certainty:—the course of Saul as a zealot  
may have often led him even to preach,  
if not circumcision in its present debated  
position, yet that strict Judaism of which  
it formed a part.

**why am I still persecuted?]** *still* is logical, i.e., **what further  
excuse is there for my being** (as I am)  
**persecuted** (by the Jews)**?—For,** if this is  
so, if I still preach circumcision, **then is  
brought to nought,** is done away, **the  
OFFENCE** (this word has the emphasis) **of  
the cross—**because, if circumcision, and not  
faith in Christ crucified, be the condition of  
salvation, then the cross has lost its offensive character to the Jew: ‘For not even  
the cross did so much scandalize the Jews,  
as the having to leave off obeying the  
fathers’ laws. For when they brought  
up Stephen, they did not allege against him  
that he worshipped Him who had been  
crucified, but that he spoke against the  
law and the holy place.” Chrysostom.

**12.]** The verse introduces a climax—**I would  
that they who are unsettling you would  
even....** As to the verb which follows,  
(1) it cannot be passive, as A. V., ‘*were even  
cut of.’* (2) It can hardly mean ‘*would  
cut themselves off from your communion*,’  
as the *even* is against so mild a wish, besides  
that this sense of the word is unexampled.  
(3) The only admissible sense of the word  
is one carrying harshness, and more, to  
our ears; viz. *amputation*. And (4) such  
a meaning of the word is that in which  
(agreeably to its primitive classical sense,  
of hewing off limbs) it is used by the Septuagint translators in Deut. xxiii. 1, and by  
other authors. It seems to me that this  
sense *must be adopted,* in spite of the protests raised against it. And so Chrysostom and the great consensus of ancient  
and modern Commentators: and, as Jowett  
very properly observes, “the common interpretation of the Fathers, confirmed by the  
use of language in the Septuagint version, is  
not to be rejected only because it is displeasing to the delicacy of modern times.”

**13—CH. VI. 5.]** THE THIRD or HORTATORY PORTION OF THE EPISTLE, not however separated from the former, but united  
to it by the current of thought:—and

**13—15.]** *Though free, be one another's servants in love.*

**13.] For** gives the reason why  
the Apostle was so fervent in his denunciation of these disturbers; because they  
were striking at the very root of their  
Christian calling, which was **unto** (or, **on  
condition of) freedom. Only (make not)  
your liberty into** (or, use it not for) **an  
occasion** (opportunity) **for the flesh** (for  
giving way to carnal passions), **but by means  
of (your) love be in bondage** (so literally:  
the word is used in opposition to *freedom*)  
**to one another.** Chrysostom remarks,  
“Here again he hints, that strife, and faction, and the love of rule, and vanity, has  
been to them the cause of this error: for  
the desire of rule is the mother of heresies.”

**14.]** See Rom. xiii. 8, 9.—“The  
question, how the Apostle can rightly say  
of the *whole* law, that it is fulfilled by  
loving one’s neighbour, must not be answered by understanding **the law** of the  
*Christian* law, or of the *moral* law only, or  
of the *second* table of the decalogue, or of  
every divinely revealed law in general;—  
**for the whole law** cannot, from the circumstances of the whole Epistle, mean any  
thing but ‘*the whole law* of Moses;’—  
but by placing ourselves on the lofty spiritual level from which St. Paul looked  
down, and saw all other commands of the  
Jaw so far subordinated to the law of love,  
that whoever had fulfilled *this* command,  
must be treated as having fulfilled the  
whole.” Meyer: who also remarks that