**privately** (in a private conference: not to be  
conceived as separate from, but as specifying, the former communication) **to those  
that were eminent** (more at length ver. 6,  
*“they which seemed to be somewhat.”*  
These were James, Cephas, and John,  
ver. 9,—who appear to have been the only  
Apostles then at Jerusalem. ‘This is  
said, not for his own sake, but for that of  
others: meaning, that all might see the  
unity of the preaching, and that the truths  
proclaimed by me were well pleasing to  
the rest.” Theodoret)**, lest by any means  
I should** (seem to) **be running, or** (to)  
**have run, in vain.** It is quite out of the  
question, that this last clause should express a *bona fide* fear, lest his ministry  
should really be, or have been, in vain,  
without the recognition of the church at  
Jerusalem: such a sentiment would be  
unworthy of him, and, besides, at variance with the whole course of his argument here. The reference must be to  
the *estimation* in which his preaching  
would be held by those to whom he imparted it. When we consider the very  
strong prejudices of the Jerusalem church,  
this feeling of anxiety, leading him to  
take measures to prevent his work from  
being tumultuously disowned by them, is  
surely but natural.

**3.] Howbeit**(so far were they from regarding my course  
to have been in vain, that) **not even was  
Titus, who was with me, a Greek** (i.e.  
though he was a Gentile, and therefore  
liable to the demand that he should  
be circumcised), **compelled to be circumcised** (i.e. we did not allow him to be  
thus compelled: the facts being, as here  
implied, that the church at Jerusalem  
[and the Apostles? apparently not, from  
Acts xv. 5] demanded his circumcision,  
but on account of the reason following,  
the demand was not complied with, but  
resisted by Paul and Barnabas. So Meyer,  
and others, and I am persuaded, rightly,  
from what follows. But usually it is understood, that the circumcision of Titus  
*was not even demanded,* and that St. Paul  
alleged this as shewing his agreement  
with the other Apostles. But had this  
been so, besides that the following could  
not have stood as it does, not the strong  
expression **was compelled,** but the weakest  
possible one would have been used—*‘the  
circumcision of Titus was not even mentioned’*):

**4.] and that** (restricts and  
qualifies the broader assertion which went  
before. *‘Titus was not compelled ...: and  
the reason was,’ &c.*) **because of the false  
brethren who had been foisted in among  
us** (the Judaizers in the church at Jerusalem, see Acts xv. 1), **men who crept in  
to spy out** (in a hostile sense) **our freedom**(from the ceremonial law: to see whether,  
or how far, we kept it) **which we have  
in Christ Jesus, with intent to enslave  
us utterly: to whom not even for one  
hour did we** (Barnabas, Titus, and myself)  
**yield with the subjection required of us,  
that the truth of the gospel** (as contrasted with the perverted view which  
they would have introduced. Had they  
been overborne in this point, the verity of  
the Gospel would have been endangered  
among them,—i.e. that doctrine of justification, on which the Gospel turns as the  
truth of God) **might abide with you**