CHAP. I. 1—5.] ADDRESS AND GREETING. In the very opening sentence of the  
Epistle, we see the fervour of the Apostle’s  
mind and the weightiness of his subject  
betraying themselves. The vindication of  
his own apostolic calling,—and the description of the work and purpose of  
Christ towards us, shew him to be writing  
to those who had disparaged that apostleship, and were falling from their Saviour.

**1.]** It is better not to join the word  
**Apostle** (here of course used in its strict  
and highest sense) with **from men,** but  
to let it stand by itself, and take the two  
prepositions as indicating, **from** the remote  
originating cause, **by** the nearer instrumental one. In St. Paul’s case, neither  
of these was merely human: the Lord  
Jesus was both the original Sender, and  
Himself the Announcer of the mission.

**and God the Father]** If by Jesus  
Christ, then also by God the Father, in  
and by whose appointment all the mediatorial acts of Christ in the Headship of  
His Church are done. The strongest possible contrast is here drawn between man,  
in the ordinary sense, on the one side, and  
**Jesus Christ,** and **God the Father,** on the  
other. Had not the Apostle regarded  
Jesus Christ as one with the Father in the  
Godhead, he never could have written thus.  
It is important to remember that the mission of Paul to the actual work of the  
ministry was by the command of the *Holy  
Spirit,* Acts xiii. 2,—proceeding from, and  
expressing the will of, the Father and the  
Son.

**who raised Him from the dead]**  
Why specified here? Not, I think, because  
(Meyer) Paul was called to be an Apostle  
*by the risen Saviour*,—nor merely to identify the Father as the Originator of the  
Son’s work of Redemption (which is so in  
Rom. iv. 24,—but here would not immediately concern Paul’s calling to be an  
Apostle),—nor to meet the objection that  
he had never seen Christ, and turn it into  
an advantage, in that he alone was commissioned by the already risen and ascended Jesus,—for in this case we should  
not find “*who raised Him*” stated as a  
predicate of the Father, but “*which was  
raised*” as one of the Son,—nor as asserting the Resurrection against the Jews and  
Judaizing Galatians, which is far-fetched,  
—nor again as expressing an attribute of  
the Father, without which He can hardly  
be thought of by the believer,—for this is  
too loose a relevancy for a sentence so  
pointed as the present: but because the  
Resurrection, including and implying the  
Ascension, was the Father’s bestowal on  
Christ of gifts for men, by virtue of which  
(Eph. iv. 11) St. Paul’s *Apostleship had  
been received.* See a similar sentiment in