denying practice, “This is the only time  
when he is mentioned in conjunction with  
St. Paul, since the date of the quarrel in  
Acts xy. 39.” Stanley) **not power to  
abstain from working** (i. e. power to look  
for our maintenance from the churches,  
without manual labour of our own) ?

7—12.] *Examples from common life,  
of the reasonableness of the workman  
being sustained by his work.*

7.]  
*From the analogies of human conduct : (1  
The soldier.*

**at his own charges**]  
with pay furnished ont of his own resources. (2) *The husbandman.* (3) *The  
shepherd*.

**8.] Am I speaking these  
things merely according to human judgment of what is right? Or** (see note, ver.  
6) **does the law too not say these things**?

**9.]** (It does say them) **For in the  
law of Moses it is written, Thou shalt not  
muzzle an ox while treading out the corn.**It was and still is the custom in the East,  
to place the newly-reaped grain on a floor  
in the open air, and then, by means of  
oxen, or buffaloes, to crush out the grain  
from the husk, either by the feet of the  
beasts, or by machines dragged by them.

**Is it for the OXEN that God is  
taking care?**— The question imports,  
In giving this command are the *oxen*,  
or those *for whom the law was given*,  
its objects?” And to such a question  
there can be but one answer. Every duty  
of *humanity* has for its ultimate ground, not  
the mere welfare of the animal concerned,  
*but its welfare in that system of which MAN  
is the head:* and therefore, *man’s* welfare.  
The good done to man’s immortal spirit by  
acts of humanity and justice, infinitely outweighs the mere physical comfort of a  
brute which perishes.

**10.] Or** (the  
other alternative being rejected) **on** OUR  
**account** (i.e. on account of us ministers  
of the Gospel: not, of *men in general*)  
**altogether** (*altogether*, excluding entirely  
the other idea) doth he (or perhaps it,  
the law) **say (this)**? **yea, for our sakes it**(viz., “*Thou shalt not muzzle the ox,” &c*.)  
**was written: because the plougher**(not  
literal but spiritual, see below) **ought to  
plough in hope, and the thresher** (to  
thresh) **in hope of partaking** (of the  
crop).—The words used in this sentence  
are evidently *spiritual*, and *not literal.*  
They are inseparably connected with **for  
our sakes,** which precedes them: and  
according to the common explanation of  
them as referring to a mere maxim of agricultural life, would have no force whatever.  
But spiritually taken, all coheres. “The  
command (not to muzzle, &c.) was written  
on account of us (Christian teachers), because we ploughers (in the ‘*husbandry of  
God*,’ ch. iii. 9) ought to plough in hope,