**which He promised** (Luke xii. 31, 32,  
&c.) **to them that love Him?**

**6.]** *Contrast to God's estimate of the  
poor.* **But ye dishonoured the poor man**  
(in the ease just now put. “It is improper  
to debase those whom God extols, and to  
treat contumeliously those whom He counts  
worthy of honour. But God honours the  
poor: therefore he inverts God’s order,  
who rejects them.” Calvin. This is his  
first argument. Now, vv. 6, 7, he brings  
in another, deduced from the conduct of  
rich men towards Christians, and towards  
Christ Himself). **Do not the rich** (opposed  
as a class, to *the poor* above. This  
serves to shew that “*the rich man*,” when

generally spoken of in the Epistle, as e.g.  
ch. i. 10, is not the Christian rich man,  
but the rich man as such, in his worldliness  
and enmity to God) **oppress you**  
(literally, use power, or lordship, or licence,  
against you to your hurt), **and is it not  
they that drag you** (the term implies  
violence) **to courts of judgment** (see

ch. v. 6. The words may refer either to  
persecutions, or to oppressive law-suits;  
or perhaps to both, See on the matter,  
1 Cor. vi. 2, 4)?

**7.]** **Is it not  
they that blaspheme** (actually and literally,  
in words, it being, as we have maintained  
throughout, ungodly and heathens  
who are pointed at. Those who maintain  
them to be Christian rich men, would  
understand this *blasphemy* of disgracing  
by their lives) **the goodly name which  
was called on you** (i.e. which when you  
were admitted into Christ’s Church by baptism  
was made yours, so that you are called  
*Christ's*, 1 Cor. iii. 28 [not necessarily  
“*Christians:*” no particular form of the  
appropriation of the name is alluded to, but  
only the fact of the name being called over  
them. The appellation may or may not  
have been in use at this time, for aught that  
this shews]. The name is of course that  
of *Christ:* not that of God, as some think,  
nor that of ‘brethren,’ as others)? So that  
if ye thus dishonour the poor in comparison  
with the rich, you are 1) contravening  
the standard of honour which God sets up  
in His dealings: 2) opposing your own  
interest: 3) helping to blaspheme the  
name of Christ.

**8—11.]** *Proof that this behaviour  
is a transgression of God’s law.* The  
connexion is somewhat recondite. The  
adversative **yet** clearly takes exception  
at something, expressed or understood.  
Calvin and others suppose the  
Apostle to be meeting an objection of his  
readers:—“But thus, according to you,  
we should he breaking the injunction,  
Love thy neighbour, &c., for we should  
view the rich with hatred and contempt.”  
Then he replies, “Certainly, if ye, &c.  
ye do well:” understanding **ye do well**  
as a very feeble approbation. But this  
seems to me very unnatural. It contains  
indeed the germ of the true view,  
which appears to be this: The Apostle is  
not replying to a fancied objection on  
the part of others, but is guarding his  
own argument from misconstruction:  
“All this is true of the rich. Still I do  
not say, hate them, drive them from  
your assemblies, &c.: if you choose to  
observe faithfully the great command,  
Love others as yourselves, in your   
conduct to all, well and good: but respect  
of persons, instead of being a keeping, is  
a breach of this law; for I have proved  
it to be sin, and he who commits sin is  
a transgressor of the law, of the whole  
law, by the very terms of legal obedience.”  
Thus the context seems to run smoothly  
and naturally. **Yet** (for the connexion see  
above) **if ye fulfil** (if ye really choose to *fulfil*  
in its completeness that law) **the royal law**  
(the law which is the king of all laws, as  
the old saying makes *law itself king of all.*