of the Gospel is altogether different, and  
His work different: He has absolutely reconciled the parties at variance, and MADE  
THEM ONE in Himself. Remember St.  
Paul’s habit of insulating the matter in  
hand, and dealing with it irrespective of all  
such possible objections. I must refer the  
reader for even the shortest account of  
other explanations, to my Greek Test.  
We may profitably lay down one or two  
canons of interpretation of the verse. (1)  
Every interpretation is wrong, which understands Christ by **the mediator** in this  
verse. The context determines it to be abstract, and its reference to be to Moses, the  
mediator of the Law. (2) Every interpretation is wrong, which makes **one** mean ‘one  
party’ in the covenant. **God is one** itself  
confutes any such view, being a wellknown general proposition, not admitting  
of a concrete interpretation. (3) Every  
interpretation is wrong, which confines  
**God is one** to its mere numerical meaning,  
and does not take into account the ideas  
which the general proposition would raise.  
4) Every interpretation is wrong, which  
deduces from the verse the *agreement* of  
the law with the promises: because the  
Apostle himself, in the next verse, draws  
the very opposite inference from it, and  
refutes it on other grounds. (5) Every  
attempt to set aside the verse as a gloss is  
utterly futile.

**21.]** The law being  
thus set over against the promises,—being  
given through a mediator between two,—the promises by the one God,—it  
might seem as if there were an inconsistency between them. The words of **God** are  
not without emphasis: the promises given  
rest immediately on God, and were given  
by no mediator.

**for if, &c.]** Notwithstanding all the above features of contrast  
between the law and the prophets, it is  
not against them, for it does not pretend  
to perform the same office: *if it did,* then  
there would be this rivalry, which now  
does not exist. The term **to give life**  
takes for granted that we by nature are  
*dead* in trespasses and sins.

**verily**  
has the emphasis: **in very truth,** and not  
only in the fancy of some, **by the law** (as  
its ground) **would have been righteousness**(which is the condition of life eternal.—If  
life, the result, had been given by the law,  
then righteousness, the *condition* of life,  
must have been by it also: reasoning from  
the whole to its part).

**22.] Howbeit,  
ive., but on the contrary** (this not being  
the case,—no law having been given out  
of which could come righteousness) **the  
scripture** (not the Law; but as in ver. 8,  
the Author of Scripture, speaking by that,  
His witness) **shut up** (see note Rom. xi. 32,  
where the same expression occurs. “The  
term **shut up** is beautifully chosen to set  
off more clearly the idea of Christian freedom by and by.” Windischmann: see  
ch. v. 1) **all** (literally, all things: neuter,  
as indicating the entirety of mankind and  
man’s world: *all human matters*) **under  
sin, in order that** (the *intention* of God, as  
in Rom. xi. 832: *not the mere result,* here  
or any where else) **the promise** (i.e. the  
things promised—the *inheritance*, cf. vv.  
16, 18) (which is) **by** (depends upon, is  
conditioned by) **faith of** (which has for its  
object and its Giver—is a matter altogether belonging to) **Jesus Christ might be  
given** (be a *free gift*—**given** has the emphasis) **to them that believe** (the word  
“*given*” having the emphasis, “*to them  
that believe*” does no more than take up  
the words “*by faith*” above, as if it had  
been said ‘to those who fulfil that condition’).

**23.]** **But** (*this* carries us on  
to a further account of the rationale and  
office of the law) **before** (this) **faith** (not,  
*the faith,* in the sense of *the objects of  
faith,* but the faith just mentioned, viz.  
*the faith of Jesus Christ*, which did not  
exist until Christ) **came** (was found, or was  
possible, in men), **we** (properly, we Jewish