**Love fulfils the whole law, Rom. xiii. 10),  
according to the Scripture, Thou shalt  
love thy neighbour as thyself, ye do well**  
(i.e. *well* *and good*; see above: if you  
choose to do this, I have nothing to object.  
But then, this you can never do, as long  
as you respect persons):

**9.]** **but if  
ye respect persons, it is sin that ye are  
working** (not obedience to this royal law),  
**being** (i.e. seeing that ye are) **convicted**  
**by the law as transgressors** (viz. by  
virtue of what I have already proved as  
wrong in your conduct. “For God  
commands us to love our neighbours, not to  
respect persons.” Calvin).

**10.]** *The  
fact of transgression of this law is proved*  
by its *solidarity*, not admitting of being  
broken in one point, and yet kept in the  
whole. “God,” says Calvin, “will not  
he served with reservations, so that we  
might except from this law what happens  
not to please us.” **For whosoever shall  
have kept the whole law, but shall  
have offended** (literally, stumbled) **in** (the  
matter of: as in ch. iii. 2: see there) **one  
thing** (one thing enjoined, one commandment,  
as by and by explained), **has become**  
**guilty of** (brought into the condemning  
power of, involved in) **all** (things mentioned  
as objects of prohibition—for such  
is the reference here, see below—in the law).

**11.]** *Reason for this assertion:* the  
unity of the divine Author of the whole  
law, and of that law, as the exponent of  
His will : “He is one who made the whole  
law: those who violate His will in one  
thing, violate it all.” Bengel. **For He  
who said, Commit nct adultery, said**  
**also, Commit not murder. Now if thou  
committest no adultery, but committest  
murder, thou hast become a transgressor  
of the law.** Various fanciful reasons have.  
been given for the selection of these two  
commandments: ‘because these two were  
punished with death,’ Baumgarten:  
‘because no one had laid a charge of adultery  
against the readers, but the other they  
violated by violating the law of love,’  
Wiesinger. But it is far more likely that they  
are alleged as the two first which regard  
our duty to our neighbour generally : the  
prohibition of adultery being put first, as  
in Mark x. 19; Luke xviii. 20; Rom.  
xiii. 9; Philo also has this order, and lays  
a stress on it, as shewing that adultery is  
the greatest of social crimes. So that  
this order must have been one preserved  
in ancient tradition: or perhaps found  
anciently in the Septuagint. The Rabbis  
have the same sentiment as this. They  
say of the thirty-nine precepts of Moses,  
“If a man do them all, but omit one, he  
is guilty of all and every of them.”

**12, 13.]** *Concluding and summary  
exhortations,* to speak and act as subject to the  
law of liberty and love. **So speak, and so  
do** (**so** both times does not regard what  
has gone before, but what follows. *Speaking*  
had been before hinted at in ch. i.  
19: and will come again under consideration  
in ch. iii.), **as being about to be  
judged by** (by means of, as the measure  
by which your lives will be estimated) **the  
law of liberty** (the same as in ch. i. 25:  
that perfect expansion of God’s will, resting  
on the free unrestrained principle of love,