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The Letter to the Galatians

Saint Paul wrote his letter to the Gentile churches in Galatia in response to a report that came to him—we know not how—concerning their recent activity. Specifically, we learn that the Galatians had begun to observe the precepts of the Mosaic Law (which Paul calls simply, “the Law”), including circumcision, and to believe that such observances, in addition to faith, were necessary for their salvation. Paul therefore writes to rebuke them for departing from his teaching and to guide them back to believing and practicing the Gospel that he preached while he was there; namely, the Gospel of justification through faith alone, without the need to observe the precepts of the Law. This, therefore, is the main question of the letter: “To what extent should Christians, especially Gentile converts, be concerned with observing the precepts of the Mosaic Law?” Paul’s answer is clear. The Old Law has been nullified, and justification is now received only through faith in Christ, who redeemed us from slavery to the Law. The believer’s faith works through love, but no longer under the instruction of the Law; rather, it works spontaneously, at the instigation of the Holy Spirit, whose fruits the believer produces, at the same time as he or she avoids the manifest works of the flesh.

The letter itself is carefully constructed for the sake of his argument. After the customary greetings at the beginning of the letter (1:1–5), Paul immediately levels the charge that the Galatians have abandoned God and the Gospel, and reveals that he knows about the false teachers, who have distorted the Gospel that he preached (1:6–7). He does not yet, however, explain how they have abandoned the Gospel. Rather, he first lays the foundation for their acceptance of what he will have to say, by demonstrating his own authority, and that his teachings are not his own invention or opinion, but are from God.

To prove that his teaching is from God, Paul first reminds the Galatians of his calling to faith and the apostolic office by a revelation of Christ,
who converted him from persecutor to preacher (1:11–16). Then, in affirmation of this divine calling, and that there is no other explanation for the perfection of his teaching, he shows that he could not have learned the Gospel from men, because he did not have sufficient contact with the other apostles for at least fourteen years (1:16–2:10). When he finally did go up to Jerusalem to meet with the other apostles, they discovered his teachings to be perfectly in agreement with their own. Even his account of the conflict between himself and Peter (2:11–14), whose adjustment of his own behavior in response to Paul’s correction is implicit, serves to support the perfection of Paul’s teaching, since he was able to correct even the chief of the apostles.

Only after this does Paul positively describe the Gospel that he preached (2:15–21) and explain that God justifies men through faith in Christ and not through works of the Law. It becomes clear in chapter 3 that this is exactly the mistake that the Galatians had made. That only faith is required, and not also fulfillment of the Law, should have been evident to them because they received the Holy Spirit and his gifts through faith (3:2–6). Paul goes on to argue against the necessity of keeping the precepts of the Law. First, he cites Abraham, as the example par excellence of someone who lived by faith (3:7–9). Second, he speaks of the curse of the Law, from which Christ redeemed us, so that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith (3:10–14). Third, he teaches that the giving of the Law did not nullify the promise that was made to Abraham before the Law was given (3:15–18).

At this point, if the reader is following Paul’s argument, he should be asking this question that Paul now asks: “Why, then, the Law?” (3:19). Paul explains that the Law was instituted as a temporary measure, “because of transgressions,” until the “seed” promised to Abraham should come. The Law by itself gave neither life nor righteousness (3:21). Rather, it acted like a tutor, preparing the people for the coming of Christ. Paul goes on to explain this image at greater length. As a preliminary, he states that the Galatians are sons of God, clothed with Christ through baptism, regardless of race, status, or sex (3:26–29). The Law acted as a guardian, under which the people were kept in servile state until the time appointed by the Father, which was the Incarnation of the Son of God (4:1–5), who would redeem them from their slavery to the Law and make them adopted sons of God.

What is difficult to understand at this point is that the Galatians were Gentiles and were not under the Law at all before Christ came into the world. The adoption as sons is not, however, only for those who are
under the guardianship of the Law. Paul therefore emphasizes again that the Galatians are also sons, as evidenced by the Holy Spirit within them, who cries out, “Abba, Pater,” in both Hebrew and Greek, for Jews and Gentiles alike. The Gentiles’ observance of the Law is like a return to their former pagan practices (4:8–20).

Returning to his argument that the Law is now nullified, Paul uses an illustration from the Law to demonstrate that it predicted its own termination. The two mothers, Hagar and Sarah, who conceive in different ways (by flesh and by promise) and who give birth to different children (one a slave and the other the heir), figuratively represent the two Jerusalems, on earth and “above” (4:21–31). Everything is at stake here. Obeying even a part of the Old Law would require the Galatians to observe the entire Law, return them their to their former slavery, and deprive them of the grace they had received (5:1–6). The false teachers for their part must be rejected (5:7–12).

The annulment of the Law raises the question, “What will the new life of freedom in faith look like?” and Paul goes on to answer it. Freedom from the Law is not a freedom to sin but to love, which is the summary of the entire Law (5:13–14). In this life, while the flesh and Spirit are at war with each other, we must avoid the works of the flesh and instead exhibit the fruits of the Spirit (5:16–24). Doing so, however, should not make anyone conceited or rivalrous with others (5:26). Rather, he who is spiritual should bear with the weaker brother, to restore him if he falls, and each should be concerned with examining himself, since each will bear his own burden before Christ’s Judgment (6:1–5). Finally, Paul exhorts the Galatians to do good in supporting their teachers, and not to grow weary in doing good but to be spurred on in their effort, by looking forward to the reaping of their reward (6:6–10).

To close the letter, Paul confirms its authenticity by finishing it with his own hand (what preceded must have been dictated) and recapitulates the main point: only false teachers will force you to into circumcision, which in reality counts for nothing. What matters is the “new creation” (which earlier he calls “faith working through love”). The letter concludes with a benediction.

Nicholas and His Commentary
Nicholas of Lyra, OFM (1270–1349), lived in turbulent times. Amidst a flurry of political turmoil, from 1309 until well after his death, the papacy resided at Avignon. The Franciscan order, meanwhile, had troubles of its
own. Nicholas lived through intense conflict between regular Franciscans like himself and other more radical “Spirituals” who held to a stricter ethic of poverty. The papacy had little sympathy with the latter, who often faced excommunication and persecution for their beliefs. More could be said about this history, but it is difficult to see much of Nicholas’s own context reflected in his commentary on Galatians. Perhaps in his comments on Gal 1:4 against the Manichaean notion of the evil of the substance of the world, Nicholas may have in mind the Cathari; his comments on Gal 5:19–20, where he structures the works of the flesh singularly around luxuria, may reflect a particularly Franciscan emphasis; or on Gal 5:20, his interpretation of “dissentions” and “sects” as pertaining specifically to the Church may imply a preoccupation with recent events within the Franciscan order. Such tenuous straining of literary criticism, however, is as close as we can come to identifying a direct application of the text. The reader of Nicholas’s commentary should bear in mind that his purpose is not to apply the text but to explain its meaning. He is not extracting moral lessons from the text, but clarifying what Saint Paul—or the Holy Spirit, who wrote the letter through the Apostle—most directly intended to be understood. Nicholas explicitly states this purpose in his second prologue to the Postilla. Inconsistent, unsuitable, and unsatisfactory spiritual meanings had come to plague the common practice of homiletic exegesis. Therefore a new commentary was needed, to restore a firm understanding of the literal meaning of the text, because the literal meaning was the indispensable foundation of any spiritual meaning. If anyone was to preach or defend the faith, it had to be on the basis of the literal meaning, as Augustine had said in his letter against Vincentius. Nicholas’s commentary facilitated the effortless discovery of the literal meaning, which previously seemed to take too much work to understand. His Postilla litteralis thereby provided a remedy for the epidemic of lazy preaching (and its symptom of inadequate spiritual exegesis), which was content to explain a text spiritually without understanding the foundational literal meaning.

Although Nicholas’s commentary is a learned and well-researched work, it is not as lengthy as we might expect. It had to be concise enough for its target audience to be likely to consult it. In other words, it is not merely for the purpose of getting through all of Scripture that Nicholas’s comments are so brief. Nicholas was preparing a commentary that had to be accessible and concise enough for the average preacher realistically to read and use. This explains why his Postilla is remarkably terse. Frequently he gives a short answer to a traditional question without providing a fuller
rationale for why it is correct, or he omits discussion of an issue that he
deems to have been resolved without giving any indication that contro-
versy surrounds the issue.³ On Gal 2:5, for example, he does not discuss
the important textual variant that omits the negative and would therefore
make the text read “to whom we subjected for a moment,” even though
this variant is discussed at great length by other expositors. Again, when
faced with a choice between several different interpretations, Nicholas
often chooses to include only one or two. Also for the sake of brevity, ellip-
sis is a frequent characteristic of his style of writing, as will be apparent.
When commenting on the works of the flesh on Gal 5:21, he explicitly
states that he is declining to give examples, to keep things brief. When he
considers the literal meaning to be clear, such as at 1:14, 2:12, and 5:2, he
says so and moves swiftly on to what seems more needful of explanation.
Thus we should not interpret his choices of which comments to exclude
as a negative judgment on his part of what he has read in others, but as a
process of intentional selection of what he deemed most accurate, likely,
or useful for his intended readership. Likewise, Nicholas’s process of selec-
tion should not be understood to contradict the practice that we observe
in other writers, of providing multiple possible explanations of the literal
meaning, when they are likely and congruent with the rule of faith.

Nicholas wanted to strengthen, or reestablish, the foundational lit-
eral meaning, but he continued to believe in the usefulness and necessity
of the other, spiritual meanings, as is clear from his prologues. Although
the spiritual meaning was not always what was primarily intended in a
given passage, it could still be affirmed as an intended meaning of Scrip-
ture if it was consistent with the literal meaning. For example, the literal
meaning of “Do not muzzle an ox while it is treading out the grain” is
clear. Arguing from the lesser to the greater (that if we should show charity
to an animal, then how much more should we show charity to a man?), we
can arrive at a moral interpretation, that a worker is worthy of his wage,
and this—because it is consistent with the literal meaning—may also val-
idly be called God’s intended meaning.⁴

In addition to his literal commentary, therefore, Nicholas later
(from 1333 to 1339) composed the Postilla moralis, a moral commentary,
which served to make explicit such spiritual lessons that could be derived
from the literal meaning of Scripture. It was not intended to be an exhaust-
tive or final list of all moral interpretations, but it could be used, together
with the literal commentary, to demonstrate how a moral interpretation
could be derived from the literal. In this way, preachers would be able to
apply a passage to their specific context, as and when it suited them to do so.5 For Galatians, however, as for all the Pauline and canonical epistles, Nicholas did not compose a separate moral commentary (which is why it does not appear in this volume) because he thought that the literal meaning was already sufficiently—if not entirely—moral, and so he had already fully explained it in his Postilla litteralis.6 Likewise for the books of Solomon (Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs), the moral commentary is omitted, because the moral meaning was already explained in the literal commentary.7 For other books of Scripture, for which Nicholas furnished both literal and moral commentaries, the reader would do well to be aware of both, and read them together, for a fuller understanding of Nicholas’s interpretation of any given text.

Nicholas and Aquinas

Nicholas had many resources available to him, but it seems that—at least for his commentary on Galatians—there was none more influential than Thomas Aquinas, and this will be apparent in my notes. There are certain points of similarity between Aquinas and Nicholas that make them prime candidates for comparison, despite the temporal distance between the eras in which they flourished. Such a comparison serves well to explain the natural use of the former by the latter. Both belonged to mendicant orders. Although Thomas belonged to the Dominicans and Nicholas to the Franciscans, far from being a point of contrast, this brings them closer together. Both orders had been targets of jealous opposition from the secular faculty of the University of Paris in 1256, at just the time when Aquinas and Bonaventure, his contemporary, were ready to be appointed to their respective Dominican and Franciscan chairs. Indeed, the famous friendship between Bonaventure and Aquinas seems to have set a solid precedent for future cooperation between the orders. Later the Franciscan Peter Auriol (1280–1322) declared in his interpretation of the Apocalypse that the foundation of the Franciscan and Dominican orders together were the cause of the renewal of the world, in fulfillment of the first resurrection of Rev 20:4.8

Both writers are also intimately connected with the University of Paris. Aquinas had lived there at three different times during his life: early in his career from 1245 to 1248 as a student; again from 1252 to 1259 as a student, teacher, and regent master; and finally from 1268 to 1272 as regent master for a second time, after ten years in Italy, always abiding in the Dominican studium of Saint Jacques. Nicholas for his part lived and worked at the Franciscan House of the Cordeliers in Paris for about
forty-eight years, starting in 1307, where he became a regent master for the theological faculty of the University of Paris in 1308/09.

Concerning biblical exegesis, both men have a reputation for focusing on the literal meaning of the text. Murphy says of Aquinas that he has an “unflagging interest in the literal meaning of Paul’s words,” while Martin Luther commends Nicholas in his Table Talk, saying: “Lyra’s Commentaries upon the Bible are worthy of all praise. I will order them diligently to be read, for they are exceeding good, especially on the historical part of the Old Testament. Lyra is very profitable to him who is versed in the New Testament.” Although Nicholas is best known for his use of Rabbinic literature, which surfaces in his comments on Gal 4:29, Aquinas clearly influenced Nicholas’s commentary on books of both the Old and the New Testament.

Finally, to meet the objection that Aquinas may not have been considered fit for study at that time because of the condemnation of Aristotelian principles in 1277, we should remember that at the same time as Nicholas was beginning to write his commentary, Aquinas’s reputation was being fully restored. Nicholas embarked upon the epic work of the Postilla in 1322 (which would take him more than a decade to complete), and Aquinas was formally canonized in the following year, 1323. Besides, it seems unlikely that such an official condemnation would have affected Aquinas’s reputation too adversely in Paris, particularly among the mendicants. There the university masters, who relished their freedom from episcopal supervision, and for whom the boldness of Aquinas’s integration of Aristotelian philosophy made him a revered, avant-garde reformer, would have seen his condemnation as an inappropriate encroachment of ecclesial authority, and a meddling in things that the papacy did not understand. Never was this clearer than in the early 1330s, during the controversy concerning the beatific vision, when the opposition of John XXII further united the mendicant orders. Nicholas, in his work De visione divinae essentiae, would lend his full support to Aquinas’s teaching that the souls of the saints after death go immediately to enjoy the Beatific Vision. Particularly after Aquinas’s canonization, it is almost inconceivable that Nicholas would not have wanted to consult the Angelic Doctor’s work wherever he could. It should come as no surprise, therefore, that Nicholas’s commentary on Galatians is frequently influenced by several works of Aquinas. Hopefully my many notes comparing Aquinas and Nicholas on Galatians will contribute to the observations that Krey and others have made concerning Aquinas’s influence on Nicholas’s commentary on the Old Testament.
Since the famous two verses on the fourfold meaning of Scripture appear in Nicholas’s commentary on Galatians (on 4:24; they are also found in prologues), it seems only right briefly to consider here his interpretive framework. Many scholars have paid close attention to his second prologue, in which he explains that the literal sense could sometimes be twofold, and that the second, prophetic, or Christological meaning was also part of the literal sense, in addition to what the words most immediately signified. In his second prologue, Nicholas does not say that the literal meaning is continuously twofold (as Krey observes in his practice), but that the literal meaning could—sometimes—include both a meaning for the prophet’s own time and a meaning for its Christological fulfillment. This, however, is a confusing assertion, when compared with his first prologue, and his commentary on Gal 4:24, which are more in line with a traditional understanding of the division between literal and spiritual meanings. Traditionally, it was understood that there could only be one literal meaning. In other words, not only does his practice seem inconsistent with his theory, but the theory of the second prologue seems inconsistent with that of the first. Whereas his second prologue seems to invite us to categorize Paul’s interpretation in Gal 4:24 as an exposition of the secondary literal meaning of Genesis, his comments on this passage identify the secondary meaning as spiritual—specifically, allegorical. How should we explain this? I would suggest that we should be wary of making too much of the “double literal meaning” that Nicholas mentions in his second prologue, because it should be understood simply as an alternative way of describing the literal meaning, namely, as the intended meaning. First, we must remember that Nicholas had no intention of reinventing the hermeneutic wheel, so to speak. He wanted his commentary to consolidate the universally accepted teachings of the Church, not to introduce anything new. Second, as I already mentioned, his primary concern in composing this work was to make a sharp distinction between an imported spiritual interpretation and an innate intended meaning, and one way of doing this was to go so far as to call the innate or intended secondary meaning “literal.” Third, and most importantly, we should not consider Nicholas’s theory or language to be original, since it is essentially the same as what we find in Aquinas’s Summa Theologiae I, q. 1., a. 10. Aquinas says that if the literal meaning is the intended meaning (which for men is only one meaning), then there can be multiple literal meanings for a passage of Scripture, because God is the author who comprehends everything in his
understanding. Here he cites Augustine (Confessions 12) as his authority for the propriety of speaking in such a way. The possibility of multiple literal meanings, however, is subordinate to his general argument that Scripture can have more than one meaning for the same passage (“sub una littera”), which is the question posed by the entire article. It becomes clear, moreover, that although Aquinas recognizes Augustine’s way of speaking as acceptable, he apparently does not consider it the most helpful, since he returns to distinguishing the literal meaning from the mystical meanings by saying that the latter pertain to the former (“illa tria . . . ad unum litteralem sensum pertinent”). Thus Aquinas prefers to safeguard the unity of the literal meaning. Nicholas’s statement about the twofold literal meaning must likewise be understood in context, under the heading of his third rule concerning the spirit and letter, which asserts that the historic and mystical meanings can be drawn from one and the same passage (“sub eadem littera”). Nicholas, like Aquinas, also refers to Augustine’s letter against Vincentius the Donatist (in which he says that arguments must be made from the clear literal meaning), with the difference that, while Aquinas used this to affirm that the one literal meaning upon which the others were founded is unequivocal, Nicholas uses it to affirm that the Christological meaning may also be called literal. Nevertheless, Nicholas at the end concedes that theologians do not speak this way, and—like Aquinas—he returns to the unity of the literal meaning.15 Thus Nicholas’s second preface should be understood in the light of Aquinas’s Summa Theologiae, as should his first preface, which contains similar statements, such as the uniqueness of Scripture, which contains many meanings because its principal author is God himself (as opposed to man).

There is no difference, therefore, between Nicholas’s secondary literal meaning and the intended spiritual meaning. In his commentary on Gal 4:24, we observe Nicholas’s consistency with Aquinas’s choice of terminology (used, of course, also by others), to make a clear distinction between the literal and spiritual meanings, and we should also consider this consistent with his own prologues.16

Nicholas does not equate the intended meaning with the literal; rather, the intended meaning of a passage can include both literal and spiritual senses. This, however, is not always the case. Some passages have only one meaning and cannot be understood to have a spiritual meaning in addition to the literal.17 What is remarkable about the second prologue is that he limits the intended meaning to being duplex and does not call it quadruplex or multiplex, giving us cause to suspect that he considers
Scripture capable of only one additional layer of meaning at a time. For when he supplies the famous verses concerning the four senses of Scripture, Nicholas notably does not go on to say that a passage could have four senses. His example of the noun “Jerusalem” is instructive in this regard. For although it can bear various spiritual meanings in addition to the literal, as he explains, nevertheless he gives no example of where the three spiritual meanings are in effect at the same time. Rather, on Gal 4:26, where “Jerusalem” is used, Nicholas explains that only the allegorical meaning is meant, apparently to the exclusion of the moral and anagogical, while the one literal meaning is left intact.

Additionally, we should not think that Nicholas, in his comments on Gal 4:26, is departing from his principle in his composition of the Postilla, in which he generally devotes his attention to explaining the literal meaning. For although it seems that he is concerning himself with allegory, this is only because the literal meaning of Galatians concerns the allegorical meaning of Genesis. Nicholas is not considering a spiritual meaning of Galatians at all. For although this passage of Galatians is useful for demonstrating the presence, at least in some places in Scripture, of an intended spiritual meaning in addition to the literal, Nicholas is by no means claiming this hermeneutic to be the spiritual meaning of this passage. He does not claim that the fourfold meaning is everywhere present, nor that there always is an intended spiritual meaning. Indeed, his omission of the epistles of the New Testament from his Postilla moralis may indicate that he did not consider these books to hold any divinely intended meaning in addition to the literal, which he calls entirely moral (“sensus litteralis est simpliciter moralis”).

This theoretical framework is complicated by figures of speech, parables and, to an extent, genres of writing. Figures of speech—or “tropes,” as they are sometimes called—are frequently included in the literal meaning without much difficulty, because the intended meaning is close to the surface. It is relatively easy, for example, to see that the “hand” and “finger” of God are metaphors for his power and Spirit, and are not to be taken literally. What happens, however, when the speaker or writer uses extended metaphor or allegory, and even wants his intended meaning to remain obscure, or understood by only a few? In such cases, the literal meaning of the riddle, saying, instruction, or story (all of which may be classified under the heading of “parable”), may make sense but the literal meaning is not what is intended, and indeed may contain what is false or inappropriate. The intended meaning of such “parables” is difficult to fit
into the framework of the division between literal and mystical, because it does not fit into the definition of the *sensus litteralis*, but cannot without reservation be called mystical either, since it is the primary meaning, and all mystical meanings must be founded on the primary, which is usually the literal. Nicholas explains in his prologue to the *Postilla moralis* that, according to the proper definition of the literal meaning, namely, what is signified through the words, such parables, and other passages like them, have no literal meaning, because if they did, then a meaning of Scripture would be false.  

No meaning of Scripture can be false, however, which is intended by God. The solution, therefore, which other teachers of the Church arrived at before him, is to call the intended meaning of the parable the “literal meaning,” even though it is mystical according to the proper definition. Nicholas writes:

Some teachers [of the Church], however, say that [the mystical meaning of such passages] should be understood as the parabolic meaning, broadly speaking, because where there is no [intended] meaning signified through the words, the parabolic meaning is primary, and therefore, broadly speaking, is called “literal,” because the literal is the primary meaning when there is no other [intended meaning], and to signify this they say that the parabolic is contained under the literal. And I myself, speaking this way, have in many places called the parabolic meaning “literal” in commenting on the the books of holy Scripture. But in some places holy Scripture has a literal and a mystical meaning, such as in Genesis, where it is said that Abraham had two sons, Isaac and Ishmael, and this is true according to the literal meaning and likewise according to the mystical.

Such an explanation, though it appears in the prologue to the *Postilla moralis*, would also have been most appropriate in his prologue to the *Postilla litteralis*. In the case of certain books of Scripture, for which the genre is entirely parabolic, such as Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes, this explanation is essential for understanding why he includes in his literal commentary what according to the proper definition seems entirely mystical. In such cases, Nicholas does not call the literal meaning “double.” Rather, what is signified by the words, even if it must necessarily be explained in order to understand the parabolic meaning, cannot be understood as the literal meaning because God did not intend it, and in its place, the parabolic meaning, which is the primary meaning, is subsumed into the “literal”
category. Ultimately, therefore, even in his seemingly mystical comments on parabolic passages and books, Nicholas maintains the unity of the literal meaning.

**Divine Authorship**

One presupposition that Nicholas works with in his commentary merits particular attention, because it is somewhat foreign to the modern approach. Central to his understanding of Paul’s epistle is that, like the rest of Scripture, it is inspired by the Holy Spirit. Although Paul is the instrument, God is the true author. This leads to a number of other hermeneutic principles, which Nicholas follows closely. For example, Paul’s epistle must be entirely congruent in its teaching with the rest of Scripture. Thus Nicholas freely uses other passages, from anywhere in the Bible, to elucidate the meaning where necessary. Likewise, nothing in the epistle can say anything contrary to the universal Christian creeds, which are based on the clearest teachings in Scripture; no valid interpretation can contradict the rule of faith. God’s authorship also leaves no room for superfluous or pointless words—everything was written for a reason, which, if it is not at first apparent, may be discovered by careful “searching.” This manifests itself particularly in Nicholas’s analysis of the structure of Galatians, which is often highly detailed. Close analysis of structure was a common scholastic method of explaining any text, but with Scripture, it was understood that some significance potentially rested in the placing and order of every last word. Nicholas’s description of the structure of the works of the flesh and the fruits of the Spirit (Gal 5:19–23), for example, pays close attention to the order and relation of words in a manner that might perplex the modern reader.

**The Structure and Content of Galatians, according to Nicholas**

Because Nicholas’s structural descriptions are often quite complicated, it is worth here mapping them all out, to give a coherent picture of how he understood Galatians in its entirety. Hopefully this may assist the reader, who can easily get lost (as I sometimes did) in the various divisions and distinctions that Nicholas describes. According to Nicholas, the entire letter may be divided into three parts: greeting, prosecution, and confirmation.
Part 1: Greeting (1:1–5)

I. People sending greetings (1:1)
II. People receiving greetings (1:2)
III. Good wishes (1:3)

Part 2: Prosecution (1:6–6:10)

I. Paul’s judgment (1:6–1:10)
   A. Motivating reason (1:6–7)
   B. Presentation of the sentence (1:8–9)
   C. Solution to unspoken question (1:10)

II. Declaration that the judgment is just (1:11–4:31)
      i. Demonstration of evangelical, authentic, and perfect nature of Paul’s teaching: “lesser part” (1:11–2:14)
         a. Paul’s teaching inspired by God (1:11)
            1. Intention (1:11–12)
            2. Proposition (1:13–24)
               A. Not from man before conversion (1:13–14)
               B. Not from man after conversion (1:15–24)
         b. Paul’s teaching discussed among the chief apostles, examined by them and approved (2:1–2)
         c. Paul’s teaching stood firm (2:3–5)
         d. Paul’s teaching not made greater by apostles (2:6–10)
         e. Paul’s teaching returned to sincerity (2:11–14)
      ii. Intended conclusion: precepts of Law need not be kept (2:15–21)
         a. General demonstration (2:15–17)
         b. Specific demonstration: Paul himself (2:18–21)
   B. Imperfection of the Law of Moses (3:1–4:31)
      i. Scolds Galatians (3:1–4)
         a. Presents reproach (3:1)
         b. Reasoning for reproach (3:2–4)
            1. Spirit received from hearing of faith (3:2–3)
            2. Foolish to suffer without cause (3:4)
      ii. Declares proposition: cessation of precepts of Law (3:5–4:31)
         a. According to reason (3:5–29)
            1. Reasoning set forth: “lesser part” (3:5–18)
INTRODUCTION

A. Faith in Christ justifies (3:5–7)
B. Blessing of God from faith, not from Law (3:8–14)
C. Eternal inheritance through faith, not through Law (3:15–18)

   A. Punishing of sins (3:19–20)
   B. Man’s recognition of sin (3:21–22)
   C. Introduction to faith (3:23–29)

b. By similitude: two similes (4:1–31)
   1. Child under tutors (4:1–20)
      A. Presentation and application (4:1–7)
      B. Ungratefulness of Galatians (4:8–20)
   2. Sarah and Hagar (4:21–31)
      A. Figure set forth (4:21–27)
      B. Application to proposition (4:28–31)

III. Leads Galatians to observe judgment (5:1–6:10)
A. By avoiding what is evil (5:1–12)
   i. First evil: slavery (5:1)
   ii. Second evil: loss of grace (5:2)
   iii. Third evil: obligation to keep entire Law (5:3)
   iv. Fourth evil: separation from Christ (5:4–6)
   v. Conclusion: Galatians were impeded by false teachers (5:7–12)
B. By following what is good (5:13–6:10)
   i. Chief part (5:13–5:18)
      a. Freedom from the Law (5:13)
      b. Easy fulfillment of entire Law (5:14–15)
      c. Outpouring of Holy Spirit (5:16–18)
   ii. Incidental part: distinction between flesh and Spirit (5:19–6:10)
      a. Distinction: flesh and Spirit (5:19–23)
         1. Flesh (5:19–21)
            A. Pertaining to luxury (5:19–21)
            B. Pertaining to gluttony (5:21)
         2. Spirit (5:22–23)
            A. Mind well disposed towards itself (5:22)
            B. Towards what is next to it (5:22–23)
            C. Towards what is below it (5:23)
      a. Admonition (5:24–6:10)
1. To suppress the works of the flesh (5:24–26)
2. To support each other (6:1–10)

Part 3: Confirmation of the above (6:11–18)

Although this seems quite complex, it is worth noting that it is far simpler than what Aquinas describes, although it follows along similar lines. Nicholas does not present much that is innovative or unique to his interpretation, except that he describes the structure of Paul’s argument in more forensic terms, as if he imagined Paul to be a court-room prosecutor and judge. He also reassesses the rationale for the order of the works of the flesh (Gal 5:19–21) in a manner that I have not read in other authors. Most of his commentary, however, stays very close to what others have written before, either by summarizing what they said or by choosing which comments seemed most helpful for elucidating the literal meaning.

The content of Nicholas’s commentary closely reflects what Paul himself was most obviously teaching, without importing any elaborately imagined situational “context” that would drastically change the meaning. Unlike the tendency of some modern commentaries, there is no room in medieval exegesis for a radically “new perspective.” And unlike some Reformation-era commentaries, Nicholas focuses on the annulment of the 613 precepts of the Mosaic Law and does not try to distinguish “Law” from “Gospel” abstractly in terms of what mankind must do in contrast what God does for us. The annulment of the Old Law, however, is not the passing away of a divine standard of morality; Nicholas is no antinomian. Rather, he understands the “Old Law”—of slavery to specific precepts in the books of Moses—to have been replaced by the “New Law.” The New Law consists of grace and an eternal inheritance, which are distributed through the Sacraments; freedom from the works of the flesh; and love for one’s neighbor, to which the Christian is driven by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. There is an understood necessity to the inseparability of faith from charity and good works. Faith cannot help but work through charity. When someone believes in Christ (or is drawn by God to believe), then, through the Sacraments, that believer receives the Holy Spirit. He pours out his grace, or infuses it into the believer (“gratia infusa”), producing the first fruit of charity (from which other fruits follow), and consequently, through charity, good works towards one’s neighbor (“fides quae per caritatem operatur,” Gal 5:6). In other words, the Holy Spirit adorns, beautifies, and shapes faith with his charity and other fruits (“fides caritate
formata”), and instigates the believer to work for his neighbor. Thus, God is at work at every stage, producing faith, pouring out his Spirit, producing fruit, and instigating works. If I am here accurately depicting Nicholas’s theology as reflected in his commentary, it seems to me quite far removed from the unfair characterization, which was all too prevalent in the Reformation era, of all medieval theology as a “God-begins-and-man-finishes” brand of semi-Pelagianism. Nicholas’s commentary seems to me to maintain Augustine’s understanding of the depravity of human nature and the necessity of divine grace, while simultaneously expecting the regenerated sinner to be “dead to sin and alive to God in Christ Jesus.”

It might seem, from the discussion so far, that Nicholas would no longer have any use for the Old Testament Scriptures. The exact opposite, however, is true. The New Law, while it resulted in the annulment of the Old Law, did not abolish it entirely but led to the need to keep it spiritually, according to the summary of the entire Law, which is love. Thus the Old Testament Scriptures remain useful insofar as they can continue, particularly through their spiritual meaning, to teach us about love, which some have called the “moral” or “universal” law. Nicholas, like others, would have understood the Ten Commandments as a neat summary of the Law, but even these must be interpreted spiritually, so that “You shall not murder” also forbids ira, and “You shall not commit adultery” also forbids luxuria, as Jesus explained in Matthew 5. Moreover, Nicholas’s affirmation of the usefulness of the Old Testament is manifest from his own diligent explanation of the literal meaning, for elucidation of which he tirelessly consulted Jewish expositors, particularly Rashi. Such use of Jewish sources precipitated both praise and criticism, of course, but also an interest in them that had not been seen among Christian expositors, it might be fair to say, since the time of Jerome. Even in his commentary on Galatians (4:29), Nicholas uses his knowledge of Rashi to expound the meaning of Gen 21:9 and thereby shows the continuing need to understand the Old Testament, in order to be able properly to understand the New.

History of the Text
The full importance of Nicholas’s Postilla, in terms of its influence and readership in subsequent generations, has not been greatly researched or documented (as others have likewise lamented). The existence of between eight to twelve hundred manuscripts and over a hundred printed editions in a wide variety of different formats from the fifteenth to the eighteenth
century is a good indication of how broad a readership it must have had over hundreds of years, but also of how daunting a task it would be to trace the impact of this monumental work. Nicholas’s influence on Martin Luther is quite well known (although, on Galatians, I have found that Luther does not seem to have used Nicholas at all), but what of other authors? Little has been said of the influence of Nicholas’s *Postilla* on such works, for example, as Bugenhagen’s *Annotationes in epistolam Pauli ad Galatas* or Calvin’s *Commentarii in epistolam Pauli ad Galatas*. Hopefully, the recent publication of Gerald Bray’s edition *Galatians, Ephesians*, will help to resuscitate interest in these works and others, and will subsequently lead to new discoveries concerning Nicholas’s influence. Likewise I hope that the availability of this edition of Nicholas’s commentary on Galatians will help not only to broaden our understanding of the tradition of the interpretation of this epistle but also to facilitate and promote further research and interest in the influence of Nicholas’s *Postilla* on later works.

**About the Translator’s Commentary**

In providing comments on Nicholas’s text, I have had two purposes in mind: first, to elucidate the meaning of the text; and second, to give some idea of the tradition of interpretation and some of the sources from which Nicholas may have drawn inspiration. The first of these purposes I have tried to satisfy mostly through the translation itself, but this has needed some help at times, where technical vocabulary is employed, where the English translation, for lack of any better expression in our own language, inadequately expresses the meaning of the original, or where the English vocabulary implies something that the Latin does not. The second purpose occupies the majority of my commentary.

Tracking and identifying an interpretive tradition, the influences on a given author, and those in opposition to whom he is writing, implicitly or explicitly, is an open ended project and is fraught with many difficulties. There are many other commentaries on Galatians, which I have not consulted, but may have influenced Nicholas. There is also every reason to suppose that the influences on Nicholas are not limited to formal commentaries. Where Nicholas’s comments seem to be original, he may have consulted an unknown source. Conversely, when it seems clear that an earlier writer has influenced him, it is possible that he came up with the same idea on his own. Even when we think we have identified an exact influence, corroborated by indisputable verbal similarity, it could later be discovered that Nicholas was using a florilegium and not the original work.
Often a comment in Nicholas’s text is reflected in several earlier commentaries, and it is impossible to know from which he derived his comment. Even if we knew the precise contents of his library, considering what a monumental task he had in front of him, and in what a short time he completed the work, it would be impossible to prove which works he was consulting at which times.

The reader should be aware of these difficulties when reading my notes, and beware of reading them as if they always indicate direct influences. Sometimes this is the case and sometimes not. What I have tried to represent is the tradition, before Nicholas, of interpretations by those who came to similar conclusions. Since different or opposing interpretations are not cited, the reader should not assume a universal interpretive consensus from the notes. Although I sometimes assert a conclusion (e.g., the direct influence of Aquinas on Nicholas’s comments on Gal 5:22–23), the reader is mostly left to decide for himself how likely a direct influence may be in each case. The reader should also be aware that, since I have used translations by others, sometimes a verbal discrepancy may appear between translations, which is not there in the Latin. To have included the Latin of every quotation, however, would have made this work too heavy with notes. To verify verbal similarities, the reader should consult the Latin of the cited quotation (editions are listed in the bibliography) and compare it with the Latin provided below, on the pages that face the translation.

For the purposes of this work, which is for a classroom that does not necessarily require a knowledge of Latin, I have chosen for the most part to limit my comments to those works on Galatians that are already translated into English. These are the commentaries by Marius Victorinus (ca. 350–65), Jerome (386–88), Ambrosiaster (ca. 366–80), Augustine (394–95), Haimo of Auxerre (ca. 840–60), Bruno the Carthusian (ca. 1060–80) and Aquinas (1259–65, 1272–73), and partial commentaries by Peter Lombard (1150s) and Robert Grosseteste (ca. 1225–35). Yet to be investigated is the influence on Nicholas’s commentary, direct or indirect, of other works that remain untranslated, most of which lie dormant in the volumes of *Patrologia Latina* and *Patrologia Graeca*. Computer software will doubtless play a greater role in the future in identifying verbal reminiscences in the original language of the text, and in improving our knowledge of which works were most influential upon which authors, but even computers will be unable to replace the human mind when it comes to finding similar ideas that are expressed differently, or those against which an author is arguing implicitly.
When I refer to other commentators without further reference, it is to their respective commentaries on Galatians, and the supplied translations are taken from those works mentioned in the bibliography. References to Augustine are to the chapter and section; thus (14.1) means the first section of the fourteenth chapter of his commentary. References to Aquinas’s commentary are to the chapter of Galatians and lecture; thus (2.2) refers to his second lecture on chapter 2 of Galatians. References to other commentaries, unless otherwise indicated, are to the pertinent chapter and verse.

In addition to these commentaries, I also mention the Glossa Ordinaria, where Nicholas seems to derive his comments from it. The history of this important text is complicated and often misunderstood. In the 1603 edition that I used, for example, as is evident in the bibliography, the Gloss is misattributed to Walafrid Strabo. The authoritative status of the Gloss before Nicholas almost required him to include some of its explanations and to ensure that he did not depart too much from what it contained. For the Gloss on Galatians, however, we must be cautious about which edition we think that Nicholas was using. As Lesley Smith observes, “frequently, the Gloss which circulates as the Pauline Epistles is less full than the text recorded by Rusch,” and the scene is further complicated by the continuing circulation of Gilbert de la Porée’s Media glosatura and Lombard’s Magna glosatura or Collectanea at the same time as the Parva glosatura (the redaction of Anselm of Laon’s work, which appears in the Rusch edition). Therefore, we cannot assume that Nicholas had before him the same edition that is familiar to us today.

I also cite Lombard’s Sentences when it came to mind, and the Summa Theologiae of Aquinas, whose influence seems to me greater than that of anyone else, although Nicholas does not acknowledge it in this commentary.

In the process of looking at these sources, a sketch of intertextual relationships begins to form. By juxtaposing the comments of different authors, we can start to see patterns of the influence of Victorinus on Jerome and Augustine, Jerome on Augustine, Ambrosiaster and Haimo, Augustine on the Glossa Ordinaria, the Glossa Ordinaria on Aquinas, and the influence of almost all of the above, directly or indirectly, on Nicholas. The comments in formal commentaries frequently correspond to questions that arise and are answered traditionally, as if a lack of an answer on such questions would fall below expectations. A comparison of texts also helps us to begin to draw up a catalogue of such traditional questions, such
as, “Why is James called the brother of the Lord?” to which the author is expected to give a satisfactory response or at least an answer. This may seem to leave little room for originality, but the genius of each author subsists in the extent to which he can contribute to—and improve upon—the traditional questions and answers that he has received from other authors. In Nicholas’s case, his work exhibits a scrupulous selectivity with which he chooses one interpretation or conclusion over another, or summarizes and abridges an entire tradition, without giving in to the temptation of offering a new ingenious solution. New theology from his perspective is suspect theology, and the most constructive biblical expositors are not presenting new material but improving upon the tradition that they have inherited.32

About the Translation

I have for the most part stayed very close to the Latin text, except where I could improve the English without changing the meaning. Thus I have transformed a great many passive sentences into active, divided up sentences, supplied understood verbs, and so on, so that the text reads more easily. I have indicated any significant additions by square brackets. At the same time, I have tried to reproduce the main stylistic features of Nicholas’s commentary, which does not always employ full sentences or separate the quotations from the commentary in a manner we might expect. Many comments follow on from each other, main verbs are understood from the last line, the words of a quotation often serve as the subject or direct object, antecedent, and so on. If the meaning still seems unclear, the reader might try reading it more quickly or continuously. The explanations in the notes and the presence of the Latin on the facing page should also help to elucidate the meaning.

About the Latin edition

The Latin text is based principally on the printed text of 1603. I have used this edition for two reasons: first, because it is readily available online, courtesy of the Lollard Society; and second, because, according to Gosselin, the editors used Nicholas’s autograph manuscript.33 Since this is not a critical edition, I have made some efforts to make the text more accurate and readable. I have corrected this text primarily with the help of a fifteenth century manuscript, BNF, lat. 11978, which is available online and reproduced with sharp detail, thanks to the Gallica project of the Bibliothèque nationale de France. In general, I have found the readings
of this manuscript to be very good, for which reason I most often give them preference. It is also a beautiful text, in a neat hand, clearly preserved over time. Only where this manuscript differs from the 1603 edition have I have compared it to another early printed edition of 1488 and made my own judgments concerning which reading to use. I have also silently checked and corrected references to chapters of Scripture.

To make the text more readable, I have standardized and re-edited the orthography and punctuation in many places. Capital letters are standardized after quotations, quotations are given in bold type, and so on. I have classicized most medieval spellings, for example, *obtulit* is given instead of *optulit*, *littera* instead of *litera*, and *notitia* instead of *noticia*. For this I can beg as my defense that the classicizing of the text is also practiced in many printed editions of the *Postilla*. Besides, as a classicist by training, I am hardly competent to edit a text in any other way. I have nevertheless declined to “correct” Nicholas’s grammatical idiosyncrasies, such as his frequent use of the “super pluperfect,” for example, *fuerant passi*.

The translation will follow the printed Latin text. The reader may also observe that I have not tried to harmonize the biblical quotations with other printed Vulgate or English Bibles. This is so that the thought of Nicholas and the textual tradition of his own Bible could be better represented. The lemmatized quotations in this edition, however, may sometimes be longer than those that Nicholas himself used; he would have assumed that the reader also had the biblical text at hand. Longer quotations are often needed to make sense of the commentary, when the biblical text is not on the same page. For example, the 1603 edition on Gal 6:1 reads: “*Et sic imple*. Quae est lex charitatis,” which makes little sense, but the fuller quotation of MS lat. 11978 (which does not contain the full biblical text) clears up the obscurity: “*Et sic adimplebitis legem Christi*. Quae est lex caritatis.” Since this edition likewise does not contain the full biblical text, I have mostly followed the quotations of MS lat. 11978 but have supplied fuller biblical quotations where it seemed necessary for understanding the commentary.

NOTES

1 On Nicholas’s life, and for further bibliography, see the introduction to Krey’s edition, *Nicholas of Lyra’s Apocalypse Commentary*; Krey and Smith, *Nicholas of Lyra*; and “Nicholas of Lyra” in McKim, *Historical Handbook*, pp. 116–22. For the later influence of Nicholas’s *Postilla*, see Gosselin, “A Listing of the Printed Editions of Nicolaus de Lyra.”

2 From Nicholas’s second prologue: “Expositio mystica discrepans a sensu litterali reputanda est indecens et inepta, vel saltem minus decens caeteris paribus et minus apta, et
ideo volentibus proficere in studio sacrae scripturae necessarium est incipere ab intellectu sensus litteralis, maxime cum ex solo sensu litterali et non ex mystico possit argumentum fieri ad probationem vel declarationem alicuius dubii, secundum quod dicit Augustinus in epistola contra Vincentium Donatistam. Nicholas’s prologues are in volume 1 of the 1603 edition. See also Augustine, Ep. 93.8, which is cited in Aquinas, ST, I, q. 1, a. 10, ad 1.

Nicholas’s judicious selection of information provided simplicity for the sake of those whom he did not expect to read another commentary. This, however, need not lead us to think that he expected his commentary to be the last word on the matter, nor in any way sufficient for more learned readers, but he knew they could consult other commentaries for more detailed discussion.

See Dt 25:4, which Paul interprets spiritually in 1 Cor 9:9 and 1 Tim 5:18. Paul frequently employs the argument a minore ad maius, and vice versa. Jesus himself demonstrates this logical extraction of the spiritual meaning, e.g., in his defense of healing on the Sabbath, Mt 12:11.

In his prologue to the Postilla moralis, Nicholas names this target audience and purpose: “Non tamen intendo omnes sensus mysticos scribere, nec per singula verba discurrere, sed aliquae breviter ordinare, ad quae lectores Bibliorum ac praedicatores Verbi Dei revertere poterunt prout et quando eos videbitur expedire. Ne quis miretur si in expositione mystica plura dimittam. Nam hoc faciam propter brevitatem, et quoniam sic fecerunt praecedentes expositores, et etiam Christus” (ed. Butzbach, not paginated).

In his Postilla moralis, between the commentaries on John and Acts, he gives the reason: “Epistolas Pauli et septem canonicas pertranseo quia totum est simpliciter morale,” and again after Acts: “In septem epistolis canonics sensus litteralis est simpliciter moralis, propter quod illas pertranseo (ed. Butzbach, not paginated).

In his Postilla moralis, after Psalms, Nicholas explains: “Parabolae Salomonis. Sensus litteralis huius libri est simpliciter moralis ut patet intuenti. Similiter sequens qui dicitur Ecclesiastes. Nam in eo de contemptu falsae felicitatis agitur, et de appetitu verae. Tertium autem scilicet Cantica Canticorum exposui de praecessu Ecclesiae, propter quod de alia expositione spirituali in istis pertranseo quoad praesens” (ed. Butzbach, not paginated). See also Dove, “Literal Senses in the Song of Songs.” I suspect that his omission of other books may be related to issues of canonicity.

See Krey, Nicholas of Lyra’s Apocalypse Commentary, p. 17. Peter Auriol’s commentary on the Apocalypse comprised a large part of his Literal compendium of the Whole of Sacred Scripture, published in 1319. See Seeboeck (1896).

See Richard T. A. Murphy’s introduction to Aquinas’s Commentary on Saint Paul’s Epistle to the Galatians (trans. Larcher), p. x. For Luther, see Table Talk (trans. Hazlitt), DXXXVIII, pp. 234–35.

See Krey and Smith, Nicholas of Lyra, p. 255n15: “We know [Nicholas] used very heavily Aquinas’s Job commentary. For the Romans commentary Nicholas definitely had the Summa theologiae before him.”


From Rule 3 of Nicholas’s second prologue (not paginated): “Considerandum quod eadem littera aliquando habet duplicem sensum litteralem.”

Nicholas of Lyra’s Apocalypse Commentary, ed. Krey, pp. 18–19.

Postilla litteralis, first prologue (not paginated): “Secundum igitur primam signi-
Postilla litteralis, second prologue (not paginated): “Licet autem utraque; expositio sit litteralis simpliciter, secunda tamen est de Christo spiritualis.”

On Nicholas’s intentional separation of and distinction between literal and spiritual meanings, to an even greater extent than Aquinas, see Klepper, *Insight of Unbelievers*, pp. 33–34.

Postilla moralis, prologue (not paginated): “Sciendum autem, quod licet sacra scriptura habeat quadruplicem sensum praedictum, hoc tamen non est in qualibet sui parte ... nam alicubi haber tantum sensum litteralam.”

Postilla moralis, prologue (not paginated): “Sensus enim litteralis est proprii qui significatur, ut praedictum est, et talis sensus non est hic, nec in consimilibus. Sequetur enim quod sensus sacrae scripturae esset falsus.”

Postilla moralis, prologue (not paginated): “Quod autem aliqui doctores dicunt sensum parabolicum esse intelligendum large loquendo, quia ubi non est sensus per voces significatus, parabolicus est primus, et ideo large loquendo dicitur literalis, eo quo litteralis est primus quando non est ibi alius, et ad hoc significandum ipsi dicunt parabolicum contineri sub literali, et hoc modo loquendo ego sensum parabolicum vocavi in pluribus locis litteralem super libros sacrae scripturae. Aucubi vero sacra scriptura habet sensum literalem et mysticum, sicut in Gene. dicitur quod Abraham duos filios habuit, scilicet Isaac et Hismaelem, et hoc est verum secundum litteralem sensum et similiter secundum mysticum.”

In this and other ways, Nicholas closely reflects the presuppositions of earlier writers, such as Augustine. See *Commentary on Galatians*, ed. Plumer, pp. 90–101.

This was to be a searching of all of Scripture, not just of the immediate context of the specific passage. Cf. Jn 5:39 and Acts 17:11.

The “New Perspective” is the term for a modern fashion of interpreting Galatians, which imports a particular eschatological framework to Paul’s letter. See, for example, *Galatians: A New Translation*, trans. Martyn.

This, of course, is itself a simplistic characterization of an era in which accusations of all kinds were flying in every direction. Although such theologians as Nicholas, Lombard, and Aquinas tended not to be charged with the particular error of “Pelagianism,” Reformed theologians often lumped the “Scholastics” together in a manner that today looks like a condemnation of all Scholastic theologians. In passages where individual theologians are named, it becomes clear that some reformers did agree with the theology of certain scholastic writers. Philipp Melanchthon, for example, in his *Apology of the Augsburg Confession*, art. 2, speaks of the “wiser” (cordatiore) scholastic theologians, and cites positively Aquinas, Bonaventure, and Hugh of Saint Victor, in the process demonstrating his use for Lombard’s *Sentences*. Elsewhere, however, he criticizes Aquinas in particular for his understanding of justification through *fides caritate formata*. See Meijering, *Melanchthon and Patristic Thought*, pp. 97–98, 107–108.

Rom 6:11.


E.g., Gosselin, “A Listing of the Printed Editions of Nicolaus de Lyra,” p. 401: “Apart from a few articles and books dealing with the relationship between Nicholas and Martin Luther, Conrad Pellican, and Johann Reuchlin, very little has been written on
Nicholas’s significance for other Biblical scholars and commentators in the Renaissance and the Reformation.”

27 For these dates of composition, see the introductions to the respective translations in the bibliography.

28 For a better understanding of the origins and development of the Gloss, Smith’s *The Glossa Ordinaria* is an essential resource.

29 The Lombard, for example, often refers to the Gloss simply as *auctoritas*, “the Authority.” On the influence of the Gloss on medieval preaching, see Froehlich, *Biblical Interpretation*, ch. IV.


32 This seems to have been a consistent attitude towards novelty in the medieval ages. See Smalley, “Ecclesiastical Attitudes to Novelty.”

33 See “*The Glossa Ordinaria*,” The Lollard Society, accessed August 14, 2015, http://lollardsociety.org/?page_id=409. The date 1601 is printed in vol. 6, but the first five volumes have 1603, so the date 1601 for vol. 6 is undoubtedly a misprint. This edition is no. 56 in the catalogue by Gosselin, “A Listing of the Printed Editions of Nicolaus de Lyra,” p. 411, which is the same as no. 53, according to the information about the editors. If what the editors claim is true, this could fortuitously be one of the most accurate of the printed editions.
Text and Translation
Postilla Nicolai Lyrani super Epistolam Sancti Pauli ad Galathas.

Capitulum Primum

Commentary on the
Letter of Paul to the Galatians

Chapter 1

1. Paul, an Apostle] This letter to the Galatians is divided into three parts, namely, into the greeting, the prosecution, at: I am amazed, and the confirmation, at: You see with what letters, near the end of the letter. To begin with, the people sending greetings are put first, when he says:

Paul] Who first was called Saul in Acts 8 [verse 3].1 Also, the reason for the change of this name was given in Romans 1 for all the other letters.2

an Apostle] His office.

not from men] Acts 13 [verse 2] is based on this: “The Holy Spirit said, ‘Set apart for me Barnabas and Saul for the work to which I called them,’” etc.

nor through a man] That is, not purely through a man.3

but through Jesus Christ] True God and man.

and God the Father] For the works of the Trinity are undivided. Two persons are here mentioned explicitly, and the Holy Spirit is implicitly understood, who is not mentioned here, because he is mentioned sufficiently in Acts 13, as we have said, which is about the appointing of Paul into the apostolic office, after he had previously been called to faith.

who raised him from the dead] The Apostle mentions this in order to show the worthiness of his appointment. For the other apostles were appointed by Christ while he was still in a mortal body.4 Paul, however, was appointed by him after he had taken on an immortal body, and was established at the right hand of the Father, which the Apostle states on account of the false apostles, who were trying to condemn his teaching, because he had not been with Christ physically as the other apostles had.

**Ecclesiis Galathiae.** Hic secundo ponuntur personae salutatae, cum dicitur:


3. *Gratia vobis.* Hic tertio ponuntur optata bona, cum dicitur:

**Gratia vobis.** In praesenti.

**Et pax.** In futuro. Beatitudo enim futura bene nominatur pax, quia totaliter quietat appetitum.

**A Deo patre nostro.** Id est, a tota trinitate.

**Et domino Iesu Christo.** Deitas enim quae una est in tribus personis est gratiae et gloriae causa efficiens principalis, humanitas vero Christi causa instrumentalis coniuncta in persona filii.

4. *Qui dedit semetipsum pro peccatis nostris.* Ex maxima enim charitate ad nos et obedientia ad patrem, seipsum obtulit ad mortem.

**Vt eriperet nos de præsenti saeculo nequam.** Transferendo nos ad gloriam. Dicitur autem præsens saeculum nequam, non propter creaturarum substantiam, sed propter mala quae fiunt in hoc saeculo, sicut dicitur Eph. V. *Dies mali sunt.* id est, dicuntur, propter mala quae in eis fiunt.

**Secundum voluntatem Dei.** Ideo dicit Salvator Io. VI. Descendi de coelo non ut faciam voluntatem meam, sed voluntatem eius, qui misit me.

5. *Cui est gloria.* Ex redemptione nostra. Secundum quod dicitur Phil. II. capitulo, Humiliavit semetipsum factus obediens usque ad mortem, mortem autem crucis, propter quod et Deus exaltavit illum, et dedit illi nomen quod est super omne nomen, etc. Per passionem enim suam meruit gloriam corporis et exaltationem sui nominis.

**In saeculum saeculorum.** Id est, aeternaliter.
2. and the brothers who are with me] Who desire your salvation, and grieve because of your subversion.

to the churches of Galatia] Here in second place he puts the people who are receiving the greeting, where it says:

2. and the brothers who are with me] Who desire your salvation, and grieve because of your subversion.

to the churches of Galatia] That is, to the faithful who live in that land. Indeed, Galatia is a certain region of Greece. For in the seventeenth year of King Artaxerxes, the Gallic Senones, led by Brennius, invaded Italy and captured Rome, with the exception of the Capitoline (from the besieging of which they withdrew, having accepted a large bribe for their withdrawal). The king of Bithynia, since he was waging an impossible war, summoned them to himself to assist him. Then, when the victory was won, they divided the kingdom with him, and they called the part that he gave them “Gallo-Greece,” which afterwards was called Galatia.

3. Grace to you] Here in third place come the good wishes, when he says:

Grace to you] For the present.

and peace] For the future. Indeed, future beatitude is rightly called peace, because the appetite is entirely at rest.

from God our Father] That is, from the whole Trinity.

and our Lord, Jesus Christ] For the Deity that is one in three persons is the principal efficient cause of grace and glory, but the humanity of Christ is the instrumental cause, united in the person of the Son.

4. who gave himself for our sins] For out of the greatest charity toward us, and obedience toward the Father, he gave himself into death.

that he might deliver us from the present age of evil] By bringing us to glory. The present age, however, is called “evil” not on account of the substance of created things, but on account of the evil things that happen in this age, as is said in Ephesians 5 [verse 16], “the days are evil,” that is, they are called [evil] because of the evil things that happen in them.

according to the will of God] Thus says the Savior in John 6 [verse 38], “I came down from heaven, not that I might do my own will, but the will of him who sent me,” etc.

5. to whom is the glory] For our redemption. In agreement with this Philippians 2 [verse 8] says, “He humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even death by a cross. Therefore, God has also exalted him and given him a name that is above every name,” etc. For by his own passion, he merited the glory of the body and the exaltation of his own name.

forever and ever] That is, eternally.

Miror quod sic tam cito transferimini ab eo. id est, a Deo.
Qui vocavit vos in gratiam Christi. Per praedicationem meam.
In aliud evangelium. Id est, in aliam doctrinam falsam. Idea subditur.

7. Quod non est alius. Quia falsum et non ens convertuntur, sicut verum et ens. Legalia enim cessaverunt in passione Christi, ita quod ex tunc fuerunt mortua.
Nisi sunt aliqui. Scilicet falsi apostoli.
Qui vos conturbant. Persuadentes quod non potestis salvari absque legalium observatione, quod erat durum conversis ex Gentilitate.
Et volunt convertere evangelium Christi. In servitute legis Moysaicae.

8. Sed licet. Hic consequenter fert suam sententiam dicens:
Sed licet nos. Quasi dicit: Non solum falsi apostoli non sunt in hoc audiendo, sed neque etiam veri apostoli, neque angeli sancti, si hoc praedicarent. Ideo dicit:
Sed licet nos. Id est, ego vel alii apostoli Christi.
Aut angelus de caelo. Id est, angelus sanctus.
Evangelizet vobis praeter quam quod evangelizavimus. Et dicit:
6. I am amazed] Here, in turn, the prosecution of the letter is placed. About this, we should know that the Galatians received faith in Christ according to the preaching of the Apostle, but after his departure from them, they were subverted by false apostles, who said that it was necessary for their salvation to be circumcised and to observe the precepts of the Law together with the Gospel of Christ, which is erroneous. Because of this, the Apostle in this letter intends to eliminate this error. And it is divided into three parts, because first, he brings his sentence against those who are spreading this error; second, he declares that it is just, at: I am making it known, [chapter 1, verse 11]; and third, he leads them to observe it in chapter 5. The first part divides into three, because first, the motivating reason is given for this sentence, second comes the presentation of the sentence, at: but even if, and third is the solution to the unspoken question, at: For am I now. For the motivating reason for his writing this letter was the subversion of the Galatians through false prophets, being amazed at which he says:

I am amazed that you are so quickly turning away from him] That is, from God.
who called you into Christ’s grace] Through my preaching.
to another gospel] That is, to a different and false teaching.

7. which is not another] Because the false and not real are exchanged for what is true and real. For the precepts of the Law came to an end in the passion of Christ, so that since then they have been dead.
except there are some] Namely, false apostles.
who stir you up] Persuading you that you cannot be saved without observing the precepts of the Law, which was hard for Gentile converts.
and want to transform the Gospel of Christ] Into slavery to the Law of Moses.

8. but even if] Here, in turn, he presents his sentence, saying:
but even if we] As if he is saying: “Not only are false apostles not to be listened to on this subject, but also not even the true apostles, nor even the holy angels, if they were preaching this.” Therefore he says:
but even if we] That is, I, or the other apostles of Christ.
or an angel from heaven] That is, a holy angel.
gives you a gospel besides that] And he says:
Praeter quam, etc. Id est, aliud detrahens vos a veritate evangelii, quam vobis praedicavi. Et non dicit: plus quam praedicavimus, quia bene poterant alia praedicari, quae facerent ad declarationem veritatis evangelii. Anathema sit. Id est, separatus a communicatione Dei et sanctorum. Circa quod scendendum, quod aliqua propositio conditionalis potest esse vera, cuius tamen utroque pars est falsa aut impossibilis, sicut est ista: Si homo volat homo habet alas, quae est vera, et tamen hominem volare et alas habere falsum est. Sic est in proposito de verbo apostoli. Nam apostoli veri erant in gratia confirmati, et adhuc magis angeli sancti, propter quod de utrisque falsum est et impossibile, quod praedicarent contra veritatem evangelii, et quod essent anathematizati, et tamen conditionalis est vera, scilicet si hoc facerent essent anathematizandi.

9. Sicut praedixi etc. Repetitio est eiusdem sententiae ad maiorem assertionem.

besides etc.] That is, “something other than,” which draws you away from the truth of the Gospel that I preached to you. And he does not say “more than we preached,” because other things could well be preached that would serve to declare the truth of the Gospel.

let him be anathema] That is, separated from communication with God and the saints.¹⁶ Concerning this, we should know that a conditional proposition can be true, even if each part of it is nevertheless false or impossible, as in this example: “If man flies, man has wings.” This is true, and yet it is false that man flies and has wings. So it is with what the Apostle proposes. For the true apostles were confirmed in grace, and still more were the holy angels, on account of which it is false and impossible, concerning each part, both that they would preach against the truth of the Gospel, and that they would be anathematized; and yet the conditional proposition is true, namely, that if they were to do this, they would be anathematized.¹⁷

9. As I said before, etc.] Repetition of the same sentence, for a greater assertion.

10. For now] Here, in turn, he responds to a certain unspoken question, because someone could ask, “Why does he condemn them so harshly?” And he replies that this is because he is not seeking to please man, but God, saying:

For am I now persuading men, or God?] That is, to honor men, or God? And he shows that he is seeking to honor God, saying:

or am I trying to please men?] As if he is saying: “no.” But we should understand this to be with respect those things that would be opposed to what is pleasing to the Lord.¹⁸ Therefore he adds:

If I were still trying to please men] Namely, in evil ways, I would not be the servant of Christ.
11. **Notum enim.** Hic consequenter ostendit praedictam sententiam esse iustam et hoc ostendit dupliciter. Primo ex perfectione legis evangelicae. Secundo ex imperfectione legis Moysaicae capitulo III. Prima adhuc in duas, quia primo ostendit doctrinan quam praedicavit, scilicet evangelicam esse autenticam et perfectam. Secundo infert conclusionem intentam, ibi **Nos natura.** Circa primum facit talem rationem: illa doctrina est autentica et perfecta, quae est a Deo inspirata, a principalibus apostolis discussa, a falsis apostolis impugnata, et tamen stetit immobillis, et post impugnationem ab ecclesia approbata, et in sua claritate et sinceritate reposita. Sed evangelica doctrina quam praedicavi est huiusmodi. Ergo, etc. Maiorem huius rationis supponit apostolus tanquam manifeste veram. Minorem autem declarat per singulas partes procedendo, quae patebunt prose- quendo. Primo igitur declarat primam partem minoris, scilicet quod doctrina quam praedicavit sit a Deo inspirata. Et dividitur in duas, quia primo ponit intentum. Secundo manifestat propositum, ibi **Audistis.** Circa primum dicit: 

**Notum enim vobis facio fratres evangelium, quod evangelizatum est a me, quia non est secundum hominem.** Id est, factum secundum adinvenionem humanam.

12. **Neque enim ego ab homine accepi illud.** Id est, ab aliis apostolis, qui cum Christo fuerunt corporaliter addiscendo. 

**Sed per revelationem Iesu Christi.** Immediate factam mihi.

13. **Audistis.** Hic consequenter manifestat propositum. Et ostendit primo, quod non habuit per viam humanam ante suam conversionem. Secundo, quod neque etiam post ipsum ibi: **Cum autem.** Primum autem manifestat per hoc quod ante conversionem suam inquantum poterat, persequebatur evangelicam doctrinam et observatores eius. Ex quo patet, quod tunc non studuit ad confingendum eam, nec ad discendum eam ab aliis. Et ista erant nota illis quibus scribent. Ideo dicit: 

**Audistis enim, etc.** Et patet littera usque ibi:
11. For I am making it known] Here, in turn, he shows that the previously stated sentence is just, and he shows this in two ways: first, from the perfection of the Law of the Gospel; second, from the imperfection of the Law of Moses, in chapter 3. The first part is further divided into two parts, because first he demonstrates the [nature of the] teaching that he preached, namely, that it is evangelical, authentic, and perfect. Second, he introduces the intended conclusion, at: We who are by nature [chapter 2, verse 15]. Concerning the first part, he gives this reasoning: “A doctrine is authentic and perfect when it is inspired by God, disseminated by the chief apostles, attacked by false apostles, and yet stands firm, and after it is attacked, is approved by the church and returned to its proper state of clarity and sincerity. And the evangelical teaching that I preached is of this kind. Therefore, etc.” He supposes that the greater part of this reasoning is manifestly true. He makes the lesser part clear by proceeding in small steps, which will be clear in what follows.19 First, therefore, he announces the first step of the lesser part, namely, that the teaching that he preached was inspired by God. And it is divided into two parts, because first he states the intention; second, he reveals the proposition, at: You have heard. Concerning the first part he says:

For I am making it known to you, brothers, that the Gospel that was preached by me is not according to man] That is, made according to human invention.

12. For I did not receive it from man] That is, from the other apostles, who were with Christ bodily for their instruction.20 but through the revelation of Jesus Christ] Which happened to me directly.

13. You have heard] Here in turn he reveals the proposition, and he shows first that he did not have it in any human way before his conversion, and second, not even after that, at: When, however.21 But first, he clarifies that before his conversion, insofar as he was able, he persecuted the evangelical teaching and its followers. From this it is clear that at that time he made no effort to invent it, nor to learn it from others. And these things were well known to those for whom he was writing. And the literal meaning is obvious, up to:
14b. **Emulator existens.** Id est, zelator.
**Paternarum mearum traditionum.** Tunc autem apud Iudaeos erant aliqua tradita patribus a Moyse, scilicet quae scripta sunt in lege. Et aliqua erant tradita a patribus aliis minoribus quae vocabantur traditiones seniorum, ut pater Mt. XV. capitulo. Et ambarum traditionum erat apostolus zelator ante suam conversionem.

15. **Cum autem.** Hic consequenter ostendit, quod nec post conversionem suam habuit per viam humanam, quia statim ivit ad praedicandum Gentilibus fidelam catholicam per tres annos antequam videret apostolos vel alios discipulos, qui possent eum docere de fide catholica. Et hoc quod dicit:
**Cum autem placuit ei.** Vocatio enim sua evidentiter fuit ex divino placito, quia fidelam Christi persequebatur actualiter quando fuit vocatus, ut patet Act. IX.
**Qui me segregagavit ex utero matris meae.** Id est, de medio synagogue.

16b. **Continuo non acquievi carni et sanguini.** Id est, ad Iudaeos, de quorum sanguine ego sum, non accessi.

17. **Neque veni Ierosolimam.** Ubi erant apostoli et alii discipuli in lege evangelica instructi.
**Sed abii in Arabian.** Ad praedicandum Gentilibus legem evangelicam, ad quod eram vocatus, ut praemittitur:
**Ut evangelizarem illum in Gentilibus.** Praedicatio autem praesupponit notitiam. Ex quo patet quod apostolus habuit notitiam evangelii, non per doctrinam hominis, sed per revelationem Iesu Christi, quia non est medium, quia si habuisset etiam per ministerium angelorum, adhuc sequitur, quod hoc fuisse a Christo principaliter.
**Et iterum reversus sum Damascum.** Ubi primo disputaverat contra Iudaeos.
14b. being an imitator] That is, zealous.
of the traditions of my fathers] At that time, however, among the Jews, some things were given to the fathers from Moses, namely, those things that were written in the Law. And some things were handed down by other, lesser fathers, which were called the traditions of the elders, as is clear in Matthew 15 [verse 2].22 And the Apostle was zealous for both traditions before his conversion.

15. When, however] Here, in turn, he shows that neither did he have [the evangelical teaching] by human means after his conversion, because then he immediately went to preach the catholic faith to the Gentiles, [and did so] for three years before he saw the apostles, or other disciples, who would have been able to teach him about the catholic faith. And this is what he is saying with:

When, however, it pleased Him. For his calling evidently derived from God’s will, because he was in the act of persecuting the faith of Christ when he was called, as is clear from Acts 9 [verses 1–4].

who set me apart from my mother’s womb] That is, from the midst of the synagogue.23

16b. I did not immediately seek out flesh and blood] That is, I did not approach the Jews, from whose flesh and blood I am.

17. Nor did I go to Jerusalem] Where the apostles were, and other disciples who were instructed in the Law of the Gospel.24

But I departed for Arabia] To preach the Law of the Gospel to the Gentiles, for which I was called, as he declares:

that I might preach him to the Gentiles.] Preaching, however, presupposes knowledge. From this it is clear that the Apostle had knowledge of the Gospel, not by the teaching of man but by the revelation of Jesus Christ, because there is no intermediary. For even if he had received it through the ministry of angels, it still follows that this would have been chiefly from Christ.25

and again I returned to Damascus] Where he had first argued against the Jews.
18. Deinde post annos tres, etc. Id est, postquam tribus annis praedicaverat. Et sic non habui notitiam evangelii a Petro. 
Et mansi apud eum diebus quindecim. Quasi dicit: Si indiguissem ab eo doceri, tamen in tam parvo tempore non potuisset me docere veritatem evangelii.

Nisi Iacobum. Sicilicet illa vice, quia postea vidit Iohannem, ut habetur infra secundo capitulo. 
Fratrem domini. Hoc dicitur ad differentiam aliter Iacobi apostoli qui fuit frater Ioannis. Et dicitur iste frater domini, quia erat sibi valde similis in facie et in omnibus lineamentis corporis.

20. Quae autem scribo vobis, etc. In hoc per iuramentum asserit etiam praedicta.


22. Eram autem ignotus facie ecclesiis Iudeae. Id est, quae erant in Iudaea. Et dicit: 
Facie. Quia notus erat eis per famam, ut patet ex littera sequenti.
18. Then after three years, etc.] That is, after I had preached for three
years. And thus I did not have my knowledge of the Gospel from Peter.
And I remained with him for fifteen days] As if he is saying, “If I had
needed to be instructed by him, nevertheless, he would not have been able
to teach me the truth of the Gospel in such a short amount of time.”

19. I saw, however, none of the other apostles] Either before then or at
that time, from whom I could have been instructed.
except James] On that occasion. Because afterwards he saw John, as it says
below in the same chapter [chapter 2, verse 9].
the brother of the Lord] This is said to distinguish him from the other
apostle James, who was the brother of John. Also, he is called “brother of
the Lord” because he was very similar to him in his appearance and all the
proportions of his body.

20. What I am writing to you, etc.] Here he affirms through an oath the
things already said.

21. Then I went to parts of Syria and Cilicia] To preach to the Gentiles.

22. But I was personally unknown to the churches of Judaea] that is,
[to the churches] which were in Judaea. And he says:
personally] Because he was known to them by reputation, as is clear from
the literal meaning of what follows.
Secundum Capitulum

1. Deinde. Hic consequenter declaratur secunda pars praedictae minoris, scilicet quod doctrina a Paulo prædicata fuit cum principalibus apostolis discussa, examinata et approbata. Et hoc est quod dicit:

Deinde post annos quatuordecim. Scilicet a conversione sua.

Ascendi Hierosolymam. Non ex curiositate vel levitate. Ideo sequitur:

2. Ascendi autem secundum revelationem. Scilicet domini, ad declarationem veritatis evangelii. Ideo sequitur:

Contuli cum illis evangelium. Et consequenter ostendit cum quibus contulerit, dicentes:

Seorsum autem. Id est, ad partem.

His qui videbantur aliquid esse. Quasi dicit: Non contuli coram communitate, cujus maior pars est simplicium, sed cum illis tantum, qui erant principales et a Deo instructi, scilicet cum Petro, Iacobo et Ioanne, ut habetur infra eodem capitulo.

Ne forte in vacuum currerem aut cucurrissem. Per li forte, non intelligitur quod apostolus dubitaret se aliqua minus vera vel dubia prædicasse, quia per revelationem Dei erat certus in veritate prædicationis suae. Sed li forte, refertur ad aëstimationem simplicium qui possent de hoc dubitare, nisi cum principalibus apostolis hoc contulisset.

3. Sed neque Titus. Hic declaratur tertia pars praedictae minoris, scilicet quod doctrina ab apostolo prædicata steterit immobilis, quamvis fuerit a falsis apostolis impugnata, qui conabantur inducere Gentiles ad observandum legalia. Quod ostendit per hoc, quod Titus Gentilis veniens cum Paulo Ierosolimam non fuit compulsus a veris apostolis circumcidi, sed communicaverunt ei sicut Paulo, quamvis ad eius circumcisionem niterentur falsi apostoli. Et hoc est quod dicit:

Sed neque Titus qui erat mecum. In Ierusalem.

Cum esset Gentilis. Natione ex utroque parente.

Compulsus est circumcidi. A veris apostolis, sed indifferenter communicaverunt ei, sicut et mihi. Unde et Petrus satis cito post ascensionem Christi communicavit Cornelio centurioni et aliis in circumcisis, qui erant cum eo indifferenter sicut cum Iudaeis, ut habetur Act. X. et XI.
Chapter 2

1. Then] Here, in turn, the second part of the previously mentioned “lesser part” is declared, namely, that the teaching that Paul preached was discussed among the chief apostles, examined by them, and approved. And this is what he is saying with:

Then after fourteen years, again] Namely, after his conversion.  
I went up to Jerusalem] Not out of curiosity or frivolity. Therefore he continues:

2. I went up, however, according to a revelation] Namely, from the Lord, to declare the truth of the Gospel, therefore he continues:

And I conferred with them] And, in turn, he explains with whom he conferred it, saying:

separately, however] That is, to a few of them.

with those who seemed to be important] As if he is saying, “I did not confer openly with the community, the greater part of whom are simple folk, but only with those who were the leaders and instructed by God, namely, with Peter, James and John,” as he writes below, in the same chapter [verse 9].  

lest perhaps I was running, or had run, in vain] By the perhaps, we should not understand that the Apostle was anxious that he had preached things that were less true or doubtful, since by the revelation of God he was certain in the truth of his preaching, but the perhaps is said in consideration of the simple people, who could have had doubts about this, unless he had conferred with the leading apostles.

3. But neither was Titus] Here the third part of the previously mentioned “lesser part” is declared, namely, that the teaching preached by the Apostle stood firm, although it had been impugned by false apostles who were trying to lead the Gentiles to observe the precepts of the Law. He demonstrates this by the fact that Titus, a Gentile who came with Paul to Jerusalem, was not compelled by the true apostles to be circumcised, but they interacted with him as they did with Paul, even though false apostles were urging his circumcision. And this is what he is saying with:

But neither was Titus, who was with me] In Jerusalem, although he was a Gentile] By birth, by both parents.

compelled to be circumcised] By the true apostles. But without distinction, they interacted with him as they did with me. Whereby Peter also, quite soon after the Ascension of Christ, associated with Cornelius the centurion and other uncircumcised people, who were with him without distinction, just as they were with the Jews, as it says in Acts 10 and 11.
4. Sed propter subintroductos etc. Quasi dicit: Non restiti veris apostolis volentibus Titum circumcidi, sed falsis apostolis ad hoc conantibus. 
Qui subintroierunt. Non vocati a veris apostolis, sed fallaciter sub titulo fidei intraverunt societatem fidelium ad explorandum qualiter possent fidem impugnare. Ideo subditur: 
Libertatem nostram. Qua per Christum liberati sumus a iugo legis. 
Ut nos in servitutem redigerent. In observatione legalium, quod est onus importabile, ut dicitur Act. XV.

5. Quibus neque ad horam cessimus subiectioni. Id est, in subiuctione legalium observantiarum. 
Ut veritas evangelii. Per quam evacuata sunt legalia. 
Maneat apud vos. Sine admixtione veteris fermenti.

6. Ab his autem. Hic consequenter declaratur quarta pars suprapositae minoris, scilicet quod doctrina Pauli per principales apostolos in nullo fuit augmentata, sed magis e converso, doctrina Pauli valuit eis in temporali subsidio. Ideo dicit: 
Ab his autem qui videbantur esse aliquid. Scilicet Petro, Iacobo et Iohanne. Supple: nihil accepi. 
Quales aliquando fuerunt. Scilicet ante vocationem suam a Christo. Tunc enim fuerunt pauperes, illitterati et simplices, sicut patet ex evangelio. Paulus autem ante vocationem suam fuit instructus in lege et prophetis, et etiam potens et nobilis. 
Nihil mea interest. Id est, non est necesse talia referre. Cuius causa subditur: 
Deus enim personam hominis non accipit. Vocando ad fidem vel ad apostolatum propter potentiam temporalem vel nobilitatem generis vel scientiam, sed plures vocavit simplices et pauperes, licet aliquid a principio vocaverit litteratos, ut dictum est de Paulo. Et idem patet de Nathanaele, et Nicodemo. 
Mihi enim qui videbantur esse aliquid. Id est, principales apostoli. 
Nihil contulerunt. In notitia evangelii, vel subsidio temporali.
4. But on account of those secretly brought in, etc.] As if he is saying, “I did not oppose the true apostles, who did not want Titus to be circumcised, but I opposed the false apostles, who were striving for this end.”

who came in stealthily] Not called by the true apostles, but falsely under the pretense of faith, they entered into the society of the faithful, in order to explore how they might be able to attack the faith. Therefore he adds:

our freedom] By which, through Christ, we were freed from the yoke of the Law.

that they might bring us back into slavery] By observing the precepts of the Law, which is an unbearable burden, as it says in Acts 15 [verse 10].

5. to whom we did not yield in subjection even for a moment] That is, in subjection to observances of the Law.

that the truth of the Gospel] Through which the precepts of the Law were nullified.

might remain among you] Without any mixing in of the old yeast.

6. But from those] Here, in turn, the fourth part of the aforementioned “lesser part” is declared, namely, that Paul’s teaching was in no way made greater through the chief apostles, but rather the contrary: Paul’s doctrine strengthened them in temporal assistance. Therefore he says:

But from those who seemed important] Namely, Peter, James and John.

whoever they were at one time] Namely, before their calling to Christ.

For then they were poor, illiterate simpletons, as is clear from the Gospel. Paul, however, before his calling, was instructed in the Law and prophets and was also powerful and of noble birth.

It makes no difference to me] That is, there is no need to mention such things. The reason for this is added:

For God does not regard the person of man] By calling people to faith or to the apostolic office on account of temporal power, nobility of race, or knowledge, but he called many simple folk and paupers, though he also called some who were literate from their youth, as is said about Paul, and the same is clear about Nathaniel and Nicodemus.

For to me those who seemed important] That is, the chief apostles.

contributed nothing] In knowledge of the Gospel, or temporal assistance.
7. Sed e contra. Contuli eis, quod postea magis exprimitur. Cum vidissent quod creditum est mihi evangelium praeputii. Id est, officium apostolatus ad praedicandum evangelium Gentilibus. Sicut et Petro circumcisionis. Id est, officium apostolatus ad praedicandum Iudaeis.

8. Qui enim operatus est, etc. Ab eodem enim uterque vocatus est ad fidem et ad apostolatum.


7. But on the contrary] I assisted them. Later he expresses this more fully. When they saw that the Gospel of the foreskin had been entrusted to me] That is, the office of apostle, for preaching the Gospel to the Gentiles. just as also to Peter, that of circumcision] That is, the office of apostle, for preaching to the Jews.

8. For he who worked, etc.] For each of them was called to faith and to the apostolic office by the same person.

9. and when they recognized the grace that was given to me] But they recognized this by the gift of tongues, and the working of miracles, and other gifts necessary to the apostolic office, which were as clearly present in Paul, as they were in themselves.40 James] The “brother of the Lord.”41 and Cephas] That is, Peter, as is clear from John 1 [verse 42]. seemed to be pillars] That is, leaders in the church of the Jews.42 they gave their right hands to me, etc.] This is a way of confirming the bond of friendship,43 by giving their right hands to each other.

10. only] Supply: “they asked us.” that we be mindful of the poor] That is, of the faithful who lived in Jerusalem, who had sold their possessions and placed the proceeds at the feet of the Apostles, renouncing their ownership. Because of this they were afterwards needy and begging to be helped by other believers who had not given up their temporal goods in the same way.44 and I was already anxious to do this very thing] As is clear in his earlier letters.

11. When, however] Here, in turn, he declares the last part of the truth as it was stated above, namely, that the truth of the Gospel that Paul preached, concerning the end to the precepts of the Law, was returned to its sincerity, although Peter, the chief apostle, had somehow adversely obscured it by separating himself from the society of Gentile believers, because they were uncircumcised, lest he should scandalize the Jewish believers. Paul rebuked him openly for this, in order to declare the truth of the Gospel. The literal meaning is clear from the words, except for a few, which will be discussed.

12b. fearing those] Namely, fearing to scandalize them.45

*Coram omnibus.* Quia defectus erat publicus.

14b. *Gentiliter et non Iudaice vivis.* Scilicet ante adventum Iudaeorum.

*Cogis Gentes Iudaizare.* Non imperio, sed facto. Quia ex modo se habendi in legalibus aliqui Gentiles credebant eorum observationem necessarium ad salutem.

Ad maiorem tamen declarationem huius litterae et praecedentis, sciem quod Ieronymus et Augustinus videntur varie sensisse de legalium cessatione, maxime quod ad caeremonialia, de quibus est hic sermo. Ieronymus enim distinxit duo tempora tantum: unum ante Christi passionem, in quo legalia habuerunt vim obligativam et expiativam suo modo; aliud post passionem Christi in quo legalia secundum ipsum statim fuerunt mortua et etiam mortifera, ita quod servantes ea mortaliter peccarent. Et consequenter habuit dicere quod apostoli post passionem Christi numquam servaverunt ea secundum veritatem, sed solum quadam pia simulatione, scilicet ne scandalizarent conversos de Iudaeis, et aliorum conversionem impedirent. Quae quidem simulatio non est sic intelligenda quod actus illos secundum rei veritatem non facerent, sed quia non faciebant illos tantum legis ceremonias observantes, sicut si quis pelliculam membri virilis abscinderet non causa circumcisionis servandae, sed sanitatis recuperandae.

Sed quoniam indecens videtur quod apostoli propter scandalum occultarent ea, quae pertinent ad veritatem vitae et doctrinae, et quod simulacione uterentur in his, quae pertinent ad salutem fidelium, ideo convenientius distinxit Augustinus tria tempora. Unum ante Christi passionem, in quo legalia cursum suum habuerunt. Aliud autem post divulgationem evangelii, in quo legalia sunt mortua et mortifera. Tertium autem est tempus medium, scilicet a passione Christi usque ad divulgationem evangelii, in quo legalia fuerunt mortua, quia nullam vim habebant, nec aliquis ea servare tenebatur. Tamen non erant mortifera, quia conversi de Iudaismo poterant.
13. and to his simulation] The meaning of this will afterwards be explained more, according to the truth of the Gospel, concerning how he observed the precepts of the Law, as will be stated more fully.

openly before everyone] Because the misdemeanor was public.46

14b. If you live like a Gentile and not like a Jew] Namely, before the arrival of the Jews.

you compel the Gentiles to become like Jews?] Not by command, but by deed. Because by the way he conducted himself according to the precepts of the Law, certain Gentiles began to think that observing them was necessary for salvation.

For a greater clarification, however, of the literal meaning—here and in what went before—we should know that Jerome and Augustine seem to have different opinions concerning the cessation of the precepts of the Law, especially with respect to the ceremonial precepts, with which this speech is concerned.47 For Jerome distinguishes only two times: one before the passion of Christ, when the precepts of the Law held obligatory force and, in their own way, the power of expiation; the other after the passion of Christ, when the precepts of the Law of themselves became at once dead and also deadly, so that those who keep them sin mortally. And consequently he thought it right to say that the apostles after the passion of Christ never kept them in truth, but only in some kind of pious simulation, so that they would not scandalize the Jewish converts and impede the conversion of others. Indeed, this simulation is not to be understood as if they did not actually do those actions, but because they were not doing them as those who keep the ceremonies of the Law. It is as if someone cuts off his foreskin not for the sake of keeping the law of circumcision, but for the sake of regaining his health.

But since it seems indecent for the apostles, on account of scandal, to obscure those things that pertain to the truth of life and doctrine, and for them to make use of simulation in these things that pertain to the salvation of the faithful, therefore Augustine’s distinction of three times is more agreeable. The first [time is] before the passion of Christ, during which the precepts of the Law held their own course. The second is after the preaching abroad of the Gospel, when the precepts of the Law are dead and deadly. The third, however, is the time in between, namely, from the passion of Christ until the publication of the Gospel. During this time the precepts of the Law were dead, because they held no force and no one was required to keep them. They were not, however, deadly, because the converts from Judaism were legitimately allowed to keep them, as long as
illa licite servare, dum tamen non ponerent in eis spem illa reputantes sibi necessaria ad salutem, quasi sine eis fides Christi iustificare non posset.

Haec autem licentia servandi ad tempus leg auta fuit ex instinctu Spiritus Sancti. Quia si conversis de Iudaismo ad fidem statim fuisset inhibitus legis ritus, sicut conversis de Gentilitate idololatriae cultus, videretur quod lex semper fuisset mala sicut idololatria, nec per consequens a Deo data fuisset. Illis autem, qui convertebantur de Gentilitate, non inerat haec causa talis observantiae. Proprie quod Paulus circumcidit Timotheum ex Matre Iudaee natum, Act. XVI. Titum vero, qui natus fuit ex Gentilibus, noluit circumcidere, ut prae dictum est.

Gentilibus tamen imposita fuit ad tempus observatio aliquorum legalium, ut habetur Act XV, scilicet quod abstinerent ab immolatis simulacrorum et sanguine suffocato, non tanquam necessariis ad salutem, sed ad amicabilem societatem Iudaeeorum, et Gentilium ad invicem. Nam illo tempore Iudaee abhorreabant ista comedere, sicut etiam frequenter contingat, quod lex semper esset mala sicut idololatria, nec per consequens a Deo data esset. Illis autem, qui convertebantur de Gentilitate, non inerat haec causa talis observantiae. Propter quod Paulus circumcidit Timotheum ex Matre Iudaee natum, Act. XVI. Titum vero, qui natus fuit ex Gentilibus, noluit circumcidere, ut prae dictum est.

Sed contra hoc videtur quod hic dicitur, quod Petrus fuit reprehensibilis ex tali observazione. Dicendum quod non peccavit ex facto, quod erat sibi licitum, ut dictum est, sed ex modo faciendi, quia in hoc nimiam diligentiam adhibebat, ne Iudaeeos offenderet, ita quod ex hoc sequebatur scandalum Gentilium, in tantum, quod aliqui inducibantur ad credendum quod talis abstinentia ciborum in lege prohibitorum esset necessaria ad salutem. Et propter hoc Paulus, qui erat Gentilium apostolus ipsum publice reprehendit, et Petrus audito periculo Gentilium sibi acquievit. Propter quod licet peccaverit in modo observandi (propter quod reprehensibilis fuit, ut scribit hic Paulus in scriptura canonica, in qua nihil est falsum), fuit tamen peccatum veniale, quod bene fuit post confirmationem spiritus sancti in apostolis. Unde dicit Iohannes prima canonica primo capitulo: Si dixerimus quia peccatum non habemus, nosmet ipsos seducimus et veritas in nobis non est.
they did not put any hope in them, or think that they were necessary for their salvation, as if faith could not justify without them.

This freedom, however—of keeping the precepts of the Law for a time—was inspired by the Holy Spirit. Because if the ritual of the Law had been immediately forbidden to converts from Judaism, as the cult of idolatry was for Gentile converts, it would look like the Law had always been bad, just like idolatry, and consequently it would not have been given by God. For those, however, who were converted from the Gentiles, there was no inherent reason for such observance. For this reason Paul circumcised Timothy, since he was born of a Jewish mother, as it says in Acts 16 [verse 1], but he was unwilling to circumcise Titus, whose parents were Gentiles, as was said above.48

On the Gentiles, however, a temporary observation of certain precepts was imposed, as it says in Acts 15, namely, that they abstain from meats sacrificed to idols, and strangled blood, not as if they were necessary for salvation, but for the sake of the mutually amicable association of Jews and Gentiles.49 For at that time the Jews shuddered at the notion of eating these things, just as it also frequently happens that someone in another’s company abstains from foods that are abominable to his own friends. But as time went on, and the cause desisted, the effect also came to an end. The apostles, therefore, who were converts from Judaism, in the intermediate time, namely, from the passion of Christ until the publication of the Gospel, are read at times to have kept the precepts of the Law legitimately in the way we have described.

But against this, it seems that here it is being said that Peter was reprehensible because of his observation of the Law. We should say that he did not sin because of the deed, which was permitted to him, as we have said, but because of the way he did it, because he applied too much diligence to it, lest he offend the Jews, so that from this there followed a scandal to the Gentiles, insofar as some were led to believe that such abstaining from foods that are prohibited by the Law was necessary for salvation. And because of this, Paul, who was the apostle to the Gentiles, corrected him publicly, and Peter, when he heard about the danger that was posed to the Gentiles, for his part acquiesced. Because of this, although he sinned in his manner of observing (because of which he was truly reprehensible, as Paul writes here in canonical Scripture, in which nothing is false50), the sin was nevertheless venial, which was well after the confirmation of the Holy Spirit on the apostles. Whereby John says in the first chapter of his first canonical letter: “If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us.”51


17. Quod si quaerentes iustificari in Christo. Id est, in fide Christi. Inventi sumus et ipsi peccatores. Quod est si haec fides non iustificat absque legalibus. Numquid Christus peccati minister est. Quasi dicit: Hoc inconveniens sequetur ex quo tradidit fideem non iustificantem. Absit. Quasi dicit: Hoc patet falum ex praedictis, quia supra probatum est quod doctrina evangelica est a Deo inspirata et perfecta, quod non esset, nisi iustificaret; nam in hoc consistit legis perfectio.
15. **We ourselves, by nature** | Here, from what has been said, he infers the intended conclusion, namely, that the precepts of the Law; according to the teaching of the Gospel that he preached, are emptied of meaning and no longer need to be kept. And he shows this first generally and then specifically, at **For if.** In the first part he reasons like this: Jews who are justified by a faith in Christ that is satisfied in the Gospel dismiss the precepts of the Law. Gentiles, therefore, who are justified by the same faith—such as the Galatians were, to whom he was writing—should dismiss the precepts of the Law all the more. The logic is clear, because the Law was given to the Jews and not to the Gentiles. The Apostle proves the premise by his own example, and that of the other apostles, saying:

**We ourselves, by nature Jews and not from the Gentiles, sinners** | That is, we who are Jews by birth, and were not born from Gentiles, were sinners; supply “as long as we were living under the Law.”

16. **knowing, however, that man is not justified from works of the Law** | On account of his own imperfection.

**except through faith in Jesus Christ** | Whereby even the fathers of the Old Testament were not justified, except through faith in the Christ who was to come.

**and we have believed in Christ Jesus, that we might be justified** | For through the same faith, the faithful of the New Testament are justified, because he whom others believed was to come is he whom these believe has come, and has fulfilled the mystery of redemption. But because the false apostles were saying that faith in Christ does not justify without the observation of the precepts of the Law, he therefore goes on to refute this, saying:

17. **But if while we seek to be justified in Christ** | That is, in faith in Christ.

**we are ourselves found to be sinners** | This is the case, if this faith does not justify without the works of the Law.

**Christ is not servant of sin, is he?** | As if he is saying, “This inconsistency follows from the fact that he gave us a faith that does not justify.”

**Far be it!** | As if he is saying, “This is clearly false from what has been said.” Because above, it was proven that the teaching of the Gospel is inspired by God and perfect, which it would not be, if it did not justify; for the perfection of the Law consists in this.
18. Si enim. Hic ostendit particulariter quod legalia sint abiicenda sui ipsius exemplo, dicens:
   *Si enim quae destruxi.* Scilicet legalia, quae docui debere relinqui.
   *Haec iterum reaedifico.* Id est, observo tanquam necessaria ad salutem, et alios ad hoc induco.
   *Praevaricatorem me constituo.* Id est, facto confiteor me errasse, quod absit. Ideo subdit:

   *Legi.* Scilicet Veteri.
   *Mortuus sum.* In quantum evacuat legalia, sicut praedictum fuit Ier. XXXI: Ecce dies veniunt dicit Dominus et feriam domui Israel, et domui luda foedus novum, non secundum pactum, quod pepigi cum patribus vestris, etc. Per hoc enim quod dicitur: Non secundum pactum, per quod intelligitur lex Moysaica, ostenditur quod per Legem Novam erat evacuanda.
   *Ut Deo vivam.* Per Christi gratiam. Ideo subditur:
   *Christo confixus sum cruici.* Scilicet per compassionem ex fide procedentem. Ideo subditur:

20. *Vivo autem iam non ego.* Scilicet qualis fui sub lege.
   *Vivit vero in me Christus.* Habitans in me per gratiam vivificantem.
   *Quod autem nunc vivo.* Per Christi gratiam.
   *In carne.* Id est, adhuc existens in carne passibili.
   *In fide vivo Filii Dei.* Qui in resurrectione dabit mihi corpus immortale.
   *Qui dilexit me, etc.* Ex dilectione enim maxima voluntarie mortem subiit pro salute nostra. Et quia tanta gratia non est negligenda sed veneranda, ideo subdit:
18. **For if**] Here he shows in particular that the precepts of the Law should be thrown away, using himself as an example, saying:

**For if what I destroyed**] That is, the precepts of the Law,\(^5^9\) which I taught that we should abandon.

**I rebuild again**] That is, if I observe them as if they are necessary for salvation, and lead others to do the same.

**I make myself a transgressor**] That is, I confess that I erred in deed, which, far be it! Therefore he adds:

19. **For as for myself, through the Law**] Namely, the New Law.
**to the Law**] Namely, the Old Law.\(^6^0\)

**I died**] Insofar as he laid aside the precepts of the Law, as it was predicted in Jeremiah 31 [verses 31–32], “Behold, the day is coming, says the Lord, and I will bring to the house of Israel and to the house of Judah a new covenant, not according to the agreement that I made with your fathers.”\(^6^1\) For by what is said, this: “not according to the agreement,” by which the Law of Moses is understood; it is shown that through the New Law, the Old Law was to become voided.

**so that I might live for God**] Through the grace of Christ. Therefore he adds:

**I have been crucified on a cross with Christ.**] Namely, through the compassion that proceeds from faith.\(^6^2\) Therefore he adds:

20. **I live, but it is no longer I**] Namely, the sort of person I was under the Law.\(^6^3\)

**but Christ lives in me**] Dwelling in me by a life-giving grace.\(^6^4\)

**What, however, I now live**] Through the grace of Christ.

**in the flesh**] That is, still being in flesh that is capable of suffering.\(^6^5\)

**In faith in the Son of God**] Who in the Resurrection will give me an immortal body.

**who loved me, etc.**] For out of the very greatest love he willingly endured death for our salvation. And because such great grace is not to be ignored, but adored, therefore he adds:
21. Non abicio gratiam Dei. Id est, abiecam non repto, quod tamen esset si absque legalibus non sufficeret ad salutem. Ideo subditur: 

Si enim per legem iustitia. Supple: habetur.

Ergo Christus gratis mortuus est. Id est, sine causa. Ex quo sine hoc habebatur iustitia, quae facti hominem dignum vita aeterna. Galathae vero habebant pro inconvenienti quod frustra fuisset mors Christi, et per consequens debent inconvenienti reputare illud ex quo sequeratur, scilicet quod observATIO legalium iustificaret, vel esset necessaria ad salutem.

Capitulum Tertium

1. O insensati. Postquam apostolus improvavit errorem de observatione legalium cum evangelio ex perfectione legis evangelicae, hic consequenter idem facit ex imperfectione legis Moysaicae. Ista tamen divisio non est precisa, quia in praecedentibus posita sunt aliqua de imperfectione legis Moysaicae, et e converso in sequentibus aliqua ponuntur de perfectione legis evangelicae. Sed haec divisio accipitur secundum id, quod principalius intelligitur. Et divitit in duas partes, nam amplius primo Galathas increpat; secundo propositum declarat, ibi Qui ergo. Prima adhuc in duas, quia primo ponit suam increpationem; secundo increpationis rationem, ibi Hoc solum. Circa primum dicit:

O insensati Galathae, quis vos fascinavit? Id est, adulando decepit.


Sciendum etiam quod fascinatio aliquando accipitur pro illusione sensuum qua aliquis non advertit ea, quae sunt ante ipsum, et sic erat de Galathis, quia iniuriam factam Christo per falsos apostolos in praesentia eorum non advertebant. Ideo subditur:
21. I do not throw away the grace of God] That is, I do not consider it thrown away, which it nevertheless would be, if it were not sufficient for salvation without the works of the Law. Therefore he adds: for if justification through the Law Supply: “is had.” Then Christ died gratuitously] That is, without cause. Because without this we would get justification, which makes man worthy of eternal life. But the Galatians considered it nonsense that the death of Christ could have been in vain, and consequently they ought to have considered what the conclusion was drawn from also to be nonsense, namely, that observation of the precepts of the Law justified, or was necessary for, salvation.

Chapter 3

1. O foolish] After the Apostle has disproved the error of observing the precepts of the Law together with the Gospel, arguing from the perfection of the evangelical Law, here in turn he does the same thing, based on the imperfection of the Mosaic Law. This division, however, is not precise, because in what went before some things were stated concerning the imperfection of the Mosaic Law, and conversely in what follows some things are said concerning the perfection of the evangelical Law. But this division is accepted according to that which is chiefly understood. And it is divided into two parts, because first he scolds the Galatians; second, he declares the proposition, at He therefore [verse 5]. The first part may be further divided into two parts, because first he presents his reproach; second the reasoning for his reproach, at This alone [verse 2]. First he says: O foolish Galatians! Who has bewitched you?] That is, deceived you by flattery.

so as not to be obedient to the truth] Namely, of the Gospel, through which the precepts of the Law are excluded. For although the Apostle knew that they had been deceived by false apostles, he nevertheless asks “Who has bewitched you?” not out of ignorance, but in amazement at their instability, just as in Genesis 3 [verse 9], “Adam, where are you?” is not said out of ignorance.

We should also know that bewitching is sometimes taken to mean a deception of the senses, by which someone does not notice those things that are in front of him, and so it was with the Galatians, because they did not notice the injury that was done to Christ by the false apostles in their presence. Therefore he adds:
Ante quorum oculos Iesus Christu proscriptus est. Id est, condemnatus per falsos apostolos asserentes vobis quod fides eius non sufficit ad salutem sine legalibus et sic condemnantes eum tanquam impotentem ad salvandum, cum tamen lex hoc promittat de Christo venturo, ipsum fore Salvatorem, ut patet per auctoritatem Ieremiae praecedenti capitulo inductam. Lex enim frequenter accipitur pro toto Veteri Testamento.

Et in vobis crucifixus. Per eosdem tanquam homo purus. Hoc enim asserebant a tempore apostolorum aliqui pseudo apostoli sive haeretici, propter quod Iohannes in principio evangelii sui compulsus fuit eius divinitatem declarare, ut dicit Ieronymus in prologo super Iohannem.


Hoc solum volo a vobis discere. Id est, audire ut deceptio vestra appareat ex vestra responsione.

Ex operibus legis Spiritum accepistis. Scilicet in signo visibili.
An ex auditu fidei. Id est, ex receptione fidei Christi per baptismum. Quasi dicit: Manifeste patet per effectum quod non potestis negare vos ex fide Christi recepisse. Ideo concludit eorum deceptionem dicens:


Nunc carne consummamini. Super eam volentes recipere legalium observationem. Quae dicuntur iustitiae carnis Heb. IX. eo quod tollebant quasdam immunditias ex immunorum tactu provenientes, ut ex tactu morticini, menstruatae, et huiusmodi, ex quibus homo reddebatur inhabilis ad ingressum templi.
before whose eyes Jesus Christ was outlawed[69] That is, condemned by the false apostles who asserted to you that faith in him is not sufficient for salvation without works of the Law. Thus they condemn him as unable to save, even though the Law nevertheless promises, concerning the coming Christ, that he will be the Savior, as is evident from the testimony of Jeremiah that we presented in the last chapter. For “Law” is frequently taken to mean the entire Old Testament.

and in you crucified] By the same people; as if he were just a man.70 For some people, false apostles, or heretics, had been asserting this from the time of the apostles. For this reason, John at the beginning of his Gospel was compelled to declare his divinity, as Jerome says in his introduction to John.

2. This alone] Here in turn he gives a twofold reason for his rebuke. The second starts at So much. To begin with, we should know that, in the primitive church, the Holy Spirit was given to the baptized under the visible sign, through the laying on of the hands of the apostles, as is clear in Acts 8 [verses 17–19] and in many other passages. In this way [the Holy Spirit] had been given to the Galatians who, in faith in Christ, had been baptized. He was not, however, given in this way to those who were observing the precepts of the Law. And in this way, they were able to perceive that works of the Law were not necessary for salvation, if only they had not been bewitched in the manner mentioned above. And this is what he is saying with:

This alone I want to learn from you] That is, to hear from you, so that it might become clear from your response that you were deceived.

Did you receive the Spirit from works of the Law] Namely, in a visible sign.71

or from the hearing of faith?] That is, from receiving faith in Christ through baptism. As if he is saying, “It is manifestly evident from the effect that you cannot deny that you received the Spirit from faith in Christ.” Therefore he finishes speaking of how they were deceived.

3. Are you so stupid that, whereas you began in the Spirit] As Gentiles receiving directly the teaching of the Gospel, which is spiritual.

now you would be perfected by the flesh?] In addition to this [teaching], wanting to accept the observation of the precepts of the Law?72 These are called regulations of the flesh in Hebrews 9 [verse 10], in that they remove certain impurities that come from touching things that are unclean, such as the skin of a dead animal, a menstruating woman, and the like, from which a man is rendered unfit to enter the temple.
4. **Tanta.** Hic ponitur secunda ratio, quia pati magnum detrimentum sine causa fatuum est, sic erat de Galathiis, propter quod erant increpandi, sicut fatui. Et hoc est quod dicit:

**Tanta passi estis.** Quod exponitur dupliciter. Uno modo de persecutionibus quas pro Christo sustinuerant.

**Sine causa.** Id est, sine utilitate proveniente, imo cum detrimento. Minus enim dicendo plus significat. Per deceptionem enim pseudo apostolorum dictae sufferentiae perderiderat meritum, et cum hoc incurrebant peccatum.

**Si tamen sine causa.** Id est, si perseveretis in errore. Quasi dicit: Si abiiciatis errorem, recipietis iterum gratiam bona mortua revivificantem. Alio modo exponitur de expensis magnis quas fecerant pro pseudo apostolis, et sic fuerant passi damnum in temporalibus et sine utilitate spirituali, immo cum detrimentoonorum spiritualium. Et hoc videtur sonare littera, cum dicitur:

**Tanta passi estis.** Id est, plura damna, scilicet in temporalibus et spiritualibus bonis.

5. **Qui ergo.** Post Galatharum increpationem, hic consequenter apostolus declarat cessationem legalium propter eorum imperfectionem. Et dividitur in duas partes, quia primo declarat hoc per rationem; secundo per similitudinis adaptationem, capitulo IIII. Prima adhuc in duas, quia primo ponitur ratio; secundo solvitur tacita quaestio, ibi *Quid igitur lex*. Circa primum facit talem rationem: Illa lex, quae non iustificat, nec benedictionem Dei conferit, nec haereditatem affert, tanquam imperfecta cessat adveniente lege iustificante, benedictionem Dei conferente, et haereditatem etiam aeternam affere. Sed sic se habet lex Moysaica ad evangelicam. Ergo, etc. In hac ratione sic procedit, quod supponit maiorem tanquam manifeste veram, et declarat minorem quantum ad tres eius partes. Primo primam, secundo secundam, ibi *Providens autem*, tertio tertiam, ibi *Fratres*. Primam autem declarat, scilicet quod lex non iustificat, sed fides Christi, dicens:
4. So much] Here he gives the second reason (for his rebuke), that it is foolish to suffer great detriment without cause. So it was with the Galatians, because of which they needed to be scolded like fools. And this is what he is saying with:

Have you suffered so much] Which he explains in two ways. One concerns the persecutions that they endured for the sake of Christ.73

without cause] That is, without any usefulness coming out of it, indeed, but with detriment.74 For by saying less, he means more. Because through the deception of the false apostles, the sufferings just mentioned lost their merit, and incurred sin in addition.

if it really is without cause] That is, if you persist in error. As if he is saying, “If you should throw out your error, you will get back again the grace that brings back to life good works that have died.”75 The other way [in which they suffered] concerns the money they paid the false apostles, and thus they suffered a loss in temporal goods, and without spiritual benefit, indeed, but with detriment to their spiritual goods. And the literal meaning seems to be speaking of this when it says:

Have you suffered so much] That is, many losses, namely, in temporal and spiritual goods.

5. He therefore who] After rebuking the Galatians, here in turn the Apostle declares a cessation to the precepts of the Law, on account of their imperfection. And this is divided into two parts, because first he declares this according to reason; second by the application of a simile in chapter 4. The first part is further divided into two, because first the reasoning is set forth; second, the unspoken question is resolved, at Why therefore. To begin with, he gives this reasoning: “That Law, which does not justify, and does not confer the blessing of God, and does not bring an inheritance, as it is imperfect, it ceases when a law comes along that justifies, confers the blessing of God, and also brings an eternal inheritance. But the Law of Moses is this way in relation to the Gospel. Therefore, etc.” According to this line of reasoning, he proceeds like this, supposing the greater part of it to be manifestly true, and he declares only the lesser part, according to its three parts: the first part first; the second part second, at Scripture, however; and the third part third, at Brothers. He declares, however, the first part, namely, that the Law does not justify, but faith in Christ, saying:
Qui ergo tribuit vobis Spiritum. Scilicet, in signo sensibili.
Et operatur virtutes in vobis. Id est, miracula videntibus vobis. De quo certum est quod est ipse Deus, quia talia fieri non possunt, nisi virtute divina.
Facitne hoc ex operibus legis an ex auditu fidei? Id est, ex receptione fidei Christi. Quasi dicit: Manifeste patet per effectum quod hoc non est ex merito legis, sed ex merito fidei, quia talia non sunt servantibus legis, sed recipientibus fidei. Et confirmat per scripturam, dicens:

6. Sicut scriptum est. Gen. XV. capitulo: Credidit Abraham Deo et reputatum est ei ad iustitiam. Et sic ex fide Christi venturi iustificatus fuit, et non ex operibus legis, quae per magnum tempus postea fuit data. Ideo concludit:

7. Cognoscite ergo quia qui ex fide sunt. Credentes per fidem Christi iustificari. Hi sunt filii Abrahae. Id est imitatores fidei suae, et per eam iustificati, sicut et ipse.


9. Igitur qui ex fide sunt. Id est, de numero fidelium. Benedicentur cum fidei Abraham. Quod non convenit legalia servantibus. Ideo subditur:
He therefore who gave you the Spirit] Namely, in the visible sign.\textsuperscript{76}
and caused the working of powers in you] That is, miracles, which you witnessed. Concerning this, it is certain that it is God himself [who caused this], because such things could not occur except by God’s power.\textsuperscript{77}
does he produce this from works of the Law or from the hearing of faith?] That is, from receiving faith in Christ? As if he is saying: “It is manifestly clear from the effect that this does not come about by the merit of the Law, but by the merit of faith, because such things do not happen to those who keep the Law, but to those who receive faith.” And he confirms it through the Scriptures, saying:

6. as it is written] In Genesis 15 [verse 6].
Abraham believed God and it was credited to him for righteousness] And thus from faith in the coming Christ he was justified, and not from works of the Law, which was given a long time later. Therefore he concludes:

7. Know, therefore, that those who are of faith] Who believe that they are justified through faith in Christ.
they are sons of Abraham] That is, imitators of his faith, and justified through it, just as he was.\textsuperscript{78}

8. Scripture, however] Here the second part of the lesser part is declared, namely, that the blessing of God is not had from the Law, but from faith in Christ, saying:
Scripture, however, foreseeing] That is, God, the author of Scripture.\textsuperscript{79}
that God justifies the Gentiles from their faith] And not from the Law, as was said above.
announced beforehand to Abraham] In Genesis 22 [verse 18], a long time before the giving of the Law.
that “All nations will be blessed in you”] This was fulfilled in Christ, who is a descendant of Abraham according to the flesh, and in whom some people from all nations believe, and this will be more fully accomplished near the end of the world.

9. Therefore, those who are from faith] That is, from the number of the faithful.
will be blessed, together with Abraham the faithful] This is disagreeable to those who keep the precepts of the Law. Therefore, he adds:
10. **Quicunque enim ex operibus legis sunt.** Asserentes quod sine illis operibus non est salus.  
**Sub maledicto sunt.** Quia non possunt illa implere. Propter quod dicit Petrus Act. XV:  
Hoc est onus, quod neque nos neque patres nostri portare potuimus.  
Sed contra videtur esse quod dicit Hieronymus in expositione fidei, scilicet illos esse maledicendos, qui dicunt Deum praecipisse aliquid impossibile. Dicendum quod aliquid est impossibile dupliciter. Uno modo simpliciter et absolute, et sic loquitur Ieronymus. Alio modo, quia non est bene possibile, sicut de lyra, dicitur quod non potest sonare quando male sonat, ut dicitur quinto Metaphysicae. Et sic dicitur quod Iudaei non poterant servare, propter difficultatem servandi, quia non poterant de facili servare, et ideo multi erant transgressores. Quod autem tales sint maledicti probatur per scripturam Deut. XXVII. capitulo.  
**Maledictus omnis qui non permanserit in omnibus quae scripta sunt in libro legis ut faciat ea.** Id est, opere impleat, quod tamen praedicti non faciebant. Et ulterius ad probandum quod lex non iustificet, inducit scripturam, Abacuch. II. dicens:  

11b. **Iustus ex fide vivit.** Vita gratiae.  

12. **Lex autem non est ex fide.** Li *ex* tenetur hic materialiter, sicut cum dicitur: Ex aere fit statua. et pro tanto dicitur Lex non esse ex fide, quia in Lege Veteri non fuerunt data praecpta de credendis. Hoc enim pertinet ad Legem Novam in qua facta est explicatio credendorum, propter quod Ro. III. Lex Vetus dicitur lex factorum, Lex autem Nova dicitur lex fidei. Nec est per hoc intelligendum quod patres Veteris Testamenti fuerunt sine fide, sine qua impossibile est placere Deo, Heb. XI. Multi enim ipsorum fuerunt sancti et Deo placentes, sed non habuerunt fidem explicitam sicut patres Novi Testamenti, in quo veritas per Christum est aperta revelata.  
**Sed qui fecerit ea.** Scilicet legis praecepta.
10. For whoever are from the works of the Law] Who assert that without these works, there is no salvation.
are under the curse] Because they cannot fulfill them. Because of this, Peter says in Acts 15 [verse 10], “This is a burden that neither we nor our fathers were able to bear.”

But what Jerome says in his explanation of the faith seems to be opposed to this, namely, that those people are to be cursed who say that God commanded anything impossible. We should say that something may be called impossible in two ways. One way [in which something may be called impossible] is simply and absolutely, and Jerome is talking about this way. Another way [in which something may be called impossible] is because it is not easily possible, just as a lyre is said to be unable to make a sound when it makes a bad sound, as it is said in [Aristotle’s] *Metaphysics*, book 5 [ch. 12]. And so it is said that the Jews were not able to keep [the Law] on account of the difficulty of keeping it, because they were not able to keep it easily, and therefore many were transgressors. The fact, however, that such are accursed is proven through Scripture, in Deuteronomy 27.

Cursed be everyone who does not abide in all the things that are written in the book of the Law, to do them] That is, to fulfill them in deed, which, however, the aforementioned people were not doing. And to prove further that the Law does not justify, he presents Scripture, from Habakkuk 2 [verse 4], saying:


12. The Law, however, is not out of faith] The out of is here taken materially, as when it is said: “a statue is made out of bronze.” And this is why the Law is not said to be out of faith, because in the Old Law no commandments were given concerning what should be believed. For this pertains to the New Law, in which an explanation is given of things that need to be believed. Because of this, in Romans 3 [verse 27], the Old Law is called a law of deeds, but the New Law is called a law of faith. And we should not understand by this that the fathers of the Old Testament were without faith, “without which it is impossible to please God,” as Hebrews 11 [verse 6] says. For many of them were saints and pleasing to God, but did not have a faith that had been explained, unlike the fathers of the New Testament, in which the truth was openly revealed through Christ. But the one who does them] Namely, the precepts of the Law.
Vivet in eis. Quia non incurreret poenam mortis, quae transgressoris inferebatur. Et ideo non dicit absolute: vivet, sed vivet in eis, vita corporali. Vita vero spiritualis datur per fidem caritate formatam.

13. Christus nos redemit de maledicto legis. Id est, de poena transgressoris legis debita, nos absolvendo a debito servandi eam. Et quia fecit hoc per suam passionem, per quam legalia sunt evacuata, ideo subditur:
Factus pro nobis maledictum. Id est, sustinens pro nobis poenam mortis, sed non culpam, quae mors inferebatur maledictis in lege, scilicet per suspensionem in ligno.
Quia scriptum est. Deuter. XXI.
Maledictus, etc. Et quia per suam passionem meruit promissionum factarum patribus impletionem, ideo subditur:

Fieret in Christo Iesu. Promissum enim erat Abrahæ, quod in semine eius benedicerentur omnes Gentes terræ Gen. XXII. quod impletum est in Christo descendente ab Abraham secundum carnem.
Ut pollicitationem Spiritus. Id est, promissionem Spiritus Sancti.
Accipiamus per fidem. Quia datur credentibus in Christum.

15. Fratres. Hic declaratur tertia minoris suprapositae, scilicet quod haereditas aeterna non datur per legem, sed per Christi fidem, quia promissio huius haereditatis facta fuit Abrahæ per longum tempus ante legis dationem ut declaravi plenius, Gen. XV. Si igitur daretur ex lege, quae postea data est, sequeretur quod promissio illa per legem fuisset irritata. Ex quo non daretur ex promissione, sed ex alia causa. Hoc autem est inconvenientis dicere de divina promissione iuramento divino firmata, qualis fuit ista sicut patet Gen. XXII. ubi reperitur haec promissio, et additur: Per memet ipsum iuravi, dicit Dominus, etc. Hanc autem rationem deducit apostolus diffuse, et aliquantulum intricate, dicens:
shall live in them] Because he will not incur the penalty of death, which was brought against transgressors. And therefore he does not say he shall live absolutely, but he shall live in them, in the life of the body. But spiritual life is given through faith that is formed by charity.

13. Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the Law] That is, from the penalty that is due to those who transgress the Law, by releasing us from the obligation to keep it. And because he did this through his own passion, through which the precepts of the Law were nullified, therefore he adds:

who was made a curse for us] That is, enduring for us the punishment of death, but not the guilt. This death was brought to those who were cursed in the Law, namely, by being suspended on a tree.

Because it is written] In Deuteronomy 21 [verse 23].

Cursed etc.] And because through his own passion he won the fulfillment of the promises that were given to the fathers, therefore he adds:

14. so that the blessing of Abraham] Namely, the promises.

might become, in Christ Jesus, also for the Gentiles] For it had been promised to Abraham that all nations on earth would be blessed in his seed, in Genesis 22 [verse 18], which was fulfilled in Christ, who descended from Abraham according to the flesh.

that the pledge of the Spirit] That is, the promise of the Holy Spirit.

we might receive through faith] Because [the promise] is given to those who believe in Christ.

15. Brothers] Here the third part of the lesser part that was mentioned above is declared, namely, that the eternal inheritance is not given through the Law, but through faith in Christ, because the promise of this inheritance was made to Abraham a long time before the giving of the Law, as I declared at greater length in Genesis 15. If [the eternal inheritance] were given from the Law, which was given afterwards, it would follow that this promise was voided through the Law. Therefore it would not be given from the promise, but by some other means. It is improper, however, to say this about God’s promise, which was confirmed by divine oath, as this was, as is clear from Genesis 22, where this promise is found, and it is added: “I have sworn by my very self” says the Lord,” etc. The Apostle, however, draws out this logic at great length and somewhat intricately, saying:
Fratres secundum hominem dico. Id est, per factum humanum osten-
dendo propositum.
Tamen hominis, etc. Quasi dicat: Licet homo nihil sit respectu Dei.
Tamen hominis confirmatum testamentum. In quo ordinat de haereditate
pro filiis.
Nemo spernit, etc. Id est, immobiliter tenet. Antiquitus enim homines
in suis testamentis ordinabant de successione haereditatis, et adhuc fit in
aliquibus terris.

16. Abrahae dictae sunt promissiones. Scilicet, divinae per modum
testamenti firmatae, ut postea patebit. Ideo sunt firmae.
Et semini eius. Scilicet Christo, in quo impletae sunt, et non in alio. Ideo
dicitur semini in singulari.

17. Hoc autem dico testamentum, etc. Id est, promissiones istae per
modum testamenti sunt firmatae, quia iuramento divino.
Quae post quadrigentos, etc. Construenda est sic littera:
Lex quae post quadringentos, et triginta annos. Scilicet a tempore
promissionis factae Abrahae.
Facta est. Id est, data in monte Sinae.
Non irritum facit ad evacuandam promissionem. Id est, non evacuat
promissionem Abrahae factam quasi irritam, quod tamen faceret, si daretur
ex lege. Ideo subditur:

Iam non ex promissione. Quia datur ex alia causa.
Abrahae autem per repromissionem. Firmam.
Donavit Deus. Ergo non ex lege.
Brothers, I speak according to man] That is, by demonstrating his proposition through a human act.

Even a man's] As if he is saying: “Granted that man is nothing before God.”

Even a man’s confirmed testament] By which he gives instructions concerning the inheritance for his sons.

no one rejects etc.] That is, it unwaveringly holds its ground. For in time of old, men used to give instructions in their testaments concerning the handing down of their inheritance, and this still happens in some lands.

16. To Abraham the promises were spoken] Namely, the divine promises, confirmed in the manner of a testament, as will be clear afterwards. Therefore, they are fixed.

and to his seed] Namely, Christ, in whom they were fulfilled, and not in another. Therefore, he says seed in the singular.⁹²

17. I say, however, that this testament, etc.] That is, those promises were confirmed according to the manner of a testament, because [they were confirmed] by God’s oath.⁹³

what was made four hundred and thirty years later] The literal meaning is to be put together like this:

The Law, which after 430 years] Namely, from the time of the promise that was made to Abraham.⁹⁴

was made] That is, given on Mount Sinai.

does not make void, to nullify the promise] That is, it does not nullify the promise that was made to Abraham, as if it were void, which it nevertheless would do, if [the inheritance] were given from the Law. Therefore he adds:

18. For if the inheritance from the Law] Supply: “is given.”

it is already not from the promise.] Because it is given from a different cause.

To Abraham, however, through a repeated promise] Fixed.

God gave it.] Therefore not from the Law.
19. **Quid igitur.** Hic consequenter apostolus respondet tacitae quaestioni. Ex hoc enim, quod apostolus dixit, quod ex lege non est iustitia, nec benedictio, nec haereditatis consecutio, sed per fidem, quae fuit etiam in patribus ante Legem, ideo posset aliquis quaerere: Ad quid Lex Moysi fuit data? quia videtur hoc fuisse frustra. Et hoc est quod dicitur:  
**Quid igitur lex?** Id est, ad quid fuit utilis?  
**Propter transgressionem.** Hic respondet ad quaestionem, ostendens triplicem legis utilitatem. Prima est: Punitio peccatorum, quia in lege determinantur certae et graves poenae pro determinatis peccatis, quarum terrore cohibebantur homines a peccatis usque ad tempus legis evangelicae, quae est lex amoris. Et hoc est quod dicitur:  
**Propter transgressionem.** Scilicet puniendam et reprimendam.  
**Posita est lex, donec veniret semen.** Scilicet, Christus de semine Abrahae, cui promiserat. Id est, in quo complendae erant promissiones divinae. Consequenter redit apostolus ad ostendendum qualiter lex sit data, dicens:  
**Ordinata per angelos.** Non enim fuit data immediate a Deo, sed per angelum, ut habetur Act. VII. de Moyse. Hic est qui fuit in ecclesia in solitudine cum angelo, qui loquebatur ei in monte Sinae. Quia tamen ille angelus in persona Dei loquebatur, frequenter nominatur Deus in Exodo.  
**In manu mediatoris.** Id est, in potestate Christi ad mutandum eam pro voluntate sua tanquam Dominus eius. Unde dicit Matth. XII. Dominus est filius hominis, etiam sabbathi.

20. **Mediator autem unius non est.** Sed duorum extremorum, quae coniungit. Est enim Christus mediator Dei et hominum reconcilians homines Deo Patri. Sed quia unum extremum est simpliciter indivisibile, scilicet Deus, ideo subditur:  
**Deus autem unus est.** Homines autem multi faciunt tamen unum extremum per unitatem fidei.

21. **Lex ergo.** Hic ponitur secunda utilitas, quae est hominum conclusio sub peccato, quia Lex peccatum ostendebat, nec tamen gratiam iustificamenti conferebat, et sic homines movebantur ad desiderandum adventum Christi, per quem erant iustificandi. Dicit igitur apostolus interrogative:
19. Why, therefore, the Law? Here in turn the Apostle replies to the unspoken question. For from what the Apostle has said—that righteousness is not from the Law, nor blessing, nor the receiving of inheritance, but through faith, which also belonged to the fathers before the Law—therefore, someone could ask to what end the Mosaic Law was given, because this seems to have been in vain. And this is what he is saying with: Why, therefore, the Law? That is, what was it good for?

On account of transgression] Here he replies to the question, showing a threefold usefulness for the Law. The first is the punishing of sins. Because in the Law, sure and serious punishments are appointed for specific sins, in dread of which men were restrained from sins until the time of the evangelical Law, which is the Law of love. And this is what he is saying with: On account of transgression] Namely, punishing and repressing it.

the Law was established, until the seed would come] Namely, Christ, descended from the seed of Abraham.

to whom he repeated the promise] That is, in whom the divine promises were to be fulfilled. Next the Apostle returns to showing in what way the Law was given, saying:

ordained through angels] For it was not given directly by God, but through an angel, as it says in Acts 7 [verse 38] concerning Moses: “This is he who was in the congregation in the desert with the angel, who spoke to him on Mount Sinai.” Because, however, that angel spoke for God, he is frequently called God in Exodus.

in the hand of a mediator] That is, in Christ’s power, to change it according to his will, just as he is its Lord. For this reason Matthew 12 [verse 8] says, “The son of man is Lord, also of the Sabbath.”

20. A mediator, however, is not of one] But of two extremes, which he joins together. For Christ is the mediator of God and man, reconciling men to God the Father. But because the one extreme is simple and invisible (namely, God), therefore he adds:

God, however, is one.] Men on the other hand, though many, nevertheless make one extreme through the unity of the Faith.

21. Is the Law therefore] Here he sets forth the second usefulness [of the Law], which is man’s realization that he is under sin, because the Law showed sin, and yet did not give him a justifying grace, and thus men were moved to desire the coming of Christ through whom they would be justified. Therefore the Apostle says, asking a question:
Lex ergo adversus promissa Dei? Ea irritando.
Absit. Quia Lex illa data fuit a Deo, et sic non irritat Dei promissa, quia sic Deus irritaret seipsum. Nec valet, si obiciatur de Lege Nova a Deo data, quae tamen evacuat Veterem, quia non sic evacuatur per Novam, quin maneat in meliori, scilicet in figurata, quae melior est ipsa figura. Sic autem non est in proposito, quia Dei promissa de iustificatione, et haereditatis consecutione non figurabant legem, sed magis e converso, quia lex figurabat impletionem promissorum.
Si enim data esset lex, quae possit iustificare. Iustitia infusa, quae facit dignum vita aeterna.
Vere ex lege esset iustitia. Et non ex promissione Abrahae facta, et sic per legem esset irritata.

22. Sed conclusit scriptura. Id est, Lex Moysi, quae est Lex scripta.
Omnia sub peccato. In quantum peccatum ostendebat, nec mundabat.
Ut promissio. De iustificatione, et per consequens de haereditatis consecutione.
Ex fide Iesu Christi. Id est, per fidem eius.
Daretur credentibus. Fide formata, quae tendere facit in Deum.

23. Prius autem quam veniret. Hic ponitur tertia utilitas, quae est introductio hominum ad fidem Christi, ad quam Lex Vetus fuit quaedam dispositio, in quantum Lex illa erat figura Novae Legis, et totus ille status Novi Testamenti fuit figurativus. 1 Cor. X. Omnia in figura contingebant illis. Figura vero ducit, licet imperfecte in cognitionem rei figuratae. Et hoc est quod dicit:
Prius autem quam veniret fides. Scilicet revelata et explicita in evangelio.
Sub lege custodiebamur. Scilicet per cultum unius veri Dei.
Conclusi in eam fidem, quae revelanda erat. Est enim eadem fides in Novo et Veteri Testamento, sed in Veteri erat implicita et figuris velata, in Novo vero est explicita et revelata. Ex quo concludit:
Is the Law therefore opposed to the promises of God?] By nullifying them.
Far be it!] Because this Law was given by God, and thus it does not invalidate the promises of God, because then God would be invalidating himself. And it would not be a valid objection if someone were to say concerning the Law that God gave a new one, which nullifies the old, because it is not nullified like this by the New Law, but rather it remains for something better, namely, for what it prefigures, which is better than the figure itself. But in this way, it is not part of the argument that God's promises of justification and receiving an inheritance did not prefigure the Law, but rather the opposite, that the Law prefigured the fulfillment of the promises.
For if a law had been given that could justify] By an infused righteousness, which makes one worthy of eternal life.
Truly, righteousness would be from the Law] And not from the promise that was made to Abraham, and thus it would be voided through the Law.

22. But Scripture has imprisoned] That is, the Law of Moses, which is the written Law.
all things under sin] Insofar as it revealed sin and did not cleanse it.
so that the promise] Of justification, and consequently also of receiving the inheritance.
from faith in Jesus Christ] That is, through faith in him.
might be given to those who believe] After faith has been formed, which makes one cling to God.

23. But before] Here he sets forth the third usefulness of the Law, which is man's introduction to faith in Christ. The Old Law was some kind of disposition to this, insofar as that law was a figure of the New Law, and its entire essence was figurative of the New Testament, as it says in 1 Corinthians 10:6, “Everything happened to them as figures.” But a figure leads, albeit imperfectly, to a recognition of the thing that it prefigures.
And this is what he is saying with:
But before this faith came] Namely, before it was revealed and explained in the Gospel.
we were held captive under the Law] Namely, through the ritual worship of the one true God.
imprisoned until that faith would be revealed] For is it the same faith in the New and the Old Testament, but in the Old Testament it was implicit and veiled in figures, but in the New Testament it is explicit and revealed. From this he concludes:
24. *Itaque Lex paedagogus noster fuit in Christo.* Id est, disponens ad Christum, sicut paedagogus disponit puerum ad virtutem tempore futuro habendam. Ideo subditur: 
*Ut ex fide.* Scilicet revelata. 
*Iustificemur.* Iustitia infusa.

25. *At ubi venit fides.* Id est, tempus fidei revelatae. 
*Iam non sumus sub paedagого.* Id est, sub observationibus legalibus, sicut puer adveniente aetate adulta iam non est sub paedagogi disciplina, sed sub superiori doctrina. Et eadem ratione adveniente evangelio cessant legalia, et sicut in naturalibus cessat dispositio ad introductionem formae. Ideo subdit apostolus:

*Per fidem.* Caritate formatam.

27. *Quicunque enim in Christo Iesu baptizati estis Christum induistis.* Id est, ei conformes facti estis, et sic non estis in statu puerili imperfecto, sed perfecto quantum ad gratiam et virtutem. Nec in hoc est distinctio ratione nationis, conditionis, aut sexus. Ideo dubditur:

28. *Non est Iudaeus, etc.* Unum enim vos estis in Christo Iesu. Id est, incorporati sibi per fidem.

*Secundum promissionem.* Sibi factam. 
*Haeredes.* Regni caelestis. In promissione enim Abrahae facta de promissione terra intelligitur principaliter terra viventium promissa, prout Gen. XV. plenius declaravi.
24. And so the Law was our tutor in Christ] That is, preparing us for Christ, just as a tutor prepares a boy to be virtuous in the future. Therefore he adds:
so that from faith] Namely, which was revealed.
we might be justified] By infused righteousness.

25. But when faith came] That is, the time when faith was revealed.
Now we are no longer under a tutor] That is, under the observations of the Law, like a boy who—when he comes of adult age—is now no longer under the discipline of a tutor, but under a higher teaching. And by the same reasoning, when the Gospel comes, the precepts of the Law cease, just as also in the elements of nature the disposition to introduce form ceases. Therefore, the Apostle adds:

26. For you are all sons of God] Adopted.
through faith] That is, formed by charity.

27. For whoever of you were baptized in Christ Jesus have put on Christ] That is, you were made conformed to him, and thus you are not in an imperfect childish state, but in a perfected state, at least with respect to grace and virtue. And in this there is no distinction because of nationality, condition, or sex. Therefore he adds: 28. There is no Jew, etc. for you are one in Christ Jesus.] That is, incorporated into him through faith.

29. Therefore you are the seed of Abraham] Just as Christ is his seed.
according to the promise] That was given to him.
heirs] Of the heavenly kingdom. For in the promise that was made to Abraham concerning the promised land, we are chiefly to understand the promised land of the living, as I explained at greater length in Genesis 15.
Quartum Capitulum

1. Dico autem. Postquam apostolus declaravit cessationem legalium per rationem, hic consequenter idem facit per similitudinem. Et dividitur in duas partes secundum duas similitudines. Secunda ibi Dicite mihi. Prima adhuc in duas, quia primo ponit et adaptat primam similitudinem, secundo arguit Galatharum ingratitudinem, ibi Sed tunc quidem. Haec autem prima similitudo accipitur ex humana consuetudine, qua filius tenetur sicut servus, quamdiu est parvulus, factus autem adultus liberatur ab illis modis servilibus. Status autem legis fuit quasi status puerilis, ut dictum est supra. Ideo ibi servitus sub multis observantiis legalibus, a quibus liberamur in Novo Testamento, in quo est status quasi viri perfecti. Et hoc est quod dicitur:

Dico autem. Id est, probo per similitudinem.
Quanto tempore heres parvulus est nihil differt a servo. In statu vitae et subiectionis modo.
Cum sit dominus omnium. In potentia propinqua.

2. Sub tutoribus et actoribus est. Ipsum castigantibus et reprimentibus sicut servum.
Usque ad praefinitum tempus a patre. Id est, usque ad aetatem adultam.

3. Ita et nos. Scilicet Iudaei.
Cum essemus parvuli. Id est, in statu Veteris Testamenti.
Sub elementis mundi eramus servientes. Sub legalibus observantiis. Quae dicuntur elementa, id est: litterae, quia sicut in addiscendo puer incipit ab istis elementis, ut sciat ea nominare et distinguere, procedente vero tempore dimissa hac occupatione circa scientialia occupatur, ita legales observantiae fuerunt quaedam figurae disponentes ad Christum, ut dictum est, propter quod in eius adventu sunt dimissae. Ideo subditur:
Chapter 4

1. I say, however] After the Apostle has declared an end to the precepts of the Law according to reason, he follows by doing the same thing according to similitude. And this is divided into two parts, corresponding to two similes. The second begins at Tell me. The first is further divided into two parts, because first he presents and applies the first simile, and second he argues that the Galatians are ungrateful, at But then, indeed. This first simile, however, is taken from the realm of human custom, according to which a son is considered to be like a slave as long as he is young, but when he becomes an adult, he becomes free from those servile ways. But the status of the Law was like that of a child, as was said above. Therefore, there was servitude under the many observances of the Law, from which we are liberated in the New Testament, in which the status is like that of a fully grown man. And this is what he is saying with: I say, however] That is, I prove through a similitude.

that for as long as the heir is a child, he is no different from a slave] In the status of his life, and in the manner of his subordination.

although he is the master of all] In near potentiality.

2. but he is under tutors and administrators] Who chide and scold him as they would a slave.

until the time appointed by his father] That is, until he comes to an adult age.

3. So also we] Namely, the Jews.

when we were children] That is, in the status of the Old Testament. were serving under the elements of this world] Under the observations of the Law. These things are called elements, that is, letters, because just as in his learning a boy begins with elemental things, so that he may know how to name and distinguish things, but as time goes on and this occupation is dismissed, he becomes occupied with scientific things, in the same way the observances of the Law were figures of a sort, educating us for Christ, as has been said, because of which they were dismissed at his arrival. Therefore he adds:
4. At ubi venit plenitudo temporis. Id est, tempus Christi in quo data est plenitudo Spiritus Sancti. Vel aliter:

**Plenitudo temporis.** Id est, impleto temporis praefiniti a Deo Patre.

**Misit Deus filium suum factum ex muliere.** Quantum ad corpus sumptum de virgine.

**Factum sub lege.** Quia voluit legalia servare.

5. Ut eos qui sub lege erant. Legalibus observantiis obligati.

**Redimeret.** Per suam passionem, per quam abstulit dictam obligationem.

**Ut adoptionem filiorum.** Scilicet Dei.

**Reciperemus.** Per Christum, qui est eius filius naturalis. Et hanc filiationem declarat consequenter per effectum dicens:

6. Quoniam autem estis filii Dei. Id est, ut haec filiatione monstraretur.

**Misit Deus Spiritum Filii sui.** Id est, Spiritum Sanctum, qui dicitur Spiritus Filii, sicut et Patris eo quod procedit ab utroque.

**In corda nostra.** Per gratiae infusionem.

**Clamantem.** Id est, clamare facientem per confessionem fidei. Ro. X. Corde enim creditur ad iustitiam, ore autem confessio fit ad salutem. Vel aliter:

**Clamantem.** Id est, per signum sensibile ostendentem, sicut Gen. IIII. dicitur: Vox sanguinis fratris tui Abel clamat ad me de terra. In primitiva enim ecclesia dabatur Spiritus Sanctus in signo sensibili significans gratiam infusam menti, et per consequens filiationem adoptivam, et paternitatem sibi correspondentem.

4. But when the fullness of time came] That is, the time of Christ, when the fullness of the Holy Spirit was given. Or understood in another way: the fullness of time] That is, the fullness of the time that God the Father had set.116

God sent his son, made of a woman] With respect to his body, which was conceived of the Virgin.117

made under the Law] Because he wanted to keep the precepts of the Law.118

5. so that those who were under the Law] Who were bound to the observations of the Law.

he might redeem] Through his Passion, by which he removed the bondage just mentioned.

so that the adoption of sons] Namely, of God.

we might receive] Through Christ, who is his son by nature.119 And next he declares this sonship with regard to its effect, saying:

6. Since, however, you are sons of God] that is, so that this sonship might be shown.

God sent the Spirit of his Son] That is, the Holy Spirit, who is called the Spirit of the Son, just as also of the Father, because he proceeds from each of them.120

in our heart] Through the infusion of grace.

crying out] That is, making us cry out through the confession of faith, as in Romans 10 [verse 10].121 For it is with the heart that one believes unto justification, but with the mouth that confession is made unto salvation. Or understood in another way:

crying out] That is, showing through a perceptible sign, just as it says in Genesis 4 [verse 10]: “The voice of the blood of your brother Abel cries out to me from the land.” For in the earliest church, the Holy Spirit was given with a perceptible sign, signifying the grace that was infused into the mind, and consequently also the sonship of adoption and the paternity that corresponds with it.

Abba, Father] By confessing that God is our father. And here he gives two words which mean the same thing. The first is Hebrew, or rather, Syriac, but the Jews commonly used it, because the Syrian and Hebrew languages were closely related. The second word is Greek, though Latin speakers use it. This is to signify that God is a father to both Jewish and Gentile converts, and they ought to be united in their confession of the faith.122 And from these words he infers the conclusion, saying:
7. *Itaque iam non est servus sed filius.* Scilicet quicunque confitetur fideliter Deum patrem.

*Quod si filius.* Per adoptionem.

*Et heres per Deum.* Ipsum adoptantem. Filio enim adoptivo debetur aliqua pars haereditatis secundum leges.

8. *Sed tunc quidem.* Hic arguit Galatharum ingratiitudinem. Per filiationem enim Dei adoptivam erant liberati a servitute legis, ut praedictum est, et ideo magna erat ingratiitudo hanc servitutem recipere tanquam Dei donum esset insufficiens ad salutem, et erat maior ingratiitudo in Gentibus, conversis de idololatria, quia sic non erant nutriti in observantiais legalibus, sicut fuerant conversi de Iudaeis. Ideo dicit:

*Sed tunc quidem.* Scilicet ante conversionem vestram.

*Ignorantes Deum.* Verum.

*His qui natura non sunt dii.* Sed solum fictione hominum, cuiusmodi sunt idola.

*Serviebatis.* Colendo ipsa.


*Cum cognoveritis Deum.* Per fidem.

*Immo cogniti estis a Deo.* Qui vocavit vos per gratiam suam.

*Quomodo convertimini iterum ad infirma et egena elementa.* Id est, ad legales observantias, quae dicuntur *elementa* ratione praedicta et *infrima* et *egena*, quia non iustificabant, nec gratiam continebant, sicut faciunt sacramenta Novae Legis. Dicit autem:

*Iterum.* Non quia ante conversionem suam legalia servassent, ut praedictum est, sed quia tunc idola coluerant, qui cultus erat illicitus, et similiter legalium ritus, ponendo ibi spem suam tanquam esset necessarius ad salutem, quod Galathae faciebant. Ideo subditur:
7. And so he is no longer a slave, but a son] Namely, whoever faithfully confesses that God is his father.
But if a son] Through adoption.
also an heir through God] Who is himself the one adopting. For according to the laws, some part of the inheritance is owed to the adopted son.

8. But then indeed] Here he argues that the Galatians are ungrateful. For by being adopted as sons of God, they were freed from slavery to the Law, as was said above. And so it was hugely ungrateful of them to take up again this servitude, as if the gift of God were not sufficient for salvation, and it was an even greater ingratitude for the Gentiles, who had been converted from idolatry, because they had not been raised like this on the observations of the Law, as the converts from Judaism had. Therefore he says:
But then indeed] Namely, before your conversion.
not knowing God] The true God.
to those who were not by nature gods] But only by man's making, which is what idols are.
you were slaves] By worshipping them.

since you know God] Through faith.
or rather, since you are known by God] Who called you through his grace.
how is it that you turn back again to feeble and needy elements?] That is, to the observances of the Law, which are called elements for the reason we mentioned above, and feeble and needy because they could not justify and contained no grace, as the sacraments of the New Law do. He says, however:
again] Not because before their conversion they had kept the precepts of the Law, as was said above, but because previously they had worshipped idols, which was an illicit kind of worship, and keeping the precepts of the Law was similarly illegitimate, if one put one's hope in it as if it were necessary for salvation, which the Galatians were doing. Therefore he adds:
10. **Dies observatis.** Apud Iudaeos celebres, ut decimam diem mensis primi, ad accipiendum agnum paschalem, et huiusmodi.

**Et menses.** In principio enim mensium celebrabant Iudaei Neomeniam.

**Et tempora.** Ut tempus egressionis de Aegypto mense primo, et tempus liberationis Isaac mense septimo, et sic de aliis.

**Et annos.** Scilicet septimum annum qui dicebatur remissionis, et quinquagesimum, qui dicebatur iubileus. Et quia talis observantia erat illis illicita, subit:

11. **Timeo ne forte sine cause.** Id est, inutiliter.

**Laboraverim in vobis.** Praedicando vobis fidem catholicam, quae non proficit dicto modo iudaizantibus. Ideo subditur:

12. **Estote sicut et ego.** Dimittentes legalia, sicut ego dimisi.

**Quia et ego.** Fui in errore.

**Sicut vos.** Fuistis. Et ideo sicut sum correctus, ita et vos corrigatis.

**Fratres.** Post Galatharum increpationem, hic apostolus ponit eorum consolatoriam monitionem, modo boni Samaritani, post vinum mordicativum infundens oleum lenitivum. Circa quod sciendum quod apostolus magnas persecutiones in corpore substinuerat antequam Galathis praedicaret, et hoc erat eis notum. Et tamen non respuerunt eum tanquam hominem abiectum et passum, sed valde reverenter et caritative receperunt eum. De quo commendat eos dicens:

**Fratres obsecro vos.** Supple: Ne credatis ex odio me vos increpasse, sed ex amore. Ideo subdit:

**Nihil me laesistis.** Sed supple: mihi bona fecistis, ut postea exprimitur.

13. **Scitis autem quia per infirmitatem carnis.** Id est, tribulationes passus in corpore.

**Evangelizavi vobis iam pridem.** Id est, antea. Et est adverbium temporis.
10. You observe days] The Jewish festivals, such as the tenth day of the first month, to eat the paschal lamb, and other such days.\footnote{132}

and months] For at the beginning of each month, the Jews used to celebrate the New Moon.

and times] Such as the time of their departure from Egypt in the first month, and the time of Isaac’s liberation in the seventh month, and so on for other events.

and years] Namely, the seventh year, which was called the Year of Remission, and the fiftieth year, which was called the Year of Jubilee. And because such observance was not allowed for them, therefore he adds:

11. I fear that perhaps without cause] That is, uselessly.\footnote{133}

I have labored for you] By preaching to you the catholic faith, which—as we have explained—is of no benefit to the Judaizers. Therefore he adds:

12. Be as even I am] Dismissing the precepts of the Law, as I have dismissed them.\footnote{134}

Because I also] Was in error,

just like you] Were. And so just as I was corrected, so you also should correct yourselves.\footnote{135}

Brothers] After scolding the Galatians, here the Apostle gives them comforting advice, just as the Good Samaritan, after pouring on the stinging wine, applied the soothing oil.\footnote{136} Here we should know that the Apostle had sustained in his body great persecutions before he preached to the Galatians, and this was known to them.\footnote{137} And yet they did not reject him like a man who is persecuted and cast out, but most reverently and lovingly received him. For this he commends them, saying:

Brothers, I beseech you] Supply, “that you believe that I am scolding you not out of hatred, but out of love.”\footnote{138} Therefore he adds:

You did me no harm.] But, supply, “you helped me,” as he states afterwards.

13. You know, however, that through a weakness in my flesh] That is, the sufferings that he endured in body.

I preached the Gospel to you already long ago] That is, “beforehand,” which is a temporal adverb.\footnote{139}


16. Ergo inimicus vobis factus sum verum dicens vobis. Arguendo de malis. Quasi dicat: Non me debitis ex hoc minus diligere, sed magis. Et quia inducebantur ad hoc per falsos apostolos, simulantes hoc facere ex Galatharum dilectione, ideo subdit:


18. Bonum autem aemulamini. Id est, imitamini. Et non tantum cum praesens sum apud vos. Id est, fui. Quia tunc erat praesens, quando scripsit hanc epistolam. Et quod ferventer profectum eorum desideret ostendit, dicens:

19. Filioli mei, quos iterum parturio. Id est cum lacrimis et dolore de errore vos revoco, sicut prius revocavi vos a Gentilitate. Donec formetur Christus in vobis. Per sinceritatem fidei formatae.
14. and you did not spurn your temptation that was in my flesh] Here temptation is taken to mean “trial.” For to be tempted is to receive a trial. The meaning, therefore, is: “You did not spurn me, who had suffered in the flesh, though it was a trial for you to know this.”

15. Where, therefore, is your blessedness?] That is, your good beginning, in which you were called “blessed,” and dwelt in hope. For I bear witness to you, etc.] From having seen and heard. that if it could have been done] But agreeably. you would have torn out your eyes] For although, absolutely speaking, they could have done this, nevertheless they could not have done it well. It can also be said that this is hyperbole, to better express the depth of the charity that they showed to him. But because they had changed, he adds:

16. Therefore I became an enemy to you, by telling you the truth] By arguing against what was evil. As if he is saying, “You should not for this reason love me less, but more.” And because they were brought to this point through false apostles, who were pretending to be acting out of love for the Galatians, therefore he adds:

17. They strive after you] That is, they desire you. not well] But in pretense, and for your harm. Therefore he adds: but they want to exclude you] From the truth of the Gospel. so that you might strive after them] That is, so that you would imitate them in the observances of the Law.

18. But strive for what is good!] That is, imitate it. and not only when I am present among you] That is, I was. Because then he was not present, when he wrote this epistle. And he shows that he fervently desired their profit, saying:

19. My children, to whom I am again giving birth] That is, with tears and grief over your error, I am calling you back, just as I first called you out from among the Gentiles. until Christ should be formed in you] Through the sincerity of a formed faith.
*Et mutare vocem meam.*Increpando vos aspere, qui modo verbis suavibus vobis scribo. *Et subditur causa:* 
**Quoniam confundor in vobis.** Id est, apud alios fideles confundor de vestra subversione. 

21. *Dicite mihi.* Hic ponitur secunda similitudo ad ostendum cessationem legalium, et accipitur de scriptura Gen. XVI. et XXI. Et primo figura ponitur, secundo ad propositum adaptatur, ibi *Nos autem.* Circa primum dicit:  
**Dicite mihi, qui sub lege vultis esse.** Falsis apostolis acquiescendo. 
**Legem non legistis.** Id est, libros Moysi, qui apud Hebraeos proprie Lex dicuntur. Quasi dicit: Videtur, quod non legistis, vel si legistis non intellexistis. 

22. *Scriptum est enim.* In locis praeallegatis. 
**Quoniam Abraham duos filios habuit.** Plures autem habuit de Cethura, ut patet Gen. XXV. sed istos duos hic tantum exprimit apostolus, quia de illis magis loquitur scriptura, et quia faciunt ad propositum, non autem alii. 
**Unum de ancilla.** Scilicet Ismaelem. 
**Et unum de libera.** Scilicet Isaac. Sciendum tamen quod Agar mater Ismaelis fuit uxor Abrahae, ut dictum fuit Gen. XVII. Quia tamen Sara erat uxor eius principalis, ideo haec Agar retinuit nomen ancillae. 

23. *Sed qui de ancilla secundum carnem natus est.* Id est, per modum naturalem. 
**Qui autem de libera per repromissionem.** Scilicet Dei adiuvantis naturam, quia Sara erat sterilis, et cum hoc transierat in ea tempus concipiendi, quando concepit Isaac. Erat enim tunc nonagenaria, Gen. XVII.
20. I wish, however, that I could be among you now] With a bodily presence. and change my tone] To scolding you harshly; I who am now writing to you with gentle words. And he adds the reason: because in you, I am perplexed] That is, I—among other believers—am perplexed by your subversion.

21. Tell me] Here he places the second similitude, to show the cessation of the precepts of the Law, and he draws from Scripture in Genesis 16 and 21. And first he gives the figure, second he applies it to the proposition, at We, however. Concerning the first part, he says: Tell me, you who want to be under the Law] By acquiescing to false apostles. have you not read the Law?] That is, the books of Moses, which in Hebrew are properly called “the Law.” As if he is saying, “It seems that you did not read it, or if you read it, that you did not understand it.”

22. For it is written] In the aforementioned passages. that Abraham had two sons] He had more, however, by Keturah, as is clear from Genesis 25 [verse 1], but the Apostle only mentions these two here, because Scripture speaks more about them and because they are relevant to the proposition, but the others are not. one from a slave girl] Namely, Ishmael. and one from a free woman] Namely, Isaac. We should know, however, that Hagar, the mother of Ishmael, was Abraham’s wife, as it said in Genesis 16 [verse 3]. Because Sarah, however, was his first wife, for that reason Hagar here kept the name of a slave girl.

23. But he who was born of the slave girl was born according to the flesh.] That is, in the natural way. He who was born of the free woman, however, was born according to the promise.] Namely, of God, who assisted nature, because Sarah was sterile, and in addition, her time for conceiving had past when she conceived Isaac. For she was then ninety years old, as it says in Genesis 17 [verse 17].
24. Quae sunt per allegoriam dicta. Habet enim sacra scriptura quadruplicem sensum, scilicet historicum, qui per voces significatur, et mysticum, qui per rem significatam intelligitur, et hic est triplex: Scilicet moralis quando intelligitur quod agendum, allegoricus cum significatur quid credendum, anagogicus quando significatur quid sperandum in patria. Et haec possunt videri in hoc nomine *Ierusalem*, quod in sensu litterali significat civitatem Iudaee metropolim; in morali animam fidelem; in allegorio ecclesiam militantem; in anagogico ecclesiam triumphantem. Unde versus:

*Littera gesta docet, quid credas allegoria,*
*Moralis quid agas, quo tendas anagorgia.*

**Haec enim sunt duo testamenta.** Secundum sensum allegoricum.

**Unum quidem in monte Sina.** Quia Vetus Testamentum fuit ibi datum a Deo, cuius in hoc fuit Abraham figura.

**In servitutem generans.** Id est, subiiciens servi tuti legalium, quod fuit onus importabile, ut dictum est supra III. capitulo.

**Quae est Agar.** Scilicet significativa. Fuit enim figura servitutis legalis.

25. *Sina enim mons est in Arabia, etc.* Id est, licet Sina secundum sensum litteralem multum distet a Ierusalem, tamen coniunctus est ei secundum sensum allegoricum, quia servitus legis per montem Sina significata tunc vigebat in Ierusalem, ubi erat templum, in quo offerebantur sacrificia et exercebantur legalia. Nondum enim erat destructum per Romanos, quia destructio illa fuit post passionem apostoli, qui passus fuit sub Nerone. Templum vero fuit destructum postea Vespasiani tempore.

**Et servit cum filiis suis.** Id est, cum Iudaes in servitute legis.

26. *Illa autem quae sursum est Ierusalem.* Scilicet ecclesia, quae est *Ierusalem* allegorica, quae dicitur *sursum*, quia praedicat et promittit bona caelestia.

**Libera est.** A servitute legis.

**Quae est mater nostra.** Per baptismum enim regenerati sumus ex ea.
24. These things were spoken allegorically] For holy Scripture has a fourfold meaning, namely, a historical, which is signified through the words, and a mystical, which is understood through the thing that is signified, and the latter is threefold: namely, it is the moral meaning when it says what should be done. It is allegorical when it indicates what should be believed. It is anagogical when it signifies what should be hoped for in our final home. And these things can be seen in the noun “Jerusalem.” According to the literal meaning, it is the capital city of Judaea; according to the moral, it means the faithful soul; according to the allegorical, the militant church; and according to the anagogical, the triumphant church. Hence the couplet:

The letter teaches deeds, what to believe does allegory;
The moral what to do and where you’ll go does anagogy.153

For these women are the two testaments] According to the allegorical meaning.

Indeed, one is on Mt Sinai] Because the Old Testament was given there by God, for whom Abraham was here a figure.

bearing children into slavery] That is, subjecting men to slavery to the precepts of the Law, which was an impossible weight, as was said above in chapter 3.155

This is Hagar] Namely, figuratively. For she was a figure of slavery to the Law.

25. For Sinai is a mountain in Arabia, etc.] That is, although Sinai is, according to the literal meaning, a long way from Jerusalem, nevertheless it is united to it according to the allegorical meaning, because slavery to the Law, which was signified by Mt Sinai, was at that time strong in Jerusalem, where the Temple was, in which the sacrifices were offered, and the precepts of the Law were practiced. For it had not yet been destroyed at the hands of the Romans, because that destruction took place after the Apostle’s passion. He suffered under Nero, but the Temple was destroyed later, in the time of Vespasian.

and she is in slavery with her children] That is, with the Jews in slavery to the Law.

26. but she who is the Jerusalem above] Namely, the church, which is the allegorical Jerusalem, which is called above, because she proclaims and promises heavenly blessings.

is free.] From slavery to the Law.

and she is our mother.] For through baptism we have been born again of her.157
27. *Scriptum est enim.* Isa. LIII. de hac generatione secunda.

*Laetare sterilis, quae non paris.* Id est, ecclesia de Gentibus collecta, quae tempore Veteris Testamenti erat sterilis ab operibus bonis.

*Erumpent.* In laudem divinam.

*Et clama.* Corde et ore pro gratiarum actione.

*Quia multi filii desertae.* Id est, Gentilitatis ad Christum conversae, quae ante erat a Deo deserta propter eius idololatriam.

*Magis quam eis qui habet virum.* Id est, synagogae, quae in monte Sinai desponsata fuit Deo in legis susceptione.

28. *Nos autem.* Hic consequenter magis adaptatur figura ad propositum, cum dicitur:

*Nos autem.* Scilicet, Christiani.

*Secundum Isaac.* Id est, ad similitudinem eius.

*Promissionis filii sumus.* Id est, geniti per gratiam, non per naturam sicut Ismael.

29. *Sed quomodo tunc is, qui secundum carnem natus fuerat.* Scilicet Ismael.

*Persecutatur eum qui secundum spiritum.* Scilicet Isaac, qui natus erat secundum promissionem divinam. Spiritus enim est Deus, Io. IIII.

*Persecutatur, etc.* De hac persecutione dictum fuit Gen. XXI. quod secundum expositores catholici fuit corporalis. Nam Ismael, qui erat maior corpore et fortior Isaac, sub specie ludi laedebat eum malitiose. Secundum Hebraeos vero fuit spiritualis, quia inducebat Isaac ad aliqua, quae sapiebant idololatriam. Dictio enim Hebraica ibidem posita est equivoca ad ludum et idololatiram. Et dictum apostoli videtur esse magis consonum secundae expositioni, cum subditur:

*Ita et nunc.* Quia pseudo apostoli suadebant Galathis iudaizare, quod est simile ipsi idololatriae post evangelium publicatum.
27. For it is written] In Isaiah 54 [verse 1], concerning this second birth: Rejoice, you barren woman, who have not given birth.] That is, the church gathered from the Gentiles, which in the time of the Old Testament was sterile of good works.\(^{158}\)

Break out] Into praise for God.

and shout] With heart and voice in thanksgiving.

because many are the sons of the desolate woman] That is, the Gentile world. She is converted to faith in Christ, though she was previously deserted by God because of her idolatry.

more than those of her, who has a husband] That is, the synagogue, who on Mt Sinai was betrothed to God in her reception of the Law.

28. We, however] Here in turn the figure is further applied to the proposition, when he says:

We, however] Namely, we Christians.

corresponding to Isaac] That is, according to our similarity to him.

are children of the promise] That is, children by grace, not by nature like Ishmael.

29. But just as at that time he who had been born according to the flesh] That is, Ishmael.

persecuted him who had been born according to the Spirit] Namely, Isaac, who was born according to God’s promise. For the Spirit is God, as it says in John 4 [verse 24].

persecuted, etc.] Genesis 21 [verse 9] speaks about this persecution, which according to the catholic expositors was bodily persecution. For Ishmael, who was physically bigger and stronger than Isaac, while pretending to be playing, was maliciously harming him. But according to the Jews, it was spiritual, because he was introducing Isaac to things that smacked of idolatry. For the Hebrew word that appears there signifies equally both playing and idolatry.\(^{159}\) And the saying of the Apostle seems to be more in line with the second explanation, when he adds:

So also now.] Because the false apostles were persuading the Galatians to become Judaizers, which is just like idolatry itself after the publication of the Gospel.
30. Sed quid dicit scriptura. Gen. XXI.

Eiice ancillam, etc. Et sic factum fuit ad litteram de Agar et Ismaele filio eius. Per quod figuratum fuit, quod legalis observantia cum observatoribus suis a consortio fidelium erat in adventu Christi abiicienda. Ideo concludit apostolus:

31. Itaque fratres non sumus ancillae filii. Id est, servituti legalium subjicii.

Sed liberae. Id est, militantis ecclesiae a talibus liberatae.

Qua libertate Christus nos liberavit. Qui per suam benedictam passionem legalia evacuavit.

Capitulum Quintum

1. State. Postquam apostolus suam sententiam de cessatione legalium ostendit multipliciter esse iustam, hic consequenter inducit Galathas ad eius observantiam. Et dividitur in duas partes, quia primo inducit ad hoc ex evasione mali; secundo ex consecutione boni, ibi Vos in libertatem.

Primum autem malum quod evaditur per sententiam apostoli est servitus, quae est mors civilis. Ideo dicitur:

State. In fide catholica.

Et nolite iterum iugo servitutis contineri. Legis enim servitus erat quasi importabile onus, ut dictum est supra capitulo III. Secundum malum est amissio gratiae Christi, quod tangitur cum dicitur:

2. Ecce ego Paulus, etc. Et patet littera. Tertium est obligatio ad universam legem faciendam, quod vix aut numquam potest quis facere, quod notatur cum dicitur:

3. Testificor autem, etc. Sicut enim in susceptione baptismi obligatur recipiens ad fidem catholicam servandam, sic in circumcisione obligabatur ad legem Moysaicam faciendam. Quia sicut Lex Moysaica dicitur lex factorum, sic Lex evangelica dicitur lex fidei, Rom. III. Quartum malum est separatio a Christo. Et hoc notatur cum dicitur:
Throw out the slave girl etc.] And so it happened, according to the literal meaning, to Hagar and Ishmael her son. Through this it was prefigured that the observance of the Law, with all of its observers, was to be thrown out from the company of the faithful at Christ's coming. The Apostle therefore concludes:

31. And so, brothers, we are not sons of the slave girl] That is, subject to slavery to the precepts of the Law.
but of the free woman] That is, of the militant church, who was freed from such precepts.160
It was for this freedom that Christ set us free.] Who through his blessed Passion emptied the precepts of the Law.

Chapter 5

1. Stand firm] After the Apostle has shown in many ways that his decree concerning the cessation of the precepts of the Law is correct, here in turn he leads the Galatians to observe this. And this is divided into two parts, because first he leads them to this by avoiding what is evil, and second by following what is good, at You to freedom. But the first evil that is avoided through the Apostle's decree is slavery, which is civil death.161 Therefore he says:
Stand firm] In the catholic faith.
and do not be bound again by the yoke of slavery] For slavery to the Law was like an unbearable burden, as was said above in Chapter 3.162

The second evil is the loss of the grace of Christ, which he touches upon when he says:

2. Look! I Paul] And the literal meaning is clear.
The third evil is the obligation to keep the entire Law, which scarcely or never can anyone accomplish, which he remarks upon when he says:

3. I testify, however, etc.] For just as in receiving baptism the recipient is bound to keeping the catholic faith, so in circumcision, one was bound to keeping the Law of Moses, because just as the Law of Moses is called a law of works, so the Law of the Gospel is called a law of faith, as in Romans 3 [verse 27].
The fourth evil is separation from Christ, and he notes this when he says:
4. Evacuati estis a Christo qui in lege iustificamini. Id est, in observantia legalium quaeritis iustificati, reputantes non sufficere vobis fidem Christi ad salutem, et per consequens blasphematis eum tanquam impotentem.

5. Nos enim Spiritu. Id est, per Spiritum Sanctum. Ex fide. Scilicet Christi. Spem iustitiae expectamus. Id est, aeternam beatitudinem, quae est merces iustitiae per Christum datae.

6. Nam in Christo Iesu neque circumcisio, etc. Id est, ad salutem, quae per Christum datur, circumcisio vel praeputium nihil operatur. Sed fides quae per caritatem operatur. Fides enim sine operibus mortua est, ut dicitur Iac. II. capitulo, et ideo non sufficit ad salutem consequendam, ad quam requiritur vita gratiae.

7. Currebatis. Hic infert conclusionem ex dictis, scilicet quod Galathae impediti erant a profectu iustitiae per falsos apostolos, dicens: Currebatis bene. Ad bravium salutis aeternae. Quis vos impedivit. Scilicet ab isto cursu. Supple: Docens vos. Veritati non obedire. Non quaeit hoc ex ignorantia, sciens quod hoc erat per falsos apostolos, sed ex admiratione, sicut salvator Lucae VIII. Quis me tetigit, etc.

8. Persuasio haec. Scilicet servandi legalia. Non est ex eo, qui vocat vos. Id est, vocavit. Quia non est ex instinctu Christi, sed diaboli.

9. Modicum fermentum. Bonum enim consistit ex omnibus circumstantiis bonis, malum autem ex singulis defectibus, ita quod una sola circumstantia mala facit totum actum malum, et similiter in congregatione fidelium unus perversus in fide corrumpit alios. Quia tamen apostolus confidebat de correctione Galatharum, subdit:
4. For you have been emptied of Christ, you who are justified in the Law. That is, you seek to be justified in the observance of the precepts of the Law, thinking that faith in Christ is not enough for your salvation, and consequently you blaspheme him as though he were powerless.

5. For we by the Spirit. That is, through the Holy Spirit. from faith. That is, in Christ. we await the hope of righteousness. That is, eternal happiness, which is a reward for the righteousness that is given through Christ.

6. For in Christ Jesus, neither circumcision, etc. That is, for the salvation that is given through Christ, both circumcision and foreskin accomplish nothing. but faith that works through love. For faith without works is dead, as it says in James 2 [verse 17], and so it is not enough for salvation to follow, for which a life of grace is needed.

7. You were running. Here he infers the conclusion from what has been said, namely, that the Galatians had been impeded in the advancement of their righteousness through false apostles, saying: You were running well. Towards the prize of eternal righteousness. Who impeded you? Namely, from that course. Supply: “teaching you.” not to obey the truth? He asks this not out of ignorance, because he knows that this was through false apostles, but out of amazement, just as the Savior in Luke 8 asks “Who touched me?” etc.

8. This persuasion. Namely, to keep the precepts of the Law. is not from him who called you. Because it is not at the instigation of Christ, but of the devil.

9. A little yeast. For that which is good consists of entirely good attributes. What is bad, however, consists of individual flaws. So it is that only one bad attribute makes the entire act bad, and similarly among the congregation of the faithful, one man who is perverse in his faith corrupts the others. Because, however, the Apostle was hopeful about correcting the Galatians, he adds:
In Domino. Id est, per adiutorium Dei, ita:
Quod nihil aliud sapietis. Nisi veritatem evangelii quam praedicavi vobis.
Qui autem conturbat vos. Asserendo quod sine circumcisione salvari non potestis.
Portabit iudicium. Id est, poenam sibi debitam. Cessationem autem circumcisionis ostendit per factum suum. Erat enim natione Iudaeus, et per consequens circumcisus, propter quod non est credibile quod vellet odium Iudaeorum et persecutionem ab eis sustinere, eo quod praedicabat cessationem circumcisionis, nisi ita esset in veritate. Et hoc est quod dicit:

11. Ego autem, fratres, si circumcisionem adhuc praedico. Dicendo quod sit necessaria ad salutem.
Quid adhuc persecutionem patior. Quasi dicit: Non debeo amplius pati, quia pro re alia non sequuntur me Iudaei. Ideo concludit:
Ergo evacuatum est scandalum crucis. Quia Iudaei non scandalizabantur de Paulo praedicante Iesum Nazarenum crucifixum fuisse, sed quia praedicabat eum verum Christum esse et circumcisionem evacuasse, cuius contrarium quantum ad cessationem circumcisionis falsi apostoli asserebant. Ideo subdit de illis:

12. Utinam abscindantur. Id est, totaliter a vobis separantur.
Qui vos conturbant. Dicentes quod circumcision sit vobis necessaria ad salutem.

13. Vos enim. Hic consequenter inducit Galathas ad dimissionem legalium ex consecutione boni inde provenientis. Et dividitur in duas partes, scilicet in partem principalem, et incidentalem, quae incipit ibi Manifesta sunt. Primum vero bonum sequens ex cessatione legalium est libertas, quae est summe desiderabilis, in tantum quod etiam bruta animalia praeponunt eam satietati ventris, ut patet in avibus inclusis. Ideo dicit:
10. I am confident in you] That you will correct yourselves according to my admonition.
In the Lord] That is, with God’s help,170 of this:
that you will know nothing else.] Except the truth of the Gospel that I preached to you.171
He, however, who put you to confusion] By asserting that you could not be saved without circumcision.
will bear his own judgment.] that is, the punishment that is owed to him.172 He shows, however, the end of the practice of circumcision by his own action. For he was a Jew by birth, and as a result he was circumcised. Because of this, it is not believable that he would want to encourage hatred for the Jews or suffer persecution at their hands due to the fact that he was preaching an end to circumcision, unless it were really true. And this is what he is saying with:

11. As for me, however, brothers, if I still preach circumcision] By saying that it is necessary for salvation.
why am I still suffering persecution?] As if he is saying: “I should not be suffering any more, because the Jews are not persecuting me for anything else.”173 Therefore, he concludes:
Therefore the scandal of the cross has been removed.] Because the Jews were not scandalized by Paul’s preaching that Jesus of Nazareth had been crucified, but because he was preaching that he was the true Christ and that he had voided circumcision,174 to which the false apostles were asserting the opposite, at least concerning the end to circumcision. Therefore he adds concerning them:

12. I wish they would be cut off.] That is, be totally separated from you.175
who throw you into confusion] Who say that circumcision is necessary for your salvation.

13. For you] Here in turn he leads the Galatians to discard the precepts of the Law for the sake of the good that comes thereby. And this is divided into two parts: namely, the chief part and the second, incidental part, which begins at Manifest are. The first good, however, that follows from the cessation of the precepts of the Law is freedom, which is most highly desirable, so much so that the brute beasts prefer it to a satisfied stomach, as is clear with caged birds.176 Therefore he says:
Vos enim in libertatem. A legali servitute, quae est maxima.

Vocati estis fratres. Per gratiam Christi vos liberantis. Verumtamen quia non est abutendum hac libertate, ideo subdit:

Tamen ne libertatem in occasionem detis carnis. Quasi dicit: Hoc tamen est vobis necessarium, quod non laxetis vos ad insequendum carnis impulsum, credentes quod sit vobis licitum, sicut dixerunt aliqui haeretici per libertatem Spiritus omnia licere sibi.

Se per caritatem servite invicem. In temporalibus et spiritualibus mutuo vos iuvando. Secundum bonum est universae legis facilis impletio. Ideo dicit:

14. Omnis enim lex in uno sermone impletur. Scilicet in praecepto charitatis, quod tamen duplicatur, in quantum dilectio respicit Deum et proximum. Unde dicit Salvator Mt. XXII. capitulo: In his duobus mandatis pendet tota Lex et prophetae, quia omnia alia praecepta non sunt nisi quaedam explicationes mandati dilectionis Dei et proximi. Apostolus tamen non prosequitur hic nisi de dilectione proximi, dicens:

Diliges proximum tuum sicut teipsum. Id est, in ordine, ad eandem beatitudinem consequendum. Et consequenter removet contrarium dicens:


Videte, etc. Id est, advertere debetis, quod ad hoc sequitur destructio vestra in corpore et anima. Et hoc est quod dicit:

Ne ab invicem consumamini. Tertium bonum est sequela Spiritus Sancti, per quam homo proficit in spiritualibus, et retrahitur a desideriis carnalibus. Et hoc est quod dicit:
For you, to freedom] From slavery to the Law, which is a massive burden. you were called, brothers] Namely, through the grace of Christ, who sets you free. Nevertheless, because this freedom should not be abused, therefore he adds: but not so that you could make your freedom an opportunity for the flesh.] As if he is saying: “But this is necessary for you: that you not let yourselves loose to follow after the impulses of the flesh, nor believe that it is allowable for you, as some heretics have said, who claim that through the freedom of the Spirit they are allowed to do everything.”177
But serve one another in charity] By helping one another in temporal and spiritual matters. The second good is the easy fulfillment of the entire Law. Therefore he says:

14. For the entire Law is summed up in one saying.] Namely, in the commandment of love, which, however, is twofold, in as much as love looks both to God and neighbor.178 For this reason the Savior says in Matthew 22 [verse 40], “On these two commandments depend all the Law and the prophets,” because all other commandments are nothing but some kind of explanation of the commandment of love for God and neighbor. The Apostle, however, only follows up here concerning love for one's neighbor, saying:
You shall love your neighbor as yourself] That is, in order, and for the pursuit of the same beatitude.179 And consequently he removes the opposite, saying:

15. But if you bite each other etc.] By hurting each other with harsh words. And devour] By cheating each other, just as it is commonly said about usury, that someone is devouring the one to whom he lends money at interest. see to it] That is, you should pay attention to the fact that that your destruction in body and soul results from this. And this is what he is saying with: that you are not in turn consumed.
The third good is the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, through which man advances in spiritual things, and is drawn away from fleshly desires. And this is what he is saying with:
16. Dico autem in Christo. Id est, ex doctrina Christi. 
Spiritu ambulate. Sequentes instinctum Spiritus Sancti, quem nata est mens humana sequi. 
Et desideria carnis non perficietis. In opere, licet insurgant motus carnales concupiscientiae.

17. Caro enim concupiscit adversus spiritum, etc. Id est, sensualitas contra rationem, et e converso sicut experimur in nobis. Et hic accipitur spiritus rationalis. Ideo subdit: 
Ut non quaecunque vultis. Secundum rationem. 
Illa faciatis. Impediti motu sensualitatis. Et sic suo modo dissentiunt libertas spiritus et servitus legis. Ideo subdit:

18. Quod si spiritu ducimini. Sequentes instinctum Spiritus Sancti. 
Non estis sub lege. Id est, servitute legalium alligati.

19. Manifesta sunt. Haec est secunda pars incidentalis, in qua distinguuit opera carnis et spiritus, eo quod fecerat mentionem de utroque. Et dividitur in duas, quia primo ponitur haec distinctio; secundo apostoli monitio, ibi Qui autem sunt Christi. Prima in duas, quia primo distinguuit opera carnis; secundo Spiritus, ibi Fructus autem. Circa primum sciendum quod opera luxuriae et gulae. Primo ergo distinguuit opera luxuriae; secundo gulae, ibi Ebrietates. In operibus vero luxuriae primo ponit quae proprie pertinent ad luxuriam, dicens:

Manifesta sunt autem opera carnis. Quia sunt sensibilia. 
Quae sunt fornicatio. Quantum ad concubitum soluti cum soluta. 
Immuditia. Quantum ad vitium contra naturam. 
Impudicitia. Quantum ad exteriorem inhonestatem in aspectu, gressu, tactu, et huiusmodi quae procedunt ex impudicitia cordis. 
Luxuria. Nomen est generale ad omnia quae pertinent ad hoc vitium. Et sic omnia alia, quae non sunt ennumerata, per hoc includuntur.
16. But I speak in Christ] That is, from Christ’s teaching.

Walk in the Spirit] Following the instigation of the Holy Spirit, whom the human mind was born to follow.

and do not perform those deeds that the flesh desires!] In action, even though the fleshly movements of concupiscence rise up.

17. For the flesh lusts in opposition to the spirit, etc.] Namely, sensuality against reason, and vice versa, as we experience in ourselves. And here the rational spirit is understood. Therefore he adds:

so that whatever things you do not want] According to reason.

those things you do.] Tripped up by the movement of your sensuality. And thus, in their own way, the freedom of the spirit and slavery to the Law are opposed. Therefore he adds:

18. But if you are led by the Spirit, etc.] Following the instigation of the Holy Spirit.

You are not under the Law] That is, bound to slavery to the precepts of the Law.

19. Manifest are the works] This is the second, incidental part, in which he distinguishes the works of the flesh from those of the spirit, because he had mentioned each of them. And this is divided into two parts, because first comes this distinction, second is the Apostle’s admonition, at Those, however, who belong to Christ. The first part divides into two, because first he distinguishes the works of the flesh; and secondly, those of the spirit, at the fruit, however. First of all, we should know that the works of the flesh are called those to which the flesh inclines, and these are properly speaking the works of luxury and gluttony. First, therefore, he distinguishes between the works of luxury; secondly, the works of gluttony, at drunkenness. But for the works of luxury, he first gives those that properly pertain to luxury, saying:

Manifest, however, are the works of the flesh] Because they are perceptible.

which are fornication] This is when an unmarried man sleeps with an unmarried woman.

uncleanness] This is a vice against nature.

shamelessness] This pertains to outward dishonesty in one's look, movement, touching, and things like this that proceed from shamelessness in the heart.

luxury] This is a general term for everything that pertains to this vice, and thus it includes all the other things that were not mentioned.
20. **Idolorum.** Hic secundo ponit alia, quae sequi solent ad luxuriam, dicens: 

**Idolorum servitus.** Ut patet de Salomone III. Reg. XI. qui ex ardore libidinis cum mulieribus alienigenis motus fuit ad sequendum deos earum. 

**Veneficia.** Id est, sortilegia, quae ratione libidinis solent fieri. In hac significacione dicitur Psalmo LVII. Venefici incantantis sapienter. 

**Inimicitiae.** Latentes in animo, sicut II. Reg. XIII. capitulo Absalon concepit odium contra Amon, eo quod sororem suam violaverat. 

**Contentiones.** Verbis clamorosis. 

**Aemulationes.** In verbis pungitivis. 

**Irae.** In vindicandi actu. 

**Dissensiones.** Quando incipiunt fieri partes. 

**Sectae.** Quando sunt firmatae. 

21. **Invidiae.** In animo. 

**Homicidia.** In facto. Quod autem haec omnia frequenter sequuntur ad luxuriam patet. Et possent poni exempla de omnibus, sed propter prolixitatem omitto. 

**Ebrietates.** Hic ponuntur opera carnis quantum ad vitium gulae, cum dicitur: 

**Ebrietates.** In quo notatur excessus et quaecunque inordinatio circa potum. Dicitur enim ebrietas a bria, quod est mensura, quasi extra mensuram rationis. 

**Comessationes.** In quo notatur omnis excessus et inordinatio circa cibum. 

**Et his similia.** Ad quae caro est prona, sicut nimia mollicies lectorum, balneorum, et huiusmodi. 

**Quae praedico vobis.** Antequam veniat Dei iudicium, quia tunc paenitere non poteritis. 

**Quoniam qui talia agunt regnum Dei non consequentur.** Et per hoc excluditur error dicentium quod damnati salvabuntur post magna curricula temporum.
20. *slavery to idols* Secondly here he mentions other things that usually follow on from luxury, saying: *slavery to idols* As is clear concerning Solomon in 1 Kings 11 [verses 1–6], who because of his strong desire for sexual relations with foreign women, was moved to follow after their gods. *sorcery* That is, soothsaying, which is usually motivated by sexual desire. This meaning appears in Psalm 58 [verse 5], “a soothsayer, skillfully charming.” *enmities* Hidden within the soul, as in 2 Samuel 13 [verse 22], where Absalom conceived a hatred for Amon because he had violated his sister. *contentions* With harsh words. *rivalries* With stinging words. *fits of rage* In the act of taking revenge. *dissentions* When factions begin to form. *sects* When they are entrenched.

21. *envy* In the soul. *murder* In deed. It is clear, however, that all of these things frequently follow from luxury. And examples could be given for all of them, but I omit them for the sake of brevity.

*drunkenness* Here he lists the works of the flesh that pertain to the vice of gluttony, when he says *drunkenness*, by which he means an excess and a certain lack of control when it comes to drink. For the word “inebriated” comes from *bria*, which is a measure, as if it means: “outside the measure of reason.”

*banchets* By which all excess and immoderation concerning food is signified. *and things like these* To which the flesh is inclined, such as too much softness when it comes to sleeping, bathing, and things of this kind. *These things I preach to you* Before the Judgment of God comes, because then you will not be able to repent. *that those who do such things will not inherit the Kingdom of God* From this he confounds the error of those who say that the damned will be saved after ages have run their great courses.
22. Fructus. Hic consequenter enumerantur opera Spiritus, quae dicuntur fructus, ad similitudinem fructus materialis, qui procedit de arbore et percipitur cum quadam suavitate. Sic ista a Spiritu Sancto procedunt et mentem delectant, quorum distinctio accipitur secundum quod mens hominis, per processum Spiritus Sancti in nobis, bene disponitur in se, et ad id quod est iuxta se, et ad id quod est infra se. In se vero bene disponitur, quando bene se habet in bonis et in malis. Prima vero dispositio eius ad bonum est per amorem, qui est prima affectio et radix aliarum affectionum, propter quod inter fructus Spiritus primo ponitur.

Caritas. Rom. V. Caritas Dei diffusa est in cordibus nostris per Spiritum Sanctum, qui datus est nobis. Ad quam sequitur:

Gaudium. Quod est fructus secundus. Omnis enim amans gaudet ex praesentia amati, quam facit caritas. I. Ioan. IIII. Qui manet in caritate in Deo manet, etc. Perfectio vero gaudii est:

Pax. Quantum ad duo. Primo quantum ad quietem ab exterioribus conturbationibus, aliter non esset gaudium perfectum. Secundo quantum ad sedationem desiderii interioris. Non enim perfecte gaudet quis de aliquo, cui non sufficit illud. Haec autem duo importat pax, ideo ponitur tertius fructus. In malis autem bene disponitur mens, primo quando non perturbatur ex imminentia malorum, quod pertinet ad:

Patientiam. Secundo ut non perturbetur ex dilatione bonorum, quod pertinet ad:

Longanimitatem. Nam carere bono habet rationem mali V. Ethicorum. Ad illud autem quod est iuxta se, scilicet ad proximum, bene se habet mens hominis, primo quidem per voluntatem benefaciendi, quod facit:

Bonitas. Secundo per beneficientiae executionem, quod facit:

Benignitas. Unde dicuntur benigni, quos bonus ignis amoris fervere facit ad benefaciendum proximus. Tertio per hoc quod aequanimiter tolerantur mala ab eis illata, quod facit:

Mansuetudo. Quae cohibet iram. Quarto per hoc quod non infertur nocumentum proximo per fraudem vel dolum, quod facit:
22. The fruit] Here in turn the works of the Spirit are numbered, which are called fruits according to their likeness to material fruit that comes from a tree and is tasted with a certain sweetness.¹⁹³ So these come from the Holy Spirit and are pleasing to the mind. A distinction among them can be accepted, according to which the mind of man, through the operation of the Holy Spirit within us, is well disposed towards itself, and towards what is next to it, and towards what is below it. But it is well disposed towards itself, when it conducts itself well in good and bad times. But its first disposition to the good is through love, which is the first affection and the root of other affections, because of which it is placed first among the fruits of the Spirit.¹⁹⁴

**Love**]¹⁹⁵ Romans 5 [verse 5] reads, “the love of God has been poured out into our hearts through the Holy Spirit, who was given to us.” In agreement with this he adds:

**joy**] This is the second fruit. For every lover rejoices in the presence of the one whom he loves, which love accomplishes, as in 1 John 4 [verse 16], “He who abides in love abides in God.”¹⁹⁶ But the perfection of joy is:

**peace**] This pertains to two things; first, it concerns quiet from outer disturbances, or else it would not be perfect joy. Second, it concerns the pacification of inner desire. For no one can perfectly rejoice about something, when that thing is not enough for him. Peace, however, introduces these two things, therefore it is placed as the third fruit.¹⁹⁷

In bad times, however, the mind is well disposed, first when it is not upset by the threats of evil things, which pertains to:

**patience**] And second when it is not upset by the sparseness of good things, which pertains to:

**longsuffering**] For to lack good is a kind of evil, as [Aristotle says] in *Ethics* 5.¹⁹⁸

The mind of man, however, with regard to that which is next to it, namely, one’s neighbor, conducts itself well, first by wanting to do good, which

**goodness**] Does. Second, by carrying out acts of good will, which

**kindness**] Does. For this reason people are called kind: when the good fire of love makes them ardent to do good to their neighbor. Third by the fact that they calmly bear evils that come to them from their neighbor, which

**gentleness**] Does, which restrains anger. Fourth, by the fact that they bring no harm to their neighbor through fraud or deceit, which
23. **Fides.** Si pro fidelitate sumitur. Si vero sumatur pro fide qua creditur in Deum, sic per eam bene disponitur mens ad id quod est supra se, subiiciendo Deo suum intellectum. Ad illud vero quod est infra se, bene disponitur mens hominis; primo quidem in actionibus per:  
**Modestiam.** Quae in dictis et factis debitum modum observat; secundo in interioribus concupiscentiis, per:  
**Continentiam et castitatem.** Diversimode tamen, quia continens patitur concupiscentias fortes, sed non vincitur; castus vero non vincitur, nec patitur. Et sic habentur duodecim fructus Spiritus, qui signantur Apoc. ultimo. Ex utraque parte fluminis lignum vitae afferens fructus duodecim.

24. **Qui autem.** Hic consequenter ponitur apostoli monitio duplex. Secunda ponitur in principio VI. capituli. Prima vero est ad carnis opera reprimendum, et opera Spiritus Sancti prosequendum, dicens:  
**Qui autem sunt Christi.** Id est, imitatores eius.  
**Carnem suam crucifixerunt cum vitiis et concupiscentiis.** Ita quod concupiscentiae et vitia carnis mortua sunt in eis.

25. **Si vivimus Spiritu.** Hic accipitur si pro quia, quia Spiritus est qui vivificat, caro autem non prodest quicquam Io. VI.  
**Spiritu et ambulemus.** Sequendo instinctum Spiritus Sancti in operibus nostris, vel dictamen rectae rationis, quae etiam dicitur spiritus. Et quia bonum opus frequenter est occasio vanae gloriae, ideo subditur:

26. **Non efficiamur inanis gloriae cupidi.** Quae est principium aliorum malorum. Ideo subditur:  
**Invicem provocantes.** Verbis iniuriosis.  
**Invicem invidentes.** De bonis proximorum dolentes.
23. faith] Does, if it is understood as “faithfulness.” But if it is taken as the faith with which we believe in God, in this way, through faith the mind is well disposed to that which is above itself—by subjecting its intellect to God. But to that which is below itself, the mind of man is well disposed: first of all in its actions, through: modesty] Which keeps due measure in words and deeds; second [the mind of man is well disposed] in the inner sinful desires, through: continence and chastity] But in different ways, because the continent man endures strong sinful desires, but is not overcome; the chaste man, however, is neither overcome, nor does he suffer the desires. And so we have the twelve fruits of the Spirit, which are signified in the last chapter of Revelation [verse 2], “Out of each part of the river came the tree of life, bearing twelve fruits.”

24. Those, however] Here in turn the Apostle gives an admonition in two parts. The second part begins at the start of Chapter 6. The purpose of the first is to suppress the works of the flesh and follow the works of the Spirit, when he says: Those, however, who belong to Christ] That is, who are imitators of him. have crucified their flesh, together with its vices and desires] So that their fleshly desires and the vices of the flesh are dead in them.

25. If we live by the Spirit] Here we take “if” to mean “because.” Because it is the Spirit who makes alive, but the flesh profits nothing, as it says in John 6 [verse 63]. let us also walk by the Spirit] By following in our works the instigation of the Holy Spirit, or the dictates of right reason, which is also called “the spirit.” And because a good work is frequently an opportunity for vainglory, therefore he adds:

26. Let us not work out of a desire for vainglory] Which is the beginning of other evils. Therefore he adds: provoking one another] With hurtful words. and envying one another.] Feeling grieved because of our neighbors’ blessings.
Capitulum Sextum

1. Fratres. Hic consequenter ponitur apostoli secunda monitio, qua inducit Galathas ad mutuum supportationem, et primo in malo culpae, non ipsum fovendo, sed leniter corripiendo, dicens:

_Si praeoccupatus fuerit homo._ Per aliquam passionem insurgentem vel per ignorantiam.

_In aliquo delicto._ Ex eis perpetrato.

_Vos qui spirites estis._ Id est, perfectores scientia et vita.

_Instruite huiusmodi._ Id est, ad bonum reducete.

_In spiritu lenitatis._ Peccantes enim ex certa malitia sunt magis acriter corripiendi.

_Considerans teipsum._ Id est, fragilitatem propriam.

_Ne et tu tenteris._ Et sic ex passione labaris, et per consequens indigeas mansuetudine correctionis. Secundo inducit ad supportationem mali poenae, dicens:

2. _Alter alterius onera portate._ Id est, infirmitates mutuas et labores, mutuo subveniendo.

_Et sic adimplebitis legem Christi._ Quae est lex caritatis. Et ad praedicta inducit rationem, dicens:

3. _Nam si quis exististimat se aliquid esse._ Id est, magnum quid sentiens de se.

_Cum nihil sit._ De se nisi vanitas et peccatum.

_Ipse se seducit._ Quia per hoc in contemptum fratris et alia peccata cadit. Ideo subditur:

4. _Opus autem suum probet unusquisque._ Id est, diligentem eximinet.

_Et sic in semet ipso tamen gloriam habebit._ Scilicet in testimonio propriae conscientiae.

_Et non in altero._ Id est, in falsa laude alterius, cui non est credendum.

5. _Unusquisque enim onus suum portabit._ Id est, poenam debitam pro peccatis propriis, propter quod subitur:
Chapter 6

1. Brothers] Here in turn the Apostle gives his second admonition, by which he guides the Galatians to support each other. And first he treats the evil of blaming each other, by not encouraging it, but by gently rebuking it, saying:

if someone is overtaken] Because of some kind of rising passion or ignorance.  
by some kind of fault] That he did because of these things.  
you who are spiritual] That is, more perfect in knowledge and life.  
instruct such people] That is, bring them back to what is good.  
in a spirit of gentleness] For those who sin out of pure malice are more sharply to be corrected.

Consider yourself] That is, your own fragile state.  
and do not also be tempted] And thus do wrong because of your passion, and as a result lack gentleness in your correction. Second, he guides them to bear the penalty of the wicked man, saying:

2. Bear one another’s burdens] That is, each other’s weaknesses and trials, by helping one another.  
and in this way you will fulfill the Law of Christ.] This is the Law of love. And in agreement with what he said before, he gives the reason, saying:

3. For if anyone thinks that he is someone important] That is, thinking quite highly of himself.  
though he is nothing] Of himself, except vanity and sin. He deceives himself.] Because through this, he falls into contempt for his brother, and other sins. Therefore he adds:

4. But let each man test his work] That is, diligently examine.  
and thus he will have glory in himself] Namely, in the testimony of his own conscience.  
and not in another] That is, in the false praise of another, who should not be trusted.

5. For each man will bear his own burden.] That is, the penalty that he deserves for his own sins, because of which he adds:
6. Communicet autem is, qui cathecizatur verbo. Id est, instruitur verbo
   doctoris.
   Ei qui se cathecizat in omnibus bonis. Quia non debet ei communicare in
   malis. Mt. XXIII. capitulo. Quae dicunt facite, opera eorum nolite facere.

7. Nolite errare. Credendo quod possitis conformari eis in malis licite,
   sicut dicunt aliqui: Quare non faciam hoc, ex quo sacerdos meus facit?
   Deus non irridetur. Id est, talibus non decipitur.

8. Quae enim seminaverit homo, etc. Id est, mercedem recipiet secundum
   opera sua.
   Quoniam qui seminat in carne sua. Sequendo impetus carnis.
   De carne et metet corruptionem. Scilicet culpae, et gehennae.
   Qui autem seminat in Spiritu. Sequendo instinctum eius.
   De Spiritu metet vitam aeternam. Id est, virtute Spiritus Sancti eum
   moventis, consequetur vitam beatam. Propter quod subdit:

   Tempore enim suo metemus non deficientes. Quia merces illa erit
   aeterna. Et sic concludit:

   Operemur bonum ad omnes. Generaliter.
   Maxime autem ad domesticos fidei. Quia sic est caritas ordinata.

11. Videte. Haec est ultima pars huius epistolae, quae est praecedentium
   confirmatio. Ut enim Galathae certi essent quod praesens epistola esset
   Pauli, scripsit hanc ultimam partem manu propria. Ideo dicit: Videte. Id est, attendite.
   Qualibus litteris vobis scripsi manu mea. Quasi dicat: Per considerationem
   litterarum potestis hoc perpendere, quia cognoscebant manum suam. Et
   quoniam intentio eius in hac epistola erat reprobare observationem
   legalium, ut patet ex praecedentibus, ideo revertitur ad improbandum
   legalium observantiam, dicens:
6. Let him, however, who is catechized in the word, share] That is, who is instructed by the word of his teacher.\textsuperscript{212} with him who is instructing him in all good things.] Because it is not fitting for him to share in bad things, as it says in Matthew 23 [verse 3]: “Do the things that they say; but do not do their works.”\textsuperscript{213}

7. Make no mistake] By believing that you can legitimately conform to them in bad deeds, like some people, who say, “Why should I not do this, when my priest is doing it?”\textsuperscript{214} God is not mocked.] That is, he is not deceived by such things.\textsuperscript{215}

8. For what a man sows, etc.] That is, he will receive a reward according to his works.\textsuperscript{216} Because he who sows in his flesh] By following the impulses of the flesh. will also reap from the flesh corruption.] Namely, guilt\textsuperscript{217} and eternal punishment. He, however, who sows in the Spirit] By following his instigation. will reap from the Spirit eternal life.] That is, by the power of the Holy Spirit who moves him, he inherits eternal life. Because of this he adds:

9. But let us not desist from doing good] By ending the good that was started. For when our time comes, we will not cease reaping the rewards] Because that prize will be eternal. And so he concludes:

10. Therefore while we have time] Namely, for meriting, which is short. Let us do good works to all] In general. but especially to those who are in the household of faith] Because charity has been ordered this way.\textsuperscript{218}

11. See] This is the last part of this letter, which is a confirmation of what went before. For in order that the Galatians might be certain that the letter before them was from Paul, he wrote this last part with his own hand.\textsuperscript{219} Therefore he says: See] That is, “Pay attention!” with what letters I have written to you with my own hand] As if he is saying, “By looking at the letters, you can examine this,” because they knew his handwriting.\textsuperscript{220} And because his intention in this letter was to reprimand them for keeping the precepts of the Law, as is clear from what went before, therefore he returns to his disapproval of keeping the precepts of the Law, saying:
12. Quicunque enim volunt placere. Iudaeis. 
In carne. Id est, in legalibus observantiiis, quae dicuntur: iustitiae carnis Heb. IX. capitulo. 
Hi cogunt vos circumcidi. Id est, ad hoc vos inducunt. 
Ut crucis Christi persecutionem non patiantur. Scilicet a Iudaeis persecuentibus me et alios praedicantes evacuationem circumcisionis per crucem Christi. Falsi namque apostoli, quaerentes apud Christianos quae tum et apud Iudaeos quietem, praedicabant simul legalia cum evangelio esse necessaria ad salutem.

Legem custodiant. Quia in multis transgrediebantur. 
Sed volunt vos circumcidi ut in carne vestra glorientur. Id est, de vestra circumcisione carnali, se iactando quod multos proselitos legis fecerunt, quam gloriam tanquam malam excludit a se apostolus, dicens:

14. Mihi autem absit gloriari nisi in cruce Domini. Id est, in fide et praedicatione Christi crucifixi. 
Per quem mihi mundus crucifixus est. Id est, concupiscencia mundi est mihi mortua, nullam virtutem habens in me. 
Et ego mundo. Quia nihil mundanum concupisco.

15. In Christo enim Iesu neque circumcision aliquid valet neque praeputium. Quia neutrum aliquid facit ad consecutionem vitae beatae, quae datur per Christum. 
Sed nova creatura. Id est, regeneratio per baptismum, in qua datur gratia, quae est per creationem et de novo constituit hominem in esse gratiae.
12. For those who want to please] The Jews\textsuperscript{221} in the flesh] Namely, in the observances of the Law, which are called “observances of the flesh,” in Hebrews 9 [verse 10].\textsuperscript{222} they compel you to get circumcised] That is, they lead you to this. only] Supply, “They do this.” so that they might not suffer the persecution of the cross of Christ] Namely, at the hands of the Jews who persecute me and others who preach the emptying of circumcision through the cross of Christ. For false apostles, looking for an advantageous position among Christians and for civil rest among the Jews, were preaching that the precepts of the Law, together with the Gospel, were necessary for salvation.

13. For neither do those who are circumcised] That is, the false apostles. keep the Law] Because in many ways they were breaking it. but they want you to be circumcised, so that they might be glorified in your flesh.] That is, because of your fleshly circumcision, by boasting that they have made many converts to the Law.\textsuperscript{223} The Apostle shunned this glory from himself—as if it were something evil—saying:

14. Far be it from me, however, to be glorified in anything but the cross of our Lord] That is, in the faith and preaching of Christ the Crucified. through whom the world has been crucified to me] That is, the sinful desire of the world is dead to me, and has no power over me.\textsuperscript{224} and I to the world] Because I desire nothing worldly.

15. For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor foreskin has any power] Because neither does anything to inherit the beatified life that is given through Christ. But the new creation] That is, being born again through baptism,\textsuperscript{225} in which grace is given, which happens through creation, and in which he establishes man once again to live in grace.
16. Et quicunque hanc. Id est, certam doctrinam.  
Secuti fuerint. Fide et opere.  
Pax super illos. Id est, quies mentis.  
Et misericordia. Id est, remissio peccatorum, quae totaliter tolluntur per baptismum.  
Et super Israel Dei. Id est, super observantes legem intellectu spirituali Rom. II. Non enim qui in manifesto Iudaeus est, neque quae in manifesto in carne est circumcisio, sed qui in abscondito Iudaeus est, et circumcisio cordis in spiritu non littera.

17. De cetero nemo mihi molestus sit. Id est, O vos Galathae, non detis mihi de cetero causam molestiae recipiendo doctrinam pseudo apostolorum.  
Ego enim stigmata. Id est, signa militiae Christi.  
In corpore meo porto. Per tribulationes quas pro ipso sustinui. Quasi dicit: Non debet mihi aliunde tribulatio inferri. Et satis probabiliter potest dici quod in eius corpore sensibiliter apparebant vestigia plagarum et verberum quae sustinuerat pro Christo, ut dictum est supra II. Cor. XI.

16. and whoever follows this rule] That is, the sure teaching.226
foll0ws] In faith and work.
Peace be upon them.] That is, a quiet of mind.227
and mercy] That is, the remission of sins that are completely removed
through baptism.228
and upon the Israel of God:] That is, upon those who keep the Law
according to its spiritual understanding, as it says in Romans 2 [verses
28–29]: “For a Jew is not someone who is openly a Jew, nor is circumc-
sion something that can be shown in the flesh, but he is a Jew who is a Jew
secretly, and circumcision is of the heart, in the spirit, not the letter.”

17. From now on, let no one be a nuisance to me. That is, O Galatians,
you shall no longer cause me distress, by accepting the teaching of false
apostles.
For I bear the scars] That is, the marks of fighting for Christ.
In my body.] Through the tribulations that I sustained for him, as if he is
saying, “Tribulation should not come to me from anywhere else.” And it is
fairly reasonable for us to say that in his body, there were visibly apparent
scars from the blows and lashes that he suffered for Christ, as he says in 2
Corinthians 11 [verses 23–25].229

18. The grace of our Lord] And not slavery to the Law.230
be with your spirit, brothers. Amen.] This grace, indeed, is a pledge of
glory. And to this he leads us, who is blessed, and lives and reigns forever
and ever. Amen.

NOTES

1 Nicholas’s text, like other cited works, is without verse references, so I have added
these in brackets.
2 Nicholas refers to his own commentary on Rom 1:1: “Paul. For he was first called
Saul in Acts 8, but afterwards he was called Paul, because of a noteworthy thing that he did,
namely, the conversion of the proconsul Paul in Acts 13 [verses 6–12].”
3 A Christological concern arises here, because Christ himself, by virtue of his human
nature, would seem to be excluded by “not through a man.” Thus, Victorinus comments:
“No was it through Christ as a human being; rather it was through the Christ who was in
the human being. For Christ is both God and a human being.” Likewise Jerome writes: “the
heresy of Ebion and of Photinus is likewise shown to be refuted. For our Lord Jesus Christ
is God, since the apostle, who was sent by Christ to preach the gospel, denies that he was
sent by a man. . . And so, let them universally hear that Christ is both God and man,” and
likewise, commenting on 1:11: “if he is not a man, then logically he is God. It is not that we
are denying that he assumed humanity, but we deny that he is merely man.” Ambrosiaster
similarly comments: “Paul says that he was not sent from men, because those who had forced the Galatians to be circumcised thought that Christ was only a man. He was sent by Jesus Christ, that is to say, by the one who is both God and man.” Likewise Haimo of Auxerre says: “he did not receive his instruction and appointment from any mortal human being here on earth but rather from Almighty God in heaven. However, in doing so he did not deny Christ’s true humanity but rather affirmed what he had accomplished in his immortal state.” Aquinas similarly clarifies (1.3): “nor of man, i.e., purely man . . . from mere man, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.” Cf. below, on 1:11–12.

4 Nicholas frequently refers to Paul as “the Apostle.” By the “other apostles” who were chosen by Christ during his earthly life, Nicholas clearly does not include Matthias. In his commentary on Acts 1:26, however, he does affirm that Matthias’s appointment had restored the number of apostles to the symbolic number twelve. Cf. Lombard, Sentences IV, d. 47, ch. 2.

5 By “Greece” we should understand those regions inhabited by Greek-speaking populations.


7 The source of this etymology may be Isidore, Etymologies, 14.38. Cf. Haimo’s preface to his commentary on Galatians.

8 Aquinas speaks similarly, in Compendium Theologiae, pt. 2, ch. 9: “Consequently that good which man chiefly and mainly desires must be of such a nature that it is not sought for the sake of something else and that it satisfies man. This good is commonly called happiness, inasmuch as it is man’s foremost good: we say that certain people are happy because we believe that everything goes well with them. It is also known as beatitude, a word that stresses its excellence. It can also be called peace, so far as it brings quiet; for cessation of appetite appears to imply interior peace. This is indicated in the words of Psalm 147:14: Who has placed peace in your borders.” Cf. note 197, on 5:22.

9 Compare this with the Aquinas’s commentary (chapter 1, lecture 1), in which he locates the efficient cause of grace in the cross of Christ. Perhaps for this reason Nicholas specifies that the Divinity is the principal efficient cause.

10 Since all that God has created must be good, it would be heretical to consider any created substance to be evil. In Nicholas’s day, such an error would readily have been labeled “Manichean,” and was known to have been associated also with the Cathari. Likewise Jerome: “It is asked how the ‘present age’ may be said to be ‘evil.’ For the heretics customarily seize upon this passage as an occasion to assert that there is one creator of light and of the future age, another creator of darkness and of the present age. But we say that he is not so much calling the age itself evil—which runs on day and night, through years and months—as he is referring to the things that happen in the age. . . . It is not that the world itself is evil, but that evils are done in the world by men.” Cf. Aquinas, Commentary on the Sentences, II, d. 1, q. 1, a. 1.

11 Christ’s meriting of glory by his passion is complementary, not opposed, to the fact that the passion was also for our salvation. See Lombard, Sentences, III, d. 18.

12 Nicholas’s use of the term “sentence” should be understood here forensically, like the final sentence of a judge.

13 Similarly Jerome writes: “another gospel which is not another. For nothing that is false subsists, and what is contrary to truth does not exist, as it says in the following: ‘Do not give your scepter, O Lord, to those who are not.’ And God called ‘things that were not’ in order to cause ‘what was not’ to exist.”
Nicholas’s comment, “holy angel” should not be understood as if he thought it possible. Thus Victorinus comments: “it would be an error if an angel, even an angel from heaven, would have preached differently to you,” and Jerome: “he does not mean that an apostle or an angel could preach otherwise than they had once spoken.” Ambrosiaster by contrast comments: “Even if the devil should pretend to be an angel of God, in order to get himself a better hearing, and appear from heaven, teaching things that went against what they had received.” Glo. ord. states that Paul could mean a: “Good or bad,” angel, assuming that he deceives by preaching a Gospel “which is thought to be good.” Bruno argued that this would be impossible: “The angel may be one splendid in form who could more easily persuade the Galatians. For if such a being were to emerge from the darkness of hell bearing a frightful and hideous form, it would never be able to deceive them.”

Likewise Glo. ord. (on 1:10, I would not be a servant of Christ): “Which I am now, and therefore I excommunicate them.” And Aquinas (1.2): “let him be anathema, i.e., excommunicated.”

This explanation of the conditional proposition is necessary to explain the apparent impropriety of cursing a true apostle or angel of God. For if such cursing were not couched within the conditional construct, Paul would seem disorderly, or excessively impassioned and irrational. Cf. Aquinas (2.2): “We must solve the objections which arise on this point. The first is that, since an equal has no authority over his peers, and less so, angels who are superior. . . . Therefore, the anathema is invalid. The answer to this is that the Apostle passed this sentence not on his own authority, but on the authority of the Gospel teaching, of which he was the minister.”

Likewise, other expositors asserted that pleasing men is not an evil per se, but only when it is opposed to pleasing God. Jerome writes: “if it can happen that we may equally please God and men, one should please men too.” Augustine writes (5.4, 10): “One pleases others in a useful way only when one does so for the sake of God,” and Aquinas says (1.2): “if I intend now and then to please men so that I might draw them to God, I do not sin.”

The “lesser part” of Paul’s argument is that his teaching is “of this kind.” The term “lesser part” is what those familiar with the language of logic would call the “minor premise.”

Likewise Haimo: “from a human being, that is, from any of the other apostles.”

The same description of structure occurs in Glo. ord.: “I did not learn from man, not before my conversion, nor afterwards, as you yourselves know. Not before, which he proves; and not afterwards, he shows at: When, however, it pleased.” Likewise Aquinas, on verse 15: “After showing that he did not receive the Gospel from man before his conversion, the Apostle now proves that he did not receive it from man after his conversion.”

Mt 15:2: “Why do your disciples break the tradition of the elders?” Victorinus comments: “patriarchal traditions, that is, the texts of Judaism and the Law.” Aquinas likewise (1.3) speaks of these “traditions of my fathers, namely, those traditions which the Jews lawfully kept, and “which the good fathers added,” as is said in a Gloss” [Glo. ord.]. Augustine’s commentary here (7.4) likewise refers to Mt 15:6.

Nicholas seems to understand this to be the literal meaning, for which “mother’s womb” is a figure of speech. Cf. Victorinus and Jerome, who interpret this literally to mean his mother’s womb, as does Ambrosiaster: “in his mother’s womb, that is to say, before he was born, and from birth God knew what good he would do.” Similarly Glo. ord. states: “According to the letter, as if saying: He who made me to be born was mighty
to lead me here; for before anyone is born, God knows who he will be,” etc. Both Haimo and Bruno allow for a literal or a figurative meaning here, whereby the mother's womb refers to the synagogue. Aquinas likewise gives the reader options; first a literal meaning as if it were not a figure of speech, but he adds other possibilities (1.4): “It is indeed true to say that God separates one from the womb, even though it is a work of nature. . . . Or: from my mother's womb, i.e., the synagogue, whose womb is the college of Pharisees who trained him in Judaism. . . . Or his mother is the Church of Christ, and the womb, the college of apostles.”

Unlike Jerome, Haimo, and Aquinas (1.4), Nicholas does not here consider the traditional question that arises from a comparison with Acts 9, where Paul is said to have visited Jerusalem shortly after his conversion.

The role of angels in the divine economy, particularly with respect to revelation, is a topic of great interest among scholastic authors. That angels serve as intermediaries in all cases of divine prophecy is argued in Aquinas, *ST*, IIaIIae, q. 172, a. 3. On verse 8, Aquinas affirms (1.2): “For the Old Law was not issued by a human will but by angels in the hand of a mediator.”

Jerome likewise comments: “the reason he records ‘fifteen’ days is to show that there was not much time for him to learn anything from Peter. Thus everything is related back to that meaning with which he began: Paul was not taught by man but by God.”

Likewise *Glo. ord.*: “Thus it is evident that I did not learn from the others either.”

The need to explain in what sense James is called “brother” naturally arises from the assumption that Mary remained a virgin after Jesus's birth. Different interpreters have provided a number of explanations. Jerome (who in his commentary refers to his other works), in *On Illustrious Men* 2, says that James was the son of Mary, the Virgin Mary's sister. In his defense of the perpetual virginity of Mary against Helvidius, he proposed that by “brother,” Scripture here signifies “cousin.” In chapter 15 of the same work, however, he asserted that James was not called the Lord's brother because he looked similar to Jesus, but because the two were similar in wisdom and virtue. Ambrosiaster, however, agreeing with Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History* (II.1–4), called James the son of Joseph by another wife: “This James was the son of Joseph, which is why he is called the brother of the Lord.” Augustine hedged his bets (8.5): “James is understood to be the Lord's brother because he was one of Joseph's sons by another wife or perhaps one of the relatives of the Lord's mother Mary.” Haimo writes: “namely, the son of Mary, wife of Clopas, the Lord's maternal aunt, who was begotten of Alphaeus [Jn 19:25].” Bruno comments only: “who was bishop of Jerusalem.” Aquinas gives the most comprehensive treatment (1.5): “James is singled out from his other brothers and called the brother of the Lord for two reasons: first, because of a likeness in appearance, for he had a facial resemblance to Christ; and because of a likeness in their lives, for he imitated the manners of Christ. Or he is called the brother of Christ, because Alpheus, his father, was related to Joseph . . . he, rather than the others, was called the brother of the Lord, because they were related to Him only on His mother's side. Furthermore, ‘brother’ is taken here in the sense of kinsman,” etc. See also his *Compendium Theologiae*, 225. Nicholas's explanation, of James's physical resemblance to Jesus, implies an understanding of their familial relationship. Likewise Luther, influenced by Jerome, would determine that James was Jesus's cousin (1519 Commentary on Galatians): “James is called the Lord's brother—that is, a son of the Lord's foster father's brother or rather a son of His mother's sister—in order to distinguish him from the others who are called James.” Aquinas
(and later, Luther) therefore, understanding that James the bishop of Jerusalem had been one of the Twelve, identifies him specifically with the son of Alphaeus and Mary (Mt 10:3; Mk 3:18 and 15:40; Jn 19:25), since the other James (“the greater”) had been killed by Herod (Acts 12). Only Victorinus denies that James was one of the apostles: “the Lord’s brother, the one regarded as his brother according to the flesh. Now, when he called him his brother, he denied that James is an apostle,” and this seems to stem from his understanding of Gal 2:12, where he calls James the “progenitor of the Symmachians,” taking James to be approving of the heresy of those who were sent from him.

29 The swearing of an oath was not considered sinful per se (contrary to widespread modern interpretations of Mt 5:33–37), but could easily be abused. See Lombard, Sentences, III, d. 37, where this question is considered. Augustine comments (9.2): “an oath is not against the Lord’s command if the evil from which it comes is not that of the person swearing but that of the unbelief of the person to whom he is forced to swear,” etc. Likewise Victorinus asserts that Paul swore an oath: “for the benefit of those who had already strayed from faith.”

30 The need to explain the timing arises from the confusion that can ensue concerning the timelines of the movements of Peter and Paul, and the need for Paul to have lived for twenty-five years in Rome before his martyrdom, as Aquinas explains (2.1): “I answer that when he says, Then, after fourteen years, it is not to be understood that after three years there was another lapse of fourteen years before he went to Jerusalem, but that he went again in the fourteenth year of his conversion.” etc. Glo. ord. reads only: “After preaching in Syria and Cilicia.” And likewise Lombard: “after fourteen years means from the time of Christ’s passion, following the Apostle’s preaching in Syria and Cilicia,” etc. Thus Haimo (following Jerome) would be mistaken, who says: “The three former years joined with these fourteen amount to seventeen.”

31 Nicholas considered both curiosity and frivolity to be reprehensible motives. On curiosity, cf. Aquinas, Super Euangelium Iohannis reportatio, ch. 9 lecture 2, no. 1317, and on frivolity, cf. Gregory the Great, Regula Pastoralis, pt. 3, ch. 18. Other commentaries reflect this concern.

32 This implies the same reasoning that Victorinus supplies: “But the populus could have been uninformed.”

33 On the use of is, see Latham, Revised Medieval Latin Word List, p. 275.

34 Others respond to the same concern, namely, whether Paul doubted if he was running to any avail. Thus Jerome writes: “It is not that Paul feared that he had preached a false gospel among the Gentiles for seventeen years, but that he might show his predecessors that he ‘was not running or had run in vain,’ as the ignorant had supposed.” Lombard writes: “in vain, that is, lest I be thought to have been preaching to no avail.” And similarly Aquinas (2.1): “But did he really wonder whether he was running in vain? I answer that he did not wonder for himself, but for those to whom he had preached, because if his teaching was not firmly held by them, he would have run in vain as far as they were concerned.”

35 Cf. below, on 2:14b. Ambrosiaster likewise distinguishes between Timothy and Titus: “Timothy had a Jewish mother and a Greek father. . . . They did not complain about Gentiles, which is why Titus was not obliged to be circumcised.” Similarly Augustine (11.1): “Though Titus was a Greek and not obliged by any custom or parental relationship to be circumcised (as was the case with Timothy),” and Aquinas (2.1, ad fin.): “But the special reason why Timothy was circumcised and Titus not was that Timothy was born of
a Gentile father and Jewish mother, whereas Titus's parents were both Gentiles. And the opinion of the Apostle was that those born of a Jewish parent on either side should be circumcised, but those born entirely of Gentile parents should on no account be circumcised.”

This seems simplistic when compared with Bruno, who considers the circumstances of each occasion: “When Paul came to Jerusalem on another occasion, for the sake of dispelling all suspicion about himself, he had Timothy circumcised again even though Timothy was already circumcised [Acts 16:3]. It is not that Paul believed circumcision could actually confer anything, but some were claiming that he said the Law had always been useless. Thus, in an effort to prove that this charge was baseless, Paul presented Timothy for circumcision. But in this instance he did not want Titus to be circumcised for any reason,” etc. Likewise Lombard: “Paul did not submit to circumcising Titus here, lest he give an opportunity to those who were saying that the believers who lack that circumcision cannot be saved. . . . Indeed, when it would do no harm, he did circumcise Timothy rather than scandalize the Jews. He did this so that the Jews would not think that he detested circumcision itself in the way that idolatry should be detested. . . . With regard to the sons of the Greeks there was no scandal, however, since the letter of the Apostles had been issued stating that there was no need for them to be circumcised. But the believing Jews were circumcising their own sons because the Apostles’ letter did not prohibit this. In fact it issued no directives to these people [see Acts 15:12–29]. That is why Titus was not compelled to be circumcised. It was because he was from among the Greeks or Gentiles. But Timothy, the son of a Jewish woman, was circumcised.”

36 This is translated according to the variant nolentibus. The preferred Latin reading, volentibus, would literally read, “I did not oppose the true apostles because they wanted Titus to be circumcised,” etc. This, however, raises an ambiguity—that Nicholas doubtless did not intend—regarding whether the true apostles wanted Titus to be circumcised.

37 From Glo. ord.: “While they were in the Law, before they were apostles.”

38 This explanation seems to stem from the desire to avoid a perception of superciliousness on Paul’s part, which would be inappropriate. Thus a balanced demonstration of Paul’s superiority (in terms of education) and humility is necessary. Ambrosiaster writes: “This means that the apostles were originally simple people with no education and no distinction in the law, but that this did not matter.” And Glo. ord. (on God does not regard the person of man): “He who bestowed understanding upon the ignorant also gave it to me.” See also Bruno: “Indeed, I was certainly worthier than they were at the time, but this sort of glory means nothing to me.” And Lombard: “no interest to me since they were sinners and ignorant people. In other words, they were of no benefit to me in this state of misery, for what is past neither helps nor hinders. . . . God shows no partiality, for if God did, then God would never have conferred such things upon me were I, Paul, previously so wicked, which I certainly was.”

39 Not being a respecter of persons is a key component of judicial impartiality. Hence Lv 19:15, Dt 1:16–17, Acts 10:34, Rom 2:11, etc. Thus Jerome: “He did not accept [the person] of Moses, he did not accept that of David, he did not accept that of others; therefore, he will not accept theirs,” etc., and Bruno: “shows no favoritism, meaning that God does not find people acceptable on account of the reputation of ethnicity, wealth, or knowledge.” Aquinas speaks about this generally and then specifically (2.2): “accepting of persons in any transaction is, properly speaking, to take as a deciding factor in that transaction some aspect of the person that has nothing to do with the matter. . . . Hence, since God in His works and
benefits regards nothing that pre-exists on the side of the creature—for that which pertains to the creature is an effect of His election—but takes as His measure merely what pleases His will, according to which He effects all things, and not the condition of their person, as is said in Ephesians [1:11], it is evident that He does not regard the person of man.”

40 Glo. ord. (on the grace that was given): “That I had done miracles, and that I had converted the Gentiles.” Likewise Bruno locates the miracle primarily in conversions: “grace that was given to me because I was converting more people to the faith than they were.”

41 See note 28 above, on 1:19.

42 That Nicholas gives no affirmation here, even implicitly, for the primacy of Peter may seem unusual. For Ambrosiaster, this point is more prominent, who says (on 2:8): “Paul mentions only Peter and compares himself to him, because he received the primacy and founded the Church,” and (on 2:11) “Peter, the chief of the apostles, to whom the Lord had given the keys of the kingdom.” Jerome’s text even puts Peter first, which Lombard follows: “Cephas, namely, Peter, and James and John,” and he adds: “they gave to me and Barnabas their right hands . . . . They consented that I would be foremost in preaching among the Gentiles, just as Peter is among the circumcision. As the other apostles were obedient to Peter, so Barnabas was to Paul.” Aquinas, however, emphasizes the equality of these apostles, if not the supremacy of James, perhaps for the same reasons as for his reticence to speak of ecclesiology in general, namely, the political tensions between his family and the papacy. Still, implicit in Aquinas’s commentary is the question why Peter is not mentioned first as in Mt 10 (2.2): “James is mentioned first, as being the Bishop of Jerusalem where these events took place. The John mentioned was John the Evangelist who did not quit Judea until the time of Vespasian. Who seem to be pillars. This is a metaphor standing for the support of the entire Church. ‘For just as a whole edifice is supported by the pillars, so the whole Church of the Jews was supported and governed by these men.”

43 Similarly Victorinus: “This means that they joined together in friendship, peace, and resolve; they declared they had one gospel.”

44 In the same way, Jerome, Augustine (14.1), Glo. ord., Haimo, Lombard, and Aquinas (2.2) all interpret “the poor” here to refer to those Jews who had sold their possessions and brought the proceeds to the feet of the apostles.

45 The explanation here seems necessary because timidity or “worldly fear” would be inappropriate for the apostles after Pentecost, who were filled with a Spirit of boldness (cf. 2 Tim 1:7). Thus Glo. ord.: “Because they were weak. Or: in case the weak might be scandalized on account of his behavior.” And again: “Peter therefore knew well about the abolition of the law, but he simulated out of fear for the Jews, lest they fall from the faith because of the Gentiles, and he thereby lose his flock.” Thus Bruno: “fearing to offend those,” etc. Lombard: “fearing not the foods themselves but those who were from the circumcision, namely, those from Judea. Peter did this because they were weak, though he would have done so even if they were strong, lest they be scandalized by his behavior. Thus, so that they would not be scandalized but rather nourished in the faith little by little, Peter became like a Jew to the Jews, pretending to think along the same lines as the weak did.” And Aquinas (2.3): “fearing them who were of the circumcision, i.e., the Jews, not with a human or worldly fear but a fear inspired by charity, namely, lest they be scandalized, as is said in a Gloss.”

46 That public sin required public correction is expressed by Augustine (15.9): “For it
would not have been useful to correct in private an error that had done its harm in public.” For Nicholas, this was not only opinion, but also the law (since the Council of Arles, 813, as Levy comments in his edition, p. 93). Thus Haimo: “he publicly rebuked Peter because he had sinned publicly, and so that by correcting him the rest might be strengthened in the faith. Public sin calls for public castigation before all, as the canons maintain.” Victorinus takes the public nature of the rebuke from verse 11: “I opposed him to his face, that is, I spoke out against him publicly.” Likewise, Bruno “to his face, that is, in the plain view of the Church”; and Lombard: “to his face, meaning that he was not trying to get his attention by gesturing, nor addressing him in secret, but instead in the presence of all those whom Peter was harming.” Aquinas likewise makes the public rebuke correspond with the public sin (2.3): “before them all, because that dissimulation posed a danger to all: ‘Them that sin, reprove before all’ [1 Tim 5:20]. This is to be understood of public sins and not of private ones, in which the procedures of fraternal charity ought to be observed.”

47 Much of what follows here reads like an abridgement of Aquinas’s commentary (2.3). Aquinas repeats these arguments later in 5.1. Lombard at this point in his commentary also gives a lengthy excursus concerning the same disagreement between Jerome and Augustine. See Augustine, letters 28, 40, 71 and 75, and Jerome’s commentary, on 2:11–13.

48 See Nicholas’s comments on 2:3 in note 35 above. Aquinas likewise affirms the work of the Holy Spirit (2.3): “Therefore, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, the legal observances were condoned for a short time for the reason given, namely, to show that the legal observances had been good in the past.”

49 See Acts 15:24–29. According to the Law (Lv 3:17), the eating of blood was forbidden, so abstaining from “strangled blood,” by synecdoche, means abstaining from eating the meat of an animal that had been killed by strangling (instead of by slitting the throat), in which case the carcass would still contain the blood.

50 Nicholas names Scripture as the determining witness in this dispute, in agreement with Aquinas (2.3): “If it is unlawful to say that anything false is contained in Sacred Scripture, it will not be lawful to say that Peter was not deserving of rebuke. For this reason the opinion and statement of Augustine is the truer, because it is more in accord with the words of the Apostle.”

51 Though some seemed to consider the apostles incapable of sin after the day of Pentecost, Nicholas here affirms that they continued to sin, but venially. Likewise Aquinas (2.3): “I answer that after the grace of the Holy Spirit the apostles did not sin mortally, and this gift they had through the divine power that had strengthened them: ‘I have established the pillars thereof’ [Ps 74:4]. Yet they sinned venially because of human frailty: ‘If we say that we have no sin,’ i.e., venial, ‘we deceive ourselves’ [1 Jn 1:8].” Thus both Nicholas and Aquinas sided with Augustine over Jerome, in affirming that Peter did sin, though venially.

52 Like Victorinus, Nicholas in his comment does not associate “sinners” with the Gentiles, but with the subject; thus I have translated the verse according to his interpretation. It might seem that Nicholas is here saying that believers no longer sin, but this would be inconsistent with what he affirms above, even about the apostles (on 2:14). The explanation is to be found in the use of the word “sinner.” See Aquinas (2.4): “I answer that it is one thing to sin and another to be a sinner. For the first names an act, but the second a readiness or habit of sinning. Hence Scripture is wont to call the impious and those loaded down with the heavy burden of sin ‘sinners.’” Thus “sinners” is a term for Gentiles particularly
because they do not keep the ceremonial precepts of the law. Victorinus interprets “sinners” according to the other definition. Glo. ord. seems to go both ways, keenly emphasizing that the Jews are also sinners (on Gentiles): “Sinners, yes, but not like the idolatrous and unclean Gentiles,” but adding (on sinners) “He seems to have used ‘sinners’ to mean ‘very wicked people,’ not for those who, though they live justly and laudably, are not without sin.” Bruno writes: “not sinners from among the Gentiles. In other words, we have not sinned in the manner of Gentiles by worshiping idols and the like. For the Jews did not do that. Yet, even though we are Jews by birth, we are still not justified by works of the Law.” Lombard, conflating the options in Glo. ord., writes: “Sinners from among the Gentiles. It is as if to say, ‘We are certainly sinners, but not as the unclean and idolatrous Gentiles are’ . . . the Jews imposed that title upon the Gentiles as though they themselves were so just when in fact they also were sinners. This designation, however, is not used in the Scriptures about those people who live justly and laudably and yet are not without sin.”

Nicholas here attributes man’s inability to be justified from works of the Law to the imperfection of man, not of the Law (hence he uses suam, not eius), although later in chapter 3 he speaks also about the imperfection of the Mosaic Law. Here we should note the two definitions for justification. Aquinas writes (2.4): “I answer that ‘to be justified’ can be taken in two senses, namely, doing what is just and being made just. According to the first sense, however, a man is justified who does the works of justice. But no one is made just except by God, through grace.” Aquinas, however, speaks here of the imperfection of the Law (2.4): “But with respect to being made just by the works of the Law, a man does not seem to be justified by them, because the sacraments of the Old Law did not confer grace. How turn you again to the weak and needy elements? [Gal 4:9] i.e., that neither confer grace nor contain grace in themselves. The sacraments of the new Law, however, although they are material elements, are not needy elements; hence they can justify.” Cf. Glo. ord. (on be justified): “Works come from grace, but not grace from works.” Similarly Lombard explained: “not justified by works of the Law, through those legalistic works which comprise sacrifices and the other figurative practices.”

That this should be translated “faith in Jesus Christ” and not, as many modern translators render it, “faith of Jesus Christ” I consider almost self-evident. See also Glo. ord. (on faith), qua creditur in Christum: “with which one believes in Christ” (Lombard repeats this definition), to distinguish it from the faith, qua ereditur, i.e., as it is expressed in the Creed. For man’s faith (not Christ’s faith) as the instrument of salvation, see the second part of this verse. See also Aquinas, ST, IaIIae, q. 4. According to Cooper’s note on Gal 3:22 in his translation of Victorinus’s commentary (p. 297), “Neither Victorinus nor any of the ancient commentators even consider the subjective genitive.”

Aquinas likewise directs the salvation of those under the Old Law toward Christ (2.4): “although some who observed the works of the Law in times past were made just, nevertheless, this was effected only through faith in Jesus Christ.”

In faith,” not “by faith.” Nicholas is here explaining “in Christ,” a favorite Pauline phrase (cf., e.g., Rom 8:1 and 16:7, 1 Cor 1:30, 2 Cor 5:17, Gal 1:22, Phil 1:1) as the state of being “in faith,” without explicitly making faith a cause of justification.

See note 52 above.

Thus Glo. ord.: “As if he is saying, it would be amazing if anyone were to say that.”

Lest Paul should be said to have destroyed the Law itself, which is good, Lombard words this differently: “those things which I have destroyed, referring to the pride that
boasts in the works of the Law.” A little later, however, he is less precise and says only: “those things which I have destroyed, namely, the law.”

Similarly Victorinus: “Paul could seem to have spoken of two laws, one of Christ and another of Moses, so as to say that through the law which was given by Christ, he died to that law which was given to the Jews.” Jerome writes: “the soul ‘died to the’ former ‘law through the law’ of the gospel.” Ambrosiaster: “Paul says that by the law of faith he has died to the law of Moses.” And Haimo: “I, through the Law, of the Gospel, died to the Law, of Moses.”

Aquinas uses the same scriptural quotation here, explaining it as one of the many explicit self-imposed limitations of the Old Law (2.6): “For a law is destroyed by means of the law when the law itself contains some local or temporary precept, such that the law should be observed for such a time or in such a place and no other, and this fact is expressed in the law,” and he cites Jer 31:31 and Dt 18:15 as examples of such local or temporary precepts. He does, however, give the reader the option: “Or else, I by the law spiritual am dead to the law carnal.” Lombard gives the reader options: “Through the Law, as it is spiritually understood, I am dead to the Law, with the result that I no longer live within it in a fleshly manner. Or perhaps by through the Law the Apostle means that through the authority of the Law I have dismissed it as though I am dead to it since I retain none of its fleshly sense. For it is written, ‘The Lord will raise up a prophet,’” etc. (Dt 18:15).

It is unclear whether Nicholas means that Paul had an emotive compassion for Christ, or a more literal suffering with Christ in the sense of Colossians 1:24. The expository tradition here is diverse. Haimo: “nailed to the cross with Christ, meaning that I was nailed to the cross of Christ because my sins have been fastened upon his cross, that is, blotted out and put to death.” Bruno: “that is, I have affixed my sense through the power of Christ’s cross lest, abiding in the faith of Christ, I might take the opportunity to lend my hand or foot to evil deed. I am crucified upon the cross of Christ for the glory of Christ who so crucified me. Through this cross we are able to abstain from evil.” And Lombard: “crucified with Christ. This means that Christ’s cross has extinguished the ardor of sin within me, so that I might no longer be stretched out across it by the fear of God, as though having my flesh fastened with nails. ‘Fasten my flesh by your fear’ [Ps 118:120].” Aquinas connects this image with baptism: “I am nailed to the cross, i.e., concupiscence or the inclination to sin, and all such have been put to death in me through the cross of Christ: ‘Our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin may be destroyed’ [Rom. 6:6]. Also from the fact that I am crucified with Christ and have died to sin; and because Christ rose again, I, too, have risen.”

Cf. Glo. ord. (on not I): “That is, the old man.” And Lombard: “according to the flesh, for I am no longer the sinner that I once was.”

For the notion that Christ, the word of Christ, or the spirit of Christ dwells in the Christian, cf. Eph 3:17, 1 Cor 3:16, 6:19, 2 Cor 6:16, Rom 8:11, Col 3:16. This, however, is not taken very literally by many expositors. Thus Haimo: “Truly Christ lives, or reigns, in me through faith and through all virtues.” And Bruno: “Christ lives in me. In other words, I myself live by having become Christ himself, by having been conformed to him.” Lombard: “Christ truly lives in me, which is to say that the newness of Christ appears in me. It should be taken in this sense: ‘The righteousness in me is not my own but instead belongs to Christ.’” And Aquinas: “Christ liveth in me, i.e., the newness which has been given to us through Christ.”
65 An explanation seems necessary because the word “flesh” can connote sinfulness. Hence Bruno: “in the flesh. Although the flesh attacks the spirit, it is still the spirit that lives in me and slays the desires of the flesh. Hence to live in the flesh now is itself a miracle.” And Aquinas (2.6): “And note that he says in the flesh, not ‘by the flesh,’ because this is evil.”

66 Similarly, Victorinus glosses this: “has died in vain, that is, has died for no reason,” and Glo. ord. comments briefly (on gratuitously): “in vain.” Haimo says only “neither advantageous nor detrimental,” and Lombard states concisely: “meaning for no purpose and without reason.” An expanded explanation here, however, is common, to flesh out what is only a partial syllogism. Thus Victorinus: “A return now to the Law after faith in Christ will make it seem that Christ died in vain and achieved nothing for us, as the Law was already supposedly doing it. But in fact the Law was not doing it, and that is why Christ came to do it himself. Therefore, Christ has not died in vain; rather, through Christ himself, justification has come to us.” Ambrosiaster likewise writes: “If a person could have been justified by the law, Christ would not have had to die. But because the law could not grant forgiveness of sins nor prevent the second death from robbing its captives, whom it held because of sin, Christ died to achieve what the law could not do, and for this reason he did not die in vain. His death is the justification of sinners.” Bruno, likewise gives a fuller argument: “in vain, that is, Christ would have died unnecessarily when he sought to justify us since righteousness could still have been obtained through the Law. But you would not want to concede that Christ died unnecessarily.” And Aquinas fleshes out the argument quite fully (2.6): “For if justice be by the law, then Christ died in vain, i.e., if the Law is sufficient, i.e., if the works of the Law suffice to justify a man, Christ died to no purpose and in vain, because He died in order to make us just: ‘Christ also died once for our sins, the just for the unjust, that he might offer us to God’ [1 Pt 3:18]. Now if this could have been done through the Law, the death of Christ would have been superfluous. But He did not die in vain or labor to no purpose, as it is said in Isaiah [49:4]; because through Him alone came justifying grace and truth, as it is said in John [1:17].”

67 Glo. ord.: “He warns them with a reproach.”

68 Nicholas does not make the involvement of satanic arts explicit, but cf. Aquinas (3.1): “according to a Gloss, bewitchment is, properly speaking, a sense delusion usually produced by magical arts. . . . This can also be brought about by demons.” Jerome comments that Paul does not mean to say that witchcraft is involved, but that it looks similar: “It is as though someone has cast a spell on them and they have vomited out the food of the Holy Spirit.”

69 Differences arise here because of a variant reading, praescriptus est, instead of proscriptus est. Nicholas’s interpretation agrees with the latter reading. Likewise Ambrosiaster: “proscribed, that is to say, degraded and condemned”; Augustine: “proscribed. . . . In other words, they saw Christ Jesus lose his inheritance and his possession”; and Bruno: “Christ Jesus was proscribed. People are said to be proscribed when driven from their reign and inheritance. The Galatians were driving Christ from his reign and inheritance. For although Christ ought to be ruling over them inasmuch as they were his own inheritance, they were now secretly withdrawing from him.” Or understood another way, “Christ was proscribed by others whom you corrupted by your evil example even as you proscribe Christ among yourselves when you expel him from your midst.” And thus Glo. ord.: “While you abandon Christ through the Law, Christ is outlawed by you just as he was by Pilate, and while you believe him to be insufficient, you are no different from those who crucified him.” Aquinas
(4.1) likewise asserts that “outlawed” is the correct reading. Jerome, however, interprets this as “written before”: “For the whole chorus of the prophets predicts his gallows and passion,” etc., following whom Haimo comments: “Christ Jesus was publicly portrayed as crucified for you. Before their eyes the crucified Christ Jesus was publicly portrayed.”

70 The same anti-Arian (or rather, anti-“Photinian”—cf. above, on 1:1) emphasis is found in Ambrosiaster: “This means ‘In your minds he has been crucified as a man. The full hope [of salvation] is not to be found in him because he is only a man,’” and is reproduced by Aquinas (4.1): “crucified, i.e., merely died, but justified no one.”

71 Explaining that the Holy Spirit produced an evident effect, or a visible sign, was necessary because it no longer happened in Nicholas’s day. Jerome writes (on 3:5): “The Galatians, having received the Holy Spirit after their faith, had the gifts of the virtues, that is, prophecy, kinds of tongues, healing of diseases, and the other things that are listed among the spiritual gifts in the letter to the Corinthians.” According to Ambrosiaster: “At that time it was not possible to deny that the Spirit of God dwelt in believers. . . . When hands were laid on them the Holy Spirit came down upon them and blessed them with the gift of other tongues along with the interpretation of them, so that no one would dare deny that the Holy Spirit was present in them.” Augustine similarly writes (20.2): “The presence of the Holy Spirit showed itself in perceptible miracles,” and Haimo affirms that the sign was the evidence of the Holy Spirit: “What is more, they received the variety of tongues through which they demonstrated that they possessed the Holy Spirit.” Likewise Aquinas (3.2): “It should be noted that in the early Church, by God’s providence, in order that the faith of Christ might prosper and grow, manifest signs of the Holy Spirit took place in the hearers immediately after the apostles preached the faith.” This is different from what Nicholas states next, that the Galatians received the Spirit through baptism (perhaps he is thinking of Acts 19). Aquinas cites Acts 10:44, where the Spirit is received through hearing, and separately from baptism, but Nicholas may be thinking of the more recent systematic association of baptism (particularly for infants) with the gift of the Holy Spirit and faith, which would also have been reflected in the baptismal liturgy. See Lombard’s Sentences, IV, d. 4, ch. 1 and 4.13. See also note 71 below, on 3:5.

72 Flesh is likewise interpreted by Haimo as “carnal ceremonies . . . referring to the circumcision of the flesh and all such sacrifices prescribed by the Law,” which Bruno calls the “fleshy law.” So also Aquinas (3.2) equates “flesh” here with the “carnal observances of the Law.”

73 Similarly Haimo: “They had suffered many evils at the hands of Jews and persecutors because they were refusing to observe circumcision.” Bruno comments briefly: “at the hands of unbelievers,” and Aquinas says (3.2): “Now it was with labor and tribulation suffered at the hands of their fellow citizens that they had received the Holy Spirit.”

74 Augustine likewise comments (20.8): “What is said to have been done ‘for no reason’ is superfluous. Something superfluous, however, neither helps nor harms; but in this case they must watch out lest it lead to destruction.” Cf. Glo. ord.: “Without usefiness.”

75 The opportunity to repent was considered equal to the span of one’s life.

76 See note 71 above, on 3:2.

77 Nicholas seems to imply a dispute here concerning the subject of the sentence. Victorinus understands a divine subject: “God worked a great deal of powers among them; and if God worked powers, God has bestowed the Spirit upon them.” Likewise Haimo: “God did not give us the Spirit because we observe the Law but on account of our faith.”
Bruno, however, makes Paul the subject: “did Paul—who granted you the Spirit, the one through whose hands you received the Holy Spirit and who works virtues and miracles among you—did he have the Spirit by works of the Law,” etc. Glo. ord. likewise reads: “By his ministry, not authority.” Aquinas frames his interpretation with Paul as the general subject (3.2): “From what I have done in giving you through my ministration the Holy Spirit, Who worketh miracles among you, do I do this by the works of the law or by the hearing of the faith?” But he affirms (as Nicholas insists) that the Holy Spirit must be the subject of “caused the working of powers in you.” Perhaps Aquinas considered such a rapid change in subject to be possible because he mistook the conjunction to be qui (“who”), as in Phil 2:13 (qui operatur in vobis, etc.), instead of et (“and”). Thus he raises the question: “But can anyone give the Holy Spirit?” and replies that men can, but only sacramentally speaking: “It can be said that holy men by administering the sacraments give the Holy Spirit. And this is the way the Apostle had in mind—the way mentioned in a Gloss.”

Likewise Glo. ord. (on 3:8, in you): “In imitation of your faith.” Similarly Aquinas locates the sonship of Abraham in imitation (3.3): “who are of faith, i.e., who believe that they are justified and saved by faith, the same are the children of Abraham, namely, by imitation and instruction.”

That God is the author of Scripture is not in need of a gloss; rather, this serves to clarify that it is God who is foreseeing, because the action of foreseeing requires a personal subject. Likewise Bruno writes: “Scripture in Genesis foreseeing, that is, showing that God foresaw and did so from eternity”; and Aquinas (3.2): “Scripture, introducing God, who is speaking to Abraham, says,” etc.

Ambrosiaster affirms the same thing, namely, man’s inability to keep the law: “The commandments are so great that it is impossible to keep them. This is why the apostle Peter says in the Acts of the Apostles: ‘Why do you put a yoke on the brothers which neither our fathers nor we have been able to bear?’” Similarly Aquinas (3.4): “under a curse, namely, of transgression; not that the Law produces the curse, for concupiscence does not come from the Law, but the knowledge of sin does, to which we are prone through concupiscence banned by the Law. Therefore, inasmuch as the Law begets a knowledge of sin and offers no help against sin, they are said to be under a curse, since they are powerless to escape it by those works. . . . No one can keep the Law in the way in which the Law prescribed: ‘As many as do not keep and do all that is written in the book of the law,’ etc. . . . But it is impossible to fulfill the whole Law, ‘cursed shall they be’ [Dt 28:15].”

Cf. Aquinas, Sententia Metaphysicae, book 5, lecture 14, no. 13: “For it is said that one lyre can make a sound, because it sounds good, and another cannot make a sound, because it does not sound good.”

Nicholas is referring to Pelagius’s Libellus fidei ad Innocentium I, which was mistakenly attributed to Jerome and referred to by the title Explanatio symboli ad Damasum or Expositio Catholicae Fidei (Aquinas quotes the same passage in ST, IaIae, q.109, a. 4, arg. 2). Nicholas’s interpretation of Jerome here seems to assert that some people could keep the Law of Moses, though with difficulty. Aquinas, however, asserts the opposite (ST, IaIae, q. 109, a. 4, co.): “Neither in the state of perfect nature [before the Fall], nor in the state of corrupt nature can man fulfill the commandments of the law without grace.” Likewise in his commentary (3.4): “For the Law commands that good be done and evils avoided, and by commanding it puts one under the obligation without giving the virtue to obey.
And hence he says, *Cursed*, as though placed in contact with evil, *is every one*, without exception; because, as it is said in the Acts [10:34]: ‘God is not a respecter of persons’ . . . as it is said in James [2:10], ‘Whosoever shall keep the whole law, but offend in one point, is become guilty of all’ . . . ‘Moses,’ says a Gloss, ‘did indeed command many things which no one could fulfill, in order to tame the pride of the Jews who said: *There are many willing and able, but no one to command.*’ Likewise Glo. ord. includes no contingency on the impossibility of keeping the law (*whoever does not abide*): “Which no one can, for which reason Peter said: ‘Why are you trying to put on us a burden that neither we nor our fathers were able to bear?’ [Acts 15:10].”

83 Nicholas passes silently over much of this verse, which has been important in the more modern history of the interpretation of Galatians, but see his comment on 2:16 in note 53 above. Aquinas rewords his earlier distinction between types of justification (3.4): “But against this, it is said in James [2:21]: ‘Was not Abraham our father justified by works?’ I answer that ‘to be justified’ can be taken in two senses: either as referring to the execution and manifestation of justice, and in this way a man is justified, i.e., proved just, by the works performed; or as referring to the infused habit of justice, and in this way one is not justified by works, since the habit of justice by which a man is justified before God is not acquired but infused by the grace of faith. Therefore the Apostle says significantly, *with God*, because the justice which is before God is interior in the heart, whereas the justice which is by works, i.e., which manifests that one is just, is before men.”

84 Thus Ambrosiaster: “The law is not based on faith, because it does not command us to believe anything”; and Glo. ord. (on faith): “It commands nothing that should be believed.”

85 Aquinas likewise asserts that the fathers of the Old Testament had an imprecise faith in the Christ who was to come (3.4): “So also the Old Law contains some things that are of faith—not that the Jews considered them to be as they were, of faith, but they considered them only as a figure of faith in Christ, and a declaration, by believing in which the just were saved.”

86 Augustine comments similarly (21.8): “Therefore ‘whoever does them,’ he says, ‘shall live by them,’ that is, shall have a reward: he will not be punished by having to undergo such a death. But in that case his reward is not with God,” etc. Glo. ord. also distinguishes the definitions of “live” with the short phrase (on shall live): “Not before God.”

87 The equation of the penalty and the curse is likewise found in Aquinas (3.5): “*from the curse of the law*, i.e., from guilt and penalty.”

88 Because Jesus is perfect, and guilt comes from sin, Nicholas says here that Jesus did not assume any guilt (*culpa*). Haimo, citing Ambrosiaster and Augustine, similarly affirms here that Jesus had no guilt: “*He became a curse for us*. As Saint Ambrose says, it is not that Christ himself became curse as though he had sin. Rather, he became a curse, that is, a sacrifice offered up for the sake of the cursed and sinners, namely, for us who were bound under the curse and death of the first human being. Or perhaps it is, as Saint Augustine says, that Christ became a curse in the sense that he became mortal just as we are, although he was without sin.” Bruno comments: “Christ redeemed us, *having become a curse for us* so that we should be redeemed. He was not just cursed but even *became a curse*. For if those crucifying Christ wished to curse someone, they would curse that person, saying, ‘May what happened to this crucified man happen to you.’ Indeed, Christ became a curse . . . although certainly not for the guilt of any crime of his own. He was only cursed in this
way so that he might bear the penalty of the curse.” In Glo. ord., Jesus’s guilt is connected with punishment (on curse): “Since he is killed like a guilty man” and with the perception of others (on cursed): “He was thought to be cursed, because he was hanged.” Therefore, neither guilt nor curse truly belong to Christ, because such things properly pertain to the man who hangs (on who hangs): “For his own crimes, which Christ did not.” Aquinas likewise affirms Jesus’s sinlessness but affirms that the curse pertains to both guilt and punishment, though the former is only according to the perception of the Jews (3.5): “He redeemed us from the evil of guilt by being made a curse, i.e., of guilt: not that there was really any sin in Him—for ‘He did not sin, neither was guile found in his mouth,’ as is said in 1 Peter [2:22]—but only according to the opinion of men . . . the Jews regarded Him as the worst type of criminal. . . . Secondly, it is explained with respect to the evil of punishment. For Christ freed us from punishment by enduring our punishment and our death which came upon us from the very curse of sin.”

89 It is less than clear how Nicholas understands the “promise of the Holy Spirit” in relation to the blessing of Abraham. Aquinas gave the reader different explanations for this clause, the first of which understands it as epexegetical to “the promise,” and the second of which takes it as a purpose clause (3.5): “Now this blessing, this fruit, is that we may receive the promise of the Spirit, i.e., the promises which the Holy Spirit, given to us as a pledge and an earnest, works in us concerning eternal happiness. . . . Or: that we may receive the promise of the Spirit, i.e., the Holy Spirit. As if to say: That we may receive the promise made to the seed of Abraham concerning the Holy Spirit: ‘Upon my servants I will pour forth my spirit’ [Jl 2:29]. For it is through the Spirit that we are joined to Christ and become children of Abraham worthy of the blessing.”

90 Again, salvation is not through Christ’s faith, but through the faith of those who believe in Christ (credentibus in Christum). Likewise Aquinas (3.5): “Through faith, too, we receive the Holy Spirit, because as is said in Acts [5], the Lord gives the Holy Spirit to those who obey Him, namely, through faith.” Cf. Nicholas’s comments on 2:16 and 3:22.

91 Bruno refers to this verse only implicitly (on 3:17): “God swore that he was going to fulfill it,” but Aquinas cites it explicitly, in explaining the manner by which (3.6): “The testament was confirmed, namely, with an oath.” Cf. note 93 below, on 3:17.

92 Affirmation of Saint Paul’s identification of the seed with Christ here contrasts with 3:29, below, where “seed” is used to refer to all Christians; thus it is to be understood here carnally, and later spiritually. Haimo therefore asserts: “the seed of Abraham is Christ, because Abraham begot Isaac, who begot Jacob, and Jacob then Judah, from whose tribe and progeny the Lord assumed flesh in the womb of the Blessed Virgin Mary.” Nicholas’s emphasis on the fulfillment of the promise through the seed is reflected more in Aquinas (3.6): “And to thy seed, which is Christ, because He is the only one through Whom and in Whom all could be blessed. For He alone and exclusively is the one who does not lie under the curse of guilt, in spite of the fact that He deigned to be made a curse for us.” See note 109.

93 This refers to Gen 22:16. See note 91 above, on 3:15.

94 Similarly Grosseteste comments: “after 430 years from the time the promise was made to Abraham and his seed.” The numerical debate, included in the commentaries of Ambrosiaster, Jerome, and Augustine, is omitted here, and a simple resolution given. Haimo gives an abbreviated account. Aquinas (3.6) gives a fuller calculation, citing Scripture passages and a gloss by Rabanus on Acts 7.
Likewise Augustine asserts (24.1): “There follows an unavoidable problem. For if faith justifies and the earlier saints who were justified before God were justified by faith, why did the law have to be given?” Similarly Aquinas (3.7): “The question which might arise from the foregoing is this: If the Law was unable to justify, was the Law without purpose? This question he raises when he says, *Why then was the law?* i.e., what purpose did it serve? This is the punctuation which, as a Gloss says, Augustine favors, although earlier he approved the reading, *What then?* followed by *The law was set up because of transgressions.* Haimo had given the same history of interpretation from Augustine's commentary and *Retractationes.*

This threefold usefulness of the Law contrasts with Aquinas, who adopted a fourfold purpose (3.7): “corresponding to the four consequences of sin enumerated by Bede, namely, because of wickedness, weakness, passion, and ignorance.” Nicholas's uses correspond with the first, second, and fourth of these. Perhaps he considered Aquinas's third use, namely, “in order to tame the concupiscence of a wanton people, so that, worn out by various ceremonies, they would not fall into idolatry or lewdness,” to be able to be included in the first use, “to suppress wickedness.”

Likewise for Aquinas, the first purpose of the Law is punishment for the end of prevention of wickedness (3.7): “The Law was given first of all to suppress wickedness, since by forbidding sin and by punishing, it restrained men from sin. This he touches on when he says, *The law was set because of transgressions,* i.e., to prevent them.” Thus Ambrosiaster: “The law could not forgive sins or make sinners righteous, but was given to frighten people into living a good life by punishing those who did not respect it,” and *Glo. ord.* (on *On account of transgression*): “Or that they might cease to transgress out of fear, as they occasionally do voluntarily.” Haimo emphasizes repression over punishment: “To transgress is to overstep and trespass. Thus the Law was given after the promise in order to restrain and hold back human beings from sins, who were otherwise prone to transgress the commandments of Almighty God as well as natural law.” Bruno gives the same reason: “for the sake of preventing transgressions,” as well as Nicholas's second use (see note 103 below, on 3:21) as options for the interpretation of “because of transgression.”

Nicholas interprets angels to mean those spiritual creatures of pure form. Similarly, Jerome writes: “God speaks in ‘angels,’ since the Lord also speaks in the prophets through the angels who are in men, as Haggai says, ‘And the angel who spoke in me says,’” etc. Thus Augustine comments (24.16): “It was through angels, who, like the prophets, sometimes represented themselves and sometimes represented God, that the dispensation of the law was put in place.” Haimo likewise writes: “*through angels,* that is, the Law itself was arranged, described, and dictated by an angel. God was speaking to Moses by way of a subordinate creature, namely, through the angel, just as Stephen says to the Jews,” [in Acts 7] etc. Bruno, *Glo. ord.*, Grosseteste, and Aquinas, however, give the option that they can also refer to human messengers. Thus Bruno: “*through angels,* meaning through Moses and Aaron, who were God's messengers to the people. Or Paul could be referring to heavenly angels by whose ministry the Law was handed down to Moses.” Grosseteste: “*Through angels,* that is, through Moses and the other servants of God. Or *through angels,* that is, the ministry of angels in whom God was speaking.” And Aquinas (3.7): “*by angels,* i.e., the messengers of God, namely, Moses and Aaron: ‘They shall seek the law at his mouth: because he is the angel of the Lord of hosts’ [Mal 2:7]. Or: *by angels,* i.e., by the ministry
of angels: ‘You have received the law by the disposition of angels’ [Acts 7:53].’ For angels understood as preachers, see also Aquinas’s *Compendium Theologiae*, 245 (citing Augustine, sermon 351). Grosseteste adds one further possibility: “Or again, through angels it is said that the Law was ordained in the sense that it was administered in an ordered manner. For it was through the ministry of angels that the din of the trumpet call, the thunder and lightning, and all of the things took place and were so terrifyingly demonstrated upon that mountain.” Ambrosiaster, however, interprets angels exclusively to mean “Moses, Joshua the son of Nun and the other prophets up to John the Baptist.”

100 Thus Jerome: “We should interpret ‘hand of a mediator’ of the power and virtue of him who, though according to God is himself one with the Father, but according to the office of mediator is understood to be different from him.” Likewise Haimo: “in the hand of a mediator, which is to say, through the power of the Word of God, the Son of God, who, by later assuming flesh, became our mediator.” And Bruno: “in the hand, that is, in the power of the mediator Christ.” Grosseteste gives another option: “mediator refers to Moses, who was the mediator between God and the people. Even better, it means in the hand of Christ, who is the true mediator. It is also proven that Christ is the true lawgiver and thus the master of the Law; he has the power to make the Law and, when he so wills, to bring it then to an end.” Aquinas says (3.7): “in the hand of a mediator, i.e., in the power of Christ.”

101 This corresponds with Glo. ord. (on mediator): “Who is God and man, [is] between God and man.” Augustine gives a much fuller explanation of this in his commentary (24.4–9). Nicholas’s wording is similar to Grosseteste: “The mediator, therefore, is not of one but rather the mediator of two extremes who forges a union between the extremes. That is why the mediator himself is not of one nature but of two natures, two extremes, namely, the divine and the human.” Aquinas’s first explanation (of three) of what “mediator” can mean is similar (3.7): “Since He is the mediator of God and men, it was fitting that He be God and man. For were he purely man or solely God, He would not be a true mediator.”

102 This explanation, that Saint Paul is concerned for the unity of the Trinity, is reflected also in Haimo: “The Apostle added this lest anyone think that Christ was inwardly divided from the unity of the divine nature when he accepted the office of mediator.” Bruno: “it does not follow from this that there are two gods but one God alone.” Grosseteste: “For he is one and the same God, one with God the Father and the Holy Spirit,” etc. And Aquinas (3.7): “Specifically it is not the Father, not the Holy Spirit, but the Son who is mediator; nevertheless, God is one.”

103 Likewise Aquinas says: (3.7): “Secondly, the Law was set down in order to disclose human weakness. For men gloried in two things: First in their knowledge; and secondly, in their power. . . . And therefore the Law was given which would cause a knowledge of sin, ‘for by the law is the knowledge of sin’ [Rom 3:20]. But it did not give the help of grace to avoid sin, so that man, bound by the Law, might test his strength and recognize his infirmity. Finding that without grace he was unable to avoid sin, he would more ardently yearn for grace.” Thus Victorinus writes: “We have said that the Law given by Moses teaches nothing but sins—what sins are—and advises how they are to be avoided.” Ambrosiaster comments: “the law was given in order to make sinners realize that they were guilty in the eyes of God. Once their sins have been made clear, they are trapped and cannot make any excuses but only ask for mercy.” Similarly Augustine (24.14): “The law was ordained,
therefore, for a proud people so that they might be humbled by their transgression . . . so
that they might seek grace and not assume they could be saved by their own merits (which
is pride), and so that they might be righteous not by their own power and strength, but by
the hand of a mediator who justifies the impious,” who repeats this point (e.g., 25.9). Thus
Glo. ord. (on 3:19, On account of transgression): “to cause people to transgress, so that a
physician might be sought.” Grosseteste similarly comments (on 3:23): “even as the Law
was reproaching sins, it was still powerless to free anyone from sin. Thus, by necessity, it
was pointing to justifying faith.”

104 Nicholas gives “justify” (iustificare), not “make alive” (vivificare), as the Vulgate
reads. The same reading occurs in Aquinas, ST, IaIIae, q. 103, a. 2, s. c., but each instance
could be a simple error, of reading u instead of st. Aquinas’s commentary here reads vivificare.

105 Clarification is necessary because “Scripture” for Nicholas’s readers also included
the New Testament.

106 Similarly Aquinas (3.7): “Fourthly, the Law was given as a figure of future grace in
order to instruct the ignorant, according to Hebrews [10:1]: ‘For the law, having a shadow
of the good things to come.’”

107 An explanation seems necessary because Paul says here that everyone baptized has
“put on Christ,” yet in Rom 13:14, he tells the baptized to put on Christ. Haimo therefore
explains: “Now it should be said that ‘putting on Christ’ can be understood in two ways.
The first refers to the reception of the sacrament, and the second to the sanctification of
one’s life. The first applies to the evil and the good alike, whereas the second applies to the
good alone.” Bruno, however, identifies this with baptism: “put on Christ. The Apostle
says, put on, because a person is naked on account of sin and suffers poverty and shame.
Yet when people come to Christ in baptism, they put him on so as to cover up their
own nakedness and enter into his glory.” Grosseteste comments briefly: “you have put on
Christ and have been assimilated to him,” but the relation between these is less than clear.

Aquinas offers several explanations, one of which corresponds with Nicholas (3.9): “And
note that some put on Christ outwardly by good works and inwardly by a renewal of the
spirit; and with respect to both they are configured to His holiness, as is mentioned in a
Gloss.” Thus Glo. ord. (on you have put on): “That is, you have been conformed to him,
which is your honor and protection against storms.”

108 Nicholas binds the abolition of distinctions between persons to the unity of man
with Christ through faith, as opposed to a general abolition of social contracts and con-
ventions. Thus Augustine explains (28.1, 3): “In this faith there is no distinction between
Jew and Greek, slave and free, male and female; since all have been baptized, all are one
in Christ Jesus. . . . yet because the body is still dead on account of sin, that difference,
whether of peoples or of legal status or of sex, while indeed already removed in the unity
of the faith, remains in this mortal life. That this order is to be observed on this life’s journey
is the teaching of the apostles, who hand down very salutary rules as to how Christians
should live together with regard to differences,” etc. Similarly Haimo: “There is neither
Jew, etc. All people of whatever manner of difference are nonetheless directed to Christ,
since we are all one in Christ. Paul says one, and he does not add that he means that we are
one without differentiation.” Bruno likewise writes: “there is no nation, no condition, and
no difference of sex in the faith of Christ.” Glo. ord. explains (on whoever): “Are in Christ
through faith, whereby: whoever, that is, regardless of condition or sex.” Thus Aquinas
asserts (3.9): “there is nothing in man that would exclude anyone from the sacrament of
faith in Christ and of baptism. And he mentions three differences among men to show that no one is excluded from faith in Christ by any of them.”

109 See Nicholas’s comments on 3:16 and 3:19 in note 92 above. Likewise Augustine (28.8): “The one seed, Christ, signifies not only the Mediator himself but also the Church, of which he is the head of the body.” Victorinus had explained this in terms of a closer identification of believers with Christ: “As long as Christ is the seed of Abraham according to faith, and you are in Christ, and you are on that account the seed of Abraham, you are heirs according to the promise, given that an inheritance was promised to the seed of Abraham. But you have been baptized in Christ Jesus, you have received Christ, and you are Christ; you are therefore the seed of Abraham.”

110 See Nicholas’s commentary on Genesis 15 [verse 7]: ut darem, etc. Per quam principaliter intelligitur terra viventium promissa.

111 Likewise Victorinus: “Paul pursues the point through a simile he has added” (per adiunctam similitudinem).

112 Nicholas here uses a philosophical phrase, potentia propinqua (also used in jurisprudence), which denotes a potentiality that is likely to be actualized, as opposed to potentia remota, a potential that is unlikely to be actualized.

113 Likewise Aquinas (4.1): “when we were children in the state of the Old Law,” etc.

114 Jerome’s second interpretation reads similarly: “Others interpret the ‘elements of the world’ as the law of Moses and the utterances of the prophets, because by them, as it were by the beginning and the ABC’s, we receive the fear of God, which is the beginning of Wisdom.” Likewise Glo. ord. (on under elements): “Under the Law, which is the first institution directed towards faith and justice.”

115 Bruno gives a similar pedagogical explanation: “under the elements, that is, under the laws. For just as a child passes through the elements of the alphabet on the way to acquiring knowledge of literature, so through the Law one had to pass into knowledge of God, which must be obtained through faith.” And Aquinas’s comment is even closer to Nicholas (4.1): “The Old Law is called ‘element,’ because just as boys who are to be trained in a science are first taught the elements of that science and through them are brought to the fullness of science, so to the Jews was proposed the Old Law through which they would be brought to faith and justice,” but he offers an alternative: “Or, under the elements, i.e., the corporeo-religious usages which they observed, such as days of the moon, new moons, and the Sabbath,” etc.

116 Nicholas’s interpretations correspond loosely with those given by Glo. ord. (on fullness of time): “That is, after the preceding time was complete. Or: because in that time the gifts of the Spirit were given fully.” Aquinas emphasizes only Nicholas’s second interpretation (4.2): “when the fullness of the time was come, i.e., after the time fixed by God the Father for sending His son had been accomplished.”

117 The qualification “with respect to his body” is Christologically motivated, stemming from the desire to affirm Christ’s full humanity and divinity, and is precipitated by the heretical use of this passage, especially the word ‘made,’ to claim that Jesus was a creature. Thus Victorinus comments: “It matters a great deal, however, whether he said the Son was ‘made’ or made under the Law. It is something different for a son who was already a son to have been sent, especially when he was a begotten son. But now, as he was born of a female, he can be said to have been made, but made to this end: that he be under the Law.” Augustine similarly writes (30.3): “The Apostle said ‘made’ on account of the Son
of God’s assumption of the nature of a created being”; and Bruno comments: “For the one who was uncreated and eternal wished to assume a new creation from a woman.” Aquinas’s interpretation (4.2) speaks against Photinus, Ebion, and Nestorius, like Jerome’s commentary on Gal 1:3.

118 This emphasis on Christ’s willing observance of the Law counteracts the perception that “under” denotes slavery and oppression. Thus Aquinas (4.2): “And in this way one is said to be under the Law if he is oppressed by fear of the Law. But neither Christ nor spiritual men are said to be under the Law in this way.”

119 The distinction between types of sonship, namely, adoptive and natural, is likewise made by Victorinus: “that we might be sons of God, but sons by adoption. We are not sons like the Son himself, but are sons through the Son.” Similarly Augustine (30.6): “He says ‘adoption’ to distinguish our sonship from that of God’s only Son. For we are sons of God by the kind regard of God’s mercy, while he is the Son by nature, since he is what the Father is.” And Aquinas (4.2): “the adoption of sons, i.e., that through the natural Son of God we might be made adopted sons according to grace through Christ.”

120 Nicholas’s language (procedit ab utroque) reflects the Nicene Creed: “who proceeds from the Father and from the Son” (qui ex patre filioque procedit). He therefore interprets this passage to support the filioque and hence also to affirm the Second Council of Lyon (1272–74), where the schism between East and West on this issue seemed finally to have been resolved. Glo. ord. explains (on Spirit): “Whom the Son also sends,” and adds a condensed quotation from Augustine’s Sermons on the Gospel of John (99.6) in support of the procession of the Spirit from both Father and Son. Aquinas likewise here affirms the creedal filioque (4.3): “Even here, when he says, God the Father hath sent the Holy Spirit, mention is made at once of the Son, for he adds, of his Son. Nor does it matter that at times the Holy Spirit is only said to proceed from the Father, for the fact that the Son sends Him shows that He proceeds from Him.” Earlier Haimo had likewise used this passage to support the filioque. “The Holy Spirit is common to both the Father and the Son such that whenever it is sent by the Father it is also sent by the Son,” and thereby affirmed the doctrine that had recently been approved by the local council of Aachen in 809, in condemnation of Adoptionism. See Levy, p. 41.

121 Likewise Haimo: “crying, making us cry”; and Aquinas (4.3): “Crying, i.e., making us cry.”

122 Similarly Augustine comments (31.2): “His use of equivalent words from two languages was not redundant but elegant: it was on account of the whole people, called from both Jews and Gentiles into the unity of faith.” Haimo writes: “Abba, Father, have mercy on me. Abba is Hebrew and Syriac, while Father [pater] is Greek and Latin.” Bruno likewise comments: “crying, that is, making us cry Abba among Jews and Father among Gentiles. Because we are all God’s children,” etc. Aquinas says (4.3): “Abba in Hebrew and Pater in Greek have the same meaning of ‘father.’ And he makes mention of both to show that the grace of the Holy Spirit, as such, is related in a common way to both.”

123 Likewise Glo. ord. comments (on through God): “Through God’s adoption.”

124 Nicholas usually employs the singular, “Law,” to refer to Scripture, but here he must be thinking of the plurality of the various laws in the books of Moses. See Gen 15:2–3 for the inheritance of an adopted son, especially a manumitted slave. Cf. 1 Chr 2:35. The inheritance of all of Israel may be understood in these terms, insofar as God redeemed them from slavery in Egypt.
Similarly Aquinas speaks of the Galatians’ ungratefulness (4.4): “The Apostle here censures the Galatians, who scorned this grace, for being ungrateful for so great a gift.”

Likewise Glo. ord. (on then): “When [you were] unbelievers,” and (on 4:9, again): “as before your conversion.” Aquinas (4.4): “But then indeed, when you were heathens.”

Similarly Glo. ord. (on by nature): “Not by their own nature, but in the opinion of men.” Aquinas (4.4): “not gods, but by the opinion of men.”

Aquinas comments (4.4): “with the worship of latria,” perhaps thinking of the distinction made in the Seventh Ecumenical Council between the reverence due to icons and the worship (latreia) due to God alone.

Nicholas’s interpretation here seems to reply to the question that Aquinas raises (4.4): “after you are known by God, seem to cause a difficulty, for God has known all things from eternity. . . . I answer that this is said causally, so that the sense is: you are known by God, i.e., God has caused you to know Him. . . . we cannot know God of ourselves save by Him: ‘No man hath seen God at any time: the only begotten Son, Who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared him.’”

For this distinction between the sacraments of the Old and New Law, see Aquinas’s words above, in note 53, on 2:16. Glo. ord., in agreement with Jerome, likewise identifies these “elements” as the “Initial Law that prescribed the worship of God.” Aquinas says (4.4): “how turn you from the faith to the elements, i.e., to the literal observance of the Law? It is called an element, because the Law was the prime institution of divine worship. To elements, I say, that are weak, because they do not bring to perfection by justifying: ‘For the law brought nothing to perfection’ [Heb 7:19], and needy, because they do not confer virtues and grace, or offer any help of themselves.” Jerome, by contrast, seems to have asserted that the Law was not always weak and needy: “before the gospel of Christ flashed throughout the whole world, the commands of the law had their own radiance.” Cf. notes 114–15 above, on Gal 4:3.

Idolatry is here, in a way, equated with slavery to the Law. Cf. Victorinus, who finds it difficult to discern whether Paul is speaking of the Law of Moses or adding the charge that the Galatians have also fallen back into idolatry. Augustine writes (34.5): “They, too, are enslaved to times, to which you also desire to be enslaved again and to join them in observing days, months, years, and times—things to which you were enslaved even before you came to believe in Christ.” And Glo. ord. on Gal 5:1 (on do not again): “This slavery is not lighter than idolatry.”

Much of the same information concerning Jewish observances is provided in Jerome’s commentary, but Nicholas’s text is much closer to Aquinas (4.4): “You observe the days of the Jewish rite, namely, Sabbaths and the tenth day of the month and such things, which are mentioned in a Gloss, and months, i.e., new moons, as the first and seventh month, as is had in Leviticus [25], and times, namely, of the exodus from Egypt, and the practice of going to Jerusalem three times a year, and years of jubilee and the seventh year of remission.”

Likewise Glo. ord. (on without cause): “Without usefulness, which it is, if you receive the Law fully.”

Thus Glo. ord. (on be just as I): “I who dismissed the Law”; (because I also): “was once in the Law”; (just as you): “now want to be, and I abandoned it with good reason.”

Nicholas conflates the different interpretations of “Be as even I am” that Aquinas provides, drawing from different interpretations in Glo. ord. (4.4): “Be ye as I. In a Gloss
this is taken in three ways. In the first way, thus: Be ye as I, namely, abandon the Law as I have abandoned it. In a second way, thus: Be ye as I, namely, correcting the old error, as I have corrected mine. And this you can do, because I am as you, and yet I have been corrected of my error. In the third way, thus: Be ye as I, i.e., live without the Law, because I, who had the Law and was born in the Law, am now as you formerly were, namely, without the Law.” The difficulty of understanding seems to concern to what time the verbless clauses should pertain.

136 Aquinas uses the same illustration, based on the tropological interpretation of the Good Samaritan (4.5): “it is customary for a good pastor in correcting his subjects to mingle gentleness with severity, lest they be discouraged by too great severity. For it is written in Luke [10] that the Samaritan in caring for the wounded man poured in oil and wine.”

137 Likewise Glo. ord. interprets this to pertain to Paul’s bodily afflictions through persecution (on infirmity): “Since this manifested his persecution,” and (on flesh): “Because my flesh had been afflicted.” Cf. Jerome: “through weakness of the flesh. He does not mean his own flesh but that of the hearers. . . . you did not spurn your temptation in my flesh. This is an obscure passage . . . we might suppose that the apostle was sick when he first came to the Galatians and had not ceased being in the grip of some bodily infirmity. . . . For tradition records that he often suffered from severe headaches,” etc.

138 Bruno likewise contrasts hatred and love: “you have done me no harm in anything. Why would I hate you so much that I might feel obliged to conceal the truth?” and on verse 14: “you received me as an angel of God and just as Jesus Christ. Since no hatred emerges from this but instead much reason for love, anyone who suspects me of being your enemy is mistaken.” Thus, according to Aquinas’s structural analysis (4.5): “First he shows that he has no reason for hating them; secondly, that contrariwise he has reason for loving them.”

139 The obscurity of the phrase iam pridem seems to precipitate this gloss. Thus Aquinas (4.5): “heretofore, i.e., in times past.”

140 Nicholas’s interpretation of temptation as “trial” (experientia) may stem from Jas 1:13 (“God tempts no man”) and the ambiguity concerning the source of the temptation. For such a distinction see, e.g., Augustine, Sermo 57.9. Ambrosiaster does not specify the source of the trial: “The apostle’s wounds were a test for the Galatians, and they had come out of it strong, not doubting their faith.” Bruno, like Nicholas, redefines temptation to mean a “trial” from God: “test in my flesh. In my infirmity God was putting you to the test as though to say, ‘If they forsake Paul’s infirmity, they are guilty. If they accept it with kindness, they are worthy.’” Glo. ord., however, considers the devil to be the tempter (on temptation): “That is, me, because I was persecuted, through which the devil was tempting you not to believe.” Aquinas’s interpretation is the same as Nicholas’s both for Paul’s “weakness,” as (4.5): “the many tribulations I suffered from the Jews who are of my flesh and persecuted me,” and for the Galatians’ temptation: “And although this infirmity might have been reason for scorning me and a cause of temptation for you, according to Zachariah [13:7]: ‘Strike the shepherd and the sheep will be scattered,’ nevertheless, your temptation, which was in my flesh, i.e., my tribulation, which was a source of temptation for you, you despised not.” By contrast Victorinus interprets the Galatians to be those who were doing the testing.

141 If by “hyperbolically,” Nicholas is referring to “angel” (as the text seems to read) and not to “Christ Jesus,” then he must understand “angel” here in the limited sense of
those creatures of pure form. Victorinus by contrast explains that an angel means “a mes-
senger, a preacher sent by God.” Similarly Aquinas (4.5): “preachers are called angels.” Cf. 
note 99 above, on 3:19.

142 Likewise Glo. ord. (on be done): “It cannot be done, because it cannot be done 
justly.” Aquinas (4.5): “if it could be done, i.e., had been just to do so (for that can be done 
which it is just to do) or had been to the advantage of the Church.”

143 This condenses a lengthy rationale of why the person who is corrected should love his 
corrector, who runs the risk of incurring hatred, as Aquinas explains, citing Prv 28:23 and 9:9 
(4.5): “I tell you the truth, can be taken as an indication of hatred, even though telling the 
truth at the proper time and place is a sign of love. . . . For at first, when men are corrected, 
they are attached to their sins—that is why a sinner’s first reaction is to hate the one correcting 
him; but after the correction he puts aside his attachment to sin and loves the one correcting 
him.” Victorinus also expands Paul’s condensed argument, providing a different rationale: 
“why have I become an enemy to you? For an enemy ought to be someone who, when 
asked what is true, teaches what is false. Whereas because I spoke what is true (for one who 
proclaims Christ speaks what is true), it is unlikely that I would have become your enemy.”

144 Likewise Victorinus: “emulation means imitation,” and Augustine (37.8): “imitate 
them.” Implicit here is the self-interest and advantage of the false apostles, which Aquinas 
likewise associates with harm to the Galatians (4.5): “They wanted to keep the Apostle 
away from them as one opposed to their own advantage—and secondly, because this was 
a source of harm to the Gentiles—for they sought from them an advantage by which the 
latter would suffer harm; for these reasons he says, They are zealous in your regard but not 
well, because they are not interested in your welfare.”

145 Similarly Victorinus: “whom I long with great labour and great pangs of my soul 
to be reborn to life and to salvation.”

146 Likewise other expositors presume that Paul would speak more harshly were he 
present. Therefore Victorinus writes: “If only I were with you now, I would take action! 
For this is what change my tone means. Not a change by which I would proclaim the gospel 
differently, but that I would express myself in anger.” Jerome comments: “change my coax-
ing voice to words of scolding.” And Ambrosiaster: “Paul wants to go to them and rebuke 
him. He wants to change his voice from praise to criticism.” Likewise Augustine (39.1–2): 
“When he called them ‘sons’ he was sparing them in a letter out of concern that if they 
were upset by a more severe rebuke, they might be induced to hate him . . . change my 
tone—that is, could deny that you are sons—for I am ashamed of you.” Thus also Bruno: 
“change my tone. For if I now call you little children, were I present I would call you, 
among other insults, strangers who detract from God. Although Paul would say such things 
were he present, he still did not want to write that in the Epistle because he knew that the 
Epistle itself was going to last for a long time to come.” Similarly Glo. ord. (on change my 
tone): “To vituperation, so that I might tell you what words you deserve, which I do not 
wish to write, lest they remain among you.” And Aquinas, relating this to 2 Corinthians 
10:10, comments (4.6): “change my voice. As if to say: I use gentle language now, calling 
you friends and sons, in my absence; but if I were present among you, I would correct you 
more sharply. For if I were present and speaking the things I am now writing in a letter, 
the correction would be more severe; because I would then be able to express the scolding 
tones of my rebuke and the cries of my anger and the pain in my heart, much better than 
I can convey them by letter.”
Similarly Glo. ord. considers the opinion of other Christians (on I am perplexed): “I blush before others because of you,” with which Aquinas agrees (4.6): “I am ashamed for you, i.e., I blush for you in the presence of others.”

Nicholas is probably referring here to the Jewish use of the word “Torah.”

Likewise Glo. ord. (on have you not read the Law?): “You read it, but you did not understand it.”

Other writers likewise explain why Paul says “two” here. Augustine (40.2): “Those he fathered by another wife after Sarah’s death are irrelevant to what is being signified here.” Bruno writes: “two sons. Actually, Abraham had many sons, but these two were a suitable symbol for faith and law.” Thus Glo. ord. (referring to Augustine’s commentary on Gal 40.2): “He had more, for after the death of Sarah, he begat others by another wife, namely Keturah, but they are irrelevant to the meaning here.” This Gloss is also quoted by Lombard on 4:22. Likewise Aquinas comments (4.7): “In fact he had more than two, because after Sarah’s death, he fathered other sons of Keturah, as is stated in Genesis [25]. But the Apostle does not mention them because they have no role in the allegory.”

This contrast therefore does not deny the natural the conception and birth of each, but that the latter occurred miraculously. Ambrosiaster comments: “Ishmael . . . was born in the normal way. Isaac, however, was not born in the normal manner, but providentially by the power of God, since Sarah was both old and infertile.” Augustine explained this contrast and miracle in view of what physicians say is naturally possible through the sexual relations of an old man with a young and old woman respectively (see Quaestionum in heptateuchum libri septem, book 1, q. 35), and writes (40.7): “Isaac was born miraculously through the promise, since both his parents had grown old.” Thus Glo. ord. comments (on promise): “He was born miraculously.” Bruno contrasted Hagar and Sarah: “Hagar was a young and fertile woman . . . Sarah was an old and sterile woman.” Nicholas’s words seem to correspond with the two potential misunderstandings that Aquinas preempts (4.7): “The first is lest we understand born according to the flesh as though “flesh” refers here to an act of sin . . . as though Abraham sinned in begetting Ishmael. The other is lest we suppose, when it is said, by promise, that Isaac was not born according to the flesh, i.e., through a carnal union, but by the Holy Spirit.” Perhaps Aquinas was speaking against the interpretation of Victorinus: “Since the two of them were joined when his seed, and even her womb, had lost vitality, it could no longer be from the flesh but only from the spirit that they procreated the son they had.” Nicholas follows Aquinas’s teaching that the miracle of the promise is fulfilled in a natural way, yet goes “beyond the nature of the flesh: for the nature of the flesh cannot achieve that a son be born of an old man and a barren old woman, as Sarah was.” Aquinas’s words closely resemble those of Haimo, who attributes them to Augustine.

Aquinas likewise gives an excursus here on the four senses of Scripture and divides them into two groups (4.7): “For that signification by which the words signify something pertains to the literal or historical sense. But the signification whereby the things signified by the words further signify other things pertains to the mystical sense.”

Many scholars have supposed that these verses originated with Nicholas, who uses it not only here but also in his prologues to the Postilla. Henri de Lubac, however, notes that this couplet was quoted “as early as the year 1286,” by John of Genoa in his Summa quae vocatur Catholicon, and he traces its origin to Augustine of Dacia’s Rotulus Pugillaris, “a work of fifteen chapters, around [AD] 1260.” See his Medieval Exegesis (trans. Sebanc), 1:1. Likewise The Bible in Medieval Tradition, ed. Levy, p. 252.
Likewise Glo. ord. (on mountain): “The Old Testament was given on this mountain.”

See Nicholas’s comment above, on 3:10.

Technically, according to Nicholas’s comment on 4:24, the allegorical Jerusalem is specifically the militant Church (on earth, not yet in heaven), which explains why he next understands the birth as taking place sacramentally, i.e., through living believers. Victorinus by contrast takes “Jerusalem above” anagogically (according to Nicholas’s definitions), to mean: “in heaven. This is what he says: but the Jerusalem on high, the Jerusalem above the heavens, in no way serves, because she is not in the world. For whatever is in the world serves. Therefore, this Jerusalem, along with her peoples, is free. He says that this Jerusalem is the mother of all of us,” etc.

Haimo likewise emphasizes the sacramental causes of spiritual birth (on 4:31): “children of the Gospel through baptism and the gifts of the Holy Spirit. We have received these gifts as much in baptism as in the laying on of the bishop’s hands, as well as through the communion of the Lord’s body and blood in which we participate.” Cf. Ambrosiaster, on 4:19: “Paul had originally given birth to them by faith in baptism,” etc.

Nicholas’s identification of the “barren woman” with the Church of the Gentiles and of “her who had a husband” with the synagogue agrees with Victorinus: “when he spoke of many children of the desolate woman, he has made reference to the Church . . . the woman who has a husband stands for the Law and the Church of the Jews.” Jerome: “The synagogue had a husband, the law . . . but the Church, while she was in the desert, was barren.” Likewise from Glo. ord. (on Rejoice): “Chrysostom: Who is sterile and abandoned? Is it not obvious that this is the Church from the Gentiles, which had previously been without the knowledge of God? But who is she who has a husband? Does it not follow that this is the Synagogue?” By contrast, Ambrosiaster (also quoted in Glo. ord.) identifies her with the heavenly Jerusalem: “He calls the heavenly Jerusalem, which he says is our mother, infertile, because she does not give birth according to the flesh nor does she suffer the pains of childbirth. Instead, she gives birth without suffering, in a spiritual way, and rejoices.” Augustine likewise writes (40.9): “the heavenly Jerusalem, which Scripture calls barren because for a long time she did not bear sons on earth.” Haimo gives a twofold interpretation, first commenting: “The prophet [Isaiah] is speaking to the Church of the Gentiles who for so long remained barren of good deeds. It failed to generate any children for God from the time of the destruction of the Tower of Babel, which is now in Babylon, until the coming of the Lord. . . . The synagogue once had almighty God as her true protector,” etc., but adding: “Let us speak in still more lofty tones, in keeping with Saint Augustine, and thus refer those things to the Church that already reigns with Christ in heaven and yet is called barren. It is not called such for lack of good deeds and praise of its Creator but rather for lack of fleshly propagation.” Although this seems to interpret children to mean “good deeds,” he adds: “More children of the once-forsaken Gentiles will come to you than from the synagogue that formerly had almighty God as husband.” Aquinas likewise identifies the barren woman with both the Church on earth and in heaven, but in keeping with the previous verse he understands the “fruit” to signify the believers themselves (or their entry into the kingdom of heaven), not their good works (4.8). Nicholas’s comment “sterile of good works” should therefore be understood to include “not producing children of God.”

Nicholas for the first time here explicitly affirms his consultation of “catholic
expositors,” whom I assume he has been using throughout his Postilla. That the “catholic expositors” generally explain the “playing” in terms of bodily persecution, however, is hardly the case. Bruno does comment that: “Ishmael, being the firstborn, used to beat Isaac,” etc. Haimo, however, relates a number of different Jewish interpretations in his commentary (see Levy’s edition, p. 115). Glo. ord. on this passage, which Lombard quotes at length in his Collectanea on 4:25, emphasizes deception, not physical harm (on persecuted): “I do not think that we can easily find where Ishmael had persecuted Isaac, except for when the son of the Egyptian was playing with Isaac, and Sarah was offended [see Jerome’s commentary on 4:29–31]. Augustine [see In Johannis evangelium tractatus 12.4]: For Sarah understood the playing as a persecution, because the playing of the elder with the younger is an illusion and a deception, because he pretends one thing while intending another, that is, by playing with the boy he deceives him. Thus, even more so today, people who seduce by playing are persecuting. And just as Sarah understood that game, so now the Church understands this game as a persecution.” Aquinas comments similarly, but includes the Jewish association of playing with idolatry (4.9): “I answer that the Apostle calls this playing a persecution, because there is deception when an older person plays with a younger one; since the older person, in playing with the younger, intends to deceive him. Or, as some say, Ishmael compelled Isaac to adore the clay images he fashioned. By this he was teaching him to be turned from the worship of the one God; and this was a considerable persecution, since it is a greater evil to cause spiritual death than bodily. Furthermore, in Genesis this is called a game because he did this under the guise of a game.” Pertinent to this discussion are the commentaries on Gen 21:9. There Glo. ord. cites the Liber quaestionum hebraicarum in Genesim of Jerome, who is himself referring to Hebrew expositors (on When Sarah saw): “Jerome: This is explained in two ways: either because he played with idols, as in Exodus 32, ‘the people sat to eat and drink and rose up to play,’ etc., Or: because, in his sporting and playing, [Ishmael] was asserting the right of the firstborn, which Sarah could not bear to hear.” Nicholas comments on Gen 21:9: “For some say that Ishmael, who was older and stronger, by wrestling with Isaac and playing with him in other ways, was hurting him, which displeased Sarah, because of which she wanted Ishmael to be cast out. But this explanation comes from the manner of our translation, namely, that our text includes everything in the words: ‘playing with Isaac her son,’ but in the Hebrew there is only ‘playing,’ and what follows is not in the text. Therefore the Hebrews explain it differently. For where we have ‘playing,’ the Hebrews have MZHL, and this is an equivocal word in Hebrew, because it means ‘playing,’ ‘idolatrizing,’ ‘falling,’ and ‘going into’ or ‘fornicating.’ [he gives examples] . . . and our translator seems to have been ignorant of this equivocation, or did not think much of it, because everywhere it is translated with one meaning, namely, that it denotes a game. The Hebrews therefore say that this word MZHL is understood to have a threefold meaning, because Sarah saw Ishmael doing things that pertained to Idolatry. Likewise she perceived that he was subtly trying to kill Isaac, to get his inheritance, whereby also the Apostle in Galatians 4 says that ‘He who was according to the flesh,’ that is, Ishmael, ‘was persecuting him who was then according to the Spirit,’ namely, Isaac. Likewise she perceived that he was prone to luxury [that is, lust], and fearing that he would lead her son Isaac to similar things, she reported these things to Abraham and asked him to cast out Ishmael.” Nicholas doubtless depends on Rashi, who quotes the Rabbah (53:11). The same three definitions for “play” in Nichola’s Genesis commentary may be found in Rashi. For Rashi, see Rosenberg, Genesis, Volume I, p. 246, and for the Rabbah, see Neusner, Genesis Rabbah, p. 253, “Parashah Fifty-Three.”
See Nicholas’s distinctions in verse 24 and comment on verse 26. Other writers do not define the “heavenly Jerusalem” so specifically to be the militant Church, but variously also as the triumphant Church, or the church in general. Thus Glo. ord. (on free woman): “Namely, the heavenly Jerusalem,” and again (on Throw out): “Ambrose: These are the words of Sarah, who provides a type of the heavenly Jerusalem, bringing forth Isaac out of the promise, so that—one once the son of the slave-girl has been cast out, that is, the Jewish people has been thrown out (for they are slaves of sin, to whom the remission of sins has not been given) —the heir may be the son of the free woman, that Jerusalem above, which is the new people of the Kingdom of Heaven.”

“Civil death,” (mors civilis) is a legal term referring to the status of someone who is treated legally as if they were dead, making them unable to buy or own property, etc. On this topic, see Borgmann, “Mors civilis.”

Likewise other expositors explain that Paul does not mean that anyone is truly justified by the Law, e.g., Victorinus: “If you believe yourselves to be justified from that, you have been cut off from grace”; Bruno: “that is, you who seek righteousness through the law;” Glo. ord. (on you who are justified): “you who believe you are justified”; and Aquinas (5.1): “justified in the law, i.e., who believe that you are justified.”

This seems to conflate two or three out of the four interpretations that Aquinas provides in his commentary (5.2): “i.e., for justice and hope, namely, eternal happiness. . . . Or: Christ, by Whom we have a hope of righteousness, because we are justified by Him. . . . Or: the things we hope for, and unto which righteousness tends, namely, eternal life.” Bruno comments similarly: “hope of righteousness, referring to the beatitude that is hoped for by way of righteousness.”

From this verse comes the formula fides caritate formata, “faith formed by love,” found above in 3:12 and 3:26. With this in mind, Aquinas likewise cites Jas 2:17: “but faith, not unformed, but the kind that worketh by charity: ‘Faith without works is dead.’ For faith is a knowledge of the word of God—‘That Christ may dwell by faith in your hearts’—which word is not perfectly possessed or perfectly known unless the love which it hopes for is possessed.” Concerning the relation between works and grace, see ST, IaIIae, q. 108, a. 1, co.: “Accordingly external acts may have a twofold connection with grace. In the first place, as leading in some way to grace. Such are the sacramental acts which are instituted in the New Law, e.g., baptism, the Eucharist, and the like. In the second place, there are those external acts which ensue from the promptings of grace.” The latter category of works or acts therefore proceed from a faith that is active, as Bruno writes: “faith alone that would not remain idle. For faith works not obstinately but through love of God and neighbor.” Likewise Glo. ord. comments (on but faith): “which is not idle.” Such works that proceed from faith, however, should not be equated with the love (caritas) that
motivates them, as Aquinas reveals in his comment on the next verse (5.2): “You did run well, namely, by means of the works of faith formed by love, which incites one to run: ‘I have run the way of thy commandments, when thou didst enlarge my heart.’” Thus the love that forms faith is what drives the believers to do good works. Lombard (Sentences, I, d. 17, ch. 1) divides love and works so far as to identify caritas with the Holy Spirit himself: “The very same Holy Spirit is the love or charity by which we love God and neighbor,” although subsequent theologians found this objectionable (see Rosemann, The Story of a Great Medieval Book, pp. 30–31, 51). Aquinas distinguishes the Holy Spirit from our love for God (see Super Sent., I, d. 17, q. 2, pr.) and affirms that a believer’s love is created by God (ibid., I, d. 17, q. 1, a. 1, s. c. 1): “In the soul that holds the Holy Spirit, there is some kind of created charity.” Cf. Nicholas’s comments on Apoc. 3:18 (Krey ed., p. 63): “Love is the very same as grace, or in inseparably annexed to it and is not purchased through works.”

166 Cf. Nicholas’s comment above, on 3:1.

167 Similarly Glo. ord. comments (on not from him): “namely, God, but from the devil.” Aquinas (5.2): “not from him, i.e., from God who calleth you to life, but from the devil.” This supernatural understanding contrasts with Jerome: “this persuasion that we now follow is not from God, who called you in the beginning, but from those who have caused trouble for you afterward.”

168 Likewise Glo. ord. (on the entire lump): “the congregation of the Church of the faithful”, and Aquinas (5.2): “the whole lump, i.e., the congregation of the faithful.”

169 Similarly Jerome comments: “Perverse teaching begins with one person and finds scarcely two or three hearers at the beginning. But gradually the cancer grows.”

170 Likewise Glo. ord. (on the Lord): “with God’s help.” Similarly Aquinas (5.2): “He removes the obstacle on the part of God Who offers His help to this end.” Thus God’s help pertains to the correction of the Gentiles, not Paul’s certainty. Cf. Jerome: “I have confidence in you, but now he adds in the Lord, since he is confident by means of some kind of divine spirit, because he knew that he has prophesied what will happen.”

171 Similarly Glo. ord. (on nothing else): “than what I taught”; and Aquinas (5.2): “of another mind than what I taught you.”

172 Clarification is necessary because judgment is technically a neutral term that can denote vindication (especially in the Psalms) or condemnation (e.g., Rom 13:2, 1 Cor 11:29). Thus Bruno comments: “will bear the judgment, that is, will incur condemnation,” Glo. ord. (on he will bear): “he will meet with damnation”; and Aquinas (5.2): “bear the judgment, i.e., he will undergo condemnation.”

173 The same argument is supplied in Glo. ord. (on why): “I am not suffering at the hands of the Jews for any other reason.” Likewise Aquinas (5.2): “For the Jews persecuted Paul precisely because he taught that the legal ceremonies should not be observed . . . otherwise, he would not have suffered their persecutions.”

174 Likewise Jerome writes: “For I do not suffer persecution from the Jews so much because I preach the crucified and say that Jesus is the Christ, whom the law and the prophets predicted, as because I teach that the law has been completed.” Ambrosiaster comments similarly: “If Paul had accepted circumcision, there would have been no scandal, and we would have lived in peace with the Jews.” Thus Augustine (42.15): “If in fact he was preaching circumcision, they would have stopped persecuting him.” Bruno comments: “Jews were scandalized because I was preaching that human beings are justified through the cross alone. Yet if I were to mix circumcision with the cross and say that people are justified
by both, then these Jews would be very pleased with me.” *Glo. ord.* explains (on removed):
“The Jews are not angered by the cross, if I affirm that circumcision justifies.” Likewise Aquinas (5.2): “the main reason why they are scandalized is because we preach that through the cross of Christ the legal ceremonies are made void. Therefore, if I preach circumcision, the stumbling-block is removed, i.e., there will no longer be a stumbling-block for the Jews from the cross.”

175 Nicholas’s interpretation seems somewhat sanitized in relation to other expositors. Victorinus expounds this as a double entendre: “May they be cut off, he says, from the truth of the gospel; may they be separated from themselves, or by tormented by punishments. . . . Let them not only be snipped around, but let them also get it cut off.” Jerome understands this quite literally to refer to self-castration, and there is some serious concern over the propriety of such a curse, yet he adds the more charitable explanation, “that Paul has not so much cursed them as prayed for them, that they might lose those parts of the body through which they were being compelled to transgress.” Ambrosiaster interprets this in two ways, as “cut off from the mercy of God” and “not only spiritually but also in the flesh. Because they forced the Galatians to be circumcised, they themselves would be cut off, so that the pain of their body might be increased.” Augustine follows Jerome in understanding it as both curse and blessing (42.20): “Not merely ‘circumcise,’ he said, but castrate themselves. For thus they will become eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of heaven and cease to sow carnal seed.” Aquinas also comments (5.2): “As if to say: They trouble you on one matter, namely, they want you to be circumcised; but I would that they be not only circumcised but wholly emasculated.” This, however, he interprets spiritually: “wishing them to be emasculated spiritually, i.e., abolish the legal ceremonies, that they might preserve spiritual chastity,” or: “wishing them the impotence that eunuchs have . . . that they lose the power of engendering among you and others. And this deservedly, because they engender sons unto error and subject them to the bondage of the Law.” In this he agrees with Bruno: “wholly cut off, that is, not only in their foreskin. Paul does not mean that any of their body parts actually should be cut off. Yet just as severed testicles cannot procreate, so may these people be cut off lest they beget anyone in their own error.”

176 In other words, as modern-day ornithologists also observe, if wild birds are caged, they refuse to eat, and Nicholas attributes this to their desire for freedom.

177 Thus Jerome: “Let us not imagine that everything is permitted to us, that everything is expedient”; Augustine (43.7): “Do not think you may sin with impunity because you heard the word *freedom*”; and Aquinas (5.3): “As if to say: you are free, but not so as to misuse your liberty by supposing that you may sin with impunity.”

178 Cf. Rom 13:9 and Jas 2:8. For the “law of love,” see Jesus’s words in Mt 22:37–39, Mk 12:30–31, and Lk 10:27 (from Dt 6:5 and Lv 18:19). Like Nicholas, *Glo. ord.* comments (on in one saying): “That is, in the one commandment of love,” and recognizes that this is only half of the law, by adding “without which God is not loved either.” Aquinas likewise answers this difficulty (5.3): “However, it is said in Matthew [22:40]: ‘On these two commandments, namely, of the love of God and of neighbor, dependeth the whole law and the prophets.’ Therefore, it is not fulfilled in the one precept alone. I answer that in the love of God is included love of neighbor: ‘This commandment we have from God, that he, who loveth God, love also his brother’ [1 Jn 4:21]. Conversely, we love our neighbor for the love of God. Consequently, the whole law is fulfilled in the one precept of charity.” Thus Augustine explains (45.3–4): “it follow that a person who loves God with all his heart,
all his soul, and all his mind, also loves his neighbor as himself. . . . Similarly, who can love his neighbor—that is, everyone—as himself, if he does not love God, by whose command and gift he is able to fulfill the love of neighbor?

179 With the words “in order,” Nicholas refers to the “order of charity,” a theological commonplace; and with “for the pursuit of the same beatitude,” he means the final end of that charity, namely, God. Cf. his comment on 6:10. Aquinas likewise refers here to this order (5.3): “According to the order of charity a man should love himself more than his neighbor,” and the goal of charity: “as referring to order, i.e., that just as you love yourself for the sake of God, so you love your neighbor for the sake of God, namely, that he may attain to God.” For more on the order of charity, see esp. Lombard, Sentences, III, d. 29, and Aquinas, ST, IIaIIae, q. 26.

180 This seems to be an expansion of the short Glo. ord. (on do not perform): “in action,” in defense of the venial nature of the sins of illicit desires, when they are not acted upon. Likewise Bruno: “do not perform them in your actions.”

Nicholas’s assertion that spirit can mean “mind” or “reason” is implied in the previous verse. In this he follows an ambiguity of interpretation, which is reflected in other expositors, including Haimo: “Some claim that the Apostle spoke here about the spirit of a human being, as so wise a man as Cassian says in his Collations of the Fathers. Others, such as Saint Augustine, say he is referring to the Holy Spirit. In fact, both opinions are perfectly suitable, and either one can be accepted without violating the true faith.” Bruno: “by the spirit, meaning that you should accomplish this by working well in accordance with what the Spirit exhorts you to do. To do so is itself in keeping with reason.” Glo. ord. (on Spirit): “reason that is assisted by the grace of God.” Aquinas comments (5.4): “walk in the spirit, i.e., in the mind and reason. For sometimes our mind is called a spirit, according to Ephesians [4:23]: “Be renewed in the spirit of your mind.” But he recognizes the ambiguity by adding: “Or, walk in the spirit, i.e., make progress in the Holy Spirit, by acting well. For the Holy Spirit moves and incites hearts . . . the human reason cannot stand perfectly except to the extent that it is governed by a divine spirit.” Nicholas should therefore not be understood to mean reason or rationality alone here, but the enlightened reason of those who believe in Christ. The ambiguity of interpretation is thus limited to “Holy Spirit” or “reason assisted by grace or the Holy Spirit.” Cf. Nicolas’s comment on 5:25.

182 Here Nicholas specifies that “spirit” means “Holy Spirit,” in agreement with Jerome: “He is not signifying the spirit of man who is in him, but the Holy Spirit, by following whom we become spiritual and cease being under the law.”

183 Luxury (luxuria) is often translated “lust” where it occurs in the list of deadly sins, but its semantic range is broader than the English word suggests to most hearers. My translation, “luxury,” must therefore be taken in a technical sense of “sensuality and lasciviousness,” as pertaining to all illicit desires and acts of the flesh.

184 Aquinas gives a similar definition (5.5): “fornication, when an unmarried man becomes one with an unmarried woman with respect to the natural use of lust.”

185 Similarly Glo. ord. comments (on uncleanness): “what is contrary to nature.” Cf. the Glo. ord. on 2 Cor 12:21 (on uncleanness): “luxury against nature.” A certain verucundity enshrouds the subject. Thus Jerome comments: “It is very shameful even to name these things, lest even the mouth of the speaker and the ears of the hearers be defiled.” Nicholas assumes that his readers understand the scholastic definition of “vice against nature,” which he seems to equate with “uncleanness.” Technically, however, the vice against nature is a
broader category, of which uncleanness is only a part. Thus Aquinas says (5.5): “unclean-
ness as to a use which is contrary to nature.” See also ST, IaIIae, q. 154, a. 11, where he
defines the vice against nature as pertaining to “the [venereal] acts from which reproduction
cannot follow.” One form of this is committed “by procuring pollution, without any copu-
lation, for the sake of venereal pleasure: this pertains to the sin of uncleanness which some
call effeminacy.” He goes on to explain that other forms of the vice against nature include
bestiality, homosexuality, etc. The vice against nature therefore would also concern the use
of contraceptives, while uncleanness pertains specifically to masturbation.

186 The connection between sorcery and illicit desire is also made by Jerome: “For
often it is through magical arts that it comes to pass that pitiful people both fall in love
and are loved”; and Haimo: “Sorceries are evil doings, that is, malevolent schemes through
which the unfortunate victims are often induced to love someone or else become the object
of love.”

187 I refer here to the numbering in the English Bible. In the Vulgate (Gallican Psalm),
this is Ps 57:6.

188 Bruno likewise comments: “factions, which are called ‘heresies’ in Greek.” Sim-
ilarly Glo. ord. (on dissensions): “when they make factions in the Church” and (on divi-
sions) “[called] ‘heresies’ in Greek.” In Nicholas’s day, some “Spirituals,” such as the “Poor
Hermits” under the leadership of Pietro da Macerata (d. 1305), had separated themselves
from the rest of the Franciscan community and rejected Boniface VIII as pope.

189 Literally this reads “for the sake of prolixity.”

190 By this, Nicholas could mean an unreasonable amount of drink, or that the man
who drinks becomes irrational. Following Aquinas, the latter seems more likely. Cf. Aqui-
nas’s comments on Rom 13:13 (Super Rom., ch. 13 lecture 3): “drunkenness, which per-
tains to the overabundance of drink that puts man outside of the measure of his reason,”
and on Ti 2:12 (Super Tit., ch. 2 lecture 3): “Soberly with respect to himself, as if to say
‘moderately,’ for ‘bria’ is a measure, and this happens if a man makes use of external things
and his own passions with a measure of reason.”

191 Similarly Glo. ord. comments (on I preach): “before the Judgment, while it is still
possible to repent.”

192 This teaching, a form of universalism called apokatastasis, was allegedly taught by
Origen (modern scholarship tends to dispute this claim) and was often condemned by
catholic writers, such as Augustine (e.g., De Civitate Dei, 21.17). Jerome here seems to
support this teaching in his comment “no rational creature perishes forever with God.”

193 Similarly Aquinas (ST, IaIIae, q. 70, a. 1, co.): “Now fruit, among material things,
is the product of a plant when it comes to perfection, and has a certain sweetness.”

194 Likewise Aquinas (ST, IaIIae, q. 70, a. 3, co.): “Now the first disposition of the
human mind towards the good is effected by love, which is the first of our emotions and
the root of them all.”

195 Here as elsewhere, though not everywhere, I reluctantly translate caritas as “love,”
aver of the semantic deficiency of the English words “love” and “charity.”

196 Similarly Aquinas, ST, IaIIae, q. 70, a. 3, co.: “The necessary result of the love of
charity is joy: because every lover rejoices at being united to the beloved. Now charity has
always actual presence in God Whom it loves, according to 1 John 4[:16]: ‘He that abideth
in charity, abideth in God, and God in Him.’”

197 On peace, cf. Nicholas’s comment on 1:3 above, in note 8. Nicholas here abridges
Aquinas's words from \textit{ST}, IaIa, q. 70, a. 3, co.: “Now the perfection of joy is peace in two respects. First, as regards freedom from outward disturbance; for it is impossible to rejoice perfectly in the beloved good, if one is disturbed in the enjoyment thereof. . . . Secondly, as regards the calm of the restless desire: for he does not perfectly rejoice, who is not satisfied with the object of his joy. Now peace implies these two things, namely, that we be not disturbed by external things, and that our desires rest altogether in one object. Wherefore after charity and joy, peace is given the third place.” This seems influenced by Jerome's comment: “We should not suppose that peace is only to be sought in this, if we do not quarrel with another; rather the peace of Christ, that is, our inheritance, is ‘among’ us if a tranquil mind is undisturbed by any passions.”

198 Nicholas derives this and his remaining comments on the fruits of the Spirit from Aquinas, \textit{ST}, IaIa, q. 70, a. 3, co.: “In evil things the mind has a good disposition, in respect of two things. First, by not being disturbed whenever evil threatens: which pertains to \textit{patience}; secondly, by not being disturbed, whenever good things are delayed; which belongs to \textit{longsuffering}, for ‘to lack good is a kind of evil,’ as it is said in \textit{Ethics v},” etc.

On Aquinas's understanding of Aristotle's \textit{Ethics}, see his \textit{Commentary on the Nichomachean Ethics}, book 5, lectures 5 and 10, where he comments on \textit{Ethics} 5.3 and 5.5.

199 Nicholas continues to follow the \textit{Summa} closely here, but cf. also Aquinas's commentary (5.6): “With respect to what is above us, namely, God, the Spirit establishes right order through faith; hence he says \textit{faith}, which is a knowledge of invisible things with certainty: ‘Abraham believed God and it was reputed to him unto righteousness.’”

200 Likewise \textit{Glo. ord.} (on \textit{modesty}): “which keeps due measure in words and deeds.”

201 Nicholas interprets the contrast between these fruits only with respect to the inner desire, not the outward act. Jerome, whose text does not include “chastity,” likewise explains: “Desires still arise in the thoughts of the one who is ‘containing’ himself.” Conversely, \textit{Glo. ord.} says (on \textit{continence}): “which abstains from what is licit,” and (on \textit{chastity}): “when one makes right use of what is licit.” Aquinas offers both options in the \textit{Summa} and in his commentary (5.6): “\textit{continency}, which abstains even from things that are lawful; and \textit{chastity}, which correctly uses what is lawful, as a Gloss says. Or, another way: \textit{continence} refers to the fact that although a man be assailed by base desires, yet by the vigor of his reason he holds fast lest he be carried away . . . but \textit{chastity} is taken from the fact that one is neither attacked nor carried away, and is derived from ‘chastening,’ for we call him well-chastened who is rightly tempered in all things.”

202 Aquinas likewise asserts in the \textit{Summa} (IaIae, q. 70, a. 3, co.) and in his commentary (5.6) that these are the twelve fruits spoken of in Rev 22:2. Ambrosiaster's text, by contrast, like that of Augustine, seems to have included only nine or ten fruits.

203 Aquinas likewise (5.7) exposits this text in light of Jn 6:63.

204 Again, reason should be understood here in the context of faith, with the assistance of grace. Cf. Nicholas's comments above, on 5:17–18.

205 The connection between vainglory and what follows is also made in \textit{Glo. ord.} (on \textit{vainglory}): “Vainglory does these things; leading to court cases and trial and other illicit acts.”

206 Haimo similarly interprets this to pertain to those who sin less grievously and without malice of forethought: “When a person sins suddenly and unexpectedly, one is overtaken in sin because it had not been premeditated. . . . But the person who sins unexpectedly must be rebuked in a different way because the offense was not first premeditated.”
Likewise *Glo. ord.* (on *overtaken*): “as if he is foolishly tripped up, so that he cannot avoid it. And this is no marvel, because he is a man.” Aquinas likewise (6.1): “*overtaken in any fault*, i.e., fall through want of circumspection and because of trickery, so that he could not escape.”

Similarly Ambrosiaster: “They too were capable of sinning”; Augustine (56.4): “For nothing makes people more inclined to be merciful than the thought of their own danger”; Haimo: “because you too are a human being of fragile nature just as they are”; *Glo. ord.* (on *consider yourself*): “that you are also fragile”; and Aquinas (6.1): “As if to say: You should do as I say, because you, too, are weak.”

Likewise Jerome: “What is the *law of Christ*? ‘This is my commandment that you love one another’”; Augustine (58.1): “the *law of Christ*, specifically the law of love.” *Glo. ord.* here likewise comments (on *Law of Christ*): “love,” as does Aquinas (6.1): “the *law of Christ*, i.e., charity.” For the “Law of love,” see Nicholas’s comments on 5:14 and note 178 above. Paul’s use of “law” in this manner may seem self-contradictory, since our English use of the word tends to have negative semantic associations of “legalism.” Note, however, the “Law of Faith” of Rom 3:27 and the “Law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus” of Rom 8:2. In elucidation of this “Law of love,” which is the same as the “Law of the Gospel,” see, e.g., Aquinas, *ST*, IaIIae, q. 106, and the introduction to *Collationes in decem praeceptis*, in which the old and new “laws” are contrasted.

Aquinas explains this vanity similarly (6.1): “For if any man think himself to be something, i.e., through pride judge in his own mind that he is greater in comparison to a sinner,” and more fully explains Nicholas’s comment “of himself” (6.1): “whereas he is nothing of himself, because whatever we are is from the grace of God,” perhaps influenced in this by Bruno: “they are nothing, since it is really the grace within them that is something.”

Likewise Jerome: “If your conscience does not sting you, you have glory in yourself”; Augustine (59.2): “that is, inwardly in his own conscience and not in another, that is, when another praises him”; Bruno: “*in himself*, that is, before himself in his own conscience”; and Aquinas (6.1): “let everyone prove, i.e., diligently examine . . . and so in himself, i.e., in his own conscience.”

Nicholas’s explanation is a solution to the traditional problem of the harmony of this verse with 6:2, above. Thus, in close resemblance to the commentaries of Victorinus and Jerome, who assert that this burden can be good or bad, Haimo comments: “own burden. These words seem to be contrary to what the Apostle said above: ‘Bear one another’s burdens.’ We must realize, however, that those words pertain to the time of this present life, whereas these pertain to one’s dying day, or to the Day of Judgment generally.” Likewise Aquinas (6.1): “*For every one shall bear his own burden*. But this seems contrary to what he had said earlier, namely, *Bear ye one another’s burdens*. But it should be known that he was speaking there of the burden of supporting weakness, a burden which we ought to carry one for another; but now he is speaking of the burden of rendering an account. This, everyone will carry for himself, whether it be a burden of reward or of punishment. . . . *carry his own burden*, i.e., each the punishment for his own sin.”

This gloss seems necessary because of the unfamiliarity of the word *catechizatur*. Thus Bruno: “*those who are catechized*, that is, those who are instructed”; *Glo. ord.* (on *catechized*): “instructed”; and Aquinas (6.2): “*catechized in the word*, i.e., taught the word of God.”

This reference to Mt 23:3 is also implicit to the comments of Ambrosiaster: “If
the latter teach one thing and do another, there should be no sharing with them.” Glo. ord. similarly comments (on good deeds): “Not in the bad, if he does them; so that you follow the Law, not the man” (ut lex sit tibi dux, non homo). Bruno writes: “Do not try to excuse yourselves by claiming that one must not obey those who teach well with words and yet do not behave accordingly.” Aquinas similarly says (6.2): “in all good things: ‘Whatsoever they shall say to you, observe and do: but according to their words, do ye not’ [Mt 23:3],” but he adds another interpretation, “that he communicate his own goods to the teacher. For this is commanded by the Lord: ‘They who preach the gospel should live by the gospel’ [1 Cor 9:14]; ‘The workman is worthy of his meat’ [Mt 10:10]; ‘The laborer is worthy of his hire’ [Lk 10:7] . . . for even temporal things are called goods.” Jerome interprets this only in the latter manner: “They should supply fleshly things to their teachers,” as does Augustine (60.1): “For it is customary for the one to whom the word of God is preached to supply the needs of the preacher.” Likewise Haimo: “The Apostle advises the listeners and disciples to be zealous in providing worldly goods like food and clothing to their teachers, from whom they receive the word of life and faith. For workers are worthy of their wages.”

214 Aquinas similarly considers such an excuse (6.2): “You say that we ought to imitate them save in the things they do; and the only thing I observe in them is evil. Therefore, I ought to imitate them in evil.” He adds, however, corresponding with his second explanation of all good things, and in close resemblance to Jerome’s commentary (whom Haimo also follows): “They could say: We are poor and have nothing to communicate. But he rejects this, saying, Be not deceived, i.e., think not to excuse yourself in vain, by pretending poverty; God is not mocked, i.e., cannot be deceived, for He knows our hearts and is not unaware of our possessions. A likely excuse may deceive a man and satisfy him; but it cannot deceive God.”

215 Similarly Ambrosiaster: “Nobody doubts that God cannot be fooled”; Bruno: “God is not mocked. God will not be deceived by such a devious ploy”; Glo. ord. (on not mocked): “He cannot be deceived. But from Him each person receives what he deserves”; and Aquinas (6.2): “God is not mocked, i.e., cannot be deceived: ‘Shall he be deceived as a man, with your deceitful dealings?’ [Job 13:9]”

216 Nicholas’s use of “reward” should be understood inclusively, as denoting both reward and punishment, in light of what follows in the rest of the verse, as Aquinas explains (6.2): “He will be rewarded or punished according to his works, be they good or evil, great or small.”

217 Guilt should not be understood here as an emotional affect, but in the sense of an objective culpability that adheres to the perpetrator of sin and results in condemnation at the Last Judgment.

218 On the order of charity, see note 179 above, on 5:14. Unsurprisingly, Aquinas here comments on this order (6.2): “Because we cannot do good to everyone, he presents the order in which it is to be done,” etc. Victorinus had spoken of this as a “gradient, so that the good which we work for all, we would most of all work for those who are the family of faith.”

219 This implies that he composed the rest of the letter by dictation. Likewise Jerome comments: “And to prevent any suspicion from arising that the letter was false, he himself has written it from this point right to the end, which shows that the preceding part was written by someone else.” Glo. ord. gives the same motive (on my own hand): “so that you know that this letter was sent by me, and thereby so that you more readily obey.” Similarly Aquinas writes (6.3): “with my own hand; to the end, namely, that you might
firmly hold to the foregoing, and that knowing this epistle is sent by me, you might obey better."

220 Likewise Jerome: “It is not that the letters themselves were large . . . but that the marks of his own ‘hand’ were known to them.” Bruno interprets this similarly: “by my own hand. For by recognizing my writing you may be sure that this actually is my own epistle.”

221 Similarly Bruno: “to please those Jews”; Glo. ord. (on to please): “the unbelieving Jews”; and Aquinas (6.3): “to please, namely, the unbelieving Jews.”

222 Cf. Nicholas’s comment on 3:3 and note 72 above.

223 Similarly Bruno comments: “so that they may glory before others in your circumcised flesh. The false teachers will say to Jews, ‘Look at the great increase in converts your Law has achieved through our efforts.” Likewise Glo. ord. (on your flesh): “that is, concerning your fleshly circumcision, in which there is pain for you,” and (on be glorified): “among the Jews, because they make so many converts.” Aquinas, in reference to Mt 23:15, writes (6.3): “that in your flesh, i.e., in your fleshly circumcision, they may glory among the Jews for making so many proselytes.”

224 Similarly Jerome: “The world has been crucified to that man for whom the world is dead”; and Glo. ord. (on world): “The sinful desires of the world have no dominion, nor does the world assail me any more; and I am strong against it.”

225 Glo. ord. comments only (on new creature): “that is, rebirth,” in agreement with Ambrosiaster: “Our rebirth is a new creation.” Augustine, by contrast, says (63.5): “The term ‘new creation’ refers to the new life through faith in Jesus Christ.” Slightly differently again, Bruno identifies the new creature as: “the faith that renews the mind and even liberates the flesh from sin,” and Aquinas similarly says (6.4) that this new creature is the faith formed by charity (fides caritate formate—cf. note 165 above, on 5:6), “by which we are reborn into a new life by the Holy Spirit . . . and by the cross of Christ.” Nicholas here again explicitly emphasizes the sacramental means of rebirth, as above, on 4:26, and below, on 6:16.

226 Likewise Jerome comments: “The doctrine of God is, so to speak, like a norm for our words.”

227 Aquinas likewise reminds us here (6.5): “For peace is tranquility of mind.” Cf. Nicholas’s comments, and my notes, on 1:3 and 5:22.

228 Cf. Bruno, who dissociates this mercy from baptism: “mercy, a second forgiveness for those who have lapsed,” Glo. ord. (on mercy): “that is, the forgiveness of sins,” and Aquinas comments (6.5): “mercy, by which we are set free of our sins.”

229 Nicholas mentions these afflictions above, on 4:13–14. Thus Victorinus comments: “This means that I too have suffered.” Jerome explains: “The one who was ‘flogged beyond measure, frequently in prison, was beaten three times with rods, was once stoned,’ and who suffered all the other things that are written in his catalogue of glorying [2 Cor 11:23–28], this is the one who carries the stigmata of the Lord Jesus on his body.” Ambrosiaster comments: “The marks, that is, the scars from his beatings.” Augustine speaks of these scars in terms of the punishment of a slave, that they came (64.4–5) “from the persecutions that he suffered,” and in reference to Acts 9:16 he adds: “For he knew that this was retribution for the offence of persecuting the churches of Christ.” Aquinas speaks similarly, but without reference to Acts (6.5): “The Apostle says he bears the marks of the Lord, branded, as it were, as a slave of Christ; and this, because he bore the marks of Christ’s passion, suffering many tribulations in his body for Him . . . let no man be troublesome to me, for I bear
the marks of Our Lord Jesus Christ in my body; consequently, no one has any right over me except Christ.” Similarly Haimo explains: “The stigmata are those marks of servile punishment by which fugitive slaves are customarily branded when apprehended by their masters. The Apostle was bearing such stigmata, or marks, sustained for Christ’s sake because the scourges of the rods and the lacerations were still apparent upon his body”; and Bruno: “A stigma is said to be a sign that is made with a hot iron. Paul is enduring chains and other torments and bears these stigmata on his body for the sake of Christ.”

230 Nicholas finishes with one final jab at the Law. Similarly Jerome: “not dissension, not servitude to the law, not quarreling, not wrangling, but the grace”; Ambrosiaster: “Paul does not say that it was the grace of the law, but the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ”; and Glo. ord. comments briefly (on grace): “not the Law.”
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