

## A PURITAN'S PERSPECTIVE OF GALATIANS 2:20

By: Adam McClendon

Ph.D. Student in Biblical Spirituality at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

### Introduction

It is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me. And the life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me.<sup>i</sup>

Galatians 2:20 is one of “those” verses, and the Puritans are some of “those” people. They are both difficult to put in neat structured categories and tend to invoke interesting reactions. Galatians 2:20 provides a concise, mysterious, and powerful picture of the Christian life incorporating within one small verse elements related to justification and the spiritual life that flows from one who has been reconciled with God in redemption. The Puritans, on the other hand, were a group of religious non-conformists seeking to remove the lasting elements of Catholicism from the church. As a group, they loosely began in the early to mid 1500’s and were, as a recognized group, essentially over by the late 1600’s.<sup>ii</sup> As Lea aptly admits, “Just as it had a vague beginning it gently slides into obscurity.”<sup>iii</sup>

In light of those observations, the purpose of this article will be to summarize and critique William Bridge’s (1600?-1671) perspective of Galatians 2:20<sup>iv</sup> as presented in a series of five sermons preached over eight weeks in 1648.<sup>v</sup> Before beginning, a couple of qualifications need to be made. Constructing someone’s exegetical thoughts from a sermon is generally a challenge. This work proves to be no exception. Since the Puritans were so keenly focused on application, care must be taken in this reconstruction, because their sermons are not intended to be read as exegetical commentaries. Additionally, this article will seek to focus on those exegetical insights that are granted to the reader verses Bridge’s points of application.<sup>vi</sup>

### Background

#### Bridge’s Background.

William Bridge was born in Cambridgeshire between 1600 and 1601.<sup>vii</sup> He graduated

with his Bachelor's degree from Cambridge in 1623 and his Master's degree in 1626 after which he became a fellow at the college. Though he had been ordained into the Church of England, early on Bridge began to demonstrate signs of contention with some of the sacramental forms and theology of the instituted church, which eventually led to his temporary suspension by Corbet in 1634 for "attacking Arminians and espousing a limited atonement."<sup>viii</sup>

Two years later, 1636, Bridge's nonconformity was brought to full light when he rejected the authority of Matthew Wren, the bishop of Norwich, and was excommunicated. Later that year, Bridge arrived at Rotterdam and renounced his ordination. While there, he was re-ordained by a fellow nonconformist minister and began pastoring a congregation.

In 1641, Bridge returned to England where he preached against Catholicism to the House of Commons. Over the next couple of years, the Puritan's voice of dissention grew only louder. Through sermons and writings relevant to the times, he consistently addressed the social woes facing those whom he was called to minister. His works were applicationally driven and practical ranging from the issues of government to the rights of the people and even discipline in the army.

As the town pastor, in 1643, he established an Independent church at Yarmouth. While serving there as pastor for the next eighteen years, he would tirelessly work with other nonconformists to oppose and reform the Church of England by meeting, writing, lecturing, and preaching. His active ministry in Yarmouth came to an end in 1661 after the "Restoration" of Charles II, after which he took on an Independent church in Clapham in 1663. Though he continued to be outspoken for the rights of nonconformists, through some financial assistance, he was able to return to Yarmouth around the beginning of 1668. His stay this time only lasted a little over a year when the Lord Townshend restricted him from coming within five miles of Yarmouth. Thus, in 1669, Bridge returned to Clapham where he died at the age of seventy on 12 March 1671.

The five specific sermons<sup>ix</sup> that will be examined were preached in 1648 during Bridge's pastorate in Yarmouth and later published in volume three of a three volume set of his

works in 1649. The first four sermons were preached in four successive weeks at Stepney, while sermon five was preached five weeks later at Christ's Church.

### **The Puritan Hermeneutic.**

As a general rule, a consistent hermeneutic in the Puritan's approach to interpreting the scriptures can be seen. Lea is helpful at this point in laying out six interpretative rules that the Puritan pastor tended to follow in preparing his sermon.<sup>x</sup>

1. The Puritan "emphasized the importance of words in the text of Scripture."<sup>xi</sup>
2. Understanding the immediate context of any given word or text was essential.<sup>xii</sup>
3. With careful thought and intentionality, they sought to apply the truths of Scripture.<sup>xiii</sup>
4. Scripture was used to interpret Scripture. No verse is given in isolation, but serves within the larger framework of God's Word.<sup>xiv</sup>
5. The literal meaning of the text is sought first and foremost. This point in no way should imply that they did not acknowledge typology or mysterious spiritual insights into certain text, because they did; however, they did so as the text directed them and not of their own imaginations.<sup>xv</sup>
6. Similar to the fifth point, "they recognized the appearance of figures of speech in Scripture."<sup>xvi</sup>

In addition to these interpretive rules, Packer provides some additional and helpful insight in exposing two of the presuppositions which drove these interpretive practices. These two presuppositions related to the nature and the subject matter of Scripture. Concerning the nature of Scripture, for the Puritan, the Bible was the Word of God.<sup>xvii</sup> The Bible is God's message. It is God's truth. Concerning the subject matter of Scripture, the Bible teaches man what to believe and how to live.<sup>xviii</sup> Thus, the Scriptures are God's authoritative and inspired instructions for man, designed to transform his mind and his life.

These principles and presuppositions can be readily seen in Bridge's sermons and provide a helpful backdrop for understanding him.

## Sermons Summary

### Galatians 2:20 Contextually

The first of Bridge's five sermons sets the tempo and content of what can be expected throughout the series. His opening provides a glimpse into his thoughts concerning the purpose of the Epistle to Galatia and his understanding of the context of 2:20.

In this epistle, the Apostle *Paul* does industriously prove, *That a man is justified by faith in Christ alone, and not by the works of the law.* Which he plainly affirms at the 16. verse, *Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified.*<sup>xix</sup>

These first two sentences reveal four important concepts that contribute to Bridge's applicational<sup>xx</sup> understanding of 2:20: the theme of the book of Galatians, the centrality of this passage to the book, the context of 2:20 and the object of faith in salvation.

Justification "*by faith in Christ alone, and not by the works of the law*" serves as the theme of the entire book and is most evidently seen in verse sixteen, which seems to operate as a thematic or central verse for the epistle. Though Bridge operates as if his congregation has a fully functioning definition of justification, near the beginning of sermon two he takes time to lay out for them exactly what he means. For the preacher, justification is the process whereby a person is forensically declared as righteous before God. He explains, "By this *justification*, I mean, *That act of Gods grace, wherby (sic) through the imputation of our sins to Christ, and Christs righteousness unto us, God the father doth pronounce us righteous in his sight.*"<sup>xxi</sup>

Along with this theme of justification, Bridge clearly sets faith in opposition to works. Now, what will quickly be developed throughout his first sermon is that these works are not works which flow from a regenerate heart. Godly (i.e. regenerate) people should live a life in conformity to God's will. Such "good" works are most definitely expected. As a matter of fact, that is part of his point throughout sermon one in establishing that "justification by faith alone, and our being crucified with Christ; is no enemy but a friend unto this Spiritual life.

*Nevertheless, I live.*<sup>xxii</sup> Rather, the condemned works of which he is speaking are works intended as the basis by which one would seek to be presented “right” with God. In essence, they are works intended to serve as the basis for one’s justification: right standing before God.

In light of the theme of “justification by faith in Christ alone,” this passage serves as the preeminent passage in the book for the articulation and demonstration of justification by faith in Christ alone. Immediately after the two introductory sentences, Bridge introduces, as he often does through the sermon, a potential objection that a critic might make concerning his point. This rhetorical tool allows him to flow the message directly into verses seventeen through nineteen. In doing so, he reveals that he sees the section of verses fifteen through nineteen as not only providing the immediate context but serving centrally to the theme of the entire book. Thus, for him, this section seems to be the linchpin passage upon which the entire book turns.

As a final observation of the two introductory sentences to sermon one, the object of faith for the believer in salvation is Christ and Christ alone. At first glance, the specific wording Bridge chooses to use here may seem confusing or misleading to the modern exegete. He states initially that the theme is justification by faith *in* Christ, but then quotes the passage and translates the first part of verse sixteen<sup>xxiii</sup> as “Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith *of* Jesus.”<sup>xxiv</sup> The key issue concerns whether “Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ” is an objective or subjective genitive. In other words, is one justified by “faith in Christ” (objective) or by the “faithfulness of Christ” (subjective)?<sup>xxv</sup> For Bridge, the emphasis is clearly on the personal expression of faith in Christ. Christ’s faithfulness is not in view, despite the translation of “the faith *of* Christ.” All Bridge is doing in that translation “*of* Christ” is presenting a simple genitive without any interpretive influence. Though Bridge is presenting an elementary translation, he clearly understands the syntactical influence of the genitive here, which he presents in his interpretation. Later, in relation to justification, he will say, “’Tis done only by *Faith* as the *Instrumental* cause, so we are said to be justified by *Faith alone*. Yet not so, as that a man is justified by faith which hath no works; for all justifying faith is full of works...”<sup>xxvi</sup> Thus, he sees the faith of verse sixteen as being that personal expression which

one exercises as the means by which justification is applied and experienced. It is the believer's faith in view in verse sixteen, which then shapes how faith is understood in verses seventeen through twenty-one.

### **Galatians 2:20 Specifically**

With the theme of justification established, Bridge focuses on the reality that justification is central to the spiritual life as manifested in Galatians 2:20. For him, justification seems to be encompassed in the crucifixion with Christ: I have been crucified with Christ (2:19b). In Christ, the believer finds their new identity and standing before God, i.e. they are justified. The law no longer has a condemning authority over them. As a result, little time is spent explaining or expounding the particular nuances of this crucifixion with Christ;<sup>xxvii</sup> rather, the spiritual life that flows out of this relationship with Christ takes center stage: *Nevertheless, I live.*

...If a man be not justified by the works of the Law, then is he free from the Law, then is he dead unto the Law, then may a man live as he likes? Nay, not so (says the Apostle at the 19. Verse) *For I through the Law, am dead to the Law, that I might live to God:* (quite contrary) *That I might live to God, I am dead to the Law. Yea, and though I am crucified with Christ, yet now I live, and I never did live till now; but now I live:* This very principle of justification by faith alone, is the fountain, and original of all my spiritual life.<sup>xxviii</sup>

He seamlessly manages this transition from a focus on justification to a focus on the believers spiritual life based on his view that the "I"<sup>xxix</sup> in this passage as representative of all believers, not just Paul.<sup>xxx</sup> This passage is intended to be indicative of the Christian experience and not just Paul's. He proclaims, "And when he says, *I live*: he speaks it in the Person of every Believer: not in his Own Person, but he personates a Believer all along."<sup>xxxi</sup> And later in his third sermon, he will reiterate this point, "...in all these *I's*: *I through the Law*; and *I am crucified*; and, *I live*; *Paul* doth personate a Believer (*sic*), one that seeks Justification by faith alone, according to the tenure of the Gospel."<sup>xxxii</sup>

As a result, everyone in Christ now has Christ in them and Christ should be manifested through their spiritual living. While for some, this notion of the "spiritual life" may

be interpreted as vague or even mystical, the Puritan leaves no room for speculation. As with many of his finer points, Bridge is careful to provide a detailed definition of exactly what he means.

For the opening of this Truth unto ye, We must first of all enquire, What this Spiritual life is. Take therefore this description of it: *It is that supernatural perfection of soul, whereby a man being united unto Christ, by the Spirit, is able to act, move, and work towards God as his utmost end.*<sup>xxxiii</sup>

His point is that as a believer in Christ, their natural lives, their lives according to the flesh, their lives according to the rule and order of the condemnation of the law is now over. It is dead. It has been terminated in and because of the crucified death of Christ. A new order of life now exists and is accessed through faith. That new life is found in Christ and is the life of Christ in and through the believer. They can now serve God. They can now produce “good” fruit and should produce such fruit as is in keeping with the reality of the repentance that they have expressed. This pivotal point is clearly emphasized from the outset of the series<sup>xxxiv</sup> and serves as the basis for his applicational comments encouraging and providing guidelines for confirming to godly living.

As evidenced from the comments above, this new life is effectual now. The life a believer has in Christ is not simply forensic (justification language) and it is not simply a future hope (though that is affirmed), it is a present reality. In support of this point, John 6:40, 47, 48, and 54 are all briefly expounded upon<sup>xxxv</sup> and shown to be a powerful witness to Galatians 2:20. Thus, Galatians 2:20 provides a picture of what the true believer should experience in their present life as a result of genuine conversion. It is a salvation that brings about current transformation with current promise and hope in the here and now.

Three properties characterize such a spiritual life and will consume the rest of his conversation concerning the text: self denial (yet not I), Christ advancement (Christ lives in me), and a life of faith (I live by faith).<sup>xxxvi</sup> For Bridge, these three properties are key aspects of the verse which provide insightful instruction concerning the nature and the manifestations of

spiritual life; however, since faith is the means by which the believer is justified and results in Christ in the child of God, Bridge focuses primarily on self denial and the continual and never ceasing indwelling presence of Christ. The life of faith is really an overarching component shown first near the beginning of his sermons regarding justification and then later as a constant in the life of the believer. Thus, faith is not simply an instrument in justification, but in sanctification as well. As a result, only the first two properties receive pointed discussion and will be examined in this review.<sup>xxxvii</sup>

First, the text explains through the phrase “yet not I” that the spiritual life is a self-denying life. “*Every true Beleever (sic), that seeks justification by faith alone, is an Humble, Self-Denying person; denying himself in Spiritual things. The way of the Gospel is a Self-denying way.*”<sup>xxxviii</sup> The preacher picks up on something here, specifically, the idea that salvation is in part birthed in humiliation. In other words, in order to identify with the death of Jesus, one must understand that they cannot save themselves. A humbling is involved in salvation whereby the believer identifies with the death of Christ. To do so, one must acknowledge the lack of worth in their former life: in themselves apart from Christ. In the same way now, once a person receives Christ, the life they now have is attributed to Christ; therefore, any worth which is associated with the person is not credited as their own doing, but a result of their identification with Christ. This truth applies to their obedience as well.<sup>xxxix</sup> For he announces, “...he [the believer in Christ] cannot endure to write an I, upon his own Performance. *Yet not I. He will Obey God: but he will not have an I, to be written upon his Obedience.*”<sup>xl</sup> However, the self-denial that Bridge is specifically concerned with is a denial of one’s religious self whereby they believe that they can obtain favor and a right standing before God based on their own works. One clarification is needed here. This denial is not a denial of duty, only of the religious self. The believer is still responsible, and even more so he will say, to follow the Law; however, the true believer does not follow the Law for merit (i.e. as a covenant of works), but in obedience and gratitude for the redemption provided in Christ (i.e. as a rule of life).

For Answer, Ye must know that the word *Law*, in the new Testament is taken Two waies (*sic*): either it is taken for the *Covenant of Works*, thus: If you keep the Ten Commandements perfectly, you shall live for ever; this is the Covenant of Works; Sometimes (*sic*) the Law is taken for the *Ten Commandements*, the Rule of mans life. In the first sense a Christian is dead unto the Law, and is freed from it: but in the second sense, a Beleever (*sic*), a Justified person, is more bound to the Law, to observe it as a Rule of life, than ever he was.<sup>xli</sup>

Thus, anything that I do in obedience to the law, I may do in duty, but it is done through the empowerment of Christ in me.<sup>xlii</sup>

Second, the spiritual life is a Christ advancing life: Christ lives in me. “The former words, *Yet not I*, hold forth a *Depression*, and *annihilation* of a mans self in Spiritual things.<sup>xliii</sup> These words, *But Christ liveth in me*, hold forth the *Advancings* of Jesus Christ. He gives the *Power, Strength, and Honor* of all unto Jesus Christ, *But CHRIST liveth in me.*”<sup>xliiv</sup> One of the key ways that this spiritual life is experienced and expressed is the direct result of Christ living in the believer. Throughout the entire series, this emphasis on the spiritual life will take center stage and the death of “I” and the “life of Christ” is shown to be the core of the spiritual life. The question that must immediately be addressed by the preacher for his people concerns how “I” no longer live, but Christ lives “me.” How and to what extent does Christ live in me? To what extent do “I” still function as a person?

Christ lives in the believer (John 6:56; 2 Cor 13:5), not as the second person of the Trinity, but by the Spirit of Christ (the Holy Spirit, the third person of the trinity) whom Christ gives to the believer in salvation as a sign and seal of their redemption. Christians are united with Christ through the Holy Spirit. Bridge emphatically and repeatedly makes this point.<sup>xlv</sup>

And thus, in a Spiritual and Mystical way and manner, Christ is in all Beleevers (*sic*) by his Spirit, the third Person: not only the *Graces* of Christ, but Christ *Himself*, in and by Spirit, is in the heart of a Beleever (*sic*); I say, Christ by his Spirit. And therefore *Chrysostom* observes, Whereas it is said, in the 8. of Romans, and the 9. verse, That, *if the Spirit of God dwell in ye*: at the 10. verse following, it is said, *If Christ be in you*, Those two being made one, one being put for the other. Now I say, That Christ that is in a Beleever (*sic*), is not the Habit of grace only, which the Saints have in their souls, but Christ Himself by his Spirit. And therefore if ye look into that 5. chapter to the Romans, ye shall find, That beside the *Grace* of the Spirit, the Spirit *it Self* is said to be given unto us. verse the 5. *Because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts, by the holy Ghost which is given unto us*. Not

only the *Grace* of the holy Ghost given unto us, and shed abroad in our hearts: but the Spirit *it Self* which is given unto us. And so in that 16. chapter of *John*, where the Lord promises to send the Comforter. *He shall teach ye* (says Christ), *and he shall teach ye all things; and he will shew unto ye things to come,* verse the 13.<sup>xlvi</sup>

Later, he will reference John 7:38, 14:23, Romans 8:10-1, and 1 Corinthians 3:16 and state, “Where the Spirit of Christ is, there is Christ.”<sup>xlvii</sup>

The question that remains in relation to Christ in the Christian is to what extent does Christ indwell the person and to what extent do “I” still function as a person? If “I” have been crucified with and then indwelt by Christ, where are the dividing lines in relationship to my person in distinction from the person of Christ? Additionally, there are implications here concerning the degree of sanctification in the believer’s life. If “I” am crucified and Christ is in me, does that mean that “I,” who now lives this spiritual life, am supposed to be perfect and no longer struggling with sin? Bridge anticipates all of these concerns and seeks to adequately address them for his audience without removing all elements of mystery.

Before Christ, a person has no real life in him. Sure, an unregenerate person moves and breathes and acts, but those are mechanics of humanity without any real life, just like a watch or clock.<sup>xlviii</sup> Real life is spiritual and the product of the life of God in the Christian. In conversion, that former life, the life dead under the condemnation of the Law is crucified and new life is brought by the indwelling power of the Spirit.<sup>xlix</sup> The former mechanical life is still there in terms of function and being, but not in terms of condemnation or standing before God. In other words, nothing, in Bridge’s view, changes ontologically in the person at conversion: only forensically and spiritually. The person does not “biologically” change, but a spiritual change does take place in their person. A different spiritual disposition exists in the believer, which is evidenced throughout his application regarding conviction of sin, the stirring of the affections in communion, etc. Thus, for the regenerate person, they are “united” with Christ in a meaningful way.<sup>1</sup>

This union with Christ is not by way of mixture where distinct identities of persons are indistinguishably combined, but it is a union of application or addition. This point proves

significant for Bridge in helping to clarify how Christ is in the born again person and yet the person does not “become” Christ, nor does “Christ” become the person in an indistinguishable fashion where it could be said of someone with full authority, “They are Christ.”<sup>li</sup> Bridge provides several helpful contrasts at this point.<sup>lii</sup> He explains that this union was a voluntary act by Christ so that he may, by his own authority, unite with the believer so far as it pleases him, and thus, it is not a natural and indistinguishable union. Furthermore, a great difference exists in union by way of contact and that of composition. Christ’s union to the believer is one of contact where “Christ [is] touching the soul by his Spirit; and the soul [is] touching Christ by faith.”<sup>liii</sup> As another example, he will share that just as light and air are joined in appearance, a difference exists between what light is and what air is. But, the one illustration that seemed to clarify his position best was that of union through application verses mixture.

Ye see in a heap of Stone and Wheat, they both make but one heap: and the Stone may say, I am in this heap, and the Wheat may say, I am in this heap; but the Stone cannot say, I am the Wheat; nor the Wheat cannot say I am the Stone: Why? Because though they be united...it is by way of Application of one Essence unto another.... But now, take Water and Wine, and mingle them together, and there every part may say, I am Water, and I am Wine: Why? Because there is an Union by way of Mixture.<sup>liv</sup>

The regenerate person is united with Christ by way of application, not mixture. Continuing to explain this union, he anticipates from John 17:20-1 someone challenging him and asking what the difference is between the believer’s union with Christ and the hypostatic union at the incarnation?<sup>lv</sup> Bridge argues that there is a substantial difference and presents a variety of arguments in order to further clarify how Christ is in the life of the believer. One of his arguments goes back to a previous contrast of a natural union verses a voluntary union. “The Spirit doth not Assume the heart of a Beleever (*sic*), as the second Person did Assume our flesh....”<sup>lvi</sup> Another argument made is that unlike the flesh of the incarnation, a person had being before the indwelling of the Spirit. The habitation of the Spirit does not remove the person; rather, he joins to their soul by way of application as described above.

As a continued point of emphasis, Bridge explains that union with Christ does not

remove the believer from genuine action. In other words, the believer's body does not become a shell through which Christ lives and works. They are not "mixed" with Christ in that way. Their motives and decisions in obedience still matter.

Due to the emphatic nature of the verse, as evidenced above, questions concerning the degree to which the believer has been crucified with Christ and the extent to which Christ now lives through the believer inevitably arise. One of the more common questions is, "Does this verse teach perfectionism?" After all, Bridge affirms that the spiritual life "*is that supernatural perfection of soul, whereby a man being united unto Christ, by the Spirit, is able to act, move, and work towards God as his utmost end.*"<sup>lviii</sup> For Bridge, this perfection is a perfection of the soul through the soul's connection to the life of God in regeneration. His description in no way denies that one will still struggle with sin.

By the "perfection of the soul," he is describing the "new birth," that a lost person's soul, which is spiritually dead, is brought to life when united with the Spirit. "So our Spiritual life, it doth arise from our union with Christ, and though a man have never so many moral virtues, and his conversation be never so fair, yet if not united to Christ by the Spirit, he is but a dead man, spiritually a dead man."<sup>lviii</sup> Thus, the perfecting of the soul for Bridge is the reality of new life brought about by a union with Christ. It is not a perfecting of action; though, progressively, he would see behavior continually changing to become more like Christ as a result of this supernatural union. In the end, Bridge does not hold to perfectionism in this life, yet clearly sees in this text the need to answer how one born again can account for remaining sin despite having been crucified with Christ. He argues that though one has been crucified with Christ there remains an element of self.

Though every true Beleever (*sic*), be an Humble, Self-Denying person, and is made partaker of this Gospel-Self-Denial: yet know, there is something of Self, some remains of Self that still continues with the best, something still that will taste of the Cask. Though the Onion that is beaten in the mortar, be taken out of the mortar, yet the mortar will smell of it. A godly, gracious man, is sensible of his own Pride, and Self-Advancing in spiritual things, and will cry out and say, Oh! What a Proud heart have I! A Self-Advancing heart have I! But shew me that man, that was ever so transformed, melted, changed into the mould of the

Gospel; but still some favor of Self remains.<sup>lix</sup>

Thus, although a believer will always struggle with sin, due to the indwelling influence of the Spirit, a believer will never be content with and will experience conviction of sin.

Therefore, for Bridge, Galatians 2:20 expounds upon the reality of the believers union with Christ. They have been crucified with Christ by faith and justified before the throne of God. As a result, they no longer live to themselves. Their lives are not their own, but marked by a new reality and branded by a new brand. The Christian has a new life, a spiritual life, through union with Christ who indwells them by the Holy Spirit. In effect, though they will always struggle with sin, their lives are now to be lived by faith and to be marked by a tendency towards righteousness.

### **Sermon Critique**

Bridge's sermons provide a beautiful picture of Puritan preaching. They are theologically thoughtful, well-ordered and logical, derived from the text set in context, crafted from a view of the totality of scripture with no verse in isolation from the canonical context, and they are applicationally driven with clarifying illustrations. At the end of the day, his sermons are crafted to instill an understanding of the text and an understanding of the implications of the text in the life of the listener. Though these sermons are an outstanding example of preaching which displays a passion for its people to practice godly living from a mind of biblical understanding, some comments related to a few of the stronger and weaker aspects of the sermon set are warranted.

Going back to verse sixteen, at the beginning of sermon one, was a necessary and helpful step in establishing the context of the verse and setting a platform to enable him to explain his view of justification (crucified with Christ) and the priority of personal faith. Bridge rightly understood the function of verses fifteen through nineteen in relation to verse twenty and the entire book. This passage serves centrally to the theme and structure of Galatians.

Along those lines, I agree with Bridge that the "faith of Jesus Christ" (πίστεως Ἰησοῦ

Χριστοῦ) should be interpreted as an objective genitive (faith *in* Jesus Christ) highlighting the faith that we as believers are to express as the instrument of justification and not the faithfulness of Jesus Christ. While a compelling case can be found grammatically for either side,<sup>lx</sup> the objective genitive seems to fit the whole and flow of scripture the best.

Also, Bridge's illustrations and explanation of how Christ indwelt the believer was incredible and much more detailed and fully developed than many commentators. This idea is most evident throughout sermon four. Along these lines, he also provides some helpful comments concerning how the believer's identity is now found in Christ.<sup>lxi</sup> The implications here, among which he expounds some, are fabulous and well balanced. His specific point concerning Christ indwelling the believer through his Spirit by means of application verses mixture was extremely insightful and well articulated.

Concerning his view of the "I," Bridge explained that "in all the *I*'s: *I through the Law*; and *I am crucified*; and, *I live*; *Paul* doth personate a Beleever (*sic*), one that seeks Justification by faith alone, according to the tenure of the Gospel."<sup>lxii</sup> I think he is right.<sup>lxiii</sup> While an argument could easily be crafted to declare that Paul is first and foremost speaking of himself and secondarily to every believer, Paul does not seem to be doing that. He shifts from the first person plural to the first person singular in verse eighteen as an explanation of what is true for every believer. Thus, Bridge does well to recognize that Paul is speaking generally of anyone who would fall into the specific categories that he is elaborating,<sup>lxiv</sup> so that in verse twenty, he is building off of his point from verse nineteen in explaining what it means to live to God.

Additionally, Bridge doesn't try to diffuse or dismiss the mystery of the text. He seeks to balance the tension between explanation and mystery acknowledging that there are certain aspects of this passage that may transcend human reason and understanding. "In Gospel-Self-denial there is, the Gospel does work Mysteriously like it self, it is the great Myserie (*sic*). Take a Christian, a Beleever (*sic*) & I pray, do not observe a little, What a great Myserie (*sic*) there is in all his Humilitie (*sic*), and Self-denial, wrought by the Gospel."<sup>lxv</sup> These mysteries; however,

do not exempt us as believers from seeking to understand the deep truths of scripture.

But it is a great Mystery. Are ye able to tell me, How the Child is formed in the Mothers womb? Or, are ye able to tell me, How the Soul is United to the Body? Who then can tell exactly, How Christ is United to the soul of a Beleever (*sic*)? 'Tis a great Mysterie (*sic*), one of the great Mysteries of the Gospel. But because our Saviour hath said, *unto you it is given to know the Mysteries of the Kingdom, and to others it is not*; Therefore we should all labor to understand it.<sup>lxvi</sup>

Now, one of the weaker points of the sermons seems to be Bridge's explanation of how sin remains in the life of the believer. While I affirm his position that the believer will never experience perfection in this life, he does not adequately explain how Galatians 2:20 should then be understood. Part of the problem lies with his lack of clarification concerning what aspect of the "I" is crucified with Christ. He ambiguously focuses on the point that a remnant or residue of "self" remains and as a result the believer will forever struggle with sin. This idea, while ambiguous, is helpful because it best harmonizes with the rest of scriptural testimony concerning a believer's battle with sin,<sup>lxvii</sup> but he doesn't do an adequate job in explaining how the crucified ego ("I") of Galatians 2:20 should be understood within the immediate context of Galatians: specifically 5:19-21 and 24,

Now the works of the flesh are evident: sexual immorality, impurity, sensuality, idolatry, sorcery, enmity, strife, jealousy, fits of anger, rivalries, dissensions, divisions, envy, drunkenness, orgies, and things like these. I warn you, as I warned you before, that those who do such things will not inherit the kingdom of God...And those who belong to Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with its passions and desires.<sup>lxviii</sup>

Another less significant area in which Bridge's sermons may have better expounded upon the meaning of the text is in his explanation of the tension between being crucified in Christ and the spiritual life now. While each aspect, the aspect of death and life, are mentioned, the ironic tenor of the passage is never alluded to. The fact is that the life the believer now has in Christ is a life birthed in death. That's ironic. That's paradoxical. And, that aspect of the text is unfortunately overlooked.

Admittedly, this next criticism is somewhat unfair. When any pastor is preparing their sermon, they must decide what to include and what to exclude; nonetheless, the absence of any

talk concerning the love or the gifting of God, which is so rich in the latter half of the verse, seemed unfortunate and misses a critical component of the verse.<sup>lxi</sup>

A final point of contention had to do with the emphasis that Bridge placed upon duty, especially in relationship to the Law.<sup>lxx</sup> “So long as a man seeks to be justified by works, and by the Law, so long he looks upon himself as his own: but when a man sees that he is justified by faith alone, then he looks upon himself as Christ’s; that he is not his own and so he is more obedient unto Christ than ever he was before.”<sup>lxxi</sup> Absolutely! To a great extent, Bridge and I have much in agreement; however, the extent to which the Ten Commandments are normative over the believer and how they are instructive are in question, specifically the role of the Sabbath. Bridge provides absolutely no clarification in this regard primarily because his comments are direct against antinomianism. However, the Sabbath rest while applicable under the Mosaic covenant is instructive for believers today as a picture of the rest that they are to find in Christ (Heb 4). Additionally, other verses seem to indicate that believers today are no longer bound in obligation to maintain a physical day of Sabbath (Rom 14:5f; Col 2:16-7). Now, granted, other verses exist which emphasize the importance of keeping such commands (Num 15:32-6; Heb 10:28-9). Thus, this point is an area of contention concerning Bridge’s lack of specificity and over emphasis of Christian duty.

### **Conclusion**

All things considered, the positives of this work far outweigh any criticism. These sermons present an absolutely beautiful picture of Puritan preaching and that Puritan commitment to seek to be faithful to the text while applying it specifically to the lives of the congregants. The fact that these are sermons and not exegetical commentaries must be remembered. Considering these points, Bridge does a masterful job presenting deep and relevant truth to his people. He takes complicated ideas and presents them through simple illustrations in such a way that a child in his midst could at least grasp the hem of the sermon.

For Bridge, Galatians 2:20 unveils a powerful concise picture of justification and the

resulting spiritual life that flows from it. This verse typifies the reality of the Christian life.

Salvation is a gift. Believer's are justified by grace through the instrument of faith and given real spiritual life so that they might now serve him in the freedom of the Law and not under its condemnation.

In the end, these sermons present a rich theology and practical application even for today's reader. Their worth has transcended the century and a half gap which separates us from Bridge. Hopefully, as a result, you leave with a greater appreciating for this passage and for this passionate group of believers known as the Puritans.

---

<sup>i</sup>*The Holy Bible : English Standard Version.* (Wheaton: Standard Bible Society, 2001), Gal 2:20b. While most English translations place "I have been crucified with Christ" at the beginning of verse twenty, most commentators place it at the end of verse nineteen. Bridge alludes to the implications of the believers having been crucified in Christ throughout sermons one and two, specifically in his discussion related to justification. Nevertheless, it seems that he understood this phrase to belong to verse nineteen which is why it is not formally mentioned in relationship to the text of 2:20. As a result, "I have been crucified with Christ" is not included in this citation. For discussion concerning whether it should be included with nineteen or twenty see Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 41 (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1990, 92).

<sup>ii</sup>Both a concise definition concerning who the Puritans were and clear dates concerning when they may have begun or ended are beyond the scope of this paper. Nonetheless, a few comments seem warranted here. The beginnings and ending of Puritanism as well as what parameters define the category itself are difficult to determine. They are a people passionate for purity in the Christian life who regularly demonstrated a heart devoted to God and his word. For the Puritan, no authority equaled that of God's, not the King's and certainly not the Pope's.

Two brief complications in providing a specific definition of the group will be mentioned. First, one has to determine whether Puritanism should be seen foremost as a political, theological, or spiritual movement. (See Stephen J. Yuille, *Puritan Spirituality: The Fear of God in the Affective Theology of George Swinnock* [Colorado Springs, CO: Paternoster, 2007], 8-17.) Certainly components of all three can be seen. Second, the word "Puritan" was generally not self-descriptive but was used pejoratively similar to modern day terms such as "bigot, killjoy or extremist." (John Coffey, "Puritanism, Evangelicalism and the Evangelical Protestant Tradition," in *The Advent of Evangelicalism*, ed. Michael A. G. Haykin and Kenneth J. Steward [Nashville, TN: B&H Academics, 2008], 255.) Puritans were in a variety of churches and many if not most of their leaders were pastors. There were no "First Puritan Churches" or "Puritan meetings"; rather, the term described a group of people from a variety of backgrounds over an extended period of time who were functioning in various locations and vocations from Old to New England. Concerning their dates, because of their separatist leanings and the persecution they endured, some might argue that the Puritans as a group ended in 1689 with the passage of the Act of Toleration; however, at minimum, it should be acknowledge that there were a variety of theological elements that brought cohesion to those who would be within this group that did not immediately dissipate with the passing of the Act of Toleration. For a basic, but incomplete, list of some of those characteristics, see Kapic, Kelly M. and Randall C. Gleason, eds., *The Devoted Life: An Invitation to the Puritan Classics* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 23-32.

For more information concerning these and other difficulties see "Puritanism: The Problem of Definition" in Basil Hall, *Humanists and Protestants 1500-1900* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1990), 237-254; Coffey, "Puritanism, Evangelicalism and the Evangelical Protestant Tradition," 255-8; Kapic, *The Devoted Life: An Invitation to the Puritan Classics*, 16-8; Thomas D. Lea, "The Hermeneutics of the Puritans," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 39 (1996): 271-2; Barrington R. White, Barrington, ed. *The English Puritan Tradition* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1980), 12.

---

<sup>iii</sup>Lea, “The Hermeneutics of the Puritans,” 272.

<sup>iv</sup>For another extended treatment of this passage by a Puritan, see Richard Sibbes, “The Life of Faith,” and “Salvation Applied,” in *Works of Richard Sibbes*, ed. Alexander B. Grosart, vol. 5 (Carlisle, PA: The Banner of Truth Trust, 2001), 357-408.

<sup>v</sup>See “Background” below for more detailed information concerning the sermons.

<sup>vi</sup>One of the real treasures of Bridge’s sermons is his application. While these are not examined in this article, here are a few specifically related to Christ in the believer. 1. Christ in us results in a deep satisfaction in life. 2. Christ in us results in an inseparable communion with Christ. 3. Christ in us results in a life that we proclaim to others. 4. Christ in us results in a forgiven and forgotten past. 5. Christ in us results in finding our identity in Christ. 6. Christ in us results in a “more blessed and glorious Communion with Christ than the other way. For Union is the root of Communion...” (Bridge, 84.) 7. Christ in us results in the ability to “come with boldness unto the throne of grace, and with unlimited expectations of mercy from God...” (Ibid., 86.) 8. Christ in us results in the experience of “life, growth, and conviction” (Ibid., 15-20.) 9. Lastly, Christ in us results in the ability and responsibility to follow God’s law.

<sup>vii</sup>The information from this section was derived from Richard L. Greaves, “Bridge, William (1600/01-1671),” in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison, vol. 7 (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 559-561. See also Paul S. Seaver, *The Puritan Lectureships: The Politics of Religious Dissent 1560-1662* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1970), 97, 256, 281.

<sup>viii</sup>Greaves, “Bridge, William (1600/01-1671),” 559.

<sup>ix</sup>Sermon one (July 2, 1648), sermon two (July 9, 1648), sermon three (July 16, 1648) and sermon four (July 23, 1648) were all preached at Stepney, while sermon five (August 25, 1648) was preached at Christs Church.

<sup>x</sup>Lea, “The Hermeneutics of the Puritans,” 276-82. Packer also has a helpful list of six principles, which varies more in wording than in concept to Lea’s work. (J. I. Packer, *A Quest for Godliness: The Puritan Vision of the Christian Life* [Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 1990], 101-5.) Kopic and Gleason’s comments concerning the seven characteristics that bind Puritans together also provides helpful glimpses into their hermeneutics and the presuppositions that they would have generally held. (Kopic, *The Devoted Life: An Invitation to the Puritan Classics*, 23-32.) Lastly, Barry H. Howson addressed the Puritan hermeneutic; however, the beginning of his point draws heavily from Packer’s comments and the focuses of the work is too narrow for the scope of the discussion in this paper. (Barry H. Howson, “The Puritan Hermeneutics of John Owen: A Recommendation,” *Westminster Theological Journal* 63 [2001]: 351-76.)

<sup>xi</sup>Lea, “The Hermeneutics of the Puritans,” 276.

<sup>xii</sup>Ibid., 278.

<sup>xiii</sup>Ibid., 279.

<sup>xiv</sup>Ibid.

<sup>xv</sup>Ibid., 280. See also Greg K. Daniel, “The Puritan Ladder of Meditation: An Explication of Puritan Meditation and its Compatibility with Catholic Meditation,” (M.A. thesis, Wheaton College, 1993), 95-129. Note specifically the distinction between the Catholic and Puritan use of imagination.

<sup>xvi</sup>Ibid., 281.

<sup>xvii</sup>Packer, *A Quest for Godliness: The Puritan Vision of the Christian Life*, 98-9.

<sup>xviii</sup>Ibid., 99-100.

---

<sup>xix</sup>William Bridge, *The Works of William Bridge, sometime fellow of Emmanuel Colledge in Cambridge, now preacher of the Word of God at Yarmouth*, vol. 3 [electronic resource]: Viz. 1. The spiritual life, and in-being of Christ in all believers. 2. The woman of Canaan (London: Printed by Peter Cole, at the sign of the Printing-Press in Cornhil, near the Royal Exchange, 1649), 1.

<sup>xx</sup>Bridge's sermons, as with other Puritans' of his day, are driven by application. While they are thoughtful and demonstrate intelligent exegesis, the sermons themselves spend the majority of the time helping the congregant see how a particular passage or thought should change one's life, invoke within them a passion for righteousness and righteous living, convicting them of sin and bring about the conversion of the lost. This point is important because it will impact the way in which the work is read. Additionally, more work has to be done and a degree of speculation is necessary in order to try and determine the exact exegetical thought driving any particular point of application.

<sup>xxi</sup>Bridge, *The Works of William Bridge*, 26.

<sup>xxii</sup>Ibid., 2.

To further illustrate the point that good works flow out of the spiritual life, immediately after connecting 2:20 with verse sixteen at the beginning of sermon one, Bridge will inject a potential objector as a rhetorical device to argue his point and transition to verses seventeen through nineteen. "But if a man be not justified by the works of the law, then a man may live as he likes, may cease from working. Not so (says the Apostle) . . ." (Ibid., 1.). In sermon two he will say "This very principle of justification by faith alone, is the fountain, and original of all my spiritual life" (Ibid., 25-6.). All of sermon two is devoted to explaining justification and its role.

<sup>xxiii</sup>εἰδότες [δὲ] ὅτι οὐ δικαιοῦνται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

<sup>xxiv</sup>Bridge, *The Works of William Bridge*, 1. (emphasis added)

<sup>xxv</sup>According to BAGD, πίστεως can be translated as either "faithfulness" or as "faith". (William Arndt, Frederick W. Danker and Walter Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000], s.v. πίστις.)

<sup>xxvi</sup>Bridge, *The Works of William Bridge*, 27. Note, two pages are marked back to back as page twenty six. The next page is marked as twenty eight. This reference is found on the second page marked as twenty six.

<sup>xxvii</sup>On page thirty-one, time is taken to talk about the former life "in Adam" in contrast to the new life found "in Christ." He explains that all "unholiness" was imputed to humanity through the sin of Adam. It seems that he is elaborating briefly upon the need for being "crucified in Christ." That old man under the condemnation of the law had to die to the law. Thus, in being crucified with Christ, Christ's righteousness is imputed to him.

<sup>xxviii</sup>Bridge, *The Works of William Bridge*, 26-7.

<sup>xxix</sup>ἐγώ

<sup>xxx</sup>Risto Saarinen calls this "I" the "exemplary I" (Risto Saarinen, *God and the Gift: An Ecumenical Theology of Giving* [Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2005], 42) and Richard Longenecker calls it the "gnomic" use of I, "referring to all who by an act of personal commitment ('faith') have based their hopes on Christ ('the faithfulness of Christ') and not on the law ('the works of the law')." Longenecker, *Galatians*, 91. Pauline authorship of Galatians is not heavily contested. For commentary concerning authorship see Longenecker, *Galatians*, lvii-lxix.

<sup>xxxi</sup>Bridge, *The Works of William Bridge*, 2.

<sup>xxxii</sup>Ibid., 49.

---

<sup>xxxiii</sup>Ibid., 3. The same idea of connecting “spiritual,” “supernatural,” or “divine” life can also readily be seen in Jonathan Edwards, *Religious Affections*, ed. John E. Smith, vol 2 (New Haven, CT: Yale, 1959), 197f.

<sup>xxxiv</sup>“There is a Natural life: and there is a Spiritual life. He does not here speak of the Natural life, when he says, *Nevertheless I live*; because he adds, *yet not I but Christ liveth in me*: that is Spiritually.” (Ibid., 2.)

<sup>xxxv</sup>Bridge expounds upon these verses by focusing on the fact that the verbs are present and not future tense verbs. “‘Tis not said, He *shall* have everlasting life, but he *hath* everlasting life; everlasting life is begun in him already” (Ibid., 3.)

<sup>xxxvi</sup>Ibid., 49f. Sermon three (49-72) is devoted to the property of self-denial, sermon four and five (73-115) is devoted primarily to the property of Christ advancement. While a life of faith is the third property, this property seems to get caught up with the discussions concerning Christ in the believer and is not as clearly distinguished or elaborated upon in the sermon; therefore, it will not be discussed in detail in this review.

<sup>xxxvii</sup>Although it could be argued that the picture of abiding faith can be most readily seen in his comments concerning inseparable communion with Christ as result of Christ in the believer (13, 73-4, 85).

<sup>xxxviii</sup>Ibid., 49.

<sup>xxxix</sup>These points are made evident in Bridge’s application throughout his sermons.

<sup>xl</sup>Ibid., 50.

<sup>xli</sup>Ibid., 34.

<sup>xlii</sup>Though the sermon is very thoughtful and logical, he does briefly interject and acknowledge the element of mystery found within the text (56-8).

<sup>xliii</sup>Again, it is important to note that by “spiritual things” he is affirming the idea that man cannot do anything of spiritual value in and of himself. Any spiritual life in and through a believer is the result of the life of Christ in them. It is God’s life, not their own.

<sup>xliv</sup>Bridge, *The Works of William Bridge*, 73.

<sup>xlv</sup>Ibid., 4, 9, 12, 29, 74-6, 98-9, etc.

<sup>xlvi</sup>Ibid., 75-6.

<sup>xlvii</sup>Ibid., 98.

<sup>xlviii</sup>Ibid., 9.

<sup>xlix</sup>Ibid., 4.

<sup>l</sup>Ibid., 74-6.

To see a fuller picture of the Puritans’ view of union with Christ, which is so critical to Galatians 2:20, see Tudur R. Jones, R., “Union with Christ: The Existential Nerve of Puritan Piety,” *Tyndale Bulletin* 41 (1990): 186-208. Pages 196-7 speak specifically of Bridge and his understanding of union through Covenant Theology. See pages 202-5 for conversation concerning “Indwelling.”

<sup>li</sup>Bridge viewed such talk as blasphemous and attributed it to the heresy of Montanism. (Ibid., 77.) Bridge’s teaching here is completely consistent and compatible with other teachings in the Puritan vein. For example, Edwards will make remarks that at first may seem to be in contradiction with Bridge. In relationship to Galatians 2:20 and Christ living in us, Edwards writes, “So the saints are said to live by Christ living in them (Gal.

---

2:20). Christ by his Spirit not only is in them, but lives in them; and so that they live by his life; so is his Spirit united to them, as a principle of life in them . . . The light of the Sun of Righteousness don't only shine upon them, but is so communicated to them that they shine also, and become little images of that Sun which shines upon them . . .” (Edwards, *Religious Affections*, [New Haven, CT: Yale, 1959], 200-1.) Edwards is talking of how in the lives of believers, as they are continual conformed to the image of the Son through obedience, they become a living example of Christ. In a sense, they become a picture of the incarnate Son; however, he is in no way arguing that they become Christ or are in some catatonic state where Christ is acting through them apart from any component of their own will.

<sup>lii</sup>Bridge, *The Works of William Bridge*, 78-80.

<sup>liii</sup>*Ibid.*, 78.

<sup>liv</sup>*Ibid.*, 79.

<sup>lv</sup>*Ibid.*, 81-2.

<sup>lvi</sup>*Ibid.*, 81.

<sup>lvii</sup>*Ibid.*, 3.

<sup>lviii</sup>*Ibid.*, 4.

<sup>lix</sup>*Ibid.*, 67.

<sup>lx</sup>To be sure there are a variety of scholars with intelligent arguments on both sides of this debate. Here is a small sampling.

For arguments in support of the objective genitive position see, F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, *The New International Greek Testament Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 139; James D. G. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, *Black's New Testament Commentary* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1993), 138-9; Timothy, George, *Galatians*, *The New American Commentary* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1994), 195-6; Arland J. Hultgren, “The *Pistis Christou* Formulation in Paul.” *Novum Testamentum* 22 (1980): 248-263. Barry R. Matlock, “Detheologizing the ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΗΡΙΣΤΟΥ Debate: Cautionary Remarks from a Lexical Semantic Perspective,” *Novum Testamentum* 42 (2000): 11-3; Frederic Rendall, “The Epistle to the Galatians,” in *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, ed. W. Robertson Nicoll, vol. 3 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), 164; Thomas R. Schreiner, *Galatians* (Advance copy given to Galatians class, Fall 2010, PDF), 126-9.

For arguments in support of the subjective genitive position see, Martinus C de Boer, “Paul’s Use and Interpretation of a Justification Tradition in Galatians 2.15-21,” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 28 (2005): 193f; Hung-Sik Choi, “ΠΙΣΤΙΣ in Galatians 5:5-6: Neglected Evidence for the Faithfulness of Christ,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 124 (2005): 467-90; George E. Howard, “On the Faith of Christ,” *Harvard Theological Review* 60 (1967): 460; Longenecker, *Galatians*, 87-8, 93-4; Sam K. Williams, “Again *Pistis Christou*,” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 49 (1987): 431-47.

For an argument that sees the issue of objective/subjective genitive as missing the point see, Mark A. Seifrid, “Paul, Luther, and Justification in Gal 2:15-21,” *Westminster Theological Journal* 65 (2003): 218-219, who sees the genitive here as being “a genitive of quality, source, or possession.”

<sup>lxi</sup>Bridge, *The Works of William Bridge*, 14, 37-8, 84.

<sup>lxii</sup>*Ibid.*, 49.

<sup>lxiii</sup>That being said, Scot McKnight in refuting New Perspective teaching, presents a case worth consideration that argues that “a third option is that the ‘Ego’ of 2:19 is *Peter’s and Paul’s Ego as Jewish Christians*. It should be observed that such a view utilizes a consistent first person reference from beginning to end . . .” (Scot McKnight, “The Ego and ‘I’: Galatians 2:19 in New Perspective,” *Word & World* 20 [2000]:272-80.)

---

<sup>lxiv</sup>I see this same phenomenon happening in Romans 7:14f.

<sup>lxv</sup>Bridge, *The Works of William Bridge*, 56-7.

<sup>lxvi</sup>*Ibid.*, 77-8.

<sup>lxvii</sup>Here are a few: Rom 13:12-4; 14:10, 13; 1 Cor 1:11; 3:1f; 4:21f; 6:8f; 7:2; 10:6f; 14:20; “put off” – “put on” theme of Eph; Col 3:8; 1 Thess 4:2-7; 2 Thess 3:11-12; 1 Tim 4:7-8; Titus 3:1-2, 9-11; 1 Pet 2:11; 3:9.

<sup>lxviii</sup> *English Standard Version*, Gal 5:19-21, 24.

<sup>lxix</sup>For some philosophical interactions with the idea of the giving of a gift (and he gave himself for us) see Oswald Bayer, “Justification: Basis and Boundary of Theology,” in *By Faith Alone: Essays on Justification in Honor of Gerhard O. Forde*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 67-85; Bayer, “Categorical Imperative or Categorical Gift?” in *Freedom in Response*, translated by Jeffrey F. Cayzer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 13-20; Todd J. Billings, “John Milbank’s Theology of the ‘Gift’ and Calvin’s Theology of Grace: A Critical Comparison,” *Modern Theology* 21 (2005): 87-107; Niels Hendrik Gregersen, “Radical Generosity and the Flow of Grace,” in *Word – Gift – Bring: Justification – Economy – Ontology*, ed. B. K. Holm and P. Widmann (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 117-144; Marice Godelier, *The Enigma of the Gift*, translated by Nora Scott (Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1998); Jan-Olav Henriksen, *Desire, Gift, and Recognition: Christology and Postmodern Philosophy* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009); Bo Holm, “Justification and Reciprocity,” in *Word – Gift – Bring: Justification – Economy – Ontology*, ed. B. K. Holm and P. Widmann (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 87-116; Holm, “Luther’s Theology of the Gift,” in *The Gift of Grace: The Future of Lutheran Theology*, edited by Niels Henrik Gregersen, Bo Holm, Ted Peters, and Peter Widmann (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2005) 78-86; Robyn Horner, *Rethinking God as Gift: Marion, Derrida, and the Limits of Phenomenology* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2001); John Milbank, “The Gift and the Given,” *Theory, Culture and Society* 23 (2006): 444-7; Milbank, “Can a Gift be Given? Prolegomena to a Future Trinitarian Metaphysic,” *Modern Theology* 11 (1995): 119-61; Stephen Charles Mott, “The Power of Giving and Receiving: Reciprocity in Hellenistic Benevolence,” in *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation*, ed. Gerald F. Hawthorne (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), 60-72; C. F. D. Moule, “Obligation in the Ethic of Paul,” in *Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox*, ed. W. R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule, and R. R. Niebuhr (Cambridge: University Press, 1967), 389-406; Risto Saarinen, *God and the Gift: An Ecumenical Theology of Giving* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2005); Colin J. Sedgwick, “Not as the World Gives,” *Expository Times* 109 (1997): 55-6; Walter F. Taylor Jr., “Obligation: Paul’s Foundation for Ethics,” *Trinity Seminary Review* 19 (1997): 91-112; Miroslav Volf, *Free of Charge: Giving and Forgiving in a Culture Stripped of Grace* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005); Stephen H. Webb, *The Gifting God: A Trinitarian Ethics of Excess* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).

<sup>lxx</sup>By “Law,” Bridge specifically singles out the Ten Commandments. (Bridge, *The Works of William Bridge*, 34.) One may find it unusually to be injecting conversation concerning the commandments here; however, Bridge explains throughout his sermons that the presence of Christ in the believer increases one’s ability and obligation to keep the Law.

<sup>lxxi</sup>*Ibid.*, 35.