







ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

---

THE TEXT REVISED;

AND ILLUSTRATED BY

A COMMENTARY,

INTENDED PRINCIPALLY FOR

THE USE OF

MINISTERS, AND STUDENTS OF THEOLOGY.

BY

HENRY T. J. BAGGE, B.A.

LONDON :

JAMES NISBET AND CO., 21, BERNERS STREET.

MDCCCLVI.

BS 3686  
B2



I DEDICATE THESE PAGES TO

My Dear Father.



## PREFACE.

A RECENT WRITER,<sup>1</sup> with qualifications for the task of revision of a character far higher than my own, has, himself acting upon the principle, described as "hazardous, if not presumptuous," the undertaking to construct an original text. And although I have ventured to give upon my title the promise of a revised text, I am certainly not prepared to invest myself with any capabilities for the satisfactory performance of that which so many better men have left undone. Still however, although I adhere generally to the important principle that the text is to be sought for in *ancient* authorities only, there are many reasons why a critic should not be able unreservedly to follow either of the great representatives of this principle—Lachmann and Tischendorf. For aiming as we do to produce a text probably genuine, it is now very generally allowed that criticism must be allowed a prominent place in the due execution of such a task. And this renders it manifestly impossible to follow unreservedly Lachmann, whose aim was not to produce such a text, but the form which it presented in the fourth century, and whose text is therefore to be considered mainly as material for the operations of the critic. Nor, on the other hand, can any one who has followed Tischendorf in the working out of his critical rules and the application of his general principle, feel otherwise than that in many instances the fundamental element of antiquity is almost entirely cast aside, while indeed—and here I must speak for myself alone—I have found myself unable to assent

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Ellicott, Pref. to his Comment. on the Ep. to the Galatians, p. xv.



always to the conclusions to which his criticism has brought him. Thus then, although it is but rarely that I have differed either from the one or the other, there are, I think, valid reasons to account for occasional departures. It might however be asked why I have not contented myself with taking the text of one or the other as my basis, giving my reasons for any departures which I might deem necessary. This would, I acknowledge, have appeared the more modest course. And in my defence I can only plead the fact that, with the aid of the critical apparatus which the labours of Tischendorf and others have rendered available to us, I have really worked independently, in satisfaction of my own wants, and in the pursuit of my own gratification. In doing this I have been brought to an agreement sometimes with Lachmann, sometimes with Tischendorf, in the majority of instances with both,—in one instance only (ch. iv. 31) adopting a reading hitherto inedited. But having attained independent results, I have been unable to see any necessity for withholding the fact that they were so.

A list of the MSS. which I have either used<sup>1</sup> or quoted will be found at the end of the Preface; and, in the list of works which follows, the titles are given of the editions and collations which I have used.

It will be seen that, besides the uncial MSS., B. C. A. D. H. F<sup>a</sup>.—F. G. E. J. K., I have quoted a certain number of cursive MSS. selected from among the somewhat cumbrous mass which is more or less available to us. It is scarcely necessary to observe that all these documents, uncial and cursive, do not occupy the same position, and fulfil the same functions, in the apparatus of the critic. There are cursive MSS. which represent (more or less nearly) the earliest text, and uncial ones (e. g. J. K.) which give us the distinguishing text of the mass of modern copies. Those MSS., therefore, which present the text of the Eastern recension possess that peculiar value which belongs to the agreement of two different recensions, an agreement to which, while it furnishes *corroborative* evidence, other uncertainties necessarily attach themselves, and which, though it may be accepted in evidence,

<sup>1</sup> i. e. in various Editions.

must of course often fail, and is not a necessary element in the construction of a text.

What shall be the limits of our *authoritative* apparatus I do not presume to define, or to found a broad theory upon my own comparatively limited experiences. Premising, however, that I believe that considerable advantage may result from the systematic use of certain cursive MSS. which present most nearly the Alexandrian text, I will go so far as to say that I have found<sup>1</sup> that A. B. C. D. F. G. and the fragment H.—the ante-Hieronymian Latin Version—The Vulgate—The Peschito-Syriac, and Origen—furnished in most instances combinations which, supported by critical probability, were to my own mind of a very satisfactory character. It will, therefore, be understood that, believing as I do that the wise and critical use of a comparatively small number of authorities, carefully selected with a view to antiquity (and this not only of document but of text), diversity of region, and individual value, is more to be desired than the multiplication of them, the limits presented in my own quotations are not those which I should assign to the *necessary* apparatus of the textual critic.

This is not, of course, the place for me to enter in detail into the discussion of the individual merits of the authorities cited. I would, however, venture to say one word respecting the Old Latin Version, and the manner in which I have quoted it.

There has prevailed among many persons considerable misunderstanding with respect to this Version. Augustine<sup>2</sup> says, “Qui Scripturas ex Hebræa lingua in Græcam vertunt, numerari possunt, Latini autem interpretes nullo modo. Ut enim cuique primis fidei temporibus in manus venit codex Græcus, et aliquantulum facultatis sibi utriusque linguæ habere videbatur, ausus est interpretari;” and again,<sup>3</sup> “In ipsis autem interpretationibus Itala cæteris præferatur; nam est verborum tenacior cum perspicuitate sententiæ.” This language has given rise, as Dr. Wiseman observes,<sup>4</sup> to one of the most difficult problems in sacred criticism. Two hypotheses have prevailed respecting it :

<sup>1</sup> It will be remembered that I am speaking of the Pauline Epistles.

<sup>2</sup> De Doct. Christ. Lib. ii. cap. 11.

<sup>3</sup> Ib. c. 15.

<sup>4</sup> Two letters on some parts of the controversy concerning 1 John v. 7. Rome, 1835, p. 21.

(I.) That there existed in the early Western Church one authentic Version called the Itala, which St. Augustine here preferred to all others.<sup>1</sup> (II.) That there were in ordinary use many Latin translations, of which Augustine happened to prefer one called Itala. It is hardly worth while to discuss the difficulties which attach themselves to both these hypotheses, because the most eminent critics are now pretty generally agreed that they are erroneous. And the arguments of Dr. Wiseman seem to prove very satisfactorily that by the words “interpretari,” “interpretes,” and “verterunt,” Augustine did not mean *translation*, but *recension* of one common Version. These arguments I shall not reproduce here, but will content myself with briefly observing, that the true state of the case appears to be that there existed but one Version, which was made, in all probability, in Africa as early as the second century: that the texts of Gaul, Africa, and Italy presented distinct recensions of that Version: and that by the word “Itala” Augustine merely indicated that recension presented by Italian codices; or, “in other words, that Itala is not an appellative, but a relative term, adopted by him because he was living in Africa.”<sup>2</sup> And, indeed, I am sure that every critic who has examined at any length the quotations of the Latin Fathers must assent to the conclusion of Wiseman, “that their agreement in many extraordinary readings can spring only from the use of an identical Version, however altered by ordinary causes;”<sup>3</sup> and that “the consistent degree of approximation to the original preserved throughout, in short, the uniform moulding of the features of their text, shows that it is all in the same type, the offspring of one country, almost of one man.”<sup>4</sup> Now, if it be actually the case that we possess one Version of this high antiquity, it is hardly possible to overrate the importance of the position which it must occupy in the work of textual criticism. For, assuming that we can attain the genuine readings of that Version, it is evident that, in the agreement with it of such MSS. as A. B. C., we have strong presumptive evidence of a

<sup>1</sup> Two letters on some parts of the controversy concerning 1 John v. 7. Rome, 1835, p. 21.

<sup>2</sup> Wiseman, p. 28.

<sup>3</sup> p. 24.

<sup>4</sup> *Ib.*

mutual agreement with Greek MSS. of an antiquity not very far removed from that of the original writings themselves. But although critics are, as I before observed, generally adopting truer views respecting this Version, it seems hardly as yet to have received the attention it deserves. For although there undoubtedly exist in the various libraries of Italy and of other parts of Europe many copies of it, comparatively few efforts have been made to bring them into use. In the Gospels, indeed, the labours of Blanchini, Sabatier, Tischendorf, and others, have rendered available to us an apparatus of fair extent. But in the Pauline Epistles it is of the most meagre character.

As regards the manner in which I have quoted it under my text, it is evident that if we adopt the hypothesis that the term *Itala* applies to the Italian recension of the Old Latin, we pledge ourselves, in quoting it under that title, to give that recension exclusively and decidedly. This I have not felt myself prepared to do; and therefore I have thought it better to take the *Cod. Clarom.*,<sup>1</sup> with the early Latin Fathers, and the interpreter of Irenæus,<sup>2</sup> as ante-Hieronymian witnesses; and to give their evidence either together or separately, as it offered itself; noting, at the same time, any difference of reading occurring in the writings of any one Father. The general testimony, therefore, of the Old Latin, whether displayed in the writings of African or Italian<sup>3</sup> Fathers, or both, is thus, as far as it goes, placed clearly before the reader. To this testimony I have added that of Jerome and the Vulgate, classing together under the word *Lat.* all Latin testimony, whether ante-Hieronymian or Hieronymian.

And here, while I am alluding to my own critical apparatus, I may take the opportunity of saying that, assuming that my readers would possess some good critical edition of the Greek Test., I have not thought it necessary to do more than indicate under my text the variations of the *Textus Rec.*, by which I mean that of Stephens and the Elzevirs<sup>4</sup> combined,

<sup>1</sup> The Latin Version of the *Cod. Boern.* is an admixture of both Latin Versions, I have therefore not used it.

<sup>2</sup> These quotations I have given principally on the authority of Sabatier and Buttman.

<sup>3</sup> With these Augustine may probably be classed.

<sup>4</sup> Readings peculiar to the *Elz.* I have not noted.

giving on those passages the judgments of Griesbach, Lachmann, and Tischendorf; and the authorities<sup>1</sup> on which my own reading is based. Other variations will be found noticed in the body of the Commentary. So much it appears necessary to say respecting the text.

With respect to the Commentary, it will itself best explain what are the principles of interpretation by which I have been guided. One great aim has been, as far as I could accomplish it, to place the criticism of the Greek Test. upon a Greek, and to remove it from a Hebrew basis. Feeling that in the Greek tongue, above all others, the ever-varying subtleties of human thought are, in their most refined form, wedded, as in no other tongue, to the most exquisitely apposite forms, I felt, as must every one who has really thought on the subject, that every word, nay, almost every syllable, of the New Testament ought to be sifted to the fullest extent of our powers,—every form, as far as is possible, traced up to some definite usage and law.<sup>2</sup> And I will add, further, that I felt, and feel still, that if we would be conscientious ministers of the everlasting gospel, acting up to the conviction which we profess to entertain, that Scripture is indeed inspired by God—if we would make our people think that it is indeed a fountain ever throwing forth fresh and living waters—if, above all, we would combat successfully the dangers which now, in the latter days of this evil age, are assailing the Church of the living God; we must give over once for all and for ever that miserable intellectual Antinomianism which sinks lazily down, and expects the Spirit of Wisdom and of Might to enlighten those who *will not* endeavour to enlighten themselves; we must throw to the winds that wretched superficial exegesis which is pouring in upon us like a flood; which, neglecting nothing so much as the actual language which embodies God's glorious thoughts, gives us what is human to solace us for the loss of what is divine. True, earthen vessels we shall ever be, dependent for all we know upon the wisdom

<sup>1</sup> In those cases where the MS. B. is neither quoted for nor against a reading, I have indicated the fact by the mark B. sil.

<sup>2</sup> I can ill express the obligations I am under, in my endeavours in this direction, to Jelf's Greek Grammar, a work which no student of the Greek Test. ought to be without.

of the Head—our risen Lord ; reposing, all feeble as we are, upon that strength which is made perfect in human weakness. But an all-important element in the progress of the soul, as also of the intellectual powers now belonging to a new creature in Christ, is *effort*—effort which presses on with all the energies and all the powers which God has given us, not only towards a greater knowledge of a sanctifying Lord, but towards a knowledge, something more than superficial, of the title-deeds of our inheritance, of the mysteries of redeeming love, of the eternal weight of glory which we may scan, although we shall not fathom until that which is perfect is come, and that which is in part is done away.

But I would quote here the eloquent words of one who, actuated by desires similar to my own, has expressed them and carried them out far more ably than I can hope to do. "If," says Mr. Ellicott, "we would train our younger students to be reverential thinkers, earnest Christians, and sound divines, we must habituate them to a patient and thoughtful study of the words and language of Scripture, before we allow them to indulge in an exegesis for which they are immature and incompetent. If the Scriptures are divinely inspired, then surely it is a young man's noblest occupation, patiently and lovingly to note every change of expression, every turn of language, every variety of inflexion, to analyze and to investigate, to contrast and to compare, until he has obtained some accurate knowledge of those outward elements which are permeated by the inward influence and power of the Holy Spirit of God. As he wearisomely traces out the subtle distinctions that underlie some illative particle, or characterize some doubtful preposition, let him cheer himself with the reflection that every effort of thought he is thus enabled to make is (with God's blessing) a step towards the inner shrine, a nearer approach to a recognition of the thoughts of an Apostle, yea, a less dim perception of the mind of Christ."

I do, indeed, regret beyond measure the grievous loss I sustained in not having the advantage of using Mr. Ellicott's able work—a work which, carrying out one of my own aims,

was, more than any other with which I am acquainted, calculated to be of the greatest service to me.<sup>1</sup>

I need hardly add, while I am speaking of my own countrymen, how greatly also I regret that I have not had the advantage of consulting Mr. Alford's third volume.

A list of the commentaries and other aids which I have either systematically used or referred to, will be found at the end of this preface. I have given it in order to enable any one, who might wish it, to refer to the works of the authors whom I have quoted.

I purposely abstain from adding an introduction on Authenticity and Genuineness, Time, Place, &ca. These matters belong to Introductions to the New Test., and I desire to confine myself to the execution of that which my title promises, a commentary illustrating the text. I may, however, just observe that in as far as any decided opinion can be held about matters which are generally enveloped in doubt,<sup>2</sup> I believe, with Lardner and others, that this Epistle was written during the sojourn of the Apostle at Corinth, of which we have the record in Acts xviii., that is, after his first, and before his second, visit to the Galatians.

I pray God to accept and deign to bless this humble effort to set forth the riches of His grace, for the sake of Him in whom all the promises are Yea and Amen.

<sup>1</sup> I regret this the more, because it has been long enough before the world to have enabled me to have profited considerably by it had I been aware of its merits. The fact, however, is, that although circumstances have delayed the completion and publication of my commentary until now, it was, with the exception of the last eight verses, finished in January last, and it was only in December 1855 that a friend, himself an eminent Greek scholar, first made me acquainted with the extent of the loss which I had sustained. I have since that time not been able to do more than look through my own commentary, giving in a few places references to Mr. Ellicott's. It is especially with regard to the grammatical features of his commentary that I speak. In matters of exegesis I have found that I sometimes differed from him; in other instances I have been glad to find that we were *d'accord*. His own few words fail in doing justice to what he has done in textual criticism. But I am disposed to think his judgment upon various doubtful readings is not inferior in value to any other part of the work.

<sup>2</sup> One thing I will in this case venture to affirm, viz. that there is not a single expression in the Epistle itself which can furnish a valid argument in favour of the supposition that it was written after the second visit.

## LIST OF MSS. USED OR REFERRED TO.

- A. Codex Alexandrinus, Sec. v. (published by Woide)  
 B. Codex Vaticanus, 1209, Sec. iv.  
 C. Codex Ephræmi Syri rescriptus, Sec. v. The first 20 verses of this Ep. are wanting in this MS. (published by Tischendorf)  
 D. Codex Claromontanus, Gr. Lat. Sec. vi. (published by Tischendorf)  
 E. Codex Sangermanensis, Gr. Lat. (An inaccurate copy of Cod. D.) Sec. x.?  
 F. Cod. Augiensis, Gr. Lat. Sec. ix.  
 G. Cod. Boernerianus, Gr. Lat. Sec. ix. (published by Matthæi)  
 H. Codex Coislinianus 202, Sec. vi. (A fragment published by Montfauçon, Bibl. Coislin.) It contains of this Ep. only ch. i. 4—10, ch. ii. 9—14.  
 F.<sup>a</sup> Cod. Coislinianus, Sec. vii. (A fragment containing of this Ep. only verses 21 and 22 of ch. iv.)  
 J. Codex Angelicus Romanus, Sec. ix.  
 K. Codex Mosquensis, Sec. ix. (Matthæi g)

- 
1. Bas. B. vi. 27, Sec. x.  
 3. Corsendoncensis, Sec. xii. (Alter)  
 6. Regius 3425, (Steph. ε) Sec. xi.  
 9. Regius 2870, (Steph. ι) Sec. x.  
 11. Cantab. K. k. 6, 4, Sec. xi.  
 12. Regius 2869, (Steph. ιε) Sec. x.  
 17. Regius 14, Sec. xi.  
 18. Coislinianus 199, Sec. xi.  
 21. Coislin. 205, Sec. xi.  
 28. Baroccianus 3, Sec. xii.  
 36. Huntington. 1. (Two portions. The earlier portion, which includes the Pauline Epistles, Sec. xii.)  
 37. Leicestrensis, Sec. xiv.  
 38. Laud 2, Sec. xiii.  
 39. Lincolnienſis 2, Sec. xi.  
 41. Magdalenensis, Sec. xi.  
 46. Petav. 3, Alex. Vat. 179, Sec. xi. (Birch)  
 47. Roe 2, Sec. xii.  
 49. Lambec. 28, Sec. xi. (Alter)  
 50. Rhodiensis, "adhibitus a Complutensibus, passim laudatus a Stunica" (Scholz.)  
 55. Augustanus 6, Sec. xi.  
 57. Lambec 1, Sec. xiii. (edited by Alter) (Birch)  
 61. An unknown MS. cited in the copy of Mill's Greek Test. in the Bodleian by the name Hal.  
 62. Harl. 5588, Sec. xiii.



67. Lambec. 34, Sec. xii. (Alter) (Birch)  
 71. Sup. Koll. 10, Sec. xii. (Alter) (Birch)  
 72. Haun. 1, Script. 1278.  
 73. Upsaliensis. (Two portions. The latter portion including St. Paul's Epistles from 1 Cor. xiii. 6, Sec. xi.)  
 80. Vat. 367, Sec. xi. (Birch)  
 83. Vat. 765, Sec. xi. (Birch)  
 89. Alex. Vat. 29, Sec. xii. (Birch)  
 91. Pio Vat. 50, Sec. xii. (Birch)  
 93. Neapol. Sec. x.  
 96. Laur. iv. 20, Sec. xi. (Birch)  
 97. Laur. iv. 29, Sec. x. (Birch)  
 98. Laur. iv. 31, Sec. xi. (Birch)  
 99. Laur. iv. 32, Sec. xi. (Birch)  
 101. Laur. x. 6, Sec. x. (Birch)  
 102. Laur. x. 7, Sec. xi. (Birch)  
 108. Venet. 10, Sec. xiv. or xv. (Birch)  
 109. Venet. 11, Sec. xi. (Birch)  
 110. Venet. 33, Sec. xi. (Birch)  
 111. Venet. 34, Sec. xi. (Birch)  
 112. Venet. 35, Sec. xi. (Birch)  
 113. Matthæi. Cod. a. Sec. xi.  
 114. c. "Scr. 1445."  
 115. d. Sec. xi.  
 116. f. Sec. xiii.  
 117. Cod. K. noted above  
 118. h. Sec. xii.  
 119. i. Sec. xii.  
 120. k. Sec. xi.  
 121. l. Sec. xii.  
 122. m. Sec. xi.  
 123. n. Sec. xi.  
 124. q. Sec. xiv.

---

## MSS. OF THE VULGATE.

- Cod. Amiatinus, "circa an. 541 scr." Edited by Tisch.  
 Fuldensis, Sec. vi. (Lach. and Buttm.)  
 Demidovianus. "Scriptus videtur Sec. xii. sed haud dubie ex antiquissimo fonte cum magna accurate petitione est."  
 Tisch. Edited by Matthæi in his Gr. Test.  
 Harleianus, Sec. vii. (Griesb. Symbb. Criticæ)

---

## MS. OF THE ANTE-HIERONYMIAN LATIN VERSION.

- Cod. Claromont. Sec. vi.

## LIST OF WORKS USED OR REFERRED TO.

- Novum Testamentum Græcum. e Cod. MS. Alexandrino descriptum a C. G. Woide. London, 1786.
- Appendix ad Ed. Nov. Test. Græci, e Cod. Alex. a C. G. Woide descrip. in qua continentur fragmenta Nov. Test. juxta interp. dialecti, quæ Thebaica vel Sahidica appellatur, cum dissert. &ca. quibus subjicitur Codicis Vaticani Collatio. Oxon. 1799.
- Codex Ephræmi Syri rescriptus. Fragment N. T. Ed. Tischendorf. Lipsiæ, 1843.
- Codex Claromontanus. Ed. Tischendorf. Lipsiæ, 1852.
- XIII. Epistolarum Pauli Codex Græcus. olim Boernerianus. Ed. C. F. Matthæi. Misena, 1818.
- Codex Amiatinus. N. T. Lat. interp. Hieronymo, Ed. Tischendorf. Lipsiæ, 1854.
- Bibliotheca Coisliniana. Montfaucon. Paris, 1715.
- Nov. Test. Græcum. lect. var. et not. Millii. recens. Lud. Kuster. Roterodami, 1710.
- Nov. Test. Gr. cum lect. var. necnon comment. pleniore ex Scriptoribus vet. Hebræis, Græcis, et Latinis, historiam et vim verborum illustrante. Op. et Stud. J. J. Wetstenii. 2 vols. Amstelædami, 1751—2.
- Nov. Test. Gr. ex codd. nunquam antea examin. ed. var. lect. et animad. subjunct. C. F. Matthæus. 12 vols. Rigæ, 1788.
- Nov. Test. ad Codicem Vindobonensem, Græce expressum, var. lect. addidit F. C. Alter. 2 vols. Viennæ, 1787.
- Nov. Test. Gr. textum ad fid. Codicum, Versionum, et Patrum recensuit, et lect. var. adjecit D. Jo. Jac. Griesbach. 2 vols. Londini, 1809—10.
- Nov. Test. Gr. Textum ad fid. testium criticorum recensuit, lect. fam. subjecit M. A. Scholz. 2 vols. Lipsiæ, 1830—36.
- Nov. Test. Græce et Latine. C. Lachmannus recensuit, P. Buttmannus Græcæ lectionis auctoritates apposuit. 2 vols. Berolini, 1842—50.
- Nov. Test. Græce. ad antiquos testes recensuit, apparat. crit. apposuit Const. Tischendorf. Lipsiæ, 1849.
- Variæ Lectiones ad textum. Act. App. Epp. Catholicarum et Pauli. e codd. Græc. MSS. Biblioth. Vatic. Barberin. Augustinianorum Eremit. Romæ, Borgianæ Velit. Neapolitanæ reg. Laurent. S. Marci Venet. Vindob. Cæsar, et Hauniensis regiæ, collectæ et editæ ab And. Birch. Hauniæ, 1798.
- Alberti Bengelii Apparatus Criticus ad Nov. Test. Editio secunda, curant. P. D. Burkio. Tubingæ, 1763.
- J. J. Griesbachii Symbolæ Criticæ, &ca. Halæ, 1785.
- Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinæ Versiones Antiquæ, &ca, op. et stud. P. Sabatier. 3 vols. Paris, 1751.
- Novum Testamentum Gr. Editio Hellenistica, E. W. Grinfield. 2 vols. London, 1843.
- Scholia Hellenistica in Nov. Test. E. W. Grinfield. London, 1848.
- Ab. Trommii Concordantiæ Græcæ Vers. LXX. Interpretum. Edid. B. de Montfaucon. 2 vols. Amstel. et Trajecti ad Rhenum, 1718.
- Vetus Testamentum Græcæ juxta LXX. Interpretes, Ed. Const. Tischendorf. 2 vols. Lipsiæ, 1850.
- Concordantiæ omnium Vocum Nov. Test. Gr. primum ab Eras. Schmidio

- editæ, nunc secundum critices et hermeneutices nostræ ætatis rationes emendatæ, auctæ, meliori ordini dispositæ, cura C. H. Bruder. Lipsiæ, 1842.
- Hesychii Lexicon Græcum cum notis virorum doctorum, cura Alberti. 2 vols. Lug. Bat. 1746—66.
- Suidæ Lexicon Gr. et Lat. cura Kuster. 3 vols. Cantab, 1705.
- Glossarium Græcum ex MSS. ed. Alberti. Lug. Bat. 1735.
- Mæridis Lexicon Atticum, cura J. Pierson. Lug. Bat. 1759.
- Thomæ Magistri Dictionum Atticarum collectio, cum notis variorum, ed. Bernard. Lug. Bat. 1757.
- Phrynici Eclogæ nominum et verborum Atticorum, cum notis Nunnesii, &c., ed. Lobeck. Lipsiæ, 820.
- Zonaræ et Photii Lexica Græca, ex Codd. MSS.<sup>tis</sup> nunc primum edita a Tittmann et Hermann. 3 vols. Lipsiæ, 1808.
- Ammonius De adfinitum vocabulorum differentia, ed. Valckenaer. Lug. Bat. 1739.
- Astii Lexicon Platonicum. 3 vols. Lipsiæ, 1835.
- Schweighæuser Lexicon Polybianum. Oxon. 1822.
- Ib. Lexicon Herodoteum. Londini, 1824.
- A Greek-English Lexicon by Liddell and Scott. Third Ed. Oxford, 1848.
- Parkhurst's Greek and English Lexicon to the New Test. ed. Rose and Major. London, 1845.
- Robinson's Gr. and Eng. Lexicon to the New Test. London, 1847.
- Lexicon Græco-Latinum in Nov. Test. J. F. Schleusner, juxta ed. Lips. quartam. Glasguae, 1824.
- Jelf, Greek Grammar, chiefly from the German of Raphael Kühner. 2 vols. Second Ed. Oxford, 1851.
- Matthiæ's Greek Grammar, translated by S. V. Blomfield. Fifth Edition, revised by Kenrick. 2 vols. London, 1832.
- Suiceri Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus. 2 vols. Amsterdam, 1728.
- Joannis Alberti Periculum Criticum. Lug. Bat. 1727.
- Joannis Alberti Observationes Philologicæ in sacros Novi Fœderis libros. Lug. Bat. 1725.
- Raphelii Annotationes in Sacram Scripturam. 2 vols. Lug. Bat. 1747.
- J. Elsneri Observationes sacræ in Novi Fœderis libros. 2 vols. Trajecti ad Rhenum, 1720—54.
- G. D. Kypke Observationes sacræ in Novi Fœderis libros. 2 vols. Wratislaviæ, 1755.
- Eliæ Palairot Observationes Phil.-Criticæ in Sacros Nov. Fœd. libros. Lug. Bat. 1752.
- Loesneri Observationes ad Nov. Test. e Philone Alexand. Lipsiæ, 1777.
- Krebsii Observationes in Nov. Test. e Flav. Josepho. Lipsiæ, 1755.
- Rosenmüller, Scholia in Nov. Test. 5 vols. Norimbergæ, 1785.
- Bloomfield Recensio Synoptica Annotationis Sacræ. 8 vols. London, 1826.
- Bengelii Gnomon Novi Test. 2 vols. Tubingæ, 1850.
- Hypomnemata in omnes Libros Novi Test. ed. a Viet. Strigelio. Lipsiæ, 1565.
- Schoettgenii Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ in Nov. Test. 2 vols. Dresdæ et Lipsiæ, 1733.
- Surenhusii Βίβλος Καταλλαγῆς. Amstelædami, 1713.
- Schmidii Notæ et Animadversiones in Nov. Test. cum Versione Nova. Norimbergæ, 1658.
- S. F. N. Mori Acroases in Epist. Pauli ad Galatas. Lipsiæ, 1795.
- Biblia Sacra cum Glossa ordinaria, a Strabo Fuldensi collecta, et Postilla Nic. Lirani, cum Additionibus Pauli Burgensis, &c. 6 vols. Antwerpia, 1634.

- \* Poli Synopsis Criticorum, ex recensione J. Leusden. 5 vols.  
 Ultrajecti, 1684.
- Calovii Biblia Illustrata. 4 vols.                      Francofurti, 1672—76.
- Hunnii Thesaurus Apostolicus, complectens commentarios in omnes Novi  
 Test. Epistolas.    Wittenbergæ, 1705.
- Cornelii A Lapide in omnes Pauli Epistolas Commentaria. Lugduni, 1690.
- Wolfii Curæ Philologicæ et Criticæ in N. Test. 5 vols. Hamburg, 1739.
- William Perkins, Commentarie or Exposition upon the five first chapters  
 of the Epistle to the Galatians. Works, vol. 2.                      Lond. 1616.
- Hieronymi Stridonensis Opera omnia, studio et labore Monachorum Ordinis  
 S. Benedicti. 5 vols.    Paris, 1693, 1706.
- Aurelii Augustini Opera omnia. 18 vols.                      Bassani, 1797.
- Tertulliani Opera, cura Leopold. 3 parts.                      Lipsiæ, 1839—41.
- Cypriani Opera, cura Goldhorn. 2 parts.                      Lipsiæ, 1838.
- Theodoretii Commentarius in omnes Pauli Epistolas.                      Oxonii, 1852.
- Chrysostomi in Divi Pauli Epistolam ad Galatas Commentaria.                      Oxonii, 1852.
- Patrum Apostolicorum Epistolæ. Textum recensuit F. X. Reithmayr.                      Monachii, 1844.
- Seldeni Opera omnia, collegit ac recensuit D. Wilkins. 3 vols.                      London, 1726.
- Vitringa De Synagoga Vetere Libri tres.                      Franequeræ, 1696.
- Deyling Obs. Sac. 5 parts.    Lipsiæ, 1720.
- Pearson on the Creed. Ed. Burton. 2 vols.                      Oxford, 1843.
- Corpus Juris Civilis, cum notis Gothofredi, opera et studio Sim. van Leeuwen.  
 Amstelod. 1663.
- Corpus Juris Canonici, a P. et F. Pithæo notis illustratum. Lipsiæ, 1705.
- Bibliotheca Juris Canonici Veteris, opera et studio Voelli et Justelli.                      Lutetiæ Parisiorum, 1661.
- Willetts Synopsis Papismi.    London, 1614.
- F. Spanhemii Opera. 3 vols.    Lug. Bat. 1701—3.
- Gill's Exposition of the Old and New Test. 9 vols. fol.                      London, 1748—63.
- Ainsworth's Annotations on the Pentateuch, &c.                      London, 1639.
- Luther's Commentary on the Galatians.                      &ca.                      &ca.

\* The references to, or quotations from, Grotius, Erasmus, Estius, Vatablus, Piscator, Gomarus, Beza, Drusius, Vorstius, Bonfrerius, Menochius, Paræus, are given on the authority of Pole's Synopsis.

## ERRATA.

- Page 2, line 9 from bottom, for ἀνθρώπου read ανθρώπου.  
 — 20, line 11 from top, for ἀποκλυψαι read ἀποκαλύψαι.  
 — 29, line 17 from top, for λαβρααίς read λαβραίας.  
 — 61, line 6 from bottom, for αὐτόν read αὐτόν.  
 — 108, note 5, for B. iβ. read Βιβ.  
 — 177, line 3 from top, for Εὐφάνθητι read Εὐφράνθητι.  
 — 183, note, line 6 from bottom, for διο read διό.  
 — 198, line 9 from bottom, for ἐκλ read ἐκλ.  
 — 207, line 11 from top, for μνησικακία read μνησικακία.

## ΠΡΟΣ ΓΑΛΑΤΑΣ.

### I.

1 Παῦλος ἀπόστολος, οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου, ἀλλὰ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, 2 καὶ οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ πάντες ἀδελφοί, ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατίας. 3 χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 4 τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν περὶ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, ὅπως ἐξέλθῃται ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος αἰῶνος πονηροῦ κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν, 5 ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων· ἀμήν.

6 Θαυμάζω ὅτι οὕτως ταχέως μετατίθεσθε ἀπὸ τοῦ καλέσαντος ὑμᾶς ἐν χάριτι Χριστοῦ εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον, 7 ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο εἰ μὴ τινές εἰσιν οἱ ταρασσόντες ὑμᾶς, καὶ θέλοντες μεταστρέψαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ. 8 ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐὰν ἡμεῖς ἢ ἄγγελος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ εὐαγγελίζηται ὑμῖν παρ' ὃ εὐηγγελισάμεθα ὑμῖν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. 9 ὡς προειρήκαμεν, καὶ ἄρτι πάλιν λέγω, εἴ τις ὑμᾶς

4.—Rec. ὑπέρ.—Gb. Ln. Tisch. περί c. A. D. E. F. G. J. K. (B. sil.) 37, 38, 41, 71, 72, 89, 113, 115, 117, 121, 122, 123. al. Orig. al.

εὐαγγελίζεται παρ' ὃ παρελάβετε, ἀνάθεμα εστω. 10 ἄρτι γὰρ ἀνθρώπους πείθω ἢ τὸν Θεόν; ἢ ζητῶ ἀνθρώποις ἀρέσκειν; εἰ ἔτι ἀνθρώποις ἤρεσκον, Χριστοῦ δοῦλος οὐκ ἂν ἦμην.

11 Γνωρίζω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν κατὰ ἄνθρωπον. 12 οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγὼ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου παρέλαβον αὐτὸ οὐδὲ ἐδιδάχθην ἀλλὰ δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. 13 ἠκούσατε γὰρ τὴν ἐμὴν ἀναστροφὴν ποτὲ ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ, ὅτι καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἐδίωκον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἐπόρθουν αὐτήν. 14 καὶ προέκοπτον ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ ὑπὲρ πολλοὺς συνηλικιώτας ἐν τῷ γένει μου, περισσοτέρως ζηλωτῆς ὑπάρχων τῶν πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων. 15 ὅτε δὲ εὐδόκησεν ὁ ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου, καὶ καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, 16 ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί, ἵνα εὐαγγελίζωμαι αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, εὐθέως οὐ προσανεθέμην σαρκὶ καὶ αἵματι, 17 οὐδὲ ἀπῆλθον εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα πρὸς τοὺς πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἀποστόλους, ἀλλὰ ἀπῆλθον εἰς Ἀραβίαν, καὶ πάλιν ὑπέστρεψα εἰς Δαμασκόν. 18 ἔπειτα μετὰ ἔτη τρία ἀνῆλθον εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἱστορῆσαι Κηφᾶν, καὶ ἐπέμεινα πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡμέρας δεκαπέντε. 19 ἕτερον

10.—Rec. *εἰ γὰρ ἔτι*—Gb. (⊕) Ln. Tisch. om. γὰρ c. A. B. (Bentl.) D\* F. G. 17, 39, 67\*\*, 71, 80. Cyr.<sup>3</sup> Dam. Lat. Clarom. August. Hilar. Cypr. Tertul. al. Vulg.—Cop. Arm.

11.—Rec. Ln. *δέ*.—Gb. (˘) Tisch. γὰρ c. B. (Bentl.) D\* F. G. 17, al. Dam.—Lat. Clarom. Aug. Hieronym. Vulg.

12.—Rec. Gb. Tisch. *οὔτε*—Ln. *οὐδέ*, c. A. D\* F. G. (B. sil.) 71, 80, al. Pp. Gr.

15.—Rec. Gb. (⊕) [Ln.] ὁ Θεός.—Tisch. om. c. B. F. G. al. Chrys.<sup>1</sup> Theod.<sup>2</sup> Lat. Ir.<sup>1</sup> Faustus ap. Augustin. Ambrst. Hieron. Pelag. Vulg.—Syr.

17.—Rec. Gb. *ἀνῆλθον*.—Ln. Tisch. *ἀπῆλθον*, c. B. D. E. F. G. 46, 115, 116.—Syr.

Rec. Gb. *ἀλλ'*—Ln. Tisch. *ἀλλά*, c. A. D. E. F. G. &ca. (B. sil.)

18.—Rec. Πέτρον—Gb. (˘) Ln. Tisch. Κηφᾶν c. A. B. 17, 67\*\*, 71.—Syr. al.

δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων οὐκ εἶδον εἰ μὴ Ἰάκωβον τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυρίου. 20 ἃ δὲ γράφω ὑμῖν, ἰδοὺ ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ ὅτι οὐ ψεύδομαι. 21 ἔπειτα ἦλθον εἰς τὰ κλίματα τῆς Συρίας καὶ τῆς Κιλικίας. 22 ἤμην δὲ ἀγνοούμενος τῷ προσώπῳ ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Ἰουδαίας ταῖς ἐν Χριστῷ, 23 μόνον δὲ ἀκούοντες ἦσαν ὅτι ὁ διώκων ἡμᾶς ποτὲ νῦν εὐαγγελίζεται τὴν πίστιν ἣν ποτὲ ἐπόρθει. 24 καὶ ἐδόξαζον ἐν ἐμοὶ τὸν Θεόν.

## II.

1 Ἐπειτα διὰ δεκατεσσαρων ἐτῶν πάλιν ἀνέβην εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα μετὰ Βαρνάβα, συμπαραλαβὼν καὶ Τίτον. 2 ἀνέβην δὲ κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν, καὶ ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ κηρύσσω ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσιν, μή πως εἰς κενὸν τρέχω ἢ ἔδραμον, 3 (ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Τίτος ὁ σὺν ἐμοί, Ἕλληνας ὢν, ἠναγκάσθη περιτμηθῆναι,) 4 διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους, οἵτινες παρεισῆλθον κατασκοπεῖσαι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῶν ἣν ἔχομεν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα ἡμᾶς καταδουλώσουσιν. 5 οἷς οὐδὲ πρὸς ὄραν εἴξαμεν τῇ ὑποταγῇ, ἵνα ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου διαμείνη πρὸς ὑμᾶς. 6 ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναί τι, ὅποιοί ποτε ἦσαν, (οὐδὲν μοι διαφέρει) πρόσωπον Θεὸς ἀνθρώπου οὐ λαμβάνει. ἐμοὶ γὰρ οἱ δοκῶντες οὐδὲν προσανέθεντο, 7 ἀλλὰ τούναντίον, ἰδόντες ὅτι πεπίστευμαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας, καθὼς Πέτρος τῆς περιτομῆς, 8 (ὁ γὰρ ἐνεργήσας Πέτρῳ εἰς ἀποστολὴν

4.—Rec. Gb. καταδουλώσονται—Ln. Tisch. καταδουλώσουσιν, c. A. B. C. D. E. 39, al.

8.—Rec. Gb. καὶ ἐμοί.—Ln. Tisch. κάμοι, c. A. C. D.\* F. G. 57, 93, 116, al. (B. sil.).

τῆς περιτομῆς, ἐνήργησεν κἀμοὶ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη,) 9 καὶ γνόντες τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι, Ἰάκωβος καὶ Κηφᾶς καὶ Ἰωάννης, οἱ δοκοῦντες στῦλοι εἶναι, δεξιὰς ἔδωκαν ἐμοὶ καὶ Βαρνάβα κοινωνίας, ἵνα ἡμεῖς εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, αὐτοὶ δὲ εἰς τὴν περιτομήν· 10 μόνον τῶν πτωχῶν ἵνα μνημονεύωμεν, ὃ καὶ ἐσπούδασα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι.

11 Ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν Κηφᾶς εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν, κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ ἀντέστην, ὅτι κατεγνωσμένος ἦν. 12 πρὸ τοῦ γὰρ ἐλθεῖν τινὰς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου, μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν συνησθίεν· ὅτε δὲ ἦλθον, ὑπέστελλεν καὶ ἀφώριζεν ἑαυτόν, φοβούμενος τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς· 13 καὶ συνυπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ Ἰουδαῖοι, ὥστε καὶ Βαρνάβας συναπήχθη αὐτῶν τῇ ὑποκρίσει. 14 ἀλλ' ὅτε εἶδον ὅτι οὐκ ὀρθοποδοῦσιν πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, εἶπον τῷ Κηφᾷ ἔμπροσθεν πάντων, Εἰ σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων ἐθνικῶς ζῆς καὶ οὐχὶ Ἰουδαϊκῶς, πῶς τὰ ἔθνη ἀναγκάζεις ἰουδαΐζειν; 15 ἡμεῖς φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἐθνῶν, ἀμαρτωλοί, 16 εἰδότες δὲ ὅτι οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν, ἵνα δικαιωθῶμεν ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, διότι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ. 17 εἰ δὲ

9.—Rec. ἡμεῖς.—Gb. [Ln.] Tisch. add. μέν. c. A. C. D. E. 39, 47, 57, 67\*\* 72, 93, 108, al. Cop. Syr<sup>p</sup>. Pp. Gr.

11.—Rec. Πέτρος.—Gb. (✠) Ln. Tisch. Κηφᾶς. c. A. B. C. H. 17, 46, 67\*\*. 80, 115, Ambrst. Vulg. Syr. Cop. Sahid. Æth. al.

14.—Rec. Πέτροφ.—Gb. (˘) Ln. Tisch. Κηφᾶ. c. A. B. C. 17, 67 (\*ap. Alter sed\*\* ap. Birch) Syr. Vulg. Vv.

Rec. Tisch. τί.—Gb. Ln. πῶς, c. A. B. C. D. E. F. G. 37, 39, 57, 71, 73, 80, 116, al.<sup>4</sup> Or. Dam. Lat. quomodo. Clarom. August. (quemadmodum,<sup>1</sup> quomodo<sup>1</sup>) Ambrst. Hieronym. Vulg.—Syr. vv.

16.—Rec. εἰδότες.—Gb. (✠) Ln. Tisch. add δέ, c. B. C. D.\* (E?) F. G. J. 71, 80, 108, 110, 111, 116, al. Cyr. Theodrt. Lat. autem. Clarom. August. (sed<sup>1</sup>) Ambrst. Hieron. Vulg.

Rec. οὐ δικαιωθήσεται ἐξ ἔργων νόμου.—Gb. Ln. Tisch. ἐξ ἔργ. νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται. c. A. B. C. D. E. F. G. 37, 73, 116, 118. Theodrt.<sup>1</sup> Dam. &ca.



ζητοῦντες δικαιωθῆναι ἐν Χριστῷ, εὐρέθημεν και αὐτοὶ ἁμαρτωλοί, ἄρα Χριστὸς ἁμαρτίας διάκονος; μὴ γένοιτο. 18 εἰ γὰρ ἂ κατέλυσα ταῦτα πάλιν οἰκοδομῶ, παραβάτην ἑμαυτὸν συνιστάνω. 19 ἐγὼ γὰρ διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον, ἵνα Θεῷ ζῆσω. 20 Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι· ζῶ δὲ, οὐκέτι ἐγώ, ζῆ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός· ὁ δὲ νῦν ζῶ ἐν σαρκί, ἐν πίστει ζῶ τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ. 21 οὐκ ἀθετῶ τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ· εἰ γὰρ διὰ νόμου δικαιοσύνη, ἄρα Χριστὸς δωρεὰν ἀπέθανεν.

### III.

1 Ὡ ἀνόητοι Γαλάται, τίς ὑμᾶς ἐβάσκανεν, οἷς κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς προεγράφη ἐν ὑμῖν, ἐσταυρωμένος; 2 τοῦτο μόνον θέλω μαθεῖν ἀφ' ὑμῶν, ἐξ ἔργων νόμου τὸ πνεῦμα ἐλάβετε, ἢ ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως; 3 οὕτως ἀνόητοί ἐστε; ἐναρξάμενοι πνεύματι, νῦν σαρκὶ ἐπιτελεῖσθε; 4 τοσαῦτα ἐπάθετε εἰκῆ; (εἴ γε καὶ εἰκῆ.) 5 ὁ οὖν ἐπιχορηγῶν ὑμῖν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν, ἐξ ἔργων νόμου ἢ ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως; 6 καθὼς Ἀβραὰμ ἐπίστευσεν τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. 7 γινώσκετε ἄρα ὅτι οἱ ἐκ πίστεως, οὗτοί εἰσιν υἱοὶ Ἀβραάμ. 8 προἰδοῦσα δὲ ἡ γραφὴ ὅτι ἐκ πίσ-

18.—Rec. συνίστημι.—Gb. Ln. Tisch. συνιστάνω. c. A. B. C. D\*. F. G. 17, 67\*\*, 71, 80, 118, al. Cyr.

III. 1.—Rec. τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πείθεσθαι.—Gb. Ln. Tisch. om. c. A. B. D.\* E.\* F. G. 17,\* 67\*\*. Cyr. Chrys.<sup>2</sup> Theodrt.<sup>1</sup> al. Lat. Clarom. Augustin. [Hieronym. “legitur in quibusdam codicibus ‘quis vos fascinavit non credere veritati;’ sed hoc, quia in exemplaribus Adamantiū non habetur, omisimus.”]—Syr. Vv.

τεως δικαιοῖ τὰ ἔθνη ὁ Θεός, προευηγγελίσατο τῷ Ἀβραάμ, ὅτι ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. 9 ὥστε οἱ ἐκ πίστεως εὐλογοῦνται σὺν τῷ πιστῷ Ἀβραάμ. 10 ὅσοι γὰρ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσίν, ὑπὸ κατάραν εἰσίν· γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὃς οὐκ ἐμμένει ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτά. 11 ὅτι δὲ ἐν νόμῳ οὐδεὶς δικαιοῦται παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ, δῆλον, ὅτι ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται· 12 ὁ δὲ νόμος οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ πίστεως, ἀλλ' ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς. 13 Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου, γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα (ὅτι γέγραπται, Ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὁ κρεμάμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου), 14 ἵνα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ἡ εὐλογία τοῦ Ἀβραάμ γένηται ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος λάβωμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως.

15 Ἀδελφοί, κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λέγω. ὅμως ἀνθρώπου κεκυρωμένην, διαθήκην οὐδεὶς ἀθετεῖ ἢ ἐπιδιατάσσεται. 16 τῷ δὲ Ἀβραάμ ἐρρέθησαν αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ. οὐ λέγει, Καὶ τοῖς σπέρμασιν, ὡς ἐπὶ πολλῶν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐφ' ἑνός, Καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου, ὅς ἐστιν Χριστός. 17 τοῦτο δὲ λέγω· διαθήκην προκεκυρωμένην ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, εἰς Χριστόν, ὁ μετὰ τετρακόσια καὶ τριάκοντα ἔτη γεγωνὸς νόμος οὐκ ἀκυροῖ, εἰς τὸ καταργῆ-

10.—Rec. γάρ.—Gb. Ln. Tisch. add. ὅτι. c. A. B. C. D. E. F. G. 17, 73, 80, 118. Cyr. Dam. Lat. Clarom.

12.—Rec. ἀνθρωπος.—Gb. Ln. Tisch. om. c. A. B. C. D\*. F. G. 17, 67\*\*, 80. Chrys. Cyr. Dam. Lat. Clarom. August. Ambrst. Amb. Hieron. Vulg.—Syr. Æth. Vv.

13.—Rec. γέγραπται γάρ.—Gb. (ς) Ln. Tisch. ὅτι γέγραπται. c. A. B. C. D\*. F. G. 17, 39. Dam. Lat. Ir. August. (scriptum est enim<sup>1</sup>) Ambrst. Hilar. Hieron. Vulg.—Æth.

16.—Rec. ἐρρήθησαν.—Gb. (ς) Ln. Tisch. ἐρρέθησαν. c. A. B. (? vid. not.) C. D\*. F. G., 1, 46, 57, 71, (?) 73, 114, 121. Dam. al.

17.—Rec. ἔτη τετρακόσια καὶ τριάκ.—Gb. Ln. Tisch. τετρακ. καὶ τριάκ. ἔτη. c. A. B. C. D. E. F. G. 37, 57, 71, 80, 116. Cyr. Chrys. Dam.—Vv.

σαι τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν. 18 εἰ γὰρ ἐκ νόμου ἡ κληρονομία, οὐκέτι ἐξ ἐπαγγελίας· τῷ δὲ Ἀβραάμ δι' ἐπαγγελίας κεχάρισται ὁ Θεός.

19 Τί οὖν ὁ νόμος; τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν προσετέθη, ἄχρις οὗ ἔλθῃ τὸ σπέρμα ᾧ ἐπήγγελται, διαταγείς δι' ἀγγέλων, ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου. 20 ὁ δὲ μεσίτης ἑνὸς οὐκ ἔστιν, ὁ δὲ Θεὸς εἷς ἐστίν. 21 ὁ οὖν νόμος κατὰ τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ; μὴ γένοιτο. εἰ γὰρ ἐδόθη νόμος ὁ δυνάμενος ζωοποιῆσαι, ὅντως ἐκ νόμου ἂν ἦν ἡ δικαιοσύνη. 22 ἀλλὰ συνέκλεισεν ἡ γραφὴ τὰ πάντα ὑπὸ ἁμαρτίαν, ἵνα ἡ ἐπαγγελία ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοθῇ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν. 23 πρὸ τοῦ δὲ ἐλθεῖν τὴν πίστιν, ὑπὸ νόμον ἐφρουρούμεθα, συγκλειόμενοι εἰς τὴν μέλλουσαν πίστιν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι. 24 ὥστε ὁ νόμος παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν γέγονεν εἰς Χριστόν, ἵνα ἐκ πίστεως δικαιωθῶμεν. 25 ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς πίστεως, οὐκέτι ὑπὸ παιδαγωγόν ἐσμεν. 26 πάντες γὰρ υἱοὶ Θεοῦ ἐστὲ διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. 27 ὅσοι γὰρ εἰς Χριστόν ἐβαπτίσθητε, Χριστόν ἐνεδύσασθε. 28 οὐκ ἔνι Ἰουδαῖος οὐδὲ Ἕλληγ, οὐκ ἔνι δοῦλος οὐδὲ ἐλεύθερος, οὐκ ἔνι ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ· πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἷς ἐστὲ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. 29 εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ, ἄρα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ σπέρμα ἐστέ, κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν κληρονόμοι.

21.—Rec. Gb. ἂν ἐκ νόμου—Ln. Tisch. ἐκ νόμου ἂν. c. A. C. (B. ἐν νόμῳ ὄντως ἂν. ap. Bentr.) (D. ἐκ νόμ. ἦν. omiss. ἂν.)

23.—Rec. Tisch. συγκλεισμένοι—Gb. (·) Ln. συγκλειόμενοι. c. A. B. (Bart. Bentr.) (Birch. συγκλεισμένοι.) D\*. F. G. Clem.<sup>1</sup> Cyr.<sup>3</sup> Dam.

29.—Rec. καί.—Gb. (±) Ln. Tisch. om. c. A. B. (Bentr.) C. D. E.—Theod.<sup>msp.</sup> Dam.—Lat. Clarom. August. Ambrst. Pelag. Hieron. Vulg.—Copt. Arm.

ΙΥ.

1 Λέγω δέ, ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ὁ κληρονόμος νήπιός ἐστιν, οὐδὲν διαφέρει δούλου, κύριος πάντων ὢν, 2 ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ ἐπιτρόπους ἐστὶν καὶ οἰκονόμους, ἄχρι τῆς προθεσμίας τοῦ πατρός· 3 οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς, ὅτε ἤμεν νήπιοι, ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἤμεν δεδουλωμένοι· 4 ὅτε δὲ ἤλθεν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός, γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον, 5 ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ, ἵνα τὴν υἰοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν. 6 ὅτι δέ ἐστε υἱοί, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν, κρᾶζον, Ἄββᾶ ὁ πατήρ. 7 ὥστε οὐκέτι εἶ δοῦλος ἀλλὰ υἱός· εἰ δὲ υἱός, καὶ κληρονόμος διὰ Θεοῦ.

8 Ἀλλὰ τότε μὲν οὐκ εἰδότες Θεόν, ἐδουλεύσατε τοῖς φύσει μὴ οὔσιν θεοῖς· 9 νῦν δὲ γινόντες Θεόν, μᾶλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ Θεοῦ, πῶς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα, οἷς πάλιν ἄνωθεν δουλεύειν θέλετε; 10 ἡμέρας παρατηρεῖσθε καὶ μῆνας καὶ καιροὺς καὶ ἐνιαυτούς. 11 φοβοῦμαι ὑμᾶς, μή πως εἰκῆ κεκοπίακα εἰς ὑμᾶς.

12 Γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγώ, ὅτι καγὼ ὡς ὑμεῖς, ἀδελφοί,

6.—Rec. ἡμῶν—Gb. (~). Ln. Tisch. ἡμῶν. c. A. C. D\*. F. G. 71, 73, 115, 116, 118, al. (B. sil.) Ath.<sup>4</sup> Bas. Pseud-Ath. Didym.—Lat. Clarom. Tertull. Hilar. Ambros. Vigil Taps. Vulg. (Codd. Am. et Flor. [al. ap. Tisch.]).

7.—Rec. Θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ—Ln. Tisch. διὰ Θεοῦ. c. A. B. C\*. 17.—Clem. Ath. Bas. <sup>disert.</sup> Cyr. Didym. Lat. August. Amb. Pelag. Vulg.—Copt.

8.—Rec. μὴ φύσει—Gb. (⊛) Ln. Tisch. φύσει μὴ. c. A. B. C. D\*. E. 17, 71, 73, 80, 118. Cyr. <sup>serpo.</sup> Dam. Ath.<sup>4</sup> Bas.<sup>2</sup> Nyss.<sup>4</sup> al. Lat. (Clarom. *hi* (sic) *qui non sunt Dei*). (Iren. *qui non erant dii*). Amb. August. Ambrst. Pelag. Hieron. Vulg.—Goth. Copt.

δέομαι ὑμῶν. οὐδέν με ἠδικήσατε· 13 οἴδατε δὲ ὅτι δι' ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν τὸ πρότερον, 14 καὶ τὸν πειρασμὸν ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου οὐκ ἐξουθενήσατε οὐδὲ ἐξεπτύσατε, ἀλλὰ ὡς ἄγγελον Θεοῦ ἐδέξασθέ με, ὡς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν. 15 τίς οὖν ἦν ὁ μακαρισμὸς ὑμῶν; μαρτυρῶ γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι εἰ δυνατὸν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν ἐξορύξαντες ἐδώκατέ μοι. 16 ὥστε ἐχθρὸς ὑμῶν γέγονα ἀληθεύων ὑμῖν; 17 ζηλοῦσιν ὑμᾶς οὐ καλῶς, ἀλλὰ ἐκκλείσαι ὑμᾶς θέλουσιν, ἵνα αὐτοὺς ζηλοῦτε. 18 καλὸν δὲ τὸ ζηλοῦσθαι ἐν καλῷ πάντοτε, καὶ μὴ μόνον ἐν τῷ παρεῖναι με πρὸς ὑμᾶς, 19 τεκνία μου, οὓς πάλιν ὠδίνω ἄχρις οὔ μορφωθῆ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν· 20 ἤβηλον δὲ παρεῖναι πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἄρτι, καὶ ἀλλάξαι τὴν φωνήν μου, ὅτι ἀποροῦμαι ἐν ὑμῖν.

21 Λέγετέ μοι, οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον θέλοντες εἶναι, τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε; 22 γέγραπται γάρ, ὅτι Ἀβραὰμ δύο υἱοὺς ἔσχεν, ἓνα ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης, καὶ ἓνα ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας. 23 ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης κατὰ σάρκα γεγέννηται, ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας. 24 ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα· αὗται γάρ εἰσιν δύο διαθήκαι, μία μὲν ἀπὸ ὄρους Σινα, εἰς δουλείαν γεννώσα, ἥτις ἐστὶν Ἄγαρ, (25 τὸ δὲ Ἄγαρ Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ,)

14.—Rec. Tisch. μου τὸν—Ln. ὑμῶν. c. A. B. C. (\*\* ὑμῶν τὸν. “Quid a prima scriptum fuerit, difficile dictum est. Pauciora fuere absque dubio. Atque existimo equidem omisso ὑμῶν lectum esse τὸν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου.” Tisch. Append. Ed. Cod. C.) D\*. F. G. 17, 39, 67\*\*. Cyr. Lat. Clarom. August. Ambrst. Hieron. Vulg.—Copt.

15.—Rec. Gb. ἀν—Ln. Tisch. om. c. A. B. (Bentl.) C. D\*. (F. G. καὶ ἐδώκατέ μοι). 17, 47, Dam.

Rec. ai—Gb. Ln. Tisch. om. c. A. B. C. D. E. F. G. J. K. 3, 17, 49, 57, 67, 71, 72, 73, 80, 89, 108, 109, 113, 114, 116, 117, 120, 121, 123, al.—Pr.

25.—Rec. Gb. Tisch. τὸ γὰρ Ἄγαρ—Ln. mg. τὸ δὲ Ἄγαρ. c. A. (B. τὸ Ἄγαρ). D. E. 37, 73, 80. Cyr.<sup>1</sup> Lat. Ambrst. (Sina autem).—Copt. Vide not. in loc.

Rec. δουλεύει δὲ—Gb. Ln. Tisch. δουλεύει γὰρ. c. A. B. C. D. F. G. 17, 39, 47, 73, 80. Cyr. Or.<sup>interp.</sup> Lat. Clarom. August.<sup>4</sup> (et servit<sup>3</sup>). (Vulg. Hieron. et servit). Copt. Arm. Syr.<sup>p.</sup> (sed δὲ in mg.).

συστοιχεῖ δὲ τῇ νῦν Ἱερουσαλήμ, δουλεύει γὰρ μετὰ των τέκνων αὐτῆς. 26 ἡ δὲ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐλευθέρα ἐστίν, ἣτις ἐστὶν μήτηρ ἡμῶν. 27 γέγραπται γὰρ Εὐφράνθητι στεῖρα ἢ οὐ τίκτουςα, ῥῆξον καὶ βόησον ἢ οὐκ ᾠδίνουσα, ὅτι πολλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐρήμου μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς ἐχούσης τὸν ἄνδρα. 28 ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀδελφοί, κατὰ Ἰσαὰκ ἐπαγγελίας τέκνα ἐστέ. 29 ἀλλ' ὥσπερ τότε ὁ κατὰ σάρκα γεννηθεὶς ἐδίωκεν τὸν κατὰ πνεῦμα, οὕτως καὶ νῦν. 30 ἀλλὰ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή; Ἐκβαλε τὴν παιδίσκην καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς· οὐ γὰρ μὴ κληρονομήσῃ ὁ υἱὸς τῆς παιδίσκης μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἐλευθέρου. 31 ἡμεῖς δέ, ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἐσμὲν παιδίσκης τέκνα, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἐλευθέρου, (V. 1) τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἣ ἡμᾶς Χριστὸς ἠλευθέρωσεν.

Στήκετε οὖν, καὶ μὴ πάλιν ζυγῷ δουλείας ἐνέχεσθε.

2 Ἴδε ἐγὼ Παῦλος λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἐὰν περιτέμνησθε

26.—Rec. πάντων—Gb. [Ln.] Tisch. om. c. B. C\*. D. E. F. G. 6, 67\*\*.—Or. <sup>ampc</sup> Cyr. Chrys. Theodrt. al. Lat. Clarom. August. (*mater omnium nostrum.*<sup>1</sup> *mater nostra aeterna in caelis*<sup>1</sup>).—Ambrst. Vulg.—Syr. utr. Copt. Æth. al.

28.—Rec. Gb. ἡμεῖς—ἐσμέν—Ln. Tisch. ὑμεῖς—ἐστέ. c. B. D\*. (E. ?) F. G. 6, 17, 61, 67, 71.—Orig. ap. Hieron. Lat. Clarom. (*vobis* (sic)-*estis*).—Iren. Ambr. Ambrst. Tichon.—Sahid.—Æth.

31.—Rec. Gb. \*Αρα. Tisch. Ln. διό—ἡμεῖς δέ. c. A. C. 57, 73. Cyr.<sup>1</sup> Marc.<sup>mo</sup> Dam. Lat. August.<sup>3</sup> Hieron.<sup>1</sup>—Copt.

V. 1.—Rec. Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς—Gb. (\*) Ln. Tisch. ἡμᾶς Χριστὸς. c. A. B. D. E. F. G. 37, al.—Cyr. Dam.<sup>1</sup>

Rec. ἐλευθ. οὖν—Ln. om. οὖν. c. A. B. C\*. F. G. 17, 37, 47, 67\*\*, 71 (ap. Birch.), 73, 80, al.—Cyr. Bas. Dam. Or.<sup>interp.</sup> Lat. Clarom. *filii . . liberæ qua libertate nostra Christus liberavit*.—Tertullian, *qua libertate Christus nos manumisit*.—Augustin. *qua libertate Christus nos liberavit*, et sim. Ambrosiast. Hieron. Vulg.—Copt. Arm.

Rec. στήκετε (Gb. Tisch. om. οὖν utroque loco)—Ln. στήκετε οὖν—c. A. B. C\*. F. G. 17, 37, 47, 67\*\*, 71 (ap. Birch.), 73, al.—Cyr. al. Lat. Boern. Augiens. August. Vulg. ms.—Goth. Copt. Æth.

Χριστὸς ὑμᾶς οὐδὲν ὠφελήσει. 3 μαρτύρομαι δὲ πάλιν παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ περιτεμνομένῳ ὅτι ὀφειλέτης ἐστὶν ὄλον τὸν νόμον ποιῆσαι. 4 κατηργήθητε ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ οἵτινες ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοῦσθε, τῆς χάριτος ἐξεπέσατε. 5 ἡμεῖς γὰρ πνεύματι ἐκ πίστεως ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης ἀπεκδεχόμεθα. 6 ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ οὔτε περιτομή τι ἰσχύει οὔτε ἀκροβυστία, ἀλλὰ πίστις, δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη.

7 Ἐτρέχετε καλῶς· τίς ὑμᾶς ἐνέκοψεν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πειθῆσθαι; 8 ἡ πεισμονὴ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος ὑμᾶς. 9 μικρὰ ζύμη ὄλον τὸ φύραμα ζυμοῖ. 10 ἐγὼ πέποιθα εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐν κυρίῳ ὅτι οὐδὲν ἄλλο φρονήσετε· ὁ δὲ ταρασσὼν ὑμᾶς βαστάσει τὸ κρῖμα, ὅστις ἂν ᾔ. 11 ἐγὼ δέ, ἀδελφοί, εἰ περιτομὴν ἔτι κηρύσσω, τί ἔτι διώκομαι; ἄρα κατήργηται τὸ σκάνδαλον τοῦ σταυροῦ. 12 ὄφελον·—καὶ ἀποκόψονται οἱ ἀναστατοῦντες ὑμᾶς·— 13 ὑμεῖς γὰρ ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ ἐκλήθητε, ἀδελφοί· μόνον μὴ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν εἰς ἀφορμὴν τῇ σαρκί, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης δουλεύετε ἀλλήλοις. 14 ὁ γὰρ πᾶς νόμος ἐν ἐνὶ λόγῳ πεπλήρωται, ἐν τῷ Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν. 15 εἰ δὲ ἀλλήλους δάκνετε καὶ κατεσθίετε, βλέπετε μὴ ὑπὸ ἀλλήλων ἀναλωθῆτε.

16 Λέγω δέ, πνεύματι περιπατεῖτε, καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκὸς οὐ μὴ τελέσητε. 17 ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα κατὰ τῆς σαρκός, (ταῦτα γὰρ ἀλλήλοις ἀντίκειται,) ἵνα μὴ ἂ ἂν θέλητε ταῦτα

7.—Rec. ἀνέκοψε—Gb. Ln. Tisch. ἐνέκοψε. c. A. B. C. D. E. F. G. J. K. 3, 6, 9, 11, 12, 17, 18, 21, 28, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 46, 71, 72, 80, 91, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 115, 116, 120, 121, al. mult. Pp.

14.—Rec. Gb. πληροῦται—Ln. Tisch. πεπλήρωται. c. A. B. C. 17, 21, 37, 39, 71, 116, al.—Dam. al. Lat. August. (*impleta est. impletur.*) (ap Sabatier.)

Rec. Tisch. ἐαυτόν—Gb. Ln. σεαυτόν. c. A. B. C. D. E. K. 18, 21, 44, 89, 89, 113, al. mult. Pp. Gr.

17.—Rec. ἀντίκειται ἀλλήλοις—Gb. Ln. Tisch. ἀλλήλοις ἀντίκειται. c. A. B. C. D. E. F. G. 17, 37, 73, 80, 116, al. mult. Dam. &ca.

ποιῆτε. 18 εἰ δὲ πνεύματι ἄγεσθε, οὐκ ἔστ' ὑπὸ νόμον.  
 19 Φανερά δέ ἐστιν τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκός, ἅτινά ἐστιν  
 πορνεία, ἀκαθαρσία, ἀσέλγεια, 20 εἰδωλολατρεία, φαρ-  
 μακεία, ἔχθραι, ἔρις, ζῆλοι, θυμοί, ἐριθειῖαι, διχοστασίαι,  
 αἰρέσεις, 21 φθόνοι, φόνοι, μέθαι, κῶμοι, καὶ τὰ ὅμοια  
 τούτοις, ἃ προλέγω ὑμῖν, καθὼς καὶ προεῖπον ὅτι οἱ τὰ  
 τοιαῦτα πράσσοντες βασιλείαν Θεοῦ οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν.  
 22 ὁ δὲ καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματός ἐστιν ἀγάπη, χαρὰ, εἰρήνη,  
 μακροθυμία, χρηστότης, ἀγαθωσύνη, πίστις, 23 πραύ-  
 της, ἐγκράτεια. κατὰ τῶν τοιούτων οὐκ ἔστιν νόμος.  
 24 οἱ δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὴν σάρκα ἐσταύρωσαν σὺν τοῖς  
 παθήμασιν καὶ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις.

25 Εἰ ζῶμεν πνεύματι, πνεύματι καὶ στοιχῶμεν.  
 26 μὴ γινώμεθα κενόδοξοι, ἀλλήλους προκαλούμενοι,  
 ἀλλήλοις φθονοῦντες.

## VI.

1 Ἀδελφοί, ἐὰν καὶ προλημφθῆ ἄνθρωπος ἐν τινι  
 παραπτώματι, ὑμεῖς οἱ πνευματικοὶ καταρτίζετε τὸν  
 τοιοῦτον ἐν πνεύματι πραύτητος, σκοπῶν σεαυτόν, μὴ  
 καὶ σὺ πειρασθῆς. 2 ἀλλήλων τὰ βάρη βαστάζετε,  
 καὶ οὕτως ἀναπληρώσετε τὸν νόμον τοῦ Χριστοῦ. 3 εἰ

19.—Rec. *μοιχεία*.—Gb. Ln. Tisch. om. c. A. B. C. 17, 47, Clem. Cyr. Dam.—*Lat.* Tertull. Hilar. (ap. Wetstein). Concil. Carthag. ap. Cyr. (non Cyr.) August.<sup>9</sup> (*adulteria, fornicationes.*)—Hieron. (“*primum itaque carnis opus, est fornicatio*”). Pelag. al. Vulg.—Syr. Copt. Æth. al. Vide not.

23.—Rec. Gb. *πραότης*.—Ln. Tisch. *πραύτης*. c. A. B. C. 17, 47, 80, 118, —Doroth. Vide not.

VI. 1.—Rec. Gb. Ln. *πραότητος*.—Tisch. *πραύτητος*. c. B. al. Vide v. 23 et not.

2.—Rec. Gb. Tisch. *ἀναπληρώσατε*.—Ln. *ἀναπληρώσετε*. c. B. F. G. al. Theodrt. ms. Asterius. Proclus. Marc.<sup>mon</sup> *Lat.* Clarom. Tertull. Cyr. Augustin. Optat. Pacian. Hieron. Vulg.—Syr. Æth. al. Vide not.



γὰρ δοκεῖ τις εἶναι τι, μηδὲν ὦν, φρεναπαταῖ ἑαυτόν.  
 4 τὸ δὲ ἔργον ἑαυτοῦ δοκιμαζέτω ἕκαστος, καὶ τότε εἰς  
 ἑαυτὸν μόνον τὸ καύχημα ἔξει καὶ οὐκ εἰς τὸν ἕτερον.  
 5 ἕκαστος γὰρ τὸ ἴδιον φορτίον βαστάσει.

6 Κοινωνεῖτω δὲ ὁ κατηχούμενος τὸν λόγον τῷ κατη-  
 χοῦντι ἐν πᾶσιν ἀγαθοῖς. 7 μὴ πλανᾶσθε, Θεὸς οὐ  
 μυκτηρίζεται· ὁ γὰρ ἐὰν σπείρη ἄνθρωπος, τοῦτο καὶ  
 θερίσει· 8 ὅτι ὁ σπείρων εἰς τὴν σάρκα ἑαυτοῦ, ἐκ τῆς  
 σαρκὸς θερίσει φθοράν, ὁ δὲ σπείρων εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα, ἐκ τοῦ  
 πνεύματος θερίσει ζωὴν αἰώνιον. 9 τὸ δὲ καλὸν ποιοῦντες  
 μὴ ἐγκακῶμεν· καιρῷ γὰρ ἰδίῳ θερίσομεν, μὴ ἐκλυόμενοι.  
 10 ἄρα οὖν ὡς καιρὸν ἔχομεν, ἐργαζώμεθα τὸ ἀγαθὸν  
 πρὸς πάντας, μάλιστα δὲ πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους τῆς πίστεως.

11 Ἴδετε πηλίκους ὑμῖν γράμμασιν ἔγραψα τῇ ἐμῇ  
 χειρί.

12 Ὅσοι θέλουσιν εὐπροσωπῆσαι ἐν σαρκί, οὗτοι ἀναγ-  
 κάζουσιν ὑμᾶς περιτέμνεσθαι, μόνον ἵνα τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ  
 Χριστοῦ μὴ διώκωνται. 13 οὐδὲ γὰρ οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι  
 αὐτοὶ νόμον φυλάσσουσιν, ἀλλὰ θέλουσιν ὑμᾶς περιτέμ-  
 νεσθαι, ἵνα ἐν τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ σαρκὶ καυχῆσωνται. 14 ἐμοὶ  
 δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχᾶσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου  
 ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἑσταύρωται  
 κἀγὼ τῷ κόσμῳ· 15 οὔτε γὰρ περιτομὴ τι ἔστιν οὔτε

3.—Rec. Gb. ἑαυτὸν φρεναπαταῖ—Ln. Tisch. φρεναπαταῖ ἑαυτόν. c. A. B. C. 57, 80, 116, 118, Chrys. Copt. Sahid.

9.—Rec. Gb. ἐγκακῶμεν—Ln. Tisch. ἐγκακῶμεν. c. A. B. D\*. 17, 39.—Vide not.

12.—Rec. Gb. ἵνα μὴ—Ln. Tisch. μὴ ante διώκωνται. c. A. B. C. D. E. 31, 73, 118,—Lat. Clarom. August. Hieron. Vulg.

13.—Rec. περιτεμνημένοι—Gb. (·) Ln. mg. Tisch. περιτεμνόμενοι. c. A. C. D. E. K. 49, 67\*, 71, Chrys. Theodrt. Dam. Lat. Vulg.—Syr. utr.

15.—Rec. Ln. ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ—Gb. (ς) Tisch. om. c. B. 17, Chrys. al. Lat. Aug. Hieron.—Syr. al. Vide not.

Rec. ισχύει—Gb. Ln. Tisch. ἔστιν. c. A. B. C. D\*. E. F. G. 67\*\*. 80.—Or. Theophyl.—Lat. Clarom. August. Ambrst. Hieron.—Syr. Syr.<sup>p<sup>in</sup>ms</sup> Sahid. Æth.

ἀκροβυστία, ἀλλὰ καινὴ κτίσις· 16 καὶ ὅσοι τῷ κανόνι τούτῳ στοιχοῦσιν, εἰρηνὴ ἐπ' αὐτοὺς καὶ ἔλεος, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

17 Τοῦ λοιποῦ κόπους μοι μηδεὶς παρεχέτω· ἐγὼ γὰρ τὰ στίγματα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματί μου βαστάζω.

18 Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοί· ἀμήν.

16.—Rec. στοιχήσουσιν—Gb. (✱) Ln. mg. Tisch. στοιχοῦσιν. c. A. C\*. D. E. F. G. 71, al.—Cyr.—Lat. Clarom. August. Ambrosiast. Hieron.—Syr utr. al.

17.—Rec. κυρίου.—Gb. (‡) Ln. Tisch. om. c. A. B. C\*. 17, 118,—Lat. Vulg. Codd. Amiat. et Demidov.

THE reader is particularly requested to take notice of the following more important errata and omissions.

- Page 29, line 20 from top, *dele* as.
- 57, line 11 from top, *after* Wetstein *add* on Rom. vi. 11.
  - 61, line 17 from top, *for* formally *read* formerly.
  - 76, line 1, *after the word* There *add in a parenthesis* Deut. xxvii. 26.
  - 208, line 11 from bottom, *for* Vo. *read* Vv.
  - 209, line 1, remove the inverted commas before and after the words, “kingdom of glory.”

# A COMMENTARY

ON ST. PAUL'S

## EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

---

### CHAPTER I. VERSE 1.

1.—ἀπόστολος answers to the Lat. *legatus*, and means simply one sent by and in the name of another, and therefore representing the person of the sender. It seems probable that at the time that Christ gave this title to the twelve, officers having the same name were attached to the Jewish High Priest;<sup>1</sup> so that the name was already familiar to the Jews. But be this as it may, the title was given by our Lord Himself,<sup>2</sup> κατ' ἐξοχήν,<sup>3</sup> to those twelve who were sent *directly* forth by Himself, and who did therefore, according to His own statement, directly represent Him to the world. He was primarily the Great Apostle of the Father.<sup>4</sup> Being sent Himself, He sent others. "As Thou hast sent me into the world,

<sup>1</sup> See Mosheim, *Affairs of the Christians, &c.*, translated by Vidal, vol. i: p. 120, seq. note.

<sup>2</sup> δώδεκα οὖς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν. Luke vi. 13.

<sup>3</sup> The name ἀπόστολος was afterwards given to others who assisted the apostles κατ' ἐξοχήν. See Acts xiv. 4, 14; 2 Cor. viii. 23, &c.

<sup>4</sup> Heb. iii. 1.

even so send I them into the world ;”<sup>1</sup> and again, “as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you ;”<sup>2</sup> and as a result of this He says, applying a rule current among the Jews, that the “sent is the same as the sender,”<sup>3</sup> “He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth Him that sent me.”<sup>4</sup> So that the Apostles representing Christ, and Christ as very God representing the Father, they did in fact also represent the Father. And so we may observe, that when Matthias<sup>5</sup> was chosen to supply the place of Judas, the Apostles clearly recognised the necessity to apostleship in its highest sense of a *direct* divine commission ; for they did not leave it to human decision to select one or the other, but they cast lots, leaving the designation through that method to God and Christ.<sup>6</sup>

St. Paul, from the remarkable nature of his mission, necessarily assumed a place among these *directly* and divinely appointed Apostles.<sup>7</sup>

—οὐκ ἀπ’ ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ δι’ ἀνθρώπου—After the destruction of the temple, the Jewish Patriarchs had attached to them officers of authority, who were called Apostles.<sup>8</sup> These men seem to have been often sent upon missions to distant Christian Churches, with a view either to persecution<sup>9</sup> or proselytism : Jerome says, “Usque hodie a Patriarchis Judæorum Apostolos mitti, a quibus etiam tunc reor Galatas depravatos Legem observare cœpisse . . . Ad dis-

<sup>1</sup> John xvii. 18.

<sup>2</sup> John xx. 21.

<sup>3</sup> See Schættgen on Gal. iv. 14.

<sup>4</sup> Matt. x. 40.

<sup>5</sup> Acts i. 23, et seq.

<sup>6</sup> Lightfoot.

<sup>7</sup> See 2 Cor. xii. 11.

<sup>8</sup> F. Spanheim, Miscell. Sacr. Opp. Tom. ii. p. 292.

<sup>9</sup> Spanheim, ubi sup.

inctionem itaque eorum qui mittuntur ab hominibus, et sui qui sit missus a Christo talem sumpsit exordium, Paulus Apostolus non ab hominibus neque per hominem." But it seems more likely that the expression of the Apostle had reference to something which had been said by the false teachers respecting his apostleship. If, as seems probable, the term was familiar to them, nothing would be more likely than that they would, referring probably to the circumstances recorded in Acts xiii. 2, 3, say that St. Paul was only an Apostle appointed by men, and not by Jesus Christ, and hence arises this form of exordium.

I should take *ἀνθρώπου* in a collective sense, of man considered as a being simply human; δι' ἀνθ. being opposed to διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστ. The article is sometimes omitted with collective nouns.<sup>1</sup>

—διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ—Theodoret: Καὶ ἵνα μή τις ὑπολάβῃ ὑπουργὸν εἶναι τοῦ Πατρὸς τὸν υἱόν, εὐρῶν προσκείμενον τὸ διὰ, ἐπήγαγε, 'καὶ Θεοῦ πατρός,' κ.τ.λ. Ἐφ' ἑκατέρου γὰρ προσώπου τὸ διὰ τέθεικε, διδάσκων ὡς οὐδεμίαν φύσεως ἢ πρόθεσις αὕτη σημαίνει διαφοράν. There are three points here worthy of remark. *First*, the community of the διὰ to both Father and Son, which makes it impossible to argue that an agency<sup>2</sup> indicating inferiority to the Father is ascribed to the Son. *Second*, the opposition between ἀνθρώπος and Ἰησ. Χρ. *Third*, the ascription here of the same work to the Son which in Acts xiii. 2 is said to be of the Spirit, thereby proving the unity of Son and Spirit. So Chrysostom: "Ὁθεν δῆλον, ὅτι μία

<sup>1</sup> See Jelf, Gr. Gr. 447, Obs. i.

<sup>2</sup> See the note on ch. iv. ver. 7, διὰ Θεοῦ.

ἐξουσία Υἱοῦ καὶ Πνεύματος. Ὑπὸ γὰρ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἀποσταλεῖς, ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ φησὶν ἀπεστάλθαι.

—καὶ Θεοῦ πατρός—All the Apostles, being sent by Christ, were also sent by the Father. Paul is enabled to add—τοῦ ἐγείραντος, κ.τ.λ.—that resurrection being, as Bengel says, “fons justitiæ et apostolatus.” Rom. i. 4, 5; iv. 25.

Some would from this invest the apostleship of St. Paul with attributes higher than those belonging to the rest. But I think τοῦ ἐγείραντος refers more to the completion of the scheme which he came forward to declare.

God is here represented as raising Christ from the dead.<sup>1</sup> This is in respect of the humanity of the Son. As very God He could say, “Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up;”<sup>2</sup> and “I have power to lay down (my life), and I have power to take it again.”<sup>3</sup>

2. —καὶ οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ πάντες ἀδελφοί.—By ἀδελφοί I conceive that the Apostle means certain of his colleagues who were then with him at Corinth,<sup>4</sup> including Silas and Timothy, who had accompanied him on his first visit to the Galatians, and who had rejoined him there.<sup>5</sup> Cf. Phil. iv. 21, 22, ἀδελφοί—ἄγιοι.

3. —χάρις.—Free love<sup>6</sup> displaying itself in a free gift, ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἡ δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι,<sup>7</sup> that free love being the sole cause of redemption,

<sup>1</sup> Acts ii. 24, 32; iii. 15, &c.

<sup>2</sup> John ii. 19.

<sup>3</sup> Ib. x. 18.

<sup>4</sup> From this place, after St. Paul's first visit to Galatia, I conceive this Epistle to have been written.

<sup>5</sup> Acts xviii. 5.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. χαρίζεσθαι. Luke vii. 42, 43; 2 Cor. ii. 10; xii. 13.

<sup>7</sup> Rom. v. 15.

ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν—κατὰ τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ,<sup>1</sup> of our predestination, προορίσας ἡμᾶς εἰς υἰοθεσίαν—εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ,<sup>2</sup> and manifesting itself in election, ἐκλογὴν χάριτος,<sup>3</sup> in the gift of the faith which invests us with the privileges of the Christian,<sup>4</sup> in the imputation of the righteousness of Christ,<sup>5</sup> in short, in the gift of every Christian privilege,<sup>6</sup> the word grace comprehending the whole Christian life, grace being given for grace.<sup>7</sup>

—εἰρήνη—See the note on εἰρήνη, ch. v. ver. 22.

The ἀπό is common to Father and Son, showing that in the unity of the divine nature every good gift flows from both.<sup>8</sup>

4. —τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτόν.—i. e. to death, as Rom. iv. 25; viii. 32; Titus ii. 14. Jesus παρέδωκεν ἑαυτόν . . . προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν τῷ Θεῷ.<sup>9</sup> Jerome: “Neque Filius se dedit pro peccatis nostris absque voluntate Patris: neque Pater tradidit Filium sine Filii voluntate: sed hæc est voluntas Filii, voluntatem Patris implere, ut Ipse loquitur in Psalmo: <sup>10</sup> ‘Ut facerem,’ &c.”

—περί—Cf. LXX. Is. liii. 10, ἐὰν δῶτε περὶ ἁμαρτίας,—and Heb. x. 18, προσφορὰ περὶ ἁμαρτίας.

—ὅπως—“in order that”—ἐξέληται—So Polyb. xv. 22, ἐξελούμενοι τοὺς Κιανούς ἐκ τῶν περιεστώτων κακῶν. The Seventy use the word constantly in a similar sense, i. e. of delivering from danger.

<sup>1</sup> Eph. i. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Ib. 5, 6.

<sup>3</sup> Rom. xi. 5.

<sup>4</sup> John vi. 44, “fides gratia est.” August. Tract iii. in Joan.

<sup>5</sup> Rom. iii. 24; v. 16, seq.

<sup>6</sup> 1 Cor. i. 30.

<sup>7</sup> John i. 16.

<sup>8</sup> Coll. Phil. iv. 23, χάρις τοῦ Χριστοῦ, with Col. i. 6, χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ; also Phil. iv. 7, εἰρ. τοῦ Θεοῦ, with Col. iii. 15, (Gb. Tf. Ln. Sch.), εἰρ. τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

<sup>9</sup> Eph. v. 2.

<sup>10</sup> Psalm xl.



—ἐκ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος αἰῶνος πονηροῦ—ἐνεστῶς is equivalent in this place to νῦν. Cf. LXX. 1 Esdr. ix. 6, τὸν ἐνεστῶτα χειμῶνα, and see Rom. viii. 38, and 1 Cor. iii. 22, where ἐνεστῶτα and μέλλοντα are opposed to one another. Hesychius: ἐνεστῶτα. παρόντα. προκειμένον. αἰών means properly a space or period of time, an age. It is used here, as elsewhere, of the space of time, the age which began with the creation of man, and which especially belongs to the present life of man. So Hesychius: αἰών. ὁ βίος τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὁ τῆς ζωῆς χρόνος. Compare Mark iv. 19, αἱ μέριμναι τοῦ αἰῶνος, with Luke viii. 14, μεριμνῶν τοῦ βίου. This age is evil in respect of the curse and presence of sin which belongs to it. And the object of Christ's work of redemption was to deliver man finally and completely (ἐξαιρεῖν ἐκ) from out of the present evil age. This deliverance is commenced in the person of the believer, in the gift of a life which essentially belongs to a future state, so that the saints attain a foretaste of their final deliverance before the termination of the present αἰών. They wait for the perfecting of the work, but are even now delivered from the condemnatory power of sin, and from many of those evils centering in and flowing from sin, which constitute the present age evil.

—κατὰ τὸ θελημα, κ. τ. λ.—Join this with δόντος.

5.—ἡ δόξα——“pro hac voluntate salutifica.”<sup>1</sup>

6.—Θαυμάζω——The Apostle had the greater cause for wonder, from the fact of the Galatians having at the first so gladly received him and his preaching. See chap. iv. 14, 15.

<sup>1</sup> Bengel.

—οὕτως ταχέως— from their first *joyful* reception of him. Cf. iv. 14, 15.

—μετατίθεσθε— “Ye are changing about.”<sup>1</sup> “Sapientes quoque sæculi eos qui de dogmate transferuntur ad dogmata, *translatos* vocant; ut Dionysius ille, ejus fuit ante sententia, dolorem non esse malum; postquam oppressus calamitatibus et dolore cruciatus, cœpit affirmare quod dolor esset summum omnium malorum, ab his appellatus est *transpositus* sive *translatus*, quod scilicet a priori decreto recedens, in contrarium recedisset.”<sup>2</sup> He alludes to a passage of Athenæus, which is quoted by Wetstein. καὶ μεταθέμενος καλούμενος ἔχαιρε, καὶ τοι γεραῖος ἀποστάς τῶν τῆς Στοᾶς λόγων, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἐπίκουρον μεταπηδήσας. Cf. also LXX., 3 Reg. xxi. 25,<sup>3</sup> ὡς μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν Ἰεζάβελ, and Apocryph. 2 Macc. vii. 24, μεταθέμενον ἀπὸ τῶν πατρῶν νόμων.

—τοῦ καλέσαντος— The context appears to me to require that we should refer this not to the effectual calling of God, but to the instrumental work of the Apostle himself. From the personal nature of the charges brought against him by the false teachers, this Epistle often assumes a personal character. See iv. 14, 15.

Calling is a word which equally describes the effectual work of God, and the instrumental one of his ministers, and there seems to be but little real weight in the argument—which is all that can be adduced against this interpretation—that because the Apostle in other passages ascribes calling to God, he should not here, and under the peculiar circum-

<sup>1</sup> See Lidd. and Scott, *μετατιθ.* ii. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Jerome.

<sup>3</sup> Quoted by Jerome.

stances in which he was placed, use the same word in describing his own instrumental work.

—ἐν χάριτι—Notwithstanding all that has been said on the meaning of ἐν here, I must still venture to express my belief that it is used in a *pregnant* sense, implying not only motion to, but position *in*, the dispensation of which the great characteristic is *grace*, made effectual through Christ, see ch. v. 4, and the note. 1 Cor. vii. 15, ἐν εἰρήνῃ καλεῖν · Eph. iv. 4, ἐν μιᾷ ἐλπίδι καλεῖν · and 1 Thess. iv. 7, ἐν ἁγιασμῷ καλεῖν, appear to me to be precisely similar passages : εἰρήνη, ἐλπίς, and ἁγιασμός, are each and all in those passages characteristics of a dispensation. Therefore the believer is called not only to the dispensation, but to an actual and *present* position *in* that dispensation, and those its characteristics.<sup>1</sup>

The Apostle is speaking of himself only in his character of preacher and apostle, calling them to the benefits of the true Gospel. The use of the present indicates that the defection was still going on when he wrote. Cf. v. 3, περιτεμνομ., and vi. 13.

—εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον—“unto a different gospel.” Schœttgen remarks : “Inter primas Christianorum sectas erant etiam Hebræi et Nazareni, qui Jesum Messiam esse statuebant, et tamen ceremonias Judæorum simul retinebant. Et hi singulare aliquod Evangelium habebant, a nostris diversissimum.” In using the word εὐαγγ. the Apostle probably adopts the term used by the false teachers to express their own Judaizing doctrines.

<sup>1</sup> See on the usage of ἐν with verbs of *motion*, to imply *position in*, as well as motion to ; and the reverse usage of εἰς with verbs of *rest*, to imply *motion to*, as well as position *in*, Steph. Thes. Ed. Dind. Tom. iii. p. 960, and Ib. p. 292.

7. —ὅ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο εἰ μὴ, κ. τ. λ.—“which is nothing else than that there are certain persons who are unsettling you, and desiring to pervert the Gospel of Christ.” The antecedent is not so much the word εὐαγγέλιον, as the action involved in the εὐαγγ. *objectively* considered: viz. the offering of this “gospel” to the Galatians, and the motive of that offering. There is a strong opposition between telling good news, and unsettling the mind, and especially between εὐαγγ. and μεταστρέψαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, q. d. their gospel is nothing less than an attempt to pervert the true Gospel. ἄλλο εἰ μὴ is nearly equivalent here to ἄλλο ᾗ. Aristophanes uses a similar construction, Eq. 615: <sup>1</sup> τί δ' ἄλλο γ' εἰ μὴ νικόβουλος ἐγενόμην.

—τινές—“infelices.”<sup>2</sup>

—ταράσσοντες—unsettling. Cf. Acts xv. 24; Gal. v. 10.—μεταστρέψαι—to pervert, make a bad use of. Plato, Rep. ii. 367, A. μεταστρέφοντες αὐτοῖν τὴν δύναμιν φορτικῶς.

8.—ἡμεῖς—i. e. ἐγὼ καὶ οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ πάντες ἀδελφοί, v. 2.

—ἄγγελος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ—The transition in the Apostle's mind appears to be from ἀπόστολος to ἄγγελος, from the regular ambassadors of the new covenant to an *extraordinary* messenger from heaven.

—εὐαγγελίζεται—Chrysostom says here, καὶ οὐκ εἶπεν, ἐὰν ἐναντία καταγγέλλωσιν, ἢ ἀνατρέπωσι τὸ πᾶν, ἀλλὰ, καὶ μικρόν τι εὐαγγελίζονται παρ' ὃ εὐηγγελισάμεθα, καὶ τὸ τυχὸν παρακινήσωσιν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστωσαν. But this distinction is not a just one, for παρά out of

<sup>1</sup> Compare Plato, Crat. 412, D.; Euthyd. 277, D., &c.; Herodot. i. 49.

<sup>2</sup> Bengel.

the sense of “on the other side of,” “beyond,” (transgression,) assumes that of “contrary to.” So Rom. i. 26, *παρὰ φύσιν*, iv. 18, *παρ’ ἐλπίδα*, and so the expressions *παρὰ τὸ δίκαιον*, *παρὰ τοὺς ὄρκους*<sup>1</sup>—*παρὰ δίκην*.<sup>2</sup> The scheme which Paul preached was one in which salvation was free. The smallest adherence to works as the *ground of justification* invalidated that freeness. Cf. ch. ii. 21. Therefore any gospel which introduced works with such a view was directly opposed to that of Paul. The *minutest* infusion of works produced a *complete* opposition.

—*ἀνάθημα*—This is Hebraic Greek for *ἀνάθημα*. It is used by the Seventy to express the Hebrew *כֶּרֶם*, *Cherem*; *ἀνάθημα* means, especially in classic usage, a votive offering in a temple, as a statue, or a tripod, and therefore something separated from common use, and devoted to a religious purpose. Hence it assumed the meaning of a simple ornament, and so Hesych., *ἀνάθημα. κόσμημα*. Adopted however by the Seventy in its later form of *ἀνάθημα* to express the Hebrew *Cherem*, it assumed in that form a new sense. The meaning therefore of the *ἀνάθημα* of the New Testament is to be sought for in that of the Jewish *Cherem*, of which it was clearly the adaptation under new circumstances.<sup>3</sup> We have then (I.) the *Cherem* of the divinely constituted Jewish polity, as developed in Holy Scripture, and (II.) its later form. The *Cherem* of Scripture has a two-fold sense; first, consecrated or holy to the Lord, as in the strict sense of *ἀνάθημα*. We have it

<sup>1</sup> See Jelf, Gr. Gr. 637, III. d (C).

<sup>2</sup> Josephus, Ant. vi. 13, 2.

<sup>3</sup> Selden. De Syned. Vet. Heb. Lib. I., cap. viii., Fol. 88f, Vol. I., Tom. 2, Op.

in this sense in Ezek. xlv. 29, where the offerings devoted to the Lord are assigned to the priests. The Seventy here translate by ἀφόγισμα, but the other interpreters, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, have ἀνάθημα. In Levit. xxvii. 28, we have it also in the sense of consecrated, and here the Seventy translate by ἀνάθημα. The second sense is that of devoted to destruction, yet so as that that destruction is to the glory of God.<sup>1</sup> In the first sense the thing was devoted to God's *use*, in the second to His *vengeance*. Of both senses we have instances in the case of Jericho, recorded in Josh. vi. 17, seq. The city of Jericho was devoted to *destruction*; but the gold and silver, and vessels of brass and iron, were devoted to the *use* of God, and brought into His treasury. Further it may be observed, that in the case of devotion to destruction, this took place either (1.) by the immediate command of God, or, (2.) by that of the judges<sup>2</sup> who stood in His place, or (3.) in pursuance of a vow or promise made to that effect, as Numbers xxi. 2, 3.<sup>3</sup> The consequences of an appropriation of the things devoted we may see in both senses; in the case of Achan, Josh. vii. 22, seq., and in the record of God's anger against Saul for sparing what was devoted to destruction, 1 Sam. xv. 9, seq. Selden gives four different developments of the general notion of *Cherem*, and divides the fourth into two species. As an instance of the first, he cites Levit. xxvii. 28, already given. Of

<sup>1</sup> " *Herem* autem in Hebræo duplicem habet significationem: uno modo significat sanctificationem: alio modo significat destructionem, non quamcumque, sed destructionem aliquam ad Dei gloriam ordinatam." De Lyra in cap. 27, Levit. ver. 28.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Exod. xxii. 28.

<sup>3</sup> De Lyra, ubi sup.

the second, the case of Jericho. Of the third, the edict of Ezra (x. 8), saying that whosoever would not come within three days, according to the counsel of the princes and elders, ἀναθεματισθήσεται πᾶσα ἡ ὑπαρχὴς αὐτοῦ, which the Vulgate translates by “*auferetur universa, &c.*” but the two principal points which it seems necessary to bear in mind are those specified already, of *use* and *destruction*. The fourth kind, however, brings us to the lesser excommunication, *Niddui*, which it would seem, together with the principal idea of *Cherem*, was also meant by the ἀνάθεμα of New Testament usage; and here I will quote the words of Selden:—“*Quarti denique generis, quod, jure pacis, diris fiebat, species sunt binæ; altera, ubi diris quis devovebatur si quid imposterum sive committeret sive omitteret; altera, ubi quis ob jam commissum quid ita devovebatur. Prioris exemplum est egregium in illo Josuæ,<sup>1</sup> Juravitque Josua in tempore illo, dicens; Maledictus sit coram Domino qui surgens ædificaverit urbem istem Hierichuntem. In primogenito suo fundabit eam, et in minore (filio) collocabit portas ejus. Scilicet proles ejus posteritasque universa destruat, &c.*<sup>2</sup> And then of the other he says, “*Ejusce species altera est, qua ex sententia forensi devovebatur is qui excommunicatus, seu a cœtu Israelitico ejusque consuetudine rite juxta mores receptos semotus, intra tempus sibi iterato præstitutum non resipisceret, sed ex contumacia sua aut neglectu sibi in causa esset ut excommunicatione interim non solveretur;*”<sup>3</sup> and in the next chapter,

<sup>1</sup> Cap. vi. 26.

<sup>2</sup> Seld. De Jure naturali et Gentium, Lib. 4, cap. 7, Fol. 471, Vol. I. Tom. I. Op.

<sup>3</sup> Seld. ubi sup. Fol. 476.

“Viginti quatuor apud Talmudicos assignantur causæ, ob quas excommunicandus erat quis, seu libera cœtus Israelitici consuetudine interdicens. Excommunicationem ejusmodi *Niddui* vocant:—Eandem etiam excommunicationem appellant *Sham-matha*.”<sup>1</sup> Many persons make *Niddui* and *Sham-matha* distinct forms, thus giving three sorts of excommunication. Selden, however, says that this is “contra locorum in commentariis Talmudicis innumerorum fidem.”<sup>2</sup> This form of *Niddui* answers more especially to the Greek τὸ ἀφορίζειν, as Luke vi. 22, and ἀποσυνάγωγον ποιῆϊν, as John ix. 22; xvi. 2. It was a separation for thirty days from civil, domestic, and religious privileges; while *Cherem* denoted a giving over to the vengeance of God, and a similar separation, but without any statement of a particular period. So Grotius:<sup>3</sup> “Altera ἀφορισμοῦ species erat *Cherem*, ἀνάθεμα Græcis, qua is qui deliquerat diris quibusdam, ut Deo ultori sacer, devovebatur.” And he says that ἀνάθεμα was “*sine præfinitione temporis ejectionem*, quæ tamen pœnitentia ductis reditum non semper præcludit.”<sup>4</sup> Now Selden, showing that the excommunication of the apostolic period differed from that which was in use at a somewhat later, and yet very early, age of the Church, says, “Quod vero ad apostolorum tempora attinet, profecto credendum non omnino videtur in Christianismo tunc alias fuisse excommunicationis species seu gradus quam qualis ipsius Judaismi tunc temporis atque ante; id est, *Niddui* et *Cherem*, seu *separatio-*

<sup>1</sup> Seld. ubi sup. cap. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Ib. Fol. 479.

<sup>3</sup> In Luc. iv. 22.

<sup>4</sup> Grot. ubi sup.



*nem et anathema*, quo nomine utraque species seu gradus interdum designatur.”<sup>1</sup> And he adds, what it would be well if all would bear in mind in their theories about church government and discipline, “Apostolos enim ipsos, reliquosque discipulos qui aut dum Christus in terris, aut per aliquot annos post ascensionem ejus, accessere, ex Judæis fuisse omnes, adeoque Judæos, palam est, ritibusque Judæicis seu avitis innutritos adsuetosque.”<sup>2</sup> The Greek ἀνάθεμα would then appear to involve both the notions of *Cherem* and *Niddui*. This is the view of Croius, whose inedited opinion is given by Selden,<sup>3</sup> on the authority of Patricius Junius; and he quotes in support of this the definitions of Hesychius, ἀνάθεμα. ἐπάρατος. ἀκοινώνητος. as if ἐπάρατος referred to *Cherem*, and ἀκοινώνητος to *Niddui*.<sup>4</sup> As regards, then, the apostolic use in the Christian churches, the consequences were, separation from the congregation of the faithful, and a deliverance over to the vengeance of God; this sentence being, in the case of the Apostles, not only declaratory but judicial. In this case I conceive the greater excommunication, or *Cherem*, to be intended, as it is rendered in the Syr. and Arab. Erp. I am disposed to think that the peculiar idea of separation from God and Christ, with which the word ἀνάθεμα was invested by the ecclesiastical writers, was a somewhat later notion, arising partly out of the peculiar circumstances which attended this new adaptation of the Jewish excommunication, and partly from an adaptation of the

<sup>1</sup> Selden, de Syned. Vet. Heb. Lib. I. cap. 8, Fol. 885, Vol. i. Tom. 2, Op.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Ib. Fol. 893.

<sup>4</sup> Ib. Fol. 886.

*separating* notion of *Niddui* to the higher notion of *Cherem*.

9. —ὡς προειρήκαμεν,——i. e., at the time that he and his fellow-labourers, Silas and Timothy, were preaching to the Galatians. For knowing as St. Paul did at the time of his first preaching among the Galatians how active the Judaizers were, nothing could be more likely than that, anticipating that the Galatians would be assailed by them, he would warn them in general terms against receiving any new doctrine which might be presented to them under the name of Gospel.<sup>1</sup>

—καὶ ἄρτι πάλιν λέγω——This must be connected with *προειρη*. The force of *ἄρτι* is, “now that I am writing to you.” The clause *εἴ τις* seems to be a quotation of the actual words used by him, or the substance of them; the *ὅτι* which generally precedes such quotations, and which is pleonastic, being omitted. Cf. 2 Thess. iii. 10.

Chrysostom says here: “Ἴνα γὰρ μὴ νομίσης θυμοῦ τὰ ῥήματα εἶναι, ἢ ὑπερβολικῶς εἰρηῆσθαι, ἢ κατὰ συναρπαγὴν τινα, δεύτερον τὰ αὐτὰ πάλιν τίθησιν.

—ὁμᾶς εὐαγγελίζεται——εὐαγγελίζομαι is more properly joined with a dative of the person, and so it is elsewhere used by St. Paul. This construction however is found several times in the Acts. Thomas Magister, εὐαγγελίζομαι, οἱ πάντες δοτικῆ. ἅπαξ δέ που καὶ αἰτιατικῆ συντασσόμενον εὔρηται, ὡς παρὰ Χαρικλεία,<sup>2</sup> καὶ ἐν τῇ θείᾳ γραφῆ. σὺ δὲ δοτικῆ ἀεὶ συντασσε. See Lob. Phryn. p. 266, seqq. Suidas says,

<sup>1</sup> See the note on ver. 6.

<sup>2</sup> “Dubio procul Heliodorus innuitur, qui *Theagenis* et *Charicleæ* amores conscripsit; quod opus olim Χαρίκλεια a plebe dictum.” Alberti, Peric. Crit. p. 16.

εὐαγγελίζομαι σε. αἰτωτικῆ. εὐαγγελίζομαι δέ σοι χαράν.  
recognising apparently that both constructions were  
in use.

—παρελάβετε—Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 1; Phil. iv. 9.

10. —ἄρτι γάρ— I think that the γάρ is explan-  
atory of his reiteration of the anathema. ἄρτι refers  
to the same word in the preceding verse, q. d. “ I  
now repeat this, for am I now,” &c.

—πέιθω— “ am I seeking the favour of,” “ pro-  
pitiatng.” Cf. Acts xii. 20, and Josephus, Ant. iv.  
6, 5. With χεῖμασι, or τῷ ἀργυρίῳ, the word is used  
of bribing, and so later in a bad sense without χεῖμα.  
Krebs. considers Matt. xxviii. 14, and Acts xii. 20,  
passages in which the word means to “ win over by  
money.”

—ἀρέσκειν— “ to please by flattering.” Cf. 1  
Thess. ii. 4, 5.

—ἔτι ἤρεσκον— i. q. ζητῶ ἀρέσκ. The imperf.  
expresses the attempt. I should take ἔτι to refer to  
his former life and the character of his then endea-  
vours.

—ἤμην— This is a form of the first pers. imperf.  
used by Xenophon and Lysias. Mœris however  
says, ἦν, Ἀττικῶς. ἤμην, Ἑλληνικῶς. Cf. Lob. Phryn.  
p. 152; Mœris, p. 172. According to Lobeck, it is  
not “ especially ”<sup>1</sup> used in the form ἤμην ἄν.

11.—Γνωρίζω γάρ— He now gives the reason of  
his pronouncing an anathema against the preachers  
of any other gospel. “ For I declare to you.” Thus,  
to me, the context appears to require γάρ, and cer-  
tainly the weight of authority is in its favour.

<sup>1</sup> Jelf, Gr. Gr. 286, Obs. 3. “ The middle ἤμην occurs, especially in the  
formula ἤμην ἄν.”

—κατὰ ἀνθρώπων——*Lit.* “after the fashion of man.”<sup>1</sup> There is a general connexion with ver. 8—10. He confidently pronounces the anathema, because his gospel is not of man. He seeks the favour of God, and not of man, therefore he boldly reiterates the anathema against all gospels of human invention and character. That he *does* seek the favour of God is proved, because the gospel which he preaches is of God. That he *does not* seek the favour of man is also proved, because the gospels which he anathematizes are of man, human in their character, carnal in their tendencies. The carnal mind is enmity against God: nothing but a carnal scheme can please man as man. “Evangeliū quod secundum hominem est, mendacium est.”<sup>2</sup>

12. —οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγὼ, κ. τ. λ.——“For I did not even receive it from<sup>3</sup> man, nor was I taught it but (i. e. in any other way than) through a revelation of Jesus Christ,” i. e. of Christ Himself, the Truth and the centre of the whole gospel mystery; cf. ver. 16. A divine gospel might be instrumentally delivered by man, but the Apostle would show that there had not been in his case even this instrumental delivery, so little was it κατὰ ἀνθρ. Where οὐδέ follows οὐδέ, the first often is equivalent to *ne quidem*, and the second copulative.<sup>4</sup> ἀλλά is used here exceptively, in the sense of εἰ μή.<sup>5</sup>

The word ἀποκ. is used of an extraordinary revelation of the treasures of wisdom hid in Christ.<sup>6</sup> Cf. Col. i. 26, 27; 2 Cor. iii. 14.

13. —ἠκούσατε——This is here used in the sense

<sup>1</sup> Jelf, Gr. Gr. 629, 3, e.      <sup>2</sup> Augustin.

<sup>3</sup> Jelf, Gr. Gr. 637, 2.

<sup>4</sup> Ib. 776, 2.

<sup>5</sup> Ib. 773, 4.

<sup>6</sup> Col. ii. 3.

of knowing, i. e. having heard of by report. Compare Plato, Gorg. 503, C., *Θεμιστοκλέα οὐκ ἀκούεις ἄνδρα ἀγαθὸν γεγονότα*, where, as Heind. observes, *ἀκούεις* is for *ἀκήκοας*.

The Apostle now proceeds to demonstrate the truth of what he has just said, by a relation of the peculiar circumstances of his previous life, and his call to the apostleship. The *γάρ* ushers in this explanation. A part of the proof lay in the fact that his former zeal for Judaism pointed to something supernatural as the cause of so great a change. In this the notoriety of his mode of life enables him to appeal to the knowledge which the Galatians themselves had. And besides, this part of his demonstration would have peculiar force with the Galatians: they were now Judaizing; the Apostle can remind them that he was once *περισσοτέρως ζηλωτής* of the same things.

—*ἀναστροφῆν*— “mode of life.” So Polybius, iv. 82, 1, *κατά τε τὴν λοιπὴν ἀναστροφῆν τεθραυμασμένος*, and the LXX., Tob. iv. 14.

—*τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ*—The following verse shows that the Apostle meant by this the complete and later system, containing human traditions super-added to what was of divine institution. The article particularizes the abstract.<sup>1</sup>

—*καθ' ὑπερβολήν*—Rom. vii. 13; 2 Cor. i. 8.

—*τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ*.—Augustine, “Si persequendo et vastando Ecclesiam Dei proficiebat in Iudaismo, apparet contrarium esse Iudaismum Ecclesiae Dei, non per illam spiritalem Legem quam acceperunt Judaei, sed per carnalem conversationem

<sup>1</sup> See Jelf, Gr. Gr. 448.

servitutis ipsorum.” It was not only the superadded tradition of the Pharisees, but the carnality of their estimate and performance of what was of divine origin, which necessarily opposed itself to the Church of God. The children of the bondwoman persecuted the children of the free, cf. ch. iv. 29. The Church of God, consisting of the First-born and His many brethren, is actuated by the loving obedience of sons. It must be therefore ever opposed by the Judaizers of the day, the advocates of a slavish obedience, fearing punishment, hoping for reward.

—ἐπόρθουν—Cf. ver. 23.

—14. προέκοπτον—“I made progress, or proficiency in.” So Josephus, Vit. § 2, εἰς μεγάλην παιδείας προὔκοπτον επίδοσιν.

—συνηλικ.—“contemporaries.” The word means literally “equals in age,” hence schoolfellows, comrades, contemporaries. It answers to the Latin “æqualis.”

—γένει—ἐκ γένους Ἰσραήλ.<sup>1</sup>

—ζηλωτής—See Acts xxi. 20; Rom. x. 2; Phil. iii. 6.

—παραδόσεων—not necessarily oral only. Cf. 2 Thess. ii. 15. He means here, the traditions of the Pharisees. Cf. Acts xxii. 3; xxvi. 5.

15. As far as external authority goes, it is extremely difficult to decide whether ὁ Θεός ought or ought not to be omitted in this place. Griesb. and Lachm. doubt, but do not remove them. Tischendorf does so, and I follow him, because, although it is possible that the omission arose from the recurrence of ὁ, it

<sup>1</sup> Phil. iii. 5.

is *probable* that the words were a marginal gloss which afterwards got into the text.<sup>1</sup>

—ὁ ἀφορίσας, κ. τ. λ.—See Jer. i. 5; and compare Rom. ix. 11.

—καὶ καλέσας—Acts ix. 5. This is the second step in the history of his apostleship, and the second also in the history of his own personal salvation. He is called effectually to a saving knowledge of Jesus Christ, and a manifestation of that knowledge in his life.

16. —ἀποκαλύψαι—This is the third step.

—τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί—Chrysostom, Διὰ τί δὲ μὴ εἶπεν, ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν Υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐμοί, ἀλλ' ἐν ἐμοί; Δεικνύς ὅτι οὐ διὰ ῥημάτων μόνον ἤκουσε τὰ περὶ τῆς πίστεως, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλοῦ πνεύματος ἐπληρώθη· τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως καταλαμπύσεως αὐτοῦ τὴν ψυχὴν, καὶ τὸν Χριστὸν εἶχεν ἐν ἑαυτῷ λαλοῦντα. See 2 Cor. xiii. 3; Eph. iii. 3, 5.

—αὐτόν—By virtue of the extraordinary revelation in him of Christ, he preached with divine power Him who was revealed as a personal Saviour to himself.—ἐν τοῖς ἔθν.—See ch. ii. 8.—εὐθέως. This is immediately connected with ἀπῆλθον εἰς Ἀρ.

—προσανεθ.—So Diod. Sic.<sup>2</sup> says of Alexander, τοῖς μάντεσι προσαναθέμενος περὶ τοῦ σημείου. Translate, “I did not take counsel of.”

—σαρκὶ καὶ αἵμ.—This is a Heb. expression for “mortal man.”<sup>3</sup> See Sir. xiv. 18; xvii. 31. Matt. xvi. 17; and cf. ver. 12.

17. —ἀπῆλθον εἰς Ἱερ.—The reading ἀνῆλθον probably arose out of the ἀνῆλθ. in ver. 18.

<sup>1</sup> This is the conjecture of Mill. Prol. 478. <sup>2</sup> xvii. c. 116. <sup>3</sup> Schöttgen.

—ἀπῆλθον εἰς Ἀρ.—I departed into Arabia.

—Ἀραβίαν—This was that part of Arabia which lay near to Damascus, and was then, with that town, under the government of one and the same king, Aretas.<sup>1</sup> St. Luke makes no mention of this journey. I agree with Bloomfield in thinking that there is no reason to suppose that it was a long one, or that it occupied a long time. From this cause probably, and also from the want of *personal* knowledge at this time of the Apostle's proceedings, Luke omits to mention it. This was the commencement of Paul's work, ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

—Δαμασκόν—2 Cor. xi. 32.

18. —μετὰ ἔτη τρία—reckoning from his conversion. The force is, "it was three years after my conversion, before I went to Jerusalem." Cf. ver. 16, 17. The visit to Arabia *may* have taken place immediately after the *ἡμέρας τινάς* of Acts ix. 19. I conceive that these and the *ἡμέραι ἰκαναί* of ver. 23 are all comprehended in the three years, the former being perhaps included in the latter. As for the quotation by Paley of 1 Kings ii. 38, 39, I can see in it nothing but a curious coincidence.

—ἱστορεῖσαι—The word is used in the sense of seeing and surveying, as *ἱστορεῖσαι τὴν πόλιν. τὴν χώραν.* and Chrysostom seizes this idea, and says it is the expression of those *τὰς μεγάλας πόλεις καὶ λαμπρὰς καταμανθάνοντες.* I think however with Erasmus, Raphel, &c., that the force of the word is to see with a view to acquiring information, and this either by actual inquiry or inspection. It is used frequently by Herodotus in the sense of asking,

<sup>1</sup> Schættgen.



questioning, and so Hesych., *ιστορεῖ. ἐρωτᾷ*. There is an unwillingness on the part of some commentators<sup>1</sup> to suppose that the word has here this meaning, on account of what the Apostle says before, as in ver. 16, as also in chap. ii. ver. 6; but it appears to me that Paul, as the Apostle of the Gentiles, might very well consult the Apostle of the Circumcision (cf. cap. ii. 7) about many minor matters, without lowering in the least the dignity or independence of his apostleship; and this view is strengthened by the mention of the time during which he remained: it was too long for the simple purpose of seeing, and too short for any fundamental requisite for apostleship to have been taught.

—*πρὸς αὐτόν*—See the note on chap. iv. 18.

19. —*Ἰάκωβον τὸν ἀδελθὸν τοῦ Κυρ.*—This was James the Less, the Apostle, the son of Alphæus, or Clopas, and Mary the sister of the Lord's mother. (Matt. x. 3; Mark xv. 40; and John xix. 25.) He was therefore the first cousin of the Lord. Michaëlis thinks it unlikely that two sisters should receive the same name, and conceives this Mary to have been the cousin of the Lord's mother. Others suppose that she was her sister-in-law, being the sister of Joseph. At all events, James was the kinsman of our Lord, and such were among the Jews called brethren. (Cf. Gen. xiii. 8, xxix. 13—15).

20. —*ἰδοὺ ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ*—We may here understand *διαμαρτύρομαι*, "I protest," or some similar word. The expression is a species of oath or religious affirmation, as in Rom. i. 9; 2 Cor. xi. 31, and other places. Cf. also 1 Sam. xii. 3. It is

<sup>1</sup> Vid. C. A. Lapide, in loc.

equivalent to *μάρτυρα τὸν Θεὸν ἐπικαλοῦμαι, μάρτυς ὁ Κύριος*. Without entering upon the general subject of the occasions on which oaths are lawful, it is sufficient to observe here that Paul invoked God as a witness, in his earnestness for the salvation of souls, and in matters relating principally to God Himself.<sup>1</sup>

21. —*κλίματα*——This word means originally “inclination;” hence, from the supposed inclination of the heavens to the poles, the word was applied to the space contained between two parallels of latitude,<sup>2</sup> and afterwards more generally denoted a region, or tract of country. It occurs Rom. xv. 23, and 2 Cor. xi. 10.

—*Συρίας*——“By Syria (Winer observes) is here to be understood (as appears from Acts ix. 30) that part of Syria which is elsewhere called Phœnice.”<sup>3</sup> (Mr. Ellicott however says that Meyer “very convincingly shows that Syria must here be Syria Proper (*ἡ ἄνω Συρία*, Strabo), as St. Paul’s object is to show the distance he was from any quarter where he could have received instruction from the Apostles.”) This journey was in pursuance of his mission, *ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν*.

22. —*τῷ προσώπῳ*——The dative of reference.

—*τῆς Ἰουδαίας*——“extra Jerusalem.”<sup>4</sup> Chrysostom, *τῆς μὲν Ἰουδαίας οὐχ ἀπτόμενος, διὰ τε τὸ πρὸς τὰ ἔθνη ἀπεστάλθαι, καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ ἂν ἐλέσθαι ἐπ’ ἀλλότριον θεμέλιον οἰκοδομεῖν* (Rom. xv. 20).

—*ταῖς ἐν Χριστῷ*——cf. Rom. xvi. 7.<sup>5</sup> I con-

<sup>1</sup> See Grot. on Matt. v. 34, and Selden de Sinedriis vet. Ebræorum, Tom. II. Vol. i. Op. p. 1466.

<sup>2</sup> See Robinson Lex.

<sup>3</sup> Bloomf.

<sup>4</sup> Beng.

<sup>5</sup> Wolf.

ceive that he adds this, not, as some<sup>1</sup> suppose, to prove the falsity of the assertion, that he had in these churches taught the necessity of circumcision, but to demonstrate further the independence of his apostleship. So Jerome comments here, “ex quo ostendit, non Petrum, non Jacobum, non Johannem se habuisse doctores; sed Christum, qui sibi Evangelium revelasset.” In using the words ἐν Χριστῷ, the prominent idea in the Apostle’s mind may have been not merely a Christian Church based upon a common outward profession, but a vital spiritual body capable of communicating spiritual knowledge.

23. —ἀκούοντες.—The individuals composing the churches. On the participle with εἶναι, cf. Jelf, Gr. 375, 4. The Attic usage is however not quite parallel to this.

—ὁ διώκων— the participle has a substantival force here.—τὴν πίστιν,—gospel doctrine. Cf. Acts vi. 7; 1 Tim. iv. 1.—ἦν ποτε ἐπόρθει—“Vastabat fidem, quia Christi fidelibus fidem extorquere persequendo nitebatur.”<sup>2</sup>

24. —ἐν ἐμοί.—They glorified God, for the display of his grace *in my person*.

<sup>1</sup> Chrys. Grot.

<sup>2</sup> Est.

## CHAPTER II.

1. —διὰ——“After the lapse of.” See Jelf, Gr. Gr. 627, 2; Acts xxiv. 17; and the LXX., Deut. ix. 11. The main idea kept in view by the Apostle in this relation is to show, that after his conversion he carried out *independently* his mission, ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. He reckons therefore still from his conversion. He mentions his first visit to Jerusalem three years after this. The next important feature to be noticed was this visit fourteen years afterwards, q. d. “I had been independently working for fourteen years, when this occurred.” The whole scope of the Apostle would clearly prove to me that the calculation is to be thus made, if indeed this view were devoid of the support of the bulk of the best authorities. As for the conjecture of Grotius and Lud. Capellus, that τεσσαράων is the true reading, it is unsupported by a single MS. The journey here alluded to was that of which we have the account in Acts xv. He had been to Jerusalem once between this visit and the one undertaken three years after his conversion, but this he does not mention,—most probably, as Spanheim<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Hist. Christ. Tom. I. Op. fol. 535.

supposes, because, owing to the Herodian persecution which then raged, he had no communication with the other Apostles. His object was only to mention those circumstances which bore in any way upon the assertion of the false brethren, that he was ἀπόστολος ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων.

—ἀνέβην—ἀναβαίνειν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ. 3 Reg. xii. 28; Acts xv. 2. The Jews always spoke of going up to Jerusalem.

—Βαρνάβα—Acts iv. 36, ix. 27, xv. 2.

—συμπααραλαβών—LXX., Job i. 4.—Τίτον,—2 Cor. ii. 13; Tit. i. 4.

2. —κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν—“At illa profectio, Act. xv., erat ex humano consilio sive decreto. Resp. Quod homines statuerant, Deus quoque idem faciendum monuit, quomodo et Petrum monuit, Act. x., ut iret quo ab hominibus quærebatur.”<sup>1</sup>

—ἀνεθέμην—“ut solent æquales; non ut confirmarent me, sed ut alios, Acts xv. 2.”<sup>2</sup> Cf. ἀνατίθ. Acts xxv. 14; 2 Macc. iii. 9. Artemidorus, ii. 59, Ed. Reiff., quoted by Wetstein, καὶ ἀναθέμενός τι τῶν ἐπιστημόνων τὸ ὄναρ.

—αὐτοῖς—Cf. Acts xv. 4. “Hierosolymitanis,”<sup>3</sup> “illud adjectivum latens in substantivo Hierosolyma.”<sup>4</sup> The church generally.

—ὁ κηρύσσω—which I did preach, and still continue to preach.

—κατ' ἰδίαν—Suidas. κατ' ἰδ. ἰδίως. Mark iv. 34; 2 Macc. iv. 5: privately, apart from the rest.

—τοῖς δοκοῦσι—There is an ellipsis here either of εἶναι τι, which is added in ver. 6, or ἐξέχουσιν,<sup>5</sup> or

<sup>1</sup> Estius. <sup>2</sup> Bengel. So also Jerome. <sup>3</sup> Bengel. A Lapide.

<sup>4</sup> A Lapide.

<sup>5</sup> See Krebs. and Læsn. in loc.

some expression of that sort. The same use of *δοκοῦντες* alone, to express the same idea, is found in classical writers, e. g. Euripides,<sup>1</sup> Hec. 295.<sup>2</sup> Hesychius says, *δοκοῦντες, οἱ ἔνδοξοι*. Theodoret explains by *τοῖς ἐπισήμοις*.

—*μή πως εἰς κενὸν τρέχω, κ. τ. λ.*—I connect this, on the one hand, not only with the latter part, but with the whole of the preceding clause, commencing at *ἀνεθέμην*, or even *ἀνέβην*: and on the other, immediately with *διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους*. Verse 3 I look upon as parenthetical, and shall presently give my reasons. The sense would then be, “I laid the Gospel which I preach among the Gentiles before the Church generally, and at a private conference (before) the principal Apostles, lest anyhow I should run, or had run, in vain, *and this* through the false brethren, &ca.” (Cf. Acts xv. 1, 2.) This explanation at once removes two difficulties; the first arising in the fact that as St. Paul *cannot* mean to imply that he himself was in doubt, it is difficult to see the exact meaning of *μή πως εἰς κενὸν, κ. τ. λ.*; the other being what (considering the whole scope of the Apostle’s teaching and Epistle) appears to me to be the entire want of legitimate connexion between ver. 3 and 4.<sup>3</sup> In this way however all is made plain. The reason of his laying his Gospel before the Church was the fear, not that he himself had preached the Gospel in a wrong manner, or that by a decision contrary to his opinion weak minds might be unsettled, but simply lest he should lose all his past and future labour

<sup>1</sup> Erasmus. Scholefield.      <sup>2</sup> Vide Liddel and Scott, v. *δοκέω*, ii. 5.

<sup>3</sup> See note on ver. 5.

through these false brethren; whom therefore it was necessary to silence.

3.—ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Τίτος—The main object now of the Apostle is, not to show that the other Apostles agreed with him, but to demonstrate the proposition with which he commences the Epistle, that he was ἀπόστολος—διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. With this view he is now showing the real bearing of this visit to Jerusalem upon his mission. He went up, it is true, but not to gain any knowledge, only to obtain an unanimous decision, which should remove a difficulty from his path; nay, more than this, he shows, ver. 6—8, how even at Jerusalem he maintained the independence of his position. But the fact that Titus was not compelled to be circumcised was in itself the most convincing proof of what the view taken by the Apostles was; and therefore although St. Paul, taught by Christ, and undertaking this very mission, κατὰ ἀπολύψιν, took a ground far too high to need any proof that he was in the right; and although he would not have lengthily interrupted his principal argument to show this, he makes this short statement which effects the inferior purpose, without materially interfering with the greater. For the dispute had especial reference to Gentiles, as is evident from Acts xv. 14, and especially 23;<sup>1</sup> if therefore Titus, a Greek both on the side of father and mother, and brought prominently before them, was not compelled to be circumcised, this sufficiently explains the view taken. The Apostle therefore says parenthetically, “But not even

<sup>1</sup> See the note on ver. 5.

Titus, who was with me, and a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised." That this sort of abrupt parenthesis is commonly used by the Apostle, and is in accordance with the vehemence of his character and style, will be manifest to all who have any acquaintance with his writings.

4. — *παρεισάκτους* — Hesychius, *παρείσακτον. ἀλλότριον.* " *Emissarios* Castellio vertit: sed rectius Beza *irreptitios*; sicuti Apostolus se ipsum explicat, cum dicit *οἱτινες παρεισῆλθον*." <sup>1</sup> Cf. 2 Pet. ii. 1; Polybius, i. 18, *καὶ τῶν παρεισάγεσθαι καὶ παρεισπίπτειν εἰωθότων εἰς τὰς πολιορκουμένας πόλεις.* <sup>2</sup>

— *ψευδαδέλφους* — False brethren who, although Judaizers, feigned themselves to be Christians.

— *παρεισῆλθον* — "Crept in by stealth." So Chrysostom observes, *οὐ τῷ τῶν κατασκόπων ὀνόματι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ τρόπῳ τῆς λαθραίας εἰσόδου καὶ παρεισδύσεως* <sup>3</sup> *τὴν ἐπιβουλὴν αὐτῶν ἐνδεικνύμενος.* Raphel cites a passage from Polybius, I. vii. 3, showing the use of the word in this sense, as *παρεισελθόντες δ' ὡς φίλιοι, καὶ κατασχόντες τὴν πόλιν, οὓς μὲν ἐξέβαλον τῶν πολιτῶν, οὓς δ' ἀπέσφαξαν.* So also II. lv. 3, *παρεισῆλθε . . λάθρα νυκτὸς ἐντὸς τῶν τειχῶν.*

— *κατασκοπήσαι* — Chrysostom, *οἱ κατάσκοποι δι' οὐδὲν εἰσέρχονται, ἀλλ' ἵνα καταμαθόντες τὰ τῶν ἐναντίων, πρὸς τὸ πορβῆσαι καὶ καθελεῖν πολλὴν ἐαυτοῖς παρασκευάσωσι τὴν εὐκολίαν.* Cf. LXX., 2 Reg. x. 3, and Gen. xlii. 9, 11, 14. Hesychius, *κατάσκοποι. κατοπτρεύοντες. ἐπίβουλοι.*

— *τὴν ἐλευθερίαν* — The liberty which we have, as believers, in Christ, who is Himself free. <sup>4</sup> He is free

<sup>1</sup> Sopingius in Hesych.

<sup>2</sup> Quoted by Raphel on 2 Pet. ii. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Jude 4, *παρεισέδυσαν τινες.*

<sup>4</sup> Cf. John viii. 36.



from the contract between man and the law; therefore *in* Him we are dead to the law,<sup>1</sup> and therefore free from condemnation.<sup>2</sup> He is free from merited punishment, because He obeyed in all points. *In* Him therefore we are accepted.<sup>3</sup> He is free as a Son. *In* Him therefore we are delivered into the glorious liberty of the children of God.<sup>4</sup> He is free as an inheritor of the promised blessing. *In* Him therefore we are heirs.<sup>5</sup> It is the liberty which we have *in* Christ, because in Him being sons, *in* Him also we receive the Spirit of adoption.<sup>6</sup> Cf. also 2 Cor. v. 17.

—*ἵνα ἡμᾶς καταδουλώσουσιν*—The authority for rendering here the fut. indic. is overpowering. It is unnecessary to say that its use cannot be defended as grammatical. But although respect for external authority requires that we should retain what is undoubtedly a solecism, I should think that few persons will think it probable that an error of this sort, which might so easily arise in transcribing, originated with a writer like St. Paul.

If this word *καταδουλώσουσιν* had not been <sup>7</sup> interpreted as if the object of the false brethren had been to make the Galatians personally their slaves, it would seem almost unnecessary to observe that the opposition is between *ἐλευθ.* and *καταδουλ.* Their aim was to bring them back into their old bondage to the law.

<sup>1</sup> Rom. vii. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Ib. viii. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Eph. i. 6.

<sup>4</sup> Rom. viii. 21.

<sup>5</sup> Gal. iii. 16, 17.

<sup>6</sup> Ib. iv. 6.

<sup>7</sup> By Dr. Bloomfield, who says (Greek Test. 4th Ed.) that —*σουσιν* is “plainly an emendation proceeding from some one who did not discern the force of the middle verb —*σονται*, i. e. to make any one a slave to oneself.”

5. — οἷς οὐδέ—The MS. D. (a primâ manu),<sup>1</sup> with the Latin version attached to it, and the Cod. Sangerm, and Irenæus, and Ambrosiaster, omit both these words, and read πρὸς ὥραν. The latter however confesses, “Græci e contra dicunt: nec ad horam cessimus.”<sup>2</sup> Sedulius says, “male in Latinis codicibus legitur ‘quibus ad horam.’”<sup>3</sup> Jerome testifies simply to such being the reading in them, and so also read Primasius and Claudius Antiss.<sup>4</sup> Tertullian and Ambrose<sup>5</sup> read “nec ad horam,” omitting the οἷς, while the former says: “Intendamus enim et sensui ipsi et caussæ ejus, et apparebit vitiatio scripturæ. Cum præmittit: sed nec Titus, qui mecum erat, cum esset Græcus, coactus est circumcidi, dehinc subjungit: propter superinductitios falsos fratres, et reliqua; contrarii utique facti incipit reddere rationem, ostendens propter quid fecerit, quod nec fecisset nec ostendisset, si illud, propter quod fecit non accidisset.”<sup>6</sup> It would seem also from the comment of Pelagius that he favoured the omission, for he supposes that the words διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεισ. imply that Titus was circumcised.

Now the reasons which led to this omission of the negative are plain: we have seen those of Tertullian: Ambrosiaster departs from the Greek on the same ground: “Quid jam sonat, nisi quia cessit ad horam, propter subintroductos *autem* falsos fratres?”<sup>7</sup> The construction is obscure; supposing a connexion

<sup>1</sup> “πρὸς ὥραν, primæ manus lectio certissima est.” Tischendorf, Append. ad Cod. Clar.    <sup>2</sup> Ap. Sabatier.    <sup>3</sup> Ibid.    <sup>4</sup> Mill.

<sup>5</sup> Ambrose is cited by Tisch. G. T. as reading οἷς οὐδέ. In the Ep. quoted by Sabatier, he says “nec ad horam, ut ipse ait.” I think it as well to mark this distinction.

<sup>6</sup> Adv. Marcionem, Lib. v. c. 3.

<sup>7</sup> Ambrosiast. ap. Mill.

between ver. 3 and 4, it is manifestly contrary to the whole scope of the Epistle to suppose the Apostle to mean that he refrained from circumcising Titus only because the false brethren insisted upon it: and so certain transcribers and commentators, arguing from a wrong understanding of St. Paul's motives in circumcising Timothy, conceived a strong objection to lie in the  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  of ver. 4, and, imagining that Titus *was* circumcised as a matter of *expediency*, they either connected ver. 4 with  $\epsilon\lambda\acute{\xi}\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu$ , omitting  $\omicron\iota\varsigma \omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ , or laying a stress upon  $\eta\nu\alpha\gamma\kappa\acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\epsilon$  they took the  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  as *implying* in its opposing force the concession, and then omitted the  $\omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  alone in ver. 5. Now it is perfectly certain that the evidence in favour of the *retention* of  $\omicron\iota\varsigma \omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  is about as strong as any evidence can be; and to my mind the evidence against it is equally weak, for the very confession of those who would reject it shows that their alteration was conjectural, and unsupported by the Greek copies. The passage then must be taken as it is, and to me it seems that nothing can be more plain. The  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ , so far from implying an opposition, is used to take up the sentence interrupted by the parenthesis.<sup>1</sup> And ver. 2 and 4 are immediately connected in the sense. Nor in the fact that Paul would not yield to the false brethren in the case of Titus, can I see anything at all inconsistent with his conduct on another occasion with respect to Timothy. For the mother of the latter was a Jewess, and therefore, as the use of the ceremonies of the law had not ceased among the Jews, the

<sup>1</sup> Jelf, Gr. Gr. 767, 4.

Apostle circumcised him, lest the novelty of the omission might offend the Jews;<sup>1</sup> but at the same time he might with perfect reason oppose himself to the introduction of Jewish rites among the Gentiles.

—πρὸς ὥραν——“for a season,” “for a short time.” Cf. John v. 35; 2 Cor. vii. 8; Philem. 15. Cf. also the LXX., Syr. xii. 15, xi. 27. See Wetst. i. 874. Connect this with οὐδέ. “To whom not even temporarily,” pending the decision at Jerusalem.

—τῇ ὑποταγῇ——Lit. “by the submission.” The dative expresses the mode or manner of the concession. The article specifies the particular instance of submission required by the false teachers. (See Ellicott in loc.)

—ἵνα ἡ ἀλήθ., κ. τ. λ.——γνώσεσθε τὴν ἀλήθειαν, καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια ἐλευθερώσει ὑμᾶς<sup>2</sup>——The truth gives freedom; the loss of freedom obscures the truth.

—διαμείνη——I retain Tischendorf’s reading here, but I rather doubt whether διαμένη be not the genuine reading. The Cod. C. is imperfect here, but the E and H remain, and certainly, if the edition of the MS. by Tischendorf is to be depended on, there is only space for N between the two. He says in the appendix “non satis liquet utrum διαμείνη an διαμένη legatur. Tamen probabilius est διαμένη.” Cf. Gal. i. 15, 16, εὐδόκησεν . . . . . ἀποκαλύψαι . . . ἵνα εὐαγγελίζωμαι . . where it may be remarked that the original transcribers of D. and E. have both written —σωμαι.

6.—ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν, κ. τ. λ.——The passage commencing here has considerably perplexed comment-

<sup>1</sup> Selden, De Syned. Vet. Eb. Lib. i. cap. 3, p. 792.

<sup>2</sup> John viii. 32.

ators; and many have been reduced to the necessity of supposing that there is a deficiency in the construction. I rather think that ἀπό is used here in the sense of *περί*, as the Lat. *de, quod attinet ad*.<sup>1</sup> So Herodot. iv. 53, ταῦτα μὲν τὰ ἀπὸ τουτέων τῶν ποταμῶν; also iv. 195, and vii. 195, τὰ ἐβούλοντο *πυθέσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς Ξέρξεω στρατιῆς*. In translating, therefore, "but as regards those of note," I should say further that the prominent idea in the Apostle's mind was not about the individuals, but the statements, bearing upon his position, which had been made respecting those individuals. ποτε is not here used temporally, but as in Demosth. De Pace, 4, εἰρήνην . . . ὅποια ποτ' ἐστὶν αὕτη<sup>2</sup> and Olynth. iii. 9, ἰδίᾳ δ' οὕτω σώφρονες ἦσαν καὶ σθόδρ' ἐν τῷ τῆς πολιτείας ἥθει μένοντες, ὥστε τῆν . . . τῶν τότε λαμπρῶν οἰκίαν εἴ τις ἄρ' οἶδεν ὅποια ποτ' ἐστὶν, ὁρᾷ τῆς τοῦ γείτονος οὐδὲν σεμνοτέραν οὖσαν.

I should join, then, ὅποιοί ποτε ἦσαν, not with οὐδὲν μοι διαφ., but with ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν, κ. τ. λ. The immediate connexion then subsists between ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναι τι ὅποιοί ποτε ἦσαν, and πρόσωπον Θεός, κ. τ. λ., the οὐδὲν μοι διαφ. being thrown in parenthetically. We may therefore paraphrase the whole thus: "But with respect to that part of the statement regarding me, which regards the men of note, whether they were or were not the very ὑπερλίαν ἀπόστολοι (for it matters nothing

<sup>1</sup> "De me autem, suscipe paulisper meas partes, et eum te esse finge qui sum ego." Cic. Ep. ad Fam. Lib. iii. Ep. 12.

<sup>2</sup> "Qualis qualis est, honesta an turpis, commoda an incommoda, hinc discimus interpretari locum Pauli melius quam vulgo solet. (Gal. ii. 5, 6.) Vertendum *qualescumque erant*." Dounæi prælect. in Philip. De Pace. Dem. et Æsch. Oratt. ed. Dobson, London, 1827, tom. v. p. 395.

to me), I answer, God respects not the person of man, &c.

—δοκούντων εἶναί τι—Cf. Plat. Gorgias, 472, A., ὑπὸ πολλῶν καὶ δοκούντων εἶναί τι, and Phædr. 242, E., σεμνύνεσθαι ὡς τι ὄντε.

—οὐδέν μοι διαφέρει—Cf. Plat. Prot. 338, C., ἐπεὶ τό γ' ἐμὸν οὐδέν μοι διαφέρει. Gorgias, 497, B., τί σοὶ διαφέρει. See also Wetstein in loc.

—πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν is used by the LXX. to translate a Hebrew phrase, meaning to show partiality or favour, and this either in a good sense, as Mal. i. 8, or in a bad one, as Mal. ii. 9. It is used in the latter sense in the New Testament. Hence the words προσωπολήπτης, Acts x. 34, and προσωποληψία, Rom. ii. 11; Eph. vi. 9; cf. Luke xx. 21. The same idea is also expressed by πρόσωπον θαυμάζειν, as Levit. xix. 15.

—προσανέθεντο—“communicated nothing new to me.”<sup>1</sup> Cf. ἀνεθέμην, ver. 2, in our translation, “communicated unto them.”<sup>2</sup> Jerome: “Ipse superius cum illis contulit, et multa ad eos retulit, quæ in Gentibus perpetrarat: illi nihil contulerunt ei, sed tantummodo quæ ab eo dicta sunt comprobantes, dexteras dederunt consortii: et unum suum Paulique evangelium firmaverunt.”

7. —ιδόντες—i. e. James, Cephas, and John (ver. 9). The order is, ἀλλὰ τὸναντίον Ἰάκωβος καὶ Κηφᾶς καὶ Ἰωάννης, οἱ δοκοῦντες στῦλοι εἶναι, ιδόντες . . . καὶ γνόντες . . . δεξιὰς ἔδωκαν, κ. τ. λ. Scholefield justly observes that by interposing the nominative between the two participles our translators have confused the sense.

<sup>1</sup> Scholefield.

<sup>2</sup> Scholefield. Bengel.

—πεπίστευμαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον—Compare the same construction, Rom. iii. 2; 1 Cor. ix. 17; 1 Thess. ii. 4; 1 Tim. i. 11; Titus i. 3. So also Polybius,<sup>1</sup> xxxi. 26, 7, ἐπιστεύθη δὲ τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν τῶν ὅλων ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως. εὐαγγέλιον means the preaching of the Gospel, as Rom. i. 1; 2 Cor. ii. 12.

—ἀκροβυστίας—to the Gentiles. Cf. Rom. ii. 26, 27. Cf. Acts ix. 15, xiii. 2.

—καθώς—“Just as.” καθώς is used by Polyb. vii. 9, 15; Herodot. ix. 82 (here however Schæfer conjectures that the reading is καί), &c. See Lob. Phryn. pp. 425, 426. See the note at the end of ver. 9.

—τῆς περιτομῆς—to the Jews. Cf. Rom. iv. 12. 8. This verse is parenthetical.

—ἐνεργήσας Πέτρῳ—I should translate here *by*,<sup>2</sup> as I think if he had intended to say, in Peter, he would have repeated the preposition, ἐνεργ. ἐν Πετ., and so in the following clause. Compare iii. 5; 1 Cor. xii. 6.

—εἰς ἀποστολήν—εἰς expresses the end or purpose<sup>3</sup> of the operations of God, viz. the carrying out through the instrumentality of Peter the work of the apostleship of the circumcision. See 1 Cor. ii. 4; Col. i. 29.

—εἰς τὰ ἔθνη—for εἰς ἀποστολήν τῶν ἐθνῶν. See the note above on ἀποστολήν.

9. —γνόοντες—knowing by their own personal observation of me.

—τὴν δοθεῖσαν—Cf. 2 Pet. iii. 15.<sup>4</sup>

—Ἰάκωβος καὶ Κηφᾶς καὶ Ἰωάννης—James

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Raphel on 1 Cor. ix. 17.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. LXX., Prov. xxi. 6, ὁ ἐνεργῶν θησαυρίσματα γλώσση ψευδεῖ.

<sup>3</sup> Jelf, Gr. Gr. 625, 3.

<sup>4</sup> Bengel.

might very naturally be named first, as head of the Church at Jerusalem, and as taking a prominent part in this affair (cf. Acts xv. 19). The M.S. A. omits *Κηφᾶς*, and Grotius considers this the true reading. I should however take this to be the reading and order.

—*δοκοῦντες στύλοι εἶναι*—held in repute as pillars. Cf. Apoc. iii. 12; 1 Tim. iii. 15;<sup>1</sup> Prov. ix. 1. So Clemens Rom. i. 5, *δικαιοτάτοι στύλοι ἐδιώχθησαν*. Cf. Eph. ii. 20—22. See Suicer Thes. Tom. ii. pp. 1043, seqq.; and Schœttgen and Wetstein on this place.

—*δεξιὰς ἔδωκαν*—in token of their agreement to receive him as a fellow Apostle, and also to recognise the arrangement that Paul should go to the heathen and they to the circumcision. Cf. Levit. vi. 2, “putting of the hand.”

—*ἡμεῖς μὲν . . . αὐτοὶ δέ*—“that on the one hand we . . . and on the other they, &ca.” “Scil. iremus (cum evangelio),”<sup>2</sup> the ellipsis is common.

It may be as well to remark here the bearing of these 6th, 7th, 8th, and 9th verses upon an important point of Romish teaching. The Papists assert that Peter was the Head and Prince of the Apostles,<sup>3</sup> and that in the command, ‘Feed my sheep’ (John xxi. 16), there was given to him universal jurisdiction over the whole Church.<sup>4</sup> Now, if Peter was Head of the Apostles, he was so either *personally* or

<sup>1</sup> I have, for my own part, no hesitation about referring *στύλος* here to Timothy.

<sup>2</sup> Bengel.

<sup>3</sup> Corpus Juris Canonici, Dist. xi. cap. ‘quis nesciat’—Dist. xxii. cap. ‘sacrosancta’ § 5—Caus. vii. Qu. I. cap. ‘mutationes;’ et in vi. De elect. cap. ‘fundamenta,’ &ca.

<sup>4</sup> Joan iii. Pap. Ep. Unic. Bellarm. De Pontif. Rom. Lib. i. c. 14.



*officially*. Had he been so in virtue of a personal preëminence, Paul, speaking of him, James, and John, would not have said πρόσωπον Θεός ἀνθρώπου οὐ λαμβάνει. It could not therefore have been personal. Nor could it have been official, because, first, his office was one and the same with all the rest, viz., ἀποστολήν—and, second, the power of exercising the office was also one and the same, viz. the manifestation in the earthen vessel of divine power; and it is easily proved from ver. 8 that this *work* was equal in Paul and himself. If, therefore, he was not Head of the Apostles he was not either Head of the Church. But again, his jurisdiction was either personal or official. The same argument which we have used before will prove that it was not personal, because if he had a jurisdiction independent of apostleship there was in this a *personal* preëminence. His jurisdiction therefore was that of apostleship: but τὸ εὐαγγέλιον and ἀποστολήν express the same thing; first, because of the very nature of apostleship; second, because to show that τὸ εὐαγγέλιον had been committed equally to him and Peter, Paul says, ὁ γὰρ ἐνεργήσας εἰς ἀποστολήν, κ. τ. λ. But the word καθὼς in ver. 7 shows that Paul's mission to preach the Gospel was the same as that of Peter;—therefore, his apostleship was the same, and therefore the jurisdiction which belongs to apostleship. Therefore, Peter had not universal jurisdiction.

10. —μόνον, κ. τ. λ.—“scil. ὑπέθεντο τοῦτο ex ver. 6, ut Schmidius observat.”<sup>1</sup>

—τῶν πτωχῶν— not the poor generally, but that we the Apostles of the *Gentiles* should contribute to

<sup>1</sup> Wolf.

the necessities of the believing *Jews* at Jerusalem<sup>1</sup> or in Judæa<sup>2</sup> generally, who through the persecution carried on against them by their own nation were in great distress.<sup>3</sup> Cf. Rom. xv. 25; 1 Cor. xvi. 1; 1 Thes. ii. 14.

—ὁ καὶ ἐσπούδασα, κ. τ. λ.—“which very thing I was even anxious to do.” The relative and demonstrative constructions are blended together, as frequently elsewhere in St. Paul’s Epistles.

11. —ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν, κ.τ.λ.—Bengel, “Ad summa venit argumentum. Paulus ipsum Petrum reprehendit: ergo non debet homini doctrinam suam.”—This visit of Peter to Antioch was *after*<sup>4</sup> the council. Cf. Act. xv. 30, 35.

—κατὰ πρόσωπον . . . ἀντέστην—Chrysostom and Jerome are here followed by Erasmus and A. Lapede in a strange departure from honesty, common sense, and sound criticism; and translating κατὰ πρόσω. ‘in appearance,’ say that Paul’s opposition was feigned, and (as Elsner says of Jerome) “pias fraudes minus pie defendunt.” If any desire to be shown the absurdity and wickedness of such a supposition, they may read Augustine’s letters<sup>5</sup> to Jerome, in which he opposes the idea. It will be enough to show here from parallel passages the true force of κατὰ πρόσω. St. Paul indeed sufficiently explains himself by ἐμ-προσθεν πάντων, in ver. 14, but we have the very expression in the LXX., Deut. vii. 24, xi. 25; Jud. ii. 14,—showing that it means open opposition. So

<sup>1</sup> Vatablus. Piscator. Estius.

<sup>2</sup> Grotius.

<sup>3</sup> Vide Chrys. *in loc.*

<sup>4</sup> So Est. Gom. Par.

<sup>5</sup> Epist. lxxv. Augustini ad Hieron., et Epist. lxxvii. inter Epp. Hieron. Tom. iv. par. 2; Op. Ed. Bened. pp. 601 et 604. See however Jerome, Dial. adv. Pelag. Lib. i. Tom. iv. Pars 2, p. 498.

Polybius, quoted by Raphel; ἐκείνους μὲν ἔφη λάθρα καὶ κατ' ἰδίαν ποιῆσθαι κατ' αὐτοῦ τὰς διαβολάς· αὐτὸς δὲ ἔκρινε κοινῇ καὶ κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν ποιήσασθαι τὴν κατηγορίαν. See also Acts xxv. 16.<sup>1</sup>

—κατεγνωσμένος ἦν—The prominent notion in καταγινώσκειν is, to lay something to a person's charge, hence to accuse, and to condemn; but in this latter sense the notion of accusation and declaratory condemnation is always apparent. I cannot therefore but think that the most satisfactory way of translating this is, "he stood condemned" (*ipso facto*), i. e. *declared* condemned by his actions.

12. —ἐλθεῖν . . ἀπὸ Ἰακ.—“id est a Judæa, nam Ecclesiæ Ierosolymitanæ Jacobus præfuit.”<sup>2</sup> “Ab eo loco ubi erat Jacobus, quomodo recte hic sumit Syrus. Sic dicimus, *Eamus ad me.*”<sup>3</sup>

—συνήσθιεν—I should take the word in its literal sense, though it involves also a general association in familiar intercourse. Cf. Acts x. 28.

—ἦλθον—The reading ἦλθεν adopted by Ln. might have arisen either from the proximity of ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν in ver. 11, or from a misunderstanding of the commencement of this verse.

—ὕπέστειλλεν—ἐαυτόν must be understood with ὑπέσ., thereby giving it the sense of the middle voice,<sup>4</sup> to dread, to shrink back—“he shrunk back and separated himself.”

—τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς—the Jewish converts. Cf. Acts x. 45; Col. iv. 11; Tit. i. 10.

13. —συνυπεκρίθησαν—συνυποκ. means, to play a part along with another. Polyb. iii. 31, 7, πρὸς

<sup>1</sup> See also Elsner, Raphel, and Krebsius, *in loc.*

<sup>2</sup> August.

<sup>3</sup> Grotius.

<sup>4</sup> See Jelf, Gr. Gr. 363, 4.

τὸ παρὸν ἀρμολόμενοι, καὶ συνυποκρινόμενοι. See Raphael in h. l.

—λοιποί—“the rest of the believing Jews in Antioch.

—ὥστε—“so that even Barnabas.” The infinitive is used with ὥστε “when the result or effect follows from, and is, as it were, necessarily implied in the nature of some thing.”<sup>1</sup> The indicative is used “when the thing spoken of is to be represented primarily in its character of an action or fact, so that this is rather brought forward, while its other character of a *result* is not wholly lost sight of but only kept in the background; hence it signifies something really following from the principal verb, but not immediately or of necessity.”<sup>2</sup>

—συναπήχθη αὐτῶν τῇ ὑποκρίσει—“led away along with them in their dissimulation.” In this construction σύν seems to refer to the partners of the subject in the action; and the dative of the thing to the circumstances defining the action, and within which the mutual action takes place. So 2 Pet. iii. 17, τῇ τῶν ἀθέσμων πλάνῃ συναπαχθέντες. In Rom. xii. 16 the dative of the person is expressed. (See Ellicott *in loc.*)

14. —ὀρθοποδοῦσι — “Metaphora a claudican-  
tibus, ut 1 Reg. xviii. 21.”<sup>3</sup>

—πρός—“according to.” So Luke xii. 47; 2 Cor. v. 10; Jelf, Gr. Gr. 638, iii. 3.

—τὴν ἀλήθειαν, κ. τ. λ.—Cf. ver. 5 and the note. The truth of the Gospel reveals to man the freedom which he enjoys in Christ; to the Jew, the ceremonial law finished and centering in Him; to

<sup>1</sup> Jelf, Gr. Gr. 863, 2, a.

<sup>2</sup> Ib. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Gomarus.

the Jew and Gentile, the moral law perfectly performed by Him, and the contract between man and the law dissolved in His person by death. It manifests therefore the entire destruction of the whole of that material system of which the moral law, *as a condition of salvation*, and the ceremonial law, were the characteristics. Now Peter had recognised the truth of this ; he had cast aside the exclusiveness of the Jew with respect to the Gentile, which belonged to that system ; he had given himself up freely to that independence of ceremonial observance which belongs to the spiritual Church, that Church which bases its existence in an event which, being the anti-type of all those types, at once extinguished and represents them all ; and therefore, knowing the truth of the Gospel, he had lived up to the liberty which was its theme ; but fearing to offend those who still clung to their old slavery, he assumed a subservience to bondage, and by example taught those Gentiles with whom he had associated that they must conform to the ceremonies of the law. It does not seem that he lost his own perception of Gospel freedom, for the word "dissembled" shows that he did not act according to his convictions. But conviction of the truth of a doctrine is one thing, and a full spiritual consciousness of that truth is another. The former may survive when the last has been obscured by sin. Of this spiritual sense of freedom there must have been a certain clouding over, and a tendency to bondage in his very dissimulation. Oscillating between Gospel liberty and legal slavery, he walked not uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel.

—ἐμπροσθεν πάντων—Cf. 1 Tim. v. 20.

—ἔθνικῶς ζῆς καὶ οὐχὶ Ἰουδαϊκῶς—Although the weight of MSS. authority is in favour of the other form of this passage, in which ζῆς follows Ἰουδαϊκῶς, I am disposed to follow Tischendorf in this reading, on the ground that the other form is the one most likely to be substituted by a transcriber. I adopt the reading οὐχὶ upon the authority of Birch's collation of B.<sup>1</sup> The omission of one I by the transcriber would be very likely to arise from the juxta-position of two. Cf. 1 Cor. vi. 1, x. 29.

Selden says, “ζῆν ἔθνικῶς erat vivere non juxta mores ritusque Judaicos seu Judaice circumcisionem.”<sup>2</sup>

—πῶς—q. d. “If you have entirely emancipated yourself from Jewish ceremonies, how in the world,<sup>3</sup> with what sort of consistency can you, &c.” I cannot understand how Tisch. can, consistently with his own principles, edit here τί.

—ἀναγκάζεις, κ. τ. λ.—I quote here the words of Jerome: “Si, inquit, O Petre, tu natura Judæus es, circumcisis a parva ætate, et universa Legis præcepta custodiens, nunc ob gratiam Christi scis ea nihil per se habere utilitatis; sed exemplaria esse et imagines futurorum; et cum his qui ex gentibus sunt, cibum capis, nequaquam ut ante superstitiosè, sed libere et indifferenter victitans: quomodo eos qui ex gentibus crediderunt, nunc recedens ab eis, et quasi a contaminatis te separans et secernens, compellis judaizare. Si enim immundi sunt a quibus recedis, idcirco autem recedis, quia non habent cir-

<sup>1</sup> Tischendorf, however, does not quote B. as an authority for this reading. <sup>2</sup> De Syned. Vet. Eb. lib. i. cap. ix. vol. i. tom. 2, fol. 931.

<sup>3</sup> Vide Liddell and Scott, πῶς, II.

cumcisionem, compellis eos circumcidi et Judæos fieri: quum tu ipse natus Judæus, gentiliter vixeris.”

—Ἰουδαίῳζειν—Cf. LXX., Esth. viii. 17.

15. —ἡμεῖς φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι, κ.τ.λ.—With Elsner and Schmidt I should place a comma after ἐθνῶν, connecting ἁμαρτωλοί with φύσει Ἰουδ., and supplying ὄντες with ἁμαρτωλοί. For whatever was the feeling of the Jews themselves with regard to the Gentiles, it is continually the Apostle's aim to show that both Jews and Gentiles were equally sinners before God. See Rom. iii. 9, 23, 24, and in this Ep. iii. 22; and this view is clearly in accordance with the context and with the present scope of the Apostle; for in remonstrating with Peter for having indirectly required the Gentiles to become Jews, he would remind him that the end of creation was a scheme which could give life; that the basis of that scheme was the connexion of man as a sinner with a Saviour; that this was all that was figured forth in the interposed Jewish dispensation, which in itself could not give life; that therefore, inasmuch as the Jew himself could only come in the end to this point, the Gentile who either had been or could be brought directly into the spiritual dispensation need not go back to one that was material, leading to the other, and its type. Translate then, “We who are Jews by nature, and not Gentiles, being sinners.”

16. —εἰδότες δέ—“and knowing.”

—δικαιοῦνται—That this word has the *forensic* meaning of “to declare or pronounce just,” is rendered sufficiently evident by its usage by the LXX. and by St. Paul himself. Cf. Exod. xxiii. 7; Deut. xxv. 1; 2 Reg. xv. 4; 3 Reg. viii. 32; 2 Par. vi.

23; Psal. cxlii. 2; Isa. v. 23, l. 8; and the Apoc. Syr. xxxiv. (xxxii.) 5. See also Rom. iii. 20, 24, et seq., iv. 5, v. 18 (where *δικαίωσις* is opposed to *κατάκριμα*), and especially viii. 33. But indeed the whole phraseology of Scripture with respect to the mutual position of God and man is manifestly *forensic* in its character, and so illustrates in no unimportant manner the forensic nature of the term justification. Thus we have *κριτής*, Acts x. 42 (see also xvii. 31); Heb. xii. 23; *ὑπόδικος*, Rom. iii. 19; *βῆμα*, Rom. xiv. 10; 2 Cor. v. 10; *κατήγορος*, John v. 45; Apoc. xii. 10; *ἐγκαλεῖν*, Rom. viii. 33; *κατάκριμα*, Rom. v. 16, 18; *παράκλητος*, 1 John. ii. 1; *ἀντίλυτρον*, 1 Tim. ii. 6, &ca, &ca; which, as Calovius says, “qui negant judicialia esse, solem in meridie lucere negant.” See Calovius, *Bibl. Illust.* tom. iv. p. 12; Deyling, *Obs. Sac. Pars* iii. p. 570.

—ἐξ ἔργων νόμου—The legal system comprising the moral and ceremonial law offered the *occasion* of justification. Man’s carnal nature made it the *occasion* of giving greater permanence than ever to his criminality. *ἐκ*, from its sense of *immediate* origin (Jelf, 621, 3), attains the meaning of *instrumentality*; thus conveying nearly the same sense as *ὑπό*, or *διά*, with a gen. (Jelf, 639, 2, c., and 627, 3, c). See Rom. x. 17.

—ἐὰν μή—The one great argument which forms the subject of the whole of this Epistle is that the inheritance is by promise, and therefore not of works; that not only is the law of no avail in the justification of the believer, but that Christ is become of no effect to those who would be justified by the



law, that they are fallen from grace.<sup>1</sup> To suppose therefore that the Apostle means to imply here that the believer who has been pronounced just through faith in Christ is afterwards justified through the works of the law, is to make the Apostle contradict himself in one and the same verse, to sink the whole subject of dispute between himself and the false teachers, and stultify the whole argument of the Epistle. So manifest indeed is this, that commentators of every possible shade of opinion take *ἐάν μή* in the sense of *ἀλλά*.<sup>2</sup> This however is an arbitrary and unjustifiable way of escaping from a difficulty. For they first invest *εἰ μή* in certain passages<sup>3</sup> with an adversative sense, and then make *ἐάν μή* equivalent to *εἰ μή*. But whatever may be the peculiar usage of *εἰ μή*, it by no means follows that the conclusions drawn therefrom are to be extended to *ἐάν μή*. *εἰ μή* is used constantly, and in the New Testament in nearly every instance, without a following verb: whereas *ἐάν μή* is with the exception of this one passage *invariably* followed by a verb. It is clear therefore that *εἰ μή* has attained an usage which *ἐάν μή* has not; and moreover, I should not think that any one would doubt but that the *apparently* adversative sense of *εἰ μή* is one which has arisen

<sup>1</sup> Ch. v. 4, where see the notes, and also on ver. 6 of the same ch.

<sup>2</sup> E. g. Grotius, Beza, A. Lapide, Drusius Piscator, Rosenmuller, Gomarus, Vorstius, Bengel, Bloomfield, Hackspan, Scholefield, Schleusner, &c.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Cor. vii. 17 must at all events be entirely excepted from the list of these passages. For a much plainer construction is open to us by placing the stop after, and not before *εἰ μή*, *εἰ* having in both instances the sense of *whether*, Lat. *an* (Jelf, Gr. Gr. 877, b.), and the second *εἰ* being dependent upon a mental supply of the question *τί οἶδας*. So the Sch. Gr. ap. Matthæi, *τινές στίζοντες τελείαν (στιγμήν) εἰς τὸ εἰ μή, τοιαύτην τήν ὄλην σύμφρασιν ποιῶσι· τί οἶδας εἰ σώσεις, τί οἶδας εἰ μὴ σώσεις*.

from this peculiar usage. Other differences there are between the force and usage of  $\epsilon\iota$  and  $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu$ , but this one alone is sufficient to show that the peculiar usage of one proves nothing with regard to the other.

But, moreover, the constant usage of  $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu \mu\acute{\eta}$  not only shows that a verb must be supplied here ( $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\upsilon\nu$ ), but that that verb must be in the *conjunctive*; and if this be the case, it is unnecessary to say, that it is absolutely impossible to give to  $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu \mu\acute{\eta}$  the sense of  $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$  adversative.

The best way then of explaining the passage is, that there is before the last clause a mental supply of the general negation, which is only expressed in the first clause; q. d. man is not justified, unless (he be justified) through faith in Christ.

— $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha} \pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma \text{ 'I}\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon \text{ X}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$ —Man stands before God a criminal, needing the pronouncement on His part of a sentence of acquittal or justification. He became a criminal through the offence of the first of his species. He remains so because not only is Adam's sin *imputed* to him, but his sinful nature *imparted*. That fallen nature retained a certain consciousness of the law of God,<sup>1</sup> and drew conclusions, which at least tended towards truth, from the manifestations of Divinity which surrounded it.<sup>2</sup> And, moreover, man had a certain consciousness that eternal life depends upon justification, and a natural tendency to seek for justification and life through acts in conformity with God's law. But while he did indeed see and approve the abstract good manifested in the unwritten law, he not only lacked the power to follow it, but departed ever

<sup>1</sup> See Rom. ii. 12—15.

<sup>2</sup> Rom. i. 19, seqq.

more and more from its requirements, and was untrue to those conclusions to which his inner nature really tended. And thus he remained a sinner. But these manifestations of the sinful nature, although in themselves condemnatory, were not, in the absence of a written law,<sup>1</sup> *reckoned in*<sup>2</sup> as a ground of condemnation; nevertheless, man was already condemned on account of the imputed sin of his first parent:<sup>3</sup> while indeed these actual sins served to demonstrate the justice of the existent condemnation. But to the Jew God gave in the ten commandments an embodiment of the same law of which the work was written on the Gentile heart. And this law, whatever was its true object, pre-determined by God, and brought into action by its combination with a fallen nature, did in fact offer, in a divine and authoritative form, a mean of justification by actual performance. But although in itself the law was holy,<sup>4</sup> it was brought into contact with a fallen being;<sup>5</sup> and, therefore, instead of giving him justification and life, it wrought only condemnation and death;<sup>6</sup> defining with the greatest clearness the smallest sin, and increasing therefore the consciousness of guilt.<sup>7</sup> And although given exclusively to the Jew, it did yet manifest the true tendencies and the true consequences of every system of legal justification which man would construct out of his faint knowledge of the law of God. So that whatever great truths are revealed in connexion with the law

<sup>1</sup> Rom. iv. 15, v. 13.

<sup>2</sup> *οὐκ ἄλλογεῖται*,—Rom. v. 13. Hesych., *ἄλλογεῖ. καταλογήσαι*. See Lidd. and Scott at *ἄλλογ.* and *καταλογίζομαι*.

<sup>3</sup> See Rom. v. 12—16.

<sup>4</sup> Rom. vii. 12.

<sup>5</sup> *Ib.* 14.

<sup>6</sup> See Rom. vii. 10.

<sup>7</sup> Rom. iii. 20.

as given to the Jew, since man retains a certain consciousness of the *same* law, and since it was as fallen *man* that the Jew failed to obey, the natural consciousness of every one, whether Jew or Gentile, is ever tending towards one and the same truth, that the law works condemnation and death. It is then proved in the divine embodiment of a system of works, and in the person of the Jew, that man is unable to escape from condemnation through the law; and the justice of the condemnation which is based on the imputed guilt of Adam is clearly manifested in the perpetuation of the imparted and actual sinfulness. And so therefore in the mercy of God the Judge, man is justified through faith in Christ.

Now justification, being the pronouncement by God of man's innocence, stands opposed to condemnation, or the pronouncement of his guilt; and so the peculiar history of each stands opposed in its circumstances to the history of the other. Thus the history of his condemnation is that of a complete and carnal creation, and that of his justification the history of one complete and spiritual. The carnal creation began with Adam, who *disobeyed* God; the spiritual one began with Jesus Christ, who perfectly *obeyed*. The *disobedience* of the first Adam was *imputed* to all born into the old creation, and in consequence thereof death reigned. The *obedience* of the last Adam is *imputed* to all born into the new creation, and in consequence thereof life reigns.<sup>1</sup> As too in the carnal birth there was *imparted* to man an actual sinfulness and inaptitude to the performance of God's

<sup>1</sup> See Rom. v. 18, 19.

law, so in the new birth is there *imparted* an actual holiness. The basis then of condemnation is life, and the basis of justification is also life; and as each life is in its circumstances the opposite of the other, so does the existence of the second life involve as a consequence the destruction of the first. And before the positive blessings of the new creation can be given, there must be a removal of the evils belonging to the old one.

Death, then, issuing in life took place primarily in the person of Jesus Christ.<sup>1</sup> The Son of God assumed human<sup>2</sup> and mortal nature in order that<sup>3</sup> He might vicariously die for human nature,<sup>4</sup> bearing, though Himself sinless<sup>5</sup> and immortal,<sup>6</sup> the penalty of Adam's imputed sin and the guilt itself of those *παραπτώματα*<sup>7</sup> which are the necessary fruits of the sinful nature imparted to his posterity. Moreover, being born of the seed of Abraham,<sup>8</sup> He placed Himself under the law<sup>9</sup> to which the Jew was bound for life,<sup>10</sup> and thus accepted the obligation to obey that law until death dissolved the contract.<sup>11</sup> When therefore He died, He attained in His own person a real *ἀπολύτρωσις*. But this *ἀπολύτρωσις* could only become effectual in a new and succeeding life. When therefore He rose from the dead, He possessed a new and glorified life, involving an effectual fruition of the freedom attained in death. And moreover, since He had died in a perfect and perfected obedience,

<sup>1</sup> John x. 17.<sup>2</sup> Gal. iv. 4.<sup>3</sup> Heb. ii. 14.<sup>4</sup> Compare Rom. v. 8, 2 Cor. v. 14, with Plato, Conv. 179, B.—*ἰθελή-σασα μόνη ὑπὲρ τοῦ αὐτῆς ἀνδρὸς ἀποθανεῖν.*, and Xen. An. vii. 4. 9; Hist. Gr. iii. 4. 15.<sup>5</sup> Luke i. 35; 2 Cor. v. 21; Heb. iv. 15; 1 Pet. ii. 22.<sup>6</sup> Psal. xvi. 10; Acts ii. 24, 27.<sup>7</sup> 2 Cor. v. 19.<sup>8</sup> Heb. ii. 16.<sup>9</sup> Gal. iv. 4.<sup>10</sup> Rom. vii. 1.<sup>11</sup> Cf. Rom. vii. 3, 4.

He rose from the dead possessed not only of freedom, but of a perfect righteousness attained by that His perfected obedience.

Jesus Christ then, having accomplished this His vicarious work, possesses, as the Head of a new creation, life.<sup>1</sup> This life He imparts to as many as are given to Him by the Father.<sup>2</sup> These, being elected by God<sup>3</sup> from the foundation of the world<sup>4</sup> to an effectual participation in the completed work of His Son, come to Him,<sup>5</sup> being endowed by God with a living faith in His person and work, and attain through the instrumentality of this faith union with Him, and a real share in that risen life which is possessed vicariously for them, and communicated to them by Christ. Since then the life of Christ involves a freedom and a righteousness attained in death and a succeeding life, those who share the life of Christ share those features and prerogatives which belong to that His life. They share therefore His freedom attained in death,<sup>6</sup> and that perfect righteousness attained by death and possessed in life, which covers their sins,<sup>7</sup> and in virtue of which God fully justifies them, pronouncing them fair and without spot.<sup>8</sup> And these, the positive blessings of the covenant of grace, are rendered available to the elect through the general removal of the guilt and penalty of sin by the vicarious death of Christ; which removal now becomes effectual to them as a part of that one complete work through which their salvation is attained.

<sup>1</sup> John v. 26.<sup>2</sup> John xvii. 2.<sup>3</sup> 1 Thess. i. 4.<sup>4</sup> Eph. i. 4; Rev. xvii. 8.<sup>5</sup> John vi. 37.<sup>6</sup> Rom. vii. 4.<sup>7</sup> Psal. xxxii. 1.<sup>8</sup> Cant. iv. 7; Eph. v. 27.

Since then justification is attained in union with the risen life of Christ, and through the imputation of that perfect righteousness which belongs to His risen life, and since faith is the instrumental cause of union with Christ, man is justified through faith.

The *cause* then of justification is the free grace of God developing itself in the work of His Son, and in the gift of faith which makes that work individually effective.<sup>1</sup> The *nature* thereof is an imputation of righteousness based in a non-imputation of sin,<sup>2</sup> and the instrument giving it to man faith.<sup>3</sup> Of this faith the *object* is Jesus Christ,<sup>4</sup> in His person and completed work effecting deliverance and justification for man; the *effectual cause* is the Spirit of God, the *instrumental cause* the testimony of Scripture to the person and work of Christ.<sup>5</sup> And as regards the nature of faith we may observe, I. Since Scripture contains every doctrinal truth relating to Christ, and since Scripture is not the *object* but the *instrumental cause* of faith, justifying faith is not a mere belief of doctrinal statements, whether revealed in Scripture itself, or in creeds however consistent they may be with Scripture. II. Since the Spirit of God alone can give faith, and since He produces it by testifying to the sinner of the person and completed work of Christ; and since the great feature of that work is the free justification of the sinner through His im-

<sup>1</sup> See χάρις i. 3, and the note.

<sup>2</sup> Rom. iv. 6, 7, 24, 25.

<sup>3</sup> Rom. iii. 22.

<sup>4</sup> John iii. 16, 36, vi. 47; Acts xvi. 31; 1 John v. 10. See also Acts v. 42; 1 Cor. i. 23; 2 Cor. i. 19, iv. 5.

<sup>5</sup> Psal. xl. 7, 8; John i. 46; Luke xxiv. 44. See also Gal. iii. 2, and the note.

puted righteousness ; there is involved in justifying faith an individual consciousness of sin, and of the fitness of Christ's person, and the perfect efficacy of His work to effect the object which He was sent to accomplish. III. Since faith justifies by apprehending the justified life of Christ, justifying faith must be accompanied by the manifestation of His Spirit in his life.

We gather, then, generally, that justifying faith is neither an intellectual appreciation, nor even a belief, of doctrinal truths relating to the Person and work of Christ ; but the personal trust of one conscious of sin in the perfect and sufficient sacrifice of a Personal Saviour, who, in His power and the efficacy of His work, embodies those doctrinal statements which are the instrumental cause of faith : that this belief is the gift of the Spirit of God ; that it gives union with the life of Christ, and therefore must manifest itself in the action which is the necessary consequence of vitality.

—καὶ ἡμεῖς— —“ even we.” Cf. Rom. i. 16 ; Acts xv. 11.

—ἐπιστεύσαμεν— —i. e. “ we have accepted faith as the instrument of our justification.” This might or might not imply the existence of a true justifying faith.

—ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ— —Tischendorf omits Χριστοῦ here, probably on the ground that it is likely to be a scholion. But the external authority<sup>1</sup> seems too strong to be rejected.

—καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου— —This effectually ex-

<sup>1</sup> A. B. C. D.—*Lat.* Clarom. August. Ambros. Ambrst. Hieron. Vulg. Syr. &ca.



cludes all work as the ground of salvation, whether performed before or after faith ; because the system of faith implies the existence of a perfected obedience, fully justifying in the Person of Christ.

—*δίῳτι*—As the *reason* for the acceptance of justification by faith the Apostle gives this amplified quotation from Psalm cxliii. 2, thereby at once furnishing to Jews the best, because Old Testament, authority ; and showing the true bearing of David's words upon the Gospel scheme. The passage stands in the LXX., ὅτι οὐ δικαιοθήσεται ἐνώπιόν σου πᾶς ζῶν. πᾶσα σὰρξ expresses man, who, whether Jew or Gentile, is *σαρκινός* . . *πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν*,<sup>1</sup> and *therefore* unable to find justification before God through the law.—*οὐ πᾶσα σὰρξ* is a Hebraic idiom for *οὐδεμία σὰρξ*. Cf. Luke i. 37.

17. —*ζητοῦντες, κ. τ. λ.*—“if while we are (ostensibly) seeking a justification in Christ,” not, as in our translation, *by* Christ. Man is pronounced just by God because he is *in* Christ.

—*εὐρέθημεν, κ. τ. λ.*—That is, we too who are under the Gospel are found or discovered, in our search after a legal justification, to be still sinners, still under condemnation.

—*ἄρα, κ. τ. λ.*—“Is Christ a minister of sin ?” *ἄρα* is used by the Attics *ironically* as an interrogative ; and, implying generally doubt, it prepares one for a negative answer.<sup>2</sup> Berger, Vater, and Winer would read *ἄρα*, translating, “then Christ is, &ca,” and making it a sort of *reductio ad absurdum*.<sup>3</sup> But the meaning of the Apostle is clear ; he would say,

<sup>1</sup> Rom. vii. 14.

<sup>2</sup> Jelf, Gr. Gr. § 873, 2.

<sup>3</sup> Bloomfield, Gr. Test.

“ Is the cause of this in Christ? Can the application to the soul of a perfect obedience produce conviction of an imperfect one? does the consciousness of a perfect righteousness produce a sense of sin not washed out? does the sense of an entire justification cause the believer to feel himself still under condemnation? Are these the results of Christ’s work? Is His “ the ministration of condemnation ”? Nay! it is “ the ministration of righteousness.”<sup>1</sup>

—μη γένοιτο—See the note on ch. iii. ver. 21.

18. —εἰ γὰρ ἂ κατέλυσα, κ. τ. λ.—A difficulty might here arise in the minds of those whom he addressed, as to the bearing of the expression, εὐρέθημεν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἁμαρτωλοί, upon these circumstances. The Apostle anticipates this by explaining that if a believer, having been freed from the law in Christ, again seeks for a legal justification, he declares himself *ipso facto* to be again bound to the law, and therefore, as a necessary consequence, declares him to be a transgressor and a sinner. The γάρ prefaces this explanation, to add force to which he uses a μετασχηματισμός, as in 1 Cor. iv. 6 (which see especially), Rom. iii. 7, vii. 7, seqq., and elsewhere,—that is, he speaks *illustratively* of himself as a type and representative of a class. I think that he proceeds with the relation of what he said to Peter until the end of the chapter: he might or he might not have then used this very form or these words: he did doubtless, upon that occasion, explain, because he spoke ἔμπροσθεν πάντων: but while he wrote, this *resumé* had its use, and he might give the substance and scope of what he said in an impromptu form and with a present object.

<sup>1</sup> 2 Cor. iii. 9.

—ἐμαυτὸν συνιστάνω—The best translation is, I think, “I convict myself of being,” or “I declare myself;” so the LXX., Susan. 61, συνέστησεν αὐτοὺς Δανιὴλ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτῶν ψευδομαρτυρήσαντες, or Philo,<sup>1</sup> συνίστησιν αὐτὸν προφήτην. Hesychius says, συνιστάνειν. φανεροῦν. παρατιθέναι. Cf. also Rom. iii. 5, and Wetstein in loc. ; Rom. xvi. 1 ; 2 Cor. vi. 4. συνιστάνω is a rarer form of συνίστημι.

19. —ἐγὼ γὰρ διὰ νόμου, κ.τ.λ.—This explains the preceding metaphor, and at the same time shows the true nature of the law, viz. that it was not a permanent and final dispensation, but that it led to a freedom from its own power, in Christ. For the law could not of itself give life,<sup>2</sup> but was a παιδαγωγός leading to Christ.<sup>3</sup> Convincing of sin and of consequent condemnation, the law brought not itself justification, but was made the means of bringing man to seek for justification in Christ. He died to the law; and man, being joined to Christ by faith, becomes also “dead to the law by the body of Christ.”<sup>4</sup> The law, then, is an instrument bringing man to Christ. The believer dies in the Person of Christ to the law; and thus he may say, ἐγὼ διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον.

It is plainly meaningless, and foreign to the scope of the Apostle, to interpret διὰ νόμου of the νόμ. πίστεως of Rom. iii. 27.

—ἵνα Θεῷ ζήσω—The believer, dying in the Person of Christ to the law, lives in Him as a risen Saviour.<sup>5</sup> Christ lives to God.<sup>6</sup> In and through Him the believer lives to God,<sup>7</sup> and the earthly object of

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Læsner on Rom. iii. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Gal. iii. 21.

<sup>3</sup> Ib. 24.

<sup>4</sup> Rom. vii. 4.

<sup>5</sup> Rom. vi. 5, 8, vii. 4.

<sup>6</sup> Ib. vi. 10.

<sup>7</sup> Ib. 11. Compare 2 Cor. v. 15.

a participation in this His life is, that, manifesting in life that the old body of sin is dead,<sup>1</sup> he should “walk in newness of life,”<sup>2</sup> bringing forth “fruit unto God.”<sup>3</sup> To effect this then, as he participates in privileges which belong to Christ the Son of God, the believer receives the Spirit of adoption,<sup>4</sup> partakes of the wisdom and the holiness of his Lord,<sup>5</sup> having light in life;<sup>6</sup> and thus through a death to a material law, lives to God, the Author of the law, as a redeemed, justified, loving, holy son.

—Θεῶ— is the *dativus commodi*.<sup>7</sup> Wetstein adduces several instances of a similar usage, and among others a very remarkable one from Dion. Hal. iii. 17, ἀλλ' ευσεβῆς μὲν, ἔφη, πρᾶγμα ποιεῖτε, ὃ παῖδες, τῷ πατρὶ ζῶντες, καὶ οὐδὲν ἄνευ τῆς ἐμῆς γνώμης διαπραττόμενος.

20. —Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι— By the expression νόμῳ ἀπέθανον of verse 19, he shows what he meant in the ἃ κατέλυσα of the preceding verse: and here he further explains how he died to the law, namely, in being made a partaker of the death of Christ. Cf. Rom. vi. 6. But here the mode of death is also specified, viz. crucifixion, on which cf. iii. 13, and the note.

—ζῶ δέ— This refers to the ἵνα Θεῶ ζήσω of the preceding verse. He said there, “that I might live unto God,” and here again, “I live;” but immediately he, as it were, corrects himself, as in 1 Cor. xv. 10, ἐκοπίασα· οὐκ ἐγὼ δέ, ἀλλ' ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ

<sup>1</sup> Rom. vi. 6, 11, 12, 13.

<sup>2</sup> Rom. vi. 4.

<sup>3</sup> Ib. vii. 4.

<sup>4</sup> Rom. viii. 15; Gal. iv. 6, where see the note.

<sup>5</sup> 1 Cor. i. 30. Cf. also James iii. 17.

<sup>6</sup> John i. 4, viii. 12.

<sup>7</sup> See Jelf, Gr. Gr. 598.

σὺν ἐμοί, and says, 'not now,'<sup>1</sup> i. e. not in this new life, *I*, but Christ liveth in me. He explains, that is, that the new life is not inherent, but imparted; for in the union of the soul with Christ the believer not only dwells in Him, but He in the believer. Cf. John vi. 56; Cant. vi. 3, "I am my beloved's, and my beloved is mine." Apoc. iii. 20, "I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me."

—ὁ δὲ νῦν ζῶ ἐν σαρκί—And as regards the (re-generate) life which I now (i. e. since my union with Christ) live in the flesh (i. e. while my body is yet unrenewed, and therefore exposed to temptation and sin). Cf. Rom. vi. 10; and see Jelf, 835, 2, and Matthiæ, Gr. Gr. 478.

—ἐν πίστει ζῶ—The use of ἐν gives greater force than the mere instrumental dative, viz. that not only is this life given through, or obtained *by*, but exists *in* faith. That is, there is not only implied a primary instrumentality, but a continuous existence of the object in the means.<sup>2</sup> In the consciousness of faith, the believer possesses the consciousness of present life.

—τῆ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, κ. τ. λ.—The effects of faith in the person of the believer are, I. Sonship, deliverance, and justification, obtained in *individual* union with Christ; II. Consciousness of union, and, therefore, of its consequences; III. love and gratitude for the special love which gives an interest in the general plan of love. As then there is an individual and personal union, so must the faith itself be of *individual* and *personal* character, having for its

<sup>1</sup> Vide Liddell and Scott, οὐκ ἐτι.

<sup>2</sup> Vide Jelf, Gr. Gr. § 622, 3.

object Christ, in His Person as the Son of God giving Sonship, and in His work giving deliverance and justification. And it is, therefore, thus described as existing in the person of one regenerate, "faith in the Son of God, who loved *me*, and gave himself for *me*."

21. —ἀθετῶ——"irritam facio," "render void," or "invalidate," "stultify."

—τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ——the free grace of God manifested in and by the death of Christ. Cf. Eph. i. 7, "We have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ."

—γάρ——This is explanatory. An objection might arise here, 'What has this expression ἀθετῶ τὴν χάριν to do with us?' The Apostle would answer, "You say that righteousness comes through the law, and if such be really the case, Christ's death was causeless and a mere gratuitous wanton act, and so, therefore, the scheme of grace manifested therein. If you say, then, that righteousness is obtainable in the law, you are stultifying the grace of God."

—δωρεάν——is used in the same sense as in John xv. 25, ἐμίσησάν με δωρεάν. So also the LXX., 1 Reg. xix. 5, θανατῶσαι τὸν Δαυὶδ δωρεάν.

Here ends the relation of the address to Peter; and the Apostle, from this statement of the position and feelings of the believer, passes by a natural transition to the Galatians themselves. He had spoken of the death of the believer in Christ, of his crucifixion with Him, and he is reminded of the tokens of the same death which had at the first been manifested in the Galatians themselves; so that

when he now recollects their backslidings, and the circumstances under which he was addressing them, he compares mentally their present with their former state, and exclaims, “O foolish Galatians, &ca.”

---

### CHAPTER III.

1. —*ἀνόητοι Γαλάται*——Jerome supposes that the Apostle refers to some peculiar characteristic of the Galatians: “arbitror Apostolum Galatas regionis suæ proprietate pulsasse;” and Callimachus, cited by Wetstein, speaks of them as *ἄφρον φύλον* · but this reduces Wetstein to the necessity of supposing that Themistius, whom he had quoted at ch. i. 6, spoke ironically in calling them *ὄξεις καὶ ἀγχίνοι*. If they had any such character for folly, the Apostle might mean, “O true to your character.”

—*ἐβάσκανεν*——“bewitched you.” A. Morus, quoted by Wolf, says, “*βασκαίνω* dicitur tanquam *φασκαίνω*, fiebat enim harum literarum transpositio; ut *Φίλιππος Βίλιππος* dictus est apud Macedonas.” It is derived by the Greek grammarians from *φάος* and *καίειν*. This derivation is favoured by the Latin form of “fascino.”<sup>1</sup> *βασκαίνω* is, however, found in the sense of *φθονέω*, and also *συκοφαντέω*. So Ammonius, *βασκαίνειν οὐ μόνον τὸ φθονεῖν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ συκοφαντεῖν*. and Suidas, *βασκαίνει. ἀντὶ τοῦ αἰτιᾶται, καὶ*

<sup>1</sup> “Nescio quis teneros oculus mihi fascinat agnos.” Virg. Eclog. iii. 103.

μέμφεται καὶ συκοφαντεῖ,<sup>1</sup>—and some would derive it from βάσκω (βάζω, βάζω), which is equivalent to κακολογέω.<sup>2</sup> For my own part, I should adopt the former derivation; and it is not difficult to see how the belief that an evil influence existed in the eye might eventually give to the word the wider meaning of envy or slander.<sup>3</sup> St. Paul evidently uses the word in the sense of bewitching, not that he necessarily believed in such a power, but he avails himself of a strong word, or, as Jerome says, “verbum quotidianæ sermocinationis,” to express his wonder at the suddenness of the Galatians’ fall, preceded as it had been by prominent tokens of enlightenment.

—οἷς κατ’ ὀφθαλμοῦς, κ.τ.λ.—I should translate this passage, “In whom evidently Jesus Christ was formally portrayed, crucified.” The connexion thus becomes evident between this and the closing verses of ch. ii.

Two constructions are here blended together, the relative and the demonstrative, οἷς ἐν ὑμῖν being equivalent to ἐν οἷς ὑμῖν. So 1 Pet. ii. 24, οὗ τῷ μάλωπι αὐτοῦ ἰάθητε; and LXX., Deut. xxxii. 20, υἱοὶ οἷς οὐκ ἔστι πίστις ἐν αὐτοῖς. Josh. xiii. 21, ὃν ἐπάταξε Μωυσῆς αὐτόν. See Jelf, Gr. Gr. 833, Obs. 2. The comma must be placed after, not before, ἐν ὑμῖν, thus connecting those words, not with ἐστάυ. but with προεγ. With regard to the words ἐν ὑμῖν, I should, with Tischendorf, unhesitatingly retain them, even although the evidence against them were

<sup>1</sup> See also Thom. Mag. p. 148.

<sup>2</sup> Hesych. βάσκειν. λέγειν. κακολογεῖν.

<sup>3</sup> See Parkhurst, v. βασκαίνω, and Læsner in h. l.



stronger than it actually is. For it must be evident that the apparent redundancy of the words would be very likely to lead to their omission, while it is difficult, if not absolutely impossible, to account for their introduction into the text. But indeed, as regards external evidence, although there is unquestionably strong evidence for the omission,<sup>1</sup> I cannot consider it by any means of a conclusive character. Dr. Tregelles<sup>2</sup> quotes the Vulg. against them, apparently on the authority of the Codd. Amiat. and Tol. alone; for they are certainly found in the other copies. And it is a circumstance which tells very much in their favour, that the Codd. Demid. and Harl. both read “*et in vobis*,” showing clearly enough that their supposed redundancy was felt to be a difficulty. And, moreover, Jerome, in his commentary, not only reads them, but does so in the very same paragraph in which he distinctly rejects the clause τῆ ἀληθ. μὴ πείθ., on the ground of its not being found in Origen’s copies.

—κατ’ ὀφθαλμούς—“evidentissime.”<sup>3</sup> The expression is equivalent to πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν, and occurs frequently in this sense in the version of the LXX., as 2 Par. xxxii. 23; Jer. lii. 10; Ezech. iv. 12, xxi. 6, &ca.

—προεγράφη—γράφειν has, as Alberti observes,<sup>4</sup> frequently the sense of to *paint*, though indeed the original meaning would not be inconsistent with the translation I propose. Cf. 2 Cor. iii. 3, Φανερούμενοι ὅτι ἐστέ, ἐπιστολὴ Χριστοῦ . . . ἐγγεγραμμένη οὐ μέ-

<sup>1</sup> A. B. C. al.<sup>10</sup> Vulg. (Codd. Am. Tol.) Syr. &ca.

<sup>2</sup> Account of Printed Text of N. T. p. 147.

<sup>3</sup> Bengel.

<sup>4</sup> Obs. Phill. p. 361. See also Lidd. and Scott, v. γράφω, II.

λανι ἀλλὰ πνεύματι Θεοῦ ζῶντος, οὐκ ἐν πλαξίν λιθίναις ἀλλ' ἐν πλαξίν καρδίας σαρκίνοις.

2. —τοῦτο μόνον θέλω μαθεῖν——q. d. “I appeal to your own experiences, and your answer in this matter will be sufficient.” Chrysostom, διὰ συντόμου λόγου καὶ ταχίστης ἀποδείξεως ὑμᾶς πείσαι βούλομαι. *μανθάνω* is used not only in the sense of to learn, but also of the mere attempt “to seek to learn,” “to ask,” as *πυνθάνομαι*.<sup>1</sup>

—ἐξ ἔργων νόμου——ἐξ expresses the *occasion* of the outpouring of the Spirit; ἔργ. νόμ. is put for the legal system generally of which these works, as opposed to the obedience of the Gospel, are the distinguishing characteristic.

—τὸ Πνεῦμα.——It is plain from ver. 5, καὶ ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν, that the Apostle refers not only to those ordinary gifts of the Spirit which belong to a justifying faith, and are common generally to believers, but also to those extraordinary gifts which were vouchsafed especially to the early believers. Cf. 1 Cor. xii. 6—11; Mark xvi. 17; Acts viii. 17, 19.

—ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως——“through the preaching of faith,” “ex prædicatione fidei.”<sup>2</sup> ἀκοή is used not only for the *hearing*, but *the thing heard*. So in John xii. 38; and Rom. x. 16, from Isa. liii. 1; so again Matt. iv. 24,<sup>3</sup> xiv. 1, xxiv. 6; Mark i. 28, xiii. 7; and in the LXX., 1 Reg. ii. 24; 2 Par. ix. 6, &ca. So also in classical usage, as Herodot. ii. 148, ἀκοῇ παραλαβόντες λέγομεν. Plato, Tim. 23, D., ἀκοὴν παρεδέξαμεθα.<sup>4</sup> (compare Legg. iv. 713, C.,

<sup>1</sup> Lidd. and Scott, *μανθ.* II.

<sup>2</sup> Schmid. Pisc. Eras.

<sup>3</sup> See Wetstein and Schmid. on this passage.

<sup>4</sup> See also Tim. 23, A.; Legg. viii. 839, E.

φημην . . . . παραδεδέγμεθα.) and so Suidas says, ἀκοή. . . . ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἡ φήμη. The gift of the Spirit is the concomitant of justifying faith (such faith being, of course, itself a gift of the Spirit); so our Lord says, “He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water; but this He spake of the Spirit, which they that believe on Him should receive,” John vii. 38, 39. So the Apostle in this chapter of the Galatians, ver. 14, “that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith,” and Eph. i. 13, “after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise.” The preaching of faith is the preaching of God’s promises in Christ Jesus, and the holding up of Him as the object of faith, and this preaching is the appointed instrumental cause of that faith; so Rom. x. 17, where ἀκοῆς has clearly the same sense as in the preceding verse, viz. preaching,—πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς, ἡ δὲ ἀκοή διὰ ῥήματος Θεοῦ, “faith cometh through preaching, and preaching through the word of God,” i. e. the word of God as testifying of Christ furnishes matter to the preacher,<sup>1</sup> so that preaching having this Scriptural basis becomes the instrument in the production of justifying faith; and where justifying faith is wrought, it is accompanied and followed by the gift of the Spirit, that Spirit exhibiting himself either ordinarily, as a Spirit of adoption, obedience, as giving a consciousness of Gospel liberty, joy, peace, assurance, &c; or extraordinarily, in gifts of healings, prophecy, tongues, and the like

<sup>1</sup> Vid. Poli Syn. in loc. “La foi s’engendre par la prédication, et la prédication se fait suivant la parole de Dieu.” Colomesius apud Wolf, in loc.

(cf. Mark xvi. 17); and thus the Spirit is received through the preaching of faith. But preaching is an instrument which God may bless more or less extensively; and, as among the early Christians the gifts of the Spirit were extraordinary, so did very extensive and extraordinary outpourings take place, and these especially followed the preaching of the Apostles. Cf. Acts iv. 31, x. 44. It is probable that St. Paul could appeal to experiences of events such as these as having accompanied his own preaching amongst the Galatians.

3. — οὕτως ἀνοήτοι ἐστε — “Are ye *so* foolish?” Is your folly come to such a pitch as this? Cf. ver. 1. Jerome translates, “Sic stulti estis *ut* cum Spiritu cœperitis?” but if the passage were to be taken in this way, the Apostle would have written ἐπιτελεῖσθαι.

— ἐναρξάμενοι Πνεύματι — I should translate here, *by* the Spirit. The meaning of the Apostle is, “Having begun a profession, of which the great characteristic is that ye are led by the Spirit, and that through the love given by Him ye obey; nay more, having yourselves received in the communication of that Spirit, tokens of the commencement of that spiritual life which exists by Him.”

— νῦν — “quum magis magisque deberetis spirituales fieri, relictâ carne.”<sup>1</sup>

— σαρκὶ ἐπιτελεῖσθε — “Do ye think that ye are to be perfected by the flesh?” or, “Do ye seek to be perfected by the flesh?” Compare δικαιοῦσθε, ch. v. ver. 4, and the note, also the note on συνέκλεισεν, iii. 22. His meaning is, “Do ye, having entered upon a profession of which the life progresses through the

<sup>1</sup> Bengel.

aid of the Spirit of God, and in which ye attain by Him to the spiritual obedience which is the accomplishment of the law—do ye, I say, expect or seek to attain justification, and the communication you desire, through the unaided powers of the old and unrenewed nature, and by an obedience which, instead of flowing from love for justification given, is the result of fear; and has justification for its object and not for its cause.” Cf. *σάρξ*, Rom. vii. 5, 18, 25.

4. —*τοσαῦτα ἐπάθετε*—I should interpret this not of afflictions, but of the spiritual experiences of which the Galatians had been the subjects. But *πάσχω* is not used here absolutely in either a good or bad sense, but simply in its radical signification of to suffer, i. e. to experience anything either good or bad. So Schomerus, quoted by Raphel, “verbum *ἐπάθετε* eo sensu accipiendum est, quo occurrit apud Plutarchum et alios scriptores Græcos, ut explicetur de quovis affectu aut re, quæ alicui accidit, et sic sententia est hæc: Tantane signa gratiæ divinæ sensistis frustra?” For this use of the word we may cite as instances Aristoph. Nub. 461, Plut. 551, Pax, 701; Hes. Op. 218, *ἔγνων παθών*, “he has learnt by hard experience.”<sup>1</sup> There is, too, a passage in Josephus, Ant. iii. 15, 1, which is very much to the point, *τὸν Θεὸν ὑπομῆσαι μὲν ὅσα παθόντες ἐξ αὐτοῦ, καὶ πηλίκων εὐεργεσιῶν μεταλαμβάνοντες*. This general signification of the word is limited by the addition of *εἶ* or *κακῶς*, and *πάσχειν* alone is occasionally used absolutely for *κακῶς πάσχειν*, and in this sense repeatedly by St. Paul; while it is never used absolutely for *εἶ πάσχειν*. But although this is much

<sup>1</sup> See Liddell and Scott, v. *πάσχω*.

insisted upon in connexion with this passage by Bloomfield, who would by all means adhere to the old interpretation and understand ἐπάθ., of afflictions endured by the Galatians, yet I doubt whether it has any bearing upon the matter, for ἐπάθ. derives its signification from the meaning which the context clearly attaches to τσαῦτα. The influences of the Spirit experienced by the Galatians were doubtless blessings, and so indirectly ἐπάθ. is to be understood in a good sense; but τσαῦτα refers *primarily* to those influences and experiences. I translate, then, “Have ye experienced so great things?”

—εἰκῆ—“in vain.” Hesych. εἰκῆ. μάτην.

—εἶγε καὶ εἰκῆ—“since it is even in vain,” q. d. “I use the word ‘in vain’ advisedly;” εἶγε is used here in the sense of the Latin “siquidem,” as in 2 Cor. v. 3; Eph. iii. 2, and iv. 21.<sup>1</sup> The καί is intensive.

5. —ὁ οὖν ἐπιχορηγῶν, κ. τ. λ.—οὖν is not resumptive, but expresses a conclusion which is conveyed in the form of a question, and which opens up the main argument of the Epistle. In ver. 2 the Apostle appeals to the personal experiences of the Galatians, and the conclusion involved in this appeal is that they had received the Spirit through faith. Ver. 3 and 4 are in a measure parenthetical, but arise out of, and bear upon, the question of ver. 2. In this verse he takes them a step farther, and shows them that God’s plan was to give the Spirit, not through the works of the law, but through the preaching of faith; and this conclusion is conveyed, as the former, in the form of a question,—“He then who minister-

<sup>1</sup> See Liddell and Scott, εἶγε, ii.

eth," &ca, q. d. "What then is God's plan?" and then in ver. 6—9 he shows the connexion between the plan as revealed in them and in Abraham, the father of the faithful. Both participles have here a substantival power.<sup>1</sup>

—ἐπιχορ.—ἐπιχ. and χορηγεῖν are used promiscuously. The ἐπι has, however, here a certain intensive force. Bengel says, "qui prædicat χορηγεῖ, Deus ἐπιχορηγεῖ proprie." Cf. Raphel and Wetstein in 2 Cor. ix. 10. The word occurs in the LXX., Sir. xxv. 22.

—ἐνεργῶν . . . ἐν ὑμῖν—"worketh in you," not among you; cf. 1 Cor. xii. 6.

—δυνάμεις—Ib. ver. 10.

—ἐξ ἔργ. . . . ἐξ ἀκοῆς—Sub. ἐπιχορηγεῖ.<sup>2</sup>

6. —καθὼς, κ.τ.λ.—This establishes the similarity, or rather the identity, of the plan as revealed in Abraham and in themselves. To Abraham was the Gospel preached (ver. 8). The special promise which precedes this quotation from Gen. xv. 6, and which, therefore, contained the object of his faith, was that his seed should be numerous as the stars of heaven. But this is a part of that whole promise of which the other part was that in his seed all the families of the earth should be blessed, for in Gen. xviii. 18 we read, "Abraham shall surely become a great and mighty nation, and all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him;" and again, Gen. xxii. 17, 18, "In blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven . . . . And in thy seed shall all families of the earth be blessed." Now it is evident from ver.

<sup>1</sup> See Jelf, Gr. Gr. 436, a.

<sup>2</sup> Pisc. Beza. De Dieu.

16 and 17 of this chapter of our Epistle, that this promise did not refer to both the material and spiritual seeds of Abraham, but to the spiritual one only,<sup>1</sup> so that the whole promise referred to the body of believers joined together in Christ their Head, and that blessing of a free justification, with its attendant privileges, which should come upon them, the spiritual seed, through Christ; and moreover it is plain that Abraham must have been, in some manner, conscious that this was the object of his faith, for our Lord Himself says, “Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day; and he saw it, and was glad;”<sup>2</sup> that is, the day when, the fulness of time being come, God sent forth His Son, and brought into full operation His purposes of mercy towards mankind. Not only then was the Gospel preached to Abraham, but he believed the Gospel, or God’s promises in Christ. But not only did Abraham thus believe God, but

—ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην—“it was imputed to him for righteousness,” or justification, which, as is plain from Rom. iv. 1, seqq., is the principal notion in this δικαιοσύνη. For since through one man sin entered into the world<sup>3</sup> of created beings then in the loins of that one man; and since universal death became the consequence of this the universality of sin;<sup>4</sup> and since by one man’s offence judgment came upon all men to condemnation;<sup>5</sup> then manifestly Abraham, inheriting condemnation and death, needed justification and life. And, moreover, as there have been but two covenants, one of works, the other of grace, made with and

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Rom. ix. 7, 8.

<sup>2</sup> John viii. 56.

<sup>3</sup> Rom. v. 12.

<sup>4</sup> Ib.

<sup>5</sup> Ib. 18.



effectual in Christ, and as in this latter alone justification and life are to be obtained, it is plain that in Christ alone could Abraham obtain that which he needed. And as, in the covenant of grace, justification and life accrue to the sinner through the imputed righteousness of Christ, *as* condemnation and death did accrue to him through the imputed disobedience of Adam, it is evident that if Abraham were justified at all, he must have been justified through the imputed righteousness of Christ. But as regards more particularly the words themselves of this verse, the quotation is from the LXX. In the Heb. they stand, "Abraham believed God, and he (i. e. God) counted it (i. e. his faith) to him (for) righteousness." It was because of the nature of his faith that it was counted to him for righteousness. He "against hope believed in hope, that he might become the father of many nations, according to that which was spoken, So shall thy seed be." "He staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief, but was strong in faith, giving glory to God: and being fully persuaded that what He had promised He was able also to perform. And, *therefore*, it was imputed to him for righteousness."<sup>1</sup> But when we say that it was because of the nature of Abraham's faith that it was counted to him for righteousness, we do not mean that on account of a certain inherent excellence in that faith God reckoned it as a justifying righteousness. But this faith was justifying in its nature, because it derived that nature from its object, which was a Saviour giving justification through His imputed righteous-

<sup>1</sup> Rom. iv. 18, 20—22.

ness. For the seed which was promised to Abraham was, as we have seen, the spiritual one which is called into existence through faith in a Saviour so justifying sinners; and, therefore, his faith was counted to him for righteousness and justification, because it apprehended the justifying righteousness of Christ. With respect to the expression ἐλογίσθη . . . εἰς, cf. 1 Reg. i. 13, in the LXX., ἐλογίσατο αὐτήν Ἥλι εἰς μεθύουσαν· and Acts xix. 27, εἰς οὐδὲν λογισθῆναι.<sup>1</sup>

7. —Γινώσκετε——“Imperativus; Coll. 2 Tim. iii. 1.”<sup>2</sup> In the preceding verse he shows that in the case of Abraham, from whom the Jews were so proud to trace their descent, God’s plan had been the same as in that of the believer then, viz. to justify him by faith; and here he states with apostolic authority the conclusion to which these premises led, and which is the foundation of the argument which follows, “know, therefore,” &c.

—οἱ ἐκ πίστεως——This is a periphrasis for οἱ πιστεύοντες· so Rom. ii. 8, οἱ ἐξ ἐριθείας for ἐρίζοντες.

—οὔτοι——These and these alone; so Bengel, “Hi demum, exclusis ceteris Abrahamo natis.”

—οἱ Ἰσραήλ.—“If,” says the Apostle in ver. 29, “ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed;” and here, “Believers are the true seed of Abraham.” The immediate connexion is not, therefore, between faith and sonship, but between faith and Christ,—Christ and sonship. Believers in Christ become united to Christ.<sup>3</sup> Christ is the seed of Abraham.<sup>4</sup> Therefore, those who are united to Christ become in

<sup>1</sup> See Bengel on Rom. iv. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Bengel.

<sup>3</sup> Ver. 27, 28. Cf. 1 Cor. xii. 12, 27; Rom. xii. 5; Eph. i. 23.

<sup>4</sup> Gal. iii. 16.

Him the children of Abraham. This sonship is then no mere barren resemblance, but a living reality.

8. —*προϊδοῦσα δὲ ἡ γραφή*—This is probably a Jewish form of expression.<sup>1</sup> The *δέ* is copulative, the Apostle proceeding onwards in the development of his subject.

—*προϊδοῦσα*—Cf. Acts ii. 30, 31, *προφήτης οὖν ὑπάρχων . . . προιδὼν*<sup>2</sup> ἐλάλησε περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ; and the LXX., Sap. xix. 1, *προήδει γὰρ αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα*. There is implied here not a bare foreknowledge; for the promise of God to Abraham, as well as the record of that promise in Holy Scripture, was the consequence of a pre-determination on the part of God<sup>3</sup> that He would justify the heathen through faith, and this promise was recorded for those who should live when it should come into effect, or those upon whom *τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων* should come.<sup>4</sup> Cf. Rom. iv. 23, 24.

—*γραφή*—the inspired record of God's designs.

—*ἐκ*—see the note on *ἐκ*, ch. ii. ver. 16.

—*δικαιοῖ*—“*Præsens, respectu Pauli scribentis.*”<sup>5</sup>

—*προρευηγγελίσατο*—See the note on ch. iii. 22. The force of *πρό* is, *before* the giving of the law.<sup>6</sup> Cf. ver. 17, *προκεκυρωμένην*—Chrysostom says, *Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ αὐτοὺς ἐθροῦβει τὸ τὸν νόμον ἀρχαιότερον εἶναι, τὴν δὲ πίστιν μετὰ τὸν νόμον, καὶ ταύτην αὐτῶν ἀναιρεῖ τὴν ὑποψίαν, δεικνὺς ὅτι τοῦ νόμου πρεσβυτέρα ἡ πίστις, καὶ τοῦτο δῆλον ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀβραάμ· πρὶν ἢ γὰρ φανῆναι τὸν νόμον, ἐκεῖνος ἐδικαιώθη—Αὐτὸς ὁ τὸν νόμον*

<sup>1</sup> See Gill, Surenhus., Schættgen, *in loc.*

<sup>2</sup> “*Vision prophetica,*” Beng. in h. l.

<sup>4</sup> 1 Cor. x. 11.

<sup>5</sup> Bengel.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Act. ii. 23.

<sup>6</sup> Sic Lyranus.

διδούς, φησὶ, καὶ πρὶν ἢ τὸν νόμον τοῦτον δοῦναι, τοῦτο ἦν ὀρίσας, ἐκ πίστεως δικαιωθῆναι τὰ ἔθνη.

—ὅτι ἐνευλογηθήσονται, κ. τ. λ.—The Apostle does not give the exact words of any one of the passages in Genesis containing this promise. In the LXX. version the words stand: In Gen.

xii. 3, ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς.

xviii. 18, ————— ἐν αὐτῷ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη —————

xxii. 18, ————— ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου —————

It would seem then that the Apostle gives a combination of the first and second of these passages, omitting the final words, τῆς γῆς. This he might do either through quoting from memory, or because he desired to convey in words suited to his present purpose that general promise which was reiterated in slightly varying forms,<sup>1</sup> and which was first made to Abraham in Ur.

—ἐν σοί—In Gen. xxii. 18 ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου is substituted for ἐν σοί, and in Gen. xxviii. 14 we have ἐν σοὶ καὶ ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου. The nations are blessed in Abraham, as having in his loins the promised Messiah, and more especially in Christ Himself, the seed into whom they are ingrafted by faith.<sup>2</sup> So Bengel, “in te ut in patre Messiae: ergo multo magis in Messia.”

—πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. — Perkins observes here, “hence I gather that the nation of the Jews shall be called and converted to the participation of this blessing: when and how, God knows; but that it shall be done before the end of the world, we know. For if all nations shall be called, then the Jews.”<sup>3</sup> With

<sup>1</sup> Vide Βίβλος καταλ. in loc.

<sup>2</sup> See Perkins in loc. Op. vol. ii. p. 231.

<sup>3</sup> Ib.

respect to the use of a plural verb, ἐνευλογ., with the neuter plural τὰ ἔθνη, it is to be observed that “when the neuter plural signifies or stands for names of persons or animate things, and the notion of individuality is intended to be expressed, the verb is in the plural.” So Thuc. vii. 57, τοσάδε μὲν μετὰ Ἀθηναίων ἔθνη ἐστράτευον.<sup>1</sup>

9. The Apostle affirms in ver. 7, that believers are the children of Abraham. In ver. 8, he proceeds to demonstrate this, and shows in substance that which he states elsewhere, Rom. iv. 11, 12, viz. that *before* the giving of circumcision as the sign and token of the material seed, and *before* the promulgation of the law as the system of justification which belonged to the material seed, a blessing was given and promised to Abraham yet being uncircumcised, and to his seed uncircumcised also; that blessing being a free justification by faith. For this blessing was given to Abraham, and promised to his seed *in* him. He was blessed in the Messiah who should spring from him, and believers share with him the same blessing in sharing the same faith which was instrumental in giving him the blessing. And this fact, as far as the faith is concerned, is stated in this 9th verse. The ὥστε leads to the statement of a fact which is a result of that recorded in ver. 8, and this fact is not a *final* conclusion, but bears upon the development of the affirmation in ver. 7, the demonstration of which affirmation is contained in ver. 29.

The steps may be gathered throughout the Apostle's arguments in this chapter.

<sup>1</sup> Jelf, Gr. Gr. 385, a.

## I. Believers are the children of Abraham (ver. 7).

(a) Abraham was personally the subject of the blessing contained in Christ, because *in* him the nations are blessed, and this blessing accrues to him through faith (ver. 8).

(b) Believers share Abraham's blessing in sharing his faith (ver. 9).

(c) This faith is faith in Christ (ver. 22), cf. Rom. iv. 24, 25.

(d) Faith in Christ gives union with Him (ver. 26, 27).

(e) Christ is Abraham's seed (ver. 16).

(F) Believers (in Christ) are the seed of Abraham (in Christ) (ver. 29).

10. The Apostle now shows the nature of the blessing, in the certainty and nature of the curse, a redemption from which was the principal feature in that blessing. Cf. ver. 13, 14. And this certainty is not merely to be inferred from the terms of the Scripture statement, but is proved by a comparison of that statement with the quotation, in ver. 11, from Hab. ii. 4, while ver. 12 is explanatory. That is to say, the fact that those who seek salvation by the works of the law are under a curse, is proved, not by ver. 10, but by ver. 10 and 11, and the nature of this proof is further explained in ver. 12.

By ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, he means those who observe the works of the law with the hope of attaining justification before God.

—ὕπὸ κατάραν εἰσίν—i. e. the curse and condemnation of God with all its consequences.<sup>1</sup>

—ἐπικατάρατος, κ. τ. λ.—The Apostle is quoting

<sup>1</sup> See the note in chap. i. ver. 8, ἀνάθεμα.

from the LXX., and probably from memory. There the words stand, ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ὃς οὐκ ἐμμένει ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς λόγοις τοῦ νόμου τούτου ποιῆσαι αὐτούς. The words πᾶς and πᾶσι are both wanting in the Hebrew. On this Jerome says, “incertum habemus utrum Septuaginta interpretes addiderint ‘omnis homo’ et ‘in omnibus;’ an in veteri Hebraico ita fuerit, et postea a Judæis deletum sit. In hanc me autem suspicionem illa res stimulat: quod verbum ‘omnis’ et ‘in omnibus,’ quasi sensui suo necessarium, ad probandum illud, quod quicumque ex operibus legis sunt, sub maledicto sint, Apostolus vir Hebrææ peritiæ et in lege doctissimus, nunquam protulisset nisi in Hebræis voluminibus haberetur. Quam ob causam Samaritanorum Hebræa volumina relegens, inveni *Chol*, quod interpretatur *omnis* sive *omnibus*, scriptum esse: et cum Septuaginta interpretibus concordare. Frustra igitur illud tulerunt Judæi; ne viderentur esse sub maledicto, si non possent omnia complere quæ scripta sunt: quum antiquiores alterius quoque gentis litteræ id positum fuisse testentur.” However the discrepancy between the Heb. and LXX. be explained, no difference would, in point of fact, be created in the sense of the passage by the introduction or the exclusion of the words. For as Surenhusius<sup>1</sup> observes, the declaration in the 15th verse is, “Cursed be *the man* that maketh any graven or molten image,” to which “*all*” the people are to answer Amen. And as regards πᾶσι, it is clear that the general curse for disobedience, as well as the general blessing for obedience, referred to the whole law. Cf. Deut. xxviii. 1 and 15.

<sup>1</sup> Βιβ. καταλ. p. 569.

And so this 26th verse is understood by the best interpreters among the Jews themselves.<sup>1</sup>

—ἐμμένει—The sense of this word here is “to stand by,” “to cleave to.” So Thuc. iv. 118, ἐμμενεῖν ἐν ταῖς σπονδαῖς · and v. 18, Ἐμμενῶ ταῖς ξυθηκαῖς καὶ ταῖς σπονδαῖς ταῖσδε. So also the LXX., Sir. xxviii. 6. Cf. also Heb. viii. 9, and Acts xiv. 22. Thus it conveys clearly enough the sense of the Hebrew word, of which the force is, in this form, “to make to stand:” and it may be observed that in 1 Kings ii. 4, the same Hebrew word is rendered by the LXX. by στήσῃ, and by our translators, “may continue.”

—τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου—This was probably a form of quotation<sup>2</sup> familiar to St. Paul, and which through quoting from memory he substituted for the exact words of the LXX., or indeed the substitution may have been intentional and paraphrastic.<sup>3</sup>

11. ὅτι δέ—The δέ is used here as a copula. For this verse forms a part of the proof that those who are ἐξ ἔργ. νόμ. are under a curse. The simple statement that the obedience of the law is complete and perpetual does indeed involve within itself the minor proposition that no man has attained such an obedience, and therefore the conclusion that every man is under the curse. But the Apostle proves this now by a quotation from Habakkuk ii. 4. For the curse is the condemnation of God, of which the consequence

<sup>1</sup> See Gill, who quotes Jarchi and Bechai. See also De Lyra on Deut. xxvii. 26.

<sup>2</sup> Vide Surenhusii, Thes. xviii. De formulis allegandi Sac. Scrip. Βιβ. καταλ. p. 12.

<sup>3</sup> Bengel.



is eternal death, and its opposite is His justification, of which the consequence is eternal life. There is no medium between the two; if a man is condemned, he is so because he fails to obey continually in every point; if he is justified, he is so because he is the partaker of a complete and continual obedience. An escape from condemnation is therefore the equivalent of the attainment of justification. Accepting then the premises of a legal justification, it would be attained by continual action carried out in every particular; and, assuming that each individual act were complete within itself, although that act merited a justification, a series of such complete acts persevered in until death would be necessary to a final justification: so that the justification which was the consequence of one act would be nullified by a subsequent failure in obedience (cf. Ezek. iii. 20, xviii. 24). Now inasmuch as man is incapable of even such isolated perfect acts, there exist no such isolated declarations of justification. But still, assuming the possibility of one, we assume also the possibility of the other: and, as the necessary concomitant of a justification before God is the attainment of eternal life, there would belong a life to each act of perfect obedience. In continued acts then the legalist (he εἰς ἔργ. νόμ.) would attain a continued life, and it would be the characteristic of his position that he would live in or by works. But, the Apostle argues, it is manifest that in this system (ἐν νόμῳ) all must be still under the curse of God, and therefore that no one can be justified before God, for (as the prophet Habakkuk says) the just shall live, not in or by his works, but in or by his faith. The argument of the

Apostle does not necessarily involve within itself any considerations of the nature of this justification, or this life of faith. It is enough to say, this is the Scriptural characteristic of him who is justified; he lives by his faith, and therefore as a life by works cannot also be the characteristic of one justified, and as the law requires a life by works, no one can be justified in the law. But the argument may derive additional force when we define that justice and that life which are spoken of by the Prophet, and thus contrast them with that legal justice and that legal life of which we have already seen the nature. The Hebrew form of the passage is, "The just shall live by his faith." The context is, "The vision is yet for an appointed time, but at the end it shall speak and not lie: though it tarry, wait for it; because it will surely come, it will not tarry. Behold, his soul, which is lifted up, is not upright in him, but the just shall live by his faith." The "appointed time" of which he speaks is the time of the coming of Christ<sup>1</sup> (cf. Gal. iv. 2, *προδεδεσµίας*). The first portion of ver. 4 Gesenius translates, "See! he whose soul is unbelieving shall on account of this be unhappy," and we may observe generally that this word, which is translated "lifted up," expresses a proud and lofty unbelief. Now, the prophet is holding forth the promise of the Messiah as the object of faith to the Jews in the midst of the dangers which threatened them from the Chaldeans, so that this unbelief clearly represents in its highest and spiritual sense a failure in the constant faith which supports the justified believer; and so "the just" mani-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Dan. ix. 24.

festly indicates him who, being justified by faith in Christ, attains in that act an everlasting life,<sup>1</sup> and in whom God maintains that life by the instrumentality of the same faith. Some would read, “the just by his faith shall live.” I agree with Bp. Middleton in thinking that if St. Paul had understood the passage in this sense he would have said, ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ὁ ἐκ πίστεως, or ὁ ἐκ πίστεως δίκαιος, and he would have done this whatever might have been the form in the LXX.; and, moreover, in the other two passages, Rom. i. 17, and Heb. x. 38, where this quotation is made, it is quite evident that it illustrates, as here, not the first act of justifying faith, but those continued recurrences to the cross which, in maintaining union with Christ, maintain the believer’s spiritual life<sup>2</sup> while on earth. But although it appears clear to me that this last is not the true sense of the passage, it may be observed that there is, in fact, no doctrinal difference involved in the acceptance of one sense before the other. For if the justified believer lives by faith, the fact of his justification is the pledge of an already existing and eternal life, and that life is, as we have said, maintained in its progress through the world by God through faith, which being His gift is His instrument for the preservation of that life; so that to say “the just shall live by faith” is virtually the same thing as to say, “the just by faith shall live.” This justification, then, being based upon a perfect and continued obedience, is final and complete, and this life, already existent and eternal.

12. —ὁ δὲ νόμος——“*But the law.*” The Apostle

<sup>1</sup> John iii. 36.

<sup>2</sup> Gal. ii. 20.

explains in this verse, by a quotation from Levit. xviii. 5, the bearing of ver. 11 upon ver. 10.

—οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ πίστεως——“does not require faith.” So Theodoret, ὁ νόμος οὐ πίστιν ζητεῖ, ἀλλὰ πρᾶξιν ἀπαιτεῖ.

—ἀλλ’——Sub λέγει.

—ὁ ποιήσας αὐτά——The whole verse in the LXX. is καὶ φυλάξεσθε πάντα τὰ προστάγματα μου καὶ πάντα τὰ κρίματα μου, καὶ ποιήσετε αὐτά· ὃ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς. The force lies in ποιήσας, i. e. the law does not say believe, but *do*.

—ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς.——Cf. ch. ii. ver. 20, ἐν πίστει ζῶ and the note: αὐτοῖς refers of course not to bare works, but to works which carry out the terms of the commandment: that is, they must extend to each and every particular of the law. In and by such a performance the legalist “shall live,” but then that life is only coëxistent with a continued fulfilment of those conditions. But see the note on ver. 11, and especially Ezek. xviii. 24, which is there quoted.

13. —Χριστός——He now proceeds to open up the nature of Abraham’s blessing; and brings forward at once Christ, the promised Messiah, Him who had been preached to the Galatians, as the deliverer from the legal curse, and as being, therefore, in His person and work at once the foundation of Abraham’s blessing and of man’s present enjoyment of that blessing.

—ἡμᾶς——ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, ver. 10. See the note on ver. 5 of ch. iv.

—ἐξηγόρασεν——ἐξαγοράζειν means properly “to buy from any one,” so Polyb. iii. 42, 2, ἐξηγόρασε παρ’ αὐτῶν τὰ τε μονόξυλα πλοῖα πάντα. Thence

arises the notion of *power*, as well as possession on the part of the person from whom the purchase is made, and it attains the meaning of ‘to redeem,’ ‘to release,’<sup>1</sup> (i. e. from the *power* of any one,) by the payment of a price. He who is under the curse of the law is described by the Apostle, Rom. vii. 14, as *πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν*, i. e. delivered over as a slave who is sold to the *power* of sin,<sup>2</sup> and so Christ by the payment of a price bought<sup>3</sup> us out of the power of sin, and that price was His life.<sup>4</sup>

—ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου—The curse of the law is the result of an actual slavery to sin or disobedience. It is through the death of Christ that His obedience is imputed and available to us, which being put in the place of our disobedience exempts us from the curse of the law.

—ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν—“in our stead.”<sup>5</sup>

—κατάρα—The abstract is here with great force put for the concrete: so in ch. ii. 9, Eph. ii. 11, Phil. iii. 3, and elsewhere, we have *περιτομή* for *περιτετμημένοι*, and in Eph. v. 8, *σκοτός* and *φῶς* for *ἐν σκοτίαι* and *πεφωτισμένοι*. This metonymy is common in Greek,<sup>6</sup> especially in poetry, but it is found also frequently in prose. In the passage from Deut. xxi. 23, which the Apostle quotes at the end of this verse, there is the same metonymy in the Hebrew: and it is possible that he had this in his mind; while also he creates a striking antithesis between *κατάρα* and *εὐλογία* in ver. 14. In the quotation he

<sup>1</sup> Liddell and Scott, *ἐξαγοράζω*.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Schleusn., *πιπρίσκω*.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23.

<sup>4</sup> 1 Pet. i. 18, 19.

<sup>5</sup> Liddell and Scott, *ὑπὲρ* A. II. 5, and Jelf, Gr. Gr. 630, 2, b.

<sup>6</sup> Vide Jelf, Gr. Gr. 353.

uses ἐπικατάρατος to render his meaning clear, and in evident reference to ἐπικατ. of ver. 10. The clause γενόμε. ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρρα expresses less the *manner* in which this work of redemption was effected than the *extent* to which it was carried. It is more immediately connected with the first clause of ver. 14, the quotation from Deut. being parenthetical; while the last portion of ver. 14 belongs more especially to the first clause of ver. 13, the whole of ver. 14 expressing generally the end and object of the complete work of redemption. For the work of Christ, although single in its ultimate object, is multifarious in its details; the necessity for this arising in the multifarious features of man's position: and thus Christ's death being generally a vicarious death<sup>1</sup> laid also generally the foundation of remission of sins, and the justification and life which belong to His risen nature; while in the *manner* of His death he completed the efficacy of that vicarious death, becoming accursed that man might be blessed. He became obedient unto death, *and that death, the death of the cross.*<sup>2</sup> And so with respect to Christ in His person and work, we may observe that He assumed generally the characteristics of man's position which were the opposites of those of His own, in order that through Him man might partake of the characteristics which belonged to Himself. Thus being *God*, he became *man*, that *man* might be a partaker of the *divine* nature.<sup>3</sup> Being the *Son* of God, He was born of a *woman*,<sup>4</sup> that man being born of God *might* receive *adoption* and *sonship*.<sup>5</sup> He was born *under* the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Heb. ii. 9.<sup>2</sup> Phil. ii. 8.<sup>3</sup> 2 Pet. i. 4.<sup>4</sup> Gal. iv. 4.<sup>5</sup> Gal. iv. 5.

law, that man might be *free* from the law.<sup>1</sup> He was “made *sin* for *us*, who knew *no sin*, that *we* might be made the *righteousness* of God in Him.”<sup>2</sup> He became cursed, that man might be blessed. So Jerome writes, “*Injuria Domini, nostra gloria est. Ille mortuus est, ut nos viveremus. Ille descendit ad inferos, ut nos ascenderemus ad cœlum. Ille factus est stultitia, ut nos sapientia fieremus. Ille se de plenitudine et de forma Dei evacuavit, formam servi accipiens, ut in nobis habitaret plenitudo divinitatis, et domini fieremus e servis. Ille pependit in ligno, ut peccatum quod commiseramus in ligno scientiæ boni et mali, ligno deleret appensus. Crux ejus amaras aquas vertit in dulcem saporem; et securim<sup>3</sup> perditam, in profundumque demersam, missa in fluenta Jordanis levavit. Ad postremum factus est ille maledictio, factus, inquam, non natus: ut benedictiones quæ promissæ fuerant Abrahæ . . transferentur ad gentes.”*

—ὅτι γέγραπται, κ. τ. λ.—“because it is written,” &c. This quotation is, as we observed, parenthetical, explaining a difficulty which might arise in the minds of those to whom he wrote as to how Christ had become a curse; that explanation involving within itself the minor proposition of which they needed not to be reminded, that Christ had been κρεμάμενος ἐπὶ<sup>4</sup> ξύλου. The passage to which he refers is Deut. xxi. 23: ver. 22 and 23 are thus rendered in our authorized translation: “And if a man have committed a sin worthy of death, and he be to be put to death, and thou hang him on a tree,

<sup>1</sup> Gal. iv. 5.<sup>2</sup> 2 Cor. v. 21.<sup>3</sup> 2 Kings vi. 5, 6.<sup>4</sup> Cf. Act. v. 30, κρεμάσαντες ἐπὶ ξύλου.

his body shall not remain all night upon the tree, but thou shalt in any wise bury him that day; for he that is hanged is accursed of God (or the curse of God); that thy land be not defiled, which the Lord thy God giveth thee for an inheritance." But the expression, "he be to be put to death," wrongly translates the Hebrew, and gives a false notion of the nature of this Jewish suspension. And so also the Vulgate, "adjudicatus est morti," which, with the English, conveys the idea that the suspension was the carrying out of the sentence of death, and that, being hung alive, the criminal died upon the tree.

But the true rendering of the Hebrew is not "he be to be put to death," but "he be put to death." For suspension was not one of the capital punishments prescribed by the law of Moses, nor did the Jews by any tradition or custom punish their malefactors with that death; but of such as were punished with death on account of any grave crime, as idolatry or blasphemy, the bodies were exposed on a tree or gibbet, and such were accursed.<sup>1</sup> The Roman suspension differed from that of the Jews, in that the criminal was hanged alive upon the cross. "Now though Christ was not to die by the sentence of the Jews, who had lost the supreme power in causes capital, and so not to be condemned to any death according to the law of Moses; yet the providence of God did so dispose it, that He might suffer that death which did contain in it that ignominious particularity to which the legal curse belonged,

<sup>1</sup> Pearson on the Creed, Art. iv. pp. 247, 248, vol. i. See also the notes, p. 176, vol. ii., and Grotius in Deut. xxi. 23.



which is the hanging on a tree.”<sup>1</sup> He “bare our sins in His own body on the tree.”<sup>2</sup> With regard to the form of the passage from Deut. which we have here, the Apostle is evidently quoting generally from the LXX., though he substitutes ἐπικατάρατος for κεκατηραμένος, referring clearly to the ἐπικατάρατος of ver. 10 and Deut. xxvii. 26, and the bearing of the one upon the other; and he omits ὑπὸ Θεοῦ. The LXX. version itself differs also slightly from the Hebrew. The indefinite is changed to its equivalent, the general proposition, and ἐπὶ ξύλου is added from ver. 22.

14. —ἵνα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη——τὰ ἔθνη, ver. 8—“the nations,” i. e. those alluded to in the promise.

—ἡ εὐλογία τοῦ Ἀβραάμ——i. e. the blessing of redemption, justification, and life, which was given to Abraham in Christ through faith, and promised to the nations *in* him, as having in his loins the coming Messiah; and in Christ Himself, who should spring therefrom. See the notes on ver. 8 and 9.

—γένηται—εἰς.——“should come to.”

—ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ——“in Christ Jesus,” i. e. in the person of Christ. For Christ is blessed of God by virtue of that entire work of redemption crowned on the tree; and, having assumed “the seed of Abraham,”<sup>3</sup> He as the seed of Abraham possesses the blessing which was at once promised *to* Him as man, and *in* and *by* Him as the Messiah, God and man. And as that His work of redemption forms the object of the faith which gives union with Him as the head of the spiritual race, so *in* Him do the faithful possess Abraham’s blessing. “*In* Christ Jesus those

<sup>1</sup> Pearson, vol. i., ubi sup.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Pet. ii. 24.

<sup>3</sup> Heb. ii. 16.

who sometimes were far off are made nigh *by the blood of Christ.*"<sup>1</sup>

—*ἵνα τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ Πνεύματος*—*ἐπαγγ.* is put here as in Luke xxiv. 49; Acts i. 4, ii. 33; Heb. xi. 13, 33, 39, by metonymy for the thing promised. See, as regards the promises, Isaiah xlv. 3; John vii. 38, 39. It was necessary that Christ's work should be completed before the promised Spirit could be given. Cf. John vii. 39, xvi. 7. The Spirit which we receive is "the Spirit of Him who *raised up Jesus from the dead.*"<sup>2</sup> And so Christ completed His work of redemption, that we might receive that Spirit which is "shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our *Saviour,*"<sup>3</sup> and which, testifying to us of Christ in His person and work as a Saviour,<sup>4</sup> at once holds up before us the object of our faith, and gives us faith in that object; through which faith we are united to Christ,<sup>5</sup> and receive continuously the Spirit of God and Christ.<sup>6</sup>

15. —*Ἀδελφοί*—The Apostle, full of earnestness and affection, calls their attention to a new argument. The *ὦ ἀνόητοι Γαλ.* was said more in pity than in anger.

—*κατὰ ἀνθρώπου λέγω*—*κατὰ ἀνθ.* expresses the nature of this argument, namely, that it is based upon a human precedent, and of a character suited to human comprehension. Cf. Sophoc. Ajac. 760,

—*ὅστις ἀνθρώπου φύσιν*

*Βλαστῶν, ἔπειτα μὴ κατ' ἀνθρώπου φρονεῖ.*

and 777,

<sup>1</sup> Eph. ii. 13.

<sup>2</sup> Rom. viii. 11.

<sup>3</sup> Titus iii. 5, 6.

<sup>4</sup> John xvi. 8, 10, 11, 14.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. John vi. 56.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Rom. viii. 9, 10.

Ἐκτίησατ' ὁργήν, οὐ κατ' ἀνθρώπου φρονῶν.<sup>1</sup>

—ὅμως ἀνθρώπου κεκυρωμένην διαθήκην——The difficulty which has attended all attempts to interpret this passage, and which has reduced commentators to the necessity of supplying a whole sentence at the commencement, arises, I think, in referring ἀνθρώπου to διαθήκην. It depends not upon διαθ., but upon κεκυρωμένην, the construction being precisely similar to Herodot. i. 109, τὸν πάντα Ἀστυάγειος ῥηθέντα λόγον.<sup>2</sup> and ii. 91, σανδάλιόν τε αὐτοῦ πεφορημένον. See Jelf, Gr. Gr. 483, Obs. 3. The meaning then of the Apostle is, οὐδεὶς ἀθετεῖ διαθήκην ὅμως ἀνθρώπου κεκυρωμένην, “no one sets aside a covenant or testament, although ratified by man,” from whence he argues, ver. 17, that the law does not set aside διαθήκην προκεκυρωμένην ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Compare with ὅμως κεκ. Plato Phæd. 91, C. φοβεῖται μὴ ἢ ψυχὴ ὅμως καὶ θειότερον ὂν τοῦ σώματος προαπολλύηται. Xen. Cyr. v. 1, 26, οὕτως ἔχομεν, ὡς σὺν μὲν σοι ὅμως καὶ ἐν τῇ πολεμίᾳ ὄντες θαρρόοιμεν.<sup>3</sup>

—κεκυρωμένην——Hesych. κυρῶ. βεβαιῶ. Cf. Heb. vi. 16, εἰς βεβαιώσιν ὁ ὄρκος. Cf. also LXX., Gen. xxiii. 20, and Thucyd. viii. 69. See the note on προκεκ. ver. 17.

—διαθήκην——The principal notion in the word διαθήκη is a *disposition* or *appointment*. It takes its meanings from διατίθεσθαι, which is used of making laws,<sup>4</sup> of making an agreement,<sup>5</sup> and of disposing of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Wetstein in Rom. iii. 5; Liddell and Scott, κατά, B. iv. and 10; Jelf, Gr. Gr. 629, 3; Læsner in h. l.; Rom. iii. 5, vi. 19; 1 Cor. ix. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Bos supposes here an ellipsis of ὑπό, but see Jelf, Gr. Gr. 472, 3, and 483, cited above. The English *of* was formerly used in precisely the same sense.

<sup>3</sup> See Jelf, Gr. Gr. 697, d.

<sup>4</sup> Plat. Leg. viii. 834, A.

<sup>5</sup> Aristoph. Aves, 439.

property by will;<sup>1</sup> and so we find *διαθήκη* itself used of an agreement,<sup>2</sup> of a testament,<sup>3</sup> and, according to Grotius,<sup>4</sup> “pro legibus apud Orphicos et Pythagoristas, nam hi præscriptas suo gregi vivendi normas *διαθήκας* vocabant.” Now an agreement is a mutual *sponsio*. Thus, in the passage quoted above from the Aves of Aristophanes, the chorus is wishing Pisthetærus to give it some information of which Epops had spoken, and says, 432, λέγειν κέλευέ μοι, upon which Epops begs Pisthetærus to speak, who replies, “No, I will not!” ἦν μὴ διάθωνταί γ’οἶδε *διαθήκην* ἐμοὶ ἤνπερ, κ. τ. λ. and then the chorus says, *διατίθεται* γώ, I at least engage or promise, i. e. to perform my part. The word which properly expresses this *mutual* agreement, and to which *διαθήκη* is in this place just quoted equivalent, is *συνθήκη*,<sup>5</sup> but *διαθήκη* has properly a wider sense. So the Latin *sponsio* is properly a promise or engagement,<sup>6</sup> but under certain circumstances attains the notion of *συνθήκη*. So Demosthenes, νόμος ἐστὶ . . . πόλιως *συνθήκη κοινή*,<sup>7</sup> which is translated by Marcian, “lex est . . . communis sponsio civitatis;” and so Papi- nian, “lex est communis reipublicæ sponsio.”<sup>8</sup>

But the true meaning of *διαθήκη* in New Testament usage will be more clearly seen in the sense of the Hebrew תַּרְגָּו, to translate which *διαθήκη* is always used by the LXX. In Isaiah lix. 21; Jer. xxxiii. 20,

<sup>1</sup> Plat. Legg. xi. 922, C., seqq. Isæus 44, 39. 63, 5. &ca.

<sup>2</sup> Aristoph. ubi sup.

<sup>3</sup> Aristoph. Vesp. 584, 589, and frequent in the Orators. See Liddell and Scott, *διαθήκη*; Alberti, Obs. Sac. p. 199; Not. Trilleri in Thom. Magist. p. 214.

<sup>4</sup> Proleg. N. T. q. v.

<sup>5</sup> Suidas.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Digest. Lib. xxi. Tit. i. leg. xix. and Lib. l. Tit. xvi. leg. vii.

<sup>7</sup> Digest. Lib. i. Tit. iii. l. ii.

<sup>8</sup> Ib. l. i.

the word appears to be used in the sense of a promise or engagement. In Gen. xxvi. 28; 1 Sam. xxiii. 18; 1 Kings xv. 19; 2 Chron. xvi. 3, &ca, we have it in the sense of a *mutual* compact or agreement between man and man; so that it would seem to imply both a promise or engagement, and a mutual covenant or agreement, in which sense, as we have seen, it is well represented by the word *διαθήκη*. And because of this its capability of a double sense, it appears to convey most accurately the true nature of God's promises as regards the covenant of grace. For all the promises of God are yea and amen in Christ Jesus,<sup>1</sup> that is to say, these promises are made available to man in consequence of a mutual compact or agreement between Father and Son, God and Christ; and, at the same time, Christ as the "first-born,"<sup>2</sup> "the head,"<sup>3</sup> is the primary recipient of those promises which accrue to man in Him by virtue of His covenant with the Father, and the carrying out on His part of the terms of that covenant. And as these the promises of the covenant of grace involve the blessings promised, *בְּרִית*, or *διαθήκη*, assume the sense either of a *disposition* as regards God and man, or a *covenant* as regards God and Christ and man in Him. And so in Heb. ix. 16, 17, this *disposition* is spoken of as a testament. And the first and second verses of the 4th chap. show that this sense is most in accordance with the present scope of the Apostle: nor is it at all necessary that this divine disposition or covenant should answer in all its particulars to a human testament. The Apostle is simply making use of such features in the simile

<sup>1</sup> 2 Cor. i. 20.

<sup>2</sup> Rom. viii. 29.

<sup>3</sup> Col. i. 18.

as answer his present purpose. See the notes on ch. iv. ver. 1, 2.

—ἀθετεῖ—So Polyb. xv. 1, 9, ἀθετεῖν δὲ τολμῶσι τοὺς ὅρκους καὶ τὰς συνθήκας· and xxx. 3, 7, ἀθετήσασα τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν.

—ἐπιδιατάσσεται— I should translate, with Schleusn., “insuper novas et contrarias conditiones addit.” ἐπί signifies, in composition, increase or addition. διατάσσω is used, in the middle, of making a decree or will.<sup>1</sup>

16. —He now gives the particulars of the divine διαθήκη.

—ἐρρέθησαν—See under the text for the authorities for reading this form. Tischendorf gives B. (a primâ manu) as an authority for reading the same form in Rom. ix. 12, 26 (I know not whether upon his own authority or that of Bartolucci, for Bentley and Birch do not notice it), and appears to reason from this that ἐρρέθ. is also the reading of B. here. ἐρρήθ. is the better form, but Bekker gives ἐρρέθ. in Aristotle.<sup>2</sup> Both forms are used by Plato.<sup>3</sup>

—αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι—In these promises are included not only those especially alluded to in ver. 8, such as are contained in Gen. xxii. 18, xxvi. 4, xxviii. 14, but also the promises made to Abraham’s seed with reference to the land of Canaan, which typified that heavenly country of which his spiritual seed become the inheritors in Christ, as Gen. xiii. 15, xv. 18, &ca.

—οὐ λέγει—“scil. ἡ γραφή. Ellipsis Hebræis quoque familiaris.”<sup>4</sup> Cf. iv. 30; John xix. 37; Rom. iv. 3.

<sup>1</sup> Lidd. and Scott, διατάσσω, ii.

<sup>2</sup> Lidd. and Scott, ἐρω.

<sup>3</sup> See Heindorf’s note on Gorg. 460, D.

<sup>4</sup> Schættgen.

—τοῖς σπέρμασιν——עֲרַע is, in the sense of posterity, a collective word, used, at least in the Old Testament, universally in the singular; σπέρμα is rarely used in this sense in the plural.<sup>1</sup> עֲרַע is used of an individual, as Gen. xv. 3, and so also σπέρμα.<sup>2</sup> Again עֲרַע is used once in the plural, 1 Sam. viii. 15, but there it means the seeds of the earth. It is clear, then, that the Apostle could not mean to argue that the use of the singular indicated an individual, and not a posterity; because, to give this reasoning any force, the fact ought to be that עֲרַע and σπέρμα are *generally* used in the plural for posterity; whereas the reverse is the true state of the case. Nor, indeed, would such an argument be consistent with the scope of the Apostle. For his object is to show that οἱ ἐκ πίστεως are the true children of Abraham; that “the children of the flesh are not the children of God, but the children of the promise are counted for the seed,”<sup>3</sup> the children, that is to say, typified by the material descendants of Isaac,<sup>4</sup> the child of promise, and who are His true and spiritual seed through Christ.<sup>5</sup> And so the Apostle argues here that there was no specification in the promises of two posterities, the children born κατὰ φύσιν, and those born παρὰ φύσιν, the spiritual and the material seed: but that while Abraham had more than one posterity, the promise referred only to one, and that the spiritual seed<sup>6</sup> existing in, and represented by, Christ. Nor does this apply differently in the case

<sup>1</sup> Lidd. and Scott, σπέρμα, 2.

<sup>2</sup> Æsch. Cho. 474; Soph. Phil. 364; ap. Lidd. and Scott.

<sup>3</sup> Rom. ix. 8.

<sup>4</sup> Gen. xxi. 12; Rom. ix. 7.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Matt. i. 2; Luke iii. 34.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. ver. 22, 29, of this chapter, but especially iv. 22, seqq. and the notes.

of the promises, that *in* the seed the nation should be blessed, and that to the seed the land of Canaan should be given; for the spiritual seed exists in Christ. *To* Him the heavenly inheritance is primarily given, and *in* Him to believers, who are therefore blessed *in* Him; so that in both cases the seed is primarily Christ, as the head of His believing people; the whole frame, Head and members, constituting the spiritual seed.

—ἐπί,—especially with verbs of speaking, has sometimes the sense of ‘of,’ ‘concerning,’ Lat. *de*. Cf. Plat. Charm. 155, D. &ca.

—ἐνός—Scil. σπέρματος, posterity. See ver. 29, and the note.

—ός ἐστι—The relative does not agree here with its own substantive, but suffers an attraction to Χριστός. Compare the same usage, 1 Cor. iii. 17; Eph. i. 14, iii. 13, vi. 17. Cf. Herodot. v. 108, τὴν ἄκρην, αἱ καλεῦνται κληῖδες τῆς Κύπρου.

—Χριστός—Christ mystical—the one anointed body of which He, the anointed of His Father,<sup>1</sup> is the Head.<sup>2</sup> Cf. ver. 28; Matt. xxv. 34, seqq. 40; Acts ix. 4; 1 Cor. vi. 15, viii. 12, xi. 3, xii. 12, 27; Col. i. 24.

17. —τοῦτο δὲ λέγω—“And this is what I mean;” he explains now the object of the statement in ver. 15, with respect to a human testament; λέγειν, like the Lat. *dicere*, has the sense of *to mean*. So Herodot. vii. 144, ἐς τὸν πόλεμον, τὸν πρὸς Αἰγινήτας λέγων.<sup>3</sup>

—διαθήκην—See the note on ver. 15. This promise was first made to Abraham when he was in Ur

<sup>1</sup> Act. x. 38.

<sup>2</sup> Psal. cxxxiii. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Lid. and Scott, λέγω, iv. 9.



in Mesopotamia. Comp. Gen. xii. 1—3, and Acts vii. 2, 3.

—*προκεκυρωμένην*—Cf. *προεσηγγ.* ver. 8, and the note. This testament or covenant was ratified several times and in different modes. I. By sacrifice,<sup>1</sup> and the acceptance by God of the sacrifice: in which was typified that true and better covenant made between Father and Son—ratified on the part of Christ by the sacrifice of Himself,<sup>2</sup> into which covenant believers enter in Christ and by that sacrifice. II. By the institution of the sign of circumcision, which typified that “putting off of the body of the flesh,”<sup>3</sup> of which the foundation is the death and sacrifice of Christ.<sup>4</sup> III. By oath.<sup>5</sup> The first confirmation appears to me to have taken place when Abraham, obeying the command which accompanied the promise,<sup>6</sup> first entered the land of Canaan, upon which occasion the Lord appeared to Abraham, and Abraham built an altar to the Lord.<sup>7</sup> Another confirmation, of which the circumstances are more minutely recorded,<sup>8</sup> took place ten years later,<sup>9</sup> when Abraham having at the command of the Lord slain and divided into pieces certain animals, the Divine presence in the form of fire<sup>10</sup> passed between those pieces.

—*εἰς Χριστόν*—“with respect (or reference) to Christ.” I should decidedly retain these words in the text, notwithstanding the authority of the MSS.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Psal. l. 5.    <sup>2</sup> Cf. Dan. ix. 26, 27.    <sup>3</sup> Col. ii. 11, Gb. Tisch.

<sup>4</sup> Rom. vi. 3, seqq.    <sup>5</sup> Gen. xxii. 16, 17; Heb. vi. 13—17.

<sup>6</sup> Gen. xii. 1.

<sup>7</sup> Gen. xii. 7; but see, respecting this, the note further on in this verse.

<sup>8</sup> Gen. xv. 8, 9, 17.    <sup>9</sup> Cf. Gen. xvi. 3.

<sup>10</sup> A Lapide, Bonfrerius, Gill, *in loc.*

A. B. C. and the Vulgate. For, not to speak of the MSS. which contain it, with other Versions, it is clear that the words were in the MSS. used for both the Peschito and Harclean Syriac Versions. Tischendorf quotes these as reading, with the Latin of D. G. and Ambrosiaster, “in Christo;” but he is evidently citing not from the Original, but from the Latin translation, and conveys consequently a wrong impression. For the Syriac prefix  $\Omega$ , while it has the sense of the Lat. *in* with an ablative, is used for *in* with an accusative or  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ , as in 1 Tim. vi. 9; Heb. x. 19, &ca; and it may be observed, moreover, that it is also used in the sense of *de*, or the Greek  $\upsilon\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho$  in its equivalence to  $\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}$ , as in 2 Cor. v. 12, viii. 24, &ca,—a sense which is nearly allied to that which I conceive to be the true one in this passage. The Latin Version of D. and Ambrosiaster read ‘in Christo,’ and so also that of G., in which certainly this MS. must follow the old Latin. It is true that Augustine frequently quotes the passage without the words, but while this may to some extent weaken, it does not certainly invalidate, the testimony of the old Latin Version. Now I cannot but think that, in a construction like the present, the rendering ‘in Christo’ is wrong; it is certainly unsupported by the usage of the Apostle. But, be this as it may, it is utterly improbable that ‘in Christo’ should be translated by  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$   $X\rho$ . Mill indeed takes it to be a scholion, and seems to think that this opinion is supported by the fact that Pelagius comments upon the passage as it stands in the Vulgate, by the words ‘in Jesu Christo;’ but, for the reason just given, this proves nothing as to  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$   $X\rho$ . And indeed the testi-

mony of the Peschito proves clearly enough that the reading could not have sprung from a Latin Scholion.

But, moreover, as regards internal evidence, believing as I do that the sense of *εἰς* here is 'with respect to,'<sup>1</sup> I would observe that St. Paul not only constantly uses it in this sense, as in ch. iv. 11, v. 10; Rom. iv. 20; 2 Cor. xii. 6; Eph. v. 32; 1 Thess. v. 18, &ca; but in the same sense,<sup>2</sup> in conjunction with this very word *κυρόω*, in 2 Cor. ii. 8.<sup>3</sup> Nor can I see that *εἰς* *Xρ.* is superfluous. In ver. 15, the Apostle states certain facts relative to a human testament. In ver. 16 he gives the terms of the divine promises, and here the words *εἰς* *Xρ.* show at once the connexion between the promises of ver. 16 and the testament of ver. 15, and display this confirmation of the testament which took place both typically and actually before the law as having reference to Christ, who should come after the law, and who was now held up before them as the object of their faith.

Scholefield<sup>4</sup> would translate this passage, " 'a covenant before confirmed of God with Christ,' or even 'to Christ,' " and explains it of the covenant made between God and Christ. I would observe, I. that *to* is not the same as *with*, and that the mutual *covenant* between Father and Son requires to express it, not *to* but *with*, which is not the meaning of *εἰς* and, II. that the prominent idea throughout is here not the *covenant* as regards God and Christ, but

<sup>1</sup> See Jelf, Gr. Gr. 625, 3, c.

<sup>2</sup> Not in our English translation.

<sup>3</sup> I may observe here, in connexion with the preceding remarks, that the Syriac has here  $\text{ܐܢܝܢ}$

<sup>4</sup> Hints, &ca.

the *testament* or *promise* as regards God, and man in Christ: and, moreover, that εἰς Χρ. depends not upon διαθήκη, but upon προκεικ., and expresses the *object* of the *ratification* of the *testament*. For there was both a typical and a true ratification, and that which was typical had reference to the true ratification and to the benefits which should accrue to man through that true ratification, and in the person of Christ.

—ὁ μετὰ τετρ. καὶ τριάκ. ἔτη, κ. τ. λ. — The scope of the Apostle seems to require that we should date these four hundred and thirty years from the *confirmation* of the covenant. If we do not, there remains nothing but to go back to its earliest institution. Accordingly Paræus, taking the circumstances recorded in Gen. xv. to be those of the first confirmation, would calculate from thence; and he is consequently obliged to make the period of the actual sojourn in Egypt two hundred and twenty-five years instead of two hundred and fifteen. On the other hand, others would date from the first giving of the promise; following Augustine, who says<sup>1</sup> that the four hundred and thirty years are to be computed from the seventy-fifth year of Abraham, “quando ad eum facta est prima promissio,” and at the time that he left Haran. But it is evident, from a collation of Gen. xii. 1—3 with Acts vii. 2, 3, that the promise was made first when Abraham was in Ur, in North Mesopotamia, before he went to Haran. And the expression of Stephen,<sup>2</sup> πρὶν ἢ κατοικῆσαι αὐτὸν ἐν Χαρρῶν, as well as that of Gen.

<sup>1</sup> De Civitate Dei, Lib. xvi. cap. xxiv. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Acts vii. 2.

xi. 32, seem plainly to indicate a stay of some duration, and to support Dr. Hale's computation,<sup>1</sup> which interposes fifteen years between the call in Ur and the departure from Haran. Now taking Gen. xii. 1 and Acts vii. 1 as records of one and the same event, it does not appear that any promise or command was given to Abraham whilst he was in Haran. He probably stayed in this place on some grounds connected with his father, for we read<sup>2</sup> it was after his father was dead that he left Haran. Acting upon the command which had been given him, he went forth, and entered for the first time the land of Canaan. Upon an occasion so remarkable the Lord appeared to him, and reiterated the promise in a different form,<sup>3</sup> upon which Abraham built an altar to the Lord. It is evident from the juxtaposition of the two statements that the building of the altar had reference to the giving of the promise, and surely in these circumstances there is not indistinctly implied a sacrifice, and an acceptance of that sacrifice having the same typical import as that confirmation recorded in Gen. xv. For the altar could but indicate sacrifice,<sup>4</sup> and sacrifice that offering of the body of Christ which ratified the true covenant.

Now, as I before remarked, we have no alternative between dating the four hundred and thirty years from the first giving of the promise, and the first confirmation thereof; and the words of the Apostle

<sup>1</sup> I am guided by the dates of Dr. H. given in the Oxford Chronological Tables.

<sup>2</sup> Acts vii. 4.

<sup>3</sup> Gen. xii. 7. We have already seen, in the note on ver. 16, that the promise respecting the land of Canaan referred in reality to the communication of the blessings promised generally in and through the spiritual seed. See Bengel on ver. 16.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Exod. xx. 24; Heb. xiii. 10.

seem to require the latter. But if, taking the account in Gen. xv. to be that of the first confirmation, we adopt the former course, we must date, not from the departure from Haran, but from the call in Ur, whatever might have been the period which elapsed between the two events; and if we do not thereby (as it appears to me we clearly do) materially add to the prescribed period, we do at all events involve the calculation in all that uncertainty which hangs over the sojourn in Haran. But if we take the first confirmation to have occurred when Abraham first entered the land of promise, the calculation at once becomes simple, and accords itself with the scope of the Apostle. The respective periods composing the four hundred and thirty years are then as follows: From the departure from Haran to the birth of Isaac, twenty-five years.<sup>1</sup> From the birth of Isaac to the birth of Jacob, sixty years.<sup>2</sup> From thence to the going down of Jacob and his family into Egypt,<sup>3</sup> one hundred and thirty years. From thence to the death of Joseph, seventy-one years. From the death of Joseph to the birth of Moses, sixty-four years. From the birth of Moses to the Exodus, eighty years.<sup>4</sup> In all four hundred and thirty years. With regard to the statement in Exodus xii. 40, that "the sojourning of the children of Israel who dwelt in Egypt was four hundred and thirty years," it is to be observed (I.) that it is manifest from Exod. vi. 4, and Gen. xxiii. 4, xxviii. 4, xxxvi. 7, xxxvii. 1, that as to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, so also to the children of Israel who descended from

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Gen. xii. 4, and xxi. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Gen. xxv. 26.

<sup>3</sup> Gen. xlvii. 9.

<sup>4</sup> Exod. vii. 7.

them, that land of Canaan which was afterwards their own was before "terram peregrinationis,"<sup>1</sup> a land, that is, in which they were strangers, (cf. Psal. cv. 11, 12,) persons dwelling in a country not their own; and (II.) that the Hebrew word מֵיֶשֶׁב translated "sojourning," while it means generally any dwelling, has also this very sense of the dwelling of strangers in a country foreign to them, as is well illustrated by the use of the word מֵיֶשֶׁב in Exod. xii. 45, Levit. xxv. 47, &ca, and where the LXX. translate by *παροικίος*.<sup>2</sup> So that this "sojourning" is to be understood of the whole period spent by the children of Israel in Egypt, and by their fathers in the land of Canaan, according to the actual form of the passage in the Samaritan Pentateuch and the LXX. Moreover, we may observe that, as is the case in our English translation and the Vulgate in the Antwerp and Paris Polyglotts, the relative אֲשֶׁר may be referred to the children of Israel, so that the words, "who dwelt in Egypt," are simply incidental. The meaning therefore of the verse is, that the whole period during which the children of Israel dwelt in Egypt and, in the persons of their fathers, in the land of Canaan as a strange country, not their own, was four hundred and thirty years, and thus the period stated here agrees exactly with that given by the Apostle.

There remains, however, yet the consideration of the difficulty involved in the mention of four hundred years in Gen. xv. 13 and Acts vii. 6. To meet this it will suffice to observe, (I.) that the "strange land"

<sup>1</sup> Usher, *Chronologia Sacra*, cap. viii.

<sup>2</sup> The Alex. MS. of the LXX. reads in Exod. xii. 40—*παροικησις*.

refers, as we showed before, to the land of Canaan as well as to Egypt; <sup>1</sup> (II.) that, as it was in Isaac especially that the seed of Abraham was called, <sup>2</sup> the four hundred and five years which elapsed from his birth until the Exodus are meant by the round number 400; <sup>3</sup> (III.) that as Usher <sup>4</sup> says, quoting Pererius, “In his verbis ut tum ab aliis <sup>5</sup> tum a Pererio est observatum tria ‘continentur <sup>6</sup> quorum unum est peregrinatio seminis Abrahæ in terra non sua, alterum servitus, tertium afflictio. Tempus itaque illorum 400 annorum non competit in quodlibet illorum trium disjuncte ac separatim, sed in tria illa conjuncte; quod illa tria eventura essent et complenda intra spatium 400 annorum.’”

—οὐκ ἀκυροῖ—This is opposed to προκεικ. The meaning is, that the covenant which was confirmed the law does not render unconfirmed: a conclusion which is drawn from the premises contained in ver. 15.

—εἰς τὸ καταργῆσαι τὴν ἐπαγγ.—“so as to render useless (or fruitless) the promise.” εἰς expresses the *consequence*, without the notion of purpose.<sup>7</sup> So Rom. i. 20, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀναπολογήτους. 1 Thess. ii. 16, εἰς τὸ ἀναπληρῶσαι αὐτῶν τὰς ἀμαρτίας πάντοτε. καταργεῖν is a word of very unusual occurrence, except in the Epistles of St. Paul. It is found, however, in the Phœniss. of Euripides, 760, and in a fragment quoted by Suidas, and attributed by Valesius to Polybius. It derives its meaning from ἀργός, con-

<sup>1</sup> August. Quæst. xlvii. in Exod. § 6; Usher, Chron. Sac. cap. viii.

<sup>2</sup> Gen. xxi. 12; Rom. ix. 7; Heb. xi. 18.

<sup>3</sup> August. ubi sup.

<sup>4</sup> Ubi sup. <sup>5</sup> A Lapide, Menochius.

<sup>6</sup> Pererius in Exod.

<sup>7</sup> Jelf, Gr. Gr. 625, 3, a.



tracted from ἀεργός, strictly *not working*, and hence *idle*; and so especially of money *lying idle*, *yielding no return*, and of land *lying fallow*. The primitive meaning of καταργεῖν appears then to be *to make useless or fruitless*, and hence by implication *to make to cease, to destroy, abolish, &c.*; the prominent notion being the effecting of a change in the power, tendency, or capability of anything to produce certain results. So in Luke xiii. 7, Jesus says of the fig-tree, ἔκκοψον αὐτήν· ἵνα τί καὶ τὴν γῆν καταργεῖ; “why doth it render the ground useless and unproductive?” So Rom. iii. 3, μὴ ἡ ἀπιστία αὐτῶν τὴν πίστιν τοῦ Θεοῦ καταργήσῃ; “shall their unbelief make the faith of God fruitless,” or unproductive of its proper consequences? but especially Rom. iv. 14, κατήργηται ἡ ἐπαγγελία, “is the promise made fruitless or inefficacious.” And this appears clearly to be the meaning in the fragment attributed to Polybius, τὸν δὲ, καθήμενον περὶ τὰ Τύανα, κατηργημένοι καὶ καταπροῖεσθαι τοὺς καιρούς. And so also in Eurip. Phoeniss. 760,

ἀλλ' εἴμ', ὅπως ἂν μὴ καταργῶμεν χέρα.

18. The Apostle has shown in the preceding verses that the law does not set aside the promise. The γάρ therefore is here *explanatory*, and depends upon something which was supplied in the mind of the writer; q. d. I have used this argument; for to assign the inheritance to the law is to set aside the promise. It is scarcely necessary to observe that this elliptical use of γάρ is not only classical,<sup>1</sup> but in accordance with the style and constant usage of the Apostle Paul.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Jelf, Gr. Gr. 786, 1, Obs. 1; Liddell and Scott, γάρ, i. 2.

<sup>2</sup> See Robinson's Gk. Lex. γάρ, i. b.

—ἐκ νόμου—through a system which says, “Do and live.”

—ἡ κληρονομία—The heavenly Canaan, an inheritance “eternal,<sup>1</sup> incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away;”<sup>2</sup> the lot of the spiritual seed, and of which they receive an earnest<sup>3</sup> in the present blessings of the covenant of grace; this inheritance being typified by the earthly Canaan, the inheritance of the material seed.<sup>4</sup>

—οὐκέτι ἐξ ἐπαγγελίας—The promise is of free grace; and if of grace, it is not of works: otherwise grace is no longer grace:<sup>5</sup> and moreover faith is the characteristic of the promise, and εἰ οἱ ἐκ νόμου κληρονόμοι, κεκένωται ἡ πίστις, καὶ κατήργηται ἡ ἐπαγγελία.<sup>6</sup>

—τῷ δὲ Ἀβραάμ, κ. τ. λ.—The conclusion that the inheritance is not of the law is involved in the foregoing clause: and here a fresh proof of this springs out of that clause, viz. that *God*, the author of the scheme of salvation, gave it to Abraham by *promise*.

—κεχάρισται—See the usage of χαρίζομαι in 1 Cor. ii. 12; Phil. i. 29, ii. 9. Cf. also Herodot. i. 91; Aristoph. Eq. 54; <sup>7</sup> Polyb. xvi. 24, 9.

19. —τί οὖν ὁ νόμος—τί has here, as in Att.<sup>8</sup> usage, the sense of διὰ τί, “wherefore.” ἐδόθη is probably understood. The Apostle having brought the Galatians to the conclusion that the inheritance is not through the law, he here, anticipating an objection

<sup>1</sup> Heb. ix. 15.<sup>2</sup> 1 Pet. i. 4.<sup>3</sup> Eph. i. 13, 14.<sup>4</sup> 1 Chron. xvi. 18; Psal. cv. 11.<sup>5</sup> Rom. xi. 6.<sup>6</sup> Rom. iv. 14.<sup>7</sup> Liddell and Scott, χαρίζ. ii.<sup>8</sup> Ibid. τίς, viii.; Raphael in 2 Pet. i. 5.

which might arise, introduces the statement of the true object of the law and its important bearing upon the covenant of grace. Chrysostom says, Ἐπειδὴ τὴν πίστιν ἐπῆρε, καὶ πρεσβυτέραν ἔδειξεν, ἵνα μὴ τις νομίσῃ περιττὸν τὸν νόμον, καὶ τοῦτο διορθοῦται τὸ μέρος, δεικνύς ὅτι οὐκ εἰκῆ, ἀλλὰ πάνυ χρησίμως ἐδόθη. Νόμος means of course the whole legal dispensation.

—τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν—χάριν is used elsewhere by St. Paul<sup>1</sup> invariably in its proper and ordinary sense of “for the sake of,”<sup>2</sup> in which there is implied the existence of some *future* end or object in the word governed, and not, as in Luke vii. 47, 1 John iii. 12, and the LXX. 3 Reg. xiv. 16 (Alex. MS.), a reason belonging to the past. And we may translate here “for the sake of transgressions,” i. e. to define sin more completely, to make every negative ἀμάρτημα, every failure in obedience to the unwritten law a positive παράβασις. For it is to be observed that Adam *transgressed*<sup>3</sup> because there had been given to him a definite command. From Adam to Moses death reigned, καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς μὴ ἀμαρτήσαντας ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδάμ,<sup>4</sup> but during that time man’s sins were not clearly defined, the proper term being not παράβασις, but ἀμάρτημα or παράπτωμα, and so St. Paul distinctly says, that where no law is there is no παράβασις.<sup>5</sup>

—προσετέθη— Cf. Herodot. i. 108, Ἄρπαγε, πρῆγμα τὸ ἄν τοι προσθέω, μηδαμᾶ παραχρήσῃ and iii.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Eph. iii. 1, 14; 1 Tim. v. 14; Tit. i. 11.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Lidd. and Scott, χάρις, v., and the examples.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Rom. v. 14; 1 Tim. ii. 14.

<sup>4</sup> Rom. v. 14.

<sup>5</sup> Rom. iv. 15.

62, Πρήξασπες, οὕτω μοι διεπρήξαι τό τοι προσέθηκα  
 πρῆγμα; and especially Eurip. Herac. 506,

αὐτοὶ δὲ προστιθέντες ἄλλοισιν νόμους.

The reading ἐτέθη probably originated in a mistaken idea that προσετέθη clashed with ἐπιδιατάσσεται in ver. 15.<sup>1</sup>

—ἄχρις οὗ—Cf. Rom. xi. 25; 1 Cor. xi. 26, xv. 25; and Herodot. i. 117, ἐντειλάμενος . . . παρὰ μένοντα φυλάσσειν ἄχρι οὗ τελευτήσῃ.

—ἔλθῃ—Cf. ἐλθεῖν, ver. 23.<sup>2</sup>

—τὸ σπέρμα—Christ and those joined to Him<sup>3</sup> through faith. Cf. ver. 16 and 22.

—ᾧ ἐπήγγελλται—ἐπήγγ. is the perfect *middle*,<sup>4</sup> taken in a passive sense, ἡ κληρονομία being understood.

The question here arises, to what does the law serve since the coming of Christ? Before the fulness of time was come, while it served as a dispensation to convince man of sin, and thus to prepare for the more perfect dispensation which centred in Christ, it had yet a higher and spiritual signification, in that it typified in all its parts the spiritual dispensation, and testified to the person and work of Christ. But until that work was completed by the resurrection of Jesus, the true character of the law was not apparent; then “the children of Israel could not stedfastly look to the end of that which is abolished”<sup>5</sup> (τοῦ καταργουμένου), but now “the veil is done away in Christ.”<sup>6</sup> Now,

<sup>1</sup> Bengel prefers ἐτέθη on this very account, “facilius stat cum versu 15.”

<sup>2</sup> Bengel.

<sup>3</sup> So Beza, Bengel, Vorst.

<sup>4</sup> See Jelf, Gr. Gr. 364, 4, obs. and 366. According to Kuster (De Verb. Med. p. 9, note), this would be passive with a middle sense.

<sup>5</sup> 2 Cor. iii. 13.

<sup>6</sup> Ib. 14.

therefore, although the law as a dispensation is "made to cease,"<sup>1</sup> it remains, the mirror in which the spiritual Israel may see reflected the work of Christ. Thus, while before Christ came it convinced the old race of disobedience and sin, it now serves to convince the new creature in Christ Jesus of obedience and righteousness; while formerly the moral law showed the descendants of the first Adam what the holiness of God required; while the repeated<sup>2</sup> and imperfect<sup>3</sup> sacrifices showed in their nature, and by their repetition, that sins were ever repeated, and incompletely atoned for; now, the spirit of a risen Saviour manifests the last Adam, and His race justified by a performance of that law, sin washed out and completely atoned for, by that one completed sacrifice by which Jesus has perfected for ever<sup>4</sup> all His people: and thus Christ destroyed the law *as a dispensation*, because he fulfilled it in His own person and in those of His elect.

—*διαταγείς*—Cf. 1 Cor. ix. 14, xvi. 1,—also Herodot. i. 110. This sentence is an instance of *asyndeton*. Our translators rightly supply the conjunction.

—*δι' ἀγγέλων*—I cannot see why commentators should assume that there exists an immediate connexion between this statement of the Apostle and the record of Exodus xx. For God having on that occasion "talked" personally with the people "from heaven,"<sup>5</sup> they afterwards transgressed the very first command,<sup>6</sup> whereupon Moses broke the tables<sup>7</sup> which

<sup>1</sup> See the note on *καταργεῖν* in ver. 17.

<sup>2</sup> Heb. x. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Ib. 4.

<sup>4</sup> Heb. x. 14.

<sup>5</sup> Exod. xx. 22. See also ver. 1 and 19.

<sup>6</sup> Exod. xxxii. 1, seqq.

<sup>7</sup> Ib. 19.

were, as it were, the record of that first delivery, and received the law a second time, *in the character of a mediator and intercessor*.<sup>1</sup> So that I should take the true commencement of the completed Jewish system to be the second delivery recorded in the 34th chapter of Exodus: the whole dispensation being, therefore, as it were, based upon an act of reconciliatory mediation. And it is remarkable, in connexion with this, that St. Paul in 2 Cor. iii. 7, speaking generally of the Jewish dispensation as a ministration of death, connects it immediately with circumstances belonging to that second delivery.<sup>2</sup> It appears, indeed, to me that the whole circumstances connected respectively with the first and second delivery were of the most significant character, and typical of the true bearing of the law upon man, his need of reconciliation through Christ the mediator of the better covenant, and his incapability of true legal performance.

With regard to the expression δι' ἀγγέλων, I cannot follow Morus, Læsner, Krebsius, &ca, in interpreting διὰ here of the *presence* rather than of the *agency* of angels. For this passage is evidently parallel to Heb. ii. 2, where it is clear that διὰ implies agency, because δι' ἀγγέλων is opposed to διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου in ver. 3. And, indeed, although διὰ does express the *accompaniments* through which an action passes,<sup>3</sup> as in Rom. viii. 25, δι' ὑπομονῆς ἀπεκδεχόμεθα, xiv. 20, διὰ προσκόμματος ἐσθίουσι, 2 Cor. ii. 4, ἔγραψα ὑμῖν διὰ πολλῶν δακρύων, &ca, I could not class under this head or with these passages either this one of

<sup>1</sup> See Exod. xxxii. 30, seqq., xxxiii. 12, 13, xxxiv. 9; Psalm cvi. 23.

<sup>2</sup> Exod xxxiv. 30.

<sup>3</sup> See Jelf, Gr. Gr. 627, 3.

our Epistle or that other in 2 Tim. ii. 2, διὰ πολλῶν μαρτύρων, which is quoted by Morus and others as its equivalent. Taking then διὰ as expressing agency, the explanation which appears to me the best is this: In Acts vii. 38,<sup>1</sup> Moses is represented as being μετὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου . . . καὶ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν.<sup>2</sup> Now this angel is clearly here, as in ver. 30 of the same chapter, the second Person in the Trinity, “the angel of the covenant.”<sup>3</sup> By the expression διαταγείς δι’ ἀγγέλων we may, therefore, understand that when the divine Logos, the “mighty angel,”<sup>4</sup> delivered the law to Moses in the mount, He was accompanied in His character of messenger by other angels, who were, therefore, in an indirect manner agents in the delivery.<sup>5</sup>

—ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου—μεσίτης is properly a middle man, and hence it represents more particularly that middle man in connexion with certain functions arising out of his position. The LXX. use it (Job ix. 33) to translate the Heb. הַרְבֵּי, which is properly an arbitrator, one who adjusts by proper reasons and considerations matters in debate. Hesychius says, Μεσέγγυον. μεσίτην,<sup>6</sup> and Moeris, Μετέγγυος, Ἀττικῶς. μεσίτης Ἑλληνικῶς. Μεσέγγυος is equivalent to μεσεγγυητής, the third party with whom a security (μεσεγγύημα) is deposited.<sup>7</sup> But it involves also more particularly the idea of *reconciliation*

<sup>1</sup> This I should unhesitatingly refer to the second delivery. Of course it by no means follows that because Stephen proceeds to record events which happened before that second delivery, he is speaking in the order of time.

<sup>2</sup> “Medius ergo erat Moses,” Bengel in loc.

<sup>3</sup> Malachi iii. 1.

<sup>4</sup> Rev. x. 1. See Gen. xviii.

<sup>5</sup> See Surenhus. B. ἰβ. καταλ. pp. 420, 421.

<sup>6</sup> See Thomas Magist. p. 609.

<sup>7</sup> Lidd. and Scott.

through mediation. So Suidas, *μεσίτης. ὁ εἰρηνοποιός*,<sup>1</sup> and it is in this sense that it seems to be used by St. Paul. For the mediation of Moses was typical of the more perfect one of Christ; and therefore it has the same characteristics as those of its Antitype. Now Christ, as a mediator, effected reconciliation, and it is impossible to separate this notion from His mediatorship: and so in 1 Tim. ii. 5, where He is called the one mediator, the man Christ Jesus, that great feature of His mediation and His humanity is immediately afterwards stated, viz. that He gave Himself *ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων*, through which ransom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins, and therefore reconciliation: and it is remarkable that we find Moses as the type of Christ prefacing his mediation by offering to make an atonement for the sins of the people, and subsequently praying God to inflict upon him a vicarious punishment.<sup>2</sup> The reconciliation of the Jewish dispensation was, of course, ever incomplete, bearing the same relation to that of the new dispensation as the former *εἰρηνοποιός* did to Christ, who made “peace by the blood of His cross,”<sup>3</sup> and as the former sacrifices did to their great Antitype.

20. —ὁ δὲ *μεσίτης ἐνδὸς οὐκ ἔστιν*—The first clause of this verse forms, as Bengel observes, the middle term of a syllogism, of which the conclusion is understood. The Apostle has stated in the preceding

<sup>1</sup> See also Suicer, Thes. Tom. ii. p. 343. Lidd. and Scott, *μεσίτης*.

<sup>2</sup> Exod. xxxii. 30, 32. So Ainsworth on this latter verse says, “Moses dealt as Mediator between God and men, and was a figure of our Mediator Christ, who laid down His life for the sheep, John x. 15, and redeemed us from the curse of the law when He was made a curse for us.”

<sup>3</sup> Col. i. 20, q. v.



verse that the law was given, ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου. He here reminds them of the peculiar characteristic of a mediator, and hence also of the conclusion which is latent in the mention of a mediator in ver. 19. The article is used indefinitely, μεσίτης representing as an individual the collective unity of a class.<sup>1</sup> ἐνὸς οὐκ ἔστιν expresses that a mediator cannot, in respect of his functions, be dependent upon,<sup>2</sup> and the agent of one party alone, but must be called into action by the equal exigencies of two; and the conclusion involved in this is that both man needed to be reconciled to God and God to man: that not only is the "wrath of God revealed from heaven against all unrighteousness of men,"<sup>3</sup> but that the "carnal mind is enmity against God."<sup>4</sup> Two parties are, therefore, represented in a position needing the interposition of a reconciler, and therefore in one of opposition. But out of this an objection might arise, viz. that in the giving of the promise God is not represented in such a point of view as regards man as furnishes the idea of reconciliatory mediation being necessary. This the Apostle meets by saying, But God is one; i. e. There are not two Gods, one giving the promise, the other the law, but One only.<sup>5</sup> In this there is again involved a consequence, viz. that until the fulness of time was come, whether before or at the giving of the law, God and man were in such a position regarding one another as to need an act of reconciliatory mediation. And so, therefore, that mediation which was called into

<sup>1</sup> See Jelf, Gr. Gr. 446, b.

<sup>2</sup> See Lidd. and Scott, *εἰμί*, iii. 2, and Jelf, Gr. Gr. 518, 2, a.

<sup>3</sup> Rom. i. 18.

<sup>4</sup> Rom. viii. 7.

<sup>5</sup> Ib. iii. 30.

action at the giving of the law was only typical of the full reconciliation upon which the spiritual dispensation is based. For the promise was made primarily to Christ, given ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου that it might be inherited by believers in Him, because it was promised to, inherited, and received by Him as a Saviour effecting a complete *reconciliation* for iniquity.

21. The Apostle now, by availing himself of an objection which might here arise, brings forward the general conclusion that the law is in entire conformity with the promise, that the same God gave both, that man always needed reconciliation through death and through a perfect righteousness; that such a righteousness is unattainable through the law; and that man was given up to the sense of estrangement through sin, in order that he might be brought to the full consciousness of reconciliation through Christ.

κατά is used in this hostile sense by Æsch. and Soph.<sup>1</sup> Cf. also the LXX., Psal. ii. 2.<sup>2</sup>

—μὴ γένοιτο—This answers to the Heb. הֲלִיִּי, which is translated by the LXX. by μὴ γένοιτο in Gen. xlv. 7, 17; Josh. xxii. 29, xxiv. 16;—by μηδαμῶς in Gen. xviii. 25; 1 Reg. xii. 23, xx. 2, xxii. 15 (in which two last places Symmachus translates by ἰλεώς);—by μὴ εἴη in Job xxvii. 5, xxxiv. 10, and by ἰλεώς<sup>3</sup> in 2 Reg. xx. 20, xxiii. 17.

—εἰ γὰρ—“Vis conditionalis non super *data est* cadit: nam utique lex *data est*: sed super *potens*.”<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Lidd. and Scott, κατά, A. II. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Grinfield.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Matt. xvi. 22; Wetst. N. T. Tom. i. p. 432; Kypke, Obs. Tom. i. p. 82; Parkh. verb. ἰλεώς.

<sup>4</sup> Bengel.

The truth of the antecedent is denied, as also in fact the truth of the consequent.<sup>1</sup>

—ὁ δυνάμενος ζωοποιῆσαι—The Apostle proves that the law is not opposed to the promise, by showing that it wanted only the *ability* to carry out tendencies in conformity with those of the promise. For the law tended towards life.<sup>2</sup> Its very conditions were, ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς.<sup>3</sup> But man was “carnal,”<sup>4</sup> “dead in trespasses and sins,”<sup>5</sup> and lacked spiritual life to enable him to carry out the requirements of the law, and so the intrinsic tendency of the law itself was frustrated by the fallen nature of man.<sup>6</sup> If it could have given spiritual life, ὅντως ἐκ νόμου ἂν ἦν ἡ δικαιοσύνη, that is, the righteousness which is in the law<sup>7</sup> would have been *real*, and therefore justifying, and an end in conformity with that of the promise itself would have been attained.

22. —ἀλλὰ συνέκλεισεν ἡ γραφή—“But the Scripture (Angl. “revelation”) hath exhibited all shut up under sin.” With regard to συνέκλεισεν, as Hemsterhusius<sup>8</sup> observes, “Venuste quis et ornate dicitur aliquid facere, quod fieri vel factum esse scribit, narrat, statuit, opinatur.”<sup>9</sup> See Acts x. 15, σὺ μὴ κοίνου, which Hesychius explains by μὴ ἀπάθαρτον νόμιζε. The use of the Aorist indicates the general

<sup>1</sup> See Jelf, Gr. Gr. 856.

<sup>2</sup> Rom. vii. 10.

<sup>3</sup> Gal. iii. 12.

<sup>4</sup> Rom. vii. 14.

<sup>5</sup> Eph. ii. 1.

<sup>6</sup> See Rom. viii. 3.

<sup>7</sup> Phil. iii. 6.

<sup>8</sup> In a note on Thomas Magister, p. 187. See also Alberti, Obs. p. 240, and Læsner, p. 199, who quotes Philo.

<sup>9</sup> “Getæ vocantur ἀθανατίζοντες vel ἀπαθανατίζοντες, quia mentes esse credebant immortales. . . Porro philosophorum opiniones breviter, ut solet, hac figura describit Aristoteles. Τῶν ἄλλως λεγόντων καὶ γεννώντων αὐτὸν (τὸν οὐρανόν).” Hemster. ubi sup. The whole note should be consulted. So Thomas Magister, γεννᾷ ὁ Πλάτων τὸν οὐρανόν, ἀντὶ τοῦ γεννητὸν λέγει.

truth by the statement of the indefinite recurrence of the exhibition spoken of.<sup>1</sup>

—τὰ πάντα——scil. τὰ ἔθνη (ver. 8). Jew as well as Gentile. See Rom. iii. 9, 19.

—ἵνα, κ. τ. λ.——God gave the law, which was in itself a manifestation of the same holiness in which man through the promise is made to participate. Man's fallen nature frustrated the intrinsic object of the law itself; but thereby worked out God's design that through the law man should be shown to be sold under sin, a slave without the power of escape. This clause expresses the object of that design of which Scripture is the inspired manifestation and record. Conviction of sin leads to faith in Christ. Faith in Christ gives union with Him, the heir of the promise. Union with Him gives co-heirship with Him. ἐπαγγ. is put by metonymy for the thing promised, as in ver. 14.

23. —πρὸ τοῦ δὲ ἐλθεῖν τὴν πίστιν——The faith of the new dispensation came with the complete manifestation of that person and work which is the object of faith. πίστ. is here put for that dispensation of which the great characteristic is justification through faith. The patriarchs indeed believed, but their acts of faith were isolated and extraordinary.

—ὕπὸ νόμον ἐφρουρούμεθα——“we were guarded under the law.” Hesych. φρουρεῖ. φυλάττει, ἢ προφυλάττει. Cf. Herodot. iii. 90; Xen. Cyropæd. vi. 1, 10.

—συγκλειόμενοι——“being shut up, &ca.” This explains the meaning of the expression ἐφρουρ., viz. that the object of the Jewish dispensation was to

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Jelf, Gr. Gr. 402, 1.

hem in the convicted sinner, and bring him as it were by gracious violence to lay hold on the faith of the gospel. As regards the expression *συγκλείειν εἰς πίστιν*, Raphel says, “significat *ad fidem adigere*, eo necessitatis quem redigere, ut ad fidem tanquam sacram anchoram confugere cogatur;” and he quotes in illustration of this several passages from Polybius, of which a striking one is from Lib. xviii. cap. 36, Ἐκεῖνος μὲν γάρ, προκαταληφθεῖς, εἰς αὐτὰς συνεκλείσθη τὰς ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις οἰκέταις καὶ φίλοις ἐλπίδας.

The evidence with respect to the two readings *συγκεκλεισμένοι* and *συγκλειόμενοι* is conflicting. There can I think be little doubt but that B. reads the latter, and upon the whole that reading is the best supported. It is manifestly the one least likely to be an emendation, and this consideration greatly influences me in adopting it.

—εἰς τὴν μέλλουσαν, κ. τ. λ.—There is a transposition here, the proper form being, *εἰς τὴν πίστιν τὴν μελλοῦσαν*. Faith was revealed generally as the characteristic of a dispensation in Christ its object, and is revealed savingly through Him as its author.

24. —ὥστε—“so that.”

—παιδαγωγός—This person differed from the *διδάσκαλος*, *præceptor* or schoolmaster.<sup>1</sup> Strictly speaking the former was the slave<sup>2</sup> who led the child to and from school. But his functions were also of a more extended character; for, while he was an attendant, he exercised also a supervision (and that generally of a rigid and severe character) over the morals and actions of those committed to his

<sup>1</sup> See Schleusn. and Parkh. Cf. also Seneca De Ira, ii. 22.

<sup>2</sup> See the passage from Plato quoted ch. iv. 1.

charge, and superintended their progress.<sup>1</sup> So Jerome, “*Pædagogus parvulis assignatur; ut lasciviens refrenetur ætas, et prona in vitia corda teneantur, dum tenera studiis eruditur infantia; et ad majores Philosophiæ ac regendæ reipublicæ disciplinas, metu pœnæ coercita præparetur.*” The *διδάσκαλος*, or schoolmaster, instructed the child in all things belonging to actual learning, arts, sciences, &c.<sup>2</sup> Hesychius evidently attaches to *παιδαγωγός* the idea of somewhat extended duties, for his definition is, *παιδευτής. καὶ τὰ ὅμοια*, and so St. Paul himself, as may be inferred from his usage of it in 1 Cor. iv. 15. The supervisional office of the pedagogue as understood by the Jews themselves, is illustrated by Schoettgen and Wetstein, by the following among other quotations; “*Rex filio pædagogum constituit et singulis diebus ad eum invisit, interrogans eum: Num comedit filius meus? num in scholam abiit? Num ex schola rediit?*”<sup>3</sup>

The pædagogue then, as Chrysostom says, *οὐκ ἐναντιοῦται τῷ διδασκάλῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ συμπράττει, πάσης κακίας ἀπαλλάττων τὸν νέον, καὶ μετὰ πάσης σκολῆς τὰ μαθήματα παρὰ τοῦ διδασκάλου δέχεσθαι παρασκευάζων*. and so the law, so far from being opposed to the promises of the gospel, coöperated with them, and, in its own inferior and typical teaching, with Christ the great spiritual teacher of man. It was terrible and severe in all its aspects, but its very severity led to the greatest grace. It was a ministration of condemnation, in order that both ceremonially and morally it might lead up the

<sup>1</sup> See a note of Lipsius on Seneca, ubi sup.; and see especially Elsner's note on this place.      <sup>2</sup> Lipsius, ubi sup.      <sup>3</sup> Tanchuma.

guilty sinner to the perfect sacrifice and the perfect righteousness of Christ.

—εἰς Χριστόν— I should translate this, “until Christ.”<sup>1</sup> Cf. ver. 19; ch. iv. ver. 2, 4; Rom. x. 4. The coming of Christ, or rather the completion of that work to the performance of which he was *anointed* by the Father, opened up to the heir the enjoyment of his inheritance. Until that time he was under the severe training of the law, the *παιδαγωγός*.

—ἵνα ἐκ πίστ. κ. τ. λ.— This expresses the object of that training.

25. —ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς πίστεως, κ. τ. λ.— Although the law in this its character of *pædagog*ue was given exclusively to the Jew, it must be remembered that as a system of works it was a divine form of that law of which the Gentile manifested a consciousness: and as such it was the only *authorized* system through which man could carry out his own tendencies in the direction of a justification by works: and whatever were the peculiar characteristics of this divine system, whatever effect it produced upon the mind and conscience of man in the person of the Jew, characteristics and effects precisely similar, though in a modified form, belong to the unwritten law. And so each natural heart finds in the law a *παιδαγωγός*, urging it to performance, and punishing by fears of condemnation each act of disobedience. And thus the law of the Jew does in its nature and effects show in the mirror of abstract truth the true nature and true tendency of every system of works which is set up in the unregenerate heart. There is, then, to the Gentile as well as the Jew a true

<sup>1</sup> On this usage of εἰς see Jelf, Gr. Gr. 625, 2.

position and a true consequence belonging to a system of works. In the one case, natural consciousness combines with positive revelation. In the other there is no external revelation, but the same unvarying and necessary tendencies are revealed in the heart. Now when Christ came, faith as the characteristic of the new dispensation, and as the instrumental cause of salvation, was, in fact, revealed; and because this faith gives union with Christ and sonship in Him, a state of things arose in Christ in which man is no longer under the law, written or unwritten, or a *παιδαγωγός*, revealed or unrevealed. But, as far as the practical working of this change upon man is itself concerned, it is only in a true sonship that the state of legal bondage ceases, and only in a true faith that true sonship arises. And so though Christ *is* come, though we *are* no longer under a *παιδαγωγός*, the natural tendency of the human heart ignores the fact, and still continues to recognise the *παιδαγωγός* in the law. Thus, then, while abstractedly and really the coming of Christ did away with the law, it is only effectually<sup>1</sup> done away when a man effectually believes; when faith is revealed, not only in the person of the Saviour, but in the heart of the believer. And, indeed, in that the flesh continues even in the regenerate to lust against the spirit, so the believer forgets his real position in Christ, and reverts to one, in respect to the law, which is unreal. See the note on ch. iv. ver. 3.

26. —*πάντες*——all, whether Jews or Gentiles.

<sup>1</sup> By "effectually" I mean, of course, as far as the consciousness of the *fact* works effectually in the history of individual salvation.



—*υιοί*—“filiī adulti,<sup>1</sup> emancipati,<sup>2</sup> in hæreditatem immissi<sup>3</sup> custode remoto.<sup>4</sup>”

—*Θεοῦ*—Of Him who is the Judge and the justifier, and who appointed the law as a *παιδαγωγός*. See, on the nature of the believer's sonship, the note on ch. iv. ver. 5, 6.

27. —*ὅσοι γὰρ εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε*—In the preceding verse the Apostle states the truth that we are the sons of God by faith in Christ Jesus. It is evident that one step is wanting to complete his demonstration, viz. that faith in Christ Jesus gives union with Him, and therefore and thus sonship in Him. The whole argument might have been thus stated: I. Christ is the Son of God. II. Faith in Christ joins the believer with Him. III. Therefore faith in Christ makes the believer a son of God. But this link in the chain is supplied in this verse in a different form, and instead of saying, “as many as believe in Christ put on Christ,” he says, “as many as are baptized *εἰς Χριστόν*, put on Christ.” The nature, therefore, of the argument *peremptorily* demands that one and the same thing should be implied in both these expressions. Now it is quite evident that by faith in Christ is meant nothing less than a real, vital, saving faith, because it gives sonship: and sonship is not merely the condition of a dispensation, but it is a *reality* in that dispensation, which is *felt*, and which is *manifest* (see ch. iv. 6; Rom. viii. 15, 16), and which contains in itself the pledge of heirship (ch. iv. 7) and salvation. And,

<sup>1</sup> Piscator. Vorstius. Paræus. Menochius.

<sup>2</sup> Paræus. Bengel.

<sup>3</sup> Paræus.

<sup>4</sup> Bengel. Alex. Morus, ap. Wolf.

moreover, since it is in Christ the Son that the believer is also a son, this sonship must be one which has belonging to it circumstances peculiar to both Father and Son, which are common to Christ and the believer in Him. Thus, as Christ as a Son loves the Father, and intelligently appreciates His attributes and His holiness; the sonship of the believer will ever manifest an earnest reaching forward towards such perfect love and such perfect intelligence. And all these and such as these are characteristics of a state of salvation felt by the believer and manifest to the world. Either then a faith which is not vital and saving can give this sonship, or else the faith of which the Apostle is speaking is that saving trust which is revealed in the soul by Christ Himself. Since, then, the faith of which he speaks must be that vital principle which produces effects such as these; it is evident from the whole scope of the Apostle's argument that the baptism of which he speaks is a baptism which, representing a true faith, admits into a state of conscious manifest sonship, and gives, therefore, an actual inheritance among those that are sanctified through faith in Jesus.<sup>1</sup> And, further, the commencement of this state of sonship is regeneration,<sup>2</sup> a new and second birth: for

<sup>1</sup> Acts xxvi. 18.

<sup>2</sup> "If to be born causeth a relation to a Father, then to be born again maketh an addition of another: and if to generate foundeth, then to regenerate addeth a Paternity. Now, though we cannot *enter the second time into our mother's womb*, nor pass through the same door into the scene of life again; yet we believe and are persuaded that *except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God*. A double birth there is, and the world consists of two, the first and the second man. . . . Thus, *whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is the born of God*; which regeneration is, as it were, a second creation; for we are *God's workmanship, created in*

the sons of God are born, not as in their first birth of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God ;<sup>1</sup> and therefore regeneration and a true and *manifest* sonship are inseparable the one from the other. The expression, then, εἰς Χριστὸν, can by no means imply only a baptism in the name of Christ, because although baptism in the name of the Divine Trinity is the mean and seal of the *believer's* entrance into a state of regeneration, it is a fact, which no one will attempt to deny, that baptism does not alone and of itself admit into this state of *conscious* and *manifest* sonship. I should then give to εἰς the simple meaning of *motion into*. For in baptism the believer is transplanted out of the old creation *into* the new one in Christ Jesus ; *into* Him and the realities which belong to His work as a Saviour. So St. Paul<sup>2</sup> says, ὅσοι ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ ἐβαπτίσθημεν.

—Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε.—Some commentators derive this metaphor of the Apostle from the custom of the newly baptized putting on white garments. But it is much more likely that the custom itself arose out of the metaphor,<sup>3</sup> and its spiritual signification. The Apostle is in fact using a phraseology which was common to the Jews, and which might very naturally arise out of his knowledge of the earliest types of man's fall and renewal in Christ. For the Christian for whom the veil is removed from the in-

*Christ Jesus unto good works.* And He alone, who did create us out of nothing, can beget us again and make us of the new creation." Pearson on the Creed, Art. i. p. 37.

<sup>1</sup> John i. 12, 13.

<sup>2</sup> Rom. vi. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Centuriat. Magdeburg, Tom. i. pp. 382, 383; Ed. Basil. 1624, 3 vols. fol. See Deyling, Obs. Sac. xlii. Part iii. p. 417.

spired records of the old creation, recognises, in Adam's consciousness of nakedness, a type of his fall, and of the loss of that image in which he was created; and in his desire to be clothed, the necessity which arose in that fall that he should be clothed with the righteousness of Christ. And out of the Apostle's knowledge of the typical nature of the first creation as revealed in its earliest events, he might draw the metaphor with which he expresses the earliest privilege of the new creation in Christ Jesus. And moreover, as we observed, the phraseology was familiar to him as a Jew. To some small extent indeed the Jews seem to have been familiar with the very notion. They spoke of the Schechina as the garment lost by Adam in the fall, and at length to be restored to man in another life;<sup>1</sup> though indeed they knew nothing of being clothed with Jehovah as Jehovah Tsidkenu,<sup>2</sup> the Lord our Righteousness.

But as regards the notion itself in its bearing upon the present argument of the Apostle, it is evident that, under the idea of putting off the old man,<sup>3</sup> and putting on Christ who is the life<sup>4</sup> of the new man,<sup>5</sup> all which is so especially and aptly typified in baptism, he is expressing that intimate union between Christ the Son of God and the believer which lies at the root of our sonship with respect to God. So Chrysostom, *τίνος ἕνεκεν οὐκ εἶπεν, ὅσοι γὰρ εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε, ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐγεννήθητε; τὸ γὰρ ἀκάλουθον τοῦ δεῖξαι υἱοὺς τοῦτο ἔν. "Ὅτι πολλὸ φρικωδέστερον αὐτὸ τίθησιν. Εἰ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ,*

<sup>1</sup> See Schættgen on Rom. xiii. 14, and 2 Cor. v. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Jerem. xxiii. 6.

<sup>3</sup> Col. iii. 9.

<sup>4</sup> Col. iii. 4.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Eph. iv. 24; Col. iii. 10.

σὺ δὲ αὐτὸν ἐνδεδύσαι, τὸν υἱὸν ἔχων ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀφομοιωθεῖς, εἰς μίαν συγγένειαν καὶ μίαν ιδέαν ἕχθης. • And to the same effect Theodoret. And this putting on does not therefore exclusively refer to the justification of the sinner, but to that complete and general union in which there is involved the investiture, as with a robe, of the sinner whose nakedness<sup>1</sup> is only covered with filthy rags,<sup>2</sup> with His *imputed* righteousness,<sup>3</sup> and His *imparted* holiness and wisdom.<sup>4</sup>

I subjoin here the words of Jerome on this passage: “Quomodo filii Dei per fidem, quæ est in Christo Jesu, nascamur, ostendit dicens: *Quiquumque enim in Christo baptizati estis, Christum induistis.* Quod autem Christus sit indumentum, non solum de præsentī loco; verum etiam de alio comprobatur, Paulo eodem cohortante, *Induite vos Dominum Jesum Christum* (Rom. xiii. 14). Si igitur qui in Christo baptizati sunt, Christum induerunt, manifestum est eos qui non sunt induti Christum, non fuisse baptizatos in Christo. Ad eos enim qui fideles et baptisma Christi consequuti putabantur, dictum est, *Induite vos Dominum Jesum Christum.* Si quis hoc corporeum et quod oculis carnis aspicitur, aquæ tantum accipit lavacrum, non est indutus Dominum Jesum Christum. Nam et Simon ille de Actibus Apostolorum, acceperat lavacrum aquæ: verum quia Sanctum Spiritum non habebat, indutus non erat Christum. Et hæretici vel hypocritæ, et hi qui sordide victitant, viden-

<sup>1</sup> Rev. iii. 17.

<sup>2</sup> Isa. lxiv. 6.

<sup>3</sup> See Isaiah xlv. 24, lxi. 10 (and on this last Vitringa's comment); Jerem. xxiii. 6; Cant. iv. 7; Matt. xxii. 11, 12.

<sup>4</sup> 1 Cor. i. 30. Cf. also Rom. xiii. 14 (on which see Strigelius).

tur quidem accipere baptismum: sed nescio an Christi habeant indumentum.”

28. —ἐνι—This is for ἐνεστι,<sup>1</sup> the reference being of course to Christ and His mystical body. So Col. iii. 10, 11, ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον . . . ὅπου οὐκ ἐνι Ἑλληγν καὶ Ἰουδαῖος, κ. τ. λ.

—Ἰουδαῖος οὐδὲ Ἑλληγν—The world was divided during the Jewish dispensation into two classes; those who had, and those who had not, been circumcised and received the oracles of God. And owing to the wide-spread use of the Greek language, the term Ἑλληγνες came to be very generally applied to all who were not Jews. See 2 Mac. iv. 13, where Ἑλληγνισμός, and ἀλλοφυλισμός, are used synonymously, 2 Mac. vi. 9; John vii. 35; Rom. i. 16, ii. 9, 10, iii. 10; 1 Cor. i. 22, 24, x. 32, &ca.

—ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ—γένος, *sex*, is here understood—ἄρσην is the older Attic form of ἄρρην.<sup>2</sup> Schœttgen remarks here, that among the Jews women were deprived of many privileges which belonged to the men. But all this proves nothing as to the bearing of the passage upon any existing state of things among the Galatians. Nor indeed do I believe that there is any application of this sort in the passage. The Apostle has shown that *all*, whether Jews or Gentiles, who are baptized into Christ have put on Christ. He then says that in Christ, standing as the believer does in Him, there is no distinction of nation such as had before been so marked in the case of Jew and Gentile. And to show still further the union of believers as a body under Christ the Head, he adds that there is no dis-

<sup>1</sup> So Bengel. Rosenmul. See Lidd. and Scott, ἐνι.   <sup>2</sup> Lidd. and Scott.

inction of position or of sex. In the first creation God created mankind, ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ ·<sup>1</sup> in the new creation one divine nature is common to all.

—πάντες γάρ—For all, whether Jews or Greeks, bond or free, male or female.

—εἷς ἐστί—καινός ἄνθρωπος, Eph. ii. 15.<sup>2</sup> One Christ, 1 Cor. xii. 12, 13. So Chrysostom, Ὁ Ἕλληνας καὶ ὁ Ἰουδαῖος καὶ ὁ δοῦλος πρῶην, οὐκ ἀγγέλου οὐδὲ ἀρχαγγέλου, ἀλλ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ πάντων δεσπότητος τὴν μορφὴν ἔχων περιέρχεται, καὶ ἐν ἑαυτῷ δεικνύς τὸν Χριστόν.

Theodoret's comment, τὸ εἷς, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐν σῶμα, sufficiently explains what must have been the origin of the reading ἐν in F. and G. and *unum* in the Latin versions and Fathers, &c. Grotius manifests criticism as unsound as his doctrine, in the note in which he commends the reading of A. which omits εἷς altogether.

29. —εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ—This and the similar expressions, οἱ δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ in ch. v. 24, and ὑμεῖς δὲ Χριστοῦ in 1 Cor. iii. 23, in all which there is an ellipse of the verb εἶναι, find I think their best classical parallel in those passages in which εἶναι with a genitive expresses *dependence on*.<sup>3</sup> The idea of possession might indeed be involved, for we are doubtless His, bought with a price: but the simple notion of *dependence upon* seems more suited to the context here. For the believer who is joined to *Christ*, and, therefore, to an anointed and glorified Saviour, is dependent upon Him for the life of His new nature, in its origin and in its maintenance; and for every characteristic belonging thereto.

—ἄρα τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ σπέρμα ἐστί—ᾧ ἐρρέθησαν αἰ

<sup>1</sup> Mark x. 6.

<sup>2</sup> Bengel.

<sup>3</sup> Jelf, Gr. Gr. 518, 2, a.

ἐπαγγελίαι, ver. 16; ᾧ ἐπήγγελλται, ver. 19. This verse shows plainly that σπέρμα and Χριστός in ver. 16 mean Christ mystical.

In ver. 7 of this chapter the Apostle states the fact that believers are the children of Abraham. In ver. 16 he shows that to the posterity of Abraham the promise of the Gospel was made. In the 19th and five following verses he shows the true nature of the legal dispensation which was interposed between the giving of the promise and the appearance of the seed to whom it was made. He then proves that under the Gospel dispensation of faith they are no longer under the law, because under the law they were subject to a pædagogues, and by faith they are emancipated sons of God: and to demonstrate this, he reminds them that whoever and whatever they are, if they are baptized into Christ they are closely united to Him the Son of God. In ver. 28 he displays yet more plainly the intimacy of that union: and thus having shown that being joined to the Godhead of Christ we become the sons of God, he now deduces the proof of his declaration in ver. 7, and demonstrates that in union with Him who took the seed of Abraham,<sup>1</sup> we become also sons of Abraham and the seed to whom the inheritance was promised. "If children, then heirs; heirs of God, joint heirs with Christ."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Heb. ii. 16.

<sup>2</sup> Rom. viii. 17.



## CHAPTER IV.

1. —**Λέγω δέ**——I should translate **λέγω** here as in ch. iii. 17 (where see the note), and ch. v. 16, “I mean”—the reference being to the signification of what he had said in the 24th ver. about a **παιδαγωγός**.<sup>1</sup> The **δέ** is used as a connecting copula,—“And I mean.” The last three verses of the last chapter have led the Apostle away from the subject which he had introduced of the pædagogic character of the law: and here he reverts to it in his own rapid way, and enlarges upon and illustrates it in connexion with the word **κληρονόμοι**,<sup>2</sup> to which the argument immediately preceding had brought him.

—**ὁ κληρονόμος**——The article is used indefinitely.

—**νήπιός**——Bengel and others take this as meaning a minor, i. e. one not yet of age. But the case which furnishes the Apostle with his simile is not that of a minor (**ἀνηβος**), who, until a certain age fixed by law is under an **ἐπίτροπος**: but that of one who *from* a particular time and *until* a particular time is, by the will of the father, subjected to an

<sup>1</sup> So Piscator and Beza in Pole, “Quod autem dixi supra, iii. 24, sic intelligo;” and sim. Bengel.

<sup>2</sup> “Hæc appellatio repetitur ex cap. iii. 29.” Bengel.

ἐπίτροπος, *tutor*. And this very power as existing in a testator is thus stated by Ulpian: <sup>1</sup> “Tutorem autem et a certo tempore dare et usque ad certum tempus licet.” Now a *tutor* (*tutor*) is appointed for the protection <sup>2</sup> of those who on account of their age are unable to protect themselves, and, therefore, the limits of this period appointed by the father would fall within the legal minority. But I should take νήπιος here to mean simply a child, and to imply, as it constantly does in classical <sup>3</sup> and Pauline <sup>4</sup> usage, imperfection of understanding as well as of age. <sup>5</sup>

—οὐδὲν διαφέρει δούλου—Compare the following from the *Lysis* of Plato. <sup>6</sup> Ἡ που, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, ᾧ Λύσι, σφόδρα φιλεῖ σε ὁ πατήρ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ; Πάνυ γε, ἦ δ' ὄς. . . . Ἐῶσιν ἄρα σε ἂ βούλει ποιεῖν, καὶ οὐδὲν ἐπιπλήττουσιν οὐδὲ διακωλύουσι ποιεῖν ᾧ ἂν ἐπιθυμῆς; Ναὶ μὰ Δί' ἐμέγε, ᾧ Σώκρατες, καὶ μάλα γε πολλὰ κωλύουσι. . . . καὶ μοι ἔτι τόδε εἰπέ· σὲ αὐτὸν ἐῶσιν ἄρχειν σεαυτοῦ, ἣ οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἐπιτρέπουσί σοι; Πῶς γάρ, ἔφη, ἐπιτρέπουσιν; Ἄλλ' ἄρχει τίς σου; Ὅδε, παιδαγωγός, ἔφη. Μῶν δοῦλος ᾧν; . . . τί δὲ ποιῶν αὖ οὗτος ὁ παιδαγωγός σου ἄρχει; Ἄγων δὴ πού, ἔφη, εἰς διδασκάλου. Μῶν μὴ καὶ οὗτοί σου ἄρχουσιν, οἱ διδάσκαλοι; Πάντως δὴ πού. Παμπόλλους ἄρα σοι δεσπώτας καὶ ἄρχοντας ἐκὼν ὁ πατήρ ἐφίστησιν. But as regards the parallelism here, see the note on ἐπιτρ., ver. 2.

—κύριος πάντων ᾧν—The participle has here the same force as if καίπερ were added. See Jelf,

<sup>1</sup> Digest. Lib. xxvi. Tit. ii. l. viii. See also Inst. Lib. i. Tit. xxii. § 5.

<sup>2</sup> Digest. Lib. xxvi. Tit. i. l. i.

<sup>3</sup> See Lidd. and Scott, νήπιος II.

See also Suidas.

<sup>4</sup> See Rom. ii. 20; 1 Cor. iii. 1; Eph. iv. 14; Heb. v. 13.

<sup>5</sup> So Chrys., A Lapide, and the author of the Interlineary Gloss.

<sup>6</sup> 207, D. E., 208, B. C. D.

Gr. Gr. 697, d. He is treated as a δούλος, a *slave*, although he is (de jure) κύριος, the master of all things belonging to the inheritance.

2. —ἐπίτροπος—Elsner says here, “Vulgo hic interpretes commentari video de Tutoribus et Curatoribus patre defuncto filio præfectis: cum tamen hic sermonem esse appareat, de illis sub quorum arbitrio filius erat ob ætatem patre adhuc vivente volenteque ac jubente.” And he therefore takes ἐπίτροπος to be equivalent to παιδαγωγός, being probably misled by the expression ἄξει τῆς προθεσ., κ. τ. λ. But, as I before observed, the case which furnishes St. Paul with his simile, is that of a father directing by his will that his child should be, during a certain specified time, under an ἐπίτροπος or ἐπιτρόποι. These were, among Jews,<sup>1</sup> as well as Greeks and Romans, persons to whom was committed the charge of orphan children; guardians whose administration was based upon *right* and *power*, and involved *authority*, *care*, and *management*, as parts bearing upon the general object of *defence* and *protection*. In all these features, indeed, they represented the defunct parent, whose position, to a considerable extent, they filled.<sup>2</sup> For parallel usages of ἐπίτροπος, see Herodot. ix. 10; Thucyd. ii. 80;<sup>3</sup> and in the LXX., 2 Mac. xi. 1, xiv. 2.

—οἰκονόμους—These answered to the Latin *curatores*. When a minor arrived at the age of puberty (in males 14 and in females 12) the state of

<sup>1</sup> Selden De Success. in bona defuncti ad leges Ebræor., Cap. ix. vol. ii. p. 25. See also Wetstein and Schættgen on this place.

<sup>2</sup> On this subject the whole of the 26th book of the Digest may be consulted in Van Leeuwen's Edition of the Corpus Juris Civilis, Amsterdam. 1663.

<sup>3</sup> Lidd. and Scott, ἐπίτ. 2.

tutelage ceased.<sup>1</sup> But from that time until the age of 25, *curators* were appointed to manage their affairs, which they, although no longer minors, were not accounted capable of doing until that age.<sup>2</sup> But in certain cases, as when the patrimony was dispersed over various parts, curators were associated with the tutors,<sup>3</sup> and when the jurisdiction of the latter ended, so did also that of the curator who had been appointed to act with him ;<sup>4</sup> but then, when the tutelage was closed by the heir's arrival at the age of puberty, other curators were assigned to him until he was 25 years old.<sup>5</sup> The case which the Apostle seems to have had in view was probably one in which the ἐπίτροποι and οἰκονόμοι were associated in some way of this kind. The heir may be said to be *under* the οἰκονόμοι because they, and not he, had the direction and management of his own property.

—τῆς προθεσμίας—Subaud. ἡμέρας. προθέσμιος means *appointed beforehand*. It is used in connexion either with ὥρα or ἡμέρα understood.<sup>6</sup> In the former case it means a fore-appointed and limited *space* of time. In the latter it expresses a fore-appointed day, or the *end* and *limit* itself of that space of time. The latter usage seems to have sprung out of the former. In the former sense the word is used by Plato<sup>7</sup> and Demosthenes.<sup>8</sup> In the latter it occurs in the writings of Lucian, Josephus, Philo,<sup>9</sup> and others (who

<sup>1</sup> Instit. Lib. i. Tit. 22.

<sup>2</sup> Instit. Lib. i. Tit. 23.

<sup>3</sup> Codex, Lib. v. Tit. xxxvi. l. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Ib. Tit. lx. l. 1.

<sup>5</sup> Ib.

<sup>6</sup> Kypke gives an example from Achil. Tat. in which χώρα or πόλις must be supplied.

<sup>7</sup> Legg. xii. 954, D. E.

<sup>8</sup> See Lid. and Scott, at the word προθέσμιος. (They do not clearly state the two different usages; and create obscurity by instancing only ἡμέρα as the word to be supplied.) See also Kypke's quotation from Demos.

<sup>9</sup> See the quotations from Philo given by Læsner.

however, supply instances also of the first usage). So Lucian,<sup>1</sup> αἰτία δὲ τοῦ πολέμου ἔμελλεν ἔσσεσθαι, τοῦ φόρου ἢ οὐκ ἀπόδοσις, ἤδη τῆς προθεσμίας ἐνεστῶσης. and Josephus,<sup>2</sup> τῆς προθεσμίας ἐνισταμένης, καθ' ἣν ἔδει τῷ βασιλεῖ τοὺς φόρους ἀπαριθμεῖν. It would seem that Thomas Magister understood the word in the first sense, for he says, Προθεσμία, ῥητορικόν· Διωρία, κοινόν. and to the same effect Phrynicus. Wetstein<sup>3</sup> quotes Thomas, but spells Διωρία, διορία, which completely alters the meaning. Διορία is derived from ὄρος, Διωρία from ὦρα.<sup>4</sup> Διωρία means a space of time. So Josephus,<sup>5</sup> Δόξαν δ' ἐπανεῖναι πρὸς ὀλίγον τὴν πολιορκίαν, καὶ διωρίαν βουλῆς τοῖς στασιασταῖς παρασχεῖν. And Suidas, quoting this, defines by ἀνακωχή. In Justinian's Novells the word is used for a space of two hours. Διορία is explained by both Suidas and Hesychius by προθεσμία, and they both take προθεσμία in the second sense which I have indicated, and which is the one in which it is here used by the Apostle. As regards the peculiar meaning involved here, see the quotation from Ulpian in the note on ver. 1.

3. —οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς—Jews and Gentiles—κληρονόμοι, ch. iii. 29. Cf. also ver. 8 and 9 of this chapter.

—νήπιοι—τῇ γνώσει ἀτελεῖς.<sup>6</sup> Until the time arrived in which wisdom should be laid open to man in the Person of Christ, The Truth, he was neces-

<sup>1</sup> V. H. i. 36, quoted by Elsner.      <sup>2</sup> Ant. xii. 4, 7, quoted by Krebsius.

<sup>3</sup> Wetstein has destroyed the force of his quotations as bearing upon the meaning of the Apostle, by placing in juxtaposition a number of passages which contain examples of both usages; without indicating the distinction.

<sup>4</sup> See the note on Διορία in Alberti's Hesychius.

<sup>5</sup> De Bell. Jud. v. 9. 1.

<sup>6</sup> Schol. Gr. Ap. Matthæi.

sarily a babe in knowledge : and God's dispensations prior to the Great Revelation of His Son, were based upon the existence of this imperfection.

—ὕπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου δεδουλ.—στοιχεῖα, Lat. *elementa*, means primarily *physical* elements. Hence, these being reduced to four, the usage embodied in the definition of Hesychius, πῦρ, ὕδωρ, γῆ, καὶ ἀήρ.<sup>1</sup> Then the word was applied to *grammatical* elements, as the letters of the alphabet,<sup>2</sup> γράμματα.<sup>3</sup> and then to the elements of knowledge, the sciences, &ca.<sup>4</sup> So Galen,<sup>5</sup> τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς Ἱπποκράτους τέχνης. Cf. also Hesych. στοιχεῖωσις. πρώτη μάθησις. The Lat. *elementa* is used in the same sense.<sup>6</sup> It is in this last sense that it is used here by St. Paul, as also in Col. ii. 8, 20; Heb. v. 12. κόσμος is used as in 1 Cor. i. 20, iii. 19, and indicates what is weak, material, and imperfect..

Now the Apostle is speaking of Jews and Gentiles. He represents both as under the dominion of στοιχ. τοῦ κόσμ. in the same way as the heir is under ἐπιτ. καὶ οἶκον., and differs nothing from a slave. And what, in the case of the Jew, he means by στοιχ. τοῦ κόσμ. is plain from ver. 10, and from his whole scope and object. But though in ver. 10 he alludes to portions of the ceremonial law, he is not confining himself to it exclusively, but means the whole legal system. For when he says in ver. 5 that Christ redeemed them that were under the law, he is clearly referring to what he had just said about their being

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Seneca, De Ira, ii. 18.

<sup>2</sup> Polyb. x. 45, 7.

<sup>3</sup> Hesych.

<sup>4</sup> See Lidd. and Scott.

<sup>5</sup> Quoted by Wetstein.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Hor. Sat. i. 25,

—“ ut pueris olim dant crustula blandi  
Doctores, elementa velint ut discere prima.”

ὑπὸ στοιχ. τοῦ κόσμ. δεδουλ., and certainly Christ's work in this respect was not confined to the ceremonial law. Now the legal system was, although of Divine origin, yet a material type of a perfect dispensation, and was in itself weak and imperfect. The sacrifices pointed to the one great sacrifice of Christ. The feasts, the observances, all pointed to particulars belonging to His Person and work. And not less was the moral law, as revealed in the ten commandments, material as compared with the spiritual obedience of the Gospel, and weak and imperfect in respect of any power to give life, and produce a people zealous of good works. And so indeed the moral law, written upon tables of stone, was at best but a type of the law written in the hearts of the spiritual Israel by the Spirit of an ascended Saviour. And the nature and imperfection of this law is shown in the word δεδουλ. As the unformed faculties of the child did not appreciate his true advantage, and needed an ἐπίτροπος to defend him and force him into the way which led thereto; and as the παιδαγωγός constrained to obey by fear, him whose ripened faculties would have made him a willing learner; so the law terrified into an obedience which, in a perfect dispensation, would be one of intelligence and love. And it must be remembered that these στοιχεῖα, though weak, material, and imperfect, were yet the first principles, divinely revealed, of Truth as finally and fully manifested in the Person of Christ. As the ἐπίτροπος was appointed by the father in the very testament which gave the inheritance, so the law delivered to the Jew was a portion of the scheme of life; and all its

discipline was exercised in the direction of the Gospel dispensation itself.

But the Gentile is included here with the Jew. He too is said by the Apostle to have been under *στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου.*, that is to say, according to what we have already seen, material and imperfect elements of divine truth. And from the 8th verse of this chapter, and Col. ii. 8, we may gather that the Apostle has in view the *idolatry* and the *philosophy* of the heathen. Now the religious and philosophical systems of the heathen may, in all their multifarious developments, be traced to the manifestation to them of God in the works of creation,<sup>1</sup> and a consciousness within them of good and evil. Knowing God “they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened: professing themselves to be wise, they became fools; and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things.”<sup>2</sup> And thus, therefore, a knowledge which, though elementary and material, and powerless to produce renewal, was yet *real*, lay at the foundation of all their idolatry. And so too with their moral and philosophical systems. The work of God’s law was so far written upon their hearts<sup>3</sup> that their conscience approved what was done in conformity therewith, and reproved what was opposed thereto.<sup>4</sup> But while they could thus see and to some extent approve, as to their inner man, what was good, their fallen nature prevented them from following it, and so evil was manifested

<sup>1</sup> Rom. i. 19, 20.<sup>2</sup> Ib. 21—23.<sup>3</sup> Rom. ii. 15.<sup>4</sup> Ib.



to them in departures from what was good. And so they systematized both good and evil, and systematized too their speculations upon topics which connect themselves with the origin of both. And, moreover, they systematized performance, although throughout they confused oftentimes not only the boundaries, but the very regions themselves of good and evil. But still in these things and such as these the basis is the same, an elementary and weak and material knowledge of divine truth. And not less than in the case of the Jew, was there in all this, bondage; and the very fertility of speculation showed that God in creation, and His law in the heart, spoke only to condemn. But moreover, as with the more defined knowledge of God and of His law which was given to the Jew, these divine teachings were preparatory for the Gospel scheme,—the kingdom of nature prepared for the kingdom of grace. Containing, as did these *στοιχεῖα*, germs of the Highest Truth; combined with a fallen nature, they wrought, as did the Jewish law, consciousness of evil and imperfection, and led up, therefore, to Christ as a Saviour and Deliverer, and the Fountain of Wisdom and Truth. Cf. the note on ch. iii. 25.

4. —ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου—πλήρωμα means a sum or complement. Cf., as regards a period of time, Herodot. iii. 22.<sup>1</sup> The sum or complement of a period of time arrives with the end or limit of that time, *προθεςμία ἡμέρα*. Cf. Eph. i. 10,<sup>2</sup> τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν. Mark i. 15. Cf. *πλήρωσις τῶν ἡμερῶν*, LXX., Ezek. v. 2; Dan. x. 3.

<sup>1</sup> See Liddell and Scott, *πλήρωμα*, and Raphel on this place.

<sup>2</sup> As regards the usage of the *word*.

—ἐξἀπέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς, κ. τ. λ. The Person thus sent forth by God the Father<sup>1</sup> was Him who, being the Son of God, born of a woman, born under the law, was the Christ. The object of His mission as the Christ is stated in the next verse. His mission then commenced in His incarnation.<sup>2</sup>

—τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ——This refers not to His eternal generation as the only begotten Son of the Father, but to His generation in time of the Holy Ghost, by virtue of which the Christ was the Son of God.<sup>3</sup> See the note on ver. 6.

—γενόμενον——“born.” This sense, in which St. Paul uses the word in Rom. i. 3, is common enough in classical writers. So Xenoph. *Cyropæd.*,<sup>4</sup> ὁ σὸς δὲ πατὴρ ἔγημε τὴν τοῦ ἐμοῦ πατρὸς θυγατέρα, ἐξ ἧς σὺ ἐγένου, and *Anab.*,<sup>5</sup> μέγιστον δὲ μαρτύριον ἡ ἐλευθερία τῶν πόλεων ἐν αἷς ὑμεῖς ἐγένεσθε καὶ ἐτράφητε. So also Herodotus,<sup>6</sup> Ἡμέρην δὲ ἀπασέων μάλιστα ἐκείνην τιμᾶν νομίζουσι τῇ ἕκαστος ἐγένετο; and so the LXX., Gen. iv. 26, xxi. 3, 5, 9, xxxv. 26, xxxvi. 5, xli. 50, xlvi. 20, 27, xlviii. 5, &ca, &ca. Compare also *Ælian*,<sup>7</sup> ἐξ Ἰλλυρίδος γυναικὸς γενομένη.

Tertullian,<sup>8</sup> writing against the Valentinian and docetic theory generally, says that the Apostle expressly says *factum* and not *natum*, and gives as his reason, “Factum dicendo, et verbum caro factum est,<sup>9</sup> consignavit, et carnis veritatem ex virgine factæ

<sup>1</sup> 2 Cor. i. 3; Eph. i. 3; 1 Pet. i. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Augustine, *Tract xlii.* in *Johan.* § 8, “Christi ergo missio est incarnatio,” and *sim.* *Tract xxxvi.* § 7.

<sup>3</sup> Luke i. 35. See the note on ver. 5 of this chapter.

<sup>4</sup> VIII. v. 19.   <sup>5</sup> III. ii. 13.   <sup>6</sup> i. 133, and *sim.* ii. 82, and ix. 110.

<sup>7</sup> *Var. Hist.* xiii. 36, quoted by Alberti on this place.

<sup>8</sup> *De Carne Christi*, 20.

<sup>9</sup> John i. 14.

adseveravit." And if it was not ignorance of the Greek usage, it was probably some reason of this sort which gave rise to the Latin rendering of *factum*.<sup>1</sup> But in fact the word *born* expresses the nature and fact of the incarnation with far greater force and truth.<sup>2</sup> For, setting aside that divine power and operation through which the Virgin was enabled to conceive, it implies that whatever in and from the moment of conception until the completion of parturition takes place in the ordinary human birth, took place in the case of Jesus.<sup>3</sup> Otherwise He would not have been in every respect, and therefore truly, man, and the seed of the woman who should bruise the head of the serpent.<sup>4</sup> And so also as the life of the newborn babe consists in the union of soul and body, Christ as man was "of the substance of His mother born in the world," "perfect man of a reasonable soul<sup>5</sup> and human flesh subsisting."<sup>6</sup> With regard to our English rendering of *made*, Scholefield,<sup>7</sup> saying that "perhaps" *γενόμε. ὑπὸ νόμον* means "made subject to the law," adds, "it seems to have been by some confusion in reference to this common sense of *γενέσ-*

<sup>1</sup> The Codd. Demidov. and Tolet. of the Vulg. read "natum," and so Cyprian. But this may have arisen from a Greek emendation, *γεννώμενον*.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Tertullian ubi sup. § 1.

<sup>3</sup> *First*, we acknowledge a true, real, and proper conception, by which the Virgin did conceive of her own substance the true and real substance of our Saviour, according to the prediction of the Prophet, Isa. vii. 14, and the annunciation of the angel, Luke i. 31. *Secondly*, she did also nourish and increase the same body of our Saviour once conceived, by the true substance of her own (cf. Luke ii. 5, *οὐσθη ἐγκύφη*). *Thirdly*, she did truly and really bring forth her Son by a true and proper parturition, and Christ was, thereby, properly born by a true nativity. Pearson on the Creed, Art. iii. pp. 217, 218.

<sup>4</sup> Gen. iii. 15.

<sup>5</sup> See Matt. xxvi. 38.

<sup>6</sup> Athanasian Creed. See Pearson, Art. iii. p. 200.

<sup>7</sup> Hints, &c.

θαι ὑπὸ τινά that our translators were led (for uniformity's sake?) to the strange expression, *made of a woman.*" But it is much more likely that they referred the word to the miraculous operation of the Holy Ghost as distinguished from human generation: q. d. *made*, not begotten.<sup>1</sup>

—ἐκ γυναικός—αὕτη κληθήσεται γυνή.<sup>2</sup> Cf. Homer,<sup>3</sup> Ἡ θεὸς ἦ ἐ γυνή.

—γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον—“born under the law;” that is, not only born man, but “of the seed of Abraham,”<sup>4</sup> and therefore bound during life<sup>5</sup> to the Mosaic legal system. Calovius objects to the idea of Christ being said to be by birth subject to the law; and, on the ground of the words of our Lord in Mark ii. 28, “The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath,” understands a subsequent and voluntary subjection to its requirements. Now as regards the meaning of this passage from St. Mark's Gospel, it must be remembered that as a Jewish feast,<sup>6</sup> the Sabbath, in common with the whole body of Jewish observances, represented something spiritual, and it was the spiritual, and not the mere outward observance which was really required.<sup>7</sup> The law is abrogated in Christ, because the spiritual truth involved therein is now a reality, not only objectively, as regards Christ Himself, but subjectively, as regards His people. And the obedience of Christ was spiritual. He conformed, it is true, in many

<sup>1</sup> Calovius, Perkins, Estius, and others, comment to this very effect.

<sup>2</sup> Gen. ii. 23. Cf. also iii. 15.

<sup>3</sup> Od. x. 228.

<sup>4</sup> Heb. ii. 16.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Rom. vii. 1.

<sup>6</sup> Levit. xxiii. 2, 3. It was of course of earlier institution and universal obligation, and was, in the fulness of its original and spiritual import, taken into the Jewish system.

<sup>7</sup> Hosea vi. 6; Psal. li. 16, 17.

things, to the outward observances of the law which He came to do away ; but, perfectly obedient to the Spirit, He might, and did, modify the letter as He thought fit, and so it is because of His spiritual and perfected obedience that the law as a killing letter is for ever done away. And this I take to be the meaning in this passage of Mark. The Sabbath, says our Lord, was made for man, that is to say, it was given him, in connexion with the very object of his being, as a day of spiritual rest, in which, contemplating, in its nature, and author, that rest which is eternal, he might gain strength to help him forward in his journey towards heaven. The ceremonial observance, the outward rest, in all its developments, typified this, and therefore, the Son of man, reaching alone of all men to a truly spiritual obedience, and fulfilling therefore in His own person the object of its institution, had the best right to dispense with any portion of the mere outward form. But there rested no less upon Him a necessity to obedience. He was born man and a Jew, and therefore bound to obey. Being such as He was, He obeyed spiritually and perfectly.

And as regards the objection generally, we may observe that we might say with equal justice that the death of Christ was not a necessity which arose in His incarnation, but a voluntary subjection to that which, although He was really man, He need not have undergone. But St. Paul expressly says <sup>1</sup> that He took flesh and blood, "*that through death He might destroy Him that had the power of death.*" And so too, in being born of the seed of Abraham,

<sup>1</sup> Heb. ii. 14.

He placed Himself *by that act* in the same position with regard to the law as that in which His brethren were whose nature He took, and to whom in all things excepting sin He was made like.<sup>1</sup> His incarnation, involving every consequence thereof, was a voluntary act, but, once undertaken, the consequences became necessities; and it is because in His birth He subjected Himself vicariously to those necessities, that they meritoriously procure our salvation.

5. In the preceding verse, the Apostle, describing the person of Christ as the Son of God, the Son of man, the seed of Abraham, represents His fitness to undertake, and His power to carry out His mission. He here gives us the end and object of that mission.

Augustine, and after him Bengel, connect the first clause of this verse with *γενόμεν. ὑπὸ νόμ.*, and the last with *γενόμεν. ἐκ γυναικ.* But the distinction is more verbal than real. For the person and work of Christ as a whole is concerned in each point in the history of man's salvation, and thus our redemption from the curse of the law depends no less upon His human than upon His Jewish birth.

—*τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον* — This virtually represents Gentiles as well as Jews. For although it was not the office of that knowledge, which we may call the law of the Gentile, to add another cause of condemnation to that already existent in the imputed guilt of Adam,<sup>2</sup> yet since it did in fact serve to demonstrate the truth of his fall, and the justice of the condemnation thence ensuing, so also did it produce in man himself a consciousness of fall, and of incapacity for what is good, and of certain and ex-

<sup>1</sup> Heb. ii. 17.

<sup>2</sup> See Rom. v. 13, 14, 16, 18.

istent condemnation. And moreover as this law was not in itself the cause of condemnation, so neither did it in any way offer an occasion of justification : and since it is the tendency of every natural mind to seek for salvation through a system of works, the very absence of system forced the Gentile into the creation of systems of his own, which, being the offspring of a fallen nature, developed themselves in constant accessions of human vice and weakness. And so, as the savage is terrified by the reflection of his own features, not knowing them to be his own, man shrinks appalled before the developments of systems which have sprung from the consciousness of moral obligation in his own corrupt and fallen nature. And thus while the revealed law of the Jew wrought fear, distinct in its character, divine in its origin, a fear, less distinct, it is true, and less directly produced, was the result of the consciousness of the Gentile of the unwritten law, and formed doubtless a portion of that discipline which should prepare Gentile as well as Jew for the coming Saviour. So that in all these points the Gentile was *ἐπὶ νόμον*. But the law as revealed to the Jew was a divine system, a divine embodiment of the *same* law which was less distinctly revealed to the Gentile. So that if the Gentile would have been saved in a covenant of works, the Jewish law was the only divine and authorized system within which he could have obtained justification. For because of this its nature, it did of itself offer justification, although it failed in giving it because it was brought into combination with a fallen nature. When therefore Christ became a Jew, and therefore bound during

life to the Jewish law, in fulfilling perfectly and spiritually that law, and in dying in that obedience, he fulfilled all divine law in its only authorized and divine embodiment; and when He died in this perfect obedience, He dissolved in His own person, and vicariously, the legal contract, not only in regard to the Jew, but to the Gentile also; and he is therefore assured that all those legal fears which, arising out of a consciousness of a true position, reflected the revealed threatenings of the Sinaitic law, are done away in and by Christ.

—ἐξαγοράση—See the note on chap. iii. ver. 13; Eph. i. 7; Heb. ix. 12. Christ being born man and a Jew was bound during life to the Mosaic embodiment of divine law. Assuming therefore a mortal nature He not only died vicariously for man, bearing the guilt and punishment of sin, but He dissolved in His own person by death the legal contract.<sup>1</sup> Being God He rose again as God, and glorified man, and therefore free as man from that contract. And thus, since in assuming vicariously mortal and finite nature he both bore vicariously the punishment and guilt of sin, and dissolved by death the legal contract,—by that act of death He redeemed those who were under the law. But also being bound to the law He vicariously and perfectly fulfilled its requirements until death; and hence having thus died in a continued and perfected obedience he rose, possessed as man of a real righteousness vicariously attained, and therefore imputed for justification to those for whom it was attained. And thus as He lived in order that He might die, and

<sup>1</sup> See Rom. vii. 4.



died that He might live, He redeemed by death those who were under the law; offering, in His consummated and vicarious sacrifice, His life as the price by which He should attain their deliverance, and should substitute justification for condemnation. And thus through one and the same act of becoming man and a Jew, Christ inherited vicariously the promise made to Abraham and his seed, and attained the justifying righteousness which is the main element in His people's full fruition of that promise.

So far then we see the person and work of Christ as delivering the heir (ver. 1) from the slavery of the law.

—*υιοθεσίαν*—Hesychius, *υιοθεσία*. ὅταν τις θετὸν υἷον λαμβάνῃ. See Herodot. vi. 57, ἣν τις θετὸν παῖδα ποιέεσθαι ἐθέλη, βασιλῆων ἐναντίον ποιέεσθαι. *υιοθεσία* represents here the position into which believers are brought through the completed mission of the God-man Christ Jesus. In connexion with human affairs the word indicates the position of an individual not naturally and by birth the son of the adopting father; yet by virtue of his adoption treated as such, and invested with all the privileges of a true son. But the divine *υιοθεσία* involves a step beyond this, and out of the pale of human similitudes; because the son once begotten of a human parent is again born of God,<sup>1</sup> and not only invested with privileges which are his through adoption, but which belong to him because his adoption has resulted in a true sonship.

For when the Second Person of the Trinity, begot-

<sup>1</sup> John i. 12.

ten in eternity by the Father, became the Christ, He was begotten of the Holy Ghost,<sup>1</sup> and thus became, in respect of a generation in time, the Son of God.<sup>2</sup> And moreover, since having died as man He is risen from the dead, He is in these respects, begotten to another life out of the grave.<sup>3</sup> Thus then since the believer in baptism puts on Christ,<sup>4</sup> he is united to one begotten of the Holy Ghost, and declared to be the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead.<sup>5</sup> And the very act of union is a regeneration. Since therefore there is a real new birth, and a real union with Christ as a Son, there arises to the believer a real sonship, and in these respects Christ Himself said,<sup>6</sup> "I ascend unto my Father and your Father." But it must not be lost sight of that there is a higher degree of sonship which belongs to Christ alone, as the only begotten of his Father in eternity: and this sonship is not communicated to His people.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Matt. i. 20.

<sup>2</sup> Luke i. 35. See Pearson on the Creed, p. 135, Art. ii.

<sup>3</sup> See Acts xiii. 33; Pearson, pp. 135, 136.

<sup>4</sup> Chap. iii. ver. 27, where see the note.

<sup>5</sup> Rom. i. 4.

<sup>6</sup> John xx. 17. See Pearson, pp. 41, 42.

<sup>7</sup> See Pearson, p. 42, and 136, seqq. So Augustine, Tract xxi. in Johan., § 3, quoted by Pearson, note x. vol. ii. p. 18: "Non sicut Christi Pater, ita et noster Pater. Nunquam enim Christus ita nos conjunxit, ut nullam distinctionem faceret inter nos et se. Ille enim Filius æqualis Patri, ille æternus cum Patre, Patrique cœternus: nos autem facti per Filium, adoptati per Unicum. Proinde nunquam auditum est de ore Dom. J. C., cum ad discipulos loqueretur, dixisse illum de Deo summo Patre suo, Pater noster; sed aut Pater meus dixit, aut Pater vester. Pater noster non dixit, usque adeo ut quodam loco poneret hæc duo, 'Vado ad Deum meum,' inquit, 'et Deum vestrum.' Quare non dixit, Deum nostrum? Et Patrem meum dixit et Patrem vestrum, non dixit Patrem nostrum. Sic jungit ut distinguat, sic distinguit ut non sejungat. Unum nos vult esse in se, unum autem Patrem et se."

This *υιοθεσία* involves the elements of the complete liberty of the adult son. To effect the deliverance from slavery, and the introduction into this state of sonship, God sent forth His Son, born of a woman, born under the law. To complete the work He sent forth the Spirit of His Son to give the consciousness of sonship.

6. —ὅτι δέ ἐστε υἱοί—The Apostle changes the person to bring home the fact of the sonship of the new dispensation more forcibly to the Galatians themselves. The reading Θεοῦ originated most probably in a gloss referring to iii. 26. As regards υἱοί, see the note on that verse.

—ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ—The whole three Persons in the Trinity are here seen engaged in the work of salvation. The Spirit, which, being God,<sup>1</sup> the third<sup>2</sup> person<sup>3</sup> in the Trinity, is sent from God<sup>4</sup> and Christ,<sup>5</sup> is, in His relation to the work of our salvation, the Spirit of Christ<sup>6</sup> as an ascended Saviour,<sup>7</sup> declared by that act to be the Son of God with power.<sup>8</sup> So that this mission of the Spirit is a part of, and dependent upon, the complete work of salvation through Christ.

—τὰς καρδίας—The heart, the seat of the understanding<sup>9</sup> and the affections.<sup>10</sup>

—ἡμῶν—This reading is by far the best sup-

<sup>1</sup> See Acts v. 3, 4, 9.

<sup>2</sup> See Matt. xxviii. 19; Eph. ii. 18.

<sup>3</sup> See Acts x. 19, xiii. 2, xv. 28; Eph. iv. 30.

<sup>4</sup> John xiv. 26; Matt. x. 20; 1 Cor. ii. 11, 12; Rom. viii. 9.

<sup>5</sup> John xv. 26.

<sup>6</sup> Rom. viii. 9; 1 Pet. i. 11; Phil. i. 19.

<sup>7</sup> See John xvi. 7; Acts ii. 32, 33; Eph. iv. 8.

<sup>8</sup> Rom. i. 4.

<sup>9</sup> See Luke iii. 15, ix. 47; Acts xxviii. 27; 2 Cor. iv. 6; Eph. i. 18. (Text of Griesb., Lachm., Scholz., Tisch. *διανοίας* being probably added originally in the margin as an explanatory word.)

<sup>10</sup> Matt. vi. 21; Mark vii. 6.

ported, and the use of Ἀββᾶ afterwards shows it to be the true one; ὑμῶν is an emendation, arising probably out of the use of the second person plural just before.<sup>1</sup>

—κράζον—Suidas, κεκράξομαι. οὐκ ἐπὶ φωνῆς ἀλλ' ἐπὶ προθυμίας, καὶ συντόνου καὶ σπουδαίας εὐχῆς. Δαβίδ.<sup>2</sup> Πρὸς σὲ, Κύριε, κεκράξομαι. And so frequently in other places in the Psalms, as Psal. iii. 5, iv. 4, xvii. 7, xxvii. 1, &ca., and Jer. xl. 3.

—Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ—אבא is a Chaldee form of the Heb. אבא, *my father*: א being used in Chaldee for the Heb. pronoun suffix, י, *my*.<sup>3</sup> Lightfoot<sup>4</sup> observes that as אבא signifies a natural father, it means also a civil father, a master, elder, doctor, magistrate: while אבא denotes only a natural father. And he quotes several passages to prove that whenever in Scripture “mention is made of a natural father, the Targumists use the word אבא, but when of a civil father, they use another word.” It was one thing therefore to call God, as the Jews did, אבא, Lord, King, Governor, Teacher, &ca, and another to call Him אבא in the exclusive sense of a natural Father.<sup>5</sup> With re-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Mill. Proleg. 1376.

<sup>2</sup> Psal. xxix. 9. (LXX.)

<sup>3</sup> Parkhurst, Chal. Gr. § iv. 3. But it must also be observed that “as א prefixed to a Heb. noun often denotes the emphatic or definitive art., *the*, so does א postfixed to a Chaldee noun.” Park., ib. § iii. 14.

<sup>4</sup> On Mark xvi. 36. Vol. ii. Opp. fol. London, 1684.

<sup>5</sup> Lightfoot, p. 354. Selden explains this passage in a different manner: He says, “in servis familiaribus censitus, aut ex ancilla susceptus, assertione patris, aut servum illum non esse, sed sibi filium, aut hujus matrem manumissam fuisse (saltem si ejusce proles inter filios cæteros rite educata fuisset) inter liberos legitimos seu hæredes locum obtinuit. Quod de libero ita asserto multo magis dicendum. Libero homini etiam fas erat patrem, nomine compellendo ac frequenti adlocutione, quempiam sibi ita adsciscere, ut adoptionem illam veluti sibi invitatum ambiendo præpararet quæ ab adscito patre filium etiam agnoscente demum firmabatur. Cæterum nec servis nec ancillis hoc licuit, ne patris sic adsciti et natales

gard to ὁ πατήρ, the conclusion seems inevitable that if it is explanatory in one place, it is so in all, and it seems very unlikely that Mark and Paul should, if they meant only to explain, both adopt this elliptical form. Nor is Alberti's<sup>1</sup> quotation of Acts xiii. 8, Ἐλύμας ὁ μάγος, at all apposite, because ὁ μάγος is not added there to explain, but the fact of his name representing his profession is afterwards remarked upon. And indeed I cannot but think that if they had intended to interpret they would have said πάτερ μου. (Comp. Matt. xxvi. 39, 42, with Mark xiv. 36.) I am led, therefore, to think that ὁ πατήρ is, in conformity with classical usage, the nominative for the vocative,<sup>2</sup> and that Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ was a form, which, in the visible out-pouring of the Spirit on the early church, was, under His especial influence, used in the prayers of the early Christians.<sup>3</sup> And moreover I should share the opinion of Augustine and Bengel, that this cry of the Spirit in the redeemed signified the union of Jews and Greeks, who, in the unity of the mystical body of Christ, and through Him the Head, have access by one Spirit to the Father.<sup>4</sup> Nor, if such be the cry of a risen Saviour in the hearts of His people, can there be

et familia macula servili inspergi viderentur. Etenim hoc est quod legitur in gemara Babylonia ad tit. *Berachoth*. cap. ii. fol. 17. *Nec servi nec ancillæ compellationis illo genere, Pater, seu Abba N. aut Mater, seu Imma N. utuntur.*" De Success. ad Leges Ebræor., cap. iv. pp. 14, 15, vol. ii. But the case of the freeman of the Gospel is totally dissimilar. He cries Abba, not only because he is redeemed and free, but because he is adopted. The quotation from the Gemara, however, throws additional light upon the explanation of Lightfoot.

<sup>1</sup> Glossar. p. 28.

<sup>2</sup> Jelf, Gr. Gr. 476, c.

<sup>3</sup> Schættgen on Rom. viii. 15.

<sup>4</sup> Eph. ii. 14, 15, 16, 18. Cf. Augustin. Serm. clvi. § 15, Tom. vii. pp. 756, 757.

any reason to doubt but that His own cry, Abba, Father, while on earth, was one among the many significant acts of His vicarious work, in which He foreshadowed the supplication which He, in whom Jew and Greek should be gathered together, should offer for them and in them: <sup>1</sup> and which they should offer in and through Him the Son of God, and their Redeemer.

This then is the nature of this cry. The Spirit of Christ risen testifies to him who is redeemed and adopted, of Christ who wrought the work; <sup>2</sup> and thus filling him with a consciousness of the reality of that work, and all its consequences as revealed in himself, <sup>3</sup> causes him to cry aloud to God as his own Father in Christ, and as the author of the scheme of salvation, and his own interest therein; <sup>4</sup> and, since as yet the work of redemption is not completed by the renewal of the body, <sup>5</sup> the Spirit helps "the infirmities" <sup>6</sup> which arise in the imperfection of our state, and, making "intercession with groanings which cannot be uttered," <sup>7</sup> cries Himself, <sup>8</sup> while He causes the redeemed to cry to God as a loving Father. And thus, of the fulness of Christ as a humiliated and glorified Redeemer and Son we all receive, and grace for grace. <sup>9</sup>

7. —*ὡς τὸ εἶ*—This expresses the consequence of the work thus completed.

—*εἶ*—The Apostle changes the person to bring

<sup>1</sup> So the author of the Interlineary Gloss.

<sup>2</sup> John xv. 26.

<sup>3</sup> John xvi. 13; Rom. viii. 16; 1 Cor. ii. 9—12.

<sup>4</sup> John vi. 44, 65.

<sup>5</sup> Rom. viii. 23.

<sup>6</sup> Ib. 26.

<sup>7</sup> Ib.

<sup>8</sup> "Diserte inquit clamantem, ut significet gemitum ineffabilem, de quo Rom. viii. scribitur." Strigel. in h. l.

<sup>9</sup> John i. 16.

home the fact of this perfected sonship to the individual soul of any one who thus cried Abba, Father. See a similar change of person, ch. vi. 1 ; Rom. xii. 19, 20 ; 1 Cor. iv. 6, 7.

—*υἱός*—a son in the full enjoyment of all the privileges of his position.

—*εἰ δὲ υἱός, καὶ κληρονόμος διὰ Θεοῦ*—The external evidence is strong in favour of the reading *διὰ Θεοῦ*. The Greek scholiast in Matthæi's MS. d. of the Gospels cites, in a comment on John i. 3, this passage, and also 1 Cor. i. 9, to prove that *δι' αὐτοῦ*, as applied to Christ, does not indicate any inferiority of person, and Matthæi asserts that *διὰ Θεοῦ* was substituted in this place for *διὰ Χριστοῦ* to serve some orthodox purpose. But the reading *διὰ Θεοῦ* was in existence in the time of Clemens Alexandrinus, and, although the germs of the Arian view of Christ's person were apparent even then in the tenets of the Ebionites, Theodotus, and Artemon, surely no candid critic would argue that it was then more likely that *διὰ Χριστοῦ* should be changed into *διὰ Θεοῦ*, than that, with the context at the close of ch. iii. and with Rom. viii. 17 in view, *διὰ Θεοῦ* should be changed into *διὰ Χριστοῦ*. The supposition could only be advanced by one determined, at all hazards, to depreciate the authority of the Western recension. And granting, for the sake of argument, that there was then any powerful motive for such a change, there could be no necessity for it, seeing that there were so many other passages at hand, as Rom. xi. 36 ; 1 Cor. i. 9 ; Gal. i. 1 ; Heb. ii. 10, to serve their purpose.

As regards the meaning of the passage in this

form, the Apostle has just shown that God sent forth Christ and His Spirit to bring about in man the completed work of redemption and conscious adoption. In the same way, then, that an agency is attributed to Christ as very God in the act of creation,<sup>1</sup> and in His mission and work for man, so here the act of God is represented as an agency of His will and His love; and so Anselmus Laudunensis, the author of the Interlineary Gloss, says here, “per operationem Dei.” Just in the same way in ch. i. 1, the *διὰ* is common to Christ, in respect of His mission and work, and God, in respect of His operation in raising Christ from the dead; and so also in 1 Cor. i. 9, where St. Paul speaks of the operation of God in calling those whom He has chosen, *εἰς κοινωνίαν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*. And in the fact that this operation is an agency of the will and love of God, is involved the consideration that the completed work of redemption and adoption in the individual soul is the result, not of merit, but of the sovereign will and free grace of God. And this I take to be the force of this passage. *διὰ Θεοῦ* is supplied in thought after *υἱός*. “If,” the Apostle would say, “as we have seen, it is God who of His free mercy hath made thee a son; so also, since that son is an heir, God hath made thee an heir.” And in this is involved the consummation of the work effected by God through Christ. Redeemed, freed, brought into the full and glorious liberty of the children of God,<sup>2</sup> the conscious son, who is sealed<sup>3</sup> with the Spirit of his Lord, is reminded that heirship is

<sup>1</sup> John i. 3; Heb. i. 2.<sup>2</sup> Rom. viii. 21.<sup>3</sup> Eph. i. 13, 14.



a part of sonship,<sup>1</sup> and that the same God gives him in Christ that which was promised to Abraham's seed—glory,<sup>2</sup> and an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away.<sup>3</sup>

8. —'Αλλὰ τότε——“But aforetime,”<sup>4</sup> i. e. before the fulness of time was come, and when ye (Galatians) were under the elements of the world.<sup>5</sup>

—οὐκ εἰδότες Θεόν——i. e. as ye know Him now in the Gospel dispensation. Cf. Hosea vi. 6.

—ἐδουλεύσατε——This word plainly refers to δουλωμένοι in ver. 3, and therefore it implies a slavish service. Compare Deut. xxviii. 64, in the LXX., δουλεύσεις ἐκεί θεοῖς ἐτέροις, ξύλοις καὶ λίθοις, and the usage of δουλεύειν in Gen. xv. 14; Exod. xiv. 12, xxi. 2; Deut. xv. 12, &ca, &ca.

—τοῖς φύσει μὴ οὖσιν θεοῖς——“to those who by nature are not gods,” i. e. idols “of silver and gold, the work of men's hands,”<sup>6</sup> “images made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things,”<sup>7</sup> which are only λεγόμενοι θεοί.<sup>8</sup> Cf. LXX., 2 Par. xiii. 9, τῶ μὴ ὄντι θεῶ, and Deut. xxxii. 21, ἐπ' οὐ θεῶ. I suspect that the transposition of φύσει in the reading τοῖς μὴ φύσει οὖσιν θεοῖς was the work of some one of the orthodox party, wishing thereby to give the meaning, “to those who are not gods by nature.” For φύσις means *essence*, and so Athanasius defines, φύσις εἴρηται διὰ τὸ πεφυκέναι καὶ εἶναι.<sup>9</sup> And the word is used by the Greek orthodox Fathers to express the di-

<sup>1</sup> Rom. viii. 17; Gal. iii. 29.

<sup>2</sup> Rom. viii. 30.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Pet. i. 4.

<sup>4</sup> See Lidd. and Scott, τότε.

<sup>5</sup> See the note on ver. 3.

<sup>6</sup> Psal. cxxxv. 15. See also Acts xvii. 29.

<sup>7</sup> Rom. i. 23.

<sup>8</sup> 1 Cor. viii. 5.

<sup>9</sup> See Suicer Thesaurus, Tom. ii. p. 1469.

vine nature or Godhead, as also the human nature or manhood, of Christ.<sup>1</sup> Giving, therefore, this meaning to this passage, they might argue that if Christ were not φύσει Θεός, *essentially* God, He could not be in any way a proper object of religious worship.<sup>2</sup>

9. —νῦν δέ—Now that the fulness of time is come.

—γρόντες Θεόν—Knowing God in and through Christ, and therefore loving Him as a Father. See the note on γνωσθέντες. The Apostle is describing, not the universal experiences of all within the new dispensation, but the necessary conditions and characteristics of that dispensation, which would be individually realized in the person of each one whom he addressed, who had really put on Christ and received His Spirit.

—μᾶλλον δέ—“or rather.”<sup>3</sup> Cf. Polyb. ii. 56, 2, χρήσιμον ἂν εἴη, μᾶλλον δ' ἀναγκαῖον· and ii. 71, 2, χρήσιμον ἐδόκει, μᾶλλον δ' ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι, &ca. Cf. Rom. viii. 34.

—γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ Θεοῦ—The Heb. יָדָע, which the LXX. in most instances translate by γνώσκω, has a pregnant sense, and constantly indicates a knowledge involving *love*. So Ps. ix. 10 [11].<sup>4</sup> (Compare this with Ps. v. 11 [12]<sup>5</sup>), xci. [xc.] 14, cxix. [cxviii.] 79; Isa. i. 3; Hos. vi. 3. See also Job xxiv. 16 (here the LXX. translate by ἐπέγνωσαν). And so it is used of the love of God, as Exod. ii. 25;

<sup>1</sup> See Suicer Thesaurus, Tom. ii. p. 1469.

<sup>2</sup> Elsner, commenting upon the received text, makes use of this very argument against the Socinians, and so also Calovius.

<sup>3</sup> Lidd. and Scott, μάλα, ii. 5. See Raphel in h. l.

<sup>4</sup> The numbers in brackets are those of the LXX.

<sup>5</sup> See Vitringa on Isa. xi. 2.

Nahum i. 7; and especially of His electing love, as Amos iii. 2 (compare this with Deut. vii. 6); Jer. i. 5 (where the LXX. use ἐπίσταμαι). See also Exod. xxxiii. 12, 17 (where the LXX. translate by οἶδά). And thus we find γινώσκω used in the New Testament in the same pregnant sense as the Heb. See John x. 14, 15; Rom. viii. 29, xi. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 19; 1 Cor. viii. 3, xiii. 12.

The Apostle then, in this place speaking generally of the terms of the Gospel dispensation, and particularly to those who had possessed personal proofs of God's love, corrects what he had first said, and adopts an expression which more truly displays the position of the spiritual Israel. For they know and love God, because it is His love and knowledge<sup>1</sup> of them before the foundation of the world,<sup>2</sup> which brings them to the Saviour which His love has sent to a guilty world,<sup>3</sup> which gives them in Him redemption<sup>4</sup> and sonship,<sup>5</sup> and which sends into each of their hearts the Spirit of adoption and of love to Him.<sup>6</sup>

—πῶς——“how is it possible that.” Cf. θαυμάζω, ch. i. ver. 6.<sup>7</sup> See the note on πῶς, ch. ii. ver. 14.

—πάλιν——This refers to the position which the law and all στοιχεῖα<sup>8</sup> occupied as preparatory for, anterior to, and done away by the full revelations of the Gospel.

—ἀσθενῆ——weak, because they could not give justification and life. Cf. iii. 21; Heb. vii. 18, 19, x. 1.

<sup>1</sup> Rom. viii. 29; 1 Pet. i. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Eph. i. 4.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Cor. i. 9.

<sup>4</sup> Eph. i. 7.

<sup>5</sup> Ib. 5.

<sup>6</sup> Rom. v. 5.

<sup>7</sup> Bengel.

<sup>8</sup> See the note on στοιχεῖα, ver. 3.

—*πτωχά*—poor, because not containing the rich blessings of the Gospel inheritance.

—*στοιχεῖα*—i. e. as contained in the Mosaic system. See the note on *στοιχ.*, ver. 3.

—*πάλιν*—See the note on ver. 3, as regards the *elementary* character of the heathen worship.

—*ἀνωθεν*—“from the beginning,”<sup>1</sup> i. e. commencing with the first and initiatory features of the Jewish system. Cf. ch. v. 3.

10. —*ἡμέρας παρατηρ, κ. τ. λ.*—It is plain from this that the false teachers had not only preached circumcision, but also *τὰς ἐορτὰς καὶ τὰς νομιμίας*.<sup>2</sup>

—*παρατηρεῖν*—means ‘to observe, or watch closely,’ but, used in this sense, it does not necessarily mean to observe superstitiously. For Josephus,<sup>3</sup> enumerating the ten commandments, thus gives the fourth: *ὁ δὲ τέταρτος, παρατηρεῖν τὰς ἐβδομάδας, ἀναπαυομένους ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔργου*. Viewed in the spiritual light of the Gospel, all Jewish observance becomes superstitious; but the Apostle does not speak here in a limited sense of superstitious observance, but generally of the observance of *periods*.

—*ἡμέρας*—weekly Sabbaths,<sup>4</sup> as developed in the Jewish dispensation, which were but figures of the rest of Christ after the completion of His work in the new creation,<sup>5</sup> and the eternal rest in Him of His believing people;<sup>6</sup> of which rest they enjoy, and seek a weekly foretaste in the contemplation of

<sup>1</sup> Lidd. and Scott, *ἀνωθεν* II.

<sup>2</sup> Chrysost. and Selden, *De An. Civ. Vet. Jud. cap. xxi. vol. i. p. 59.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ant. iii. 5, 5.*

<sup>4</sup> See *Col. ii. 16*, and the order in *1 Chron. xxiii. 31*; *2 Chron. xxxi. 3.* Bengel.

<sup>5</sup> Compare *Gen. ii. 1, 2*, with *John xvii. 4, xix. 30.*

<sup>6</sup> *Heb. iv. 9.*

His finished work,<sup>1</sup> on the day<sup>2</sup> of His resurrection in power.<sup>3</sup>

—*μῆνας*——i. e. *νοσημηνίας*, new moons, beginnings of months,<sup>4</sup> days sanctified by special sacrifices, and which were types of the constant renewing of the church, which is called “fair as the moon,”<sup>5</sup> by Christ the Sun of righteousness.<sup>6</sup>

—*καιρούς*——the principal feasts<sup>7</sup> which were to be proclaimed, *ἐν τοῖς καιροῖς αὐτῶν*.<sup>8</sup> The passover, which typified the sacrifice of Christ, the lamb of God,<sup>9</sup> spotless,<sup>10</sup> taken from the flock,<sup>11</sup> who, as a slain Saviour, is the food of His believing people.<sup>12</sup> The feast of Pentecost, or of the first-fruits of the wheat harvest,<sup>13</sup> typifying the gathering in of the first-fruits of the church of a risen Saviour,<sup>14</sup> when His promised Spirit first descended upon it. The feast of Tabernacles,<sup>15</sup> typifying Him who *σὰρξ ἐγένετο, καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν*.<sup>16</sup>

—*ἐνιαυτούς*——yearly solemnities,<sup>17</sup> as the day of atonement,<sup>18</sup> on which in sacrifices there was a remembrance made again of sins every year,<sup>19</sup> typifying the one perfected sacrifice of Christ of everlasting efficacy.<sup>20</sup>

These periodical solemnities of the law showed, by

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Rev. v. 9—13.

<sup>2</sup> John xx. 19; Rev. i. 10.

<sup>3</sup> Rom. i. 4.

<sup>4</sup> Numbers x. 10, xxviii. 11.

<sup>5</sup> Cant. vi. 10.

<sup>6</sup> Mal. iv. 2. See also Ps. xxxvi. 9; John i. 4, 9, viii. 12; Eph. v. 8.

<sup>7</sup> Levit. xxiii.

<sup>8</sup> Ib. 4 (LXX.).

<sup>9</sup> 1 Cor. v. 7; John i. 29, 36; 1 Pet. i. 19.

<sup>10</sup> Exod. xii. 5; 1 Pet. i. 19; Heb. ix. 14.

<sup>11</sup> Exod. xii. 5; Heb. ii. 17.

<sup>12</sup> Exod. xii. 8; John vi. 53—55.

<sup>13</sup> Exod. xxiii. 16, xxxiv. 22; Levit. xxiii. 16, 17; Numbers xxviii. 26.

<sup>14</sup> Acts ii. 41.

<sup>15</sup> Levit. xxiii. 34; John vii. 2.

<sup>16</sup> John i. 14.

<sup>17</sup> Bengel, q. v.

<sup>18</sup> Levit. xvi. 34; Exod. xxx. 10; Heb. ix. 7.

<sup>19</sup> Heb. x. 3.

<sup>20</sup> Ib. 12, 14.

the fact of their periodical repetition, the imperfection of the dispensation to which they belonged; typifying each feature of Christ's work, which as one great and perfect whole has been performed once for all and for ever, and were material representations of those spiritual truths which the spiritual Israel learn in union with Christ as a risen Lord. To observe periods then, now in the fulness of time, is to deny the perfection of the Gospel dispensation, the complete and finished nature of Christ's work; to forsake Him as the great spiritual teacher of His brethren, and to return to carnal pædagogues; to throw aside sonship in all its fulness, and the spirit of adoption; and to return to childhood and the rule of tutors and governors.

Some commentators connect this verse with the former, and place after *ἐνιαυτούς* a note of interrogation. The ordinary punctuation seems, however, the best. The Apostle is, as it were, reminding the Galatians of the extent to which they had fallen from Gospel liberty.

11. —*εἰκῆ*—See iii. 4. *κεκοπίακα*.—Cf. LXX., Isa. xlix. 4.<sup>1</sup>

—*εἰς ὑμᾶς*—“with respect to you.” See iii. 17, *εἰς Χριστόν*, and the note.

12. The Apostle, here giving vent to those personal feelings of affection which he entertained towards his converts, reminds them of their former affection for him, and indicates that the very sharpness of his reproof proceeds from his love towards them.

—*Γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγώ*—i. e. “love me as I love you.”

<sup>1</sup> Grinfield.

—ὅτι καὶ γὰρ, κ. τ. λ.—“because I love you as ye formerly loved me.” This is the explanation of S. F. A. Morus, who thus paraphrases, “amate me, ut ego vos amo; ego amo vos, ut vos olim me amastis. Sit igitur mutuus inter nos sensus mutuusque amor, ut nuper erat.”

—μὲ—i. e. me personally. He repudiates the idea that the severity of his reproofs proceeded from any personal feeling, created by their depreciation of his ministry at the instigation of the false teachers; and connects his present feelings towards them with their own former kindness to him, which, nothing that had subsequently occurred, obliterated from his mind.

13. —ὀίδατε δέ—q. d. “But, on the contrary, I can appeal to your own knowledge of the kindness which you once showed to me personally.”

—δι’ ἀσθενεῖαν— I must confess that I do not find it easy to reconcile myself to the conclusion that the Apostle *means* here, what certainly his words at first sight would seem to imply, that *on account of* some bodily sickness he preached the Gospel to the Galatians. It seems to me that a meaning is thus given to his words, which, if not irreconcilable with the context, is at all events totally foreign to his whole scope, which is to show that the Galatians received him with joy and eagerness, notwithstanding the existence of τὸν πειρασμόν, which was manifestly the ἀσθενεῖα of this verse. Nor can I see how any knowledge of the actual circumstances can clear up the difficulty. Moreover if διὰ be taken in the sense of ‘on account of,’ the Apostle can only mean to say, “sickness detained me among you, and there-

fore I preached." This statement seems an exceedingly improbable one, unless we conclude, either that the sickness which prevented him from moving was afterwards moderated, and that he preached during convalescence, or that, having been detained in the country by illness, he changed his plans, and remained, after he was well, to preach. But the Apostle, in saying that they did not reject τὸν πειρασμόν, i. e. the ἀσθένεια, manifestly indicates that he did preach during that very ἀσθένεια. The conclusion, to me at least, seems almost unavoidable that the ἀσθένεια was not of such a character as to hinder either his movements or his preaching, while it was such as to oppose obstacles to the ready reception of him as a preacher. I must therefore still venture to consider that διὰ is used here as in διὰ νύκτα, διὰ τὸν χειμῶνα, to express the fact that he preached *during* a period, or an attack of sickness.

The Apostle magnifies the kindness of the Galatians to his person, and assures them of his sense thereof, by reminding them that it was displayed to him when he was suffering under bodily infirmity and disease. Cf. ἀσθένεια, Luke v. 15, viii. 2; 1 Tim. v. 23. LXX.; 2 Macc. ix. 21, 22. Thucyd. ii. 49.

—τῆς σαρκός—“of the body.” See Acts ii. 31; 1 Cor. xv. 39; Col. ii. 1, 5; 2 Cor. iv. 11 (compare ver. 10); LXX., 4 Reg. iv. 34. See Lidd. and Scott, σάρξ. Palaiet, Obs. Phill. p. 276.

—τὸ πρότερον—“formerly.” Cf. LXX., Deut. ii. 12; Josh. xi. 10. New Testament, John vi. 62, ix. 8; 1 Tim. i. 13 (see Tisch.). Xenoph. Memorab. iii. 8, 1.

14. —καὶ τὸν πειρασμόν ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου.—



I accept the reading  $\acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$ , not only on the ground of strong external evidence, but because it is manifestly the one most difficult of interpretation,<sup>1</sup> and therefore the least likely to be an emendation. A transcriber having 2 Cor. xii. 7 in his mind would be very likely to substitute  $\mu\omicron\upsilon$  for  $\acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$ . The meaning of the Apostle is, that the bodily infirmity under which he was labouring, when he first preached to the Galatians, was to them a temptation to reject their own spiritual advantage in rejecting his ministry. What this infirmity was, it is as impossible to ascertain, as it is unnecessary to inquire. That it was a bodily infirmity is, I think, apparent; and the context in this place requires us to conclude that it was one of such a nature as to affect his personal appearance and general physical conformation. Cf. 2 Cor. x. 1, 10. Diseases of the nature of palsy fulfil these conditions: and here we may safely stop, without wasting time by endeavours<sup>2</sup> to specify the precise nature and locality of the affection. Cf. 2 Cor. xii. 7, seqq.

— $\omicron\upsilon\kappa \acute{\epsilon}\xi\omicron\upsilon\theta\epsilon\nu\eta\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon$ .—That is, ye did not despise my infirm and diseased person, which offered to you a temptation to reject my ministry.  $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\omicron\upsilon\theta\epsilon\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  is a later form of  $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\omicron\upsilon\delta\epsilon\nu\acute{\omicron}\omega$ , arising out of the substitution of  $\Theta$  for  $\delta$  in  $\omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma$ ,  $\omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ .<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Mill in loc. and Proleg. 921.

<sup>2</sup> Some of the speculations of commentators are absurd—one disgusting; so absurd, indeed, and so disgusting as to need no recapitulation, and to excite one's wonder that so much time should have been wasted to so little purpose. Those who feel inclined to investigate the subject may consult Bloomf. Recens. Synop. and Wolf, on 2 Cor. xii. 7, on which place compare  $\sigma\kappa\acute{\omicron}\lambda\omicron\psi$ , Ezek. xxviii. 24. (LXX.)

<sup>3</sup> See Lobeck's Phrynicus, pp. 181, 182, and Jelf, Gr. Gr. 166, Obs. i.

—ἐξεπτύσατε.—“loathed.” *εκπτ* signifies more than *ἐξουθεν*.<sup>1</sup>

—ὡς ἄγγελον Θεοῦ.—This is a Jewish phrase, signifying that the Galatians had received him with the greatest honour and respect. Cf. 2 Sam. xiv. 17, 20, xix. 27; Zech. xii. 8.

—ὡς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν.—The Apostle enlarges upon the idea involved in the form of expression which he had used, q. d. “Ye received me as an angel of God, nay indeed as Christ himself, the great Angel and Apostle of the Father, who had Himself said to His Apostles, “He that receiveth you receiveth me, &ca.” Cf. Matt. x. 40; Luke x. 16; John xiii. 20. See the note on i. 1.

15. —τίς οὖν ἦν ὁ μακαρισμὸς ὑμῶν.—The Latin version of D. and Ambrosiaster translate “Quæ ergo erat beatitudo vestra;” and Augustine, “Quæ ergo fuit beatitudo vestra.” I am inclined to retain this reading, in opposition to that of A. B. C., on the ground that while it is extremely improbable that *τίς* should be substituted for *ποῦ*, a transcriber ignorant of this usage of *τίς* would be very likely to substitute *ποῦ*, as is indeed shown by the comment of Theodoret, τὸ τίς, ἀντὶ τοῦ ποῦ τέθεικε. And *ποῦ* having got into the text, the omission of *ἦν* would be very likely to follow. *τίς* and *ἦν* have moreover the plain testimony of the old Latin version on their side; *τίς* is here equivalent to *ποῖος*.<sup>2</sup> The whole passage is one of those in which the precise meaning of the Apostle is rendered obscure by that abruptness of style which

<sup>1</sup> Grot. See Kypke in l.

<sup>2</sup> Lidd. and Scott, *τίς*, vi. ; Herman Viger, n. 114. Palaiet, Obs. Phil. p. 433.

was the natural consequence of his ardent disposition. He has first reminded the Galatians of the distinction and kindness with which they had received his person, and in so doing calls up before his own mind their professions of the blessedness they felt in his presence and ministry. Hence a mental comparison arises of their former and present feelings, and the Apostle exclaims, "What then was the nature of your professed blessedness?"

—ὁ μακαρισμός.—This word properly means a pronouncing happy or blessed.<sup>1</sup> I think the best translation of it in this place is 'professed blessedness,' the word having here a reflexive sense.<sup>2</sup> Plato uses the word once,<sup>3</sup> and in a sense somewhat similar, οὐκ ἐκπληττόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ τῶν πολλῶν μακαρισμοῦ. In Rom. iv. 9, St. Paul uses the word in an active sense of a declaration of blessedness. At a later period, those Psalms which begin with μακάριος, and the 3rd and 8 following verses of Matt. v., were called μακαρισμοί,<sup>4</sup> and books which contained the Beatitudes were called μακαρισμάρια.<sup>5</sup>

The Apostle as it were justifies the use of the word μακαρισμός. The sentence whereof γάρ introduces the reason is supplied in the Apostle's mind, q. d. "Ye cannot deny the force of your feelings, and the fact of your μακαρισμός for, &c."

—εἰ δυνατόν τοὺς ὀφθ.—κ. τ. λ.—"Summum Galatarum erga se fuisse amorem significat: nihil enim oculis carius."<sup>6</sup> See the examples given by Wetstein. Cf. also Deut. xxxii. 10; Psal. xvii. 8; Prov.

<sup>1</sup> Lidd. and Scott.      <sup>2</sup> See the note on ver. 18.

<sup>3</sup> Rep. 591, D.

<sup>4</sup> Suicer Thesaur. Tom. ii. pp. 290, 291.

<sup>5</sup> Montfaucon, Palæographia Græca, p. 386.

<sup>6</sup> Elsner, q. v.

vii. 2 ; Zech. ii. 8. Lucian<sup>1</sup> relates, that one of two friends being taken prisoner, the other sought out the captor with the view of redeeming his friend, and that his eyes being asked as the price of his ransom, ὁ δὲ αὐτίκα παρέσχευ ἐκκόπτειν αὐτούς. The expression ἐξορ. τοὺς ὀφθ. is used in a literal sense of putting out the eyes, by Herodot. viii. 116.

— ἐδώκατέ μοι.—*ἄν* is clearly the supposed emendation of a transcriber. The omission of it invests the action of the apodosis with actuality and certainty, putting out of sight the conditions of the protasis. Jelf, Gr. Gr. 858, 1. See also Ellicott in loc.

16. — ὥστε—“Am I therefore,” &ca. This sentence is interrogative.<sup>2</sup> Can it be, the Apostle would say, that I, who was so honoured and loved by you while I told you the truth, am now become your enemy on that very account? On the use of ὥστε with interrogative sentences, see Jelf, Gr. Gr. 867, 1.

17. — ζηλοῦσιν ὑμᾶς—ζηλοῦν means ‘to esteem or pronounce happy,’ or ‘blessed,’ and hence ‘to envy.’ So, according to Hesychius, Suidas, Thomas Magister, Mœris, ζηλῶ is equivalent to μακαρίζω.<sup>3</sup> There is then, I think, a reference to μακαρισμός, ver. 15. The Apostle asked there, what was the nature of their professed happiness, i. e. whether it was based upon a personal attachment, or upon his communication to them of Gospel truth. The existing feelings, however, of the Galatians cause him to exclaim, as if in doubt of the

<sup>1</sup> Toxaris, 40.

<sup>2</sup> So Schmid.

<sup>3</sup> See Lidd. and Scott, ζηλόω, 2. Astius Lex. Plat.

possibility of such a thing, "Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth? i. e. do you no longer deem yourselves blessed, as you did before, and that because, &ca?" He then proceeds to contrast with his own ministry that of the false teachers. "I," he would say, "told you the whole truth, and ye declared yourselves blessed in my presence among you. They call you blessed not rightly, but (on the contrary) they would shut you<sup>1</sup> out (from Gospel truth<sup>2</sup> and liberty), in order that you may call them (personally) blessed, or deem them objects of envy and emulation."

—*ἵνα . . . ζηλοῦτε*.—The use of *ἵνα* with the present indic. cannot be defended as in accordance with grammatical propriety. But see the note on *καταδουλώσουσιν*, ch. ii. 4.

18. —*καλόν*—This is equivalent to *πρέπει*.<sup>3</sup>

—*ζηλοῦσθαι*—I should take this to be the middle<sup>4</sup> voice. Cf. *μακαρισμός*, ver. 15. The reading of *ζηλοῦσθε* in B., and *œmulamini* in the Vulgate, might very easily have arisen out of the permutation of *ε* and *αι*, so common in Greek MSS., and which was the natural consequence of the similarity of pronunciation.<sup>5</sup>

—*ἐν καλῷ*—"in the possession of good." I

<sup>1</sup> The late Professor Scholefield exhibits here a singular example of textual criticism. He scarcely ever notices various readings of real importance, and supported by all that is valuable in MSS. authority; but here, upon the ground that the "sense obviously requires *ἡμᾶς*," he perpetuates a reading which has nothing to support it but the mere conjecture of Beza, or, according to Tischendorf, a few codd. minusc.

<sup>2</sup> So De Lyra, "ab evangelica veritate."

<sup>3</sup> See Wetstein, Alberti, Kypke, on Matt. xv. 26.

<sup>4</sup> Bengel, Rosenm.

<sup>5</sup> See Alberti Gloss. p. 7.

should have much preferred to have taken this adverbially, if it had been possible in so doing to give a satisfactory interpretation of the passage. For taking it in the sense I have given, the more correct form would have been ἐν τῷ καλῷ. But it is so impossible to interpret the passage on the former supposition, and this latter sense is so well suited to the scope of the Apostle, that there can be no doubt about his meaning.

—πάντοτε—Phrynicius says, πάντοτε μὴ λέγε, ἀλλ' ἐκάστοτε καὶ διαπαντός, and sim. Thomas Magister. Triller however says, in a note on the latter, that it is found in Herodian, lib. iii. cap. 9, and he thinks also in Plutarch and Athenæus. See also Wolf on Luke xviii. 1.

—πρὸς ὑμᾶς—πρὸς has here the sense of παρά with a dative, an usage common enough in the New Testament,<sup>1</sup> but among profane authors found only, and that rarely, in late poets.<sup>2</sup>

As regards then the meaning of the whole verse, the force lies, I think, in the use of the middle voice in connexion with the Apostle's allusion to the μακαρισμός of the Galatians in ver. 15. They *had* called themselves blessed, i. e. they had felt a confidence and joy in the possession of the truth ministered to them by the Apostle; and had needed no elaborate assurances thereof from without. But having lost that μακαρισμός, (which fact is of course indirectly implied in ver. 16,) their own confidence had been replaced by vain assurances of blessedness on the part of the false apostles. And so, therefore, the

<sup>1</sup> See chap. i. 18, ii. 5; 1 Cor. ii. 3, xvi. 7, &ca.

<sup>2</sup> Lidd. and Scott, πρὸς, C. v.

Apostle reminds them here, that they ought not to need external assurances of blessedness, but that a confidence and joy, based upon the possession of the truth, ought to be always vigorous in their own minds, and ought not to be dependent upon the mere personal presence of him who had ministered it to them. Translate, therefore, "It is good to call oneself blessed in the possession of the truth at all times, and not only when I (i. e. he who ministered it to you) am present among you."

19. —*τεκνία μου, κ. τ. λ.*—This verse is in fact a part of ver. 18, and must be closely connected with the clause *ἐν τῷ παρ.* immediately preceding. The Apostle is carried away by ardour and affection into the expression of his feelings, which differed so widely from those of the false brethren. *They* would exclude their converts from the truth. *He* longed as a woman in travail for the full manifestation in them of Christ, the Truth.

—*ὠδίνω ἄχρισ οὖ, κ. τ. λ.*—I cannot agree with Grotius, Beza, Perkins, &ca, in taking *ὠδίνω* here in the sense of *ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχω*. It is used *once*<sup>1</sup> by the LXX. in that sense, and Hesychius says, *ὠδίνει. τίκτει, ἢ ἐγκυμονεῖ.* but beyond this I can find no authority for such an usage; and therefore, even if the scope of the Apostle appeared to require such an interpretation, I should hesitate to adopt it. But the metaphor used by St. Paul, is that of a mother, arrived at the consummation of the period of gestation, and undergoing the pangs of travail, until the longed-for moment of actual *birth* arrives, and the

<sup>1</sup> Isa. xxvi. 17.

foetus is revealed, a living, moving, and fully-formed babe. And thus the Apostle would represent himself (the minister by whom they believed) <sup>1</sup> as undergoing the most painful mental throes, <sup>2</sup> waiting, and longing for such a *manifestation* in them of the *life*, <sup>3</sup> and *features* of Christ, as should cause his anxieties to merge into the blessed assurance that they should grow up “unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ,” <sup>4</sup> receiving the end of their faith, and of his ministry, the eternal salvation of their souls. <sup>5</sup>

—μορφώω in the pass. means, to “take form or shape.” <sup>6</sup> Translate then the whole passage, “My little children, with whom I am again in travail until Christ take form (i. e. well-defined and manifest) within you.” Cf. Ignat. Eph. ix., Εστὲ οὖν . . . πάντες . . . Χριστοφόροι. <sup>7</sup>

20. —ἤθελον δέ—“But I could wish.” Ver. 19 is of course interjectional: so that as regards the sense, this verse must be taken as immediately following ver. 18. The force of δέ is “but (although I say generally that it should not be only during my presence that you should feel yourselves blessed in the possession of the truth) yet I could wish, &c.”

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. iii. 5. Compare iv. 15.

<sup>2</sup> I do not mean to convey by this expression the idea that St. Paul uses ὠδίνω, as does Plato, simply in the sense of mental throes; for in the passage before us, the metaphor is the accurate type of a reality. The human birth figures forth a real new birth of the Spirit of God; and the Apostle says οὖς ὠδίνω with a special reference to the connexion between his ministry and their new birth.

<sup>3</sup> 2 Cor. iv. 10, 11, ἵνα . . . ἡ ζωὴ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ . . . φανερωθῇ. Coll. Gal. ii. 20, ζῆ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός. Col. iii. 4, Χριστός . . . ἡ ζωὴ ἡμῶν.

<sup>4</sup> Eph. iv. 13.

<sup>5</sup> 1 Pet. i. 9.

<sup>6</sup> Lidd. and Scott.

<sup>7</sup> Quoted by Grinfield.



With respect to the peculiar usage of the imperfect ἤθελον, cf. Jelf, Gr. Gr. 398, 3. Compare also ix. 3, ἡὺχομένην γὰρ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι. See Raphel, h. l.

—πρὸς ὑμᾶς—See the note on πρὸς, ver. 18.

—ἄρτι—“at this moment.”

—ἀλλάξαι τὴν φωνήν μου—“to change my tone,” i. e. to use either tender exhortation or stern reproof,<sup>1</sup> according to circumstances and feelings, which might arise in the course of a personal intercourse; or of which, actually existing, such an intercourse could alone enable him to form a correct judgment. Compare, as illustrating the force of ἀλλάξαι here, Plat. Rep. ii. 380, D., ἀλλάττοντα τὸ αὐτοῦ εἶδος εἰς πολλὰς μορφάς.

—ἀποροῦμαι—“I am distressedly perplexed.” St. Paul evidently uses this word here as in 2 Cor. iv. 8, in a sense which indicates not only mere doubt and perplexity, but severe mental anxiety and distress arising therefrom in his own mind. So the LXX. use the word, Gen. xxxii. 7, ἐφοβήθη δὲ Ἰακώβ σφόδρα, καὶ ἠπορεῖτο. and in the Apocr., 1 Macc. iii. 31, ἠπορεῖτο τῇ ψυχῇ αὐτοῦ σφόδρα. Hesychius too defines ἀπορεῖ. ἀδημονεῖ. ἀγωνιᾷ. Cf. also the usage of ἀπορία in Levit. xxvi. 16; Isa. viii. 22.

—ἐν ὑμῖν.—“On account of you,” (and your defection,) Lat. propter vos. This is a rare usage of ἐν. It occurs, Matt. vi. 7, ἐν τῇ πολυλογίᾳ; Luke i. 21, ἐν τῷ χροníζειν; x. 20, ἐν τούτῳ; Eph. iii. 13, ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσίν μου; Col. ii. 16, ἐν βρώσει. It is not, however, a Hebraism, for Plato uses it in this sense, Legg. ix. 881, E., ἐν εὐθύνοισι ἔστω

<sup>1</sup> Cf. 1 Cor. iv. 21.

τῶν κατηγορημάτων τῶν μεγίστων ἐν τούτῳ αὐτῷ, (hanc ipsam ob causam,<sup>1</sup>) and so also Andocides and Demosthenes.<sup>2</sup> “ἐν indicates, as it were, the sphere in which the mental action takes place.” Ellicott in loc.

21. — Λέγετέ μοι — “Urget, quasi *præsens*: dicite.”<sup>3</sup>

—ὕπὸ νόμον — under the Mosaic law, i. e. under a system in which justification before God was sought through ceremonial and moral observance.

—τὸν νόμον — i. e. the books of Moses the law-giver. There is perhaps, as Bloomfield observes, a παρανομασία on the two meanings of νόμος. Compare the various usages of νόμος in Matt. xi. 13, xii. 5; Luke xvi. 16, 17, xxiv. 44; John x. 34, xv. 25; 1 Cor. xiv. 21.

—ἀκούετε — “understand.”<sup>4</sup> ἀκούειν is used by the LXX. to translate the Heb. שָׁמַעַ, which means to *understand* as well as to *hear*. Cf. Gen. xi. 7, xli. 15, xlii. 23; Deut. xxviii. 49; 4 Reg. xviii. 26; Isa. xxxvi. 11; Jer. v. 15. And hence probably arose St. Paul’s usage of the word in this sense here, as in 1 Cor. xiv. 2. Kypke, however, illustrates this latter passage by quotations from Porphyrius, Stobæus, and Libanius; and to these we may add Lucian, Paras. 10, which Reitzius further illustrates by a quotation from Galen.

<sup>1</sup> Astius in loc.

<sup>2</sup> Quoted by Viger. See also a passage from Dio Cassius, quoted by Palairot, Obs. Phil. pp. 261, 262.

<sup>3</sup> Bengel.

<sup>4</sup> Rosenm. S. F. Morus, “non consideratis sensum μυστικώτερον verborum Mosis.” Grot.

To *understand* the writings of Moses and the Old Testament Scriptures generally is to understand them as testifying of Jesus, and in their spiritual bearing upon the covenant of grace. Cf. Acts viii. 30, 35, Ἐν ἧ Ἀρά γε γινώσκεις ἃ ἀναγινώσκεις; . . . ὁ Φίλιππος. . . ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς γραφῆς ταύτης εὐηγγελίσατο αὐτῷ τὸν Ἰησοῦν. Cf. also 2 Cor. iii. 14, 15.

22. — γέγραπται γάρ — Gen. xvi. 15, xxi. 2. Having, with the view of showing their real ignorance of their own Scriptures, and of the writings of Moses their lawgiver, put to them the question of the preceding verse, the Apostle, now carrying on the train of thought of ch. iii., and with reference to their own desire, as Jews, to be thought the children of Abraham, brings forward two remarkable facts recorded by Moses; and afterwards proceeds to explain the bearing of those facts, and that record upon their own state, and the covenant of grace as contrasted with that of works.

— ἕνα ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης — See Gen. xvi. 1, ἣν δὲ αὐτῇ παιδίσκη Αἰγυπτία ἦ ὄνομα Ἄγαρ. There is a certain demonstrative force in the article, q. d. Hagar, the bondwoman mentioned in Scripture. (See Jelf, Gr. Gr. 444, 5, e.) παιδίσκη is, as used by the best Greek writers, the *κατηγόρημα* not of a *condition*, but of *age*, and was used to denote a young girl, whether a *slave* or *free*.<sup>1</sup> The LXX., however, use it almost<sup>2</sup> exclusively in the former

<sup>1</sup> Lobeck on Phrynicus, p. 239. See also Thom. Mag. p. 671; Mæris, p. 319. Liddell and Scott are hardly justified in saying that “the Gramm. deny that its use for ‘slave’ was correct.” What they deny is, the correctness of its *exclusive* use in that sense.

<sup>2</sup> Gen. xxxiv. 4 (Alex. MS.) is an exception, and so also Ruth iv. 12; Amos ii. 7.

sense: and so in the New Testament, Matt. xxvi. 69; Mark xiv. 66, 69; Luke xii. 45, xxii. 56; John xviii. 17; Acts xvi. 16, and (possibly also) xii. 13.<sup>1</sup>

The child of Hagar, as a Gentile slave, would itself be a slave.<sup>2</sup>

—ἐνα ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρως.—The child of a free-woman, and therefore himself free-born.<sup>3</sup> Sarah is nowhere called free, but the fact is known in the mention of her family.<sup>4</sup>

23. —κατὰ σάρκα γεγέννηται—i. e. according to the ordinary course of nature, of a young and fruitful mother. Cf. Gen. xvi. 1, 2. This is the second remarkable particular respecting Ishmael as the type of the material seed. He was (I.) born in bondage, (II.) born κατὰ φύσιν.

—διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας—ἐπαγ. is put by metonymy<sup>5</sup> for that which was promised, viz. the divine visitation and miraculous power through which Sarah, when “past age,”<sup>6</sup> was enabled to bear a child to Abraham when he was a “hundred years old.”<sup>7</sup> Compare Gen. xviii. 10—14, xxi. 1, with Rom. ix. 9; ἐπαγγελίας γὰρ ὁ λόγος οὗτος. Κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον ἐλεῦσομαι καὶ ἔσται τῆ Σάρρα υἱός. See also Gen. xvii. 16, 19.

Isaac then was born (I.) a freeman, (II.) παρὰ φύσιν, and through a *miraculous* power gratuitously *promised* by God.

<sup>1</sup> Alberti, however, would translate here *puellam*.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Vitringa; De Syn. Vet. p. 677, Selden, De Jure Nat. et Gent. Lib. vi. cap. viii. p. 645, vol. i.; Surenhus. βιβ. καταλ. p. 578.

<sup>3</sup> Surenhus. ubi sup.

<sup>4</sup> See Gen. xx. 12. See also Surenhus. p. 577.

<sup>5</sup> See ch. iii. 14, and the note.

<sup>6</sup> Heb. xi. 11.

<sup>7</sup> Gen. xvii. 17; Rom. iv. 19.

24. — ἄτινά ἐστὶν ἀλληγορούμενα. — Translate “which events are related allegorically,”<sup>1</sup> or with a spiritual and hidden import. Hesychius, ἀλληγορούμενον. τροπολογούμενον. φυσιολογούμενον. and ἀλληγορία. ἄλλο τι παρὰ τὸ ἀκουόμενον ὑποδεικνύουσα. Schol. Gr. Ap. Matthæi, ἀλληγορούμενα. ἐτέρως μὲν λεγόμενα, ἐτέρως δὲ νοούμενα. Suidas, ἀλληγορία. ἢ μεταφορά. ἄλλο λέγον τὸ γράμμα, καὶ ἄλλο τὸ νόημα. Καὶ ἀλληγορικοὶ ὄνειροι,<sup>2</sup> οἱ ἄλλα δι’ ἄλλων ἀγορεύοντες. Θεωρηματικοὶ δὲ οἱ τῆ ἑαυτῶν θεῶν προσεικότες. See the examples adduced by Wetstein, Kypke, and Elsner. Chrysostom says, καταχρηστικῶς τὸν τύπον ἀλληγορίαν ἐκάλεσεν. But the Apostle is not speaking of a *type*, but of the *record* of a type. The facts are types. These facts the law ἀλληγορεῖ.<sup>3</sup> Now it must be borne in mind that, inasmuch as Holy Scripture is possessed of characteristics for which no exact parallel can be found, no profane usage of the word ἀλληγορέω or ἀλληγορία can illustrate the *exact* sense in which Scripture is an allegory. Thus the Rhetoricians may say that allegory is a continued metaphor, but though this may help to lead us to the particular sense implied here, it cannot give us the sense itself. For Scripture is the record of actual *facts*, which facts involved in themselves a spiritual meaning. That is to say, the very birth and actions of certain persons belonging to the old creation were, under the direction of God, made to shadow forth spiritual realities, or indeed

<sup>1</sup> “Quæ sunt ita dicta ut aliud significant.”—Schmid. “Quæ sunt per allegoriam dicta.”—Vulgate.

<sup>2</sup> See the quotation from Artemidorus given by Wetstein.

<sup>3</sup> Lysias and Antipho, quoted by Lidd. and Scott, have the expression, ὁ νόμος ἀγορεύει.

other and material circumstances and events connected with those realities: and Scripture, recording these *facts* which were themselves typical, does so *in a form and manner* which, while it displays the type, *can* and does display the antitype to the eye become spiritual in Christ: and this form is given to Scripture by God for the especial benefit of those who live in the day of Christ, the great central Antitype to whom these types and their record point. See 1 Cor. x. 11.

—*αὗται*—Hagar and Sarah.

—*εἰσίν*—“represent.”<sup>1</sup> Cf. Gen. xli. 26 (LXX.); Matt. xiii. 37, 39, xxvi. 26, 28; Luke viii. 9; 1 Cor. x. 4.

—*δύο διαθήκαι*—“two dispensations.” See the note on *διαθήκη*, ch. iii. 15.

—*μία μὲν ἀπὸ ὄρους Σινᾶ*—“one on the one hand sprung from Mount Sinai,” from which God gave the law which was the basis of the dispensation.

—*εἰς δουλείαν γεννώσα*—“generating to bondage,” because the law had dominion over a man as long as he lived, and wrought transgression, bondage, and death. *εἰς* expresses the *end*, without the notion of purpose.

—*ἥτις ἐστὶν Ἄγαρ*—The antecedent here is not merely *μία διαθήκη*, but that *διαθήκη* described as *εἰς δουλείαν γεννώσα*. *ἥτις* has a definite force, introducing special attributes belonging to this the declared nature of the covenant, viz. that as one which generated to bondage, it represented Agar the bond-

<sup>1</sup> So the author of the Interlineary Gloss; Estius; A Lapide; all Romanists. This is worthy of notice in connexion with the controversy about *ἔστι* in Matt. xxvi. 26, 28.

woman, and corresponded to the existing Jerusalem. (For this clause must be connected with *συστοιχεῖ δέ* in the next verse.)

25. —τὸ δὲ Ἰαγαρ Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ—  
I should certainly follow A. D. E.<sup>1</sup> in reading here *δέ* instead of *γάρ*. For the Apostle is not giving the reason why Agar represents the dispensation from Mount Sinai, but having noticed the main point of correspondence between Agar and that dispensation which sprung from Mount Sinai, he<sup>2</sup> now parenthetically mentions a remarkable coincidence, viz. that the word Agar denotes in Arabia Mount Sinai.<sup>3</sup> For the Arabic word Hagar signifies a rock,<sup>4</sup> and it would seem probable, and is indeed distinctly asserted by Harantius,<sup>5</sup> that Sinai was so called (*κατ' ἐξοχὴν*). So the Schol. Gr. ap. Matthæi says of Sinai, *τοῦτο τῇ τῶν ἀράβων γλώσσῃ ἄγαρ καλεῖται*. As regards the reading *τὸ γὰρ Σινᾶ, κ.τ.λ.*, the testimony of the Vulgate, of Jerome in his commentary, and of the Latin Fathers, including Augustine, is entirely in its favour, and, if it were not that the Latin Version of D. reads, “*Agar enim mons est in Arabia,*” I should be inclined to think that it was the reading of the Old Latin. But it is impossible to reject the testimony of MSS. combining with that of the Peshito-Syriac in favour of the retention of the word in the text; and it is plain that a difficulty arising out of the junction of the neuter article with Ἰαγαρ

<sup>1</sup> B., according to Tischend., omits either particle. It may be noticed that Ambrosiaster reads, “*Sina autem mons est, &c.*,” and so also the Sahidic Vers. <sup>2</sup> See ch. i. 17.

<sup>3</sup> See Marsh's Michaelis, vol. ii. part i. p. 402; and Rosenmuller in h. l.

<sup>4</sup> Michaelis, ubi sup.

<sup>5</sup> Ap. Busching Descr. Asiæ, p. 535. See Rosenmul. in loc.

would be very likely to lead to its omission from the text.

—συστοιχεῖ δέ—This, as I have before observed, must be connected with ἡτις. The construction, indeed, absolutely forbids its connexion with anything else; and it was, doubtless, the sense of this, combined with a mistaken notion that Ἄγαρ, and not the dispensation represented by her, was immediately referred to, which led to the substitution of ἡ συστοιχοῦσα, with a view of connecting it with Ἄγαρ in ver. 24. As regards the meaning of the word συστοιχεῖ, I do not conceive that the Apostle means anything more than simply “corresponds to,” a sense which would very naturally arise out of the more original meaning of the word, and which is illustrated by Polybius in the synonymous use of ὅμοια and σύστοιχα. The Apostle is neither speaking of the mutual relation of type and antitype, nor of the *coördinate* character of the features respectively involved in each. He is simply noticing the correspondence between the prædicated conditions of the dispensation represented by Hagar, and the then condition of Jerusalem.

—τῇ νῦν Ἰερουσαλήμ<sup>1</sup>—“the existing Jerusalem.” There is no authority whatever for taking Jerusalem to represent here the Jewish church or dispensation; nor is such an interpretation consistent with the present scope of the Apostle.

—δουλεύει γὰρ μετὰ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς.—He is speaking of the civil bondage of Jerusalem to Rome, which then, at the very time when the liberty of

<sup>1</sup> The adverb νῦν here, as ἄνω in the next verse, stands for an adjective. See Jelf, Gr. Gr. 456, 2, a. b.



the spiritual Israel was revealed, presented so remarkable a parallel to the spiritual bondage of the Jews: and which indeed showed that the conditions required in the antitype of the bondswoman Agar were completely carried out, and that the spiritual bondage of the Jewish church was connected with the civil bondage of Jerusalem, the metropolis and centre of worship. By τέκν. the Apostle means the whole Jewish people; Jerusalem being represented as being in bondage with her *children*, in order to keep up the parallel with εἰς δουλείαν γεννώσα, ver. 24.

The scope of the Apostle in this and the preceding verses appears to be this:—In ver. 22 he brings before the Jews and the Judaizing Gentiles, Hagar the bondswoman, and Sarah the freewoman, and shows that they represented two dispensations. Now, inasmuch as the Jews were descended from Sarah after the flesh, they would very naturally conclude that their own peculiar dispensation must be the one represented by Sarah; and they would repudiate the idea of any connexion existing between themselves and Agar the bondswoman. But the Apostle, describing the Sinaitic dispensation as one generating to bondage, establishes a parallel between it and Agar the bondswoman, and, moreover, shows them that Jerusalem, their metropolis and the centre of their worship, was in bondage too.

26. The Apostle then, having thus shown them that the Jewish church and nation, the subjects of the legal dispensation, *were* the representatives of Hagar the bondswoman, and therefore were *not* the representatives of Sarah the freewoman; he now

takes them from the known condition of the earthly Jerusalem to that of the heavenly city,—of the connexion of which with the hopes of the Christian, they, although now Judaizing, must have been aware,—and contrasting the freedom of the heavenly with the bondage of the earthly Jerusalem, shows that in her freedom she represented Sarah the free-woman; and thus he shows them that the spiritual, and not the carnal, seed are the true descendants of Sarah the freewoman.

—ἡ δὲ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ.—The heavenly Jerusalem, a *material* city, the final dwelling-place of glorified *bodies* as well as souls, the abode of God and the Lamb,<sup>1</sup> and therefore of the church, the body of the Lamb;<sup>2</sup> the metropolis of that heavenly inheritance of which the militant church has already received an earnest;<sup>3</sup> the centre of the worship, hopes, and desires<sup>4</sup> of the saints; the city which hath foundations,<sup>5</sup> and which is prepared in a heavenly country<sup>6</sup> for Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,<sup>7</sup> in common with the last of their spiritual race; the city in which the saints on earth exercise even now the privileges and taste the joys of citizenship,<sup>8</sup> but of which the glories we, with our finite powers, can neither describe nor imagine, for “eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him.”<sup>9</sup>

—ἐλευθέρα ἐστίν.—manifestly and incontrovertibly free in virtue of its very nature and position;

<sup>1</sup> Rev. xxi. 22, 23.

<sup>2</sup> Heb. xii. 22, 23.

<sup>3</sup> Eph. i. 14.

<sup>4</sup> Col. iii. 1, 2.

<sup>5</sup> Heb. xi. 10.

<sup>6</sup> Ib. 16.

<sup>7</sup> Ib. 9.

<sup>8</sup> Phil. iii. 20.

<sup>9</sup> 1 Cor. ii. 9.

the free mother of those who are delivered into the glorious liberty of the children of God.

—*ἡτις ἐστὶν μήτηρ ἡμῶν*—This clause answers exactly to *ἡτις ἐστὶν Ἄγαρ* in ver. 24, where see the note. The antecedent of *ἡτις* is Jerusalem described as free; and the meaning of the Apostle is, that as free, she represented Sarah, who is called *μήτηρ ἡμῶν*, to bring home forcibly to the Jews, and so to the Judaizers also, that she, who was the mother of the Jews after the flesh, represented, not the Mosaic, but the Gospel dispensation.

27. The conclusion arrived at in the preceding verse is, that the heavenly Jerusalem, as free and the mother of a free progeny, represented Sarah the freewoman. Sarah therefore appears as the type of the Christian church. She was barren until the divine visitation promised by God enabled her to conceive a child *παρὰ φύσιν*. And so the church of the faithful, whose existence began with righteous Abel, remained in a barren state until the fulfilment of God's promises in Christ. And then she received strength to bear seed, *παρὰ φύσιν*. Sarah then, and the church of the faithful which she represents, attain their promised progeny in that spiritual seed, which, since the completion of Christ's work by the descent of the Spirit, springs from the grave with Him, and lives by His risen life; that progeny, which, being now gathered especially from among the Gentiles, will attain its fulness at the receiving again of the Jew.

These, the implied and expressed conclusions of the Apostle, he now confirms by quoting the pre-

diction of Isa. liv. 1, giving it word for word in the language of the LXX.

—Εὐφάνθητι.—The Heb. means to cry out, to sing for joy, and hence implies joy expressed by singing.

—στειῖρα.—The free church of those justified through faith in a coming Messiah, which until the gift of the Spirit of a risen Saviour, and the calling of the Gentiles, remained as it were barren, and was thus typified by Sarah the freewoman in her long period of barrenness.

—ῥῆξον.—The Hebrew is קָרָה וְקָצַף The Heb. קָצַף is used in the same manner as the Greek, ῥῆξαι<sup>1</sup> with φωνήν, and the Lat. *rumpere* with *vocem*. It is indeed rendered by the LXX. twice by βοάω. Isa. xiv. 7, xliv. 23, βοήσατε εὐφροσύνην, and once also by ἄδω, in Psal. xcvi. 4. But קָרָה means a cry, a crying out for joy, and so joy expressed by crying out. The LXX. translate it by ἀγαλλίασις<sup>2</sup> εὐφροσύνη,<sup>3</sup> and once by χαρά.<sup>4</sup> And the same phrase which we have here, is, in Isa. xlix. 13, rendered by ῥηξάτωσαν εὐφροσύνην. See also Isa. lii. 9. The Hebrew requires therefore that we should supply here, not φωνήν, but εὐφροσύνην.

—πολλά, κ. τ. λ.—Cf. Isa. lxvi. 8; Acts ii. 41, iv. 4. See also Isa. li. 2, 3.

—τῆς ἐρήμου.—Heb. תַּרְוִיחַ. Cf. 2 Sam. xiii. 20, where the LXX. translate the same word by χησέουσα. Sarah was in a widowed and desolate state while Abraham lived with Hagar, and so the true

<sup>1</sup> See the examples of this usage given by Wetstein and Kypke, in h. l.

<sup>2</sup> Psal. xxix. 6, xlvi. 1, &ca.

<sup>3</sup> Isa. xxxv. 10, xlvi. 20, &ca.

<sup>4</sup> Isa. lv. 12.

church was left widowed and desolate during the period of the Jewish dispensation represented by Hagar.

—*τῆς ἐχούσης τὸν ἄνδρα*—The force of this is, “she who is generating children, *κατὰ φύσιν*,” viz. Hagar, who represented the Mosaic dispensation, whose children were born in bondage to the law, and yet *κατὰ φύσιν*, and so unable to perform the law.

28. —*ὁμοῖς δὲ . . . ἐστέ*—“Ye then, brethren.” The *δέ* takes up the thread of the argument interrupted by the quotation in the preceding verse. The reading *ἡμεῖς ἐσμέν* arose, I have little doubt, from a comparison of this verse with ver. 31, where see the note.

—*κατὰ Ἰσαάκ*—“after the likeness” or “fashion of Isaac.” Cf. Herodot. i. 121, *κατὰ Μιτραδάτην*.<sup>1</sup> Compare the usage of *κατά*, Rom. xv. 5; 1 Pet. i. 15.

—*ἐπαγγελίας τέκνα*—That is, as Christians born of God, and *παρὰ φύσιν*, according to God’s promises in Christ. See the note on *ἐπαγγελ.* ver. 23. So Theodoret, *οὐ γὰρ κατὰ φύσιν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ χάριν ἐτέχθημεν*. The Apostle is here only stating the characteristics of the Gospel dispensation, q. d. “Such are the privileges rendered available to you, Gentiles and Jews.”

29. The parallel between the seed of the covenant of grace and Isaac displays, as hitherto stated, only the blessings and privileges of the Christian. The Apostle now, with a special reference to the efforts

<sup>1</sup> See Jelf, Gr. Gr. 629, 3, e., and Raphel, Kypke, and Wetstein, in h. l.

of the Judaizers, observes a correspondence in attendant evils.

—*ὡσπερ τότε*—“Just as aforetime.”<sup>1</sup> *ὁ κατὰ σάρκα γεν.* See note on *κατὰ σάρκα*, ver. 23.

—*ἐδίωκεν*—The Apostle alludes to the circumstance recorded in Gen. xxi. 9, viz. that Sarah saw the son of Hagar mocking. The best explanation<sup>2</sup> given of this is, that Ishmael, seeing the great feast<sup>3</sup> with which Abraham celebrated the day on which Isaac was weaned, made either it, or Isaac himself, the subject of mockery, intimating that, notwithstanding all this, he was the first-born and the heir. Sarah seeing this, and fearing lest in process of time he should actually take the inheritance, said, “Cast out this bondwoman and her son,” &c.<sup>4</sup>

—*τὸν κατὰ πνεῦμα*—scil. *γεννηθέντα*. That is, him who was born *διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας*,<sup>5</sup> and *παρὰ φύσιν* who typified the regenerate Christian born of God,<sup>6</sup> born of the Spirit.<sup>7</sup>

—*οὕτως καὶ νῦν*—As Ishmael mocked Isaac, claiming the inheritance by right of primogeniture and legitimate birth, so the false teachers, themselves born *κατὰ φύσιν*, and the children of the legal covenant, persecuted the Galatians, disputing their right to the heavenly inheritance in and through Christ, the Head of the spiritual Israel; and claiming it as the reward of the works of the law on the ground of the primogeniture of the carnal and legal seed.

And we too of the present day may add our ex-

<sup>1</sup> Lidd. and Scott, v. *τότε*.

<sup>2</sup> See Pauli Burgens Addit. in Gen. xxi. 9. Cf. also Hieronym. Quæst. Heb. in Gen. Opp. Tom. ii. p. 524.

<sup>3</sup> Ver. 8.

<sup>4</sup> Ver. 10.

<sup>5</sup> Ver. 23, where see the note.

<sup>6</sup> John i. 13.

<sup>7</sup> Ib. iii. 6.

perience to that of every age of the church, and say, οὕτως καὶ νῦν.

30. —ἀλλά——*But* so far from these claims being just, what is the verdict of God in Scripture? *Cast out, &c.*

—λέγει——See the note on λέγει, iii. 16.

—ἡ γραφή——i. e. God recording in Scripture with a spiritual import, and for the benefit of the spiritual seed, that which Sarah, typifying, in words actually spoken, spiritual things, had said concerning Isaac, the type of the children of the free church existing in Christ their Head. See the note on ἀλληγορούμενα, ver. 24.

The passage, according to the LXX., is ἔκβαλε τὴν παιδίσκην ταύτην καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς· οὐ γὰρ μὴ κληρονομήσει ὁ υἱὸς τῆς παιδίσκης ταύτης μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ μου Ἰσαάκ. The Apostle is evidently quoting from the LXX., slightly however altering the form to suit his present purpose.

—τὴν παιδίσκην.——See the note on παιδίσκη, ver. 22.

—οὐ γὰρ μὴ κληρονομήσει.——οὐ μὴ is frequently joined with aorist (1 and 2), and sometimes, though rarely, the present conjunctive. The best explanation of the construction appears to be that after οὐ some such expression as φοβητέον or ἐνθυμητέον is to be understood, e. g. οὐ (φοβητέον) μὴ τοῦτο γένηται, “It is not to be feared lest this should happen,” which is equivalent to the statement, “this cannot by any means happen.” So that a very strong negative is implied.<sup>1</sup> The following are examples

<sup>1</sup> See a note of Astius on Plato, Pol. i. 341, B., and Jelf, Gr. Gr. 748, 2, a. and the whole of the section.

of this usage of the first aorist: <sup>1</sup> Xen. Anab. iv. 8, 13, οὐδεὶς μηκέτι μείνη τῶν πολεμίων; Cyropæd. iii. 2, 8, ὡς οἱ γε Ἀρμένιοι οὐ μὴ δέξωνται τοὺς πολεμίους; Plato, Phæd. 66, B., ὅτι . . . . . οὐ μὴ ποτε κτησώμεθα ἰκανῶς οὗ ἐπιθυμοῦμεν; Phædrus, 273, E., ταῦτα δὲ οὐ μὴ ποτε κτήσεται ἄνευ πολλῆς πραγματείας; Pol. x. 609, B., οὐ γὰρ τό γε ἀγαθὸν μὴ ποτέ τι ἀπολέσῃ; Phæd. 105, D., οὐ μὴ ποτε δέξεται. Cf. also N. T. Matt. x. 23, 42; Luke ix. 27 (Tisch. Gb.); Gal. v. 16, &ca, &ca.

—ὁ υἱὸς τῆς παιδίσκης—“Liberi ex concubina conditionis servilis, aut extranea seu gentili, a successione plane apud Ebræos excludebantur. Id satis liquet ex Misna, tit. *Jabimoth*, cap. II.”<sup>2</sup> Selden<sup>3</sup> notices in connexion with this a curious fact; “Mirum est,” he says, “quod habet vetustus antoe τοῦ Beresith Rabba, fol. 68, col. 2. Apud Alexandrum magnum, rerum Asiæ potitum, Ismaelitas sive Arabas litem adversus Israelitas instituisse *de jure*, aut prærogativa, *primogeniti*. Etenim Ismael Abrahæ primogenitus erat, licet ancillæ filius. Advocatum respondisse, *Domine mi rex, nonne fas est cuique pro libitu suo cum filiis seu liberis agere?* Regi annuente, At scriptum est, inquit, Genes. xxv. 5, *Et dedit Abraham totam substantiam suam Isaaco*. Et de distributione porro interrogantibus Ismaelitis, illud quod sequitur ibi subjecit, *At filiis concubinarum quæ Abrahæ erant, dedit Abraham dona*. Inde lite abstinabant, et ob pudorem ultra disputare nolebant.”

<sup>1</sup> Matthiæ (Gr. Gr. 517) says, but without reason, that the 1st aorist passive only is used in this manner. But Cf. Jelf, Gr. Gr. ubi sup. Obs. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Selden De Successionibus ad Leges Ebræorum, cap. 3, vol. ii. p. 11.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.



—μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἐλευθέρου.—See Gen. xxi. 12.

The Apostle, having, in ver. 26, brought the Galatians to the conclusion, that as Christians theirs was the dispensation represented by Sarah the freewoman, argues in ver. 28 that they are, therefore, children of promise. In this verse he indirectly establishes another consequence, viz. that as the children of promise they are heirs: and he pronounces in the very words of Scripture the sentence of condemnation against the false teachers and their doctrine. Not only are they, the carnal and legal seed, not heirs,—not only is their system of a conjoined justification by Christ and the law, opposed to the direct terms of Scripture,—but they are to be cast forth from the very presence and favour of God.

31. The correct form of the following sentence, including this verse and v. 1, I take to be, Ἡμεῖς δέ, ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἐσμὲν παιδίσκης τέκνα, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἐλευθέρου, τῆ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἣ ἡμεῖς Χριστὸς ἠλευθέρωσεν. Στήκετε οὖν καὶ μὴ πάλιν ζυγῶ δουλείας ἐνέχεσθε. For the clause ἡμεῖς δέ, κ. τ. λ., appears to me clearly to spring out of the preceding verse, and the consideration involved therein of the fate of the carnal and legal seed. The Galatians had been too ready to listen to the Judaizing teachers; but they had “run” so “well” that the Apostle was still full of hope<sup>1</sup> regarding them. And so now, uniting them with himself in the word ἡμεῖς, he expresses the comforting and hopeful assurance, that they are not of that seed which is to be cast forth, but, on the contrary, that they are the children of the freewoman, through the liberty wherewith Christ had made them free. Before, as

<sup>1</sup> Ch. v. ver. 10.

in ver. 28, he had spoken only generally of the terms of that covenant to which they professed to belong (*ὑμεῖς δέ*). Here he speaks more particularly of a real living participation in the blessings belonging to the covenant (*ἡμεῖς δέ*). And in the clause *τῇ ἐλευθ.* he at once shows the means whereby this free birth is brought about, and recalls to their minds the liberty which they had actually felt and enjoyed, appealing as it were to their own experience to aid him in assuring them of their true condition in Christ.<sup>1</sup> For the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free is attained in union with His risen life. When Christ became the descendant of Sarah after the flesh, He accepted the responsibility of obedience to the law until death, and after death, He lived possessed of a true *ἀπολύτρωσις*, and a perfect righteousness attained by a perfect obedience. Becoming then thus a Jew, by that one act He made Himself

<sup>1</sup> I had written the above (as indeed nearly the whole of my commentary—see Preface) before I had had the advantage of seeing Mr. Ellicott's admirable commentary. I have been very much gratified to find that, although he hesitates to adopt the reading *ἡμεῖς δέ*, he takes a view of this verse in many respects similar to my own. He says, "Verse 30 describes the fate of the bond-children; ver. 31 will then form a sort of consolatory conclusion, deriving some force from the emphatic *κληρον*, 'But we shall have a different fate, we shall be inheritors, for we are children, not of a bond-woman, but of a free.'" For some time, with him, I suspected *ἡμεῖς δέ*, on the ground that it looked like a repetition from ver. 28; but if *ὑμεῖς* be the true reading there, it is perhaps even more probable that the substitution there of *ἡμεῖς* arose out of *ἡμεῖς* in this verse.

As regards the adoption of the reading *ἡμεῖς δέ*, external authority is so conflicting that it is hardly necessary to apologize for neglecting in this instance to follow any other editor. The question lies between *διο* and *ἡμεῖς δέ*. *Ἄρα* is clearly the reading least supported. My own belief is, that a transcriber was misled by the following injunction, *στίκετε οὖν*, into the idea that this verse was a conclusion from what goes before, and that failing to see the true force of *ἡμεῖς δέ*, he changed it into a word which expressed more forcibly that conclusion.

heir of the inheritance promised in Isaac, and attained that righteousness which, being imputed to man, gives Him a claim thereto. So that man, attaining in union with Him this righteousness and this freedom from the law, attains spiritual liberty, and becomes also the descendant of the freewoman and heir of the inheritance, this free descent being now actually associated with the spiritual liberty of which it was the type. And thus through the liberty attained by Christ, sought by, and communicated to His elect people, they become τέκνα τῆς ἐλευθέρου, and, in the consciousness of spiritual liberty, they may gather the assurance that they are born παρὰ φύσιν, sons of the freewoman and heirs of the heavenly inheritance. With regard to the connexion of τῆ ἐλευθ. with the preceding verse, it appears to me that the construction requires it no less than the scope of the Apostle. For if τῆ ἐλευθ. were to be connected with στήκετε, the Apostle would have used the preposition ἐν,<sup>1</sup> as 1 Cor. xvi. 13; Phil. i. 27, iv. 1; 1 Thess. iii. 8. The position of οὖν I do not urge in connexion with this, because Griesb. and Tisch. omit it altogether; but it is certain that the reading which most favours the common interpretation, viz. that in

<sup>1</sup> Wetstein comments on στήκετε by a reference to Rom. xi. 20, τῆ πίστει ἑστηκας, as if the Apostle meant to say here "stand fast *by* the liberty, &c. And Bengel says, τῆ ἐλευθ. is put emphatically without the article for "ipsa libertas vim standi confert." This interpretation is, especially as regards Bengel, manifestly fanciful and untenable; but it serves at least to show that these critics felt that the absence of the preposition created a difficulty in the connexion of ἐλευθ. with στήκετε. Dr. Bloomfield, who of course adheres to the received form, and blames Griesb. for "rashness" (Gk. Test. 2nd Ed.), actually comments (Recens Synop.) here as if ἐν were in the text: thus tacitly acknowledging the force of the argument derived from its absence.

which οὖν follows ἐλεσθ., is the one most devoid of support.

As regards the relative ᾗ, I should feel justified in retaining it, as do Griesb. and Tisch., on the ground that its omission may be so easily accounted for through the juxta-position of the η in ἡμᾶς.

---

## CHAPTER V.

1. —στήκετε οὖν——“Stand firm then.” The LXX. (Cod Alex.) use στήκετε, Exod. xiv. 13; and Aquila, Josh. x. 19. This exhortation is based upon the affectionate and hopeful assumption of the Apostle, that the Galatians were yet effectually in possession of Gospel liberty. See the note on the preceding verse.

—πάλιν——See the note on πάλιν, iv. 9.

—ζυγῶ δουλείας——See Acts xv. 10. Compare Plato, Legg. vi. 770, E., δούλειον ὑπομείνασα ζυγόν; Ep. viii. 354, D., φεύγουσι τὸν δούλειον ζυγόν ὡς δὲ κακόν. See iv. 3, 9, and the notes.

—ἐνέχεσθε.—Transl. “fettered.” Compare Herodot. ii. 121, τῇ πάγῃ ἐνέχεσθαι.

2. It was a very natural consequence of the position which Christianity occupied with respect to Judaism, that in the early age of the church, the distinction between the two was not clearly manifested. Until the destruction of Jerusalem, the city and the

temple<sup>1</sup> were regarded by both as religious centres : and the prejudices of the Jewish converts were wisely considered to furnish a valid ground for permitting the association with the Christian profession of observances which were engrained in their very nature.<sup>2</sup> The consequence of this was that that which was at first *permitted*, in the case of Jews, came to be insisted upon as necessary to salvation in the case of Gentiles,<sup>3</sup> as well as Jews. The Judaizers, following the form whereby the proselytes of justice were admitted among the Jews, required the union of circumcision as an initiatory<sup>4</sup> rite, with the baptism of the Christian converts. “Certain men,” we read,<sup>5</sup> “which came down from Judæa, taught the brethren, Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses,<sup>6</sup> ye cannot be saved.” And this was the yoke which threatened the neck of the Galatians. The doctrine of those who sought to fetter them was doubtless the same as that of the Judaizers at Antioch. The Apostle therefore, exhorting his converts to stand firm, meets the efforts of those who would unsettle them, with an emphatic declaration expressed in terms the very reverse of theirs, q. d. “These false apostles say to you, If ye be not circumcised, ye cannot be saved. I Paul, an Apostle not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ,<sup>7</sup> say to you, If ye be circumcised, ye cannot be saved ; Christ shall profit you nothing.”

—ἐὰν περιτέμνησθε—i. e. with a view to justifi-

<sup>1</sup> See Acts ii. 46, iii. 1, v. 20, xxi. 26.

<sup>2</sup> See Acts xvi. 3, and the note on ii. 5. See also Acts xxi. 20.

<sup>3</sup> See Acts xv. 23, 24, and the notes on ch. ii. 3, and 5.

<sup>4</sup> See Acts xv. 5.

<sup>5</sup> Acts xv. 1.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Levit. xii. 3 ; John vii. 22. <sup>7</sup> See the note on ἀπόστολος, i. 1.

cation and salvation. Cf. ver. 4, and Acts xv. 10, 11.

—Χριστὸς ὑμᾶς οὐδὲν ὠφέλησει.—i. e. for justification and salvation; because the justification which is attained in Christ through faith is *free* and *complete*.<sup>1</sup> Compare Ignat. Magn. x.,<sup>2</sup> "Ἀτοπὸν ἐστίν, Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν λαλεῖν, καὶ ἰουδαΐζειν.

3. —μαρτύρομαι δέ—*But* so far from profiting you, I protest, &c.

—πάλιν—“again.” The Apostle had virtually said the same thing before, ch. iii. 10.

—παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ—Jew as well as Gentile.

—περιτεμνομένῳ—“who is being circumcised,” i. e. with a view to the attainment of justification, and as a matter of necessity. See the note on the preceding verse.

—ὀφειλέτης ἐστίν—*ipso facto*.

—ὄλον τὸν νόμον ποιῆσαι—To seek for justification through circumcision was to place themselves *ipso facto* under the legal covenant; of which the terms were, “Cursed is every one that continueth not in *all* things which are written in the book of the law to *do* them.” It was therefore to accept these its terms and responsibilities, to ignore the redemption from the curse of the law, effected by Christ; to reject the vicarious work of Him, in whom the believer is “complete, circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ.”<sup>3</sup>

4. —κατηργήθητε ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ—Lit. “ye have made yourselves to cease from Christ,” i. e. from ac-

<sup>1</sup> See ii. 21, and the note. <sup>2</sup> Quoted by Gr'nfield. <sup>3</sup> Col. ii. 10, 11.

ceptance of Him, and the benefits of His complete and vicarious work. See the note on *καταργεῖν*, iii. 17. Cf. Rom. vii. 2, 6.

—*ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοῦσθε*—“think that ye are to be justified,”<sup>1</sup> and so therefore “seek for justification by the law,” or “in the law.”

—*τῆς χάριτος ἐξέπιστατε*—Because “to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned *κατὰ χάριν ἀλλὰ κατὰ ὀφείλημα*.”<sup>2</sup> Wetstein says here, “Si omnino fieri non posset, ut quis gratia excideret, absurde hæc dicerentur,” and Dr. Bloomfield<sup>3</sup> calls this a “shrewd” remark. The simple fact however is, that this verse has no bearing whatever upon the doctrine of the final perseverance of the saints. All that the Apostle means to say is, that inasmuch as the salvation offered through Christ is *χάριτι*, by grace, the person who, having openly accepted Christ and His salvation, seeks for justification as a reward of works, is fallen from a position in which justification is of the free grace of God. The grace which is the characteristic of the dispensation is one thing, and that which gives vital union with Christ is another. The professing Christian accepting Christ is in a state of grace, in so far as the terms of his profession are justification and salvation by grace: and if he openly and avowedly seeks for salvation through works, he is fallen from that state of grace, and therefore openly separated from Christ.

5. —*ἡμεῖς γὰρ, κ. τ. λ.*—The Apostle, having in the preceding verse shown that the legalist, seeking

<sup>1</sup> Compare the note on *συνέκλεισεν*, iii. 22.

<sup>2</sup> Rom. iv. 4. See also xi. 6.

<sup>3</sup> Recens. Synop.

for salvation as the reward of works, can be no longer accepting salvation by *grace* in Christ, now contrasts with the fears and experiences of the seeker after a legal justification, the hopes and experiences of the true believer—*we*, i. e. I and those who are truly united to Christ, and seeking for salvation in Him. *πνεύματι* is the instrumental dative, being put by metonymy, as in 1 Cor. xiv. 2, &ca, for the operation of the Spirit. For it is the Spirit of a risen Saviour which gives the true believer a confident expectation of the glory which is the object of his hope, and which is the reward of the perfect righteousness of Jesus. He testifies to him of the perfectness of Christ's work, the freeness of God's Gospel mercies, the magnitude of His love. He fills him with a consciousness of union with Christ, an assurance that Christ is his and he is Christ's; and these revelations, and such as these, assure the believer that his redemption and adoption shall be completed in glory,<sup>1</sup> that he shall have an everlasting salvation,<sup>2</sup> an everlasting righteousness,<sup>3</sup> a crown of glory,<sup>4</sup> the hope of his calling,<sup>5</sup> which is laid up for him in heaven.<sup>6</sup> Cf. Rom. xv. 13.

—*ἐκ πίστεως*—An assured expectation of salvation springs immediately from a true faith in the person and work of the Saviour, and this faith is the gift of the Spirit. Cf. Rom. v. 1, 2.

—*ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης*—*ἐλπ.* is put by metonymy for that which is hoped for, viz. the full salvation which is, in the person of the believer, the conse-

<sup>1</sup> Rom. viii. 23.

<sup>4</sup> 1 Pet. v. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Isa. xlv. 17.

<sup>5</sup> Eph. i. 18.

<sup>3</sup> Dan. ix. 24.

<sup>6</sup> Col. i. 5.



quence of the imputation of Christ's perfect righteousness. Cf. 2 Tim. iv. 8 ; Col. i. 5.

—ἀπεκδέχόμεθα—“expect,” as Phil. iii. 20.

6. —ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ—i. e. in the Christian dispensation.

—ἰσχύει—*valet*, i. e. in the attainment of justification and salvation.

—δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη—“which through love is operative.” ἐνεργεῖν means “to work,” and expresses power *in action*. ἐνεργεῖσθαι (mid.) means “to be operative,” and expresses not necessarily action, but the power which is the impulse of, and which tends to, action. This sense is apparent in each one of the passages in which the word occurs in the New Testament.<sup>1</sup> The Apostle, as is evident from ver. 3 and 4, is excluding all works, whether moral or ceremonial, from a share in the justification of the sinner. Ascribing that justification to the instrumentality of faith *only*, he adds δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργ. to show that this very faith through which alone the Christian is justified, is a power which, through love, produces action, and out of which therefore spring those works which, although they have no power to justify, constitute an all-important feature in the life of the believer.

Now faith is a continued and supernatural apprehension and consciousness of the love of God and Christ. The life of the Christian is maintained through faith in the Son of God, who *loved* him.<sup>2</sup> And the consequence of the personal apprehension of this love of God and Christ, is a reciprocal love

<sup>1</sup> Rom. vii. 5 ; 2 Cor. i. 6, iv. 12 ; Eph. iii. 20 ; Col. i. 29 ; 1 Thess. ii. 13 ; 2 Thess. ii. 7 ; Jac. v. 16.

<sup>2</sup> Gal. ii. 20.

on the part of the believer. "We love Him because He first loved us."<sup>1</sup> Again, as faith is the instrumental cause of union and sonship, and as sonship is followed by consciousness thereof,<sup>2</sup> there springs out of this consciousness, love of a child to its Heavenly Parent, and this developes itself in a childlike obedience, the manifestation of gratitude for justification and sonship. And the believer who is thus conscious of sonship and union, knows that new and heavenly ties bind him to all, who with him are partakers of the same heavenly calling. The consciousness of common blessings, common trials, a common hope of a common home—these, springing out of faith, produce that love to the brethren which is the pledge of a transition from death to life.<sup>3</sup> But more particularly, the believer, being united to Christ, is filled with His Spirit, and so partakes of *His* love to God, *His* love to the members of His mystical body, *His* love and tender pity to the whole world for whom He died.

The love<sup>4</sup> then of which the Apostle speaks is that love to God and man which, springing from faith, is the pledge and characteristic of the new birth;<sup>5</sup> and which, embracing the whole range of moral observance, developes itself in obedience to the moral law.<sup>6</sup> And, since obedience springs from and is dependent upon love, and love springs from and is dependent upon faith, or the apprehension of divine love manifested in justification and adoption; faith is the

<sup>1</sup> 1 John iv. 19.

<sup>2</sup> Gal. iv. 6.

<sup>3</sup> 1 John ii. 9, 10, iii. 14.

<sup>4</sup> See the note on ἀγάπη, ver. 22.

<sup>5</sup> See 1 John iv. 7.

<sup>6</sup> Matt. xxii. 37—40; Rom. xiii. 9.

power which alone can and does tend to produce, and produce action, and upon the vigour of which vigorous action depends.

We may observe therefore, that since the good works of the Christian are the result of love, and since love is called forth by the consciousness of justification *ready attained*, they can have no share in the attainment of justification. Nor, again, can faith without operating love be powerless to give union with Christ,<sup>1</sup> or justification; because justification is the fruit of union, and love does not precede justification, but succeeds it. Cf. Augustine, Enar. in Psal. lxxvii. § 41. “Fides . . . opera præcedit, quia sine bonorum operum meritis per fidem justificatur impius, sicut dicit Apostolus, Credenti in eum, qui justificat impium, reputatur fides ejus ad justitiam: ut deinde ipsa fides per dilectionem incipiat operari. Ea quippe sola bona opera dicenda sunt, quæ sunt per dilectionem Dei. Hæc autem necesse est, ut antecedit fides, ut inde ista, non ab istis incipiat illa, quoniam nullus operatur per dilectionem Dei nisi prius credat in Deum. Hæc est fides de qua dicitur, In Christo Jesu neque circumcisio aliquid valet, neque præputium, sed fides quæ per dilectionem operatur.”

7. — Ἐπρῆχστε καλῶς — i. e. in that onward course of obedience, which springs from the continuous apprehension of the love of Christ through faith. Cf. 1 Cor. ix. 24, seqq.; Heb. xii. 1; Ps. cxix. 32; Phil. iii. 13, 14.

— ἐνέκοψεν — “hindered” you in your course. Cf. ἐγκ. Rom. xv. 22; 1 Thess. ii. 18.

<sup>1</sup> See Concil. Trident. Sess. VI. c. vii.

—τῆ ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πείθεσθαι—Supply here ὥστε and ὑμᾶς. This expresses the result or effect of this hindrance in the persons of the Galatians, viz. that they who had run well, had, in yielding to the bondage of the law, become disobedient to that truth which had made them free.<sup>1</sup> πείθεσθ. cf. Rom. ii. 8.

8. —ἡ πεισμονή—This is an extremely rare word. It is given by Hesychius and Suidas as the equivalent of πειθῶ, which means (I.) Persuasion as a goddess, and hence persuasiveness, the faculty of persuading, and (II.) a persuasion in the mind. Suidas understands πειθῶ in the former sense, Hesychius in the latter; and in this sense, viz. of a persuasion in the mind, πεισμονή is, I think, used here. The article has a certain demonstrative force, pointing out this πεισμονή as that which made the Galatians disobedient to the truth.

—ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος ὑμᾶς—i. e. God. Cf. ver. 13; 1 Thess. v. 24; Phil. iii. 14.<sup>2</sup>

9. This verse is probably a quotation from some poet whose writings were known to St. Paul.<sup>3</sup>

—φύραμα means a kneaded mass, and hence dough.

—ζυμοῖ—The Apostle is justifying the statement of ver. 7. The Galatians might object that they had only adopted some few Jewish observances, that they still adhered in the main to the Christian profession, and that there was therefore no ground for the view he took respecting their state. He would reply,—The adherence in one particular to legal observance as a ground of justification destroys

<sup>1</sup> John viii. 32.

<sup>2</sup> Bengel.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. 1 Cor. v. 6; Acts xvii. 28; 1 Cor. xv. 33; Titus i. 12. See Schmid. on 1 Cor. v. 6.

that faith in a complete and free salvation, which is the basis of your life and profession as Christians; a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump. Cf. Matt. xvi. 12. The reading *δολοῖ* originated, according to Epiphanius, with Marcion.

10. —*ἐγὼ πέποιθα εἰς ὑμᾶς*—I feel confidence respecting<sup>1</sup> you. Cf. 2 Thess. iii. 4.

—*ἐν Κυρίῳ*—*in* the Lord. Cf. 2 Thess. iii. 4; Phil. ii. 19. The confidences and hopes of the believer are exercised *in* the Lord, i. e. *in* that life which is hid with Christ in God. They rise therefore into assurance of His purposes of mercy, and submit themselves humbly to His will.

—*ᾧτι, κ. τ. λ.*—i. e. that ye will, though you have fallen, yet feel no otherwise than that the leaven of Judaism, however small it may be, has this fatal effect upon your whole Christian life and profession.

—*δέ*—*But* although I have a good hope of God's purposes of mercy towards you, he, &ca.

—*ταράσσω*—Cf. i. 7, note. Galen.,<sup>2</sup> *οἱ δὲ . . . ταραττοντες μόνον τοὺς μανθάνοντας, διδάσκοντες δ' οὐδέν.*

—*βαστάσει*—Cf. LXX., 4 Reg. xviii. 14. And compare in the Hebrew, Lev. v. 1, 17. St. Paul speaks judicially as an Apostle.<sup>3</sup>

—*τὸ κρίμα*—i. e. the condemnatory judgment, with its consequent punishment,<sup>4</sup> which attaches to all, *ἐξ ἔργων νόμου*.<sup>5</sup> that punishment to which these false teachers had exposed the Galatians, but

<sup>1</sup> Jelf, Gr. Gr. 625, 3, c.

<sup>2</sup> Quoted by Wetstein.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. 1 Cor. v. 5; 1 Tim. i. 20.

<sup>4</sup> Matt. xxiii. 14; Rom. ii. 3, iii. 8. Hesychius, *κρίμα. ἀνταπόδοσις Θεοῦ.*

<sup>5</sup> iii. 10.

from which the mercy of God shall save the converts, while the teachers, by whom the offence came,<sup>1</sup> shall be left to bear their punishment, to perish in the destruction which they had prepared for others. Cf. Psal. xxxv. 7, 8.

—ὅστις ἂν ᾖ——“Whosoever he be”—τὸ ὅστις, ἀόριστόν ἐστι.<sup>2</sup> It is plain that the Apostle is not designating any particular person.<sup>3</sup> He speaks *definitely* concerning a certain number of individuals who were then troubling and unsettling the Galatians; but *indefinitely* of any and every one among that number. It is, however, possible that there was some one person præëminent among the false teachers, to whom the Galatians paid particular respect; and that with a mental reference to this, the Apostle uses the singular instead of the plural, in order to exhibit the condemnation as attaching to each and every one without distinction. Compare the use of the singular for the plural, ch. vi. 1, καταρτίζετε . . . σκοπῶν· and see the note, and Elsner and Kypke in loc.

11. —ἐγὼ δέ, κ. τ. λ.—As a Pharisee St. Paul would have taught before his conversion the very same doctrine as that of these Judaizers: and, having after his conversion yielded to Jewish prejudices that he might gain the Jews,<sup>4</sup> the Galatians had probably been taught to believe that St. Paul himself still (ἔτι) and since his conversion preached the necessity of circumcision. If, says the Apostle, this be the case,

—τί ἔτι διώκομαι——Cf. iv. 29, vi. 12.

<sup>1</sup> Luke xvii. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Thomas Magister.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. v. 12, vi. 12, 13.

<sup>4</sup> 1 Cor. ix. 20. See Acts xvi. 3, and the note on ii. 5.

—τὸ σκάνδαλον—*The* offence, i. e. the doctrine that the law cannot give justification. σκάνδ. is a later form of σκανδάληθρον. It means, properly, the stick in a trap on which the bait is placed, and which, being touched by the animal, springs up and makes the trap shut. Hence it means anything of a physical, moral, or spiritual nature, which is, becomes, or is made, the cause or occasion of evil, physical, moral, or spiritual. Cf. LXX., Levit. xix. 14; Psal. cxviii. 165. Apocryph., Judith v. 1, xii. 2; Sap. xiv. 11. N. T., Rom. xiv. 13; 1 Cor. i. 23; 1 Pet. ii. 7; Rev. ii. 14.

—τοῦ σταυροῦ—i. e. the doctrine of the cross. Cf. 1 Cor. i. 17; Gal. vi. 12; Phil. iii. 18. The doctrine of the cross was the doctrine of heirship by promise, of a free and complete salvation in Christ. It necessarily involved, therefore, the doctrine of the entire uselessness of all legal observance as a means of attaining justification. This doctrine was, especially to the Jew, the offence of the cross, and the ground upon which the children of the bondwoman persecuted the children of promise, the heirs of the inheritance.<sup>1</sup> “If, therefore,” the Apostle would say, “I preach the necessity of circumcision, if I tell you as Christians that you must seek for justification through the works of the law, why do the Jews continue to persecute me? Then, in preaching circumcision, I have removed that doctrine which is the cause of offence. The offence of the cross is made to cease.

12. —ὁφελον—“I would that it were!” I should place thus a stop after ὁφελον, connecting it with

<sup>1</sup> See the notes on iv. 29, 30.

what goes before, q. d. I would indeed that the offence of the cross were done away among my own people, and yourselves especially, i. e. not that which is made a cause of offence,<sup>1</sup> but the offence itself; not the doctrine rejected, but the rejection of the doctrine. Compare 1 Cor. iv. 8, *χωρὶς ἡμῶν ἐβασίλευσατε· καὶ ὄφελόν γε ἐβασίλευσατε*. Bengel says, “Post ὄφελον in Augustano sexto<sup>2</sup> ponitur *στιγμῆ*, opinor, in pluribus MSS., si philologi annotarent talia; nam comma certe est in editionibus quibusdam antiquis, præsertim Basileensi Ann. 1545.<sup>3</sup> Immo ὄφελον percommode connectas cum præcedentibus.”

—*καὶ, κ. τ. λ.*—This clause is of an interjectional character. The Apostle breaks off suddenly in his expression of hope, q. d. I desire this, but, &ca.<sup>4</sup> *καί* is used in an adversative<sup>5</sup> sense, as in Matt. xii. 39; xiii. 14, 17; John x. 25; Eph. iv. 26, &ca.

—*ἀποκόψονται*.—This is evidently used in a figurative<sup>6</sup> sense. The best way is therefore to interpret it in connexion with the idea which is prominent in the Apostle’s mind, viz. the inevitable perdition of those who had led his converts astray, opposed to his hopes and confidences respecting his converts themselves. He uses then *ἀποκ.* in a sense similar to *βαστάσει τὸ κρίμα*, in ver. 10. They shall

<sup>1</sup> See the note on the next verse.

<sup>2</sup> A MS. of the eleventh century, numbered 55.

<sup>3</sup> Four editions, reprints of the text of Erasmus, were published at Basle in this year. <sup>4</sup> So Schwartz ap. Wolf. <sup>5</sup> Jelf, Gr. Gr. 759, 3.

<sup>6</sup> The interpretation of *ἀποκ.* given by Grotius and other commentators, both ancient and modern, appears to me to involve a positive insult to St. Paul.



be cut off, i. e. from a position of hope that they may ever accept the salvation of Christ.

—οἱ ἀναστατοῦντες—They who subvert you. ἀναστατοῦν, a late word for ἀνάστατον ποιεῖν, means to *upset, overthrow, subvert*. Cf. Acts xvii. 6. Hesych., ἀναστατοῦντας. ἀνατρέποντας. The old Latin correctly translates *subvertunt*. The Apostle uses it here in a sense similar to ταρασσῶν, *unsettling*, in ver. 10, both words conveying an idea opposite to στήκετε, ver. 1.

13. —ὤμεῖς γὰρ ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ ἐκλήθητε — This verse stands immediately connected with ὄφελον, in ver. 11. The Apostle speaks of the doctrine of the uselessness of the law in the matter of justification, as τὸ σκάνδαλον τοῦ σταυροῦ, viz. that which the Jews made the occasion or cause of rejecting the Gospel. In ver. 12, seizing the preceding idea, and mentally investing σκάνδαλον with the sense of the offence itself, rather than the cause of offence, he exclaims, Would that it were done away, i. e. would that the Jews no longer rejected the doctrine that the law cannot justify! for, he adds here, ye have been called unto liberty. ἐπ' ἐλ. ἐκλ. expresses the general truth as regards the calling of the Christian. ἐπί expresses the object and aim of the calling, considered as the motive or foundation thereof.<sup>1</sup>

—μόνον μὴ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν, κ. τ. λ.—The ellipsis in this clause is thus supplied by Bos., μόνον ὀρᾶτε μὴ παραλάβητε τὴν ἐλευθερίαν εἰς ἀφορμὴν τῇ σαρκί. The Judaizers made the liberty of the Gospel the *occasion* of rejecting it. The Apostle meets this by affirm-

<sup>1</sup> Jelf, Gr. Gr. 634, 3. Cf. 1 Thess. iv. 7, ἐκάλεσεν . . . ἐπὶ ἀκαθαρία.

ing that the very object of their Christian calling was the possession of liberty. He here warns the Galatians against making their Gospel liberty the *occasion* of indulging the flesh.

—ἀφορμή— Hesych., ἀφορμή. πρόφασις. αἰτία. “ἀφορμή proprie est locus unde tuto et commode exire possis ad incursionem faciendam. Hinc ductâ metaphorâ, ἀφορμή dicitur quævis res ἀφ’ ἧς ὁρμώμενοι ποιούμεν τι, sive a quâ, tanquam principio aliquo, commode proficissimur ad aliquid gerendum vel consequendum . . . Hinc non mirum eo nomine *prætextum* quoque et *causam* interdum appellari posse.”<sup>1</sup> Cf. 1 Tim. v. 14.

—διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης—i. e. by the love peculiar to the calling. See the note on δι’ ἀγ. ἐνεργ. ver. 6.

—δουλεύετε—This is antithetical to ἐλευθ. Cf. 1 Pet. ii. 16. See also 1 Cor. ix. 19; cf. Mark x. 44.

14. —ὁ γὰρ πᾶς νόμος—“For the entire law,” q. d. “the whole body of legal commandment by which ye seek to be justified.” Cf. Rom. xiii. 9.

—ἐν ἐνὶ λόγῳ— in one precept. Cf. λόγος, LXX.; Exod. xx. 1, xxxiv. 28, xxxv. 1, &ca.

—πεπλήρωται— “is summed up,” “is complete.” Cf. ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται, Rom. xiii. 9.<sup>2</sup>

—Ἀγαπήσεις, κ. τ. λ.—Levit. xix. 18.

—τὸν πλησίον—The Heb. גַּרְ, which the LXX. in this as in most other places translate by ὁ πλησίον,

<sup>1</sup> Kuster in Hesych.

<sup>2</sup> The prominent notion here is not the performance of the body of the law, but the statement and delivery of its requirements. It is of course an inevitable and manifest consequence, that if a complete statement is made in the one command of love, a complete performance is attained in obedience to that complete statement.

means properly one of the same flock, and hence a friend or companion, and generally any one, whether friend or enemy,<sup>1</sup> with whom one is, under any circumstances, connected.

—*ὡς σεαυτόν*—The sinfulness of the old creation develops itself in the individual selfishness of each member thereof. The holiness of the new creation manifests itself in the individual sacrifice of self. Christ as the Head of the new creation laid down His life, giving thereby the pattern of that sacrifice of self which was to be the rule of action to His people;<sup>2</sup> and, having risen from the dead, He gives to each member of His new creation a consciousness of that His love, and thus holding up before them the pattern, He shows them how far short their love falls of conformity to that pattern, and thus quickens them to those renewed strivings after a more perfect love which are the pledge of sanctification. But more than this, His Spirit does not only thus testify to them of Himself, as the great exemplar of their love, but infuses into their souls<sup>3</sup> the very spirit and love of Christ, the Head of the new creation. The neighbour then of the Christian is every one, friend or enemy, rich or poor, of any nation throughout the world, who stands connected with him as man for whom Christ died. But in a special manner, his neighbour is each member of the same flock,<sup>4</sup> each co-heir, each member of the household of faith, partaker with him of the same heavenly calling. For

<sup>1</sup> See Exod. xi. 2.

<sup>2</sup> See John xv. 12, 13, 17, xiii. 34; Eph. v. 2; Mark x. 45; Phil. ii. 5—8.

<sup>3</sup> Gal. v. 22.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. John x. 11.

the happiness and welfare of each and all of these the Christian works, not only not allowing self to interfere with that his object, but carrying it out through a positive substitution of the love of others for the love of self. And since this love is the consequence of union with Christ, it cannot exist without the love of God also;<sup>1</sup> so that the fulfilment of the second commandment of the law of Christ necessarily involves the fulfilment of the first.<sup>2</sup> And thus he who loves his neighbour has fulfilled the requirements of that imperfect legal dispensation<sup>3</sup> which shadowed forth the spiritual obedience which is the result of love.<sup>4</sup> See also the note on vi. 2.

15. —δέ— It is evident from this that disputes existed among the Galatians: and it was, in all probability, the doctrine of these very Judaizers which “gendered” those “strifes,”<sup>5</sup> and produced results so different from those which flow from the acceptance of that perfect justification which they despised. See Theodoret in loc.

—δάκνυτε— Hesych. δάκνει. λυπεῖ. Cf. Xen. Cyrop. i. 4, 13, Ἀκούσας δὲ ταῦτα ὁ Κῦρος ἐδήχθη, and sim. iv. 3, 3.

—κατεσθίετε— Cf. LXX., Prov. xxx. 14; Esai. ix. 12. Chrysostom, ταῖς λέξισι δὲ ἐμφαντικῶς ἐχρήσατο. Οὐ γὰρ εἶπε, δάκνυτε μόνον, ὅπερ ἐστὶ θυμουμένου, ἀλλὰ καί, κατεσθίετε, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἐμμένοντος τῇ πονηρίᾳ. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ δάκνων, ὀργῆς ἐπλήρωσε πάθος· ὁ δὲ κατεσθίων, θηριωδίας ἐσχάτης παρέσχεν ἀπόδειξιν.

—βλέπετε μὴ, κ. τ. λ.— “Take heed that ye be

<sup>1</sup> See 1 John iv. 20, 21.

<sup>2</sup> See Matt. xxii. 37—40.

<sup>3</sup> Rom. xiii. 8.

<sup>4</sup> See the note on ver. 6.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. 2 Tim. ii. 23; 1 Tim. i. 4, vi. 4, 5; Titus iii. 9; Rom. xiv. 13.

not destroyed<sup>1</sup> by one another," i. e. take heed that ye do not by these mutual disputes and strifes end in being mutually instrumental in the destruction of one another's souls.

16. —*Λέγω δέ*—See iii. 17, iv. 1; and the notes. The Apostle developes here more fully the admonition of ver. 13. There he spoke generally of the Christian vocation, warning his converts against an abuse of its greatest blessings;—here he shows them the true secret of a walk worthy of that their vocation.<sup>2</sup>

—*Πνεύματι περιπατεῖτε*—This is equivalent to *κατὰ Πνεῦμα περιπατ.* in Rom. viii. 4; Cf. Acts xxi. 21, *τοῖς ἕθεσιν περιπατ.*; and 2 Cor. xii. 18, *τῷ αὐτῷ Πνεύματι περιεπατ.* Compare *περιπατ.*, LXX., Prov. viii. 20; 4 Reg. xx. 3. (Compare this with 3 John 3.) To walk according to or after the Spirit is to walk in conformity with His operations, to walk in *newness* of life,<sup>3</sup> as *renewed* by Him,<sup>4</sup> to walk clothed<sup>5</sup> with the righteousness of Jesus, of which He testifies to the soul,<sup>6</sup> to "walk in love,"<sup>7</sup> which He sheds into the heart,<sup>8</sup> to walk in truth,<sup>9</sup> and wisdom,<sup>10</sup> and as a child of light,<sup>11</sup> carrying out His influences as a Spirit of Truth.<sup>12</sup> Cf. ver. 22. To walk according to the Spirit is to follow His leadings, to go forth to meet His gracious influences, to yield up the soul to Him, desiring that His divine strength may be made perfect in personal weakness and incapacity. And as in the old creation the desire of sin, and the action carrying out the desire, are developments of the car-

<sup>1</sup> See Lidd. and Scott, *ἀναλίσκ.* II.

<sup>2</sup> See Eph. iv. 1, 2.

<sup>3</sup> Rom. vi. 4.

<sup>4</sup> Titus iii. 5; John iii. 5.

<sup>5</sup> See Apoc. xvi. 15.

<sup>6</sup> John xvi. 8.

<sup>7</sup> Eph. v. 2.

<sup>8</sup> Rom. v. 5.

<sup>9</sup> 3 John 3.

<sup>10</sup> Col. iv. 5.

<sup>11</sup> Eph. v. 8.

<sup>12</sup> John xvi. 17.

nal life and nature; so the desires of holiness, and the action responding thereto, are developments of the spiritual life which is one with Christ. So that the Christian who would thus carry out in action the promptings of the Spirit, will seek for greater power of action in a greater communication of the life of the Head, Christ Jesus, through faith.

—ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκὸς οὐ μὴ τελέσητε—“Ye shall not fulfil,” or “carry out in action,<sup>1</sup> the desire of the flesh,” i. e. that “infection of nature which doth remain, yea, in them that are regenerate,”<sup>2</sup> τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός.<sup>3</sup> Herodotus,<sup>4</sup> i. 32, has the expression ἐπιθυμίην ἐκτελέσαι, and so Achilles Tatius,<sup>5</sup> ii., ἐπιθυμίαν τελέσαι. As regards the construction οὐ μὴ τελέσητε, see the note on οὐ μὴ κληρονομῆση, iv. 30.

17. —ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ—γὰρ is explanatory; σὰρξ is here equivalent to ἐπιθυμία σαρκός, as in Rom. viii. 4, 12, 13; Gal. v. 13, 19. The meaning of the Apostle is, “for the desire of the flesh exercises its proper influence in opposition to the Spirit, or the leadings and operations of the Spirit. Compare the usage of κατὰ, Plat. Gorg. 472, A., ἐὰν βούλη κατ’ ἐμοῦ μάρτυρας παρασχέσθαι, ὡς οὐκ ἀληθῆ λέγω, and sim. Apol. 37, B.

—τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα—But the Spirit, i. e. the leadings and operations of the Spirit, ἐπιθυμία Πν. This clause must be immediately connected with ἵνα μὴ, κ. τ. λ. ταῦτα γὰρ<sup>6</sup> ἀλλήλοις ἀντικ. being parentheti-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. John viii. 44, τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν θέλετε ποιεῖν, and compare νόμον τελεῖτε, James ii. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Art. ix.

<sup>3</sup> Rom. viii. 6.

<sup>4</sup> Quoted by Raphel.

<sup>5</sup> Quoted by Palairret and Wetstein.

<sup>6</sup> I follow here Lachmann in reading γὰρ, on the authority of B. D,\* E. F. G. (al. ap. Scholz.), the Latin Version of D., Cyprian, August., Ambrosiast., Jerome, al. the Vulgate and the Coptic Versions.

cal. The meaning then of the whole clause will be, But the Spirit exercises His proper influence in opposition to the desire of the flesh, that ye may not do, or lest ye should do, the things which ye desire, i. e. lest ye should carry into action ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκός. How any other sense than this is to be extracted from the words of the Apostle I do not comprehend: nor can anything be plainer than his meaning. In the preceding verse he has told the Galatians, that if they follow the leadings and operations of the Spirit, they shall not fulfil, or rather, it would be impossible that they should fulfil (for οὐ μὴ τελέσητε implies the strongest negative), the desire of the flesh. Here he adds the reason, viz. that those leadings of the Spirit which they were to follow are in opposition to the desire of the flesh, and therefore, that following, and carrying into action those leadings of the Spirit, it was impossible that they should carry into action ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκός.

18. —ἐἰ δὲ Πνεύματι ἄγασθε—“And if ye be led, &c.”—i. e. if the Spirit be leading, and ye are following.

—οὐκ ἔστέ ὑπὸ νόμον—because against the fruits of the Spirit there is no law. See ver. 23, and the note.

19. —Φανερά δὲ ἔστιν τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκός—“Now the works of the flesh are manifest,” i. e. of such a character as to declare at once and plainly whence they emanate. The δὲ is *resumptive*, as it is taken by our English translators. For the preceding verse, without being exactly parenthetical, is of a parenthetical character, pertaining more to the general scope of the Epistle than to the immediate context.

—*πορνεία*—The Apostle is not giving an accurate or extended list of the works of the flesh. He is merely giving instances illustrative of the proposition that the works of the flesh are manifest. And therefore it would be by no means necessary that he should specify *μοιχεία* as well as *πορνεία*, which under other circumstances I think he would have done.<sup>1</sup> For although *μοιχεία* involves *πορνεία*, it by no means follows that the latter involves the former. And so although we may find the adulterous act of a married person described as *πορνεία*,<sup>2</sup> it does not follow that the same act in unmarried persons would be described as *μοιχεία*.<sup>3</sup> While, therefore, I do think that *μοιχεία* is an interpolation, I should not with Simon<sup>4</sup> and others account for the omission by supposing that it is involved in *πορνεία*. I should rather suppose that the Apostle confined himself to certain instances, as I have before remarked, and that a transcriber, losing sight of this, added *μοιχεία* in the margin, from whence it got into the text.<sup>5</sup>

—*ἀκαθαρσία*—“uncleanness.” This involves every unclean act akin to fornication. Cf. Col. iii. 5; Rom. i. 24.

—*ἀσέλγεια*—“wantonness.” Cf. LXX., Sap. xiv. 26. According to Suidas, the word is derived from *α* intens. and *Σέλγη*, a city of Pisidia, ὅπου κακῶς ἔζων οἱ ἄνθρωποι, κ. τ. λ. But see Alberti Obs. Phill. pp. 332, 333.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. 1 Cor. vi. 9, οὔτε πόρνοι . . . οὔτε μοιχοί.

<sup>2</sup> LXX., 4 Reg. ix. 22. Apocryp., Syr. xxiii. 23. N. T., Matt. v. 32, xix. 9.

<sup>3</sup> We may observe that the definition of Hesychius is not πόρνοις. μοιχοῖς, but μοιχοῖς. πόρνοις.

<sup>4</sup> Histoire des Versions, p. 38.

<sup>5</sup> So Mill. Proleg. 801.

<sup>6</sup> See also Wetst. Tom. i. p. 588.



20. —*εἰδωλολατρεία*—The Jews extended this term to various sins.<sup>1</sup> But I see no reason for taking it here otherwise than in its simple sense. Cf. Acts xiv. 12, 13, xix. 24, seqq.; 1 Cor. viii. 10, x. 20.

—*φαρμακεία*—*φάρμακον* means properly a drug or medicine, hence it was used of a potion or drug given in connexion with witchcraft to produce secret and hurtful effects.<sup>2</sup> Such were *φίλτρα*,<sup>3</sup> and (*φάρμακα*) *ἀμβλωθρίδια*.<sup>4</sup> Hence the word *φαρμακεία* attained the wider sense of sorcery, enchantment, Lat. *veneficium*. So Suidas says, *φαρμακείας. γοητείας.* quoting Polyb. xl. 3, 7. Cf. also Herodot. vii. 114. In this sense the word is used by the LXX., Exod. vii. 11, 22, viii. 18; Esai. xlvii. 9, 12; Apocryph., Sap. xii. 4, xviii. 13. N. T., Apocal. ix. 21, xviii. 23;<sup>5</sup> and so *φάρμακον*, 4 Reg. ix. 22; Nahum iii. 4; N. T., Apoc. xxi. 8, xxii. 15. The Apostle probably uses the word here in this extended sense, involving every species of magic, incantation, and exorcism. Cf. Acts xix. 13, 19, and see Poli Synop., Wetstein, Kypke, on ver. 19.

—*ἔχθραι*—“hatreds.” Cf. LXX., 1 Macc. xiii. 6, *συνήχθησαν τὰ ἔθνη ἐκτρίψαι ἡμᾶς ἔχθρας χάριν; 2*

<sup>1</sup> See Schættgen and Wetst. on Eph. v. 5.

<sup>2</sup> See Suidas, voc. *γοητεία*. Ammonius, voc. *φαρμακεία*, and Lex. MS. Bibl. Coislin. voc. *μαγεία*, p. 236.

<sup>3</sup> Suidas. Cf. Senec. Epist. ix. Cf. *κηλητήριον*. Soph. Trach. 575.

<sup>4</sup> Suidas, *ἀμβλωθρίδιον. φθόριον φάρμακον*. See Suicer Thes. Tom. ii. p. 1419. Compare Conc. Ancy. can. xxi. Biblioth. Juris Canon. Vet. Justel. Tom. i. p. 38, and the note p. 77,—also the Digest. Lib. xlviii. Tit. xix. c. 38, with the notes. Corp. Jur. Civ. Ed. Gothofred. Van Leeuwen.

<sup>5</sup> In this passage *φαρμακ.* is spoken of as the practice of Babylon, *ἡ πόρνη*, and so in 4 Reg. ix. 22, and Nahum iii. 4, *φάρμακ.* and *πορνεία* are placed in juxtaposition. Possibly, therefore, the idea of the metaphor in this passage of the Apoc. may be more that of *φάρμακον ἔρωτος*. So Mede, Works, p. 912.

Macc. iv. 3, τῆς δὲ ἔχθρας ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον προβαινούσης ὥστε καὶ . . . . φόνους συντελεῖσθαι.

—ἔρις—“strife.” Cf. Rom. xiii. 13; 2 Cor. xii. 20.

—ζῆλοι<sup>1</sup>—“Jealousies.”<sup>2</sup> Cf. LXX., Syr. xxx. 24, ζῆλος καὶ θυμὸς ἐλαττοῦσιν ἡμέρας· xl. 5; Rom. xiii. 13; 1 Cor. iii. 3; 2 Cor. xii. 20.

—θυμοί—Translate here “angry passions.” Suidas, θυμὸς ὀξύς καὶ ὀλιγοχρόνιος· ἡ δὲ ὀργὴ βραδυτέρα μὲν, μοιμηωτέρα δέ. Ammonius, θυμὸς μὲν ἐστὶ πρόσκαιρος· ὀργὴ δέ, πολυχρόνιος μνησικακία. Cf. Rom. ii. 8, ὀργὴ καὶ θυμὸς· Eph. iv. 31.

—ἐριθεῖαι—factions.<sup>3</sup> Rom. ii. 8; Phil. i. 17, ii. 3.

—διχοστασίαι—mutual divisions. This is equivalent to σχίσματα. Cf. Rom. xvi. 17; 1 Cor. iii. 3. Their character is well illustrated by 1 Cor. i. 10—12.

—αἰρέσεις—διχοστασία is a mutual standing apart or division within the body of the church. Cf. 1 Cor. xii. 25. αἰρέσεις denotes the choice of, and rallying round a peculiar, and therefore, as regards the church, an extraneous principle or doctrine: and, therefore, it involves a separation from the unity of the church. Cf. 1 Cor. xi. 19; Acts v. 17, xv. 5, xxiv. 5.

21. —φθόνοι—malice. Matt. xxvii. 18; Rom. i. 29; Phil. i. 15.

—φόνουι—homicides. Tischendorf certainly removes this word on very insufficient grounds,

<sup>1</sup> See the note on ver. 21, for my reasons for reading here ζῆλοι.

<sup>2</sup> Ζῆλος κ' ἐπὶ τῆς ξηλοτυπίας, οὐχ ὡς οἴονται ἐπὶ τῆς μιμησεως μόνον. Timæi Lex. Platon. MS. Montfaucon, Bibl. Coislin. p. 482.

<sup>3</sup> Lidd. and Scott.

whether we regard the external or internal evidence.

—μέθαι — “drunkenness.” Rom. xiii. 13; LXX., Judith xiii. 15, Ἴδὸν ἡ κεφαλὴ Ὀλοφέρνηου . . . καὶ . το κωνωπεῖον ἐν ᾧ κατέκειτο ἐν ταῖς μέθαις αὐτοῦ.

—κῶμοι — “carousals.” Lat. *comessationes*. Hesych., κῶμοι. ἀσελγῆ ἄσματα πορνικά, συμπόσια, φῶδαι. Cyril, Lex. MS., κώμοις . . . συμποσίοις, φῶδαῖς μεθυστικάις. Cf. Rom. xiii. 13; Plato, Theæt. 173, D., δεῖπνα καὶ σὺν ἀλλήτερισι κῶμοι.

—καὶ τὰ ὅμοια τούτοις—Whitby remarks that many of these vices specified by the Apostle do not seem to come properly under the head of *works* of the flesh. But the Apostle, by the use of the plural in such words as ἔχθραι. θυμοί. ἐριθειῖαι. φθόνοι, &c., expresses the phænomena of the abstract notion,<sup>1</sup> and so, therefore, leads us to those ἔργα which he describes as φανερά. For the reason involved in this, I have retained ζῆλοι, which is the reading of<sup>2</sup> C. D\*\*\*. J. K. Pp. Gr. (ap. Tisch.) Lat. Clarom. Cypr. Lucif Calar. August. Ambrosiast. Hieron. Vulg. Vo. pl. (ap. Tisch.) Those words which are in the singular point to, and involve in themselves, acts.

—ἃ προλέγω ὑμῖν—“concerning which I foretell you,” i. e. “ante eventum.”<sup>3</sup> Compare the construction in Plat. Rep. i. 348, D., σὺ δὲ οἶει με ἴσως τοὺς τὰ βαλλάντια ἀποτέμνοντας λέγειν· and Æsch. Ag. 672,

καὶ νῦν ἐκείνων εἰ τίς ἐστὶν ἐμπνέων  
λέγουσιν ἡμᾶς αἷς ὀλωλότας.

Compare also Phil. iii. 18, οὗς ἔλεγον ὑμῖν.

<sup>1</sup> See Jelf, Gr. Gr. 355, I. c. β. γ.

<sup>2</sup> The MS. A. is imperfect here.

<sup>3</sup> Bengel.

—*βασιλείαν Θεοῦ*——“the kingdom of glory.” 1 Cor. vi. 9, xv. 50.

—*οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν*——Because they who do such things have not the Spirit of Christ, and therefore are not in Christ, who is the heir of the inheritance.

22. —*ὁ δὲ καρπὸς τοῦ Πν.*——“But the fruit of the Spirit,” i. e. the fruit of the branches of the true vine which in union with Christ share His Spirit, that fruit being the consequence and the evidence of union. Cf. John xv. 1, 2, 4, 5; Psal. i. 3; Jerem. xvii. 8; Luke vi. 43.

—*ἀγάπη*——This word does not occur in profane Greek authors. It is used by the LXX. to translate the Heb. *אָהָבָה*, Cant. ii. 4, 5; Eccles. ix. 1, 6; 2 Reg. xiii. 15, and by Aquila and Symmachus, Prov. x. 12. See the note on *δι' ἀγαπ. ἐνεργ.*—ver. 6, and also the note on ver. 14.

—*χαρά*——Joy which flows from the revelations made by the Spirit,<sup>1</sup> of Christ to the soul; which arises from the apprehension by faith<sup>2</sup> of His perfect righteousness,<sup>3</sup> and from the hope<sup>4</sup> of the consequent salvation and glory;<sup>5</sup> joy which attains its fulness in the full fruition of the presence<sup>6</sup> of the Lord, and which, therefore, fills the soul of the believer on earth, in proportion as the person of Jesus is revealed to him through faith; “joy unspeakable, and full of glory.”<sup>7</sup> Cf. Phil. iv. 4.

—*εἰρήνη*——Peace of conscience, the consciousness of reconciliation and adoption, confidence in evan-

<sup>1</sup> See 1 Thess. i. 6; Rom. xiv. 17.    <sup>2</sup> See Rom. xv. 13; Phil. i. 25.

<sup>3</sup> See Psal. cxvii. 12.    <sup>4</sup> Rom. xii. 12.    <sup>5</sup> Rom. v. 2; Luke x. 20.

<sup>6</sup> Psal. xvi. 11.

<sup>7</sup> 1 Pet. i. 8.

gical promises, whether for time or eternity, peace which is enjoyed only<sup>1</sup> by those who are made partakers of the righteousness of the Prince of peace,<sup>2</sup> of which the work is peace, and the effect, quietness and assurance for ever.<sup>3</sup> Cf. Matt. xi. 28; John xiv. 27, xvi. 33.

—μακροθυμία— forbearance; literally, slowness to wrath. So LXX., Prov. xiv. 29; μακρόθυμος is opposed to ὀξύθυμος in ver. 17. Cf. LXX., Jer. xv. 15. This is the result of love, ἡ ἀγάπη μακροθυμεῖ. 1 Cor. xiii. 4.

—χρηστότης—kindness. Cf. LXX., Psal. cxliv. 7, lxxvii. 11. N. T., Eph. ii. 7; Rom. ii. 4; Tit. iii. 4. The result of love, ἡ ἀγάπη χρηστεύεται. 1 Cor. xiii. 4.

—ἀγαθωσύνη—goodness. Cf. LXX., Nehem. ix. 25, 35; N. T., Eph. v. 9. The main difference between χρηστ. and ἀγαθ. lies, I rather think, in the fact that the former is, and the latter is not, Attic Greek.<sup>4</sup> Jerome however says, “Benignitas sive suavitas, quia apud Græcos χρηστότης utrumque sonat, virtus est lenis, blanda, tranquilla, et omnium bonorum apta consortio; invitans ad familiaritatem sui, dulcis alloquio, moribus temperata. Denique et hanc Stoici ita definiunt: Benignitas est virtus sponte ad bene faciendum exposita. Non multum bonitas a benignitate diversa est: quia et ipsa ad benefaciendum videtur exposita. Sed in eo differt: quia potest bonitas esse tristior, et fronte severis moribus irrugata, bene quidem facere et præstare quod poscitur: non tamen suavis esse consortio, et sua cunctos invitare dulcedine.”

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Is. lvii. 21. <sup>2</sup> Is. ix. 6. <sup>3</sup> Is. xxxii. 17. <sup>4</sup> Thom. Magist. p. 921.

—*πίστις*—The majority of commentators take this to mean faithfulness, probity; but I should rather think that the Apostle means *trust*, i. e. in others; a readiness and desire to impute good motives to, and to avoid unworthy suspicions about, others. This is expressly described as the result of love, 1 Cor. xiii. 5, 7, ἡ ἀγάπη οὐ λογίζεται τὸ κακόν—πάντα πιστεύει, παντα ἐλπίζει. See a remarkable instance of the reverse of this in the conduct of the children of Ammon and Hanun towards David, 2 Sam. x. 2—4.

23. —*πραΰτης*—meekness. Cf. Eph. iv. 2 (Tf.), ταπεινοφροσύνης καὶ πραΰτητος. 2 Cor. x. 1; Cf. LXX., Syr. iv. 8, xxxvi. 28; also Numbers xii. 3; Psal. xxxvi. 11, cxlix. 4; Matt. v. 5, xi. 29. *πραΰτης* is a form of *πραότης* arising from *πραῦς*,<sup>1</sup> from which *πρᾶος* takes its feminine, *πραεῖα*. It is the form adopted generally by Ln. and Tf. throughout St. Paul's Epistles, on the authority of the most ancient MSS. Hesychius has it, and it is the prevailing form in the LXX.

—*ἐγκράτεια*—continnence, general self-control,<sup>2</sup> 2 Pet. i. 6. Suidas,<sup>3</sup> ἐγκράτεια . . . ἕξις ἀήττητος ἡδονῶν. Ἐγκράτεια σωφροσύνης διαφέρει. ἡ μὲν γὰρ σωφροσύνη ἡρεμαίας ἔχει τὰς ἐπιθυμίας. ἡ δὲ ἐγκράτεια σφοδράς· ἐγκρατῆς λέγεται, οὐ κατὰ ἀπάθειαν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ πᾶσχειν μὲν, μὴ ἀγεσθαι δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν παθῶν.<sup>4</sup>

The reading *ἀγνεῖα* of D. (a prima manu) E. F. G. probably arose from a double Latin interpretation,

<sup>1</sup> Lobeck says (Phryn. 403), *πραῦς* autem an *πρᾶος* Atticis familiaris fuerit, exploratu difficile; in editis utrumque invenitur. Photius however says, *πρᾶος* οὐ *πραῦς*. Lex. p. 330.

<sup>2</sup> Lidd. and Scott.

<sup>3</sup> From Diog. Laert.

<sup>4</sup> Suidas quotes here Alexand. Aphrodis. in Topic. Aristot.

*continentia* and *castitas*; the latter word being perhaps specially added to support some exaggerated ideas about the dignity of the virgin state.

—κατὰ τῶν τοιοῦτων—This clause ought properly to be connected with the next verse. In speaking of the carnal man the Apostle uses the word ἔργα, and specifies certain results in action of the variously developed lust of the flesh. In describing the spiritual man he specifies not action, but the affections and desires which spring from a vital union with the Author of all law, and which *necessarily* produce action. τοιοῦτων then refers to these affections and desires, expressed collectively by καρπός. Action is the immediate result of the exercise of the will. The tendency of the will is to operate in the direction of the affections. Affections therefore and desires are the foundation of all action. In the case of the carnal man his affections and desires are evil, and his will carries out those affections in acts which are therefore evil. The carnal man retains his old affections, and therefore cannot perform good and holy actions. The spiritual man, born again of the Holy Spirit, has new affections and desires, a new will, and a new power of action. Now the law forbids, and commands action, but does not give spiritual life, the desires and affections which produce action. Therefore the unrenewed desires are always exercising themselves in actions which are opposed to the deeds required by the law; and the law is therefore always in opposition to the desires and affections of the flesh. But not so in the case of the new creature in Christ Jesus; his affections tend in the same direction as the requirements of the law, be-

cause they centre in love, which is the essence of the law; and so therefore against these, the fruits of the Spirit of the Author of the law, there is no law. Cf. 1 Tim. i. 9.

24. —οἱ δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ—Sub. ὄντες. See the note on ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ, iii. 29. The authorized translation renders here quite correctly, *And they that are Christ's*. For the Apostle, speaking of the fruit of the Spirit, is describing the characteristics of the believer's *life*, and now describes those of his *death*. They who are joined to a risen Saviour, manifest not only a share in His life, but a share also in His *death*. Not only do they bring forth the fruit of holy affections, producing action, and in perfect harmony with the requirements of a holy law,—the new affections of a new nature,—but they have really and effectually died with Him in His vicarious death. That is, not only is their old carnal nature with its attendant evils dead in Christ, but this death is manifested in the death and crucifixion of those affections and desires which are peculiar to the carnal nature. Cf. Rom. vi. 6, 12, 13.

25. —εἰ ζῶμεν Πν.—“If we live by the Spirit,” i. e. if our life as Christians is one which is given and maintained through the operation of the Spirit.

—Πνεύματι καὶ στοιχῶμεν—“Let us also walk according to the Spirit.” Compare the usage of στοιχῆν, chap. vi. 16; Rom. iv. 12; Phil. iii. 16. The notion involved in στοιχῆν appears to be the endeavour of the believer, in his onward walk, to bring his actions into a constant conformity and uniformity with the operations of the Spirit. This verse is a repetition in substance of the exhortation



of ver. 16. Then he said generally, Πν. περιπατ. In ver. 22, 23, he describes the particular operations of that Spirit in the person of the believer. Here he exhorts them to frame and fashion their life, of which the Spirit is the principle, according to the defined rule, displayed in such operations of that Spirit as those he has described.

26. Here, as in ver. 15, the Apostle is evidently alluding to an evil actually existent among the Galatians; and, as an exhortation which was so much required by them, might be felt by them as a rebuke, he uses great mildness of speech, classing himself with them.

—κενόδοξοι— vain-glorious. Polyb. xxvii. 6, 12, Πολυάρατον ἀλαζονικώτερον ὄντα καὶ κενόδοξον. Cf. κενοδοξία, LXX., Sap. xiv. 14, and New Testament, Phil. ii. 3. Suidas, κενοδοξία. ματαία τις περὶ ἑαυτοῦ οἴησις. Cf. chap. vi. 3; Rom. xii. 3.

—ἀλλήλους προκαλούμενοι—challenging one another to contests and rivalries, about personal qualities and gifts, real or supposed. This is the natural consequence of κενοδοξία. Hesych., προκαλεῖσθαι. ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀλαζονικοῦ,<sup>1</sup> εἰς ἀμιλλαν ἀρετῆς καλεῖσθαι τινα. Compare the note on ver. 15.

<sup>1</sup> See the quotation from Polyb. at κενόδοξοι above.

## CHAPTER VI.

1. THE admonitions which immediately follow are all so connected with the idea of *κενοδοξία*, and indeed with the whole of ver. 26, that it is possible that the fresh chapter ought more properly to commence with ver. 26, or 25, of the preceding chapter. As however there is a change of person here, it is perhaps best to consider these admonitions as flowing from, rather than forming with ver. 25, 26, one unbroken whole.

—'Αδελφοί——Beza says that in this word here “*latet argumentum.*” I see however no reason why here, more than elsewhere in the Epistle, it should have a peculiar significance.

—ἐὰν καὶ προλημφθῆ——If a man be even <sup>1</sup> overtaken in a fall. The notion involved in *προλημφθῆ*, appears to be the catching a man in the actual duration of a fall, and before (*πρό*) he has recovered himself, or rather, to speak more strictly, before he has been raised. ἐν expresses the situation or circumstances in which the individual is caught.<sup>2</sup> Cf. *παράπτωμα*, Rom. xi. 11.

—ὁμείψ οἱ πνευματικοί——Ye who have, or have had within yourselves manifest tokens of the in-

<sup>1</sup> See on *ἐὰν καὶ*, Jelf, Gr. Gr. 861.

<sup>2</sup> Jelf, Gr. Gr. 622, 3, b.

dwelling of the Spirit, either in His ordinary or extraordinary (cf. iii. 5) gifts and operations. Cf. 1 Cor. ii. 15, iii. 1.

—καταρτίζετε—“restore.” The word means to adjust, set right,<sup>1</sup> and is used here with evident reference to the idea of fall.

—ἐν πνεύματι πραΰτητος—“in a spirit of meekness;” Cf. 1 Cor. iv. 21,—in a spirit and frame of mind of which the characteristic is that meekness which is the gift of the Spirit of God. ἐν expresses the mode and manner<sup>2</sup> in which the act of restoration was to be performed. Cf. 2 Thess. iii. 15.

—σκοπῶν σεαυτὸν μη, κ. τ. λ.—“looking to thyself, lest thou also shouldst be tempted;”<sup>3</sup> i. e. cultivating a watchfulness against the advent of, and the yielding to, temptation. πειρασθ. has the full sense of being actually overcome by temptation. So πειράζειν, 1 Cor. vii. 5; 1 Thess. iii. 5. The Apostle changes the construction from the plural to the singular to individualize the admonition. See on this enallage of number, Jelf, Gr. Gr. 390.

2. The emphasis here lies upon the word βαστάζετε, q. d. Instead of making the sins and weaknesses, βάρη<sup>4</sup> καὶ ἀσθενήματα,<sup>5</sup> of others a ground of glorying in yourselves,<sup>6</sup> bear those burdens,<sup>7</sup> griev-

<sup>1</sup> Lidd. and Scott.

<sup>2</sup> Jelf, Gr. Gr. 622, 3, c.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. 1 Cor. x. 12.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Psal. xxxviii. 4.

<sup>5</sup> See Rom. xv. 1.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. ver. 26 of ch. v. with note, and ver. 4 of this ch.

<sup>7</sup> “Dicuntur cervi, quando transeunt freta in proximas insulas pascuæ gratia, capita super se invicem ponere; et unus qui ante est solus portat caput, et non ponit super alterum: sed cum et ipse defecerit, tollit se ab anteriore parte, et redit posterius, ut et ipse in altero requiescat: et sic portant omnes onera sua, et perveniunt ad quod desiderant; et non patiuntur naufragium, quia quasi navis est illis caritas. Itaque caritas

ing over, sympathizing with, and praying for the removal of your brother's sins, and thus following the example of the Great Head of the spiritual body, who bore our sins and carried our sorrows. Cf. Isa. liii. 4; 1 Pet. ii. 24; Matt. viii. 17; Heb. ix. 28.

—καὶ οὕτως ἀναπληρώσατε—The testimony of B., the two Latin Versions, and the Peschito, decides, in my opinion, in favour of the future. But this reading is, moreover, clearly the one most in accordance with the present scope of the Apostle. For he is not now giving them any general exhortations about fulfilling the law of Christ, but speaking with especial reference to the *καύχημα εἰς τὸν ἔτερον*, shown by the Galatians, and especially by the false brethren (see ver. 13, 14). Telling them to bear one another's burdens, instead of making them the ground of personal glorying, he adds a sort of parenthetical observation to these vain-glorious seekers after a legal justification, "And thus ye will be completely fulfilling (a law far more strict than the law of Moses) the law of Christ." The reading *ἀναπληρώσατε* arose, not improbably, from a misapprehension of the particular bearing of the passage upon the context; and the investing it more with the character of a general, and, to a certain extent, an isolated, admonition.

The law of Christ is the law of love. *ἐντολὴν καινὴν δίδωμι ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους, καθὼς ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς, ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους.*<sup>1</sup> His love was manifested in bearing the burden and punishment

portat onera, sed non timeat ne prematur talibus oneribus." August. in Ps. 129, § 4.

<sup>1</sup> John xiii. 34.

of sin.<sup>1</sup> He, therefore, who bears his brother's burden is acting with a love like that of Christ, and so fulfils His commandment, Love *as* I loved you. The force of ἀναπληροῦν is, perhaps, a fulfilment *throughout*, in all its details and of all its requirements.

3. —εἰ γὰρ, κ. τ. λ.—Cultivate a spirit of meekness and humility with respect to an erring brother. Glory not in your own imagined freedom from his burdens, but bear those burdens: *For* if any man fancies himself to be something, i. e. is κενόδοξος, investing himself with peculiar virtues, and freedom from burdens such as those which, existing in others, form the ground of his glorying, &c.

—μηδὲν ὄν—This expresses the actual circumstances under which the verbal action must take place, i. e. the real condition of each and every one. See Wetstein, Raphel, and Kypke in h. l.

—φρεναπαταῖ ἑαυτόν—“he deceiveth his own mind,” i. e. the very act of personal glorying in individual excellence, individual freedom from the sins which weigh upon others, demonstrates the fact of self-deception. Cf. 1 Cor. x. 13, iv. 7.

4. —τὸ δὲ ἔργον ἑαυτοῦ δοκιμαζέτω ἕκαστος—“But let every one scrutinize his own work,” i. e. each and every action, his whole conduct. ἔργον is used collectively, as 1 Pet. i. 17, and so takes the article.<sup>2</sup>

—τὸ καύχημα—καύχ. is, I think, used here not of the *ground* of glorying, but of the glorying itself, as 1 Cor. v. 6; 2 Cor. v. 12, ix. 3; Heb. iii. 6; LXX., 1 Par. xvi. 27; Syr. i. 11. If the Apostle meant

<sup>1</sup> See the note at the commencement of this verse.

<sup>2</sup> Jelf, Gr. Gr. 447.

the ground of glorying, he would probably have used  $\epsilon\upsilon$ , and not  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ . For the only sense of  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  which seems at all suitable to the passage is "with respect to," and since the *ground* of glory is presumed to exist *in* the person of self or another, we cannot say that he has the *ground* of glory *with respect to* the individual; though it is quite correct to say, that he has the glorying itself *with respect to* the person *in* whom the *ground* of glory exists. The article points out *that* glorying which he is speaking of as possessed by the man who thinks himself to be something. The act of glorying remains, while the change of object implies a change in its nature and characteristics.

— $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$   $\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu$   $\mu\acute{\omicron}\nu\omicron\nu$ —with respect to<sup>1</sup> himself alone. Compare 2 Cor. x. 13,  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$   $\tau\acute{\alpha}$   $\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\tau\tau\alpha$   $\kappa\alpha\upsilon\chi\eta\sigma\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$ . and ver. 15, 16 of the same ch.

— $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$   $\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu$   $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$ —The article used with  $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$  in this way simply points out the individual, whoever he may be, who being brought into connexion with self, is *the other* considered with reference to self as *the one*. Cf. Rom. ii. 1; 1 Cor. iv. 6, vi. 1, x. 24, 29.

The whole passage may be paraphrased, "Let every man, instead of looking into the actions of others, and glorying in his own imagined freedom from the faults and weaknesses which he discovers in them, narrowly scrutinize his own conduct, and then he will indeed retain his glorying, but it will be one which arises from an examination of self alone, and not of others."

The result of this self-examination will be the consciousness of his own faults and weaknesses.

<sup>1</sup> Jelf, Gr. Gr. 625, 3, c.

This new glorying therefore, springing from a lowly view of self, and not from a disparaging view of others, must be that glorying ἐν ἀσθενείαις,<sup>1</sup> which produces the true and only glory of the new creature in Christ Jesus, a glorying in the Lord.<sup>2</sup>

5. —ἕκαστος γάρ, κ. τ. λ.—(Let him do this) for every man must bear his own load. The future, βαστάσει, expresses here necessity.<sup>3</sup> The Apostle is addressing them as Christians, and therefore this necessity is based on the assumption of the Christian profession; his meaning being that there lies upon every Christian, a necessity to look into, and mourn over his own load of sin. And in proportion as the Christian grieves over his own sin, gathering from his grief fresh lessons of faith in a Saviour, his own love will glow in the contemplation of that of Christ; and, with the Spirit of Him who bore his griefs, he will grieve over and bear the burdens of others.

6. —Κοινωνεῖτω δέ— κοινωνεῖν means, properly, to be a partaker or sharer, and takes a genitive of the thing and a dative of the person. In the majority of instances, however, in the New Testament<sup>4</sup> it is used with a dative of the thing. This dative represents the *circumstances* in which the act of κοινωνία takes place. But κοινωνεῖν is also used transitively in the sense of μεταδιδόναι, Lat. *communicare*. So Thom. Mag., κοινωνῶ σοι ὧν ἔχω, ἀντὶ τοῦ μεταδίδωμι. Πλάτων (Pol. ii. 369, E. 370, A.) ‘τετραπλάσιον χρόνον τε καὶ πόνον ἀναλίσκειν ἐπὶ σίτου παρασκευῆ, καὶ ἄλλοις κοινωνεῖν· ἤγουν, μεταδιδόναι τούτου. καὶ πάλιν

<sup>1</sup> See 2 Cor. xi. 30, xii. 9—11.

<sup>2</sup> See Gal. vi. 14, and 2 Cor. x. 17.

<sup>3</sup> Jelf, Gr. Gr. 406, 3.

<sup>4</sup> Rom. xii. 13, xv. 27; 1 Tim. v. 22; 1 Pet. iv. 13; 2 John 11.

ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ 'καὶ μὴ ἄλλοις κοινωνοῦντα πρᾶγματα ἔχειν.' And, according to most commentators, it has this meaning here, the ἀγαθά referring to those temporal good things (σαρκικά<sup>1</sup>) which the taught was to give to the teacher, in return for those which were spiritual. So Zonaras on this place, κοινωνεῖτω. μεταδιδότω. and Theodoret, κελύει τοῖς τῶν πνευματικῶν ἀπολαύουσι μεταδιδόναι τῶν σαρκικῶν. Chrysostom explains ἐν πᾶσιν ἀγαθοῖς by πᾶσαν ἐπιδεικνύσθω (ὁ κατηχ.) περὶ αὐτὸν δαψίλειαν.<sup>2</sup> His whole note should be read. The δέ, after κοινωνεῖτω, I should be inclined to take as a copula, although there is a certain opposition in the transition to another subject, q. d. "But although every man must bear his own burden of sin and infirmity, it is not the less your duty to relieve your teachers of the burden of poverty."

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. ix. 11.

<sup>2</sup> The meaning of κοινωνεῖν in this place depends greatly upon that of ἀγαθά. For if these refer to temporalities alone, a gift on the part of one party alone is necessarily implied, though indeed, strictly speaking, the act of κοινωνία may even in this case be considered as independent of the gift. But κοινωνεῖν may perhaps be taken intransitively, and ἀγαθά referred to things, πνευματικά (cf. Luke i. 53; Rom. x. 15; Heb. x. 1), as well as σαρκικά. The act of κοινωνία would be then represented as taking effect in those good things which consisted of the gifts of each party, and the meaning of the Apostle would be, "Let there be between the taught and the teacher a mutual interchange of those good things which each has to bestow." And Chrysostom, although he understands ἀγαθά of temporal things alone, says, more truly perhaps than is consistent with his own explanation elsewhere, κοινωνίαν τὸ πρᾶγμα καλεῖ, δεικνύς ἀντίδοσιν γινομένην. In point of fact, however, this explanation comes to the same thing as the other, because the act of giving and receiving spiritual things is implied in the words *taught* and *teacher*; so that the verbal action points mainly, if not entirely, to the giving of temporal things alone; the only difference between this and the other interpretation being that in this one the motion of *return* is more prominently kept before the eye.



—ὁ κατηχούμενος——κατηχεῖν means properly to sound *at* some one, the sounding being, as it were, aimed *at* another. Hence it means to instruct *vivâ voce*. Hesych., κατηχούμενος. διδασκόμενος. It means also to inform, Plut. De Fluv., κατηχηθῆεις δὲ περὶ τῶν συμβεβηκότων. Luke i. 4. and to incite, to exhort. Suidas, κατηχῶν. προτροπόμενος. παραινῶν. On the Eccl. usage, see Suicer, Tom. ii. pp. 70, et seqq., and Justel. Biblioth. Jur. Can. Vet. pp. 73 and 78.<sup>1</sup>

—τὸν λόγον——The Gospel. Cf. Acts iv. 4, viii. 4, xiv. 25, xvi. 6; λόγον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, Acts xv. 7; τοῦ Κυρίου, Ib. 35; τοῦ Θεοῦ, Ib. xii. 24, xiii. 5; 1 Thess. ii. 13; τῆς ἀληθείας, Eph. i. 13; ζωῆς Phil. ii. 16.

—ἐν πᾶσιν ἀγαθοῖς——See the note on this verse, above.

7. —μὴ πλανᾶσθε——“Deceive not yourselves,”<sup>2</sup> i. e. by thinking that God is mocked, and that you can palm off upon Him, in the persons of His ministers, gifts which involve no sacrifice of self, which are but the overflowings of a full cup, and bear no proportion to the real amount of your resources. It seems as if the Apostle spoke with reference to a particular evil existent among the Galatian converts, and that they had invented vain excuses in order to avoid the responsibility of contributing to the necessities of their teachers. So Hunnius, “Apparet ex his, jam tum fuisse aliquos, qui vario prætextu eludebant doctores suos, ne quid eis dare cogerentur, aut si quid dabant, parce dabant, et fraudulentè, et invitè.”

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Conc. Nic. can. xiv. Conc. Neocæs. can. v.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. 1 Cor. vi. 9, xv. 33.

—Θεὸς οὐ μυκτηρίζεται.—μυκτηρίζειν means, properly, to sneer at by turning up the nose,<sup>1</sup> and so generally to mock.<sup>2</sup> Cf. LXX., Prov. xii. 8; 2 Par. xxxvi. 16; 3 Reg. xviii. 27; Es. xxxvii. 22; Jer. xx. 7.<sup>3</sup> The Apostle appears to be speaking here of that *mockery* which is involved in successful attempts to deceive: so that his meaning is, “God cannot be deceived.”<sup>4</sup> Jerome comments, “Scit, inquit, corda vestra, non ignorat facultates: Excusatio verisimilis hominem potest utquumque placare, Deum non potest fallere.” Cf. Theodoret in loc.

—ὁ γὰρ ἐὰν σπείρῃ, κ. τ. λ.—This proverbial expression<sup>5</sup> must of course be taken here in immediate connexion with the subject of which he is now writing, as in 2 Cor. ix. 6. The idea of the simile is, “whatever grain a man sows, he reaps the fruit peculiar to that grain, and the nature of it.” Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 38, Θεὸς δίδωσι. . . ἐκάστῳ τῶν σπερμάτων τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα. And the meaning of the Apostle is, whatever be the nature of a man’s gift, as derived from, and displayed in the spirit in which it is bestowed, the fruit which he will reap, will be that which is peculiar to, and belongs to that nature.

8. —ὅτι—The Apostle now describes with great

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Horat. Lib. i. Sat. vi. 5, “Naso suspendis adunco ignotos.”

<sup>2</sup> See Elsner in h. l.

<sup>3</sup> Polycarp. Phil. v. quotes this expression of St. Paul; Εἰδότες οὖν, ὅτι Θεὸς οὐ μυκτηρίζεται, ἀφείλομεν ἀξίως τῆς ἐντολῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ δόξης περιπατεῖν. Cf. also Tertullian De Pudicit. c. 2, “Deus zelotes, et qui naso non deridetur.”

<sup>4</sup> So the author of the Interlineary Gloss, De Lyra, Calovius, and sim. Berger. ap. Bloomfield.

<sup>5</sup> See Grotius, Wolf, Elsner in loc. Cf. Job iv. 8; Prov. xxii. 8, xi. 18; Hos. x. 12.

er particularity, the nature of this return, giving the reason of his former statement.

—ὁ σπείρων εἰς τὴν σάρκα.—He who sows or gives with reference to his own flesh, i. e. with a view to self-accommodation, the gratification of the old self-existent carnal nature. Bengel says, “εἰς tanquam in agrum.” But this seems altogether foreign to the meaning of the Apostle.<sup>1</sup> For the simile contains no idea at all about the ground in which the seed is sown; it refers solely to the nature and kind of the seed sown. This nature is clearly expressed by ὁ σπείρων εἰς, κ. τ. λ. It is carnal in its nature, the result of the affections and lusts of the unregenerate nature, and therefore,

—ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς θερίσει φθοράν.—“from the flesh will reap eternal death,” i. e. sowing seed carnal in its nature, he will certainly reap the fruit which is peculiar to the flesh, viz. φθοράν, destruction, perdition, eternal death. Hesych., φθορά. ὄλεθρος. Cf. LXX., Psal. cii. 4; Jon. ii. 7. N. T., Col. ii. 22. See also Ast. Lex. Plat.

—ὁ δὲ σπείρων εἰς τὸ Πν.—“But he who gives with a reference to the Spirit,” i. e. with a total renunciation of self, and out of love to God and His ministers. This is clearly spiritual seed, the fruit of the new man in Christ, and so,

—ἐκ τοῦ Πν. θερίσει ζωὴν αἰώνιον.—“will from the Spirit reap eternal life,” i. e. will receive again that fruit which is peculiar to the spiritual nature of the seed sown, viz. eternal life.

The meaning of the Apostle in these two verses

<sup>1</sup> Moreover, the proper expression would be σπείρειν ἐν or ἐπί.

may be thus expressed: "Your gifts may in the eyes of men be liberal, your own excuses may be accepted by them as valid and truthful, the account you give of your own means may be believed, but you cannot deceive God. If your gifts are not cheerfully and willingly given, they are carnal in their nature, and you will reap the fruit which is peculiar to carnality, eternal death: while, on the other hand, if your gifts are spiritual in their nature, the hope of the spiritual man, eternal life, is yours."

9. —τὸ δὲ καλὸν ποιοῦντες μὴ ἐγκακ.——"And in well doing, let us not give in through weariness." In the former verses the Apostle has been speaking with especial reference to those who were endeavouring to escape from their responsibilities with regard to their teachers. He now addresses a word of warning and encouragement to such as might not need his former admonitions. ἐγκακεῖν seems to be clearly the true reading in all those places in the New Testament<sup>1</sup> in which the Text. Rec. reads ἐκκακεῖν. Hesychius has both words. Liddell and Scott quote Polyb., iv. 19, 10, for ἐκκακεῖν, but incorrectly, if the true reading there be ἐνεκάκησαν. The LXX. never use either ἐγκ. or ἐκκ. Symmachus uses ἐγκ. in Gen. xxvii. 46, and Theodot. in Prov. iii. 11, (where the LXX. render by ἐκλύειν,) to translate the Heb. γַרַּב in the sense of "to be weary."

—καιρῷ γὰρ ἰδίῳ θερίσ.——"for at the proper time we shall reap," i. e. eternal life, the reward peculiar to the spiritual man sowing spiritual seed. See ver. 8. Cf. 1 Cor. ix. 10; 2 Tim. ii. 6.

<sup>1</sup> Luke xviii. 1; 2 Cor. iv. 1, 16; Eph. iii. 13; 2 Thess. iii. 13.

—μὴ ἐκλυόμενοι.—“if we faint not,” i. e. during this *present* time of probation. The participle expresses the conditions under which each individual will reap the spiritual reward at the harvest of the spiritual man. Cf. Matt. xxiv. 13; Rev. ii. 10; 1 Cor. ix. 24—27. Compare ἐκλύεσθαι, LXX., Thren. ii. 12, 19; Judith xiv. 6; Syr. xliii. 10; 1 Macc. iii. 17. N. T., Matt. xv. 32; Mark viii. 3. The word seems to have very much the same sense as ἐγκακῆν. Compare the translations of Theodot. and the LXX. of Prov. iii. 11.

10. —Ἄρα οὖν, κ. τ. λ.—“So then, inasmuch as we have opportunity.” καιρός represents the opportunity of present time, the καιρός of sowing. Jerome, “Tempus sementis, tempus est præsens, et vita quam currimus.” Cf. John ix. 4, and also xii. 35. If the Apostle had meant, as Knatchbull and Homberg interpret, followed by Wolf, *Prout habemus opportunitatem*, he would have said ὡς ἂν καιρὸν ἔχωμεν.

—ἐργαζόμεθα τὸ ἀγ.—ἐργάζεσθαι τὸ ἀγ. is equivalent to ποιῆν τὸ ἀγ. Compare Rom. ii. 10; Eph. iv. 28, with Rom. xiii. 3.

—πρὸς πάντας—πρός represents the *direction* of the act of benevolence *towards* the individual. Cf. Eph. vi. 9.

—τοὺς οἰκείους τῆς πίστεως—οἰκεῖοι means those belonging to the same family or household (cf. 1 Tim. v. 8), persons related, especially by intermarriage.<sup>1</sup> Wetstein adduces instances from Strabo and Diod. Sic. of the usage of the word with abstract nouns, e. g. οἰκεῖοι φιλοσοφίας. ὀλιγαρχίας.

<sup>1</sup> Ammonius, οἰκεῖοι. οἱ κατ' ἐπιγαμίαν ἐπιμιχθέντες τῷ οἴκῳ. Hesych., οἰκεῖοι. οἱ κατ' ἐπιγαμίαν προσήχοντες.

τυράννιδος. No translation however can possibly be more appropriate than that of our English Version. For οἱκ. τῆς πίς. represents not only persons bound together by the profession of one common faith, but those who through faith which unites them to Christ, the bridegroom, become members of one heavenly family, fellow-citizens with the saints, καὶ οἰκεῖοι τοῦ Θεοῦ. Eph. ii. 19. Cf. also 1 Tim. iii. 15, and 1 Pet. iv. 17.

11. — Ἴδετε πηλίκοις ὑμῖν γράμμασιν ἔγραψα, κ. τ. λ. — “See in how large letters I write to you with mine own hand.” I confess that I cannot understand upon what principles of sound criticism these words can be tortured into the meaning of “how long” or “large a letter.” That γράμματα does occasionally, like the Lat. *litteræ*, mean *an epistle* is perfectly true, and it is so used in one place in the New Testament, Acts xxviii. 21. But, considering that St. Paul uses ἐπιστολή repeatedly, and never γράμματα, it is extremely improbable that in this one place alone he should use it so here. Again, πηλίκος expresses magnitude—“how great,” “how large.” Cf. LXX., Zach. ii. 2, Διαμετρῆσαι τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ, τοῦ ἰδεῖν πηλίκον τὸ πλάτος αὐτῆς ἐστὶ καὶ πηλίκον τὸ μῆκος, so that if γράμματα means an epistle, we have no choice but to translate “how great an epistle;” which, to say the least, seems a very unlikely way of expressing its length, unless indeed we adopt and apply the explanation of Jerome, “Grandibus ergo Paulus litteris scripsit Epistolam: quia sensus erat grandis in litteris; et spiritu Dei vivi, non atramento, nec calamo fuerit exaratus.” But even if πηλ. γρ.

be, considered by itself, susceptible of the interpretation of our Translation, the Apostle would, if he had meant this, have used, not the dative, but the accusative (cogn.), *πηλίκια γράμματα ἔγραψα*.

With Professor Scholefield, I take then *ἔγραψα* to be used here in the sense of "I write," and to refer to what the Apostle is now beginning to add to the Epistle with his own hand. The force of this aorist lies in the fact, that when the person to whom a letter is addressed sees and reads that letter, the act of writing is past. And the use of it in this place, and with respect to what follows, is fully accounted for by the word *Ἰδετε*, in which the imagination of the Apostle carries him forward to the very act of vision subsequent to the completion of what he is now beginning to write. As regards the words *πηλ. γράμ.*, they can only be understood to refer to the actual magnitude of the letters used; and it would seem that the Apostle, possibly from some cause connected with his infirmity, used, in what he is now beginning to write, letters larger than those employed by the amanuensis whom, in accordance with his usual custom,<sup>1</sup> he had employed to write the bulk of the Epistle.<sup>2</sup> This interpretation appears to be no less required by the actual words of the Apostle, than indicated by the whole form of the context. The verses which follow have no connexion with what immediately precedes them; they evidently contain a sort of recapitu-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Rom. xvi. 22, 24.

<sup>2</sup> Some of the Greek commentators understand *πηλικοίς* to imply the *ἀμορφία* of the letters, as well as size. I cannot however see that there is any absolute necessity to draw this conclusion.

latory warning against the efforts of the false brethren, and are, in form and character, precisely what we should expect that the Apostle might add to an Epistle like this, instead of the ordinary salutation with which he closed his Epistles,<sup>1</sup> and which was *σημεῖον ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ*. 2 Thess. iii. 17.

12. —*ἐὐπροσωπῆσαι* — “to make a specious show,” i. e. of religion before men. *ἐὐπρόσωπος* is used in the sense of fair in outward show, specious.<sup>2</sup> Cf. Lucian Hermot. 51.<sup>3</sup> Strigel comments, “*ἐὐπρόσωπα* argumenta apud Rhetores vocantur popularia et plausibilia, *ἐὐπροσωπῆσαι* assentatores dicuntur, qui alludunt ad effectus principum aut vulgi. Herodot. vii. 168, *ὕπεκρίναντο μὲν οὕτω ἐὐπρόσωπα*.” So Demosth. Pro Coron. speaks of *λόγοι ἐὐπρόσωποι*.<sup>4</sup>

—*ἐν σαρκί*—i. e. while still in their unregenerate nature, devoid of the true spiritual obedience which flows from affections and desires renewed by the indwelling Spirit of God and Christ. Some commentators, both ancient and modern, take *ἐν σαρκί* to mean *apud homines*, but this is clearly and necessarily implied in the word *ἐὐπροσωπῆσαι*.

—*ἀναγκάζουσιν, κ. τ. λ.*—i. e. both by precept and example. Cf. cap. ii. 3, 14, also cap. v. 2, note.

—*μόνον ἵνα τῷ σταυρῷ, κ. τ. λ.*—i. e. lest they should incur that persecution which was, and is the lot of those who preach the distinctive doctrine of redemption through the crucifixion of Christ, viz. the inability of the law to give justification, and the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 21; Col. iv. 18; 2 Thess. iii. 17.

<sup>2</sup> Lidd. and Scott.

<sup>3</sup> Quoted by Elsner, in loc. q. v.

<sup>4</sup> Quoted by Elsner and Wetstein. See the examples given by the latter.



entire freeness of the salvation of the Gospel. See cap. v. 11 and the note, and iv. 29; cf. also cap. v. 4 and the note. *σταυρωθ*, expressing the  *motive*, is the  *instrumental dative*.<sup>1</sup>

13. —*οὐδὲ γὰρ οἱ περιτι.*—“For not even they who are being circumcised,” i. e. who are actually carrying out in practice their Judaizing tendencies. Cf. *ἀνθ. περιτεμνομένων*, chap. v. 3. *περιτετμημένοι* is the reading which one would desire, but for that very reason must be rejected.<sup>2</sup>

—*νόμον φυλάσσουσιν*—“conform to the requirements of the law as a dispensation.”

—*ἵνα ἐν τῇ ὑμετέρα σαρκὶ καυχῆσωνται*—“that they may  *personally* glory in your carnality,” i. e. in the fact that you have yielded to their influence, and followed their example. Cf. iv. 17 and note. Morus comments, “ut gloriolam quamdam capiant inde, quod dicant: hic quoque per me factus est Judæus!”

14. —*ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο, κ. τ. λ.*—The transition in the mind of the Apostle appears to be,—These Judaizers, who are so desirous of attaining justification in themselves by the law, glory only in self; but God forbid that I should glory in self. God forbid that I should glory, save in that death through which the law is dead to me, and I to the law. Cf. Eph. ii. 15; Col. ii. 14; and see Pearson, vol. i. p. 248.

—*δι' οὗ*—I should be disposed, with Bengel, to refer this to *σταυρωθ*, as being the word which represents the principal idea in the sentence.

<sup>1</sup> See Jelf, Gr. Gr. 607.

<sup>2</sup> *περιτεμνόμενοι* is the reading of A. C. D. E. K. 49, 67, al. Chrys. Theodrt. Dam. al. *Lat. Vulg.*—Syr. utr.

—ἐμοί —The dative of *reference*.

—κόσμος ἐσταύρωται, κἀγὼ, κ. τ. λ. — The Apostle is clearly speaking of the justification attained in and by Christ, in contradistinction to that which the Judaizers sought in the law. I should therefore take κόσμος to imply here *principally*, not the world with its pleasures, &c., but, in the same way as στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου in iv. 3, a worldly and carnal obedience.<sup>1</sup> Comp. Col. ii. 20, ἀπεθάνετε σὺν Χριστῷ ἀπὸ τῶν στοιχείων τοῦ κόσμου, and Rom. vii. 4. See the note on στοιχ. τοῦ κόσμ., chap. iv. 3. The two clauses represent, I think, not merely a reciprocal notion, but the objective and subjective features of the death of Christ, as regards the person of the believer. Through the cross, the world and its elements are dead with respect to me, and I (with consciousness which developes itself in action) am dead with respect to the world, counting all things “but dung that I may win Christ, and be found in Him, not having mine own righteousness which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith.”<sup>2</sup>

15. —οὔτε γὰρ περιτομή, κ. τ. λ. —circumcision, which was one of the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, iv. 3. See preceding verse.

I should not hesitate to follow Tischendorf in the removal of the clause ἐν γὰρ X. I. from the text. Jerome, in his commentary, and Augustine, give us, doubtless, the form of the old Latin; and the evidence furnished by this, added to that of B. and the Pesch. Syr., is, especially when coupled with the extreme

<sup>1</sup> Bengel comments, “nil penes me valet mundus cum suis elementis.”

<sup>2</sup> Phil. iii. 8, 9.

probability of the clause being an interpolation from cap. v. 6,<sup>1</sup> quite strong enough to outweigh all the MSS. evidence in favour of its retention.

—*τι ἐστίν*—Cf. *εἶναί τι*, ch. ii. 6, and note, also vi. 3; 1 Cor. iii. 7, x. 19. Bengel, “non modo nil valet, sed etiam *nil est* et circumcisio et præputium: est vero nova creatura, et gloriatio in cruce Domini Jesu Christi.”

—*καινὴ κτίσις*—i. e. that new creation which is dead with Christ to the weak and beggarly elements of the law, and of which the obedience is that of renewed affections and desires. Cf. ch. v. 24, note. Cf. 2 Cor. v. 17. Bengel, “*nova creatio ex cruce Christi.*” Eph. ii. 15, seq.

16. —*ταῦ κανόνι τούτῳ στοιχοῦσιν*—“walk according to this rule.” Cf. v. 25, *πνεύματι στοιχῶμεν*, and the note. I should refer *κανών* to the sentiment expressed in ver. 14; ver. 15 being of a parenthetical character, and explanatory of that sentiment. With reference to this metaphorical sense of *κανών*, see Elsner in loc.

—*εἰρήνη*—See note on cap. v. 22.

—*ἔλεος*—Eph. ii. 4; 1 Tim. i. 2; 2 Tim. i. 2.

—*ἐπί*—Cf. 2 Cor. xii. 9, *ἵνα ἐπισκηνώσῃ ἐπ’ ἐμὲ ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Χριστοῦ*.

—*καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ Θεοῦ*—I should certainly take the *καὶ* here to be, as in other passages of St. Paul’s Epistles, exegetic.<sup>2</sup> The main scope of the whole Epistle is to show that *οἱ ἐκ πίστεως* are the true seed of Abraham:<sup>3</sup> and the Apostle now most appropriately closes by showing that not the

<sup>1</sup> See Mill. Proleg. 884.

<sup>2</sup> See Bruders Schmidt. p. 469.

<sup>3</sup> ch. iii. 7, 9, 29, &ca, &ca.

advocates of circumcision, not those who gloried in self, but those who gloried only in the cross, are in fact the true Israel. Cf. Phil. iii. 3; Rom. ii. 29, ix. 6—8.

17. —τοῦ λοιποῦ——“for the future.” This is the temporal genitive. In late writers the form is generally λοιπὸν or τὸ λοιπὸν. Cf. Jelf, Gr. Gr. 523, 1.

—κόπους μοι μηδεὶς παρεχέτω——i. e. by calling in question, as the false brethren had done, the character of his apostleship,<sup>1</sup> and forcing upon him the labour of a written and controversial defence.<sup>2</sup> The expression κόπους παρέχειν<sup>3</sup> is less correct<sup>4</sup> than the kindred ones πράγματα, ὄχλον, ἔργον, πόνον παρέχειν τινί.

—ἔγὼ γὰρ τὰ στίγματα, κ. τ. λ.——q. d. “The very scars on my body, caused by the stripes and the bonds,<sup>5</sup> which I have suffered for the sake of Christ, testify that I am His acknowledged servant<sup>6</sup> (or soldier<sup>7</sup>).” The Apostle alludes to the practice of branding slaves (or soldiers). The

<sup>1</sup> See ch. i. ver. 1, and note.

<sup>2</sup> Compare the Interlineary Gloss, “‘molestus sit’ ut iterum cogat scribere de eodem.”

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Matt. xxvi. 10; Mark xiv. 6; Luke xi. 7, xviii. 5.

<sup>4</sup> See Steph. Thes. Ed. Dindorf, vol. vi. p. 499, D.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. 2 Cor. xi. 23, seqq. If the conjecture that this Epistle was written at Corinth between the first and second visits of St. Paul, be (as I am daily more and more convinced it is) correct, the allusion of the Apostle may have particular reference to the stripes and imprisonments he had not long before undergone at Philippi. See Acts xvi. 23, 24; 1 Thess. ii. 2.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Rom. i. 1; Gal. i. 10; Phil. i. 1; Tit. i. 1.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. 2 Tim. ii. 3; so the author of the Interlineary Gloss, “‘stigmata’ signa militiæ Christi; quæ me comprobant ejus esse.” See also a note of Gothofred’s on Cod. Lib. xi. Tit. ix. l. 3.

former were marked on the forehead,<sup>1</sup> the latter in the hand.<sup>2</sup> Cf. Apoc. vii. 3, xiii. 16, xiv. 1, 9, 11; and see, with respect to other *στιγματοφόροι*, the Codex, Lib. xi. Tit. ix. l. 3, and Tit. xlii. l. 10. See also Spencer De Legibus Hebræorum, Lib. ii. cap. xx. § 1. Deyling, Obs. Sac. Part iii. p. 423, seqq.

18. —*ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου . . . μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν*—This form occurs, Phil. iv. 23 (Ln. Tisch.), Philem. 25. The force of it appears to be, “May the grace, love, and mercy of God, which is manifested in and through Jesus Christ, be, through the influences of the Holy Spirit, ever present to and with your spirit,<sup>3</sup> so that, being ever conscious of that love, and of the freeness of the gift inherited by believers in Christ, you may walk in accordance with that consciousness.”

<sup>1</sup> See Apuleius, Lib. ix. “frontes literati.” Valerius Max. vi. 8. Macrobius, Saturnal. i. 11. Martial. Lib. x. Epig. 56, Lib. vi. Epig. 64. Diogen. Laert. Vit. Lib. iv. Bion. ἐμοῦ ὁ πατήρ μὲν ἦν ἀπελεύθερος, . . . ἔχων οὐ πρόσωπον, ἀλλὰ συγγραφὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ προσώπου, τῆς τοῦ δεσπότου πικρίας σύμβολον. See more examples in Wetstein. See also Hesych. νν. Ἰστριανά and ἐπίσημα and Σαμίων ὁ δῆμος.

<sup>2</sup> See Aetius viii. 12, *στίγματα καλοῦσι, τὰ ἐπὶ τοῦ προσώπου ἢ ἄλλου τινὸς μέρους τοῦ σώματος ἐπιγραφόμενα· οἷά ἐστιν τῶν στρατευομένων ἐν ταῖς χερσίν.* See also Veget. de Re Militari, ii. 5.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Rom. viii. 16; 1 Cor. ii. 11.

THE END.



BS  
3686  
.B2

13564

Bagge  
R. H. M. T. Galathea

907 2 11 1938

WITNESSES

Booked up  
James H. Mack  
1-30-51

183  
9486  
182

Rogge

Bibl. NT. Galatien

18327

DEC 2 1944  
NOV 2 1942

Biblia

571 29.12.1942

183  
182