which this is taken, is directly Messianic:  
indicating in its foreground the reviviscence  
of Israel after calamity, but in language  
far surpassing that event. The citation is  
from the Septuagint version, verbatim. St.  
Paul here interprets the barren of Sarah,  
who bore not according to the flesh (representing the promise), and the fruitful, of  
Hagar (representing the Law). In the  
next clause we must not render, as A.V.,  
“*many more &c.*,” which is inaccurate:  
but, **many are the children of the desolate, more than** (rather than; both being  
numerous, hers are the *more* numerous) **of  
her, &c.**

**28.] Now ye** (or, **we), brethren, like Isaac, are children of PROMISE**(emphatic:—are children, not *according to  
the flesh,* but *by the promise*, see ver. 23,  
and below, ver. 29).

**29.] he that  
was born after the flesh,** see ver. 23. It  
has been thought that there is nothing in  
the Hebrew text to justify so strong a  
word as **persecuted**. It runs, ‘and Sarah  
saw the son of Hagar mocking’—the Septuagint has, ‘sporting with her son Isaac.”  
‘The Hebrew word is the same as that used  
when Lot seemed as one that “*mocked*” to  
his sons-in-law, Gen. xix. 14. And this  
would be quite ground enough for the  
word here, for the spirit of persecution was  
begun. So that we need not refer to tradition, as many have done, to account for  
St. Paul’s expression.

**him [that was  
born] after the Spirit,** i.e. in virtue of the  
promise, which was given by the Spirit.  
Or, *‘by virtue of the Spirit’s agency.’* but  
the other is better.

**30.] Nevertheless:** notwithstanding the fact of the persecution, just mentioned. The quotation  
is adapted from the Septuagint, where *my  
son Isaac* (as in our English text) stands  
for “*the son of the freewoman.*” We need  
hardly have recourse to the fact that God  
confirmed Sarah’s words, in order to prove  
this to be *Scripture*: the Apostle is allegorizing the whole history, and thus every  
part of it assumes a significance in the allegory.

**31.]** I am inclined to think,  
against Meyer, and others, that this verse  
is, as commonly taken, the conclusion from  
what has gone before: and that the **wherefore** is bound on to the word *inherit* preceding. For that we are *heirs*, is an  
acknowledged fact, established before, ch.  
iii. 29; ver. 7. And if we are, we are not  
the children of the handmaid, of whom it  
was said *that they should not inherit,* but  
of the freewoman, of whose son the same  
words asserted that he should inherit.

**V. 1—12.]** This may be called the *peroration* of the whole second part of the  
Epistle. It consists of *earnest exhortation*