fanatical spirits who depreciate the majesty of  
Baptism, and speak wickedly and impiously  
concerning it. Paul, on the other hand,  
dignifies Baptism with sublime titles, calling it the font of regeneration and of the  
renewal by the Holy Spirit (Tit. iii. 5),  
and here says that all the baptized put on  
Christ: as if he said: ye have not received  
in baptism a mere ticket of admission into  
the number of Christians, as many fanatics  
of our time have fancied, who have made  
of baptism a mere admission ticket, i.e. a  
transitory and empty sign: but he declares  
that in baptism, they put on Christ: i.e.  
ye were snatched away from the law into a  
new birth, which was effected in your baptism.” But we may notice too, as Meyer  
remarks, that the very putting on of Christ,  
which as matter of standing and profession  
is done in baptism, forms a subject of exhortation to those already baptized, in its  
ethical sense, Rom. xiii. 14).

**28.]** The  
absolute equality of all in this sonship, to  
the obliteration of all differences of earthly  
extraction or position. See Col. iii. 11;  
Rom. x. 12; 1 Cor xii. 13. Observe, “**neither** *Jew* **nor** *Greek*,”—“**neither** *bond*  
**nor** *free*,” but “*male* **and** *female*:” the two  
former being accidental distinctions which  
may be entirely put off in falling back on  
our humanity,—but the latter a necessary  
distinction, absorbed however in the higher  
category: “there is no distinction into  
male and female.”

**for]** reason why  
there is neither, &c.—viz. our unity in  
Christ. The unavoidable inference from  
an assertion like this is, that Christianity  
did alter the condition of women and slaves.

**one [man],** more forcible and more  
strict than *one:* for we are one, *in Him,  
“one new man,”* as St. Paul says in Eph. ii.  
15, speaking on this very subject.

**29.]**  
Christ is ‘*Abraham’s seed*’ (ver. 16): ye  
are one in and with Christ, have put on  
Christ; therefore *ye* are Abraham’s seed;  
consequently heirs by promise; for to  
Abraham and his seed were the promises  
made. The stress is on **ye, Abraham’s,**and **according to promise,** especially on the  
latter,—carrying the conclusion of the  
argument, as against inheritance *by the  
law.* See on this verse, the note on  
ver. 16 above. “The declaration of ver. 7  
is now substantiated by 22 verses of the  
deepest, the most varied, and most comprehensive reasoning that exists in the  
whole compass of the great Apostle’s  
writings.” Ellicott.

**IV. 1—7.]** The Apostle shews the correspondence between our treatment under  
the law and that of heirs in general: and  
thus, by God’s dealing with us, in sending  
forth His Son, whose Spirit of Sonship we  
have received, confirms (ver. 7) the conclusion that WE ARE HEIRS.

**1. the  
heir]** any heir, generic. The question,  
whether the *father* of the *heir* here is to  
he thought of as dead, or absent, or living  
and present, is in fact one of no importance: nor does it belong properly to the  
consideration of the passage. The fact is,  
the antitype breaks through the type, and  
disturbs it: as is the case, wherever the  
idea of *inheritance* is spiritualized. The  
supposition in our text is, that a father  
(from what reason or under what circumstances matters not) has preordained a  
time for his son and heir to come of age,  
and till that time, has subjected him to  
guardians and stewards. In the *type*, the  
reason might be absence, or decease, or  
even high office or intense occupation, of  
the father: in the *antitype*, it is the  
Father's sovereign will: but the *circumstances* equally exist.

**differeth nothing  
from a bond-servant]** for he may be