatian Judaizers. Their interest, he perceived, was absorbed by matters which were properly for them things of no concern at all, but which, with ostentatious zeal as such persons do, they were *making* their concern. The cause of their doing so lay, we may believe, in the feeling which was growing up in their minds that such like outward observances would of themselves make their life acceptable to God; this general sentiment habiting itself, in the choice of the particular form of outward ceremonies to be adopted, in the observance of the celebrations given by God to his people for the season of their nonage. The principle itself was no doubt repugnant to the apostle’s mind, even apart from the Judaizing form which it was

assuming, and which threatened a defection from Christ. Curious regard to such matters he evidently on its own account regards with scorn and impatience. But therewith also the old venerable religion, localized at Jerusalem as its chief seat, would under the impulse of such sentiments be sure to perilously attract their minds away from the "reformation" (*διόρθωσις*, Heb. ix. 10) to which it had now been subjected; and they were in danger of losing, nay, had in great degree at least already lost, the zest which they once had felt in embracing the exceeding great and precious gifts which Christ had brought to them. What was there here but the "evil heart of unbelief" spoken of in Heb. iii. 12, "in departing from the living God," now manifesting himself to his people in his Son? It is this animus characterizing the behaviour of the Galatian Churchmen which marks its essential difference as compared with that observance of "days" and "meats" which in Rom. xiv. the apostle treats as a matter, relative to which Christians were to live in mutual tolerance. As long as a Christian continued to feel his relation to the Lord Jesus (Rom. xiv. 6—9), it mattered not much if he thought it desirable to observe the Jewish sabbath or to abstain from eating animal food. He might, indeed, make himself thereby chargeable with spiritual un wisdom; the apostle clearly thought he would; but if he still held fast by Christ as the sole and all-sufficing Source to him of righteousness before God and of spiritual life, he was to be received and welcomed as a brother, without being vexed by interference with these foolish tenets of his. It became different when his care for such really indifferent externals took his heart away from a satisfied adherence to the Lord; then his ceremonialism or asceticism became rank and even fatal heresy. And this was what the apostle was fearing on behalf of his once so greatly cherished disciples in Galatia.

Ver. 11.—I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain (*φοβούμαι ὑμᾶς, μή πως εἰκὴ κεκοιτάκα εἰς ὑμᾶς*); I am afraid of you, lest by any means I have bestowed labour upon you in vain. That is, this behaviour of yours makes me fear whether I may not have bestowed labour upon you fruitlessly. A similar construction of *μή πως* with an indicative occurs in 1 Thess. iii. 5, *Μή πως ἐπειράσεν ὑμᾶς ὁ πειράζων*, "Fearing, whether the tempter may not have tempted you;" followed by the subjunctive, *Καὶ εἰς κενὸν γένηται ὁ κόπος ἡμῶν*, "And lest our labour should [in the as yet future result] prove to be for no good." This passage in the Thessalonians serves to

illustrate the nature of the mischief, which, in the present case, the apostle feared might result. For one thing, there was the hurt, the perhaps fatal hurt, which the Galatian believers might themselves receive from that virtual renouncement of their spiritual inheritance which they now seemed to be foolishly making. But there was also the disappointment which would accrue to himself through the failure of his work among them: "For what," as he wrote to the Thessalonians, ii. 19, "is our hope, or crown of glorying? Are not even ye, before our Lord Jesus at his coming?" The same anticipated joy he speaks of in writing to the Philippians, as about to accrue to himself from the steadfastness of his converts: "That I may have whereof to glory in the day of Christ, that I did not run in vain, neither labour in vain." This anticipation was a joy which he would fain not have wrested from him.

Ver. 12.—Brethren, I beseech you, be as I am; for I am as ye are (*γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγώ, ὅτι καὶ ὡς ὑμεῖς, ἀδελφοί, δέομαι*); be ye as I; because I on my part am as ye; brethren, I entreat. We may compare 1 Cor. xi. 1, "Be imitators of me, even as on my part I am of Christ (*μιμηταὶ μου γίνεσθε, καθὼς καὶ γὰρ Χριστοῦ*)."

There is no need in respect to *γίνεσθε* to accentuate the notion of *change*: this verb often means simply "show one's self," "act as;" as e.g. 1 Cor. xiv. 20, *Μὴ παιδία γίνεσθε . . . ; τὰς δὲ φρεσὶ τέλει γίνεσθε*; *ibid.*, xv. 58, and often. "Be as I;" to wit, rejoicing in Christ Jesus as our sole and all-sufficing Righteousness before God, and in that faith letting go all care about rites and ceremonies of the Law of Moses, or indeed ceremonialism of any kind, as if such things mattered at all here, in the business of being well-pleasing to God, whether done or forborne. "Because I on my part am as ye." I, a born Jew, once a zealous worker-out of legal ceremonial righteousness, have put that aside, and have placed myself on the footing of a mere Gentile, content to live like a Gentile (*ἐθνικῶς καὶ οὐκ Ἰουδαϊκῶς*, ch. ii. 14), trusting in Christ like as any Gentile has to do who was bare alike of Jewish prerogative and of ceremonial righteousness. This "for" or "because" is an appeal to them for loving sympathy and fellow-working. What was to become of him if *Gentiles* withheld from him *their* practical sympathy with his religious life? To what other quarter could he look for it? From Jewish sympathy he was an utter outcast. The *ἀδελφοί, δέομαι*, "brethren, I entreat," comes in here as a breathing forth of intense imploring. And a remarkable instance is here afforded of that abrupt, instantaneous transition in the expression of feeling

which is one great characteristic of St. Paul when writing in one of his more passionate moods. Compare for this the flexure of passionate feeling prevailing through the tenth and three following chapters of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. Just before, in this chapter, vers. 8—11, the language has been that of stern upbraiding, and, indeed, as if *de haut en bas*; as from one who from the high level of Israelite pre-eminence was addressing those who quite recently were mere outcast heathens. But here he seems suddenly caught and carried away by a flood of passionate emotion of another kind. The remembrance comes to his soul of his own former sorrows, when he "suffered the loss of all things," as he so pathetically tells the Philippians (iii. 4—14); when in the working out of his own salvation, and that of the Gentiles to whom he had been appointed to minister, he had cut himself off from all that he had once prized, and from all the attachments of kindred and party and nation. A terrible rending had it been for him when he had ceased to be a Jew; his *flesh* still quivered at the recollection, though his *spirit* rejoiced in Christ Jesus. And now this mood of feeling prompts him to cast himself almost as it were at the feet of these Gentile converts, adjuring them not to turn away from him, not to bereave him of their fellowship and sympathy. **Ye have not injured me at all** (*οὐδέν με ἤδικήσατε*); *no wrong have ye done me*. This commences a new sentence, which runs on through the next three verses. The apostle is anxious to remove from their minds the apprehension that he was offended with them on the ground of unkindness shown by them towards himself. It was true that he had been writing to them in strong terms of displeasure and indignation; but this was altogether on account of their behaviour towards the gospel, not at all on account of any injury that he had himself to complain of. He is well aware of the virulent operation of the sentiment expressed by the old maxim, "Odium quos læsimus;" and is therefore eager and anxious to take its sting out of the mutual relations between himself and them. When the apostle is writing under strong emotion, the connecting links of thought are frequently difficult to discover; and this is the case here. But this seems to be the thread of connection: the Galatian Christians would not be ready to accord him any sympathetic compliance with his entreaty that they would "be as he was," if they thought he entertained towards them sentiments of soreness or resentment on personal grounds. There was no reason, he tells them, why they should; they had done him

no wrong. There is no reason for supposing that the time of the action referred to in *οὐδέν με ἤδικήσατε* is identical with that indicated by the aorists of the two next verses. From the words, *τὸ πρῶτον*, "the first time," in ver. 13, it is clear, as critics have generally felt, that there had been a second visit after that one. If so, a disclaimer of offence taken during the first visit would not have obviated the suspicion of offence taken during a later one. The aorist of *ἤδικήσατε* must, therefore, cover the whole period of intercourse. Perhaps thus: whatever wrong you may suspect me of charging you with, be assured I do not charge you with it; there was no personal affront then offered me. In what follows, it is true, he dwells exclusively upon the enthusiastic demonstration which they made of their personal attachment to him when he first visited them; but though the assertion here made is not to its full extent proved good by the particulars given in vers. 13 and 14, and though the enthusiasm of personal kindness there described must, under the circumstances, have very considerably abated; yet, very supposably, nothing may have occurred since then—nothing, for example, during his second visit—which would show that they now disowned those feelings of love and respect. At all events, he refuses to allow that there had. No personal affront had he to complain of; while, on the other hand, their former intense kindness had laid up as it were a fund of responsive affection and gratitude in his bosom which could not be soon exhausted.

Ver. 13.—**Ye know** (*οἴδατε δέ*); *and ye know*. The apostle very often uses the verb *οἴδαμεν* or *οἴδατε*, conjoined with either *δέ*, *γάρ*, or *καθὸς*, when recalling some circumstance of personal history (1 Cor. xvi. 15; Phil. iv. 15; 1 Thess. ii. 1, 2, 5, 11; iv. 4; 2 Tim. i. 15) or to introduce the statement of a doctrine as one which would be at once recognized as certain or familiar (Rom. ii. 2; iii. 19; viii. 28; 1 Tim. i. 8; 2 Thess. ii. 6). The phrase as so used is equivalent to "We [or, 'you'] do not need to be told," etc.; and with *δέ* is simply a formula introducing such a reminiscence, this conjunction having in such cases no adversative force, but being simply the *δέ* of transition (metabatic); equivalent to "now" or "and," or not needing to be represented at all in translation; so that the Authorized Version is perfectly justified in omitting it in the present instance. The phrase may be taken as meaning "And you will well remember." If the apostle had intended to introduce a statement strongly adversative to the last preceding sentence, he would probably have written *ἀλλὰ τοῦναντίον* (Ch. ii. 7) or some such phrase. **How** through infirmity of the

flesh I preached the gospel unto you (ὅτι δι' ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς ἐπηγγέλισάμην ὑμῖν); that because of an infirmity of the flesh I preached the gospel unto you. "An infirmity of the flesh;" that is, a bodily illness. The noun ἀσθένεια is used for "illness" in John xi. 4; Acts xxviii. 9; 1 Tim. v. 23; Matt. viii. 17. It also denotes a nervous disablement, as Luke xiii. 11, 12; John v. 5. The verb ἀσθενέω is the common word for "being sick," as Luke iv. 40; vii. 10; John xi. 3, etc. It is possible that the apostle meant to say that the Galatians might not unnaturally have thought themselves treated slightly in that his remaining among them so long was owing to illness and not to his own choice; but that yet, for all that, they had shown themselves most eager in welcoming their involuntary visitor. The words, however, do not require to be thus construed, and in all probability intend no more than to bring back to their remembrance the disorder under which he was then suffering. The illness would seem to have been of a nature to make his personal appearance in some way unsightly, and even repulsive; for the ἐξεπύσαστε, spat out, of the next verse suggests even the latter idea. Evidently this disorder, as also the one noted in 2 Cor. xii. 7, 8, did not disqualify him for ministerial work altogether. He adverts to the circumstance, as making it yet more remarkable and more grateful to his feelings, that, notwithstanding the disagreeable aspect which in some way his disorder presented to those about him, they had cherished his presence among them with so much kindness as they did and also with such reverential respect. How it was that his illness brought about this protracted stay, whether it was that he fell ill while journeying through the country so as to be unable to pursue his way to his ulterior destination, or whether the remarkable healthiness of the climate either first attracted him thither or detained him there for convalescence (see Bishop Lightfoot, 'Galatians,' p. 10, note 2, for the character of the climate at Angora, the ancient Ancyra), it is impossible for us to determine. It is noticeable that St. Chrysostom's comments on the passage appear to show that he considered the apostle to be simply stating the circumstances *under which* and not those *in consequence of which* he preached the gospel to them; and so also Ecumenius and Theophylact paraphrase δι' ἀσθένειαν by μετὰ ἀσθενείας, suggesting the conjecture that they and St. Chrysostom understood the words as equivalent to "during a period of infirmity of the flesh." But this gives to διὰ with an accusative a sense which, to say the least, is not a common one. Is this illness of body to be connected with the affliction, most probably a bodily affliction,

mentioned in 2 Cor. xii. 7, 8, "the stake in the flesh"? This latter affliction has been discussed very fully by Dean Stanley and Meyer on the Corinthians, by Bishop Lightfoot in his commentary on the Galatians, and by Dr. Farrar in his 'Life of St. Paul.' It appears to have first befallen the apostle after the "revelations" accorded to him fourteen years before he wrote his Second Epistle to the Corinthians, which he is supposed to have done in the autumn of A.D. 57. This would bring us back to about A.D. 43. The apostle's first visit to Galatia, according to Bishop Lightfoot, p. 22, took place about A.D. 51. When we consider that no doubt many of those wearing labours and hardships, interspersed with frequent suffering of gross personal outrage, recounted in 2 Cor. xi. 23—27, had been undergone in the eight first of those fourteen years (the stoning at Lystra certainly had), it must seem very precarious to conjecture that the malady here referred to was a recurrence of just that particular disorder experienced eight years before. How many other ailments might not the apostle have been subject to, amid the cruel allotment of suffering and hardship which prevailing marked his course! It is quite as probable, to say the least, that he may then have been suffering in health or in limb from some assault of personal violence recently undergone. St. Luke gives no particulars whatever of this portion of St. Paul's journey, which is only just mentioned in Acts xvi. 6. The apostle visited Corinth for the first time not many months after this first sojourn in Galatia; and it is interesting to observe that he speaks of his having then ministered to them in "feebleness" (ἀσθενεία, 1 Cor. ii. 3), in a manner strongly suggestive of bodily weakness. At the first (τὸ πρότερον); the first time—an expression plainly implying that there had been a subsequent sojourn. Respecting this latter visit, all we know is what we have so cursorily stated in Acts xviii. 23; unless, perchance, we may be able to draw some inferences relating to it from what we read in this Epistle itself. Chronologers are pretty well agreed in placing the commencement of this third apostolical journey about three years after the commencement of the second.

Ver. 14.—And my temptation which was in my flesh (καὶ τὸν πειρασμὸν ὑμῶν [Receptus, πειρασμὸν μου τὸν] ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου); and that which was a temptation for you in my flesh. "In my flesh;" that is, in my bodily appearance. Instead of ὑμῶν, the Textus Receptus gives μου τὸν: but ὑμῶν is the reading of the best manuscripts, and, as the more difficult one, was the one most likely to be tampered with; it is accordingly accepted by recent editors with great unani-

mity. "My trial" would add to the sentence a tinge of pathetic self-commiseration. "Your trial" brings out the sentiment how greatly his affliction would be likely to indispose his hearers to listen to his message; it "tested" very severely the sincerity and depth of their religious sensibility. **Ye despised not, nor rejected** (*οὐκ ἐξουθενήσατε, οὐδὲ ἐξέπυύσατε*); **ye scouted not, nor loathed.** The disfigurement on the apostle's person, whatever it was, did not detain their attention; they did not, at least not long, occupy themselves with indulging their feelings of ridicule or disgust; their sense of it got to be soon absorbed in their admiration of the apostle's character and in their delight in the heavenly message which he brought to them. The verb *ἐξουθενέω*, in the New Testament found only in St. Luke and St. Paul, means always, not merely "to despise," but to *express* contempt for a thing, "to scout" (comp. Luke xviii. 9; xxiii. 11; Acts iv. 11; Rom. xiv. 3, 10; 1 Cor. i. 28; vi. 4; 2 Cor. x. 10; 1 Thess. v. 20). Grotius observes of *ἐξέπυύσατε* that it is a figurative expression drawn from our spitting out of our mouth what greatly offends our taste; quoting Catullus ('Carm.' 50, 'Ad Lic.'): "Precesque nostras, Oramus, ne despuas." Critics have remarked that *ἐκπύειν*, which is not found elsewhere used thus metaphorically as *ἀποπύειν* is, is probably so applied here by the apostle to produce a kind of alliteration after *ἐξουθενήσατε*: as if it were "Non reprobastis, nec reipuitis." But received me as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus (*ἅλλ' ὡς ἑγγελον θεοῦ ἐδέξασθέ με, ὡς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν*); but as an angel of God received ye me, as Christ Jesus. Their first feeling of aversion from his personal appearance gave place to emotions of delight in his message of which he seemed as it were the embodiment, and of reverential love and gratitude to himself. His manifest absorption in the glad tidings he brought, and in love to his Lord, irradiating his whole being with his unbounded benevolence and gladness as the messenger of peace (Eph. ii. 17), was recognized by them with a response of unspeakable enthusiasm. A faint parallel is afforded by 1 Thess. ii. 13.

Ver. 15.—Where is then (or, what was then) the blessedness ye spake of? (*ποῦ ὄν [Receptus, τίς ὄν ἦν] ὁ μακαρισμὸς ὑμῶν*); where, then, is that gratulation of yourselves (or, of yours)? The reading, *ποῦ ὄν*, which is that of the best manuscripts, is now generally accepted in preference to that of the Textus Receptus, *τίς ὄν ἦν*, in which, however, *τίς ὄν* stands on a higher footing of evidence than the remaining word *ἦν*. This latter reading may be taken to mean: either, "Of what sort, then, was that gratulation of

yours?" that is, what was its value in respect to the depth of conviction on which it was founded?—*τίς* being *qualis*, as Luke x. 22; xix. 3, etc., which would bring us to much the same result as *ποῦ*: or, "How great, then, was that gratulation of yours!" But the "then" (*ὄν*) comes in lamely; *τότε* ("at that time") would have been more in place; and, further, it is questionable whether the *τίς* of admiration ever occurs without the wonder taking a tinge of inquiry, as, for example, Mark vi. 2; Luke v. 21; Col. i. 27, which would be out of place here. With the more approved reading, *ποῦ ὄν*, the apostle asks, "What is, then, become of that gratulation of yourselves?" The "then" recites the fact, implied in the description given of their former behaviour, that they did once felicitate themselves on the apostle's having brought them the gospel. This is more directly brought into view in the words which follow. As the verb *μακαρίζω* means "pronounce happy," as Luke i. 48 and Jas. v. 11, the substantive *μακαρισμός* denotes "pronouncing one to be happy;" as Rom. iv. 6, 9. So Clement of Rome ('Ad Cor.', 50), who weaves the apostle's words into his own sentence with the same meaning. This felicitation must have been pronounced by the Galatians upon themselves, not upon the apostle; the apostle would have spoken of himself on the object of their *ἐλλογία*, not of their *μακαρισμός*. For I bear you record (*μαρτυρῶ γὰρ ὑμῖν*); for I bear you witness; testify on your behalf; the phrase always denoting commendation (Rom. x. 2; Col. iv. 13). Compare "Ye were running well," ch. v. 3. The verb denotes a deliberate, almost solemn, avowment. That, if it had been possible, ye would have plucked out your own eyes, and have given them to me (*ἴτι, εἰ δυνατόν, τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν ἐξορύξαντες ἐδώκατέ [Receptus, ἔν ἐδώκατέ μοι]*); that, if possible, ye had plucked out your eyes to give them to me. The phrase, *ἐξορύσσειν ὀφθαλμούς*, occurs in the Septuagint of Judg. xvi. 21 and 1 Sam. xi. 2, Hebrew, "bore out the eyes." The omission of the *ἔν*, which is rejected by recent editors, perhaps intimates the certainty and readiness with which they would have done it; but the particle occurs very sparingly in the New Testament as compared with classical Greek. There seems something strange in the specification of this particular form of evidencing zealous attachment. If there had otherwise appeared any question of making gifts, the apostle might have been construed to mean, "Ye were ready to give me anything, your very eyes even;" but this is not the case. Possibly the particular mention of "the Churches of Galatia" in 1 Cor. xvi. 1 may have been occasioned by their having shown an especial readiness, even at the apostle's second sojourn among

thom, to take part in the collection referred to; or by their having been the first Churches he came to in that particular tour, the directions which he gave to them being given also to all the Churches he went on to visit; but on this point see *Introd.* p. xvi. The tone of ch. vi. 6—10 does not betoken especial open-handedness on their part, unless, perhaps, the words, "let us not grow weary," hint at a liberality once displayed but now declined from. On the whole, this specification of "eyes" seems rather to point to there having been something amiss with the apostle's own eyes, either from ophthalmia or as the effect of personal outrage perpetrated upon him. It is especially deserving of notice how the apostle, in the two clauses of this verse, links together their joy in their newly found Christian blessedness with their grateful love to himself; the latter fact is adduced as proof of the former. Their gospel happiness, he feels, was indissolubly woven in with their attachment to *him*: if they let go their joy in Christ Jesus, as, apart from any qualification to be acquired by observances of the Law of Moses, their all-sufficient righteousness, they must also of necessity become estranged from him, who was nothing if not the exponent and herald to them of that happiness. This consideration is of great moment for the right understanding of the next verse.

Ver. 16.—Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth? [*ὡστε ἐχθρὸς ὑμῶν γέγονα ἀληθεύων ὑμῖν*]; so then, am I become your enemy, because I deal with you according to truth? This is a wailing remonstrance against an apprehended incipient state of alienation. "So then," *ὡστε* (see note on ver. 7), occurs repeatedly before an imperative; as 1 Cor. iii. 21; iv. 5; x. 12; Phil. ii. 12; iv. 1; Jas. i. 19; here only before a question. Its consecutive import here lies in the essential identification between their attachment to St. Paul and their allegiance to the pure gospel. If they forsook the gospel, their heart was gone from *him*. Naturally also their incipient defection from the truth was accompanied by a jealousy on their part how he would regard them, and by a preparedness to listen to those who spoke of him, as Judaizers everywhere did, with disparagement and dislike. No doubt the accounts which had just reached him of the symptoms showing themselves among them of defection from the gospel, and which prompted the immediate despatch of this Epistle, had informed him also of symptoms of a commencing aversion from himself. The construction of *γέγονα* with *ἀληθεύων* is similar to that of *γέγονα ἔφρων* with *καυχώμενος* in the Textus Receptus of 2 Cor. xii. 11, which is perfectly good Greek, even though the word *καυχώμενος* must be removed from

the text as not genuine. The verb "I am become" describes the now produced result of the action expressed by the participle *ἀληθεύων*, "dealing according to truth"—an action which has been continuous to the present hour and is still going on. If the apostle were referring only to something which had taken place at his second visit, he would have probably used different tenses; either, perhaps, *ἐχθρὸς ὑμῶν ἐγενόμην ἀληθεύων*—compare *φαρῆ . . . κατεργαζομένη* in Rom. vii. 13 (or with a contemporaneous aorist participle, *ἀληθεύσας*); or, *ἐχθρὸς ὑμῶν γέγονα ἀληθεύσας*, like *εἶναι μοιχαλίδα γενομένην ἀνδρὶ ἐτέρῳ* in Rom. vii. 3. As it stands, "dealing with you according to truth" (*ἀληθεύων ὑμῖν*) expresses the apostle's continuous declaration of the gospel, and his never-finch-ing insistence upon the mortal danger of defection from it (see ch. i. 9, *προειρήκαμεν*); and "I am become your enemy" points to the result now manifesting itself from this steadfast attitude of his, in consequence of their consciousness of meriting his disapproval. The verb *ἀληθεύω* occurs only once in the Septuagint—in Gen. xlii. 16, *Εἰ ἀληθεύετε ἢ οὐ*, "Whether there be any truth in you" (Authorized Version and Hebrew); and once besides in the New Testament—in Eph. iv. 15, *Ἀληθεύοντες ἐν ἀγάπῃ*, where the verb denotes, apparently, not merely being truthful in speech, but the whole habit of addiction both to uprightness and to God's known truth; for we can hardly leave out of our view this latter idea, when we consider how frequently the apostle designates the gospel by the term "the truth" (2 Cor. iv. 2; vi. 7; xiii. 8; ch. iii. 1; Eph. i. 13; 2 Thess. ii. 10, 12, 13; 1 Tim. ii. 4). "Enemy" is either one regarded as adopting a hostile position to them, or one viewed with hostile feeling by them, which latter is its sense in Rom. xi. 28; 2 Thess. iii. 15. The above exposition of the import of this verse is confirmed by the consideration that the Epistle affords no trace of the apostle's relations with the Galatian converts having been other than mutually friendly at even his second visit to them. This fact is implied in ver. 12, and ch. i. 9 furnishes no evidence to the contrary; for those warnings may have been uttered in his first visit as well as in his second, without occasioning or being occasioned by any want of mutual confidence. This view of their mutual relations is confirmed likewise by the feelings of indignant astonishment with which evidently the apostle took up his pen to address them in this letter: the tidings which had just reached him had been a painful surprise to him.

Ver. 17.—They zealously affect you, but not well (*ζηλοῦσιν ὑμᾶς οὐ καλῶς*); they admire you in no good way. Of the several

senses of the verb *ζηλοῦν*, those of "envy," "emulate," "strive after," are plainly unsuitable in this verse and the one which follows. So also are the senses "to be zealous on one's behalf," "to be jealous of one," which in Hellenistic usage crept into it, apparently from its having been in other senses adopted to represent the Hebrew verb *qinnē*, and borrowing these from this Hebrew verb. The only phase of its meaning which suits the present passage is that which it perhaps by far the most frequently presents in ordinary Greek, though not so commonly in the Septuagint and in the New Testament, namely, "to admire," "to deem and pronounce highly fortunate and blessed." When used in this sense, it has properly for its object a person; but with a suitable qualification of meaning it may have for its object something inanimate. Very often is the accusative of the person accompanied with the genitive of the ground of gratulation, as Aristophanes, 'Ach.,' 972, *Ζηλωσε τῆς εὐβουλίας*, "I congratulate, admire, you for your cleverness;" see also 'Equit.,' 834; 'Thesmoph.,' 175; 'Vesp.,' 1450; but not always; thus Demosthenes, 'Fals. Legat.,' p. 424. "*Θαυμάζουσι καὶ (ζηλοῦσι)* they admire and congratulate and would each one be himself like;" 'Adv. Lept.,' p. 500 (respecting public funeral orations), "This is the custom of men admiring (*ζηλοῦντων*) virtue, not of men looking grudgingly upon those who on its account are being honoured;" Xenophon, 'Mem.,' ii. 1, 19, "Thinking highly of themselves, and praised and admired (*ζηλοῦμένους*) by others;" Josephus, 'C. Ap.,' i. 25, "*(ζηλοῦμένους)* admired by many." It thus seems to be often just equivalent to *ὀλβίζω* or *μακαρίζω*, with the sense of which latter verb it is brought into close neighbourhood in Aristophanes, 'Nubes,' 1188, "Blessed (*μάκαρ*), Strepsiadēs, are you, both for being so wise yourself and for having such a son as you have,—thus will my friends and fellow-wardsmen say, in admiration of me (*ζηλοῦντες*)." Probably this is the sense in which the apostle uses the verb in 2 Cor. xi. 2, *Ζηλω γὰρ ὑμᾶς Θεοῦ ζηλω*, "I rejoice in your felicity with an infinite joy;" referring to the intense admiration which he felt of their present felicity, in their having been betrothed a chaste maiden to Christ; not till the next verse introducing the mention of his fear lest this paradisaical happiness might be darkened by the wiles of Satan. It is in a modified shade of the same sense that the word is employed—where it is rendered "covet earnestly" in our Authorized Version—in 1 Cor. xii. 31; xiv. 1, 39. In the passage now before us, then, *ζηλοῦσιν ὑμᾶς* probably means "they admire you," that is, they tell you so. They were expressing strong admiration of the high Christian character

and eminent gifts of these simple-minded believers; the charisms which had been bestowed upon them (ch. iii. 2); their virtues, in contrast especially with their heathen neighbours; their spiritual enlightenment. No doubt all this was said with the view of courting their favour; but *ζηλοῦτε* can hardly itself mean "court favour," and no instance of its occurring in this sense has been adduced; and this rendering of the verb breaks down utterly in ver. 18. The persons referred to must, of course, be understood as those who were busy in instilling at once Judaizing sentiments and also feelings of antipathy to the apostle himself, as if he were their enemy (ver. 16). The Epistle furnishes no indication whatever that these persons were strangers coming among them from without, answering, for example, to those spoken of in ch. ii. 12 as disturbing the Antiochian Church. It is quite supposable that the warning which, not long after the writing of this Epistle, the apostle addressed to the Ephesian elders at Miletus (Acts xx. 29, 30), when putting them on their guard against those who "from among their own selves should rise up speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them," was founded in part upon this experience of his in the Galatian Churches. Galatian Churchmen it may well have been, and no other, who now (as the apostle had just been apprised) were employing that *χρηστολογία καὶ εὐλογία*, that "kind suave speech" and that "speech of compliment and laudation," which in Rom. xvi. 18 he describes as a favourite device of this class of deceivers, to win the ear of their unwary brethren. "In no good way;" for they did it insincerely and with the purpose of drawing them into courses which, though these men themselves knew it not, were nevertheless fraught with ruin to their spiritual welfare. **Yes, they would exclude you;** or, *οὐκ ἔθελον ὑμᾶς θέλουσιν*; *παύ*, rather, to shut you out is their wish. The reading "us," noticed in the margin of the Authorized Version, is probably a merely conjectural emendation made in the Greek text by Beza, wholly unsupported by manuscript authority. The *ἀλλὰ* is adversative to the *οὐ καλῶς*, the secondary thought of the preceding clause, in the same way as the *ἀλλὰ* in 1 Cor. ii. 7 is adversative to the secondary negative clauses of ver. 6. The verb "shut out," with no determinative qualification annexed, must have it supplied from the unexpressed ground for the "admiration" denoted by the verb *ζηλοῦσιν*. The high eminence of spiritual condition and happiness on the possession of which these men were congratulating their brethren, they would be certainly excluded from if they listened to them. Compare the phrase, "who are unsettling you," driving you out

of house and home, in ch. v. 12, where see note. That ye might affect them (*ἵνα αὐτοὺς ζηλοῦτε*); that ye may admire themselves. The position of *αὐτοὺς* makes it emphatic. We may paraphrase thus: that, being detached from regard to my teaching, and made to feel a certain grave deficiency on your own part in respect to acceptableness with God, ye may be led to look up as disciples to these kind-hearted sympathetic advisers for instruction and guidance. The construction of *ἵνα* with *ζηλοῦτε*, which in ordinary Greek is the present *indicative*, *ζηλωτε* being the form for the present *subjunctive*, is precisely similar to that of *ἵνα μή* with *φοιούσθε* in 1 Cor. iv. 6. When it is considered how punctually St. Paul is wont to comply with the syntactical rule with reference to *ἵνα*, and that these two remarkable deflections therefrom are connected with contract forms of verbs in *-ω*, Rückert's suggestion seems to be perfectly reasonable, that the solecism lies, not in the syntactical construction, but in the grammatical inflexion, contracting *-θη* into *-ου* instead of into *-ω*. This form of contraction may have been a provincialism of Tarsus, or it may have been an idiom of St. Paul himself. Other expedients of explanation which have been proposed are intolerably harsh and improbable.

Ver. 18.—But it is good to be zealously affected always in a good thing, and not only when I am present with you (*καλὸν δὲ ζηλοῦσθαι* [Receptus, τὸ ζηλοῦσθαι] *ἐν καλῷ παντοῦτε, καὶ μὴ μόνον ἐν τῷ παρῑναι με πρὸς ὑμᾶς*); but good it is to be admired, in what is good, at all times and not only when I am present with you. That is, but as to being admired and felicitated, the good kind of admiring felicitation is that which, being tendered on a good account, is enjoyed at all times, and not only, my little children, when I am with you, as on that first occasion when you were so full of mutual felicitation and joy in the newly found sense of God's adoption and love in Christ Jesus. In signification, this *ζηλοῦσθαι*, to be admired, is equivalent to *μακαρίζεσθαι*, to be congratulated, and was illustrated in the first note on ver. 17, especially by the reference to Aristophanes, 'Nubes,' 1188. *Ζηλοῦσθαι ἐν τῷ παρῑναι με πρὸς ὑμᾶς*, "to be objects of admiration when I am present with you," is manifestly a recital of the *μακαρισμὸς ὑμῶν*, "the gratulation of yourselves," of ver. 15. The vivid remembrance of the simple-hearted joy and frank sympathy with each other's happiness of those days comes back to the apostle's mind with fresh force, after his brief mention and rebuke of the false-hearted gratulations and compliments by which they were now in danger of being ensnared. With a gentle reprehension of their levity, in that they were now bartering that former well-

founded happiness for this later poor gratification of being recipients of mere false flattery, he yearns to bring them back to what they were so senselessly casting away, and that they should hold it fast, a stable joy, whether he was with them or not. This would be the case if "Christ were truly formed in them." The phrase, *ἐν καλῷ*, "in what is good," is similar to *ἐν κρυπτῷ* (John vii. 4); *ὁ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ, ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαίου* (Rom. ii. 28, 29). The sphere in which this admiring felicitation acts must be "what is good;" here that highest good which these Galatians were in danger of losing, if, indeed, they possessed it—being, and knowing themselves to be, sons of God. It is a doubtful point whether ver. 19 should be conjoined with this present verse, with a colon between vers. 19 and 20, and a comma only at the end of ver. 18; or whether the sentences should be separated as they appear in our Authorized Version. But at all events, the earnest, anxious, tender affectionateness which, as it were, wrings the apostle's heart in writing ver. 19, is to be felt already working in his soul in the writing of this eighteenth verse. The sense above given to the verb *ζηλοῦν*, though disallowed by Alford and Bishops Ellicott and Lightfoot, appears to be that recognized by the Greek commentators Chrysostom and Theophylact.

Ver. 19.—My little children, of whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you (*τεκνία μου* [or, τέκνα μου] *ὁὸς πάλιν ὠδίνω, ἄχρι οὗ μορφωθῆ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν*); my little children (or, my children) of whom I am again in travail, until Christ be formed in you. It has been above remarked to be doubtful whether this verse should be conjoined with the preceding verse or with that which follows. The objection to the latter arrangement, presented by the *δὲ* at the commencement of ver. 20, is thought by many to be obviated by a number of instances which have been alleged in which this conjunction is used with a sentence following a vocative compellation (see Alford, Ellicott). But such cases appear marked by a tone of vivacity and surprise which is not present here. On the other hand, the tone of loving affectionate anxiety breathing in this verse links it more closely with the preceding than with the following one, in which such pathos is no longer discernible, but is replaced by a deliberative attitude of mind. The word *τεκνία* occurs as a compellation here only in St. Paul's writings, though repeatedly in St. John's Epistle and once in his Gospel (John xiii. 33), where it appears as used by our Lord in an access of deeply moved affectionateness. St. Paul addresses Timothy as "his child" (*τέκνον*) in 2 Tim. ii. 1 and 1 Tim. i. 18, not only as a term of endearment, but as



denoting also his having been spiritually begotten by him (comp. Philem. 10; 1 Cor. iv. 15). Here the like sense attaches to the word, as is clear from the following clause, "of whom I am again in travail;" but the diminutive form of the noun, agreeing well with the notion of a child at its birth, combines in this case apparently a tender allusion also to the extremely immature character of their Christian discipleship (compare "babes (*νήπιοι*) in Christ," 1 Cor. iii. 1)—so immature, in fact, that the apostle is travailing of them afresh, as if not yet born at all. This particular shade of meaning, however, must be sacrificed, if we accept the reading *τέκνα μου*, "my children," which is highly authenticated. The verb *ᾄδω* cannot be understood as pointing to gestation merely; it can only denote the pangs of parturition. The apostle by this figure describes himself as at this hour in an anguish of desire to bring the souls of his converts both to a complete state of sonship in Christ Jesus, and to a complete consciousness of that state—now at length bring them thereto, though that former travail had seemingly been in vain. In 1 Cor. iv. 15 and Philem. 10 he refers to himself as a spiritual father of his converts, and this too with touching pathos. Great is the pathos too of his reference to himself as, in his fostering care of his Thessalonian converts, like a tender "nursing mother cherishing her own children," and also as of a "father" of them (1 Thess. ii. 7, 11). But neither of those passages equals the present in the expression of intense, even anguished, longing to effect, if only he might be able to effect it, a real transformation in the spiritual character of these Galatian converts. "Until"—I cannot rest till then!—"Christ be formed in you." The verb *μορφώω*, form, occurs only here in the New Testament in its uncompound shape. A passage is cited from 'Const. Apost.,' iv. 7, in which it occurs in the phrase, "formed man in the womb." In the Septuagint of Exod. xxi. 22 we have *ἐξεικονισμένον* of the unborn infant. It certainly seems as if the apostle used the word as one belonging to the same region of thought as the *ᾄδω*, but, with the like bold and plastic touch as elsewhere characterizes his use of imagery, refusing to be tied to thorough-going consistency in its application. Compare for example 2 Cor. iii. 2. When the hour of *ᾄδω* is come, the period of the "formation" of the babe has expired. Further, as showing the freedom of the writer's use of imagery, the easiest way of taking *ἐν ὑμῖν* is to suppose that "Christ" is here viewed as "within" them, and not as a likeness to which they are to be conformed; comp. ch. ii. 22, "Christ liveth in me;" and Col. i. 27,

where the "mystery" of the gospel is summed up in the words, "Christ in you the hope of glory." He cannot rest, he means, till the image, thought, of Christ as the Object of their sole and absolute trust, as the complete ground of their acceptance with God and their souship, shall be perfectly and abidingly formed in their hearts. The hour in which a perfectly formed "Christ," that fair Divine Child of joy and hope, has come to be there, in their hearts, will be the hour in which the apostle's travailing pangs have issued in their birth. No doubt the apostle is writing to persons baptized into Christ and thus clothed with Christ (ch. iii. 27); persons, in the language of the Church, "born again." But however straitly we choose to be restrained in the use of such images, solidifying into rigid dogma similitudes used for such passing illustration as the occasion of the moment requires, the sacred writers themselves recognize no such restriction. As Chrysostom observes in his 'Commentary,' the apostle's language in effect is, "Ye need a fresh new-birth, a fresh remoulding (*ἀναγεννήσεως ἐτέρας ὑμῖν δεῖ καὶ ἀναπάσεως*)." Baptized into Christ as those Galatians were, they were, however, in his view no true sons of God, until Christ had been really formed in their hearts.

Ver. 20.—I desire to be present with you now (*ἤθελον δὲ παρῆναι πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἄρτι*); I could wish to be present with you this very hour. The *δὲ* marks here simply a transition to another thought, and, as is not unfrequently the case, and as our Authorized Version assumes, needs not to be represented in translation at all. Bishop Lightfoot writes, "But, speaking of my presence, I would I had been present," etc. But this explanation is not necessary. The imperfect verb *ἤθελον*, like the *ἐβουλόμην* of Acts xxv. 22 and the *ἠύχουμην* of Rom. ix. 3, denotes a movement as it were which had just been stirring in the mind, but which for good reasons is now withdrawn: "I could almost wish—but long distance and pressure of other duties make it impossible." Thus much in explanation of the withdrawal of the wish. The wish itself was occasioned by the feeling that the yearning desire of his soul might perhaps be more likely to be achieved if, by being on the spot, he were enabled to adapt his treatment to a more distinct consciousness of the circumstances than he can possibly now have. "To be present with you;" the very words are repeated from ver. 18. It was well both with you and with me when I was with you: would that I could be with you now! (On *ἄρτι*, "this very hour," see note on ch. i. 9.) And to change my voice (*καὶ ἀλλάξαι τὴν φωνήν μου*). The tense of the infinitive

ἀλλὰδαί hardly allows us to take the word as meaning "from moment to moment according to the rapidly varying emergencies." This would have been expressed rather by ἀλλὰδέν. The question then arises—Change: from what to what? to which a great variety of answers have been proposed. The clue is probably supplied in the words, "be present with you this very hour." This ἔρτι, contrasting as it does the very present with the former occasions on which the apostle had been with them, suggests that he meant that the tone of his utterance would need to be different if amongst them just now from what it had then been. Then, it was the simple, un-anxious, joyous, exposition of the blessed gospel, untrammelled by fear of being misunderstood; such a way of speaking as one would be naturally drawn on to pursue who found himself addressing those whom he could confide in, and who were disposed frankly and lovingly, with an honest and good heart, to drink in from his lips the simple faith. Perhaps he might now find it necessary to replace that mode of utterance by guarded words, by stern reasoning, by the refuting of wilful misconceptions, by exposing and abashing evil and objection. For I stand in doubt of you; or, I am perplexed for you (ἀπορούμαι γὰρ ἐν ὑμῖν); I am perplexed about you. Compare θαρρῶ ἐν ὑμῖν, "I am in good courage concerning you" (2 Cor. vii. 16). As "in" the Corinthians the apostle found ground for good courage, so "in" the Galatians he found ground for perplexity. This explains his wishing that he were with them. He would in that case be less unable to clearly understand their state of mind.

Ver. 21.—Tell me, ye that desire to be under the Law (λέγετέ μοι, οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον θέλοντες εἶναι). After the outburst of affectionate earnestness expressed in the last four verses, the apostle seems to have paused, reflecting in what way he could the most effectually convince these Galatian legalists of their error. At length, a consideration occurs to him, which he impetuously so to speak hastens to abruptly set before them. He has before (ch. iii. 29) shown to the Galatian believers that they were "Abraham's seed." He now means to show that, as children of Abraham through faith in Christ, they stood on a far higher footing than the children of the Sinai covenant did—a position which, by subjecting themselves afresh to the Law, they would forego. The verb "desire" (θέλοντες), as here introduced, intimates that this aspiration of theirs was a mere freak of self-will, there being nothing in the circumstances to prompt it. So in ver. 9, "Ye desire to be in bondage." In consequence

of there being no article with νόμον, some would render ὑπὸ νόμον "under Law," that is, Law viewed *in genere*, as in Rom. iv. 15. But the whole scope of the Epistle resists this view. The apostle's contention with the Galatian perverters of the truth is not concerning Christians being subject to Law absolutely, but concerning their being subject to a Law of outward ceremonial observance; that is, to the Law of Moses; for there was no other system of positive ordinances by which, as of Divine authority, they could imagine themselves to be bound. The noun νόμος is used without the article, like other monadic nouns with an understood specific reference (for examples, Θεός, Κύριος, Χριστός, Πνεῦμα, διάβολος, κόσμος); as it is also Rom. ii. 23; iii. 31; iv. 13, 14; v. 13; 1 Cor. ix. 20; ch. ii. 21; iv. 5; Phil. iii. 5, 6. Do ye not hear the Law? (τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε); to that Law give ye no heed? The article is here prefixed to νόμον to make the repetition of the noun the more telling; just as it is in Rom. ii. 23, "Ὁς ἐν νόμῳ καυχῶσθαι, διὰ τῆς παραβάσεως τοῦ νόμου τὸν Θεὸν ἀτιμάζεις; The verb ἀκούετε, hear, like our "listen to," means "take to heart what it says," as in Matt. x. 14; Luke xvi. 29, 31. There is no reason for attributing to the verb such a sense of listening to an oral utterance as should warrant us in supposing, that the apostle is thinking in particular of the Galatian Christians as in the habit of "hearing" the Pentateuch and other Old Testament Scriptures read, whether in Jewish synagogues (cf. 2 Cor. iii. 14, 15; Acts xv. 21) or in Christian assemblages. That such Scriptures in the Septuagint Version were customarily read aloud when Christians assembled for united worship, especially in the absence or dearth of other inspired writings, is more than probable; we know from Justin Martyr ('Apol.,' i. p. 83) that such was the custom from Sunday to Sunday in his days, when there were ἀποστολικὰ ἱπομνημονεῖματα also available for such use. Moreover, the existence of such a custom helps us to understand how it was that the apostle could here, as in Rom. vii. 1, presuppose with Christian believers an acquaintance with the contents of the Pentateuch. But we require more here than the thought, "Are ye not wont to hear the Law read?" It is rather an acquaintance with its contents, and taking due account of them, that he demands of his readers. Some uncial manuscripts have ἀναγινώσκετε, read, instead of ἀκούετε. This reading of the text would only imply, not without a touch of sarcasm, the sense which the more accredited reading, ἀκούετε, may be understood as directly denoting. The use of the word "Law" to denote at once the system of

Mosaic legislation and the historical record in which it is embedded, is remarkable. The Jews were accustomed to designate the Pentateuch by this term (comp. Matt. v. 17; Luke xvi. 16; xxiv. 44); and whoever would fain subject themselves to the positive enactments of the Mosaic Law as possessing Divine authority, would of course feel themselves bound also to accept the teaching of the historical record as clothed with the like authority. The apostle himself also accepted both as alike coming from God; only he required that the Divine purpose in both should be clearly understood and be suitably complied with.

Ver. 22.—For it is written (*γέγραπται γάρ*); for the Scripture saith. The phrase does not here, as it does usually, introduce the citation of a text, but prefaces a brief summary of facts; these facts being recited in words gathered out of the Septuagint Version of Gen. xvi. and xxi., in much the same way as the story of Melchisedec is sketched in Heb. vii. 1—4. That Abraham had two sons (*ὄντι Ἀβραὰμ δύο υἱοὺς ἔσχεν*); that Abraham had gotten two sons; for *ἔσχεν* is not exactly equivalent to *είχεν*. Attention has been drawn to other sons born of Keturah (Gen. xxv. 1, 2), who both in ancient and in modern days (see Windischmann) have been very plausibly interpreted as analogously pointing forward allegorically to those heretical bodies, now vanished, which threatened such danger to the Church in the first centuries. But the apostle's concern here is exclusively with the posture of affairs subsisting at the time of Hagar's and Ishmael's expulsion from the patriarch's family, quoted in ver. 30 from Gen. xxi. Even if he had seen fit by allegorical exposition to apply Scripture to those dire forms of utterly perverted Christianity, which he certainly did look forward to as about to arise, it is very questionable whether he would have conceded to them so venerable a parentage as having Abraham for their forefather. Mosaism in its place was a thing of Divine origin, even as Christianity itself was, both of them "covenants" of God; not so the monstrous forms of Gnostic and Manichean teaching which horrified the primitive Church. In fact, typology, that is to say, the interpretation of Old Testament Scripture as bearing a *designed* allegorical sense, requires very cautious handling. The tracing of analogies is an interesting and pleasing exercise of theological ingenuity; but it is one thing to trace a parallelism, and a quite different thing to detect a latent predictive sense intended by the Holy Spirit. The one by a bondmaid (*ἕνα ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης*); one by the handmaid; the expression pointing to the individual mother known

from the sacred history. The word *παιδίσκη* in classical Greek means a girl either slave or free. In the Septuagint it is generally a slave (not, however, in Ruth iv. 12, where it renders the Hebrew *na'arah*); in the New Testament it is always a maidservant. St. Paul borrows the word from the Septuagint of Gen. xv. and xxi., where it renders the Hebrew *shiphchah*. Hagar was the personal property of Sarah. The other by a freewoman (*καὶ ἕνα ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρης*); and one by the freewoman. The word "freewoman" is never applied to Sarah in the story in Genesis; not even in the passage freely quoted in ver. 30; but it was an obviously true description, and with perfect fairness introduced in antithesis to Hagar. As applied to one holding so princely a position in the story as Sarah, the idea of a freewoman stands coloured with a deep tincture of dignity.

Ver. 23.—But he who 'was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh' (*ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης, κατὰ σάρκα γενένηται*); *howbeit the son by the handmaid is shown as born (or, begotten) after the flesh*. The *ἀλλὰ* is strongly adversative; both, indeed, were sons of Abraham, but there was a marked distinction in the way in which they severally came into being. The apostle has evidently in his eye the analogy presented by the natural birth of the Jewish descendants from Abraham, as contrasted with the birth of Abraham's spiritual seed through faith in the promises of the gospel. This point, however, he is content with merely, in vers. 28, 29, glancing at. His main point is the condition of both mother and child in each case, as being either both free or both in bondage. It is not clear whether the apostle by *γενένηται* meant "born" or "begotten," the verb being used in both senses; but neither is it material. The perfect tense of the verb *either* supposes us to be as it were present at the time of Ishmael's expulsion, in which case it would mean, "hath been born," or is used with reference to the record in the history, meaning in this case "appears in the story as having been born." So the perfect tense is used also in Heb. vii. 6, *δεδεκάτωκε, εὐλόγηκε*, and Heb. x. 18, *ἐγκεκρίσται*. "According to the flesh" does not precisely mean "in the common course of nature;" the word "flesh" rather contrasts the present visible sphere of human life with the invisible spiritual world, in much the same way as "flesh" is so often contrasted with "spirit." Ishmael was born "after the flesh," because he was born in the common course of nature; Isaac was born (ver. 28) "after the Spirit," because his birth was connected with the invisible spiritual world "through the promise," which on the

hand was given by God the great Sovereign of the spiritual world, and on the other was laid hold of and made effectual in that same world of spiritual action by Abraham's and Sarah's faith. But he of the freewoman was by promise (*ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρης, δι' [Receptus, διὰ τῆς] ἐπαγγελίας*); but the son by the freewoman through a promise (or, through the promise). If the article before *ἐπαγγελίας* be retained, it is to be taken as pointing to the well-known promise made by the Lord to Abraham, both in the night in which God made a covenant with him (Gen. xv.), and afresh, in a more definite form, on the eve of the destruction of Sodom (Gen. xviii.). This promise was the means of Isaac's being born, calling forth as it did an acting of faith in God, both in Abraham (Rom. iv. 17—21), and likewise in Sarah (Heb. xi. 11), in consideration of which the Almighty beyond the course of nature gave them this child.

Ver. 24.—Which things are an allegory (*ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα*); which things are written (or, expounded) with a further meaning. The relative *ἅτινα*, as distinguished from *ἃ*, probably means "which facts, being of this description, are," etc., or, "things, which are of such a sort that they are," etc. (comp. Col. ii. 23 in the Greek). The apostle, perhaps, intimates that the particulars just recited by him belong to a class of objects distinguished among other objects presented to us in the Old Testament by having a further sense than the literal historical one; the literal historical sense, however, by no means being thereby superseded. Comp. 1 Cor. x. 11, "Now these things happened unto them (*τοῖσιν*, or *τυπικῶς*) as figures [or, 'by way of figure']." The verb *ἀλληγορεῖν*, is shown by lexicons, Liddell and Scott's and others, to mean, either to speak a thing allegorically or to expound a thing as allegorical. Bishops Ellicott and Lightfoot furnish passages illustrative of both meanings, particularly of the second; and the latter adds the observation that it is possible that the apostle uses the verb here in the sense of being allegorically expounded, "referring to some recognized mode of interpretation." St. Paul did at times refer to authority extrinsic to his own (Eph. iii. 5; 1 Cor. xi. 16; xv. 11). But whichever of the two possible senses of the verb *ἀλληγορεῖσθαι* was the one here intended by the apostle, there is no improbability in the supposition that not now for the first time was the narrative of Hagar and Ishmael thus applied: it is quite supposable, for instance, that it had been so applied at Antioch, in the animated discussions in which Paul, Barnabas, and Silas encountered the Judaists in that Church. At all events, it is not merely supposable,

but in a high degree probable, that at least some of the historical personages, institutions, and events of the Old Testament Scriptures were wont to be allegorically treated by leaders of Christian thought of the highest authority. We cannot acquiesce in the position adopted by some critics, that such allegorizing is to be relegated to the region of mere Jewish rabbinism, now to be regarded as exploded. And we need not here insist upon the consideration that a rabbinical origin would constitute no valid objection to our acceptance of such allegorizing treatment of Scripture, because that the results of rabbinical exegesis and of rabbinical investigations in theology were in many cases of the highest value—a fact which those who are acquainted, for example, with Professor Reuss's 'Histoire de la Théologie Chrétienne' will not be disposed to question. For we resist the attempt to thrust us back upon the schools of the rabbins, as if it were from them only that St. Paul derived this allegorical method of Scripture exposition. Those schools may have made him acquainted with it, it is true; but altogether independently of rabbinical instruction, the leading teachers of the Church, even before Paul's conversion, "unlearned men," *ἰδιῶται*, as the rabbins regarded them, had, as we cannot doubt, learnt thus to apply Scripture in the school of Jesus. Christ himself, not only before his passion, but also, and, we may believe with greater definiteness and particularity, after his resurrection (Luke xxiv. 27, 45; Acts i. 3), had imparted to his apostles and other disciples some expositions of historical facts of the Old Testament, which must have been of this description, and which would suggest the legitimate application of the same method in other analogous instances. And those men were not only disciples, pupils of Jesus, but were likewise especial, though not the exclusive, organs of the Holy Spirit's teaching in the Church (John xvi. 12—15; Eph. iii. 5; iv. 11). Particular allegorical expositions, therefore, received amongst those apostles and prophets of Christ, came clothed with the highest authority, emanating as they well might have done from Christ's own oral teaching, or from an immediate special leading of his Spirit. And, further, we feel ourselves entitled to believe that the supreme Revealer of spiritual truth to mankind might well think fit to appoint, not only words or ceremonial institutions as means of imparting religious instruction or of prophetic indication, but historical incidents as well; not merely so ordering the manner in which his inspired organs framed their narratives of certain occurrences as to make those narratives pro-

phetical, but also in his disposal of human affairs so ordering the occurrences themselves as that they should be prophetic; furnishing (so to speak) *tableaux vivants*, in which the faith of his servants should read, if not spiritual facts which were as yet future, at least spiritual facts after they had come to pass, the prophetic adumbration of which, now recognized by them, would serve to confirm their belief in them and their comprehension of them. The fact that Christ repeatedly and most pointedly referred to the strange experiences of Jonah as prophetic of his own passion and resurrection proves to a certainty that events might be predictive as well as utterances of prophets. Our Lord's use of the story of the brazen serpent, of the gift of manna, and of the Passover (Luke xxii. 16) points in the same direction. We have also apostolical guidance in construing the Passover, the Exodus, the story of Melchisedec, Abraham's offering up of his son, the yearly Feast of the Atonement, as legitimately subject to similar treatment. Since the old economy with its histories and its ordinances originated from the same Divine Author as the new, it is no unreasonable belief that in the things of preparatory dispensations he had set foreshadowings, and in no scant number, of those great things in the spiritual economy which from "eternal ages" had been his thoughts towards us, and in which the whole progress of human history was to find its consummation. In the apostle's discussion of his subject there are in part distinctly specified, in part merely indicated, a great variety of contrasts; these the reader will find presented by Bengel in his 'Gnomon' in a tabulated form with great distinctness. For these are the two covenants; or, *testaments* (*αἵραι γὰρ εἰσι δύο* [Receptus, *εἰσιν αἱ δύο*] *διαθήκαι*); for these women are two covenants. The Textus Receptus has *αἱ δύο διαθήκαι*: but the article is expunged by all recent editors. What the apostle means is this: the circumstance that Abraham had two wives pointed to the fact that there were to be, not one covenant only, but two. He has previously (ch. iii. 15, 17) spoken of "the promise" as a covenant; while also this term was already a familiar designation of the economy which God appointed to the natural "seed of Abraham." Compare also Jeremiah's mention of these two "covenants" (xxx. 31). For the use of the verb "are," comp. Matt. xiii. 37—39; Rev. i. 20. A is B, and B is A, in the characteristics which they have in common. The one from the Mount Sinai (*μία μὲν ἀπὸ ὄρους Σινῶ*); one from Mount Sinai. The *μία δὲ, ὅ, ἡ δὲ δευτέρα*, which should have followed to make the sequel of the sentence conformable with its

commencement, is, in form, wanting, having in the framing of the sentence got lost sight of, through the parenthesis introduced immediately after this clause to illustrate its bearing; for the words *ἡ δὲ ἐκὼ Ἰερουσαλήμ* of ver. 26 only in substance furnish the apodosis to this protasis, being themselves evolved out of what immediately precedes them. The covenant which is our mother is styled, in ver. 23, "promise." Windischmann proposes for a formally corresponding apodosis something of this sort: 'Ἡ δὲ δευτέρα, ἀ' ὄραου (ὅ, ἀνωθεν), εἰς ἐλευθερίαν γεννώσα, ἥτις ἐστὶ Σάββα, συστοιχεῖ δὲ τῇ ἐκὼ Ἰερουσαλήμ, ἡ ἐλευθερία ἐστὶ μετὰ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς τοῦτεστιν ἡμῶν (ὅ, ὀφεινὴς ἔσμεν ἡμεῖς). "From Mount Sinai;" being promulgated from Mount Sinai, it takes its being therefrom. Which gendereth to bondage (*εἰς δουλείαν γεννώσα*); bearing children unto bondage. Those subject to a covenant are regarded as its offspring; as Acts iii. 35, "Ye are the children . . . of the covenant," etc.; their lives are moulded by its direction; they come under the promises, or the discipline, assured by its terms; in short, they owe to it their spiritual condition. The apostle assumes it to be a manifest fact, having before repeatedly asserted it, that those under the Law are in a condition of servitude. Which is Hagar (*ἥτις ἐστὶν Ἄγαρ*); which is Hagar. The meaning of *ἥτις* here is, "which being such in character as it is, is Hagar." This covenant, with its children, being wrapped in an element of slavery, is kindred in character with Hagar and her offspring. It is objected that Ishmael was not, in fact, a slave. But as Hagar does not appear to have been a recognized concubine of Abraham, in the same way as Bilhah and Zilpah were concubines of Jacob, but still continued to be Sarah's handmaid ("thy maid," Gen. xvi. 6), her child was, of course, born into the same condition. With Sarah's consent, it is true, Abraham might, if he had thought fit, have adopted him as a child of his own; but this does not appear to have been done.

Ver. 25.—For this Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia. This clause has been the subject of much conflicting opinion. The reading of the Greek text is itself much debated, and in the original authorities (manuscripts, versions, and Fathers) it appears in a great variety of forms. A detailed discussion of the latter point would be out of place here; and for the premisses from which the critical judgment is to be drawn, the reader is referred to Alford, and to a detached note which Bishop Lightfoot adds in his 'Commentary,' at the end of this fourth chapter. Only the main result needs to be stated. There are two forms of the text, between which the choice lies. One is that of the

Textus Receptus, namely, *Τὸ γὰρ Ἄγαρ, Σινᾶ ὄρος ἔστιν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ*, "For the word Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia." This is maintained by Meyer, Alford, Ellicott, and Sanday. The other, omitting the word Ἄγαρ, runs thus: *Τὸ γὰρ Σινᾶ ὄρος ἔστιν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ*, "For Sinai is a mountain in Arabia." This is accepted by Bentley, Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf (latterly), Bengel, De Wette, Windischmann, Howson, and Lightfoot. In respect to the original authorities, there is not generally thought to exist any great preponderance in the evidence for either the retention or the omission of the word "Hagar." The decision, therefore, depends chiefly upon a comparison of the internal probabilities. In order to this, we must gain as clear a view as we can of the meaning of the above two readings. That of the Textus Receptus, *Τὸ γὰρ Ἄγαρ Σινᾶ ὄρος ἔστιν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ*, according to Chrysostom, as well as modern critics, means this: "For the word Hagar is [represents] in Arabia Mount Sinai." Chrysostom remarks, "Hagar is the word for Mount Sinai in the language of that country;" and again, "That mountain where the old covenant was delivered, hath a name in common with the bondwoman." Critics make reference to ch. i. 17, "I went away into Arabia." "It is difficult," says Dean Stanley, 'Sinai and Palestine,' p. 50, "to resist the thought that he [St. Paul] too may have stood upon the rocks of Sinai, and heard from Arab lips the often-repeated *Hajar*, rock, suggesting the double meaning to which the text alludes." But the Arabic word for "rock" is *chajar*, differing from *Hajar*, the Arabic form of the bondwoman's name, by having *cheth* for its initial letter instead of *he*. Further, the Arabs would have used the word only as a common noun, "rock," and not as a proper noun, the name of the mountain. St. Paul could not have mistaken the one for the other. There is no evidence at all to substantiate Chrysostom's assertion that the Arabs did name the mountain Hagar; he apparently thought so only because the apostle seemed to him to affirm it. See Lightfoot further on this point. Moreover, the sentence, "The word Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia," is not what St. Paul would have written to express this idea; either, instead of "in Arabia" he would have written "in the language of the country;" or else, "for the Mount Sinai is called Hagar in Arabia." Another objection to this reading is the order in which the words *Σινᾶ* and *ὄρος* stand. Elsewhere where the words are conjoined the order is, as in ver. 24, *ὄρος Σινᾶ*. The passages are these: Exod. xix. 18, 20; xxiv. 26; xxxi. 18; xxxiv. 2; Neh. ix. 13, Acts vii. 30. The reversal of the order here indicates that *Σινᾶ* is the subject,

and *ὄρος* belongs to the predicate; that is, that Ἄγαρ must be expunged from the text, and that we adopt the other reading, *Τὸ γὰρ Σινᾶ ὄρος ἔστιν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ*, "For Sinai is a mountain in Arabia," the well-known land of Hagar and her descendants; Gen. xvi. 7; xxi. 21; xxv. 18 (see Mr. Poole's articles on "Hagar" and "Shur" in the 'Dictionary of the Bible'). The article is prefixed to *Σινᾶ* as having been already just mentioned; as if it were "for this Sinai is," etc. The purpose of the clause, however it be read, is plainly to make more colourable the allegorical exposition; it explains why the locality of the giving of the Law has been referred to in the words, "one, from Mount Sinai"—a local specification quite alien to the apostle's usual manner in referring to the old covenant, and only had recourse to here for this particular object. And answereth to (or, is in the same rank with) Jerusalem which now is (*συστοιχεί δὲ τῇ νῦν Ἱερουσαλῆμ*); and standeth in the same class (literally, in the same column) with the Jerusalem that now is. The use of the verb *συστοιχεῖν* the reader will find amply illustrated in Liddell and Scott's 'Lexicon.' In the military language of Greece, illustrated out of Polybius, *οἱ συστοιχοῦντες* were those standing in the same file or column, one behind another (as *οἱ συζυγοῦντες* were those standing side by side in the same rank). Hence, as if tabulated on a board, ideas belonging to the same class, both types and antitypes, were conceived of as if placed in a vertical line in column, and so were called *συστοιχοῦντες*: whilst ideas belonging to a class contrasted with the former, both types and antitypes, were conceived of as placed horizontally opposite to the former in another column; the two sets of contrasted ideas being *ἀντίστοιχα* to each other. Thus in the present instance we have two columns—Hagar, slave mother; Sarah, freewoman. Ishmael, slave child; Believers, free children.

Covenant from Sinai; Promise.  
Jerusalem that now Jerusalem that is is; etc. above; etc.

(Compare Erasmus's note in Poole's 'Synopsis.') It is not improbable, as Bishop Lightfoot observes, that St. Paul is alluding to some mode of representation common with Jewish teachers employed to exhibit similar allegories (see Bengel's note above referred to). We may, therefore, conclude that the subject of the verb *συστοιχεί*, whatever it is, is regarded by the apostle as standing in the same category with the now subsisting Jerusalem, especially in the particular respect which he presently insists upon; namely, as being characterized by slavery. For this is the main point of this whole

allegorical illustration; that Judaism is slavery and the Christian state liberty. It is not clear whether the subject of this verb, "standeth in the same column with," is "the covenant from Mount Sinai," or "Hagar," or "Sinai." If either of the two former, then the first clause of this verse is a parenthesis. The construction runs the most smoothly by adopting the third view, which takes "Sinai" as the subject. Sinai, that gave forth the covenant which is represented by Hagar, "stands in the same column" with "the Jerusalem that now is;" for Sinai is the starting-place of the covenant which has now its central abode in Jerusalem; the people that was *there* is now *here*; and the condition of slavery into which Sinai's covenant brought them marks them now at Jerusalem. And is in bondage with her children (*δουλεύει γάρ* [Receptus, *δουλεύει δὲ*] μετὰ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς); for she is in bondage with her children. The reading γάρ is substituted for δὲ by the editors with general consent. That the subject of the verb "is in bondage" is "the Jerusalem that now is," is apparent from the contrasted sentence which next follows, "but the Jerusalem that is above is free." "With her children;" repeatedly did our Lord group Jerusalem with "her children" (Matt. xxiii. 37; Luke xiii. 35; xix. 44), having, however, in view the city itself with its inhabitants; while St. Paul probably regards Jerusalem more in idea, as representing Judaism in its central manifestation; "her children" being consequently those who were living under the Law. The apostle here assumes that this mystical Jerusalem with her children was in bondage, making the fact a ground for identifying her with Hagar. That the fact was so St. Paul knew, both from his own experience and from his observation of others. The religious life of Judaism consisted of a servile obedience to a letter Law of ceremonialism, interpreted by the rabbins with an infinity of hair-splitting rules, the exact observance of which was bound upon the conscience of its votaries as of the essence of true piety. The apostle also probably took account of the slavish spirit which very largely characterized the religious teaching of the ruling doctors of Judaism; their bondage, that is, not only to the letter of the Law, but to the traditions also of men; that spirit which those who heard the teaching of the Lord Jesus felt to be so strongly contrasted by his manner of conceiving and presenting religious truth. "He taught as one having authority, and not as the scribes." But the main point now contemplated by the apostle was bondage to ceremonialism.

Vcr. 26.—But Jerusalem which is above is

free (*ἡ δὲ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ, ελευτέρα ἐστίν*); but the Jerusalem that is above is free. The mystic Jerusalem in which Christ reigns, the Son of David, who is at the right hand of God. For the word "above," *ἄνω*, comp. Col. iii. 1, 2, "Seek the things that are above (*τὰ ἄνω*) where Christ is, seated at the right hand of God: set your mind on the things that are above; your life is hid with Christ in God;" and Phil. iii. 20, "Our citizenship (*πολίτευμα*) is in heaven." This is identical with the "heavenly Jerusalem" of Heb. xii. 22, which, standing in contrast with the "mount that might be touched and that burned with fire," Sinai with its soul-crushing terrors, appears associated with the pacifying blood of Jesus, and with communion with all that is holiest and most glorious. The essential identity of the contrast in the two passages, which are mutually illustrative, bespeaks a common origin in one and the same mind. The supernal Jerusalem is not chiefly contrasted with the Jerusalem "that now is," in point of time: she is not the future only, though in the future to be manifested—the holy city, New Jerusalem, coming down (as St. John writes) from God out of heaven (Rev. xxi. 2); but she is there *now*, with God. It would be in harmony with St. Paul's representation to suppose that he conceives of her having been there with God in heaven of old, her citizens upon earth being the true servants of God in all ages. In former ages, however, she was comparatively barren; it needed that the enthronization of the God-Man, "the Mediator of the new covenant" (Heb. xii. 24), on "God's holy hill of Zion," should take place before she could become the prolific mother here shown to us. Commentators refer to rabbinical speculations relative to a Jerusalem which was conceived of as existing in heaven, as illustrated by Schöttgen's 'Dissertatio de Hierosol. Cælesti' ('Hor. Hebr.' vol. i. diss. γ.), and also by Wetstein both here and on Rev. xxi. It would be interesting if we could determine when those rabbinical speculations first arose, and how far it may be judged probable that they or some earlier form of them out of which these sprang suggested anything to St. Paul for the form in which he clothed his own conception of this idea; there may have been such. Meanwhile, we cannot but be struck by the purely ideal and spiritual character in which the apostle here exhibits his conception of it; though something like a *terrene* manifestation in the future seems indicated in Rom. viii. 21. "Is free;" the counterpart of Sarah, as mentioned in vers. 22, 23. That this Jerusalem is free, the apostle feels it needless to state; she to his very consciousness is the very home and bosom of God's love, having her

very existence, as well as her outward-acting power, in his pervading, actuating Spirit. Bondage, constraint, *there* cannot be; for all volitions are those harmonized, absorbed, by the Spirit of love uniting her component elements both with each other and with God. Which is the mother of us all (*ἡ ἴστί ἐστὶ μήτηρ ἡμῶν* [Receptus, *πάντων ἡμῶν*]); which is our mother. Here again, as in ver. 24, *ἡ ἴστί* means "which, being such as she is, is our mother." We look at the Jerusalem that is above, and in her princely freedom we recognize what we her children are. The *πάντων*, which the Textus Receptus has before *ἡμῶν*, and which is by the general consent of critics rejected, is with much probability supposed to have come into the text by the copyist's recollection of the similar sentence in Rom. iv. 16, 17, *Ἄβραμ, ὅς ἐστι πατὴρ πάντων ἡμῶν*. But *πάντων*, which there belongs to the essential thought of the context that God had made Abraham "the father of many nations," is unnecessary here, where the apostle is chiefly concerned with the freedom which characterizes the family of promise. If documentary evidence proved it to be genuine, it would find its justification in the notion of the fruitfulness which now at length, as the apostle presently shows, is given to the supernal Jerusalem.

Ver. 27.—For it is written (*γέγραπται γάρ*). The points indicated in the section of Isaiah (liv.) referred to by the quotation which is made of the first verse, and which amply make good what the apostle has been stating and implying, are these: that a new economy was to appear; that by this economy a multitude of servants of God should be called into being; that this multitude should in numbers far surpass those called into being heretofore; that this economy, though newly manifested, had been in existence before, but comparatively unblest with offspring; that it was to be known as an economy of forgiving, adopting love, involving a principle of spiritual life and of spontaneous, no longer constrained and servile, obedience. We need not hesitate in asserting that the last-named features of the new economy were, in the apostle's view, included in the prediction he means to refer to, although not contained in those words of the prophet which he has expressly quoted. For it is one of the characteristics of a Jewish religious teacher's method of citing Scripture, noted by the learned Dr. Biesenthal, himself a Jew, in his 'Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews' ('Einleitung,' p. 54), that he is wont to omit in his express citation more or less of the passage referred to, leaving it to his hearer or reader to supply the omitted portions from his own knowledge, even

when these are most material for the argument; as *e.g.* in Heb. vi. 13, 14, the "oath," fully recorded in Gen. xxii. 16, is not itself contained in the citation made by the writer. The above-named, then, we may assume to have been points which the apostle regarded as contained in the passage he refers to, because they are contained in the section of which the cited words are an integral portion. Whatever may be thought of the applicability, *in a measure*, of the prophet's language in the section alluded to, in the case of Israel restored from the Babylonian captivity, yet that such an application furnishes no complete explanation of its import is clear from the circumstance that this jubilant prophesying follows immediately upon the delineation in the preceding chapter of the sufferings of Christ—a delineation which ended with the intimation of the results which should follow in the triumph over mighty powers opposing the Sufferer, and in the work of justification which he would accomplish upon "many" (Isa. liii. 10—12). That the section was understood by our Lord to refer to the new economy which he was himself to introduce, is evidenced by his citing the words, "All thy children shall be taught of the Lord" (ver. 13), as pointing to the spiritual illumination which should at the time referred to characterize the people of God universally, so universally that none would be numbered amongst God's true people, that is, amongst the disciples of his Son, who had not "heard from the Father" (John vi. 45). We have, then, in this section of Isaiah a distinctly *predictive* description of a condition of spiritual well-being which was to result from Christ's mediation; that is, of the illumination, peace and joyful sense of God's love which then should be the "heritage of the servants of the Lord." This, construed in the apostle's imagery, connecting itself with that of the words which he expressly quotes, is the large multiplication of the children of the free-woman, bringing forth her offspring into a state of freedom and adoption in the great Father's family. The Greek rendering of the passage given by the apostle is identical with that of the Vatican text of the Septuagint. The Alexandrian text varies only in adding *καὶ τέρω*, "and be glad," to the word *βόησον*, "cry," apparently to explain what kind of crying out was intended. Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not (*εὐφράθητι στείρα ἢ οὐ τίκτουσα*). The Authorized Version as well as the Revised thus renders the Greek here; but in the original passage in Isaiah the former renders, "that didst not bear," the Hebrew having the preterite indicative; and similarly, the "travaillest not" in the next clause here is "didst not travail" there. The participles,



τίκτουσα and ὀδίνουσα, may be classed with τυφλὸς ὢν, ἔρτι βλέπω in John ix. 25, expressing the normal state as *hitherto known*, though just now subjected to a change. **Break forth and cry, thou that travailest not** (ῥῆζον καὶ βήσον ἢ οὐκ ὀδίνουσα); *break forth and shout, thou that travailest not*. But the Hebrew has "break forth into singing" instead of "break forth and shout;" and so in Isa. xlix. 13; the word for "singing" denoting unarticulated cries of joy, as in Ps. xxx. 5, and often. The Hebrew word for "break forth" appears to mean "scream (for joy)," as in Isa. xii. 6, etc. **For the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband** (ὅτι πολλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐρήμου μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς ἐχούσης τὸν ἄνδρα); *for more are the children of the desolate than of her which hath the husband*. The word "desolate" represents the same Hebrew participle in 2 Sam. xiii. 20, where the Septuagint has χηρεύουσα, widowed. It points in the present case to the solitary and unhappy condition of a woman "forsaken by her husband" (comp. Isa. liv. 6). On the other hand, the words, τῆς ἐχούσης τὸν ἄνδρα, render the one Hebrew word *be'ulah*, the passive participle of the verb *ba'al*, cohabit with. Compare the use of this verb in Deut. xxiv. 1 ("married her," Authorized Version; συνοίκηση αὐτῆ, Septuagint); Deut. xxi. 13, "and be her husband." The words, therefore, denote her that had her husband living with her as such; "hath," as John iv. 18; 1 Cor. v. 1; vii. 2. "The husband" is conceived of as belonging both to her and of right to the "desolate one." Perhaps τὸν ἄνδρα may be rendered "her husband." In the prophet's view, the "woman which had her husband" was the visible Israel, possessing the temple and the other tokens of the Lord's dwelling in her midst; the "desolate one" was the spiritual or the ideal Israel to be manifested in the future; for the present out of sight and seemingly in abeyance; but thereafter to be quickened into fertility by the inhabitation of the Lord (for he in the prophet's vision, ver. 5, is the Husband), revealed in his first suffering then glorified Servant as portrayed in the foregoing prophesying. So exactly do these two images correspond with "the Jerusalem that now is" and "the Jerusalem that is above," of the apostle's imagery, that his use of the prophet's words is plainly no mere accommodation to his purpose of language which was in reality alien to the subject, but is the citation of a passage regarded by him as strictly predictive, and therefore probative of the truth of his representation. The view of this prophecy of Isaiah found in Clemens Romanus, Ep. ii., 'Ad Cor.,' § 2, and in Justin Martyr, 'Apol.,' p. 88,

which regards it as referring to the Gentile Church as contrasted with the Jewish, is plainly a misconception of its import: the rejoicing mother of the prophet, as well as the supernal Jerusalem of the apostle, knows of no distinction in her believing offspring, between Jew and Gentile, comprising both alike.

Ver. 28.—**Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise** (ἡμεῖς δέ, ἀδελφοί, κατὰ Ἰσαὰκ, ἐπαγγελίας τέκνα ἐσμέν [οἱ, ὑμεῖς δέ . . . ἐστέ]); *now we (or, now ye), brethren, after the manner of Isaac, are children of promise*. In the Greek text it is uncertain whether we should read ἡμεῖς . . . ἐσμέν or ὑμεῖς . . . ἐστέ, "we are" or "ye are." The only difference is that "ye are" would more directly thrust upon the attention of the Galatians the conclusion, which "we are" would express in a more general form. "After the manner of Isaac;" κατὰ as in Eph. iv. 24, Τὸν κατὰ Θεὸν κτισθέντα; 1 Pet. i. 15, Κατὰ τὸν καλέσαντα; Lam. i. 12, Septuagint, Ἄλγος κατὰ τὸ ἔλγος μου. The apostle is viewing Isaac as in the manner of his being brought into being, the type, to which the children of the mystic free-woman were in after ages to be assimilated. In both cases the children are born or begotten through a promise which God of his own free grace hath given, and which, by an accepting faith, is appropriated and made effectual. Thus Isaac was born (see ver. 23 and Rom. ix. 8, 9). The children of the supernal Jerusalem are begotten through the gospel, which in effect is a promise of adoption through Christ to be children of God held out to all who will accept it. Obviously the cases differ in this—that in one it was the faith of the parents which made the promise effectual; in the other, the faith of those who in consequence of believing become children. But none the less is it true that the result is due to an announcement proceeding out of God's own free grace—"Not of works but of him that calleth" (Rom. ix. 7—13; comp. John i. 12, 13; 1 Cor. iv. 15; Jas. i. 18; 1 Pet. i. 23). The "promise" is not the parent of the children; this, in the imagery now present to the apostle's mind, is in the antitypal case the mystic Free-woman. The genitive "of promise" is a genitive of qualification, pointing here to the means through which the children are begotten. Compare a somewhat similarly loose use of the genitive in Rom. ix. 8, "Not the children of the flesh . . . but the children of the promise." The case of baptized infants is not in the apostle's view.

Ver. 29.—**But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit** (ἀλλ' ὥσπερ τότε ὁ κατὰ σάρκα γεννηθεὶς ἐδίωκε τὸν κατὰ Πνεῦμα).

(For the phrase, "after," or "according to, the Spirit," see note on ver. 23.) It must be conceded that the apostle somewhat strains the expression in applying it to the case of Isaac; but he does it for the purpose of exhibiting the manner of his birth as homogeneous with that of his antitypes; for these are they of whom it is the more characteristically true; for they are begotten through the Spirit's agency, into the Spirit's kingdom, to be to the uttermost perfected by the Spirit. The imperfect *ἔδλωκε*, was persecuting, points to the scene presented to our view in Gen. xxi. 9, in the midst of which intervenes the injunction, "Cast out," etc.; or possibly the apostle regards what then took place as one among other incidents exhibiting the same animus on the part of Ishmael. We cannot doubt that St. Paul points to the word "mocking," which occurs in the passage referred to. At the feast held in honour of Isaac's being weaned, "Sarah saw the son of Hagar the Egyptian, which she had born unto Abraham, mocking." The same Hebrew verb is used of insult and disrespect in Gen. xxxix. 14, "He hath brought in an Hebrew unto us to mock us;" so again ver. 17. The Septuagint, as we now have it, instead of "mocking," has *παίζοντα μετὰ Ἰσαὰκ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτῆς*, "at play with Isaac her son;" which would indicate no unkindness on Ishmael's part, but suggest the idea that Sarah's resentment was simply a movement of jealous feeling, roused by her seeing Ishmael assuming a position of equality with a child of hers. But the apostle disregards this interpretation, if indeed the words, "with Isaac her son," had already then been interpolated into the passage. As those words are not in the Hebrew, the participle, lacking any such explanatory adjunct, would fail of itself to express this idea. It is further rendered improbable by the disparity in age between the two lads; for Isaac, having been just weaned, would be only two or three years old, whilst Ishmael would be sixteen or seventeen. It is much more likely that Ishmael, having arrived at these years, participated in Hagar's feelings of jealousy and disappointment that this child should have come to supersede him in the position which, but for this, he might have held in the family; and that, on the occasion of this "great feast," by which the aged pair were celebrating their pious joy over this "child of promise" as well as very markedly signaling his peculiar position as Abraham's heir, the elder-born indulged himself in ill-natured and very possibly profane ridicule of the circumstances under which Isaac was born. Hagar's feelings towards her mistress had of old been those of upstart insub-

ordination (Gen. xvi. 4). That both mother and son were very greatly in the wrong is evidenced by the sanction which Heaven accorded to the punishment with which they were visited. The critics (see Wetstein) quote the following passage from the rabbinical treatise, 'Bereshith rabb,' 53, 15. "Rabbi Asaria said: Ishmael said to Isaac, 'Let us go and see our portion in the field;' and Ishmael took bow and arrows, and shot at Isaac, and pretended that he was in sport." St. Paul's view, therefore, of the import of the Hebrew participle rendered "mocking" is corroborated by the rabbinical interpretation of the word—a consideration which in such a case is of no small weight. The particular word, "persecuted," with which the apostle describes Ishmael's behaviour to his half-brother, was, no doubt, like the expression, "born after the Spirit," suggested by the antitypal case to which he is comparing it. But the features justifying its application to Ishmael viewed as typical were these—spiteful jealousy; disregard of the will of God; antipathy to one chosen of God to be Abraham's seed; abuse of superior power. Even so it is now (*οὕτω καὶ νῦν*); even so he does now. The full sentence represented by this elliptic one is: "even so now does he that is born after the flesh persecute him that is born after the Spirit." This was a fact with which the apostle's experience was but too familiar. In Asia Minor itself, as the Acts abundantly testifies, from city to city had he been dogged by the animosity of the "children of Hagar." No doubt something of this had been witnessed even in the Galatian towns, of the evangelization of which we have no equally full particulars; there, too, we may believe, St. Paul's converts had had to note the abhorrence with which their master was regarded by the adherents of the old religion; and it was natural that this should have a tendency to lessen his hold upon their minds; for were not the Jews the ancient Israel of God, the depositaries of his revelations? Moreover, the hostility which harassed him would also alight more or less upon them as being disciples of his (see ch. vi. 12, and note). All this might make some of them the more ready to listen to Judaizing suggestions. In this verse, therefore, St. Paul is not merely breathing out a sorrow of his own but is fortifying the Galatian believers against a temptation assailing themselves.

Ver. 30.—**Nevertheless what saith the Scripture?** (ἀλλὰ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή). "Nevertheless:" man is acting thus; but, what doth God say touching the matter? The similar question in Rom. xi. 2, "But what saith the answer of God (ὁ χρηματισμὸς) to him?"

favours the belief that by "the Scripture" the apostle does not mean Scripture in general (as e.g. John x. 35), but the particular "passage of Scripture" to which he is referring (cf. John xix. 37; Acts i. 16). The animation of his tone is that of the triumphant assertion of the Almighty's will as an all-sufficing answer to all objections and all discouragements. For "the Scripture" is equivalent to "the utterance of God;" not merely as found in an inspired volume, but because of the circumstances attending upon the speaking of the words (comp. Rom. ix. 17; ch. iii. 8). They were, indeed, uttered by Sarah; being, however, not words of a simply jealous and petulant woman, but of a righteously indignant matron, whose just, if severe, requirement was enforced upon the reluctant Abraham by God's own express command. The historical fact itself, as thus recorded, was singularly noticeable, standing in a position marking it as peculiarly significant: that it really was a type, prophetic of a certain future spiritual procedure, is ascertained for us by the apostle's exposition. **Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman** (ἐκβαλε τὴν παιδίσκην καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς: οὐ γὰρ μὴ κληρονομήσῃ [οἱ, κληρονομήσει] ὁ υἱὸς τῆς παιδίσκης μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἐλευθέρως); **cast out the handmaid and her son: for the son of the handmaid shall not inherit with the son of the freewoman.** The Septuagint has "Cast out *this* (ταύτην) handmaid and her son: for the son of this (ταύτης) handmaid shall not inherit with my son Isaac (μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ μου Ἰσαὰκ);" the apostle's citation being literally exact, except that it has not the words ταύτην and ταύτης (which are not in the Hebrew), and substitutes "the son of the freewoman" for "my son Isaac." His object in these changes, which do not in the least affect the substance, is to mark the utterance the more distinctly as God's own voice, speaking of the parties concerned, not as Sarah did, being one of them, but as supreme Ruler and Judge: for the Lord adopted her decision for his own. In respect to Ishmael's exclusion from inheriting, the instance of Jephthah (Judg. xi. 1, 2), excluded in somewhat similar terms by the legitimate sons of his father ("Thou shalt not inherit in the house of our father; for the son of a harlot woman art thou"), does not apply. Hagar was not a "harlot;" but stood *with respect to Sarah* in much the same position as did Bilhah and Zilpah to Rachel and Leah. We cannot doubt but that the discrimination made between the two sons, whatever was the character of Sarah's feelings in the matter, is to be ascribed to God's own sovereign appointment (see Rom. ix. 7, 11). In this terrible sentence, by which

Hagar and Ishmael were driven forth beyond the pale of God's most especial guardianship and blessing, the apostle hears the voice of God bidding away from his covenant all who disbelieved the gospel—all, that is, who set aside God's assurances of his free unmerited love to all who believed in Jesus. It should seem that it was mainly for the purpose of introducing this denunciation that the apostle has been at the pains to trace out the allegorical meaning of the narrative. The apostle is not now thinking of the national excision of the Jews; he is contemplating, not nationalities, but habits of mind—servile legality on the one side, and on the other faith accepting a free gift of grace. It is at their extreme peril, he in effect tells the Galatians, that they forsake the latter to take up with the former: God has shown that by so doing they will forfeit the inheritance altogether.

Ver. 31.—In the Greek text of this verse, taken in connection with the first of the next chapter, there is a great diversity of readings. The following are the forms in which it is presented by the principal editors:—(1) Textus Receptus: "Ἄρα, ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἐσμὲν παιδίσκης τέκνα, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἐλευθέρως. Τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ οὐν ἢ Χριστοῦ ἡμᾶς ἠλευθέρωσε, στήκετε, καὶ μὴ πάλιν ζυγῷ δουλείας ἐνέχεσθε. (2) L. T. Tr., Meyer, Revisers, W. and H.: Διό, ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἐσμὲν παιδίσκης τέκνα, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἐλευθέρως. Τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἡμᾶς Χριστοῦ ἠλευθέρωσε, στήκετε οὐν, καὶ μὴ, κ.τ.λ. (3) Ellicott: Διό, ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἐσμὲν παιδίσκης τέκνα, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἐλευθέρως. Τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἡμᾶς Χριστοῦ ἠλευθέρωσε στήκετε οὐν, καὶ κ.τ.λ. (4) Lightfoot: Διό, ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἐσμὲν παιδίσκης τέκνα, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἐλευθέρως τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἢ ἡμᾶς Χριστοῦ ἠλευθέρωσε στήκετε οὐν, καὶ κ.τ.λ. The following are the probable translations of these several forms of the text:—(1) "Therefore, brethren, we are not a handmaid's children, but *children* of the freewoman: stand fast then in [or, 'by,' or, 'to'] the freedom with which Christ set us free; and do not again get held in a yoke of bondage." (2) "Wherefore, brethren, we are not a handmaid's children, but *children* of the freewoman: with freedom did Christ set us free; stand fast, then," etc. (3) "Wherefore, brethren, we are not a handmaid's children, but *children* of the freewoman; in the freedom with which Christ set us free stand fast, then, and," etc. (4) "Wherefore, brethren, we are not a handmaid's children, but *children* of the freewoman by [i.e. 'by virtue of'] the freedom [or, 'children' of her who is free with that freedom] with which Christ set us free; stand fast, then, and," etc. It will be seen by the above that there appears a general agreement among recent editors of the Greek text upon three points: (1) they all substitute διό for ἄρα—an alteration which makes no

difference whatever in the sense; (2) they expunge the *οὐν* after *ἐλευθερία*; (3) they insert *οὐν* after *σῆκετε*. The forms (3) and (4) are identical except in the punctuation. The construction of the dative *ἐλευθερία* with *σῆκετε* in forms (1) and (3) is difficult, and has not yet been quite satisfactorily accounted for. We miss the preposition *ἐν*, to express the idea of *immanence* which is evidently intended, and to express which *ἐν* is elsewhere found present; as 1 Cor. xvi. 13; Phil. i. 27; iv. 1; 1 Thess. iii. 8. The arrangement given in form (3) is, in addition, greatly embarrassed by the "then" standing so far on in the sentence—this participle marking, as it does, an inference from the sentence in the preceding verse. The furthest place in the sentence adduced by Winer ('Gram. N. T., § 61) is the fourth word, in 1 Cor. viii. 4. The fourth form presents by far the easiest construction. It seems strange, however, if this was the original text, that it came to be changed into shapes so much more difficult to construe. In the second form, the clause, "with freedom did Christ set us free," seems somewhat strangely phrased; but this iteration of the idea of freedom, marking the apostle's anxious insistence upon it, may have led the copyists to suspect an error of transcription, and thus have set them upon the endeavour to improve, as they thought, the text before them. The same anxious insistence upon an idea leads the apostle to a somewhat similar introduction of a clause which is almost a parenthesis, in Eph. ii. 5, "By grace have ye been saved." It will be noticed that the variations in the text above noted make not the smallest difference in the main contents of thought. The same factors of thought are present in all. The further remarks now to be made will assume for their basis the second form of the text. *Wherefore, brethren, we are not a handmaid's children, but children of the freewoman.* This *διό* (Receptus, *ἄρα*) gathers up the result of the whole foregoing allegorical exposition, not that of its concluding portion only, as a basis for practical remark. "We are not a handmaid's children;" that is, "It is not a slave-girl that is our mother." The article is wanting before *παιδίσκης*, not because the apostle is thinking, as some imagine, of there being other handmaids besides *Mosaism*, as, for example, *heathen ceremonialism*; for the context points to only one slave-girl that can possibly answer to Hagar; but because he wishes by contrast to fasten attention upon the character of her who *is* our mother. Hence also there is *οὐ ἡμεῖς* or *ὁμοίως*, as in ver. 28. "But children of the freewoman," or "of her who is free;" not defining what individual is our mother, but, who our mother is being now assumed as known, marking

what her condition is. *With freedom did Christ set us free* (*τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἡμᾶς Χριστὸς ἠλευθέρωσε*). This clause both justifies and explains the word "freewoman." Our mother is a freewoman, because all her children have been emancipated by Christ; and the nature of her freedom is likewise defined by the nature of his work. This sense is more directly asserted in the fourth form of the Greek text—"children of the freewoman by the freedom with which Christ set us free;" but it is in reality contained in the second. Christ's emancipating work was twofold: he at once, by his atonement, effected our deliverance from guilt, and by the manner of his death (ch. iii. 13) disconnected his people from the ceremonial Law. The former aspect of his work is essential to the beneficial effect of the latter. The clear realization of the fact that he has effected our perfect reconciliation with God cuts up from its roots all desire even, that we should ourselves strive, either to make or to keep ourselves acceptable with God by obedience to a Law of positive ordinances; while we also must see that, as connected with a Crucified One, it is impossible that we can be in harmony with the *Mosaic ritual*. A desire to Judaize cannot coexist with true faith in our crucified Redeemer. By affirming that Christ bath set us free, the apostle points, not merely to our release from real or fancied obligation to obey the Law of Moses, but also to our "joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have received reconciliation" (Rom. v. 11). *Stand fast, therefore.* According to this reading, *σῆκετε* standing alone receives its colour of reference from the context. So 2 Thess. ii. 15. Here it means the steadfast holding to a whole-hearted assurance that in Christ Jesus our freedom is complete. *And do not again get held in a yoke of bondage.* The verb *ἐνέχουμαι* is used (Herod., ii. 121) literally of being caught and held fast by a man-trap; also figuratively of being entangled with perplexities (*ἀπορίαι*, Herod., i. 190), with a curse, or with guilt, or with arbitrary dicta of a teacher (see Liddell and Scott). The condition of a slave is described by the word "yoke," 1 Tim. vi. 1, "Ὅσοι εἰσὶν ὑπὸ ζυγὸν δοῦλοι," "As many as are bond-servants under the yoke." And it was probably with this particular shade of meaning that St. Peter used the term at the conference at Jerusalem respecting the ceremonial Law (Acts xv. 10)—"a yoke which neither we nor our fathers had strength enough to bear;" referring to it, we may suppose, as slavery, not merely because obedience to it was difficult, but as being observed from a legalistic anxiety to approve one's self thereby to the Divine acceptance or to escape the Divine displeasure. This view of the passage explains how the apostle

was able to use the word "again" of these Galatian converts. They had been once under the yoke of an "evil conscience;" but Christ had come to them also, who were "afar off" in Gentile guiltiness, preaching peace, as he had come to them that were "nigh" in the Israelite covenant (Eph. ii. 17). But if they could not have "peace" and "access

to the Father" save through conformity with Mosaic ceremonialism, then their "freedom" was forfeited; they sank back again into their former state of bondage. But see also the note on ver. 9. This exhortation to "stand fast" presupposes that they had not yet lapsed, but were only in danger of it (comp. the *μεταθεσθε* of ch. i. 6).

### HOMILETICS.

Vers. 1—3.—*The Church of God in its minority.* The apostle now passes to a new phase of argument. He has used the similitudes of a testament, a prison, a school-master, to mark the condition of believers under the Law; he now uses the similitude of an heir in his nonage. The Galatians are here taught that the state of men under the Law, so far from being an advanced religious position, was rather low and infantile. Mark—

I. THE HEIR'S POTENTIAL POSITION. He is "lord of all." He is such by birth and condition; and, if his father is dead, he is actual possessor, though he may not in the years of his minority enjoy his property or assert his complete mastery over it. This passage implies that saints under the Law had experience of blessings enjoyed by saints under the gospel, though their dispensational privileges were fewer and their knowledge far less perfect. There is but one inheritance in which the saints of all dispensations share alike—they are all "Abraham's seed" by faith in Christ Jesus.

II. THE PERIOD OF DISCIPLINE AND SUBJECTION. "The heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a bond-servant." 1. *The infantile period.* The apostle does not refer to childhood in the physical sense so as to imply any weakness of understanding or immaturity of judgment, but childhood in its legal aspect. He refers to the lifetime of the Church. The pre-Christian state was childhood; the Christian state was ripe age in full possession. The heir in his nonage thus represented the state of the world before the gospel, when both Jews and Gentiles were under tutelage; because he had said in the third chapter that all, both Jews and Gentiles, were heirs and children of God. 2. *Its discipline.* The heir is "under guardians and stewards." This subjection is necessary to ensure that he should not misapply his powers or waste his property. The discipline is manifest in two or three respects. (1) The heir is no better than a bond-servant, who is secured in food and clothing such as his master may allow him, but he has no more power of independent action than the bond-servant. He can do no act except through his legal representative. The guardian watches over his person; the steward over his property. The Law is here represented as filling this double place in relation to Old Testament believers. (2) The heir is under training, for he is "in bondage under the elements of the world." (a) It was a burdensome condition; for the Levitical ordinances "gendered to bondage;" "a yoke," says Peter, "which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear"—very exacting in its demands and ineffectual in the result. Every duty was minutely prescribed, and nothing left to the discretion of worshippers, as to worship, labour, dress, food, birth, marriage, war, trade, tax, or tithe. (b) The education was limited to "the elements of this world;" to elementary teaching through worldly symbols—the fire, the altar, the incense, the blood-shedding—having reference to things material, sensuous, and formal, rather than to things spiritual. Thus the Church in its minority had outlines of spiritual truth suited in a sort to its capacity. The elements in question were "weak and beggarly," though those of the Jews were much superior to those of the Gentiles, because they were appointed by God.

III. THE PERIOD OF DISCIPLINE WAS TO BE TEMPORARY. "Till the time appointed of the father." The father's will was to be supreme in the whole transaction. The Church was not always to be under Law. The fulness of time was to end the nonage of the Church. Believers were not, therefore, to be always children. "This is a powerful battery," says Calvin, "against Roman Catholic ceremonies: they are to aid the ignorant, in sooth; but it was during the nonage." "Are Roman Catholics," he

asks, "children or full-grown men?" It also condemns the Judaists for going back to "elements of the world," which had their place and use only in a condition of nonage. "Yet the pope and Mahomet have tried to bring back the race, free and of full age, to its minority again."

Vers. 4, 5.—*The fulness of time with its blessings.* This corresponds with "the time appointed of the father." The nonage of the Church was past. The world had arrived at mature age. A new dispensation was at hand.

I. THE FITNESS OF THE TIME. The new dispensation was no abrupt phenomenon; for it came at the fittest time in the world's history. 1. *When all the prophecies of the Old Testament centred in Jesus Christ.* When the whole economy of type had done its work in preparing a certain circle of ideas in which Christ's person and work would be thoroughly understood; when the Law had worked out its educational purpose. 2. *When a fair trial had been given to all other schemes of life.* Not only art and education, culture and civilization, but Divine Law itself, had done their utmost for man, yet notwithstanding the knowledge of the true God was almost lost among the heathen, and true religion had almost died out among the Jews. The necessity of a new provision was thus demonstrated. 3. *It was an age of peace,* in which the world had a breathing-space for thinking of higher things, in which the communications of the Roman empire facilitated the progress of the gospel, and in which the Greek language, being all but universal, was ready to become the vehicle of the new revelation. Thus the fulness of time was the turning-point of the world's history, in which Jesus Christ became its true Centre. Thus, as Schaff says, the way for Christianity was prepared by the Jewish religion, by Grecian culture, by Roman conquest; by the vainly attempted amalgamation of Jewish and heathen thought; by the exposed impotence of natural civilization, philosophy, art, political power; by the decay of old religions; by the universal distraction and hopeless misery of the age; and by the yearning of souls after the unknown God.

II. THE MISSION OF THE SON. "God sent forth his Son." These words imply the pre-existence as well as the Divine nature of Christ. The Son existed as a Divine Person with God before he came to be made of a woman. He was the eternal Son of God, as God the Father is the eternal Father. They are two distinct Persons, else the one could not send the other. He came, not without a commission, for the Father sent him; and he came to do the Father's will, and became "obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." His mission was not the ransom, but the presupposition of the ransom, the possession of the Divine nature giving it an infinite value.

III. THE TRUE HUMANITY OF THE SON. "Made of a woman." This language implies the possession of a higher nature; for if the Son possessed no other than mere humanity, where would have been the necessity of saying that he was "made of a woman"? The phrase points significantly to his supernatural conception, for there is an exclusion of human fatherhood. The apostle teaches his true humanity. It is a significant fact that Mary is here called simply, not "virgin," or "mother of God," but "woman;" just as John in the phrase, "the Word became flesh," ignores the virgin-mother. There is nothing in Scripture to sanction the Mariolatry of the Church of Rome. The incarnation of the Lord is here represented as the deed of God the Father, as it is elsewhere spoken of as the Redeemer's own act (2 Cor. viii. 9). Without his sharing in our humanity he could possess neither the natural nor the legal union with his people which is presupposed in his representative character. Thus he becomes the second Man of the human race, or the last Adam.

IV. HIS PLACE UNDER LAW FOR MAN. "Made under the Law." This clause affirms that he was made under the Law for the sake of those under Law, and therefore not from any personal obligation of his own. We were born under Law as creatures; he took his place under Law for the ends of suretyship. The phrase does not signify merely that he was born a Jew. His subjection to the Law, as well as his mission, was in order to our redemption; the one was the way to the other, as appears from the particle which connects the last clause of the fourth verse with the first clause of the fifth. Both Jews and Gentiles were under Law as the condition of life by the fact of birth (Rom. ii. 14; iii. 9). The meaning of the phrase is that he placed himself under Law with a view to that meritorious obedience by which we are

accounted righteous (Rom. v. 19). Thus he fulfilled all the claims of the Law for us, both as to precept and penalty.

V. **THE DESIGN OF THE MISSION OF THE SON.** "To redeem them that were under the Law." His object was to redeem both Jews and Gentiles from the curse of the Law, and from subjection to it. He was visited with the penal consequences of sin, with its curse and wages (ch. iii. 13), from the day he entered into humanity by incarnation. The deliverance wrought for us was the result of purchase. Thus we are entitled to regard the cross of Christ as the fulfilment of the Law, the expiation of sin, the ransom of the Church, the sacrificial blood which brings us near to God in worship.

VI. **THE ULTIMATE RESULT OF THE REDEMPTION.** "That we should receive the adoption of sons." This does not mean sonship, but son-position. Believers were even in Old Testament times true sons of God, but they were treated as servants. Now they emerge into the true condition of sons. The adoption has three foundations. It is by free sovereign grace; for "we are predestinated to the adoption of children" (Eph. i. 6). It is by incarnation, according to the text; it is by resurrection. Jesus, the Son, is the Form, the Fountain-head, the Fulness from which they all proceed. We are chosen to be sons in him who is the eternal Son; we are regenerated by his Spirit; the basis and example of the work of sanctification is the Son of God, born into our nature by the same Spirit; and "the resurrection of the just," which the apostle himself strives to attain (Phil. iii. 11), and which is limited to the "sons of God" (Luke xx. 36), has its type in Jesus, the First-begotten from the dead.

Ver. 6.—*The evidence of sonship.* "And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." The presence of the Spirit was the witness of their sonship (Rom. viii. 15).

I. **THE MISSION OF THE SPIRIT.** "God sent forth the Spirit of his Son." Here are the three Persons of the blessed Trinity. "God manifests himself in the Son, but communicates his life by the Holy Ghost" (Oosterzee). 1. *He is called the "Spirit of his Son," just as he is called the "Spirit of the Father."* The title applies to the Son, not in his Messiahship, but in his Godhead. He is often described as the Spirit of Christ; and, if that were all, it might imply that he is simply related to Christ in his office as Mediator, either given to Christ or given by Christ. But he is called the Spirit of God's Son, which is not a title derived by Christ from his office, but from necessary and eternal relation. It cannot be supposed that he is the Spirit of the Father in one sense and to one effect, and the Spirit of the Son, who is also God, in another sense and to another effect. It is this eternal and necessary relation which is the ground of his coming forth in the free interpositions and covenant operations of his grace. 2. *The mission of the Spirit.* Just as in the fulness of time the Son was sent forth, so in the fulness of time the Spirit was sent forth to apply and witness the redemption purchased by Christ. It is the Spirit who unites us to Christ in our effectual calling, and makes us "sons of God by faith in Christ Jesus." 3. *The sphere of his operations.* "In your hearts." It is thus an inward, sanctifying, saving work; for it has its seat in the heart, in which the habits of grace are implanted, and out of which are all the issues of life. "I will put my Spirit within them."

II. **THE OFFICE WHICH THE SPIRIT PERFORMS IN THE BELIEVER'S HEART.** "Crying, Abba, Father." 1. *The crying is the earnest importunate prayer of the believer,* of which he is the organ and the Spirit the agent. The intensity of feeling in prayer is due to the Holy Spirit, who enables us to realize our need and the fulness of supply in Christ Jesus. 2. *The cry finds voice in the tender accents of "Abba, Father."* The two words—one Aramaic, and the other Greek—are a fitting type of the union of Jew and Gentile in Christ. The dearest conception in Christianity is the fatherhood of God. The believer is enabled by the Spirit of the Son to realize the tenderness as well as the dignity of the new relation in which he stands by adoption.

III. **THE CONCLUSION OF THE WHOLE MATTER.** "Wherefore thou art no more a slave, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ." Thus the apostle corroborates the closing verse of the third chapter: "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." The slave is not an heir; the son enters on his father's inheritance, which comes to him, not by merit, but by promise.

Ver. 8.—*An appeal to the Gentile Galatians.* “Howbeit then, when ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods.” The apostle here seems to turn to the Gentile portion of the Church, and impresses upon them the folly of placing themselves under the yoke of Mosaic Law.

I. CONSIDER THEIR FORMER IGNORANCE OF GOD. “When ye knew not God.” The apostle gives no hint here of that self-satisfied agnosticism of our day, which says either we cannot or we do not know anything of God, but simply asserts the fact that they did not as Gentiles know God. God is not unknowable. The apostle explains, in the first chapter of Romans, how the knowledge of God died out of the minds of men. It occurred through a deliberate perversion of the moral powers of man. They knew not God, and were thus in a terrible sense “without God in the world.” Yet they were not without religion. Religion is a necessity of man’s nature, and hence its universality. It may be dimmed by superstition and ignorance and sin; it may be left to rust by disuse, till it has all but disappeared; yet it is never wholly lost.

II. CONSIDER THE SUPERSTITION THAT WAS BUILT UPON THIS IGNORANCE. “Ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods.” 1. *The objects of their superstitious worship were no gods.* He says elsewhere they were demons: the gods had no real existence. They were either evil spirits or dead men, or the lights of heaven deified by human ignorance and folly. It is fearful to think of the widespread delusions of the heathen. 2. *Their worship was a degrading bondage.* It was full of labour and fear and suffering. “The bondage of the Jews was pedagogic; the bondage of the Gentiles was more wretched, for they did not know God at all.” The Gentile bondage was terrible with its sacrifices, its mutilations, its orgies, its cruelties. It degraded the mind, fettered the imagination, cramped the heart, of its votaries.

Ver. 9.—*A protest against relapse.* “But now, after having known God, or rather were being known of God, how are you turning again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?”

I. MARK THEIR NEW POSITION OF KNOWLEDGE AND PRIVILEGE. The Galatians had come to know God through the preaching of the gospel. 1. *This was their high privilege.* “This is life eternal, to know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.” 2. *It was a sign of Divine fellowship.* “I am the good Shepherd, and know my sheep, and am known of mine.” 3. *It came through Christ.* “No man knoweth the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever he will reveal him.” But there is another side to this truth. They were “rather known of God,” as if to obviate any possible inference that the reconciliation implied in this knowledge may have been the effect of man’s action. It was an affectionate and interested knowledge on God’s part which made knowledge of God possible on their part. “In thy light shall we see light.” God knew them ere they knew him.

II. THE INCONSISTENCY OF A RETURN TO WEAK AND BEGGARLY ELEMENTS. They had been slaves to the “elements” under the forms of heathen idolatry; they were now going back into bondage to elements under the form of Judaism. 1. *This threatened relapse implied that they had no true understanding or appreciation of the simple gospel of salvation.* The seeds of defection and apostasy lie in almost every heart. 2. *The apostle’s surprise at their inconsistency:* arising partly from his knowledge of their full and cordial reception of the gospel at the beginning, and partly out of the character of the religion for which they were parting with “the truth of the gospel”—“weak and beggarly elements.” This language of contempt applies to the legal rites of the ceremonial Law, which were, of course, of Divine appointment, and as such to be regarded with due honour. But the elements became “weak and beggarly” by their misapplication in the hands of Pharisaic men. They were “weak,” because they had no power to justify or promote salvation (Rom. viii. 3); “beggarly,” because they could invest no sinner with “the unsearchable riches of Christ.” The worshippers, after all their drudgery, found themselves none the better. The apostle might well express his surprise to find Christians going back upon mere elements which the gospel had for ever superseded.

Ver. 10.—*The observance of days.* The apostle now gives a specimen of this bondage. “Days ye are observing, and months, and seasons, and years.” The days



were the Jewish sabbaths, with other times of religious observance; the months were the new moons, always exactly observed; the seasons were annual festivals, as Passover, Pentecost, and Feast of Tabernacles; and the years were the sabbatical year and the year of jubilee.

I. THE GROUNDS OF THE APOSTLE'S CONDEMNATION OF HOLY DAYS. 1. *Not that they were not of Divine appointment.* God expressly appointed them all. The Judaists, after all, had more to say for themselves than the Roman Catholics for their fasts and festivals, which were not appointed by God. 2. *Not that Jewish converts were wrong in observing them;* for he himself observed some of them, and there was a liberty allowed in this transition period of the gospel. "One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind" (Rom. xiv. 5). Thus the Jewish converts were in the habit of "keeping the days unto the Lord." 3. *He condemns the Galatians, as Gentiles, for observing days which, as Jewish, had no relation to them,* and most of which, as Jewish, applied only to the conditions of society in the Holy Land. The Galatians are accordingly condemned: (1) Because they attached importance to ecclesiastical days, "like children who were in bondage to the elements of the world," suited, it might be, to the infancy of the Church, but no longer applicable to a state of spiritual manhood. Similarly in Col. ii. 16 he says, "Let no man judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days." (2) Because they regarded the observance of these days as essential to salvation. This was a still more fatal error.

II. THE CONDEMNATION IN PRINCIPLE STILL ABIDES IN CHRISTIANITY. 1. *It cannot apply to the observance of the Lord's day,* because (1) the apostle has not such a day in his thoughts at all when he censured their observance of days; (2) because, so far as we know, the Lord's day was a fully accepted observance in the Church from the very first, both by Jews and Gentiles; (3) because a day of rest existed before the establishment of the Jewish economy, and could not, therefore, be affected by the downfall of Judaism. 2. *It cannot apply to the case of individuals voluntarily observing days of fasting and thanksgiving for their own spiritual edification,* while they do not attempt to make them obligatory on others. 3. *It cannot apply to the right of the Church,* by its own authority, to appoint such days of fasting or thanksgiving as public emergencies may suggest as necessary to the highest interests of man. This idea excludes the thought of any special holiness attaching to the day itself. 4. *But it does condemn the appointment by the Church of stated and permanent days which take their place, as a religious service, with all the regularity of the weekly sabbath itself.* The apostle displaces all the Jewish days of observance without exception as belonging "to the rudiments of the world," and allows to the Gentiles no day of regularly appointed worship but the Christian sabbath. The tendency of holy days is, not to spiritualize the week, but rather to secularize the sabbath. This, at least, is manifest in Roman Catholic countries.

Ver. 11.—*The apostle's apprehensions for his converts.* "I am apprehensive of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain."

I. THE GALATIANS COST THE APOSTLE MUCH LABOUR. He was their spiritual father; he had paid them a second visit which was full of effort and anxiety; and this Epistle represented effort and anxiety in a very extreme form. The apostle never spared himself. He laboured more abundantly than all the apostles.

II. HIS UNCERTAINTY AND CONCERN FOR THEM. It was doubtful whether he would succeed after all in repelling the attack of the Judaists and rescuing his converts from their injurious influences. But, though he labours in uncertainty, he works in hope. "Other work-folks find their work as they left it, but a minister hath all marred many times between sabbath and sabbath" (Trapp). Yet it is manifest that it is not his own interest, but that of his converts, which is his supreme anxiety at this moment of crisis in Galatia.

Ver. 12.—*An affectionate call to liberty.* "Brethren, I beseech you"—as if he would redouble his tenderness to converts so dearly loved—stand in your true Christian liberty apart from the weak and beggarly elements of Judaism.

I. HE ASKS THEM TO STAND ON THE SAME PLATFORM OF LIBERTY WITH HIMSELF. "Become ye as I am"—free yourself from the bondage of ordinances as I have done—"for I also have become as ye are," standing in your Gentile freedom, that I might preach the gospel to you Gentiles. I became "as without Law to them that were without Law, that I might save them that were without Law" (1 Cor. ix. 21). He had abandoned the legal ground of righteousness as well as the ceremonial formalism of the Jews, and he now invites the Gentiles, to stand beside him in this position of freedom and privilege.

II. THE QUESTION BETWEEN HIM AND THEM HAS NO PERSONAL ELEMENT WHATEVER. "Ye did me no wrong." Though they were led to deny or doubt his apostleship, he had no personal ground of complaint against them. The interest at stake was far deeper.

Vers. 13—16.—*A retrospect with its lessons.* The apostle seeks an explanation of their changed attitude toward himself.

I. HE RECALLS THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF HIS FIRST RELATIONS WITH THE GALATIANS. "Ye know how on account of an infirmity of the flesh I preached the gospel unto you at the first." 1. *His visit was not designed, but accidental.* He was travelling through their country on his way to regions beyond, when he was seized with illness and detained so long that he found an opportunity to preach the gospel. Precious infirmity to the Galatians! It was an opportunity providentially created. 2. *His preaching was therefore in a sense compulsory*; a circumstance which greatly enhanced the enthusiastic welcome of the Galatians. His infirmity might not admit of travel, but it was compatible with a considerable evangelistic activity.

II. THE NATURE OF HIS INFIRMITY. 1. *It was sharp physical distress.* (2 Cor. xii.) 2. *It must have been humiliating to himself*; for it was designed as a check to spiritual pride: "Lest I should be exalted above measure." 3. *It must have been a severe trial to a man with such sleepless zeal*; for it threatened to hinder his activity as an apostle. 4. *It could not be concealed from others.* 5. *It had a tendency to cause loathing in those who had intercourse with him.* Perhaps it accounted for "his speech being contemptible" and "his presence weak." 6. *It was chronic.* It is impossible to know what it was, though learned opinion gravitates between the theory of falling sickness and that of disease of the eyes. It had the effect, at all events, of checking him in his travels at a momentous period, when the Galatians became his debtors for the gospel.

III. THE SYMPATHETIC TEMPER OF THE GALATIANS. 1. *They did not treat him with either indifference or loathing.* "And your temptation which was in my flesh, ye despised not nor loathed." His bodily ailment might have led them to the rejection of his preaching. 2. *They conferred upon him unusual honour and affection.* "But received me as an angel of God, even as Jesus Christ." Angels are the highest of created beings, and it is good "to entertain angels unawares." But Christ is higher than angels. The passage implies the Galatian attachment to Christ, for they received Paul as they would have received Christ. "He that receiveth you receiveth me." 3. *They would have undergone personal suffering on his account.* "I bear you record, that, if it had been possible, you would have plucked out your own eyes, and have given them to me." An extraordinary mark of affection! But it is merely a proverbial mode of speech taken from the indispensableness of the eyes. "We owe more than the eyes of the body to those who have given us the eyes of the soul." 4. *They had congratulated themselves upon their unspeakable privilege in having such a teacher.* "Where is then the blessedness ye spake of?"

IV. SUGGESTED CAUSE OF THE GALATIAN CHANGE. "So then am I become your enemy by speaking the truth to you?" The apostle refers not to the plain-speaking of the Epistle nor to the occasion of his first visit, but to a second visit which brought to light the incipient action of Judaist principles. 1. *Enmity created by truth-speaking implies a grave departure from the truth.* The truth-teller is disliked because he inflicts pain, but the pain shows there is something wrong within. People generally dislike to think that others know their particular faults. "Truth breeds hatred as the fair nymphs the ugly fauns and satyrs" (Trapp). 2. *The truth-speaker is our best friend.* "Faithful are the wounds of a friend, but the kisses of an enemy are deceitful" (Prov. xxvii. 6). 3. *Think of the courage of the apostle.* He tells the

Galatians the truth at the sacrifice of their personal friendship and love. Truth was a more precious thing than man's esteem. It was the very truth of the gospel, with man's salvation hanging upon it, and therefore incapable of being betrayed or surrendered through any spirit of unworthy compliance or men-pleasing.

Vers. 17, 18.—*The tactics of the false teachers.* The apostle is naturally led from the thought of the Galatian alienation to speak of the seductive arts by which it was caused.

I. THEIR ARTS OF SEDUCTION. "They are paying court to you, but not honestly." They manifested an anxious zeal to win over the Galatians to their own party. They tried with fair words and fine speeches to seduce them, professing, no doubt, a deep interest in their welfare, as well as great zeal for the glory of God; but their motives were not "honest."

II. THE DESIGN OF THESE ARTS. "Nay, they desire to exclude you in order that ye may zealously affect them." They aimed at isolating their converts from the sounder portion of the Church that they might thus be led to throw themselves completely into the hands of their seducers. They wished to form them into a separate clique. The first object of errorists is usually to undermine the confidence of converts in their old teachers, and then to get themselves regarded as alone worthy to fill their place.

III. THE CHARACTER AND AIM OF TRUE ZEAL. "But it is good to be courted fairly at all times, and not only when I am present along with you." 1. *Christian zeal must spring from a Christian motive*—love to Christ, love to the truth, love to the souls of men. Zeal must be according to knowledge. 2. *It must be exercised toward Christian ends.* Not like the zeal of inquisitors, for the destruction of heretics, but for the glory of God and the advancement of truth. 3. *It must be permanent, and not fitful, in its influence.* "Always." There are many difficulties to check zeal, such as the perpetual antagonism between the Church and the world, the friction of human effort, and the law of the members in believers themselves. But the zeal of believers ought to be as lasting as the realities of religion are permanent. 4. *It ought to be independent of external guidance or suggestion*; whether faithful teachers are present or absent.

Vers. 19, 20.—*A tender appeal to his converts.* The Epistle alternates from reproof to argument and from argument to entreaty.

I. THE APOSTLE'S EARNEST DESIRE FOR THEIR GROWTH INTO SPIRITUAL MANHOOD. "My little children, of whom I travail in birth again till Christ be formed in you." 1. *Mark the tenderness of his address.* "My little children;" implying (1) that he had been the instrument of their conversion, he had "begotten them through the Word" (Jas. i. 18); (2) that they were still little children, with much of the feebleness and simplicity of childhood. 2. *Mark his deep anxiety on their account.* "Of whom I travail in birth again." The idea not being so much that of pain as of long-continued effort; it was a renewal to him of the birth-pains that accompanied their regeneration. 3. *Mark the end of all his anxiety.* "Till Christ be formed in you." This refers, not to their regeneration, but to their progressive sanctification. The false teachers had tried to form a new shape in their hearts—not Christ, but Moses—but he aimed at the complete development of their spiritual manhood, at the fully formed results of Christ within them.

II. HIS PERPLEXITY ON THEIR ACCOUNT. "I am perplexed about you;" as to their actual spiritual condition as well as how to recover them to the truth of the gospel. If the apostle had doubts about the Galatians, they might well have doubts about themselves—a proof that faith may consist with doubts of our personal salvation.

III. HIS DESIRE FOR A PERSONAL INTERVIEW. "I could, indeed, wish to be present with you now and to change my voice." 1. *A personal interview would necessarily dissipate many misapprehensions.* 2. *It might revive the old affection in its entireness.* 3. *It would give him an opportunity of changing his tone.* He had been severe in his rebukes, but if present with them he might deal with them with all the softness and tenderness of a mother. "A letter is a dead messenger, for it can give no more than it hath." But the living voice can adapt itself closely to all times, occasions, and persons.

Vers. 21—23.—*An appeal to Bible history.* "Tell me, ye that desire to be under

the Law, do ye not hear the Law?" The apostle makes a fresh appeal to convince the Galatians of the essential difference between the Law and the promise. The reasoning is conveyed in language of affectionate remonstrance. Consider—

I. THE IMPORTANCE OF HIS ARGUMENT. The Law itself, upon which the Galatians laid such stress, showed that they were not meant to be under it. If he could prove from the Law of Moses that Abraham's children by faith were free from the bondage of the Law, no further argument was needed to show that obedience to the Law was not necessary to salvation.

II. THE ARGUMENT AS EMBODIED IN THE HISTORY. "For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, one by the bondmaid, the other by the freewoman; howbeit, he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh, but he of the freewoman was of the promise." Here we have: 1. *Two sons of Abraham*—Ishmael and Isaac, Ishmael being mentioned first, because he was born first. Abraham had other sons by Keturah, but they had no relation to the particular illustrations desired by the apostle. 2. *Two different mothers*—the bondmaid Hagar whom Sarah gave to Abraham that he might not be without offspring; and the freewoman, Sarah. 3. *Two entirely different conditions of birth*. Ishmael was born in bondage and in the common course of nature; Isaac was born in freedom and against nature, when Sarah was old, according to "the promise." These are the simple historic facts which form the basis of the apostle's allegorical explanation. 4. *They are Scripture facts*. "It is written," as if to show that God's Word is decisive upon the question.

Ver. 24.—*Allegorized interpretation of the facts*. "Which things are to be allegorically treated."

I. THE FACTS ARE CAPABLE OF THIS TREATMENT. The apostle does not mean to signify that the facts are not historical; nor does he mean to explain them away as if they were allegory like Bunyan's 'Pilgrim's Progress;' nor does he mean that Moses shaped his narrative in Genesis with a view to this allegorized treatment. It is more correct to say that the lives of these real personages were so shaped by Divine providence as to afford a striking illustration of other events or objects. The two covenants were prefigured in the Old Testament under the image of the two wives of Abraham and their seed respectively. There is nothing in the apostle's usage to justify the allegorizing methods of Origen and the rabbis, which destroy the true sense of Scripture. If we admit the apostle's inspiration, we cannot reject his allegorical interpretation of the ancient facts.

II. THE CONTRAST BETWEEN THE TWO COVENANTS. "For these"—that is, the two women—"are the two covenants." Hagar and Sarah represent the two covenants in three important points of contrast. 1. *In the historic origination of the covenants*. (1) One dates from Mount Sinai—"one, indeed, from Mount Sinai;" "which is Hagar; for this Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia." This was the covenant of Law, which finds its true representative in the religious attitude of "the Jerusalem which now is." (2) The other dates from the promise made by God to Abraham. This was the covenant of promise, which finds its representative in "the Jerusalem which is above"—the ideal metropolis of Christ's kingdom, "the heavenly Jerusalem." 2. *In their religious effects*. (1) The covenant of the Law "gendereth to bondage," and answers to "the Jerusalem which is in bondage with her children." The apostle had already described this very bondage under the Law, under schoolmasters, under stewards and tutors, under "elements of the world." (2) The covenant of promise involves freedom and corresponds to "Jerusalem which is free, the mother of us all," whether Jews or Gentiles. Believers are therefore "to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made his people free." 3. *In their future expansion*. Both Hagar and Sarah were to have large posterity, but Sarah was to have the larger family, according to Scripture prophecy itself. The original promise—"In thee and in thy seed shall all families of the earth be blessed"—implied this pregnant fact. But a voice from Isaiah sets it forth in an impressive light, "Rejoice, thou barren, that bearest not," that is, Sarah, or the Abrahamic covenant; "break forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she" (Hagar) "which hath the husband" (Abraham). Thus Sarah was to become "the mother of nations." Thus Abraham was to become the heir of the world, and Jews and Gentiles were to enter into his wide inheritance.

Vers. 28—31.—*Conclusion of the whole matter.* The apostle points to a further coincidence between the type and the antitype.

I. MARK THE HISTORIC FACT. "He that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit." He refers to Ishmael's mockery of Isaac. As the elder son, with the right of primogeniture, he ridiculed the feast given in honour of Isaac as the heir. The spirit of persecution was in that mockery that sprang out of jealousy and ill feeling.

II. MARK ITS ALLEGORIC SIGNIFICANCE. "Even so it is now." The persecutors of Paul were Judaists "born after the flesh," for they claimed to inherit the blessings of the covenant by virtue of carnal ordinances. They were adroit in all the arts of cruel mockery. Scripture tells the vivid story of persecution directed against the Christianity of the first age by the fanaticism of the Jews. The apostle might well say in his first epistolary writing concerning the Jews, "who both killed the Lord Jesus, and the prophets, and drove out us; and please not God, and are contrary to all men" (1 Thess. ii. 15).

III. THE INHERITANCE AN EXCLUSIVE POSSESSION. "Nevertheless what saith the Scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall in no wise be heir with the son of the freewoman." The apostle adopts the words of Sarah addressed to Abraham; not giving any hint of the nearness of the destruction of Jerusalem and its whole ecclesiastical polity, but emphasizing the importance of the Galatians standing clear of the doomed system. As there could be no joint heirship between Ishmael and Isaac, so there could be no fusion or amalgamation of Law and gospel. Judaism could not be combined with Christianity. It was to be utterly cast out, though it then tenaciously held its ground side by side with Christianity even within the Church of God itself.

IV. INFERENCE FROM THIS WHOLE ALLEGORIC LESSON. "So then, brethren, we are not children of a bondwoman, but of the free." "We, as Isaac was, are children of promise." Let us, therefore, recognize our true position with its blessed immunities and privileges. Let us forsake the dangerous fellowship of those who are children of the bondwoman. The Galatian tendency was false and evil; for it involved their losing what they had and getting nothing better in its place. Their true attitude was that of freedom.

#### HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

Vers. 1—7.—*Majority through the gospel.* Paul, having spoken of the Law-school in the preceding sections, and of the participation of believing Gentiles in the privileges of the Abrahamic family, proceeds in the present section to speak of the times before Christ's advent as infantile, of the advent as the fulness of times, and of the majority which is realized by believers through the gospel. Four leading thoughts are thus presented.

I. THE IMPERFECT TIMES. (Vers. 1—3.) The Old Testament times represent the experience of *all* men before the reception of the gospel. They were the minority of humanity. The soul was then like a child who is placed under stewards and guardians, and is not allowed to take charge of itself. It lived by law and rule, and had not entered upon proper self-government and independence. Now, all the world was in this legal condition as well as the Jews. Nay, we are all before conversion in it; we are legalists by nature, we do what is prescribed with more or less fidelity, and congratulate ourselves upon the doing of it. It is the "infantile" stage. It is the imperfect times, as contrasted with the riper experience the gospel brings. And yet it is better that the soul should be at the school of Law than wandering waywardly after its own devices. Better be under restraint than be utterly spoiled by getting our own way. We ought not to under-estimate the discipline which the Law-school secured.

II. THE ADVENT OF THE SON. (Vers. 4, 5.) It was Christ's coming which brought in the fulness of times. He came to put an end to the world's minority and to secure the world's redemption. He did so by being "born of a woman," by being "born under the Law," and undertaking all his brethren's responsibilities. Having obeyed the Law in its penalty of death for disobedience as well as in its precepts, he redeemed men

from the condemning power of Law, and secured their adoption as sons. The world at the advent of the Son must have looked differently to the eye of God the Father. For millenniums he had been looking anxiously down to see if there were any that did understand and seek God. But, alas! the verdict had to be that "they are all gone aside, they are *all* together become filthy: there is none that doeth good, no, not one" (Ps. xiv. 2, 3). But at the advent of Christ a new example presented itself, a new type arose—a sinless Being appeared upon the stage, with all the interest around him of sinlessness. A breach of continuity took place when the babe was born in Bethlehem. Instead of the world being now condemned wholesale, it possessed for the Divine mind a deep attraction. The drama of sinlessness amid temptation was being carried on, and a repulsive world became the centre of moral and spiritual power. A new age thus dawned upon humanity. Man's minority was over and his inheritance was at hand.

III. THE ADVENT OF THE SPIRIT. (Ver. 6.) The magnificent panorama of sinlessness, however, might have passed impressively before the eye of God, and have given fresh interest to the problem of humanity, without at all affecting men themselves. But the advent of the Spirit secured men in their spiritual inheritance. The cry of the human heart, which had been so indefinite before, became definite and pathetic. It became the cry of children who had learned at last to feel at home with God. The converted Jew and the converted Gentile began to cry to the one Father in heaven, and to feel "orphans" no more (cf. John xiv. 18). The Holy Spirit as the Spirit of adoption enables human hearts to look up hopefully to heaven, and to realize that it is no longer empty, but filled with the presence of an infinite and all-merciful Father, who desires above all things the welfare of his children. It is this marvellous arrangement of the advent of an infinite Spirit of adoption which ensures the reality of adoption, and makes all the sons feel at home. Poets doubtless wrote about man being "God's offspring" (Acts xvii. 28), but the fancy of the poet could only become a fact of human experience when the indwelling Spirit prompted the cry, "Abba, Father."

IV. THE HEIR THEREBY ENTERED UPON HIS MAJORITY. (Ver. 7.) The termination of slavish fear, and the advent of a sense of sonship, is what we call conversion. But we hardly realize at once the meaning of our inheritance. How magnificent it is! To realize that God no longer is angry with us, but looks down with ineffable tenderness as our heavenly Father; to realize that, though we have nothing of ourselves, we have become heirs of all things, and find that all things are being made to work together for our good (Rom. viii. 28); to realize that we are "heirs of God through Christ,"—is surely glorious! There is happiness when noble heirs reach their majority. What feasting and good will and congratulation goes on in the baronial halls! Poets sing of it, and artists paint the scene. But no joy of majority on earth can compare with the joy which attends the sense of our spiritual majority before God. The baron's heir is filled with mingled feelings if his heart beat true, for he knows that the condition of his inheritance is, alas! his father's death. He must be base indeed who can contemplate such a condition without emotion. But when the Spirit of adoption comes within us it is to enable us to realize that, not only is our majority come, but also our inheritance as sons of God; into this inheritance we may enter at once. The Father never dies, and his presence, instead of keeping us out of our enjoyment, consecrates and enlarges it to a heavenly fulness. "All things are ours, if we are Christ's" (1 Cor. iii. 20—23). May we no longer live as bond-servants before God, but enter by adoption into the privileges of sons!—R. M. E.

Vers. 8—11.—*The return of the legal spirit.* Having spoken of the majority which it is intended we should realize through the gospel, Paul proceeds next to speak about the return to legalism which had characterized the Gauls. Before Paul's advent to Galatia and his gospel message, they had been idolaters, but his preaching had brought them face to face, so to speak, with God. Into this Divine knowledge they had dipped, but, alas! it had only been a swallow-flight, for, after tasting the liberty of the gospel, they had flown back to bondage. They had skimmed the surface of salvation, and had winged their way back to the old legalism which had characterized their idolatrous days. Here, then, we have suggested—

I. THE LEGALISM WHICH NECESSARILY CHARACTERIZES IDOLATRY. (Ver. 8.) The

philosophy of idolatry is a most interesting inquiry. Nowhere is it more succinctly set before us than in Ps. cxv. The idols are there shown to be after the image of their makers (ver. 8), and, conversely, their worshippers become assimilated to them. The stolid idols which the poor artists make are simply copies of the stolid life around them; and the worship of the idol makes the stolidity perpetual. It is the apotheosis of inaction and of death. Hence it will be found that idolatry can secure nothing higher than *ritualism*, that is, the performance of rites and ceremonies for the sake of achieving a religious reputation, and not for the sake of communion with the object of worship. For in the case of the idol there can be no communion of mind with mind or of heart with heart. The form consequently is everything and the fellowship is nothing. If there be no self-righteousness promoted by the ceremony, it promotes absolutely no interest at all. Hence the whole genius of idolatry is legalism. If men are not achieving some religious reputation, they are achieving nothing at all. Paul consequently was looking back to the idolatrous life of the Galatians, and carefully analyzed it when he recognized in it the expression of a purely legal spirit.

II. THE GOSPEL PROMOTES ACQUAINTANORSHIP WITH GOD. (Ver. 9.) It seeks to bring about an interview with God. Paul's experience on the way to Damascus is typical. He there became acquainted for the first time with Jesus Christ as his Divine Saviour. He there felt that it was nearer the truth to say that Jesus had found him than that he had found Jesus. It was true that he had come to know God in Christ, but this was the consequence of God in Christ in the first instance knowing him. Now, Paul's missionary life was to promote the same acquaintanceship among men. He wanted these Galatians to know God through realizing that God previously knew them. And he had hopes that they had entered the charmed circle of the Divine acquaintanceship. He hoped that they had experienced the truth, "Acquaint now thyself with God, and be at peace." This is the essence of the gospel. "This is life eternal, to know [*i.e.* to be acquainted with] thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent."

III. THE RETURN TO LEGALISM. (Vers. 9, 10.) The false teachers had come from Jerusalem to preach up the virtue of Jewish rites and ceremonies. Hence the fickle mountaineers of Galatia fell into their superstitious observances, and fancied that, if they kept carefully the Jewish calendar, with its weekly, monthly, annual, and septennial feasts and fasts, they must hereby propitiate the Supreme. Accustomed as idolaters to the making of religious reputations, they could enter the more easily into the legal spirit for which the false teachers called. And indeed there is nothing so insidious, because there is nothing so palatable to the natural heart. To be in a position to achieve a religious reputation, to win by our own hands certain characters and certain rights, is wonderfully flattering and grateful to human pride. We need to be constantly on our guard against the temptation. 1. One way is by remembering how "weak," as Paul here puts it, the elements out of which we would manufacture our reputation are. They do not bear analysis. Once we touch them with honest thought they stand in felt helplessness before us. Ceremonies which do not lead to communion with God, ceremonies which are simply to add to human pride and foster self-righteousness, are weak as water, and can only harm us. 2. We should remember also how "beggarly" they are. They can minister no wealth of thought or feeling to the superstitious soul. They are merely the instruments of bondage.

IV. THE DANGER OF THE LEGAL SPIRIT. (Ver. 11.) If Paul's preaching only resulted in such an outbreak of legalism, then he would regard his mission among them as "love's labour lost." There is no difference between the legalism of Judaism and the legalism of idolatry. Both are mere phases of self-righteousness. The gospel has missed its aim altogether if it leave people in legal bondage. The gospel is the great scheme for overthrowing self-righteousness. It emancipates the soul from the delusive hope of establishing any claim before God. It shuts us up to the acceptance of salvation as God's free gift. It deposes self and makes free grace supreme. Hence Paul's anxiety to see the Galatians brought back from legal bondage to gospel liberty. Unless they gave up their hope from ceremony, and betook themselves to hope in the Saviour alone, then they must be lost. It is most important that the exceeding danger of the legal spirit should be constantly kept in view, that we may maintain our standing on the footing of free grace.—R. M. E.

**Vers. 12—20.**—*The appeal of the suffering apostle.* To render Paul's appeal more emphatic, he proceeds next to remind them of the tender relations in which he had stood to them when he preached the gospel to them the first time. He had been suffering from the thorn in the flesh; he was consequently a very weak specimen when as a preacher he stood before them; but the message was so emancipating to their souls that they would have done anything for him in their gratitude. They would have even plucked out their own eyes and have given them to him. Why, then, should they turn against him when he seeks to tell them the truth? It is consequently the pathetic appeal of the apostle to those who had once been so interested in him.

**I. PAUL'S EXAMPLE OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY.** (Ver. 12.) He wants the Galatians to be as he is, for he is as the Gentiles are so far as legalism is concerned. How did Paul act among the Gentiles? Not certainly as Peter had done at Antioch, in a vacillating spirit. He sat down deliberately at the tables of the heathen and carried no Jewish scruples into Gentile society. The ceremonial Law did not bind him to keep his converts at arm's length or to insist on their submission to Jewish scruples. He felt that Jesus had fulfilled for him all righteousness, and that he was consequently free from the ceremonial yoke. Hence with the greatest breadth of view and consistency, Paul acted the free and social part among the heathen.

**II. PAUL'S APPEAL FOR SOMETHING LIKE THE OLD SYMPATHY.** (Vers. 13—15.) He had appeared among them in a suffering condition. The "thorn in the flesh," which had been sent to buffet him and keep him humble, had manifested itself in full force. There is every reason to believe that it consisted in weak eyes, which never recovered the shock on the way to Damascus. But the weak-eyed, despicable-looking preacher (2 Cor. x. 10) had got an admirable reception in Galatia. His hearers so sympathized with his message as to forget his outward weakness, nay, rather to so sympathize with him in it as to be ready to pluck out their own eyes and give them to him, if it had been possible. The poor preacher was in their estimation an angel of God, and was received with the same consideration as they would have extended to Christ Jesus himself. This was admirable. And Paul wishes them to revive this sympathy for him and lead them along the path of liberty he himself is treading. How deep and pathetic the true sympathy between pastor and people ought to be!

**III. THE UNREASONABLE CHARACTER OF THEIR PRESENT ANTIPATHY.** (Ver. 16.) Because of Paul's faithfulness they are inclined to resent his interference with their legalism as a hostile act. But he would have them to analyze their antipathy fairly and to own how unreasonable it is. And yet this has been the fate of faithful men in all ages. They are hated because they tell the truth. The unreasonableness of antipathy to a man who tells us God's truth may be seen in at least three particulars. 1. Because the truth sanctifies (John xvii. 19). 2. Because the truth makes men free (John viii. 32). 3. Because the truth saves (1 Tim. ii. 4).

**IV. ATTENTION MAY BE MISINTERPRETED.** (Vers. 17, 18.) The false teachers were assiduous in their attentions to Paul's converts. They could not make enough of them. But Paul saw through their designs. Hence he declares, "They zealously seek you in no good way; nay, they desire to shut you out, that ye may seek them" (Revised Version). It was a zeal to get the Galatians under their power; it was to make them ritualists of the Jewish type, and so amenable to their Jewish authority and direction. Young converts require warning against the designs of zealots whose prerogative it is to curtail Christian liberty and put the simple under bondage. Now, Paul had paid all sorts of attention to the Galatians. He compares himself to a mother who had travailed with them and would consequently nurse them with the utmost tenderness. He courts comparison between his attentions and those of the false teachers. He more than insinuates that they are receiving different treatment at their hands than they did when he was present with them. It is only fair and right that attention should be weighed in the balances carefully, and a selfish fuss not be confounded with an unselfish and disinterested enthusiasm.

**V. A PASTOR'S SPIRITUAL ANXIETIES ABOUT HIS PEOPLE.** (Vers. 19, 20.) Paul had been in agony for their conversion when in Galatia. But their legalism has thrown him into perplexity about them. His agony, like a woman's travail, has to be repeated. He will not be content till Christ is formed within them as their true Hope of glory. He wishes he were present with them once again and were able by tender,



maternal tones to convince them of the unselfish interest he has in them. The whole case is instructive as showing how painful is the interest of a true pastor in his flock and to what straits their waywardness may reduce him. A mother's anxieties should summon a pastor to an enthusiasm of affection for those committed to his charge.—  
R. M. E.

Ver. 21—ch. v. 1.—*The children of the bondwoman and of the free.* Paul now passes from a personal appeal to an allegorical argument from the Law. As legalists, they are asked if they will not hear the Law which in its history really condemns them as children of the bondwoman and not children of the freewoman. For such an allegorical interpretation we are content with Paul's authority, since he was inspired of God in his handling of Scripture as well as in writing additions to it. His rabbinical education would incline him to allegory; but we would not in consequence take any liberties with Scripture on the same track. Still, as we face the history as given in Gen. xxi. with Paul's help in our hands, it gives a very interesting and beautiful application of it.

I. LET US CONSIDER THE CHILD OF THE BONDWOMAN IN HIS EARLY YEARS. (Ver. 23.) Ishmael, as the child of Abraham, had for thirteen years a happy and interesting life. He was the issue of a union promoted by Sarah in her own despair. Upon him the patriarch looked with all an old man's pride; and, had not God expressly forbidden it, Abraham would have looked no further than Ishmael for a son and heir. Hagar naturally played the haughty part before her mistress and despised the beautiful woman because of her barrenness. But as soon as Isaac came to gladden the aged pair, Hagar and Ishmael fell of necessity into the background. In due time there is the weaning feast. "Hagar and her son heard the merriment," says Robertson, "and it was gall to their wounded spirits; it looked like intentional insult; for Ishmael had been the heir presumptive, but now, by the birth of Isaac, had become a mere slave and dependant; and the son of Hagar mocked at the joy in which he could not partake." Now, Ishmael all these years was the type of the legalist who prides himself on his observance of the ceremonies. Just as the boy thought that he was son and heir by undisputed right and title, so the legal spirit imagines that in God's house his rights cannot be disregarded. In the pride of self-satisfaction he sees no rival in the house and is disposed to brook none. And yet a touch of fate will make him realize at once his slavery and outcast condition.

II. CONSIDER NEXT THE SON OF PROMISE. (Ver. 23.) But for the promise of God, Isaac never would have been born. He belonged consequently to a different order from Ishmael. Ishmael was the son of nature; Isaac was the product of grace. In this Isaac is the type of the son of the gospel, as Ishmael is the type of the son of the Law. Isaac is born to freedom, to honour, to inheritance; while Ishmael is cast out as the slave who has no recognized rights in the household. So is it with the free-born son of the gospel as contrasted with the legalists of Paul's time. The believer is God's son through the freewoman; he has his inalienable rights in God's household; he may be persecuted and mocked by the Ishmaels who are but bondslaves; but he is destined to keep the field of privilege in spite of foes and triumph over them at last.

III. LEGALISM AND GOSPEL FREEDOM ARE INCOMPATIBLE. (Vers. 24—30.) One house could not hold both Ishmael and Isaac. They could not get on together. No more can the legal and the gospel spirit. Self-righteousness and faith in Christ are irreconcilable. Hence the war between the legalists and the apostle. It was war to the bitter end. The principles are antagonistic, and the one must triumph over the other. And liberty is sure to triumph over legalism in the end, as Isaac triumphed over Ishmael.

IV. THE CONSEQUENT DUTY OF MAINTAINING OUR CHRISTIAN LIBERTY. (Ch. v. 1.) Paul calls upon the Galatians not to go back to bondage, but to maintain the freedom which Christ has given them. If he has fulfilled the ceremonies, why should they go back to the bondage of observances? If they are born as children of promise, why go back to the birth of bondslaves? It is like emancipated slaves insisting on surrendering their freedom. What the liberty bestowed by Christ is in its length and breadth may be realized from the close and climax of one of Liddon's masterly sermons. "It is freedom from a sense of sin, when all is known to have been pardoned through the atoning blood; freedom from a slavish fear of our Father in heaven, when conscience is

offered to his unerring eye morning and evening by that penitent love which fixes its eye upon the Crucified; freedom from current prejudice and false human opinion, when the soul gazes by intuitive faith upon the actual truth; freedom from the depressing yoke of weak health or narrow circumstances, since the soul cannot be crushed which rests consciously upon the everlasting arms; freedom from that haunting fear of death, which holds those who think really upon death at all, 'all their lifetime subject to bondage,' unless they are his true friends and clients who by the sharpness of his own death 'opened the kingdom of heaven to all believers.' It is freedom in time, but also and beyond freedom in eternity." May we realize our rights as children of the free!  
—R. M. E.

Vers. 1—11.—*Majority and minority.* I. THE CHILD COMING TO HIS MAJORITY. *Analogy.* "But I say that so long as the heir is a child, he differeth nothing from a bond-servant, though he is lord of all; but is under guardians and stewards until the term appointed of the father." At the close of the preceding chapter Christians were described as Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise. It is with regard to this that the apostle now makes use of an analogy. It is a very simple and well-known case on which he founds. It is that of an heir, while he is a child or is a minor, as we say, *i.e.* has the paternal control yet exercised over him. He may be the heir of a kingdom; but, so long as he is in his nonage, he differeth nothing from a bond-servant, though he is lord of all. He is better in some respects, but not better in respect of subjection to control. He is under *guardians* of his person and *stewards* of his property. When the Prince of Wales in his childhood on one occasion refused submission to his governess, appealing to his dignity as heir of the throne, Prince Albert very pertinently read him this passage out of the New Testament. The supposition is that a minor has not yet wisdom to guide him; his will therefore, meanwhile, is a cipher. He can only act through guardians and stewards, who are understood to carry out the father's will. This arrangement continues in force until the term appointed of the father. It has been a question whether Paul contemplates the father here as dead. It is enough to say that he is regarded as in the background, while his will is operative. In the case to which the analogy applies the Father is alive. Objection has been taken to Paul describing the limit of dependence as appointed of the father, when in most countries it is fixed by statute. The infancy of a Roman child ended at seven; he donned the virile gown at seventeen; he was not entirely emancipated from tutelage until he was twenty-five. There is this to be said, that the limit was not necessarily fixed by statute; that when it was so fixed it was in name of the father, and that there was discretionary power within the statute. 1. *The Church's minority.* "So we also, when we were children, were held in bondage under the rudiments of the world." The minor here is generally supposed to be both Jews and Gentiles. But it is scarcely a Pauline idea that the heathen compared with Christians were as children compared with men, heirs in their minority compared with heirs come to full rights. Certainly their religions were not the rudiments which God taught them. The reference is to be determined by the way in which the analogy is introduced by the apostle. He points back to his description of Christians as Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise. He must be understood, therefore, as pointing now to those who were *formerly* Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise. These were the children over whom God placed guardians and stewards. The instruction he gave them was of a *rudimentary* nature. They were not taught religion in its perfect form (which is Christianity), but only the rudiments. These were true so far as they went; still, they were only religion in a form suitable for children. They were rudiments of the world, *i.e.* of the *outward* and *sensible*; for the world in an evil sense cannot be brought into connection with the Father teaching his children. It is by the outward and sensible that abstract truth is introduced into the minds of children. So, while the Church was in its childhood, God carried forward its education by outward services and sensible representations. This was inconceivably better than being left to themselves, as the heathen were; but it was *bondage* in comparison with the spirituality which was to be brought in with a full revelation. "It was a yoke," said Peter, "which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear." The amount of bodily service required by Jews, in their frequent washings and journeys to Jerusalem, was very great. And even the types, in their keeping back

the plain meaning, confined the spirit. This was the Church in its state of minority.

2. *The Church's majority.* It is matter for thought that the Church came to its majority in connection with the *greatest manifestation of Godhead.* (1) *Time of the Christian manifestation.* "But when the fulness of the time came." The fulness of the time was the moment in which time received its full significance. It was that toward which all that went before was moving, and from which all after-time is dated. It corresponds to "the term appointed of the father." It was the time appointed in the counsels of the Father. But the appointment was founded on the foreseen fitness of circumstances. It would not have been a fitting time, we may understand, if Christ had appeared immediately after the Fall. As the nature of sin had only very partially been manifested at the first, there would have been no proper appreciation of redemption. Neither would it have been a fitting time, we may understand, if Christ had appeared at the commencement of the Jewish nation. It would have been as if some high work of art were submitted for criticism to novices. Christ appeared when circumstances were so prepared that the deepest, most lasting impression of his work could be produced on men. Even heathenism was a preparation for Christianity. It was so chiefly in a *negative* way. It was, as it is represented in the Bible, the wild olive tree. It was humanity left to itself. It was an experiment on a vast scale as to what man unaided could or could not do. And, though there was a feeling after God, and weak longing for redemption, yet, as the result of the experiment, it was conclusively proved that the world by wisdom knew not God. When Christ came great Pan was dead. The old religions were manifestly powerless to impart any spiritual consolation, or to check sin which came to its full manifestation. The chosen people were sinful humanity with Divine helps. And, though they greatly pointed the lesson of what man could not do, yet there was not a little drilling of them into the idea of the Divine unity, the idea of an overruling Providence, the reality of sin, the conception of righteousness, the certainty and mode of redemption. And there were some who had so entered into the preparatory Jewish system that, at the time of Christ's appearance, they were waiting for the consolation of Israel. In the outward state of the world, too, there was a conspiring of remarkable providences: *The whole world was included in one empire.* There were facilities of intercourse between nations, such as had never existed before. The great Roman roads were the prepared means by which the gospel was to be carried to all quarters of the earth. *There was very much, too, one language.* With the victories of Alexander commenced a movement toward the general use of the Greek language, the most expressive of all languages. *There was also a cosmopolitizing of the Jews.* They were to be found in all the great centres, with their monotheism and Messianic hopes. *And lastly, it was a time of universal peace.* The whole world was quiet and at rest. The temple of Janus was shut. Such was the time chosen by God for the appearance of Christ. (2) *Manner of the manifestation.* (a) *The Divine Messenger.* "God sent forth his Son." The pre-existence of Christ is implied. God sent forth from himself—from his own immediate presence. It was not an archangel whom he sent forth, but his own Son. As the Son of God, Christ was eternally pre-existent—the equal in every respect of the Father. In the Son, the Father saw himself perfectly reflected. And yet he was in a mysterious way subordinated as the Son to the Father. To him, then, it essentially belonged to be sent forth, as on creation, so on redemption. On his part there was a perfect response. For, in the volume of the book of the Divine counsels it was written that he was prepared at the fitting time to speed forth to do the Father's will. (b) *His birth of humanity.* "Born of a woman." Though unborn as the Son of God, he was subjected to the ordinary law of human birth. "Man that is born of a woman," said Job; and so also it was true of Christ that he was born of a woman. He was not a separate creation from humanity, without father, without mother. But he was brought into the closest relation to humanity by having a human mother. Even from the first he was looked forward to as the Seed of the woman. (c) *His birth of the Jewish race.* "Born under the Law." Historically he was connected with the Jewish race. It has been said that what the Jewish nation provided was the mother of our Lord. His surroundings were Jewish. He was subjected to the rite of circumcision. He was placed under obligation, not only to the Law of God generally, but to the Mosaic Law in particular. It is not to be inferred that he was merely Jewish. For the singular thing is that,

though brought up a Jew, in his teaching and life he did not give the impression of belonging to one nation more than to another. Still, the Mosaic system had authority over him, and had to do with his training as the Messiah. (3) *Twofold aim of the manifestation.* (a) *Deliverance from the Mosaic system.* "That he might redeem them which were under the Law." It is true that God sent forth his Son to redeem from the curse of the broken Law generally, and from the curse of the Mosaic Law in particular; but it is also true that, in connection with that, he had a subsidiary design to which prominence is given here. It was that, by his Son discharging all the obligations of the Mosaic Law, and answering its ends, it should no longer continue a burden on the conscience. And it is well to have this subsidiary design connected with the great sending forth of the Son. (b) *Instating of Christians as sons.* "That we might receive the adoption of sons." "We" is to be taken in the wider sense here, as it was taken in the narrower sense in the third verse. The reference is Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise. As these were, in the minority of the people of God, Jews, so now are they Christians. The design of the sending forth of the Son was to bring up the people of God into the position of sons. Not only does the time of his being sent forth rule the time of their becoming sons; but the fact of his being Son seems to rule their getting the position of sons. The Son goes forth, and it is *sons* he brings with him to glory. Such was the twofold aim of the manifestation. He proceeds to show how God did not stop short at giving us the position of sons. He followed it up by giving us the qualification of sons. *The Spirit of the Son our qualification as sons.* "And because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father." Our qualification was the Spirit of his Son, *i.e.* the Spirit who was sent forth on the Son, and who fitted him for his work. He was within him as the Spirit of the true Son. In the darkest hour Christ conquered by being true to the Father. The Spirit proceeds from Christ upon us. He is also within us as the Spirit of the true Son. He draws us to God as our Father. That is the congenial element of his working. The word "Father" is the outcome. His is the language of *filial confidence*. His is the language of *filial affection*. His is the language of *filial obedience*. His is withal the language of *earnestness*. He is represented as crying, *i.e.* importunately calling. And he is represented as crying, "Abba, Father." The idea is emphasized by repetition. And it is expressed in two languages, Aramaic and Greek, strikingly showing the fusion of Jew and Greek in Christ. According as the Spirit of Christ thus dwells in us are we qualified and have the realization of our freedom as sons. *General conclusion regarding heirship.* "So that thou art no longer a bond-servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir through God." He individualizes what he says by changing from the plural to the singular. Even the Gentile had not to pass through Judaism into the kingdom of God. The fact of sonship having been formerly arrived at is simply stated here as the basis on which a conclusion is drawn regarding heirship. If thou hast the position of a son, and the qualification of a son, through God's infinite love, art thou not certainly an heir through the same love? Thus it is made out that the people of God have attained to their majority. They have the heirship, not of mere children, *i.e.* without rights, but of sons, *i.e.* with full rights.

II. THE SON FALLING BACK INTO HIS MINORITY. *So he represents the Galatians.*

1. *Their idolatrous past.* "Howbeit at that time, not knowing God, ye were in bondage to them which by nature are no gods." It was their disadvantage that they were ignorant of God. That being the case, it was not to be wondered at that they did service to idols. The religious instinct, if it does not find the true, will find the false. If we have not God to fill up the vacuum of our nature, we must have idols. These Galatians had done service to them which by nature were no gods. Paul's idea in one place (1 Cor. x. 20) is that they were devils whom the heathen worshipped. They certainly were only Divine in their own imagination. They had not the nature of God; they disputed for power; they were not even moral. What bondage to be in error regarding the greatest of all objects! What fearful bondage to think of him as not only imperfect, but as swayed by the vilest passions! 2. *Their relapse.* "But now that ye have come to know God, or rather to be known of God, how turn ye back again to the weak and beggarly rudiments, whereunto ye desire to be in bondage over again? Ye observe days, and months, and seasons, and years. I am afraid of you, lest

by any means I have bestowed labour upon you in vain." They had come to know God, i.e. when the gospel was preached among them. It was then that they first knew God in his unity and in his real character as a God of love. But, having said this, he corrects himself. It was rather that they had come to be known of God; for it was purely of God that the gospel came to them. They were not thinking of it; even Paul was not thinking of it; for it did not lie within his plan to preach the gospel to them. By a singular providence, to which he refers in the next paragraph, he was constrained to turn aside to Galatia. It was God, then, that had given them the advantage. *The relapse from Christianity into Judaism as affecting the position of the Christian sabbath.* How are we to understand the language which is employed in this place and in Col. ii. 16, 17? Are we to infer from the teaching of the apostle (for it is no more than an inference, and a startling thing it is to be left to inference) that, as Christians, we are relieved from obligation to keep sacred one day in seven? It is not unnecessary, in view of all that has been written on these passages, to guard against an understatement of the difficulty. For instance, it is said by Ridgeley and others that certain feast days, being withdrawn from a common to a sacred use, were called sabbaths, and that the apostle alludes exclusively to these. Unless the difficulty is fairly admitted and mastered, it is sure to leave doubt on the mind, and to be ever coming up for settlement in exegesis. There is really only one difficulty, but it is presented under different forms. The passages in question are similar; so much so that the same writer can readily be detected in both. There are two statements in Galatians, and these correspond to two statements in Colossians. Taking, then, the parts which correspond as one, we have to deal with two statements. (a) *There is a statement about distinctions of times.* The statement made by the apostle in this Epistle is that Christians, by observing days, and months, and seasons, and years, were returning to bondage, and that, on that account, he was afraid of them, lest he had bestowed labour upon them in vain. In the preceding context his teaching is that they have the liberty of sons, and are not as under tutors and governors. It is to be noted that the bondage referred to was in making distinctions as to times. His order of classification is to begin with the more frequent and to proceed to the less frequent observances. There are first days, or weekly observances; then there are months, or observances connected with the new moon; at a longer interval are the seasons, or great festive occasions, of which there were three in the year; and, at the longest interval, are the years, in which the reference is to the sabbatic year and the year of jubilee. The corresponding statement in Colossians is that Christians are not to be judged in meat or in drink (or, in eating and drinking), or in respect of a feast day, or a new moon, or a sabbath day (Revised Version), on the ground, as given in the context, that the handwriting which contained these things has been put out of the way, being nailed to the cross. Under the head of distinctions there is a sub-classification having reference to distinctions in meats and drinks. As to meats, there were some that were appropriated to holy uses, and numerous prohibitions are mentioned in Lev. vii. 10—27. As for drinks by themselves, wine was forbidden to the Nazarites and also to the priests during the time of service. The apostolic teaching is that Christians are entitled to disregard such distinctions. The classification of times in Colossians (years being omitted) proceeds in the reverse order from the less frequent to the more frequent, beginning with the feast day, and ending with the sabbath day. What meaning is to be attached to the sabbath day will be seen; but the apostolic teaching is plainly this—that, as Christians are freed from the observance of the three principal feasts, and freed from the observance connected with the new moon, so also are they freed from the observance of the sabbath day. In reference to the passage in our Epistle, Alford remarks, "Notice how utterly such a verse is at variance with any and every theory of a Christian sabbath, cutting at the root, as it does, of all obligatory observance of times as such." And similar remarks are made by him elsewhere. But: (a) *In that view of it, the conclusion is a much wider one than can consistently be admitted.* It is not merely that we are under no obligation to observe a Christian sabbath, or, in other words, that we are free to observe it or not as we see fit; but it goes further, and is this—that *the observance of a Christian sabbath implies fault.* We accept Alford's remark on the word translated "observe." There does not seem to be any meaning of superstitious

or inordinate observance, but merely a statement of the fact. The view, then, is that the ordinary observance of a Christian sabbath supposes the making of distinctions as to days which are all done away with under Christianity. How, then, is this observance of one sacred day in seven regarded by the apostle? It is condemned by him as a bondage from which we need to be freed. Nay, more, it is held as affording ground for fears being entertained with regard to our very Christianity. "I am afraid of you, lest by any means I have bestowed labour upon you in vain." If that, then, was really the view of the apostle, should we not have expected of him that, in his own practice, he would have disregarded all distinctions of days? But how does that consist with what is recorded of him? If we turn to Acts xx. 6, 7, we find what his practice was, upon which Alford thus suitably comments: "We have here an intimation of the continuance of the practice, which seems to have begun immediately after the Resurrection, of assembling on the first day of the week for religious purposes." If we turn next to 1 Cor. xvi. 2, we find him issuing a general order to the Churches connected with the first day of the week, upon which Alford again suitably remarks, "Here there is no mention of their *assembling*, which we have in Acts xx. 7; but a plain indication that the day was already considered as a special one, and one more than others fitting for the performance of a religious duty." If, then, the apostle thus recognized a distinction in time, how can he escape from the condemnation which he passed upon these Galatian Christians? Was he not in bondage in so distinguishing? and have we not reason to be afraid of *him*? It is either this or the conclusion drawn is too wide. And what are we to make of the consistency of the writers who take this view? They no sooner make out the language of the apostle to have reference to all distinctions of time whatsoever, than forthwith they search about for reasons for the observance of a sacred day. Alford upholds the observance of the Lord's day as an institution of the Christian Church, analogous to the ancient sabbath, binding on us from considerations of humanity and religious expediency, and by the rules of that branch of the Church in which Providence has placed us. And Frederick William Robertson says, "So far as we are in the Jewish state, the fourth commandment, even in its rigour and strictness, is wisely used by us; nay, we might say, indispensable." And further he says, "Experience tells us, after a trial, that those Sundays are the happiest, the purest, the most rich in blessing, in which the spiritual part has been most attended to—those in which the business letter was put aside and the profane literature not opened, and the ordinary occupations entirely suspended." That is to say, the apostle was afraid of the Galatian Christians for making a distinction of one day in seven; and yet the Galatian Christians were right after all. A modification of so wide a conclusion as is supposed is suggested by the passage in Colossians. It is there stated that we are not to be judged in meats and drinks; that is, we are freed from all such distinctions in meats and drinks as existed under the Law. But yet it is the case that, under the New Testament dispensation, there exists a distinction of *meat and drink*. For in the Lord's Supper we have bread and wine appropriated to holy uses and placed under certain restrictions. And, if it does not follow from the apostle's language that all distinctions of meats and drinks are done away with under Christianity, so neither does it necessarily follow that all distinctions of time are done away with.

(β) *We are to understand the language of the apostle to have reference to Jewish institutions as a whole.* It is not as though there had been before him the one point—*Is it right to observe one day in seven?* Then his argument would have been—The Jews did that; we as Christians are relieved from it, or rather are to be condemned, if we countenance such a distinction. But, instead of that, the apostle is giving a characteristic of Jewish institutions as a whole. There was a multiplying of distinctions in them, both in respect of meats and drinks and in respect of times. And what the Galatian Christians were chargeable with was their abiding by all such distinctions as were made under the Law. Nay, they probably added to them by adopting gospel distinctions or symbols as well. To circumcision they added baptism; to the Passover they added the Lord's Supper; and to the observance of the seventh day they added the observance of the first. It was a legalistic spirit which possessed them. They were making the gospel more complicated, more burdensome in its outward prescriptions, than the Law, whereas it is characterized by simplicity and freedom. No wonder, then, that the apostle was afraid of them because of their making *so many* distinctions. They were

endangering the gospel; they were forgetting their privileges as sons. (y) *We are to understand the language of the apostle to have reference to Jewish institutions in so far as they were Jewish.* The sabbath was not a purely Jewish institution; it existed from the beginning. The essential idea of it was a proportion of time devoted to God in acknowledgment of his sovereign right to all our time. The proportion was sovereignly fixed at one-seventh, and there is reason to believe that it was fixed in relation to our physical constitution. Under the Law the sabbath, while retaining its original character, received certain ceremonial adjuncts. It was numbered among the *moadeem*, or feasts; and was, indeed, placed at the head of them. "Concerning the feasts of the Lord, which ye shall proclaim to be for holy convocations, even these are our feasts. Six days shall work be done; but the seventh day is the sabbath of rest." The special services appointed for the sabbath in the sanctuary were these: first, the doubling of the daily burnt offering—two lambs instead of one, with a corresponding increase in the meat offering; and then the presenting of the fresh loaves of shewbread on the Lord's table. When, then, the apostle says that we are not to be judged in respect of the sabbath day in the same way in which we are not to be judged in respect of the feast day and in respect of the new moon, this meaning is plainly suggested—that we, as Christians, are freed from all the ceremonial adjuncts of the sabbath. But, more than that, there was a practical question as to the observance of what was called the sabbath as distinguished from the Lord's day—the observance of the seventh day as distinguished from the first. The connecting of God's time with the seventh was from the beginning, but it had been very much bound up with the Jewish ceremonial. It also came to be regarded as the Jewish day as distinguished from the Christian day; and it had a certain position as such *during the period of transition.* The apostle, then, may be understood as deciding for the Christian Church that they were under no obligation to observe two sacred days in the week. Now that they observed the Lord's day they were freed from the observance of *the sabbath.* But at the same time, the sabbath had a broad human aspect. This Christ declared when legalism was expiring, and not certainly as though the sabbath were expiring with it. He said that *the sabbath was made for man.* It lies embedded in our deepest nature. It is needed under all earthly conditions and dispensations; and is not certainly to be numbered, like the feast day and the observance connected with the new moon, among things *Jewish*, from which as Christians we are freed. Whether it is the seventh day or the first is matter of Divine arrangement for the time being; but underneath both there is the obligation laid in our nature, from which we cannot be freed, to devote a proportion of our time to God. (b) *There is a statement made regarding the transitory nature of ceremonial institutions in which the sabbath is included.* There is not much difficulty presented by the statement in this Epistle, that ceremonial institutions are *weak and beggarly elements.* This language is to be applied to them in respect of their having served their purpose. They had been, with certain drawbacks, very helpful and rich in blessing to God's people. They may have been once so to some of these Galatian Christians, but, now that the Divine authority had been removed from them, now that the gospel had come in their place, to turn to them was indeed to turn to the weak and beggarly elements. So it was with *the sabbath*, or seventh day. It once had the Divine sanction. It once was one of the channels through which the Divine blessing flowed. But, now that it was no longer to be observed as the sacred day, now that the Lord's day had come in its place, to turn to it was to turn to one of the weak and beggarly elements. Nor is there much difficulty presented by the corresponding statement in Colossians that ceremonial institutions are *the shadow of things to come*, whereas the body is of Christ. That does not exclude the possibility of there being a sign to represent the substance, the reality, after it had come. We know that circumcision represented regeneration, the putting away of the sin of the flesh. And the Divine blessing accompanied it as the shadow of the coming reality. But when the reality came that corresponded to circumcision, it was put by Christ into the New Testament institution of baptism. In the context here the two ordinances are closely interwoven in the apostolic thought. "In whom ye were also circumcised" (the reference, says Alford, being to the historical fact of their baptism) "with a circumcision not made with hands, in the putting off of the body of the flesh, in the circumcision of Christ: having been buried with him in baptism." We know, too, that the Passover

pointed forward to a sacrifice to be offered for sin. And it was a nourishing ordinance as the shadow of the coming sacrifice. But when Christ, our Passover, was sacrificed for us (and it happened at the very time of the offering of the paschal lamb), the great reality was put by Christ into the New Testament institution of the Lord's Supper. And so it seems to be with regard to the sabbath. It pointed forward to the reality of a rest in Christ, and as such it was refreshing. But when the reality came, and needed no longer to be shadowed, it was put into the institution of the Lord's day. And we have reason to think that it will remain there for us until its full disclosure in heaven.—R. F.

Vers. 12—20.—*Personal appeal.* I. HE ASKS RECIPROCITY. "I beseech you, brethren, be as I am, for I am as ye are." Born a Jew, in accommodation to them he had taken up the Gentile position, *i.e.* in respect of freedom from Jewish ordinances. Let them, as brethren, show reciprocity. Let them give up their adopted Jewish practices and occupy the Gentile position along with him.

II. HE RECALLS WITH PLEASURE THEIR RECEPTION OF HIM. 1. *Negatively.* "Ye did me no wrong." He was free to confess that he had no ground of personal complaint against them. 2. *Positively.* (1) *It was an infirmity of the flesh that was the occasion of the first of his two visits to them.* "But ye know that because of an infirmity of the flesh I preached the gospel unto you the first time." This infirmity of the flesh is not mentioned by name, and has given rise to conjecture, with which subjective feeling has mingled. When the Church was persecuted, it was supposed to be persecution. The monks supposed it to be carnal thoughts. Luther supposed it to be a temptation of the devil. The language plainly points to a *bodily malady*. Regarding the first visit of Paul to Galatia we read, "And they went through the region of Phrygia and Galatia, having been forbidden of the Holy Ghost to speak the Word in Asia." It may be understood that it was by means of the bodily malady that the Holy Ghost forbade his preaching in Asia and at the same time directed his way into Galatia. And it was while detained by the malady that he preached the gospel to the Galatians. (2) *His infirmity proved no hindrance to them.* "And that which was a temptation to you in my flesh ye despised not, nor rejected; but ye received me as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus." That which was in his flesh was a temptation to them. It was something which made trial of them. While it did not wholly silence him, it interfered with him as a public speaker. It might have led him to be despised or rejected (the latter word, literally "spit out," pointing to a more active form of contempt). It is a wrong thing to despise any one because of what God has made him; but want of good feeling might have led them to turn his infirmity into ridicule; or their ignorance as barbarians might have led them to think that he was spurned of the gods, and therefore to be spurned of them. Instead of yielding to the temptation, however, and throwing contempt upon him because of his infirmity, they received him as though he had been an angel sent to them from heaven; nay, they received him as though he had been Christ himself. Their Celtic emotionalism came out in the reception they gave him. It gave, as we have seen, a peculiar vividness to the message. It was as though Christ had been actually crucified before their eyes. So it threw a peculiar halo round the preacher. They warmed toward him and heaped kindnesses on him, as though it had been the Master himself.

III. HE CONTRASTS THEIR PRESENT WITH THEIR PAST FEELING TOWARD HIM. "Where then is that gratulation of yourselves? for I bear you witness, that, if possible, ye would have plucked out your eyes and given them to me." There was no more gratulation of themselves because by a singular providence Paul had found his way among them with the gospel. Their Celtic realism was gone. That realism had gone to a great length. If it had been possible they would have plucked out their eyes to have given them to Paul. This language seems to point to an affection of the eyes as the malady from which Paul suffered. This supposition agrees with the conditions. It was just such a malady as would interfere with his comfort and effectiveness as a speaker, while not reducing him to silence. It was just such an occasion as the Celtic nature would seize and work upon. To make the gospel messenger freer for his work, they would gladly have parted with their very eyes, to make up for his deficiencies. And it was only the impossibility of thus serving Paul that kept them back from the sacrifice.



The thorn in the flesh, as following upon Paul being in the third heavens, and as pointing to something acute, agrees with the supposition of his being a sufferer from an affection of the eyes. Whether we interpret the words here as deriving point from a weakness of Paul's eyes or not, they are manifestly expressive of a very warm feeling toward him, which now seems to him to have fled.

IV. HE CONTRASTS HIS CONDUCT AND THAT OF THE FALSE TEACHERS TOWARD THEM.

1. *His fidelity.* "So then am I become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?" He had told them the truth on the occasion of his second visit. He had also been telling them the truth, with a certain sharpness, in this letter. That showed that he was no flatterer of them to gain his own ends. He did not believe in friendly relations being maintained unless on a basis of reality. Was it, then, a reasonable thing that he should be regarded by them as their enemy, as standing between them and their good, because he expressed himself according to the demands and under the restraints of truth? Was there any ground which could be stated for their change of feeling? 2. *The dishonourableness of the Judaizing teachers.* "They zealously seek you in no good way; nay, they desire to shut you out, that ye may seek them." He refers to the false teachers, whom, with a certain feeling of dignity, he does not name. They made the Galatians the objects of their zealous attentions. But they did not do this in a disinterested manner. Their object was to shut the Galatians out, *i. e.* to isolate them from Paul and the Christian circle, so as to become themselves the exclusive objects of the zealous attentions of the Galatians. They were thus mere flatterers, to gain their own ends. Instead of placing themselves under the restraints of truth, they gave themselves the licence of error. *While condemning them on this ground, the apostle makes a twofold reservation.* (1) *He is not to be condemned who makes others the objects of his zealous attentions in a good matter.* "But it is good to be zealously sought in a good matter." We condemn those who would compass sea and land to make one proselyte. But it is to be borne in mind that the zeal is a good thing in itself. What is to be condemned is misdirected zeal. And what is to be commended is, not the want of zeal, but zeal intelligently directed toward the good, especially the highest good, of others. Let the soul be on fire with a desire to do good. Let there be a compassing sea and land, not to make proselytes, but to bring souls to Christ. And we are not certainly to resent, but to welcome, the zealous attentions of others in the matter of our salvation. We ought to be thankful that we are not let alone, but that there are those who care for our souls. (2) *He did not lay any claim to exclude others from seeking the good of the Galatians.* "At all times, and not only when I am present with you." If others sought the real good of the Galatians in his absence, he had no feeling of jealousy toward them. On the contrary, he would bid them God-speed.

V. HE EXPRESSES A DESIRE TO BE PRESENT WITH THEM. 1. *Affectionate address.*

"My little children, of whom I am again in travail until Christ be formed in you." He addresses them, not as children, but, more tenderly, as little children, after the manner of John. He was not as a father to them (according to the conception here), but, more tenderly, as a mother. He had endured much in prayer and thought and service on their account. And he had thought that his motherly endurance had been rewarded in their spiritual birth. But it was as if he had been disappointed in them. And there was the recurrence of the same motherly endurance on their account. The object for which he endured was their spiritual birth. This is not thought of as the development of self, even of their true self. Nor is it thought of as a Pauline development, the accepting of a Pauline doctrine, the being recipient of Pauline influences. But it is thought of as the development of the Christ within them. Christians are those who have Christ as the Germ and Norm of their development. 2. *Reason for his presence.* "Yea, I could wish to be present with you now, and to change my voice; for I am perplexed about you." He wished to be present with them, in the hope that he would be able to bring back the old relations between them. In that case he would be able to change his voice, to adopt a gentler tone, which was more congenial to him and would be more pleasant to them. Meantime, he could not be all gentleness, for his information led him to be perplexed about them. He had not given up all hope of them, but the fears he had sometimes made his voice to grate on them, as it was not pleasant to himself.—R. F.

Ver. 21.—ch. v. 1.—*Allegory of Hagar and Sarah.* To them that desired to be under the Law he proposes to read a lesson out of the Law. "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the Law, do ye not hear the Law?" He conceives of them as men who could not do without the bondage of the Mosaic Law, and he will read their condemnation out of the Pentateuch, in which that Law is contained.

I. HISTORY ON WHICH THE ALLEGORY IS FOUNDED. "For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, one by the handmaid, and one by the freewoman. Howbeit, the son by the handmaid is born after the flesh; but the son by the freewoman is born through promise." The two sons, Ishmael and Isaac, had the same father. They differed in two respects. 1. *Ishmael was by the handmaid, Hagar; Isaac was by the freewoman, Sarah.* 2. *Ishmael was born after the flesh, i.e. according to the ordinary course of nature.* That there is not excluded from "flesh" a certain ethical meaning is seen from its being opposed in the twenty-ninth verse to the Spirit. Isaac was born through promise, i.e. through the Divine efficiency present in the promise, surmounting natural obstacles.

II. ALLEGORY. "Which things contain an allegory." By "which things" we are to understand, not merely those which have been mentioned, but the whole class of things pertaining to Hagar and Sarah. Allegorizing is explaining one thing by another. In this case there is the plain historical meaning to begin with. Upon that there is imposed a second meaning. We are not to understand that the apostle evolved this second meaning out of his own thoughts. But God really meant more than the historical meaning. It is true that God thinks through all history; especially does he make known his thoughts through sacred history. More particularly in his dealings with Hagar and Sarah he intended to indicate what his dealings were to be with others, represented by them. "For these women are two covenants." 1. *Hagar.* (1) *She represented the Sinaitic covenant.* "One from Mount Sinai, bearing children unto bondage, which is Hagar." Hagar was an Egyptian bondwoman in the household of Abraham. To the mind of God, she represented the Sinaitic covenant. As Hagar bare children unto bondage, so the Sinaitic covenant bare children unto bondage. *A remark is made regarding the locality of Sinai.* "Now this [the thing] Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia." Mount Sinai is situated in Arabia. This country is inhabited by the descendants of Hagar. The Arabs to this day regard themselves as the sons of Hagar. It was a country with which Paul had been made familiar during his residence in it for three years after his conversion. Once, in its lightnings, and thunderings, and blackness, and darkness, and tempest, Mount Sinai had been made to body forth the terrors of the Law. As Paul had felt it in its oppressive blackness and ruggedness, it seemed to body forth sufficiently the despair of the Law. It was a fit locality for bondmen. (2) *The Sinaitic covenant answered to the Jewish Church.* "And answereth to the Jerusalem that now is: for she is in bondage with her children." The Sinaitic covenant answered to the literal Jerusalem that was then standing, i.e. the Jewish Church. What was true regarding the Sinaitic covenant was true also regarding the Jewish Church, which was its embodiment. The bondwoman represented both. The Jewish nation at that time was a mother whose children were born to pass under the Roman yoke. So viewed ecclesiastically it was a mother whose children were born to pass under a yoke more grievous than the Roman. 2. *Sarah.* "The other is from Mount Zion, bearing children unto freedom, which is Sarah. Now this Sarah is Mount Zion in the Holy Land, and answereth to the Jerusalem that is above, for she is free with her children." That, we may suppose, is how the allegory would have run if it had been fully drawn out. It has already been stated that Sarah represents the other covenant, i.e. the gospel covenant. And it may be regarded as implied that, as Sinai breathed the spirit of despair, so Zion breathed the spirit of hope. But all that the apostle does here, is at once to oppose the Christian Church to the Jewish Church. "But the Jerusalem which is above." Opposed to the literal Jerusalem, which was then undestroyed, was the spiritual and indestructible Jerusalem, of which even now we are regarded as citizens. (1) *The Christian Church regarded as a mother.* It has three marks. (a) *It is free.* "Is free, which is our mother." We are taught to think of the Church as our mother. We are the Church's sons, through the efficiency of Christ in the Church and its services. All our well-springs are in the Church. It is of Zion that it is said, "This man and that man was born in her." The Church of

Christ is represented by the freewoman. We are taught to regard it as the home of freedom. We feel free in our covenant position before God, in our immediate relation to him, and in our glorious prospects. (b) *It has a numerous offspring.* "For it is written, Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for more are the children of the desolate than of her which hath the husband." This is a quotation from Isa. liv. 1. In the same prophecy (li. 2) use is made of God giving Abraham and Sarah a numerous offspring. In this language the prophet makes use of Sarah having a more numerous people descended from her than Hagar. And what the apostle does in quoting it is to give the fact another application. The Church represented by the desolate Sarah is to have a more numerous offspring than the Church represented by the favoured Hagar. (c) *It has an offspring according to promise.* "Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are children of promise." We are not certainly children according to the course of nature, or in virtue of influences that belong to our nature. We are children through the Divine influences that are efficient in the gospel surmounting great natural obstacles. We are miraculously, supernaturally born. (2) *An instructive parallel added.* (a) *The persecutors.* "But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now." It is said, in connection with a festival in honour of the weaning of Isaac, that Sarah saw the son of Hagar, which she had born unto Abraham, mocking. This little circumstance is referred to here, not so much for what it was in itself, as for its foreshadowing the bearing of the Arab tribes toward the Israelites. As the descendants of Ishmael persecuted the descendants of Isaac, so in the apostle's day did the Jews persecute the Christians. It was a well-known fact that they were the bitterest enemies of the Christians and were the principal instigators of persecution against them. (b) *Their fate foreshadowed.* "Howbeit what saith the Scripture? Cast out the handmaid and her son; for the son of the handmaid shall not inherit with the son of the freewoman." Ishmael could not be allowed to live in the same house with Isaac. He had to be cast out and was no sharer of the inheritance with him. So the Jewish Church and the Christian Church could not coexist. Jews could only be in the Church as Christians. As Jews they were cast out of the special covenant position, the stern reality of which was soon to be made evident in the destruction of Jerusalem and the breaking up of the Jewish nationality. (3) *General conclusion regarding our state of freedom.* "Wherefore, brethren, we are not children of a handmaid, but of the freewoman." *Exhortation founded on it.* (a) *To maintain our freedom.* "With freedom did Christ set us free: stand fast therefore." We owe our freedom to Christ. And it can be said that with a great price have we obtained our freedom, that price being his blood. We are not, therefore, to treat lightly what has been so dearly won. We must show our sense of it by maintaining it in its entirety. (b) *To eschew bondage.* "And be not entangled again in a yoke of bondage." They had formerly been under the yoke of heathenism; they were not to put themselves under the similar yoke of Judaism. A slave who has been liberated does not voluntarily put himself into the hardships he has left. So they who had experienced the sweets of Christian liberty were not to go back to bonds.—R. F.

Vers. 4, 5.—*The advent in redemption.* We naturally ask the question which forms the title to Anselm's famous book, 'Cur Deus Homo?' Why could not God effect his gracious purposes without the incarnation of his Son? The verses before us throw light on this question. Ver. 4 indicates the two leading points of the humiliation of our Lord—the personal and the moral. Ver. 5 shows the object of these respectively. "The Son of God was born a man, that in him all men might become sons of God; he was born subject to Law, that those subject to Law might be rescued from bondage" (Lightfoot).

1. CHRIST BECAME A SON OF MAN THAT WE MIGHT BECOME SONS OF GOD. "He was born of a woman" "that we might receive the adoption of sons." His humanity was real; he had a natural body and soul, and he entered the world by birth. His humanity was a humbling of himself (see Phil. ii. 7, 8). It was the emptying himself of primæval glory; the subjecting himself to earthly limitations of knowledge, power, etc., even down to the unconscious helplessness of infancy; the endurance of the toil, the weariness, the distress of a hard life, ending in that horror and mystery which we call

“death.” Consider how this incarnation of Christ leads to our adoption. 1. It is the *secret of his influence over us*. Attraction is in proportion to nearness. To influence a man you must descend to his level. There the power of sympathy is most felt. So Christ stooped to us that he might lift us (see Heb. iv. 15). 2. It is the *source of his power to conquer our great foes, sin and death* (see Heb. ii. 14). Sin and death chain us down from the glory of the Divine life. To conquer these Christ faced them. 3. It is the *ground of his atonement with God*. God could not welcome us while all right and justice opposed. Christ, as the representative Man and for his brethren as both Priest and Sacrifice, opened the way back to God (see Heb. ii. 17). Hence the great privilege—Divine sonship. He became as we are that we might become as he is; he joined himself to us that we, united with him, might rise to his glorious life.

II. CHRIST WAS MADE SUBJECT TO LAW THAT HE MIGHT FREE US FROM THE BONDAGE OF LAW. 1. He was born subject (1) to the Levitical Law—as a Jew; (2) to the social law—subject to his parents, etc. (Luke ii. 51); (3) to the civil law (Matt. xvii. 24—27); (4) to the moral law—not only to that pure morality which God and all holy beings follow, but to the definite precepts of morality which accompany the limitations of human life. 2. He was also subject to the penalties of the Law though himself sinless: (1) to the shame and trouble of the world generally which he shared in entering it; (2) to death, the distinctive doom of sin. 3. How does this lead to our liberation? (1) By facing the death-doom of the Law Christ conquered this for us. (2) By obedience to the Law he triumphed over the Law. The largest liberty is in obedience. The Law is made for evil-doers; it is powerless against the good. Christ makes his people righteous (Rom. viii. 3), and so frees them from Law. (3) By rising from obedience to the letter of the Law, to the higher obedience of the Spirit, he leads us also to that freer service of love which is the emancipation from Law.—W. F. A.

Ver. 6.—“*Abba, Father.*” I. TRUST IN THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD IS A PECULIARLY CHRISTIAN GRACE. 1. Christ revealed the fatherhood of God. Mohammedans think of “Allah” as an omnipotent autocrat, and Jews regard “the Eternal” as a righteous Lord; but Christians know God as “our Father in heaven.” It is not that the idea of the fatherhood of God was not conceived before the time of Christ, for Hebrew psalmists found comfort in it (Ps. ciii. 13), and even Homer sang of “the father of gods and men.” But (1) Christ gave prominence and supremacy to an idea which before was only co-ordinate with, or even less regarded than, other Divine attributes; and (2) he revealed for the first time the richness and tenderness of this the inmost character of God. 2. The fatherhood of God is to Christians a relationship of *love and gentleness*. God is not regarded, like the Roman father, as one who might be a terror to his children. The “*Abba, Father*” in the old home language—the language of the nursery—suggests the feelings of little children to their father, and may we not say their mother (see Isa. xlix. 15)? The type of the citizen of the kingdom of heaven is a little child; a little child’s affection for his parents is the pattern of the purest Christian devotion. Nevertheless, this childlike confidence does not conflict with the rightful authority of God. The father is not weak because he is gentle. The trust of love is an obedient trust. 3. From trust in God’s fatherly love the Christian life grows into a *habit of aspiration*. The yearning of the soul for God is met only to be deepened and intensified, so that the Christian learns to press on ever nearer and nearer to God, the burden of his heart’s desire finding utterance in the cry, “*Abba, Father.*”

II. THIS GRACE GROWS OUT OF AN INSPIRATION OF THE SPIRIT OF GOD’S SON. Christ reveals the fact of the fatherhood of God; but the mere knowledge of that fact which we may derive from studying the words and life of Christ will not enable us to realize the spirit of trustful sonship. It is little to know that God is a Father if we do not experience the love and close relationship of his fatherhood. So great a change is required before we can do this that nothing short of a Divine inspiration can make it possible. Indeed, it is Christ’s Spirit in us that utters the cry, “*Abba, Father.*” Thus the yearning of the soul for God is itself the result of God’s visit to the soul. All aspiration springs from inspiration. Because Christ lived in trust and communion with God, his Spirit entering us enables us to do the same. He is the true Son, and therefore his Spirit gives to us the grace of sonship.

III. THE DIVINE INSPIRATION DEPENDS ON OUR RELATION OF SONSHIP WITH GOD.

Though God is naturally the Father of all, it is not every one who can cry, "Abba, Father." The mingled trust and aspiration of such a cry are only possible to those who are sons indeed, reconciled to God and restored to the family home. The Spirit that inspires the cry is not given to all. We must be receptive if we are to receive it. The Spirit of God's firstborn Son is given to the true sons of God. The sonship, St. Paul teaches, is the consequence of our own faith, and the inspiration follows. Therefore the consciousness of trustful aspiration towards God as our Father is a proof of sonship. The Spirit thus bears witness with our spirit that we are sons of God.—W. F. A.

Ver. 7.—*The son and the slave.* The Christian is compared to the son, the Jew to the slave. The gospel brings sonship, Law inflicts bondage. The sonship of the new order involves liberty and heirship. Consider some of the privileges herein implied.

I. INTELLIGENT PRINCIPLES SUBSTITUTED FOR SPECIFIC COMMANDMENTS. The slave is ordered to do this or that without his master condescending to tell him the reason for his mandates. He is bound to a blind, implicit obedience. Nothing is done to develop his understanding and to help him to choose and decide on his own judgment. But the son is admitted to his father's counsels, and educated so as to reason for himself and to act on the dictates of his own conscience. The Law keeps men as slaves. It commands, it does not explain. Christianity (1) *enlightens* so that we see the principles of righteousness, understand their inherent rightness and discern their applicability to specific cases; (2) *liberates* by allowing us freedom to apply these principles according to our own conscientious convictions, instead of forcing upon us a rigid course of conduct.

II. LOVE AS A MOTIVE INSTEAD OF COMPULSION. The slave may hate his master and only obey in fear of the lash. The true son is above this abject, servile obedience. He has learnt to love his father, and from love to seek to anticipate his father's wishes and willingly to endeavour to please him. The Law commands, threatens, drives, compels. The gospel persuades and attracts. The Christian obeys God because he first loves God. The secret is that Law cannot change our hearts, while the gospel does "create a new heart within" us, so that we no longer need the restraints of Law, but earnestly desire to please God.

III. FAMILY FELLOWSHIP IN PLACE OF SERVILE INFERIORITY. The slave is kept at a distance from his master, holds an inferior position, and is excluded from familiar intercourse. The son lives at home in the presence of his father and enjoys close companionship with him. Law keeps us at a distance from God. Jews were made to feel a sense of separation caused by their Levitical system. Christians are brought near through Christ and belong to the family of God.

IV. A RICH INHERITANCE IN EXCHANGE FOR HELPLESS POVERTY. The slave can own nothing. All he earns and his very person are the property of his master. Sons are heirs. Law allows us to gain nothing—it is a hard master; but the gospel offers the richest gifts. Christians, being God's sons, become fellow-heirs with Christ.—W. F. A.

Vers. 8, 9.—"*Beggarly rudiments.*" I. THE OLD HEATHENDOM. St. Paul needs to remind the Galatians of the evils of the condition from which they have been liberated. We are all inclined to gild the past with false glories, looking back with fond regret to its lost delights, while we forget the things that troubled it. Note three characteristics of this evil past. 1. *Ignorance of God.* The heathen were without the light, the joy, the guidance, and the help that come with the true knowledge of God. All men who are spiritually dead to God are thus heathen at heart. The heathenism that was congenital was some excuse for moral failure; for men cannot serve the God they do not know. Conduct which is pardonable in the ignorant, however, is inexcusable in those who know God. 2. *The worship of those who are no gods.* Man must worship. The monstrosities of heathenism are a pathetic witness to our religious nature, which, if it has not light for its healthy development, will exercise itself in the most distorted manner rather than be suppressed. But such religion is based on a delusion. The worshipper prays to what does not exist. So do all who erect their own notions of divinity and do homage to them instead of learning to serve the God of revelation. 3. *Spiritual bondage.* The Galatians seem to have been entangled in the toils of a mongrel religion, which combined the terrible

superstitions of their Celtic forefathers with the immoral mysticism of their Phrygian neighbours. The result was a bondage at once of fear and of lust. But all heathen religions keep their devotees in subjection. Religious liberty is a fruit of Christianity.

II. **THE NEW CHRISTIANITY.** This was in all respects a deliverance, an advance, and an elevation. It involved great spiritual acquisitions. 1. *The knowledge of God*; always the first essential. We cannot trust, love, or serve a God of whose character and will we are ignorant. Any faith that precedes this knowledge is faith in the priest, not faith in God. 2. *Being known of God.* The apostle corrects himself. It was not enough to speak of knowing God. Though that was the first essential step towards the new life, it is not now the most characteristic feature of that life. We must not rest in the knowledge of God alone. Knowledge is not redemption. The further step is to receive the grace of sonship from God and the inspiration of the Spirit of Christ wherewith we breathe the aspiration to God as to our Father (ver. 6). Such an experience shows that we are acknowledged by God—"known of God."

III. **THE RELAPSE.** Is it possible that any should consciously and wilfully choose to fall from such privileges as those of the new Christianity to such bondage as that of the old heathendom? It was important that the Galatians should see that their perversion to Judaism was essentially such a relapse. The startling point of the apostle's argument lay just in this—that, with the insight of inspired genius, he saw the identity of the religion of Law which his converts regarded as a more progressive stage of Christianity with their old discarded heathenism. At first sight it might appear that austere Mosaism could have nothing in common with corrupt Phrygian orgies and gloomy Celtic sacrifices. Yet the bondage was essentially the same. They had three points in common. 1. *Their rudimentary character.* Both were mere beginnings. Christianity had left both behind. The advanced scholar should not waste time over the alphabet; the graduate need not matriculate afresh. 2. *Their weakness.* For the purpose of creating righteousness and regenerating character the Levitical Law with all its lofty morality was as impotent as the impure and horrible rites of the old Galatian cult. 3. *Their poverty.* Both were "beggarly." After holding the pearl of great price, it was strange that any should turn from such riches of Divine love to any other religion which, lacking the wondrous grace of the gospel, was by comparison as a beggar to a prince. Yet all make this mistake who forsake the grace and liberty of the gospel for the bondage of rites and holy days and priestly authority.—W. F. A.

Vers. 10, 11.—*Observing seasons.* St. Paul considers the observing of days, and months, and seasons, and years as so gross an instance of relapse to the weak and beggarly rudiments that he fears on that account that he may have bestowed labour in vain on the Galatians. So grave a judgment on the observance of seasons may startle us if we do not consider what the apostle really is condemning.

I. **THERE IS A RIGHT REGARD FOR SEASONS.** The sabbath was made for man, and it is therefore good for man that he should make use of the one day in the week that is set apart for rest and worship. Clearly if other seasons, such as Christmas, Easter, the coming of the new year, the harvest, etc., can be utilized profitably, the recognition of them may be justified on good grounds. 1. *The profitable arrangement of time.* There is a time for everything. Christ did not utter his parables of judgment at the wedding feast in Cana. We need time for worship. Though we should ever live in the spirit of prayer, we must still have distinct seasons of undistracted devotion if our religious life is to be deep and vigorous. It often happens, moreover, that what can be done at any time is not done at all. As it is well to set aside a definite portion of one's income for charitable purposes, lest too little or even none should be left after satisfying innumerable personal claims—though really if we love our neighbour as ourselves we shall count nothing wholly our own—so, while God demands all our time, and while any season is suitable for devotion, some time must be set aside for worship, or the busy work of life will absorb the whole. 2. *The exigencies of public worship.* The social requirements of worship make set seasons necessary when all the worshippers can mutually agree to assemble themselves together. The same principle requires definite places of worship. 3. *The influence of association.* We are all more or less affected by sentiment. Birthdays, wedding-days, and death-days, days of joy and days of sorrow, are chronicled in our almanacs, and the recurrence of them naturally raises

sympathetic emotions. The same applies to the great Christian anniversaries, and the power of association may help us to profit by the lessons of the Incarnation at Christmas and of the Resurrection at Easter.

II. THERE IS A DANGEROUS OBSERVANCE OF SEASONS. 1. *Regarding the mere observance of the seasons as a virtue on its own account.* The means receives the credit due only to the end. Mere "sabbath-keeping" is no good thing. The question is, "What good do we do or gain through use of the privileges of the day?" 2. The idea that the holy season sanctifies what would be otherwise common. 3. Making the sanctity of the day an excuse for neglecting duty. This was the fault of hypocritical Pharisees in the time of our Lord. Charity was sinned against that the sabbath might be respected. 4. Treating the religious observance of the holy season as an excuse for irreligion at other seasons. How many in Roman Catholic countries seem to think that attendance at Mass in the morning gives an indulgence for attendance at the theatre in the evening! How many Protestants seem to think that cessation from business on Sunday shows so much respect for religion that all the work of the week may be carried on in utter worldliness! Surely it is best not to put up the shutters on the first day of the week, if this act is only a piece of hypocrisy intended to cover the sin of using false weights and measures and selling adulterated goods on the other six days.

In conclusion, let us remember that each man must draw the line between the harmless use and the dangerous observance of seasons for himself. It depends much on natural constitution and on early habits. If some Christians seem rather over-observant of days, those who with St. Paul regard all days, the sabbath included, as in themselves equally holy, are not to judge their weaker brethren, but to reverence their devotion and to be charitable to their failing (Rom. xiv. 5, 6).—W. F. A.

Ver. 11.—*Labour bestowed in vain.* I. AN APOSTLE MAY BESTOW LABOUR IN VAIN. If St. Paul might thus fail, we are not to be surprised when we do not meet with success. We are not responsible for the results of our work, but only for the faithfulness of our efforts.

II. A TRUE WORKMAN WILL BE ANXIOUS NOT TO BESTOW LABOUR IN VAIN. Christian work is not mere treadmill drudgery. It is labour of interest, of sympathy, of love. The servant of Christ will be anxious, not only that he may be saved, though, perhaps, "so as by fire," but that his work may be preserved (1) for the honour of Christ; (2) for the welfare of men; (3) for the personal interest occasioned by self-sacrificing toil. If we care nothing for the results of our work, this is a manifest proof that our heart is not in it, and therefore that the work will be ill done. We must earnestly desire a good harvest if ever we are to be rewarded with the sight of the ripe golden ears.

III. THE PROSPECT OF FAILURE IN WORK WILL LEAD AN EARNEST MAN TO DO ALL HE CAN TO PREVENT IT. It was the dread of such failure that called forth the whole Epistle to the Galatians from St. Paul. 1. Failure, though in prospect, may often be obviated by *improved methods*, for we may be ourselves to blame for the want of success that we attribute to the stubbornness of the soil. It is a mistake to be wedded to any one method. The slavery of routine is fatal to success. New emergencies demand new plans. Beware of sacrificing the work to the machinery. 2. Failure may be avoided by *more earnest efforts*. St. Paul expostulates with the Galatians. He exhibits something of the long-suffering of God. It is foolish and weak and wrong to despair at the first lack of success. God despairs of no soul. If we were more hopeful and more patient we should be more fruitful.

IV. IT IS LAMENTABLE TO BE IN THE CONDITION OF THOSE UPON WHOM LABOUR HAS BEEN BESTOWED IN VAIN. They who thus fail are without excuse. All that has been done for them will rise up in judgment against them. How terrible to have been privileged with the ministry of an apostle, of a St. Paul, and, in spite of all his eloquence, his zeal, his self-sacrificing devotion, his inspiration, to make shipwreck at last! We who have the New Testament in our hands have that ministry for our benefit. If after enjoying the privileges of living in a Christian country and receiving Christian teaching we fail of entering into the Christian life, all the labour spent in vain upon us will condemn us. The responsibility rests on each individual soul. It is a delusion to throw the blame on the preachers. The highest influences, even up to the preaching of a St. Paul, will fail, unless we yield our own hearts in obedience to the truth.—W. F. A.

Ver. 16.—*A friend mistaken for an enemy.* On his first visit to Galatia, St. Paul was received, so he tells us, “as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus.” He paid, it appears, a second visit to the province, and then the fickle people treated him with coldness and suspicion because he found it necessary to point out their faults and the danger of them, as though he had become their enemy solely because he told them the truth. This narrow and unfair conduct of the Galatians is only too common to human nature. The causes of it are worth examining, and the evil of it being detected as a warning against a repetition of the same egregious blunder.

I. IT IS SOMETIMES THE DUTY OF THE PREACHER TO TELL UNPLEASANT TRUTHS. It is a mistake to suppose that because he has a gospel to declare he must let only honied phrases fall from his lips. Jeremiah set up the prophesying of smooth things as the one sure test of a false prophet (Jer. xxviii. 8, 9). John the Baptist prepared for the gospel by denouncing the sins of his fellow-countrymen. Christ uttered some of the most terrible words ever spoken (e.g. Matt. xxiii. 33). The Church has been too much pampered with comforting words. We need more preaching to the conscience. 1. *There are unpleasant truths.* Nature is not all roses and lilies; nettles and vipers exist. The page of history is blotted with tears and blood. There are many ugly facts in our own past experience. 2. The great ground on which the preacher is required to utter unpleasant truths is that *we are all sinners.* The doctor who describes the cases in a hospital must say much about terrible diseases. 3. The purpose for which it is necessary to utter painful truths is *to lead to repentance.* It is not done merely to give pain nor to drive to despair. The lightning flash reveals the precipice that the unwary traveller may start back from destruction. Until we know ourselves to be in the wrong way we shall not turn to a better.

II. THE PREACHER OF UNPLEASANT TRUTHS MUST EXPECT TO BE TREATED AS AN ENEMY BY THE VERY MEN HE IS TRYING TO HELP. This has been the case all the world over with the prophets of Israel, John the Baptist, the apostles, reformers in every age, and, above all, Christ himself, who was crucified simply because he told truths that stung the Jews to madness. The noblest heroes of the “noble army of martyrs” suffered on this account. It is well to understand and be ready for such treatment even in the milder form which it generally assumes in our own day. It can be explained, though of course it cannot be justified. It may be traced to the following causes:—1. *The influences of association.* The messenger of ill tidings is hated for his message. Milton calls the bird that foretells “a hapless doom” “a rude bird of hate.” 2. *Misinterpretation.* It is assumed that the preacher wishes trouble because he predicts it, that he has pleasure in humiliating us by revealing our faults. 3. *A corrupt conscience.* Men often refuse to admit unpleasant truths about themselves, treat them as libels and the preachers of them as libellers of the race.

III. IT IS A GREAT BLUNDER TO TREAT THE PREACHER OF UNPLEASANT TRUTHS AS AN ENEMY. 1. It is *foolish.* Truth is not the less true because we are blind to it. The revelation of its existence is not the creation of it. 2. It is *unjust.* The faithful servant of Christ, like his Master, will wish nothing but good to those whose guilt he denounces. He is the enemy of the sin just because he is the Friend of the sinner. 3. It is *ungenerous.* It is always a thankless task to tell unpleasant truths. For a man of kindly disposition it is a most painful task. He undertakes it for the good of his friends. It would have been much more pleasant for St. Paul to have retained his popularity at the expense of the Church’s welfare. He is an ungrateful patient who treats as an enemy the surgeon who hurts only that he may heal.—W. F. A.

Vers. 21—31.—*The allegory of Hagar.* Writing to men who were unduly subservient to the Jewish Law, St. Paul clenches his argument with an appeal to what he regards as the typical meaning of the history contained in that very Law. This was an *argumentum ad homines.* It is important, when possible, to convince men on their own ground. Among believers in Scripture, arguments are naturally drawn from Scripture. Only it is necessary to bear in mind that there are different “views” of Scripture; so that we must not be impatient if the dogmatic assertion of our own interpretation as Scripture itself is not acquiesced in. To many the allegory of Hagar seems to be an illustration rather than an argument. A reference to it is chiefly useful to move our sympathies. It needs to be preceded by solid reasoning founded on direct statements of



Scripture. Thus St. Paul argues from the history of Abraham (ch. iii. 6) before making use of the typical significance of Hagar.

I. BOTH SARAH AND HAGAR WERE OF THE HOUSEHOLD OF ABRAHAM. The very honours conferred upon Hagar led to her ultimate rejection from the home through the spirit of insubordination they bred in her. The Law was given by God. We must not assume that all things of Divine origin possess equal value, nor because a thing is only intended for some lower use and is set aside when that use has been made of it, that it is therefore inherently bad and cannot have come from God.

II. HAGAR WAS ONLY A BONDWOMAN, WHILE SARAH WAS A WIFE AND A FREEWOMAN. Herein is a type of the fundamental distinction between the Law and the gospel. 1. The Law imposes bondage (1) to *constraint and compulsion*; (2) to *definite precepts and irksome details*; and (3) to the *burden of past transgression and omissions*. 2. The gospel brings freedom (1) in *forgiveness* of the past and *justification by faith* for the future; (2) in revealing *general principles* of righteousness and giving us liberty to apply them for ourselves; and (3) in *infusing love* as the motive of obedience.

III. ISHMAEL WAS A SLAVE, WHILE ISAAC WAS FREE. The children took the status of their mothers. We enjoy only the privileges of the religion under which we live. The Law cannot develop liberty. As it is a system of bondage, all who follow it lose their freedom, whether they will or no. The gospel confers liberty on all who accept it—even on those who at first have not faith, or hope, or desire to be free.

IV. ISAAC ONLY RECEIVED THE PROMISE. God's blessing comes to the free soul. If we cling to our fetters we lose the grace of God. Liberty is the parent of innumerable good things, politically, socially, religiously. As we free ourselves from superstition and needless restraints we rise into the healthy atmosphere where the largest Divine blessings flourish.

V. ISHMAEL WAS FINALLY CAST OUT. The Law, having done its part, is discarded. The Jews lost their peculiar position as the central spiritual light of their age when their mission was completed. The tutelage of Law may be useful for a time, but to dwell in it perpetually will be to become ultimately castaways.—W. F. A.

## EXPOSITION.

### CHAPTER V.

Ver. 1.—(See p. 209.)

Ver. 2.—Behold, I Paul say unto you (ἰδοὺ, ἐγὼ Παῦλος λέγω ὑμῖν); *lo, I Paul say unto you*. The adverbial exclamation ἰδοὺ, found in St. Paul's writings only here (in Rom. ii. 17 it should be εἰ δέ), seems to be more abrupt than ἰδοὺ, pointing to the immense importance and yet possibly unexpected character of what follows. The Galatians might be surprised to hear it; but that which they seemed disposed to take in hand was fraught with utter ruin. "I, Paul:" he thus puts forward his personality, as solemnly gaging his whole credit and responsibility upon the truth of that which he is about to affirm. The turn of thought is somewhat different in 2 Cor. x. 1 and Eph. iii. 1. There is no reason to suppose that he is glancing at the use which might have already been made or might be made of the fact of his having himself circumcised Timothy. That if ye be circumcised (ὅτι εἰν περιτέμνησθε); *that if ye set about having yourselves circumcised*. The present tense is used also in the next verse and in ch. vi. 12, 13; 1 Cor. vii. 18. Compare the present tense, δικαιοῦσθε, in ver. 4. In Acts xv. 1

the περιτέμνησθε of the Textus Receptus is replaced by περιμυθήτε, which is better suited to the posture of mind of those Pharisee Christians who had in view the abhorrent uncleanness attaching, as they considered, to those described as ἀκροβυστίαν ἔχοντες (Acts xi. 3); upon whom themselves the Jews fastened the epithet of ἀκροβυστία, not as a mere colourless *antitheton* to περιτομή, but as a selected term of reproach as objects of offence and disgust. The apostle, on the other hand, is here not thinking of outward corporeal condition; for he presently (ver. 6) affirms that in Christ Jesus it mattered nothing whether a man were in περιτομή or in ἀκροβυστία, as indeed he proved to be his feeling by circumcising Timothy (Acts xvi. 3). It is the posture of mind that the apostle is thinking of exclusively. What was this? The very warning of this verse shows, that, in wishing for circumcision, these Galatians did not *intend* to withdraw from Christ; and it appears from the next verse that they did not, either, contemplate the doing of the whole Law. But then, too, the fourth verse, in which apparently the apostle means to explain and justify the assertion of this second verse, indicates that they sought circumcision with the view of

being justified by the Law; not, as has just been remarked, by obeying the whole Law, but by submitting themselves to the Law so far as undergoing this one rite prescribed by it. The conclusion to be drawn from these premisses is that what the apostle means is this: If ye have yourselves circumcised with the view of thereby obtaining righteousness before God, ye forfeit all hope of receiving benefit from Christ (see note on ch. iv. 10). In comparing the present passage with ch. vi. 12, 13, we observe that, while here he is dealing with those who sought circumcision with the view of assuring their righteousness before God, he is there referring to persons actuated by an altogether different set of motives. *Christ shall profit you nothing* (Χριστὸς ὑμᾶς ὠφελήσει). "The future tense marks the certain result of their being circumcised: 'Christ (as you will find) will never profit you anything'" (Bishop Ellicott). The future time is not, in particular, for example, the time of Christ's second coming; but that which follows upon their receiving circumcision—the hour in which their distrust in Christ eventuated in the overt act of having themselves circumcised for the purpose of gaining righteousness thereby, would decisively cut them off from Christ. Their circumcision would be for them the sacrament of excision from Christ. We may compare with this the awful passage referring to the consequences accruing to Jewish Christians from their relapsing to Judaism, in Heb. x. 26—30. It is difficult to overestimate the importance of this passage, in determining the relation between trust in Christ's atonement and participation in the benefits of that atonement. It is at his extreme peril that a Christian allows himself in misgivings as to whether Christ's mediation is all-sufficient for the securing of his peace with God and his part in God's kingdom. It is by *reliance* upon Christ's work that his salvation through Christ is secured; by *distrust* in it his salvation is brought into peril; by *definite unbelief* his salvation is forfeited. This is in perfect accordance with the apostolic doctrine in general; but rarely is it so strongly and incisively asserted as it is here.

Ver. 3.—For I testify again (μαρτύρομαι δὲ πάλιν); *I protest again*. In using the word μαρτύρομαι, *pro teste loquor*, "I speak in the presence of a witness," the apostle intimates that he is making his affirmation with a definite sense of the Lord being his Witness (cf. Eph. iv. 17, "This I say and testify in the Lord"). The original construction and force of the verb are shown in Judith vii. 28, μαρτύρομαι ὑμῖν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν. The apostle is wont to use it with a distinct sense of its emphatic import (see Acts xx. 26; 1 Thess. ii. 11). The word "again"

points, not to the substance of the subsequent affirmation, as if it were a repetition of that made in the preceding verse, which in fact it does not appear to be, but to the solemnity with which he makes this fresh affirmation. For the phrase, "I Paul say unto you," was one form of solemn affirmation which in effect gaged his personality as Christ's apostle and as acting in his name; and this "I protest" is another of equally solemn import. To every man that is circumcised (παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ περιτεμνομένῳ); *to every man that is having himself circumcised*. St. Paul's statements elsewhere, and his own proceeding in circumcising Timothy, as well as the present context, make it certain that, however absolute and universal his affirmation at first sight seems to be, it is nevertheless meant to be taken as made with reference to certain understood conditions. Thus: "I protest to any one of you Gentiles, who, being already baptized into Christ, has himself circumcised with the view of winning righteousness and favour with God, by obeying this one prescription of the Law—that," etc. The conjunction δὲ is most probably the δὲ of transition (metabatic), introducing a fresh particular merely; and in this instance, as often, it needs not to be represented in translation at all. Certainly "for" is not its meaning. Possibly, as De Wette supposes, it points back, as an adversative, to the words, "Christ shall profit you nothing," as if it were "but on the contrary." That he is a debtor to do the whole Law (ὅτι ὀφειλέτης ἐστίν ὅλον τὸν νόμον ποιῆσαι); *that he is under obligation* (Greek, *is a debtor*) to do the whole Law. By having himself circumcised, he adopts the token of the Lord's covenant (Gen. xvii. 11, 13) made with those who were his people after the flesh; he enrolls himself with them to share with them their obligations. And to them the Lord had given the Law of Mount Sinai to be their appointed *pedagogue* till the Christ should come. "By being circumcised" (he means) "you of your own accord put yourself back afresh under this *pedagogue*, and just his bidding you must do. And for what? All the ordinances and ceremonies he puts you upon observing will leave you as far off as ever from remission of sins and justification with God! And this self-surrender to the *pedagogue* God has not asked for at *your* hands; while what he does require, *that* you withhold, even faith in him whom he hath sent: nay, not merely withhold your belief, but by open act and deed testify your *disbelief* in him." Under all that the apostle is here writing there appears to lie the principle, which, however, he has not distinctly stated, but which we see to be true, that circumcision was the peculiar badge of Israel after the flesh," appertaining to them alone

and not to be meddled with by any who did not mean to become naturalized as fellow-citizens with them. (For the use of *ἀφελήτης ἔστιν*, comp. Rom. viii. 14.) The noun more commonly points to a debt incurred, or guiltiness; but here it simply denotes obligation.

Ver. 4.—**Christ is become of no effect unto you** (*κατηργήθητε ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ*); or, *ye have disconnected yourselves from Christ*. The verb *καταργεῖν* is a favourite word with St. Paul, occurring twenty-seven times in his Epistles, including twice in the Hebrews, whilst in the rest of the New Testament it occurs only once, and that in the Pauline St. Luke (xiii. 7). Its proper meaning is “to make inoperative,” “make of no effect,” as above (ch. iii. 17). The phrase, *καταργεῖσθαι ἀπὸ*, etc., occurs Rom. vii. 2, “If the husband die (*κατήργηται ἀπὸ*), she is discharged from the law of the husband;” it ceases to have any effect upon her; so *ibid.*, ver. 6. “Now we have been discharged from the Law (*κατηργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου*);” it has ceased to have any operation towards us. The phrase combines the two ideas—*separation* suggested by the *ἀπὸ* (comp. Rom. ix. 3), and the *cessation of a work* (*ἔργον*) or an *effect* till then wrought by one upon the other of the two parties: the two parties have nothing more to do with each other. The sense given in the Authorized Version is perfectly justifiable; only, perhaps, here the passive takes, as it sometimes does, the reflective sense of the middle verb; but it may be that the apostle means simply to express the result which has accrued. The aorist tense of *κατηργήθητε*, as well as of the *ἐξέπεσθε*, expresses the certainty and promptness with which the result followed upon the (supposed) act. **Whosoever of you are justified by the Law** (*οἵτινες ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοῦσθε*); *such of you as go about to be justified by the Law*. “By the Law;” literally, *in the Law*; seek to find in the Law the means of justification (cf. ch. iii. 11, and note). The present tense is the present of design or endeavour; the result in this case being, in fact, unattainable (ch. iii. 10, 21). **Ye are fallen from grace** (*τῆς χάριτος ἔπεσθε*); *ye have fallen from the state of grace*. “Grace” denotes the condition of acceptance with God into which faith in Christ brings us. Cf. Rom. v. 2: “Through whom we have had our access by faith into this grace wherein we stand.” The verb *ἐπίπτω* is used as in 2 Pet. iii. 17, “Lest—ye fall from (*ἐκτέσθητε*) your own steadfastness.” So *πίττω*, Rev. ii. 5, “Remember whence thou hast fallen [*πέπτωκας*: *Receptus, ἐπέπτωκας*].” In classical Greek the verb was frequently used as a set term to describe those who, in the alternating success of adverse factions in the several independent

cities of Greece, were compelled by a more powerful adverse party to submit to exile; its correlative verb being *ἐκβάλλω*. This fact leads Bishop Lightfoot, having an eye to the *ἐκβαλε* of ch. iv. 30, to render *ἐξέπεσθε* here, “are driven forth and banished with Hagar your mother.” But this very idiomatic colour of meaning it seems very precarious to give to the word in the Greek of St. Paul. The more general signification of the term is amply sustained by its use in Plutarch as cited by Wetstein.

Ver. 5.—**For we through the Spirit** (*ἡμεῖς γὰρ πνεύματι*); *for we for our parts by the Spirit*. “We” who abide in Christ, and continue steadfast in the grace into which Christ has brought us; that is, we believers in Christ, as such. Not, “I and those who go along with me,” as *e.g.* in Phil. iii. 17. “By the Spirit.” *Πνεῦμα* can hardly here mean, as in ch. iii. 3, the element of spiritual life; but much more probably the personal Spirit of God, referred to as inspiring and prompting the action of the believer’s mind. The presence of this Spirit has been already described as the distinguishing blessing of believers in Christ (ch. iii. 2—5, 14; iv. 6); while presently after (ver. 18, *πνεύματι*: 22—25) the apostle dwells on the work of the same Divine Agent in regulating the Christian’s habits of feeling and action (the dative as in vers. 16, 18; Rom. viii. 13). It is here referred to as evincing the Divine sanction which attaches to the particular action of faith and hope now to be described (comp. Rom. viii. 15—17; Eph. i. 13). **Wait for the hope of righteousness by faith** (*ἐκ πίστεως ἐλπίζα δικαιοσύνης ἀπεδεχόμεθα*); *from the ground of faith do wait for the hope of righteousness*. The term which has the principal accent in this clause is *ἐκ πίστεως*, “from the ground of faith.” This appears, both from the preceding context, in which the opposed idea of “justification by the Law” holds the foremost place, requiring here the confronting mention of “faith,” and also from the next verse, which substantiates the statement before us by affirming the all-importance of “faith.” In point of construction, *ἐκ πίστεως* does not appear to qualify “righteousness,” although, from the classical text Hab. ii. 4 (Septuagint), it is so often connected with *δικαίος* and *δικαιοῦσθαι*; but rather the whole clause, “wait for the hope of righteousness.” What the apostle is now concerned to say is that it is by virtue of our faith that we look forward to hereafter receiving the hope of righteousness. This, of course, includes our being by faith justified. The word “hope” here designates the object hoped for, and not the sentiment itself. So Rom. viii. 24, “hope that is seen;” Col. i. 5, “the hope which is laid up for you in the heavens;”

Titus ii. 13, "looking for the blissful hope." The genitive, "of righteousness," may be (1) the "genitive of apposition," the hope which is, or which consists of, righteousness, similar to the genitives in the phrases, "the earnest of the Spirit," "the sign of circumcision," "the leaven of malice," "the recompense of the inheritance," "the peaceable fruit of righteousness" (2 Cor. v. 5; Rom. iv. 11; 1 Cor. v. 8; Col. iii. 24; Heb. xii. 11); or (2) "the hope of righteousness" may mean the hope that appertains unto righteousness, which would be the "inheritance" spoken of in ch. iii. 18, 22, as accruing, not "from the Law," but to those who are justified by faith. The apostle is not wont to speak of justification as a blessing to be received at the day of final decision, to which he evidently here refers, but as a blessing received at once by those who believe in Christ as the fruit even here of their faith. Thus Rom. v. 1, "Being justified (*δικαιωθέντες*) by faith, we have peace with God;" *ibid.*, ver. 11, "We have now received the reconciliation." Thus also in this Epistle (ch. iii. 24—27) it is declared that, in consequence of being justified by faith, we are clothed with Christ and God's adopted sons (see also ch. iv. 6, 7). There can surely be no question of the already received justification of those in whom the Spirit testifies that they are sons. Nor does Phil. iii. 9 ("That I may be found in him, having . . . the righteousness which is through faith in Christ") speak a different language: he aspires (he there says) to be in that final judgment found in possession of a righteousness which he had received in this life through the faith which he had in this life exercised. As Bengel here observes, "Paul, in mentioning things beyond, includes and confirms things present." Of Judaical legalism it was true that it did not think itself already possessed of righteousness, but with an ever-unappeased conscience was always still striving after it; whereas it is the privilege and glory of faith that it can enjoy the assurance of being even now justified and at peace with, "at one" with, God. Most certainly, what the apostle here calls "hope" is not the sentiment which we so often thus name when we intend thereby an imperfectly assured expectation of some probably coming good. In the apostle's vocabulary it denotes a confident anticipation unclouded by doubt (comp. Rom. viii. 23—25; Heb. xi. 1). In fine, this is what the apostle means: We Christians, as led by the Spirit of adoption, do rest in the confident anticipation of receiving the inheritance which is the future award of the righteous, on the ground of our faith in the Lord Jesus. The verb *ἀπεκδέχομαι*, in all the six other passages in which it is found,

is used with reference to objects or events pertaining to the close of the present dispensation: Rom. viii. 19, 23, 25; 1 Cor. i. 7; Phil. iii. 20; Heb. ix. 28. The preposition *ἀπό* in this compound verb is probably intensive, expressing thoroughgoingness; an entirely assured, steadfast expectation, persistent to the end.

Ver. 6.—For in Jesus Christ (*ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*); for in Christ Jesus. "For;" to prove that it is from the ground of faith that we look for the final awards due to righteousness, and not from obedience to any ceremonial law. "In Christ Jesus" means more than in Christ's religion. We had the phrase above, ch. iii. 28, "All ye are one man in Christ Jesus." It occurs frequently in St. Paul's writings; remarkable instances are supplied in Rom. xvi. 17, "who were in Christ before me;" *ibid.*, 11, "which are in the Lord;" 1 Cor. i. 30, "of him [*i.e.* of God] are ye in Christ Jesus." It is, perhaps, best illustrated by our Lord's own parable of the vine in John xv. 1—4. The spiritual union with Christ therein portrayed is maintained and operative through the action of the soul habitually cleaving to and depending upon him, and constantly receiving from him responsive gifts of spiritual vitality and power. Neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love (*οὔτε περιτομή τι ἰσχύει, οὔτε ἀκροβυστία, ἀλλὰ πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη*); neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith operative through love. In two other passages the apostle makes a very similar statement. One is below, ch. vi. 15, "For neither is circumcision anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature." The other is 1 Cor. vii. 19, which with its context runs thus: "Was any one called being circumcised? let him not become uncircumcised (*μὴ ἐπισπᾶσθω*). Hath any been called in uncircumcision? let him not be circumcised. Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing; but the keeping of the commandments of God." The comparison of these three passages suggests: (1) That the "availeth not anything" now before us is tantamount to the "neither is anything" and to the "is nothing" of the other two passages; and that the meaning in each case is that neither circumcision nor uncircumcision has any effect for good; for since the antithetic affirmation in all three cases states what is effectual for good, it is obvious to infer that it was of a beneficial effect only that the apostle was thinking in the foregoing statement. (2) This leads to the question why "uncircumcision" should be thus repeatedly affirmed, twice to the Galatians, to be of no beneficial effect. More

must be meant than a mere completing of the sentence by adding to the mention of "circumcision" the mention of its opposite. It is clear that there were those who imagined that uncircumcision made a favourable difference in men's religious condition, just as there were others, like these Galatian reactionaries, who imagined that circumcision did. That there were persons to be found in the Church who held the former view is put beyond doubt by the exhortation, "Let him not become uncircumcised," which immediately precedes 1 Cor. vii. 19, now under review with the passage immediately before us; with reference to which exhortation comp. 1 Macc. i. 15; Josephus, 'Ant.' xii. 5. 1. It was in no such ways, the apostle tells them, that the Divine approval was to be either gained or secured; and only mischief would result from entering upon them. (3) The antithetic affirmation of what really is effectual for our spiritual well-being varies in the three passages; but it is natural to infer that *that* which in all three is declared to be the thing of vital importance, either is at bottom one and the same thing, or at least necessarily involves it. "Faith operative through love" must be identical with, or involve, "the keeping of the commandments of God," and "a new creature." A close examination of the first of these three sentences will show that it is so. The participle *ἐνεργουμένην* cannot be a passive, as Estius maintained; who even asserted a passive sense for the verb *ἐνεργεῖσθαι* in all the eight other passages in which it is found (Rom. vii. 5; 2 Cor. i. 6; iv. 12; Eph. iii. 20; Col. i. 29; 1 Thess. ii. 13; 2 Thess. ii. 7; Jas. v. 16). In perhaps not one of these passages is a passive meaning probable; while in some of them, as Eph. iii. 20; Col. i. 29; 1 Thess. ii. 13, it is palpably inadmissible. In the case before us, if a passive sense were admitted, we should have the expression, "faith wrought in us by love;" an account of the *genesis* of faith which must be judged to be in the strictest sense of the word *preposterous*. Faith does indeed grow and become perfected through love; but it is not in the first instance wrought in us by love, except indeed it be God's love to us (Eph. ii. 4). In those passages of the New Testament in which the verb *ἐνεργεῖν* occurs in the active voice (Matt. xiv. 2; Mark vi. 14; ch. ii. 8, twice; 1 Cor. xii. 6, 11; Eph. i. 11, 20; ii. 2; Phil. ii. 13), the subject of the verb is a personal agent, or one which, as in Matt. xiv. 2 and Mark vi. 4, is probably spoken of as such. It is most commonly followed by an accusative of the thing wrought, which, however, is sometimes left to the reader to supply. The middle voice appears in St.

Paul always to have for its subject an impersonal agent (Winer, 'Gram. N. T.,' § 33, 6); and such an agent is said *ἐνεργεῖσθαι* in the sense always of "proving, acting out, its vitality and power," and never of simply "doing" such and such things. It is nowhere followed by an accusative. It is thus distinguished from *ἐργάζομαι*, which either is followed by an accusative of the work done or is used absolutely of "doing work," as in Matt. xxi. 28; Rom. iv. 4, 5; 1 Cor. iv. 12. The apostle, therefore, by the words, *πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένην*, means, not "faith through love doing works of beneficence," but "faith evincing its vitality and power through the love which it begets in us;" "faith by love operative and influential." Love is not contemplated as a separate acting of the Spirit, added on to faith as it were by an extrinsic effort of the soul, but as a product of faith itself, by which faith exerts its own internal energy. The apostle's meaning becomes clearer if we consider the object on which the justifying faith of the Christian fastens. This the apostle describes in this Epistle as Christ, "who gave himself for our sins;" "who loved me and gave himself for me" (ch. i. 4; ii. 20). When this marvellous exhibition of Divine compassion and love is through faith in very deed caught sight of and realized, it naturally becomes a truth-power, exercising over the man an influence imperative and supreme. This was the apostle's own experience; so much so that he seems to struggle with language while compelling it to describe the intensity of self-devotion with which it animated him. In this Epistle we may cite the passages ch. ii. 20; vi. 14. And in other Epistles he writes in a similar strain. Let it suffice to cite 2 Cor. v. 14, 15: "The love of Christ constrained us; because we thus judge, that one died for all, therefore all died; and he died for all, that they which live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto him, who for their sakes died and rose again;" adding, in ver. 17, "Wherefore if any man is in Christ, he is a new creature; . . . all things are of God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ"—words which show what he meant by the "new creature" mentioned below, ch. vi. 15. Thus the apostle evinces how in his own case faith through love became operative and influential. Christ's love to himself, on being realized by him, awakened in his soul a sentiment of grateful affection to his Redeemer, which was so strong and influential as thenceforward to sway and regulate the whole of his life. To complete, however, our estimate of the apostle's view of this matter, we must not forget to take account of the words "by the Spirit" in the preceding verse. The Spirit

alone can make even the love of Christ thus influential with our souls, which but for his quickening grace remain, even in sight of the cross, still numbed and cold. The accordance of the notion of "faith through love operative and influential" with that of a "new creature" has been already indicated; and no other principle than this can enable us for the "keeping of the commandments of God;" and this does, and even *constrains* the soul to keep them. "But," it may be asked, "does the ordinary experience of Christian men and women as we see them bear out this representation? Is faith in their case thus operative and influential?" It would be foolish to say that it is; with the average, even of those Christians who make a religious life their most serious concern, it is not. And the case was no doubt the same with the average of Christian believers in the apostle's own time. But this we can affirm: in *proportion* as our faith in Christ's being our reconciling Redeemer is vivid and real, in that proportion is it energizing and transforming. It is in its own nature essentially love-inspiring and consecrating. It argues a miserable defect in our faith when we have to supplement, as we so often must, its vitalizing power by injunctions and restraints of "the letter" and "the Law;" so far as it is so with us, so far we live as "bondmen" and not as "free." If "the Son makes us free, then are we free indeed;" and this is how he makes us free—he imparts to us the gift of love to himself; and that makes obedience to be no longer a constrained service, but a very instinct of our nature.

Vers. 7—12.—In these verses the language is remarkably curt and disjointed. Their style seems to betoken, *either* the mind of the writer musing in painful embarrassment, uncertain how best to grapple with the case before him through imperfect knowledge of the circumstances ("Who did hinder you?"); or, possibly, the painful effort which it cost the apostle to "write with his own hand." In ver. 13 he at length takes up a line of thought which he is able to follow on with fullness and fluency.

Ver. 7.—Ye did run well (*ἐτρέχετε καλῶς*); full well ye were running. "To run" is a favourite figure with St. Paul, drawn from the foot-races of the Isthmian Games or other public games common throughout the Roman empire, and applied above (ch. ii. 2) to his own course of apostolic service, but here, as in 1 Cor. ix. 24—27; 2 Tim. iv. 17; and Phil. iii. 14, in a wider reference to the course of general Christian obedience. In vers. 5, 6 the apostle has indicated the proper character of a Christian believer's life, as one which is animated by a faith energizing through love, and by the antio-

pation of attaining hereafter the awards to be rendered to the justified. Compare the general strain of thought, strikingly similar to that in the present context, pursued in Phil. iii. 12—14. Obviously, one important element in the comparison is the Christian's forward advance in self-improvement, as well as his continuing prosecution of work for Christ's cause. These characteristics had, and not long before, marked the manner of life of the Galatian Christians. Upon the recurrence of this recollection, here again, as in ch. iii. 1—4; iv. 13—16, the apostle bewails the change that had taken place. They had been so full of joy and of love in believing (ch. iv. 14, 15). But now an incipient relinquishment of their hope in Christ had left them cheerless, and, in consequence, ready to look abroad in quest of other grounds of assured confidence; while also the thence ensuing conflicts of controversy and faction had marred their once happy mutual concord (ver. 15). The form of Christian life which the Galatian Churchmen had in those days presented to view was apparently similar to that which at an earlier date he had described as marking the Thessalonian Church (1 Thess. i. 3), and at a later time applauds in the Colossian (Col. i. 4—6, 8). Who did hinder you; or, who did drive you back (*τίς ὑμᾶς ἐπέκοψε*. [Receptus, ἀπέκοψε]). The ἀπέκοψε of the Textus Receptus would mean, as in the margin of our English Bibles, "Who has driven [or, 'beaten, struck'] you back," and would be illustrated by the use of the verb in Wisd. xviii. 23, "Standing between, he beat back the wrath," as Aaron did. But ἐπέκοψε is the reading of all recent editors. The precise meaning of ἐγκόπτω does not seem to be, as some suppose, "to stop," but rather "to hamper, shackle, impede." It occurs Acts xxiv. 4, "be tedious;" 1 Thess. ii. 18, "Satan hindered;" Rom. xv. 22 and 1 Pet. iii. 7, "hindered." So the substantive ἐγκοπὴ, 1 Cor. ix. 12, "That we may cause no hindrance to [clog the success of] the gospel." Possibly this sense is derived from the hindrance caused to the traveller by the road being "cut into" or cut up before he goes over it. But it is more probably connected with the use of κόπω in the sense of "worry," as in Demosthenes, 'Olynth.,' ii. p. 22, "Worried from time to time by these expeditious up and down." So here, "Who was it that clogged your steps in running your race?" Not positively "arrested your steps:" this disastrous result, it was to be hoped, was not yet brought about; they were only as yet lagging in their course. This interrogation "who" does not so much demand that the evil worker shall be named and brought to light, as express the pity of it, that any one

should have been able to work them so much mischief; as in ch. iii. 1. Nevertheless, the author of the mischief had cause to tremble (see ver. 12, and note). That ye should not obey the truth? (τῆ ἀληθείᾳ [T. Tr., Light-foot, omit the τῆ] μὴ πείθεσθαι); that ye should not be hearkening unto the truth (or, unto truth)? "The truth" directly cites the gospel; that is, the gospel which proclaims righteousness as theirs who believe in Christ, apart from works of the ceremonial law; comp. ch. iii. 5, "That the truth of the gospel might continue with you," the particular phase of the gospel there intended being clearly evinced from the circumstances referred to. "Truth," without the article, denoting "that which is true," cites the same by implication. The verb πείθεμαι, frequently rendered in the Authorized Version by "obey," as Rom. ii. 8 and Heb. xiii. 17, properly means to lend a compliant ear to advice or persuasion; "to hearken," as Acts v. 36, 37, 40; xxiii. 21; xxvii. 11. The apostle means that they were turning their ears away from the truth to listen to pernicious counsels or teaching. The verb is in the present tense with reference to the continued attention which they ought to be now giving to the gospel.

Ver. 8.—This persuasion cometh not of him that calleth you (ἡ πείσμονή σου ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος ὑμᾶς); this persuasion, or the mind to hearken to this doctrine, is not from him that calleth you. The exact force of the word πείσμονή, which so far as has been noted does not occur in any earlier writer, is disputed. We may group it with ἐπιλησμονή, forgetfulness; φεισμονή (sparingsness), elchemy; πλησμονή, fulness, satiety; which are likewise verbal nouns formed from the perfect passive (ἐπιέλησμαι, etc.). And the comparison favours the conclusion that πείσμονή denotes the disposition, state, or habit of mind evinced in being persuaded in the way now thought of. So the Greek commentators (Ecumenius and Theophylact understand it of their having been persuaded to Judaize. The explanation of the noun as an active verbal, as if it were the persuasion which was soliciting them from without, does not seem to be so well borne out by its etymological formation, but appears nevertheless to be that accepted by Chrysostom. This noun, seemingly not often used, appears to have been selected by the apostle to brand the belief in the truth of Judaizing views which the Galatians were imbibing as being in nature diverse from the πίστις, faith, which realizes the truth of the gospel; it is the product of over-persuasion, of cozenage even, rather than an acceptance of the plain setting forth of the simple truth, while "faith" is "the gift of God" (Eph. i. 19, 20; ii. 5, 8). As Chrysos-

tom observes, "It was not men's persuasion (πείσμονή ἀνθρώπινη), but the power of God, which persuaded the souls of those who believe." By "him that calleth you" is plainly meant God (comp. 1 Thess. ii. 12; v. 24). "The present participle is preferred here to the aorist, because the stress is laid on the person rather than the act" (Bishop Lightfoot). That persuasibleness of the Galatians was not from God; at the best it was from the world (comp. Col. ii. 20); but was it not, rather, from Satan, whose emissaries those false teachers were (comp. 2 Cor. xi. 15)? The apostle makes this assertion categorically, knowing it to be true. The gospel which he had brought to them had been sealed by the gifts of the Spirit accompanying its reception; while the doctrine they were now in danger of listening to was another thing altogether (ch. i. 6)—a thing with an anathema upon it.

Ver. 9.—A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump (μικρὰ ζύμη ὄλον τὸ φέραμα ζυμοί); a little leaven leaveneth the whole kneading. This proverb is cited again in precisely the same words in 1 Cor. v. 6, with the words prefixed, "know ye not that." In both passages the leaven is an element of evil, and so also in Matt. xvi. 11; but our Lord applied it also to an element of good, which was to penetrate (apparently) the whole mass of humanity (Matt. xiii. 33). What has the apostle precisely in his view as the leaven in the present instance? In 1 Cor. v. 6 it is unchastity, which, if once tolerated in a Church, especially amid so licentious a population as that of Corinth, would be but too likely to impregnate balefully the sentiment of the whole community. And here likewise, as there, the leaven does not appear to denote, as some have supposed, the individuals in whom some noxious element was conspicuous, but that noxious element itself; namely, to judge from the colouring of the immediate context, the "readiness to hearken" to "another gospel," which was promising comfort and sense of acceptance, more or less, in the practice of at least some of the outward ordinances of Judaism. This leaven had already begun to work, embodying itself in the observance, pedantically and ostentatiously, of the days and feasts of the Jewish calendar (ch. iv. 10). Now, a movement of mind manifesting itself in some form of external religionism, when once it begins to show itself in a Christian community, has a great tendency to spread. For always, in every Church, there are unstable souls, too often not a few, never able to come to the knowledge of the truth; which have never truly discerned Christ's all-sufficiency for their spiritual needs, or have lost any superficial persuasion of it once enjoyed; and which, consciously

unsatisfied with what they as yet possess, and nevertheless only toying with spiritual things, are ready to adopt almost any novelty of religious behaviour offering itself for their acceptance. The particular form in which the external religionism of seekers after another gospel clothes itself varies according to varying tastes or circumstances. Among the Galatian Christians such persons were now beginning to feel attracted by that venerable kind of outward piety exhibited by devout or professedly devout Jews; but in their own practice committing the fatal blunder of mistaking the external shows of saintliness for the reality of saintliness, and but too willing to make the former serve in lieu of the latter. The danger of the leaven spreading was, in the present case, increased by the instability of character and the quick impulsiveness belonging to the Celtic temperament. The true antidote to this "leaven" is in every age the same; namely, that which the apostle in this Epistle strives to administer—the gospel of the righteousness and Spirit of Christ crucified.

Ver. 10.—**I have confidence in you through the Lord** (*ἐγὼ νένοῦθα εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐν Κυρίῳ*); **I for my own part have confidence with respect to you in the Lord.** The pronoun *ἐγὼ* prefixed to the verb, perhaps, distinguishes the writer from some about him, particularly those who had just before brought that unfavourable report of the state of affairs in Galatia which had prompted the writing of this letter. The apostle has himself a vivid remembrance of their warm-hearted acceptance of his message (ch. iv. 13—15), and of their sufferings in the good cause (ch. iii. 4). "Have confidence with respect to you." The preposition *εἰς* is used as in 2 Cor. viii. 22, equivalently with *ἐν* in 2 Cor. ii. 3 and 2 Thess. iii. 4; in which last passage ("We have confidence in the Lord touching you"), as well as in Phil. ii. 24 ("I have confidence in the Lord that I myself shall come shortly"), the phrase, "in the Lord," expresses, not the object of trust, but the sphere of consciousness in which he is able to feel this confidence. So also here, in the realized presence of the Lord Jesus, the apostle feels that his care for his people, and his faithfulness towards those in whom "he has begun a good work" so conspicuously as in their case, warrant him in entertaining a strong assurance that, after all, they would not disappoint his hopes (comp. Phil. i. 6; 1 Thess. v. 24). This expression of confidence implies, of course, a measure of underlying apprehension; while it is also in effect an admonition, couched in an affectionate form, designed to rally them back to their true allegiance. The phrase, "with respect to you," separates

their case from that of any who were "troubling them;" kindly implying that, in the main, they were still unperverted. That **ye will be none otherwise minded** (*οὐδὲν ἄλλο φρονήσετε*); that is, that your sentiments will continue, or will be found to be, such as I have been setting forth as those inspired by the gospel, and such as you once manifestly entertained. The future tense of the verb seems to point forward to the time when his appeal should have reached them, and have led them to bethink themselves as to what, in spite of perhaps some momentary superficial wavering, their sentiments at bottom really were. (For the sense of the verb *φρονεῖν*, comp. Acts xxviii. 22; Phil. iii. 15.) **But he that troubleth you** (*ὁ δὲ ταρασσὼν ὑμᾶς*); **but he that is troubling you.** "But;" indicating that, even if such a person's machinations proved abortive, through their steady adherence to the gospel, that man should receive his deserts none the less. In ch. i. 7 we had "There are some that trouble you." Comparing the two expressions, the one in the singular number, the other in the plural, we may conclude, either that the phrase *ὁ ταρασσὼν* designates any one who shall be found falling under the description of a *ταρασσων*, i.e. any one of those referred to in the plural number; or that it points to one particular individual on whom the apostle had his eye as the prime ringleader of the rest. If we adopt the first view, the clause, "who-soever he be," appears to mark the absoluteness of the resolve expressed by the apostle, while leaving in indefiniteness the individual to whom it would apply. With the second view, the same clause would affirm that no circumstances attaching to the offender, such as (suppose) a mission from leading Churches in Jerusalem, or official eminence in a Galatian Church, or any other, should shield him, as he or others might suppose that it would, from the effect of the sentence to be pronounced upon him. The second seems the more probable view; and, in unison with it, it appears supposable that the hypothetical case stated in ch. i. 7 ("if we or an angel from heaven") had an eye to the eminent position held by the person here alluded to. This individualization of the threatening would make it the more telling when the letter should arrive—a thunder-clap bursting forth upon the head of that arch-troubler. **Shall bear his judgment, whosoever he be** (*βαστιάσει τὸ κρίμα, ὅστις ἂν ᾖ*). With the phrase, *βαστιάσει κρίμα*, compare *λαμβάνει κρίμα* in Luke xx. 47; Rom. xiii. 2; Jas. iii. 1. "Shall bear," as a heavy burden (comp. ch. vi. 2, 5). The *κρίμα* shall be laid upon him, and carry it he shall, whether he will or no. The *κρίμα*, judgment, is the "sentence;" the deci-



sion of the judge upon his conduct, and the consequent punishment. The apostle threatens that he will bring into exercise the "power" which, as he says in 2 Cor. xiii. 10, the Lord had given him for the edification of his people, and the use of which would be accompanied by consequences proving that "Christ was speaking in him" (ibid., 2, 3). Instances of its exercise are seen in 1 Cor. v. 4, 5; 1 Tim. i. 20; Acts xiii. 11. How grievous was this offender's guilt has been strongly declared by the "anathema" of ch. i. 7—9.

Ver. 11.—And I, brethren (ἐγὼ δὲ, ἀδελφοί); but in respect to myself, brethren. The personal pronoun is again accentuated. It seems that it had been affirmed by some one, most probably that individual "troubler" of the preceding verse (on which account the point is just here mentioned), that the apostle did himself "preach circumcision." The compellation "brethren" has a tone of pathos in it: it appeals, not merely to their knowledge of his experience of persecution, but to their sympathy with him under it. He is grappling to himself, as it were, the better-minded of those he is writing to. If I yet preach circumcision (εἰ περιτομῆν ἔτι κηρύσσω); if I am still preaching circumcision. The phrase, "preach circumcision," is like that of "preaching the baptism of repentance" in Mark i. 4; it denotes openly declaring that men should be circumcised. The force of ἔτι is best explained by supposing that the apostle is quoting the assertion of this gainsayer—"Why, Paul himself up to this hour still preaches circumcision, just as he did when he followed Judaism." And taking it thus, we may discern a shade of irony in the apostle's repeating the ἔτι in his reply: "Why, then, am I still persecuted up to this hour?" He had begun to be the object of persecution as soon as he began to preach Christ, as he pathetically reminds the Corinthians (2 Cor. xi. 32; cf. Acts ix. 24). In trying to imagine how this gainsayer could have given the least colour of probability to so audacious an assertion, we may suppose that he would point to St. Paul's behaviour at Jerusalem, and no doubt elsewhere, when he "to the Jews became as a Jew; to those under the Law as under the Law" (1 Cor. ix. 20); and in all probability, as Chrysostom and others have observed, cited the well-known fact of his circumcising Timothy; and there doubtless were other facts of a similar complexion, all which, with a little distortion, might enable an unscrupulous or a merely very eager opponent to dress up a statement like that before us with a certain amount of plausibleness. Why do I yet suffer persecution? (τί ἔτι διώκομαι); why am I still persecuted? The apostle distinctly implies

(1) that his persecutions were mainly occasioned by the hostility of the Jews; and (2) that the hostility of the Jews mainly originated in his teaching the doctrine that the cross of Christ put circumcision, together with the observance of the Law of Moses, aside as terms of acceptance with God. The first point is fully borne out by the history of the Acts and various allusions in the Epistles, showing that the fact was so, both before and after the time when this letter was written. The second is perfectly consistent with the history, and alone fully explains it. Then is the offence of the cross ceased (ἔρα κατήργηται τὸ σκάνδαλον τοῦ σταυροῦ); then the stumbling-block of the cross hath been done away. The stumbling-block of the cross is that which makes the cross a stumbling-block. In 1 Cor. i. 23 "Christ crucified" is designated as "to the Jews a stumbling-block;" while to Gentiles it simply seemed "folly." "Then" follows up an argument *ex absurdo*, as in 1 Cor. xv. 14, 18. The apostle means that the cross would not be to Jews the stumbling-block that it was if it had been preached in conjunction with the obligatoriness of circumcision together with the observance of the ceremonial law, upon those who believed in Christ. If, then, he had preached Christ crucified thus, he could not have been so offensive to the Jews. But it was all otherwise. It has been supposed that the notion of a crucified Messiah was offensive to Jewish feeling, merely because it ran counter to their conception of the Christ as a secular king and conqueror. St. Paul's words show that this was not the case. That preconception of the Jews no doubt made it difficult to them to believe in the Jesus whose worldly career had been closed by an early violent death; even as before our Lord's passion it had made it difficult to the apostles to believe that he was thus to die. But after the question whether the Christ was predestined to be a suffering Christ (Acts xxvi. 23) had been discussed, and it had been shown from the Old Testament that the Messiah was to suffer before he should reign, it had yet to be determined in what relation the particular form of Jesus' death stood with respect to the Mosaic Law. Gentiles would naturally think of the cross chiefly, indeed solely, as a sign of extremest ignominy; they thought scorn of the Christians who looked for life from "this Master of theirs, who was crucified" (Lucian). But to Jews, with the habits of feeling to which they had been trained in the school of Moses' Law, the cross was more than a sign of extremest ignominy—to them it was a sign also of extremest pollutedness. Now, to the Apostle Paul it had been given to see, with more distinctness than the general body of

believers at Jerusalem appear to have seen it, the inference to which the finger of Divine providence pointed in the particular form of death which, in the counsels of God, had been selected for the Christ to suffer (cf. John xvii. 32). He had seen that faith in the crucified Saviour, by just consequence and in the Divine purpose, disconnected those, who embraced it as the supreme element of spiritual life, from all obligation to the ceremonial law as viewed in relation to their acceptance with God (ch. ii. 19, and note). And because he held forth this truth, and insisted upon its vital importance in determining the mutual relations of Jew and Gentile in the Christian Church, therefore it was that he drew upon himself the peculiar unrelenting enmity with which the Jews pursued him. They could manage to live on terms of peace with their fellow-Jews at Jerusalem who held that the Christ predicted in the Old Testament was to be, in the first instance, a suffering Christ, and trusted in Jesus as fulfilling those predictions; for they saw that they, while believing in Jesus, continued, as St. James told St. Paul all of them did, to observe and to be zealous for the Law (Acts xxi. 20); they were able, therefore, in some degree to tolerate their "heresy." But St. Paul was led by the Saviour of all the world to adopt a different line. The truth, which lay wrapped up in the manner of Christ's death, and which at Jerusalem was left, so to speak, in its latency, it became necessary for the welfare of mankind that Paul should bring forth into view, and apply for the doing of the work which it was designed to accomplish. The cross annihilated the obligatoriness upon God's people of the Law of Moses. And, by teaching this, this apostle revived against himself the animosity which had flamed forth so fiercely upon St. Stephen, who was charged with saying that "Jesus the Nazarene was to change the customs which Moses had delivered unto them." It illustrates the *economy* which marks the Holy Spirit's development of revealed truth in the consciousness of the Church, that this consequence of the crucifixion of our Lord was for a while left so much in abeyance in the mother Church in Judæa. The fact stands on the same footing as the development of the doctrine of the essential Godhead of the Lord Jesus; for this too would seem to have been not at once and by an abrupt illumination brought distinctly home to the consciousness of the Hebrew Church, but to have been deposited like a seed in its bosom to unfold itself gradually. It seemed meet to the Divine Wisdom to cradle the infant faith tenderly, that it should not be exposed to too great risks through want of sympathy on the part of its first nursing

mother towards these two of its most important elements. By-and-bye, when circumstances allowed, the same great apostle, who in his Epistle develops the doctrine of the cross in relation to Mosaism, could with advantage address the Hebrew Church, either himself or through another whom he inspired with his thoughts, that Epistle, in which the Godhead of Jesus is proclaimed with as much clearness and emphasis as the dissolution of the Mosaic institute in face of the new spiritual economy. The Epistle to the Hebrews, however, in proving that the new covenant was superseding the old, does not lay the chief stress of the argument upon the Crucifixion, but upon the utter unavailingness of the Mosaic priestly functions for the clearing of the conscience as compared with the efficacy of Christ's one offering. Nevertheless, the other point is not altogether neglected; at least, a kindred argument is suggested in Heb. xiii. 10—13, in which passage contact with Christ as suffering without the camp is spoken of as inferring a pollution which was incompatible with "serving the tabernacle." The "cross" is definitely named only once, and that with relation to extreme "shame" attaching to it (Heb. xii. 2). In other Epistles which are certainly of St. Paul's own composition, the "cross" is mentioned in connection with the abrogation of the ceremonial law, in Eph. ii. 16; Col. i. 20; ii. 14; but the manner in which it brought about this result is nowhere so plainly indicated as in this Epistle to the Galatians, in which "the cross" is the very key-note of the whole discussion. The flashing out of resentful feeling which we read in the next verse was probably in part evoked by the clear glimpse which the apostle this moment caught of the conscious *insincerity* of those seducers, shown in their making or adopting such an assertion respecting himself as he here rebuts, which facts proved to be so glaringly false.

Ver. 12.—I would they were even cut off which trouble you (*ὄφελον καὶ ἀποκόψονται οἱ ἀναστατούντες ὑμᾶς*); would to God they would make themselves even as the *apocopi* of *Cybele* (Greek, would even mutilate themselves), who are casting you out of country and home! The word *ὄφελον*, originally a verb, had got, thus stripped of its augment, to be a mere particle of wishing. Its sense with an indicative aorist is seen 1 Cor. iv. 8, "Ὁφελόν γε ἰβαριλεύσατε," "Would to God ye had come to your kingship [which is far from being really the case yet!];" Exod. xvi. 3; Numb. xiv. 2; xx. 3 (Septuagint), "Ὁφελόν ἀπεθάνομεν," "Would to God we had died!" with an indicative *imperfect*, 2 Cor. xi. 1, "Ὁφελόν ἀνέλχεσθέ μεν μικρὸν ἀφροσύνης," "Would to God ye were [*i.e.* could be] tolerant

of a little foolishness of mine! [might I hope for it?]:" Rev. iii. 15, "Ὁφελον ψυχροῦ ἤς, etc., "Would that thou wert cold," etc. With an indicative *future* (an extremely rare combination), it may still be regarded as expressing a longing that something *might* be looked forward to, which in reality is not to be anticipated; different from a simple desire that a thing *may* be, unaccompanied by the feeling that it cannot be, which is its force with an optative, as in Ps. cxix. 5. The tone of especially fervid aspiration, the vivacity, which usually marks wishes introduced by ὄφελον, is perhaps unduly tamed down by the rendering "I would that." In respect to the verb ἀποκόβονται, Greek scholars are pretty well agreed that the passive rendering of our Authorized Version, "were cut off," cannot be defended. There is no certain instance (Bishop Ellicott remarks) of a similar interchange of the middle voice with the passive. The sense of the verb is shown by the Septuagint rendering of Deut. xxxiii. 1, Οὐκ εἰσελεύσεται θλαδίας καὶ ἀποκεκομμένος εἰς ἐκκλησίαν Θεοῦ: where the word ἀποκεκομμένος answers to the Hebrew *kerūth shōphkah*, rightly rendered in the Vulgate and in our English Bible (cf. Gesenius's 'Thesaurus,' and Fürst, under *shōphkah*). "This meaning is assigned to ἀποκόβονται," observes Bishop Lightfoot, "by all the Greek commentators, I believe, without exception (the Latin Fathers, who read 'abscondantur' in their text had more latitude, and seems alone tenable." (See Grotius, in Poole's 'Synopsis.')

This interpretation gives its full force to καὶ ("not only circumcise, but even," etc.): it explains the form of the aspiration as one not likely to be realized; whereas the excision from the Church of these extremely aberrant members, falling nearly if not quite under the *anathema* of the first chapter, was a thing quite within the apostle's own power: it harmonizes with the intense resentment which colours the phrase, οἱ ἀναστατούντες ὑμᾶς (see below). The sentiment, it is true, seems one which it would be impossible for a public speaker, or even a writer, amongst ourselves to give such open expression to. Nevertheless, when viewed as framed in amid the surroundings which environed it at the time, it wears none of that aspect of coarseness which would confessedly be felt to attach to it under the conditions of modern life. That the worship of Cybele at Pessinus, one of the principal cities of Galatia, was deformed by the practice of such self-mutilation on the part of some of its devotees, was a matter of universal notoriety, and we may confidently assume that the apostle, when in the neighbourhood, heard frequent mention of those *apocopi* as they were called, and thus was

led now to allude to it as he seems to do in this malediction. For it is a malediction, as Chrysostom describes it; a malediction, however, which in severity falls far short of the *anathema* which has been previously pronounced. Good were it (he means) for the Church, and even perhaps themselves, if they would have the rashness to go a little further with what they call "circumcision," which in their case is mere *concoision* (Phil. iii. 2), and make it clear to all men how purely senseless and unchristian their action in this matter is. "Casting you out of country and home." The verb ἀναστατοῦν occurs besides only in Acts xvii. 6 ("turned upside down") and Acts xxi. 38 ("made an uproar"). It is not found in classical Greek, in which we have in its stead ἀναστάτους ποιεῖν or τινεῖναι: the verbal adjective ἀνάστατος, when it is applied, as it frequently is, to populations, meaning, "made to rise up and depart," "driven from house and home;" applied to cities, "ruined," "laid waste" (Liddell and Scott). Chrysostom observes, "Well does he say, ἀναστατούντες ὑμᾶς: for they compelled them to abandon their own proper country and liberty and heavenly kindred, and to seek an alien and strange one; casting them out of 'Jerusalem which is above and free,' and forcing them to wander abroad as captives and perforce emigrants." The present tense of the participle points to the action of these perverters as one which, if successful, would have this result; which (ver. 10) the apostle hopes to defeat. The selection of this particular verb, which goes far beyond the *ραρσάουτες* before used, and which the word "unsettled" adopted here by the Revisers, does not, as commonly used, completely represent, betokens the apostle's intense feeling of the ruinous consequences of the proposed Judaizing reaction. It shows that he adds the words *ætiologically*, that is, to justify his strong words, ὄφελον ἀποκόβονται. The energy of both expressions suggests the feeling that probably the apostle would not have written as he has here done except for his burning resentment on behalf of Christ's people threatened with so great a hurt. In 1 Cor. vi. 4 indignant feeling carries him away beyond himself to an utterance which in the next verse he virtually retracts, remarking, "I say it to move you to shame." Perhaps we have here something of the same kind.

Ver. 13.—For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty (ὁμοίς γὰρ ἐπ' ἐλευθερίῳ ἐκλήθητε, ἀδελφοί); for ye, brethren, were called unto (Greek, for) freedom. The "for" points back to the closing words of the preceding verse, which implied a settled state of well-being from which those

troublers were driving his readers; that happy state (the apostle says) was the very glory and essence of their "calling." This, of course, was that condition of free men described at the end of the foregoing chapter, and summarized in the first verse of this chapter. This is again, even more briefly, recapitulated in the first clause of the present verse. As the summary in the first verse supplied a starting-point for the warnings against the Judaizers which have taken up the foregoing twelve verses, so this new summary furnishes the starting-point for exhortations designed to guard the evangelical doctrine against antinomian perversion, by insisting upon the moral behaviour required of those who enjoy the freedom which Christ gives. These exhortations occupy the remainder of this chapter and a part of the next. "Ye," being what ye are, believers baptized into Christ. The verb "were called" expresses a complete idea, meaning of itself without any adjunct, "called by God to be people of his own" (cf. "calletth," ver. 8, and the passages there cited). The words, "unto," or "for freedom," supply an adjunct notion; as in Eph. iv. 4, the clause, "in one hope of your calling," does to the same verb. So again 1 Thess. iv. 7, "For God called us, not unto [or, 'for'] uncleanness, but in sanctification." The preposition ἐπι, both in the passage last cited and in the present verse, denotes the condition or understanding upon which God had called them: they were "called" upon the understanding that they should be in a state of liberty. So Eph. ii. 10, "Created in Christ Jesus unto [Greek, 'for'] good works." God calls us in Christ to be free in these three respects: (1) free from condemnation and conscience of guiltiness; (2) free from pupilage to a ceremonial institute of positive, carnal ordinances, and from bondage to a letter-Law; (3) free, as consciously his children, knit to him by his adopting Spirit, which makes us partakers of his nature. Only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh (μόνον μὴ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν εἰς ἀφορμὴν τῆς σαρκός); only, no freedom which shall be an occasion to the flesh! or, only, make not your freedom into an occasion for the flesh. The noun ἐλευθερίαν, being in the accusative, cannot be taken as simply a resumption of the ἐλευθερία immediately before. In his eagerness to at once bar the antinomian's abuse of the gospel, the apostle omits the verb which should account for this accusative; and the result is a sentence which may be taken as grouping with various passages in classical Greek authors, being in fact quite a natural way of speaking in any language; such as in Demosthenes, 'Phil.' i. p. 45, "No ten thousand . . . mer-

cenaries for me! (μή μοι μυριάς . . . ξένους);" Sophocles, 'Ant.', 573, "No more loiterings! but . . . (μή τριβὰς ἐπ' ἀλλὰ . . .);" Aristophanes, 'Ach.', 326, "No false pretences for me, but . . . (μή μοι πρόφασιν, ἀλλὰ . . .)." In such cases it simply weakens the vivacity of the style, if we supply any verb. The alternative rendering supplies δατε, which is in fact found in two uncial manuscripts, F, G, or ἀποχρήσασθε, proposed by Eucumenius. In the former way of construing we have in thought to supply a second τὴν after ἐλευθερίαν, as in 1 Cor. x. 18, Βλέπετε τὸν Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα: 2 Cor. vii. 7; Col. i. 8; Eph. ii. 15. The preposition εἰς is used as Rom. xi. 9; 1 Cor. xiv. 22, etc. The sense of the noun ἀφορμή, starting-point, is well illustrated by its use, in the military language of Greece, for a "basis of operations" (cf. Rom. vii. 8, 11; 2 Cor. v. 12; 1 Tim. v. 14). Reflection at once shows us that a "freedom" which allows a man to obey the behests of his lower nature is only by a false use of the term capable of being grouped with that freedom wherewith Christ makes us free. It adopts out of the latter the single element of emancipation from ceremonial law and letter-Law, and lets go altogether the concomitant notions of spiritual emancipation which are of its very essence. Such an emancipation hands its victim clean over to the thralldom of sin (John viii. 34; 2 Pet. ii. 18, 19). St. Peter, in his First Epistle, addressed to a large group of Churches founded by St. Paul, including those of Galatia, has a number of passages which apparently take up sentiments and even expressions found in St. Paul's writings (see 1 Pet. v. 12), as it were, ratifying them; and possibly he has an eye to the present verse when he writes (1 Pet. ii. 16), "as free, and not using your freedom for a cloak of wickedness, but as bond-servants of God." "The flesh" is not to have its own way, but is to own the mastery of the Spirit. But by love serve one another (ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης δουλεύετε ἀλλήλους); but through love be in bondage to one another; i. e. let love make you bond-servants to one another. The verb δουλεύω also means "do acts of bond-service," as Eph. vi. 7 and 1 Tim. vi. 2. This sense is included in the "being in bondage" here spoken of. In the present posture of affairs in these Churches, the apostle sees occasion for selecting just here one particular branch of Christian goodness to enforce upon their observance. Presently after (vers. 16—24) he enlarges the field of view; though even there still giving much prominence to the vices of malignity and to the benignant virtues. Just now he has his eye especially on the evils of contentiousness (ver. 15), and upon love as their corrective. We may

suppose such evils were now especially rife amongst the Galatians, whose natural character, commonly described as quarrelsome, was apparently evincing itself in connection with the disputes which the teaching and yet more the outward action of the Judaizers were giving rise to. In fact, a loving temper of mind, along with other benefits, is recommended also by this, that it guards Churches from corrupting innovations in doctrine and Church practice; checking our self-will and our obtrusive vanity, it leads us to avoid giving uneasiness to others by thrusting upon them new notions or new modes of conduct, and makes it our ambition to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. The pattern set by our Lord (John xiii. 15), both in washing his disciples' feet and indeed in his whole incarnate life (Phil. ii. 7), was grandly imitated by the apostle himself (1 Cor. ix. 19—22), who in outward things habitually sacrificed the pride of independence and self-assertion, and the pride of apparent self-consistency, in his devotion to the spiritual welfare of men. He here preaches just what he himself practised.

Ver. 14.—For all the Law is fulfilled in one word, even in this; Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself (ὁ γὰρ πᾶς νόμος ἐν ἐνὶ λόγῳ πεπλήρωται [Receptus, πληροῦται], ἐν τῷ, Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν [Receptus, εαυτὸν]); for the whole Law hath in one word been fulfilled, even in this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. Thus is very briefly enunciated what in the Epistle to the Romans (xiii. 8—10), written a short while after, the apostle more fully develops thus: "Owe no man anything, save to love one another: for he that loveth his neighbour hath fulfilled (πεπλήρωκε) the Law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not covet, and if there be any other commandment, it is summed up (ἀνακεφαλαιούται) in this word, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbour: love therefore is the fulfilment (πλήρωμα) of the Law." This passage of the Romans may be regarded as a lengthened paraphrase of the one now before us. From the comparison of the two, several things are made clear. We see from it what is meant by the πεπλήρωται, "hath been fulfilled." Some have been disposed to regard it as equivalent to ἀνακεφαλαιούται, "it is summed up." Not to urge that it is very doubtful whether the verb admits of this sense, it is enough to observe that in the parallel passage the verb πληροῦν, both in πεπλήρωκε, hath fulfilled, and the verbal πλήρωμα, fulfilment, means to fulfil in actual obedience; and that the perfect tense of the πεπλήρωται of this

passage reappears in the πεπλήρωκε of the other. The sentence in Romans, "He that loveth his neighbour (τὸν ἑρέρον) hath fulfilled the Law;" that is, as the context shows, "the whole Law," makes it clear that, by the words before us, "the whole Law hath been fulfilled in one word," is meant that the whole Law hath been fulfilled in the fulfilling of the one word, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." The whole Law is regarded as couched in that "one word." In the larger passage the Law, so far as it is explained, is represented as regulating our behaviour to our neighbours, for the apostle cites exclusively commandments of the "second table," in addition to which, we observe that the immediately preceding context (vers. 1—7) is taken up with the discussion of duties to our fellow-men, sliding into what follows through the words, "Owe no man anything, save to love one another." This suggests the inference that when the apostle says, "He that loveth hath fulfilled the Law;" and at the close of the paragraph, "Love is the fulfilment of the Law," he has in view that part only of the Law which enforces the duties appertaining to human relationships, and not the whole Law as enforcing, together with these, the duties we owe to God; for "love," he says, "is the fulfilment of the Law, because it worketh no evil to his neighbour." And this might seem further to justify the like inference with reference to the passage before us; and here also the immediate context (ver. 13) points only to relations between man and man, making no reference to our relations towards God. And this inference we seem warranted in accepting. Only, we have to bear in mind that the apostle has already taken account of our spiritual relations to God, in stating (ver. 6) that in Christ Jesus the all-important and only thing is faith working through love. For the faith which he means is plainly the principle which unites the soul to Christ Jesus, and in him to God as our reconciled Father, through the vitalizing and actuating power of the Spirit of adoption. And precisely the same consideration presents itself with respect to the parallel passage in the Romans; for there, too, the apostle has been previously engaged in building up the gospel doctrine of Christ's redeeming us from the control of a condemning Law, which is also mere "letter," and can give no spiritual life; and of his handing us over to the law of the Spirit of life, whereby the requirement of the Law is fulfilled in them who walk, not after the flesh, but after the Spirit (Rom. viii. 1—4). The apostle takes it for granted that it is with these views in their minds that his readers will receive what he here writes. Further, account is to be

taken of the spiritual sense in which the apostle uses the terms "law" and "love." Under the term "law" he no longer intends the Law of Moses, either as a ceremonial institute or as a letter-Law regulating moral behaviour; but that higher and spiritual law, of which the precepts of the letter-Law are only incomplete hints or adumbrations—the good and acceptable and perfect will of God (Rom. xii. 2). Likewise, by the term "love" he designates a very different thing from that principle of kindness, good nature, benevolence, which an Aristotle or Cicero, an Epictetus or Plutarch, could conceive and describe, and in their own practice exemplify; with St. Paul, as with St. John, it is a fruit of the Spirit, an emanation of Christ's life in the soul, organically and vitally ramifying out of filial love to God. They that were in the flesh *could* not please God. In order that we may fulfil the Law, the prime and indispensable requisite is that the Spirit of Christ be dwelling in us and leading us.

Ver. 15.—But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another (εἰ δὲ ἀλλήλους δάκνυτε καὶ κατασθίετε, βλέπετε μὴ ὑπὸ ἀλλήλων ἀναλωθῆτε); but if ye be biting and eating up one another, take heed that ye be not one of another utterly destroyed. "Biting" and "eating up" are images drawn from carnivorous animals furiously fighting with each other. The verb κατασθίετε, eat up, which in 2 Cor. xi. 20 and Matt. xxiii. 14 is applied to the eating up of a neighbour's goods, is here employed in its more literal sense, in order to furnish a figure describing that intense desire to vex and damage an antagonist, which but too often disgraces the so-called religious controversialist or partisan. The verb ἀναλίσκω, utterly destroy, occurs besides only in Luke ix. 54 and 2 Thess. ii. 8, of destruction by fire or lightning; so the compound κατανάλίσκω, Heb. xii. 29. It points to another sphere of hurt than that referred to in the two foregoing verbs; for while these latter describe the eager endeavour to sting and "run down" a theological opponent, the former describes the utter laying waste of the inward life of piety. The orthodox opinion may survive, and perhaps be even made clearer and more accurate; but the kernel of filial love and joy in God, and of love towards our brethren, may by the φιλονεικία, the bitter antagonism, of controversies have got to be altogether eaten out. A Christian disciple who has ceased to love, Christ teaches us, is salt which has lost its savour—utterly refuse and hopeless of recovery (Mark ix. 50).

Ver. 16.—This I say (λέγω δέ). Like τοῦτο δὲ λέγω in oh. iii. 17, and λέγω δὲ in oh. iv. 1, the phrase, λέγω δέ, here introduces a

further illustration of a point already referred to. It points back to the line of remark commenced in ver. 13 in the words, "No freedom to be an occasion to the flesh! but through love be in bondage one to another." The voluntary bondage of love is one most important part of the spiritual life; as indulgence in malignant passions is also a leading branch of the working of the flesh. The mention, therefore, of these two points in vers. 14, 15 naturally leads up to the more general exhortation of the present passage. Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil (or, fulfil not) the lust of the flesh (Πνεύματι περιπατεῖτε, καὶ ἐπιθυμίας σαρκὸς οὐ μὴ τελήσῃτε); walk by the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust (or, desire) of the flesh. The precise meaning of the several words and statements in this verse, as also in the two which follow it, have been much disputed. It must suffice here briefly to explain and justify what appears to the present writer the true view. The word "spirit," it seems most natural to understand in all three in the same sense. To take it in the first two verses as meaning that part of our composite being which has the nearest affinity to the higher moral and spiritual life (whether as in a state of nature or as informed by the Spirit of God), whilst in ver. 18 its import is determined by comparison with other passages to be the Divine Spirit, appears to be an arbitrary variation of its sense, which there is no necessity for adopting. The "Spirit" is mentioned alongside with "the flesh," not because it belongs to the like category of being a part of our nature, but because he has been graciously sent forth by God to contravene in us that evil principle which else we should be unable to overcome. This evil principle is termed "the flesh;" not as being merely sensual corruption, though vices of that class are mentioned in vers. 19 and 21 as leading instances of its working; for we see in vers. 20 and 21 vicious works of the flesh specified, which are to be referred to malignity (comp. 1 Cor. iii. 3), or to a perversion of the religious element, rather than to sensuality. It appears, therefore, to denote the principle of corruption which taints our moral nature in general—that which in the ninth of the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England is defused under the heading of "Original or Birth-Sin." The word "flesh" may be supposed to have been selected to denote this, because the depravation of our sensuous beings into sensuality constituted the most prominent and noticeable form in which the general degradation of our state from its proper nobler life in God manifests itself. The dative case of Πνεύματι, marks—either the sphere, element, path, in which we are to walk, which is intended by

the rendering in our Authorized Version, "in the Spirit," as the dative is used with *πορεύεσθαι* (Authorized Version, "walk") in Acts ix. 31; xiv. 16, and with *περιπατεῖν*, walk, in Acts xxi. 21; 2 Cor. xii. 18; or the rule according to which, together with the enabling power by which, our daily behaviour is to be regulated, so as to be synonymous with the phrase, "walking after (κατὰ) the Spirit," in Rom. viii. 4. The meaning at all events seems to be, Let the prompting of the Spirit be your guide, and the grace of the Spirit your strength, in the course of your life continually. This is afterwards expressed as being "led by the Spirit" (ver. 18), and as an "orderly walking by the Spirit" (ver. 25). The exhortation implies two things: first, that the Christians addressed, had had the gift of the Holy Spirit imparted to them (comp. ch. iii. 2; iv. 6, where "our hearts" includes the persons addressed; 1 Cor. xii. 13); and next, that this gift would not avail for the actual sanctification of their life without diligent endeavours after self-improvement on their own part. Comp. Phil. ii. 12, 13, "Work out your own salvation [i.e. by your own endeavours work out your salvation] with fear and trembling; for it is God which worketh in you both to will and to work, for his good pleasure." The generality of the form in which the exhortation is couched intimates that they were to endeavour to live in compliance with the Spirit's promptings in all the branches of spiritual activity proper to their Christian calling; not only in that of "love" already adverted to, but in those others also which the apostle presently after counts up in vers. 22, 23. It inculcates, therefore, the cultivation of a joyous spirit of filial love towards God, as well as a high strain of virtuous conduct towards their fellow-men and in relation to their own selves. In the next clause, the words, *οὐ μὴ τελέσητε*, "ye shall not fulfil," are by many (see margin of our Authorized Version) taken in an imperative sense; as if it were, walk by the Spirit, and by no means fulfil the desire of the flesh. It is, however, with much force objected to this view that, although the future with *οὐ* is often used for an imperative, as *οὐ κλιψέις, οὐκ ἐπινοήσεις*, etc., there is no instance adduced of *οὐ μὴ* being used in the New Testament in this sense. We are led, therefore, to adopt the other view, that the passage belongs to that form of sentence in which an imperative clause is followed by a clause denoting the result which will ensue in case the direction before given has been complied with; as e.g. "Come unto me . . . and I will give you rest." In place of the simple *οὐ τελέσετε*, we have the more emphatic form, *οὐ μὴ τελέσητε*, "Of a surety ye will not," etc.

By writing thus the apostle strongly accentuates the statement that walking by the Spirit is absolutely incompatible with an indulgence in the inclinations prompted by the flesh. There is probably a twofold doctrinal inference couched under this emphatic statement; namely, Ye will of a surety not fall under the Law's condemnation (comp. Rom. viii. 1—4); and, Ye will not need the Law's restraints (1 Tim. i. 9). But it is pregnant also with a hint of rebuke and of practical direction, not unneeded by the Galatians (ver. 15). The article is wanting before *ἐπιθυμίαν*, probably because it is wanting before *σαρκός*, as in *καταβολῆς κόσμου*, Luke xi. 50; *ἀρχῆς κτίσεως*, Mark x. 6; *ἔργων νόμου*, Rom. iii. 20, etc.; so that *ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκός* is put for *τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν τῆς σαρκός*. The verb *τελέσητε* is selected in preference to *ποιήσητε* (cf. Eph. ii. 2, *ποιούντες*) to express the idea that it is impossible for one walking by the Spirit to carry into full effect any desire of the flesh. For this is the proper force of the verb *τελεῖν*, of which the ever-memorable *Τετέλεσται*, "It is finished" (John xix. 30), is a typical illustration. This meaning obtains even in Rom. ii. 28 and Jas. ii. 8. The apostle seems to concede that the desire of the flesh may be felt by one who is walking by the Spirit; nay, even in at least an inchoate degree, given way to; but this much he affirms, that it will be impossible for such a one to carry it out into full accomplishment. This qualified representation of the Christian's holiness is intimated in the next verse more explicitly.

Ver. 17.—For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh (*ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ ἐπιθυμεί κατὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος, τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα κατὰ τῆς σαρκός*); for the flesh doth lust (or, hath desires) against the Spirit; but the Spirit likewise against the flesh. The first clause, "for the flesh hath desires against the Spirit," justifies the mention of "the desire of the flesh" in ver. 16, as being an experience which Christians in general have still to deal with; as if it were, "For the flesh really is present still, originating within you desires contrary to those prompted by the Spirit." Then the apostle adds, "but the Spirit likewise [or, 'hath desires'] against the flesh;" intimating that, although the flesh was still at work within, prompting desires tending away from holiness, that nevertheless was no reason for their giving way to such evil inclinations; for the Spirit was with them as well, originating desires after what was holy and good; and he would help them against those other inclinations towards evil, if only they would surrender themselves to his guidance. That this is the proper way of construing these two passages

seems betokened by the *δέ*. If the apostle had just here meant to say, "There are two mutually opposing principles at work within you," for the purpose of justifying by explicit statement the tone of ver. 16 which implies this fact, he would have written, *ἢ τε γὰρ σὰρξ ἐπιθυμῆι κατὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα κατὰ τῆς σαρκός*: or, *ἢ μὲν γὰρ σὰρξ . . . τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα*, etc.; "For both hath the flesh desires against the Spirit and the Spirit against the flesh;" or, "for on the one hand the flesh hath desires . . . and on the other," etc. But the adversative *δέ* standing alone tends to disjoin the two clauses rather than to conjoin them so closely together as the Authorized Version leads us to suppose. We need supply no other verb than *ἐπιθυμῆι*, "hath desires," with the words, "but the Spirit;" for this verb is used in a good sense as well as in a bad; as e.g. Luke xxii. 15, *ἐπιθυμία ἐπιθύμησα*, "with desire did I desire;" 1 Pet. i. 12, "the angels desire (*ἐπιθυμοῦσιν*) to look into;" Phil. i. 23, "the desire (*ἐπιθυμίαν*) to depart." In fact, the verb properly implies a simply strong wish, not necessarily an ill-governed one. And these are contrary the one to the other (*ταῦτα γὰρ ἀλλήλοις ἀντίκειται* [Receptus, *ταῦτα δὲ ἀντίκειται ἀλλήλοις*]); for these oppose themselves the one to the other. Taking the former two clauses as has been proposed above, we can discern the force of the "for" introducing this new clause. The apostle having been by two several turns of thought led to state, first that the flesh prompts desires or action in opposition to the Spirit, and then, as a distinct sentence, that the Spirit prompts desires or action in opposition to the flesh, he now conjoins the two several notions in the affirmation of the mutual antagonistic agency of these two principles; "For these oppose themselves the one to the other." The verb *ἀντίκειμαι* always denotes opposing action, and not mere contrariety of nature; being used as a participial noun for "adversaries" or "opponents" in Luke xiii. 17; xxi. 15; 1 Cor. xvi. 9; Phil. i. 23; 1 Tim. v. 14; and as a verb in 2 Thess. ii. 4 and 1 Tim. i. 10, to denote setting one's self in opposition to. This clause, therefore, describes the continual endeavour of the flesh and of the Spirit to thwart and defeat each other's action in the hearts of the persons spoken of. So that ye cannot do the things that ye would (*ἵνα μὴ ἂν θέλητε, ταῦτα ποιῆτε*); to the end that what things soever ye *fain* would do, those ye shall not do. This last clause describes the result aimed at by each of those conflicting principles, namely, to thwart each of them the volitions prompted by the other. The words remind us of Rom. vii. 15, *Ὁὐ γὰρ ὁ θέλω, τοῦτο πράσσω*, "For not, what thing I

fain would, that do I practise;" *ibid.*, 16, *Ὁὐ θέλω, τοῦτο ποιῶ*, "What thing I fain would not, that I do;" *ibid.*, 19, *Ὁὐ γὰρ ὁ θέλω ποιῶ ἀγαθόν, ἀλλ' ὁ οὐ θέλω κακόν, τοῦτο πράσσω*. "For not what good thing I fain would, do I do; but what evil thing I fain would not, that I practise." The comparison of the indefinite relative, "what things soever ye fain would do (*ἂν θέλητε*)," in the present passage, with the more definite "what thing I fain would do," or "fain would not do (*ὁ θέλω, ὁ οὐ θέλω*)," in the Romans, points to the conclusion that by the clause, "what things soever ye fain would do," is meant, "whichever be the kind of your volitions, whether they be those prompted by the flesh or those prompted by the Spirit." In comparing the two passages, it is important to notice that in the seventh chapter of the Romans the apostle is concerned exclusively with the frustration of our good volitions, which, there, are not ascribed to the prompting of the Holy Spirit, but to the prompting of our own moral sense quickened by the voice of the Law's commandment. Such good volitions he represents as overpowered by the controlling influence ("law") of the evil principle, "the flesh;" a condition of miserable thralldom, out of which, the apostle (*ibid.*, 25), with triumphant gratitude, alludes to believers in Christ being delivered—delivered by the coming in upon the scene of a new agent, "the Spirit of life:" whereas, in the passage before us, he is describing the condition of believers in Christ, to whom now has been imparted this new power for doing what is good. In these, "the mind" (Rom. vii. 25), powerless before to overcome the law of sin, is encouraged by the presence of a mighty Ally, through whom, he intimates elsewhere, the believer has it within his power to do all things (Phil. iv. 13). Many expositors, including Bishop Lightfoot, take *ἵνα* in the present clause as denoting simply the result actually brought about; thus the Authorized Version, "so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." Whether this sense, of result actually produced, can be shown ever to attach to *ἵνα* followed by the subjunctive, is a question which has been much debated. In 1 Thess. v. 4, "Ye are not in darkness that (*ἵνα*) that day should overtake you as a thief," the particle "that" points to the ordering of Divine providence spoken of in the two preceding verses, that they who are in darkness should be taken by surprise by the coming of the day of the Lord. It is certainly possible so to understand the particle here; the mutually thwarting agency of the flesh and the Spirit may be understood as latently attributed to Divine providence ordering; that thus it should be. But this view would



hardly seem to harmonize, either with the almightiness of the Divine Agent engaged in the conflict or with the triumphant language of Rom. viii. 1—4. In actual experience, it does indeed seem to be but too often almost a *μαχη* *ισόρροπος*, a drawn battle; so greatly is the Spirit's agency clogged and hampered by the weakness of human faith and the inconstancy of human purpose. But it does not need to be so. In the case of St. Paul himself, as we may infer from all that he says of his own career subsequent to his conversion, and in perhaps not a few cases besides, the Spirit has been completely and persistently triumphant. It therefore appears inconvenient to suppose that the apostle means to ascribe such a result to the ordering of Divine providence making it inevitable. Certainly such a construction of the passage is not necessary. We escape from it altogether by ascribing the notion of purpose latent in this *ἴνα*, "to the end that," to the *nisus* severally of the two agents. Taken so, the passage affirms this: Will whatever you may, whether good or evil, you will be sure to meet with an adverse agency, striving to bar the complete accomplishment of your desire. There appears to be no good reason for limiting the application of this statement, as some propose our doing, to the case of immature Christians, in whom Christ is as yet imperfectly formed (ch. iv. 19). With every Christian, to the very last, the life of holiness can only be a fruit of *conflict*; a conflict on the whole, even perhaps persistently, successful; yet a conflict still, maintained by the help of the Spirit against an evil principle, which can never, as long as we live, cease to give occasion for care and watchfulness (see 1 Cor. ix. 24—27; 1 Tim. vi. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 7). Why, it may be asked, is the apostle concerned to refer to this conflict here? Apparently because the Galatians showed by their behaviour that they needed to be stirred up and put upon their guard. They were, as the apostle (1 Cor. iii. 3) told the Corinthian believers *they were*, "carnal, walking as men." They had foregone the sense of their adoption; they were worrying one another with contentions. The flesh was in their case manifestly thwarting and defeating the desires of the Spirit. Therefore the apostle here reminds them of the conditions of the Christian life; it is to stimulate them to that earnest endeavour to walk by the Spirit, without which (ver. 24) they could not be Christ's.

Ver. 18.—But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the Law (*εἰ δὲ Πνεύματι ἄγεσθε, οὐκ ἐστὲ ὑπὸ νόμου*); but if ye are led by the Spirit, ye are not under the Law. The sense of Πνεύματι, as denoting the Spirit of God is put beyond question by the parallel passage

in Romans (viii. 14), "As many as are led by the Spirit of God (Πνεύματι Θεοῦ ἄγονται), these are sons of God." The dative case with ἄγεσθαι in both passages is illustrated by 2 Tim. iii. 6, "silly women laden with sins, led away by divers lusts (ἀγόμενα ἐπιθυμίαις ποικίλαις)." In all three cases the dative must be the dative of the agent, there being in 2 Tim. iii. 6 a slight personification. This use of the dative is not in prose writers a common construction with passive verbs, though not altogether unknown (Winer, 'Gram. N. T.,' § 31, 10). In the present case its harshness is perhaps relieved by the circumstance that the noun does not represent an agent whose personality is markedly conspicuous *ab extra*, but rather an internally swaying influence, whose personality is a matter of faith. Hence in 2 Tim. iii. 6 we render, "led away *with* divers lusts." This shade of sense might be represented by rendering, "led with the Spirit." In Luke iv. 1, "led by the Spirit," we have ἤγετο ἐν τῷ Πνεύματι. In all these passages the passive, "being led," must, from the nature of the case, include the voluntary self-subjection of those led. In Romans, "being led by the Spirit" stands instead of "walking after the Spirit" in ver. 4; "being after the Spirit" in ver. 5; "by the Spirit mortifying the deeds of the body" in ver. 13. Similarly, here it is tantamount to the "walking by the Spirit" mentioned above in ver. 16. The phrase cannot be fairly understood of merely having that *presence* of the Holy Spirit, which is predicated of the whole "body of Christ," even of those members thereof whose conduct is plainly not regulated by the sacred influence (comp. 1 Cor. xii. 13; vi. 19); it must be understood as describing the case of such as recognize its presence and yield themselves to its guidance. The sense of the phrase, "being under the Law," is illustrated by ch. iii. 23, "we were kept in ward under the Law;" ch. iv. 4, "made to be under the Law;" *ibid.*, 5, "to redeem those which were under the Law;" *ibid.*, 21, "ye who would fain be under the Law;" Rom. vi. 14, 15, "not under the Law, but under grace;" 1 Cor. ix. 20, "to those which are under the Law as under the Law, that I might gain those who are under the Law." These are all the passages in which the expression occurs. The inference is clear that the apostle designates by it the condition of such as are subject to the Law of the old covenant, viewed as a whole, in its ceremonial aspect as well as its moral; his meaning would not be exhausted by the paraphrase, "subject to the condemnation of the Law." What he affirms here is this: If in the course of your lives you are habitually swayed by the inward motions of the Spirit of God, then you

are not subject to the Law of the old covenant. The connection between the premiss and the conclusion has been clearly shown by the apostle above (ch. iv. 5—7); it is this, that the possession of the Spirit of adoption proves a man to be a "son"—one who has attained his majority and is no longer subject to a *pedagogue*. This aphorism of the apostle, that *if* they were led by the Spirit they were not under the Law, suggests the inquiry—But how was it with those Christians who were not led by the Spirit? Would the apostle teach, or would he allow us to say, that Gentile Christians (for it is to such that he is writing), and Jewish as well, if not guided by the Spirit, were bound to obey the Law of the old covenant? With reference to this point we are to consider that the apostle has elsewhere clearly stated, for example in Rom. xi., that the Church of God forms, in solidarity with Israel of old, one "Israel of God," as he speaks in the sixth chapter of this Epistle (ver. 16); Gentiles, being "grafted in" upon the original stock, have thus become branches (*συμφοῖται*) having one common life and nature therewith; or, in the language of another figure, "fellow-heirs, and fellow-members of the body, and fellow-partakers of the promise in Christ Jesus," with those who originally were heirs and forming the body and partners in the promised blessing (Eph. iii. 6). This leads us to the view that God's Law, the revelation of his will relative to his people's conduct, given in successive developments—patriarchal, Mosaical, prophetic—is, with such modifications as have been made by the crucifixion and the priesthood of Christ, and by the mission and work of the Holy Spirit, God's Law relative to his people's conduct still. The cross and priestly work of Christ, as we are taught by this Epistle and the Epistle to the Hebrews, do for all Christians eliminate from this Law its ceremonial prescriptions altogether; but its moral prescriptions, more fully perfected by the moral teaching of Jesus and his apostles, are still incumbent upon them. Those Christians who really give themselves up to the Spirit to be taught and animated by him, who are as St. Paul says (ch. vi. 1) "spiritual," these use this Law (as Calvin phrases it) as a *doctrina liberalis*; the Law of the Spirit of life within them leads and enables them to recognize, and so to speak assimilate, the kindred import of the Law embodied in the letter; which thus ministers to their instruction and consolation (Rom. xv. 4; 2 Tim. iii. 16; 1 Cor. ix. 10). The letter of the Law is now their helper, no longer their absolute rigid rule; as a rule it is superseded by the law written in the heart (2 Cor. iii. 6—11; Heb. viii. 8—11). As Chrysostom writes in

his note on the present passage, "They are raised to a height far above the Law's injunction." But in the degree in which they are not spiritual, but natural (*ψυχικοί*, 1 Cor. ii. 14—16; Jude 19), in that degree must they use the letter of the Law, in the New Testament as well as the Old, as the rule of their conduct. We, those who have been sacramentally brought into covenant with God, cannot be left to ourselves; either we must be sweetly, persuasively, instinctively, swayed by the Spirit of God within, or else own the coercing dominion of the written Law. In fact, the same individual Christian may at different times be subject to alternation between these two diverse phases of experience, passing over from one to the other of them according to his fluctuating needs. Christians may, therefore, be broadly divided into three classes: (1) the spiritual (ch. vi. 1; Rom. viii. 1—4); (2) those who are as yet in bondage to the letter; (3) those who are living after the flesh—"carnal" (1 Cor. iii. 3). The above statement of the case commends itself as in accordance with what the apostle writes in 1 Tim. i. 8—11, "We know that the Law is good [*καλός*; cf. Rom. vii. 12] if a man use it lawfully [*νομίμως*, according to the manner in which God has directed us to use it in his gospel (ver. 11)], knowing this [having his eye upon this], that the Law is not made (*ὀν κείται*) for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for . . . according to the gospel of the glory of the blessed God." In contrast with this Law, coercing impiety and immorality wherever it is found, whether in the world or in the Church, the apostle has before in ver. 5 declared that its function is superseded in the case of the spiritual believer: "The end of the commandment [see Alford] is charity, out of a pure heart and a good conscience, and faith unfeigned." The perpetual obligation of the Law given under the old covenant, subject to the qualifications noted above, appears to be emphatically affirmed by our Lord: "I came not to destroy the Law, but to fulfil: for verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the Law, till all things be accomplished" (Matt. v. 17, 18). And the recognition of this principle underlies all his moral teaching; as, for example, in the sermon on the mount; in his controversies with the Jewish rabbins; in such passages as Mark x. 19; Matt. xxii. 37—40. The moral Law given in the Old Testament amalgamates itself with that given in the New, forming one whole.

Ver. 19.—Now the works of the flesh are manifest (*φανερὰ δὲ εἰσὶ τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκός*). The apostle's purpose is here altogether one of practical exhortation. Having in ver. 13

emphatically warned the Galatians against making their emancipation from the Mosaic Law an occasion for the flesh, and in ver. 16 affirmed the incompatibility of a spiritual walk with the fulfilment of the desire of the flesh. he now specifies samples of the vices, whether in outward conduct or in inward feeling, in which the working of the flesh is apparent, as if cautioning them; adducing just those into which the Galatian converts would naturally be most in danger of falling. Both in the list which he gives them of sins, and in that of Christian graces, he is careful to note those relative to their Church life as well as those bearing upon their personal private life. Instances of enumeration of sins which may be compared with that here given are found, with respect to the heathen world, in Rom. i. 29—31; with reference to Christians, Rom. xiii. 13; 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10; 2 Cor. xii. 20, 21; Eph. v. 3—5, followed by a brief indication of fruits of the Spirit in ver. 9; Col. iii. 5—9; 1 Tim. i. 9, 10; 2 Tim. iii. 2—4. “Manifest;” namely, to our moral sense; we at once feel that these are the outcome of an evil nature, and are incompatible with the influence of the Spirit of God. “Works of the flesh” means works in which the prompting of the flesh is recognizable. The phrase is equivalent to “the deeds or doings of the body,” which we are called to “mortify, put to death, by the Spirit” (Rom. viii. 13). In Rom. xiii. 12 and Eph. v. 13 they are styled “works of darkness,” that is, works belonging properly to a state in which the moral sense has not been quickened by the Spirit, or in which the light of Christ’s presence has not shone. Which are these (ἀτινά ἐστι); of which sort are. Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness (πορνεία [Receptus, μοχλία, πορνεία], ἀκαθαρσία, ἀσέλγεια). This is the first group, consisting of offences against chastity—sins against which the Church has to contend in all ages and in all countries; but which idolatry, especially such idolatry as that of Cybele in Galatia, has generally much fostered. The first in our English Bible, “adultery,” is rejected from the Greek text by the general consent of editors. But in fact, “fornication” (πορνεία) may be taken as including it (Matt. v. 32), though it may also stand at its side as a distinct species of unchastity. “Uncleanness” covers a wider range of sensual sin (“all uncleanness,” Eph. iv. 19); solitary impurity, whether in thought or deed; unnatural lust (Rom. i. 24), though it can hardly be taken as meaning this lust alone. “Lasciviousness,” or “wantonness,” is scarcely an adequate rendering of ἀσέλγεια in this connection; it appears to point to reckless shamelessness in unclean indulgences. In classical Greek the adjective

ἀσέλγης describes a man insolently and wantonly reckless in his treatment of others; but in the New Testament it generally appears to point more specifically to unabashed open indulgence in impurity. The noun is connected with “uncleanness” and “fornication” in 2 Cor. xii. 21; with “uncleanliness” in Eph. iv. 19; is used of the men of Sodom in 2 Pet. ii. 7; comp. also 2 Pet. ii. 18; 1 Pet. iv. 3; Jud. 4 (cf. 7). Only in Mark vii. 22 can it from the grouping be naturally taken in its classical sense.

Ver. 20.—Idolatry, witchcraft (εἰδωλολατρεία, φαρμακεία); idolatry, sorcery. These two form a second group—sins of irreligion; and such as would be likely greatly to beset new converts from idolatry. We may compare, in respect to the former, the temptations which the apostle recognizes the danger of in the case of the Corinthians (1 Cor. viii. and x.). “Sorcery.” The word φαρμακεία, originally denoting the use of drugs merely, means, sometimes, their use for poisoning; but this sense would not be very suitable here. But the nouns φαρμακός, φαρμακεύς, and φαρμακεία, like *veneficium* and *veneficium* in Latin, are also often used with reference to the employment of drugs in charms and incantations; and thence of the employment of black arts in general—magic, sorcery, witchcraft; cf. Rev. ix. 21; xxi. 8; xxii. 15; where the Authorized Version gives “sorceries,” “sorcerers;” and in the Septuagint, Exod. vii. 11, 22; viii. 18 (Authorized Version, “magicians”); Isa. xlvii. 9, 12 (“enchantments”). See also μαγεύων, μαγείαις (“sorceries”), Acts viii. 9, 11. The claim to the possession of such powers, common at Ephesus (Acts xix. 19; 2 Tim. iii. 13, γόητες), and rife, perhaps, universally among heathens, certainly so in the Roman empire round the Mediterranean, had no doubt been a snare also to the Galatians. Bishop Lightfoot adverts to a very stringent canon of the Council of Ancyra (the capital of Galatia), A.D. 314, condemning φαρμακείαι. It may be doubted whether the apostle himself would regard, or had reason to regard, pretensions to such supernatural arts as merely delusive or superstitious. Experiences such as that recorded in Acts xvi. 16—18, would hardly permit him to do so. Hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies (ἐχθραί, ἐρις [Receptus, ἐρεις], ζήλοι, θυμοί, ἐριθείαι, διχοστασίαι, αἰρέσεις); enmities, strife, jealousies, wraths, factions, divisions, heresies (or, parties). This third group, to which belongs also the envious (φθόνος), together with the probably not genuine murders (φόνος) of the next verse, is bound together by the common characteristic of malignity. This vice of our nature, so inveterate in our fallen state—the antithesis to the love which

is the essence of goodness—is, strangely enough as it at first sight seems, most readily stimulated into rancour by differences in religion. As at this very same time at Corinth, so here in Galatia likewise, the “flesh” displayed its malignity in “jealousy, strife, and divisions (*ζηλος και ερις και διχοστασία*),” originating from this cause (1 Cor. iii. 3). “Enmities;” manifestations of aversion openly displaying itself. “Strife;” the outward mutual conflict of persons animated with such sentiments. The plural number of *ερις*, strifes, given by the Textus Receptus, as well as, perhaps, the plural of *ζηλοι*, jealousies, which not improbably should also be read in the singular, *ζηλος*, jealousy, may have owed its introduction by the copyists to the plural number of *εχθραι*, which is not questioned. The precise import of *ζηλος*, rendered “jealousy,” is not easily determined. It is spoken of as a virtue in John ii. 17, “the zeal of thine house;” Rom. x. 2, “zeal for God;” Phil. iii. 6, “touching zeal, persecuting the Church;” 2 Cor. vii. 7, “your fervent mind [or, ‘your zeal’] for me;” *ibid.*, ver. 11, “what zeal.” But in perhaps all these cases, the ardent favouring of what is good is thought of as either ready to take, or actually taking, the aspect of *boiling* resentment against its assailants; thus also Heb. x. 27 (“fery indignation.” Authorized Version), literally, “zeal of fire.” So in ch. i. 14, “zealous;” comp. Exod. xx. 5, *Θεος ζηλωτης*, “jealous God” (Authorized Version); Heb. *el qanpā*. To this line of meaning is to be referred Acts v. 17, “filled with indignation (*ζηλου*).” In another class of passages the word denotes a wrong state of feeling, where in the Authorized Version it is uniformly rendered “envy” or “envying.” These are Acts xiii. 45 (Revised Version, “jealousy”), where it surely means the resentment which the Jews felt at the supposed invasion of their own theocratic prerogatives. In the remaining passages of the New Testament in which it occurs it is linked either with “strife,” as it is here; namely, Rom. xiii. 13; 1 Cor. iii. 3; 2 Cor. xii. 20; or with *εριβελτα*, as Jas. iii. 14, 16. In these passages there does not seem any reason on the face of them for supposing that it means “envy,” that is, grudging to another some advantage; this in Greek is *φθόνος*. A more probable view is that *ζηλος* denotes eagerness to find in another some ground for hot resentment against him. Perhaps we have no single equivalent word in our language, “jealousy” being the nearest approach. In the Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, ch. 4—6, we have a long list of instances given of persons who have suffered through being objects of *ζηλος*: in many of them “envy,”

or “rivalry,” would seem to be the more prominent notion in the word; but in others it appears to mean rather “jealousy;” in some the same as in Acts v. 17 or xiii. 45. The next word *θυμοι*, wraths, denotes violent ebullitions of passionate anger; the plural pointing to different occasions prompting such. The following term, *επιβειαι* (rendered “factions”), was formerly imagined to be etymologically connected with *ερις*, strife—a notion which is now generally abandoned. The verb from which it is derived, *επιβειω*, is to act the part of an *επιθος*, day-labourer, the noun signifying “labour for hire;” then, scheming or intriguing for a post of employment; and next, “party-action;” “the contentious spirit of faction.” In the New Testament it occurs six times besides here. In Rom. ii. 8, *τοις δε εξ επιβειας* (Authorized Version, “them who are contentious”), it appears to denote those who set themselves in factious opposition to the truth, the apostle having no doubt especially in his eye Jewish gainsayers of the gospel. In Phil. i. 16, “some preach Christ *εξ επιβειας*,” it points to factious opposition to Christ’s divinely appointed heralds. In Phil. ii. 3, “let nothing be done *κατ’ επιβειαν*,” the same sense of factious opposition to others is quite suitable. In the remaining passages, 2 Cor. xii. 20, where *ζηλοι*, *θυμοι*, *επιβειαι*, come together as they do here, and Jas. iii. 14—16, where, as above noted, it is conjoined with *ζηλον*, the notion of “factiousness,” or “faction,” perfectly satisfies the context. In the present passage the plural, *επιβειαι*, denotes factious feelings roused on behalf of this cause and that; such sentiments as are likely to eventuate in *διχοστασισαι*, divisions, that is, more distinctly formed parties “standing apart” from each other; whilst these again culminate in *αιρεσεις*. The noun *διχοστασισαι* occurs also in 1 Cor. iii. 3, where they are spoken of as indicative of a *fleshy* mind, and in Rom. xvi. 17, “Mark them which cause divisions and (*σκανδαλα*) occasions of stumbling.” We may regard this word as standing in the same relation to *αιρεσεις* as the *σχισματα*, “divisions,” or “schisms,” do which are mentioned in 1 Cor. xi. 18, “When ye come together in the Church, I hear that *divisions* exist among you; and I partly believe it; for there must be also *heresies* among you.” In endeavouring to ascertain the exact import of this last word (*αιρεσεις*), “heresies,” we must first ascertain the sense in which *αιρεσεις* was currently used before it was employed to describe phenomena appearing in the Church. The proper sense of “choice” was in this word often limited to the specific sense of “choice of views,” particularly in philosophy or religion; that is, it meant “ways of thinking;” and then,

by an easy transition, "those who followed a particular way of thinking"—"a school of thought." Thus it occurs in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 'De Dem. et Arist.', 7, etc. (see Liddell and Scott). This sense was so current in Dionysius's time as to appear in Latin in the contemporary writings of Cicero; thus, in 'Proöm. Parad,' Cicero writes, "Cato in ea est hæresi [sc. the Stoic], quæ nullum sequitur florem orationis;" 'Ad Famil,' xv. 16; 'Ad Att,' xiv. 14. Similarly Vitruvius writes, 'Præf,' 5, "Pythagoræ hæresin sequi." It is not always easy to discriminate whether the "school of thought" so designated means the way of thinking itself or the set of men who held it. In this sense the word is used in the New Testament. Thus Acts v. 17, "the high priest and all they that were with him, which is the *heresy* (*aipeusis*) of the Sadducees;" where it means the sect, and not their views. So again, Acts xv. 5, "certain of those of the *heresy* of the Pharisees;" *ibid.*, xxiv. 5, "ringleader of the *heresy* of the Nazareans," where Tertullus plainly meant those who held the views of the Nazareans, and not the views themselves. But, on the other hand, in the same chapter St. Paul in his reply (ver. 14), when he says, "After the way which they call a *heresy*, so serve I the God of our fathers," evidently uses the term as applying to "the Way" itself (comp. Acts ix. 2), and not to the people who followed it. In Acts xxvi. 5, "after the straitest *heresy* of our religion (*θηρακείας*) I lived a Pharisee," the word may be taken either way. In Acts xxviii. 22, "concerning this *heresy*, it is known to us that everywhere it is spoken against," it seems, of the two, to be rather the more obvious way to take it of "what Paul thought," than of the persons so thinking. If, however, it be taken of persons, it is of course to be taken of them as holding and representing such views. In 2 Pet. ii. 1, "false teachers, who shall privily bring in *heresies* of perdition," the qualifying genitive, "of perdition," would seem to favour our understanding the "*heresies*" of the doctrines of those false teachers, rather than of the parties following their teaching. On the whole review of these passages, it is of the utmost importance to note the manner in which, in Acts xxiv. 14, etc., St. Paul treats Tertullus's application of the term to the Christian faith. "I confess," he says, "that after the way which they call *aipeusis*, so serve I the God of our fathers, believing all things which are according to the Law, and which are written in the prophets: having hope towards God, which these also themselves look for, that there shall be a resurrection, both of the just and unjust." In thus speaking, the apostle repudiates the

application of the term *aipeusis* to the Christian faith; not, however, on the ground that the term denoted a flagrantly erroneous and vicious form of doctrine; for there is nothing to show that this was the idea which Tertullus meant to convey to Felix's mind, in so designating either Christians or their faith: what, indeed, should Felix care about the soundness or unsoundness of their doctrines? The apostle rather repudiates the term, because, as signifying "choice," it implied that the views referred to were adopted on the prompting of individual opinion or liking. That it was not this, he shows by referring partly to the broad basis of Divine revelation in general as propounding the doctrine of the resurrection, which lay at the foundation of the Christian faith; and partly to the fact that his accusers themselves admitted that doctrine. Christians believed that Jesus was raised from the dead, not because they "chose" to think so, but because God's Word taught them so to believe. We are thus landed at the conclusion that, antecedently to its introduction into the language of the Church, the term *aipeusis* denoted a school of thought or a set of opinions; sometimes the opinions themselves; sometimes the people holding them; but that it was understood to do so with reference to points on which there did not appear to be any decisive authority to determine men's convictions, and respecting which, therefore, men might choose their own opinions as they thought themselves best able. This conclusion will help us to understand its import in 1 Cor. xi. 19, in the passage before us, and in 2 Pet. ii. 1, as well as the passage in Titus iii. 10, 11, in which the case of "a man that is an heretic (*ἄθετος αἰρετικός*)" is dealt with. It is clear, from ch. i. 6—9; that the apostle regarded the "gospel" which had been delivered to the world (Jude 3) by himself and his fellow-apostles, as being a revelation so certain and authoritative, that any teacher introducing doctrine seriously infringing upon its substantial import would subject himself to the extreme malediction of God. The whole tenor of this Epistle shows that its author considered the Churches of Galatia as at this very time in danger of either producing from their own bosom, or else admitting from the teaching of others, doctrine which would be thus fatally subversive of the truth. Was it not, then, extremely probable that, when here enumerating, with an especial eye to the case of the Churches he was addressing, "the works of the flesh," which would cut off those who gave themselves up to their practice from the inheritance of the kingdom of God, he would specify this particular "work" of propounding, or embracing when propounded by

others, doctrine which should vitally deprave the truth which God had revealed? Any doctrine which thus tampered with the gospel would, of course, be a *αἵρεσις*—views of men's own devising and "choosing." The term, as has been seen, might also describe a body of adherents to such false doctrine. But in the passage before us, in which the *works of the flesh* are recited, and not the doers of such works, the term must describe, not persons, but acts—acts, that is, of conceiving or propounding in the Church views subversive of the gospel, and gathering adherents to such views; such adherents would, among Christians, form a *αἵρεσις* antagonistic to the doctrine of Christ received in the Church. "Caballings" and "divisions," *ἐπιβίαι* and *διχοστασίαι*, might arise among Christians who still held fast to the substance of the gospel; fatal to the spiritual life, it might be, of those indulging in them; but yet essentially different from "heresies," because not involving departure from the faith once for all delivered to the saints, or conscious rebellion against the accredited organs of revelation. Here the apostle has in view the more hateful phenomena, of man-conceived dogmas taking the place of God's gospel—dogmas so alien to the gospel that adherents to them would be marked among Christians as forming "sects," which in their spiritual genesis were apart from the Church and incapable of being amalgamated with it. For the Church is the product of the truth, "the Word of God" (1 Pet. i. 23—25; Jas. i. 18); whilst these "sects" are products of merely human notions or even of "doctrines of devils" (1 Tim. iv. 1; cf. Col. ii. 8, 19). That same Judaizing spirit which was now working among the Churches of Galatia proved, very early indeed, largely prolific of such "heresies," especially in Asia Minor; those "heresies" in particular which are known by the name of *Gnostic*. The apostle knew that such evils were coming, and it is certain that he anticipated their development with dread (see the later First Epistle to Timothy (iv.); the contemporaneous First Epistle to Corinth (xi. 18); the earlier Second Epistle to the Thessalonians (ii.); also Acts xx. 29, 30); not without cause, as history shows; for in truth it was only after a terrible, indeed an internecine conflict, that the Church in the second and third centuries succeeded in treading this serpent-brood underfoot. By the time that St. Paul deputed Titus to take the oversight of the Churches of Crete, "heresies" were so far developed that he is careful to direct Titus (iii. 10, 11) how to deal with any man who attached himself to them (*ἐπιβρωτον αἱρετικόν*). He is to admonish him once and again; if the warning proved

fruitless, he was thenceforward to decline having anything to do with him (*παραιτοῦ*); for that he might be sure that, being such, he was already completely wrenched off from vital union with the body of Christ (*ἐξέστραπται*), and was doing what was wrong, "self-condemned;" either (that is) condemned by the very nature of his proceeding, or condemned in his own consciousness. It seems that the apostle regards the simple fact of his giving himself to a "heresy" as proving all this; for he makes no reference to any other pravity shown by the offender; he has an eye, evidently, to the consideration that the man who forsakes the teaching of Christ, given through his accredited organs, to follow a *αἵρεσις*, knows that he does so; knows that he is no longer "holding the Head" (Col. ii. 19), but is following a mere "tradition of men" (*ibid.*, 8). With such a one Titus had no common ground. It is of prime importance in estimating the nature of this "work of the flesh," with a practical view to our present circumstances, that we bear in mind this feature of it—that it is a relinquishment, a conscious relinquishment of the teaching of Christ, a breaking off from "the Head." The above view is precisely that given by Tertullian, 'De Præscriptionibus Hæreticorum,' 6. Bishop Lightfoot, in his Introduction to his Commentary on this Epistle, pp. 30, 31, writes thus: "It is not idle, as it might seem at first sight, to follow the stream of history beyond the horizon of the apostolic age. The fragmentary notices of its subsequent career reflect some light on the temper and disposition of the Galatian Church in St. Paul's day. To Catholic writers of a later date, indeed, the failings of its infancy seemed to be so faithfully reproduced in its mature age, that they invested the apostle's rebuke with a prophetic import. Asia Minor was the nursery of heresy: and of all the Asiatic Churches it was nowhere so rife as in Galatia. The Galatian capital [Ancyra] was the stronghold of the Montanist revival, which lingered on for more than two centuries, splitting into diverse sects, each distinguished by some fantastic or minute ritual observance. Here, too, were to be found Ophites, Manicheans, sectarians of all kinds."

Ver. 21.—*Envyings, murders* (*φθόνοι* [Receptus adds *φόνου*, rejected by most editors]). These belong properly to the third group, and should have been placed in the same verse with them. We have the like alliterative combination of the Greek words in Rom. i. 29, *φθόνου, φόνου*. Judging from the evidence of manuscripts, the genuineness of *φθόνου* is extremely doubtful. Regard being had to the particular circumstances of the Galatian Churches, which the

apostle no doubt had in his eye in this enumeration, "murders" seems too strong a word to be appropriate; and this consideration seems to prove the word here not authentic. **Drunkness, revellings** (*μέθαι, κῶμοι*); *drunkennesses, revellings*. We have the same two plural nouns in Rom. xiii. 13, *κῶμοις καὶ μέθαις*. This fourth group represents sins of excess. Here, too, the apostle touches a form of vice, to which abundant testimony shows the Galatians, as well as other branches of Celts, to have been especially prone. It was, perhaps, this marked feature of the Galatian nationality in particular that led St. Peter, in addressing the Churches of "Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia," to speak (1 Pet. iv. 3) of their having formerly walked in "lasciviousness, lusts, wine-bibblings, revellings, carousings (*οἰνοφλυγίαις, κῶμοις, πότοις*), and abominable idolatries." And such like (*καὶ τὰ ὅμοια τοῖς τοῖς*); and those (works) which are like to these. Of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past (*ἃ προλέγω ὑμῖν, καθὼς* [Receptus, *καθὼς καὶ*] *προεῖπον*); of the which I forewarn you, even as I did forewarn you. The construction of the accusative *ἃ* is precisely similar to that of *ὅν* in John viii. 54, "Ὅν ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι Θεὸς ὑμῶν ἐστὶ. The *πρὸς* in *προλέγω*, as also in the *προεῖπον* which follows, has reference to the time when it shall actually be proved who are to enter into the kingdom of God. "As I did forewarn you;" this previous warning was probably given at his very first preaching of the gospel to them: he would no doubt at once speak plainly to people, very commonly sunk in vice and excess, of the awards of the "judgment to come." That they which do such things (*ὅτι οἱ τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντες*); that they which practise such things. The present tense of *πράσσοντες* is more suitable than the aorist, as being the language of warning with reference to future conduct (cf. Rom. ii. 2, 3, 7—10). Shall not inherit the kingdom of God (*βασιλείαν Θεοῦ οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν*). The apostle uses the same words in writing to the Corinthians with reference to the sins to which they were the most prone (1 Cor. vi. 9, 10). So Eph. v. 5, "No fornicator, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, which is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and God." This "kingdom" is also referred to in 1 Thess. ii. 12, "Walk worthily of God who calleth you into his own kingdom and glory" ("His own!"); 2 Thess. i. 5, "That ye may be counted worthy of the kingdom of God, for which ye also suffer;" 2 Tim. iv. 18, "will save me unto his heavenly kingdom." The like designation of the future felicity is given by St. Peter (2 Pet. i. 11), "entrance

into the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," and by St. James (ii. 5), "heirs of the kingdom which he [God] promised to them that love him." It is derived from our Lord's own teaching, as, e.g. Matt. xxv. 34, "Inherit the kingdom prepared for you;" Luke xii. 32, "It is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." It is the manifestation and consummation of "that kingdom of heaven," or "kingdom of God," heralded by Christ and his forerunner as "at hand," which the Prophet Daniel had pointed forward to (Dan. ii. 44; vii. 13, 14, 18). Bondage to "the flesh" in this life is constantly declared throughout the New Testament to form an insuperable bar to an entrance into that exalted state. And what is the alternative prospect? This the Apostle Paul does not here specify, though elsewhere he does so with awful emphasis; as e.g. Rom. ii. 8.

Ver. 22.—But the fruit of the Spirit (*δὲ δὲ καρπὸς τοῦ Πνεύματος*). As it was with a hortatory purpose, to warn, that the apostle has before enumerated the vices into which the Galatian Christians would be most in danger of falling, so now with an answering hortatory purpose, to point out the direction in which their endeavours should lie, he reckons up the dispositions and states of mind which it was the office of the Holy Spirit to produce in them. In the Epistle to the Colossians (iii. 12—15), written several years after, most of the features here specified reappear in the form of direct exhortation ("kindness, meekness, long-suffering, love, peace, thankfulness")—"joy" being there implicitly represented by "thankfulness." The word "fruit" here takes the place of "works" in ver. 19, as being a more suitable designation of what are rather states of mind or habits of feeling than concrete actions like most of those previously enumerated "works." The word "fruit," moreover, describing in the vegetable world a matured product, is very commonly used in the New Testament with reference to such product as is not only of a pleasant but also of a useful kind; thus, "fruits meet for repentance;" the fruit of the True Vine in John xv. 2—16 which glorifies God; the abundant fruit of wheat (John xii. 24); the fruit of righteousness (Pha. i. 21; Heb. xii. 11); the fruit gathered by an evangelist (John iv. 36; Rom. i. 13); so that it was no doubt introduced here, as also in Eph. v. 9 with the intended suggestion, that the graces here specified are results answering to the design of the great Giver of the Spirit's influences, and are in their own nature wholesome and grateful. The singular number of the noun is employed in preference to the plural, which is found e.g.

Phil. i. 11 and Jas. iii. 17, in consequence probably of the feeling which the apostle had that the combination of graces described is *in its entirety* the proper outcome in each individual of the Spirit's agency; the character which he will fain evolve in every soul subject to his dominion, comprises all these features; so that the absence of any one mars in a degree the perfection of the product. The relation expressed by the genitive case of the noun, "of the Spirit," is probably much the same as is expressed by the corresponding genitive, "of the flesh;" in each case meaning: "belonging to," or "due to the operation of;" for the agent who in the one case does the works is not the flesh, but the person acting under the influence of the flesh; so here, the fruit-bearer is not "the Spirit," but the person controlled by the Spirit. Comp. Rom. vii. 4, "that we might bring forth fruit unto God;" John xv. 8, "that ye bear much fruit." These fruits do not appear upon us without strenuous endeavour on our own part. Accordingly the apostle exhorts the Philippians (ii. 12, 13) to work out their own salvation with fear and trembling, because they have so august a co-Agent working with and in them. Indeed, it is for the very purpose of prompting and directing such endeavour that this list of gracious fruits is here given (comp. ver. 25). The enumeration does not expressly mention such dispositions of mind as have God for their object. These, however, may be discerned as lying couched under the three first named, "love, joy, peace," and possibly under "faith;" certainly joy and peace are the proper products of our hearty acceptance of the gospel, and of that alone; they presuppose the establishment of a conscious state of reconciliation with God. But just here the apostle seems more especially concerned to show how blessed, under the Spirit's guidance, the Christian's state will be, and in what manner Christians as thus led will act towards one another (cf. vers. 15 and 26). The Christian life is habitually regarded by the apostle much more as a corporate, fellow-Christian, life, than, owing to various causes, some of which we may hope are now in course of removal, we modern Christians, and especially English Churchmen, are in the habit of regarding it. Is love (*ἔστιν ἀγάπη*). We cannot separate this branch of Christian character from those which follow, as in essence distinct from them; it is organically connected with them, and in fact, as stated above (ver. 14), involves them all, being "the bond of perfectness" (Col. iii. 14). In the "dithyramb of love," chanted in 1 Cor. xiii., the apostle triumphantly proclaims this truth; as also on the other hand in 1 Tim. i. 5 he affirms

that true Christian love has its root in "a pure heart, a good conscience, and genuine faith." The soul cannot be free for the activity of genuine love, towards fellow-believers and towards fellow-creatures in general, as long as it is restrained in its emotions toward the supreme common Father of all; the inward vice of mind, whatever it may be, which darkens the spirit towards heaven must inevitably cramp and benumb benevolent action universally (comp. 1 John v. 2). In truth, *ἀγάπη* means a loving temper of mind which, like the love which God bears towards us, is in a degree irrespective of merit, welling forth *towards all being*, so far as circumstances permit; though with greatest intensity towards God and those in whom it can recognize the image of God. Hence St. John is able to reason as he does in 1 John iv. 20, "He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, cannot love God whom he hath not seen." Joy (*χαρά*). It is impossible to accept Calvin's notion, that this means a cheerful carriage towards fellow-Christians, though it includes it; it must mean the glad-heartedness produced by entire faith in God's love to us (comp. Rom. xiv. 17; xv. 13). The exhortation which is here implied, that such sentiments should be carefully cherished, is elsewhere given explicitly and with reiteration; as *e.g.* 1 Thess. v. 16; Phil. iv. 4. There is thus much ground for Calvin's view, that the inward feeling of satisfaction and joy, which is the proper fruit of a true Christian's faith in the gospel, cannot fail to manifest itself in his behaviour towards his fellow-men by a sacred species of light-heartedness and hilarity which it is impossible for us to manifest or to feel, as long as we have within a consciousness of estrangement from God, or a suspicion that things are not well with us in relation to him. It is probable that the apostle, in writing down this word, did it with a consciousness of the contrast which is presented by the coldness and severity of feeling towards others which are begotten by the bondage of legality (comp. 1 Pet. i. 22). Peace (*εἰρήνη*). This is conjoined with "joy" in the two passages of the Romans just before cited (xiv. 17): "The kingdom of God [*i.e.* its great blessedness] is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit;" (xv. 13), "The God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope, in the power of the Holy Spirit;" in both which passages the "peace" referred to is the serenity of soul arising from the consciousness of being brought home to the favour of God and to obedience to his will. On the other hand, the term as here introduced seems likewise intended to stand



in contrast with those sins of strife and malignity noted before among the works of the flesh, and therefore to point to peacefulness in the Christian community. The two are vitally connected: the Spirit produces peaceful harmony among Christians by producing in their minds, individually, a peaceful sense of harmony with God and a complacency in all things with his providential appointments. This resigned trustfulness towards God quells at their very fountain-head these disturbances of passion and that inward fretting and impatience in reference to outward things, including the behaviour of others, which are the main causes of strife. The interdependence between inward and outward peace is indicated in 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Col. iii. 14, 15. If "the peace of God rules, is arbitrator (*Βραβεύει*), in our hearts" individually, if it "holds guard over our hearts and our thoughts" (Phil. iv. 7), it cannot fail to produce and maintain harmony amongst us towards one another. Long-suffering, gentleness, goodness (*μακροθυμία, χρηστότης, ἀγαθωσύνη*); long-suffering, kindness, goodness. These are actings of the all-comprising grace of "love." For the two first, comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 4, "Love suffereth long, is kind (*μακροθυμεί, χρηστεύεται*);" while the third, "goodness," sums up the other actings of love enumerated in vers. 5 and 6 of the same chapter. It is difficult to distinguish between *χρηστότης* and *ἀγαθωσύνη*, except so far as that the former, which etymologically means "usableness," seems to signify more distinctly "sweetness of disposition," "amiability," "a compliant willingness to be serviceable to others." It is, however, repeatedly used by St. Paul of God's benignity (Rom. ii. 4; xi. 22; Eph. ii. 7; Titus iii. 4), as *ἀγαθωσύνη* also is by many thought to be in 2 Thess. i. 11, which last point, however, is very questionable. This latter term, *ἀγαθωσύνη*, occurs besides in Rom. xv. 14 and Eph. v. 9, as a very wide description of human goodness, apparently in the sense of active benevolence. Faith (*πίστις*); faith or faithfulness. It is disputed in what precise shade of meaning the apostle here uses this term. The sense of "fidelity," which beyond question it bears in Titus ii. 10, seems out of place, when we consider the particular evils which are now in his eye as existing or in danger of arising in the Galatian Churches. Belief in the gospel suits this requirement perfectly, and presents us with the apparently needed contrast to the "heresies" of ver. 20. If this sense seems not to be favoured by the immediate neighbourhood on one side of "kindness" and "goodness," it is, however, quite coherent with the "meekness" on the other, if we understand by this latter term

a tractable spirit, compliant to the teaching of the Divine Word; comp. Jas. i. 21, "receive with meekness the implanted word," and Ps. xxv. 9, "The meek [Septuagint, *πραεῖς*] will he guide in judgment, the meek (*πραεῖς*) will he teach his way." In Matt. xxiii. 23, "judgment, meekness, and faith," the term seems (comp. Micah vi. 8) to refer to faith towards God. In 1 Tim. vi. 11, "righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness," there is no reason for interpreting it otherwise than as faith in God and his gospel; and if so, its collocation there with "love, patience, meekness," countenances us in taking it so here, where it stands in a very similar collocation. Comp. Eph. vi. 23, "Peace be to the brethren, and love with faith, from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ."

Ver. 23.—Meekness (*πραότης*). (On this, see last note.) The humble submissiveness to the teachings of Divine revelation, to which this term probably points, stands in contrast with that self-reliant, headstrong impetuosity which in the temperament of the Celt is apt to hurry him into the adoption of novel ideas which he has not taken the trouble seriously to weigh. It may, however, stand in antithesis to self-reliant arrogance in general. Temperance (*ἐγκράτεια*); or, self-control. This stands opposed both to the "fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness," and to the "drunkenness and revellings" before mentioned. Against such there is no Law (*κατὰ τῶν τοιούτων οὐκ ἔστι νόμος*); against such things as these the Law is not; or, there is no Law. As the apostle does not write "against these things," it seems that he viewed the foregoing list of graces as one of samples only and not as exhaustive; which fact is likewise indicated by the absence of the copulative conjunction (cf. Matt. xv. 19); so that *κατὰ τῶν τοιούτων* represents "and things the like to these; against which," etc. If we render, with the Authorized Version, "there is no Law," we must suppose still that the apostle means that the Law which all along he has been speaking of is in particular "not against them." "Against;" as in ch. iii. 21. The Law finds nothing to condemn in these things, and therefore no ground for condemning those who live in the practice of them; the same idea as is more explicitly brought out in Rom. viii. 1—4. There is a tone of meiosis, of suppressed triumph in this sentence. "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's chosen ones?"

Ver. 24.—And they that are Christ's (*οἱ δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ* [Receptus omits Ἰησοῦ]; now they that are of the Christ Jesus. The expression, *οἱ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*; is not a common one. It occurs besides in Eph. iii. 1, *τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*, where, however, as indeed

here, editors are not quite unanimous in retaining Ἰησοῦ: and Col. ii. 6, τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν Κύριον. Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς without the article is continually met with. The presence of the article seems to betoken that the word "Christ" is introduced as an official description rather than as a proper name, "the Christ Jesus" being thus a phrase similar to "the Lord Jesus." Not being so familiar to us as this latter, it appears at first more uncouth than it really is. To understand the precise force of the conjunction δέ, we must review the foregoing context. In vers. 16, 17 the apostle puts in contrast with each other, "walking by the Spirit" and "fulfilling the desire of the flesh." In the three following verses (19-21) he points out what kind of life the flesh prompts men to pursue, and its fatal consequences; in vers. 22, 23 the character formed by the Spirit's influence, and its blessed immunity from the censure of the Law. He is now concerned to show how these considerations apply to Christians. A Christian (he says) by becoming such puts away the flesh; is alive, therefore, if at all, by or to the Spirit; this being so, he must in all reason by the Spirit's direction rule his conduct. It results from this review that the δέ turns the course of remark upon a new topic, namely, the essential character of a Christian's profession as a premises to introduce the practical conclusion stated in ver. 25. The use of the possessive, "of the Christ Jesus," is similar to that in 1 Cor. iii. 23, "ye are Christ's;" Rom. viii. 9, "he is not his;" *ibid.*, xiv. 8, "we are the Lord's." Comp. also 2 Tim. ii. 19; Titus ii. 14, "a people for his own possession;" Eph. i. 14. We are made Christ's people, outwardly and in covenant, by baptism; but we cannot be his very own, really and vitally (Rom. viii. 9), unless through faith we recognize him as our Lord and of our own free will and deed attach ourselves heartily to his discipleship. In that hour of renunciation of sin we in truth "fasten the flesh to the cross." **Have crucified the flesh** (τὴν σάρκα ἐσταύρωσαν). That is, have put it away from them, as a thing to be abhorred, that it might die the death. These three several particulars of thought appear combined in the *mixed mode* embodied in the word "crucified." The verb, denoting simply *affixing* to the cross, and not *putting to death* by crucifixion, intimates the lingering character of the death which the flesh was to undergo. It was, indeed, put away at once, by a final decisive act of the will; but it would still for a while continue to live. Viewed thus, the notion represented by the image harmonizes with the statement in ver. 17 of the continued conflict which is being waged within us between the flesh

and the Spirit. The time when the Christian did thus affix the flesh to the cross is indicated by the form of expression, of being "of Christ;" there can have been no time since he has been Christ's at which this thing had not been already done. It is, alas, but too possible to take the flesh still living down from the cross and clasp it afresh to our bosom; but cherishing that as our friend, we are Christ's no longer. Above (ch. ii. 20) the apostle wrote, "I am hanging on the cross with Christ; but I live;" but with a different application of the image. There he was thinking of the relation into which his union with the crucified Jesus brought him with respect to the Mosaic Law. Here he has in view the renunciation of sin which accompanies the addiction of ourselves to Christ's service. There he himself is crucified; here, the flesh. The cross once more recurs in ch. vi. 9, with yet another reference. The description here given by the apostle of Christian conversion tallies well with that given by him in Rom. vi. 3-11. There, however, the change through which a man becomes a Christian is couched under a different image—that of a death and resurrection, analogous to and founded upon the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, which, in baptism, administered according to the original primitive mode, are represented by the immersion in and the emerging from the water. While illustrating this image, the apostle further says (ver. 6), "Our old man was crucified with him (*συνεσταυρώθη*), that the body of sin might be done away, that we should no longer be in bondage to sin;" where the Greek word rendered "was crucified with (him)" again denotes being affixed to the cross, in sympathy with him "who was made sin for us," with the view of bringing to nought "the body of sin"—which phrase, "body of sin," is nearly equivalent to "flesh," being the sum total of the vicious activities in which the flesh manifests itself; this bringing to nought or doing away (*κατάργησις*) of the body of sin, being the result ultimately to follow from the crucifixion, and not identical with it. In the passage in the Romans now referred to, the apostle brings to view, not only the just now cited description of the negative side of our regeneration, but also its positive side, of a passing into a new sphere of activities "walking in newness of life," and "living unto God in Christ Jesus." In our present passage the negative phrase is alone definitely stated. The difference is probably due to the fact that the figure of crucifying the flesh supplies the illustration of only the negative aspect; whereas baptism, with its watery burial and resurrection, represents the positive aspect as well. With the affections and

*lusts* (*οὐκ τοῖς παθήμασι καὶ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις*); with its affections and its lusts. The difference between "affections" and "lusts" may be probably assumed to be this—that the former denotes disordered states of the soul viewed as in a condition of disease, well represented in the Authorized Version by "affections;" while the latter points to the *goings forth* of the soul towards objects which it is wrong to pursue. In Phil. iii. 10; 1 Pet. i. 11, and a number of other passages the noun *παθήματα* means "sufferings." Only once besides is it used in an ethical sense; in Rom. vii. 5 we read, "The *παθήματα* of sins which were through the Law wrought in our members to bring forth fruit unto death;" and in vers. 7, 8 the apostle instances "coveting" (*ἐπιθυμία*) as wrought by sin in his soul, by occasion of the commandment, "Thou shalt not covet." We seem led to conjecture that he meant that a sinful condition of the soul (*πάθημα ἁμαρτίας*) was by the commandment stimulated into a mere aggressive action. We have *πάθος* in Col. iii. 5 and 1 Thess. iv. 5, and the plural *πάθη* in Rom. i. 26; in each case of exorbitant sexual desire. But in the apostle's use of *παθήματα* in its ethical sense we seem to have neither the notion of extreme intensity nor the limitation to one particular class of desire, which are both of them apparent in his use of *πάθος*. This clause, "with its affections and its lusts," adds nothing to the substantial sense of "the flesh." The apostle seems led to subjoin the words by a pathetic remembrance of the moral miseries appertaining to "the flesh"—"those affections and those desires thereof which are so hard to control, and which are at the same time so fatal to our welfare."

Ver. 25.—*If we live in the Spirit* (*εἰ ὤμεν Πνεύματι*); *if we live by, or, to, the Spirit*. Exact critics have commonly recognized the difficulty of precisely determining either the sense in which the dative case of *Πνεύματι* is used, or the meaning of the verb "live." This verb is here distinguished from the verb of the next clause (*στοιχῶμεν*) in much the same way as it is distinguished from the verb "walk" (*περιπατεῖν*) in Col. iii. 7, "In the which ye also walked aforesaid when ye lived in these things." In both passages it denotes the moral sphere of existence in which it is our ruling choice to live. In Col. iii. 7 the apostle says that their chosen sphere of existence was once worldliness and vice; and, when it was so, then they had followed in detail those different forms of degrading sin which he has specified in ver. 5. The verb "live" is used in the same sense of the general setting of our moral habits viewed as a whole in Col. ii. 20, "If ye died with Christ from the rudi-

ments of the world, why, as though living in the world, do ye subject yourselves to ordinances, Handle not, etc.?" So, likewise Rom. vi. 2, "We who died to sin, how shall we any longer live therein?" also Rom. viii. 13, "If ye live after the flesh, ye must die; but if by the Spirit ye make to die the deeds of the body, ye shall live;" in which last passage the changed sense of the verb in the second sentence is noticeable. In the passage before us, the "we" of the verb *ὤμεν* are of course the same persons as are recited by the phrase, "they who are of the Christ," in ver. 24. These persons have fastened the flesh to the cross; by a final, professedly irrevocable resolve, they have renounced sin. The purpose that was the proper, necessary concomitant of this, was to make the domain of the Spirit thenceforward their sphere of existence; their life was now to be in the Spirit; as the apostle writes (Rom. viii. 9), "Ye are not in (*ἐν*) the flesh, but in (*ἐν*) the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you;" for in this last passage the phrase, "in the Spirit," is contrasted with "in the flesh," each denoting the sphere of moral habits; in which sense "the flesh" is often used, as well as at other times of the vitiated nature itself, the indulgence in which characterizes that sphere. So probably "according to the Spirit of holiness," in contrast to "according to the flesh," in Rom. i. 3, 4. Now, as in Rom. viii. 9 the apostle uses the word "Spirit" in two senses, first of the sphere of moral habits determined by the Spirit's influence, and then of the Holy Spirit itself, so he would appear to do here. In respect to the relation expressed by the dative case, although the *ἐν* of Rom. viii. 9 is here wanting, it admits of being taken of the sphere of being in which Christians as such live; for so we find the dative used in 1 Pet. iii. 18, "put to death (*σαρκί*) in the flesh, but quickened (*Πνεύματι*) in the Spirit," as also the dative *σαρκί* is constructed in oh. iv. 1 of the same Epistle. The relation expressed by the case, however, may be that which it denotes in Rom. vi. 2, 10, "die (*ἁμαρτία*) unto sin;" *ibid.*, 11, "dead unto sin, alive unto God;" Rom. xiv. 6, "live unto the Lord, die unto the Lord;" 2 Cor. v. 15, "live unto him that died for them;" thus Bishop Lightfoot takes it. The "if" is logical rather than conditional; they who are Christ's have no life but in the Spirit, and are thus bound in the details of their conduct to act accordingly. Let us also walk in the Spirit (*Πνεύματι καὶ στοιχῶμεν*); *by (or, unto) the Spirit let us also walk*. The dative is here most naturally understood of the rule according to which we should walk. If the relation intended by the dative in the preceding clause is expressed by "to," it

might be most convenient to render it similarly here; but even so, it must mean with reference to the Spirit as our rule and guide. The verb *στοιχεῖν*, "to move in a (*στοίχος*, i. e.) line or row with others" (see Liddell and Scott), is no doubt chosen in place of *περιπατεῖν*, the more usual word for "walk," as denoting an orderly, well-regulated way of behaviour. This tinge of meaning is discernible in the other instances of its use in the New Testament, as ch. vi. 16; Rom. iv. 12; Phil. iii. 16.

Ver. 26.—Let us not be desirous of vain glory (*μὴ γινώμεθα κενδοῦροι*); let us not be vain-glorious. The communicative form of exhortation in which the speaker conjoins himself with those whom he addresses in order to soften the tone of superiority implied in exhorting them, connects this verse closely with the preceding one, in which also it is employed. Indeed, as in outward form of expression this verse coheres with ver. 25, so also in substance it coheres strictly with the whole passage beginning with ver. 13; for this is throughout levelled against a spirit of contentiousness then rife in the Galatian Churches. One cause to which the apostle thinks this ill state of things to be especially due was the spirit of vain-glory or self-vaunting—a weakness to which the Celtic race has ever been markedly prone (see Lightfoot's 'Introduction,' p. 14). The softened form of exhortation visible in the use of the first person plural has been traced also by many critics in the use of the verb *γινώμεθα*; as if the writer meant to imply that they were not as yet really vain-glorious, but were in danger of becoming so. This, however, is not so clear. This verb is often used when there is no reference at all intended to passing out of a former state into a new one, but simply as meaning "show one's self," "be in act, so and so." Thus Rom. xvi. 2, "she hath been (*ἐγένετο*) a succorer of many;" Phil. iii. 6, "found (*γενόμενος*) blameless;" 1 Thess. i. 5, "what manner of men we showed ourselves (*ἐγενήθημεν*);" *ibid.*, ii. 7; Jas. i. 25. Very often is this verb so used in exhortations, and especially in the present tense; as Rom. xii. 16, "Be not (*μὴ γίνεσθε*) wise in your own conceits;" 1 Cor. iv. 16, "Be (*γίνεσθε*) imitators of me;" (so *ibid.*, xi. 1; Phil. iii. 17); 1 Cor. x. 82, "Be giving no occasion for stumbling (*ἀπράσκοποι γίνεσθε*);" xiv. 20, "Be (*γίνεσθε*) not babes in understanding, but in understanding be (*γίνεσθε*) full-grown men;" and so often. In many of such cases there can be no reference to preceding conduct, whether in the way of approval or disapproval, but simply an exhortation to be or not to be so and so. The Authorized Version, therefore, is quite right in here rendering, "Let us not be," etc. The adject-

ive *κενδοῦρος* occurs only here in the New Testament, as the substantive *κενδοῦρία* is only found in Phil. ii. 3. The *δόξα* from which it is derived may be either "notion," "opinion," or "glory." Accordingly in Wisd. xiv. 14, and Ignatius, 'Ad Magnes,' 11, *κενδοῦρία* appears to mean the following of vain, idle notions with which we may compare the words *ἀρρόδοτος*, *ἐπερδοτος*. But here *κενδοῦροι* is considered by most critics to mean "affecting, desirous of, empty glory;" so the Authorized Version, "desirous of vain glory," where "vain glory" are two words, not one. Such empty glory would mean glory founded on distinctive qualities, which either are merely imaginary, not existing at all, or which, if there, give no real title to honour. Perhaps, however, the *δόξα* of this compound is always "notion," "opinion," only varying so far in meaning as sometimes to denote opinions respecting ourselves; as Suidas says, "*κενδοῦρία*, a vain thinking respecting one's self;" at other times, notions about other matters. The best interpretation of the word as here used is suggested by the apostle's own words in the next chapter (ver. 3), "if a man thinketh himself to be something when he is nothing, he deceiveth himself." As again in Phil. ii. 3, "Doing nothing through faction or through vain glory;" the sense of the second noun is illustrated by the converse, "But in lowliness of mind each counting other better than himself," suggesting its meaning to be the disposition to claim a superiority over others which we are not entitled to. "Wise in our own conceits" (Rom. xii. 16) is one form of this vicious quality; but there are others, all, however, fundamentally and intensely inimical to a spirit of loving sympathy with other men. **Provoking one another, envying one another** (*ἀλλήλους προκαλοῦμεν, ἀλλήλους φθονοῦντες*); **challenging one another, envying one another**. Here again are two Greek words found nowhere else in the New Testament—*προκαλοῦμαι* and *φθονῶ*. The rendering of the first in the Authorized Version, "provoking," is perhaps not meant in the sense in which this English verb is now commonly used, and in which it also frequently occurs in our English Bible, of "making angry," but in the proper sense of the Latin verb *provocantes*, "challenging," e.g., to legal controversy, or to battle, or to mutual comparative estimation in any way. Any superiority, real or imaginary, in gifts spiritual (as *charisms*) or natural, in eloquence, in theological requirements, in qualification for office, in public estimation, even in moral consistency (for what follows in ch. vi. 1 seems to point in this last direction), might be among the Galatians either an occasion for self-vaunting or a subject of envy on the part of those who felt themselves

cast in the shade. What it was in actual facts which gave the apostle occasion for administering this implied reproof, it is impossible to conjecture. There is an evident correlation between the "challenging" on the part of those who felt themselves strong,

and the "envying" on the part of those who found themselves weak; both faults being, however, traceable to one and the same root—the excessive wish to be thought much of.

### HOMILETICS.

Ver. 1.—*The importance of standing by Christian liberty.* "Stand firm, therefore, in the liberty for which Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." The apostle hopefully assumes that the Galatians had not yet surrendered their liberty.

I. JUDAISM WAS A YOKE OF BONDAGE. It might well be described in such terms by the Apostle Peter at an earlier period (Acts xv. 10). The bondage consisted in the number, complexity, and variety of its rites and ceremonies, associated with days, and weeks, and months, and years; in the burdensome repetition of sacrifices; in the expensiveness of the old ritual; in the time and labour consumed in purifications and washings; and in the place which every trivial or important transaction of life, such as marriage, burial, ploughing, sowing, reaping, held in the religious economy of a theocratic people. The Gentiles in Galatia had had experience of the degrading yoke of heathen bondage. Were they to be "entangled again" with a yoke, even that of Judaism?

II. THE LIBERTY WON BY CHRIST. The liberty here referred to is exemption from the rites and requirements of the ceremonial Law, including circumcision itself. But that liberty implies a great enlargement in Christian blessing. 1. *It sets the believer free from the terrors of the old economy.* "We have received, not the spirit of bondage again to fear, but the spirit of adoption." Christ has freed us from many fears that must have marred the peace of Old Testament saints. 2. *He destroys the physical drudgery of religion.* His yoke is easy as his burden is light. 3. *His liberty lifts us out of the state of spiritual childhood* in which the Jews dwelt, that we may have a larger comprehension of the mysteries of the kingdom (Heb. vi. 2).

III. THE IMPORTANCE OF STANDING BY OUR NEWLY ACQUIRED LIBERTY. 1. *It would be an insult to Christ, who bought it, if his followers were to surrender it.* 2. *A man may bear an unjust burden, but not a burden upon conscience.* 3. *It is our interest to stand in the full liberty of the gospel.* "As free, yet not using our liberty as a cloak of maliciousness, but as the servants of God" (1 Pet. ii. 16). 4. *Our firmness will encourage others to a resolute assertion of Christian liberty against all sorts of ritualistic priesthoods.*

Ver. 2.—*A solemn and emphatic warning.* The apostle assumes a severer and a more authoritative tone—"I Paul"—and shows that there is something worse than folly in turning aside to the Law, for it is to take an absolutely destructive course. It is absolutely impossible to reconcile circumcision with Christ. "If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing."

I. THIS DOES NOT WARRANT THE CONDEMNATION OF CIRCUMCISION IN ITSELF. For it was a Divine appointment, not only a national rite to distinguish Jews from Gentiles, but "a seal of the righteousness of faith" (Rom. iv. 11). Nor does it condemn circumcision as a past act on the part of a Jew born under the ancient economy, nor as a mere prudential act as giving a more ready access to the Jews, for the apostle himself circumcised Timothy (Acts xvi. 3).

II. HE CONDEMNS CIRCUMCISION REGARDED AS A RITE NECESSARY TO SALVATION. 1. *This position involves the rejection of Christ, as if he had not wrought out a complete salvation.* Those who support it imply that they have entered upon another mode of justification. 2. *As circumcision was one of the types or shadows that was to pass away with the death of Christ, its continuance seemed a constructive denial that he had come at all.* 3. *Circumcision was utterly meaningless to Gentiles, who were not of Abraham's race.* If, therefore, they were circumcised, it meant that they found the rite necessary to their salvation. 4. *The declaration of the apostle, "Christ shall profit*

you nothing," emphatically applies to the rites and ceremonies of the Romish Church, which are not even of Divine appointment like circumcision. Trapp says, "Pharissical and popish justiciaries are entangled in the fond conceits of their own righteousness." But Christ will profit none but those who, "not having their own righteousness," desire to be found in Christ, having the righteousness of God by faith.

Ver. 3.—*The obligations involved in circumcision.* The Judaizing teachers did not, perhaps, allow their converts to realize the full extent of the obligation involved in circumcision.

I. THE APOSTLE REITERATES THE EXTENT OF THIS OBLIGATION IN THE CASE OF THE CIRCUMCISED. They are "debtors to do the whole Law." Circumcision was not a mere badge of Judaism, as baptism is of Christianity, but it involved a profession of obedience to the whole Jewish Law. It was not competent to select a few precepts for obedience; for the circumcised was a debtor to do "the whole Law." The false teachers did not observe it themselves (ch. vi. 13), yet it was their duty, on their own principles, to observe it unremittingly, completely, and without external help, in every department of it.

II. THE DANGER OF THIS OBLIGATION. Circumcision could only profit on one supposition, "It verily profiteth if thou keep the Law" (Rom. ii. 25). But, in case of failure, it had no power to save from the curse. Circumcision in that case becomes uncircumcision—that is, it will not save you from being treated as a transgressor or treated as if you had never been circumcised.

Ver. 4.—*The logical results of the Judaistic position.* Christ profits only those united to him, and a soul departed from him is undone for ever. This would be the exact risk of such Galatians as, following Judaistic guidance, sought to be "justified by the Law." Consider—

I. THEIR DOCTRINE INVOLVED SEPARATION FROM CHRIST. "Christ is become of no effect unto you;" rather, "you are done away from Christ." Representing circumcision as the bond of connection with the Law, the apostle declares circumcision to be a *de jure* separation from Christ, in whom all legal engagements were fully met. Justification by grace and justification by Law are mutually exclusive. If we can be saved in any other way than by Christ, we do not need him, and the adoption of that other way is a renunciation of him. To be "without Christ" is the most miserable as well as the most fatal position in life.

II. THEIR DOCTRINE INVOLVED A DEPARTURE FROM THE SYSTEM OF SALVATION BY GRACE. "Ye are fallen from grace." The clause has no bearing upon the doctrine of the perseverance of saints, for the grace here spoken of is not personal religion, but the system of salvation by grace. Law and grace are opposites; that is, the dispensation of Law and the dispensation of grace. The justified person in the one case works out salvation by his own obedience; in the other he simply receives it. The apostle declares the mode of justification by personal obedience as involving the rejection of the mode of justification by Christ.

Ver. 5.—*The blessed prospects involved in the true doctrine of grace.* "For we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith." This passage is not to be understood as saying merely that believers have no other hope of justification but by faith in Christ, or that believers wait for the hope of being justified by faith. The righteousness was, in fact, already theirs, and therefore not an object of hope at all. The apostle means that we are enabled by faith, in the power of the Spirit, to wait for the hope that is lodged in the heart of the righteousness that "is of God by faith in Christ Jesus."

I. THE CENTRAL POINT IS THE RIGHTEOUSNESS TO WHICH FAITH AND HOPE ALIKE CLING. They have, in fact, no fulcrum, or point of support, apart from this righteousness, which is itself independent of all our graces, and therefore in no way affected by our varying frames or feelings. The Judaistic heart would cling to a righteousness by works, because it seemed to think it could understand a bargain between God and man, but it saw no absolute security in mere grace. Yet "it is of faith, that it might be of grace; to the end the promise may be sure" (Rom. iv. 16).

II. CONSIDER THE HOPE THAT IS WRAPPED UP IN THIS RIGHTEOUSNESS. We "wait for the hope of righteousness;" that is, not the hope of being righteous or attaining righteousness, but the hope that belongs to the righteousness already described. In possession of this righteousness, what may you not hope for? All the blessings of the new and better covenant which Christ sealed with his precious blood; all things necessary to our present well-being and our future blessedness.

III. FAITH ENABLES US TO WAIT FOR THIS HOPE. It is itself "the substance of things hoped for." The hope leans upon the faith. Hope is the eldest-born daughter of faith (Rom. v. 1—3). Apart from faith there can be no hope. The necessity of faith is evident. The believer finds that when he becomes righteous by faith he becomes a stranger and a pilgrim on earth, his path through the wilderness one of tears and toils and conflict, and he is disappointed to find that difficulties with the world arise from the moment his difficulties with God are ended. It is a great perplexity. He forgets, however, that he has to walk by faith, not by sight. Faith is not fruition. It is not heaven. It is, after all, "but the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen."

IV. CONSIDER HOW THE SPIRIT ENABLES US TO WAIT FOR THE HOPE OF RIGHTEOUSNESS BY FAITH. 1. He strengthens faith. As it was the Spirit who first imparted faith, in the act of regeneration, so it is the Spirit who sustains it in exercise through all the stages of Christian destiny. 2. He gives a glorious view of the hopes wrapped up in the righteousness. 3. He acts upon our power of waiting as being the Spirit of prayer (Rom. viii. 26).

Ver. 6.—*The essential principle of Bible Christianity.* After condemning circumcision he qualifies his statement to the extent of making it neither better nor worse than uncircumcision. But then he reduces them both to the one level of religious ineptness. Consider—

I. THE POWER OF CHRISTIANITY CONSISTS NOT IN DISTINCTIONS LIKE THOSE WHICH SEPARATE JEW AND GENTILE. "In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision." A man is not saved because he is circumcised, nor lost because he is not. Circumcision does not introduce a man into union with Christ, and the mere absence of it does not lead to a deeper fellowship with the Saviour. It is, therefore, a mistake to have the form of godliness without the power.

II. THE TRUE POWER OF CHRISTIANITY LIES IN FAITH WORKING BY LOVE. 1. *Faith is fundamental in Christian life*, at least on man's side, as regeneration is fundamental on God's side. This fact is not inconsistent with the fact that Christ himself is the only Foundation, for he is the Foundation absolutely, whether we believe in him or not; but faith is the foundation which we lay when we are enabled through the Divine Spirit to place ourselves on the true Foundation laid in Zion. 2. *It is not a mere historical faith, nor a speculative belief* in doctrines, which may be allied with a cold and unloving heart; for "it worketh by love." It is not, therefore, a "dead faith." 3. *It is justifying faith*, for it is the instrument of our justification; and it is perfect in itself so far as it apprehends the righteousness of Christ. The Romish idea, that it is "faith made perfect by love," is founded on a mistranslation, for the verb is not the passive, but the middle, as always in the New Testament, and is opposed to the doctrine of the apostle, which is that faith is not a work and has no merit, and by its very relation to justification protests against the merit of all human works. 4. *It is at the same time an operative faith*; for "it worketh by love." It is, indeed, a mighty power. "It overcomes the world." Love is the channel in which faith flows forth to bless the world. (1) It is evident that love does not work of itself; it works in the strength of faith. No man loves a Saviour whom he cannot trust. All who are united to Christ by faith become partakers of his Spirit, one of whose fruits is love (ver. 22); and this love is the principle of all obedience (Rom. xiii. 10). (2) Love is faith's metal, for into the mould of love does faith pour love itself. (3) Love flourishes exactly as faith flourishes. If, through distress, you begin to doubt the Lord's goodness and wisdom, there is a fear that the heart will become cold toward him. The faith and the love will increase or diminish together. (4) Though faith worketh by love, the love reacts upon faith and adds to its power. Love leads to admiration, for it sees Christ's love, faithfulness, and power; and faith says at once, "I can trust him more than ever." But love

likewise forbids unbelief. Was there ever true love in man or woman that it did not forbid distrust? The want of mutual confidence in the marriage relation is the death of love. (5) Faith and love are the great allied principles of Christian life. A Puritan divine says, "Faith and love are the two arms and the two eyes without which Christ can neither be seen nor embraced." Another says, "Faith and love are the two conduits lain from the Christian soul to the Fountain of living waters, fetching in from thence a daily supply of such grace as will certainly end in a fulness of glory." (6) The pregnant statement of the apostle condemns alike all hypocrites and legalists, as well as all who are careless or slothful in the Lord's service.

Vers. 7—9.—*The sudden swerve of the Galatians from the truth.* They had been making a hopeful progress in the truth, when they suddenly started aside through the influence of the Judaists, to the deep sorrow and unfeigned astonishment of the apostle. Mark—

I. THE CHRISTIAN LIFE IS A GOOD RACE. "Ye did run well." An old divine says, "To run in religion is well, to run well is better, and to accomplish the race is the best of all." It is well in its beginning; so it was emphatically in Galatia: it is well in its progress, and the apostle gives us a fine example of running in his own case—"he pressed to the mark, for the prize" (Phil. iii. 14): and it is well in its end (Heb. xii. 1). There are three things here to be considered. 1. *The course.* "To obey the truth." This the Galatians were ceasing to do under alien influence. The truth of the gospel already hinted at (ch. ii. 5, 14), as opposed to every perversion or modification, was the clearly marked course for the believer's race; and it was truth, not merely apprehended with the intellect or admired by the imagination, but obeyed from the heart, realizing, in fact, "the obedience of faith." 2. *The condition.* "Looking to Jesus, the Author and Finisher of our faith" (Heb. xii. 2), for guidance, strength, acceptance, comfort, and eternal life (Jude 20, 21). To use a phrase of old Berridge, "Galatian anvils might be used to hammer the doctrines of grace as thin as possible," so as eventually to check the progress of the gospel altogether; for salvation is entirely of grace, and that grace through Jesus Christ. 3. *The prize* is a crown of life (Rev. ii. 10), a crown of righteousness (2 Tim. iv. 7, 8), an unfading crown (1 Cor. ix. 25; 1 Pet. v. 4).

II. HINDRANCES IN THE CHRISTIAN RACE. "Who did hinder you?" The fact is instructive that such hindrances arise; but they ought to teach us the lesson of our entire dependence on Christ for strength and protection (John xv. 4), and the necessity of constant watchfulness (Mark xiii. 37). The apostle's mode of asking the question, "Who did hinder you?" 1. Implies astonishment at the sudden perversion of the Galatians. 2. It asserts that it did not spring from any Divine call: "It cometh not from him that calleth you" (Rom. ix. 11, 24; 1 Cor. i. 9; vii. 15); it is, indeed, inconsistent with all the purposes included in the effectual call of God. 3. The question has a conciliatory aspect; for he does not, at least primarily, charge the perversion upon themselves, but upon their Judaistic seducers. 4. Its answer pointed to these seducers, concerning whom we may infer that: (1) They were few. He does not ask the question to ascertain the name of the individual who had led them astray; but it is significant that twice over he speaks of him as an individual person, "Who (τὸς) did hinder you?" "He that humbleth you." It is true that the seducers are also spoken of in the plural number: "I would they were even cut off which trouble you." The two forms of phraseology imply that they were few, but that there may have been some one man of commanding influence among them. (2) Their influence was not grounded in argument, but in "persuasion;" for they dexterously flattered the pride of the Galatians and worked upon their devotional feelings. Religious seducers have a wonderful art of "beguiling" unwary souls "with enticing words" (Col. ii. 4). Christians ought, therefore, to beware of credulousness in spiritual things. (3) Their influence, as well as their doctrine, was essentially evil, though at present it might be but "a little leaven." "Leaven" is here used in a bad sense for the principle of corruption. "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees." But the apostle here refers to persons, not to doctrines, for he could never speak of the Judaistic heresy as "a little leaven" since it superseded Christ. (4) Their influence threatened to grow. Leaven was infectious. "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump." The Judaists, by their arts and their flatteries, might yet debase the entire Christianity of Galatia.



### III. THE NECESSITY FOR INQUIRING INTO THE CAUSES OF RELIGIOUS BACKSLIDING.

1. The question of the apostle implies this necessity. 2. There is danger in neglecting the inquiry. The "little leaven" would thus have time to work unhindered. 3. Our inquiry ought to bear practical fruit. If we have been hindered from running well, let us seek the cause, and apply for restoring grace by prayer, repentance, and faith (Hos. xiv. 1, 3, 8). If we have been restored from falls or preserved from hindrances, let us caution others of their danger (Heb. iv. 1) and concern ourselves about their welfare (Luke xxii. 32) and restore the fallen in a spirit of meekness (ch. vi. 1). Thus it will be manifest that to run well must be conducive to our present comfort, to our abiding usefulness, and to our future happiness.

Ver. 10.—*The apostle's sanguine hopes of Galatian recovery.* The swerve toward ritualism was in its mere incipency. Therefore he assumes a hopeful tone in dealing with the Galatians as a Church. "He fears the worst, but hopes the best."

I. THE GROUND OF HIS HOPEFUL CONFIDENCE. "In the Lord." It is good to be of a hopeful temperament, and good to have good men to think well of our state, as their judgment will be according to truth and charity. The ground of the apostle's confidence was not (1) that there would be any change in the temper or arts of the seducers; for "they always wax worse and worse" (2 Tim. iii. 13); (2) nor in the force of his own argumentative expostulations, nor in a mere return of that affection for him which was once so ardent and so self-sacrificing; but (3) "in the Lord" himself, who had power to recover them out of their error. "Paul may plant, and Apollos water; but it is God who giveth the increase" (1 Cor. iii. 7). It is he, and he only, who can make the Galatians "like-minded" with the apostle, by blessing his reproofs, his arguments, his tender urgencies of appeal.

II. THE UNSETTLING TENDENCY OF FALSE TEACHERS. The Greek word is very expressive—"he who excites tumults among you," or who "disturbs you." Perhaps the apostle had in view a particular teacher who was specially dangerous. Such teachers (1) shake old principles from their firm foundations; (2) shake the hearts of men by unsettling doubts and distracting conflicts; (3) and shake the stability of Churches, often scattering the flock as sheep without a shepherd.

III. THERE IS A JUDGMENT FOR RELIGIOUS SEDUCERS. "He shall bear his judgment, whosoever he be." 1. It will be a just judgment. It will be according to his works. His end will be, as the apostle implies, a sure condemnation. 2. The judgment will not be averted by the high opinion seducers entertain of themselves, nor by their high position in the Church, nor by the high esteem in which they may be held by man.

Ver. 11.—*A false imputation repelled.* Perhaps one of the false teachers might say that the apostle was himself one of the subverters of the gospel, for he had circumcised Timothy. "And I, brethren, if I yet preach circumcision, why do I yet suffer persecution? then is the offence of the cross ceased."

I. IT IS RIGHT FOR GOOD MEN TO REPEL FALSE ACCUSATIONS AGAINST THEIR CHARACTER. There are ultra-spiritual people in our day who decline to notice attacks upon themselves, because, as they say, the Lord will preserve their character; and yet they are often found to do unlovely and uncharitable things condemned both by the Church and the world. The apostle could well say, at one time, that for him it was but a small matter that he should be judged by man's judgment; but he has pointedly says, "Let not your good be evil spoken of;" "Let your moderation be known to all men;" and he counsels Timothy that deacons "must have a good report from them that are without." He himself always resolutely defended his moral consistency.

II. CONSIDER THE SOUNDNESS AND RELEVANCY OF HIS ANSWER. 1. *He makes no allusion to the case of Timothy*, because that could not justify the Judaistic doctrine of circumcision. It was not because he deemed the rite necessary for Timothy's salvation, but to meet the scruples of weak Christian Jews, that he became for the time "as a Jew to the Jews." 2. *He asks, "If I preach circumcision still, why do you persecute me?"* If I preached circumcision, I should not be persecuted. I should be exactly where you are. 3. *But that position would imply that "the offence of the cross had ceased."* The cross was a stumbling-block to the Jews, because their Saviour was

presented to them in circumstances of humiliation, as a crucified Man. But it was doubly so when it appeared as the very means of atonement, so that a Jew, by simply believing in Christ, might, without legal observances, be saved. The cross is still an offence to more than Jews or Greeks, for it humbles the pride of man, it dethrones all priesthoods, and makes the sinner directly dependent for salvation upon the Lord himself. It humbles man's pride; yet, "whosoever believeth in him shall not be ashamed." The gospel is throughout the religion of a crucified Saviour and of a ruined sinner; not a mere system of morals, nor a mere revelation of truth, but a scheme of remedial mercy. We cannot alter it or shape it in accordance with the false philosophizings of the world. "Blessed is the man whosoever shall not be offended in me."

Ver. 12.—*A fierce stroke of apostolic irony.* The apostle had been so profoundly stirred by the false accusations of the Judaizers and their fanatical zeal for circumcision, which was, after all, a mere "glorying in the flesh," that he throws out a wish that those who were trying to unhinge Galatian Christianity would themselves exemplify this "glorying" to the extent that was so familiar among the worshippers of Cybele at Pessinus, one of the towns of Galatia. His readers would have no difficulty in understanding the allusion. If circumcision was good, the priests of Cybele had something better to offer. It was a piece of contemptuous sarcasm, which exhibits the passionate feeling of the apostle caused by their unceasing efforts to undermine the gospel for the sake of a mere mark in the flesh.

Ver. 13.—*The meaning of Christian liberty.* The false teachers deserve this severity of treatment, for they would deprive you of your liberty.

I. THE CHRISTIAN CALLING IS TO LIBERTY. He had already counselled them to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ had made them free (ver. 1)—a liberty which lifted them out of legal bondage, and, above all, destroyed the yoke of ancient ceremonialism; and now these Judaizers were attempting to strike at the root of their calling.

II. THE DEEP AND UNCHANGEABLE DISTINCTION BETWEEN LIBERTY AND LICENTIOUSNESS. "Only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh." This counsel was specially needed for a Celtic people emerging out of the old immoral paganism. It shows: 1. *That duty is not destroyed by liberty.* Their escape from legal bondage did not involve the annihilation of all moral restraints or the abrogation of the moral Law. In fact, the gospel brings believers under a weightier obligation to duty than the Law possibly can do, for it brings upon the believer the mighty constraint of Divine love (2 Cor. v. 14). They were no longer justified by the Law, but the Law was still a rule of life. The Antinomians of Germany and England held that believers were under Law in no sense; that they were under no obligations to obedience; and therefore were ready enough to use their liberty under the gospel "for an occasion to the flesh." It is still very necessary to emphasize the obligations of Christian people under the gospel, for gross immoralities have been committed by men with an extravagant view of gospel liberty. Christ came to call sinners to repentance, not to licentiousness; to take his yoke upon them, and yield their members instruments of righteousness unto holiness. 2. *Christian people ought to use their liberty wisely.* There is a margin left for human discretion in the application of gospel principles. Perhaps a too free use of our Christian liberty has often become an occasion of sin. Therefore a Christian divine suggests that in matters of duty we ought to do too much rather than too little, but in matters of indifference we should rather take too little of our liberty than too much.

III. THE ONLY BONDAGE ALLOWABLE IN CHRISTIANITY IS MUTUAL LOVE. "But by love serve one another." There is an antithetic force in the original, which is not so obvious in the translation: If you must have bondage, let it be the bondage of mutual love. Love is to be the means by which the mutual bondage is to be manifested. 1. *This bondage is not degrading.* Though they were servants of each other, they were not masters of each other. "All ye are brethren." Christ himself is our example in this service: "I am among you as one that serveth." This one fact lifts this duty to an incomparable height of dignity and impressiveness. 2. *It is this which will keep your liberty from degenerating into licentiousness.* Their love for one another, grounded in their love for God, would set them upon all opportune ways of benefiting each other. Thus love is the one debt always to be discharged and always due. "Owe no man

anything, but to love one another" (Rom. xiii. 8). The counsel of the apostle seems to suggest the existence in Galatia of factious quarrels and unchristian isolations.

Ver. 14.—*The spirit of the Law.* Mutual service was only possible through mutual love, and this love was expressly commanded in the Law, which says, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."

I. **WHAT IS THE LAW WHICH FINDS ITS FULFILMENT IN LOVE?** It is not the law of Christ, nor the law of liberty, nor the law of the Spirit of life, but the very Law of which the apostle has been speaking all through the Epistle. His readers could not have understood him if he had used the term "Law" in a different sense. It follows, therefore, that the Law must still be in force, because its essential commandment, love, remains for perpetual fulfilment. Love was always, even in Old Testament times, the fulfilment of the Law. The sum of the Decalogue is love (Matt. xxii. 40). The apostle says, "He that loveth another hath fulfilled the Law" (Rom. xiii. 8, 9); but this does not imply, as Antinomians say, that if we have love we have nothing to do with the Law. Believers are exhorted, in the passage quoted, to love one another on the ground of its being a requirement of the Law. It is absurd, then, for the Antinomians to talk of love as being higher than Law, for love is just the fulfilling of the Law, and nothing more. A perfect love would keep the whole Law. It is, therefore, absurd for Roman Catholics to affirm that love justifies as well as faith, because love fulfils the Law. Sin hinders the perfection of our obedience, and therefore love cannot perfectly fulfil the Law.

II. **HOW LOVING OUR NEIGHBOUR FULFILS THE LAW.** It is the want of love that leads men to commit murder, adultery, theft, false witness. If we rightly loved our neighbour, these sins would be impossible. But we cannot rightly love our neighbour till we have loved God. "He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?" "This is the love of God, that (*to*) we may keep his commandments." There is a necessary connection between love to God and love to our neighbour (1 Cor. viii. 1—3).

III. **THERE IS NOTHING HIGHER IN THE SPHERE OF DUTY THAN THIS LOVE.** The Positivists assume that they have discovered in "altruism" a principle higher than either Law or gospel ever taught. Whereas we are commanded in Scripture to love our neighbour as ourselves, the Positivists say that we ought to love him better than ourselves. We are to deny ourselves for the sake of others. This is Christ's idea; but, if there be no future life, it would be the mark of a fool, and not of a hero, to deny myself for anybody. The idea of altruism, however, fails to realize itself in the lives of Positivists. Besides, if one's own happiness ought not to be a good to himself, there is no reason why he should secure happiness for another. In a few years it will make no difference to me what I have been, whether I have practised altruism or not. The world has not yet discovered a principle for regulating human relationship that can supersede Christianity.

Ver. 15.—*The evil effects of heresy.* "But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another."

I. **HERESY GENDERS BITTEN DISPUTES.** The presence of the Judaists would naturally cause constant strife, whether they succeeded or whether they failed, for the Galatians would take sides, and be thus launched into endless debate. The strifes, of which Church history is so full, are not due to the truth, but to the efforts of errorists to debase it or to destroy it. Believers are bound to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints.

II. **THE INJURIOUS EFFECT OF DISSENSIONS UPON THE CHURCH.** 1. They put an end to Christian peace. Spiritual life is impoverished and all but killed. 2. They injure the credit, character, and usefulness of Christian people. "Hatred, envy, reviling, are as the teeth of snakes and lions" (Starke). If Christians appear to bite and devour one another, the world will receive an impression of extreme cruelty in the character of the followers of the gentle Jesus.

III. **THEY TEND TO SCATTER AND DESTROY THE CHURCH.** "Ye will be consumed one of another." The contest will not end in a victory to either party, but will end in the common extinction of both. The idea is taken from wild beasts which tear their

victims to pieces till nothing is left. "Dissolution is the daughter of dissension" (Nazianzen). The Gentiles, seeing Christians quarrelling, would be repelled from Christianity, converts would go back to their old heathenism or their old Judaism, and the Christian community might be entirely broken up.

Vers. 16—18.—*The life and warfare of the Spirit in the soul.* This important passage suggests a comprehensive view of the Spirit's work in the believer's life.

I. THE WORK OF THE SPIRIT IN THE BELIEVER. 1. "Walk in the Spirit." Nothing could be more descriptive of the natural effect of the spiritual change produced in regeneration. The new-born child soon discovers symptoms of activity. The language of the passage reminds us: (1) *Of our dependence on the Spirit.* It is not enough that we begin the Divine life; we must maintain it through all its stages and experiences. The exercises of a believer are only effectual by the Spirit. (2) *It implies consistency.* Our life must be in harmony with the mind of the Spirit. His will must be our constant guide. "Therefore grieve not the Holy Spirit." "The fruit of the Spirit is in all goodness and righteousness and truth." Only thus can we walk in the Spirit. (3) *It implies progress.* If we walk, we make progress in our journey. "Enoch walked with God." 2. *Led by the Spirit.* This implies an entire surrender of ourselves to the authority and guidance of the Spirit. The traveller in a strange land must follow his guide. So the believer is led by the Spirit with the Word, which is the chart of his journey through life. The term implies, not an isolated act of the Spirit, but a continuous help provided through all parts of a believer's life.

II. THE REASONS BY WHICH WE ARE HERE URGED TO MAINTAIN OUR DEPENDENCE UPON THE SPIRIT. 1. *There will be no fulfilling the lusts of the flesh.* This is self-evident. The Spirit's guidance will keep us apart from all sinful indulgences, from all earthliness, from all the sins and purposes of the merely natural man. The Spirit and the flesh exclude one another. We shall not trust in our own strength, and so we shall be kept; we shall consult his will supremely, and he will deliver us from the perversities and delusions of our own will. 2. *The warfare between the flesh and the Spirit demands extreme care on our part to be always in the Spirit's complete disposal.* (1) *The conflict in question is inevitable.* Indwelling sin is the calamity of all the people of God. Two powers are at work within one and the same person. If there were no such strife, with the irreconcilable antagonism involved in it, there could be no grace. "The flesh lusteth against the Spirit." It uses the senses to mar the Spirit's power. It presents to the eyes what will inflame evil passions; it appeals through the ear to appetite; it finds the tongue often too ready to serve its purposes. "The Spirit lusteth against the flesh." He is there entrenched within the soul and will not be dislodged. He uses the senses—the eye, the ear, the tongue, the hand, the foot—for the purposes of edification. He conveys thoughts, suggests impressions, and imparts motives, which restrain, guide, and influence the soul. (2) *The effects of the conflict.* "So that ye cannot do the things that ye would." This implies that the believer would be free from temptation, but he cannot; he would uninterruptedly serve God, but he cannot; he would be perfect as God is perfect, but he cannot. It is a comfort, after all, to think that on account of the Spirit's operation a believer cannot get doing all the evil he would. (3) *This conflict is not without its spiritual advantages.* It humbles the believer, by giving him a better knowledge of his sin; it makes him more watchful; it endears the Saviour to him; it commends the riches of Divine grace; it calls into exercise all the graces of the Spirit and all the faculties of his nature. It makes him long all the more for the rest of heaven. 3. *The Spirit's guidance exempts us from the Law.* "If ye be led by the Spirit, ye are not under the Law." The Galatians were for putting themselves again in subjection to Law and forgetting the free rule of the Spirit. "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." It was necessary to remind them that they were now "dead to that in which they were held" (Rom. vii. 4). It was no longer to them "a Law of sin and death." "The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" made them free from it. How, then, does the Spirit's guidance set them apart from the Law? (1) The Spirit discovers the hopelessness of acceptance with God through Law. (2) He enables the believer to acquire in the blessed discovery that "Christ is the end of the Law for righteousness to every one that believeth." (3) He enables the believer to regard the Law in a new

light. It is now a rule of life. The believer does not tremble before it, because Christ fulfilled it. He delights in it after the inward man. It is to him a Law of liberty, now that he is not really under it as a way of justification.

Vers. 19—21.—*Classification of the works of the flesh.* The picture here exhibited by the apostle is a frightful abyss into which he asks us to look down. We have sin in its many varieties pictured in many parts of Scripture (Rom. i. 18—32; 2 Cor. xiii. 2), but here we have a most complete account of the works of the flesh.

I. THE WORKS OF THE FLESH. The flesh and the body are not synonymous. The apostle usually speaks of the body in terms of respect—unlike ascetics, who regard it as an enemy, load it with abusive epithets, and try to weaken it with fasts and vigils and penances. He always depreciates and condemns the flesh as a constantly evil tendency in our actual nature. There are sins in this catalogue of an intellectual nature, which cannot be properly ascribed to the body, though they are true works of the flesh. The flesh represents, then, the whole system of corrupt nature, as it breaks forth into seventeen different forms of transgression. They fall naturally under four heads. 1. *Sins of sensual passion.* “Fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness:” the first hardly reckoned a sin in pagan countries; the second including unnatural sins, which had a fearful import in the East; the third, the impure propensity indulged without check of reason or shame. All three are grouped together elsewhere (2 Cor. xii. 21). 2. *Sins of superstition.* “Idolatry, sorcery:” the first referring to the worship of false gods and of images, which was familiar to the Galatians in connection with idol-feasts; the second to the occult dealings with the world of spirits, so common in Asia Minor. 3. *Sins of social disorder.* “Hatred, strife, envy, outbursts of anger, cavillings, divisions, factions, envyings, murders.” It has been remarked, that there is a climax in this catalogue of nine evils, for what begins in hatred ends in murder, after it has passed through a whole succession of disturbing and distracting experiences. They are all violations of brotherly love, representing the selfish, unyielding, bitter spirit, which too often enters into reactionary agitations both in Church and state. 4. *Individual excesses.* “Drunkenness, revellings:” having exclusive relation to ourselves, not to others. The two terms refer to scenes of gay and wanton dissipation.

II. THE WORKS OF THE FLESH HAVE AN OVERT CHARACTER. They are “manifest.” The flesh, as the sinful principle, breaks out into open acts of transgression, which are manifest alike to God and man, manifest by the light of nature and by the Law of God. We see the history of the flesh in the whole record of man’s moral degradation and his resulting misery. These seventeen sins may not all be equally manifest, for some are gross and others more refined; they may not all be equally heinous in the sight either of God or of man; and many of them, hateful in God’s sight, carry no brand of social reprobation with man. Yet they are all manifest, open, tangible proofs of a life at enmity with God.

III. THE APOSTOLIC WARNING. “They who practise such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.” 1. The kingdom of God, founded by Christ, is a holy kingdom, and consists of those who have entered it by regeneration, who are led by the Spirit, who are heirs of the promise, who are “made meet for the inheritance of the saints in light.” 2. Transgressors prove their want of meetness for it; they find no enjoyment in it; it has no attraction for them; for these works of the flesh are altogether inconsistent with the character of the kingdom of God.

IV. THE NECESSITY THAT EXISTS FOR REPEATED WARNINGS AGAINST SIN. “I tell you before, as I have already told you in time past.” We need “line upon line, precept upon precept,” to deepen the impression of the hatefulness of sin. It is well to convince sinners of their individual sins, that they may be shut up to fly to the Refuge.

Vers. 22, 23.—“*The fruit of the Spirit.*” Here we have the picture of a lovely garden, with all the choicest growths of the Spirit.

I. THE NINE GRACES OF THE SPIRIT. (1) The apostle speaks of the nine as constituting the fruit of the Spirit, as if to imply that it takes all the nine, and no mere selection of graces out of them, to form the one fruit of the Holy Spirit. Christian character must be fully and harmoniously developed. (2) Mark the difference between the works of the flesh and the fruit of the Spirit. Sin is our work; the graces are

the Spirit's growth in us. (8) The nine graces throw themselves naturally into three groups, each group consisting of three—the first group, “love, joy, peace,” touching our relations to God; the second group, “long-suffering, gentleness, goodness,” touching our relations to our fellow-men; the third group, “faith, meekness, temperance,” touching the regulation and conduct of our own individual Christian life. 1. *First group.* “Love, joy, peace.” They all spring out of the filial relation into which we are brought by faith in Christ. Love is the tie that binds our hearts to God as our Father; joy is the glad emotion that springs up after our reconciliation with God; peace is the summer calm that settles down upon the soul that has entered into its rest. Love has been called the foundation of the fabric; joy, the superstructure; peace, the crown of the work. Love has a primary place, for it is “shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost.” Joy is dependent upon love, and may well be called “joy of the Holy Ghost.” It is enshrined in the very heart of love. It rises and falls, with love itself, like the thin thread of mercury in the thermometer, by the action of the surrounding atmosphere. Peace is linked with joy “in believing.” Peace and joy are the two ingredients of the kingdom of God (Rom. xiv. 17). It is “the peace to which we are called in one body” (Col. iii. 15), which will keep our hearts and minds in the midst of all worldly agitations. 2. *Second group.* “Long-suffering, gentleness, goodness.” The first group blends naturally into the second, for there is a near relation between peace and long-suffering. The graces of this group begin with the passive and end with the active, for long-suffering is the patient endurance of injuries inflicted by others; goodness is an active principle, not a mere kindly disposition; while gentleness or kindness is something between the two—a principle, however, which tends largely to promote the usefulness and the comfort of life, lessening the friction that enters more or less into all our intercourse with our fellow-men. 3. *Third group.* “Faith, meekness, temperance.” These three graces refer to the regulation of Christian life. It is curious to find faith seventh, and not first, in this list of graces. Faith is the root-principle of all graces. It goes before love itself, for it “worketh by love,” and it precedes joy and peace, which both spring from our believing (Rom. xv. 13). It has, therefore, been suggested that faith is here taken for fidelity. There is no reason, however, for any departure from its usual meaning. Faith is here regarded, not as the means of salvation or as the instrument of our justification, but as the principle of Christian life, which controls and guides it. Thus faith supplies the strength of self-control that is implied in temperance, and is the secret spring of that meekness which is an ornament of great price. Temperance comes last in the list of graces, because self-control is the end of all Christian life. Like the governor in machinery, it adds nothing to the power at work, but it equalizes the power so as to produce a uniform type of work.

II. MARK THE SPECIAL PRIVILEGE THAT ATTACHES TO THESE NINE GRACES. “Against such there is no Law.” There is Law against the seventeen works of the flesh—to condemn them; but there is no Law to condemn the nine graces of the Spirit. There is Law to restrain the sinner—it exists for the purposes of this restraint—but in the graces of the Spirit there is nothing to restrain. They all chime in with the requirements of the Law, because they radiate from that love which is the very fulfilling of the Law. Thus those who are led by the Spirit are not under Law.

Ver. 24.—*The distinguishing feature of Christianity.* It is manifest in the very nature of the case that a Christian has crucified the flesh by virtue of his union with Christ. Mark here—

I. THE MOST CHARACTERISTIC DESIGNATION OF TRUE BELIEVERS. “They that are Christ’s.” The expression implies (1) that they are Christ’s by purchase, (2) by deliverance, (3) by possession, (4) by dominion. They are not his merely by external profession. It is natural, therefore, that they should manifest the fruit of the Spirit.

II. THE MOST CHARACTERISTIC PART OF CHRISTIAN LIFE. “They crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts.” This points to a past act, to their conversion, in which, by virtue of their union with Christ, they were baptized into his death (Rom. vi. 4). The believer is “crucified with Christ” (ch. ii. 19), but *here* the flesh, with its seventeen categories of evil, is crucified likewise: “Our old man has been crucified with him” (Rom. vi. 6). Thus the flesh is robbed of its supremacy. Thus union with Christ secures alike our salvation from the guilt and the power of sin. “When Christ

came in the flesh, we crucified him; when he comes into our hearts, he crucifies us.\* The flesh, with its passions and lusts, represents vice on its passive and active sides.

Ver. 25.—*The consistency of the Christian life.* If the flesh has thus been crucified, we live by the efficacy of the Spirit. "Crucified: . . . nevertheless I live" (ch. ii. 20).

I. OUR CHRISTIAN LIFE IS BY THE SPIRIT. "If we live by the Spirit." This life consists in the knowledge of God, in his love, in his favour, in his image. 1. *It is originated by the Holy Spirit.* We are dead in trespasses and sins; it is the Spirit which giveth life. He is "the quickening Spirit" (John vi. 63); "a Spirit of life" (Rom. viii. 2). 2. *It is maintained by the Spirit.* "We live by the Spirit." "He abideth with us."

II. OUR CHRISTIAN WALK IS BY THE SPIRIT. "Let us also walk by the Spirit." There must be a principle of life before it can become manifest in the outward conversation. There must be a correspondence between the outward walk and the inner standard. The walk here referred to points to something very orderly and deliberate, like the walk of soldiers marching in rank. This walk includes (1) the guidance of the Spirit (Rom. viii. 14); (2) the support of the Spirit (Eph. iii. 16); (3) the drawings of the Spirit: "So that ye walk after the Spirit" (Rom. viii. 1, 4); (4) the growth of the character in all the fruit of the Spirit (ver. 22).

Ver. 26.—*No departure allowed from the spiritual standard.* If the Spirit is our Guide and Upholder, there ought to be no room for the indulgence of a proud or contentious or envious disposition.

I. VAIN-GLORY. "Let us not become vain-glorious." A mild and suggestive warning against an evil only in its incipency. It is vain because it rests on no basis of reality; because, like a bubble, it bursts in a moment and is seen no more; because it leads to strife and envy.

II. "PROVOKING ONE ANOTHER." This applies to the habit of challenging others to combat, as if Galatian Christianity had not been already sufficiently spoiled by controversies.

III. "ENVYING ONE ANOTHER." The challenges of the strong might excite the envy of the weak. How beautifully the gospel calls the saints to peace, not to doubtful disputations!

### HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

Vers. 2—12.—*Falling from grace.* Paul in the present section exposes the legal and ceremonial spirit as a fall from the moral magnificence of grace. It has been well said that "it is harder to abolish forms than to change opinions. Ceremonies stand long after the thought which they express has fled, as a dead king may sit on his throne stiff and stark in his golden mantle, and no one come near enough to see that the light is gone out of his eyes and the will departed from the hand that still clutches the sceptre." Circumcision was such a form, and against its improper use Paul has all through this Epistle to protest. The thought of the present section is elevating and sublime. Let us follow the outline.

I. PAUL HERE IMPLIES THE MORAL MAGNIFICENCE OF SALVATION BY GRACE. (Vers. 4, 5.) For when we consider how this plan of salvation turns our minds away from self to God in Christ, giving all the glory to the Saviour and taking all the blame to self, we see that it is morally magnificent. Self-confidence is destroyed, and confidence in Christ becomes all in all. The whole sphere of activity is illumined by devotedness to him who has lived and died for our redemption. Gratitude thus is the foundation of morality, and all idea of merit is put out of sight. The more the gospel is studied as a moral system, the more marvellous and magnificent will it appear. This will further exhibit itself if we consider what the *working principle* of the gospel is. It is, as Paul here shows, "faith working through love" (ver. 6, Revised Version). And faith is the mightiest factor in the world's progress. Suppose that faith were supplanted by suspicion, and men, instead of trusting one another, lived lives of mutual suspicion, the world's progress would come speedily to an end. The gospel, then, takes this mighty principle of faith and, turning it towards Christ, it secures love as its practical

outcome. Love to God and consequent love to men becomes the law of our lives. All that is lovely is thus evoked, and the system proves its moral magnificence and practical power.

II. IT IS THE CHARACTERISTIC OF LEGALISM TO DEPRECIATE THE CROSS. (Ver. 11.) In a scheme of free grace the cross of Jesus Christ is central and all-important. How could selfish hearts be emancipated from their selfishness, had not the Holy Spirit the cross of Christ to move them? The cross is the self-sacrifice of incarnate love, and the grandest appeal of all history for self-sacrifice in return. It is, moreover, a fact and not a ceremony; a fact which bears no repetition, and which stands in its moral grandeur alone. But legalism comes in to depreciate if possible its moral value. The insinuation is thrown out that circumcision is essential to the efficacy of the cross. The cross is made out to be a mere adjunct to the Jewish ceremonial. Its offence ceases. It is no such instrument of self-sacrifice as it was intended to be. The brave apostle who preaches "Christ crucified" as the only hope of salvation is persecuted for doing so, and the whole legal band arrays itself against him. It is thus that the legal spirit depreciates and dishonours the Crucified One.

III. ALL THIS IMPLIES IN THE LEGAL SPIRIT A FALL FROM GRACE. (Ver. 4.) This is the key of the present passage. The soul, which so depreciates the cross as to go away and to try to save itself by ceremonies, has fallen from a moral grandeur into deepest selfishness. Christ profits in nothing the soul who is bent on saving himself. The righteousness of Christ, which is unto all and upon all them that believe, cannot consist with the self-seeking and self-confidence which self-righteousness implies. We must choose our saviour and adhere to him. If our saviour is to be ceremony, which is only another way of saying that our saviour is ourselves, then we may as well renounce all hope of salvation by Christ. We sever ourselves from Christ when we seek to be justified by the Law (Revised Version). We have descended in the scale of motive; we have taken up the selfish plan; we have "fallen away from grace."

IV. PAUL ANTICIPATES THAT HIS EXPOSURE OF LEGALISM WILL CURE THE GALATIANS OF IT. (Ver. 10.) He believes that legalism will be destroyed and rooted up by laying bare its real meaning. The leaven will not be allowed to spread. It is most important in the same way to be meditating constantly upon the magnificence of the gospel system as a moral system. Thus shall we prize it more and more, and never think of surrendering it for any rival and selfish system.—R. M. E.

Vers. 13—15.—*The liberty of love.* Having shown the magnificence of the gospel system, Paul now proceeds to define that freedom which it secures. It is not licence, but love, which it induces; and love not only fulfils the Law, as legalism does not, but also prevents the bitter strife which legalism ensures. We have the following points suggested:—

I. THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN LICENCE AND LIBERTY. (Ver. 13.) The grace which has freed us from the legal spirit has not endowed us with a liberty to live licentiously. The liberty it gives is totally distinct from licence. Licence is liberty to please ourselves, to humour the flesh, to regard liberty as an end and not a means. But God in his gospel gives no such liberty. His liberty is a means and not an end; it is liberty to live as he pleases, liberty to love him and love men, liberty to serve one another by love. We must guard ourselves, then, from the confusion of mistaking licence for liberty.

II. LOVE IS THE REAL LIBERTY. (Ver. 13.) As a matter of experience we never feel free until we have learned to love. When our hearts are going out to God in Christ, when we have at his cross learned the lesson of philanthropy, when we have felt our obligation to God above and to man below, then we are free as air and rejoice in freedom. Then we refuse licence as only freedom's counterfeit, for we have learned a more excellent way. We cannot imagine a loveless spirit to be free. He may achieve an outlawry, but he is not, cannot be, free.

III. LOVE IS THE REAL FULFILMENT OF THE LAW. (Ver. 14.) The legalists in their little system of self-righteousness spent their strength upon the mint, the anise, and the cummin; while the weightier matters of the Law—righteousness, judgment, and faith—were neglected. Ceremonies and not morality became their concern. The tithing of pot-herbs would entitle them to Paradise. In contrast to all this, Paul shows



that Christian love, which is another name for liberty, fulfils the demands of Law. The meaning of the commandments published from Sinai was *love*. Their essence is love to God and love to our neighbour, as well as to our "better self." Hence the gospel throws no slight on Law, but really secures its observance. The whole system turns on love as the duty and the privilege of existence. While the Law is, therefore, rejected as a way of life, it is accepted as a rule. Saved through the merits and grace of Christ, we betake ourselves to Law-keeping *con amore*. We recognize in God the supreme object of grateful love; we recognize in our neighbour the object of our love for God's sake and for his own sake; and we honour the Law of God as "holy and just and good." The whole difference between the legal spirit and the gospel spirit is that in the one case Law is kept in hope of establishing a claim; in the other it is kept in token of our gratitude. The motive in the one case, being selfish, destroys the high standard of Law. It fancies it can be kept with considerable completeness, whereas it is kept by the best with constant and manifold shortcoming. The motive in the other case, being disinterested, secures such attachment to the Law, because it has been translated into *love*, that it is kept with increasing ardour and success. Slaves will never honour Law so much as freemen.

IV. LOVE IS THE TRUE ANTIDOTE TO STRIFE AND DIVISION. (Ver. 15.) The ritualistic or legal spirit into which the Galatians had temporarily fallen manifested itself in strife and bickerings. This is, in fact, its natural outcome. For if men are straining every nerve to save themselves by punctilious observance of ceremonies, they will come of necessity into collision. It is an emulation of a selfish character. It cannot be conducted with mutual consideration. As a matter of fact, organizations pervaded by the legal spirit are but the battle-ground of conflicting parties. But love comes to set all right again. Its genial breath makes summer in society and takes wintry isolation and self-seeking all away. Mutual consideration secures harmony and social progress. Instead of religious people becoming then the butt of the world's scorn by reason of their strife and divisions, they become the world's wonder by reason of their unity and peace. It is, love, therefore, we are bound to cultivate. Then shall concord and all its myriad blessings come into the Church of God and the world be subdued before it.  
—R. M. E.

Vers. 16—26.—*Christian progress realized through antagonism.* We must not suppose, however, that the love which God gives us as our liberty can work out its will without experiencing opposition. Opposition we know it will meet in the world of selfish men; but Paul here points out the antagonism it meets within our own personalities. The flesh antagonizes the Spirit. Love does not get its own sweet way as often as we would. Self becomes a battle-ground, and God contends with the flesh for the supremacy of the soul. So violent is the contention that the flesh is actually "crucified with its affections and lusts." We are introduced, therefore, to the law of Christian progress which, because of our sinful nature, has to be through antagonizing the sinful tendencies in the interest of love. Observe—

I. SIN LEADS MAN TO FALL OUT WITH HIMSELF. (Ver. 17.) As Ullmann has beautifully said, "Man forms a unity, which is, however, only the foundation of that higher unity which is to be brought about in him, as a being made in the Divine image, by means of communion with God. Now, sin does not merely obstruct this unity, but sets up in its place that which is its direct opposite. He who has fallen away from God by sin, does, as a necessary consequence, fall out both with himself and with all mankind. True unity in man is possible only when that which is God-like in him—that is, the mind—acquiesces in the Divine order of life, and governs the whole being in conformity therewith. But when he has once severed himself from the true centre of his being, that is, from God, then also does that element of his being, his mind, which is akin to God, and which was intended to be the connecting and all-deciding centre of his personal life, lose its central and dominant position; he ceases to be lord of himself and of his own nature; the various powers which make up his complex nature begin to carry on, each for itself, an independent existence; the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit wages a fruitless war with the flesh (ver. 17); sinful desire becomes dominant; and while the man seems to be in the enjoyment of all imaginable liberty, he has lost the only true liberty and has

become a slave to himself; for 'whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin' (John viii. 34; Rom. vi. 16—23). He is the dependent of self; and being thus the slave of self, he is also the slave of pleasure, and of all those objects which it requires for its satisfaction." Man becomes thus a distracted manifold, instead of a God-centred unity.

II. THE SPIRIT OF CHRIST ANTAGONIZES THE DISTRACTING TENDENCIES AND REDUCES MAN TO A UNITY AGAIN. The way in which we are united in heart and being is by having Jesus Christ pressed resistlessly upon our attention. Faith realizes in Christ not only a perfect personal Ideal, but also a Saviour on whom man may evermore depend. "The Christ of Christendom is not simply a Master to be loved and revered; he is a Saviour to be leaned upon. His followers are to have that profound sense of their own weakness and sinfulness which renders them sensitive to the purifying and reforming influences that radiate from the personality of Jesus. Without this, their love for the ideal would lead to no practical results; it would be merely an æsthetic sentiment, expending itself in a vague and fruitless admiration. But combine the two and you have the most effective reforming influence that the world has ever known." Christ is not only the unifying element in Church life, but in the individual life as well. He fuses all the distracted faculties into a glorious unity, and makes man his own master instead of his own slave. Hence, to quote the writer last referred to, "Christianity alone among all religions maintains a constant antagonism to the special tendency which controls the nature of its followers."

III. BUT POSITIVE FRUIT IS PRODUCED BY THE ANTAGONIZING SPIRIT AS A GLORIOUS SET-OFF TO THE WORKS OF THE FLESH WHICH HE DESTROYS. (Vers. 19—24.) Religion is not to be regarded as a negative thing, contenting itself with antagonisms, but has positive and most important fruits. It is not a system of severe repressions, but a system full of stimulus towards a better and fuller life. It does not merely forbid "fornication, uncleanness," etc., under the penalty of exclusion from the kingdom of God, but it produces "love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, self-control." What a catalogue of virtues! What a contrast to the works of the flesh! Thus is man restored to something like his true and better self. The gospel of Christ is not a weary round of prohibitions, but is a glorious system of positive attainment, in a Divine life, which is loving, joyful, peaceful, and humane to its deepest depths.

IV. AGAINST SUCH SPIRITUALLY MINDED ONES THERE CAN BE NO LAW OF CONDEMNATION. (Vers. 18—23.) Law, when translated into love, becomes light. God's commandments are not grievous to the loving soul. In the keeping of them there is a great reward. Hence the Law presses heavily and hardly upon no loving spirit. "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit" (Rom. viii. 1). It is to such a blissful experience we are asked to come.—R. M. E.

Vers. 2—12.—*Circumcision.* I. PAUL SOLEMNLY PUTS BEFORE THE GALATIANS THE TRUE STATE OF THE CASE. "Behold, I Paul say unto you, that, if ye receive circumcision, Christ will profit you nothing." Commencing with an arresting word, he introduces his own name with all the solemnity of oath-taking, witness-bearing. "Behold, I Paul say unto you." What the weight of his testimony is directed against, is their submitting to circumcision. This was what the Judaizing teachers were aiming at, and, seeing that they were making false representations, he declares to the Galatians, as if their destinies were at stake, the real state of the case. For them, Gentiles, and at the instigation of the Judaizers, to submit to circumcision would be excluding themselves from all advantage by Christ. It was either circumcision or Christ with them. There was no middle ground for them to take up. There was no submitting to circumcision and clinging to Christ at the same time. If they submitted to circumcision, they must make up their minds to forego all that they had hoped for from Christ. 1. *How he makes it out that circumcision excluded them from Christ.* (1) *Circumcision implies an obligation to do the whole Law.* "Yea, I testify again to every man that receiveth circumcision, that he is a debtor to do the whole Law." Again does he clear his conscience by emitting his solemn testimony. This testimony was more particularly directed to every man among them that, under the influence of the Judaizers, had any thought of submitting to circumcision. The apostle, as it were, takes him aside, and

earnestly and affectionately warns him. Let him consider what he is doing. He is bringing himself under obligation to do the whole Law, and that personally, with this risk attached, that, if he fails to do the whole Law, he comes under its curse. (2) *Doing the whole Law excludes from Christ and grace.* "Ye are severed from Christ, ye who would be justified by the Law; ye are fallen away from grace." The apostle takes the doing of the whole Law to be equivalent to the working out of the whole of their justification. That was necessarily to the entire exclusion of Christ. There was nothing left for him to do. His work was made of none effect. They were severed from Christ and all the benefit of his work. They were thus fallen away from grace. Formerly they stood upon the merits of Christ, they had their Surety to answer for them; now they had themselves, immediately and fully, to answer to God for their Law-keeping.

2. *The case of Christians stated.* (1) *The expectancy of faith.* "For we through the Spirit by faith wait for the hope of righteousness." The thought in its simplicity is that we hope for righteousness. This can only be the righteousness on the ground of which we are justified. There is a difficulty in this being presented as future, when it can be immediately and fully enjoyed. Some attempt to get over the difficulty by supposing the meaning to be the hope that belongs to righteousness, *i.e.* the hope of eternal life. But that is attaching a not very obvious meaning to the language. If we think of justifying righteousness as future, the reference can only be to the vindication of its sufficiency on the day of judgment, and further to the establishing of our personal interest in it on that day. The latter reference especially seems borne out by the associated language. We are represented as in the attitude of expectancy. We wait for the hope, *i.e.* now the realization of the hope of righteousness. This expectancy being based, so far as God is concerned, in the work of the Spirit on our hearts, and so far as we are concerned, in the exercise of faith, is based in reality. But being based at the same time in that which is not completed, it partakes of imperfection. We are not so sure as those Judaists were who rested on the fact of their being circumcised. We are not so absolutely sure as we shall be when judgment has been pronounced in our favour. We are confident that the righteousness of Christ will be shown to be all-sufficient as the ground of justification. And we hope, more or less confidently, according to the operation of the Spirit in our hearts and the working of faith, that it will be shown that we are possessors of that righteousness. (2) *The energy of faith.* "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith working through love." The apostle here does not take so high ground with regard to circumcision. He had forbidden the Galatians to submit to circumcision, on the ground that it would exclude them from Christ. Here he puts circumcision on a level with uncircumcision, as availing nothing within the Christian sphere. Neither is what avails baptism, which has taken the place of circumcision. The outward form is a matter of indifference, unless as it is connected with the inward reality. What must ever be demanded is, as the representation is here—faith, and not a dead faith, but, according to the conception of Paul as well as according to the conception of James, a faith that is operative. And the energy of faith goes out in love. There is, as we are taught here, a blessed harmony between these two graces. If we believe that not only God is, but that he is inexhaustible Goodness, we must be drawn out in love towards him. And if we believe that the Son of God condescended to become man and devoted himself for us, we must be impelled out beyond ourselves towards the good of others.

II. CERTAIN BEARINGS OF THE CASE ON THE GALATIANS. 1. *They were hindered in a good career.* "Ye were running well; who did hinder you that ye should not obey the truth?" (1) *Points in a good career.* (a) *That it be directed to a right end.* This is brought out in connection with their obeying the truth. Their career in heathenism was vitiated by their being involved in error. The true idea of life had not been revealed to them. But when they obeyed the truth they took Christ to be their end and undertook to shape their career according to the rules of Christ. And that is necessary to the commencement of a good career. (b) *That it be commenced early.* If the Galatians did not commence in early life, yet they commenced as soon as an opportunity in providence was presented to them, and so far they can be cited as an example of commencing early. It would have been a great advantage to them to have been taught and moulded as Christians in youth. There would not have been

their heathen education to unlearn and undo. The laws of association and habit would have been working all along in their favour. And there would have been more time in which to advance to excellence and usefulness. (c) *That it be pursued with enthusiasm.* In the Galatians the warm Celtic temperament was warmed under the influences of the cross. It was this especially that called forth the admiration of the apostle. They did run well; among his converts none had displayed greater enthusiasm in the Christian race. (d) *That it be pursued with steadiness.* It was with regard to this that there was danger to the Galatians. Would they continue in their ardent attachment to the gospel? Would time cool their ardour, or would it be transferred to some other doctrine? Especially would they continue steadfast in the face of hindrances that made trial of them? It was that which was now being tested. (2) *Hindrances.* There are rocks and weeds which are put as hindrances in the way of the farmer cultivating the soil. There are difficulties to be overcome in connection with every worldly calling. We need not wonder, therefore, at there being difficulties in connection with the Christian calling. It is only by conquering difficulty after difficulty that we gain the heights of excellence. The greatest difficulties are those which arise from ourselves, from our own weak and treacherous hearts. But we are referred more here to hindrances which arise from others. "Ye were running well; who did hinder you?" In the word which is used there is an allusion to breaking up roads, by destroying bridges, raising barriers. There is suggested, by opposition, a representation of what our duty is to our fellow-men. We are to act as pioneers, clearing the way before others by levelling high places, filling up hollows, throwing bridges across rivers. We are to act towards them so that they shall have not only no temptation to fall, but every help to well-doing. And when there are those who throw obstacles across our path we are not to feel annoyed, as though we had only to deal with them. But we are to feel that God is making trial of us through them. And therefore we are not to succumb, but to persevere in the face of obstacles. Thus out of the eater shall come forth meat; out of our hindrances shall come forth the many virtues. 2. *It was not God who was seeking to persuade them to be circumcised.* "This persuasion came not of him that calleth you." Persuasion may mean either the state of being persuaded or the act of persuading. The latter seems more in keeping with the context. The course to which the Judaizers would have persuaded the Galatians would have been, in its consequences, disobedience to the truth. They would not attempt, we may suppose, to get them to set aside the cross. Their policy was rather to get them to add circumcision to the cross. This persuasion came not of him that called them. It was not in accordance, either with the idea that was in the Divine mind in calling them, or with the idea that was in their own minds in choosing the calling, which was in both cases making Christ everything in the road to everlasting happiness. It did not come from above, from the God who saved them and called them to everlasting glory, but it came from beneath—from the enemy of mankind. 3. *He was afraid of the spread of error among them.* "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump." On the one hand, the Judaists, in order to gain their point, would be inclined to minimize its importance. On the other hand, the Galatians might think the Judaistic teaching had made very little way among them. The apostle puts them on their guard by telling them that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump. This saying also occurs in 1 Cor. v. 6. The reference there is to a case of gross immorality in the Corinthian Church. By tolerating such immorality, there would be danger of the whole Corinthian Church being lowered in its moral tone and practice. So by the introduction of a little Judaistic leaven, such as the toleration of the circumcision of a single Gentile convert, there would be danger of the Christian communities of Galatia becoming Judaistic, *i.e.* communities upon which the blessing of God would not rest, from which the Spirit of God would depart. And so a little leaven of carelessness in the household, in companionship, leavens the whole lump. 4. *He had confidence in them that they would remain unchanged.* "I have confidence to you-ward in the Lord, that ye will be none otherwise minded." He had confidence that they would not change from a Christian to a Judaistic way of thinking. His confidence was not founded on reports received regarding them. For these, as we have seen, threw him into a state of perplexity. But he had confidence to them-ward in the Lord. He had confidence in the use of appointed means. He had confidence in the power of prayer. He had prayed to God on

their behalf, that they might be none otherwise minded. He had confidence in bringing proper representations before their minds, as he had endeavoured to do. He had confidence especially in the great Head of the Church making use of the means in the interests of the Galatian Churches and of the whole Church. 5. *The troubler would bear his judgment.* "But he that troubleth you shall bear his judgment, whosoever he be." One is separated here, not as ringleader, but for the sake of individualization. He is represented as a troubler. He acts over the part of Satan who, seeing the happiness of Eden, envied our first parents its possession. So he, spying the peace and prosperity of the Galatian communities, cannot let them alone; he must introduce his Judaistic leaven. But this troubler, whosoever he be (thus searched out and held up before them), shall bear his judgment. God, indeed, makes use of him in making trial of them. And they shall be judged for the manner in which they have dealt with his representations—testing them or not testing them. But let him know that he shall have the sentence, and the burdensome sentence, of a troubler passed and carried out upon him. 6. *It was evident that he was no preacher of circumcision.* "But I, brethren, if I still preach circumcision, why am I still persecuted? then hath the stumbling-block of the cross been done away." We are not under any danger of attaching a materialistic meaning to the cross. Whilst the wood to which were nailed Christ's hands and feet has now long ago mouldered away, and has no existence unless in the imagination of the superstitious, the spiritual associations of it remain. It is the greatest fact that was ever accomplished on earth or ever brought to the knowledge of earth's inhabitants, and which will not decay in time or in eternity—that the adorable Son of God, coming down to our human condition, once became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. It is this which is set forth in Scripture as the Divine and only instrument of salvation. It was this which Paul made the great burden of his preaching. Whatever remedies or methods were proposed or advocated by others, "We," says he, who was himself a wonderful trophy of the cross—"we preach Christ crucified." But it was said in Galatia for a purpose that he preached circumcision, *i.e.* in addition to the cross. He could easily have given an explanation of the circumstance on which this charge was founded, *viz.* his having circumcised Timothy; but taking the representation as it was—that he was actually a preacher of circumcision—he puts a question and draws a conclusion. (1) *He puts a question.* The very pertinent question he puts is—Why was he persecuted? Was it not the fact that it was the Judaizers who led to his being a prisoner for the gospel in Rome? Did that not show that they knew very well that there was a real and deep antagonism between their preaching and his? (2) *He draws a conclusion.* If this course, falsely attributed to him, were followed, to add circumcision to the cross to please the Judaists, and some other point to please some other party; if all parties were thus to be suited, then it strikes the apostle that this result would follow, the offence of the cross would cease, and that seems to him a most undesirable result, entirely to be deprecated. If the cross gives such satisfaction all round, and does not offend, as well, he thinks, stamp it a failure and proclaim abroad its utter inefficiency as a means of conversion. Wherein lies the offence, the scandalizing property, of the cross? It does not lie in its offending any true feeling or principle of our nature. In Christianity there is nothing that is wantonly harsh or rude. Its language is, "Giving none offence." "Woe unto him by whom the offence cometh!" But the offence of the cross lies in its running counter to the inclinations of the unrenewed heart. It can be seen, then, how it could not be true, but must be a proved lie, if it did not offend; it would be giving in to the natural heart, which it is the purpose of God not to flatter, but to subdue. (a) *The cross is an offence because it does not merely please the imagination.* Men are fond of ritualism in religion. Now, the cross is singularly simple and unadorned. In this respect it stands markedly in contrast with what preceded it. This is not pleasing to many. They would put ornaments upon the cross to take away its offensive simplicity. But that is a wrong tendency. The most beautiful rites and gorgeous shows, instead of drawing to the cross, as the meaning sometimes is, are more likely to usurp its place. The worshipper, instead of having his heart reached, is likely to have only his imagination pleased. Let the cross be left to its own simple power, though the imagination should be offended. It can do without ornaments on it in our day as well as it did in Paul's day. (b) *The cross is an offence because it is humbling to pride of reason.* It was to the Greeks foolishness,

and so it is apt to be to intellectual people still—to the Greeks, of the present day, to literary men, to the reading portion of the community. That is at least what all such have to surmount. The cross seems foolishness to them. They would like a difficult problem on which to exercise their intellects. Now, in one sense, the cross is above reason, inasmuch as reason could never have found it out. But in another sense it is below human reason; it is a revelation, a doctrine all found out for man, and a doctrine which is level to the meanest understanding. The result of the philosophic craving was, at a very early period of the Church, the rise of Gnosticism. It was very much a blending of the Greek philosophy with Christianity. It was the religion of mind, those embracing it professing to have a deeper insight into Christian facts than the common people, who took them in their obvious sense. And since the disappearance of Gnosticism, there has been, again and again, and is at present in some quarters, an effort to consider the literary and reading class so as to give the cross a philosophic cast, with the view of attracting them. Now, there are some ways of speaking to intellectual people better than others, and nothing is to be hoped for from irrational or dry discourse, yet, if the cross is turned into a philosophy, it may attract some, but it is not likely to benefit them. Let the cross be presented as level to the lowest intellect; let it be presented as a simple, divinely revealed fact, speaking to the heart more than to the intellect; let there be no fear to offend pride of intellect, which must be humbled before the soul can be saved. (c) *The cross is an offence because it is humbling to self-righteousness.* It is a strange infatuation of the natural heart that, with no righteousness to lay claim to, it is yet so natural to it to flatter itself with having a righteousness. The cross, going upon the supposition that we have no righteousness of our own, and that all the praise of our salvation is due to God, is an offence. In the Roman Catholic system there is a place given to works alongside of the merits of Christ, which is very pleasing to the feeling of self-righteousness. We are all apt to construct a theory of salvation in which there is a place left for self. Now, the cross must never be presented to please self-righteous people; that would be a fatal compromise. Let the cross be proclaimed as the impossibility of our own righteousness, as the grace of God in a righteousness freely provided for us. That is a doctrine which must offend, but it is the only doctrine that can satisfy the conscience. (d) *The cross is an offence because of its large demands. It demands that we forsake cherished sins.* And that cuts into natural liking, that is painful like a crucifying, and therefore an offence. But the cross must be presented as giving no quarter to sin, as the most tremendous proof that sin is not to be permitted, as showing how sin is utterly abhorred and condemned of God. And to be acknowledging the cross, while tolerating sin in ourselves, is crucifying the Son of God afresh and putting him to an open shame. *It demands self-sacrifice.* The cross-life is characteristically a life of self-sacrifice. Christ was sacrificing all along, and when he came to the cross he sacrificed his all—sacrificed his life in the most awful circumstances. And those who would take up the cross must be prepared to follow Christ in his course of self-denial. And there, again, is where the offence of the cross arises. Its requirements are too high. But as the cross of Christ can never be blotted out, so its requirements can never be lowered. It is the standard up to which our life must be brought if we are to attain to our perfection. There is one blessed way in which the offence of the cross ceases, and that is, when we have been humbled by it as sinners, and have been led to own its power. Then we admire it for the light it throws on the Divine perfections, and for the power there is in it over human hearts. And we say, "Far be it from me to glory, save in the cross of the Lord Jesus Christ." 7. *He wishes the Galatians deliverance from the unsettling teachers.* "I would that they which unsettle you would even cut themselves off." In the case of the offender against morality in the Corinthian Church, the apostle issued a decree that he should be cut off by the Church. That could not be done in this case, because these teachers were not under the jurisdiction of the Galatian Churches. They came to teach them as they were free to do; and all that the Galatians could do was to refuse them a hearing. That this was the apostle's mind may be gathered from the wish he expresses that they would cut themselves off. As they could not be cut off by the Church, let them cut themselves off. As they were only unsettling the Galatian order, let them leave Galatian soil. But he does no more than wish. It was certainly by itself desirable; but it might be the purpose of God that these unsettling teachers should be left there

to make trial of the Galatians, and, it might be, thereby to purify and to strengthen them.—R. F.

Vers. 13—26.—*Freedom sustained by the Spirit.* I. USE OF CHRISTIAN FREEDOM. "For ye, brethren, were called for freedom." Paul, having wished the Judaizing teachers off Galatian soil, justifies the strength of his wish. They would have led the Galatians into bondage, but God had called them for freedom. He makes a distinction between the *possession* of freedom and the *use* of freedom. He had been under the necessity of making prominent their possession of freedom in contending against the Judaists; he would, however, remind them, as brethren, that there was responsibility connected with their use of freedom. It is thus that he slides into the more practical part of the Epistle.

1. *Dangers of freedom.* "Only use not your freedom for an occasion to the flesh." By the flesh, which here becomes a leading word with the apostle, we are not to understand our corporeal nature. Nor are we to understand by it depraved tendency in connection with our corporeal nature. But we are to understand by it depraved tendency as a whole, extending to our higher nature as well as to our lower nature. It is true that in this depraved tendency our lower nature has the preponderance. And that is the reason why the whole goes by the name of flesh. But the constant element in depravity is not sense, but it is self as opposed to God and to the good of others. The admonition of the apostle, then, is, not that we abstain from all bodily gratification, as though sin were seated in the body, nor simply that we abstain from all fleshly sin, but that we abstain from all selfish gratification. The Galatians had been called for freedom, *i.e.* for ultimate and complete freedom; they were not, with their first experiences of freedom, or with their strong realization of it as against Judaistic error, to imagine that they were free to indulge the flesh. That is what, as free, we must be on our guard against, if we would not fall back into bondage, if we would come to the goal of our freedom in Christ. Let us not turn our liberty into licentiousness.

2. *The binding of freedom.* (1) *Love binds the free.* "But through love be servants one to another." As it is self in the flesh that leads to abuse of freedom, so it is love that determines the right use of freedom. Love is going out beyond self. It is that which binds us in service to another. The Galatians were free from Jewish bonds only to put on the bonds of Christian love. So it is true that we are free from the bonds of guilt only to bind ourselves in service one to another. Thus to balance our freedom—there is the bondage of love. (2) *The whole Law is fulfilled in love to our neighbour.* "For the whole Law is fulfilled in one word, even in this; Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." The one word here is the summary of the *second* table of the Law. The quotation is from Lev. xix. 18. It appears, from "neighbour" there following upon "children of thy people," that the neighbour of the Jew was his fellow-Jew. Christ has taught us to regard as our neighbour every one who is in need, temporal or spiritual. When we are commanded to love our neighbour as ourselves, it is implied that it is a right thing to love ourselves. There is a true self-love. We are to love ourselves *intensely*. It does not appear that we can be too much in earnest about our own well-being. We are to love ourselves *rationally*. We are not to seek only a section of our interest, but we are to seek our true interest as a whole. In these respects our love to our neighbour is to resemble our love to ourselves. We are to love our neighbour in the same *intense* manner. His good is as much to God as is our own good. And in all ways in which we can advance his good we are to be as much in earnest about it as though we were advancing our own. We are to love our neighbour in the same *rational* manner. We may love intensely and yet be guided by reason. We are not to seek only part of our neighbour's good. To give as much time and attention to our neighbour's business as to our own would not ordinarily be for his good, nor would it be fair to one in comparison with another. Circumstances may arise in which duty may point to sacrifice for another, even to the extent of life. Let us, then, love our neighbour as we love ourselves, both intensely and rationally. The teaching of the apostle is that he who has observed the second table of the Law (as summarized) has fulfilled the whole Law. Surprise has been expressed why there should be no reference to the first table of the Law. But the reason is obvious. He who has only gone the length of the first table has not fulfilled the whole Law. Our love to God must be carried to completion, in our loving our neighbour as ourselves. According to the thought of the

Apostle John, we only properly love our Father-God, whom we do not see, when we love our brother-man whom we see. (3) *There is disaster at the opposite pole from love.* "But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another." The language is taken from wild beasts. The fact of the Galatians being thus warned may be explained partly by their excitable Celtic temperament. They are warned of what they might expect the consequences to be. None would come off victors, but they would be consumed one of another. In such biting and devouring there is a large consumption of *time*. There is distraction from useful work. There is sometimes the consumption of *means* in litigation. There may be the consumption of *life* in brawls. There is always the consumption of *good feeling*, and, along with that, there is the consumption of the richer elements of the spiritual life.

II. THE FLESH AND THE SPIRIT. 1. *The Christian rule is walking by the Spirit.* "But I say, Walk by the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh." The apostle calls attention to a point to which he advances in the subject he has in hand. This is laying down the Christian rule as between the flesh and the Spirit. In the flesh, or our depraved nature, there is lust or desire for sinful gratification in some form or another. How are we to be delivered from this, so that it shall not be fulfilled? The way is positively to follow the leading of the Spirit. The idea is not that we are to follow the tendencies of our renewed nature. That is missing the *personal* aspect of the leading. The Spirit, indeed, renews the nature, and excites within it holy desires which seek for gratification. But the Spirit gives personal guiding, especially in and by the reason and conscience in connection with the Word. And as a Guide he is all-sufficient. He is an internal Guide. He throws all the light that we need upon the character of desires and actions, upon the path of duty. And he affords timeous guidance. For whenever we are disposed to turn from the straight path to the right hand or to the left, it is then that we hear his voice behind us, saying, "This is the way, walk ye in it." 2. *The Christian rule is founded on a contrariety between the flesh and the Spirit.* "For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; for these are contrary the one to the other; that ye may not do the things that ye would." The lust excited within the flesh is against the desire excited by the Spirit; the desire excited by the Spirit is against the lust excited within the flesh. This conflict of desires is necessary. For the flesh and the Spirit are contraries. They represent depraved self and God. They are as far apart as light and darkness. What is true of the one, then, cannot be true of the other. What the one moves toward in desire, the other necessarily moves against. Of this conflict of desires we are conscious in our own experience. When the Spirit impels to good, the flesh opposes; when the flesh impels to evil, the Spirit opposes. Thus in two ways we cannot do the things that we would. And we have in this conflict of desires, as free beings, to determine whether the Spirit or the flesh shall have the dominion of our hearts. 3. *The Christian rule excludes regulation by the Law.* "But if ye are led by the Spirit, ye are not under the Law." The Spirit is an all-sufficient Guide. His regulation renders unnecessary all other regulation. He regulates within, and that is better than outward regulation. He regulates in connection with all circumstances that arise, and that is better than having the rule to apply for ourselves. He is a timeous monitor, warning when the danger arises, and that is better than being dependent on memory. 4. *There is contrast in the manifestations of the flesh and the Spirit.* (1) *The works of the flesh.* We are to understand manifestations of depravity, and concrete manifestations as distinguished from abstract qualities. Even when the abstract word is used, it is in the plural, with the effect of giving it a concrete character; not the feeling of wrath, but separate exhibitions of wrath; not the feeling of jealousy, but acts or workings of jealousy. (a) *What they are.* "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these." Before enumerating them the apostle describes them as *manifest*, i.e. easily distinguishable or glaring. It may be pointed to as a proof of depravity that vocabularies have more words descriptive of forms of sin than words descriptive of forms of holiness. Under the fruit of the Spirit he gives a list of nine. But under the works of the flesh his list extends to fifteen, properly sixteen. And the word translated "which" implies that he did not profess to give an exhaustive list—it would have been easy for him to have added other instances. This comparison is confirmed by the relative number of words for sins and graces employed in Scripture. (a) *Sins of uncleanness.* "Fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness." The second is the



generic word; the first describes a special form; the third describes a special aggravation, namely, open disregard of propriety. There is a sad prevalence of these sins still; it can only be said that they have been made more to hide their head. (B) *Illicit intercourse with the unseen world.* "Idolatry, sorcery." What is illicit in idolatry is the use of images to represent the unseen powers. What is illicit in sorcery (literally, "pharmacy") is the use of drugs, potions, and other things, with the idea that they can influence the unseen powers to produce love or hatred, prosperity or adversity. It can be said that this class of sins has almost disappeared with the diffusion of Christianity. (γ) *Breaches of charity.* "Enmities." This is the generic word; including not only the graver, but all breaches of charity. "Strife, jealousies." In strife the variance may be slight; in acts of jealousy there is more deep-seated variance. "Wraths, factions." The former describes outbursts of anger. The latter describes deliberate and concerted compassings of selfish ends, especially by means of intrigue. "Caballings" some translate it, "cabal" being made up of the initials of an English ministry in the reign of Charles II., who were credited with sacrificing principle to place. "Divisions, heresies." The former may only be of a temporary nature. Heresies, by which we are to understand not heretical opinions, but rather their embodiments in heretical sects, are divisions of a decisive nature. There is conveyed the idea of complete separation from the Church of Christ. Hence what is said of the heretic that he is condemned of himself, i.e. in cutting himself off he has carried out the extreme sentence on himself. "Envyings, murders." The latter is omitted in the Revised translation, against the manuscripts, and against the form of classification followed by the apostle under this head. The former is want of love to our neighbour in his property; the latter is want of love in that which is most precious to him. (δ) *Sins of intemperance.* "Drunkenness, revellings." The first is the generic word; the second brings in a special association, viz. joviality. The special point of view is to be noticed here. There are some who lay the blame of intemperance on the manufacture of drink, on facilities for its sale, on the customs of society. And it does bear a relation to these things. But the apostle goes to the root of the matter, in tracing it to the depravity of the human heart. Drunkenness and revellings are works of the flesh, manifestations of alienation from God. The advantage of this point of view is that it points to what can be the only effective remedy, viz. a change of heart through the operation of the Spirit. "And such like." He could have mentioned others. We may suppose that those are named which it was important for the Galatians to note. We can see that some of them would be connected with their temperament, which was neither melancholic nor phlegmatic, and also with their surroundings. We are not all inclined to sin in the same form or forms. That has a dependence on idiosyncrasies and surroundings. But we have all the same depraved heart for which to be humbled before God, and against which to pray. (b) *What they entail.* "Of the which I forewarn you, even as I did forewarn you, that they which practise such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." He is very emphatic in his warning of the Galatians. He had forewarned them when with them. Again he forewarns them. He acted on the principles enunciated in Ezekiel: "Son of man, I have made thee a watchman unto the house of Israel; therefore, hear the word at my mouth, and give them warning from me. When I say to the wicked, Thou shalt surely die; and thou givest him not warning, nor speakest to warn the wicked from his wicked way, to save his life: the same wicked man shall die in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at thine hand. Yet if thou warn the wicked, and he turn not from his wickedness, nor from his wicked way, he shall die in his iniquity, but thou hast delivered thy soul." What the apostle, in the spirit of these words, says, is that they which are in the habit of doing such things shall certainly be punished. Their very characters unfit them for the kingdom of God. Moreover, they are rebels against the government of God; and as such they must be dealt with. Their punishment is represented as exclusion from the inheritance which otherwise they would have gained. (2) *The fruit of the Spirit.* We are to understand the result of the workings of the Spirit. Fruit is applied here not to concrete manifestations or works, but to abstract qualities from which works proceed. It is not said that the fruit of the Spirit is manifest. Qualities are not so conspicuous as works, and especially spiritual qualities. The apostle refers us to qualities in the spiritual, not because he regards works as unimportant, but because qualities must so much be taken into account in estimating their

works. Fruit points to *organic unity*. The works of the flesh are confused and conflicting. One lust contends with another for the mastery. But the fruit of the Spirit is like well-formed fruit. All is consistent. And one grace by its growth does not take from another grace, but contributes to the richness and beauty of the whole. (a) *What it is*. "But the fruit of the Spirit is love." This stands at the head of the list as comprehending or carrying with it all the rest. This is a characteristic result of the Spirit's working. The apostle beseeches by the love of the Spirit. And we are told of the love of God, *i.e.* apparently the love which constitutes the very essence of God, being shed abroad in our hearts through the Holy Ghost given unto us. Therefore we need not be surprised at the apostle connecting the Spirit, first, with the imbuing, dyeing deep of our nature with love. "Joy, peace." These two go together, not as good dispositions, but as feelings which always accompany good dispositions. With the former we associate movements, thrills; with the latter we associate repose. God is infinite Love, and therefore he is infinite Joy and Peace. And our being, through the Spirit, pulsating with his, now he sends a thrill of joy through us, and now he introduces his own calm. Oh what a joy in what God is! What a height of ecstasy does it admit of! And what a calm too in what God is! It takes away all the feverishness of sins and quiets us to the very depths of our being. And ever, as love animates us as it animates God, does the thrill pass through us, and the calm come into us, expelling doubt and fear and all restlessness of spirit. "Long-suffering, kindness, goodness." These three go together. The first is bearing with others for their good. It is that which marks the outgoing of the Divine love toward us as sinners. And therefore it is fitting that it should be reflected in us. Love (not only in God, but in all beings) "suffereth long," and, it is added, "is kind." The word translated "kindness" seems to point to delight in men as our fellow-beings. God delights in us as beings whom he has made. He feels kindly disposed toward us, as a father does toward his children. And so are we to delight in others for what they are, especially as having come from God, wearing a noble nature. And we are to feel kindly disposed toward them, wishing especially that, as they have a noble nature, they may not fail of having a noble character. The word translated "goodness" seems to point to a disposition to benefit others; extending to all forms in which they can be benefited. The highest form of goodness is when we are impelled to help others to live well. "Faithfulness, meekness, temperance." The first is having such a love for our neighbour that we would not injure him by breaking our promise to him. God is a Rock, while infinite tenderness, and there should be something of the rock in us, that dependence may be placed on us in the various relations of life. Meekness is required when wrong has been inflicted on us. It especially points to us having the command of our feelings under wrong. Temperance is self-command. It has come to have a special reference to our having the command of our appetites. When temperance is born of worldly prudence or of self-reliance it is not what it should be. It is only real and beautiful and everlasting when it is produced by the Spirit, when it is the outcome of a changed heart. (b) *What it does not entail*. "Against such there is no Law." The apostle might have extended his list. He would have us think not of these only, but of all such, and think this regarding all such, that against them there is no Law. If these things are in us, then the Law can never be adverse to us. We shall be removed beyond the condemnation of all Law. That is his way of saying that we shall be blessed. We shall be blessed in the very possession of these dispositions and feelings. We shall be blessed in our enjoying the smile of God.

5. *Christians are being delivered from the flesh*. "And they that are of Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with the passions and the lusts thereof." At a past period, in idea, they crucified the flesh. That idea is now being carried out into fact. There is a deadening, a slow and painful crucifying going on in the flesh. Its passions are being depleted of their heat; its lusts are being depleted of their force. The conflict is still going on; but the Spirit is gaining triumphs over the flesh, and there is promise of the Spirit gaining a complete triumph, of the flesh with all its inclinations to sin being annihilated.

6. *The Christian rule re-enforced*. "If we live by the Spirit, by the Spirit let us also walk." If the life of the Galatians had depended on the Law, then their first and imperative duty would have been to have submitted to circumcision; and their duty after that would have been to have subjected themselves to the whole discipline of the Mosaic ordinances. But, as they were in the better position of depending

entirely for their life on the Spirit, it was their duty to take the rule of their life simply from him. 7. *The Christian rule is applied to vain-glory.* "Let us not be vain-glorious, provoking one another, envying one another." Vain-glory is glorying in what we do not have, or in what we have in a way that is not real or according to a false standard. The spirit of the practice is sufficiently brought out in the language here. There is a provoking, literally a calling forth, to the field of contest. As the result of the trial, some are filled with a sense of their importance as superior in strength or in agility, in birth or in wealth, in culture or in honour. And others are filled with envy of those who are thus superior. But as we are not to glory in fancied possessions, so we are not to glory in possessions as though we had bestowed them on ourselves, or with an exaggerated idea of their importance. That would be glorying in what had not foundation in reality. "But he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord." Let us glory in what God is, and let us glory also in what God has bestowed upon us. Let us glory especially in having a covenant standing before God, and in covenant grace which has passed into our characters. That is having a foundation of reality for our glorying.—R. F.

Ver. 1.—*Christian freedom.* St. Paul concludes the arguments and expostulations of the two previous chapters with a vigorous exhortation. This has, of course, its special application to the condition of the Galatian Churches, and the liberty to which it directly applies is deliverance from the bondage of Law. But it admits of wider application to the circumstances of our own day. We have here brought before us a privilege, a danger, and a duty.

I. A PRIVILEGE. Christ confers freedom (see John viii. 36). 1. *Religious freedom.* (1) From servile terrors of superstition; (2) from priestly tyranny; (3) from mechanical ritual; (4) from external constraints in moral and religious life; and (5) from the rule of the flesh over the spirit. 2. *Intellectual freedom.* Unbelievers sometimes arrogate to themselves the proud title of free-thinkers; yet it would seem too often that the only freedom they allow is freedom for expressing ideas with which they sympathize. The bigotry of Roman Catholic intolerance seems likely to be equalled by the bigotry that many leading opponents of Christianity show towards those who decline to abandon their faith. It is Christ who breaks the fetters of the mind. The Christian dares to think. The grounds of this liberty are (1) loyalty to truth, and faith in its ultimate triumph; (2) light and power to attain truth. 3. *Political freedom.* This is the outgrowth of Christianity (1) through the spread of the spirit of universal brotherhood, and (2) through the cultivation of conscience which makes the gift of liberty safe.

II. A DANGER. Christian freedom is in danger. 1. It is *attacked from without.* It has to face the assaults of the ambitious. There are always those who desire to exercise undue influence over others. There is danger in officialism. The official appointed as a servant of the general body usurps the place of the master. The fable of the horse who invited a man to ride him is thus often exemplified. 2. It is *undermined from within.* The force of habit wears grooves that become deep ruts out of which we cannot stir. The dead hand lies heavy upon us. Creeds which were the expression of free thought contending in open controversy in one age become the bonds and fetters of a later age. Ritual, which palpitated with living emotion when it first joined itself naturally as the body to clothe the soul of worship, becomes fossilized, and yet it is cherished and venerated though it hangs about men's necks as a dead weight. The very atmosphere of liberty is too bracing for some of us. It will not allow us to sleep. Therefore love of indolence is opposed to it.

III. A DUTY. We are called to take a stand against all encroachments on our Christian freedom. Here is a call to Christian manliness. The freedom is given by Christ; but we are exhorted to maintain it. He fought to win it; we must fight to hold it. This is not a mere question of choice—a matter only of our own inclination or interest; it is a solemn duty. We must stand firm for liberty on several accounts. 1. That we may not be *degraded to servitude.* It is a man's duty not to become a slave because slavery produces moral deterioration. 2. That we may have *scope for the unhampered service of God and man.* 3. That we may *hand down to generations following the heritage of liberty.* Once lost it cannot be easily recovered. We owe to

our descendants the duty of maintaining intact the entail of a grand possession which we received from our forefathers, and which was secured to them at great cost.—W. F. A.

Ver. 5.—*The hope of righteousness.* I. WHAT IT IS. The hope of righteousness appears to be the hope of realizing righteousness, the hope of becoming righteous. In St. Paul's language a hope is not our subjective anticipation, but the thing for which we hope. Such a possession we as Christians anticipate. 1. *Righteousness is a great treasure.* It is a worthy object of desire. It is better than any rewards it may entail. To hunger and thirst after righteousness is to feel the deepest and purest appetite for the best of all spiritual possessions. 2. *Righteousness is not yet enjoyed.* It is a hope. Even the Christian who has the faith that admits to it has not yet the full heritage. The longer we live the higher does the magnificent ideal tower above us until it is seen reaching up to heaven. Some righteousness we enter into with the first effort of faith, but the foretaste is only enough to make us yearn for more. 3. *We may confidently hope for righteousness.* It is a hope, not a mere surmise, that urges us forward. We are encouraged by the promises of the gospel. It is a grand inspiring thought that every Christian has the prospect of ultimate victory over all sin and ultimate attainment of pure and spotless goodness.

II. HOW WE ARE TO REGARD IT. We are to wait for it. 1. We must *exercise patience.* Sudden perfect holiness is impossible. The idea that it has been attained is one of the most awful delusions that have ever ensnared the minds of good men. Physically, of course, it is possible for us never to sin, and to be perfectly holy, as physically there is nothing to prevent us from drawing a mathematically straight line; but in experience the one is no more realized than the other, and morally both are equally impossible. The law of life is progress by gradual development. 2. Nevertheless, we must *earnestly anticipate* the future righteousness. We must wait for it as those who wait for the morning, *i.e.* we must watch. To be indifferent about it is not to wait for it. Indifference will disinherit us from the hope.

III. WITH WHAT GRACE WE CAN THUS REGARD IT. 1. *Through the Spirit.* Here as often elsewhere we cannot be certain whether the apostle is referring to the Spirit of God or to our spirit. The two work together. Human spirituality is the fruit of the inspiration of the Divine Spirit. It is in this spiritual state of mind that we hate sin and long for righteousness, and have glimpses of the future that cheer us with the prospect of the great hope. Our desires and anticipations are always fashioned and coloured by the state of our hearts. Waiting for the hope of righteousness is a habit of soul only possible to those who are spiritually minded. 2. *By faith.* Here we come to the key and secret of the whole experience. Faith (1) makes us heirs of righteousness; (2) is the present assurance of things hoped for, and therefore of this great hope; and (3) leads us into that spiritual atmosphere where waiting for the hope of righteousness becomes natural to us.—W. F. A.

Ver. 6.—*Faith working through love.* St. Paul has just been writing of the relation of faith to hope (ver. 5). He now shows how it is connected with love. We can only separate the Christian graces in thought. In experience they blend and interact one with another.

I. FAITH IS AN ACTIVE POWER. It works. Christ tells us that it can move mountains. Through lack of faith the disciples had not strength to cure a lunatic boy (Matt. xvii. 19, 20). This faith of St. Paul is very different from the "dead" faith which St. James scouted with so much scorn. It is not a cold intellectual conviction of the truth of certain propositions called collectively a creed. Nor is it a mere passive reliance upon the efficacy of the "finished work of Christ," or upon the grace of God which is to do everything for us while we slumber in indifference, or upon Christ himself solely as a Saviour. It is active trust rousing all the energies of our soul to loyal service.

II. FAITH SHOWS ITS ENERGY IN LOVE. We do not read of love working through faith as some would prefer to regard the mutual operation of the two graces. We are familiar with the idea of love as a motive, and we can well understand how faith might give it a ground and channel of definite action. But the converse is here.

Faith begins to operate in its own energy and discovers a field of enterprise in love. 1. *Faith inspires love*, as love also in turn inspires faith. We believe in and trust the goodness of Christ, and so we are moved to love him. If we did not believe in his love we should never return it. 2. Faith having once roused love exercises itself in *promoting the objects of love*. We trust in the unseen God, we also love him; then we try to please him, to enjoy his favour, and to live in his presence—objects of love; but objects we should never seek if we were not supported and urged on by our belief in and trust to what is beyond our sight and experience.

III. FAITH WORKING THROUGH LOVE IS THE ONE ESSENTIAL CONDITION OF SUCCESS IN THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. Circumcision is of no use. Uncircumcision and the liberty that boasts of it by themselves are useless. Mere barren liberty is nothing. Freedom is conferred that in it we may have a field and range for noble enterprises. Mere rites, baptism, etc., mere observance of religious services, will not advance us in the spiritual life, neither will resistance to the bondage of such things. The negative side of Protestantism is no gospel if we rest only in that. Spiritual, active life is the great thing. Faith alone would not suffice, because our supreme duties are love of God and love of man, and faith is only valuable as it leads up to these. But love alone would not suffice, for without faith, even if it came into being, it would languish and perish in despair. "Faith working through love"—this is the motto for the healthy Christian life. He who relinquishes this will turn not only to a lower method, but to a worthless and fatal one. Nothing else will avail, and nothing more is needed for growth up to the attainment of the most perfect saintliness and the most fruitful service.—W. F. A.

Ver. 7.—*Hindered*. I. PAST ATTAINMENTS DO NOT DISPENSE WITH THE NECESSITY OF PRESENT PROGRESS. "Ye did run well." So far, so good. That was a matter of thankfulness. But it would count for nothing against the unworthiness of a slackened pace. Old laurels wither. Every day has its new duties. We must not waste to-day in congratulating ourselves on the success of yesterday. The tide is against us; to rest on the oars is to be swept back. No nation can prosper on its past history if the spirit of heroism has forsaken its citizens. As Christians, we never reach the goal till we have crossed the river of death. Till then we must be ever "pressing on and bearing up," or we shall assuredly make shipwreck even after earnestly running over the longest, steepest, roughest course.

II. PAST ATTAINMENTS CONDEMN US FOR NEGLECTING PRESENT PROGRESS. We are judged by our own past selves. Our history is witness against us. The past proves that we could run well. It shows that we admitted the obligation to do so. Those who have never known Christ may plead ignorance. But they who have tasted of his grace and experienced the blessings of it and used it for some work in the Christian life, are without excuse if they turn aside at last.

III. PAST ATTAINMENTS MAKE THE NEGLECT OF PRESENT PROGRESS PECULIARLY SAD. It is melancholy to see a life rendered abortive from the first, but it is much more mournful to witness the failure of a life that began in promise and made good way towards success. All the hopes and toils and sacrifices of the past are wasted. How painful to be so near the goal and yet to give up the race! to sink within sight of the haven! Such a broken life, like a day opening in a cheerful dawn and passing through a bright noon to a dark and stormy night, is of all lives most deplorable. "Ye did run well; who did hinder you"—what pathos there is in these words! Christ wept over Jerusalem sadder tears than the ruin of Sodom could call forth.

IV. WE MUST BEWARE OF THE DANGER OF NEGLECTING PRESENT PROGRESS AFTER SUCCEEDING WITH PAST ATTAINMENTS. "Who did hinder you?" There must have been new hindrances and possibly surprises and unexpected checks. 1. We must *not rest satisfied with the establishment of good habits*. Habits may be broken. 2. We must be *prepared for new difficulties*. The way that is now so smooth may become suddenly rough and stony.

"We know the anxious strife, the eternal laws,  
To which the triumph of all good is given—  
High sacrifice, and labour without pause,  
Even to the death; else wherefore should the eye  
Of man converse with immortality?"

But let us not forget that if some may hinder us there is One more mighty than all to help us.—W. F. A.

Ver. 9.—*Leaven*. A familiar proverb applied in the present instance to doctrinal errors, introduced by a small party of Judaizers, but tending to spread through the whole community of Galatian Christians. The proverb is useful, however, as a caution against the spreading of evil generally.

I. THE PRINCIPLE. Evil is like leaven. 1. It has a *life of its own*. Leaven is the yeast-plant. We must not neglect evil with contempt as an inert dead thing. A low and horrible kind of life infests the remains of death. The lower in the order of life the organism is the more persistent will its vitality be. Yeast may be preserved dry for months and yet retain its power of fermentation. The most degraded forms of evil are the most difficult to destroy. 2. Evil, like leaven, *spreads rapidly*. Leaven is the chosen emblem of evil, just on account of its extraordinary rate of growth. While the Church slumbers her enemy is sleepless. If we are not actively resisting evil it will be constantly encroaching upon the domain of goodness. It is folly to neglect a small evil. A child may stamp out a flame which, neglected, would burn a city. Scotch the young vipers while they are yet in the nest, or the brood will crawl far and wide beyond our reach. 3. Evil, like leaven, *assimilates* what it touches. The best men are injured by contact with it. All the powers and faculties of the individual, all the resources and institutions of the community, are brought under its fatal spell and turned to its vile uses. 4. Evil, like leaven, *is associated with corruption*. Fermentation is the first stage of decomposition. The leaven of evil is the leaven of moral rotteness and death.

II. APPLICATIONS OF THE PRINCIPLE. 1. *Doctrinal*. A small error unchecked grows into a great perversion of truth. A lie once admitted spreads deceit and confusion in all directions. 2. *Ecclesiastical*. The Jewish custom advocated by a few of the Galatian Christians seemed to some, perhaps, an insignificant matter. But if it had been permitted to spread, undoubtedly it would have broken up the whole Church. 3. *Moral*. (See 1 Cor. v. 6.) The taint of immorality spreads like a noxious contagion, (1) in the nation—for the whole country's sake we must not allow "the residuum" to sink into corruption; (2) in the Church—hence the necessity of reviving Church discipline; (3) in the individual—small faults breed great sins. Beware of "the little foxes that spoil the grapes."—W. F. A.

Vers. 13—15.—*Liberty and not licence*. I. THE DANGER. St. Paul was no antinomian. No Hebrew prophet ever insisted more strenuously on the necessity of righteousness than did the champion of justification by faith. With him freedom from the bondage of Law is not release from the obligations of duty. If tedious ceremonial observances are discarded, eternal principles of morality are only exalted into the higher supremacy. If we are not required to shape our conduct according to rigid rules, we are thrown back on principles of wider bearing and more absolute necessity. But there was danger that this should not be fully recognized. New-fledged liberty is tempted to take strange flights. This is an inevitable peril accompanying an undoubted boon. For fear of it many have dreaded to grant the liberty. But such policy is short-sighted and cowardly. The danger is itself the condemnation of the old bondage. The worst indictment against slavery is that it makes men servile. Unwise parents, who impose needlessly irksome home restraints, are preparing for their children a terrible peril when the coveted liberty is at length necessarily attained. The compressed spring is sure to open with violent energy.

II. THE CAUTION. How shall the danger be avoided? St. Paul points out the means. 1. *Admonition*. Let men see clearly the two sides of life. While some dwell exclusively on Law, others confine themselves too much to the mere fact of liberty. Much gospel preaching is dangerous from its one-sidedness. In preaching "liberty to the captives," let us not forget to preach also that "the kingdom of heaven is at hand;" in offering the blessings conferred by Christ as the Saviour, let us not neglect to set forth claims made by him as the King. 2. *Instruction*. Liberty requires light. The captive may be led in darkness; the freeman must see where to turn his footsteps. Ignorance may be the mother of the devotion of spiritual slaves, but knowledge is

necessary for the devotion of free men. 3. *High principle.* It is only the spiritually minded who are fit for spiritual liberty. We are only able safely to use our release from the servitude of Law when we willingly put on the yoke of service one towards another. The unselfish man is the one man who can use without abusing the privilege of the free man. He who has Christian charity joined to his Christian liberty will fulfil the essential principles of the Law while exulting in deliverance from its crushing constraints.—W. F. A.

Ver. 16.—*Walking by the Spirit.* I. THE TRUE CHRISTIAN WILL AIM AT NOT FULFILLING THE LUST OF THE FLESH. It is the fashion of the age to deify asceticism. St. Paul was not an advocate of the monkish ideal according to which there was a virtue in restraining desires and activities which are harmless in themselves. But this revolution of our own day with its "fleshy school" of poets goes much further in the opposite direction and honours as "natural," what St. Paul would repress as "carnal." It ignores two most important facts. 1. *We have a higher and a lower nature.* A man is as much an animal as a dog is. But he is also something more. In his right state the spiritual controls the animal in him. To be truly natural is not to reverse this relative position. To permit the lower self to dominate the upper self is to allow a most unnatural rebellion against right order to take place within us. As it is natural for a man to walk with his head erect, and as he is in an unnatural posture when he has fallen with his head downwards, so, as Bishop Butler has taught us, it is truly natural for conscience to be supreme, and it is going against nature to let the lower powers have unbridled liberty. 2. *Our lower nature is unduly powerful.* It has been indulged. It has broken through its proper restraints. It has grown too strong, while the higher spiritual nature has been starved and checked and weakened. As fallen creatures, we have lost the right balance of our powers. Our present nature is a corrupt nature. To reverence the unrestrained exercise of all our nature, as it now is, is to treat corruption and confusion with the honour that belongs only to order and perfection. The evil of the unrestrained sway of the lower nature is seen in its fruits. Poetry hides them, but conscientious truthfulness declares them, and a more hideous collection of horrors cannot be imagined (vers. 19—21). Such fruits are certain proofs that the root is evil. Hence the aim of all right-minded men must be to check the "lust of the flesh."

II. THE SECRET OF SUCCESS IN THIS AIM IS WALKING BY THE SPIRIT. It cannot be accomplished by mere resistance and repression. This is why the method of Law failed. No laws will make a nation moral. Positive influences only can counteract the furious passions of the lower nature. We must walk by the Spirit. 1. *Spiritual things must be the chief concerns of our lives.* We must draw off our thoughts from the lower things by engaging them with the higher. Our own spiritual nature will thus grow stronger to resist the impulses of "the flesh." 2. *God's Holy Spirit must be sought as the guide and strength of our highest activities.* Our spirituality can only flourish as the outcome of the indwelling Spirit of God. A real, direct influence will thus strengthen our better selves against the evil powers within. 3. *Spirituality growing out of the indwelling of God's Spirit must become a habit of daily life.* It is not enough that we have brief moments of devout elevation above earthly things, if, when we return to the world, our hearts and minds are as much occupied with the lower interests of life as if we knew no others. We must "pray without ceasing." The tone and temper of our mind in the world must be above the world. 4. *This condition is realized through union with Christ.* The Spirit we need is "the Spirit of Christ." When we are Christ's we crucify "the flesh with the passions and lusts thereof," and learn to walk by the Spirit.—W. F. A.

Ver. 17.—*The two selves.* I. EVERY MAN HAS TWO SELVES—A HIGHER SELF AND A LOWER SELF. 1. *A bad man has his better self.* When temptation is away, in calm thoughtful moments, or when he is stricken by mortal illness or bowed with a great sorrow, or perhaps when the beauty of a sunset or the strains of sweet music call up memories of childhood, the true self will rise in the heart of a wicked man with pain and unutterable regrets. 2. *A good man has his lower self.* The human saint is far removed from the heavenly angel. The body and its appetites are with him; the

soul has its meaner powers, its earthly passions, its self-regarding interests. There are times when the spiritual life is dull and feeble; then some sudden temptation, or even without that the depressing atmosphere of the world, will reveal to a man his worse side.

II. **THE TWO SELVES ARE IN CONFLICT.** They are not content to lie at peace each in its own domain. Both are ambitious to rule the whole man. While the flesh brooks any restraint, the Spirit strives to bring the body into subjection. Thus it comes to pass that life is a warfare and the Christian a soldier. The battle of life is not mainly a fighting against adverse circumstances and external concrete evils of the world. "A man's foes are they of his own household," say, of his own heart. The great conflict is internal. It is civil war—rebellion and the effort to quell it; of all wars the most fierce.

III. **THE CONFLICT BETWEEN THE TWO SELVES IS SUCH THAT EACH IS HELD IN CHECK BY THE OTHER.** "Ye cannot do the things that ye would." There is a deadlock. Each army holds itself safe in its own entrenchments. Neither can turn the enemy's position. Not that there is perfect balance of power. In most of us one or other force gives a temporary advantage. In many the lower self has the upper hand; in many, let us thank God, the better self maintains the supremacy. But neither has the victory that will enable it to drive the other off the field. Bad men, now and again, see yawning before them deep, black pits of wickedness, from the brink of which they start back in horror, arrested by the invisible hand of conscience. No man is wholly bad, or he would cease to be a man—he would be a devil. On the other hand, it is clear to all of us that no good man is wholly good.

IV. **IN THE STRENGTH OF THE SPIRIT OF CHRIST THE BETTER SELF OF THE CHRISTIAN WILL ULTIMATELY OBTAIN COMPLETE VICTORY.** The stress and strain of the war is but for a time. In the end all enemies shall be subdued. Meanwhile the secret of success is with those who "walk by the Spirit." So great a hope should lighten "the burden of the mystery."

"The heavy and the weary weight  
Of all this unintelligible world."

Now life is broken, confused, inconsistent, discordant. But this is but the time of passing conflict. With victory there will come true harmony of being and growth to the full stature of the soul.—W. F. A.

Vers. 22, 23.—*The fruit of the Spirit.* I. **THE GRACES OF THE CHRISTIAN LIFE GROW OUT OF THE INDWELLING OF THE SPIRIT OF GOD.** Neither of the two rival theories of Greek philosophers—that virtue comes by practice and that it is taught by instruction—would commend itself to St. Paul. Nor would he agree with Plato that it arises in the intuitive recollection of innate ideas, nor with Aristotle that it is the result of habits. Neither would he permit the modern separation of religion from morals. Morals need the inspiration of religion. Religion when truly alive must control conduct. The first great essential is for our spirit to be possessed by the Spirit of Christ through faith in him. Then Christian graces will appear as fruits of the Spirit. We must begin within. We cannot produce fruits by manipulating the outside of a dead stump. Life is the one essential, and from life within grows fruit without. Only internal spiritual life can produce external Christian graces.

II. **NEVERTHELESS, THE CHRISTIAN GRACES NEED TO BE DIRECTLY CULTIVATED.** Although the tree produces the fruit from its own life, the branches must be pruned and trained and the fruit sheltered from cold and protected from vermin and wild birds. It is not enough to think only of the inmost sources of a holy life. We must watch the course of it and guide it aright throughout. Christian ethic is an important branch of religious instruction, and is not to be ignored as unimportant because it is only serviceable in subordination to the cultivation of the inner spiritual life.

III. **THE CHRISTIAN GRACES HAVE SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THEIR OWN.** Such a list as is here given by St. Paul has a character of its own. Some of its constituent parts might be found in a heathen moralist; perhaps all of them; for there is a common conscience in all mankind. But the selection as a whole and the form and character of it are foreign to the atmosphere of paganism. The one significant fact about it is that



it is a *portrait of Christ*. Christianity is putting on Christ. He is our great Exemplar. Our true life is walking in his footsteps. In particular note: 1. Attention is directed to *internal principles* rather than to external rules of conduct. St. Paul cared little for casuistry. 2. Emphasis is laid on the *gentler graces*. Pagan ethics treat chiefly of masculine virtues. Christian ethics add what are commonly called the feminine. Yet there is nothing unmanly in the gentleness of true nobility of character thus revealed. 3. *Charity and its fruits* receive the principal place in the list.

IV. THE PARTICULAR GRACES IN THE LIST GIVEN BY ST. PAUL ARE WORTHY OF SEPARATE CONSIDERATION. 1. Three graces of *general disposition*: (1) love, the root of all joy; (2) the special joy of self-sacrificing love; and (3) peace, attained later, but more constant when attained. 2. Three graces in *our conduct with others*: (1) passive long-suffering; (2) kindness, which wishes well to others; and (3) beneficence, which does it. 3. Three more *general graces*: (1) fidelity, not made unnecessary by general kindness; (2) meekness when opposed by the evil in other men; (3) self-control in keeping under the evil in ourselves. "Against such," says St. Paul, with a touch of humour, "there is no Law."—W. F. A.

## EXPOSITION.

### CHAPTER VI.

Ver. 1.—Brethren, if (or, *although*) a man be overtaken in a fault (*ἀδελφοί, ἐὰν καὶ προληφθῆ ἄνθρωπος ἐν τινὶ παραπτώματι*); brethren, if even a man hath been overtaken in some trespass. "Brethren;" the compellation so introduced betokens a somewhat pathetic urgency; cf. above, ch. iii. 15; iv. 31; v. 11. But Phil. iii. 13, 17 suffice to show that its occurrence at the beginning of a sentence does not necessarily indicate the commencement of a new section of discourse—to which notion we, perhaps, owe the division of chapters here made. In fact, this paragraph is most closely connected with the preceding; the apostle's object being to point out that not even a moral delinquency into which a brother has fallen should lead us to indulge ourselves in any feeling of superiority in dealing with him, or to vaunt even to our own selves (see ver. 4) our greater consistency. In short, he is enforcing by a strong instance the exhortation in ver. 26, "Let us not be vain-glorious." "If even a man hath been overtaken." The apostle supposes the case as one which might very well present itself; the form of expression (*ἐὰν, not εἰ*), however, not pointing to such a case having already occurred. How possible the supposed case was, was plain enough from the enumeration of the "works of the flesh" above given, so many and so multiform. Some critics have embarrassed themselves by supposing that the *καὶ* ("even") must, of course, emphasize the first succeeding word *προληφθῆ*, "hath been overtaken." But it may just as probably be meant to emphasize the whole clause, "a man hath been overtaken in some trespass." This is proved by a number of other

instances; thus: Luke xi. 8, "if (*καὶ*) even he will not give them unto him because he is a friend;" 1 Cor. vii. 21, "but if even thou art able to become free;" 2 Cor. iv. 3; xi. 6. The verb *προλαμβάνω* occurs besides in the New Testament in Mark xiv. 8, "she hath come beforehand to anoint [or, 'she hath anticipated the anointing of'] my body;" and 1 Cor. xi. 21, "taketh before other his own supper." A more helpful illustration, however, is furnished by Wisd. xvii. 17, where, speaking of the horrible darkness falling quite suddenly upon the Egyptians, the writer says, "Whether he were husbandman or shepherd or labourer in the field, he was overtaken and endured (*προληφθεὶς ἔμενε*) the ill-avoidable necessity;" the *πρὸ* in the compound verb meaning before he could help himself in any way. So here, *προληφθῆ* means be surprised, overtaken, before he is well aware what it really is that he is doing. "Surprised;" but by whom or what? Not by a person detecting the offender in the very act; as if it were equivalent to *καταληφθῆ ἑπαντοφάρφ* (John viii. 4); for the apostle is not at all concerned with the evidence for the delinquency, which is the important consideration in John viii. 4, but simply with the *fact*. Rather, overtaken by the force of temptation; as the verb "taken" is used with "temptation" in 1 Cor. x. 13; hence the words which follow, "lest thou also be tempted." The writer thus commends the delinquent to sympathetic commiseration. But there is no palliation indicated by the word "fault" or "trespass." Not once in the fifteen other passages in the New Testament in which the noun *παραπτώμα* occurs is there any token of such palliation being intended. The petition, "forgive us our trespasses," is sufficient to exemplify

this statement. The trespass may be nothing less than one of the works of the flesh before specified. The preposition ἐν—"in," not "by"—points to the unhappy condition in which the delinquent is supposed to be, out of which it is the business of Christian charity to extricate him. Compare the expressions, "die in your sins;" "dead in trespasses;" and the imagery of a "snare of the devil," in 2 Tim. ii. 26. Ye which are spiritual, restore such a one (ὁμοίως οἱ πνευματικοὶ καταρτίζετε τὸν τοιοῦτον). The apostle intimates that the business of recovering a fallen brother is one which those Christians are not qualified to undertake who, by reason of the strong tincture of the flesh still existing in their moral character, may themselves be justly styled "carnal" (comp. 1 Cor. iii. 1). Putting as it were such persons on one side, the apostle summons to the work those in whom the Spirit hath gained so marked an ascendancy that, compared with the generality of Christians, they may be classed as "spiritual." It was incumbent on such (he says) not to stand aloof, as if it were not their concern, or as if the delinquent were to be treated as an enemy or outcast (comp. 2 Thess. iii. 15), far less to indulge themselves in taking pleasure in his inconsistency as illustrating their own spirituality, but to come forward to his assistance. Others, who might justly feel less qualified to act in the case themselves, might, however, take from the apostle's direction the hint that at least they should lend their sympathy to the work of their more capable brethren, desire and pray for their erring brother's recovery, and not exult over his fault. The verb καταρτίζειν, "to make a thing fit, even, just that which it properly should be," is used in Matt. iv. 21 of repairing nets; 1 Cor. i. 10 of a Christian community restored to its proper condition of unanimity; 1 Thess. iii. 10 of making good any lacking of faith. It is used also (Liddell and Scott) of setting a broken limb. But there is nothing to show that the apostle has any one particular image of disorder in view. The present tense of the imperative seems to mean, "apply yourselves to restore him;" the actual achievement (καταρτίσατε) may not be in their power. In the spirit of meekness (ἐν πνεύματι πραΰτητος); in a spirit of meekness. We have the same phrase in 1 Cor. iv. 21, "Shall I come to you with a rod, or in love and a spirit of meekness?" The term "spirit" seems as it were to hover between the sense of the Holy Spirit and of that particular condition of our own spirit which is produced by his influence (compare "spirit of adoption," Rom. vii. 15). But the latter seems here the one more immediately intended. It is not identical,

however, with the phrase, "meek spirit," which we have in 1 Pet. iii. 4. The meekness or tenderness meant is that of one who, humbly conscious of human infirmity in general, his own infirmity included, is prepared to be very considerate and gentle towards the ignorant and those out of the way; loth to use the "rod." Considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted (σκοπὸν σεαυτὸν, μὴ καὶ σὺ πειρασθῆς); looking to thine own self, lest thou also be tempted. The change from the plural to the singular makes the warning more impressive and searching. The verb σκοπεῖν in the New Testament always denotes looking intently; sometimes on something to be guarded against, as Luke xi. 35 and Rom. xvi. 17; at other times, at something to be aimed at or imitated (2 Cor. iv. 18; Phil. ii. 4; iii. 17). The former is meant here. The Christian is to be on his guard against his own weak and corrupt nature; lest he withhold help, or adequate help; lest in helping he get betrayed into the sin of Pharisaic self-righteousness—the sin of harshness, censoriousness. The clause is to be viewed in conjunction with the thought of the unceasing conflict between the flesh and the Spirit mentioned in ch. v. 17. "Tempted," so as to fall (1 Cor. vii. 5; 1 Thess. iii. 5; Matt. vi. 13).

Ver. 2.—Bear ye one another's burdens (ἀλλήλων τὰ βάρη βαστάετε); carry ye, or, be ready to carry, the heavy loads of one another. The position of ἀλλήλων gives it especial prominence; as it stands here it seems pregnant with the exhortation, "Look not every man only at his own griefs, but at the griefs also of others" (cf. Phil. ii. 4). The word βάρος, weight, points to an excessive weight, such as it is a toil to carry. Matt. xx. 12, "who have borne the burden (βαστάσασι τὰ βάρη) and heat of the day." So in Acts xv. 28. In 2 Cor. iv. 17, "weight of glory," the phrase, suggested by the double sense of the Hebrew word *kabhôd*, indicates the enormous greatness of the future glory. The supposition that the apostle was glancing at the burden of Mosaic observances, superseded as a matter for care on our part by the burdens of our brethren, seems far-fetched. These "heavy loads" are those which a man brings upon himself by acts of transgression: such as an uneasy conscience; difficulties in his domestic, social, or Church relations; pecuniary embarrassments; or other. But the precept seems to go beyond the requirements of the particular case of a peccant brother which has suggested it, and to take in all the needs, spiritual or secular, which we are subject to. (For βαστάειν of carrying a toilsome burden, comp. Matt. viii. 17; John xix. 17; Acts

xv. 10.) And so fulfil the law of Christ (καὶ οὕτως ἀναπληρώσατε [or, ἀναπληρώσατε] τὸν νόμον τοῦ Χριστοῦ); and so fulfil (or, ye shall fulfil) the law of Christ. The sense comes to much the same, whether in the Greek we read the future indicative or the aorist imperative. If the imperative be retained, it yet adds no new element of precept to the foregoing; the clause so read prescribes the fulfilment of Christ's law in the particular form of bearing one another's burdens. If we read the future, the clause affirms that in so doing we shall fulfil his law; which in the other case is implied. Many have supposed the word "law" to be here used for a specific commandment; as for example Christ's new commandment that we should love one another. So St. James (ii. 8) writes of the "royal law." St. Paul, however, never uses the term in this sense in his own writing, though in the Epistle to the Hebrews (viii. 10; x. 16), the plural "laws" occurs in citation from Jeremiah. It seems better to take it of the whole moral institution of Christ, whether conveyed in distinct precept or in his example and spirit of action. Compare with the present passage the advice which St. Paul gives the "strong" (Rom. xv. 1—4), that they should bear (βαρᾶν) as here, "carry" the infirmities of the weak, and not wish to please themselves; after Christ's pattern set forth in prophetic Scripture, of old time written in order to instruct us how we should act. It has been often observed that the phrase, "the law of Christ," was selected with allusion to the stir now being made among the Galatians respecting the Law of Moses. "Satisfy ye the requirements of the Law—not of Moses which some are prating about, but the law of Christ, a more perfect law than that other, and more our proper concern." Possibly the words τοῦ Χριστοῦ παρ' ὑπόνοιαν, as the scholiasts on Aristophanes are wont to express it—"and thus fulfil the law—of Christ!"

Ver. 3.—For if a man think himself to be something, when he is nothing, he deceiveth himself (εἰ γὰρ δοκεῖ τις εἶναι τι μὴδὲν ὄν, φρεναπατᾶ ἑαυτὸν [Receptus, ἑαυτὸν φρεναπατᾶ]); for if a man is nothing and thinketh himself to be something, he is deceiving his own soul. The conjunction "for" points back to the practical direction just given to the "spiritual;" meaning that for those who wished to be, and also perhaps to be thought to be, fulfilling Christ's law, this was the behaviour which they were to carry out, and without which their claim was mere self-delusion. The phrase, δοκεῖ εἶναι τι μὴδὲν ὄν, is well illustrated by the passage cited by critics from Plato's 'Apologia,' p. 41, E: Ἐὰν δοκῶσι τι

εἶναι μὴδὲν ὄντες, δυνεῖδ(ετέ αὐτοῖς . . . ὅτι . . . οἴονται τι εἶναι ὄντες οὐδενὸς ἄξιοι. "Something" is, by a common meiosis, put for "something considerable" (cf. ch. ii. 6). The especial form of eminence, the claim to which is here referred to, is eminence in spirituality and consistency as a servant of Christ. Possibly the apostle has in his eye certain individuals among the Galatians that he had heard of, who, professing much, were, however, self-complacently bitter and contemptuous towards brethren who had gone wrong in moral conduct or who differed from themselves in the disputes then rife in those Churches. The phrase, μὴδὲν ὄν, "being nothing," is a part of the hypothesis relative to the individual case spoken of, not a statement putting forth the aphorism that no one is really anything. The passage quoted above from Plato shows, that in the latter case we should have had οὐδὲν and not μὴδὲν. Some men, by the grace of God, are "something;" but these persons only fancy themselves to be so. Whether any man is really "something" or not is determined by his practical conduct—his "work" as the apostle expresses it in the next verse. The verb φρεναπατᾶν occurs in the New Testament only here, though we have the substantive φρεναπατης, deceivers, in Titus i. 10. St. James (i. 26) speaks of a man "deceiving his heart" in seemingly just the same sense. In both passages it appears to be meant that a man palms off upon his own mind fancies as if they were just apprehensions of real facts; in both also these fancies are but illusive notions of one's own religious character—here, as being "spiritual;" in James, as being "religious" or "devout" (θρησκος)—the activity of practical benevolence being in both cases wanting; for "the bridling not his tongue" in ver. 26 is proved by the contrasted behaviour spoken of in the next verse to refer to those sins of the tongue which are implicitly condemned in vers. 19—21.

Ver. 4.—But let every man prove his own work (τὸ δὲ ἔργον ἑαυτοῦ δοκιμαζέτω ἕκαστος); but his own work let each man be bringing to the proof. "His own work;" his own actual conduct. Both "work" and "his own" are weighted with emphasis; "work" as practical behaviour contrasted with professions or self-illusions (comp. 1 Pet. i. 17, "Who without respect of persons judgeth according to each man's work"); "his own," as contrasted with those others with whom one is comparing himself to find matter for self-commendation. "Be bringing to the proof;" that is, testing his actual life by the touchstone of God's law, especially of "Christ's law," with the honest purpose of bringing it into accordance

therewith. In other words, "Let each man be endeavouring in a spirit of self-watchfulness to walk orderly according to the Spirit." This notion of practical self-improving attaches to the verb δοκιμάω ("prove" or "examine") also in Rom. xii. 2; 1 Cor. xi. 28; Eph. iii. 10. And then shall he have rejoicing in himself alone (καὶ τότε εἰς ἑαυτὸν μόνον τὸ καύχημα ἔξει); and then in regard to himself alone shall he have whereof to glory. The preposition εἰς is used as in Matt. xiv. 31, *Eis τί ἐδίστασας*; "What didst thou look at that thou didst doubt?" Acts ii. 25, "concerning him;" Eph. v. 32; Rom. iv. 20; xiii. 14; xvi. 19. It depends upon the whole phrase, "shall have his ground of glorying," and not upon the word rendered "ground of glorying" alone. The distinction which ordinarily obtains between verbals of the form of πράγμα and those of the form of πράξις appears to hold good also in respect to καύχημα and καύχῃσις. Compare the use of καύχῃσις in 2 Cor. vii. 4 and Jas. iv. 16, with that of καύχημα in Rom. iv. 2, ἔχει καύχημα, "hath whereof to glory;" 1 Cor. ix. 16, οὐκ ἔστι μοι καύχημα, "I have nothing to glory of." In 1 Cor. v. 6, οὐ καλὸν τὸ καύχημα ἑμῶν, the substantive seems to mean "boast," that is, what is said in boasting, as distinguished from καύχῃσις, the action of uttering a boast. The verb καυχῶμαι, with its derivatives—a favourite term with St. Paul—often appears to mean "rejoicing" rather than "boasting" (cf. Rom. v. 2; Heb. iii. 6); but it seems desirable as a rule to render it by "glorying," with the understanding that the writer has frequently the joyous state of feeling more prominently in his view than the utterance of self-gratulation. What the apostle meant by "having one's ground of glorying in regard to one's own self alone," is well illustrated by what he says respecting himself in 2 Cor. i. 12, "Our glorying is this, the testimony of our conscience, that in holiness and sincerity of God, not in fleshly wisdom, but in the grace of God, we behaved ourselves in the world, and more abundantly to you-ward." He had been himself in the habit of testing his conduct and spirit by the standard of Christ's law; and this was the fruit. And not in another (καὶ οὐκ εἰς τὸν ἕτερον); and not in regard to that neighbour of his. The article probably points to that neighbour with whom he has been comparing himself; and so, perhaps, also in Rom. ii. 1. But it may be simply "his neighbour;" "the man who is other than himself;" as it is in 1 Cor. vi. 1 and x. 24, in neither of which passages has any particular "other person" been before referred to.

Ver. 5.—For every man shall bear his own burden (ἐκαστος γὰρ τὸ ἴδιον φορτίον

βαρῶσει); for each man shall carry his own pack. A man's business is with his own pack; and all depends upon his carrying that, not putting it down. This "pack" (φορτίον) is the whole of the duties for the discharge of which each man is responsible. It is thus that the image is employed by our Lord (Matt. xi. 30), "My yoke is easy, and my pack is light." So also in Matt. xxiii. 4, "For they tie up packs heavy and hard to carry, and lay them upon men's shoulders." The phrase, τὸ ἴδιον φορτίον, "the pack which is individually his own," implies that men's responsibilities vary, each one having such as are peculiar to himself. This "pack" is to be carefully distinguished from the "heavy loads" (βάρη) of ver. 2. Our Christian obligations Christ makes, to them who serve him well, light; but our burdens of remorse, shame, grief, loss, which are of our own wilful procuring, these may be, must needs be, heavy. One part of our "pack" of obligation is to help each other in bearing these "heavy loads;" and we shall find our joy and crown of glorying in doing so; not only in the approval of our own consciences and in the consciousness of Christ's approval, but also in the manifold refreshments of mutual Christian sympathy. On the other hand, our Christian responsibilities, including these of mutual sympathy and succour, we must not attempt to evade. One man is able to do more for others than another man can; the truly "spiritual" man, for example, can do that which others may not even attempt to touch: each one has his own part and duty. And Christ's *mot d'ordre* to all his workmen, or possibly the apostle means to all his soldiers, is this: "Every man carry his own pack!" The future tense of the verb "shall carry" does not point to some future time, but to the absoluteness of the law for all time; as in ch. ii. 16 (see Winer, 'Gram. N. T.,' § 40, p. 251, 6th edit.). The varying turn given to the same general image of carrying burdens in ver. 2 and here is quite in St. Paul's manner. Compare, for example, in 2 Cor. iii. the varying turn given to the images of "epistle" and "veil."

Ver. 6.—Let him that is taught in the word communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things (κοινωνεῖτω δὲ ὁ κατηχούμενος τὸν λόγον τῷ κατηχούντι, ἐν πᾶσι ἀγαθοῖς); let him that is receiving instruction in the Word share with him that instructeth in all good things. The Authorized Version appears to have exercised sound discretion in leaving the participle δὲ untranslated. It is, in fact, here merely a conjunction of transition: not in any degree adverbative; for the exhortation to liberality towards our teachers is perfectly germane to the preceding topics of carrying

one another's loads, and so carrying our own pack. The verb *κατηχεῖν*, etymologically "to fill with sound," thence signifies "to din a thing into another person's mind with inculcation or constant repetition," in which sense it occurs in Acts xxi. 21, 24, of the persistent repetition of a slanderous report. So early as in Hippocrates (Liddell and Scott) the verbal substantive *κατήχησις* is used for "instruction;" and the verb, though not occurring in Attic writers, seems to have continued in use in other dialects, to reappear at length in the Common Dialect of Greek. Accordingly, it is found in the sense of "instruct" in Luke i. 4; Acts xviii. 25; Rom. ii. 18; 1 Cor. xiv. 19. It does not denote instruction by question and answer in particular, but simply the inculcating of knowledge. Recently as the Galatian Churches had been founded, it appears from this passage that there were already persons among them whose particular business it was to give religious instruction to their fellow-Christians; so much their business, that they were on this ground entitled to receive from those they taught liberal help in temporal things. Such persons were doubtless included among the "elders" whom Paul and Barnabas appointed in the several Churches which they planted (Acts xiv. 23). It is noticeable, further, that the order of men alone singled out as entitled to such secular assistance is characterized as a teaching order; so characterized, perhaps, because teaching religious truth was the most prominent and characteristic of their functions. In his First Epistle to Timothy (v. 17), written, probably, some years later, "the elders who labour in Word and teaching (*διδασκαλία*)" are particularized as those among the "presiding elders" who are the "most especially" entitled to liberal payment; the form of expression, however, implying that elders whose function lay in other duties than that of teaching were likewise entitled to liberal consideration. The teaching elders would require, more than other Church officers, leisure from worldly avocations for the study of God's Word and his truth, and for the actual discharge of their especial work in private as well as in public (comp. Acts vi. 4; xx. 20). The direction here given would apply, as to the case of resident teachers, so also to that of persons who travelled about in the dissemination of the faith; as we learn from 1 Cor. ix. 4—14; 2 Cor. xi. 7—12. In 1 Thess. v. 12, 13 the apostle commends to the "high estimation" of the disciples "those who laboured among them, and were over them in the Lord, and admonished them (*καπιώνας, προϊσταμένους, νοουθεούντας*)." The expression "the Word" is used without any further qualification to design-

nate the Christian doctrine, as in Mark ii. 2; iv. 14; Acts viii. 4; xi. 19; Phil. i. 14. So the Christian religion is styled "the Way" in Acts ix. 2; xix. 9. "Share;" the verb *κοινωνεῖν* and its derivatives are frequently used with reference to that kind of "fellowship" or "partnership" which is evinced by our liberally sharing with the object of it in our worldly means. If we "count a minister our partner (*κοινωνόν*)," as St. Paul writes to Philemon (ver. 17), we shall not begrudge him frank and generous help in any direction. Thus Rom. xii. 13, "Communicating to the necessities of saints," is properly "sharing with them in generous sympathy." So Phil. iv. 14, "had fellowship with (*συνκοιμήσαντες*) my affliction" points to liberal temporal assistance. Similarly, generous sympathy embodied in money gifts is styled "communion," or "partnership," in Rom. xv. 26; 2 Cor. ix. 13; Phil. i. 5; Heb. xiii. 16; as also *κοινωνικός*, "ready to communicate," expresses one ready to show such sympathy, in 1 Tim. vi. 18. The apostle regards, and would have others regard, such offices of kindness with a fine delicate feeling, not as giving as if from a higher level of condition, but as sharing with brothers, with whom all things are held in common. Chrysostom and others consider the word to point to an interchange or barter of goods, spiritual and temporal, referring to 1 Cor. ix. 11. "In all good things;" in all good things of this life which he himself possesses. "Good things" as in Luke xii. 18, 19 ("my goods"); xvi. 25; the preposition "in" as in Matt. xxiii. 30, "partakers in the blood of the prophets." The exact import of this clause, which has been variously interpreted, is best appreciated by our taking account of the warmth of indignant feeling with which the apostle is writing. This clearly transpires both from the words, "be not deceived," and from the assurance, "God is not mocked." The apostle had evidently in his eye a certain course of conduct which he indignantly denounces as a "sneering at God." This feeling prompts him to accentuate his exhortation addressed to the cold-hearted, niggardly Christians whom he has in view, by adding this clause, which is in effect, "in every possible way;" namely, by giving them respect and good will as well as maintenance. To no other Church does he address such direct admonition respecting the liberal treatment of its teachers, though, perhaps, indirect admonition may be detected in 1 Cor. ix. 7—11. No doubt the news he had just heard from Galatia made him feel the necessity of dealing with them roundly on this point.

Ver. 7.—Be not deceived (*μὴ πλανᾶσθε*). So 1 Cor. vi. 9; xv. 33. Let nothing lead you astray from the conviction, that in the

conformity of your real aims and actual practice with the dictates of God's Spirit, and in that alone, can you hope for eternal life. God is not mocked (Θεὸς οὐ μωκτηρίζεται); God is not derided. The verb μωκτηρίζω, to writhe the nostrils (μωκτηρίζω) at one in scorn, to sneer at him, occurs frequently in the Septuagint, rendering different Hebrew words, which denote disdain; as *nāatz* ("despise"), Prov. i. 30; *bazah* ("despise"), Prov. xv. 20; *lā'ag*, "laugh (in derision)," Ps. lxxx. 6. St. Luke uses it in his Gospel twice (xvi. 14; xxiii. 35), where it is rendered "deride," "scoff at." It is, in effect, a "derision" of God when we meet his requirements of real piety and of practical obedience by the presentation of lip-professions and outward shows of religiousness. But the derision will not last long; it cannot hold good. Whatever in our hypocrisy we may pretend, or even after a fashion believe, as to ourselves, the eternal principles of Divine government are sure to work out their accomplishment. Bishop Lightfoot, founding upon the use of the verb μωκτηρίζω in Greek authors on rhetoric—with whom it denotes a kind of fine irony, in which a feeling of contempt is thinly veiled by a polite show of respect—proposes to apply this sense here; and it would well suit the tenor of the passage; but as employed by so Hellenistic a writer as St. Paul it appears safer to interpret the verb simply in the light thrown upon it by the usage of the Septuagint. For whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap (ὃ γὰρ ἐὰν σπείρῃ ἐνθρώπος, τοῦτο καὶ θερεῖται). The word σπείρῃ may be either an sorsist, as in Eph. vi. 8, "whatsoever good thing each one doeth (σπείρῃ);" or a present. The latter seems to agree better with the ὁ σπείρων of the next verse, and the more pointedly directs attention to one's present immediate behaviour. The reaping-time is either the future life or its starting-point in the "day of the Lord" which determines its future complexion, as in Rom. ii. 5—16; 2 Cor. v. 10. The axiom here stated holds good, no doubt, in much that befalls us in the present life, as is forcibly evinced by the late Fred. Robertson's sermon on this text; but this application of it hardly lies in the apostle's present field of view. All human activity is here recited under this image of "sowing," with reference to the consequences which in the day of retribution will infallibly accrue from every part of it. In 2 Cor. ix. 6, however ("He that soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly," etc.), the idea is applied to pecuniary gifts. Such an application seems to possess a peculiar propriety, founded on the benefits that the giving of money—which, viewed as gold, silver, or copper coins, is in itself a dry and useless thing—would be the

means of effecting (see vers. 12—15 of the same chapter). But this does not warrant our limiting the application of the word here to the bestowment of money gifts, though this in the context furnishes the occasion for its introduction; the next verse proves the wider application which the apostle's mind is making of it, not, however, losing sight (vers. 9, 10) of this specific reference. "Whatsoever he is sowing, that shall he reap;" the quality of the harvest (its quantity does not seem from the next verse to be particularly thought of, as in 2 Cor. ix. 6) is determined by the quality of the seed sown. In the form of expression, the deed which is done is said to be itself received back—received back, that is, in its corresponding reward or punishment. In a similar manner the apostle expresses himself in Eph. vi. 8, "Whatsoever good thing each man doeth, this shall he receive again (κομιεῖται) from the Lord." So of evil doings in Col. iii. 25, "He that doeth wrong shall receive again the wrong which he did;" and of both good and bad in 2 Cor. v. 10. These last-cited passages, together with others which will readily occur to the reader, appear to contemplate a reference to be made in the day of judgment to each several action, with an award assigned to each; which view is likewise presented by such utterances of Christ himself as we read in Matt. x. 42; xxv. 35, 36, 42, 43. On the other hand, in the passage now before us, the "eternal life," and probably also the "corruption" mentioned in ver. 8, seem to point to the general award, of life or of destruction, which each man shall receive, founded on the review of his whole behaviour (see Rev. xx. 12, 15). This is a somewhat different view of the future retribution from the former. Considering such passages in the light of moral exhortation, we are reminded that in each several action we are taking a step towards either a happy or a disastrous end—a step which, if pursued onward in the same direction, will infallibly conduct us to either that happy or that disastrous end. In regard to the relation between the two somewhat differing views of the future retribution above stated, when considered as subjects of speculative inquiry, a few observations may not be out of place here. We need find no difficulty at all in this diversity of representation so far as relates to the good actions of those who shall then be accepted or to the evil actions of those who shall be rejected. But a difficulty does seem to present itself with respect to the evil deeds done, if not before yet after their conversion, by the ultimately accepted, and also with respect to the good deeds done by the ultimately lost. Will the righteous receive the award of their evil

deeds? Will the lost receive the award of their good deeds? For there is no righteous man who hath not sinned; as also neither is there an unrighteous man whose life does not show good and laudable actions. A reference to the actual experience of souls in this life suggests, not indeed a complete solution of the difficulty which the nature of the case probably makes impossible to us at devise, but a consideration which helps to lessen our sense of it. It is this: in Christians who have a well-grounded consciousness of perfect reconciliation with God, assured to them even by the seal of the Spirit of adoption, this happy consciousness is, however, perfectly compatible with a vivid remembrance of wrong things done in the past. And this remembrance is perpetually suggestive of sentiments of self-loathing—self-loathing the more bitter in proportion as the soul, by its growing purification through the Spirit, is enabled the more truly to estimate the evil character of those evil deeds. This is exemplified by St. Paul's wailing recollection, near the very end of his course, of those heinous sins of his, committed long years before, against Christ and his Church (1 Tim. i. 15). Now, we cannot conceive of a continuous existence of the soul apart from a continued remembrance of its past experiences. The redeemed, then, in their perfected state after the resurrection, can never become oblivious of those foul blots in their spiritual history; the recollection of them can never cease at once to abase them in their own consciousness and to glorify the grace which has redeemed them. The Divine Spirit itself will still, we may believe, quicken these remembrances; and the infinite benefactions of God, in that state of felicity experienced, will be still heaping fresh coals of fire upon their heads. Their felicity will be no offspring of blindness or misconception in reference to the past; on the contrary, they will know the truth in respect to their own lives, in respect to every part of them, with a clearness unattainable in the present state; but they will know the truth too in respect to the intensity of the Divine love. God's love, it is true, cannot shed the light of approval upon those dark spots of their earthly history; cannot shed upon them those felicitating beams of "Well done, good and faithful servant," which will most assuredly flow down upon the acceptable portions of their conduct; that love itself cannot deal with his servants otherwise than according to truth. But the love of God will be clearly seen, cancelling, for Christ's sake, the penal consequences which but for Christ those several wickednesses would have incurred; in those very instances of sinfulness magnifying in each saved one's consciousness

the infinite benignity of his Father, which loved him even then, in those very hours of his extremest ill-deserving. If these speculations appear not unreasonable, then they will serve to explain in what way the sinful doings even of those finally accepted will, however, not fail of receiving their award; the award will be there, both in that sense of loss—loss of Divine commendation, which will necessarily accompany the recollection of them; and also in the sense of their debt of punishment, though cancelled. Be we sure our sin will find us out.

Ver. 8.—*For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption* (ὅστις σπείρω εἰς τὴν σάρκα ἑαυτοῦ, ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς θερῆσει φθορὰν); *for he that soweth unto his own flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption.* "For;" the causal force of the particle ὅστις, properly "because," is here greatly attenuated, being employed to introduce a sentence commending to acceptance the foregoing one, simply by a detailed exposition of particulars illustrating its meaning. This is the case also in 1 Thess. ii. 14; iv. 16; Eph. ii. 18; Phil. iv. 16. In regard to the connection of this first half of the eighth verse with the preceding context, we must take note of the sternly monitory tone which marks ver. 7. This shows that in the sentence, "whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap," the apostle has more immediately in view the terrible harvest to be reaped by those who acted as if they thought that God might be overreached. We may infer from this that this first clause of ver. 8 is mainly the thought which up to here the writer had in his mind to inculcate—the "corruption" which a man would reap from a life of self-indulgence. But, after completing the statement of this thought, his tone forthwith changes; the frown clearing away from his countenance, he adds, to the threatening admonition of the first clause, the cheering promise of the second, while a more genial tone marks his further remarks on the subject in vers. 9 and 10. The second limb of the verse thus appears introduced in the same way as the second does in Rom. viii. 13; and in both cases with the conjunction ἕ. "Sowing unto his own flesh." Many critics render, "into his own flesh," as if, with a shifting of the image, which is certainly not uncommon with St. Paul, the flesh were now the ground into which the seed is cast. This relation, however, to the verb "sow" (see Alford and Ellicott) is in the New Testament expressed differently, by ἐν, in, or by ἐπὶ, upon; while εἰς in Matt. xiii. 22 denotes "among." It is more obvious to take εἰς as "unto," "denoting the immediate object of the action, that to which it tends, that in which it terminates" (Webster

and Wilkinson, 'Commentary'). This way of construing suits better in the phrase, εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα, which follows. Applying the image of sowing generally, the apostle in ver. 7 speaks of the quality of the sowing (not precisely the quality of the seed) as determining the quality of the harvest; and here, of one kind of sowing being "unto the flesh," the other "unto the Spirit." "He that soweth unto his own flesh;" that is, he whose general action in life is referred to his own personal gratification in his lower nature—to his own profit, pleasure, honour. The addition of ἐαυτοῦ ("his own") has a marked reference to the topic which led to this general statement: the apostle has in his view a man's gratifying his own merely worldly inclinations, to the disregard of the well-being, even the physical well-being, of other men. To sow unto the flesh of our brethren, in one sense, namely, for the promotion of their physical well-being, would bear a different aspect from sowing unto our own flesh. "Shall from the flesh reap corruption." This by some commentators has been interpreted thus: In the harvest of That Day, nought will be found with him of all those things on which his heart has been set—nought save, at the best, mere rottenness, disappointment, and illusion. This would be analogous to the moral with which our Lord pointed his parable of the rich fool, to whom God said, "Whose shall those things be which thou hast provided?" "So is he," added Christ, "that layeth up treasure for himself, and is not rich toward God" (Luke xii. 20, 21). The word φθορά, corruption, involves at least as much as this; but this view alone would furnish an inadequate antitheton to "eternal life," as also it gives less force to the word itself than it appears from its ordinary use to convey. One essential element of this verbal noun φθορά is the notion of decay, or the condition of being impaired, spoilt, wasted away (cf. Col. ii. 20; Rom. viii. 21). It is used of corruption in our moral nature in 2 Pet. i. 4; ii. 12, 19; as φθέρω and διαφθείρω are likewise applied in 2 Cor. vii. 2; 1 Tim. vi. 5. But the clear presentment of its sense, when connected as it is here with "flesh," is afforded by its antithesis, with respect to the "body" or "flesh," to ἀφθαρσία in 1 Cor. xv. 42, "It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption," and *ibid.*, 50, "Neither doth corruption inherit incorruption;" and by the opposed adjectives "corruptible" and "incorruptible" (φθαρτός and ἀφθαρτός) in 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54, as well as by the use of διαφθορά of the rotting away of a dead body, in Acts ii. 27, 31; xiii. 34—37. That the apostle uses the word "corruption" with a direct reference to "flesh," and therefore

as alluding to or rather expressing a certain qualification of the flesh's condition, is shown by his inserting the words, ἐκ τῆς σαρκός, "of the flesh." Strictly speaking, those words are not necessary for the completeness of the sentence. To all appearance they are added *attologically*, to make prominent the thought that what is sown unto the flesh may be expected to issue in corruption, because corruption is the natural end of flesh itself. For an analogous reason, "of the Spirit" is inserted in the antithetic statement; the Spirit being essentially not only living, but vivific. The words, then, seem to mean this: "shall from the flesh reap that corruption which the flesh, unquicken by the Spirit of God [for comp. Rom. viii. 11], must itself issue in." In endeavouring more exactly to determine the sense of these words, it is well in the first instance to confine our view to the conceptions relative to this subject presented by St. Paul. In reviewing these, we observe that St. Paul never predicates ἀφθαρσία ("incorruption," "incorruptibility") of the future bodily condition of "those who perish (οἱ ἀπολλόμενοι)." On the contrary, in 1 Cor. xv. 42—54 he clearly restricts this conception of bodily being to the case of those whose body shall be assimilated to that of the second Adam, the Lord from heaven, as indeed it is only to them that the entire discourse (vers. 20—58) relates. So again in Phil. iii. 21, the "fashioning anew of the body of our humiliation into conformity with the body of his glory" is evidently limited to those whose end is not "perdition (ἀπώλεια)." Again, in 2 Cor. v. 1 the "house not made with hands, eternal," appears to be an exclusive designation of the resurrection-body of the accepted believer. Once more, in Rom. ii. 7 the words, "to them that by patience in well-doing seek for glory and honour and incorruption (ἀφθαρσίαν)," imply that incorruption is an attribute exclusively pertaining to the happiness after which true Christians aspire. All that we meet with elsewhere in St. Paul's writings fits in perfectly with his holding the view that, while "there shall be a resurrection both of the just and unjust," as he stated to Felix (Acts xxiv. 15)—a resurrection surely he meant in the body—the bodies of the accepted alone will be incorruptible, the bodies of the lost being, for all that appears in his teaching, left in some sense subject to corruption. In what way the apostle in his own mind connected this conception, of incorruption being a quality exclusively pertaining to the future condition of the just, with that of the "eternal destruction (αἰώνιος ὄλεθρος)" awaiting them who know not God (2 Thess. i. 9), we shall, perhaps,



do wisely in not attempting to determine. We can, it is true, *imagine* ways of conjoining the two notions; but it will be best not to positively affirm that *this* or that *that* was St. Paul's manner of viewing the subject. Possibly the Spirit had not revealed this to him; if so, he might feel it incumbent upon him to forbear from giving forth definite statements on matters not really disclosed to his view, and, therefore, not intended to form a part of revealed truth. This, however, should not keep us back from accepting what appears to be the only probable view of the sense of the present passage, namely, that they who live a life of selfishness and carnal self-indulgence will reap the final award of having a body with flesh, in some most real and important sense, subject to corruption. The consideration that the apostle is thinking of the awards of the day of judgment, at once meets the objection that corruption is predicable of the Christian's body also. It is obvious to reply that, though the body of a believer is sown in corruption even as the body of an unrighteous man, it is revealed to us that it will be raised in incorruption; which it is nowhere said that the body of him who dies in his sins will be. As applied to objects lying on the other side of the veil which parts the spiritual world from that visible world whence all our images of thought are derived, this term "corruption" must be understood as describing a condition of bodily being, not necessarily identical with, but very conceivably only in some respects analogous to, that which it describes in relation to a corpse in our present state. The resurrection state, with all that pertains to it, inscrutably blending, as the story of the forty days commencing with Christ's resurrection exemplifies, spiritual phenomena with corporeal, is one which we are wholly unable to understand or to realize. This may be thought a very superfluous observation. But it is not so. The attempts intellectually to realize the events which we are hereafter to witness and to be the subjects of, and the dogmatic affirmations relating to them, made, not merely in past ages, but in the very present, render it necessary that we should distinctly keep this truth in view. The physical theory of that future state, and the eventual history which is to be evolved in it, we not merely do not know, but are absolutely incapable of forecasting. We dare not say one syllable about them beyond what is distinctly told us; and what *is* told us, we are to remember, is through the very nature of the case no other than images, presented in a dark dim mirror, which shows them so obscurely, that to our intollective perception they seem

riddles rather than revelations: "Ἄρτι γὰρ βλέπομεν δι' ἑσώπτρου ἐν αὐτίματι (1 Cor. xiii. 12). It is, in fact, not our intellect, but our moral sense, that the revelations of the future state are designed to inform. Next, looking out from the field of purely Pauline doctrine upon the teaching presented in other parts of the New Testament, we are reminded at once of that awful and repeated word of our Lord concerning the "Gehenna of fire"—"where their worm (σκῆλη) dieth not, and the fire is not quenched" (Mark ix. 43—48). It is known that, before our Lord appeared upon earth, this conception of Gehenna, the terms of which beyond question were borrowed from the closing verses of Isaiah, had already become current in the eschatological views of the Jews. This is evidenced by Judith xvi. 17; Ecclus. vii. 17. This imagery our Lord adopted, recognizing, it should seem, in this portion of rabbinical teaching a just evolution of ideas which had been presented in the inspired volumes of the Old Testament—a development of them which we may fairly attribute to the guiding influence of the Holy Spirit promised to God's restored people, as *e.g.* in Ezek. xxxvi. 24—28. We cannot doubt that the "worm" which our Lord spoke of means the worm which preys upon rotting flesh. The image, therefore, exactly accords with the word "corruption" as interpreted above. Whether the apostle glanced at that discourse of Christ, or was even aware of it, is uncertain; but that he both knew of it and even inferred from it in using this word "corruption," is by no means unlikely. One other reference to "corruption" as the future doom of at least certain of the lost, is found in 2 Pet. ii. 12, which, according to the now approved reading of the Greek text, runs thus: "But these, as creatures without reason, born mere animals to be taken and destroyed—shall in their destroying be destroyed [or, 'in their corruption shall even rot away'] (ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρήσονται)." Possibly the word φθορά, taken as "corruption," points here to moral corruption; but the verb φθαρήσονται may very well point to the miserable doom of rotting away by which they shall judicially perish, moral corruption working physical corruption. But the exact sense is doubtful. With the clause before us we must group Rom. viii. 13, "If ye live after the flesh, ye are certain to die;" whilst the sentence which follows, "But if by the Spirit ye put to death the doings of the body, ye shall live," answers to the closing sentence of the present verse; as also does "death" as "the wages of sin," balanced against the "eternal life" which is "the gift of God," in Rom. vi. 25. The contrasted thoughts in Phil. iii. 19, 20

likewise closely touch those here presented to us. But he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting (*ὁ δὲ σπείρων εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα, ἐκ τοῦ Πνεύματος θερίσκει ζωὴν αἰώνιον*); but he that soweth unto the Spirit, shall of the Spirit reap life eternal. That is, he that expends thought, time, effort, money, upon the furthering, in himself and in others, of the fruits of the Spirit, shall receive, from that Holy Spirit to whose guidance dwelling within him he resigns himself, that quickening of his whole being, body, soul, and spirit, for an everlasting existence in glory, which it is the proper work of that Divine Agent to effect. For the latter clause, comp. Rom. viii. 11, "If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you [as the guiding, animating influence in your lives], he that raised up Christ from the dead shall quicken also your mortal bodies, because of his Spirit dwelling within you;" in which passage the ætiological clause, "by reason of his Spirit dwelling in you," corresponds exactly with the ætiological clause, "of the Spirit," in the words before us. The two verses which follow show that one specific form of sowing unto the Spirit which the apostle has definitely in view, while enforcing the general idea, is that of Christian beneficence. How closely the practice of Christian beneficence was in the apostle's mind, in conformity with Christ's own teaching (Matt. xxv. etc.), connected with the securing of the future blissful immortality, is markedly shown in 1 Tim. vi. 18, 19;—not the less so if we adopt the now approved reading, *ἵνα ἐπιλάβωσιν τοῦ βιωτός (ωῆς)*, "that they may lay hold on the life which is life indeed."

Ver. 9.—And let us not be weary in well-doing (*τὸ δὲ καλὸν ποιῶντες μὴ ἐγκακῶμεν* [Textus Receptus, *ἐγκακῶμεν*]); but in doing that which is good, let us not flag. That is, some sow unto their own flesh, some unto the Spirit; let us be of those who do that which is commendable; and not that only; let us do it with an unflagging spirit. Such seems to be the swaying of thought in the sentence; hence the position of the participial phrase before the verb: the participle is not a mere qualification of the verb, as it is in the rendering, "Let us not be weary in well-doing;" and as it is in 2 Thess. iii. 13; but, with an implied exhortation that such should be the case, it supposes that we are of the better class, and founds upon the supposition the exhortation not to flag. "That which is commendable (*τὸ καλόν*)" recites, not works of beneficence only, but every species of moral excellence, comprising in brief the enumeration given in Phil. iv. 8, all of which is included in "sowing unto the Spirit." The verb *ἐγκακεῖν*, occurs in five

other places of the New Testament—Luke xviii. 1; 2 Cor. iv. 1, 16; Eph. iii. 13; 2 Thess. iii. 13. In every one of these six passages some of the manuscripts present the variant reading of *ἐγκακεῖν*, which in all is adopted in the Textus Receptus, but is in all replaced with the general consent of recent editors by *ἐγκακεῖν*. It is, indeed, questioned whether *ἐγκακεῖν* is ever used by any Greek author. The difference in meaning is material; *ἐγκακεῖν* is to be bad in doing a thing; while *ἐγκακεῖν* would probably mean to be so bad at a course of action as to leave it off altogether. In the first four of the above-cited passages it is rendered in the Authorized Version by "faint;" whilst in 2 Thess. iii. 13 and here it is rendered "be weary," that is, "flag." In all the notion of flagging appears the most suitable, and in 2 Cor. iv. 1, 16 necessary. In the present passage the course of thought requires us to understand it as not so strong a word as *ἐκλύεσθαι*. Critics point attention to the play of phrase in connecting the expression, doing that which is commendable or good, with the verb denoting being bad at doing it. So in 2 Thess. iii. 13, *μὴ ἐγκακῆσθε καλοποιούσιντες*. The epigrammatic combination would seem to have been a favourite one with St. Paul, occurring as it does in two letters written several years apart. Such playfulness is not foreign to his style. The use of the first person plural may be merely cohortative, as above in ch. v. 24. But it may also be a real self-exhortation as well. In the long, long, weary, arduous conflict which St. Paul was waging throughout his Christian career, the flesh must often have felt weak, and have required the application of this goad. And this tone of personal feeling may, perhaps, be further discerned in the use of the phrase, "in due season;" the blessed reaping of joy may seem to us at times long in coming; but God's time for its coming will be the best time; let us, therefore, be resigned to wait for that. This seems to be the tone of the *καιροῖς ἰδίοις*, "in its own times," of 1 Tim. vi. 15. For in due season we shall reap, if we faint not (*καίρῳ γὰρ ἰδίῳ θερίσομεν, μὴ ἐκλύμενοι*); for at its own season we shall reap, if we faint not. *Καίρος ἰδίοις* is the season assigned to an event in the counsels of God; as in 2 Thess. ii. 6, *ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ καιρῷ*, "in his season," of the revelation of the "man of lawlessness." *Καιροῖς ἰδίοις* is used in 1 Tim. vi. 15 with reference, as here, to the day of judgment; and in 1 Tim. ii. 6 and Titus i. 3, of the manifestation of the gospel. In every case the phrase appears to intimate that the season appointed by God, though not what man might have anticipated or wished, was, however, to be acquiesced in as wisest

and best (see last note). The reaping is the same as that referred to in the previous two verses. "If we faint not." The verb *ἐκλιθεῖσθε* in Matt. xv. 32 and Mark viii. 2 is to faint physically from exhaustion. In Heb. xii. 3, 5 it is used of succumbing, giving in, morally; not merely feeling weak, but in consequence of weakness giving up all further effort. In this latter sense it occurs in the Septuagint of Josh. xviii. 3 and in 1 Macc. ix. 8. And this last is its meaning here. It expresses more than the flagging of spirit before mentioned; for that would not forfeit the reward of past achievement, unless it led to the actual relinquishment of further endeavour; this last would forfeit it (comp. Rev. iii. 11 and 2 John 8). Taking it thus, there is no occasion for understanding this phrase, "not fainting," as several of the Greek commentators do, including apparently Chrysostom, as if it meant thus: "We shall reap without any fear of fainting or becoming weary any more;" which surely, as Alford observes, gives a vapid turn to the sentence.

Ver. 10.—As we have therefore opportunity (*ἔρα ὄν ἕς καρπὸν ἔχουεν*); so then, *schile* (or, as) we have a season for so doing. "*ἔρα ὄν*": this combination of particles is frequently found in St. Paul's writings, being so far as appears (cf. Winer, 'Gram. N. T.,' § 53, 8 a) peculiar to him (1 Thess. v. 6; 2 Thess. ii. 15; Rom. v. 18; vii. 3, 25; viii. 12; ix. 16, 18; xiv. 12, 19; Eph. ii. 19). In every instance it marks a certain pause after a statement of premises; in several, following a citation from the Old Testament; the writer, after waiting, so to speak, for the reader duly to take into his mind what has been already said, proceeds to draw his inference. The *ἔρα* seems to point backward to the premises; the *ὄν* to introduce the inference. "Well, then," or "so, then," appears a fairly equivalent rendering. In 1 Thess. v. 6 and Rom. xiv. 19 *ἔρα ὄν* introduces a cohortative verb, as here; in 2 Thess. ii. 15, an imperative. The words which follow seem to be commonly understood as meaning "whenever opportunity offers." But this falls short of recognizing the solemn consideration of the proprieties of the present sowing-time, which the previous context prepares us to expect to find here; the term "season," as Meyer remarks, having its proper reference already fixed by the antithetical season of reaping referred to in ver. 9. Moreover, instead of *ἕς*, would not the apostle, if he had meant "whenever," have used the intensified form *καθὼς*? Chrysostom gives the sense well thus: "As it is not always in our power to sow, so neither is it to show mercy; when we have been borne hence, though we may desire it a thousand times,

we shall be able to effect nothing." Indeed it is questionable whether the sense now pleaded for is not that which was intended by the rendering in the Authorized Version. The particle *ἕς* probably means "while," as it does in Luke xii. 58 and in John xii. 35, 36, where it should replace the *for* of the Textus Receptus; but this needs not to be insisted upon. Anyway, we are reminded of the uncertain tenure by which we hold the season for doing that which, if done, will have so blessed a consequence. Let us do good unto all men (*ἐργαζόμεθα τὸ ἀγαθὸν πρὸς πάντας*); let us be workers of that which is good towards all men. The verbs *ἐργάζομαι* and *ποιῶ* appear used interchangeably in Col. iii. 23 and 3 John 5; but the former seems to suggest, more vividly than the other, either the concrete action, the *ἔργον*, which is wrought; or else the part enacted by the agent as being a worker of such or such a description—as if, here, it were "let us be benefactors." The adjective "good" (*ἀγαθός*) is often, perhaps most commonly, used to designate what is morally excellent in general; thus, e.g., in Rom. ii. 10, "the worker of that which is good" is contrasted with "the worker-out of that which is evil," as a description of a man's moral character in general. But on the other hand, this adjective frequently takes the sense of "benevolent," "beneficent;" as e.g. in Matt. xx. 15, "Is thine eye evil, because I am good?" 1 Pet. ii. 18, "masters, . . . not only the good and gentle, but also the froward;" Titus ii. 5; 1 Thess. iii. 6; 1 Tim. vi. 18; Rom. xii. 21. In the remarkable contrast between the righteous man and the good man in Rom. v. 7 (see Dr. Gifford's note on the passage, 'Speaker's Commentary,' p. 123), the latter term appears distinctly intended in the conception of virtuousness to make especially prominent the idea of beneficence. Naturally, this sense attaches to it, when it describes an action done to another, as the opposite to the "working ill to one's neighbour," mentioned in Rom. xiii. 10; "good" in such a relation, denoting what is beneficent in effect, denotes what is also benevolent in intention (see 1 Thess. v. 15). Indeed, that the present clause points to works of beneficence" is made certain by that which is added, "and especially," etc.; for our behaviour should be in no greater degree marked by general moral excellence in dealing with one class of men than in dealing with any others; though one particular branch of virtuous action may be called into varying degrees of activity in different relations of human intercourse. "Towards all men;" *πρὸς*, towards, as in 1 Thess. v. 14; Eph. vi. 9. The spirit of universal philanthropy which the apostle inculcates

here as in other passages, as *e.g.* 1 Thess. v. 15, is one which flows naturally from the proper influence upon the mind of the great facts stated in 1 Tim ii. 3—7, as also it was a spirit which in a most eminent degree animated the apostle's own life. Witness that noble outburst of universal benevolence which we read of in Acts xxvi. 29. Such an escape from bigotry and *particularism* was quite novel to the Gentile world, and scarcely heard of in the Jewish, though beautifully pointed forward to in the teaching of the Book of Jonah (see Introduction to the Book of Jonah, in 'Speaker's Commentary,' vol. vi. p. 576). Especially unto them who are of the household of faith (*μαλίστὰ δὲ πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους τῆς πίστεως*); but especially towards them that are of the household of faith. The adjective *οἰκείος* occurs in the New Testament only in St. Paul's Epistles—twice besides here, namely, in Eph. ii. 19, "fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household (*οἰκείοι*) of God;" and in 1 Tim. v. 8, "if any provideth not for his own, and specially his own household (*οἰκίαν*)." In the last-cited passage, the adjective, denoting as it plainly is meant to do, a closer relation than "his own (*ἴδιαν*)" must mean members of his household or family; and we can hardly err in supposing that in Eph. ii. 19 likewise the phrase, *οἰκείοι τοῦ Θεοῦ* denotes those whom God has admitted into his family as children. So the word also signifies in the Septuagint of Isa. iii. 5; lviii. 7; and Lev. xviii. 6, 12, 13. It is, therefore, an unnecessary dilution of its force here to render it, "those who belong to the faith," though such a rendering of it might be justified if found in an ordinary Greek author. The meaning of *τῆς πίστεως* is illustrated by the strong personification used before by the apostle in ch. iii. 23, 25, "before faith came;" "shut up for the faith which was yet to be revealed;" "now that faith is come." The apostle surely here is not thinking of "the Christian doctrine," but of that principle of believing acceptance of God's promises which he has been insisting upon all through the Epistle. This principle, again personified, is here the patron or guardian of God's people aforetime under a *pedagogue*: "of the household of faith," not "of the faith." The apostle is thinking of those who sympathized with the doctrine of justification by faith in Christ without legal observances; and very possibly is glancing in particular at the teachers under whose care the apostle had left the Galatian Churches. At first, we may believe, the Galatian Churchmen, in the fervour of their affection to the apostle himself, had been willing enough to help those teachers in every way. But when relaxing

GALATIANS,

their hold upon the fundamental principles of the gospel, they had also declined in their affectionate maintenance of the teachers who upheld those doctrines. He now commends these, belonging to faith's own household, to their especial regard (comp. Phil. iii. 17). "Especially;" this qualification in an intensified form of the precept of universal beneficence, is the outcome of no cold calculation of relative duties, but of fervent love towards those who are truly brethren in Christ. That to these an especial affection is due above all others is a sentiment commended and inculcated in almost all St. Paul's Epistles; as it is also by St. Peter, as *e.g.* in 1 Pet. i. 22, etc.; and again by St. John. With all, "love of brethren (*φιλαδέλφια*)" is a different sentiment from that sentiment of charity which is due to all fellow-men; that is, it is an intensified form of this latter, exalted into a peculiar tenderness of regard by the admixture of higher relations than those which antecedently connect true Christians with all members of the human family. Christ has himself (Matt. xxv. 31—46) taught his disciples that he deems a peculiar regard to be due from them to those "his brethren" who at that day shall be on his right hand; meaning, evidently, by "these my brethren," not suffering men, women, or children as such, but sufferers peculiarly belonging to himself (comp. Matt. x. 42; xviii. 5, 6). Thus we see that, after all, there is a *particularism* properly characteristic of Christian sentiment; only, not such a particularism as a Gentile, and too often a Jew likewise, would have formulated thus: "Thou shalt love thine own people and hate the alien;" but one which may be formulated thus: "Thou shalt love every man, but especially thy fellow-believer in Christ." The reader will, perhaps, scarcely need to be reminded of Keble's exquisite piece on the Second Sunday after Trinity in the 'Christian Year.'

Ver. 11.—Ye see how large a letter I have written unto you with mine own hand (*ἵερε πηλικοῖς ὑμῖν γράμμασιν ἔγραψα τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ*); see with what large pieces of writing (or, with what large letters) I have written (or, I write) unto you with mine own hand. There can be hardly any doubt that the rendering "ye see" of the Authorized Version, supposing, as it seems to do, that this is meant as an indicative, must be wrong (cf. John iv. 29; 1 John iii. 1). The *ἵερε* of the Textus Receptus in Phil. i. 30 is replaced by recent editors with one consent by *εἶερε*. Each one of the four next Greek words, *πηλικοῖς ὑμῖν γράμμασιν ἔγραψα*, has been subjected to a variety of interpretations. What appears to the present writer the most probable view he must explain as

briefly as he is able. The interrogative *πῶς* means "how great," as in Zech. ii. 2 (Septuagint); Heb. vii. 4. Accordingly, *πόσα καὶ πῶς* in Polyb., i. 2, 8 (cited in Liddell and Scott's 'Lexicon') means "how many and how large." Many, as e.g. Chrysostom, have supposed that the word includes a reference to clumsiness, ungainliness, as attaching to the apostle's handwriting ("with what big letters!"). But no example of the word being used in this sense of "ungainliness" has been adduced; and it seems safer not to import into its rendering this additional shade of meaning. The dative *ὑμῖν* Bishop Lightfoot proposes to connect closely with *πῶς* as *μοί* and *σοί* are often used in familiar style, with the sense *mark you!* But there is no instance of this use of the dative pronoun in the Greek Testament (see Winer, 'Gram. N. T.,' § 22, 7, Anm. 2, p. 140); and here surely it more naturally connects itself with *ἔγραψα*. It is not uncommon with St. Paul to insert some word or words between a substantive and its adjective or dependent genitive, as here between *πῶς* and *γράμμασιν* (see ch. ii. 9; iii. 15; Phil. iv. 15, etc.). In the instances now cited there appears no more logical occasion for such a seeming disarrangement of the words than there does here. The verb *ἔγραψα* is used with no objective accusative following, as in Rom. xv. 15; 1 Pet. v. 12; the substantive *γράμμασιν* being in the dative, because the apostle is referring merely to the *form* of the medium of communication, and not to the substance of the communication itself. The rendering of the Authorized Version, "how large a letter I have written," cannot be defended as a literal translation, though it may be allowed on one view of the passage to give the sense rightly. But though the plural noun *γράμματα*, in ordinary Greek, like *literæ* in Latin, sometimes occurs in the sense of a single epistle or letter, it is never so used by St. Paul, who always employs the word *ἐπιστολή* to express this notion, which he does no less than seventeen times. In Acts xxviii. 21 it is rendered "letters," in the plural number; being properly "communications in writing." The noun *γράμμα* was the word ordinarily employed in Greek to designate a letter of the alphabet. It also denotes "a writing," as when in the plural we read in John v. 47, "if ye believe not his writings," and in 2 Tim. iii. 15, "the sacred writings," or Scriptures. In Luke xvi. 6, 7 "take thy bill" is literally, "take thy writings" (*γράμματα* being the now accepted reading in the Greek text). In 2 Cor. iii. 7, "the ministration of death in writings," the word probably refers to the ten commandments, each forming one "writing;" though it may mean "in characters of

writing." In ordinary Greek it sometimes denotes a passage of a treatise or book (Liddell and Scott, under the word, ii. 4). Next (1) the verb *ἔγραψα* ("I have written") may be understood, as in Rom. xv. 15, "I have written the more boldly unto you," etc., with reference to the entire letter, now nearly complete, as it lies before him. In that case the apostle's words may be rendered, "See, with what long writings [or, 'pieces of writing'] I have written unto you with mine own hand." Through some cause or other, we know not what the cause was, writing with his own hand was not a welcome employment to him; so far unwelcome that he generally devolved the actual penning of his letters upon an amanuensis, merely authenticating each letter as his own by a postscript added in his own hand (see 2 Thess. iii. *fin.*). Perhaps Philemon forms the only exception (see ver. 19), apart from this letter to the Galatians. We may, therefore, imagine the apostle as painfully and laboriously penning one portion after another of the Epistle; often pausing wearily in the work as he came to the end of each *γράμμα*, that is, to the end of each section of his argument, each seeming to him a long and toilsome effort. And now at last he exclaims, "Look, what long, laborious performances of handwriting I have achieved in writing to you! And from that learn how deeply I am concerned on your behalf, and how grave your present spiritual peril appears to me to be!" Ordinarily it was only a brief "piece of writing" that he wrote with his own hand; here, long pieces, added one after another with painful effort. Or (2) the verb "I have written" may be referred to what the apostle is now beginning to pen, not merely because the epistolary style of the ancients, Greek and Roman, was wont to place the writer of a letter in the temporal standing-point of its recipient, as when Cicero dates his letters *scribebam Id.*, etc., but because under some circumstances it is natural that the writer should thus refer himself to the view of his correspondent. Thus in Philem. 19, "I Paul have written it (*ἔγραψα*) with mine own hand, I will repay it." It would be quite obvious to ourselves to express our meaning in the same manner. So far, then, as such considerations reach, it appears quite supposable that the apostle, having employed an amanuensis as usual as far as the end of ver. 10, then himself took up the pen for the customary addition of an authenticating postscript; and that, for the purpose of adding especial emphasis to the postscript which he here thought advisable to add, he made his handwriting most unusually large, and that it is to this emphatic style

of penmanship that he here draws attention. Many modern critics have acquiesced in this explanation; and if *γράμμασιν* means "letters," that is, characters of the writing, it seems the most probable; for it does not seem likely that the whole Epistle was written in letters of an extraordinary size; while, if the characters were those of his ordinary style of penmanship, the remark would be too trivial to come from him. The present writer inclines to the former method of interpretation.

Ver. 12.—As many as desire to make a fair show in the flesh (*ὅσοι θέλουσιν εἰσπραπαῖσαι ἐν σαρκί*); all those who wish to make a fair show in the flesh. In this verse and the next the apostle singles out for especial animadversion certain Christians, Galatian Christians no doubt, who were actuated by the aim of standing fair with the religious world of Judaism. They were Gentile Christians and not Jews; this appears from their not themselves wishing to keep the Law; for if they had been Jews, the external observance of the Law, being natural to them from their infancy, would have been with them a matter of course: St. Paul himself would probably not have urged them to relinquish it. The verb *εἰσπραπαῖν* is not found by the critics in any earlier Greek writer, though the adjective *εἰσπράσφατος*, fair-faced, is used of "specious" answers in Herodotus (vii. 168), and "specious words" conjoined with "fables" in Demosthenes ('De Cor,' p. 277). Aristophanes uses the word *σεμνοπρασπαῖν* ('Nub.,' 362) to "carry a solemn and worshipful face." The notion of falsity, plainly hinted by *εἰσπραπαῖν*, reminds us, Bishop Lightfoot observes, of our Lord's words respecting whitened sepulchres, which "outwardly appear beautiful, but inwardly," etc. (Matt. xxiii. 27). Compare the use of *πρόσωπον*, face, in 2 Cor. v. 12, "glory in appearance, and not in heart." As the acrostic of verbs denoting a certain state frequently expresses an entrance upon such a state (see *ἦνω* above, ch. ii. 19 and note), it probably is intimated that the persons referred to were conscious that their "outward appearance" was hitherto not acceptable to Jewish minds, but that they now were desirous of making it so. Time had been when they did not care so much about it. "In the flesh." This word "flesh" not unfrequently designates men's condition as unmodified by the Spirit of God; as when the apostle speaks of "being in the flesh" (Rom. vii. 5; viii. 8, 9): thence also circumstances or relations pertaining to this unspiritual condition, as in Phil. iii. 3, 4; where the apostle speaks of "having confidence in the flesh," and goes on, in vers. 5, 6, to enumerate some of those circumstances or relations. Thus,

again, in Eph. ii. 11, "ye, the Gentiles in the flesh," that is, who in that state of things in which men lived before the spiritual economy intervened, were the "uncircumcision (*ἀκροβυστία*)," while the Jews were the "circumcision." But as the distinction between these two classes was signalized by an external corporeal mark, the apostle in that passage immediately after uses the expression, "in the flesh," in a varied sense, with reference to this latter, "that which is called circumcision, in the flesh, made by hands." With similar variation of meaning the word "flesh" is used here. The Christians spoken of, losing sight of the cross of Christ and the Spirit's work, were becoming possessed by feelings belonging to the old "carnal" relations between Jews and Gentiles, and so were making it their ambition to figure with advantage in the eyes of the circumcision, as well as to escape their enmity. And then, as in the passage just referred to (Eph. ii. 11), the apostle passes from this sense of the phrase, "in the flesh," to another relating to corporeal flesh; for this he does in the next verse, in the words, "that they may glory in your flesh." They constrain you to be circumcised (*οὗτοι ἀναγκάζουσιν ὑμᾶς περιτέμνεσθαι*); these compel you to be circumcised. "Compel;" the same verb as was used above (ch. ii. 14) of St. Peter's attitude towards the Gentile believers at Antioch. As here applied, it means "advise," "urge," argue for it as right and necessary for salvation, insist upon it as a condition of friendship. "These;" not, perhaps, meaning "these only," "none but these;" it appears enough to suppose that the apostle, from definite information which he had received, was persuaded that some of those who took the lead in urging onward the Judaizing movement were led to join in it by the cowardly motives here described. With indignant scorn, he says, "As surely as a man wants to stand well with the world, so surely will he be found with these circumcisers." Only lest they should suffer persecution for the cross of Christ (*μὴ ὡς ἵνα τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μὴ διώκωνται* [Textus Receptus, *μὴ ὡς ἵνα μὴ τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ διώκωνται*]); only that they may not by means of the cross of Christ suffer persecution. "Only that;" that is, for no other reason than that. The *μὴ* is thrust out of its proper position in the sentence (which is that assigned to it in the Textus Receptus) by the fervour of the writer's feelings. To himself the cross of Christ seemed the centre of all glory and blessedness; to be connected with it he would be well pleased to suffer martyrdom; but these men could be well content to shelve it out of sight, and, in fact, were doing so: and

what for? because the Jews did not like it, and they did not wish to get into trouble by offending *them*! A grand disdain prompts the apostle, at the cost of impairing the smooth run of the sentence, to (as it were) balance against each other the "cross of Christ" and "not being persecuted." The construction of the dative to express "by means of," that by which a certain result is brought about, is not very common; but we have it in Rom. xi. 20, τῆ ἀπιστία ἐξεκλάσθησαν; and *ibid.*, 30, κληθήτε τῆ τοῦτων ἀπιστία; 2 Cor. ii. 12, τῷ μὴ εὐρεῖν. Our attention is in this passage again drawn to the manner in which the Jews regarded "the word of the cross" (1 Cor. i. 18), as that "word" was unfolded by St. Paul and received by his disciples among the Gentiles. The great point of offence (σκάνδαλον) in the apostle's teaching respecting it lay in his presenting its pollution in the view of the Law, as inferring the abrogation of the ceremonial institute itself. On this account the Jews could not abide him nor those who attached themselves to him as their teacher, though in a degree able to put up with Christians not anti-Judaists. To the Galatians he had presented "Christ crucified" (ch. iii. 1) as he saw him to be, and they had accepted the doctrine. But now some, at least, of them were beginning to feel uneasy at observing how the Jews in their neighbourhood regarded Paul and those who attached themselves closely to Paul. Had not the Jews (they felt) high claims to consideration? Were they not the original depositaries of the oracles of God? Was not their religion venerable for its antiquity, magnificent in its temple and ritual, and in origin Divine? To these new converts from the gross spiritual darkness and degradation of heathenism, some of them, perhaps, drawn from it originally by the teaching of non-Christian Jews, the adherents to the ancient faith would naturally appear entitled to high respect—respect which they themselves were also not backward in claiming (see Rom. ii. 19, 20). When the personal influence exercised upon their minds by the holy love and fervour of the apostle had through his absence begun to wane, they also, we may imagine, began to get disheartened, by feeling that their Christian discipleship was viewed with disfavour by their Jewish neighbours, by reason of its Pauline complexion; that on this account the Jews looked upon themselves, though worshippers of the same God, as unworthy of notice; nay, were even disposed to point them out to the surrounding heathens, only too willing to follow up the hint, as proper objects of contempt and ill usage (see for illustration, Acts xiii.; xiv. 22; xvii.; xviii.; 1 Thess. ii. 14—16). And herewith we have

to bear in mind also that Judaism was in Roman jurisprudence treated as a tolerated religion (*religio licita*); and that, as long as Christians were regarded as belonging to a sect or branch of Judaism, they might seem to be entitled, in the eyes of Roman law, to the same toleration as the Jews themselves enjoyed. But if the Jews cast them off or disowned them they might forfeit such immunity, and become liable to be treated, not only by mobs, but by the Roman law itself, as offenders. The persons, then, here censured by the apostle may be supposed to have pursued the course they did with the idea that, by making themselves acceptable to the Jews through the adoption to a limited extent of Jewish ceremonies, and especially through the acceptance in their own person and the urging upon others of circumcision, they would relieve themselves of "the offence of the cross" (ch. v. 4). Without ceasing to be Christians, they would wipe themselves clear of the odium which with the Jews attached to Paul and those who held with Paul. Such seems to be the situation to which St. Paul's words allude. Bishop Lightfoot interprets it somewhat differently.

Ver. 13.—For neither they themselves who are circumcised keep the Law (οὐδὲ γὰρ οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι αὐτοὶ νόμον φυλάσσουν); for neither do they who are being circumcised themselves keep the Law; or, for not even they who are being circumcised, themselves keep the Law. It is doubtful whether the οὐδὲ accentuates the main idea of the clause (see note on ch. i. 12), or only the single term, "they who are being circumcised," as in John vii. 5 it accentuates "his brethren." "For;" pointing back to the words, "only that," "for no other reason than that," of the previous verse. The apostle means, it is from no zeal for the Law itself that they do what they do, for they are at no pains to keep the Law; but only with the object of currying favour with the Jews. The present participle περιτεμνόμενοι is the reading more generally accepted, though the perfect περιτεμημένοι has a competing amount of documentary authentication. The perfect is so much the easier reading to understand ("not even those who have actually been circumcised") as to be much more likely to be a correction displacing περιτεμνόμενοι than the converse hypothesis of the latter being a correction of the other borrowed from ver. 3. "They who are being circumcised" may be understood of a party, including those who first set the movement agoing, who were one after another undergoing the rite. Another turn is given to this participial phrase, as meaning "who are eager for circumcision," "who are all for being circumcised," "the circumcision

party." Bishop Lightfoot is in favour of this view, referring to "the apt quotation" from an apocryphal book, in which the phrase appears used in this very sense (see his note). It is a sense grammatically difficult to sustain from the usage of the New Testament; for *ὁ διώκων* of ch. i. 23, which has been cited on its behalf, does not bear it out. But the passion of scorn with which the apostle writes make the supposed strain upon strict grammatical propriety not altogether improbable. "Themselves;" this is inserted with allusion to the zeal shown by those men, both the first promoters and those drawn in by them, in urging upon others the observance, not indeed of the whole Law, but of certain of its prescriptions. The verb *φύλασσω* is used similarly in Rom. ii. 26; Acts xxi. 24. The sense seems founded upon the notion of watching the Law to see what it requires, as one is endeavouring to carry it out. The article is wanting before *νόμον*, though specifically denoting the Law of Moses, as in Rom. ii. 25, 27, and often. But desire to have you circumcised, that they may glory in your flesh (*ἀλλὰ θέλουσιν ὑμᾶς περιτέμνεσθαι, ἵνα ἐν τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ σαρκὶ καυχῶσινται*); but they desire you to receive circumcision, that in your flesh they may have whereof to glory. The conjunction *ἀλλὰ* is used in its proper original sense, "instead of that." All that they want is that in their intercourse with the Jews they may have your circumcision to refer to as evidence of the high respect which they and you as influenced by them have for the Law. "See! so far from trampling upon the Law, we and these our brethren too are adopting the very badge of the servants of the Law." The word "flesh" is in this clause used in its strictly literal signification. The account which the apostle here gives of the motives actuating this particular section of Judaizing reactionaries was no doubt grounded on specific information which he had just received. But such information, both in respect to its general probability and to its grave importance, was doubtless corroborated to his own mind by large experience which he had had elsewhere among the Gentile Churches of the behaviour of unsteady and imperfectly instructed Gentile converts. In almost every important place where Gentiles were won to the faith, there were previously existing communities of Jews (Acts xv. 21); and contact with these must have given rise to an endless diversity of relations both of attraction and of repulsion. Everywhere, from the very first, the contact of Christianity with Judaism gave birth to varying phases of Judaic-Christianism such as afterwards developed into monstrous forms of error. It was no new thing with the apostle that he should find himself

called upon to check, on the part of weak or insincere brethren, a tendency to draw towards Judaism at the cost of not merely unseemly but even fundamentally fatal compliances. The peril was always very near, and had to be constantly watched and guarded against.

Ver. 14.—But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ (*ἔμοι δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχᾶσθαι, εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*); but as for me, God forbid, etc. For the construction of the dative *ἔμοι* with *γένοιτο*, Alford cites Acts xx. 16, "Ὅπως μὴ γένηται αὐτῷ χρονοτριβῆσαι, and Meyer Xenophon, 'Cyrop.' vi. 3. 11, "Ὁ Ζεὺ μέγιστε, λαβεῖν μοι γένοιτο ἀδύτου. But neither passage matches the tone of abhorrence which attaches to the phrase, *μὴ γένοιτο*, on which see note on ch. ii. 17. Here only in the New Testament does it form a syntactical part of a sentence. But in the Septuagint this construction is of repeated occurrence, following the Hebrew construction of *chali'lah* with a dative and an infinitive verb with *min*. Thus Gen. xlv. 7, *Μὴ γένοιτο τοῖς παῖσι σου ποιῆσαι, κ.τ.λ.*; id., 17. So Josh. xxiv. 16. The pronoun *ἔμοι* is strongly emphasized both in this first clause of the verse and in that which follows. The apostle is vividly contrasting his own feeling and behaviour in relation to the cross of Christ with those of the leaders of the circumcision party whom he has been denouncing. They would fain put the cross as far as possible out of sight, not to offend the Jews they were so anxious to conciliate—that "obnoxious object" (*σκάνδαλον*, 1 Cor. i. 25) itself, as well as the inferences which the apostle taught them to draw from it in relation to the ceremonial law: *their καύχημα*, that whereof they would glory, should be in preference the mutilated flesh of their misled Galatian brethren; *his* boast, rejoicing, glory, was, and God helping him should ever be, the cross of Christ—that, and that alone. It quite emasculates the energy of his utterance to paraphrase "the cross" as being "the doctrine of the cross or of Christ's atonement." Rather, it is the cross itself which rivets his admiring view; sneered at by Gentile, abhorred by Jew, but to his eye resplendent with a multiplicity of truths radiating from it to his soul of infinite preciousness. Among those truths, one group, which to us is apt to appear of but small interest, was to the apostle's heart and conscience productive of profoundest relief. In former days he had experienced the burden and the chafing or benumbing effect of the Law, both as a ceremonial institute and as a "letter" of merely imperative command. It was the cross which released him, as from the guilt and servitude



of *self*, so also from all the worry and distress of bondage to ceremonial prescriptions. And this group of truths, as well as those relating to man's reconciliation with God, he felt it to be his mission, even perhaps his own most especial mission, boldly and frankly to proclaim; not only to rejoice in them on his own behalf, but to hold them forth to the view of others, as replete with blessing to all mankind; to glorify and vaunt them. His motive at present in thus vehemently protesting his own rejoicing in the cross of Christ was doubtless to rouse into fresh activity the slumbering sympathy with those feelings which had probably in some degree once animated his Galatian converts. Therefore it is that he writes, "the cross of *our* Lord Jesus Christ," instead of "the cross of *my* Lord," which it would else have been in this case natural to him to say, as he does in Phil. iii. 8, "for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord," and according to the tone of ch. ii. 20 of this Epistle. This "our" hints to the Galatians that they have as much reason as he has to glory in the cross as redeeming God's people alike from sin and from the Law. By whom (or, *whereby*) the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world (ὁ δὲ οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται, καὶ γὰρ κόσμῳ [Receptus, τῷ κόσμῳ]); through which the world has been crucified unto me, and I unto the world. The omission of τῷ before κόσμῳ, which is now generally agreed in, adds to the terseness of the sentence. The article is wanting before κόσμῳ elsewhere, as 2 Cor. v. 19; Phil. ii. 15; Col. ii. 20; 1 Tim. iii. 16. The construing of the passage which takes the relative οὗ as reciting "our Lord Jesus Christ," loses sight of the image which is now the one most prominent to the apostle's view: this surely is not Christ himself, but his cross; as in 1 Cor. ii. 2 the apostle determines the more general term, "Jesus Christ," by the more specific one, "and him crucified." The reference of the relative is to be determined, here as often elsewhere, not by the mere propinquity of words in the sentence, but by the nearness of objects to the writer's mind at the moment. In language of singular intensity the apostle bespeaks the all-involving transformation which, through the cross of Christ, his own life had undergone. The world, he says, had become to him a thing crucified: not only a *dead* thing, ceasing to interest or attract him, but also a *vile, accursed* thing, something he loathed and despised. And conversely, he himself had become a crucified thing unto the world; not only had he ceased to present to the world ought that could interest or attract it, but also become to it a thing scouted and abhorred; as he says 1 Cor. iv. 13, "We

have been made as the filth of the world, the offscouring of all things." The whole context of those words in the Corinthians (vers. 9—13) is here compressed into the single clause, "I have been crucified unto the world." "The world;" the term denotes unregenerate mankind taken in connection with that entire system of habits of life and of feeling in which man, as unquickened by the Spirit of God, finds his sphere and home. As the apostle is speaking of his own personal experience, we must understand him as referring in particular to all those circumstances of civil, social, and religious being which had once surrounded him, the honoured Jew and Pharisee. These he enumerates at length in Phil. iii. 5, 6. To these we might add, though it would, perhaps, have hardly occurred to Paul's own mind to add it, the ordinary possession of worldly comforts and immunity from want and suffering. All, he proceeds in that passage to say, he had "forfeited" (ἐζημιώθην Phil. iii. 8). Nor did he look back upon his loss with regret: "I do count them as dung (κίββαλα)." This twofold description, "I forfeited all things," and "I do count them all as dung," is here summarized in the phrase, "the world is a crucified object to me." The world, further, thus described as crucified to him, included in particular the entire system of Jewish ceremonialism, so far as it existed apart from the vitalizing influence of the Spirit of God. The "natural man (ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος)" sets great store by religious ceremonialism; it is to him, in fact, his religion. The apostle has himself felt it to be so. But his sentiment now is the very opposite: he accounts it a dead, lifeless thing; nay, even loathsome and abhorred, whenever in the smallest degree placed even by a Christian Jew in the category of Christianly obedience. That he did regard such religious ceremonialism as belonging to the "world," from which as in Christ he had become dissevered, is plain, both from ch. iv. 3, "in bondage under the rudiments of the world," and from Col. ii. 20, "why, as though living in the world, do ye subject yourself to ordinances, Handle not," etc. That this particular ingredient in the whole system recited as "the world" was at this moment present to the apostle's mind, appears from his singling out circumcision for mention in the next verse. While, however, this was a part of the "crucified world" just now prominent to his view, this term comprised to his consciousness much beside; namely, the entire mass of ungodliness and vice which appertains to "the course, or age, of this world" (αἶον τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, Eph. ii. 2), from which αἶον the Christian is by the daily transforming of his character to be removed (Rom. xii. 2),

(See above, ch. i. 4, and note.) "Through which;" in various ways was the cross of Christ the means of effecting this mutual crucifixion between the apostle and the world. It is apparent, from the whole tenor of his Epistles, that Christ crucified, as manifesting both Christ's love to sinful men in general, and to his own self in particular, "the chief of sinners," and likewise the love of God his Father, wrought with so mighty an attraction upon his whole soul—intellect, conscience, affections—that all other objects which were only not connected with this one lost to him their whole zest and interest, while all other objects which clashed with the moral and spiritual influence of this became absolutely distasteful and repulsive. And, on the other hand, the world at large met the man who was animated with this absorbing devotion to God as manifested in a crucified Christ, with just that estrangedness and aversion which might have been anticipated. The influence exercised by the cross in crucifying the world and the apostle to each other was intensified by the especial bearing which, in the apostle's view, the cross had towards Jewish ceremonialism (see ch. ii. 19, 20, and notes). The vivid, intense manner in which the apostle proclaimed such sentiments alienated from him the adherents and champions of Judaism, and made him of all Christians the one who was to them the most obnoxious. And how this affected his standing, even in the Gentile world, there have been above repeated occasions for noting.

Ver. 15.—For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature (*ὅτι γὰρ περιτομή τι ἔστιν ὅτι ἀκροβυστία, ἀλλὰ καινὴ κτίσις*); for neither is circumcision anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature (or, creation). The reading of the Textus Receptus, followed in our Authorized Version, is this: *ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ὅτι περιτομή τι ἰσχύει, ὅτι ἀκροβυστία, ἀλλὰ καινὴ κτίσις*. But by almost all recent editors this reading is replaced by the one given above. That *ἔστιν* is the true reading, and not *ἰσχύει*, all are agreed in thinking; *ἰσχύει* being regarded as a correction imported from ch. v. 6. The evidence for the rejection of *ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*, which is found in all the uncial manuscripts except the Vatican, is by no means equally decisive. The presence of those words in ch. v. 6, where they are very suitable to the context, has with great probability been supposed to explain their being also found here, being introduced, like *ἰσχύει* from the former passage, by the copyists; but here the qualification made by them is not so certainly required. The apostle felt it to be not merely true relatively, that is, for those "in Christ Jesus,"

but, since Christ died on a cross, true absolutely, that for salvation neither circumcision was sought, nor uncircumcision, but only a new creature. For the discussion of the terms of the aphorism as here stated, as compared with its form in ch. v. 6 and in 1 Cor. vii. 19, the reader is referred to the notes on ch. v. 6. The words *καινὴ κτίσις* may mean either "a new creature," or "a new act of creation making a man a new creature." It is hardly admissible to take *κτίσις* as "creation" in a collective sense, as in Rom. viii. 19; though this may, perhaps, be its meaning in 2 Cor. v. 17, "If any man is in Christ, there is a new creation," that is (perhaps), he finds himself, as it were, in a new heaven and a new earth. Christians as such are elsewhere described by the apostle as the product of God's creative hand; thus in Eph. ii. 10, "For we are his workmanship (*ποίημα*), created (*κτισθέντες*) in Christ Jesus for good works." As "begotten again" (1 Pet. i. 23, *ἀναγεννημένοι*), or "born anew" (John iii. 3, *γεννηθέντες ἄνωθεν*), subjects of a "regeneration" (*παλιγγενεσία*, Titus iii. 5), they must, of course, be the products of a new act of creation. In 2 Cor. v. 14—18 the sentence, "If any man is in Christ, there is a new creation," or "he is a new creature," lies embedded in a passage which describes in language of remarkable intenseness the transforming influence of Christ's death, wherever by faith it has been fully grasped. That passage, occurring as it does in an Epistle written nearly at the same time as the Epistle to the Galatians, leaves no doubt as to the ideas which in the apostle's mind cluster round the term "new creation," mentioned, here too as in effect there, in close connection with the cross of Christ, his sole supreme glory. It points to the state of a sinner consciously reconciled to God by the death of Christ, and finding himself thus translated into the midst of new perceptions, new joys, new habits of life, new expectations. "The old things are passed away"—guilt, the overmastering power of sin, laborious effort after goodness frustrated after all and ineffectual, the servile routine of a dead unquickenng ceremonialism: "behold, all things are become new, and all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself through Christ." The phrase, "a new creature," appears to have been used by the Jews to describe the change resulting in the case of a heathen becoming a proselyte. That was no doubt a great change; but far greater seemed to the apostle to be the transformation in the case of one translated from the bondage and darkness of the "letter" into the "newness of the Spirit" (Rom. vii. 6). He had himself experienced how marvellously great as well as how blessed the transition was; and he has described it in

glowing terms also in Eph. i. 17—ii. 10. In the present passage the particle "for" seems to point back, not exclusively to ver. 14, but to the general tenor of the whole passage in vers. 12—14, as rebuking that great ado about circumcision which the innovators referred to were making in the Galatian Churches, thereby diverting the minds of those that listened to them from the Christian's true business. This sense of the particle may seem somewhat loose; but it suits well the rapid, decisive, summarizing strain with which the apostle is now closing up his letter. The supreme concern, he means, for every one who wishes to be a member of God's kingdom is that he shall realize in his own experience the "new creation;" alike in the freedom and joy of adoption which appertains thereto (ch. iv.), and also in that walking of the Spirit which includes the crucifixion of the flesh (ch. v. 16—25). On this point we may compare Eph. iv. 23, 24 and Rom. xii. 2.

Ver. 16.—And as many as walk according to this rule (*καὶ ὅσοι τῆ κανόνι τούτῳ στοιχεύουσιν*); and as many as shall be walking by this rule. The word *κανόν*, properly a workman's rule, according to Liddell and Scott, but according to Bishop Lightfoot, who refers to Dr. Westcott, 'On the Canon,' App. A, the carpenter's or surveyor's line by which a direction is taken, is used in 2 Cor. x. 13, 15, 16 of the measurements and delimitation of districts; here, with reference apparently to a surveyor's measuring-line, as marking out a path or road. So that *τῆ κανόνι τούτῳ στοιχεῖν* means "walking on orderly" (see note on *στοιχεῖν*, ch. v. 25) in the line marked out by what has now been said. The future tense appears to point forward to what should be the case among the Galatians when the letter now going to them should have had time to do its work. But what in the preceding context does the apostle refer to as supplying "this rule"? Many think that he points to the aphorism in ver. 15, affirming the utter indifferency of circumcision or uncircumcision, and the all-importance of a "new creature;" in which case the stress would lie mainly upon the latter point, the all-importance of a "new creature," which was of perpetual interest, rather than on the indifferency of circumcision which in itself was a matter of but passing concern. It may be fairly questioned, however, whether the apostle does not rather point to the description which in ver. 14 he has given of the manner in which he himself regarded the cross of Christ, as a pattern to the Galatian Churchmen of the manner in which they also should be affected by it. It was customary with the apostle to present himself to his converts as the model to which they should conform themselves. Thus he commends

the Thessalonians for that on their conversion they proved themselves imitators of him (1 Thess. i. 6). When discoursing to the Corinthians of his manifold afflictions and of his self-humbling, men-loving demeanour under them all, he besought them to be imitators of him (1 Cor. iv. 9—16), which entreaty he renews with a similar reference in ix. 1. So he exhorts the Philippians to unite with one another in imitating him, and to fix their regards upon such as walked as they had him and those with him for a pattern (Phil. iii. 17), and again repeats to them (iv. 9), "Those things which ye, moreover, learned, and received, and heard, and saw in me, do,"—all which clauses refer to his own character and doings as seen by themselves or as reported to them by others (see Alford, *in loc.*). This purpose, of propounding his sentiments and course of action as a model for the guidance of his converts, no doubt underlies very many of those passages in which he so frankly and (we might but for this be tempted to think) so self-approvingly dilates upon them. In those days we must remember there was no "Canon" of New Testament Scripture which might serve for the guidance of the newly-gained converts from heathenism; for practical guidance in the Christian life, besides the Old Testament Scriptures (2 Tim. iii. 15—17), they had, perforce, to be referred partly to their own moral sense, partly to the inward teachings of the Holy Spirit, and partly, and this to a very important extent, to the living examples of eminently Spirit-taught men. This purpose, of propounding himself as an example, evidently underlay the writing of ver. 14; and it is the consciousness that it was so that now leads him to use the phrase, "by this rule," in reference, as seems most probable, to that very description of his own life. It is noticeable that, after having exhorted the Philippians to do all the things which they had seen and known him to do, he adds (Phil. iv. 9), "And the God of peace shall be with you;" just as he here says, "As many as shall be walking orderly by this rule, peace upon them, and mercy!" We are now brought into a position to see clearly the force of the conjunction "and," with which he introduces this verse. It connects it closely with ver. 14. "I myself glory in the cross of Christ, and to that cross have sacrificed all I held dear; and for all that shall be found walking in that same path—upon them shall rest my hearty sympathy and my pastoral benediction." It is further deserving of notice that in Phil. iii., when presenting himself to the Philippians as their exemplar, the apostle speaks of "many"—no doubt with inclusive reference to those Judaizing advocates of circumcision whose circumcision

he scornfully styles a *conclusion*—as being “the enemies of the cross of Christ.” This was written some years after the Epistle to the Galatians; but it shows that it was a common experience with the apostle to find among the Gentile Churches two classes in particular of Christians: one, consisting of his own adherents and followers in the spirit and life of the gospel; another, of those who (either because as born Jews or Gentile Judaizers, they eschewed the pollution of the cross and its aspect towards the ceremonial Law, or because they were Gentiles, ashamed before their countrymen of trusting in a Jew who had been crucified), were fain to the utmost of their power to thrust the crucifixion of Christ out of sight—“the enemies of the cross of Christ!” Peace be on them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God (*εἰρήνη ἐπ’ αὐτούς, καὶ ἔλεος, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ Θεοῦ*). The suppletion of “be” in the Authorized Version, in preference to “shall be” or “is,” is borne out by the fact that the language of benediction, both in the greeting at the beginning of the Epistles and in their close, ordinarily omits the copula verb, which in such cases must be what is here supplied. We may compare in particular Eph. vi. 24, “Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in uncorruptness,” not only as similar in construction, requiring the like suppletion of “be,” but also as another instance in which the apostle pronounces his pastoral benediction with a certain limitation, specifying those only who sincerely “love Jesus Christ.” The limitation in these two cases only implied is in 1 Cor. xvi. 22 converted into a distinctly expressed anathema upon those who do not love Christ. The present passage makes the implied limitation without even that measure of stern precision which would have been marked by his writing *ἐπὶ τούτους* (“upon these”) instead of *ἐπ’ αὐτούς* (“upon them”). It seems as if he would fain allure back to the gospel blessing those of his readers who might feel themselves as not now coming within its range. Perhaps in the addition of the words, “and mercy,” we may detect a sympathizing sense in the mind of the apostle of the mental suffering, which those in Galatia sincerely devoted to the crucified Christ had and would still have to encounter, in contending for the truth of the gospel against fellow-Churchmen of their own. They would probably be no mere hard-minded controversialists, but humble, loving believers, to whom the *mercy* of God would be very dear. The apostle adds it to his greeting only in writing to Timothy (1 Tim. i. 2; 2 Tim. i. 2), distinguished apparently for the affectionateness and feminine-heartedness of his character. In Titus i. 4 the addition is not genuine. The words,

“and upon the Israel of God,” seem to be an echo of the “peace upon Israel (*εἰρήνη ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ*),” which, in the Septuagint, closes the hundred and twenty-fifth and hundred and twenty-eighth psalms. The addition of the words, “of God,” seems intended pointedly to distinguish the “Israel” which the apostle has in view from that which boasted itself as being Israel while it was not, and also from the false brethren (*ψευδαδελφοί*, ch. ii. 4) in the Christian Church, who were for linking themselves with the false Israel. The addition is not merely honorific, as in the expression, “the Church of God” (1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Cor. i. 1; x. 32; xi. 22; xv. 9), but distinctive as well—that which alone God views and loves as “Israel”—to wit, the entire body of real believers in Christ, who, as portrayed in this Epistle, are “children of promise after the fashion of Isaac” (ch. iv. 28), Abraham’s seed and heirs of the promise” (ch. iii. 29), and the children of “the upper Jerusalem, which is our mother” (ch. iv. 26). Of that portion of the true Israel which dwelt in Galatia (see 1 Pet. i. 1; ii. 10), those who, like the apostle, consecrated themselves to Christ as crucified, were the guiding and characterizing element; and therefore his blessing shed upon these spreads itself also upon those connected with them. That the apostle is even here still regardful of others among the Galatians, who were themselves “shifting away from the gospel” and were drawing others away too (ch. i. 6, 7), is shown by the next verse.

Ver. 17.—From henceforth (*τοῦ λοιποῦ*). This genitive form is found, in the New Testament, only here and in Eph. vi. 10, where the Textus Receptus reads *τὸ λοιπόν*. As being less ambiguous, it is chosen in preference to *τὸ λοιπόν*, because this latter word is also used in the sense “finally,” as in Phil. iii. 1; iv. 8, as well as for “henceforth,” as in Matt. xxvi. 45; Heb. x. 13. The meaning of *τοῦ λοιποῦ* is illustrated by Aristophanes, ‘Pax,’ 1050, “You shall never dine henceforth (*τοῦ λοιποῦ*) any more in the Prytaneum;” and Herod. iii. 15. Let no man trouble me (*κόπους μοι μηδεὶς παρεχέτω*). The phrase, *κόπους παρέχειν*, “cause trouble, or annoyance,” occurs also in Matt. xxvi. 10; Luke xi. 7; xviii. 5. Obviously the apostle refers to such trouble as was now accruing to him from the endeavours of the Judaizing party to pervert his Galatian disciples. On him fell the “anxiety of all the Churches” (2 Cor. xi. 28). In any of his Gentile Churches, the defeat of the work of the gospel by Judaizing perversion was a “worry” which touched him to the very quick. There is nothing to warrant the supposition that he alludes to assaults made in particular upon his apos-

tolical authority, such as he had often occasion to deal with, as, for example, at Corinth. None such have been referred to in this Epistle, though he has found occasion to complain of the alienated affections of his converts. For I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus (*ἐγὼ γὰρ τὰ στίγματα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ* [*Receptus, τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ*] *ἐν τῇ σάρτι μου βαστάω*); I am one who bear branded on my body the flesh-marks of Jesus. The *ἐγὼ* is inserted with emphasis. Being such as he here describes himself, he had a claim upon his brethren to be spared unnecessary annoyance. The Greek word *stigma* here employed denotes a mark on the flesh, either by puncture, its proper sense, with a hot, sharp instrument, very often with hot needles (see Prudentius's lines quoted by Grotius in his note on the *χέρταμα*, mark, in Rev. xiii. 16), or more summarily by simply branding without puncture. It served sometimes as a mark of permanent ownership, as upon horses or cattle (Liddell and Scott, *sub verb. στίγμα*). In respect to slaves, it was not considered humane to brand them, except for punishment, or as security in particular cases against running away. Hence *στιγματίας*, branding, designated a scoundrel or a runaway slave; as Aristophanes, 'Lys.,' 331; 'Av.,' 760. Others besides slaves were sometimes branded in ignominious punishment: Aristophanes, 'Ran.,' 1507; Herod., vii. 238. Thus we have in Æschines (38, 26), *ἐστιγμένους αὐτομόλους*, "a branded deserter." Vegetius (quoted by Faccioliati, *sub verb. stigma*), writing three hundred years later, states ('De Re Milit.,' i. 8; ii. 5) that, in the Roman army, raw recruits had to be proved fit for service before they were allowed to have the tattoo put upon them. After due trial, they were "puncturis in cute punctis milites scripti et matriculis inserti." But this testimony does not establish the fact of such usage prevailing in the Roman army in St. Paul's time; though it is quite supposable that then, as now, soldiers might sometimes tattoo on their arm or hand the name of a favourite general. Instances are cited of consecration to a particular god being signified by *stigma*. Herodotus, writing five hundred years before, says of a certain temple of Heracles, on the Egyptian coast, that if a servant, belonging to any man whatever, took sanctuary in it, and put upon himself sacred *stigmata*, giving himself to the god, no one could touch him (ii. 113). In 3 Macc. ii. 29 mention is made of a "mark of Dionysus' ivy leaf being, by means of fire, put upon the body" of Jews in Egypt in the time of Ptolemy Philopator; but this would seem to have been intended rather as a barbarous indignity, because

especially abhorrent to their religious feelings, than as an actual consecration of them to Dionysus as his "slaves." But that it was in some cases employed to signalize a "sacred slave" is attested by Philo, 'De Mon.,' ii. p. 221, M; and Lucian, 'De Dea Syr.,' § 59, as cited by Bishop Lightfoot, who remarks that "such a practice could not have been unknown in a country which was the home of the worship of Cybele." An example more familiar to the apostle's mind might, perhaps, be cited from Isa. xlii. 5 (Septuagint), *ἐγγράψεται χεῖρι αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶμα*, "shall write upon his hand, I am God's," which rendering Gesenius ('Thea.,' in *verb. kathabh*) consents to accept. But if this rendering be the right one, it may yet be doubted whether it means writing by puncture; for *γράφματα στίγματα* appear in Lev. xix. 28 to be forbidden; unless, indeed, the prohibition be taken to refer to idolatrous tattoos only. But even thus the use of such in idol-worships has a further confirmation. It appears, however, to be a strong objection to our supposing the apostle to be here alluding to either the *stigmata* of consecration or those of other ownership, that such would infer no more suffering than would attend simple tattooing; whereas it is plain that the apostle alludes to marks which evidenced the undergoing of inflictions of extraordinary severity. The word *stigma* had passed into Roman usage, being employed both in a literal sense and also in a figurative one of a "stigma," as we also speak, cast upon a person's character as by a poet's lampoon. Thus Martial ('Epigr.,' xii. 62) writes, "Frons hæc stigmata non meo notanda," "This forehead to be marked with a stigma, not of my affixing," where the word *frons* indicates a close adherence to the original notion of a slave's forehead branded. Suetonius ('Cæs.,' 73), "Catullum, a quo sibi versiculis de Mamurrâ perpetua stigmata imposita non dissimulaverat, satisfaciendam eodem die adhibuit cænam." Reviewing the evidence now adduced as to the manner in which the term was used, we observe that the words "branding" and "branded" (*στιγματίας* and *ἐστιγμένους*) were used to describe a person made infamous to open view by brand-marks put upon his person. It was natural that the word *stigma* would thus acquire the sense of a mark of patent infamy left upon a man's person by some corporal abuse which he had been subjected to, without any other qualifying idea. Now, it appears most probable that it is in this sense that the apostle here uses the word. The term points to those scars, seams, perhaps long-continuing sores, which the long course of ever-recurring hardships and ill usage, through which he had passed,

must have left upon him—patent evidence to all who looked upon him of the manner in which his fellow-men regarded and treated him; this only, apart from any qualifying idea, whether of ownership, or of military allegiance, or of religious consecration. It is in this general sense that Chrysostom appears to have read the clause; and this general sense satisfies all the requirements of the context. A strong light is thrown upon this matter by what the apostle, near about this same time, wrote to the Corinthians, in 2 Cor. xi. 22—27. The passage, as indeed does the whole Epistle, with much also of the former Epistle addressed to the same Church, betokens a strong feeling at this particular time resting on his mind, of the grievous, countless, hardships which marked his career—a feeling, very supposably, just then freshened by some very painful experiences recently gone through, from the effects of which his bodily form was still suffering. “In stripes above measure, . . . in deaths oft. Of the Jews, five times received I forty stripes save one; thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day have I been in the deep.” Such are some particulars which he specifies; and the enumeration is very suggestive with reference to our present point. Could he have undergone that “stoning” at Lystra, after which he was dragged out of the city as dead to be left to lie without burial, and have carried away no enduring disfigurement? Whether any marks would be likely to remain upon him from the five Jewish whippings, we cannot tell; but we may be assured that the three floggings inflicted with the cruel *vitis* of the Roman soldiery must have scarred his flesh with seams of permanent disfigurement. Perhaps while he wrote, sores remaining from some one of those eight punishments were making themselves painfully felt. These judicial inflictions, however, severe as some of them may have been, were nevertheless regulated by law and custom. There were in all probability other, much more barbarous and altogether unregulated, violences, which came often upon him from the brutality of mobs, from the assaults of “robbers,” from accidents in shipwreck. It could not fail but that his person presented, wherever he went, conspicuously to view, tokens that he was one wont to be both regarded and dealt with as if he were, no doubt deservedly, a wretched outcast; in his own forcible, most deeply pathetic phrase, *ὡς περικαθάρματα τοῦ κόσμου, πάντων περιψήμα*, “as the filth of the world, the offscouring of all things” (1 Cor. iv. 13). The apostle’s enemies taunted him with the contrast which subsisted between the solemnity and

power—would-be power they meant—of his letters, and the meanness and feebleness of his personal appearance and his personal address (2 Cor. x. 1, 10). His personal presence may, originally and by natural make, not have been calculated to bespeak respect. But whatever disadvantages he lay under originally, must, beyond all question, have been vastly aggravated by the bodily hardships to which he had been subjected. These must have left effects (this, perhaps, being the “stake in the flesh” which he groaned under—“Satan’s messenger to buffet him,” the fruits, certainly, of Satan’s working in the hearts of godless men) which he felt to be not only fraught with personal humiliation in whatever intercourse he held with his fellow-men, but also likely greatly to mar his efficiency in his ministerial work. The only consolation remaining to him was that, in the utter extinction of all self-love, he rejoiced to know that Christ’s grace had, in this enhanced feebleness of his instrument, the clearer field wherein to manifest its own Divine potency (2 Cor. xii. 9, 10). “The flesh-marks of Jesus.” This may be understood as meaning that they were incurred in Jesus’ service. In part it may be so taken; but the relation expressed by this genitive appears to go deeper than that. The apostle means, the marks which disfigured the body of Jesus as now reproduced in *his* body. The genitive is used in just the same way as it is in the strikingly similar clause in 2 Cor. iv. 10, “always bearing about in the body the dying of Jesus (*παντοτε την νεκρωσιν του Ήησου εν τη σώματι περιφέροντες*),” where *η νεκρωσις του Ήησου* means apparently “the deadness or corpse-condition of Jesus” (compare the use of the Greek noun in Rom. iv. 19); the state of Jesus’ *νεκρωμενον σωμα*, while yet hanging a corpse on the cross. By a strong hyperbole, prompted by the intense feeling then on his mind of his own bodily sufferings and the almost ever-present imminency of death (comp. vers. 7—12 of the same chapter), the apostle, in those words, refers to “Jesus’ corpse-condition” as reproduced in his own bodily condition, adding the expression of his assured conviction that all was to this end—that “the life also of Jesus,” that is, the life which Jesus himself lives, should be all the more clearly manifested by what he was working in the world, in and through a body apparently so death-bound as the apostle’s was. The use of the phrase, thus interpreted, coheres well with the feeling which, in the writing of this Epistle, was very near to his soul, of his being “crucified along with Christ.” The phrase, then, glances at those swollen, livid, blood-flecked, wales and bruises (*τη μωλωπι αυτου*, 1 Pet. ii. 24) which the

Roman scourging that immediately preceded his being handed over for crucifixion must have left on his sacred flesh—no part spared—the entire frame pervaded alike with disfigurement and with torture. To the body of his adorable Lord at that hour—to the human consciousness of every thoughtful spectator, defaced, shorn by the dishonouring whip of the dignity properly conate with a human body, and made utterly vile (for this should seem to have been the symbolical meaning and intent of that customary preliminary of crucifixion)—and, at length on the cross, presenting to open view those brand-marks of degradedness, the apostle feels his own body to be, in the treatment it had received and the condition to which it had been reduced, in no small measure assimilated. Not only was he in spirit joined unto his Lord and one spirit with him; but in body likewise was he (so to speak) joined unto his Lord, and one body with him; being deeply “taught” in the lesson of what was meant by being “a sharer of his sufferings, while day by day becoming more conformed to the fashion of his death” (Phil. iii. 10); clothed with Christ in this sense also; clothed with the Crucified One. The verb *βασιτάω*, as here introduced, may be distinguished from the *περιφέρωτες* of 2 Cor. iv. 10, by presenting the notion of one’s carrying something in thought separable from one’s self, instead of being (so to speak) commingled with one’s own being. “I am carrying, and can offer to your view, the brand-marks of Jesus.” Chrysostom catches this view, perhaps carrying it out somewhat far, in his animated comment, “He saith not, ‘I have,’ but ‘I carry;’ like a man priding himself on a trophy and ensigns of a king.” The use of the same verb in Acts ix. 15, “to bear my Name before the Gentiles and kings,” clearly illustrates its import here. This closing verse is withal no piteous appeal for commiserating sympathy. The tone of “from henceforth,” betokening the feeling of one who has made up his mind not to be trifled with, precludes the notion of his mood being one of mere self-pity and tenderness. Far more does the apostle hereby make claim to share with his Lord in that mingled sentiment of reverence and

deferential, sympathetic compliance, which the disciple of Christ might be expected to entertain towards his Lord, crucified for him; such a sentiment as would prompt him to lighten, if he might, his burden and pain, to take part in his enterprise, to help forward his designs. Those brand-marks would cry out in loud protest against a fellow-disciple’s antipathy, tergiversation, or disesteem.

Ver. 18.—Brethren, the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit. Amen (ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοί. Ἀμήν); the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit, brethren. Amen. “The grace of Jesus Christ” denotes his Saviour’s loving-kindness, not only effectual in making a guilty soul acceptable to God through his atonement, but also in purifying it from sin, enduing it with spiritual strength, and securing its final salvation. The precatory imperative “be,” which, of course, is to be supplied, clothes a friendly wish in the pious form of a prayer. “With,” the *μετὰ* which, in the Septuagint, represents the Hebrew *im*, meaning “present to help,” is illustrated by Gen. xxi. 22; Ruth ii. 4; Judg. vi. 12; Matt. i. 23; xxviii. 20; John iii. 2; xvi. 32. “With your spirit,” here, as in Phil. iv. 23; Philem. 25; 2 Tim. iv. 22, replaces the “with you,” which is the form in which the farewell greeting is commonly couched; as in 1 Cor. xvi. 23; Eph. vi. 24, etc. There is no polemical reference whatever in the substitution; rather it is an affectionate amplification or intensification of the kindly wish or blessing, the outcome of affectionate yearning, after the stern rebukes which he had felt himself compelled to address to them. It expresses his desire that Christ’s grace might be very near to them—near to the most intimate and most controlling part of their nature. The singular “spirit” is conjoined with the plural pronoun “your,” as in Rom. viii. 16; 1 Cor. vi. 19 (“your body”); 1 Thes. v. 23, “your spirit and soul and body.” The word “brethren” is added last of all, as it were in caressing affectionateness, as in Philem. 7. The final “Amen” seals the true earnestness and the devotional spirit of the benediction.

### HOMILETICS.

Ver. 1.—*Restoration of a fallen brother.* The apostle changes his attitude of rebuke into one of affectionate admonition as he addresses the “brethren” of the Galatian Churches. His language exhibits a marked softening of tone that recalls the warmth of his earlier relationship to them. There are “brethren” still in Galatia. Notice—

I. A GRAVE CASE OF OFFENCE. “Even if a man be surprised in a transgression.”

1. *It is not a case of mere inadvertence or ignorance, but a case of falling away from a Divine command—more probably misconduct than heresy.* The doctrinal reaction at Galatia may have had a morally unsettling tendency. It was a case in which the offender yielded to the force of temptation, as is implied in the words, “lest thou also be tempted;” yet a case in which he endeavoured to hide his transgression from the world. 2. *It is the case of a member of the Church who had fallen out of relations to brethren.* A Christian shares in the infirmities of our nature, and may be surprised by sudden temptation, like Peter and David. The honour of Christ, the credit of religion, the offender’s benefit, demand the prompt but tender interference of Christian brethren.

II. **THE DUTY OF BRETHREN.** “Ye who are spiritual, restore such a one.” It was not a mere admonition to replace the backslider in his old Church relationship, but rather to recover him from his sin and place him in a right relation to duty. There is no hint given as to the method of restoration, but it would naturally be by kindly admonition, by faithful instruction, by prayer. There must be no blind love to intercept the friendly remonstrance; there must be no careless disparagement of the fault; there must be no suffering a sin upon our brother. It was the praise of the Ephesian Church that “she could not bear transgressors” (Rev. ii. 2). Those urged to this duty must be “the spiritual”—those whose lives illustrated the graces of the Spirit (ch. v. 22), for they only would have the capacity and the inclination, while their action would be backed by the full confidence of the Church.

III. **THE SPIRIT IN WHICH THIS DUTY IS TO BE DONE.** “In the spirit of meekness.” Not with harshness or want of sympathy, dwelling bitterly on the sin and expatiating with self-complacent severity on the weakness that led to it; but rather in a spirit of love, patience, and humility, as if they had a sincere compassion for the backslider and a supreme interest in his welfare.

IV. **THE REASON OR GROUND FOR THIS SPIRIT.** “Considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted.” The apostle marks this emphatic consideration by an individualizing transition to the singular number. The case may be thine. You who are spiritual may err. The saints of God have often failed in the very grace for which they were most distinguished. Therefore “let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall.” We are, therefore, admonished to bring offenders with all love and tenderness to a due sense of their sin, and to comfort them lest they should be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow.

**Ver. 2.—The bearing of others’ burdens.** “One another’s burdens do ye bear, and so ye shall thoroughly fulfil the law of Christ.” This verse is an advance upon the first verse, for it greatly widens the sphere of duty. Consider—

I. **THE BURDENS TO BE BORNE.** They are not simply “the infirmities of the weak,” which the Roman Christians were called upon to bear; but sins, sorrows, errors, and temptations. It is a serious thing for the weak or the wayward to make themselves a burden to others, who have burdens enough of their own to carry. The Apostle Paul is an illustration: “Who is weak, and I am not weak?”

II. **THE DUTY OF CHRISTIANS.** As if to show that there is no separate interest in the Church of God, the apostle tells believers that the sins and infirmities of others are not only to be tolerated, but taken up as burdens. This is more than a counsel to “support the weak, to be patient toward all men.” Travellers have often to carry the burdens of their comrades who become faint by the way. It would be a serious thing for the weak, if believers were to draw away from them and allow them to carry their own burdens. “A Christian must have strong shoulders and stout legs in order to bear the flesh, that is, the weakness of the brethren” (Luther). Christian life is a burden-bearing, but, after all, it is something short of the supreme Sacrifice. “We ought to lay down our lives for the brethren.” Let us, therefore, bear transgressors upon our hearts at the throne of grace, and upon our shoulders by brotherly help and patience. Our gratification is not to be the rule for the exercise of our Christian liberty.

III. **THE MOTIVE TO THIS DUTY.** “Ye shall thoroughly fulfil the law of Christ.” That is the new commandment, “that ye love one another” (John xiii. 14). There could be no burden-bearing except from a principle of love, and the fulfilment of the



duty implies a fulfilment of Christ's law. This law is not to be conceived of as if it had come in the place of the moral Law, or as if believers were now exempt from Law even as a rule of life. "Love is the fulfilling of the Law." It was so in Old Testament times; for the sum of the Decalogue is love (Matt. xxii. 40); and the Apostle Paul exhorts believers to love one another, on the ground of its being a requirement of the moral Law (Rom. xiii. 8, 9). We need Law as well as love. Law tells me what to do; love gives me power to do it. Our Lord never enjoined a greater love than the Law of Moses, though he prescribed more modes of its manifestation. The law of Christ, therefore, is only new in so far as it is enjoined upon a new model, "Love one another as I have loved you"—as it is addressed only to believers, as it sprang out of a new necessity as the distinguishing mark of discipleship, and as it goes forth into life with a new impressiveness. So regarded, the injunction to the Galatians becomes doubly impressive, as our Lord's example has the force of a law for us, for he bore with us in our weaknesses, and cannot but be touched with the feeling of our infirmities.

*Ver. 3.—A warning against self-deceit.* The high but false estimate that men may form of themselves is the great hindrance to this mutual burden-bearing. Consider—

I. THE STRANGENESS OF SELF-DECEPTION. It is not remarkable that a man should be the dupe of others, but strange that he should be the dupe of himself. Yet there are many who think themselves to be something when they are nothing—partly from the want of self-knowledge; partly from the deceitfulness and pride of the human heart; partly from the fallacious habit of measuring themselves by the attainments of others; partly, too, from the influence of false teachings.

II. ITS EVIL EFFECTS UPON THE MAN HIMSELF. He deceives himself, but he cannot deceive either God or man. It is a fatal delusion while it lasts, for it stands in the way of all improvement. He lives in a fool's paradise. If he had once discovered that he was nothing he would be put in the way of getting the foundation rightly laid, and he would be the more likely to have points of sympathy with the outcast and fallen. The sense of our own weakness is the best motive to an indulgent consideration for others.

III. ITS EVIL EFFECTS AS REGARDS OTHERS. This is the crowning idea of the passage. The self-deceived man is incapable of bearing others' burdens. In fact, the imagination of superior piety leads him to be harsh and censorious and overbearing to others. There are sects in our day which pretend to a deeper communion with God than other Christians, and they are only remarkable for a censorious pride which kills love. The self-deceived man thinks meanly of others' attainments, in opposition to the gospel temper, which counsels Christians "in lowliness of mind to think others better than themselves;" while he takes no delight in their graces or gifts, and will accept neither instruction nor correction from others. He seems self-supporting and self-contained, exempt from frailty, sin, and sorrow, and therefore cares nothing for the sins or the sorrows of others. It is only the disposition that can say, "Not I, but the grace of God in me," that will be ready for that mutual burden-bearing which conduces so much to the comfort and cohesion of Christian society.

*Ver. 4.—The necessity of testing our work.* "But let each one prove his own work." It is not a mere call to self-examination, though that is a commanded duty which tends to deepen the sense of our infirmity and our need of a higher strength; it is a call to prove, not himself, but his work—for there is a sort of introspection which might only foster his self-importance; but a powerful check is provided by a rigorous account being taken of "work." The self-deception is mainly subjective; the correction is supplied by an objective standard applied to the work done—the broad practical result of his life. The result will be that "then," on the supposition that the work has stood the test, "he shall have his ground of boasting only in relation to himself, and not in relation to the other"—the man with whom he was comparing himself. He may test his own work, but he cannot test the work of the other man. The apostle does not mean to say that the test would be favourable, for, judging by himself, self-examination would discover, along with graces and virtues, many frailties and follies, that would lead him to glory, not in himself, but in the mercy and love of the Lord. Self-examination is not designed to leave us satisfied with ourselves or

oven free from doubts and fears, but to lead us to the Lord for fresh pardon and grace. It is a useful corrective to the merely morbid self-scrutiny with which men torment themselves, to have the test applied to their work.

Ver. 5.—*Our own individual burden.* “For each one shall bear his own burden.” He is not called to glory in reference to his neighbour, for he has his own burden to carry. The “burdens” of the second verse point to the mutual sympathy; the “burden,” or load, of this verse, to that burden which each one carries for himself and no one can carry for him.

I. MARK THE INDIVIDUALITY OF EACH MAN'S POSITION IN GOD'S SIGHT. Though God has set us in a wonderful scheme of human relations, we have an individual life that cannot be touched by man. We are individually responsible to God. This individuality sets man, as it were, in a solitude. He lives alone; he suffers alone; he dies alone. If he has pain in his body, no sympathy of friends can destroy it; it is still his pain. Our friends may soothe our dying moments by their prayers and their words of affection; but still we die alone. Thus every man carries alone, and apart from other men, his own burden of responsibility, or of frailty, or of sorrow. “Each soldier bears his own kit.”

II. MARK THE INFERENCES TO BE DRAWN FROM THIS INDIVIDUALITY OF POSITION. The apostle does not mean to countenance the neglect of social concern nor to recommend a selfish isolation in human relations, but he condemns the harsh judgments pronounced upon others by men who have their own imperfections and infirmities to answer for. We cannot lighten the burden of our own responsibilities by any attempt to bear hardly upon others.

Ver. 6.—*The duty of supporting the ministry.* “But let him who is being instructed in the Word communicate with him that teacheth in all good things.” The apostle had spoken of burdens, but he did not mean to exempt the Galatians from the burden of supporting their teachers. Perhaps they were niggardly—for Gaulish avarice was a proverb—and it was necessary to teach them their duty.

I. THIS PASSAGE IMPLIES THAT THERE IS AN ORDER OF MINISTERS IN THE CHURCH. If the ministry was common to all Christians, why should there have been provision made for the support of a particular class? 1. It is implied that the ministers were teachers, not mere celebrants of ritualistic devotion or spectacle. They taught orally, as the word signifies. It was thus that the early disciples were “nourished up in the words of good doctrine.” 2. It is implied that the Word of God was their text-book. The early Christians were “taught in the Word.” They had the Scriptures in their own tongue, and were in a position to test the teaching of their guides as well as “to try the spirits” generally. 3. It is implied that the teachers referred to devoted themselves entirely to the work of ministry. They had isolated themselves from secular employments, else why should it be necessary to provide them with an independent support?

II. THIS PASSAGE TEACHES THAT MINISTERS ARE TO RECEIVE AN ADEQUATE MAINTENANCE. They are to share “in all good things;” not as a gift or dole, but as a right; for Christ said, “The labourer is worthy of his hire.” If inspired teachers like the apostles and prophets deserved this consideration, is it not much more needed for a class of teachers who spend much time and thought in preparation for their work? The duty is clearly set forth by the apostle. (1 Thess. ii. 6, 9; 2 Cor. xi. 7; ix.; Phil. iv. 10; 1 Tim. v. 17, 18). Luther says, “Whosoever will not give the Lord God a penny gets his due when he is forced to give the devil a dollar.” Calvin suggests that “it is one of the tricks of Satan to defraud godly ministers of support that the Church may be deprived of their services.”

Vers. 7, 8.—*The two sowings and the two reapings.* The Galatians were probably disposed to find excuses for avoiding the responsibility of supporting their religious teachers. The apostle warns them of the danger of self-deception, and, above all, of the danger of imagining that a man may sow to the flesh and yet expect to reap the fruits of the Spirit. Mark—

I. THE SOLEMN WARNING AGAINST SELF-DECEPTION. “Be not deceived; God is not

mocked." Whether the self-deception arise from pride or corruption of heart, or from the perversions of false teachers, some might imagine that there would be no harvest after the present life; others might suppose that they would not reap the same sort of seed they were sowing; others, that the harvest would have no relation to the degree or proportion of the goodness or badness of the seed. They are sternly warned not to deceive themselves. They might impose upon themselves. That is all they can do. God is not mocked, either by a presumptuous neglect of a Divine command or with services that are pretended and not real.

II. THERE IS A NECESSARY CONNECTION BETWEEN THE SOWING AND THE REAPING. It is impossible for men to break the Divine order established in the nature of things. There is a sowing-time; there will be a reaping-time. The reaping will be as the sowing. He that sows wheat will reap wheat; he that sows cockle will reap cockle. Nobody expects, after sowing wheat, to have a crop of thistles. So it is in the acts of human life. If a man sow the seeds of charity, the harvest will be answerable both in kind and in degree. The actions of this life are as seed sown for the life to come. The tare-sower cannot expect wheat; for "whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap."

III. THE TWO SOWINGS AND THE TWO REAPINGS. "He that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting." The flesh and the Spirit represent, as it were, two corn-fields, in which different kinds of seed are sown. The future and the present here stand in the strictest connection. 1. *The sowing to the flesh.* The flesh is the unregenerate nature. Every act of life has a distinct relation to the gratification of that nature. The idea of the apostle is elsewhere represented in vivid phrase. The man who "sows to the flesh" is he who "walks after the flesh" (Rom. viii. 4), who "minds the things of the flesh" (Rom. viii. 5), who is "in the flesh" (Rom. viii. 5), who "lives after the flesh," who "minds earthly things," who "fulfils the desires of the flesh and of the mind," who "presents his members unto sin as instruments of unrighteousness" (Rom. vi. 13). 2. *The terrible reaping.* We see part of the harvest in this life. We see drunkenness dogged by disease, idleness with rags, pride with scorn, and the rejection of God by the belief of a lie. But the passage clearly points to the harvest at the end of the world, when the seed germinates into corruption. This is moral death (2 Pet. ii. 12; 1 Cor. iii. 17). "To be carnally minded is death." Great in consequence will be the misery of man upon him. 3. *The sowing to the Spirit.* All the acts of the believer have relation to the life of grace: he lays up treasure in heaven; the life created by the Spirit can have no pause—it renounces self and lives to God. 4. *The blessed reaping.* The harvest is everlasting life. The connection between the reaping and the sowing in the first case is that of desert; the connection in this case is established by grace; for, while "the wages of sin is death," "the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. vi. 23). Though the harvest is everlasting life to all sowers to the Spirit, it will not be the same to all; for "every one is to receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether good or bad."

IV. CONCLUSIONS. The passage suggests: 1. That we ought to have a due consideration to the importance of our present conduct. 2. That the hypocrite is a fool who imagines that he can sow to the flesh and yet reap "life everlasting." 3. That it is only by faith in Jesus Christ we shall ever be brought to cease sowing to the flesh and begin sowing to the Spirit.

Ver. 9.—*Encouragement to perseverance in well-doing.* The apostle enlarges the compass of his exhortation so as to include well-doing in general. Consider—

I. WELL-DOING IS THE DUTY, THE DIGNITY, THE DESTINY, OF BELIEVERS. 1. "We are, as God's workmanship, created unto good works." (Eph. ii. 10.) 2. It is "good and profitable to men" that believers should be careful to maintain good works. These works are to be "maintained for necessary uses" (Titus iii. 8, 14). 3. They are to follow the example of Christ, "who went about every day doing good" (Acts x. 38), and who so pointedly declared that it was lawful to do well on the sabbath day (Matt. xii. 12).

II. THE IMPORTANCE OF PERSEVERANCE IN WELL-DOING. "Be not weary in well-doing." The same counsel he gives to the Thessalonians (2 Thess. iii. 13). He does not hint that the Galatians were not already doing good; he merely suggests that they

must not weary in it. How much depends on perseverance! (1) God's glory is greatly promoted; (2) the prosperity of the Church powerfully enhanced; (3) our own reward proportionately increased. Therefore we ought to be open to new opportunities, to new occasions, to new objects, of usefulness.

III. THE CAUSES OF WEARINESS IN WELL-DOING. They are numerous and complex in their operation. 1. The friction of life in a world with ungodly tendencies. 2. The ingratitude and unworthiness of those we befriend. 3. We are cooled by the coldness of other men. 4. Our patience is exhausted by the number seeking our help. 5. There is so much to be done that it seems useless to begin in the hope of overtaking everything. 6. There is so much opposition to the best plans of goodness. 7. Physical fatigue has a tendency to generate moral weariness.

IV. ENCOURAGEMENT TO PERSEVERANCE. Our work will not be resultless. "In due season we shall reap, if we faint not." 1. There is a regular time for the harvest. "The harvest is the end of the world." The sowing goes on all through our lives. We must not be disheartened because the interval appears long. "Thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just." If you do not find the results of Christian service on earth, you will find them in heaven. "Be patient therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord. Behold, the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receive the early and latter rain" (Jas. v. 7). 2. The reaping will surely come. It will come partly in this world, in the blessing of God upon all we possess and all we do, in the gratitude and prayers of those we help, and in the secret satisfaction which a course of well-doing carries into the heart of the believer. But our full reward will be at the resurrection of the just, and will be proportional to the nature and extent of our labours. Therefore believers ought to be "steadfast, unmovable, ever abounding in the work of the Lord, seeing that our labour shall not be in vain in the Lord" (1 Cor. xv. 58).

Ver. 10.—*The sphere of beneficence.* This verse sums up the ideas of the previous verses, which spoke of beneficence in general, by setting forth its objects and occasions.

I. THE DUTY COMMANDED. "Let us do good." Christian life is not a mere easy and decent inoffensiveness. A man is not harmless who does no good. The barren tree is hurtful, because it cumbers the ground and draws to itself the fertilizing qualities of the earth, which would make a better tree more fruitful. It brings forth no bad fruit; yet it is cast into the fire. Therefore we must not only "cease to do evil," but "learn to do well." "To do good and to communicate forget not" (Heb. xiii. 16).

II. THE DUTY BOUNDED BY OPPORTUNITY. "As we have therefore opportunity." Cotton Mather says, "The opportunity to do good imposes the obligation to do it." It is not when our inclination or our self-interest or the thirst for fame or gratitude dispose us that we are to do good, but at every opportunity that opens on our path. These opportunities are constantly around us in the common intercourse of life, but they specially arise in connection with suffering and distress. Therefore "in the morning sow thy seed, and in the evening withhold not thine hand."

III. THE SPHERE OF BENEVOLENCE. There is a wider sphere, and a narrower within it: "Do good unto all men, and especially to them who are of the household of faith." There are distinctions even in the wider sphere. We recognize them in the obligations of family life. "If any man provide not for his own, he is worse than an infidel;" we recognize the claims of friendship and of gratitude; yet our beneficence is to extend to all men within the range of opportunity. It is a significant fact that the Apostle Peter, in naming the successive grades of life that are essential to our partaking of the Divine nature, says, "Add to your brotherly kindness charity." There may be a selfish or sectarian feeling that leads us to forget the wider relations in which we stand in the scheme of Divine providence. Yet the brotherly kindness stands first. We are to do good, "especially to them who are of the household of faith;" on the same principle as we are bound to remember first the wants of our family or our friends. The spirit of the Rousseau philanthropy would not tolerate any distinctions of this sort. The household in question, which includes the whole collective body of Christians, is a large, a growing, a loving household, and, in early times, sorely scattered by persecution. There was, therefore, a special need to show kindness to its members. The "collection for the saints" (1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2) is a practical illustration of this nearer relationship.

Ver. 11.—*A personal postscript.* “Ye see in what large letters I write with mine own hand.” There is a mystery about these large characters. It is conjectured that they may have been due to age, or to infirmity, or to weakness of eyes, or to the want of habit in writing Greek. But it is more interesting to see that, unlike other Epistles, which were written by an amanuensis, this one was written entirely with his own hand.

I. TO SHOW HIS LOVE FOR THE GALATIANS. The autograph would be a precious possession to them. It is the largest Epistle he ever wrote with his own hand.

II. TO PREVENT IMPOSTURE. Letters were sometimes forged in his name (2 Thess. ii. 2; iii. 17). But his handwriting, being probably already known to them, would prevent misunderstanding as to the authorship.

III. TO GIVE GREATER WEIGHT TO THE EPISTLE. It showed his profound anxiety on their account at a most critical moment.

Vers. 12, 13.—*Exposure of the tactics of his adversaries.* The apostle recapitulates in a few sentences the contents of the Epistle and exhibits the falseness of his Judaistic adversaries in a clear light. Mark—

I. THEIR DOGMATIC ATTITUDE. They “desire to make a fair show in the flesh.” They made a pretentious display of religion by a zeal for external rites—“the unrenewed nature cropping out under its more special aspect of sensuousness and externalism.” Yet all the while they affected a peculiar concern for God and religion.

II. THEIR URGENT ZEAL. “They are constraining you to be circumcised;” their delusive flatteries (ch. iii. 1), their arguments, their example, having all the stress of moral compulsion. The Judaizers had an immense and eager zeal for proselytism, and were asleep in their efforts to undermine the gospel of liberty.

III. THE TRUE MOTIVE OF THEIR CONDUCT. “Only lest they should suffer persecution for the cross of Christ.” 1. *Their conduct was cowardly.* They would avoid persecution either by renouncing Christianity altogether or by shaping it into Judaistic forms. The last was the course they took. They had no true love for the cause of religion when they insisted upon the indispensableness of circumcision, for their real motive was to protect themselves from the fierce anger of their countrymen. The cross of Christ offered salvation without law of any kind, and welcomed the Gentiles without their becoming Jewish proselytes; but the Judaizers, by circumcising the Gentiles, desired to show their countrymen that, in attaching themselves to the gospel, they did not abandon the Mosaic Law or ritual. 2. *Their conduct was hypocritical.* “For neither they themselves who are circumcised keep the Law.” They placed a burden on their Gentile converts which they were not themselves willing to bear. “Indifferent themselves, they make capital out of you.” They make convenient selections out of the precepts of the Law; for they have no idea of obeying the whole Law, though it all rests upon Divine authority. 3. *Their conduct was self-interested.* “They desire to have you circumcised, that they may glory in your flesh.” They wanted to swell the importance of their sect by a large array of proselytes, who were to bear in the flesh the mark of their instructions.

IV. IT WAS JUST AND NECESSARY THAT THE APOSTLE SHOULD EXPOSE A POLICY SO MEAN, SO MERCENARY, SO INSINCERE. Love may prompt the covering of a neighbour's faults, but it is right to expose religious seducers of all sorts.

Ver. 14.—*The true ground of the apostle's glorying.* “But for me far be it to glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ.”

I. THE CROSS OF CHRIST. 1. *This is not, as Romanists say, the wooden cross.* It would be beneath the good sense of the apostle to say that he gloried in a piece of wood. 2. *It was not the metaphorical cross borne by believers—afflictions.* “If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me” (Matt. xvi. 24). 3. *It was the atoning death of Christ.* The apostle did not glory in this because of its moral influence upon his life, nor even because it was a manifestation of Divine justice and love, but because Christ, through his expiatory sufferings on the cross, procured for us eternal life, which he applies by his Holy Spirit.

II. THE ATTITUDE OF THE APOSTLE TOWARD THE CROSS. He gloried in it. 1. It implied that he had abandoned the way of righteousness by the Law. 2. It implied

that he trusted in the atoning death of Christ for salvation. 3. It implied the exclusion of all other elements in which errorists might trust as grounds of salvation.

III. THE EFFECTS OF THE CROSS OF CHRIST. "By which the world has been crucified to me, and I unto the world." It is not material whether the double crucifixion here described is referred to Christ or to his cross; for as it is only Christ crucified whom the apostle preached, it is through him the believer is crucified to the world. Christ's cross has sundered the relationship between Paul and the world. They are dead to each other. Luther says, "The world and I are well agreed. The world cares not a pin for me, and I, to cry quittance with it, care as little for the world." Consider: 1. *What is the world?* It is that sphere of things in which the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life find their natural development. It is the world as opposed to God. "The friendship of this world is enmity with God" (Jas. iv. 4). 2. *How is the world crucified to the apostle?* It is not that the apostle regards (1) the world as useless. (2) Nor as a place to be abandoned, in a spirit of monkish austerity. Luther says, "The monks dreamed that the world was crucified to them when they entered into their monasteries; but by this means Christ is crucified, and not the world. Yea, the world is delivered from crucifying." (3) Nor as a scene upon which he is to wreak his morbid spite or bitter misanthropy. But (4) it implies that the world had lost its attractions for him, its power over him, its influence to lead him astray. There was a time when he was not so crucified—he was "alive once;" but death in Christ and with Christ was his death to the world and the death of that world to him. 3. *How is he crucified to the world?* The world regards him as a dead man, who has no longer any attractions that it should desire him. It regards him no longer as its own, and therefore hates him to the point of persecution. This inter-crucifixion came about through his union with Christ, and that union was effected by the cross. Well, therefore, might the apostle glory in the cross!

Ver. 15.—*The fundamental fact in Christian life.* This is regeneration. The Jew might find it in circumcision; the Gentile in liberty; but "in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creation." Consider—

I. THAT CHRIST OBLITERATES THE MOST HIGHLY VALUED DISTINCTIONS. 1. *In him the old separating distinctions are no longer in force.* They have ceased to be. Jews and Gentiles are made one in Christ. They are fellow-citizens, of the same body, of the household of God (Eph. ii. 19). They are made "one new man." 2. *In him the old separating distinctions have lost all their value.* Neither circumcision nor uncircumcision ever availed anything for justification. The Jew might be ready enough to concede the point as to uncircumcision, but he would be offended to hear that his circumcision availed nothing. The sentence of the apostle outs up by the roots all the ritualism of the Churches. Eating of meats, celibacy, holidays, are nothing; we are no better for abstaining nor are we the worse for eating.

II. THAT THE FUNDAMENTAL FACT IN CHRISTIANITY IS REGENERATION. 1. This constitutes it an entirely spiritual system, in which the outer is nothing, the inward is everything. It is not a mere change of opinion, or of party, or of outward life. It is not of "blood;"—men may be noble by birth, but they cannot be holy by birth; "not of the will of man," as many a godly father knows by bitter experience as he mourns over the waywardness of ungodly children. 2. The new life originates in Christ. "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature" (2 Cor. v. 17). The spiritual renewal springs from union with Christ. It is "not of the will of man," for man cannot change his own heart. Christ is our very Life (ch. ii. 20). 3. It is a new life; for it has new thoughts, new desires, new principles, new affections, and stands in everlasting relation to the new name, the new song, the new Jerusalem, the new heavens, and the new earth. The new birth, in a word, has ushered the believer into a new world.

Ver. 16.—*The apostolic blessing.* This takes its colour from the tenor of the Epistle. Consider—

I. THE AUTHORITATIVE RULE FOR CHRISTIAN GUIDANCE. "As many as walk according to this rule." 1. *Christians are not lawless in their obedience.* They walk according to rule, and are never so free as within the limits of rule. 2. *The rule is evidently that expressed in the previous verse—that what is outward in religion is*

nothing, and what is inward is everything; that the new creation is the whole of religion. If this position were rightly recognized, to be a Jew would be no privilege, to be a Gentile would be no barrier.

II. **THE BENEDICTION.** "Peace be on them, and mercy." The two greatest blessings of the covenant. Peace is the distinctive theocratic gift—"Peace shall be upon Israel" (Ps. cxxv. 5); mercy is the blessing in which peace finds at once its origin and support.

III. **THE OBJECTS OF THE BLESSING.** Those "who walk according to this rule" and "the Israel of God." The first class was not Gentile believers as such, and the second Jewish believers as such. The blessing is for the entire number who walk according to this rule, but the apostle finds among them a class whom he describes with a tender and suggestive fitness as "the Israel of God." He had been all along proving that the true Israel was "of faith," but he evidently thinks of his countrymen as standing apart from their Judaistic perverters in the glorious eminence of "the Israel of God." It is a peculiar expression, still more distinctive even than "Israel after the Spirit," and emphasizes the Divine ownership in those who are "the circumcision, who worship God in the Spirit, who rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh" (Phil. iii. 3).

Ver. 17.—*An apostle pleading for forbearance.* He now turns round to his adversaries, and with one parting word asks to be let alone.

I. **A CLAIM TO BE LEFT UNMOLESTED.** "Henceforth let no man cause me troubles," by gainsaying my doctrine, impugning my apostleship, or imposing upon me the labour of a defence. He might well appeal to their forbearance; he needed to be strengthened rather than weakened, comforted rather than discouraged.

II. **THE GROUND OF HIS CLAIM.** "I bear in my body the marks of Jesus." "I"—not the false teachers who plan to escape persecution by their hypocrisy—"bear in my body the marks"—in many scourgings, wounds, and scars—of Christ's ownership. These marks were the visible vouchers of his apostleship.

Ver. 18.—*His parting word.* "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit, brethren. Amen." The Epistle began with a salutation of grace and peace; it ends with grace.

I. **THE BLESSING.** "Grace," which is at once the beginning, middle, and end of Paul's theology; and the beginning, middle, and end of Christian life.

II. **THE TOKEN OF PARTING TENDERNESS.** "Brethren." It comes last in the sentence, as if, after all his grave censures, he would remember they were still brethren in Christ. His spirit softens as his pen traces the closing words of the Epistle, and the sweet "Amen" seals everything with the token of his deep sincerity and his tender interest in their welfare.

#### HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

Vers. 1—5.—*The restoration of the erring.* The walk in the Spirit, which eschews vain-glory and envy, further manifests itself in consideration for the erring. The sins of others become our concern, and we anxiously seek how we can best have them restored. Here, then, is a burden which Christians have not undertaken as earnestly and sympathetically as they ought to have done; it is the burden of sin which weighs on other people's hearts.

I. **THE PREPARATION FOR DEALING WITH OTHER PEOPLE'S SINS.** (Vers. 1—3.) The idea of Paul here is that the Pharisaic temper is utterly incapable of the restoration of the erring. Thinking himself to be something, not realizing that he is in God's sight nothing, the Pharisee deceives himself, and so cannot become the guide of others. He will be severe through his self-satisfaction, hard and unsympathetic because he is ignorant of his own need and cannot consequently know the needs of others. His pride makes sympathy for the abased impossible, and he passes on in utter usefulness. But when the Lord makes us meek, when the Lord impresses upon us the fact of our own liability to temptation, when the Lord leads us to the sifting of our own work, and to a higher standard than mere comparison of it with that of others, when, in a

word, we are led out of *Pharisaic* thankfulness that we are not as other men into Christian humility and self-abasement,—then are we in some measure fitted to take up the problem of other people's trespasses and to solve it. It is the "spiritual" who are to undertake the delicate work.

III. THE LAW OF CHRIST IS TO BE OUR METHOD. (Ver. 2.) Now, when we consider broadly the work of Christ, we find that it resolves itself exactly into this work of restoring the erring. This was the purpose of his life and death, to bear other people's burdens—the burdens of sin. Of course, Christ could deal with sin in a more radical way than we can. He was sinless; he was Divine; he could accept of the responsibilities of human sins and atone for them, as we cannot do. But we can surely have fellowship with him in concern about other people's spiritual state; we can sympathize with them, and perhaps encourage them to make us their *confidantes*, so that we may do something for their relief. We can also keep their restoration steady as a star before us, and follow the Master in leading them to renewed hope. In all these ways we may follow the law of Christ in dealing with delinquent brethren. The fact is that, because we cannot share in Christ's atoning work, we are tempted often to let sin lie outside our deliberate philanthropy. We are willing enough, perhaps, to help a fellow out of the burden of poverty, of outward misfortune; but to help him as a spiritual counsellor seems beyond our province. And yet we are not surely very thorough in our philanthropy if we do not try to touch and remove the deeper burden of heart-trouble by leading the erring to our elder Brother.

III. THERE WILL BE JOY AS WELL AS DISAPPOINTMENT UPON THIS PATH OF CHRISTIAN SYMPATHY. The heavenly world gets more joy out of the penitent prodigals than out of the unfallen beings (Luke xv. 1-10). It is the same with us in our humble efforts after restoring erring brethren. What a joy it is to think that he has repented and got unburdened and restored! There is no joy of exactly the same pure intensity in all the world. There is music and dancing in our hearts as in the great Father's house. Earth and heaven are one (Luke xv. 25). There will be a measure of disappointment. Souls over whom we have sighed and wept, for whose salvation we have longed, may disappoint us sadly; but we can assure ourselves that in this respect also we are in fellowship with God. Every impenitent soul must be a disappointment to the Supreme! We leave the mystery at his holy feet, and, notwithstanding disappointment, resolve in dependence on him to work bravely on until our day is done, persuaded that our tale of souls relieved shall be longer in the end than we have dared to dream.—R. M. E.

Vers. 6-10.—*The seed-time of philanthropy.* Paul has just spoken of the most delicate and precious form of philanthropy—that which deals with a brother's sins. And now he passes on to speak, just for a moment, of the duty which the Galatians owe to their spiritual teachers. They are pre-eminently the unburdeners of men's hearts; they undertake as life's chief work the ministering to minds diseased. Let them be considered, therefore, and receive all good things from those they serve. But he passes on to the greater truth of which this "ministerial support" is only a small application—that life is a seed-time; and, according as men sow, must they reap. Let philanthropy rejoice, therefore, in every opportunity of doing other people good, for a harvest with its golden glory awaits all true workers in the other life.

I. WHEN THIS LIFE IS LOOKED UPON AS SEED-TIME, WE ARE PROJECTED OF NECESSITY FOR OUR HARVEST UPON ANOTHER AND BETTER LIFE. The mistake many make is in turning this life into harvest and looking on what it affords as all. It makes a mighty difference if I am living in the autumn only and am for ever past the spring. Now, Christianity, as the religion of hope, leads us to this view of the present life. It is only seed-time. The harvest is not yet. No refinement of speculation can be allowed to cheat us of our assurance of immortality. We are only in the spring. The summer and the autumn are before us.

II. THOSE WHO SOW TO THE FLESH HAVE A FEARFUL HARVEST BEFORE THEM. (Ver. 8.) Now, it is well for us to remember here that ritualism, or salvation by ceremonies, is the error mainly attacked in this Epistle. And a careful study of Paul's writings shows that he puts this into the same category as the sins of the flesh. "Whereas there is among you," said he to the Corinthians, "envying, and strife, and divisions, are ye not carnal, and walk as men?" The exclusiveness of the ceremonialists



was a bondage to the elements of the world. "The Law," it has been powerfully said, "was properly a schoolmaster to bring them to Christ; but in so far as its temporary disciplinary character was lost sight of—so far as it was made a ground of national exclusiveness, and its observance a matter of personal pride—it cut its votaries off from the righteousness of God, which is essentially a derived, communicated, and universal righteousness; not of works, but of grace; not for a peculiar people, but for all men. They were living, not in the freedom and self-abandonment of the Spirit, but in the exclusiveness and selfishness of the flesh." Hence the sowing to the flesh, in its more elevated or more degraded forms, can have only one issue, and this is "corruption." What comes of the exclusiveness and fair show in the flesh? Does it promote spiritual interests? Is it not productive of vain-glory and of the corrupt, self-righteous spirit? The harvest is one of disappointment. It profiteth nothing. Into the corruption to which the grosser sins of the flesh lead we need not here enter with any particularity.

III. THOSE WHO SOW TO THE SPIRIT SHALL REAP ETERNAL LIFE, (Ver. 8.) The sowing to the Spirit is the antithesis of sowing to the flesh. It means living with spiritual and immortal aims. It means, as the succeeding context shows, the life of active philanthropy. Now, a harvest of "eternal life" (Revised Version) is before all such philanthropists. Their life on earth is a seed-time which has this immortal harvest. The very life of God, who is eternal, becomes ours, and its fulness within us is just proportional to our present diligence in philanthropy.

IV. THIS SHOULD LEAD TO GREAT PATIENCE AND COURAGE IN OUR WORK. (Ver. 9.) We should not faint or get weary in our well-doing. Work along this line is sure to tell. Let us not be discouraged. Let us give the first place in our philanthropy to "the household of faith," and the second place to "all men" indiscriminately. Let us honestly be public benefactors, and a multiplication of blessing will be found awaiting us when the harvest comes, beyond our most sanguine hopes. The patience of hope is the attitude of every believing soul, and the harvest is in a wealth of life beyond the shadows proportional to our philanthropic spirit here.—R. M. E.

Vers. 11-18.—*Glorying in the cross.* Paul has been urging the Galatians to do good to all men, for now is the seed-time of philanthropy, and the harvest will be afterwards. And now he appeals to them by the "large letters" of this unique Epistle, which seems to have been the only one which was a complete autograph. Though penmanship was a trouble to him, he was yet anxious to do for these Galatians what good he could in the spirit he has been enforcing. But philanthropy has its counterfeits. Consequently he warns them once again against those teachers of ceremonialism, who would have the heathen converts to try to save themselves by Jewish ceremonies. These are merely making tools of them to save themselves. They wish to escape persecution for Christianity. Paul, on the other hand, glories in the cross, and carries in his body the marks of the Crucified One. The following thoughts are here suggested:—

I. THE TOLERATION EXTENDED BY THE HEATHEN WORLD TO JUDAISM. The heathen world was largely latitudinarian. The idea was comprehensive. All gods were to be put in the Pantheon. But among the idolatries of the East, Judaism, a spiritual worship, got a footing. Its synagogues were built side by side with the heathen temples, and they were allowed to worship without molestation. Their proselytism was trifling; their missionary enterprise was unworthy of the name. The heathen could not fear them. Hence their immunity from persecution.

II. THE JEWISH TEACHERS THOUGHT THAT, IF THEY MADE ALL CHRISTIAN CONVERTS JEWISH PROSELYTES, THEY WOULD SECURE CHRISTIANITY FROM PERSECUTION. They did not want to be persecuted for the cross. They wanted to avail themselves of the toleration of Judaism and merge Christianity in it. An emasculated Christianity might escape the persecution which, in its naked simplicity, it was fitted to secure. It was a policy of compromise, begotten of cowardice and fear. Pride went along with it. It would be a grand thing to count up so many converts to Judaism, and glory in the growth of circumcision. It was a selfish stroke under the guise of philanthropy.

III. THE ANTAGONISM INDICATED BY THE CROSS. Now, the cross of Christ is the expression of the antagonism of the world to the self-sacrificing Philanthropist who thus perished. It could not and would not tolerate the person who would not save himself when he had the power. It believes only in those who can take care of number one.

As soon, then, as a man like Paul gets into unison with the crucified Christ, as soon as the cross becomes an experience within, and a self-sacrificing spirit takes hold of a man for the sake of doing good to others, that moment the world and he become antagonistic. They cannot get on together. The world is crucified to the person and he to the world. Each wishes to put the other out of the way, and as contemptuously as possible. As soon, therefore, as the world discovered what Christianity meant, that it meant a brotherhood of self-sacrificing philanthropy, it took alarm, for it saw that, if Christianity were not put down, it would put worldliness down. Hence the drawback of persecution attaching to the Christian faith.

IV. IN THIS UNWORLDLY CROSS PAUL GLORIED. He appreciated its efficacy. He recognized its claims. He allowed it to make him unworldly. Hence he made it the sum and substance of his teaching. He preached "Christ crucified" continually. Circumcision was nothing in which to glory. It was a carnal ordinance which might be very carnally administered, and a mere stepping-stone for pride. But the cross of Jesus was an object in which to glory. Its spirit was so unworldly, so self-sacrificing, so noble, that nothing in this world was so worthy of our interest and glorying.<sup>1</sup>

V. HE HAD CHRIST'S HAND UPON HIS BODY. Now, if a man goes in for self-sacrifice, as Paul did, under the spell of Christ's cross, his body will soon show it. There can be no pampering of the flesh. A spiritual soul soon makes the tenement enshrining it to transmit some of its glory. Paul shows the marks of self-sacrifice upon his person. Christ had made him his slave, and put the brand upon him. As Christ's prisoner, he had the seals of office in his person. Consequently, no man need trouble him or try to move him away from his standard, the cross. It is a noble ending to this fine Epistle. May it make all its students to glory in the cross also!—R. M. E.

Vers. 1—5.—*Treatment of a fallen brother.* I. CHRISTIAN WAY OF TREATING A FALLEN BROTHER. 1. *It is our duty to restore him.* "Brethren, even if a man be overtaken in any trespass, ye which are spiritual, restore such a one in a spirit of meekness; looking to thyself, lest thou also be tempted." This subject arises out of the warning against vain-glory at the close of the last chapter. When a vain-glorious spirit possesses a society, some provoke as superiors, and others are filled with envy as inferiors. Vain-glory is usually connected with such external things as rank and wealth. The apostle here supposes it carried beyond these, carried *even* (that seems to be the force of the word) into the inner sphere of character. He supposes some one connected with the society (presumably the Christian society) falling into sin. He describes him as overtaken in some trespass. The language defines without excusing. It indicates that the trespass was solitary or occasional, and not habitual. If it had been habitual, then he was not entitled to a place in the society, and the proper course toward him would have been excommunication. But the trespass was not to be regarded as a fair representation of his character as a whole. He was overtaken in it, before he rightly considered what he was doing. That by no means relieved him from blame. It showed a want of steadiness in his Christian course. It showed a want of reliance on the Divine supports. It showed carelessness in the use of appointed means. It could be said to him, "Hast thou not procured this unto thyself, in that thou hast forsaken the Lord thy God, when he led thee by the way?" In such a case, then, how was he to be dealt with by the spiritual, *i.e.* not those who remained true to Paul and his doctrine, nor those who were strong, but those who, according to the Christian idea, desired to be led by the Spirit, to express the mind of the Spirit, *i.e.* in the specified circumstances. It is the teaching of the apostle that we are to *restore a fallen brother*. It is to be our object that he should be brought to a right state of mind. That he should trespass and not be sorry for it would be neither for his good nor for the good of the society. A fallen brother having evinced sorrow, we are to receive him back into the place which he formerly occupied, even as we believe that Christ, from his treatment of sinners when on earth, receives him back. We are to restore him in the spirit of *meekness*, *i.e.* in the spirit

<sup>1</sup> This is a favourite text (ver. 14) with preachers. Among others we may mention Maclaurin in 'Glorying in the Cross;' Saurin, 'Sur la Veritable Glorie du Chretien,' in tome xii. p. 43; D'Aubigne on "The Cross of Jesus Christ," in 'Discourses and Essays;' Huntingdon, "The Cross a Burden or a Glory," in his 'Christian Believing and Living;' and M'Cheyne in the 'Remains,' p. 374.

which, while characterized by faithfulness, is chiefly characterized by meekness. There is to be the absence of *self-exaltation*. We are not to triumph over a brother, as though his fall added to our importance. There is to be the absence of that *harshness* which accompanies *self-exaltation*. We are not to wish to give him a sense of his inferiority to us in respect of his fall, nor are we to wish that he should be filled with sorrow or kept back in any way more than the ends of holiness require. We are not to break the bruised reed, nor to quench the smoking flax. The *ground* on which we are to restore him is of the strongest nature, and, to bring it home with more power, there is a singling out of the reader, "Looking to thyself, lest thou also be tempted." Thou art to look to thyself as not beyond trial. Thou art to look to thyself as having elements of weakness in thy flesh; and therefore liable to be tempted, and, when tempted, to fall. Nay, thou art to think of thyself as having in the past been tempted and having fallen before temptation. It has been said that, when looking on an offending brother, we may reflect with ourselves—We either are, or have been, or may be all that he is. If we have not sinned in the same form, yet have we sinned in a form which may be as heinous before God. We are to regard the fall of a brother only as a call to self-humiliation and tender dealing.

2. *This is to fulfil the law of Christ.* "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ." Mutual dependence is a law of the universe. As the philosophic poet has it, "All are but parts of one stupendous whole." Nothing stands alone; each depends on all. Look at the innumerable worlds that inhabit space. God might have held each world in its place separately and out of relation to every other world. But he has chosen to hold all worlds together as a universe, or one vast world, by a law according to which all worlds and all particles of matter also attract one another in a certain proportion to mass and distance. The material world is one vast inter-dependency, so finely balanced that a modification of a part would necessarily be the modification of the whole; while the aberration of a large mass might be the destruction of the whole. The apostle points out the same thing in the human body. "The eye cannot say unto the head, I have no need of thee; nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you." As in the human body, so it is in human society. The greatest happiness of individuals is not to be attained by each being his own servant, but by there being division of labour and each being as much as possible the servant of all. The greatest happiness of nations is not to be attained by each keeping within its own resources; but by each developing its own resources to the utmost, and exchanging them for those of other nations. It is not, therefore, to be wondered at that Christ, in founding a society, lays down this law of dependence for its regulation. Indeed, he has to enact no new law, but only to give a higher sanction and application to an existing law. He finds men already dependent on one another, all the more by the entrance of sin, and he takes advantage of this for the training of his people. "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ." It is implied that there are certain burdens which one Christian can bear for another, and which that other can bear for him, and which can in this way be lightened for them both.

(1) *Burden of want.* We mean the burden of poverty which is commonly called want, being most palpably, though not most really, so. For we have all to be supplied with our daily bread, and, while some are rich or comparatively rich, *i.e.* to say, have more than they need, others are poor or comparatively poor, *i.e.* to say, have less than they need. God might have ordained all to be rich and none to be poor in the Church. But he has, on the contrary; ordained some to be rich and others to be poor, *i.e.* to say, he has made a dependence of the poor on the rich. "The poor," says the Lawgiver here, "ye have always with you." And we look forward to no golden era of science when there shall be no poor in our Churches. Certain it is that many are poor by circumstances over which they have had no control. And, while trade is not conducted on thoroughly Christian principles, which it will never be while there is sin and selfishness in the heart of man, there will always be circumstances bearing hard on some of our Church members. Now, we are to consider the care of the Christian poor. Having little coming in and perhaps many mouths to fill, they have a real burden on their minds, a burden which we would not choose to bear for ourselves. And the law of Christ is that we are to bear this burden for our fellow-members, those of us who are in a position to do it—bear it as we would have them to do it for us in like circumstances. Why are we not in their position and they not in ours? why have we more than enough and they less than enough? is it not of favour, and

of favour that we may minister to their necessity? And we should minister to their necessity were it only for our own good, to counteract that greed which is apt to grow insidiously upon men who are prospering. And for this reason it were, perhaps, to be wished that there were more poor in some of our Churches, that there might be a greater flow of Christian charity. We are to bear this burden for them, as those who have the same heavenly bread to eat of. A little sacrifice on our part may do much to lighten their burdens and cheer their hearts. And we should be quick to know where we can do good in this way. If there are not always those who are in clamant need, there are always those whose struggle for subsistence might well be made easier, whose difficulties might well be made fewer, and whose comforts might well be added to. As to the way in which we are to do it, we are to do it with discrimination, as good stewards of what we have been entrusted with for others. We are to do it as though it were a luxury to ourselves, and not as though we were conferring an obligation. We may do it secretly when it is no object to manifest personal kindness. We are always to do it with reverence. For, if there is anything in our bearing calculated to destroy the self-respect of the recipient, when he is taken at a disadvantage, then we may be removing one burden, but we are at the same time laying another upon him which it will be more difficult for him to bear. When we give help to any one we should be very studious to make him feel that he is our equal in being a man, and, in the case before us, a Christian.

(2) *Burden of affliction.* We mean the burden of sickness or bereavement. For we are all mortal. "Death has set his mark and seal" on our bodies. We are all liable to sickness and decay. And, when we come within the precincts of the Church, we do not leave our ills behind us. But here, of this one and of that one it is said, "He is sick." Now, we are to consider the case of the afflicted members of the Church. They have a burden to bear. When of those beloved one after another is laid in the grave, the burden of mortality presses heavily enough upon them. "What could be heavier?" they seem to say through their tears. When, by a succession of premonitory symptoms, they are made aware that their own health is failing, the burden seems to press yet more heavily. It is something more to feel for themselves as if life were slipping out of their grasp. When, at last, they are prostrated upon the bed of sickness and are withdrawn, perhaps for ever, from the wonted scene, from the sanctuary, from the sphere of usefulness, the burden seems to be weighted as with lead, and there is a multitude of thoughts within them. Now, Christ has appointed for such; and his law laid upon fellow-members is, "Bear ye this burden for them." We are to bear this burden for them; for we may yet be in their case, and we should like the same office to be performed for us. We are to bear this burden for them; for so closely are we related to them, that it is as though part of ourselves were suffering. If we have a fine spiritual organism, then, what a fellow-Christian suffers will, as it were, vibrate through us. We are to bear this burden in the way of sympathy. We may show our sympathy by a visit to the sick-bed, by a kind inquiry, by a kind office, by a kind expression, by a kind look. We are to be studious to show that we are not wholly taken up with ourselves, but have a place and a tender feeling for them. For, oh, when life is ebbing, it is hard to think that they are forsaken; while it is cheering to think that there are around them messengers of Christ, each, as it were, conveying to them a portion of the Master's sympathy. It is a great accomplishment to be able to administer consolation.

"The noblest art

Is his, who skills of comfort best;

Whom by the softest step and gentlest tone

Enfeebled spirits own,

And love to raise the languid eye,

When like an angel's wing, they feel him fleeting by:—

Feel only, for in silence gently gliding

Fain would he shun both ear and sight."

We should cultivate this Divine art, that we may become proficient in it. We should seek each to be a Barnabas, a son of consolation, especially to the Lord's afflicted ones. It is a fine spectacle to see a pilgrim bearing the burden of a fellow-pilgrim who may be nearing his journey's end. May the Lord, by his grace, break our hearts, so that we shall feel, as with his own fineness of feeling, for every sick Lazarus in our midst!

(3) *Burden of spiritual need.* We mean the burden connected with our living the Christian life. For we have all our spiritual difficulties. We find it hard, with our natural weakness, to live up to the Christian standard. As Christians, we all need encouragement. Now, the ordinance of Christ is that we are to bear this burden for one another. We are to assist one another against the evil of our hearts, against the temptations of life. For this purpose we are constituted into a society, and not left each to live the Christian life apart by ourselves. As members of the same Christian society, we are to be interested not least in one another's highest welfare. It is very encouraging to think that there are persons interested in us as spiritual beings, who have passed through similar experiences themselves, and who are, therefore, anxious to do us all the good that lies in their power. While very sad must it be to be possessed with such a thought as that which possessed the psalmist—we have all felt a little of it in certain moods—"I looked on my right hand and beheld, but there was no one that would know me, refuge failed me, no man cared for my soul." The burden to which we are specially referred in the context is the burden of trespass with which a brother is weighted. Of all burdens, the only intolerable burden is sin. Far more than the burden which a fellow-man may lay upon us, or than what God may see fit to lay upon us, is what we lay upon ourselves when we incur guilt. Of all positions in which human beings may be placed, the worst is that of impenitence, of insensibility to sin. Next to that is when we have been awakened and have afterward been overtaken in a trespass. When there is want of sensibility as to the evil of what we have done, that is an aggravating circumstance. Now, we are to feel burdened with the burden of our brother's trespass. We are to feel vexed and saddened that he has fallen, even as though we had fallen ourselves. We are not to feel for him as though he had been simply unfortunate, but we are to feel for him as placed in the grievous position of having sinned against God. Our sympathy is not to amount to tolerating sin in him. Neither can it avail to relieve him from his guilt. But it may avail to increase his sensibility to sin, and to encourage the desire in him to be delivered from his awful position. The apostle's teaching, in keeping with ch. v. 14, is that the bearing of one another's burdens gives completeness to our filling up of the Law.

II. VAIN-GLORIOUS WAY OF TREATING A FALLEN BROTHER. 1. *The root of the evil.* "For if a man thinketh himself to be something, when he is nothing, he deceiveth himself." It is true that he who triumphs over a brother in his fall injures him, by discouraging him from coming back to the paths of rectitude. But the apostle goes to the root of the matter when he says that he practises deception on himself. He thinks himself to be something when he is nothing. That is true of the vain-glorious man. That in respect of which he raises himself above his neighbour is unreal, or he is in the way of making it unreal by the spirit in which he regards it. And thus in the false importance he attaches to himself he is prevented from being sympathetic. He does not bear his neighbour's burden, because he does not feel his own. 2. *Corrective.* "But let each man prove his own work, and then shall he have his glorying in regard of himself alone, and not of his neighbour." Let him apply the proper tests. Let him not compare himself, especially with one with whom he thinks he can compare favourably. But let him compare himself with the Bible standard. Let him compare himself with the example of Christ. Let him apply the test of humility, "God resisteth the proud, but he giveth grace to the humble." Let him apply the test of brotherly love; "We know that we have passed from death into life, because we love the brethren." The result of this self-examination will be to bring us to reality. If we have the root of the matter in us, then we shall be able to discover the working of Divine grace in us. And if there is also evil discovered, then that, being reason for our being humbled before God, will lead to our having more reality. And then, through self-examination, shall we have matter for glorying in regard of ourselves alone, and not of our neighbour. 3. *Reason for self-examination.* "For each man shall bear his own burden." It was said in the second verse, "Bear ye one another's burdens." Here it is added, with sufficient nearness to be paradoxical, "For each man shall bear his own burden." The first representation was that of standing beside a brother, holding up his burden for him. The representation here is that of each man standing solitarily by himself, bearing his own burden. Strong but not very conclusive assertions are made that this is not the burden of responsibility. The burden to which reference was made at the beginning of

the paragraph was the burden of trespass. This we are to share with a brother. Then comes in the thought of such self-deception as prevents us sharing it sympathetically with him. Following upon that is an exhortation to apply proper tests to our conduct as a whole, the result being that, if we have the root of the matter in us, we shall have matter for glorying in regard of ourselves alone, and not in regard of our neighbour. And then the apostle seems to add that we have immediately to stand before God, each with his own burden. It is true that the burden includes the burden of trespasses. And it is true that the fact that we have trespasses should make us sympathetic. But that which weights the burden of our conduct as a whole, and which should make us tender to each other, is that we have immediately to render our account to God. The thought then is—We are to feel for our brother, who in his trespass has a heavy and incommunicable load of responsibility; for in our own trespasses we have a load of responsibility that is heavy and incommunicable too. (1) *It is a burden which cannot be refused or laid down at pleasure.* By a mere wish we cannot be irresponsible. We are, in this respect, as clay in the hands of the potter. We have not the choice of our own existence or of our non-existence. All that pertains to our coming into existence, and to our constitution, has been ordained by a sovereign God, who for good and wise ends has made us, and has made us responsible. Now, what does God require of us? It is, in New Testament language, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." Apart from the graciousness of this, there is its *imperativeness*. We have not been consulted as to the making of this command; but it has been imposed in virtue of God's sovereign prerogative to lay commands on us. Is there any question as to the desirability of salvation? It is enough that God wishes to see us saved. Is there any objection to the particular way of being saved? It is enough to say that this is God's way. Having appointed it, there is no question of preference, but simply of obedience. Is there any discretion as to time? It is said, "Behold, now is the accepted time, behold, now is the day of salvation." If God says *now*, then it is at our peril if we delay for an hour. It is well to have the command laid upon us in all its imperativeness, that we may feel driven, as by weight of authority, to Christ for salvation. There is responsibility connected with our whole life. We have not really the disposal of anything, apart from God's way of disposing of it. God's will must rule our disposal of our time, of our talents, of our property. (2) *It is a burden which we cannot devolve upon another.* This is its incommunicableness, which weights it so much. We must act for ourselves in the matter of our salvation. If we wait until others save us we shall never be saved at all. They may give us their sympathy, and by their prayers and appeals influence us; but they cannot act in our soul's stead, and accept of Christ for us. Why have we been so nobly gifted? Is it not that we may act for ourselves, and not need to hold on to another? We are to act out our convictions of what is right, as those that will have to stand before the judgment-seat and give an account of all our acts. And surely we can never see our way as responsible beings to reject salvation. It will be found that all among whom our lot is cast will not be on the side of our best interests. There will be some who would lead us to ruin, as though our souls were only to be played with. But if others choose to go to ruin, that is no reason why we should go with them. And yet it is to be feared that many ruin their souls merely to please or not to displease their friend. But no one can be excused for this. For what is that but thinking more of our friend than of God? It is at our peril if we can be influenced by a fellow-man when he asks us to sin, and not be influenced by God when he asks us to be saved. If those who seek to lead us away could take our responsibility and relieve us from the consequences of our acts, then we might have some inducement to go with them. But that is what none of them can do, be he ever so great. "Wherefore should I fear [*i.e.* to say, slavishly] when the iniquity of my heels shall compass me about? They that trust in their wealth, and boast themselves in the multitude of their riches; none of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him (for the redemption of their soul is precious, and it ceaseth [*i.e.* there is a time when it ceaseth] for ever), that he should still live for ever, and not see corruption." If no one, however great, can do this, then we must act for ourselves and refuse to be influenced for evil. Oh that men, when asked to take a wrong step, would only consider before God how they are alone as responsible beings, standing or falling by themselves! (3) *It is a burden which we are always free to bear.* We mean all who

have the use of reason. We can never be forced to sin. If we could be forced, then sin would be no more sin. We sometimes hear of one being a martyr to circumstances. That is not altogether true. What God requires of us varies, indeed, according to circumstances. And there are those who have been placed under great disadvantages compared with others. But, however badly placed we have been, we cannot say that we have been necessitated to refuse salvation. With the offer of Christ in the gospel we have the power of rising above circumstances. Whatever the difficulties in our way, let Christ be glorified in our triumphing over them. At the last day it will be no valid excuse that our difficulties were great. The testing question will be—Could we have surmounted them? did we ever sincerely try to surmount them? If Christ shall ask if we tried his strength, what shall we be able to answer? Let us not lay the blame upon circumstances; let us lay the blame on our own evil hearts. (4) *It is a burden which may be borne lightly or irksomely.* One bears the burden of daily toil with a light cheerful heart; another with a heavy heart. So is it with the burden of responsibility. We have reason to thank God that it can be borne lightly. Christ took over our heavy responsibilities. That was, not each bearing his own burden, but One bearing the burden of all. He has taken the weight of guilt out of our burden, and by his grace he can make us move freely in the groove of his purpose. There is resting upon every square inch of our bodies a weight of atmosphere equal to fifteen pounds; and yet it does not oppress us. We move freely under all that weight; we never think of it being there. With as little feeling of oppression do we bear, in Christ, the burden of our responsibility. But if we stand out of relation to Christ, then it is as though we had two or three atmospheres upon us which would crush us.—R. F.

Vers. 6—10.—*Well-doing.* I THE MODE OF SUPPORTING THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY. "But let him that is taught in the Word communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things." It is implied that there is to be, in the Christian Church, an order of men whose function it is to teach in the Word. Where these give their whole time and attention to their work, which, as a general arrangement, is most advisable, it is necessary that provision should be made for their temporal support. The mode of support here sanctioned by the apostle is that the taught in the Word should contribute for the support of their teachers. Receiving spiritual things, they are to show their value of them by communicating of their temporal things. The apostle himself did not always see his way to take advantage of this mode of support. But even when he worked with his own hands to support himself, as he did at Corinth, he let it be known that he was waiving his right of support from the Church he was serving. This voluntary mode of support has a rival in the mode of endowment. Where Christian teachers are the beneficiaries of the state, there are questions raised which need not be entered into here. But there may be endowment not connected with the state. Christian people have sometimes gifted moneys and lands for the support of Christian teachers. And where these benefactions are used to support teachers for those who have not been brought under the influence of Christianity, or in aid of what can be raised by congregations, there is no violation of the spirit of the apostolic ordinance. But the question is whether Christian people should contribute, according to their ability, for the support of their minister. Should a Christian teacher be thrown on the willingness of his people? or should he have his income secured to him apart from his people? It is said to be lowering to a minister that he should be dependent on his people. So far as worldly status or emolument is concerned that may be set aside. The essential thing is that he should have the opportunity of doing good to men by teaching them in the Word. And, where he has that secured to him, he may be content to be supported in the way in which the Master and apostles were supported before him. But it is said that he is under the temptation to lower his ideal of the Christian ministry in accommodation to the tastes of those upon whom he depends for his support. That may be a reason for his being on his guard; but it is surely not a reason for dispensing with an apostolic ordinance. Is there no danger, on the other hand, of bringing down the ideal mode of supporting the Christian ministry to worldly expediency? The apostolic mode only works well where there are really spiritual men, where real spiritual benefit is done by the teacher, and where the taught are really interested and reasonable. But is it wise that it should be abandoned for a mode which dispenses with spiritual con-

ditions? Is that not coming down to lower principles upon the failure of higher principles? And is it likely that these lower principles will be accompanied with the same spiritual results? *The apostolic mode of support has advantages for the minister.* He is put more on doing his best. He is under less temptation to consult his ease, and under greater necessity to work for his people. He is under less temptation to preach according to his fancy, and under greater necessity to bind himself to the word that is most fitted to interest and to benefit. He is under less temptation to be indifferent to his people, and under greater necessity to live well in their affection. *The apostolic mode of support has also advantages for the people.* It delivers them from the feeling of dependence on others. It delivers them from spiritual inertia. And, when they have a field for their own exertions and sacrifices in connection with the gospel message, they are more likely to be interested, both in the message and in the messenger.

II. PRINCIPLE INVOLVED. "Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth unto his own flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth unto the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap eternal life." It is remarkable here how the apostle, in support of the particular duty which he has been inculcating, introduces a great and wide principle. There is a similar instance in 2 Cor. viii. He is inculcating there the duty of liberality, and he brings in the transcendent consideration of Christ's self-sacrificing love: "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might become rich." Here he is inculcating the duty of the taught in the Word doing well by their teachers; and he brings in the great principle of sowing and reaping. The immediate application is this. There are certain conditions upon which God blesses congregations. One of these is that they do well by their ministers. Let them not, then, be deceived. God is not mocked. Let them not think that he will act independently of his own regulation, or reverse it for their particular benefit. Only as they do well by their spiritual teacher shall they prosper. What a powerful enforcement of the duty! But let us look at the principle in its generality, and let us learn, in connection with the consideration of it, lessons suitable to seed-time and harvest. 1. *The sower is also the reaper.* "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." The seed he puts into the ground he gets back in the form of fruit. Everywhere is this arrangement carried out. The seed, small and hard, or walled up in stone, or blown about, is, of all objects in nature, the most suggestive. Nature sows innumerable seeds, far up in rocky places, and far away in lonely islands of the sea. Man principally confines himself to the sowing of a few seeds which are necessary for his life and would perish but for his care. A seed is a force, has power stored up in it which does not yet appear. It may be buried in the dry earth for centuries; but, under favouring conditions, it will burst forth, spring up, and come to maturity. And there is what is analogous within the spiritual sphere. All human life is a sowing. Whether we think of it or not, every time that we think and feel and exercise our wills we are sowing. All our acts are forces, which unite and form character. That is the great harvest which even here we are reaping. Let us not, then, be deceived. God is not mocked. Let us not think that he will not do what he is constantly teaching us in nature. Let us not think that we can do an action and have done with it when it is done. It is impossible. Even our slight words are forces that are productive. Our listless moods will be found by us again. As certainly as we sow shall there appear a harvest. 2. *We reap in the same kind that we sow.* "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." We are familiar with this too in nature. If we sow in our flower-plots mignonette seed, there will grow up mignonette plants. If we sow in our fields oats, there will not grow up barley; if we sow barley, there will not grow up wheat. The type of what is sown is impressed on what is produced from it. And the analogy is carried out within the spiritual sphere. We reap in the same kind that we sow. The character of our actions is stamped upon the results that they produce in our nature. We are only liberal as we have acted liberally. We are only devout as we have cultivated devout habits. Wisdom does not spring from the same kind of seed as zeal; nor gentleness from the same kind of seed as courage. Whatever fruit we would have, we must sow in that kind. Let us not, then, be deceived. God is not mocked. Let us not think that he will disregard his own appointment—like seed, like harvest. Let us not think that we can sow niggardliness and reap fatness;



that we can sow dissipation and reap steadfastness. The kind that we sow in our actions, and none other, determines what we reap. 3. *As we sow to the flesh or to the Spirit, what we reap is corruptible or incorruptible.* There are many kinds of seeds in nature; but there is one essential distinction between them. There are seeds of plants which are vile and noxious, and which we seek only to extirpate. And there are seeds of plants which are useful or beautiful, and which we seek to cultivate. Sowing to the flesh is doing what is right in our own eyes, acting without regard to the will of God. It is like sowing the seeds of weeds in the soil of our hearts. Sowing to the Spirit is what is called, in the Old Testament, sowing in righteousness, doing what is right before God. It is like sowing the seeds of useful grains, or of beautiful flowers, in the soil of our hearts. It is said, sowing "to our own flesh," but simply "sowing to the Spirit," showing that the point of the distinction is taking the rule of our actions from self or from God. The Divine ordering is that, sowing to the flesh, we shall of the flesh reap corruption. And we are sufficiently taught what corruption is. There is an offensiveness connected with wet, decayed vegetable matter. There is a greater offensiveness connected with putrid animal matter. And, as the best things corrupted are the worst, there is nothing so offensive, within the material sphere, as the human body in a state of corruption. And that, again, is but a suggestion of what the soul is in a state of corruption. Let us not, then, be deceived. God is not mocked. Let us not think that we can break God's laws with impunity. Let us not think that we can sin, and have the freshness and beauty of holiness. It is impossible. Sin is working its work of deterioration even here. It is bringing in the elements of death into our nature. It is as though mortification in all its loathsomeness were proceeding in our various powers. And it is the most solemn fact of existence that, if we die in sin, then, as certainly as there is righteousness in the character of God, will retribution follow us into the next world. On the other hand, the Divine ordering is that, sowing to the Spirit, we shall of the Spirit reap eternal life. There is nothing within the material sphere which can fitly set forth what this life is. As spirit is finer than matter, so is spiritual life finer than the most lovely flower, the most beautiful human bodily form. It has especially the element of imperishableness, eternity. Flowers quickly fade; the most beautiful face loses its freshness. But the life that is begun in God and carried on in God shall be eternal as God himself. Let us not, then, be deceived. God is not mocked. It is only by sowing to the Spirit that we can get beautiful and imperishable elements into our life. "Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honourable, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things." That is the order of the Divine government which we must observe if we would be beautified with the Divine beauty and immortalized with the Divine immortality. Seeing, then, that God cannot deny himself, must honour his own arrangement, let us learn the supreme importance of sowing to the Spirit. There is nothing in this principle, rightly considered, which militates against the doctrine of the forgiveness of sins. For the great Substitute of mankind came under the broken Law, which had its full course in him. He reaped, in terrible experience of forsakenness what we had sowed in our sins. "Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows." And, therefore, it is that we can reap a rich harvest of forgiveness. But it needs to be borne in mind, as a complementary truth, that, after we are forgiven, we have still to contend against depraved tendency, and especially against the results of our previous sinful life. And it is also to be borne in mind that we can only have the harvest of life eternal in so far as we have thought out the Divine thoughts and carried out the Divine will. Let us not be deceived. God is not mocked. In no other way can it be secured by us.

III. ENCOURAGEMENT AGAINST WEARIENESS IN WELL-DOING. "And let us not be weary in well-doing: for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not." The apostle has been exhorting to do well by Christian teachers; he now proceeds to exhort to well-doing in general, *i.e.* to all kinds of doing well to the bodies and souls of men. And let it be understood, that nothing is worthy of the name of well-doing which is not done from a right motive. It must be, not for self-glorification, but for the glory of God. 1. *Causes of weariness.* (1) *There are discouragements connected with the nature of well-doing.* It is under a high impulse that we begin the life of well-doing. It is the kind of life that is furthest removed from selfishness. It requires a large infusion

of the spirit in which Christ regarded men. But we have still to do with the matter-of-fact world. We are not placed above the ordinary cares and difficulties of life. These may increase with us and may act upon us so as to tend to weariness in well-doing. We have to give out largely too of our *best strength* in well-doing. To be burdened with the souls of men is exhausting beyond anything else. And the more intensely we care for souls the more are we laid open to a feeling of weariness. (2) *There are discouragements connected with the associations of well-doing.* We may not like the scenes of discomfort, squalor, and vice into which well-doing brings us. We may feel the want of suitable appliances for engaging in well-doing. We may feel the want of hearty co-operation. Some to whom we had reason to look may fail us, having become cold in the work. Of our fellow-workers in the same society some may be more intent on getting their own way than on the advancement of the common cause, if they do not even resort to slander and obstruction. And all these things are causes of weariness. (3) *There are especially discouragements connected with the results of well-doing.* In other work we can, to a large extent, walk by sight. We feel the encouraging influence of results. There is something to show for what our hands have done every day. But in well-doing there is little to show in the shape of results. There is something to be seen, indeed, if we feed the hungry and clothe the naked. And there are also results that can be tested, if we engage in communicating knowledge to the young and the ignorant. But if we seek to influence men's hearts through gospel truth we may have to say, "Who hath believed our report; and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed?" We may labour on, and some may appear further removed from good than they were. Some who appeared to be established may show deterioration or may fall grievously, to our great amazement and sorrow. Or, if we meet with outward tokens of success, in the very moment of success it may be felt to be unsatisfying. It may be not all real, when tested even by time. And we may afterwards be disappointed in some upon whom we reckoned as savingly influenced. And there are wearying influences that come in from a *wider range*. It may seem as if there were but poor results from the money and labour spent on missions. It may seem as if little inroads were made upon the domain of evil. It may seem as if the Church were losing its wonted fire, were feeling the chilling influence of the world. It may seem as if iniquity were abounding, and, because iniquity abounds, our love, and that of many others, is apt to wax cold. 2. *Encouragement against weariness.* We cannot remove the causes of weariness in well-doing. We cannot escape the temptation to be weary. What we have to do is to refuse to yield to the temptation. "Let us not be weary"—that is the word which the apostle sends forth to all who are inclined to be weary in well-doing. Let us learn a lesson from what we see going on in nature. The sower does not see his harvest the day he sows his seed. He has to begin by putting his seed out of sight, and it is a time before the plant appears above ground. And then he has to wait until nature slowly brings it forward to maturity. But if, in the face of what he does not yet see, he faint not as under the burning heat of the sun, then he shall assuredly one day be privileged to bring in the ripe grain into the stackyard. For God has appointed a season for this. So let us learn, in the face of all discouragements connected with well-doing, especially in the face of what we do not yet see of results, that, if we faint not, if we lose not faith in God, in the mighty influences of the Divine Spirit, in the converting efficacy of the Divine message, in the binding nature of the Divine command, and if we lose not hope for man,—then in due season we shall assuredly reap. We shall reap in our own souls, in the blessing God shall not delay to send on us for engaging, unweariedly, in well-doing. And, what is more to the purpose of well-doing, we shall reap in others, in the blessing which God may not immediately or within our observation, but shall in due season, send upon them as the result of tearful prayers and labours which he never forgets. Let us, then, cast our bread, though it may be as upon the waters, and we shall find it, though it may be after many days. God has his own time and way of bringing the seed forward, and it may be long after we are dead and gone that the fruit shall be gathered in.

IV. OPPORTUNITY OF WELL-DOING. "So then, as we have opportunity, let us work that which is good toward all men, and especially toward them that are of the household of faith." These three things constitute opportunity, viz. time, ability, and objects of well-doing. 1. *There is the limit of time.* Spring is the season for sowing

the seed. If it is not improved, there will be nothing to gather at harvest-time. So the present life is the season for well-doing. It does not appear that in the next world we shall be employed in reclaiming sinners. Let us, then, improve the time that God has given us for doing good, all the more because of the uncertainty of its being continued to us. In the morning let us sow our seed, in the evening let us not withhold our hand. Let us serve well our day and generation. 2. *There is the limit of ability.* God has given us all the means of doing good with our powers, and money. Up to that point we have obligation. Let us, then, faithfully discharge our obligation as before God. Let us know how to use our powers, not selfishly, but usefully, beneficently. Let us learn the secret of making ourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness. 3. *The objects of well-doing.* These are in a manner unlimited. The apostle says, "all men." That is to say, that, if we had time and ability, it would literally be our duty to work that which is good to all men. As it is, wherever there is a human being, he has a claim upon us on the ground of his humanity and on the ground of his being the object of God's love and of Christ's redemption. But there is a defining, limiting of the order in which we are to proceed with those whom we seek to bless. As within the natural sphere our own household have the first claim on us, so within the Christian sphere it is those who are of the household of faith. It is an additional and cogent reason for the bestowment of a charity that the objects of it have the same faith and sympathies and look forward to the same home with ourselves. Within the Christian household, too, our own family and friends, our own neighbours, our own countrymen, have a prior claim on our interest. But let us remember that, if charity begins at home, it does not end there. We must go out in the spirit of this exhortation in our sympathies and charities and labours to all the ignorant, and to them that are out of the way. "I exhort therefore that supplications, prayers, intercessions, thanksgivings, be made for all men. This is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour: who willeth that all men should be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth."—R. F.

Vers. 11—18.—*Parting words.* I. HIS HANDWRITING. "See with how large letters I have written unto you with mine own hand." He seems to intimate that not merely the following words, but, against his usual custom, the whole Epistle, was in his own handwriting. This was to be interpreted as a manifestation of his interest in them in connection with the importance of the occasion. He also intimates that he used large characters. It cannot be imagined that his intention in doing so, and in calling attention to it, was to emphasize his instructions. It was rather to be interpreted as an appeal to them in connection with his defective vision which necessitated the use of large characters.

II. THE SPIRIT OF THE JUDAIZING TEACHERS. 1. *They desired to appear well for their own interest.* "As many as desire to make a fair show in the flesh they compel you to be circumcised; only that they may not be persecuted for the cross of Christ." He does not mention the Judaizing teachers by name, but he graphically describes them. They did not care for reality; what they cared for was to make a fair show. And, though it was to make a fair show in religion, that did not remove it from the sphere of the flesh. It was still self that was the actuating principle. If they had presented the cross of Christ in its simplicity, as the apostle seems to imply they were free in their conscience to have done, they would have offended their unbelieving countrymen, and would have been subjected to persecution from them. The carnal, self-interested way in which they got over the offence of the cross was to insist on the circumcision of the Gentile converts. 2. *Their false glorying.* "For not even they who receive circumcision do themselves keep the Law; but they desire to have you circumcised, that they may glory in your flesh." They were the party of the circumcision, not merely because they were circumcised themselves, but because they made circumcision a prominent article in their teaching. They had not the zeal that might have been expected of them for the Law; for they were faulty in their own keeping of it, feeling it to be burdensome to their flesh. They displayed their zeal in proselytizing. They hoped to hold themselves up to the admiration of their countrymen in the numbers, not that had undergone a saving change, but that, through their influence, had received the mark of circumcision in their flesh.

III. HIS SPIRIT AS CONTRASTED WITH THAT OF THE JUDAIZERS. 1. *His glorying.* "But far be it from me to glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, through which the world hath been crucified unto me, and I unto the world." (1) *He gloried in the cross.* By the cross we are to understand the atoning death of our Lord Jesus Christ. By glorying in the cross we are to understand that he not only trusted in it for his own salvation, and admired it himself, but that he held it up for the trust and admiration of others. The cross is to be gloried in as a marvellous exhibition of the *Divine love*. It was God not sparing his Son, but delivering him up for the salvation of men. If love is to be measured by sacrifice, then it was a love that made infinite sacrifice. The cross is to be gloried in as a marvellous exhibition of the *Divine righteousness*. In default of man being able to make satisfaction for his sin unless in his own destruction, it was God coming forward in Christ and making satisfaction for sin by paying its utmost penalty. The cross is to be gloried in as a marvellous exhibition of the *Divine power*. It was God in Christ conquering the kingdom of Satan, showing himself stronger than the evil of man's heart. The cross is to be gloried in as a marvellous exhibition of the *Divine wisdom*. It was God showing how he could be just, and yet the Justifier of him that believeth in Jesus; showing how he could attract the sinner to himself, and yet condemn his sin. (2) *He gloried especially in the cross because of its effecting changed relations to the world.* By the world we are to understand the sphere in which the principles of the flesh find their manifestation. The cross crucified *the world to him*. He condemned it and tore himself from it because of its antagonism to God. He was independent of its favours and pleasures, for he had better within himself, in the love and approval of God, and in all the joys of sonship. The cross crucified *him to the world*. It condemned him in turn, and stood aloof from him as a lost man, and only thought of him to bate him and persecute him. In this cross, then, with all that it entailed, he gloried, and in this alone. Far be it from him to hold up anything else for the trust and admiration of men. 2. *His regard for reality.* "For neither is circumcision anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature." To him it was of no importance that men should be outwardly marked. What was of importance was that they should be inwardly changed. Numbers he would have rejoiced in if they represented saved men.

IV. AS HIS SPIRIT WAS SO HE BLESSED. "And as many as shall walk by this rule, peace be upon them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God." He invokes blessing on all who would walk by the rule laid down, i.e. who would glory only in the cross of Christ, and would seek reality and not appearances. He invokes blessing on them in the usual form, only putting peace before mercy. All such, and not those whom the Judaizers blessed, were to be regarded as the Israel of God.

V. HIS CLAIM TO BE UNMOLESTED. "From henceforth let no man trouble me: for I bear branded on my body the marks of Jesus." A general who has seen long service and has received many scars may reasonably claim to be relieved from future service. That was not Paul's claim. Hard service had a singular charm for him. But he thought that he had received scars enough to place his relationship to Christ as his servant and apostle henceforth beyond all doubt. The slave had branded on his body the name of the Master to whom he belonged. So in his past hardships he had as it were the name of Jesus branded on him. Henceforth, whatever men might do to him, let them not molest him by raising doubt as to the Master to whom he belonged.

VI. HIS SPECIAL AND FINAL BLESSING FOR THE GALATIANS. "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit, brethren. Amen." He blesses them from the centre of their being. He was so charged with indignation when he commenced the Epistle that he was long before he could address them as brethren. Now he is so charged with affection that, putting "brethren" into an unusual position, he makes it the last word that shall linger in their memory when they have completed the reading of the Epistle.

We have no evidence of the immediate effect which this Epistle had upon the Galatians. It is painful to read of heresies which, at a subsequent period, were rife among them. It is, however, pleasing to know that in the Diocletian persecution in the beginning of the fourth century, and in the "attempt to galvanize the expiring form of heathen devotion in Galatia," by Julian the apostate, there were not a few Galatian martyrs. It cannot be said that there is at the present day within the

district any representation of Pauline Christianity. The Christian Church has yet to show its indebtedness for this Epistle by going forth in the spirit of the great preacher of the cross to reconquer Galatian soil for Christ.—R. F.

Ver. 1.—*Restoring the erring.* In all the writings of St. Paul there is no more Christ-like utterance than this. It breathes the very spirit of him who came to seek and to save the lost. It seems to be addressed in particular to the more spiritual members of the Galatian Churches—to those who had not been carried away in the tide of fashionable Judaizing. There was a danger lest the severe rebuke administered by the apostle to their erroneous brethren should provoke a vain and censorious spirit in these men. St. Paul warns them of that danger (ch. v. 26), and points out the right course that is open to them. Instead of judging they were to help to restore the fallen in all gentleness and humility.

I. THE DUTY OF RESTORING THE ERRING. Too often they are harshly judged; condemned, despised, crushed, so that if they are strong they are confirmed in their errors by pride and motives of sheer self-defence, and if they are weak they become reckless and despairing and a ready prey for greater evils. The censorious will have to answer for the terrible responsibility of confirming guilt and checking repentance. In no case is it ours to judge. But to brand and ostracize the guilty is to incur the heavy guilt of those who make others to sin. How different would the history of the Church have been if, instead of the controversy which aims only at silencing opponents, there had been the counsel that seeks at restoring brethren! But it is important to see that there should be no aim short of *restoring* the erring. That is a false charity which ignores sins in others. They must be faithfully pointed out and earnestly opposed. The great end must not be mere punishment nor easy indifference, but restoration.

II. THE PERSONS CHARGED WITH THIS DUTY. The spiritual. It requires such, for it is a delicate duty. We are not all fit for it. Spirituality should produce charity. The spiritual are not to withdraw from their weaker brethren in Pharisaic pride. Such pride, indeed, is a proof of utter unspirituality. No nobler mission can be open to the purest souls than that of restoring the erring. It was Christ's great work, and he does not liberate his people from the duty of taking their share in it. The more a man has of the spirit of Christ the better will he be able to succeed in this beautiful labour of love.

III. THE SPIRIT IN WHICH THE DUTY IS TO BE CARRIED OUT. 1. *Charity.* Consider that the unfortunate man has been "overtaken" in a trespass. Make due allowance for the peculiar form of the temptation under which he fell and for the surprise with which it came upon him. 2. *Meekness.* The duty is not to scold, but to heal. The healer of souls must show the utmost possible gentleness, consideration for wounded pride, and respect for natural reserve, and should do all he can not to humiliate the offender more than is necessary, nor to injure his self-respect. 3. *Humility.* "Looking to thyself, lest thou also be tempted." It is not necessary to appear immaculate in order to restore another. The pride of assumed superiority will be the worst possible hindrance in such a work. It is well to remember that, if we had met the same temptation, we might have had even a more grievous fall. And some day our time may come, and then the present offender may be our restorer. Let the work be done, then, as by a brother to a brother.—W. F. A.

Ver. 2.—*The law of Christ.* The Galatians have been hankering after the Law of Judaism, as though some counsels of perfection could be found therein for adding higher virtue to the graces of Christianity. "If you want a law," says St. Paul, "take this rule of mutual sympathy—bear ye one another's burdens." Christ has his law, then, after all. It is not a ceremonial observance, but it is high enough for the ambition of the noblest self-sacrifice.

I. CHRIST EXPECTS US TO TAKE DEEP INTEREST IN ONE ANOTHER. Christianity is unselfish. To think that all we have to do is to save our own souls is to misunderstand the religion of Christ completely. He who would thus save his soul will lose it. The gospel is a gospel to us just because it calls us out of ourselves and leads us to deny ourselves and practise active charity.

II. OUR SPECIAL INTEREST SHOULD BE DRAWN TOWARDS THE TROUBLES OF OTHERS.

The burdens are to be our concern. How large a share of life they cover! 1. Burdens of *sin*. These seem to be uppermost in the mind of St. Paul (ver. 1). As Christ bore our sin, we are to bear our neighbour's; *i.e.* make it our trouble and anxiety, and a thing we labour at removing. 2. Burdens of *sorrow*. The trouble of our brother will be ours if we are members one of another. 3. Burdens of *care*. Fear and anxiety are magnified in loneliness. We can see the forlorn suffer from being quite desolate. 4. Burdens of *doubt*. Do not brand the doubter as a heretic. Enter into his difficulties. Discuss them frankly as with your brother.

III. IT IS OUR DUTY TO BEAR THESE BURDENS. The scribes bound heavy burdens grievous to be borne on the shoulders of their victims, and would not so much as touch them with their little fingers. The example of these men has been too often followed by the teachers of the Church. Yet God knows the burdens of life are heavy enough without our adding to them. Our part is to lighten them. This is a serious, practical work, and not a matter of humanitarian sentiment. We must take the burdens on ourselves till we feel the weight of them. 1. *By sympathy*. Real sympathy, and not mocking pity, makes another's trouble one's own. It takes the heaviest weight from the load—the dull, crushing sense of loneliness. The burden is lightened by being shared. 2. *By active relief*. When once we feel the burden we shall wish to remove it. Bearing it, we shall do all in our power to bear it away. Thus Christian sympathy produces active philanthropy.

IV. TO BEAR ONE ANOTHER'S BURDENS IS TO FULFIL THE LAW OF CHRIST. It is required by Christ. We are disobedient to him if we neglect the duty. And to fulfil it is to satisfy Christ. In face of this plain duty there is an unreality amounting almost to hypocrisy in the effort to live a holy life by practising artificial, ascetic self-denial, as if enough could not be found in the common walks of life and in ways of plain usefulness. How absurd to wear a hair shirt and lash one's self with scourges instead of taking the self-denial in the less romantic but more Christ-like way of helping the sick and ignorant and fallen!

"The trivial round, the common task,  
Will furnish all we ought to ask—  
Room to deny ourselves, a road  
To bring us daily nearer God."

W. F. A.

Ver. 3.—*The self-deception of self-conceit*. A truism, yet such that, while everybody is ready to apply it to his neighbour, few are wise enough to take it home to themselves. By the very nature of the case it is always ignored where it fits most aptly. Hence the need of insisting upon it.

I. THERE ARE STRONG INDUCEMENTS FOR FORMING AN UNDULY FAVOURABLE OPINION OF ONE'S SELF. Self-knowledge is a difficult acquisition. We cannot get the right perspective. The effort of turning the mind in upon itself is arduous. Then we are inclined to take imagination and desire for direct perception, *i.e.* to think we possess qualities which we only picture in thought; or to measure our faculties by our inclinations, to suppose that the wish to do certain things carries with it the power. *E.g.* an enthusiast for the violin is likely to suppose he can handle the instrument musically before other people are of that opinion. The very habit of thinking about ourselves causes a growing sense of self-importance. Moreover, by an unconscious selection we are led to dwell on the favourable features of our own characters, and leave out of account the unfavourable.

II. A HIGH OPINION OF ONE'S SELF IS COMMONLY FOUND TO BE ASSOCIATED WITH A LOW CONDITION OF REAL WORTH. Not invariably, for we sometimes find men of high endowments painfully self-assertive, either because they know that their merits have not been duly recognized, or because their vanity has been excited by the applause of their friends. Such cases reveal a weakness, and strike us as peculiarly unfortunate, for the men of worth would be wiser to wait for the acknowledgment which their merits by themselves will ultimately command had they but patience enough, or at the worst should be above caring overmuch for any such acknowledgment. Still, the merit may be real. In most cases, however, it is those who are least who boast the loudest. The man of little knowledge thinks he knows everything; wide knowledge reveals the

awful vastness of the unknown, and impresses profound humility. So the holiest man is most conscious of his own sinfulness. At best, too, what right have we to think much of ourselves when all we have comes from God—our natural abilities as gifts of Providence, our spiritual attainments as graces of the Spirit?

III. AN UNDUE OPINION OF ONE'S SELF IS NOTHING BUT SELF-DECEPTION. It cannot long impose upon others. The world is not inclined to attach much weight to a man's own evidence in favour of himself. (Hypocrisy, or the deliberate effort to deceive others, is out of the question here, as that implies a knowledge of the falseness of our pretensions, while we are now considering the honest belief in them.) Such self-deception is unfortunate, (1) because it will put us in a false position, incline us to make wrong claims, and to attempt the unattainable, and so result in disastrous failure; (2) because it precludes the endeavour to improve ourselves; (3) because it destroys the Christ-like grace of humility; (4) because it provokes the ridicule, scorn, or even enmity of others.—W. F. A.

Vers. 7, 8.—*Sowing and reaping.* The Galatians appear to have been niggardly in their contributions for the support of their Christian teachers (ver. 6). St. Paul warns them that such conduct will tell against themselves (see Prov. xi. 24). The principle on which he bases his admonition is one of deep significance and wide application. No doubt the apostle wished it to be impressed upon his readers in all its bearings as well as in relation to the particular case that led him to mention it.

I. IT IS A LAW OF NATURE THAT THE REAPING SHALL CORRESPOND TO THE SOWING. 1. This is part of the general law that, other things being equal, *the same cause always produces the same effect.* There is no known exception to the law of causation; there is no possible evasion of it. We see it plainly working in human affairs. The eternal constancy of nature assures us that the consequences of which certain conduct is known to be the cause will undoubtedly follow. 2. The special law of sowing and reaping is that the product of the harvest will be the *same in kind* as the seed sown. Tares will never produce wheat, nor wheat tares. But each seed reproduces its own kind. This is seen in human affairs. Commercial industry tends to commercial wealth, intellectual study to a state of intellectual culture, etc. It is vain to think that money will buy refinement or that learning is the road to wealth. Each pursuit has its own consequences in accordance with its own nature.

II. THIS LAW APPLIES TO SPIRITUAL SOWING AND REAPING. 1. Here the future depends on the past and present by a certain *law of causation.* No words could more plainly assert that our conduct is shaping our own fate; and these are not the words of St. James, but of St. Paul! and they occur, of all places, in the Epistle to the Galatians, where the doctrine of justification by faith is most vehemently asserted! Moreover, they are not addressed to Jews still under the Law, nor to heathen who have not yet availed themselves of the privileges of the gospel, but to Christians who have come into the justification by faith, as it is to Christians that St. Paul says elsewhere, "We shall all stand before the judgment-seat of God" (Rom. xiv. 10). We are here reminded that the future consequences of conduct are natural, not adventitious—that they are *caused* by what we are and do, that they flow of their own accord from our lives, and are not assigned from without by any arbitrary decree. We simply reap what our own sowing has produced for us. 2. In spiritual things there is a *correspondence* between what is sown and what is reaped. (1) Sowing to the flesh produces its own natural harvest—corruption. The mere animal life, the life of worldly interests, the life of the lower self, is itself a life of corruptible things. Its soil and nourishment are earthly and cannot outlast death. When the grave opens all is lost. Even before death thieves steal, and moth and rust eat into the treasures. The soul itself, too, is corrupted by such a life. Its faculties are dissipated and decay away. It descends to the evil state of moral rottenness and death. (2) Sowing to the Spirit produces its own harvest of eternal life. Spiritual things are eternal things. Treasures in heaven are beyond destroying influences. In proportion as the spiritual within us is cultivated we have what will outlast death and what no grave will ever claim. Already we have an eternal life in living in the things that are spiritual and therefore eternal. Money goes, but faith remains; the pleasures of the senses pall upon us, but the peace of God never fails; self-seeking leads to dissatisfaction, the love of God sustains us with undying interests.

III. THE KNOWLEDGE OF SUCH A LAW OF SOWING AND REAPING IS A WARNING AGAINST INSINCERITY. It is vain to shut our eyes to it. Nature is pitilessly inexorable, and here we are considering a law of nature which is as rigid as the law of gravitation. Deception may avail with men, but here we have God's action, and no subterfuge can escape his detection. There is a sort of irony on our petty schemes and contrivances in the calm, sure way in which the laws of the universe work out their issues, totally regardless of what we may imagine or pretend. Yet we are in danger of self-deception. 1. The harvest is *delayed*. The result is not the less certain, however, on that account. Seeds found buried with Egyptian mummies thousands of years ago when sown now bear fruit after their kind, with as little deviation as if they had been produced last harvest. 2. We expect *more consequences* than the law of sowing and reaping justifies. Thus we are surprised that bad men should be prosperous in worldly matters and good men unfortunate. But each reaps as he sows. He who sows to the world reaps worldly gain, with its ultimate corruption. He who sows only to the Spirit has no right to expect more than spiritual returns. His harvest will be eternal life, not money and pleasure. He gets just what he sows, only with increase. Finally, how can we reconcile this principle with the gospel of Christ and the doctrine of grace? Simply by seeing that to have a true submissive and obedient faith in Christ is to sow to the Spirit.—W. F. A.

Ver. 9.—*Weariness in well-doing*. I. THE CONDITION OF WEARINESS IN WELL-DOING. 1. It is a *feeling*, not at present a change of action. The well-doing is continued in spite of weariness. Our moods vary, and we can scarcely be held to be responsible for them. The essential thing is that we do not cease working. 2. It is very different from being weary of well-doing. We may grow weary in our work and yet be most anxious for the success of it. Such weariness is a common condition. How often is the flesh weak while the spirit is willing! How often is the spirit, too, wearily cleaving to the dust, and pining for a Divine inspiration, like the hart thirsting and panting for the water-brooks!

II. THE EVIL OF THIS CONDITION. 1. It is *distressing*. The task over which we sing in the freshness of the morning becomes a burden to groan under when the evening finds us jaded and worn. 2. It is likely to make our *work defective*. We cannot row fast when the stream turns contrary to us, nor work effectively against the grain. 3. It may lead to the *abandonment* of our mission. Weariness may end in despair. If we have no joy in our work we shall be tempted to negligence.

III. THE CAUSES OF THIS CONDITION. 1. In *ourselves*. (1) *Want of rest*. "Come ye aside and rest awhile," said Christ to his disciples in the midst of their busiest labours. (2) *Want of nourishment*. We grow weary if we work long without food. There is a danger lest the active servant of Christ should neglect his own private prayer and meditation and the quiet inward spiritual sustenance that is so necessary to give vigour and freshness to the external service. 2. Causes in *our work*. (1) *Monotony and drudgery*. How much of our work has no glow of romance and no inspiration of heroism about it! The soldier grows tired of camp service, though he would put forth tenfold exertions in the excitement of battle without feeling weary. (2) *Lack of results*. It often looks as though we were labouring in vain. Now, futile toil is of all toil the most wearying.

IV. THE REMEDY FOR THIS WEARINESS. 1. If it comes from our own habits and conditions, see that we have the *rest and nourishment* that our souls need. We must be more with God in prayer. Natural bodily rest may be needed too. A good holiday may be the best cure for a weariness that sadly troubles the soul of a conscientious toiler. 2. If the weariness comes from our work, (1) remember that *Christ is watching us*, so that the commonest drudgery done for his sake becomes a noble service and will receive as warm an approval as the most brilliant achievement—nay, a more kindly recognition, seeing that it was more trying to discharge the lowly duty with full fidelity; and (2) remember that the harvest, *though delayed, will surely be reaped* in due time,—then "they that sow in tears shall reap in joy."—W. F. A.

Ver. 14.—*The cross of Christ*. I. THE CROSS AS AN OBJECT OF GLORYING. 1. St. Paul can *glory in nothing else*. Yet he had whereof to glory. His birth, his education,



and his religious devotions had been sources of pride to him. His Christian attainments, his apostolic authority, his missionary triumphs, and his brave endurance of persecutions, might be taken as reasons for self-glorification. But he rejects the whole. Plainly no Christian inferior to St. Paul can have anything in himself to be proud of. 2. The glorying only begins in looking *away from self to Christ*. Men talk of glorying in their crosses. But St. Paul boasted, not in his own cross, but only in the cross of Christ. He made nothing of his sufferings for Christ; all his interest was absorbed in Christ's sufferings for him. All the brightness of Christian experience centres in Christ. 3. The grand source of glorying is *the cross of Christ*. The cross was the symbol of shame; it has become the token of what we most reverently adore. So complete is the transformation of ideas that we can with difficulty understand the paradox as it would strike the contemporaries of St. Paul when he spoke of glorying in the cross. It is as though we spoke of priding ourselves on the gallows. This cross, this instrument of shameful death has become the emblem of Christianity. Gleaning in gold on the spires and domes of our cathedrals, it typifies the most vital truth of Christianity. The glory of the cross is not a merely mystical sentiment. It springs from evident facts: (1) the fidelity of Christ as the good Shepherd, who would not forsake the flock and flee before the wolf; (2) the patience, gentleness, and forgiving spirit of Christ on the cross; but (3) chiefly the love of Christ in suffering, shame and anguish and death for us. There are some who would dispense with the doctrine of the cross; but a crossless Christianity will be a mutilated, impotent gospel, robbed of all efficacy, shorn of all glory.

II. THE CROSS AS AN INSTRUMENT OF DEATH. The cross does not change its nature by winning its glory. Still, it is a cross—tool of pain and death. It is no less than this to the Christian as it was no less to Christ. For Christianity is not a calm acceptance of what Christ has done in our stead; it is union with Christ, first in his death and then in his victory. 1. The cross means *the death of the world to us*. Before that glory of Divine love in human passion all lesser lights fade and perish. As we look upon the cross the world loses its hold upon us. In the vision of truth and purity and love even to death, the threats of the world's hurts lose their terror and the fascinations of its pleasures their charm. 2. The cross means *our death to the world*. Joined with Christ by faith, we have the old self killed out of us. Hitherto the power of the lower world has dragged us down to sin and trouble. But in proportion as we are united to the Crucified we cease to have the feelings and interests which chain us to the earthly. St. Paul describes a magnificent ideal. No man on earth has fully realized it. It must be the aim of the Christian more and more to be one with Christ, that the cross may pass more deeply into his soul till all else melts and fades out of experience.

These two aspects of the cross—its death-power in us, its glory in Christ—are directly related. For it is only after it has been the instrument of death to us that we can rise in the new life and see it as the one absorbing object of glory.—W. F. A.

Ver. 15.—“*A new creature.*” I. EXTERNAL RELIGION COUNTS FOR NOTHING. “For neither is circumcision *anything*.” Religion is wholly in the soul. 1. No rite has any value in itself. Nothing done to the body is of any religious account whatever. Neither is anything done by the body. A rite may be a symbol, and as such a means of grace; but St. Paul plainly teaches that it has no magical efficacy. 2. *Ecclesiastical position* is in itself of no importance. Circumcision was the seal of membership in the Jewish Church. Yet it was nothing. We may be members of the strictest sect, or we may hold high rank in the most august Church. But before God this is just nothing. 3. *Doctrinal orthodoxy* counts for nothing. Not that truth is unimportant. But the mere intellectual grasp of theological ideas leaves us where it finds us; and therefore if we go no further it is of no consequence whether those ideas are true or false. Conversely, to dispense with rites, to be in no Church, or to be unorthodox, is no condemnation. Neither, however, is it a merit, as some extravagant admirers of the idea of heresy strangely assert. If circumcision is not anything, neither is uncircumcision.

II. THE ONE ESSENTIAL IS TO BECOME A NEW CREATURE. This great truth implies two others. 1. In religious matters the important question is as to *what we are*. It matters not what is done to us or what we hold. All of importance is in our own life

and character. If we are not true and pure and self-sacrificing, if we have not the Spirit of Christ, all our orthodoxy, Church status, and ritual observances are an empty mockery. If we are thus Christ-like, any further question is irrelevant. The sole essential is then safe. 2. In our sinful condition we are not like Christ, but are so radically unlike him as to need a complete, new creation before we can be in a right condition. The requisite change is so thorough that no ordinary religious influences will accomplish it. Circumcision is nothing, because what we want is nothing less than the crucifixion and death of the whole old life and the creation of an entirely new life. When this change has been accomplished, however, it is the evidence of its own sufficiency. It is impertinent to raise little questions of rites, etc., when the new man bears in each lineament of his countenance, in the very tone of his conversation, and in the bearing of his whole life, the princely character of a son of God.

III. THE CHRISTIAN IS A NEW CREATURE IN CHRIST. What circumcision symbolizes faith effects (ch. v. 6). "By their fruits ye shall know them." The gospel of faith proves its claims by the results that it works. Nothing else can make men new creatures. The gospel can do this. For those, then, who are still in the old life of sin here is a warning and an encouragement. 1. A warning. Renewal is necessary. 2. An encouragement. Renewal is possible. No painful rites have to be observed, no difficult doctrines comprehended, no strict Church entered. All that is wanted is union with Christ in faith. The way is simple and clear; it is not easy and painless, for it is by being crucified with Christ. But it issues in a glorious new life.—W. F. A.

Ver. 16.—"The Israel of God." To one who enters into the ideas taught by St. Paul, the anxiety of some persons in the present day to discover that the English are descended from the lost ten tribes of Israel is altogether mistaken. Even if they could prove their very improbable theory, it would have nothing but an ethnological, or at best a sentimental, interest. Religiously it is not of the slightest importance. All Christians, whatever their birth and descent, are the true Israel of God. Look at some of the marks of Israel upon the Christian.

I. ABRAHAM'S SEED. The Jew traced his pedigree back to Abraham. He was Abraham's seed. Therefore he accounted himself the heir of the promises made to Abraham. The Christian possesses Abraham's faith. By means of this he becomes Abraham's seed (ch. iii. 29), while the Jew who lacks faith is disowned.

II. POSSESSING THE ORACLES OF GOD. St. Paul reckons as the first advantage of the Jews "that they were entrusted with the oracles of God" (Rom. iii. 2). The Hebrew race had the unspeakable privilege of receiving through their inspired teachers the highest revelation of God vouchsafed to the world for many ages. But there came a later revelation outshining this old revelation in clearness and glory. The Jew rejected this. The Christian accepted it. The Christian holds the New Testament, and he has Christ, God's brightest manifestation of himself. Thus he steps into the position held by ancient Israel.

III. SEPARATION FROM THE WORLD. The Jew was called out from the world to live apart as a lonely race with a peculiar destiny of its own. Christians are thus called out of life into the world. They are made to live as pilgrims and strangers, as sojourners with God.

IV. A MISSION TO THE WORLD. Israel did not always understand her mission, and often grossly neglected it in proud exclusiveness. Yet many of the prophets saw clearly that the chosen people were called from among the nations that they might be trained to give to the world the highest blessings. They did this, but only through giving it Christianity. Now, Christians are an elect people—elect to be missionaries and apostles to the people that sit in darkness.

V. A FUTURE HERITAGE. The Hebrew in the wilderness looked for a promised land. Abraham and the patriarchs had hoped for "a city which hath foundations, whose Builder and Maker is God." The perfect fulfilment of these hopes was not given to the Jew on earth. It is for the Christian hereafter; for "there remaineth therefore a sabbath rest for the people of God" (Heb. iv. 9).—W. F. A.

Ver. 17.—*The stigmata.* I. THE APOSTLE IS THE SERVANT OF CHRIST. The stig-

*mata* are the brands, the name of the master burnt on the slave. The most honoured of the apostles regards himself as the branded servant of Christ. To no higher honour can any Christian aspire. Christianity is living, not for self, but for Christ. We must all understand that Christ stands to us in the relation of a Master. Our part is to submit to his will. The supreme and peculiar Christian duty is obedience to Christ (John xiv. 21).

II. THE TRUE SERVANT OF CHRIST BEARS THE MARK OF HIS MASTER. St. Paul bore on his body the scars of the sufferings he had endured in the service of Christ. These plainly marked him as Christ's. Christians must all bear indications of Christ on their lives. It may be granted that St. Francis was none the better for having the wound-marks as of the nails of the cross in his hands and feet. Yet this strange condition was the last proof of his passionate identification of himself with Christ in thought and will and affection. So the Christian must ever have the Name of Jesus upon him in the Christ-likeness of his life. It is useless to have it merely on the tongue; it must be on the body, *i.e.* on the life.

III. THE MARKS OF CHRIST COME THROUGH SUFFERING FOR CHRIST. Thus St. Paul received his. They were brands burnt in by fiery trials. Suffering for Christ proves our fidelity to him and brings out our Christ-likeness of character. They who are like the rocky soil and receive the Word with joy, but cannot withstand persecution, may sing of the sweetness of the Name of Jesus in sentimental hymns; but they have no such Name branded on their persons. After all their enthusiasm has evaporated, we see nothing but self left. The Christian must deny himself for Christ. His life may not be so hard as St. Paul's. Rarely has such hardship been known as the great apostle endured; rarely have the brands been burnt so deep with such cruel fires. Yet all must have an experience that is similar in kind, though perhaps far less in degree. The sufferer, however, may console himself with the thought that the more fiery the trial he endures for Christ becomes, the deeper will be the sacred marks of the Name of Jesus upon him. For nothing makes us so Christ-like and nothing binds us so near to Christ as patient suffering and toil for his sake. This suggests the fear that it is no easy thing to be a Christian. Certainly to be a true Christian such as St. Paul was is not easy; it is the depth of self-renunciation and the height of arduous fidelity. Count the cost, then. Look at the irons ready to brand the Name of Jesus before consenting to become his servant. But look also on the other side, at what *he* suffered for us and at the glory of his service.

IV. THE BRANDS OF SERVICE SHOULD BE THE SECURITY OF THE SERVANT OF CHRIST. With such marks upon him, how dare any man trouble the apostle by questioning his authority? Suffering for Christ should be a confirmation of our faith to others. It should also be a security against the danger of unfaithfulness. How can he who bears the Name of Jesus thus conspicuously burnt in by hard trial and long service forsake his Master? Such brands should be eternal.—W. F. A.

# HOMILETICAL INDEX

TO

THE EPISTLE OF

## ST. PAUL TO THE GALATIANS.

CHAPTER I		THEME	PAGE
THEME	PAGE		
The Inspired Authority of the Apostle	42	The Duty of Intolerance ...	65
The Apostle's Companions in the Gospel	43	The Destiny, Call, and Mission of St. Paul ...	66
The Churches of Galatia ...	43	God glorified in Man ...	66
The Apostolic Benediction ...	44		
The Sum and Substance of the Epistle	44	CHAPTER II	
The Sad Defection of the Galatians	45	The Battle of Christian Liberty fought over the Case of Titus ...	92
The True Character of the Perverters	46	The Apostle takes Counsel with the other Apostles on perfectly Equal Terms ...	94
The Apostle's Anathemas ...	46	The Claims of the Poor Saints in Jerusalem ...	96
The Apostle's Explanation of his Severity ...	47	The Apostle's Rebuke of Peter at Antioch ...	96
The True Origin of the Apostle's Gospel ...	48	The True Way of Salvation ...	97
A Retrospect of his Career as a Jew After his Conversion he took no Counsel with Men as to his Doctrine or Career ...	49	An Objection met ...	99
Proofs of his Entirely Independent Course after Conversion ...	50	Fellowship with Christ in his Death and in his Life ...	100
The Gospel of Self-Sacrifice ...	52	The Nature and Conditions of Christian Life ...	101
Paul's Intolerance of any other Gospel ...	53	No Frustration of Divine Grace in the Apostle's Teaching ...	102
Paul's Personal Grasp of the Gospel	54	The Apostolic Conference ...	102
Introduction ...	56	The Apostolic Strife at Antioch ...	103
Occasion of the Epistle ...	58	The Death of Legal Hope the Life of Evangelical Obedience ...	105
Position ...	60	Period of Third Visit to Jerusalem ...	106
Apostolic Authority ...	63	Withstanding of Peter at Antioch ...	107
Christ's Sacrifice for our Deliverance	64		

THEME	PAGE	THEME	PAGE
Diversities of Administrations ...	112	The Tutor ... ..	177
A Bold Rebuke ... ..	113	Sonship ... ..	178
Justification by Faith ... ..	114		
Dying to Law and living to God ...	115		
Crucified with Christ ... ..	115		
Grace frustrated ... ..	116		
<b>CHAPTER III.</b>		<b>CHAPTER IV.</b>	
Beginning of the Polemic Part of the Epistle ... ..	147	The Church of God in its Minority ...	210
The Apostle's First Argument in this Controversy ... ..	148	The Falseness of Time with its Blessings ... ..	211
Second Argument—the Case of Abraham ... ..	149	The Evidence of Sonship ... ..	212
Third Argument—the Curse of the Law ... ..	150	An Appeal to the Gentile Christians	213
Fourth Argument—the Inconsistency of Law and Faith ... ..	151	A Protest against Relapse ... ..	213
Fifth Argument—our Salvation is by Christ made Curse for us ... ..	151	The Observance of Days ... ..	213
A New Line of Argument—the Relation between the Covenant and the Law ... ..	152	The Apostle's Apprehensions for his Converts ... ..	214
The Contents of the Covenant and the Parties to it ... ..	152	An Affectionate Call to Liberty ...	214
The Irreversibility of the Covenant by the Law ... ..	152	A Retrospect with its Lessons ...	215
The Use and Nature of the Law ...	153	The Tactics of the False Teachers ...	216
The Law designed to be Subservient to the Promise ... ..	154	A Tender Appeal to his Converts ...	216
The Blessing of Adoption ... ..	155	An Appeal to Bible History ... ..	216
The Import and Obligations of Baptism ... ..	155	Allegorized Interpretation of the Facts ... ..	217
The Unity of Believers ... ..	156	Conclusion of the whole Matter ...	218
The Heirs ... ..	157	Majority through the Gospel ... ..	218
The Bewitchery of Law ... ..	157	The Return of the Legal Spirit ...	219
The Covenant of Promise ... ..	158	The Appeal of the Suffering Apostle	221
The Law-School and the Home-Coming ... ..	159	The Children of the Bondswoman and of the Free ... ..	222
Appeal to Experience and Scripture Promise and Law ... ..	164	Majority and Minority ... ..	223
Before and after Faith ... ..	166	Personal Appeal ... ..	229
Bewitched ... ..	172	Allegory of Hagar and Sarah ... ..	231
Going back ... ..	173	The Advent in Redemption ... ..	232
The Faith and Blessing of Abraham	173	"Abba, Father" ... ..	233
The Curse of the Law and the Curse of the Cross ... ..	174	The Son and the Slave ... ..	234
The Everlasting Covenant ... ..	175	"Beggary Rudiments" ... ..	234
The Object of the Law ... ..	175	Observing Seasons ... ..	235
Direct Communication with God ...	176	Labour bestowed in Vain ... ..	236
		A Friend mistaken for an Enemy ...	237
		The Allegory of Hagar ... ..	237
		<b>CHAPTER V.</b>	
		The Importance of Standing by Christian Liberty ... ..	266
		A Solemn and Emphatic Warning ...	266
		The Obligations involved in Circumcision ... ..	267
		The Logical Results of the Judaistic Position ... ..	267
		The Blessed Prospects involved in the True Doctrine of Grace ... ..	267
		The Essential Principle of Bible Christianity ... ..	268

THEME	PAGE	CHAPTER VI	
The Sudden Swerve of the Galatians from the Truth ... ..	269	Restoration of a Fallen Brother	316, 327
The Apostle's Sanguine Hopes of Galatian Recovery ... ..	270	The Bearing of Others' Burdens ...	317
A False Imputation repelled ...	270	A Warning against Self-Deceit ...	318
A Fierce Stroke of Apostolic Irony ... ..	271	The Necessity of Testing our Work	318
The Meaning of Christian Liberty	271	Our own Individual Burden ...	319
The Spirit of the Law ... ..	272	The Duty of Supporting the Ministry	319
The Evil Effects of Heresy ...	272	The Two Sowings and the Two Reapings ... ..	319
The Life and Warfare of the Spirit in the Soul ... ..	273	Encouragement to Perseverance in Well-Doing ... ..	320
Classification of the Works of the Flesh ... ..	274	The Sphere of Beneficence ...	321
"The Fruit of the Spirit" ... ..	274, 293	A Personal Postscript ... ..	322
The Distinguishing Feature of Christianity ... ..	275	Exposure of the Tactics of his Adversaries ... ..	322
The Consistency of the Christian Life ... ..	276	The True Ground of the Apostle's Glorifying ... ..	322
No Departure allowed from the Spiritual Standard ... ..	276	The Fundamental Fact in Christian Life ... ..	323
Falling from Grace ... ..	276	The Apostolic Blessing ... ..	323
The Liberty of Love ... ..	277	An Apostle pleading for Forbearance	324
Christian Progress realized through Antagonism ... ..	278	His Parting Word ... ..	324
Circumcision ... ..	279	The Restoration of the Erring	324, 335
Freedom sustained by the Spirit ...	284	The Seed-Time of Philanthropy ...	325
Christian Freedom ... ..	288	Glorifying in the Cross ... ..	326
The Hope of Righteousness ... ..	289	Well-Doing ... ..	332
Faith working through Love ...	289	Parting Words ... ..	336
Hindered ... ..	290	The Law of Christ ... ..	338
Leaven ... ..	291	The Self-Deception of Self-Conceit	339
Liberty and not Licence ... ..	291	Sowing and Reaping ... ..	340
Walking by the Spirit ... ..	292	Weariness in Well-Doing ... ..	341
The Two Selves ... ..	292	The Cross of Christ ... ..	341
		"A New Creature" ... ..	342
		"The Israel of God" ... ..	343
		The Stigmata ... ..	343