

THIS DOCUMENT WAS TAKEN FROM THE COMMENTARY ON GALATIANS AND  
EPHESIANS BY JOHN CALVIN, DOWNLOADED FROM THE SITE OF THIRD  
MILLENNIUM MINISTRIES.

<http://thirdmill.org/books/series.asp>

IN THIS DOCUMENT, THE PORTION OF CHAPTERS 3 AND 4 OF GALATIANS WAS  
SEPARATED AND SLIGHTLY REFORMATTED.

**COMMENTARIES**  
**ON**  
**THE EPISTLE OF PAUL**  
**TO THE**  
**GALATIANS AND EPHESIANS**  
**BY JOHN CALVIN**

**TRANSLATED FROM THE ORIGINAL LATIN,**  
**BY THE REV. WILLIAM PRINGLE**

**CHRISTIAN CLASSICS ETHEREAL LIBRARY**  
**GRAND RAPIDS, MI**

<http://www.ccel.org>

# THE ARGUMENT

OF

## THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE GALATIANS.

What part of Asia was inhabited by the GALATIANS, and what were the boundaries of their country, is well known; but whence they originally came <sup>fa4</sup> is not agreed among historians. It is universally admitted that they were Gauls, and, on that account, were denominated Gallo-Grecians. But from what part of Gaul they came it is more difficult to determine.

Strabo thought that the Tectosages came from Gallia Narbonensis, and that the remainder were Celtae; <sup>fa5</sup> and this opinion has been generally adopted. But, as Pliny enumerates the Ambiani <sup>fa6</sup> among the Tectosagi, and as it is universally agreed that they were allied to the Tolistobogi, who dwelt on the banks of the Rhine, I think it more probable that, they were Belgians, whose territory extended from a very distant part of the course of the Rhine to the English Channel. The Tolistobogi inhabited that part which receives from its present inhabitants the names of Cleves and Brabant.

The mistake originated, I think, in this way. A band of Tectosagi, who had made all irruption into Gallia Narbonensis, retained their own name, and gave it to the country which they had conquered. This is intimated by Ausonius, <sup>fa7</sup> who says, "As far as the Teutosagi, whose original name was Belgians; <sup>fa8</sup> for he calls them Belgians, and says that they were first called Teutosagi, and afterwards Tectosagi. Caesar, <sup>fa9</sup> indeed, places the Tectosagi in the Hercynian <sup>fa10</sup> forest; but I consider this to have been in consequence of their emigration, which indeed appears from that very passage.

But more than enough has now been said as to the origin of the nation, so far as relates to the present passage. Pliny informs us that the GALATIANS, who inhabited that part of Asia to which they gave their name, were divided into three chief nations, Tectosagi, Tolistobogi, and Troceni, and accordingly occupied three chief cities. So great was the power which they at one time swayed over their unwarlike neighbors, that they received tribute from a great part of Lesser Asia. Losing at length their ancient valor, and giving themselves up to pleasure and luxury, they were vanquished in war and subdued, with little difficulty, by Cneius Manlius, a Roman consul.

At the time of the Apostle Paul they were under the dominion of the Romans. He had purely and faithfully instructed them in the Gospel; but false apostles had entered, during

his absence, and had corrupted the true seed by false and erroneous doctrines. They taught that the observation of ceremonies was still necessary. This might appear to be a trivial matter; but Paul very properly contends as for a fundamental article of the Christian faith. It is no small evil to quench the light of the Gospel, to lay a snare for consciences, and to remove the distinction between the Old and New Testaments. He perceived that these errors were also connected with a wicked and dangerous opinion as to the manner in which justification is obtained. This is the reason why he fights with so much earnestness and vehemence; and, having learned from him the important and serious nature of the controversy, it is our duty to read with greater attention.

One who forms his views of the subject from the Commentaries of Origen and Jerome, will be astonished that Paul should take so deep an interest in external rites; but whoever goes to the fountain will acknowledge that there was abundant reason for all this sharpness of reproof. The GALATIANS had allowed themselves to be drawn aside from the right course by excessive credulity, or rather by lightness and folly. He therefore censures them more severely; for I do not agree with those who attribute the harshness of his language to their slowness of apprehension. The EPHESIANS and COLOSSIANS had been subjected to the same temptations. If they had lent as ready an ear to the tale of the impostors, do we imagine that Paul would have treated them with greater gentleness? This boldness of rebuke was not suggested by the disposition of the people, but extorted by the baseness of their conduct.

Having ascertained what was the design of writing the EPISTLE, let us attend to the order in which it is treated. In the *first* and *second* Chapters (Galatians 1 and Galatians 2) he maintains the authority of his Apostleship, except that, towards the close of the second chapter, he touches incidentally on his main point, the question of Man's Justification, which, however, is avowedly and directly argued in the *third* Chapter, Galatians 3. Although he appears in those two Chapters to have many objects in view, yet his sole object is to prove that He is equal to the highest apostles, and that there is no reason why he should not be considered to hold an equally honorable rank with any of them.

But it is of importance to know why he labors so hard in establishing his own claim to respect. Provided that Christ reigns, and that the purity of doctrine remains uncontaminated, what matters it whether he is higher or lower than Peter, or whether they are all on a footing of equality? If all must "decrease," that Christ alone may "increase," (<430330>John 3:30,) it is idle to dispute about human ranks. Besides, it may be asked, why does he draw a comparison between himself and other apostles? What dispute had he with Peter, and James, and John? What good purpose did it serve to bring into collision those who were united in sentiment, and in the closest friendship?

I reply, the false apostles, who had deceived the GALATIANS, endeavored to obtain favor by pretending that they had received a commission from the Apostles. Their chief influence arose from insinuating the belief that they represented the Apostles, and delivered their message. To PAUL, on the other hand, they refused the name and authority of an Apostle. They objected that he had not been chosen by our Lord as one of the Twelve; that he had never been acknowledged as such by the college of the Apostles; that he did

not receive his doctrine from Christ, or even from the Apostles themselves. All this tended not only to lower Paul's authority, but to rank him with the ordinary members of the Church, and therefore to place him far below those persons who made these insinuations.

If this had been merely a personal matter, it would have given no uneasiness to PAUL to be reckoned an ordinary disciple. But when he saw that his doctrine was beginning to lose its weight and authority, he was not entitled to be silent. It became his duty to make a bold resistance. When Satan does not venture openly to attack doctrine, his next stratagem is to diminish its influence by indirect attacks. Let us remember, then, that in the person of Paul the truth of the Gospel was assailed; for, if he had allowed himself to be stripped of the honor of apostleship, it followed that he had hitherto claimed what he had no title to enjoy; and this false boasting would have made him liable to suspicion in other matters. The estimation in which his doctrine was held depended on the question, whether it came, as some had begun to think, from an ordinary disciple, or from an apostle of Christ.

He was overwhelmed, on the other hand, by the lustre of great names. Those who referred, in a boastful manner, to PETER, and JAMES, and JOHN, pretended to apostolical authority. If PAUL had not manfully resisted this boasting, he would have given way to falsehood, and would have allowed the truth of God <sup>fall</sup> to suffer again in his own person. He therefore contends earnestly for both points: that he was appointed by the Lord to be an apostle, and that he was in no respect inferior to the rest, but enjoyed the same title, and was equal to them in authority and rank. He might, indeed, have denied that those men were either sent, or hold any commission from Peter and his associates. But he takes far higher ground, that he does not yield to the Apostles themselves; and if he had declined doing so, he would have been supposed to have distrusted his cause.

JERUSALEM was, at that time, the Mother of all the Churches; for the Gospel had spread from it over the whole world, and it might be said to be the principal seat of the kingdom of Christ. Any one who came from it into other churches was received with due respect. But many were foolishly elated with the thought that they had enjoyed the friendship of the Apostles, or at least had been taught in their school; and therefore nothing pleased them but what they had seen at Jerusalem. Every custom that had not been practiced there was not only disliked, but unsparingly condemned by them. This peevish manner becomes highly pernicious, when the custom of a single church is attempted to be enforced as a universal law. We are sometimes so devoted to an instructor or a place, that, without exercising any judgment of our own, we make the opinion of one man the standard for all men, and the customs of one place the standard for every other place. Such attachment is ridiculous, if there be not always in it a mixture of ambition; or rather we should say, excessive peevishness is always ambitious.

To return to those false apostles, if they had only attempted, through wicked contention, to establish everywhere the use of those ceremonies, which they had seen observed at Jerusalem, that would have been no slight offense; for, when a custom is forthwith converted into a law, injustice is perpetrated. But a more serious evil was involved in the wicked and dangerous doctrine, which held consciences to be bound to them by religious considerations, which made justification to depend on the observation of them. Such were

the reasons why PAUL defended his Apostleship with so much earnestness, and why he contrasted himself with the rest of the Apostles.

He pursues this subject to the end of the *second* Chapter, Galatians 2, when he proceeds to argue the doctrine, that we are justified in the sight of God by Free Grace, and not by the Works of the Law. His argument is this: If Ceremonies have not the power of bestowing Justification, the observation of them is therefore unnecessary. We must remark, however, that he does not confine himself entirely to Ceremonies, but argues generally about Works, otherwise the whole discussion would be trifling.

If any person thinks that we are thus straining the matter too far, let him attend to the two following reasons. First, the question could not be settled without assuming the general principle, that we are justified by the free grace of God; and this principle sets aside not only ceremonies, but every other kind of works. Secondly, Paul did not attach so much importance to Ceremonies as to the wicked doctrine of obtaining Salvation by Works. Let it be observed, therefore, that Paul had good reasons for recurring to first principles. It was necessary to go to the fountain, and to warn his readers that the controversy related, not to some insignificant trifle, but to the most important of all matters – the method of obtaining salvation.

It is a mistake, therefore, to suppose that the Apostle confined himself wholly to the special question about Ceremonies, a subject which did not admit of being settled by itself. A similar instance occurs in history. (<sup><441502></sup> Acts 15:2.) Strife and contention had arisen out of the question, whether or not Ceremonies were necessary to be observed. In the course of the discussion, the Apostles dwell largely on the intolerable yoke of the Law, and on the Forgiveness of Sins through Free Grace. What was the object of this? It appears to be a foolish departure from the point in hand; but the contrary is the fact, for a particular error cannot be satisfactorily refuted without assuming a universal principle. As, for instance, if I am called to dispute about, forbidding the use of flesh, I shall not speak merely about the different kinds of food, but shall arm myself with the general doctrine: What authority have the Traditions of men for binding the conscience? I shall quote the declaration, that

“There is one Lawgiver, who has power to save and to destroy.” (<sup><590412></sup> James 4:12.)

In short, Paul here argues negatively from general to particular propositions, which is the ordinary and most natural method of reasoning. By what evidences and arguments he proves this principle, that we are justified by the grace of God alone, we shall see when we come to the passage. He pursues this topic till the end of the *third* Chapter, Galatians 3.

In the commencement of the *fourth* Chapter, Galatians 4, he inquires into the proper use of Ceremonies, and the reason why they were appointed; shewing, at the same time, that they are now abolished. It became necessary to meet this silly objection, which might occur to some minds. What, then, was the purpose of Ceremonies? Were they useless? Were the Fathers idly employed in observing them? He illustrates briefly two statements, that in their own time they were not superfluous, and that they have now been abolished by the coming of Christ, because He is the truth and end of them; and therefore he shews that we must abide by Him. Glancing briefly at the difference between our condition and that of

the Fathers, he infers that the doctrine of the false apostles is wicked and dangerous, because it darkens the clearness of the gospel by ancient shadows. The Apostle's doctrine is now intermingled with some affecting exhortations. Towards the close of the Chapter his argument is enlivened by a beautiful allegory.

In the *fifth* Chapter, Galatians 5, he exhorts them to hold fast the Liberty which has been obtained by the blood of Christ, that they may not surrender their consciences to be ensnared by the opinions of men. But he reminds them, at the same time, in what manner Liberty may be lawfully used. <sup>Fa12</sup> He then takes occasion to point out the proper employments of Christians, that they may not uselessly spend their time in Ceremonies, and neglect matters of real importance.

COMMENTARIES ON THE  
**EPISTLE OF PAUL**  
 TO THE GALATIANS.

## CHAPTER 3

GALATIANS 3:1-5	
1. O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you?	1. O stulti Galatae, quis vos fascinavit, ut non obediatis veritati? quibus ante oculos Iesus Christus depictus est inter vos crucifixus.
2. This only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?	2. Hoc solum volo discere a vobis: Ex operibus Legis Spiritum accepistis, an ex praedicatione fidei?
3. Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?	3. Ita stulti estis, ut, exorsi a Spiritu, nunc carne eonsummemini?
4. Have ye suffered so many things in vain? if <i>it be</i> yet in vain.	4. Tanta passi estis frustra? si tamen etiam frustra.
5. He therefore that ministereth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, <i>doeth he it</i> by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?	5. Qui ergo subministrat vobis Spiritum, et operatur in vobis virtutes; ex operibus legis, an ex praedicatione fidei id (facit)?

1. *O foolish Galatians*. An expostulation is here interwoven — I should rather say, inserted — amidst his doctrinal statements. Some will wonder that he did not delay it to the close of the Epistle, but the very serious nature of the errors which he has brought forward unquestionably roused him to a burst of passion. When we hear that the Son of God, with all his benefits, is rejected, that his death is esteemed as nothing, what pious mind would not break out into indignation? He therefore declares that those who allowed themselves to be involved in so heinous a crime must have been *ajno>htoi*, that is, “disordered in mind.” He accuses them not only of having suffered themselves to be deceived, but of having been

carried away by some sort of magical enchantment, <sup>fa54</sup> which is a still more serious charge. He insinuates that their fall partook more of madness than of folly.

Some think that Paul refers to the temper of the nation, that, being sprung from barbarians, it was more difficult to train them; but I rather think that he refers to the subject itself. It looks like something supernatural, that, after enjoying the gospel in such clearness, they should be affected by the delusions of Satan. He does not merely say that they were “bewitched” and “disordered in mind,” because they did not obey the truth; but because, after having received instruction so clear, so full, so tender, and so powerful, they immediately fell away. Erasmus has chosen to interpret the words, “that ye should not believe the truth.” I am not quite prepared to set aside that rendering, but would prefer the word *obey*, because Paul does not charge them with having, from the outset, rejected the gospel, but with not having persevered in obedience.

*Before whose eyes.* This is intended, as I have already hinted, to express an aggravation; for, the better opportunities they had of knowing Christ, the more heinous was the criminality of forsaking him. Such, he tells them, was the clearness of his doctrine, that it was not naked doctrine, but the express, living image of Christ. <sup>Fa55</sup> They had known Christ in such a manner, that they might be almost said to have seen him.

*Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth.* Augustine’s interpretation of the word *progra>fh*, (“hath been set forth,”) is harsh, and inconsistent with Paul’s design. He makes it to signify that Christ was to be thrust out from possession. Others propose a different phrase, (*proscriptus*,) which, if used in the sense of “openly proclaimed,” would not be inapplicable. The Greeks, accordingly, borrow from this verb the word *progra>mmata*, to denote boards on which property intended to be sold was published, so as to be exposed to the view of all. But the participle, *painted*, is less ambiguous, and, in my own opinion, is exceedingly appropriate. To shew how energetic his preaching was, Paul first compares it to a picture, which exhibited to them, in a lively manner, the image of Christ.

But, not satisfied with this comparison, he adds, *Christ hath been crucified among you*, intimating that the actual sight of Christ’s death could not have affected them more powerfully than his own preaching. The view given by some, that the Galatians had “crucified to themselves (<580606> Hebrews 6:6) the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame;” that they had withdrawn from the purity of the gospel; or, at least, had lent their ear, and given their confidence, to impostors who crucified him, — appears to me overstrained. The meaning therefore is, that Paul’s doctrine had instructed them concerning Christ in such a manner as if he had been exhibited to them in a picture, nay, “crucified among them.” Such a representation could not have been made by any eloquence, or by “enticing words of man’s wisdom,” (<460204> 1 Corinthians 2:4,) had it not been accompanied by that power of the Spirit, of which Paul has treated largely in both the Epistles to the Corinthians.

Let those who would discharge aright the ministry of the gospel learn, not merely to speak and declaim, but to penetrate into the consciences of men, to make them see Christ crucified, and feel the shedding of his blood. <sup>Fa56</sup> When the Church has painters such as these, she no longer needs the dead images of wood and stone, she no longer requires



pictures; both of which, unquestionably, were first admitted to Christian temples when the pastors had become dumb and been converted into mere idols, or when they uttered a few words from the pulpit in such a cold and careless manner, that the power and efficacy of the ministry were utterly extinguished.

2. *This one I wish to learn from you.* He now proceeds to support his cause by additional arguments. The first is drawn from their experience, for he reminds them in what manner the gospel was introduced among themselves. When they heard the gospel, they received the Spirit. It was not to the law, therefore, but to faith, that they owed the reception of this benefit. This same argument is employed by Peter in the defense which he makes to his brethren for having baptized uncircumcised persons. (<sup><441047></sup>Acts 10:47.) Paul and Barnabas followed the same course in the debate which they maintained at Jerusalem on this subject. (<sup><441502></sup>Acts 15:2, 12.) There was therefore manifest ingratitude in not submitting to the doctrine, by means of which they had received the Holy Spirit. The opportunity which he gives them to reply is expressive not of doubt, but of greater confidence: for their convictions, founded on their own experience, forced them to acknowledge that it was true.

*Faith* is here put, by a figure of speech, for the gospel, which is elsewhere called "the law of faith," (<sup><450327></sup>Romans 3:27,) because it exhibits to us the free grace of God in Christ, without any merit of works. *The Spirit* means here, I think, the grace of regeneration, which is common to all believers; though I have no objection to understand it as referring to the peculiar gifts by which the Lord, at that period, honored the preaching of the gospel. <sup>Fa57</sup>

It may be objected, that the Spirit was not, in this respect, given to all. But, it was enough for Paul's purpose, that the Galatians knew that the power of the Holy Spirit in his Church had accompanied Paul's doctrine, and that believers were variously endowed with the gifts of the Spirit for general edification. It may likewise be objected, that those gifts were not infallible signs of adoption, and so do not apply to the present question. I reply, that it was enough that the Lord had confirmed the doctrine of Paul by the visible gifts of his Spirit. A still simpler view of the case is, that they had been distinguished by the ordinary privilege of adoption, before those impostors had brought forward their additions. "In whom," says he to the Ephesians,

"ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation; in whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise."  
(<sup><490113></sup>Ephesians 1:13.)

3. *Are ye so foolish?* Commentators are not agreed as to what he means by *the Spirit* and by *the flesh*. He alludes, in my opinion, to what he had said about the Spirit. As if he had said, "As the doctrine of the gospel brought to you the Holy Spirit, the commencement of your course was spiritual; but now ye have fallen into a worse condition, and may be said to have fallen from the Spirit into the flesh." The flesh denotes either outward and fading flyings, such as ceremonies are, particularly when they are separated from Christ; or it denotes dead and fading doctrine. There was a strange inconsistency between their splendid commencement and their future progress.

4. *Have ye suffered so many things?* This is another argument. Having suffered so many things in behalf of the gospel, would they now, in an instant, lose it all? Nay, he puts it in the way of

reproach, if they were willing to lose the advantage of so many illustrious struggles which they had made for the faith. If the true faith had not been delivered to them by Paul, it was rash to suffer anything in defense of a bad cause; but they had experienced the presence of God amidst their persecutions. Accordingly, he charges the false apostles with ill-will in depriving the Galatians of such valuable ornaments. But to mitigate the severity of this complaint, he adds, *if it be yet in vain*; thus inspiring their minds with the expectation of something better, and rousing them to the exercise of repentance. For the intention of all chastisement is, not to drive men to despair, but to lead them to a better course.

5. *He therefore that ministereth.* He is not now speaking of the grace of regeneration, but of the other gifts of the Spirit; for a subject different from the preceding one is manifestly introduced. He warns them that all the gifts of the Holy Spirit, in which they excelled, are the fruits of the gospel, of that gospel which had been preached among them by his own lips. Their new teachers deprived them of those gifts when they left the gospel, and fled to another kind of doctrine. In proportion to the value which they attached to those gifts, to which the apostle here adds *miracles*, they ought the more carefully and resolutely to adhere to the gospel.

<b>GALATIANS 3:6-9</b>	
6. Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness.	6. Quemadmodum Abraham credidit Deo, et imputatum est illi in justitiam. ( <sup>&lt;011506&gt;</sup> Genesis 15:6 <sup>&lt;450403&gt;</sup> Romans 4:3 <sup>&lt;590223&gt;</sup> James 2:23.)
7. Know ye therefore, that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham.	7. Cognoscite ergo, quod qui ex fide sunt, ii sunt filii Abrahae.
8. And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, <i>saying</i> , In thee shall all nations be blessed.	8. Scriptura autem, quia praevidebat, quod ex fide justificet Deus Gentes, ante evangelizavit Abrahae: In te benedicentur omnes Gentes. ( <sup>&lt;012218&gt;</sup> Genesis 22:18.)
9. So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham.	9. Itaque qui ex fide sunt, benedicuntur cure fideli Abraham.

Having appealed to facts and experience, he now gives quotations from Scripture. And first, he brings forward the example of Abraham. Arguments drawn from examples are not always so conclusive, but this is one of the most powerful, because neither in the subject nor in the person is there any ground of exception. There is no variety of roads to righteousness, and so Abraham is called "the father of all them that believe," (<sup><450411></sup>Romans 4:11,) because he is a pattern adapted to all; nay, in his person has been laid down to us the universal rule for obtaining righteousness.

6. *Even as Abraham.* We must here supply some such phrase as *but rather*; for, having put a question, he resolved instantly to cut off every ground of hesitation. At least the phrase “*even as*,” (kaqw<v,) refers only to the verse immediately preceding, to the “ministration of the Spirit and of miracles by the hearing of faith;” as if he had said, that, in the grace bestowed on them, a similarity might be found to the case of Abraham.

*Believed God.* By this quotation he proves both here, and in the 4th chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, that men are justified by faith, because the faith of Abraham *was accounted to him, for righteousness.* (<450403>Romans 4:3.) We must here inquire briefly, first, what Paul intends by *faith*; secondly, what is *righteousness*; and thirdly, why faith is represented to be a cause of justification. Faith does not mean any kind of conviction which men may have of the truth of God; for though Cain had a hundred times exercised faith in God when denouncing punishment against him, this had nothing to do with obtaining righteousness. Abraham was justified by believing, because, when he received from God a promise of fatherly kindness, he embraced it as certain. Faith therefore has a relation and respect to such a divine promise as may enable men to place their trust and confidence in God.

As to the word *righteousness*, we must attend to the phraseology of Moses. When he says, that

“he believed in the Lord,  
and he counted it to him for righteousness,” (<011506>Genesis 15:6.)

he intimates that that person is righteous who is reckoned as such in the sight of God. Now, since men have not righteousness dwelling within themselves, they obtain this by imputation; because God holds their faith as accounted for righteousness. We are therefore said to be “justified by faith,” (<450328>Romans 3:28; 5:1,) not because faith infuses into us a habit or quality, but because we are accepted by God.

But why does faith receive such honor as to be entitled a cause of our justification? First, we must observe, that it is merely an instrumental cause; for, strictly speaking, our righteousness is nothing else than God’s free acceptance of us, on which our salvation is founded. But as the Lord testifies his love and grace in the gospel, by offering to us that righteousness of which I have spoken, so we receive it by faith. And thus, when we ascribe to faith a man’s justification, we are not treating of the principal cause, but merely pointing out the way in which men arrive at true righteousness. For this righteousness is not a quality which exists in men, but is the mere gift of God, and is enjoyed by faith only; and not even as a reward justly due to faith, but because we receive by faith what God freely gives. All such expressions as the following are of similar import: We are “justified freely by his grace.” (<450324>Romans 3:24.) Christ is our righteousness. The mercy of God is the cause of our righteousness. By the death and resurrection of Christ, righteousness has been procured for us. Righteousness is bestowed on us through the gospel. We obtain righteousness by faith.

Hence appears the ridiculousness of the blunder of attempting to reconcile the two propositions, that we are justified by faith, and that we are justified at the same time by works; for he who is “just by faith” (<350204>Habakkuk 2:4 <581038>Hebrews 10:38) is poor and

destitute of personal righteousness, and relies on the grace of God alone. And this is the reason why Paul, in the Epistle to the Romans, concludes that Abraham, having obtained righteousness by faith, had no right to glory before God. (<sup><450402></sup>Romans 4:2.) For it is not said that faith was imputed to him for a part of righteousness, but simply for righteousness; so that his faith was truly his righteousness. Besides, faith looks at nothing but the mercy of God, and a dead and risen Christ. All merit of works is thus excluded from being the cause of justification, when the whole is ascribed to faith. For faith, — so far as it embraces the undeserved goodness of God, Christ with all his benefits, the testimony of our adoption which is contained in the gospel, — is universally contrasted with the law, with the merit of works, and with human excellence. The notion of the sophists, that it is contrasted with ceremonies alone, will presently be disproved, with little difficulty, from the context. Let us therefore remember, that those who are righteous by faith, are righteous out of themselves, that is, in Christ.

Hence, too, we obtain a refutation of the idle cavilling of certain persons who evade Paul's reasoning. Moses they tell us, gives the name of righteousness to goodness; and so means nothing more than that Abraham was reckoned a good man, because he believed God. Giddy minds of this description, raised up in our time by Satan, endeavor, by indirect slanders, to undermine the certainty of Scripture. Paul knew that Moses was not there giving lessons to boys in grammar, but was speaking of a decision which God had pronounced, and very properly viewed the word righteousness in a theological sense. For it is not in that sense in which goodness is mentioned with approbation among men, that we are accounted righteous in the sight of God, but only where we render perfect obedience to the law. Righteousness is contrasted with the transgression of the law, even in its smallest point; and because we have it not from ourselves, it is freely given to us by God.

But here the Jews object that Paul has completely tortured the words of Moses to suit his own purpose; for Moses does not here treat of Christ, or of eternal life, but only mentions an earthly inheritance. The Papists are not very different from the Jews; for, though they do not venture to inveigh against Paul, they entirely evade his meaning. Paul, we reply, takes for granted, what Christians hold to be a first principle, that whatever promises the Lord made to Abraham were appendages of that first promise,

“I am thy shield, and thy exceeding great reward.”  
(<sup><011501></sup>Genesis 15:1.)

When Abraham received the promise,

“In multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heavens, and as the sand which is upon the sea-shore” (<sup><012217></sup>Genesis 22:17,)

he did not limit his view to that word, but included it in the grace of adoption as a part of the whole, and, in the same manner, every other promise was viewed by him as a testimony of God's fatherly kindness, which tended to strengthen his hope of salvation. Unbelievers differ from the children of God in this respect, that, while they enjoy in common with them the bounties of Providence, they devour them like cattle, and look no higher. The children of God, on the other hand, knowing that all their blessings have been sanctified by the

promises, acknowledge God in them as their Father. They are often directed, in this way, to the hope of eternal life; for they begin with the faith of their adoption, which is the foundation of the whole. Abraham was not justified merely because he believed that God would “multiply his seed,” (<012217>Genesis 22:17,) but because he embraced the grace of God, trusting to the promised Mediator, in whom, as Paul elsewhere declares, “all the promises of God are yea and amen.” (<470120>2 Corinthians 1:20.)

7. *Know ye therefore*, or, *ye know*; for both readings are equally agreeable to the Greek termination *ginw>skete*. But it matters little which is preferred, for the meaning is the same, only that the old translation, (*know ye*,) which I have followed, is more energetic. <sup>Fa58</sup> He says that those “are of faith,” who have relinquished all confidence in works, and rely on the promise of God alone. It is on the authority of Paul himself that we give this interpretation; for in the Epistle to the Romans he thus writes:

“To him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is accounted for righteousness.” (<450404>Romans 4:4,5.)

To be *of faith*, therefore, is to rest their righteousness and hope of salvation on the mercy of God. That such are the children of God he concludes from the preceding statement; for if Abraham was justified by faith those who wish to be his children must likewise abide firmly by faith. He has omitted one remark, which will be readily supplied, that there is no place in the church for any man who is not a son of Abraham.

8. *The scripture foreseeing*. What he had said in a general manner is now applied expressly to the Gentiles; for the calling of the Gentiles was a new and extraordinary occurrence. Doubts existed as to the manner in which they should be called. Some thought that they were required “to be circumcised and to keep the law,” (Acts 15:24,) and that otherwise they were shut out from having a share in the covenant. But Paul shews, on the other hand, that by faith they arrive at the blessing, and by faith they must be “in grafted” (<451117>Romans 11:17, 24,) into the family of Abraham. How does he prove this? Because it is said, *In thee shall all nations be blessed*. These words unquestionably recall that all must be blessed in the same manner as Abraham; for he is the model, nay, the rule, to be universally observed. Now, he obtained the blessing by faith, and in the same manner must it be obtained by all.

9. *Faithful Abraham*. This expression is very emphatic. They *are blessed*, not with Abraham as circumcised, nor as entitled to boast of the works of the law, nor as a Hebrew, nor as relying on his own excellence, but with Abraham, who by faith alone obtained the blessing; for no personal quality is here taken into the account, but faith alone. The word Blessing is variously employed in Scripture: but here it signifies Adoption into the inheritance of eternal life.

<b>GALATIANS 3:10-14</b>	
<b>10.</b> For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed <i>is</i> every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.	<b>10.</b> Quictrnque enim ex operibus Legis sunt, sub maledictione sunt. Scripture est enim (Deuteronomy 27:26): Maledictus omnis, qui non permanet in omnibus, quae scripta sunt in libro Legis, ut facial ca.
<b>11.</b> But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, <i>it is</i> evident: for, The just shall live by faith.	<b>11.</b> Quod autem in Lege nemo justificetur apud Deum, patet, quia justus ex fide rivet. ( <sup>&lt;350204&gt;</sup> Habakkuk 2:4 <sup>&lt;450117&gt;</sup> Romans 1:17 <sup>&lt;581038&gt;</sup> Hebrews 10:38.)
<b>12.</b> And the law is not of faith: but, The man that doeth them shall live in them.	<b>12.</b> Lex autern non est ex fide, sed, Qui fecerit haec homo, rivet in ipsis. ( <sup>&lt;031805&gt;</sup> Leviticus 18:5.)
<b>13.</b> Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed <i>is</i> every one that hangeth on a tree:	<b>13.</b> Christus nos redemit a maledictione Legis, factus pro nobis maledictio: (scriptum est enim, maledictus omnis qui pependerit in ligno, ( <sup>&lt;052123&gt;</sup> Deuteronomy 21:23,))
<b>14.</b> That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.	<b>14.</b> Ut in Gentes benedictio Abrabae perveniat per Christum Iesnm; quo promissionem Spiritus accipiaruns per fidem.

**10.** *For as many as are of the works of the law.* The argument is drawn from the contradictory nature of the two schemes; for the same fountain does not yield both hot and cold. The law holds all living men under its curse; and from the law, therefore, it is in vain to expect a blessing. They are declared to be *of the works of the law* who place their trust for salvation in those works; for such modes of expression must always be interpreted by the state of the question. Now, we know that the controversy here relates to righteousness. All who wish to be justified by the works of the law are declared to be liable to the curse. But how does he prove this? The sentence of the law is, that all who have transgressed any part of the law are cursed. Let us now see if there be any living man who fulfils the law. But no such person, it is evident, has been, or ever can be found. All to a man are here condemned. The minor and the conclusion are wanting, for the entire syllogism would run thus: "Whoever has come short in any part of the law is cursed; all are held chargeable with this guilt; therefore all are cursed." This argument of Paul would not stand, if we had sufficient strength to fulfill the law; for there would then be a fatal objection to the minor proposition. Either Paul reasons badly, or it is impossible for men to fulfill the law.

An antagonist might now object: "I admit that all transgressors are accursed; what then? Men will be found who keep the law; for they are free to choose good or evil." But Paul places here beyond controversy, what the Papists at this day hold to be a detestable doctrine, that men are destitute of strength to keep the law. And so he concludes boldly that all are cursed, because all have been commanded to keep the law perfectly; which implies that in the present corruption of our nature the power of keeping it perfectly is wanting. Hence we conclude that the curse which the law pronounces, though, in the phrase of logicians, it is *accidental*, is here perpetual and inseparable from its nature. The blessing which it offers to us is excluded by our depravity, so that the curse alone remains.

**11. *But that no man, is justified by the law.*** He again argues from a comparison of contradictory schemes. "If we are justified by faith, it is not by the law: but we are justified by faith therefore it is not by the law." The minor is proved by a passage from Habakkuk, which is also quoted in the Epistle to the Romans. (<sup><350204></sup>Habakkuk 2:4; <sup><450117></sup>Romans 1:17.) The major is proved by the difference in the methods of justification. The law justifies him who fulfils all its precepts, while faith justifies those who are destitute of the merit of works, and who rely on Christ alone. To be justified by our own merit, and to be justified by the grace of another, are two schemes which cannot be reconciled: one of them must be overturned by the other. Such is the amount of the argument: let us now attend to the separate clauses.

*The just shall live by faith.* As we had occasion to expound this passage where it occurs in the Epistle to the Romans, it will be unnecessary to repeat the exposition of it here. The prophet evidently describes a proud confidence in the flesh as contrasted with true faith. He declares, that "the just shall live;" by which he means, not that they are supported for a short period, and liable to be overwhelmed by an approaching storm; but that they shall continue to live, and that, even amidst the most imminent danger, their life shall be preserved. There is therefore no weight in the scornful reproaches of our adversaries, who allege that the prophet there employs the word Faith in a wider acceptation than Paul does in this passage. By Faith he evidently means the exercise of a calm, steady conscience, relying on God alone; so that Paul's quotation is properly applied.

**12. *And the law is not of faith.*** The law evidently is not contrary to faith; otherwise God would be unlike himself; but we must return to a principle already noticed, that Paul's language is modified by the present aspect of the case. The contradiction between the law and faith lies in the matter of justification. You will more easily unite fire and water, than reconcile these two statements, that men are justified by faith, and that they are justified by the law. "The law is not of faith;" that is, it has a method of justifying a man which is wholly at variance with faith.

*But the man who shall do these things.* The difference lies in this, that man, when he fulfils the law, is reckoned righteous by a legal righteousness, which he proves by a quotation from Moses. (<sup><031805></sup>Leviticus 18:5.) Now, what is the righteousness of faith? He defines it in the Epistle to the Romans,

"If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." (<sup><451009></sup>Romans 10:9.)

And yet it does not follow from this, that faith is inactive, or that it sets believers free from good works. For the present question is not, whether believers ought to keep the law as far as they can, (which is beyond all doubt,) but whether they can obtain righteousness by works, which is impossible. But since God promises life to the doers of the law, why does Paul affirm that they are not righteous? The reply to this objection is easy. There are none righteous by the works of the law, because there are none who do those works. We admit that the doers of the law, if there were any such, are righteous; but since that is a conditional agreement, all are excluded from life, because no man performs that righteousness which he ought. We must bear in memory what I have already stated, that to do the law is not to obey it in part, but to fulfill everything which belongs to righteousness; and all are at the greatest distance from such perfection.

**13. *Christ hath redeemed us.*** The apostle had made all who are under the law subject to the curse; from which arose this great difficulty, that the Jews could not free themselves from the curse of the law. Having stated this difficulty, he meets it, by shewing that Christ hath made us free, which still farther aids his purpose. If we are saved, because we have been freed from the curse of the law, then righteousness is not by the law. He next points out the manner in which we are made free.

*It is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.* Now, Christ hung upon the cross, therefore he fell under that curse. But it is certain that he did not suffer that punishment on his own account. It follows, therefore, either that he was crucified in vain, or that our curse was laid upon him, in order that we might be delivered from it. Now, he does not say that Christ was cursed, but, which is still more, that he was *a curse*, — intimating, that the curse “of all men <sup>fa59</sup> was laid upon him” (<235306> Isaiah 53:6.) If any man think this language harsh, let him be ashamed of the cross of Christ, in the confession of which we glory. It was not unknown to God what death his own Son would die, when he pronounced the law, “He that is hanged is accursed of God.” (<052123> Deuteronomy 21:23.)

But how does it happen, it will be asked, that a beloved Son is cursed by his Father? We reply, there are two things which must be considered, not only in the person of Christ, but even in his human nature. The one is, that he was the unspotted Lamb of God, full of blessing and of grace; the other is, that he placed himself in our room, and thus became a sinner, and subject to the curse, not in himself indeed, but in us, yet in such a manner, that it became necessary for him to occupy our place. He could not cease to be the object of his Father’s love, and yet he endured his wrath. For how could he reconcile the Father to us, if he had incurred his hatred and displeasure? We conclude, that he “did always those things that pleased” (<430829> John 8:29) his Father. Again, how would he have freed us from the wrath of God, if he had not transferred it from us to himself? Thus, “he was wounded for our transgressions,” (<235305> Isaiah 53:5,) and had to deal with God as an angry judge. This is the foolishness of the cross, (<460118> 1 Corinthians 1:18,) and the admiration of angels, (<600112> 1 Peter 1:12,) which not only exceeds, but swallows up, all the wisdom of the world.

**14. *That the blessing of Abraham.*** Having said that “Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law” he now applies that statement more closely to his purpose. The promised blessing of Abraham is founded on this, and flows from it to the Gentiles. If the Jews must be



delivered from the law, in order to become the heirs of Abraham, what shall hinder the Gentiles from obtaining the same benefit? And if that blessing is found in Christ alone, it is faith in Christ which alone brings it into our possession.

*The promise of the Spirit* appears to me to mean, agreeably to a Hebrew idiom, a spiritual promise. Although that promise relates to the New Testament, "I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh," (<sup><290228></sup>Joel 2:28,) yet, in this passage, Paul refers to another subject. The spirit is here contrasted with all outward things, not with ceremonies merely, but with lineal descent, so as to leave no room for diversity of rank. From the nature of the promise, he proves that Jews differ nothing from Gentiles; because, if it is spiritual, it is received by faith alone.

<b>GALATIANS 3:15-18</b>	
<b>15.</b> Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; Though <i>it be</i> but a man's covenant, yet <i>if it be</i> confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto.	<b>15.</b> Fratres, (secundum hominem dico) Hominis licet pactum, tamen si sit comprobatum, nemo rejicit aut addit aliquid.
<b>16.</b> Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ.	<b>16.</b> Porro Abrahae dictae sunt promissiones, et semini ejus. Non dicit, Et seminibus, tanquam Deuteronomy multis, sed tanquam Deuteronomy uno, Et semini tuo, qui est Christus.
<b>17.</b> And this I say, <i>that</i> the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect.	<b>17.</b> Hoc autem dico: pactum ante comprobatum a Deo erga Christum, Lex, quae post annos quadringentos et triginta coepit, non facit irritum, ut abroget Promissionem.
<b>18.</b> For if the inheritance <i>be</i> of the law, <i>it is</i> no more of promise: but God gave <i>it</i> to Abraham by promise.	<b>18.</b> Nam si ex Lege haereditas, non jam ex Promissione; atqui Abrahae per Promissionem donavit Deus.

**15.** *I speak after the manner of men.* By this expression he intended to put them to the blush. It is highly disgraceful and base that the testimony of God should have less weight with us than that of a mortal man. In demanding that the sacred covenant of God shall receive not less deference than is commonly yielded to ordinary human transactions, he does not place God on a level with men. The immense distance between God and men is still left for their consideration.

*Though it be but a man's covenant.* This is an argument from the less to the greater. Human contracts are admitted on all hands to be binding: how much more what God has

established? The Greek word *διαθηκη*, here used, signifies more frequently, what the Latin versions here render it, (*testamentum*), a *testament*; but sometimes too, a *covenant*, though in this latter sense the plural number is more generally employed. It is of little importance to the present passage, whether you explain it *covenant* or *testament*. The case is different with the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the apostle unquestionably alludes to testaments, (<sup><580916></sup>Hebrews 9:16, 17;) but here I prefer to take it simply for the covenant which God made. The analogy from which the apostle argues, would not apply so strictly to a testament as to a covenant. The apostle appears to reason from human bargains to that solemn covenant into which God entered with Abraham. If human bargains be so firm that they can receive no addition, how much more must this covenant remain inviolable?

**16. *Now to Abraham, and his seed.*** Before pursuing his argument, he introduces an observation about the substance of the covenant, that it rests on Christ alone. But if Christ be the foundation of the bargain, it follows that it is of free grace; and this too is the meaning of the word *promise*. As the law has respect to men and to their works, so the promise has respect to the grace of God and to faith.

*He saith not, And to seeds.* To prove that in this place God speaks of Christ, he calls attention to the singular number as denoting some particular seed. I have often been astonished that Christians, when they saw this passage so perversely tortured by the Jews, did not make a more determined resistance; for all pass it slightly as if it were an undisputed territory. And yet there is much plausibility in their objection. Since the word *seed* is a collective noun, Paul appears to reason inconclusively, when he contends that a single individual is denoted by this word, under which all the descendants of Abraham are comprehended in a passage already quoted, "In multiplying I will multiply thy seed, [*rz* (*zerang*), or °[*rz* (*zargnacha*), as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea-shore." (<sup><012217></sup>Genesis 22:17.) Having, as they imagine, detected the fallacy of the argument, they treat us with haughty triumph.

I am the more surprised that our own writers should have been silent on this head, as we have abundant means of repelling their slander. Among Abraham's own sons a division began, for one of the sons was cut off from the family. "In Isaac shall thy seed be called." (<sup><012112></sup>Genesis 21:12.) Consequently Ishmael is not included in the reckoning. Let us come a step lower. Do the Jews allow that the posterity of Esau are the blessed seed? nay, it will be maintained that their father, though the first-born, was struck off. And how many nations have sprung from the stock of Abraham who have no share in this "calling?" The twelve patriarchs, at length, formed twelve heads, not because they were descended from the line of Abraham, but because they had been appointed by a particular election of God. Since the ten tribes were carried away, (Hosa 9:17,) how many thousands have so degenerated that they no longer hold a name among the seed of Abraham? Lastly, a trial was made of the tribe of Judah, that the real succession to the blessing might be transmitted among a small people. And this had been predicted by Isaiah,

"Though thy people Israel be as the sand of the sea,  
yet a remnant of them shall return." (<sup><231022></sup>Isaiah 10:22.)

Hitherto I have said nothing which the Jews themselves do not acknowledge. Let them answer me then; how comes it that the thirteen tribes sprung from the twelve patriarchs were the seed of Abraham, in preference to Ishmaelites and Edomites? Why do they exclusively glory in that name, and set aside the others as a spurious seed? They will, no doubt, boast that they have obtained it by their own merit; but Scripture, on the contrary, asserts that all depends on the calling of God; for we must constantly return to the privilege conveyed in these words, "In Isaac shall thy seed be called." (<012112>Genesis 21:12.) The uninterrupted succession to this privilege must have been in force until Christ; for, in the person of David, the Lord afterwards brought back by recovery, as we might say, the promise which had been made to Abraham. In proving, therefore, that this prediction applies to a single individual, Paul does not make his argument rest on the use of the singular number. He merely shews that the word *seed* must denote one who was not only descended from Abraham according to the flesh, but had been likewise appointed for this purpose by the calling of God. If the Jews deny this, they will only make themselves ridiculous by their obstinacy.

But as Paul likewise argues from these words, that a covenant had been made in Christ, or to Christ, let us inquire into the force of that expression,

"In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed."  
(<012218>Genesis 22:18.)

The Jews taunt the apostle with making a comparison, as if the seed of Abraham were to be quoted as an example in all disastrous omens and prayers; while, on the contrary, to curse in Sodom or Israel is to employ the name of Sodom or Israel in forms of cursing. This, I own, is sometimes the case, but not always; for to bless one's self in God has quite a different meaning, as the Jews themselves admit. Since, therefore, the phrase is ambiguous, denoting sometimes a cause and sometimes a comparison, wherever, it occurs, it must be explained by the context. We have ascertained, then, that we are all cursed by nature, and that the blessing of Abraham has been promised to all nations. Do all indiscriminately reach it? Certainly not, but those only who are "gathered" (<236608>Isaiah 66:8) to the Messiah; for when, under His government and direction, they are collected into one body, they then become one people. Whoever then, laying disputing aside, shall inquire into the truth, will readily acknowledge that the words here signify not a mere comparison but a cause; and hence it follows that Paul had good ground for saying, that the covenant was made in Christ, or in reference to Christ.

**17.** *The law which was four hundred and thirty years after.* If we listen to Origen and Jerome and all the Papists, there will be little difficulty in refuting this argument. Paul reasons thus: "A promise was given to Abraham four hundred and thirty years before the publication of the law; therefore the law which came after could not disannul the promise; and hence he concludes that ceremonies are not necessary." But it may be objected, the sacraments were given in order to preserve the faith, and why should Paul separate them from the promise? He does so separate them, and proceeds to argue on the matter. The ceremonies themselves are not so much considered by him as something higher, — the effect of justification which was attributed to them by false apostles, and the obligation on the conscience. From ceremonies, accordingly, he takes occasion to discuss the whole subject of faith and works. If

the point in dispute had no connection with obtaining righteousness, with the merit of works, or with ensnaring the conscience, ceremonies would be quite consistent with the promise.

What, then, is meant by this *disannulling* of the promise, against which the apostle contends? The impostors denied that salvation is freely promised to men, and received by faith, and, as we shall presently see, urged the necessity of works in order to merit salvation. I return to Paul's own language. "The law," he says, "is later than the promise, and therefore does not revoke it; for a covenant once sanctioned must remain perpetually binding." I again repeat, if you do not understand that the promise is free, there will be no force in the statement; for the law and the promise are not at variance but on this single point, that the law justifies a man by the merit of works, and the promise bestows righteousness freely. This is made abundantly clear when he calls it a *covenant* founded on Christ.

But here we shall have the Papists to oppose us, for they will find a ready method of evading this argument. "We do not require," they will say, "that the old ceremonies shall be any longer binding; let them be laid out of the question; nevertheless a man is justified by the moral law. For this law, which is as old as the creation of man, went before God's covenant with Abraham; so that Paul's reasoning is either frivolous, or it holds against ceremonies alone." I answer, Paul took into account what was certainly true, that, except by a covenant with God, no reward is due to works. Admitting, then, that the law justifies, yet before the law men could not merit salvation by works, because there was no covenant. All that I am now affirming is granted by the scholastic theologians: for they maintain that works are meritorious of salvation, not by their intrinsic worth, but by the acceptance of God, (to use their own phrase,) and on the ground of a covenant. Consequently, where no divine covenant, no declaration of acceptance is found, — no works will be available for justification: so that Paul's argument is perfectly conclusive. He tells us that God made two covenants with men; one through Abraham, and another through Moses. The former, being founded on Christ, was free; and therefore the law, which came after, could not enable men to obtain salvation otherwise than by grace, for then, "it would make the promise of none effect." That this is the meaning appears clearly from what immediately follows.

**18. *If the inheritance be of the law.*** His opponents might still reply, that nothing was farther from their intention than to weaken or disannul God's covenant. To deprive them of every kind of subterfuge, he comes forward with the assertion, that salvation by the law, and salvation by the promise of God, are wholly inconsistent with each other. Who will dare to explain this as applying to ceremonies alone, while Paul comprehends under it whatever interferes with a free promise? Beyond all doubt, he excludes works of every description. "For," says he to the Romans,

"if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void,  
and the promise made of none effect." (<sup><450414></sup>Romans 4:14.)

Why so? Because salvation would be suspended on the condition of satisfying the law; and so he immediately concludes:

“Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace, in order that the promise might be sure to all the seed.” (<450416>Romans 4:16.)

Let us carefully remember the reason why, in comparing the promise with the law, the establishment of the one overturns the other. The reason is, that the promise has respect to faith, and the law to works. Faith receives what is freely given, but to works a reward is paid. And he immediately adds, *God gave it to Abraham*, not by requiring some sort of compensation on his part, but by free promise; for if you view it as conditional, the word *gave*, (*keca>ristai*,) would be utterly inapplicable.

<b>GALATIANS 3:19-22</b>	
19. Wherefore then <i>serveth</i> the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; <i>and it was</i> ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator.	19. Quid igitur Lex? transgressionum causa adjuncta fuit, donee veniret semen, cui promissum fuerat, ordinata per angelos in manu mediatoris.
20. Now a mediator is not <i>a mediator</i> of one, but God is one.	20. Porro mediator unius non est; Deus autem unus est.
21. <i>Is</i> the law then against the promises of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law.	21. Lexne igitur adversus promissiones Dei? absit; nam si data esset Lex, quae posset vivificare, vere ex Lege esset justitia.
22. But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.	22. Sed conclusit Scriptura omnia sub peccatum, ut promissio ex fide Iesu Christi daretur credentibus.

When we are told that the law has no influence in obtaining justification, various suggestions immediately arise, that it must be either useless, or opposed to God’s covenant, or something of that sort. Nay, it might occur, why should we not say of the law, what Jeremiah says of the New Testament, (<243131>Jeremiah 31:31,) that it was given at a later period, in order to supply the weakness of the former doctrine? Objections of this kind must be answered, if Paul wished to satisfy the Galatians. First, then, he inquires, — what is the use of the law? Having come after the promise, it appears to have been intended to supply its defects; and there was room at least for doubting, whether the promise would have been effectual, if it had not been aided by the law. Let it be observed, that Paul does not speak of the moral law only, but of everything connected with the office held by Moses. That office, which was peculiar to Moses, consisted in laying down a rule of life and ceremonies to be observed in the worship of God, and in afterwards adding promises and threatenings. Many promises, no doubt, relating to the free mercy of God and to Christ, are to be found in his writings; and these promises belong to faith. But this must be viewed as accidental, and

altogether foreign to the inquiry, so far as a comparison is made between the law and the doctrine of grace. Let it be remembered, that the amount of the question is this: When a promise had been made, why did Moses afterwards add that new condition, "If a man do, he shall live in them;" and, "Cursed be he that confirmeth not all the words of this law to do them?" (<031805>Leviticus 18:5; <052726>Deuteronomy 27:26.) Was it to produce something better and more perfect?

19. *Because of transgressions.* The law has manifold uses, but Paul confines himself to that which bears on his present subject. He did not propose to inquire in how many ways the law is of advantage to men. It is necessary to put readers on their guard on this point; for very many, I find, have fallen into the mistake of acknowledging no other advantage belonging to the law, but what is expressed in this passage. Paul himself elsewhere speaks of the precepts of the law as profitable for doctrine and exhortations. (<550316>2 Timothy 3:16.) The definition here given of the use of the law is not complete, and those who refuse to make any other acknowledgment in favor of the law do wrong. Now, what is the import of the phrase, *because of transgressions*? It agrees with the saying of philosophers, that "The law was made for restraining evil-doers," and with the old proverb, "From bad manners have sprung good laws." But Paul's meaning is more extensive than the words may seem to convey. He means that the law was published in order to make known transgressions, and in this way to compel men to acknowledge their guilt. As men naturally are too ready to excuse themselves, so, until they are roused by the law, their consciences are asleep.

"Until the law," says Paul, "sin was in the world:  
but sin is not imputed where there is no law." (<450513>Romans 5:13.)

The law came and roused the sleepers, for this is the true preparation for Christ. "By the law is the knowledge of sin." (<450320>Romans 3:20.) Why?

"That Sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful." (Romans 7:13.)

Thus, "the law was added because of transgressions," in order to reveal their true character, or, as he tells the Romans, that it might make them to abound. (<450520>Romans 5:20.)

This passage has tortured the ingenuity of Origen, but to no purpose. If God summon consciences to his tribunal, that those qualities in their transgression, which would otherwise give them pleasure, may humble them by a conviction of guilt, — if he shake off the listlessness which overwhelmed all dread of his judgment-seat, — if he drag to light; sin, which lurked like a thief in the den of hypocrisy, — what is there in all this that can be reckoned absurd? But it may be objected: "As the law is the rule of a devout and holy life, why is it said to be added 'because of transgressions,' rather than 'because of obedience?'" I answer, however much it may point out true righteousness, yet, owing to the corruption of our nature, its instruction tends only to increase transgressions, until the Spirit of regeneration come, who writes it on the heart; and that Spirit is not given by the law, but is received by faith. This saying of Paul, let the reader remember, is not of a philosophical or political character, but expresses a purpose of the law, with which the world had been always unacquainted.

*Till the seed should come.* If it has respect to *seed*, it must be to that on which the blessing has been pronounced, and therefore it does not interfere with the promise. The word *till*, (*a|criv ou=*), signifies *so long as* the seed is expected: and hence it follows, that it must have been intended to occupy not the highest, but a subordinate rank. It was given in order to rouse men to the expectation of Christ. But was it necessary that it should last only until the coming of Christ? For if so, it follows that it is now abolished. The whole of that administration, I reply, was temporal, and was given for the purpose of preserving among the ancient people an attachment to the faith of Christ. And yet I do not admit that, by the coming of Christ, the whole law was abolished. The apostle did not intend this, but merely that the mode of administration, which for a time had been introduced, must receive its accomplishment in Christ, who is the fulfillment of the promise. <sup>Fa60</sup> But on this subject we shall have occasion to speak more fully afterwards.

*Ordained by angels.* The circumstance, that it was delivered through angels, tends to the commendation of the law. This is declared by Stephen (<sup><440753></sup> Acts 7:53) also, who says, that they had “received the law, (*eijv diataga<v ajgge>lwn*), into the dispositions of angels.” The interpretation given by some, that Moses and Aaron, and the priests, are the angels here meant, is more ingenious than solid. Nor is it wonderful that angels, by whom God bestows on us some of the smallest of his blessings, should have been intrusted also with this office of attending as witnesses at the promulgation of the law.

*In the hand of a Mediator.* *Hand* usually signifies ministration; but as angels were ministers in giving the law, I consider “the hand of the Mediator” to denote the highest rank of service. The Mediator was at the head of the embassy, and angels were united with him as his companions. Some apply this expression to Moses, as marking a comparison between Moses and Christ; but I agree rather with the ancient expositors, who apply it to Christ himself. <sup>Fa61</sup> This view, it will be found, agrees better with the context, though I differ from the ancients likewise as to the meaning of the word. *Mediator* does not, as they imagine, signify here one who makes reconciliation, which it does in these words,

“There is one Mediator between God and men,  
the man Christ Jesus,” (<sup><540205></sup> 1 Timothy 2:5)

— but an ambassador employed in promulgating a law.

We are thus to understand, that, since the beginning of the world, God has held no intercourse with men, but through the agency of his eternal Wisdom or Son. Hence Peter says, that the holy prophets spake by the “Spirit of Christ,” (1 Peter 1:11,) and Paul makes him the leader of the people in the wilderness. (<sup><461004></sup> 1 Corinthians 10:4.) And certainly the Angel who appeared to Moses, (<sup><020302></sup> Exodus 3:2,) can be no other person; for he claims to himself the peculiar and essential name of God, which is never applied to creatures. As he is the Mediator of reconciliation, by whom we are accepted of God, — the Mediator of intercession, who opens up for us a way to “call on the Father,” (<sup><600117></sup> 1 Peter 1:17,) — so he has always been the Mediator of all doctrine, because by him God has always revealed himself to men. And this he intended to state expressly, for the purpose of informing the Galatians, that he who is the foundation of the covenant of grace, held also the highest rank in the giving of the law.

**20. *Now, a mediator is not a mediator of one.*** Some are disposed to philosophize on this expression, and would make Paul's meaning to be, that the twofold nature of Christ is not one in essence. But that Paul is here speaking of the contracting parties, no man of sound judgment entertains a doubt. And so they commonly expound it, that there is no room for a Mediator, unless when one of the parties has a matter to transact with the other. But why that statement should have been introduced they leave undetermined, though the passage manifestly deserves the most careful attention. There may, perhaps, be an Anticipation (*pro>lhyiv*) of some wicked thought that might arise about a change of the divine purpose. Some one might say, "As men, when they change their mind about their covenants, are wont to retract them, so has it happened with the covenants of God." If you take this to be the meaning, then, in the former clause, Paul would acknowledge that men, who occupy one side of this contract, are unsteady and changeable, while God nevertheless remains the same, is consistent with himself, and partakes not of the unsteadiness of men.

But when I take a closer view of the whole subject, I rather think that it marks a difference between Jews and Gentiles. Christ is not the Mediator of one, because, in respect of outward character, there is a diversity of condition among those with whom, through his mediation, God enters into covenant. But Paul asserts that we have no right to judge in this manner of the covenant of God, as if it contradicted itself, or varied according to the diversities of men. The words are now clear. As Christ formerly reconciled God to the Jews in making a covenant, so now he is the Mediator of the Gentiles. The Jews differ widely from the Gentiles; for circumcision and ceremonies have erected "the middle wall of partition between them." (<sup><490214></sup>Ephesians 2:14.) They were "nigh" to God, (<sup><490213></sup>Ephesians 2:13,) while the Gentiles were "afar off;" but still God is consistent with himself. This becomes evident, when Christ brings those who formerly differed among themselves to one God, and makes them unite in one body. *God is one*, because he always continues to be like himself, and, with unvarying regularity, holds fixed and unalterable the purpose which he has once made.<sup>fa62</sup>

**21. *Is the law then against the promises of God?*** The certainty and steadiness of the divine purpose being admitted, we are bound equally to conclude that its results are not contrary to each other. Still there was a difficulty to be resolved, arising from the apparent contradiction between the Law and the covenant of grace. This is, perhaps, an exclamation. Dreading no farther contradiction, now that the point is settled, Paul concludes, that the former arguments have placed it beyond a doubt, and exclaims: "Who will now dare to imagine a disagreement between the law and the promises?" And yet this does not prevent Paul from proceeding to remove the difficulties that might still arise.

Before answering the question, he expresses, in his usual manner, a high disdain of such folly; thus intimating the strong abhorrence with which pious men must regard whatever brings reproach on the Divine character. But another instance of high address, which claims our notice, is found in this turn of expression. He charges his adversaries with the offense of making God contradict himself. For from him the Law and the promises have evidently proceeded: whoever then alleges any contradiction between them blasphemes against God: but they do contradict each other, if the Law justifies. Thus does Paul most



dexterously retort upon his adversaries the charge which they falsely and calumniously brought against him.

*For if there had been a law given.* The reply is (what is called) indirect, and does not plainly assert an agreement between the law and the promises, but contains all that is necessary to remove the contradiction. At first sight, you would say that this sentence departs from the context, and has nothing to do with the solution of the question; but this is not the case. The law would be opposed to the promises, if it had the power of justifying; for there would be two opposite methods of justifying a man, two separate roads towards the attainment of righteousness. But Paul refuses to the law such a power; so that the contradiction is removed. I would admit, says he, that righteousness is obtained by the law, if salvation were found in it. But what?

**22. *The Scripture hath concluded.*** By the word Scripture is chiefly intended the law itself. It "hath concluded all under sin," and therefore, instead of giving, it takes away righteousness from all. The reasoning is most powerful. "You seek righteousness in the law: but the law itself, with the whole of Scripture, leaves nothing to men but condemnation; for all men, with their works, are pronounced to be unrighteous: who then shall live by the law?" He alludes to these words,

"He who shall do these things, shall live in them." (Leviticus 18:5.)

Shut out by it, says he, from life through guilt, in vain should we seek salvation by the law.  
 – The word translated *all* (*ta < pa > nta*) signifies *all things*, and conveys more than if he had said *all men*; for it embraces not only men, but every thing which they possess or can accomplish.

*That the promise by faith.* There is no remedy but to throw away the righteousness of works, and betake ourselves to the faith of Christ. The result is certain. If works come into judgment, we are all condemned; therefore we obtain, by the faith of Christ, a free righteousness. This sentence is full of the highest consolation. It tells us that, wherever we hear ourselves condemned in Scripture, there is help provided for us in Christ, if we betake ourselves to him. We are lost, though God were silent: why then does he so often pronounce that we are lost? It is that we may not perish by everlasting destruction, but, struck and confounded by such a dreadful sentence, may by faith seek Christ, through whom we "pass from death into life." (<620314>1 John 3:14.) By a figure of speech, (*mctwnumi > a*), in which the thing containing is put for the thing contained, the *promise* denotes that which is promised.

<b>GALATIANS 3:23-29</b>	
<b>23.</b> But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed.	<b>23.</b> Antequam autem veniret fides, sub Lege custodiebamur, conclusi sub fidem, quae revelanda erat.
<b>24.</b> Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster <i>to bring us</i> unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith.	<b>24.</b> Itaque Lex paedagogus noster fuit in Christum, ut ex fide justificaremur.
<b>25.</b> But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster.	<b>25.</b> Adveniente autem fide, non amplius sub paedagogo sumus.
<b>26.</b> For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.	<b>26.</b> Nam omnes filii Dei estis per fidem in Christo Iesu.
<b>27.</b> For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.	<b>27.</b> Siquidem quicumque in Christum baptizati estis, Christum induistis.
<b>28.</b> There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.	<b>28.</b> Non est Iudaeus neque Graecus, non est servus neque liber, non est masculus neque femina; omnes enim vos unus estis in Christo Iesu.
<b>29.</b> And if ye <i>be</i> Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.	<b>29.</b> Si autem vos Christi, ergo semen Abrahae estis, et secundum promissionem haeredes.

**23.** *Before faith came.* The question proposed is now more fully defined. He explains at great length the use of the law, and the reason why it was temporal; for otherwise it would have appeared to be always unreasonable that a law should be delivered to the Jews, from which the Gentiles were excluded. If there be but one church consisting of Jews and Gentiles, why is there a diversity in its government? Whence is this new liberty derived, and on what authority does it rest, since the fathers were under subjection to the law? He therefore informs us, that the distinction is such as not to interrupt the union and harmony of the church.

We must again remind the reader that Paul does not treat exclusively of ceremonies, or of the moral law, but embraces the whole economy by which the Lord governed his people under the Old Testament. It became a subject of dispute whether the form of government instituted by Moses had any influence in obtaining righteousness. Paul compares this law first to a *prison*, and next to a *schoolmaster*. Such was the nature of the law, as both comparisons plainly show, that it could not have been in force beyond a certain time.

*Faith* denotes the full revelation of those things which, during the darkness of the shadows of the law, were dimly seen; for he does not intend to say that the fathers, who lived under the law, did not possess faith. The faith of Abraham has already come under our notice, and other instances are quoted by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. (Hebrews 11.) The doctrine of faith, in short, is attested by Moses and all the prophets: but, as faith was not then clearly manifested, so the *time of faith* is an appellation here given, not in an absolute, but in a comparative sense, to the time of the New Testament. That this was his meaning is evident from what he immediately adds, that they were *shut up under the faith which should afterwards be revealed*; for this implies that those who were under the custody of the law were partakers of the same faith. The law did not restrain them from faith; but, that they might not wander from the fold of faith, it kept possession of themselves. There is an elegant allusion, too, to what he had formerly said, that “the scripture hath concluded all under sin.” They were besieged on every hand by the curse, but this siege was counteracted by an imprisonment which protected them from the curse; so that the imprisonment by the law is here proved to have been highly generous in its character.

Faith was not yet *revealed*, not because the fathers wanted light, but because they had less light than we have. The ceremonies might be said to shadow out an absent Christ, but to us he is represented as actually present, and thus while they had the mirror, we have the substance. Whatever might be the amount of darkness under the law, the fathers were not ignorant of the road in which they ought to walk. Though the dawn is not equal to the splendor of noon, yet, as it is sufficient to direct a journey, travelers do not wait till the sun is fully risen. Their portion of light resembled the dawn, which was enough to preserve them from all error, and guide them to everlasting blessedness.

**24. *Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster.*** This is the second comparison, which still more clearly expresses Paul’s design. A schoolmaster is not appointed for the whole life, but only for childhood, as the etymology of the Greek word *paidagwgo*>*v* implies. <sup>Fa63</sup> Besides, in training a child, the object is to prepare him, by the instructions of childhood, for maturer years. The comparison applies in both respects to the law, for its authority was limited to a particular age, and its whole object was to prepare its scholars in such a manner, that, when its elementary instructions were closed, they might make progress worthy of manhood. And so he adds, that it was our schoolmaster (*eijv Cristo*<*n*) *unto Christ*. The grammarian, when he has trained a boy, delivers him into the hands of another, who conducts him through the higher branches of a finished education. In like manner, the law was the grammar of theology, which, after carrying its scholars a short way, handed them over to *faith* to be completed. Thus, Paul compares the Jews to children, and us to advanced youth.

But a question arises, what was the instruction or education of this schoolmaster? First, the law, by displaying the justice of God, convinced them that in themselves they were unrighteous; for in the commandments of God, as in a mirror, they might see how far they were distant from true righteousness. They were thus reminded that righteousness must be sought in some other quarter. The promises of the law served the same purpose, and might lead to such reflections as these: “If you cannot obtain life by works but by fulfilling the law, some new and different method must be sought. Your weakness will never allow you to ascend so high; nay, though you desire and strive ever so much, you will fall far

short of the object." The threatenings, on the other hand, pressed and entreated them to seek refuge from the wrath and curse of God, and gave them no rest till they were constrained to seek the grace of Christ.

Such too, was the tendency of all the ceremonies; for what end did sacrifices and washings serve but to keep the mind continually fixed on pollution and condemnation? When a man's uncleanness is placed before his eyes, when the unoffending animal is held forth as the image of his own death, how can he indulge in sleep? How can he but be roused to the earnest cry for deliverance? Beyond all doubt, ceremonies accomplished their object, not merely by alarming and humbling the conscience, but by exciting them to the faith of the coming Redeemer. In the imposing services of the Mosaic ritual, every thing that was presented to the eye bore an impress of Christ. The law, in short, was nothing else than an immense variety of exercises, in which the worshippers were led by the hand to Christ.

*That we might be justified by faith.* He has already said that the law is not perfect, when he compared it to the training of childhood; but it would make men perfect if it bestowed upon them righteousness. What remains but that faith shall take its place? And so it does, when we, who are destitute of a righteousness of our own, are clothed by it with the righteousness of Christ. Thus is the saying accomplished, "he hath filled the hungry with good things." (<sup><420153></sup>Luke 1:53.)

**25. *But after that faith is come.*** This phrase has been already considered. It denotes the brighter revelation of grace after that "the vail of the temple was rent in twain," (<sup><402751></sup>Matthew 27:51,) which, we know, was effected by the manifestation of Christ. He affirms that, under the reign of Christ, there is no longer any childhood which needs to be placed under a schoolmaster, and that, consequently, the law has resigned its office, — which is another application of the comparison. There were two things which he had undertaken to prove, — that the law is a preparation for Christ, and that it is temporal. But here the question is again put, Is the law so abolished that we have nothing to do with it? I answer, the law, so far as it is a rule of life, a bridle to keep us in the fear of the Lord, a spur to correct the sluggishness of our flesh, — so far, in short, as it is

*"profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that believers may be instructed in every good work,"* (<sup><550316></sup>2 Timothy 3:16, 17)

— is as much in force as ever, and remains untouched.

In what respect, then, is it abolished? Paul, we have said, looks at the law as possessing certain qualities, and those qualities we shall enumerate. It annexes to works a reward and a punishment; that is, it promises life to those who keep it, and curses all transgressors. Meanwhile, it requires from man the highest perfection and most exact obedience. It makes no abatement, gives no pardon, but calls to a severe reckoning the smallest offenses. It does not openly exhibit Christ and his grace, but points him out at a distance, and only when hidden by the covering of ceremonies. All such qualities of the law, Paul tells us, are abolished; so that the office of Moses is now at an end, so far as it differs in outward aspect from a covenant of grace.

26. *For ye are all the children of God.* It would be unjust, and in the highest degree unreasonable, that the law should hold believers in perpetual slavery. This is proved by the additional argument, that they are the children of God. It would not be enough to say that we are no longer children, unless it were added that we are freemen; for in slaves age makes no alteration. The fact of their being the children of God proves their freedom. How? *By faith in Christ Jesus*; for

“as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name.”  
(<sup><430112></sup>John 1:12.)

Since, then, by faith we have obtained adoption, by faith likewise we have obtained our freedom.

27. *As many of you as have been baptized.* The greater and loftier the privilege is of being the children of God, the farther is it removed from our senses, and the more difficult to obtain belief. He therefore explains, in a few words, what is implied in our being united, or rather, made one with the Son of God; so as to remove all doubt, that what belongs to him is communicated to us. He employs the metaphor of a garment, when he says that the Galatians *have put on Christ*; but he means that they are so closely united to him, that, in the presence of God, they bear the name and character of Christ, and are viewed in him rather than in themselves. This metaphor or similitude, taken from garments, occurs frequently, and has been treated by us in other places.

But the argument, that, because they have been baptized, they have put on Christ, appears weak; for how far is baptism from being efficacious in all? Is it reasonable that the grace of the Holy Spirit should be so closely linked to an external symbol? Does not the uniform doctrine of Scripture, as well as experience, appear to confute this statement? I answer, it is customary with Paul to treat of the sacraments in two points of view. When he is dealing with hypocrites, in whom the mere symbol awakens pride, he then proclaims loudly the emptiness and worthlessness of the outward symbol, and denounces, in strong terms, their foolish confidence. In such cases he contemplates not the ordinance of God, but the corruption of wicked men. When, on the other hand, he addresses believers, who make a proper use of the symbols, he then views them in connection with the truth — which they represent. In this case, he makes no boast of any false splendor as belonging to the sacraments, but calls our attention to the actual fact represented by the outward ceremony. Thus, agreeably to the Divine appointment, the truth comes to be associated with the symbols.

But perhaps some person will ask, Is it then possible that, through the fault of men, a sacrament shall cease to bear a figurative meaning? The reply is easy. Though wicked men may derive no advantage from the sacraments, they still retain undiminished their nature and force. The sacraments present, both to good and to bad men, the grace of God. No falsehood attaches to the promises which they exhibit of the grace of the Holy Spirit. Believers receive what is offered; and if wicked men, by rejecting it, render the offer unprofitable to themselves, their conduct cannot destroy the faithfulness of God, or the true meaning of the sacrament. <sup>Fa64</sup> With strict propriety, then, does Paul, in addressing

believers, say, that when they were baptized, they “put on Christ;” just as, in the Epistle to the Romans, he says,

“that we have been planted together into his death,  
so as to be also partakers of his resurrection.”  
(<sup><450605></sup>Romans 6:5.)

In this way, the symbol and the Divine operation are kept distinct, and yet the meaning of the sacraments is manifest; so that they cannot be regarded as empty and trivial exhibitions; and we are reminded with what base ingratitude they are chargeable, who, by abusing the precious ordinances of God, not only render them unprofitable to themselves, but turn them to their own destruction!

**28. *There is neither Jew nor Greek.*** The meaning is, that there is no distinction of persons here, and therefore it is of no consequence to what nation or condition any one may belong: nor is circumcision any more regarded than sex or civil rank. And why? Because Christ makes them all one. Whatever may have been their former differences, Christ alone is able to unite them all. *Ye are one*: the distinction is now removed. The apostle’s object is to shew that the grace of adoption, and the hope of salvation, do not depend on the law, but are contained in Christ alone, who therefore is all. Greek is here put, as usual, for Gentile, and one department for the whole class.

**29. *Then are ye Abraham’s seed.*** This is not intended to convey the idea, that to be a child of Abraham is better than to be a member of Christ, — but to repress the pride of the Jews, who gloried in their privilege, as if they alone were the people of God. They reckoned no distinction higher than to belong to the race of Abraham; and this very distinction he makes to be common to all who believe in Christ. The conclusion rests on this argument, that Christ is the blessed seed, in whom, as we have said, all the children of Abraham are united. He proves this by the universal offer of the inheritance to them all, from which it follows, that the promise includes them among the children. It deserves notice, that, wherever faith is mentioned, it is always his relation to the promise.

## CHAPTER 4

GALATIANS 4:1-5	
1. Now I say, <i>That</i> the heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all;	1. Dico autem: quamdiu haeres puer est, nihil differt a servo, quum tamen sit dominus omnium;
2. But is under tutors and governors, until the time appointed of the father.	2. Sed sub tutoribus et curatoribus est, usque ad tempus a patre definitum.
3. Even so we, when we were children, were in bondage under the elements of the world:	3. Sic et nos quum essemus pueri, sub elementis mundi in servitute eramus.
4. But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law,	4. Quando autem venit plenitudo temporis, misit Deus Filium suum, factum ex muliere, redactum sub Legem;
5. To redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.	5. Ut eos, qui sub Lege erant, redimerem, ut adoptionem reciperemus.

1. *Now I say.* Whoever made the division into chapters has improperly separated this paragraph from the preceding, as it is nothing else than the concluding section, ([ejpxergasi>a](#).) in which Paul explains and illustrates the difference that exists between us and the ancient people. He does so by introducing a third comparison, drawn from the relation which a person under age bears to his tutor. The young man, though he is free, *though he is lord of all* his father's family, still resembles a slave; for he is under the government of tutors. <sup>Fa65</sup> But the period of guardianship lasts only "until the time appointed by the father" after which he enjoys his freedom. In this respect the fathers under the Old Testament, being the sons of God, were free; but they were not in possession of freedom, while the law held the place of their tutor, and kept them under its yoke. That slavery of the law lasted as long as it pleased God, who put an end to it at the coming of Christ. Lawyers enumerate various methods by which the tutelage or guardianship is brought to a close; but of all these methods, the only one adapted to this comparison is that which Paul has selected, "the appointment of the father."

Let us now examine the separate clauses. Some apply the comparison in a different manner to the case of any man whatever, whereas Paul is speaking of two nations. What they say, I acknowledge, is true; but it has nothing to do with the present passage. The elect, though they are the children of God from the womb, yet, until by faith they come to

the possession of freedom, remain like slaves under the law; but, from the time that they have known Christ, they no longer require this kind of tutelage. Granting all this, I deny that Paul here treats of individuals, or draws a distinction between the time of unbelief and the calling by faith. The matters in dispute were these. Since the church of God is one, how comes it that our condition is different from that of the Israelites? Since we are free by faith, how comes it that they, who had faith in common with us, were not partakers with us of the same freedom? Since we are all equally the children of God, how comes it that we at this day are exempt from a yoke which they were forced to bear? On these points the controversy turned, and not on the manner in which the law reigns over each of us before we are freed by faith from its slavery. Let this point be first of all settled, that Paul here compares the Israelitish church, which existed under the Old Testament, with the Christian church, that thus we may perceive in what points we agree and in what we differ. This comparison furnishes most abundant and most profitable instruction.

First, we learn from it that our hope at the present day, and that of the fathers under the Old Testament, have been directed to the same inheritance; for they were partakers of the same adoption. According to the dreams of some fanatics, and of Servetus among others, the fathers were divinely elected for the sole purpose of prefiguring to us a people of God. Paul, on the other hand, contends that they were elected in order to be together with us the children of God, and particularly attests that to them, not less than to us, belonged the spiritual blessing promised to Abraham.

Secondly, we learn that, notwithstanding their outward slavery, their consciences were still free. The obligation to keep the law did not hinder Moses and Daniel, all the pious kings, priests, and prophets, and the whole company of believers, from being free in spirit. They bore the yoke of the law upon their shoulders, but with a free spirit they worshipped God. More particularly, having been instructed concerning the free pardon of sin, their consciences were delivered from the tyranny of sin and death. Hence we ought to conclude that they held the same doctrine, were joined with us in the true unity of faith, placed reliance on the one Mediator, called on God as their Father, and were led by the same Spirit. All this leads to the conclusion, that the difference between us and the ancient fathers lies in accidents, not in substance. In all the leading characters of the Testament or Covenant we agree: the ceremonies and form of government, in which we differ, are mere additions. Besides, that period was the infancy of the church; but now that Christ is come, the church has arrived at the estate of manhood.

The meaning of Paul's words is clear, but has he not some appearance of contradicting himself? In the Epistle to the Ephesians he exhorts us to make daily progress

“till we come to a perfect man, to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ.”  
(<sup><490413></sup>Ephesians 4:13.)

In the first Epistle to the Corinthians he says, (<sup><460302></sup>1 Corinthians 3:2,)

“I have fed you with milk, and not with meat: for hitherto ye were not able to bear it, neither yet now are ye able;”



and shortly after this he compares the Galatians to children. (<480419>Galatians 4:19) In those passages, I reply, the apostle speaks of particular men, and of their faith as individuals; but here he speaks generally of two bodies without regard to persons. This reply will assist us in resolving a much greater difficulty. When we look at the matchless faith of Abraham, and the vast intelligence of the holy prophets, with what effrontery shall we dare to talk of such men as our inferiors? Were not they rather the heroes, and we the children? To say nothing of ourselves, who among the Galatians would have been found equal to any of those men?

But here, as I have already said, the apostle describes not particular persons, but the universal condition of both nations. Some men were endowed with extraordinary gifts; but they were few, and the whole body did not share with them. Besides, though they had been numerous, we must inquire not what they inwardly were, but what was that kind or government under which God had placed them; and that was manifestly a school, [paidagwgi](#)>a, a system of instruction for children. And what are we now? God has broken those chains, governs his church in a more indulgent manner, and lays not upon us such severe restraint. At the same time, we may remark in passing, that whatever amount of knowledge they might attain partook of the nature of the period; for a dark cloud continually rested on the revelation which they enjoyed. And hence that saying of our Savior,

“Blessed are the eyes which see the things that ye see: for I tell you that many prophets and kings have desired to see those things which ye see, and have not seen them; and to hear those things which ye hear, and have not heard them.” (Luke 10: 23, 24.)

We now understand in what respect we are preferred to those who were greatly our superiors; for the statements are not applied to persons, but relate entirely to the economy of the Divine administration.

This passage will prove a most powerful battery for destroying the pageantry of ceremonies, which constitutes the entire splendor of the Papal system. For what else is it that dazzles the eyes of simple people, so as to lead them to regard the dominion of the Pope, if not with admiration, at least with some degree of reverence, but the magnificent army of ceremonies, rites, gesticulations, and equipage of every description, contrived for the express purpose of amazing the ignorant? From this passage it appears that they are false disguises, by which the true beauty of the church is impaired. I do not now speak of greater and more frightful corruptions, such as, that they hold them out for divine worship, imagine them to possess the power of meriting salvation, and enforce with more rigid severity the observation of those trifles than the whole law of God. I only advert to the specious pretext under which our modern contrivers apologize for such a multitude of abominations. What though they object that the ignorance of the multitude prevails to a greater extent than it formerly did among the Israelites, and that many assistances are therefore required? They will never be able in this way to prove that the people must be placed under the discipline or a school similar to what existed among the people of Israel; for I shall always meet them with the declaration, that the appointment of God is totally different.

If they plead expediency, I ask, are they better judges of what is expedient than God himself? Let us entertain the firm conviction that the highest advantage, as well as the highest propriety, will be found in whatever God has determined. In aiding the ignorant, we must employ not those methods which the fancy of men may have been pleased to contrive, but those which had been fixed by God himself, who unquestionably has left out nothing that was fitted to assist their weakness. Let this shield suffice for repelling any objections: "God has judged otherwise, and his purpose supplies to us the place of all arguments; unless it be supposed that men are capable of devising better aids than those which God had provided, and which he afterwards threw aside as useless." Let it be carefully observed, Paul does not merely say that the yoke which had been laid upon the Jews is removed from us, but expressly lays down a distinction in the government which God has commanded to be observed. I acknowledge that we are now at liberty as to all outward matters, but only on the condition that the church shall not be burdened with a multitude of ceremonies, nor Christianity confounded with Judaism. The reason of this we shall afterwards consider in the proper place.

3. *Under the elements of the world.* *Elements* may either mean, literally, outward and bodily things, or, metaphorically, rudiments. I prefer the latter interpretation. But why does he say that those things which had a spiritual signification were *of the world*? We did not, he says, enjoy the truth in a simple form, but involved in earthly figures; and consequently, what was outward must have been "of the world," though there was concealed under it a heavenly mystery.

4. *When the fullness of the time was come.* He proceeds with the comparison which he had adduced, and applies to his purpose the expression which has already occurred, "the time appointed by the Father," — but still shewing that the time which had been ordained by the providence of God was proper and seasonable. That season is the most fit, and that mode of acting is the most proper, which the providence of God directs. At what time it was expedient that the Son of God should be revealed to the world, it belonged to God alone to judge and determine. This consideration ought to restrain all curiosity. Let no man presume to be dissatisfied with the secret purpose of God, and raise a dispute why Christ did not appear sooner. If the reader desires more full information on this subject, he may consult what I have written on the conclusion of the Epistle to the Romans.

*God sent forth his Son.* These few words contain much instruction. The Son, who was sent, must have existed before he was sent; and this proves his eternal Godhead. Christ therefore is the Son of God, sent from heaven. Yet this same person was *made of a woman*, because he assumed our nature, which shews that he has two natures. Some copies read *natum* instead of *filium*; but the latter reading is more generally followed, and, in my opinion, is preferable. But the language was also expressly intended to distinguish Christ from other men, as having been formed of the substance of his mother, and not by ordinary generation. In any other sense, it would have been trifling, and foreign to the subject. The word *woman* is here put generally for the female sex.

*Subjected under the law.* The literal rendering is, *Made under the law*; but in my version I have preferred another word, which expresses more plainly the fact that he was placed in

subjection to the law. Christ the Son of God, who might have claimed to be exempt from every kind of subjection, became subject to the law. Why? He did so in our room, that he might obtain freedom for us. A man who was free, by constituting himself a surety, redeems a slave: by putting on himself the chains, he takes them off from the other. So Christ chose to become liable to keep the law, that exemption from it might be obtained for us; otherwise it would have been to no purpose that he should come under the yoke of the law, for it certainly was not on his own account that he did so.

*To redeem them that were under the law.* <sup>Fa66</sup> We must here observe, the exemption from the law which Christ has procured for us does not imply that we no longer owe any obedience to the doctrine of the law, and may do whatever we please; for the law is the everlasting rule of a good and holy life. But Paul speaks of the law with all its appendages. From subjection to that law we are redeemed, because it is no longer what it once was. "The vail being rent," (<sup><402751></sup>Matthew 27:51,) freedom is openly proclaimed, and this is what he immediately adds.

5. *That we might receive the adoption.* The fathers, under the Old Testament, were certain of their adoption, but did not so fully as yet enjoy their privilege. *Adoption*, like the phrase, "the redemption of our body," (<sup><450823></sup>Romans 8:23,) is here put for actual possession. As, at the last day, we receive the fruit of our redemption, so now we receive the fruit of adoption, of which the holy fathers did not partake before the coming of Christ; and therefore those who now burden the church with an excess of ceremonies, defraud her of the just right of adoption.

<b>GALATIANS 4:6-11</b>	
6. And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.	6. Quoniam autem estis filii, misit Deus Spiritum Filii sui in corda vestra, clamantem, Abba, Pater.
7. Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ.	7. Itaque non amplius es servus, sed filius; si autem filius, etiam haeres Dei per Christum.
8. Howbeit then, when ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods.	8. At tunc quum nondum cognoveratis Deum, serviebatis eis qui natura non sunt dii.
9. But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?	9. Nunc autem postquam cognovistis Deum, vel potius cogniti fuistis a Deo; quomodo convertimini rursus ad infirma et egena elementa, quibus rursus Deuteronomy integro servire vultis?
10. Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years.	10. Dies observatis, et menses, et tempora, et annos.
11. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain.	11. Timeo Deuteronomy vobis, ne forte in vobis frustra laboraverim.

6. *And because ye are sons.* The adoption which he had mentioned, is proved to belong to the Galatians by the following argument. This adoption must have preceded the testimony of adoption given by the Holy Spirit; but the effect is the sign of the cause. In venturing, he says, to call God your Father, you have the advice and direction of the Spirit of Christ; therefore it is certain that you are the sons of God. This agrees with what is elsewhere taught by him, that the Spirit is the earnest and pledge of our adoption, and gives to us a well-founded belief that God regards us with a father's love.

"Who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts." (<470122>2 Corinthians 1:22.)

"Now he that hath wrought us for the self-same thing is God, who also hath given unto us the earnest of the Spirit."  
(<470505>2 Corinthians 5:5.)

But it will be objected, do not wicked men, too, carry their rashness so far as to proclaim that God is their Father? Do they not frequently, with greater confidence than others, utter their false boasts? I reply, Paul's language does not relate to idle boasting, or to the proud opinion of himself which any man may entertain, but to the testimony of a pious conscience which accompanies the new birth. This argument can have no weight but in the case of believers, for godly men have no experience of this certainty; as our Lord himself declares.

“The Spirit of truth,” says he, “whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him.”  
 (<431417>John 14:17.)

This is implied in Paul’s words, *God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts*. It is not what the persons themselves, in the foolish judgment of the flesh, may venture to believe, but what God declares in their hearts by his Spirit. *The Spirit of his Son* is a title more strictly adapted to the present occasion than any other that could have been employed. We are the sons of God, because we have received the same Spirit as his only Son.

Let it be observed, that Paul ascribes this universally to all Christians; for where this pledge of the Divine love towards us is wanting, there is assuredly no faith. Hence it is evident what sort of Christianity belongs to Popery, since any man who says, that he has the Spirit of God, is charged by them with impious presumption. Neither the Spirit of God, nor certainty, belongs to their notion of faith. This single tenet held by them is a remarkable proof that, in all the schools of the Papists, the devil, the father of unbelief, reigns. I acknowledge, indeed, that the scholastic divines, when they enjoin upon the consciences of men the agitation of perpetual doubt, are in perfect agreement with what the natural feelings of mankind would dictate. It is the more necessary to fix in our minds this doctrine of Paul, that no man is a Christian who has not learned, by the teaching of the Holy Spirit, to call God his Father.

*Crying*. This participle, I think, is used in order to express greater boldness. Hesitation does not allow us to speak freely, but keeps the mouth nearly shut, while the half-broken words can hardly escape from a stammering tongue. “Crying,” on the other hand, expresses firmness and unwavering confidence.

“For we have not received again the spirit of bondage to fear,  
 but of freedom to full confidence.” (<450815>Romans 8:15.)

*Abba, Father*. The meaning of these words, I have no doubt, is, that calling upon God is common to all languages. It is a fact which bears directly on the present subject, that the name *Father* is given to God both by the Hebrews and by the Greeks; as had been predicted by Isaiah,

“Every tongue shall make confession to my name.”  
 (<234523>Isaiah 45:23.)

The whole of this subject is handled by the apostle at greater length in his Epistle to the Romans. I judge it unnecessary to repeat here observations which I have already made in the exposition of that Epistle, and which the reader may consult. Since, therefore, Gentiles are reckoned among the sons of God, it is evident that adoption comes not by the merit of the law, but by the grace of faith.

7. *Wherefore thou art no more a servant*. In the Christian Church slavery no longer exists, but the condition of the children is free. In what respect the fathers under the law were slaves, we have already inquired; for their freedom was not yet revealed, but was hidden under the coverings and yoke of the law. Our attention is again directed to the distinction between the Old and New Testaments. The ancients were also sons of God, and heirs through Christ, but

we hold the same character in a different manner; for we have Christ present with us, and in that manner enjoy his blessings.

8. *But when ye as yet knew not God.* This is not intended as an additional argument; and indeed he had already proved his point so fully, that no doubt remained, and the rebuke which was now to be administered could not be evaded. His object is to make their fall appear more criminal, by comparing it with past events. It is not wonderful, he says, that formerly *ye did service to them which by nature are no gods*; for, wherever ignorance of God exists, there must be dreadful blindness. You were then wandering in darkness, but how disgraceful is it that in the midst of light you should fall into such gross errors! The main inference is, that the Galatians were less excusable for corrupting the gospel than they had formerly been for idolatry. But here it ought to be observed, that, till we have been enlightened in the true knowledge of one God, we always serve idols, whatever pretext we may throw over the false religion. The lawful worship of God, therefore, must be preceded by just views of his character. *By nature*, that is, in reality, *they are no gods*. Every object of worship which men contrive is a creature of their own imagination. In the opinion of men idols may be gods, but in reality they are nothing.

9. *But now, <sup>fa67</sup> after that ye have known God.* No language can express the base ingratitude of departing from God, when he has once been known. What is it but to forsake, of our own accord, the light, the life, the fountain of all benefits, — “to forsake,” as Jeremiah complains,

“the fountain of living waters, and hew out cisterns,  
broken cisterns, that can hold no water!” (<<sup>240213</sup>>Jeremiah 2:13.)

Still farther to heighten the blame, he corrects his language, and says, *or rather have been, known by God*; for the greater the grace of God is towards us, our guilt in despising it must be the heavier. Paul reminds the Galatians whence they had derived the knowledge of God. He affirms that they did not obtain it by their own exertions, by the acuteness or industry of their own minds, but because, when they were at the farthest possible remove from thinking of him, God visited them in his mercy. What is said of the Galatians may be extended to all; for in all are fulfilled the words of Isaiah,

“I am sought by them that asked not for me:  
I am found by them that sought me not.” (<<sup>236501</sup>>Isaiah 65:1.)

The origin of our calling is the free election of God, which predestinates us to life before we are born. On this depends our calling, our faith, our whole salvation.

*How turn ye again?* They could not turn *again* to ceremonies which they had never practiced. The expression is figurative, and merely denotes, that to fall again into wicked superstition, as if they had never received the truth of God, was the height of folly. When he calls the ceremonies *beggarly elements*, he views them as out of Christ, and, what is more, as opposed to Christ. To the fathers they were not only profitable exercises and aids to piety, but efficacious means of grace. But then their whole value lay in Christ, and in the appointment of God. The false apostles, on the other hand, neglecting the promises, endeavored to oppose the ceremonies to Christ, as if Christ alone were not sufficient. That

they should be regarded by Paul as worthless trifles, cannot excite surprise; but of this I have already spoken. The word *bondage* conveys a reproof for submitting to be slaves. <sup>Fa68</sup>

**10. *Ye observe days.*** He adduces as an instance one description of “elements,” the observance of days. No condemnation is here given to the observance of dates in the arrangements of civil society. The order of nature out of which this arises, is fixed and constant. How are months and years computed, but by the revolution of the sun and moon? What distinguishes summer from winter, or spring from harvest, but the appointment of God, — an appointment which was promised to continue to the end of the world? (<010822>Genesis 8:22.) The civil observation of days contributes not only to agriculture and to matters of politics, and ordinary life, but is even extended to the government of the church. Of what nature, then, was the observation which Paul reproveth? It was that which would bind the conscience, by religious considerations, as if it were necessary to the worship of God, and which, as he expresses it in the Epistle to the Romans, would make a distinction between one day and another. (<451405>Romans 14:5.)

When certain days are represented as holy in themselves, when one day is distinguished from another on religious grounds, when holy days are reckoned a part of divine worship, then days are improperly observed. The Jewish Sabbath, new moons, and other festivals, were earnestly pressed by the false apostles, because they had been appointed by the law. When we, in the present age, intake a distinction of days, we do not represent them as necessary, and thus lay a snare for the conscience; we do not reckon one day to be more holy than another; we do not make days to be the same thing with religion and the worship of God; but merely attend to the preservation of order and harmony. The observance of days among us is a free service, and void of all superstition.

**11. *Lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain.*** The expression is harsh, and must have filled the Galatians with alarm; for what hope was left to them, if Paul’s labor had been in vain? Some have expressed astonishment that Paul should be so powerfully affected by the observance of days, as almost to designate it a subversion of the whole gospel. But if we carefully weigh the whole, we shall see that there was just reason; and that the false apostles not only attempted to lay the yoke of Jewish bondage on the neck of the church, but filled their minds with wicked superstitions. To bring back Christianity to Judaism, was in itself no light evil; but far more serious mischief was done, when, in opposition to the grace of Christ, they set up holidays as meritorious performances, and pretended that this mode of worship would propitiate the divine favor. When such doctrines were received, the worship of God was corrupted, the grace of Christ made void, and the freedom of conscience oppressed.

Do we wonder that Paul should be afraid that he had labored in vain, that the gospel would henceforth be of no service? And since that very description of impiety is now supported by Popery, what sort of Christ or what sort of gospel does it retain? So far as respects the binding of consciences, they enforce the observance of days with not less severity than was done by Moses. They consider holidays, not less than the false apostles did, to be a part of the worship of God, and even connect with them the diabolical notion of merit. The Papists must therefore be held equally censurable with the false apostles; and

with this addition in aggravation, that, while the former proposed to keep those days which had been appointed by the law of God, the latter enjoin days, rashly stamped with their own seal, to be observed as most holy.

<b>GALATIANS 4:12-20</b>	
<b>12.</b> Brethren, I beseech you, be as I <i>am</i> ; for I <i>am</i> as ye <i>are</i> : ye have not injured me at all.	<b>12.</b> Estote ut ego; quia ego quoque sum ut vos. Fratres, rogo vos; nihil mihi fecistis injuriae.
<b>13.</b> Ye know how through infirmity of the flesh I preached the gospel unto you at the first.	<b>13.</b> Novistis autem, quod per infirmitatem carnis evangelizaverim vobis prius;
<b>14.</b> And my temptation which was in my flesh ye despised not, nor rejected; but received me as an angel of God, <i>even</i> as Christ Jesus.	<b>14.</b> Et experimentum mei, quod fuit in carne mea, non contempsistis, neque respuistis; sed tanquam angelum Dei suscepistis me, tanquam Christum Iesum.
<b>15.</b> Where is then the blessedness ye spake of? for I bear you record, that, if <i>it had been</i> possible, ye would have plucked out your own eyes, and have given them to me.	<b>15.</b> Ubi igitur beatitudo vestra? testimonium enim reddo vobis, quod, si possibile fuisset, etiam oculos vestros effossos dedissetis mihi.
<b>16.</b> Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?	<b>16.</b> Ergo ne vera loquendo inimicus sum vobis factus?
<b>17.</b> They zealously affect you, <i>but</i> not well; yea, they would exclude you, that ye might affect them.	<b>17.</b> Aemulantur vos, non bene; imo excludere vos volunt, ut ipsos aemulemini.
<b>18.</b> But <i>it is</i> good to be zealously affected always in a good <i>thing</i> , and not only when I am present with you.	<b>18.</b> Bonum autem est aemulari in bono semper, et non tantum quum praesens sum apud vos.
<b>19.</b> My little children, of whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you,	<b>19.</b> Filioli mei, quos iterum parturio, donec formetur in vobis Christus.
<b>20.</b> I desire to be present with you now, and to change my voice; for I stand in doubt of you.	<b>20.</b> Vellem autem nunc coram esse vobiscum, et routare vocem meam; quia anxius sum in vobis.

**12. *Be as I am.*** Having till now spoken roughly, he begins to adopt a milder strain. The former harshness had been more than justified by the heinousness of the offense; but as he wished to do good, he resolves to adopt a style of conciliation. It is the part of a wise pastor to consider, not what those who have wandered may justly deserve, but what may be the likeliest method of bringing them back to the right path. He must "be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long-suffering and doctrine." (<550402> 2 Timothy



4:2.) Following the method which he had recommended to Timothy, he leaves off chiding, and begins to use entreaties. *I beseech you*, he says, and calls them *brethren*, to assure them that no bitterness had mingled with his reproofs.

The words, *be as I am*, refer to the affection of the mind. As he endeavors to accommodate himself to them, so he wishes that they would do the like by him in return. *For I am as ye are*. "As I have no other object in view than to promote your benefit, so it is proper that you should be prevailed on to adopt moderate views, and to lend a willing, obedient ear to my instructions." And here again pastors are reminded of their duty to come down, as far as they can, to the people, and to study the various dispositions of those with whom they have to deal, if they wish to obtain compliance with their message. The proverb still holds: "to be loved, you must be lovely."

*Ye have not injured me at all*. This is intended to remove the suspicion which might have rendered his former reproofs more disagreeable. If we think that a person is speaking under a sense of injury, or revenging a private quarrel, we turn away our minds from him entirely, and are sure to torture whatever he says into an unfavourable interpretation. Paul therefore meets the rising prejudice by saying, "So far as respects myself, I have no cause to complain of you. It is not on my own account, nor from any hostility to you, that I feel warmly; and therefore, if I use strong language, it must arise from some other cause than hatred or anger."

**13.** *Ye know that, through infirmity of the flesh*. He recalls to their recollection the friendly and respectful manner in which they had received him, and he does so for two reasons. First, to let them know that he loved them, and thus to gain a ready ear to all that he says; and secondly, to encourage them, that, as they had begun well, they would go on in the same course. This mention of past occurrences, then, while it is an expression of his kind regards, is intended likewise as an exhortation to act in the same manner as they had done at an earlier period.

By *infirmity of the flesh* he means here, as in other places, what had a tendency to make him appear mean and despised. *Flesh* denotes his outward appearance, which the word *infirmity* describes to have been contemptible. Such was Paul when he came among them, without show, without pretense, without worldly honors or rank, without everything that could gain him respect or estimation in the eyes of men. Yet all this did not prevent the Galatians from giving him the most honorable reception. The narrative contributes powerfully to his argument, for what was there in Paul to awaken their esteem or veneration, but the power of the Holy Spirit alone? Under what pretext, then, will they now begin to despise that power? Next, they are charged with inconsistency, since no subsequent occurrence in the life of Paul could entitle them to esteem him less than before. But this he leaves to be considered by the Galatians, contenting himself with indirectly suggesting it as a subject of consideration.

**14.** *My temptation*. That is, "Though ye perceived me to be, in a worldly point of view, a contemptible person, yet ye did not reject me." He calls it a *temptation* or trial, because it was a thing not unknown or hidden, and he did not himself attempt to conceal it, as is usually done by ambitious men, who are ashamed of anything about them that may lower them in

public estimation. It frequently happens that unworthy persons receive applause, before their true character has been discovered, and shortly afterwards are dismissed with shame and disgrace. But widely different was the case of Paul, who had used no disguise to impose on the Galatians, but had frankly told them what he was.

*As an angel of God.* In this light every true minister of Christ ought to be regarded. As God employs the services of angels for communicating to us his favors, so godly teachers are divinely raised up to administer to us the most excellent of all blessings, the doctrine of eternal salvation. Not without good reason are they, by whose hands God dispenses to us such a treasure, compared to angels: for they too are the messengers of God, by whose mouth God speaks to us. And this argument is used by Malachi.

“The priest’s lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth, *for he is the messenger of the Lord of hosts.*” (<sup><390207></sup>Malachi 2:7.)

But the apostle rises still higher, and adds, *even as Christ Jesus*; for the Lord himself commands that his ministers shall be viewed in the same light as himself.

“He that heareth you heareth me,  
and he that despiseth you despiseth me.” (<sup><421016></sup>Luke 10:16.)

Nor is this wonderful; for it is in his name that they discharge their embassy, and thus they hold the rank of him in whose room they act. Such is the highly commendatory language which reveals to us at once the majesty of the gospel, and the honorable character of its ministry. If it be the command of Christ that his ministers shall be thus honored, it is certain that contempt of them proceeds from the instigation of the devil; and indeed they never can be despised so long as the word of God is esteemed. In vain do the Papists attempt to hold out this pretext for their own arrogant pretensions. As they are plainly the enemies of Christ, how absurd is it that they should assume the garb, and take to themselves the character, of Christ’s servants! If they wish to obtain the honors of angels, let them perform the duty of angels: if they wish that we should listen to them as to Christ, let them convey to us faithfully his pure word.

**15. *Where is there your blessedness?*** Paul had made them happy, and he intimates that the pious affection with which they formerly regarded him was an expression of their happiness. But now, by allowing themselves to be deprived of the services of him to whom they ought to have attributed whatever knowledge they possessed of Christ, they gave evidence that they were unhappy. This hint was intended to produce keen reflection. “What? Shall all this be lost? Will you forfeit all the advantage of having once heard Christ speaking by my lips? Shall the foundation in the faith which you received from me be to no purpose? Shall your falling away now destroy the glory of your obedience in the presence of God?” In short, by despising the pure doctrine which they had embraced, they throw away, of their own accord, the *blessedness* which they had obtained, and draw down upon themselves the destruction in which their unhappy career must terminate.

*For I bear you record.* It is not enough that pastors be respected, if they are not also loved; for both are necessary to make the doctrine they preach be fully relished; and both, the apostle declares, had existed among the Galatians. He had already spoken of their respect for him,

and he now speaks of their love. To be willing to *pluck out their own eyes*, if it had been necessary, was an evidence of very extraordinary love, stronger than the willingness to part with life.

**16. *Am I therefore become your enemy?*** He now returns to speak about himself. It was entirely their own fault, he says, that they had changed their minds. Though it is a common remark, that truth begets hatred, yet, except through the malice and wickedness of those who cannot endure to hear it, truth is never hateful. While he vindicates himself from any blame in the unhappy difference between them, he indirectly censures their ingratitude. Yet still his advice is friendly, not to reject, on rash or light grounds, the apostleship of one whom they had formerly considered to be worthy of their warmest love. What can be more unbecoming than that the hatred of truth should change enemies into friends? His aim then is, not so much to upbraid, as to move them to repentance.

**17. *They are jealous of you.*** He comes at length to the false apostles, and does more by silence to make them odious, than if he had given their names; for we usually abstain from naming those whose very names produce in us dislike and aversion. He mentions the immoderate ambition of those men, and warns the Galatians not to be led astray by their appearance of zeal. The comparison is borrowed from honorable love, as contrasted with those professions of regard which arise from unhallowed desires. Jealousy, on the part of the false apostles, ought not to impose upon them; for it proceeded not from right zeal, but from an improper desire of obtaining reputation, — a desire most unlike that holy jealousy of which Paul speaks to the Corinthians.

“For I am jealous over you with godly jealousy; for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ. But I fear lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ.”

(<sup><471102></sup>2 Corinthians 11:2, 3.)

To expose still more fully their base arts, he corrects his language. *Yea, they would exclude you.* <sup>Fa69</sup> They not only endeavor to gain your affections, but, as they cannot obtain possession of you by any other means, they endeavor to kindle strife between us. When you have been thrown as it were destitute, they expect that you will yield yourselves up to them; for they perceive that, so long as there shall be maintained between us a religious harmony, they can have no influence. This stratagem is frequently resorted to by all the ministers of Satan. By producing in the people a dislike of their pastor, they hope afterwards to draw them to themselves; and, having disposed of the rival, to obtain quiet possession. A careful and judicious examination of their conduct will discover that in this way they always begin.

**18. *But it is good to be the object of jealousy.*** It is hard to say whether this refers to himself or to the Galatians. Good ministers are exhorted to cherish holy jealousy in watching over the churches,

“that they may present them as a chaste virgin to Christ.”

(<sup><471102></sup>2 Corinthians 11:2.)

If it refers to Paul, the meaning will be: "I confess that I also am jealous of you, but with a totally different design: and I do so as much when I am absent as when I am present, because I do not seek my own advantage." But I am rather inclined to view it as referring to the Galatians, though in this case it will admit of more than one interpretation. It may mean: "They indeed attempt to withdraw your affections from me, that, when you are thrown destitute, you may go over to them; but do you, who loved me while I was present, continue to cherish the same regard for me when I am absent." But a more correct explanation is suggested by the opposite senses which the word *zhlou~sqai* bears. As, in the former verse, he had used the word *jealous* in a bad sense, denoting an improper way of accomplishing an object, so here he uses it in a good sense, denoting a zealous imitation of the good qualities of another. By condemning improper jealousy, he now exhorts the Galatians to engage in a different sort of competition, and that, too, while he was absent.

**19. *My little children.*** The word *children* is still softer and more affectionate than brethren; and the diminutive, *little children*, is an expression, not of contempt, but of endearment, though, at the same time, it suggests the tender years of those who ought now to have arrived at full age. (<sup><580512></sup>Hebrews 5:12.) The style is abrupt, which is usually the case with highly pathetic passages. Strong feeling, from the difficulty of finding adequate expression, breaks off our words when half uttered, while the powerful emotion chokes the utterance.

*Of whom I travail in birth again.* This phrase is added, to convey still more fully his vehement affection, which endured, on their account, the throes and pangs of a mother. It denotes likewise his anxiety; for

"a woman, when she is in travail, hath sorrow, because her hour is come; but as soon as she is delivered of the child, she remembereth no more the anguish, for joy that a man is born into the world." (John 16:21.)

The Galatians had already been conceived and brought forth; but, after their revolt, they must now be begotten a second time.

*Until Christ be formed in you.* By these words he soothes their anger; for he does not set aside the former birth, but says that they must be again nourished in the womb, as if they had not yet been fully formed. That Christ should be formed in us is the same thing with our being formed in Christ; for we are born so as to become new creatures in him; and he, on the other hand, is born in us, so that we live his life. Since the true image of Christ, through the superstitions introduced by the false apostles, had been defaced, Paul labors to restore that image in all its perfection and brightness. This is done by the ministers of the gospel, when they give

"milk to babes, and strong meat to them that are of full age," (<sup><580513></sup>Hebrews 5:13, 14.)

and, in short, ought to be their employment during the whole course of their preaching. But Paul here compares himself to a woman in labor, because the Galatians were not yet completely born.

This is a remarkable passage for illustrating the efficacy of the Christian ministry. True, we are "born of God," (<sup><620309></sup>1 John 3:9;) but, because he employs a minister and preaching as

his instruments for that purpose, he is pleased to ascribe to them that work which Himself performs, through the power of his Spirit, in co-operation with the labors of man. Let us always attend to this distinction, that, when a minister is contrasted with God, he is nothing, and can do nothing, and is utterly useless; but, because the Holy Spirit works efficaciously by means of him, he comes to be regarded and praised as an agent. Still, it is not what he can do in himself, or apart from God, but what God does by him, that is there described. If ministers wish to do anything, let them labor to form Christ, not to form themselves, in their hearers. The writer is now so oppressed with grief, that he almost faints from exhaustion without completing his sentence.

**20.** *I would wish to be present with you now.* This is a most serious expostulation, the complaint of a father so perplexed by the misconduct of his sons, that he looks around him for advice, and knows not to what hand to turn. <sup>Fa70</sup> He wishes to have an opportunity of personally addressing them, because we thus obtain a better idea of what is adapted to present circumstances; because, according as the hearer is affected, according as he is submissive or obstinate, we are enabled to regulate our discourse. But something more than this was meant by the desire to *change the voice*. <sup>Fa71</sup> He was prepared most cheerfully to assume a variety of forms, and even, if the case required it, to frame a new language. This is a course which pastors ought most carefully to follow. They must not be entirely guided by their own inclinations, or by the bent of their own genius, but must accommodate themselves, as far as the case will allow, to the capacity of the people, — with this reservation, however, that they are to proceed no farther than conscience shall dictate, <sup>fa72</sup> and that no departure from integrity shall be made, in order to gain the favor of the people.

<b>GALATIANS 4:21-26</b>	
<b>21.</b> Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?	<b>21.</b> Dicitur mihi, qui sub Lege vultis esse, Legem non auditis?
<b>22.</b> For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman.	<b>22.</b> Scriptum est enim, quod Abraham duos filios habuit; unum ex ancilla, alterum ex libera.
<b>23.</b> But he <i>who was</i> of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman <i>was</i> by promise.	<b>23.</b> Sed qui erat ex ancilla, secundum carnem erat genitus: qui vero ex libera, per promissionem.
<b>24.</b> Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar.	<b>24.</b> Quae allegorica sunt; nam duae sunt pactiones, una quidem a monte Sina, quae in servitutem generat; ea est Agar.
<b>25.</b> For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children.	<b>25.</b> Nam Agar, Sina mons est in Arabia; ex adverso autem respondet ei quae nunc est Ierusalem; servit enim cum liberis suis.
<b>26.</b> But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all.	<b>26.</b> Quae autem sursum est Ierusalem, libera est, quae mater est nostra omnium.

**21. Tell me.** Having given exhortations adapted to touch the feelings, he follows up his former doctrine by an illustration of great beauty. Viewed simply as an argument, it would not be very powerful; but, as a confirmation added to a most satisfactory chain of reasoning, it is not unworthy of attention.

*To be under the law*, signifies here, to come under the yoke of the law, on the condition that God will act toward you according to the covenant of the law, and that you, in return, bind yourself to keep the law. In any other sense than this, all believers are under the law; but the apostle treats, as we have already said, of the law with its appendages.

**22. For it is written.** No man who has a choice given him will be so mad as to despise freedom, and prefer slavery. But here the apostle teaches us, that they who are under the law are slaves. Unhappy men! who willingly choose this condition, when God desires to make them free. He gives a representation of this in the two sons of Abraham, one of whom, the son of a slave, held by his mother's condition; <sup>fa73</sup> while the other, the son of a free woman, obtained the inheritance. He afterwards applies the whole history to his purpose, and illustrates it in an elegant manner.

In the first place, as the other party armed themselves with the authority of the law, the apostle quotes the law on the other side. *The law* was the name usually given to the Five Books of Moses. Again, as the history which he quotes appeared to have no bearing on the question, he gives to it an allegorical interpretation. But as the apostle declares that these things are *allegorized*, ([ajllhgorou>mena](#);) Origen, and many others along with him, have seized the occasion of torturing Scripture, in every possible manner, away from the true sense. They concluded that the literal sense is too mean and poor, and that, under the outer bark of the letter, there lurk deeper mysteries, which cannot be extracted but by beating out allegories. And this they had no difficulty in accomplishing; for speculations which appear to be ingenious have always been preferred, and always will be preferred, by the world to solid doctrine.

With such approbation the licentious system gradually attained such a height, that he who handled Scripture for his own amusement not only was suffered to pass unpunished, but even obtained the highest applause. For many centuries no man was considered to be ingenious, who had not the skill and daring necessary for changing into a variety of curious shapes the sacred word of God. This was undoubtedly a contrivance of Satan to undermine the authority of Scripture, and to take away from the reading of it the true advantage. God visited this profanation by a just judgment, when he suffered the pure meaning of the Scripture to be buried under false interpretations.

Scripture, they say, is fertile, and thus produces a variety of meanings. <sup>Fa74</sup> I acknowledge that Scripture is a most rich and inexhaustible fountain of all wisdom; but I deny that its fertility consists in the various meanings which any man, at his pleasure, may assign. Let us know, then, that the true meaning of Scripture is the natural and obvious meaning; and let us embrace and abide by it resolutely. Let us not only neglect as doubtful, but boldly set aside as deadly corruptions, those pretended expositions, which lead us away from the natural meaning.

But what reply shall we make to Paul's assertion, that these things *are allegorical*? Paul certainly does not mean that Moses wrote the history for the purpose of being turned into an allegory, but points out in what way the history may be made to answer the present subject. This is done by observing a figurative representation of the Church there delineated. And a mystical interpretation of this sort ([ajnagwgh>](#)) was not inconsistent with the true and literal meaning, when a comparison was drawn between the Church and the family of Abraham. As the house of Abraham was then a true Church, so it is beyond all doubt that the principal and most memorable events which happened in it are so many types to us. As in circumcision, in sacrifices, in the whole Levitical priesthood, there was an allegory, as there is an allegory at the present day in our sacraments, — so was there likewise in the house of Abraham; but this does not involve a departure from the literal meaning. In a word, Paul adduces the history, as containing a figurative representation of the two covenants in the two wives of Abraham, and of the two nations in his two sons. And Chrysostom, indeed, acknowledges that the word *allegory* points out the present application to be ([kata>crhsiv](#))<sup>fa75</sup> different from the natural meaning; which is perfectly true.

23. *But he who was of the bond woman.* Both were sons of Abraham according to the flesh; but in Isaac there was this peculiarity, that he had the promise of grace. In Ishmael there was nothing besides nature; in Isaac there was the election of God, signified in part by the manner of his birth, which was not in the ordinary course, but miraculous. Yet there is an indirect reference to the calling of the Gentiles, and the rejection of the Jews: for the latter boast of their ancestry, while the former, without any human interference, are become the spiritual offspring of Abraham.

24. *These are the two covenants.* I have thought it better to adopt this translation, in order not to lose sight of the beauty of the comparison; for Paul compares the two *diaqh~kai*, to two mothers, and to employ *testamentum*, (a testament,) which is a neuter noun, for denoting a mother, would be harsh. The word *pactio* (a covenant) appears to be, on that account, more appropriate; and indeed the desire of obtaining perspicuity, as well as elegance, has led me to make this choice. <sup>Fa76</sup>

The comparison is now formally introduced. As in the house of Abraham there were two mothers, so are there also in the Church of God. Doctrine is the mother of whom we are born, and is twofold, Legal and Evangelical. The legal mother, whom Hagar resembles, *gendereth to bondage*. Sarah again, represents the second, which gendereth to freedom; though Paul begins higher, and makes our first mother Sinai, and our second, Jerusalem. The two covenants, then, are the mothers, of whom children unlike one another are born; for the legal covenant makes slaves, and the evangelical covenant makes freemen.

But all this may, at first sight, appear absurd; for there are none of God's children who are not born to freedom, and therefore the comparison does not apply. I answer, what Paul says is true in two respects; for the law formerly brought forth its disciples, (among whom were included the holy prophets, and other believers,) to slavery, though not to permanent slavery, but because God placed them for a time under the law as "a schoolmaster." <sup>Fa77</sup> (<480325> Galatians 3:25.) Under the vail of ceremonies, and of the whole economy by which they were governed, their freedom was concealed: to the outward eye nothing but slavery appeared. "Ye have not," says Paul to the Romans, "received the spirit of bondage again to fear." (<450815> Romans 8:15.) Those holy fathers, though inwardly they were free in the sight of God, yet in outward appearance differed nothing from slaves, and thus resembled their mother's condition. But the doctrine of the gospel bestows upon its children perfect freedom as soon as they are born, and brings them up in a liberal manner.

Paul does not, I acknowledge, speak of that kind of children, as the context will show. By the children of Sinai, it will afterwards be explained, are meant hypocrites, who are at length expelled from the Church of God, and deprived of the inheritance. What, then, is the gendering to bondage, which forms the subject of the present dispute? It denotes those who make a wicked abuse of the law, by finding in it nothing but what tends to slavery. Not so the pious fathers, who lived under the Old Testament; for their slavish birth by the law did not hinder them from having Jerusalem for their mother in spirit. But those who adhere to the bare law, and do not acknowledge it to be "a schoolmaster to bring them to Christ," (<480324> Galatians 3:24,) but rather make it a hinderance to prevent their coming to him, are the Ishmaelites born to slavery.



It will again be objected, why does the apostle say that such persons are born of God's covenant, and are considered to belong to the Church? I answer, strictly speaking, they are not God's children, but are degenerate and spurious, and are disclaimed by God, whom they falsely call their Father. They receive this name in the Church, not because they are members of it in reality, but because for a time they presume to occupy that place, and impose on men by the disguise which they wear. The apostle here views the Church, as it appears in this world: but on this subject we shall afterwards speak.

**25. For Agar is mount Sinai.** <sup>Fa78</sup> I shall not waste time in refuting the expositions of other writers; for Jerome's conjecture, that Mount Sinai had two names, is trifling; and the disquisitions of Chrysostom about the agreement of the names are equally unworthy of notice. Sinai is called Hagar, <sup>fa79</sup> because it is a type or figure, as the Passover was Christ. The situation of the mountain is mentioned by way of contempt. It lies in Arabia, beyond the limits of the holy land, by which the eternal inheritance was prefigured. The wonder is, that in so familiar a matter they erred so egregiously.

*And answers, on the other hand.* The Vulgate translates it, *is joined* (conjunctus est) to Jerusalem; and Erasmus makes it, *borders on* (confinis) Jerusalem; but I have adopted the phrase, *on the other hand*, (ex adverso,) in order to avoid obscurity. For the apostle certainly does not refer to nearness, or relative position, but to resemblance, as respects the present comparison. The word, *su>stoica*, which is translated *corresponding to*, denotes those things which are so arranged as to have a mutual relation to each other, and a similar word, *suatoici>a*, when applied to trees and other objects, conveys the idea of their following in regular order. Mount Sinai is said (*sustoicei~n*) *to correspond to* that which is now Jerusalem, in the same sense as Aristotle says that Rhetoric is (*ajnti>strofov*) the *counterpart* to Logic, by a metaphor borrowed from lyric compositions, which were usually arranged in two parts, so adapted as to be sung in harmony. In short, the word, *sustoicei~*, *corresponds*, means nothing more than that it belongs to the same class.

But why does Paul compare the present Jerusalem with Mount Sinai? Though I was once of a different opinion, yet I agree with Chrysostom and Ambrose, who explain it as referring to the earthly Jerusalem, and who interpret the words, *which now is, th|~ nu~n Jierousalh<m*, as marking the slavish doctrine and worship into which it had degenerated. It ought to have been a lively image of the new Jerusalem, and a representation of its character. But such as it now is, it is rather related to Mount Sinai. Though the two places may be widely distant from each other, they are perfectly alike in all their most important features. This is a heavy reproach against the Jews, whose real mother was not Sarah but the spurious Jerusalem, twin sister of Hagar; who were therefore slaves born of a slave, though they haughtily boasted that they were the sons of Abraham.

**26. But Jerusalem, which is above.** The Jerusalem which he calls *above*, or heavenly, is not contained in heaven; nor are we to seek for it out of this world; for the Church is spread over the whole world, and is a "stranger and pilgrim on the earth." (<sup><581113></sup> Hebrews 11:13.) Why then is it said to be from heaven? Because it originates in heavenly grace; for the sons of God are

*"born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh,*

nor of the will of man," (<sup><430113></sup>John 1:13,)

but by the power of the Holy Spirit. The heavenly Jerusalem, which derives its origin from heaven, and dwells above by faith, is the mother of believers. To the Church, under God, we owe it that we are

"born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible,"  
(<sup><600123></sup>1 Peter 1:23,)

and from her we obtain the milk and the food by which we are afterwards nourished.

Such are the reasons why the Church is called the mother of believers. And certainly he who refuses to be a son of the Church in vain desires to have God as his Father; for it is only through the instrumentality of the Church that we are "born of God," (<sup><620309></sup>1 John 3:9,) and brought up through the various stages of childhood and youth, till we arrive at manhood. This designation, "the mother of us all," reflects the highest credit and the highest honor on the Church. But the Papists are fools and twice children, who expect to give us uneasiness by producing these words; for their mother is an adulteress, who brings forth to death the children of the devil; and how foolish is the demand, that the children of God should surrender themselves to her to be cruelly slain! Might not the synagogue of Jerusalem at that time have assumed such haughty pretensions, with far higher plausibility than Rome at the present day? and yet we see how Paul strips her of every honorable distinction, and consigns her to the lot of Hagar.

<b>GALATIANS 4:27-31</b>	
<b>27.</b> For it is written, Rejoice, <i>thou</i> barren that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband.	<b>27.</b> Scriptum est enim: Exulta, sterilis, quoniam non paris; erumpe et elama, quae non parturis; quae plures erunt liberi desertae quam habentis maritum. (<235401>Isaiah 54:1.)
<b>28.</b> Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise.	<b>28.</b> Nos autem, fratres, secundum Isaac, promissionis sumus filii. (<450907>Romans 9:7.)
<b>29.</b> But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him <i>that was born</i> after the Spirit, even so <i>it is</i> now.	<b>29.</b> Sed quemadmodum tunc, qui secundum carnem erat genitus, persequabatur eum qui secundum Spiritum genitus erat; sic et nunc.
<b>30.</b> Nevertheless, what saith the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman.	<b>30.</b> Sed quid dicit Scriptura? Ejice ancillam, et filium ejus; non enim hereditatem obtinebit filius ancillae cum filio liberae. (<012110>Genesis 21:10.)
<b>31.</b> So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free.	<b>31.</b> Ergo, fratres, non sumus ancillae filii, sed liberae.

**27. *For it is written.*** The apostle proves, by a quotation from Isaiah, that the lawful sons of the Church are born according to the promise. The passage is in Isaiah 54 where the prophet speaks of the kingdom of Christ and the calling of the Gentiles, and promises to the barren wife and the widow a numerous offspring; for it is on this ground that he exhorts the Church to “sing” and “rejoice.” The design of the apostle, let it be carefully remarked, is to deprive the Jews of all claim to that spiritual Jerusalem to which the prophecy relates. Isaiah proclaims, that her children shall be gathered out of all the nations of the earth, and not by any preparation of hers, but by the free grace and blessing of God.

He next concludes that we become the sons of God by promise, after the example (*kata* <jIsaa<k) of Isaac, and that in no other way do we obtain this honor. To readers little skilled or practiced in the examination of Scripture, this reasoning may appear inconclusive; because they do not hold the most undoubted of all principles, that all the promises, being founded on the Messiah, are of free grace. It was because the apostle took this for granted, that he so fearlessly contrasted the promise with the law.

**29. *As then, he that was born after the flesh.*** He denounces the cruelty of the false apostles, who wantonly insulted pious persons that placed all their confidence in Christ. There was abundant need that the uneasiness of the oppressed should be soothed by consolation, and that the cruelty of their oppressors should be severely checked. It is not wonderful, he says,

that the children of the law, at the present day, do what Ishmael their father at first did, who, trusting to his being the first-born, persecuted Isaac the true heir. With the same proud disdain do his posterity now, on account of outward ceremonies, circumcision, and the various services of the law, molest and vaunt over the lawful sons of God. *The Spirit* is again contrasted with the flesh, that is, the calling of God with human appearance. (<sup><091607></sup>1 Samuel 16:7.) So the disguise is admitted to be possessed by the followers of the Law and of works, but the reality is claimed for those who rely on the calling of God alone, and depend upon his grace.

*Persecuted.* But persecution is nowhere mentioned, only Moses says that Ishmael was *qhxm*, (*metzahek*,) *mocking*, (<sup><012109></sup>Genesis 21:9;) and by this participle he intimates that Ishmael ridiculed his brother Isaac. The explanation offered by some Jews, that this was a simple smile, is entirely inadmissible; for what cruelty would it have argued, that a harmless smile should have been so fearfully revenged? There cannot then be a doubt that he maliciously endeavored to provoke the child Isaac by reproachful language.

But how widely distant is this from persecution? <sup>Fa80</sup> And yet it is not idly or unguardedly that Paul enlarges on this point. No persecution ought to distress us so much as to see our calling attempted to be undermined by the reproaches of wicked men. Neither blows, nor scourging, nor nails, nor thorns, occasioned to our Lord such intense suffering as that blasphemy:

“He trusted in God; what availeth it to him?  
for he is deprived of all assistance.” (<sup><402743></sup>Matthew 27:43.)

There is more venom in this than in all persecutions; for how much more alarming is it that the grace of Divine adoption shall be made void, than that this frail life shall be taken from us? Ishmael did not persecute his brother with the sword; but, what is worse, he treated him with haughty disdain by trampling under foot the promise of God. All persecutions arise from this source, that wicked men despise and hate in the elect the grace of God; a memorable instance of which we have in the history of Cain and Abel. (<sup><010408></sup>Genesis 4:8.)

This reminds us, that not only ought we to be filled with horror at outward persecutions, when the enemies of religion slay us with fire and sword; when they banish, imprison, torture, or scourge; but when they attempt, by their blasphemies, to make void our confidence, which rests on the promises of God; when they ridicule our salvation, when they wantonly laugh to scorn the whole gospel. Nothing ought to wound our minds so deeply as contempt of God, and reproaches cast upon His grace: nor is there any kind of persecution more deadly than when the salvation of the soul is assailed. We who have escaped from the tyranny of the Pope, are not called to encounter the swords of wicked men. But how blind must we be, if we are not affected by that spiritual persecution, in which they strive, by every method, to extinguish that doctrine, from which we draw the breath of life! — when they attack our faith by their blasphemies, and shake not a few of the less informed! For my own part, I am far more grieved by the fury of the Epicureans than of the Papists. They do not attack us by open violence; but, in proportion as the name of God is more dear to me than my own life, the diabolical conspiracy which I see in operation to extinguish all fear and worship of God, to root out the remembrance of Christ,

or to abandon it to the jeers of the ungodly, cannot but rack my mind with greater anxiety, than if a whole country were burning in one conflagration:

**30. *But what saith the Scripture?*** There was some consolation in knowing that we do but share the lot of our father Isaac; but it is a still greater consolation, when he adds, that hypocrites, with all their boasting, can gain nothing more than to be *cast out* of the spiritual family of Abraham; and that, to whatever extent they may harass us for a time, the inheritance will certainly be ours. Let believers cheer themselves with this consolation, that the tyranny of the Ishmaelites will not last for ever. They appear to have reached the highest pre-eminence, and, proud of their birthright, look down upon us with contempt; but they will one day be declared to be the descendants of Hagar, the sons of a slave, and unworthy of the inheritance.

Let us be instructed by this beautiful passage,

“not to fret ourselves because of evil-doers,  
neither be envious against the workers of iniquity,”  
(<sup><193701></sup>Psalm 37:1,)

when they hold a temporary habitation and rank in the Church, but patiently to look for the end which awaits them. There are many pretended Christians, or strangers, who hold a place in the Church, but who afterwards give evidence of their departure from the faith, as he who, proud of his birthright, at first reigned, was cast out like a foreigner with the posterity of Ishmael. Some censorious persons smile at Paul’s simplicity, in comparing a woman’s passion, arising out of a trifling quarrel, to a judgment of God. But they overlook the decree of God, which took effect in such a manner, as to make it manifest that the whole transaction was directed by a heavenly providence. That Abraham should have been commanded to humor his wife (<sup><012112></sup>Genesis 21:12) entirely in the matter, is no doubt extraordinary, but proves that God employed the services of Sarah for confirming his own promise. In a word, the *casting out* of Ishmael was nothing else than the consequence and the accomplishment of that promise, “In Isaac shall thy seed be called,” (<sup><012112></sup>Genesis 21:12,) — not in Ishmael. Although, therefore, it was the revenging of a woman’s quarrel, yet God did not the less make known his sentence by her mouth as a type of the Church.

**31. *So then, brethren.*** He now exhorts the Galatians to prefer the condition of the children of Sarah to that of the children of Hagar; and having reminded them that, by the grace of Christ, they were born to freedom, he desires them to continue in the same condition. If we shall call the Papists, Ishmaelites and Hagarites, and boast that we are the lawful children, they will smile at us; but if the two subjects in dispute be fairly compared, the most ignorant person will be at no loss to decide.

## FOOTNOTES

- <sup>Fta1</sup> "The Paul of the Reformation. More than two hundred and fifty years have elapsed since he went to join the Apostle whom he so much resembled in the kingdom of God." – Dr. Mason on Catholic Communion.
- <sup>Fta2</sup> "Sans En Faire Difficulte." "Without Any Scruple"
- <sup>Fta3</sup> The Volume To Which This Dedication Was Prefixed, Contained The Commentaries On The Epistles To The Galatians, Ephesians, Philipians, And Colossians. – *Ed.*
- <sup>Fta4</sup> "Mais quant a leur origine, et le lieu dont ils sont premierement partis, les anciens auteurs ne se trouvent d'accord." "But as to their lineage, and the place from which they originally came, ancient authors are not agreed."
- <sup>Fta5</sup> "Strabo geographe pense que ceux d'entre eux qui avoyent le nom de Tectosagois estoient venus du pays de Provence, et les autres de la Gaule Celtique." "Strabo, the geographer, thinks that those of them who bore the name of Tectosages had come from Provence, and the remainder from Celtic Gaul."
- <sup>Fta6</sup> "Ceux d'Amiens." "Those of Amiens."
- <sup>Fta7</sup> "Ausone poete Bordelois, qui a escrit en Latin." "Ausonius, the poet, a native of Bourdeaux, who wrote in Latin."
- <sup>Fta8</sup> "Usque in Teutosagos primaevio nomine Belgas."
- <sup>Fta9</sup> Bell. Gall. 50 6 100 24.
- <sup>Fta10</sup> A forest in Germany, which Caesar describes to be nine days' journey in breadth, and, at least, sixty days' journey in length. How much more he was unable to say, as he had never found any person who had traveled farther, or could tell where the forest terminated. He regrets the necessity of employing these vague terms, having placed little reliance on the skill or accuracy of his informers. It is mentioned, he adds, by Eratosthenes and other Greek writers, under the name of *Orcynia*. – *Ed.*
- <sup>Fta11</sup> "La verite de Dieu."
- <sup>Fta12</sup> "En quoy consiste ceste liberte, et quel en est le vray et droit usage" "In what that liberty consists, and what is the true and lawful use of it."
- <sup>Fta13</sup> "C'est a dire, sans aucun moyen des hommes." "That is, without any agency of men."
- <sup>Fta14</sup> "Quoy que depuis on ait observe la ceremonie accoustumee en l'ordination des ministeres." "Although the ceremony usually performed at the ordination of ministers was afterwards added."
- <sup>Fta15</sup> "Pour nos pechez." "For our sins."
- <sup>Fta16</sup> "Non pas que cela viene de la creation, mais de leur corruption." "Not that this comes from creation, but from their corruption."
- <sup>Fta17</sup> [Oujk ei+pe kat j ejpitagh<n tou~ Patro<v ajlla< kata< to< qc>lhma, toute>sti th<n ejjdoki>an.](#) "He did not say, according to the command, but according to the will, that is, according to the good pleasure, of the Father." – Theophylact.

- Fta18 “An English reader would readily suppose that ‘God and our Father’ are two different persons. The original text suggests no such idea. The meaning is, ‘our God and Father’. – The particle **kai**< (and) is here hermeneutic. As Crellius says, it is equivalent to ‘that is’ or ‘who is;’ or rather, it does not connect different persons, but different descriptions of the same person: <sup><460202></sup>1 Corinthians 2:2; <sup><490103></sup>Ephesians 1:3; <sup><490406></sup>Ephesians 4:6; <sup><520103></sup>1 Thessalonians 1:3; <sup><520311></sup>1 Thessalonians 3:11; <sup><600102></sup>1 Peter 1:2. **JHmw~n** belongs equally to both nouns, **Qcou~** and **Patro>v** – *Brown*.
- Fta19 “Leurs songes et inventions.” “Their dreams and inventions.”
- Fta20 “o{ oujk e]stin a]llo. Some have questioned the genuineness of **a]llo**, – conjecturing that some one first introduced **ajlla**< into the margin as an interpretation of **cij mh**>, and then some other person changed it into **a]llo**, *per incuriam*, and introduced it into the text. This is ingenious, but, like all conjectural criticism on the New Testament, is of no value.” – *Brown*.
- fta21 “Quand il denonce les anges pour excommuniez et pour abominables, s’ils enseignent autre chose.” “When he denounces the angels as excommunicated and detestable persons, if they teach anything else.”
- Fta22 “ **jAna>qema**. This word, which we render *accursed*, doth not signify ‘accursed or condemned of God to the punishments of another world.’ This the Apostle would not wish to the worst of men. The meaning is, ‘Let him be as a person excommunicated, or wholly cut off from the synagogue, or church, with whom it is unlawful to have any commerce or correspondence whatever.’ And so it is not properly a wish of the apostle, but a direction to the Galatians how to behave, *Let him be ajna>qema*. ‘Hold him, and treat him as an excommunicated and accursed person.’” – *Chandler*.
- Fta23 “D’enseigner autre doctrine que cello qu’il avoit enseignee aux Galatiens.” “To teach any other doctrine than that which he had taught to the Galatians.”
- Fta24 “Quand on y mesle des inventions humaines, et des choses qui ne sont point de mesme.” “When it is mixed up with human inventions, and with things that are contrary to it.”
- Fta25 “**Pei>qw**. This word, which we render *persuade*, frequently signifies ‘to obtain by treaty,’ or, ‘to endeavor the friendship and good will of any person.’ Thus in <sup><402814></sup>Matthew 28:14, the chief-priests tell the soldiers, whom they corrupted, to give a false report: ‘If this come to the governor’s ears, we will *persuade* him, and secure you, that is, prevail with him to be favorable to you, and save you from punishment.’ Thus, <sup><441220></sup>Acts 12:20, **pei>santev Bla>ston**, we render, ‘having made Blastus their friend.’ Vid. Pind. Ol. 3:28. And in the Apocryphal book of Maccabees, (2 Maccabees 4:45,) when Menelaus found himself convicted of his crimes, he promised Ptolemy a large sum of money, **pei~sai to<n basile>a**, ‘to pacify the king,’ to prevent his displeasure, and secure his favor. And thus, in the place before us, ‘to persuade God,’ is to endeavor to secure his approbation; which, the Apostle assures the Galatians, was his great and only view, as well as his great support, under the censure and displeasure of men, for preaching the pure and uncorrupted doctrines of the gospel.” – *Chandler*.
- fta26 “Qu’il ne parle point d’une chose incertaine ou incognee.” “That he does not speak about a thing uncertain or unknown.”
- Fta27 “The idiom by which there is a transposition of **of****ti** is frequent, and may here, Schott thinks, have been made use of, in order to place a highly important topic in the most prominent point of view” – *Bloomfield*.
- Fta28 “Quand par son conseil il nous destine a quelque chose.” “When he appoints us to any thing by his purpose.”

- Fta29 “ **jEn cjmoi<**, that is, ‘to me;’ but yet it appears to denote something more.” — Beza. “The ancient commentators, and, of the moderns, Winer, Schott, and Scott, seem right in regarding this as a strong expression for ‘in my mind and heart.’” — Bloomfield.
- Fta30 “The expression, ‘flesh and blood,’ is used to denote men. Thus when Peter confessed to our Lord, ‘Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God,’ Jesus answered, ‘Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee.’ (<401617>Matthew 16:17.) That is, no man hath made this discovery; and thus it hath the same meaning in the place before us. But as the apostle speaks of his countrymen and equals in age, in the verses before, I apprehend he particularly means them, and that he intends to assure the Galatians, that, notwithstanding his former zeal for the law and the traditions of the Jews, yet that, after his extraordinary conversion, he had no longer any dependence on them, nor sought the least direction from the wisest among them.” — Chandler.
- Fta31 “ **Jistorci~n** signifies either ‘to ascertain any *thing* by inquiry, or any *person* by personal examination;’ but sometimes, as here, to visit for the purpose of becoming acquainted with any one by personal communication.’ So Josephus, Bell. 6:1-8, **o{n** (scil. Julianum), **iJsto>rhsa**, ‘whom when I came to know and be with.’ See *Ac* 9:26,27.” — Bloomfield.
- Fta32 “The distinguished guest of a distinguished host.” — Grotius.
- Fta33 “Qui estoit pasteur en l’église de Jerusalem.” “Who was pastor in the church at Jerusalem.”
- Fta34 “Qu’il estoit cousin-germain de Jesus Christ, fils de la soeur de sa mere.” “That he was cousin-german of Jesus Christ, his mother’s sister’s son.”
- Fta35 This is fully consistent with the opinion commonly held, that Alpheus or Cleopas was the husband of the sister of Mary, the mother of our Lord, and consequently that James, the son of Alpheus, was our Lord’s cousin-german. — *Ed.*
- Fta36 “The word **pi>stiv** denotes not only the act of believing, but that which is believed.” — Beza.
- Fta37 “He does not say, They praised or glorified me, but, They glorified God. He says, They glorified God in me; for all that belongs to me was from the grace of God.” — OEcumenius.
- Fta38 “Sinon les choses estant douteuses et non resolues encore.” “Except in matters that were doubtful and not yet settled.”
- Fta39 “Ce voyage-la qui est escrit au quinzieme chapitre” “That journey which is recorded in the fifteenth chapter” (of the Acts of the Apostles.)
- fta40 “De la quelle il eust au assez pour les vaincre du tout.” “Which would have been sufficient for gaining a complete victory over them.”
- Fta41 “Et y montai par revelation.” “And I went up thither by revelation.”
- Fta42 “**Tw~n dokou>ntwn ci+nai> ti**, the men ‘who appeared to be somewhat,’ that is, persons of highest character and estimation. For though this word signifies to ‘appear,’ or ‘seem,’ yet it is not always used in a diminutive or disparaging sense, but to denote what they really are, and what others think them to be. Thus, **tw~n jEllh>nwn doko~untev diafc>rein** (AElia) are persons esteemed as the principal men of Greece; and Aristotle is said **so>fov a]nhr kai< w+n kai< ci+nai dokw~n**, both to be, and to be esteemed as a wise man.’ — Chandler.
- Fta43 Porphyry, (**Porfu>riov**.) a Greek philosopher, (whose original name was Malchus,) and Julian, the Roman emperor, (commonly called “the apostate,”) were able and virulent opponents of Christianity. Their writings drew forth powerful defences, by which all their arguments were triumphantly confuted. — *Ed.*
- Fta44 “**ajncqc>mhn aujtoi~v**”, <480202>Galatians 2:2.
- Fta45 “La vertu et efficace spiriluelle.”



- Fta46** “From this portion of sacred history, we are not at liberty to conclude that either of those two apostles had fallen into error in faith; or that they differed from each other about doctrine. Unquestionably, so far as relates to doctrine, Peter was of the same opinion with Paul on this subject, that it was lawful for a Jew to live on terms of friendship with believing Gentiles. — The whole of this controversy related, not to the doctrine of Christian liberty, but to the exercise of it at different times and places; and on this point the rules of prudence were better understood by Paul than by Peter.” — Witsius.
- Fta47** See p. 90.
- Fta48** “The Papists will readily acknowledge that we are justified by faith; but they add that it is in part. Now this gloss spoils all; for they are convinced that we cannot be righteous before God, unless it be accomplished by our Lord Jesus Christ, and unless we rely on that salvation which he has procured for us. The Papists see this very well; and therefore, with a careless air, they will say, We are justified by faith. But by faith alone? No. On this point they give battle, and this is the chief article on which we differ from them.” — Calvin’s Sermons.
- Fta49** Sinon en nous reconnoissant despourveus et du tout desnuez de justice propre a nons.” “Unless by acknowledging that we are poor and utterly destitute of any righteousness of our own.”
- Fta50** Eij para>basiv tiu~to nen>omistai o[ti to<n no>mon katalipo>ntev ejn Cristw~| zhtou~men dikaiwqh~nai, hJ aijti>a ejiv aujto<n Cristo<n cwrh>sci. “If this be reckoned an offence, that we have forsaken the law, and seek to be justified through Christ, the blame will fall on Christ himself.” — Theodoret.
- Fta51** Cristo>v ejsti pa>nta ejn uJmi~n kai< kratw~n kai< despo>zwn? Kai< to< me<n hJme>teron qe>lhma nekro>n ejsti. To< de< ejkei>nou zh~| kai< kuqerna~| th<n zwh<n hJmw~n. “It is Christ who does and rules and governs all in you; and our will is dead, but his will lives and directs our life.” — Theophylact.
- Fta52** “Car cene seroit point assez de considerer que Christ est mort pour le salut du monde, si avec cela un chaeun n’applique particulierement a sa personne l’efficace et jouissance de ceste grace.” “For it would not be enough to consider that Christ died for the salvation of the world, unless each individual specially apply to his own person the efficacy and enjoyment of that grace.”
- Fta53** “Dwrea<n ajpe>qane does not mean ‘in vain,’ ‘uselessly,’ ‘ineffectually,’ but ‘without just cause,’ for if righteousness be by the law, there was no reason why he should die.” — Tittmann.  
Eij ga<r ajpe>qanen oJ Cristo>v eu]dhlon o[ti dia< to< mh< ijscu>cin to<n no>mon hJma~v dikaiou~n? ejj d j oJ no>mov dikaioi~ peritto<v oJ tou~ Cristou~ qa>natov. “For if Christ died, it is very evident that it was because the law was unable to justify us; and if the law justifies us, the death of Christ was superfluous.” — Chrysostom.
- Fta54** “Baskai>nein, ‘to enchant, to fascinate, to delude by magical charms,’ — -rather an uncommon word, a{pax lego>menon in the New Testament. It may amuse to notice the etumon of the word. Some grammarians have strangely thought it derived from fa>esi kai>nein, ‘to kill with the eyes.’ Its true etymology obviously is, ba>w, ba>skw, baska>w baskai>nw. ba>skw (equivalent to fa>skw,), ‘to say, to speak,’ comes, in the form baskai>nw, to signify kakologeic~n, ‘to calumniate,’ then ‘to deceive,’ then ‘to deceive by magical arts.’” — Brown.
- Fta55** Kai< mh<n oujk ejn th|~~ Galatw~n cw>ra| ajll j ejn Jierosolu>moiv ejstaurw>qn. Pw~v ou+n fhsin, ejn uJmi~n; Th~v pi>stewv deiknu<v th<n ijscun kai< ta< po>rjJwqen duname>nhv oJra~|n. Kai< oujk ei+pen, ejstaurw>qh ajlla< proegra>qh ejstaurwme>nov dhlw~n o[ti toi~v th~v pi>stewv ojfqalmoi~v ajkribe>steron ejqew>rhsan tw~n paro>ntwn ejni>wn kai< ta< gino>mena qewme>nwn. “Yet it was not in the country of the Galatians, but in Jerusalem, that he was crucified. How, then, does he say, ‘Among you?’ To demonstrate the power of faith,

which is able to see even distant objects, And he does not say, 'Was crucified,' but 'Was painted crucified,' shewing that by the eyes of faith they beheld more distinctly than some who were present and saw the transactions." — Chrysostom.

Fta56 "Display the sufferings of Christ like one who was an eye-witness of those sufferings, and hold up the blood, the precious blood of atonement, as issuing warm from the cross." — Robert Hall.

Fta57 "Did ye receive that Spirit which was the fullest evidence of your being justified, accepted, and received as the children and people of God, by conformity to the law of Moses, or by embracing the doctrine of the gospel? If by embracing the doctrine of the gospel, then you became justified by embracing that doctrine, and consequently need not conform to the law of Moses, in order to obtain justification." — Chandler.

Fta58 "The scope of the passage shews that [ginw>skete](#) is not the Indicative, but the Imperative. Paul does not presuppose that the Galatians acknowledge this principle; he is exerting himself to convince them of it." — Brown.

Fta59 "La malediction de tous hommes."

Fta60 "Qui est le parfait accomplissement de la promesse." "Who is the perfect accomplishment of the promise."

Fta61 "Though some learned men have been of opinion that the mediator here mentioned is the Son of God, yet I think no reasonable doubt can be entertained as to its denoting Moses. Strictly speaking, Aaron, or rather the priesthood, was the mediator of the old covenant. It answers to the Great High-Priest, ([ajrcicreu>v](#)), Mediator, ([mesu>thv](#)), and Surety, ([c\]ggguov](#)), of the new covenant. But the reference seems here to the *giving* of the law: that was by Moses. 'The law was given by Moses.' (<sup><430117></sup>John 1:17.) God speaks to Moses, and Moses speaks to the people; and this arrangement was entered into by the express request of the people themselves. Moses himself says, 'I stood between the Lord and you at that time. (<sup><050505></sup>Deuteronomy 5:5.) Philo calls Moses [mesu>thv](#).'" — Brown.

Fta62 "This is confessedly one of the most obscure passages in the New Testament, and, perhaps, above all others, 'vexatus ab interpretibus,' (tortured by interpreters,) if it be true, as Winer affirms, that there are no less than 250 modes of explanation, most of which are stated and reviewed by Koppe, Berger, Keil, Bonitz, Weigand, and Scheft." — (Bloomfield.) Schott remarks, that the bare fact of upwards of 250 interpretations makes it impossible to deny that some obscurity attaches to the Apostle's language in this passage, arising chiefly from mere brevity of style, but judiciously adds, that, had there not been many commentators more eager to bring forward anything that has the appearance of novelty, than to investigate the ordinary meaning of the terms, the scope of the passage, and the doctrinal statements and reasonings contained in the writings of the Apostle Paul, the interpretations would never have swelled to so large an amount. — *Ed.*

Fta63 "As the law was before compared to a *jailer*, so it is here likened to a [paidagwgo>v](#), by which term is not to be understood a *schoolmaster*, (for that would have been [dida>skalov](#)), but the *paedagogus* or person (usually a freedman or slave) who conducted children to and from school, attended them out of school hours, formed their manners, superintended their moral conduct, and in various respects prepared them for the [dida>skalov](#)." — Bloomfield. Our author's observations on [paidagwgo>v](#), in another passage, have brought out the full meaning of this word, and the classical authorities for the use of it, in the translator's notes. — CALVIN on the Corinthians, vol. 1. p. 169. — *Ed.*

Fta64 "If any person receives nothing more than this bodily washing, which is perceived by the eyes of flesh, he has not put on the Lord Jesus Christ." — Jerome.

- fta65 “Epi>tropov signifies both a child’s guardian to take care of his person and estate, and his instructor and tutor, ejpi>tropov kai< tou~ paido<v kai< tw~n crhma>tw, ‘the guardian both of the child and of his property.’ (Aelian, v. H. 1. 3. c. 26.) Here it properly signifies the latter, his preceptor or tutor. The next word, oijko>nomov, which we render governor, here denotes his guardian, who is to take care of his person and estate; and to each of these the heirs to large inheritances are generally subject, even as servants are subject to their proper masters.” – Chandler.
- Fta66 “So far was he from subjecting to the yoke of the law those to whom the law had not been given, that he came in order to emancipate even the Jews themselves.” – Wetstein.
- Fta67 Ma~llon dc< “The Greek writers make use of these two particles for the purpose of correcting what they have already said, and, as if it had not been enough, of adding something more. Thus, <450834>Romans 8:34, and in Polybius. Crh>simon cijh ma~llon d j ahnagkai~on. “It would be useful, it would even be necessary.” Kai< ga<r ajtopon ma~llon d j wlv cijpei~n ajdu>naton, adunaton. “It would be absurd; it would even be impossible.” – Raphelius.
- Fta68 “Par ce mot de *Servir*, il reprend la necessity, a laquelle ils s’astraignoyent d’observer les ceremonies.” “By the word ‘bondage,’ he reproves them for the necessity to which they had reduced themselves to observe ceremonies.”
- Fta69 ]Esti ga<r kai< zh~lov ajgaqo<v o[tan tiv ou[tw zhloi~ w[ste mimh>sasqai th<n ajreth>n? e]sti kai< zh~lov pronhro<v w[ste ejkba>llein th~v ajreth~v to<n katorqou~nta? o[ dh< kai< aujtoi< nu~n ejpiceirou~si, th~v me<n telei>av gnw>sewv ejkba>llein qc>lontev, cijv dc< th<n hjkrwthriasm>~nhn uJma~v de< tou<v nu~n uJyhloce>rouv aujtw~n o]ntav, ejn ta>xci katasth>swsi maqhtw~n? tou~to ga<r ejdh>lwsen cijtw<n i[na aujtou<v zhlou~te.
- “There is a good zeal, when one emulates in such a manner as to imitate virtue; and there is a bad zeal, which ‘drives away’ from virtue one who is acting right. And this is what they are now attempting to do, when they wish to ‘drive away’ from perfect knowledge, and to lead them to that which is mutilated and spurious, for no other reason than that they may occupy the ranks of teachers, and that you, who are higher than themselves, may be placed by them in the rank of scholars; for this is what he meant by saying, ‘that ye may emulate them.’” – Chrysostom.
- Fta70 ajporou~mai ejn uJmin~. “By these words the apostle undoubtedly expresses more than that he was ‘in doubt about’ the Galatians, and was at a loss what he should say about them; for in the preceding verse he had given utterance to the vehement emotion of his mind. With very nearly the same kind of emphasis does this word occur in the Septuagint, at <013207>Genesis 32:7, where it is said, ‘And Jacob was greatly afraid, and was in deep anxiety.’ The concluding words are translated kai< hjporci~to.” – Keuchenius.
- Fta71 “To speak sometimes gently, and sometimes harshly, as the case might demand.” – Luther. Fwnh> signifies not only a voice, but the thing that is spoken, (Aelian, V. H., p. 347,) whether it be by word of mouth, or by letter. And therefore, when the apostle says that he ‘desired to change his voice,’ he means, that he should be glad to be present and converse with them personally, instead of writing to them at a distance; because then he could be more fully informed of their true state, and better able to know how to order his discourse to them.” – Chandler.
- Fta72 “Seulement qu’ils regardent de ne faire chose contre l’honneur de Dieu et leur conscience.”  
“Only let them beware of doing anything against the honour of God and their own conscience.”
- Fta73 “La servile condition de sa mere.” “His mother’s condition as a slave.”

- Fta74 “Et pour ceste cause elle engendre plusieurs sens et de diverses sortes.” “And therefore it produces many meanings, and of various kinds.”
- Fta75 “A cataehresis borrows the name of one thing to express another; which thing, though it has a name of its own, yet, under a borrowed name, surprises us with novelty, or infuses into our discourses a bold and daring energy. The Sacred Scriptures will furnish us with many instances of this trope. <032630>Leviticus 26:30, — ‘And I will cast your carcasses upon the carcasses of your idols;’ that is, upon the ruins of your idols, which shall be as much destroyed as the body is when it is slain, and become a dead carcase. So <053214>Deuteronomy 32:14; <198005>Psalm 80:5; <281402>Hosea 14:2. But the boldest catachresis, perhaps, in all the Holy Scriptures, is in <460125>1 Corinthians 1:25., Because the foolishness of God,’ says the apostle, ‘is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men;’ that is, what men are apt to account foolishness in God surpasses their wisdom, and what they may be ready to misconstrue as weakness in God, excels all their power. Gibbons’s Rhetoric.
- Fta76 To a Latin scholar the author’s meaning is obvious enough. But it may be proper to apprise the English reader, that *pactio* (a covenant) is a feminine noun, and, on that account, is pronounced to be more natural and graceful, in a metaphorical description of a mother, than *testamentum*, (a testament,) which, being a neuter noun, sounds harshly in this connection. In that point of view, the preference is little else than a matter of taste; but, on far higher grounds, “covenant” is a more faithful translation than “testament;” and a careful investigation of the meaning of [diaqh>kh](#) would contribute greatly to elucidate many passages of Scripture. — Ed.
- Fta77 “C’est a dire, les conduisoit comme petits enfans.” “That is, treated them like little children.”
- Fta78 “Car Agar est la montagne de Sina en Arabie, et est correspondante a Ierusalem; ou, Sina est une montagne en Arabie, correspondante a Ierusalem.” “For Agar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and corresponds to Jerusalem; or, Sinai is a mountain in Arabia, which corresponds to Jerusalem.”
- Fta79 “Several critics have thought it so extraordinary, that they have attempted to alter it from mere conjecture, as may be seen in Bowyer’s ‘Critical Conjectures.’ But no man, who knew that the Arabic word ‘Hagar’ meant *a rock*, could think of making an alteration in this passage; for it is obvious that [to< {Agar](#), in the neuter gender, cannot signify the woman *Hagar*; and Paul has not been guilty of a grammatical error, since the passage must be translated, ‘The word Hagar denotes Mount Sinai in Arabia.’ “ — Michaelis.
- “That this was an appellation of Sinai among the people of the surrounding country, we have the testimony of Chrysostom and the ancient commentators, which is also confirmed by the accounts of modern travellers. And it might well have it, since [rgh](#) (*hagar*) in Arabia signifies a rock, or rocky mountain; and as Sinai is remarkably such, it might be [kat j ejxoch<n](#), called [to< {Agar](#).” — Bloomfield.
- Fta80 “The history tells us, that he laughed at, derided, and mocked him to scorn, which is real persecution; probably through pride, and the conceit of being Abraham’s eldest son and heir.” — Chandler. “[Diw>kw](#) will here denote injurious treatment of every kind, both in deeds and words. And although the Mosaic history records only one instance of insulting treatment, — namely, on Ishmael mocking Sarah, when she weaned Isaac, (<012109>Genesis 21:9, 10,) yet when we consider the disappointment which both Hagar and Ishmael must have felt on the birth of Isaac, it was not unnatural for them to feel ill-will, and show it on every occasion, to the real heir of the promise. And many such are recorded, from tradition, in the Rabbinical writers.” — Bloomfield.