



Library of

Mellesley College.



Presented by Mr. Q. Q. Sweet

No 11563

Return on
or before

~~NOV 20~~

THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL.

II.

THE THIRD APOSTOLIC JOURNEY.

3.

EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.



ELLICOTT.

Commentaries, Critical and Grammatical, by C. J. Ellicott, Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, viz. on

GALATIANS. With an Introductory Notice by C. E. STOWE, lately Professor in Andover Theological Seminary. 8vo. pp. 183.	\$1.75
EPHESIANS. 8vo. pp. 190.	1.75
THESSALONIANS. 8vo. pp. 171.	1.75
THE PASTORAL EPISTLES. 8vo. pp. 265.	2.50
PHILIPPIANS, COLOSSIANS, AND PHILEMON. 8vo. pp. 265.	2.50
THE SET in five volumes, tinted paper, bevelled edges, gilt tops,	12.00
THE SET in two volumes, same style,	10.00
THE SET in two volumes, black cloth, rounded edges,	8.00

"We would recommend all scholars of the original Scriptures who seek directness, luminous brevity, the absence of everything irrelevant to strict grammatical inquiry, with a concise and yet very complete view of the opinions of others, to possess themselves of Ellicott's Commentaries." — *American Presbyterian*.

"His Commentaries are among the best, if not the very best, helps a student can have." — *American Presbyterian and Theological Review*.

"Ellicott is one of the best commentators of this class." — *Princeton Review*.

"I do not know of anything superior to them in their own particular line." — *Dean Alford*.

"We have never met with a learned commentary on any book of the New Testament so nearly perfect in every respect as the Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, by Prof. Ellicott, of King's College, London — learned, devout, and orthodox." — *Independent*.

"They fill the scholar with genuine admiration." — *Watchman and Reflector*.

"The Commentaries of Prof. Ellicott belong to the first class of critical writings of the New Testament." — *Boston Recorder*.

"To Bishop Ellicott must be assigned the first rank, if not the first place in the first rank, of English biblical scholarship. The series of Commentaries on the Pauline Epistles are in the highest style of critical exegesis." — *Methodist Quarterly*.

"The best English work of this character." — *New Englander*.

"Strictly grammatical and critical, thorough and fearless, concise yet complete, worthy of all confidence." — *Evangelical Review*.

HENDERSON.

Commentaries, Critical, Philological, and Exegetical, by E. Henderson, D.D., viz. on

THE BOOK OF THE TWELVE MINOR PROPHETS. Translated from the Original Hebrew. With a Biographical Sketch of the Author, by E. P. BARROWS, Hitchcock Professor in Andover Theological Seminary. 8vo. pp. 490.	\$4.00
JEREMIAH AND LAMENTATIONS. Translated from the Original Hebrew. 8vo. pp. 315.	\$3.00
EZEKIEL. Translated from the Original Hebrew. 8vo. pp. 228.	2.25

"Dr. Henderson's Commentaries are rich in wholesome and true exposition." — *Presbyterian Magazine*.

"The work is invaluable for its philological research and critical acumen. . . . The notes are replete with the fruits of varied learning." — *The Presbyterian*.

"Dr. Henderson is one of the most eminent of modern biblical critics. One of the leading features of his mode of treating Scripture is his happy blending of textual with exegetical comment. His treatise on Jeremiah is well worthy, by its elevated scholarship, to take a place side by side with the commentaries of Bishop Ellicott and of Professor Murphy, also issued by Mr. Draper." — *Publishers' Circular*.

"He excelled in weighing evidence, and impressing upon it its relative value. His discrimination was clear and his judgment was sound. He dealt with fact, not with fiction. He searched for data, not for opinions. Dr. Henderson was not only well versed in the Hebrew language, but also in its cognates. Few men, either in England or America, have been his equals in Oriental literature. His Commentary on Jeremiah has the same general characteristics which appear in his Commentary on the Minor Prophets." — *Bib. Sacra*.

"The only satisfactory commentary on the Minor Prophets we know of in the English language." — *Episcopal Recorder*.

"The volume before us gives abundant evidence of patient scholarship and clear conceptions of evangelical truth." — *Evangelical Quarterly*.

"We have met with no so satisfactory a commentary on this part of the prophetic scriptures." — *Watchman and Reflector*.

COMMENTARIES

PUBLISHED BY

WARREN F. DRAPER,

ANDOVER, MASS.

These Books will be sent, post-paid, on receipt of the price affixed.

MURPHY.

Critical and Exegetical Commentaries, by Prof. James G. Murphy, LL.D., T.C.D., viz. on

GENESIS. With a Preface by J. P. THOMPSON, D.D., New York. 8vo.
pp. 535. Cloth, rounded edges. \$3.50

EXODUS. (Uniform with Genesis.) 8vo. pp. 385. 3.00

"Dr. Murphy in his commentaries has a definite plan, which he carries out. The text is explained, translated anew, and comments are added on the difficult and mooted points. He is a fair, clear, and candid interpreter. His aim is to reconcile the Scriptures with science by an impartial examination of the text."—*Amer. Presbyterian and Theological Review*.

"Thus far nothing has appeared in this country for half a century on the first two books of the Pentateuch so valuable as the present two volumes. His style is lucid, animated, and often eloquent. His pages afford golden suggestions and key-thoughts. . . . Some of the laws of interpretation are stated with so fresh and natural a clearness and force that they will permanently stand."—*Methodist Quarterly*.

"The most valuable contribution that has for a long time been made to the many aids for the critical study of the Old Testament is Mr. Draper's republication of Dr. Murphy on Genesis, in one octavo volume. It is a good deal to say of a commentary, but we say it in all sincerity, that this volume furnishes about as fascinating work for one's hours for reading as any volume of the day, in any department of literature; while its general influence will be salutary and effective for the truth. . . . The English reader will find nothing accessible to him which will compare favorably with this as a help in the study of this portion of the divine word; while he will, of course, read always with his own judgment upon the views which find expression."—*Congregationalist*.

STUART.

Critical and Exegetical Commentaries, by Moses Stuart, late Professor in Andover Theological Seminary, viz. on

ROMANS. Third Edition. Edited and revised by PROF. R. D. C. ROBBINS.
12mo. pp. 544. \$2.25

HEBREWS. Third Edition. Edited and revised by PROF. R. D. C. ROBBINS.
12mo. pp. 575. \$2.25

THE APOCALYPSE. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 504, 504. 5.00

ECCLESIASTES. Second Edition. Edited and revised by PROF. R. D. C. ROBBINS. 12mo. pp. 346. \$1.50

BOOK OF PROVERBS. 12mo. pp. 432. 1.75

"The first characteristic of Professor Stuart as a commentator is the exhaustive thoroughness of his labors. His exegesis is in general skilful and felicitous, especially in bringing out the meaning of the obscure passages, and adding new and delicate shades of thought to the more obvious and superficial sense."—*North American Review*.

"The exegetical works of Prof. Stuart have many excellences, and it will be a long time before the student of the Bible in the original will be willing to dispense with them as a part of his critical apparatus."—*Boston Recorder*.

"The spirit of the man is so intertwined with them as to be a perpetual stimulant and benediction to the reader."—*Congregationalist*.

"In turning over its pages we recall the learning, the zeal, the acumen, and the idiosyncrasies of one of the most remarkable of the great and good men which our theological world has produced. . . . This contribution by Prof. Stuart has justly taken a high place among the Commentaries on the Epistle to the Romans, and, with his other works, will always be held in high estimation by students of the Sacred Scriptures."—*N. Y. Observer*.

ST. PAUL'S
EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

A REVISED TEXT,
WITH
INTRODUCTION, NOTES, AND DISSERTATIONS.

BY
J. B. LIGHTFOOT, D.D.

HULSEAN PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY, AND FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.



Andover:
WARREN F. DRAPER, PUBLISHER.
MAIN STREET.
1870.

11053

Μιμηταί μου γίνεσθε καθὼς καγὼ Χριστοῦ.

Παῦλος γενόμενος μέγιστος ὑπογραμμός.

CLEMENT.

Οὐχ ὡς Παῦλος διατάσσομαι ὑμῖν· ἐκεῖνος ἀπόστολος, ἐγὼ
κατάκριτος· ἐκεῖνος ἐλεύθερος, ἐγὼ δὲ μέχρι νῦν δοῦλος.

IGNATIUS.

Οὔτε ἐγὼ οὔτε ἄλλος ὅμοιος ἐμοὶ δύναται κατακολουθῆσαι
τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ μακαρίου καὶ ἐνδόξου Παύλου.

POLYCARP.

125

126

127

128

PREFACE

TO THE SECOND EDITION.

THIS Second Edition has been revised throughout. A few errors have been corrected and some additions made. At the same time the arrangement has been slightly changed in deference to opinions expressed both publicly and in private; the detached Notes being collected together at longer intervals, so that the interruptions in the continuity of the text are less frequent.¹ Having also heard complaints of the want of an Index, I have attempted to supply the defect. Since the first edition appeared, Tischendorf has laid biblical students under fresh obligations by publishing another lately discovered uncial manuscript of St. Paul's Epistles, the *Codex Porphyrii Palimpsestus*. The readings of this new authority have been taken into account, but I have not found it necessary in consequence to alter the text in a single instance. It remains for me to express my grateful acknowledgment of assistance received from both strangers and friends; among whom I may name especially Mr. A. A. Van Sittart, late Fellow of Trinity College, who has spared no trouble in

¹ In this edition the detached Notes have been placed together, after the Commentary.

correcting the sheets of this edition ; Dr. W. Wright of the British Museum, to whose courtesy I am indebted for the Syriac readings in several passages of Eusebius ; and Dr. C. Rieu, also of the British Museum, whose knowledge has supplied my own ignorance, and enabled me to give (from the Armenian Version) the readings and interpretations of Ephraem Syrus on a few important passages.

P R E F A C E

T O T H E F I R S T E D I T I O N .

THE present work is intended to form part of a complete edition of St. Paul's Epistles which, if my plan is ever carried out, will be prefaced by a general introduction and arranged in chronological order. To such an arrangement the half-title of the present work refers, assigning this epistle to the second chronological group and placing it third in this group in accordance with the view maintained in the introduction. Meanwhile, should this design be delayed or abandoned, the present commentary will form a whole in itself.

The general plan and execution of the work will commend or condemn themselves; but a few words may be added on one or two points which require explanation.

It is no longer necessary, I trust, to offer any apology for laying aside the received text. When so much conscientious labor has been expended on textual criticism, it would be unpardonable in an editor to acquiesce in readings which for the most part are recommended neither by intrinsic fitness nor by the sanction of antiquity. But the attempt to construct an independent text in preference to adopting the recension of some well-known editor needs more justification. If I had pursued the latter course, I should certainly have selected either Bentley or Lachmann. These two critics were thorough masters of their craft, bringing to their task extensive knowledge and keen insight. But Bentley's text¹ was constructed out of very imperfect materials, and Lachmann only professed

¹ His text of this Epistle is given in *Bentleii Critica Sacra*, p. 94 sqq., edited by the Rev. A. A. Ellis.

to give results which were approximate and tentative. Of the services of Tischendorf in collecting and publishing materials it is impossible to speak too highly, but his actual text is the least important and least satisfactory part of his work. Dr. Tregelles, to whom we owe the best recension of the Gospels, has not yet reached the Epistles of St. Paul. But apart from the difficulty of choosing a fit guide, there is always some awkwardness in writing notes to another's text, and the sacrifice of independent judgment is in itself an evil; nor will it be considered unseemly presumption in a far inferior workman, if with better tools he hopes in some respects to improve upon his model. Moreover I was encouraged by the promise of assistance from my friends the Rev. B. F. Westcott, and the Rev. F. J. A. Hort, who are engaged in a joint recension of the Greek Testament, and have revised the text of this epistle for my use. Though I have ventured to differ from them in some passages, and hold myself finally responsible in all, I am greatly indebted to them for their aid.

The authorities for the various readings are not given except in a few passages, where the variations are important enough to form the subject of a detached note. They may be obtained from Tischendorf or any of the well-known critical editions. Here and there, where the text may be considered fairly doubtful, I have either offered an alternative reading below or enclosed a word possibly interpolated in brackets; but these are for the most part unimportant, and do not materially affect the sense.

In the explanatory notes such interpretations only are discussed, as seemed at all events possibly right or are generally received or possess some historical interest. By confining myself to these, I wished to secure more space for matters of greater importance. For the same reason, in cases of disputed interpretations the authorities ranged on either side are not given, except where, as in the case of the fathers, some interest attaches to individual opinions. Nor, again, have I generally quoted the authorities for the views adopted, or for the illustrations and references incorporated in my notes, when these are to be found in previous commentaries or in any common

book of reference. I have sometimes, however, departed from this rule for a special reason, as, for instance, where it was best to give the exact words of a previous writer.

As the plan of this work thus excludes special acknowledgments in the notes, I am anxious to state generally my obligations to others.

What I owe to the fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries will appear very plainly in the notes and in the appendix on the patristic commentators. After these, my obligations are greatest to English and German writers of the last few years. The period from the fifth century to the Reformation was an entire blank as regards any progress made in the interpretation of this epistle. And from that time to the present century, though single commentators of great merit have appeared at intervals, Calvin, for instance, in the sixteenth century, Grotius in the seventeenth, and Bengel in the eighteenth, there has been no such marked development of interpretational criticism as we have seen in our own time. The value of Luther's work stands apart from, and in some respects higher than, its merits as a commentary.

To more recent critics, therefore, I am chiefly indebted. Among my own countrymen I wish to acknowledge my obligations chiefly to Professor Jowett, who has made the habits of thought in the apostolic age his special study, and to Bishop Ellicott who has subjected the Apostle's language to a minute and careful scrutiny. Besides these I have consulted with advantage the portions relating to this epistle in the general commentaries of Dean Alford and Dr. Wordsworth. Among German writers I am indebted especially to the tact and scholarship of Meyer, and to the conscientious labors of Wieseler. Ewald is always instructive; but my acknowledgments are due more to the *History* of this truly great biblical scholar than to his edition of St. Paul's Epistles. Roman Catholic theology is well represented in the devout and intelligent commentary of Windischmann; and the Tübingen school has furnished an able and learned expositor in Hilgenfeld. I have found both these commentators useful, though in a widely different way. Besides the writers already mentioned, I

have constantly consulted Winer, Olshausen, De Wette, and Schott; and to all of these, to the first especially, I am indebted.

I need scarcely add that my obligations to these various writers differ widely in kind. Nor will it be necessary to guard against the inference that the extent of these obligations is a measure of my general agreement with the opinions of the writers. He, who succeeds signally in one branch of biblical criticism or interpretation, will often fail as signally in another. I do not feel called upon to point out what seem to me to be the faults of writers to whom I am most largely indebted, and I have certainly no wish to blunt the edge of my acknowledgments by doing so.

Besides commentaries, great use has been made of the common aids to the study of the language of the Greek Testament. The works to which I am most indebted in matters of grammar will appear from the frequent references in the notes. The third English edition of Winer (Edinburgh, 1861), has been used.¹ I have also availed myself constantly of the well-known collections of illustrative parallels by Wetstein, Schöttgen, Grinfield, and others; of indices to the later classical writers and earlier fathers; of the Concordances to the Septuagint and New Testament; and of the more important Greek Lexicons, especially Hase and Dindorf's edition of Stephanus.

My thanks are due for valuable suggestions and corrections to the Rev. F. J. A. Hort, late Fellow of Trinity College, and to W. A. Wright, Esq., Librarian of Trinity College; and also to other personal friends who have kindly assisted me in correcting the proof-sheets.

Though I have taken pains to be accurate, experience gained in the progress of the work has made me keenly alive to a constant liability to error; and I shall therefore esteem any corrections as a favor. I should wish, moreover, to adopt the language of a wise theologian, whose tone and temper I would gladly take for my model, and to "claim a right to

¹ In this edition of Lightfoot's Commentary the references to Winer's Grammar have been conformed to Prof. Thayer's translation of the seventh German edition, edited by Prof. Lünemann. (Andover, 1868.)

retract any opinion which improvement in reasoning and knowledge may at any time show me is groundless.”¹

While it has been my object to make this commentary generally complete, I have paid special attention to everything relating to St. Paul's personal history, and his intercourse with the Apostles and Church of the Circumcision. It is this feature in the Epistle to the Galatians which has given it an overwhelming interest in recent theological controversy. Though circumstances have for the moment concentrated the attention of Englishmen on the Old Testament Scriptures, the questions which have been raised on this epistle are intrinsically far more important, because they touch the vital parts of Christianity. If the primitive gospel was, as some have represented it, merely one of many phases of Judaism, if those cherished beliefs which have been the life and light of many generations were afterthoughts, progressive accretions, having no foundation in the person and teaching of Christ, then, indeed, St. Paul's preaching was vain, and our faith is vain also. I feel very confident that the historical views of the Tübingen school are too extravagant to obtain any wide or lasting hold over the minds of men. But even in extreme cases mere denunciation may be unjust and is certainly unavailing. Moreover, for our own sakes we should try and discover the element of truth which underlies even the greatest exaggerations of able men, and correct our impressions thereby.

“A number there are,” says Hooker, “who think they cannot admire, as they ought, the power of the Word of God, if in things divine they should attribute any force to man's reason.” The circumstances which called forth this remark contrast strangely with the main controversies of the present day; but the caution is equally needed. The abnegation of reason is not the evidence of faith, but the confession of despair. Reason and reverence are natural allies, though untoward circumstances may sometimes interpose and divorce them.

Any one, who has attempted to comment on St. Paul's Epistles, must feel on laying down his task how far he has

¹ Hey's *Lectures on the Articles*.

then short even of his own poor ideal. Luther himself expresses his shame that his "so barren and simple commentaries should be set forth upon so worthy an Apostle and elect vessel of God." Yet no man had a higher claim to a hearing on such a subject; for no man was better fitted by the sympathy of like experiences to appreciate the character and teaching of St. Paul. One, who possesses no such qualifications, is entitled to feel and to express still deeper misgivings.

TRINITY COLLEGE, February 13, 1865.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

	PAGE
I. The Galatian People	9-24
II. The Churches of Galatia	25-41
III. The Date of the Epistle	42-61
IV. Genuineness of the Epistle	62-67
V. Character and Contents of the Epistle	68-73

DISSERTATIONS.

I. Were the Galatians Celts or Teutons?	75-87
II. The Brethren of the Lord	88-128
III. St. Paul and the Three	129-212

TEXT AND NOTES.

CHAP. I. 1-24. (Text and Commentary)	215-229
St. Paul's Sojourn in Arabia	307-311
St. Paul's First Visit to Jerusalem	312-314
The Name and Office of an Apostle	314-323
CHAP. II. 1-21	230-246
Various Readings in Gal. ii. 5	324-326
The later Visit of St. Paul to Jerusalem	326-332
Patristic Accounts of the Collision at Antioch	333-337

	PAGE
CHAP. III. 1-29	247-263
The Interpretation of Deut. xxi. 23	338-341
The Words denoting "Faith"	341-346
The Faith of Abraham	346-353
CHAP. IV. 1-V. 1	264-283
St. Paul's Infirmary in the Flesh	354-360
The Various Readings in Gal. iv. 25	361-363
The Meaning of Hagar in Gal. iv. 25	363-368
Philo's Allegory of Hagar and Sarah	368-371
The Various Readings in Gal. v. 1	371-373
CHAP. V. 2-VI. 18	284-306
Patristic Commentaries on this Epistle	374-385
INDEX	387-396

INTRODUCTION.

I.

THE GALATIAN PEOPLE.

WHEN St. Paul carried the gospel into Galatia, he was thrown for the first time among an alien people, differing widely in character and habits from the surrounding nations. A race whose home was in the far west, they had been torn from their parent rock by some great social convulsion, and, after drifting over wide tracts of country, had settled down at length on a strange soil in the very heart of Asia Minor. Without attempting here to establish the Celtic affinities of this boulder people by the fossil remains of its language and institutions, or to trace the path of its migration by the scores imprinted on its passage across the continent of Europe, it will yet be useful, by way of introduction to St. Paul's Epistle, to sketch as briefly as possible its previous history and actual condition. There is a certain distinctness of feature in the portrait which the apostle has left of his Galatian converts. It is clear at once that he is dealing with a type of character strongly contrasted, for instance, with the vicious refinements of the dissolute and polished Corinthians, perhaps the truest surviving representatives of ancient Greece, or, again, with the dreamy, speculative mysticism which disfigured the half-oriental churches of Ephesus and Colossae. We may expect to have light thrown upon the broad features of national character which thus confront us, by the circumstances of the

descent and previous history of the race, while at the same time such a sketch will prepare the way for the solution of some questions of interest which start up in connection with this Epistle.

The great subdivision of the human family which at the dawn of European history occupied a large portion of the continent west of the Rhine with the outlying islands, and which modern philologers have agreed to call Celtic, was known to the classical writers of antiquity by three several names, *Celtae*, *Galatae*, and *Galli*.¹ Of these, *Celtae*, which is the most ancient, being found in the earliest Greek historians, Hecataeus and Herodotus,² was probably introduced into the Greek language by the colonists of Marseilles,³ who were first brought in contact with this race. The term *Galatae* is of late introduction, occurring first in Timaeus, a writer of the third century, B.C.⁴ This latter form was generally adopted by the Greeks when their knowledge was extended by more direct and frequent intercourse with these barbarians, whether in their earlier home in the west, or in their later settlement in Asia Minor. Either it was intended as a more exact representation of the same barbarian sound, or, as seems more probable, the two are diverging but closely-allied forms of the same word, derived by the Greeks from different branches of the Celtic race with which at different times they came in contact.⁵ On the other hand, the Romans generally designated

¹ On these terms, see Diefenbach, *Celtica*, ii. p. 6 sqq. Ukert *Geogr. der Griech. u. Röm.* Th. ii. Abth. 2, p. 183 sqq. Zeuss, *die Deutschen u. die Nachbarstämme*, p. 6 sqq. Thierry, *Histoire des Gaulois*, i. p. 28.

² Hecat. *Fragm.* 19, 21, 22, ed. Müller; Herod. ii. 33; iv. 49. Both forms, *Κελτοί* and *Κέλται* occur.

³ Diod. v. 32, quoted in note 5.

⁴ Timaeus, *Fragm.* 37, ed. Müller. Pausanias says (1, 3, 5), ὅψὲ δέ ποτε αὐτοὺς καλεῖσθαι Γαλάτας ἐξενίκησε. *Κελτοί* γὰρ κατὰ τε σφῶς τὸ ἀρχαῖον καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις ὠνομάζοντο. See also the passages in Diefenbach, *Celt.* ii. p. 8.

⁵ This seems the most probable in-

ference from the confused notices in ancient writers. The most important passage is Diod. v. 32: Τοὺς γὰρ ὑπὲρ Μασσαλίαν κατοικοῦντας ἐν τῷ μεσογείῳ καὶ τοὺς παρὰ τὰς Ἀλπεῖς ἔτι δὲ τοὺς ἐπὶ τὰδε τῶν Πυρηνναίων ὄρων Κελτοὺς ὀνομάζουσιν τοὺς δ' ὑπὲρ ταύτης τῆς Κελτικῆς εἰς τὰ πρὸς νότον νεύοντα μέρη, παρὰ τε τὸν ὠκεανὸν καὶ τὸ Ἑρκύνιον ὕψος καθιδρυμένους καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἐξῆς μεχρὶ τῆς Σκυθίας, Γαλάτας προσαγορεύουσι κ. τ. λ. See also Strabo, iv. p. 189, and other passages cited in Ukert, ii. 2, p. 197 sqq.; Diefenbach, *Celt.* ii. p. 10 sq. At all events, it seems certain that the Gauls in the neighborhood of Marseilles called themselves *Celtae*.

this people Galli. Whether this word exhibits the same root as Celtae and Galatae, omitting, however, the Celtic suffix,¹ or whether some other account of its origin is more probable, it is needless to inquire. The term Galli is sometimes adopted by later Greek writers, but, as a general rule, until some time after the Christian era, they prefer Galatae, whether speaking of the people of Gaul properly so called, or of the Asiatic colony.² The Romans, in turn, sometimes borrow Galatae from

¹ See Zeuss, *Gramm. Celt.* p. 758.

² Owing to the bearing of this fact, which has not been sufficiently noticed, on such passages as 2 Tim. iv. 10, I have thought it worth while to collect the following particulars. (1) Before the Christian era, and for two centuries afterwards, the form Galatia (Galatae) is almost universally used by Greek writers to the exclusion of Gallia (Galli), when they do not employ Celtice (Celtae). It occurs on the Monumentum Ancyranum (Boeckh, *Corp. Inscr.* iii. pp. 89, 90), erected by Augustus in the capital of Asiatic Gaul, where, to avoid confusion, the other form would naturally have been preferred, if it had been in use. It is current in Polybius, Diodorus, Strabo, Josephus, Plutarch, Appian, Pausanias, and Dion Cassius. It appears also in Athen. p. 333 D, Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i. p. 359 (Potter), and Origen c. *Cels.* p. 335 B. Even Aelian (*Nat. An.* xvii. 19, referring, however, to an earlier writer), when speaking of the Asiatic people, is obliged to distinguish them as *Γαλάτας τοὺς ἐωθούς*. On the other hand, St. Basil (*Op.* i. p. 28, Garnier) describes the European Gauls as *τοὺς ἐσπερίους Γαλάτας καὶ Κελτούς*. (2) The first instance of Gallia (Galli) which I have found in any Greek author is in Epictetus (or rather Arrian), *Dissert.* ii. 20, 17, *ὥσπερ τοὺς Γαλλοὺς ἢ μανία καὶ δ οἶνος* (probably not before A.D. 100). It occurs, indeed, in the present text of Dioscorides (i. 92, *ἀπὸ Γαλλίας καὶ Τυρρησίας*), perhaps an earlier writer, but the reading is suspicious, since imme-

diately afterwards he has *ἀπὸ Γαλατίας τῆς πρὸς ταῖς Ἀλπεσιν*. Later transcribers were sorely tempted to substitute the form with which they were most familiar, as is done in 2 Tim. iv. 10 in several MSS. See below, p. 37, note 2. The substitution is so natural, that it is sometimes erroneously made where the eastern country is plainly meant, e.g. Pseudo-Dorotheus, *Chron. Pasch.* ii. p. 136, ed. Dind. The form *Γαλλία* occurs again in the Ep. of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons (Euseb. v. i.) 177, A.D. It is also common in Hierodorian. (3) In the fourth and fifth centuries the form Gallia had to a very great extent displaced Galatia. See Agathem. ii. 4, p. 37: *τῶν Γαλλίων, ὡς πρότερον Γαλατίας ἔλεγον*, and Theod. Mops. on 2 Tim. iv. 10: *τὰς νῦν καλουμένας Γαλλίας. οὕτως γὰρ (i.e. Γαλατίαν) αὐτὰς πάντες ἐκάλουν οἱ παλαιοί*. Accordingly Athanasius (*Apol. c. Arrian.* § 1, pp. 97, 98) in the same passage uses *Γαλατία* of Asiatic Gaul, *Γαλλία* of the European provinces. At a much earlier date than this Galen says (xiv. p. 80, Kuhn), *καλοῦσι γοῦν αὐτοὺς ἐνιοὶ μὲν Γαλάτας ἐνιοὶ δὲ Γαλλοὺς, συνηθέστερον δὲ τὸ τῶν Κελτῶν ὄνομα*, but he must be referring in the first two classes to the usage of the Greek and Roman writers respectively. See similar notices in Strabo, iv. p. 195; Appian, *Bell. Hisp.* § 1. The form *Γαλατία* of European Gaul still continued to be used occasionally, when *Γαλλία* had usurped its place. It is found, for instance, in Julian, *Epist.* lxxiii., and in Libanius frequently:

the Greeks, but when they do so it is applied exclusively to the Celts of Asia Minor, that is, to the Galatians in the modern sense of the term. The word *Celtae* still remains in common use, side by side with the *Galatae* of the Greek and *Galli* of the Roman writers, being employed in some cases as co-extensive with these, and in others to denote a particular branch of the Celtic race.¹

The rare and fitful glimpses which we obtain of the Celtic peoples in the early twilight of history reveal the same restless, fickle temperament, so familiar to us in St. Paul's Epistle. They appear in a ferment of busy turmoil and ceaseless migration.² They are already in possession of considerable tracts of country to the south and east of their proper limits. They have overflowed the barrier of the Alps, and poured into Northern Italy. They have crossed the Rhine and established themselves here and there in that vague and ill-defined region known to the ancients as the Hercynian forest, and on the banks of the Danube. It is possible that some of these were fragments sundered from the original mass of the Celtic people, and dropped on the way as they migrated westward from the common home of the Arian races in central Asia; but more probable, and more in accordance with tradition, is the view that, their course being obstructed by the ocean, they had retraced their steps and turned towards the east again. At all events, as history emerges into broad daylight, the tide of Celtic migration is seen rolling ever eastward. In the beginning of the fourth century a lateral wave sweeps over the

comp. Cnreton, *Corp. Ign.* p. 351. Ammianus (xv. 9) can still say, "*Galatas dictos, ita enim Gallos sermo Graecus appellat.*" Even later writers, who use *Γαλλίαι* of the Roman provinces of Gaul, nevertheless seem to prefer *Γαλατία* when speaking of the western country as a whole, e.g. Joann. Lydus, *Ostent.* pp. 52, 54 (Wachsmuth); Hierocl. *Synecd.* app. p. 313 (Parthey).

¹ e.g. in Caesar, *Bell. Gall.* i. 1. The whole subject is very obscure, owing to the confused and irreconcilable statements of ancient authorities. The ac-

count in the text, however, will, I believe, be found generally true.

² For the migrations of the Celts, see the well-known work of Thierry, *Histoire des Gaulois* (4th ed. 1857), or Contzen, *Wanderungen der Kelten* (Leipz. 1861). They are considered more in their philological aspect in Diefenbach's *Celtica*, and in Prichard's *Celtic Nations*, edited by Latham. The Article "*Galli*" by Baumstark, in Pauly's *Real-Encyclopädie*, is a careful abstract of all that relates to the subject. See also Le Bas, *Asie Mineure* (Paris, 1863).

Italian peninsula, deluging Rome herself, and obliterating the landmarks of her earlier history. Three or four generations later another wave of the advancing tide, again diverted southward, pours into Macedonia and Thessaly, for a time carrying everything before it. The fatal repulse from Delphi (B.C. 279), invested by Greek patriotism with a halo of legendary glory, terminated the Celtic invasion of Greece.

The Gaulish settlement in Asia Minor is directly connected with this invasion.¹ A considerable force had detached themselves from the main body, refusing to take part in the expedition. Afterwards reinforced by a remnant of the repulsed army, they advanced under the command of the chiefs Leonorius and Lutarius, and, forcing their way through Thrace, arrived at the coast of the Hellespont. They did not long remain here, but, gladly availing themselves of the first means of transport that came to hand, crossed over to the opposite shores, whose fertility held out a rich promise of booty. Thence they overran the greater part of Asia Minor. They laid the whole continent west of Taurus under tribute; and even the Syrian kings, it is said, were forced to submit to these humiliating terms.² Alternately the scourge and the allies of each Asiatic prince in succession, as passion or interest dictated, they for a time indulged their predatory instincts unchecked. At length vengeance overtook them. A series of disasters, culminating in a total defeat inflicted by the Pergamene prince

¹ The chief authorities for the history of the Asiatic Gauls are Polybius, v. 77, 78, 111; xxii. 16-24; Livy, xxxviii. 12 sqq.; Strabo, xii. p. 566 sqq.; Memnon (*Geogr. Min.* ed. Müller, iii. p. 535 sqq.); Justin, xxv. 2 sqq.; Arrian, *Syr.* 42; Pausanias, i. 4, 5. See other references in Diefenbach, *Celt.* ii. p. 250. It formed the main subject of several works no longer extant, the most important of which was the *Γαλατικὰ* of Eratosthenes in forty books. The monograph of Wernsdorff, *De Republica Galatorum* (Nuremb. 1743), to which all later writers are largely indebted, is a store-house of facts relating

to early Galatian history. The existing monuments of Galatia are described by Texier, *Asie Mineure* (1839-1849), i. p. 163 sqq. An article in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* (1841), iv. p. 574, by the same writer, contains an account of the actual condition of this country, with a summary of its history, ancient and modern. See also his smaller book, *Asie Mineure* (1862) p. 453 sqq. The important work, *Exploration Archéologique de la Galatie et de la Bithynie*, etc., by Perrot and others, is not far enough advanced as yet (1866) to be of much use for Galatia.

² Livy, xxxviii. 16.

Attalus the First (B.C. 230), effectually curbed their power and insolence.¹

By these successive checks they were compressed within comparatively narrow limits in the interior of Asia Minor. The country to which they were thus confined, the Galatia of history, is a broad strip of land over two hundred miles in length, stretching from north-east to south-west. It was parcelled out among the three tribes of which the invading Gauls were composed in the following way: The Troemi occupied the easternmost portion, bordering on Cappadocia and Pontus, with Tavium or Tavia as their chief town. The Tolistobogii, who were situated to the west on the frontier of Bithynia and Phrygia Epictetus, fixed upon the ancient Pessinus for their capital. The Tectosages settled in the centre between the other two tribes, adopting Ancyra as their seat of government, regarded also as the metropolis of the whole of Galatia.²

But, though their power was greatly crippled by these disasters, the Gauls still continued to play an important part in the feuds of the Asiatic princes. It was while engaged in these mercenary services that they first came into collision with the terrible might of Rome. A body of Galatian troops fighting on the side of Antiochus at the battle of Magnesia attracted the notice of the Romans, and from that moment their doom was sealed. A single campaign of the Consul Manlius sufficed for the entire subjugation of Galatia (B.C. 189).

From that time forward they lived as peaceably as their restless spirit allowed them under Roman patronage. No humiliating conditions, however, were imposed upon them. They were permitted to retain their independence, and continued to be governed by their own princes. The conquerors even granted accessions of territory from time to time to those Galatian sovereigns who had been faithful to their allegiance.

¹ The chronology is somewhat uncertain. See Niebuhr, *KL. Schrift.* p. 286. The date given is an approximation.

² So Strabo, xii. p. 567. Pliny, *II. N.* v. 42, in accordance with ancient authorities generally, and confirmed by the inscriptions, Boeckh, iii. nos. 4010,

4011, 4085. Memnon is therefore in error, c. 19, when he assigns the chief towns differently. The names of the three tribes are variously written (see Contzen, p. 221), but the orthography adopted in the text is the best supported.

It was not the policy of the Romans to crush a race which had acted, and might still act, as a powerful check on its neighbors, thus preserving the balance of power, or rather of weakness, among the peoples of Asia Minor. At length, after more than a century and a half of native rule, on the death of Amyntas, one of their princes, Galatia was formed by Augustus into a Roman province (B.C. 25).

The limits of the province are not unimportant in their bearing on some questions relating to the early history of the gospel. It corresponded roughly to the kingdom of Amyntas, though some districts of the latter were assigned to a different government. Thus Galatia, as a Roman province, would include, besides the country properly so called, Lycaonia, Isauria, the southeastern district of Phrygia, and a portion of Pisidia.¹ Lycaonia is especially mentioned as belonging to it, and there is evidence that the cities of Derbe and Lystra in particular² were included within its boundaries. When the province was formed, the three chief towns of Galatia proper, Ancyra, Pessinus, and Tavium, took the name of Sebaste or Augusta, being distinguished from each other by the surnames of the respective tribes to which they belonged.³

Thus when the writers of the Roman period, St. Paul and St. Luke, for instance, speak of Galatia, the question arises whether they refer to the comparatively limited area of Galatia

¹ The extent of the kingdom of Amyntas may be gathered from the following passages: Strabo, xii. p. 568, Dion Cass. xlix. 32 (Lycaonia); Strabo, xii. p. 569 (Isauria), p. 571 (Pisidia), p. 577 (part of Phrygia), xiv. p. 671 (Cilicia Tracheia); Dion Cass. xlix. 32 (part of Pamphylia). See Becker, *Röm. Alterth.* iii. 1, p. 155; Cellarins, *Not. Orb. Ant.* ii. p. 182. Of the formation of the Roman province Strabo says, xii. p. 567, νῦν δ' ἔχουσι Ῥωμαῖοι καὶ ταύτην [τὴν Γαλατίαν] καὶ τὴν ὑπὸ τῷ Ἀμύντᾳ γενομένην πᾶσαν εἰς μίαν συναγαγόντες ἐπαρχίαν, and similarly p. 569. This sweeping statement, however, must be qualified. See Dion Cass. liii. 26, τοῦ δ' Ἀμύντου τελευτήσαντος οὐ τοῖς

παισὶν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐπέτρεψεν ἀλλ' εἰς τὴν ὑπήκοον ἐσήγαγε· καὶ οὕτω καὶ ἡ Γαλατία μετὰ τῆς Λυκαονίας Ῥωμαίων ἀρχοντα ἔσχε· τὰ δὲ χωρία τὰ ἐκ τῆς Παμφυλίας πρότερον τῷ Ἀμύντᾳ προσνεμηθέντα τῷ ἰδίῳ νομῷ ἀπεδόθη. Cilicia Tracheia was also separated and assigned to Archelaus; Strabo, xiv. p. 671.

² The Lystreni are included by Pliny among the Galatian peoples, *II. N.* v. 42. That Derbe also belonged to Galatia may be inferred from Strabo, xii. p. 569. See Böttger, *Beiträge*, *Suppl.* p. 26.

³ Σεβαστὴ Τεκτοσάγων, Σ. Τολιστοβωγίων, Σ. Τρόκμων. See Becker, *Röm. Alterth.* iii. 1, p. 156.

proper, or to the more extensive Roman province. The former is the popular usage of the term, while the latter has a more formal and official character.

Attention has hitherto been directed solely to the barbarian settlers in this region. These, however, did not form by any means the whole population of the district. The Galatians, whom Manlius subdued by the arms of Rome, and St. Paul by the sword of the Spirit, were a very mixed race. The substratum of society consisted of the original inhabitants of the invaded country, chiefly Phrygians, of whose language not much is known, but whose strongly marked religious system has a prominent place in ancient history. The upper layer was composed of the Gaulish conquerors; while scattered irregularly through the social mass were Greek settlers, many of whom, doubtless, had followed the successors of Alexander thither, and were already in the country when the Gauls took possession of it.¹ To the country thus peopled the Romans, ignoring the old Phrygian population, gave the name of Gallograceia. At the time when Manlius invaded it, the victorious Gauls had not amalgamated with their Phrygian subjects; and the Roman consul, on opening his campaign was met by a troop of the Phrygian priests of Cybele, who, clad in the robes of their order, and chanting a wild strain of prophecy, declared to him that the goddess approved of the war, and would make him master of the country.² The work of the Roman conquest was the fusion of the dominant with the conquered race: the result chiefly, it would appear, of that natural process by which all minor distinctions are levelled in the presence of a superior power. From this time forward the amalgamation began, and it was not long before the Gauls adopted even the religion of their Phrygian subjects.³

The Galatia of Manlius, then, was peopled by a mixed race

¹ It might be inferred from the inscription, Boeckh, iii. p. 82, Ἰουλίου Σευήρου τοῦ πρώτου τῶν Ἑλλήνων, that the Greeks in Galatia were recognized as a distinct class, even under the Romans.

² Polyb. xxii. 20; Livy, xxxviii. 18.

³ A Brogitarns is mentioned as priest

of the mother of the gods at Pessinus; Cicero, *de Arusp. Resp.* 28, *pro Sext.* 26. A Dyteutus, son of Adiatrix, held the same office in the temple of the goddess worshipped at Comana; Strabo, xii. p. 558. Other instances are given in Thierry, i. p. 411.

of Phrygians, Gauls, and Greeks. But before St. Paul visited the country two new elements had been added to this already heterogeneous population. The establishment of the province must have drawn thither a considerable number of Romans, not very widely spread, in all probability, but gathered about the centres of government, either holding official positions themselves, or connected more or less directly with those who did. From the prominence of the ruling race in the Galatian monuments,¹ we might even infer that the whole nation had Romanized. Such an impression, however, would certainly be incorrect. I cannot find in St. Paul's Epistle any distinct trace of the influence, or even of the presence, of the masters of the world, though the flaunting inscriptions of the Sebasteum still proclaim the devotion of the Galatian people to the worship of Augustus and Rome.

More important is it to remark on the large influx of Jews which must have invaded Galatia in the interval.² Antiochus the Great had settled two thousand Jewish families in Lydia and Phrygia³; and even if we suppose that these settlements did not extend to Galatia properly so called, the Jewish colonists must in course of time have overflowed into a neighboring country which possessed so many attractions for them. Those commercial instincts, which achieved a wide renown in the neighboring Phœnician race, and which in the Jews themselves made rapid progress during the palmy days of their national life under Solomon, had begun to develop afresh. The innate energy of the race sought this new outlet now that their national

¹ Boeckh, *Corp. Inscr.* iii. pp. 73-115.

² The direct connection of the Galatians with Jewish history is very slight. In 2 Macc. viii. 20, there is an obscure allusion to an engagement with them in Babylonia. In 1 Macc. viii. 2 it is said that Judas Maccabaens "heard of the wars of the Romans and the brave deeds which they did among the Galatians (or Gauls), and how they subdued them and laid them under tribute"; but whether we suppose the enumeration of the Roman triumphs to proceed in geographical or chronological order, the reference is

probably to the Western Gauls, either chiefly or solely, since the successes of the Romans in Spain are mentioned in the following verse, their victories over Philip and Persæus in the fifth, and the defeat of Antiochus not till the sixth verse. The same uncertainty hangs over the incident in Josephus, *Antiq.* xv. 7, 3, *Bell. Jud.* i. 20, 3, where we read that Augustus gave to Herod as his body-guard four hundred Galatians (or Gauls) who had belonged to Cleopatra.

³ Joseph. *Antiq.* xii. 3, 4.

hopes were crushed and their political existence was well nigh extinct. The country of Galatia afforded great facilities for commercial enterprise. With fertile plains rich in agricultural produce, with extensive pastures for flocks, with a temperate climate and copious rivers, it abounded in all those resources out of which a commerce is created.¹ It was, moreover, conveniently situated for mercantile transactions, being traversed by a great high road between the East and the shores of the Aegean, along which caravans were constantly passing, and among its towns it numbered not a few which are mentioned as great centres of commerce.² We read especially of a considerable traffic in cloth goods; but whether these were of home or foreign manufacture, we are not expressly told.³ With these attractions it is not difficult to explain the vast increase of the Jewish population in Galatia; and it is a significant fact that in the generation before St. Paul, Augustus directed a decree granting especial privileges to the Jews to be inscribed in his temple at Ancyra, the Galatian metropolis.⁴

¹ An anonymous geographer (*Geogr. Min.* Müller, ii. p. 521) describes Galatia as "provincia optima, sibi sufficiens." Other ancient writers also speak of the natural advantages of this country, see Wernsdorff, p. 199 sqq. A modern traveller writes as follows: "Malgré tant de ravages et de guerres désastreuses, la Galatie, par la fertilité de son sol et la richesse de ses produits agricoles, est encore une des provinces les plus heureuses de l'Asie Mineure." And again: "Malgré tous ses malheurs, la ville moderne d'Angora est une des plus peuplées de l'Asie Mineure. Elle doit la prospérité relative dont elle n'a cessé de jouir à son heureuse situation, à un climat admirablement sain, à un sol fertile, et surtout à ses innombrables troupeaux de chèvres," etc. Texier, *Revue des Deux Mondes*, l. c. pp. 597, 602.

² Strabo, xii. p. 567, especially mentions Tavium and Pessinus, describing the latter as ἐμπορείον τῶν ταύτη μέγιστον. Livy, xxxviii. 18, calls Gordium "celebre et frequens emporium."

³ Müller's *Geogr. Min.* l. c. "negotia-tur plurimam vestem." It is interesting to find that at the present day a very large trade is carried on at Angora, the ancient Ancyra, in the fabric manufactured from the fine hair of the peculiar breed of goats reared in the neighborhood. See Hamilton, *Asia Minor*, i. p. 418: Texier, l. c. p. 602 sqq., and especially Ritter's *Erdkunde*, xviii. p. 505. It is to this, probably, that the ancient geographer refers.

⁴ Joseph. *Antiq.* xvi. 6, 2. The influence of Judaism on St. Paul's converts here does not derive the same illustration from the statistics of the existing population as it does in some other places, Thessalonica, for instance, where the Jews are said to form at least one half of the inhabitants. In 1836 Hamilton was informed that out of about eleven thousand houses in Ancyra only one hundred and fifty were Jewish, the majority of the population being Turks or Catholic Armenians; *Asia Minor*, i. p. 419.

doubtless because this was a principal seat of the dispersion in these parts of Asia Minor. Other testimony to the same effect is afforded by the inscriptions found in Galatia, which present here and there Jewish names and symbols¹ amidst a strange confusion of Phrygian and Celtic, Roman and Greek. At the time of St. Paul they probably boasted a large number of proselytes, and may even have infused a beneficial leaven into the religion of the mass of the heathen population. Some accidental points of resemblance in the Mosaic ritual may perhaps have secured for the inspired teaching of the Old Testament a welcome which would have been denied to its lofty theology and pure code of morals.²

Still, with all this foreign admixture, it was the Celtic blood which gave its distinctive color to the Galatian character, and separated them by so broad a line even from their near neighbors. To this cause must be attributed that marked contrast in religious temperament which distinguished St. Paul's disciples in Galatia from the Christian converts of Colossae, though educated in the same Phrygian worship and subjected to the same Jewish influences. The tough vitality of the Celtic character maintained itself in Asia comparatively unimpaired among Phrygians and Greeks, as it has done in our own islands among Saxons and Danes and Normans, retaining its individuality of type after the lapse of ages and under conditions the most adverse.³

¹ See Boeckh, *Corp. Inscr.* Vol. iii. P. xviii. In no. 4129 the name Ἡσαῖος occurs with a symbol which Boeckh conjectures to be the seven-branched candlestick. We have also Ἰωάννου 4045, Σάββατος 4074, Ματατᾶς 4088, Θαδεὺς 4092. Ἀκίλας or Ἀκύλας, a name commonly borne by Jews in these parts, occurs several times. It is possible, however, that some of these may be Christian; nor is it always easy to pronounce on the Hebrew origin of a name in the confusion of nations which these inscriptions exhibit.

² Pausanias (vii. 17, 5) mentions that the people of Pessinus abstained from

swine's flesh (ὅων οὐχ ἀπτόμενοι), a statement which has given rise to much discussion. See Wernsdorff, p. 324 sq. Some have attributed this abstinence to Jewish influence, but the aversion to swine's flesh was common to several Eastern peoples. Instances are given in Milman's *Hist. of the Jews*, i. p. 177 (3d ed.).

³ Modern travellers have seen, or imagined they saw, in the physical features of the modern inhabitants of Galatia traces of their Celtic origin. So Texier, l. c. p. 598, "Sans chercher à se faire illusion, on reconnaît quelquefois, surtout parmi les pasteurs, des types qui se rapportent merveilleusement à

A very striking instance of the permanence of Celtic institutions is the retention of their language by these Gauls of Asia Minor. More than six centuries after their original settlement in this distant land, a language might be heard on the banks of the Sangarius and the Halys, which, though slightly corrupted, was the same in all essential respects with that spoken in the district watered by the Moselle and the Rhine. St. Jerome, who had himself visited both the Gaul of the West and the Gaul of Asia Minor, illustrates the relation of the two forms of speech by the connection existing between the language of the Phoenicians and their African colonies, or between the different dialects of Latin.¹

With the knowledge of this remarkable fact, it will not be thought idle to look for traces of the Celtic character in the Galatians of St. Paul's Epistle, for in general the character of a nation even outlives its language. No doubt it had undergone many changes. They were no longer that fierce, hardy race with which Rome and Greece successively had grappled in a struggle of life and death. After centuries of intercourse with Greeks and Phrygians, with the latter especially, who were reputed among the most effeminate and worthless of Asiatics, the ancient valor of the Gauls must have been largely diluted. Like the Celts of Western Europe, they had gradually deteriorated under the enervating influence of a premature or forced civilization.² Nevertheless, beneath the surface the

certaines races de nos provinces de France. On voit plus de cheveux blonds en Galatie qu'en aucun autre royaume de l'Asie Mineure; les têtes carrées et les yeux bleus rappellent le caractère des populations de l'ouest de la France."

¹ Hieron. in *Epist. ad Gal.* lib. ii. præf. "Galatas excepto sermone Graeco, quo omnis Oriens loquitur, propriam linguam eandem pene habere quam Treveros, nec referre si aliqua exinde corruerint, quum et Afri Phoenicium linguam nonnulla ex parte mutaverint, et ipsa Latinitas et regionibus quotidie mutetur et tempore (vii. P. i. p. 430, ed. Vallarsi)? By "excepto sermone

Graeco" he means that they spoke Greek in common with the rest of the East, *as well as Celtic*. Thierry (i. p. 415) strangely mistakes the meaning, "les Galates étaient les seuls, entre tous les peuples Asiatiques, qui ne se servissent point de la langue grecque." It is probable that they understood St. Paul's Epistle as well as if it had been written in their original tongue. None of the Galatian inscriptions are in the Celtic language. The people of Ancyra were perhaps "trilingues" like the Celts of Marseilles.

² Livy, xxxviii. 17, represents Manlius as saying, "Et illis majoribus nostris

Celtic character remains still the same, whether manifested in the rude and fiery barbarians who were crushed by the arms of Caesar, or the impetuous and fickle converts who call down the indignant rebuke of the Apostle of the Gentiles.

St. Paul's language, indeed, will suggest many coincidences, which perhaps we may be tempted to press unduly. His denunciation of "drunkenness and revellings,"¹ falling in with the taunts of ancient writers, will appear to point to a darling sin of the Celtic people.² His condemnation of the niggardly spirit with which they had doled out their alms, as a "mockery of God,"³ will remind us that the race is constantly reproached with its greed of wealth, so that Gaulish avarice passed almost into a proverb.⁴ His reiterated warning against strife and vain-glory⁵ will seem directed against a vice of the old Celtic blood still boiling in their veins, and breaking out in fierce and rancorous self-assertion.⁶ His very expression, "If ye bite and devour one another," will recall the angry gesticulations and menacing tones of this excitable people.⁷ But, without laying too much stress on these points of resemblance, which, however plausible, do not afford ground enough for a safe inference, we may confidently appeal to the broader features of the Galatian character, as they appear in this Epistle. In two important points especially, in the general temperament and the religious bias of his converts, light is shed on the language

cum haud dubiis Gallis in terra sua genitis res erat. Hi jam degeneres sunt, mixti et Gallograeci vere, quod appellantur." This language is probably an anachronism in the mouth of Manlius, but it was doubtless true when Livy wrote and when St. Paul preached. On the degeneracy of the Western Gauls, see Caesar, *Bell. Gall.* vi. 24; Tac. *Ann.* xi. 18; *Agric.* 11; *Germ.* 28.

¹ Gal. v. 21.

² Diod. Sic. v. 26, *κάτοινοι δὲ ὄντες καθ' ὑπερβολὴν τὸν εἰσαγόμενον ὑπὸ τῶν ἐμπόρων οἶνον ἄκρατον ἐμφοροῦνται καὶ διὰ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν λάβρῳ χρώμενοι τῷ ποτῷ καὶ μεθύσθοντες εἰς ὕπνον ἢ μανιώδεις διαθέσεις τρέπονται* κ.τ.λ.: Epictet. *Dissert.* ii. 20, 17, referred to in the note

p. 11. Compare also the jest, "Gallos post haec dilutius esse poturos," quoted from Cicero by Ammian. Marc. xv. 12, and the account Ammianus himself gives of the intemperance of the Gauls.

³ Gal. vi. 6, 7.

⁴ Diod. Sic. v. 27, *ὄντων τῶν Κελτῶν φιλαργύρων καθ' ὑπερβολήν*. Livy, xxxviii. 27, calls the Galatians "avidissima rapiendi gens."

⁵ Gal. v. 15, 26. Cf. v. 20, 21; vi. 3.

⁶ Ammian. l. c. "avidis iurgiorum et sublatius insolescentes." Diod. Sic. v. 28.

⁷ Diod. Sic. v. 31, *ἀπειληταὶ δὲ καὶ ἀνατακτοὶ καὶ τετραγῶδημένοι ὑπάρχουσι*. Ammian. l. c., "Metuendae voces complurium et minaces, placatorum juxta et irascentium."

of St. Paul by the notices of the Gauls found in classical authors.

1. The main features of the Gaulish character are traced with great distinctness by the Roman writers. Quickness of apprehension, promptitude in action, great impressibility, an eager craving after knowledge, this is the brighter aspect of the Celtic character. Inconstant and quarrelsome, treacherous in their dealings, incapable of sustained effort, easily disheartened by failure, such they appear when viewed on their darker side. It is curious to note the same eager, inquisitive temper revealing itself under widely different circumstances, at opposite limits both of time and space, in their early barbarism in the west and their worn-out civilization in the east. The great Roman captain relates how the Gauls would gather about any merchant or traveller who came in their way, detaining him even against his will, and eagerly pressing him for news.¹ A late Greek rhetorician commends the Galatians as more keen and quicker of apprehension than the genuine Greeks, adding that the moment they catch sight of a philosopher they cling to the skirts of his cloak, as the steel does to the magnet.² It is chiefly, however, on the more forbidding features of their character that contemporary writers dwell. Fickleness is the term used to express their temperament.³ This instability of character was the great difficulty against which Caesar had to contend in his dealings with the Gaul.⁴ He complains that they all, with scarcely an exception, are impelled by the desire of change.⁵ Nor did they show more constancy in the discharge of their religious than of their social obligations. The hearty zeal with which they embraced the apostle's teaching, followed by their rapid apostasy, is only an instance out of many of the reckless facility with which they adopted and discarded one religious system after another. To St. Paul,

¹ Caesar, *Bell. Gall.* iv. 5.

² Themistius, *Or.* xxiii. p. 299 A. (referred to by Wetstein on Gal. i. 6), οἱ δὲ ἄνδρες ὥστε ὅτι ὁξεῖς καὶ ἀγχίνοι καὶ εὐμαθεστέροι τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων. καὶ τριβωνίου παραφανέντος ἐκκρέμανται εὐθὺς ὥσπερ τῆς λίθου τὰ σιδήρια.

³ *Bell. Gall.* iv. 1, "Mobilitate et le-

vitare animi." Cf. Tacitus, *German.* 29.

⁴ *Bell. Gall.* iv. 5, "Infirmitatem Gallorum veritus quod sunt in consiliis capiendis mobiles et novis plerumque rebus student, nihil his committendum existimavit."

⁵ *Ib.* iii. 10, "Quum intelligeret omnes fere Gallos novis rebus studere."

who had had much bitter experience of hollow professions and fickle purposes, this extraordinary levity was yet a matter of unfeigned surprise. "I marvel," he says, "that ye are changing so quickly."¹ He looked upon it as some strange fascination. "Ye senseless Gauls, who did bewitch you?"² The language in which Roman writers speak of the martial courage of the Gauls, impetuous at the first onset, but rapidly melting in the heat of the fray,³ well describes the short-lived prowess of these converts in the warfare of the Christian church.

2. Equally important, in its relation to St. Paul's Epistle, is the type of religious worship which seems to have pervaded the Celtic nations. The Gauls are described as a superstitious people, given over to ritual observances.⁴ Nor is it, perhaps, a mere accident that the only Asiatic Gaul of whom history affords more than a passing glimpse, Deiotarus the client of Cicero, in his extravagant devotion to augury, fully bears out the character ascribed to the parent race.⁵

The colors in which contemporary writers have painted the religion of the primitive Gauls are dark and terrible enough. A gross superstition, appealing to the senses and the passions, rather than to the heart and mind, enforcing rites of unexampled cruelty, and demanding a slavish obedience to priestly authority, such is the picture with which we are familiar. It is unnecessary here to inquire how far the religious philosophy of the Druids involved a more spiritual creed.⁶ The Druids were an exclusive caste with an esoteric doctrine, and it is with the popular worship that we are concerned. The point to be observed is that an outward, material, passionate religion had grown up among the Gauls, as their own creation, answering to some peculiar features of their character. Settled among the

¹ Gal. i. 6.

² Gal. iii. 1, ὦ ἄνθρωποι Γαλάται, τίς ὑμῶς ἐβάσκαθεν;

³ Livy, x. 28, "Gallorum quidem etiam corpora intolerantissima laboris atque aestus fluere; primumque eorum praelia plusquam virorum, postrema minus quam feminarum esse." Cf. Florus, ii. 4. To the same effect Cae-

sar, *Bell. Gall.* iii. 19, and Polyb. ii. 35.

⁴ Caesar's words are, "Natio est omnis Gallorum admodum dedita religionibus," *Bell. Gall.* vi. 16. Cf. Diod. Sic. v. 27.

⁵ Cicero, *de Div.* i. 15; ii. 36, 37.

⁶ The nobler aspect of the Druidical system has been exaggerated. See the remarks of M. de Pressensé. *Trois Premiers Siècles*, 2me série, i. p. 52.

Phrygians, they with their wonted facility adopted the religion of the subject people. The worship of Cybele, with its wild ceremonial and hideous mutilations would naturally be attractive to the Gaulish mind. Its external rites were similar enough in their general character to those of the primitive Celtic religion to commend it to a people who had found satisfaction in the latter. And though we may suppose that the mystic element in the Phrygian worship, which appealed so powerfully to the Græco-Asiatic, awoke no corresponding echo in the Gaul, still there was enough in the outward ritual with its passionate orgies to allure them. Then the gospel was offered to them, and the energy of the apostle's preaching took their hearts by storm. But the old leaven still remained. The pure and spiritual teaching of Christianity soon ceased to satisfy them. Their religious temperament, fostered by long habit, prompted them to seek a system more external and ritualistic. "Having begun in the Spirit, they would be made perfect in the flesh."¹ Such is the language of the apostle, rebuking this unnatural violation of the law of progress. At a later period in the history of the church, we find the Galatians still hankering after new forms of Christianity in the same spirit of ceaseless innovation, still looking for some "other gospel," which might better satisfy their cravings after a more passionate worship.

¹ Gal. iii. 3.

II.

THE CHURCHES OF GALATIA.

IN what sense do the sacred writers use the word Galatia? Has it an ethnographical or a political meaning? In other words, does it signify the comparatively small district occupied by the Gauls, Galatia properly so called, or the much larger territory included in the Roman province of the name? This question must be answered before attempting to give an account of the Galatian churches.

Important consequences flow from the assumption that the term covers the wider area.¹ In that case it will comprise not only the towns of Derbe and Lystra,² but also, it would seem, Iconium and the Pisidian Antioch; and we shall then have in the narrative of St. Luke³ a full and detailed account of the founding of the Galatian churches. Moreover, the favorite disciple and most constant companion of the apostle, Timothy, was on this showing a Galatian,⁴ and through him St. Paul's communications with these churches would be more or less close to the end of his life. It must be confessed, too, that this view has much to recommend it at first sight. The apostle's account of his hearty and enthusiastic welcome by the Galatians, as an angel of God,⁵ will have its counterpart in the impulsive warmth of the barbarians at Lystra, who would have sacrificed to him, imagining that "the gods had come down in the likeness of men."⁶ His references to "the temptations in the

¹ The warmest advocate of this view is Böttger, *Beiträge*, i. p. 28 sqq., iii. p. 1 sqq., who maintains that by the Galatian churches are meant those of Pisidia and Lycaonia *alone*.

² See above, p. 15, note 2.

³ Acts xiii. 14-xiv. 24.

⁴ Acts xvi. 1.

⁵ Gal. iv. 14.

⁶ Acts xiv. 11.

flesh," and "the marks of the Lord Jesus" branded on his body,¹ are then illustrated, or thought to be illustrated, by the persecutions and sufferings that "came unto him at Antioch, at Iconium, at Lystra."² The progress of Judaizing tendencies among the Galatians is then accounted for by the presence of a large Jewish element such as the history describes in these churches of Lycaonia and Pisidia.³

Without stopping, however, to sift these supposed coincidences, or insisting on the chronological and historical difficulties which this view creates, there are many reasons which make it probable that the Galatia of St. Paul and St. Luke is not the Roman province of that name, but the land of the Gauls.⁴ By writers speaking familiarly of the scenes in which they had themselves taken part, the term would naturally be used in its popular, rather than in its formal and official sense. It would scarcely be more strange to speak of Pesth and Presburg, of Venice and Verona, as "the Austrian cities," than to entitle the Christian brotherhoods of Derbe and Lystra, Iconium and Antioch, "the Churches of Galatia." Again, analogy is strongly in favor of the popular use of the term.⁵ Mysia, Phrygia, Pisidia, are all "geographical expressions" destitute of any political significance; and as they occur in the same parts of the narrative with Galatia,⁶ it seems fair to infer that the latter is similarly used. The direct transition, for instance, which we find from Galatia to Phrygia, is only explicable if the two are kindred terms, both alike being used in a popular way. Moreover, St. Luke distinctly calls Lystra and Derbe "cities of Lycaonia,"⁷ while he no less distinctly assigns Antioch to Pisidia;⁸ a convincing proof that in the language of the day they were not regarded as Galatian towns. Lastly, the ex-

¹ Gal. iv. 14; vi. 17.

² 2 Tim. iii. 11.

³ Acts xiii. 14, 43, 45; xiv. 1; xvi. 3.

⁴ On the other hand, in 1 Peter. i. 1, where the enumeration seems to proceed by provinces, Galatia is probably used in its political sense. This is not unnatural in one who was writing from a distance, and perhaps had never visited the district.

⁵ The case of "Asia," however, is an exception. The foundation of this province dating very far back, its official name had to a great extent superseded the local designations of the districts which it comprised. Hence Asia in the New Testament is always Proconsular Asia.

⁶ Acts xiv. 24; xvi. 6-8; xviii. 23.

⁷ Acts xiv. 6.

⁸ Acts xiii. 14.

pression used in the Acts of St. Paul's visit to these parts, "the Phrygian and Galatian country,"¹ shows that the district intended was not Lycaonia and Pisidia, but some region which might be said to belong either to Phrygia or Galatia, or the parts of each contiguous to the other.

It is most probable, therefore, that we should search for the churches of Galatia within narrower limits. In the absence of all direct testimony, we may conjecture that it was at Ancyra, now the capital of the Roman province, as formerly of the Gaulish settlement, "the most illustrious metropolis," as it is styled in formal documents;² at Pessinus, under the shadow of Mount Dindymus, the cradle of the worship of the great goddess, and one of the principal commercial towns of the district;³ at Tavium, at once a strong fortress and a great emporium, situated at the point of convergence of several important roads;⁴ perhaps also at Juliopolis, the ancient Gordium, formerly the capital of Phrygia, almost equidistant from the three seas, and from its central position a busy mart;⁵ at these, or some of these places, that St. Paul founded the earliest "Churches of Galatia." The ecclesiastical geography of Galatia two or three centuries later is no safe guide in settling questions relating to the apostolic age, but it is worth while to observe that these are among the earliest episcopal sees on record in this country.⁶

In Galatia the gospel would find itself in conflict with two distinct types of worship, which then divided the allegiance of civilized heathendom. At Pessinus the service of Cybele, the most widely revered of all pagan deities, represented, perhaps more adequately than any other service, the genuine

¹ Acts xvi. 6. See below, note 1, p. 29.

² Boeckh, *Corp. Inscr.* no. 4015, ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος τῆς λαμπροτάτης μητροπόλεως Ἀγκύρας. It is frequently styled the "metropolis" in inscriptions and on coins.

³ Strabo, xii. p. 567.

⁴ Strabo, l. c. See Hamilton's *Asia Minor*, p. 395. Perhaps, however, Tavium lay too much to the eastward of St. Paul's route, which would take him

more directly to the western parts of Galatia.

⁵ Pliny, v. 42, "Caputque quondam ejus (i.e. Phrygiæ) Gordium." Cf. Livy, xxxviii. 18, "Haud magnum quidem oppidum est, sed plusquam mediterraneum, celebre et frequens emporium: tria maria pari ferme distantia intervallo habet." See Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xviii. p. 561.

⁶ Le Quien, *Oricus Christ.* i. p. 456 sqq.

spirit of the old popular religion. At Ancyra the pile dedicated to the divinities of Augustus and Rome was one of the earliest and most striking embodiments of the new political worship which imperial statecraft had devised to secure the respect of its subject peoples. We should gladly have learned how the great apostle advocated the cause of the truth against either form of error. Our curiosity however is here disappointed. It is strange that while we have more or less acquaintance with all the other important Churches of St. Paul's founding,—with Corinth and Ephesus, with Phillipi and Thessalonica,—not a single name of a person or place, scarcely a single incident of any kind, connected with the apostle's preaching in Galatia should be preserved either in the history or the Epistle. The reticence of the apostle himself, indeed, may be partly accounted for by the circumstances of the Galatian Church. The same delicacy which has concealed from us the name of the Corinthian offender, may have led him to avoid all special allusions in addressing a community to which he wrote in a strain of the severest censure. Yet even the slight knowledge we do possess of the early Galatian Church is gathered from the Epistle, with scarcely any aid from the history. Can it be that the historian gladly drew a veil over the infancy of a Church which swerved so soon and so widely from the purity of the gospel?

St. Luke mentions two visits to Galatia; but beyond the bare fact he adds nothing to our knowledge. The first occasion was during the apostle's second missionary journey, probably in the year 51 or 52.¹ The second visit took place a few years later, perhaps in the year 54, in the course of his third missionary journey, and immediately before his long residence in Ephesus.² The Epistle contains allusions, as will be seen, to both visits; and combining these two sources of information, we arrive at the following scanty facts.

1. After the apostolic congress St. Paul, starting from Antioch with Silas, revisited the Churches he had founded in Syria, Cilicia, and Lyeaonia. At Lystra they fell in with Timothy, who also accompanied them on their journey.³ Hitherto the apostle had been travelling over old ground. He now

¹ Acts xvi. 6.

² Acts xviii. 23.

³ Acts xv. 40-xvi. 5.

entered upon a new mission-field, "the region of Phrygia and Galatia."¹ The form of the Greek expression implies that Phrygia and Galatia here are not to be regarded as separate districts. The country which was now evangelized might be called indifferently Phrygia or Galatia. It was in fact the land originally inhabited by Phrygians, but subsequently occupied by Gauls; or so far as he travelled beyond the limits of the Gallic settlement, it was still in the neighboring parts of Phrygia that he preached, which might fairly be included under one general expression.²

St. Paul does not appear to have had any intention of preaching the gospel here.³ He was perhaps anxious at once to bear his message to the more important and promising district of Proconsular Asia.⁴ But he was detained by a return of his old malady, "the thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan sent to buffet him,"⁵ some sharp and violent attack, it would appear, which humiliated him and prostrated his physical strength. To this the Galatians owed their knowledge of Christ. Though a homeless, stricken wanderer might seem but a feeble advocate of a cause so momentous, yet it was the divine order that in the preaching of the gospel strength should be made perfect in weakness. The zeal of the preacher and the enthusiasm of the hearers triumphed over all impediments. "They did not despise nor loathe the temptation in his flesh. They received him as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus.

¹ Acts xvi. 6. Διελθόντες δὲ τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ [τὴν] Γαλατικὴν χώραν. The second τὴν of the received reading ought to be omitted, with the best mss., in which case Φρυγίαν becomes an adjective. This variety of reading has escaped the notice of commentators, though it solves more than one difficulty. On the occasion of the second visit the words are (xviii. 23), διερχόμενος καθέξῃς τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν. The general direction of St Paul's route on both occasions was rather westward than eastward, and this is expressed in the second passage by naming Galatia before Phrygia, but it is quite consistent with the expression in the first, where

the two districts are not separated. If we retain the received reading, we must suppose that St Paul went from west to east on the first occasion, and from east to west on the second.

² Colossae would thus lie beyond the scene of the apostle's labors, and the passage correctly read does not present even a seeming contradiction to Col. i. 4, 6, 7, ii. 1, where it is implied that St Paul had never visited that place.

³ I see no reason for departing from the strictly grammatical interpretation of Gal. iv. 13, δι' ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκός.

⁴ Acts xvi. 6.

⁵ 2 Cor. xii. 7.

They would have plucked out their very eyes, if they could, and have given them to him.”¹ Such was the impression left on his heart by their first affectionate welcome, painfully embittered by contrast with their later apostasy.

It can scarcely have been any predisposing religious sympathy which attracted them so powerfully, though so transiently, to the gospel. They may indeed have held the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, which is said to have formed part of the Druidical teaching in European Gaul.² It is possible too that there lingered, even in Galatia, the old Celtic conviction, so cruelly expressed in their barbarous sacrifices, that only by man's blood can man be redeemed.³ But with these doubtful exceptions, the gospel as a message of mercy and a spiritual faith, stood in direct contrast to the gross and material religions in which the race had been nurtured, whether the cruel ritualism of their old Celtic creed, or the frightful orgies of their adopted worship of the mother of the gods. Yet though the whole spirit of Christianity was so alien to their habits of thought, we may well imagine how the fervor of the apostle's preaching may have fired their religious enthusiasm. The very image under which he describes his work brings vividly before us the energy and force with which he delivered his message. He *placarded* Christ crucified before their eyes,⁴ arresting the gaze of the spiritual loiterer, and riveting it on this proclamation of his Sovereign. If we picture to ourselves the apostle as he appeared before the Galatians, a friendless outcast, writhing under the tortures of a painful malady, yet instant in season and out of season, by turns denouncing and entreating, appealing to the agonies of a crucified Saviour, perhaps also, as at Lystra, enforcing this appeal by some striking miracle, we shall be at no loss to conceive how the fervid temperament of the Gaul might have been aroused, while yet only the surface of his spiritual consciousness was ruffled. For the time, indeed, all seemed to be going on well.

¹ Gal. iv. 14, 15.

² They believed also in its transmigration. See Caesar, *Bell. Gall.* vi. 14; Diod. Sic. v. 28.

³ *Bell. Gall.* vi. 16, “Pro vita hominis

nisi hominis vita reddatur, non posse aliter decorum immortalium numen placari arbitrantur.”

⁴ Gal. iii. 1, *προεγράφη*. See note, p.

"Ye were running bravely," says the apostle,¹ alluding to his favorite image of the foot-race. But the very eagerness with which they had embraced the gospel was in itself a dangerous symptom. A material so easily moulded soon loses the impression it has taken. The passionate current of their Celtic blood, which flowed in this direction now, might only too easily be diverted into a fresh channel by some new religious impulse. Their reception of the gospel was not built on a deeply-rooted conviction of its truth, or a genuine appreciation of its spiritual power.

This visit to Galatia, we may suppose, was not very protracted. Having been detained by illness, he would be anxious to continue his journey as soon as he was convalescent. He was pressing forward under a higher guidance towards a new field of missionary labor in the hitherto unexplored continent of Europe.

2. An interval of nearly three years must have elapsed before his second visit. He was now on his third missionary journey; and according to his wont, before entering upon a new field of labor, his first care was to revisit and "confirm" the churches he had already founded. This brought him to "the Galatian country and Phrygia." From the language used in describing this visit we may infer that not a few congregations had been established in Galatia. "He went through the district *in order*, confirming *all* the disciples."²

Of the second visit to Galatia even less is known than of the former. It would seem, however, that some unhealthy symptoms had already appeared, threatening the purity of the gospel. At all events, certain expressions in the Epistle, which are most naturally referred to this visit, imply that cause for uneasiness had even then arisen. He was constrained to address his converts in language of solemn warning.³ He charged them to hold accursed any one who perverted the gospel as he had taught it.⁴ Writing to them afterwards, he contrasts the hearty welcome of his first visit with his cold reception on this occasion, attributing their estrangement to the freedom with

¹ Gal. v. 7.² Acts xviii. 23.³ Gal. v. 21.⁴ Gal. i. 9.

which he denounced their errors. "Have I become your enemy," he asks, "because I told you the truth?"¹

The Epistle was written, as I hope to show, about three or four years after the second visit; but in the meanwhile St. Paul doubtless kept up his intercourse with the Galatian churches by messengers or otherwise. A large portion of the intervening time was spent at Ephesus, whence communication with Galatia would be easily maintained. An incidental allusion in the First Epistle to the Corinthians throws light on this subject. It there appears that St. Paul appealed² to the churches of Galatia, as he did also to those of Macedonia and Achaia, to contribute towards the relief of their poorer brethren in Palestine, who were suffering from a severe famine. By communication thus maintained, St. Paul was made acquainted with the growing corruption of the Galatian churches from the spread of Judaizing errors.

The avidity with which these errors were caught up implies some previous acquaintance with Jewish history and some habituation to Jewish modes of thought. The same inference may be drawn from the frequent and minute references in the Epistle to the Old Testament, assuming no inconsiderable knowledge of the sacred writings on the part of his converts. It has been shown already that there was in Galatia a large population of Jews to whom this influence may be traced.³

The apostle had probably selected as centres of his mission those places especially where he would find a sufficient body of Jewish residents to form the nucleus of a Christian church. It was almost as much a matter of missionary convenience, as of religious obligation, to offer the gospel "to the Jew first and then to the Gentile."⁴ They were the keepers of the sacred archives, and the natural referees in all that related to the history and traditions of the race. To them, therefore, he must of necessity appeal. In almost every instance where a detailed account is given in the apostolic history of the foundation of a church, we find St. Paul introducing himself to his fellow-

¹ Gal. iv. 13-16. See the notes, pp. 273-275.

² 1 Cor. xvi. 1-6.

³ See above, p. 17 sqq.

⁴ Rom. i. 16; ii. 9, 10.

countrymen first; the time, the Sabbath-day; the place, the synagogue, or, where there was no synagogue, the humbler proseucha. Thus, in the very act of planting a Christian church, the apostle himself planted the germs of bigotry and disaffection.

Not, however, that the gospel seems to have spread widely among the Jews in Galatia, for St. Paul's own language shows that the great mass at least of his converts were Gentiles,¹ and the analogy of other churches points to the same result. But Jewish influences spread far beyond the range of Jewish circles. The dalliance with this "foreign superstition," which excited the indignation of the short-sighted moralists of Rome was certainly not less rife in the provinces than in the metropolis. Many a man who had not cast off his heathen religion, and perhaps had no intention of casting it off, was yet directly or indirectly acquainted with the customs and creed of the Jews, and possibly had some knowledge of the writings of the law-giver and the prophets. Still there were doubtless some Jewish converts in the Galatian church.² These would be a link of communication with the brethren of Palestine, and a conducting medium by which Jewish practices were transmitted to their Gentile fellow-Christians.

For whatever reason, the Judaism of the Galatians was much more decided than we find in any other Gentile church. The infection was both sudden and virulent. They were checked all at once in the gallant race for the prize.³ Their gaze was averted by some strange fascination from the proclamation of Christ crucified.⁴ Such are the images under which the

¹ Gal. iv. 8, "Then, not knowing God, ye did service to them which by nature are no gods." See also Gal. iii. 29; v. 2; vi. 12; and the notes, pages 225, 235, on i. 14, *ἐν τῷ γένει μου*; ii. 5, *πρὸς ὑμᾶς*. It has been assumed that St. Peter, as the apostle of the circumcision, must have written to Jewish Christians, and that, therefore, as his Epistles are addressed to the Galatians among others, there was a large number of converts from Judaism in the churches

of Galatia. His own language, however, shows that he is writing chiefly to Gentiles (1 Pet. ii. 9, 10), and that therefore the *διασπορά* of the opening salutation is the *spiritual* dispersion. Cf. 1 Pet. ii. 11, 12.

² See the note, p. 303 on vi. 13, where the various readings *οἱ περιτετμημένοι* and *οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι* have some bearing on this point.

³ Gal. v. 7.

⁴ Gal. iii. 1.

apostle describes their apostasy. It was a Judaism of the sharp Pharisaic type, unclouded or unrelieved by any haze of Essene mysticism, such as prevailed a few years later in the neighboring Colossian church. The necessity of circumcision was strongly insisted upon.¹ Great stress was laid on the observance of "days and months and seasons and years."² In short, nothing less than submission to the whole ceremonial law seems to have been contemplated by the innovators.³ At all events, this was the logical consequence of the adoption of the initiatory rite.⁴

This position could only be maintained by impugning the credit of St. Paul. By some means or other his authority must be set aside, and an easy method suggested itself. They represented him as no true apostle. He had not been one of the Lord's personal followers; he had derived his knowledge of the gospel at second hand. It was therefore to the mother church of Jerusalem that all questions must be referred, to the great apostles of the circumcision especially, the "pillars of the church,"—to James in the forefront, as the Lord's brother; to Peter, who had received a special commission from his Master; to John, the most intimate of his personal friends.⁵ This disparaging criticism of his opponents St. Paul has in view from first to last in the Epistle to the Galatians. He commences by asserting in the strongest terms his immediate divine commission as an apostle "not of men, neither by man,"⁶ and this assertion he emphatically reiterates.⁷ He gives in the body of the letter a minute historical account of his intercourse with the apostles of the circumcision, showing his entire independence of them.⁸ He closes, as he had begun, with a defence of his office and commission. "Henceforth," he exclaims indignantly, "let no man trouble me, for I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus."⁹ He felt that there was a heartless

¹ Gal. v. 2, 11; vi. 12, 13.

² Gal. iv. 10.

³ Gal. iii. 2; iv. 21; v. 4, 18.

⁴ Gal. v. 3.

⁵ The participles *τοῖς δοκοῦσιν* (ii. 2), *τῶν δοκούντων εἶναι τι*, *οἱ δοκοῦντες* (ii. 6), *οἱ δοκοῦντες στέλγει εἶναι* (ii. 9), ought probably to be translated as *presents*,

referring to the exclusive importance which the *Judaizers in Galatia* attached to the apostles of the circumcision. See notes.

⁶ Gal. i. 1.

⁷ Gal. i. 11, 12.

⁸ Gal. i. 15–ii. 21.

⁹ Gal. vi. 17.

mockery in the denial of his apostleship, when he had been marked as the servant of Christ forever by the cruel brand of persecution.

But the attacks of his enemies did not stop here. They charged him with inconsistency in his own conduct. He, too, it was represented, had been known to preach that circumcision which he so strenuously opposed.¹ It was convenient to him, they insinuated, to repudiate his convictions now, in order to ingratiate himself with the Gentiles.² There must have been doubtless many passages in the life of one who held it a sacred duty to become all things to all men, especially to become as a Jew to the Jews,³ to which bigoted or unscrupulous adversaries might give this color. Such, for instance, was the circumcision of Timothy;⁴ such again was the sanction given to Jewish usages during his last visit to Jerusalem, when, at the instigation of James, he defrayed the expenses of those who had taken Nazarite vows.⁵ To concessions like these, I imagine, continued throughout his life, and not, as some have thought, to any earlier stage of the apostle's teaching, when his Christian education was not yet matured, and some remnants of Judaism still hung about him (for of such a stage there is no evidence), are we to look for the grounds on which his opponents charged him with inconsistency.

The instigators of this rebellion against St. Paul's authority and teaching seem not to have been Galatian residents. His leading antagonists were most probably emissaries from the mother church of Jerusalem, either abusing a commission actually received from the apostles of the circumcision, or assuming an authority which had never been conferred upon them. The parallel case of the Corinthian church, where communications between the Judaic party and the Christians of Palestine are more clearly traced, suggests this solution, and it is confirmed by the Epistle to the Galatians itself. When

¹ Gal. v. 11. See Lechler, *Apost. u. Nachapost. Zeitalter* (ed. 2), p. 384. The case of Titus (Gal. ii. 3), however we explain it, seems to be introduced in order to meet this charge.

² See the notes, pp. 222, 232, 284, 287, on

Gal. i. 10, "Do I *now* persuade men?" "Do I seek to please men?" and on ii. 3, v. 2, 11.

³ 1 Cor. ix. 20, 22.

⁴ Acts xvi. 3.

⁵ Acts xxi. 20-26.

St. Paul refers to the dissimulation at Antioch occasioned by the arrival of "certain who came from James,"¹ we can scarcely resist the impression that he is holding up the mirror of the past to the Galatians, and that there was sufficient resemblance between the two cases to point the application. Moreover, the vague allusions to these opponents scattered through the Epistle seem to apply rather to disturbances caused by a small and compact body of foreign intruders, than to errors springing up silently and spontaneously within the Galatian church itself. They are the tares sown designedly by the enemy in the night time, and not the weeds which grow up promiscuously as the natural product of the soil. "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump."² "There be some that trouble you."³ It would even seem that there was a ringleader among the Judaizing teachers, marked out either by his superior position or his greater activity: "He that troubleth you shall bear his judgment, whosoever he be."⁴

But howsoever they were disseminated, these errors found in Galatia a congenial soil. The corruption took the direction which might have been expected from the religious education of the people. A passionate and striking ritualism, expressing itself in bodily mortifications of the most terrible kind had been supplanted by the simple spiritual teaching of the gospel. For a time the pure morality and lofty sanctions of the new faith appealed not in vain to their higher instincts: but they soon began to yearn after a creed which suited their material cravings better, and was more allied to the system they had abandoned. This end they attained by overlaying the simplicity of the gospel with Judaic observances. This new phase of their religious life is ascribed by St. Paul himself to the temper which their old heathen education had fostered. It was a *return* to the "weak and beggarly elements" which they had outgrown, a *renewed* subjection to the "yoke of bondage" which they had thrown off in Christ.⁵ They had escaped from one ritualistic system only to bow before another.

¹ Gal. ii. 12.

² Gal. v. 9.

³ Gal. i. 7. See also iv. 17; vi. 12.

⁴ Gal. v. 10.

⁵ Gal. iv. 9, πῶς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα οἷς πάλιν ἄνωθεν δουλεῖν θέλετε, and v. 1, μὴ πάλιν ζυγῷ δουλείας ἐνέχεσθε.

The innate failings of a race "excessive in its devotion to external observances"¹ was here reasserting itself.

To check these errors, which were already spreading fast, the apostle wrote his Epistle to the Galatians. What effect his remonstrance had upon them can only be conjectured, for from this time forward the Galatian church may be said to disappear from the apostolic history. If we could be sure that the mission of Crescens, mentioned in the latest of St. Paul's Epistles, refers to the Asiatic settlement, there would be some ground for assuming that the apostle maintained a friendly intercourse with his Galatian converts to the close of his life; but it is at least as likely that the mother country of the Gauls is there meant.² Neither from the Epistles of St. Peter can any facts be elicited; for as they are addressed to all the great churches of Asia Minor alike, no inference can be drawn as to the condition of the Galatian church in particular. In the absence of all information, we would gladly believe that here, as at Corinth, the apostle's rebuke was successful, that his authority was restored, the offenders were denounced, and the whole church, overwhelmed with shame, returned to its allegiance. The cases, however, are not parallel. The severity of tone is more sustained in this instance, the personal appeals

¹ Caesar, *Bell. Gall.* vi. 16, quoted p. 23, note 4.

² 2 Tim. iv. 10. "Galatia" in this passage was traditionally interpreted of European Gaul. It is explained thus by Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 4, Epiphani. *adv. Hæres.* ii. 1, p. 433, Jerome (?) *Op.* ii. p. 960 (ed. Vallarsi), and by Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret commenting on the passage. It is so taken also by those MSS. which read Γαλλίαν for Γαλατίαν, for the former reading may be regarded as a gloss. The churches of Vienne and Mayence both claimed Crescens as their founder. The passage in the *Apost. Const.* vii. 46, Κρήσεως τῶν κατὰ Γαλατίαν ἐκκλησιῶν, perhaps points to Asiatic Gaul, but is ambiguous. Later writers made Crescens visit both the European and the Asiatic country. A

curious coincidence of names occurs in Boeckh, *Inscr.* no. 3888 Κρήσευτα ἐπιτροπον Λουγδούνου Γαλλίας. I attribute some weight to the tradition in favor of Western Gaul, because it is not the *prima facie* view. Supposing St. Paul to have meant this, he would almost certainly have used Γαλατίαν and not Γαλλίαν; see the note p. 11; and to the authorities there quoted add Theodoret on 2 Tim. iv. 10, τὰς Γαλλίας οὕτως ἐκάλεσεν· οὕτω γὰρ ἐκαλοῦντο πάσαι· οὕτω δὲ καὶ νῦν αὐτὰς ὀνομάζουσιν οἱ τῆς ἑξω παιδείας μετεिल्χότες. A passage in the *Monumentum Ancyranum* (Boeckh, *Inscr.* no. 4040) presents a coincidence with 2 Tim. iv. 10, in the juxtaposition of Galatia (i.e. European Gaul) and Dalmatia, ἐξ Ἰσπανίας καὶ Γαλατίας καὶ παρὰ Δαλματῶν.

are fewer, the remonstrances more indignant and less affectionate. One ray of hope, indeed, seems to break through the dark cloud; but we must not build too much on a single expression of confidence,¹ dictated, it may be, by a generous and politic charity, which "believeth all things."

It is not idle, as it might seem at first sight, to follow the stream of history beyond the horizon of the apostolic age. The fragmentary notices of its subsequent career reflect some light on the temper and disposition of the Galatian church in St. Paul's day. To Catholic writers of a later date indeed, the failings of its infancy seemed to be so faithfully reproduced in its mature age, that they invested the apostle's rebuke with a prophetic import.² Asia Minor was the nursery of heresy, and of all the Asiatic churches it was nowhere so rife as in Galatia. The Galatian capital was the stronghold of the Montanist revival,³ which lingered on for more than two centuries, splitting into diverse sects, each distinguished by some fantastic gesture or minute ritual observance.⁴ Here too were to be found

¹ Gal. v. 10.

² Euseb. *c. Marcell.* i. p. 7 A, ὡς περ γὰρ θεσπιζων τὸ μέλλον αὐτοῖς Γαλάταις τὴν τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἐξηκριβου θεολογίαν, κ.τ.λ. Hieron. *ad. Gal.* ii. *præf.* (vii. p. 427, ed. Vallarsi) "quomodo apostolus unanquamque provinciam suis proprietatibus denotavit? Usque hodie eadem vel virtutum vestigia permanent vel errorum."

³ An anonymous writer quoted by Euseb. *H. E.* v. 16, 3. Cf. Epiphani. *Hæc.* ii. 1, p. 416.

⁴ Hieron. l. c. p. 430, "Seit mecum qui vidit Ancyram metropolim Galatiæ civitatem, quot nunc usque schismatibus dilacerata sit, quot dogmatum varietatibus constuprata. Omitto Cataphrygas, Ophitas, Borboritas, et Manichæos; nota enim jam hæc humane calamitatis vocabula sunt. Quis unquam Passalorynchitas et Ascodrobo et Artotyritas et cætera magis portenta quam nomina in aliqua parte Romani orbis audivit?" The Passalorynchites and Artotyrites were offshoots of Montanism, the one so

called from their placing the forefinger on the nose when praying, the other from their offering bread and cheese at the Eucharist; Epiph. *Hæc.* ii. 1, pp. 416, 7; Philastr. *Hæc.* lxxiv, lxxvi. In the word Ascodrobi there is perhaps some corruption. Theodoret, *Hæc.* *Fab.* i. 10, speaks of the Ascodrupi or Ascodrupitæ, as a Marcsonian (Gnostic) sect. Epiphanius, l. c., mentions Tascodrugitæ as a barbarous equivalent to Passalorynchitæ. Jerome, however, seems to have had in view the sect called Ascodrogitæ by Philastrius, *Hæc.* lxxv. The account of Philastrius well exhibits the general temper of Galatian heresy: "Alii sunt Ascodrogitæ in Galatia, qui utrem inflatum ponunt et eo operiunt in sua ecclesia et circumneunt cum insanientis potibus et bacchantes, sicut pagani Libero patri. . . . Et cum suis cæcitatibus properant inservire, alieni modis omnibus Christianæ salutis reperiuntur, cum apostolus deiciat justificationem illam Judaicam carnalemque vanitatem." After all allow-

Ophites, Manichaeans, sectarians of all kinds. Hence, during the great controversies of the fourth century, issued two successive bishops, who disturbed the peace of the church, swerving, or seeming to swerve, from Catholic truth in opposite directions, the one on the side of Sabellian, the other of Arian error.¹ A Christian father of this period denounces "the folly of the Galatians, who abound in many impious denominations."² A harsher critic, likewise a contemporary, affirms that whole villages in Galatia were depopulated by the Christians in their intestine quarrels.³

From these painful scenes of discord it is a relief to turn to a nobler contest in which the Galatian Christians bore their part gallantly. A sketch of their final struggle with and victory over heathendom will fitly close this account of the first preaching of the gospel among them.

The Galatian churches furnished their quota to the army of martyrs in the Diocletian persecution, and the oldest existing church in the capital still bears the name of its bishop Clement, who perished during this reign of terror.⁴ The struggle over,

ance made for the exaggerations of orthodox writers, the orgiastic character of the worship of these sects is very apparent. The apostasy of St. Paul's converts is still further illustrated by Philastrius's account of the Quartodecimani, lxxxvii.: "Alia est haeresis quae adserit cum Judaeis debere fieri pascha. Isti in Galatia et Syria et Phrygia commorantur, et Hierosolymis; et cum Judaeos sequantur, simili cum eis errore deperunt."

¹ Marcellus and Basilus. Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, i. p. 458. Eusebius wrote two elaborate treatises against Marcellus, which are extant. On the other hand, his orthodoxy was defended at one time by several of his Catholic contemporaries, but his reputation suffered from the more decided Sabellianism of his pupil the heresiarch Photinus, likewise a Galatian. Basilus presided at the semi-Arian Synod of Ancyra, held in 358. See Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* i. p. 655.

² Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xxii. 1, p. 422 A (ed. Ben.), ἡ Γαλατῶν ἄνοια πλουτοῦντων ἐν πολλοῖς τῆς ἀσεβείας ὀνόμασι, doubtless alluding to St. Paul's ἀνόητοι, Γαλάται. Compare Basil, *Epist.* 237 (iii. pp. 365, 6, ed. Ben.); Hilar. *de Trin.* vii. 3 (ii. p. 176, ed. Ben.).

³ The Emperor Julian's language. (*Epist.* 52, speaking of Galatia and certain neighboring districts), ἀρδην ἀνατραπήναι πορθηθείσας κώμας, is a painful comment on St. Paul's warning, Gal. v. 15: "If ye bite and devour one another, take heed ye be not consumed one of another." Julian, however, at no time an unprejudiced witness, has here a direct interest in exaggerating these horrors, as he is contrasting the mutual intolerance of the Christians with his own forbearance.

⁴ Texier, *Asie Mineure*, i. pp. 195, 200, describes and figures the Church of St. Clement at Ancyra. He is wrong, however, in mentioning the Decian persecution. The legend speaks of that

and peace restored, a famous council was held at Ancyra, a court-martial of the church, for the purpose of restoring discipline and pronouncing upon those who had faltered or deserted in the combat.¹ When the contest was renewed under Julian, the forces of paganism were concentrated upon Galatia, as a key to the heathen position, in one of their last desperate struggles to retrieve the day. The once popular worship of the mother of the gods, which, issuing from Pessinus, had spread throughout the Greek and Roman world, was a fit rallying point for the broken ranks of heathendom. In this part of the field, as at Antioch, Julian appeared in person. He stimulated the zeal of the heathen worshippers by his own example, visiting the ancient shrine of Cybele, and offering costly gifts and sacrifices there.² He distributed special largesses among the poor who attended at the temples. He wrote a scolding letter to the pontiff of Galatia, rebuking the priests for their careless living, and promising aid to Pessinus on condition that they took more pains to propitiate the goddess.³ The Christians met these measures for the most part in an attitude of fierce defiance. At Ancyra, one Basil, a presbyter of the church, fearlessly braving the imperial anger, won for himself a martyr's crown. Going about from place to place he denounced all participation in the polluting rites of heathen sacrifice, and warned his Christian brethren against bartering their hopes of heaven for such transitory honors as an earthly monarch could confer. At length brought before the provincial governor, he was tortured, condemned, and put to death.⁴ At Pessinus another zealous Christian, entering the temple, openly insulted

of Diocletian; *Acta Sanct.* Jan. xxiii. In a Syrian martyrology recently published by Dr. W. Wright (in the *Journal of Sacred Literature*, Oct. 1865 and Jan. 1866) the Galatian martyrs mentioned are numerous.

¹ About the year 314. Hefele, *Concilien-gesch.* i. p. 188. See the note on Gal. v. 20, p. 291.

² Ammian. xxii. 9. Liban. *Or.* xii. 1, p. 398; xvii. 1, p. 513 (Reiske).

³ Julian, *Epist.* 49, Ἀρσακίῳ ἀρχιερεὶ Γαλατίας, preserved in Sozom. v. 16.

The "high priest" is mentioned in the Galatian inscriptions, Boeckh, nos. 4016, 4020, 4026. Julian seems to have taken the worship of the mother of the gods under his special protection. An elaborate oration of his (*Orat.* 3) is devoted to this subject. Cf. Gregor. Naz. i. p. 109 (ed. Ben.).

⁴ Sozom. v. 11. The Acts of the Martyrdom of St. Basil of Ancyra, (Ruinar, *Acta Mart. Sinc.* p. 510) are less exaggerated than most, and perhaps entitled to respect.

the mother of the gods, and tore down the altar. Summoned before Julian, he appeared in the imperial presence with an air of triumph, and even derided the remonstrances which the emperor addressed to him.¹ This attempt to galvanize the expiring form of heathen devotion in Galatia seems to have borne little fruit. With the emperor's departure paganism relapsed into its former torpor. And not long after, in the presence of Jovian, the Christian successor of the apostate, who halted at Ancyra on his way to assume the imperial purple,² the Galatian churches had an assurance of the final triumph of the truth.

¹ Gregor. Naz. *Orat.* v. 1, p. 175 A. Gregory at the same time mentions another Christian — apparently in Galatia, though this is not stated — whose bold defiance was visited with extreme

tortures. One or other of these may be that Busiris, of whom Sozomen (l. c.) speaks as a Christian confessor at Ancyria under Julian.

² Ammian. xxv. 10.

III.

THE DATE OF THE EPISTLE.

It has been already noticed that the Epistle itself contains singularly few details of St. Paul's intercourse with the churches of Galatia, and that the narrative of St. Luke is confined to the bare statement of the fact of his preaching there. Owing to this twofold silence, there is a paucity of direct evidence bearing on the date of the Epistle. A few scattered notices, somewhat vague in themselves, and leading only to approximate results, are all that we can collect; and the burden of the proof rests in consequence on an examination of the style of the letter, and of the lines of thought and feeling which may be traced in it. With this wide field open for conjecture, there has naturally been great diversity of opinion. The Epistle to the Galatians has been placed by different critics both the earliest and the latest of St. Paul's writings, and almost every intermediate position has at one time or the other been assigned to it. The patristic writers are for the most part divided between two views. Some of these, as Victorinus¹ and Primasius, sup-

¹ Mai, *Script. Vat. Coll.* vol. iii. Victorinus, who wrote about A.D. 360, mentions this as an opinion entertained by others, so that it dates further back. "Epistola ad Galatas missa dicitur ab apostolo ab Epheso civitate." I suspect it was first started by Origen. In the Canon of Marcion (Tertull. *adv. Marc.* v. 2, Epiphani. i. 3, p. 350.) the Epistle to the Galatians stood first, but I cannot think that his order was chronological. At all events, supposing it to be so, the fact of his placing the Epistles to the Thessalonians after the Romans diminishes the respect which would other-

wise be felt for the opinion of a writer so ancient. Tertullian's language, however, clearly points to a different principle of arrangement in Marcion's Canon: "Principalem adversus Judaismum epistolam nos quoque confitemur, quae Galatas docet." He placed this Epistle in the forefront as the most decided in its antagonism to Judaism. At the same time, where no such motive interposed, and where the connection was obvious, as in the Epistles to the Colossians and Philemon (on the juxtaposition of which Wieseler lays some stress, as establishing the principle of a chronological ar-

pose it to have been written from Ephesus.¹ Others, among whom are Eusebius of Emesa,² Jerome,³ Theodoret,⁴ and Euthalius, date it from Rome, in accordance with the subscription found in some MSS. and in the two Syriac and the Coptic versions. Of these two opinions, the former was doubtless a critical inference from the statement in the Acts⁵ that St. Paul visited Ephesus immediately after leaving Galatia, combined with his own mention of the suddenness of the Galatian apostasy;⁶ the latter is founded on some fancied allusions in the Epistle to his bonds.⁷ The former view has been adopted by the vast majority of recent critics, who agree in dating the Epistle during the three years of St. Paul's residence in the capital of Asia (A.D. 54-57), differing, however, in placing it earlier or later in this period, according as they lay greater or less stress on the particular expression, "ye are *so soon* changing."

Before stating my reasons for departing from this view, I shall give a brief summary of the events of the period, which it will be necessary to bear in mind in order to follow the course of the argument.

St. Paul's long sojourn at Ephesus is now drawing to a close. His labors there have been crowned with no ordinary success.

range in Marcion's Canon, *Chron.* p. 230), he would naturally follow the chronological order. Volkmar (Credner, *Neutest. Kanon*, p. 399) accepts the interpretation of Tertullian which I have given, but denies the accuracy of his statement. The author of the Muratorian fragment (c. 170 A.D.) seems to give as the chronological order, Corinthians, Galatians, Romans, which corresponds with the view I have adopted; but his language is very obscure, and his statements, at least on some points, are obviously inaccurate.

¹ So Florus Lugdun. and Claudius Altissiod. who copy the words of Primasius. Chrysostom (*Proem. ad Rom.*) says merely that the Galatians was written before the Romans, but does not define the time or place of writing.

Theophylact (*Argum. ad Rom.*) repeats Chrysostom.

² About 350 A.D. Cramer, *Caten. ad Gal.* iv. 20; "He was a prisoner and in confinement at the time." This comment is ascribed simply to "Eusebius" in the *Catena*, but the person intended is doubtless the bishop of Emesa, whose commentary on the Galatians is mentioned by Jerome (*Comm. in Ep. ad Gal.* Lib. i. *Praef.*). He naturally represents the tradition of the Syrian churches.

³ As may be inferred from his commentary on Gal. iv. 20; vi. 11, 17 (vii. pp. 468, 529, 534); Philem. 1 (vii. p. 747).

⁴ *Praef. ad Rom.*

⁵ Acts xviii. 23; xix. 6.

⁶ Gal. i. 6.

⁷ Gal. iv. 20; vi. 17.

“The word of God prevailed and grew mightily.”¹ So we read in the historian’s narrative. He says nothing of persecutions. But we must draw no hasty conclusions from this silence. For the same historian records how the apostle, in his farewell to the Ephesian elders a year later, speaking of his labors among them, reminded them of his “many tears and temptations, which befel him by the lying in wait of the Jews.”² In his own Epistles, St. Paul speaks in stronger language of the persecutions of this time. He compares his sufferings to those of the condemned slave, thrown to the beasts in the amphitheatre, and struggling for life and death — angels and men witnessing the spectacle.³ The apostles, he says, were made as the filth of the world, as the offscouring of all things.⁴

It was now the spring of the year fifty-seven, and he contemplated leaving Ephesus after Whitsuntide.⁵ Friends had arrived from Corinth and drawn a fearful picture of the feuds and irregularities that prevailed there. He at once despatched a letter to the Corinthians, reprobating their dissensions, and exhorting them to acquit themselves of guilt by the punishment of a flagrant offender. But he was not satisfied with merely writing; he sent also trusty messengers, who might smooth difficulties by explaining by word of mouth much that was necessarily omitted in the letter.⁶ Titus was one of these; and he awaited his return in great anxiety, as he had misgivings of the reception of his letter at Corinth. And now a tumult broke out at Ephesus. The opposition to the gospel came to a head. His companions were seized and violently hurried before the people. He himself was with difficulty persuaded to shelter himself by concealment till the storm was over. The storm passed, but the sky was still lowering. It was evident that his presence at Ephesus could now be of little use, and might only exasperate the enemies of the gospel. Besides, the time was near, perhaps had already arrived, when he had intended under any circumstances to turn his steps westward. So he left

¹ Acts xix. 20.

² Acts xx. 19.

³ 1 Cor. iv. 9; xv. 32.

⁴ 1 Cor. iv. 13.

⁵ 1 Cor. xvi. 8.

⁶ 1 Cor. xvi. 11; 2 Cor. xii. 18.

Ephesus.¹ But Titus had not yet come, and his anxiety for the church at Corinth pressed heavily upon him. He hastened to Troas, hoping to meet Titus there. "A door was opened" to him at Troas. But Titus came not. He was oppressed at once with a sense of loneliness and an ever-growing anxiety for the Corinthian church. He could no longer bear the suspense. He left Troas and crossed over to Macedonia. Still Titus came not. Still the agony of suspense, the sense of loneliness remained.² Time only increased his suffering. Every day brought fresh troubles; gloomy tidings poured in from all sides; church after church added to his anxiety.³ Nor had persecution ceased. The marks of violence imprinted on his body about this time remained long after; perhaps never left him.⁴ Probably, too, his constitutional complaint visited him once more — the thorn in the flesh to which he alludes in his letter to the Corinthians — the weakness which years before had detained him in Galatia. He seemed to be spared no suffering either of body or mind. There were fightings without and fears within. At length Titus arrived.⁵ This was the first gleam of sunshine. The tidings from Corinth were far more cheerful than he had hoped. His mind was relieved. He wrote off at once to the Corinthians, expressing his joy at their penitence, and recommending mercy towards the offender. The crisis was now over. He breathed freely once more. From this time his troubles seem gradually to have abated. A single verse in the sacred historian conveys all we know beyond this point of his sojourn in Macedonia. "He went over those parts," we are told, "and exhorted the people in many words."⁶ From thence he visited Greece, where he remained three months. While at Corinth he wrote the Epistle to the Romans. These are almost all the particulars known of his movements at this period. Of persecutions and sufferings we read nothing; and so far we are left in the dark. But when we contrast the more tranquil and hopeful tone of the Roman Epistle, interrupted occasionally by an outburst of triumphant thanksgiving, with the tumultuous conflict of

¹ Acts xix. 21-41.² 2 Cor. ii. 12, 13.³ 2 Cor. xii. 28.⁴ Gal. vi. 17.⁵ 2 Cor. vii. 5-16.⁶ Acts xx. 2.

feeling which appears in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, we can scarcely avoid the inference, that the severity of his trials had abated in the interval, and that he was at length enjoying a season of comparative repose.

It will be seen, then, that according to the generally received opinion, which dates this Epistle from Ephesus, the chronological order of the letters of the period will be Galatians, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Romans; the Epistle to the Galatians preceding the First Epistle to the Corinthians by an interval of a few months according to some, of nearly three years according to others. On the other hand, I cannot but think that there are weighty reasons, which more than counterbalance any arguments alleged in favor of this opinion, for interposing it between the Second to the Corinthians and the Romans. In this case it will have been written from Macedonia or Achaia, in the winter or spring of the years 57, 58 A.D. I shall proceed to state the successive steps of the argument by which this result is arrived at.

1. A few scattered historical notices, more or less distinct, must be put in evidence first, as fixing the date of the Epistle later than the events to which they refer. These notices are twofold, referring partly to St. Paul's communications with the apostles of the circumcision, partly to his intercourse with the Galatian church.

(i.) In the opening chapters St. Paul mentions two distinct visits to Jerusalem.¹ For reasons which will be given elsewhere, it seems necessary to identify the second of these with the third recorded in the Acts, during which the apostolic council was held. The Epistle, moreover, alludes to an interview with St. Peter at Antioch, in language which seems to imply that it took place after, and probably soon after, their conference at Jerusalem.² If so, it must have occurred during St. Paul's stay at Antioch, recorded in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts.³ On the most probable system of chronology these events took place in the year 51, before which date, therefore, the Epistle cannot have been written.

(ii.) The Epistle apparently contains an allusion to two

¹ Gal. i. 18; ii. 1.

² Gal. ii. 11.

³ Acts xv. 30-40.

separate visits of St. Paul to Galatia. "Ye know," says the apostle, "that through infirmity of the flesh, I preached to you *before*, and ye received me as an angel of God What then have I become your enemy by telling you the truth?"¹ He is here contrasting his reception on the two occasions, on the second of which he fears he may have incurred their enmity by his plain-speaking. If this interpretation be correct, the two Galatian visits thus alluded to must be the same two which are recorded in the Acts.² The Epistle therefore must be later than the second of these, which took place in 54 A.D.

Thus we have established the earliest possible date of the epistle, as a starting-point. On the other hand an incidental expression has been rigorously pressed to show that it cannot have been written much after this date. "I marvel," says St. Paul, "that ye are *so soon*, or *so fast*, changing from Him that called you, to another gospel."³ It is necessary to estimate the exact value of this expression.

The generally received view, which fixes the writing of the epistle at Ephesus, is founded on two assumptions with regard to this expression, both of which seem to me erroneous. *First*, it is supposed that in speaking of the rapidity of the change, St. Paul dates from his last visit to Galatia, "so soon after I left you." This, however, seems at variance with the context. The apostle is reproaching his converts with their fickleness. "They have so soon deserted their Christian profession; so soon taken up with *another gospel*." Here the point of time from which he reckons is obviously the time of their conversion, not the time of his second visit. His surprise is not that they have so lightly forgotten his latest instructions, but that they have so easily tired of their newly-obtained liberty in Christ. "I marvel," he says, "that ye are so soon changing *from Him that called you*." Whatever interval, therefore, is implied by "so soon," it must reckon from their first knowledge of the gospel, i.e. from A.D. 51. *Secondly*, it is insisted that the period cannot be extended beyond a few months, or at the outside

¹ Gal. iv. 13-16. See the notes, pp. 272-274.

³ Gal. i. 6, *οὕτως ταχέως*. See note, p. 219.

² Acts xvi. 6; xviii. 23.

two or three years. But quickness and slowness are relative terms. The rapidity of a change is measured by the importance of the interests at stake. A period of five or ten years would be a brief term of existence for a constitution or a dynasty. A people which threw off its allegiance to either within so short a time, might well be called fickle. And if so, I cannot think it strange that the apostle, speaking of truths destined to outlive the life of kingdoms and of nations, should complain that his converts had *so soon* deserted from the faith, even though a whole decade of years might have passed since they were first brought to the knowledge of Christ. So long a period, however, is not required on any probable hypothesis as to the date of the Epistle; and therefore this expression, which has been so strongly insisted upon, seems to contribute little or nothing towards the solution of the problem.¹

2. On the other hand the argument from the style and character of the Epistle is one of great importance. It may now be regarded as a generally recognized fact that St. Paul's epistles fall chronologically into four groups, separated from one another by an interval of five years, roughly speaking, and distinguished also by their internal character. The second of these groups comprises (exclusively of the Galatians) the Epistles to the Corinthians and Romans, written at the close of the third missionary journey, in the years 57 and 58. Now it appears that while the Epistle to the Galatians possesses no special features in common with the epistles of the preceding or succeeding groups, either in style, matter, or general tone and treatment, it is most closely allied in all these respects to the epistles of the third missionary journey. It was a season of severe conflict with St. Paul, both mental and bodily, and the traces of this conflict are stamped indelibly on the epistles written during this period. They exhibit an unwonted tension of

¹ The problem of the date of the Galatian Epistle, as it is generally conceived, may be stated thus: Given on the one hand the expression "*so soon*," tending towards an earlier date, and on the other the resemblance to the Epistle to the Romans, tending towards a later,

to find the resultant. I think that the former consideration may be eliminated, as will be seen from the text, while at the same time some further conditions which have been overlooked must be taken into account.

feeling, a fiery energy of expression, which we do not find in anything like the same degree in either the earlier or the later epistles. They are marked by a vast profusion of quotations from the Old Testament, by a frequent use of interrogation, by great variety and abruptness of expression, by words and images not found elsewhere, or found very rarely, in St. Paul. They have also their own doctrinal features distinguishing them from the other groups—due for the most part to the phase which the antagonism to the gospel assumed at this time. Justification by faith, the contrast of law and grace, the relation of Jew and Gentile, the liberty of the gospel—these and kindred topics are dwelt upon at greater length and with intense earnestness. All these characteristic features the letter to the Galatians shares in an eminent degree, so much so indeed, that it may be considered the typical epistle of the group; and by those who have made St. Paul's style their study, the conviction arising from this resemblance will probably be felt so strongly, that nothing but the most direct and positive evidence could overcome it.

3. It seems to follow, then, that some place must be found for the Galatian Epistle in the group which comprises the Epistles to the Corinthians and Romans. We have next to inquire whether there is sufficient evidence for determining its exact position in this group. I think this question can be answered with some degree of probability.

Pursuing the examination further we find that the resemblance is closest to the Second Epistle to the Corinthians and the Epistles to the Romans.

In the case of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, the similarity consists not so much in words and arguments as in tone and feeling. "In both there is the same sensitiveness in the apostle to the behavior of his converts to himself, the same earnestness about the points of difference, the same remembrance of his "infirmity" while he was yet with them, the same consciousness of the precarious basis on which his own authority rested in the existing state of the two churches. In both there is a greater display of his own feelings than in any other portion of his writings, a deeper contrast of inward

exaltation and outward suffering, more of personal entreaty, a greater readiness to impart himself." ¹ If it were necessary to add anything to this just and appreciative criticism, the apostle's tone in dealing with his antagonists would supply an instructive field for comparison. Both epistles exhibit the same combination of protest and concession in combating the exclusive rights claimed for the elder apostles; the same vehement condemnation of the false teachers, guarded by the same careful suppression of names; the same strong assertion of his apostolic office, tempered with the same depreciation of his own personal merits.

Besides this general resemblance, which must be felt in order to be appreciated, a few special affinities may be pointed out. For instance the expression "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." ² has a close parallel in the allied epistle, "He made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we," etc. ³ The image, "Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap," ⁴ is reproduced in almost the same words, "He that soweth sparingly shall reap sparingly." ⁵ Again, the two epistles have in common the peculiar phrases, "another gospel," "a new creature," "zealously affect you," "persuade men." ⁶ And other instances might be brought. ⁷ On these special coincidences, however, I do not lay any great stress.

The resemblance to the Epistle to the Romans is much more striking and definite. Setting aside the personal matter and the practical lessons, and excepting here and there a digressive illustration, almost every thought and argument in

¹ Jowett, i. p. 196, 1st ed. It is interesting to find that the resemblance between the two epistles was observed by a writer as early as Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Spicil. Solesm.* i. p. 50.

² Gal. iii. 13.

³ 2 Cor. v. 21.

⁴ Gal. vi. 7.

⁵ 2 Cor. ix. 6.

⁶ Gal. i. 6, 2 Cor. xi. 4; Gal. vi. 15, 2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. iv. 17, 2 Cor. xi. 2; Gal. i. 10, 2 Cor. v. ii.

⁷ Compare Gal. i. 9; v. 21, with 2 Cor. xiii. 2, and Gal. iii. 3 with 2 Cor. viii. 6. Again, the expressions ἀπορείσθαι, κανόν, κυρόω, τούναντίον, φοβοῦμαι μήπως, and the metaphor κατεσθίειν, Gal. v. 15; 2 Cor. xi. 20, are peculiar to these epistles; and this list is probably not complete. On the other hand the Galatian Epistle presents a few special coincidences with 1 Corinthians, the most remarkable being the proverb, "A little leaven," etc., occurring 1 Cor. v. 6; Gal. v. 9.

the Epistle to the Galatians may be matched from the other epistle. The following table of parallels will show how remarkable this coincidence is. In the first instance I have taken an almost continuous passage, in order better to exhibit the nature of this resemblance.

GALATIANS.

ROMANS.

(1) iii. 6. Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness.

iv. 3. What saith the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness.

iii. 7. Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham.

iv. 10, 11. How then was it accounted? in uncircumcision that he might be the father of all them that believe.

iii. 8. And the scripture foreseeing preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, "In thee shall all nations be blessed."

iv. 17. As it is written, "I have made thee a father of many nations." iv. 18. "So shall thy seed be."

iii. 9. So then they which are of faith, are blessed with faithful Abraham.

iv. 23. It was not written for his sake alone, but for us also to whom it shall be accounted, who believe, etc. Cf. iv. 12.

iii. 10. For as many as are of the works of the law are under a curse.

iv. 15. Because the law worketh wrath.

iii. 11. But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God it is evident, for

iii. 21. But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets.

"The just shall live by faith."

i. 17. As it is written, "The just shall live by faith."

iii. 12. And the law is not of faith; but "The man that doeth them shall live in them."

x. 5. Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law; that "The man that doeth them shall live in them."

iii. 13, 14. [From this curse Christ ransomed us].

[iv. 23, 24. The same thought expressed in other language.]

iii. 15-18. [Neither can the law interpose] to make the promise of none effect; for if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise; but God gave

iv. 13, 14, 16. For the promise that he should be the heir of the world was not made to Abraham through the law for if they which are of the law be

GALATIANS.

it (*κεχάρισται*) to Abraham by promise.

iii. 19–21. [But the law was temporary and ineffective: for]

iii. 22. The scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.

iii. 23–26. [We are now free from the tutelage of the law, and are sons of God through Christ.]

iii. 27. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.

iii. 28. [There is no distinction of race or caste or sex.]

iii. 29. If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.

iv. 1–5. [We have been hitherto in the position of an heir still in his minority. Christ's death has recovered us our right.]

iv. 5, 6, 7. That we might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father. Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son: and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ.

(2) ii. 16. For "by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified" (Ps. cxliii. 2).

ROMANS.

heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect therefore it is of faith that it might be by grace (*χάρις*).

[Cf. Rom. viii. 3, 4.]

xi. 32. God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all. iii. 9, 10. They are all under sin, as it is written. Cf. iii. 25; v. 20, 21.

[The same thought illustrated differently. Rom. vii. 1–3].

vi. 3. As many of us as have been baptized into Christ.

xiii. 14. Put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ.

ix. 8. The children of the promise are counted for the seed. (See the passage cited next).

viii. 14–17. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear, but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God; and if children, then heirs, heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ.

iii. 20. For "by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified before him."

In both passages the quotation is oblique; in both, the clause "by the works of the law" is inserted by way of explanation; in both, "flesh" is substituted for "living man" ($\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\ \sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi$ for $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \zeta\acute{\omega}\nu$ of the LXX, which agrees also with the Hebrew): and in both the application of the text is the same.

GALATIANS.

(3) ii. 19. For I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live to God.

ii. 20. I am crucified with Christ. Cf. v. 24; vi. 14.

Nevertheless I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.

(4) iv. 23, 28. He of the free-woman was by promise we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise.

(5) v. 14. All the law is fulfilled in one word, namely ($\epsilon\nu\ \tau\acute{\omega}$), Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.

(6) v. 16. Walk in the spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh.

v. 17. For the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh, and these are contrary the one to the other,

So that ye cannot do the things that ye would.

v. 18. But if ye be led of the spirit, ye are not under the law.

ROMANS.

vii. 4. Ye also are become dead to the law that we should bear fruit unto God. Cf. vi. 2-5.

vi. 6. Our old man is crucified with him.

vi. 8. Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him. vi. 11. Alive unto God through Jesus Christ.

ix. 7, 8. "In Isaac shall thy seed be called." That is the children of the promise are counted for the seed.

xiii. 8, 9, 10. He that loveth another, hath fulfilled the law; it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely ($\epsilon\nu\ \tau\acute{\omega}$), Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself love is the fulfilling of the law.

viii. 4. In us who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit.

vii. 23, 25. I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind with the mind I myself serve the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin.

vii. 15. What I would, that I do not, but what I hate, that I do. Cf. vv. 19, 20.

viii. 2. The law of the spirit of life hath made me free from the law of sin and death. Cf. vii. 6.

GALATIANS.

(7) vi. 2. Bear ye one another's burdens.

ROMANS.

xv. 1. We that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak.¹

It will be unnecessary to add many words on a similarity so great as these passages exhibit. Observe only that it is manifold and various. Sometimes it is found in a train of argument more or less extended, and certainly not obvious; sometimes in close verbal coincidences where the language and thoughts are unusual, or where a quotation is freely given, and where the coincidence, therefore, was less to be expected; sometimes in the same application of a text, and the same comment upon it, where that application and comment have no obvious reference to the main subject of discussion. There is no parallel to this close resemblance in St. Paul's Epistles, except in the case of the letters to the Colossians and Ephesians. Those letters were written about the same time and sent by the same messenger; and I cannot but think that we should be doing violence to historic probability by separating the Epistles to the Galatians and Romans from each other by an interval of more than a few months, though in this instance the similarity is not quite so great as in the other.

But the comparison advances us yet another stage towards the solution of our problem. There can be no reasonable doubt which of the two epistles contains the earlier expression of the thoughts common to both. The Epistle to the Galatians stands in relation to the Roman letter as the rough model to the finished statue, or rather, if I may press the metaphor without misapprehension, it is the first study of a single figure which is worked into a group in the latter writing. To the Galatians the apostle flashes out in indignant remonstrance the first eager thoughts kindled by his zeal for the gospel striking

¹ In the above extracts I have only altered the English version where our translators have given different renderings for the same Greek word. Besides these broader coincidences the following words and phrases are peculiar to the

two epistles: *βαστάζειν, δουλεία, ἐλευθερώω, ἴδε, κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λέγω* (ἀνθρώπινον λέγω), *κατὰρ καταρᾶσθαι, κῶμοι, μακαρισμός, μέθη, οἱ τὰ τοιαῦτα πρᾶσσοντες, ὀφειλέτης, παραβάτης, παρ' ὃ, τί ἐτι; τί λέγει ἡ γράφη;*

suddenly against a stubborn form of Judaism. To the Romans he writes at leisure, under no pressure of circumstances, in the face of no direct antagonism, explaining, completing, extending the teaching of the earlier letter, by giving it a double-edge directed against Jew and Gentile alike. The matter, which in the one epistle is personal and fragmentary, elicited by the special needs of an individual church, is in the other generalized and arranged so as to form a comprehensive and systematic treatise. Very few critics of name have assigned a priority of date to the Roman Epistle.

Thus connected by striking affinities with these two epistles, the letter to the Galatians seems naturally to claim an intermediate position, as a chronological link between them. Its claim, I think, is well illustrated, if it is not vindicated, by a comparison of the lists of sins in the three epistles, with which I shall close this attempt to trace their common features.

2 CORINTHIANS.

Strife, emulation, wraths, factions, backbitings, whisperings, swellings, tumults uncleanness and fornication and lasciviousness.
xii. 20, 21.

GALATIANS.

Fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, strife, emulation, wraths, factions, seditions, heresies, envious, murders, drunkennesses, revellings, and such like. v. 19-21.

ROMANS.

Unrighteousness, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness, full of envy, murder, strife, deceit, malignity, whisperers, backbiters, etc., i. 29, 30; in revellings and drunkennesses, in chamberings and wantonnesses, in *strife* and *emulation*. xiii. 13.

But if, on the other hand, this sequence is altered by interposing the letters to the Corinthians between those to the Galatians and Romans, the dislocation is felt at once. It then becomes difficult to explain how the same thoughts, argued out in the same way, and expressed in similar language, should appear in the Galatian and reappear in the Roman Epistle, while in two letters written in the interval they have no place at all, or at least do not lie on the surface. I cannot but think that the truths which were so deeply impressed on the apostle's mind, and on which he dwelt with such characteristic energy on two different occasions, must have forced themselves into prominence in any letter written meanwhile.

4. Again, if it is found that the order here maintained accords best with the history of St. Paul's personal sufferings at this period, so far as we can decipher it, as well as with the progress of his controversy with the Judaizers, such an accordance will not be without its value. I shall take these two points in order.

(i.) In the First Epistle to the Corinthians he alludes to his sufferings for the gospel more than once. He refers to them in one passage at some length,¹ to point a contrast between the humiliation of the teacher and the exaltation of the taught. He speaks of himself as suffering every deprivation, as treated with every kind of contempt. And he alludes once and again to these afflictions, as witnesses to the immortality of man: "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable."² "Why stand we in jeopardy every hour? I protest I die daily. If I fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the dead rise not?"³ But the mention of them is only occasional; it does not color the whole epistle. In the Second Epistle the case is very different. Here it is the one topic, from beginning to end. His physical sufferings have increased meanwhile; and, to them have been added mental agonies far more severe. Tribulation and comfort, strength and weakness, glorying and humiliation, alternate throughout the epistle.³ But though the whole letter is one outpouring of affliction, yet we feel that the worst is already past. The first ray of sunshine has pierced the gloom. The penitence of the Corinthian church has made him "exceeding joyful in all his tribulation."⁵ We are not surprised, therefore, when, after the lapse of a few months, we find the apostle writing in a strain of less impassioned sorrow. In the Epistle to the Romans persecution is sometimes mentioned, but in the more tranquil tone of one recalling past experiences, when the conflict is already over and the victory won.

In the Epistle to the Galatians, again, he says but little of his own sufferings. He is too absorbed in the momentous

¹ 1 Cor. iv. 9-13.

² 1 Cor. xv. 19.

³ 1 Cor. xv. 30-32.

⁴ 2 Cor. i. 3-10; iv. 7-11; iv. 16-v. 4; vi. 4-10; vii. 4-7; xi. 23-28; xii. 7-10, 12.

⁵ 2 Cor. vii. 4.

question at issue to speak much of himself. Yet once or twice the subject is introduced. A sentence at the close of the letter especially shows how it occupies his thoughts, even when all mention of it is repressed. After adding in his own handwriting a few sentences of earnest remonstrance, he sums up with these words, "From henceforth let no man trouble me; for I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus." It is his final appeal, before which all opposition and controversy must give way. Does not this seem like the language of one who has lately passed through a fiery trial, and who, looking back upon it in the first moment of abatement, while the recollection is still fresh upon him, sees in his late struggles a new consecration to a life of self-denial, and an additional seal set upon his apostolic authority? In other words, does it not seem to follow naturally *after* the tumult of affliction, which bursts out in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians?

Perhaps this passage, too, in connection with the events of the year preceding, may serve to throw light on one or two otherwise obscure hints in this epistle. "If I *still* preach circumcision, why am I then persecuted?"¹ "If I were *still* pleasing men, I should not have been a *servant of Christ*."² May we not connect these expressions with the words, "Henceforth let no man trouble me; for I bear in my body *the marks of the Lord Jesus*?"³ These sufferings marked a crisis in his spiritual life, an epoch to date from. In the permanent injuries then inflicted upon him he delighted to see the tokens of his service to his Lord, the signs of ownership, as it were, branded on him. Henceforth Jesus was his Master, henceforth he was the slave of Christ, in a fuller sense than he had been hitherto.⁴ It is at least remarkable that in the epistle which follows next upon

¹ Gal. v. 11.

² Gal. i. 10.

³ Gal. vi. 17.

⁴ It is related of George Herbert that when he was inducted into the cure of Bemerton he said to a friend, "I beseech God that my humble and charitable life may so win upon others as to bring glory to my Jesus, *whom I*

have this day taken to be my Master and Governor; and I am so proud of his service, that I will always call him *Jesus my Master*," etc. "And," adds his biographer, "he seems to rejoice in that word *Jesus*, and say that the adding these words, *my Master*, to it, and the often repetition of them, seemed to perfume his mind," etc.—I. Walton's *Life of Herbert*.

this, he designates himself "a slave of Jesus Christ,"¹ a title there adopted for the first time.

(ii.) The same result which is thus obtained from an examination of St. Paul's personal history, seems to follow also from the progress of his controversy with his Judaizing opponents.

In the Epistle to the Corinthians the controversy has not yet assumed a very definite shape. He scarcely once meets his opponents on *doctrinal* ground. He is occupied in maintaining his *personal* authority against those who strove to undermine it, resting their claims, in some cases at least, on a more intimate connection with the Lord. Doubtless doctrinal error would be the next step, and this the apostle foresaw. But hitherto he speaks with some reserve on this point, not knowing the exact position which his antagonists would take up. The heresy combated in the Galatian Epistle is much more matured. The personal antagonism remains as before, while the doctrinal opposition has assumed a distinct and threatening form.

For how different is St. Paul's language in the two cases. He tells both churches, indeed, in almost the same words, that "circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing,"² but then his practical comment in the two cases presents a striking contrast. To the Corinthians he says: "Is any man called being circumcised? let him not be uncircumcised: Is any called in uncircumcision? let him not be circumcised";³ to the Galatians; "Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing; and again, I testify,"⁴ etc. In the one epistle he is dealing with a hypothetical case; he speaks as if to guard against future error. In the other he is wrestling with an actual evil present in its most virulent form. If circumcision is but one point, it at least contains all implicitly: "Every man that is circumcised is a debtor to do the whole law."

Corresponding to this advance on the part of his antagonists we find a growing fulness in St. Paul's exposition of those doctrines, with which the errors of the Judaizers were in direct conflict. Such is the case with his account of the temporary

¹ Rom. i. 1.

² 2 Cor. vii. 18.

³ 1 Cor. vii. 19; Gal. v. 6; vi. 15.

⁴ Gal. v. 2.

purpose of the law, especially in its negative effect as "multiplying sin." In the Corinthian Epistles the subject is dismissed with a casual sentence, pregnant with meaning indeed, but standing quite alone. "The strength of sin is the law."¹ In the Galatian letter it is the one prominent topic. So again with its correlative, the doctrine of justification by faith. This doctrine is incidentally alluded to more than once in the letter to Corinth.² In one passage especially it appears prominently: "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses to them: for he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness (*δικαιοσύνη*) of God."³ Here the doctrine is stated clearly enough, but there is no approach to the fulness with which it is set forth in the Galatian Epistle. The illustration, the antithesis, the aphorism, the scriptural sanction, are missing. It is not the language which St. Paul would have used, had the doctrines been as virtually denied in the Corinthian, as they were in the Galatian Church.

5. Lastly, the chronology adopted explains one or two allusions in the Epistle to the Galatians, which otherwise it is difficult to account for.

(i.) The sixth chapter commences with the exhortation, "Brethren, though a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual restore such an one in the spirit of meekness, considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted." There is something peculiarly earnest in the abruptness with which this command is introduced. There is a marked tenderness in the appeal to their brotherhood which prefaces it. An undercurrent of deep feeling is evident here. It is as though some care weighed on the apostle's mind. Now if we suppose the Galatian Epistle, to have been written after the Second to the Corinthians, we have at once an adequate explanation of this. A grievous offence had been committed in the Christian community at Corinth. In his first epistle to the church there, St. Paul had appealed to the brotherhood to punish the guilty person. The appeal had not only been answered, but answered with so much promptness, that it was necessary to intercede

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 56. ² 1 Cor. i. 30; iv. 4; vi. 11; 2 Cor. iii. 9. ³ 2 Cor. v. 19-21.

for the offender. He commended their indignation, their zeal, their revenge; they had approved themselves clear in the matter,¹ and now they must forgive and comfort their erring brother, lest he be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow.² It was the recollection of this circumstance that dictated the injunction in the Galatian Epistle. The Galatians were proverbially passionate and fickle. If a reaction came, it might be attended, as at Corinth, with undue severity towards the delinquents. The epistle, therefore, was probably written while the event at Corinth was fresh on St. Paul's mind—perhaps immediately after he had despatched Titus and the Second Epistle, and was still in suspense as to the issue—perhaps after he had himself arrived at Corinth, and witnessed too evident signs of over-severity.

(ii.) A little later on another passage occurs, in which the vehemence of St. Paul's language is quite unintelligible at first sight. "Be not deceived," he says, "God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he reap Let us do good unto all men."³ The admonition is thrown into a general form, but it is evidently a special application in the apostle's own mind.

An allusion in the First Epistle to the Corinthians supplies the key to the difficulty; "As I gave orders to the Churches of Galatia, even so do ye."⁴ He had solicited their alms for the suffering brethren of Judea. The messenger, who had brought him word of the spread of Judaism among the Galatians, had also, I suppose, reported unfavorably of their liberality. They had not responded heartily to his appeal. He reproves them in consequence for their backwardness; but he wishes to give them more time, and therefore refrains from prejudging the case.

For the reasons given above, I have been led to place the Galatian Epistle after the letters to Corinth. They certainly do not amount to a demonstration, but every historical question must be decided by striking a balance between conflicting probabilities; and it seems to me that the arguments here advanced, however imperfect, will hold their ground against

¹ 2 Cor. vii. 11.

² 2 Cor. ii. 7.

³ Gal. vi. 7-10.

⁴ 1 Cor. xvi. 1.

those which are alleged in favor of the earlier date. In the interval, then, between the writing of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians and that to the Romans, the Galatian letter ought probably to be placed. Beyond this I will not venture to define the time; only suggesting that the greeting from "all the brethren which are with me,"¹ seems naturally to apply to the little band of his fellow-travellers, and to hint that the letter was not despatched from any of the great churches of Macedonia, or from Corinth. It may have been written on the journey between Macedonia and Achaia. And it is not improbable that it was during St. Paul's residence in Macedonia, about the time when the Second Epistle to the Corinthians was written, that St. Paul received news of the falling away of his Galatian converts, so that they were prominent in his mind, when he numbered among his daily anxieties "the care of all the churches."² If so, he would despatch his letter to the Galatians as soon after as a suitable bearer could be found.³

¹ Gal. i. 2.

² 2 Cor. xi. 28.

³ This investigation of the date of the Galatian Epistle is taken from a paper in the *Journal of Class. and Sac. Philol.* vol. iii. p. 289, altered in parts. The view here maintained is also advocated by De Wette (who speaks hesitatingly), by Conybeare and Howson (ii. p. 165,

ed 2), and by Bleek (*Eint. in das. N. T.* pp. 418, 419). Grotius says, less definitely, that it must have been written about the same time with the letter to the Romans. Jowett (i. p. 250, 2d ed.), and Stanley (*Corinthians*, p. 17, 2d ed.), leave the question undetermined. Other recent commentators date the epistle from Ephesus.

IV.

GENUINENESS OF THE EPISTLE.

THE Epistle to the Galatians has escaped unchallenged amid the sweeping proscriptions of recent criticism. Its every sentence so completely reflects the life and character of the Apostle of the Gentiles that its genuineness has not been seriously questioned.¹

Any labored discussion of this subject would therefore be out of place. Yet it will be worth while to point to a single instance, as showing the sort of testimony which may be elicited from the epistle itself.

The account of St. Paul's relations with the apostles of the circumcision has a double edge, as an evidential weapon. On the one hand, as an exhibition of the working of the apostle's mind, it lies far beyond the reach of a forger in an age singularly unskilled in the analysis and representation of the finer shades of character. The suppressed conflict of feeling, the intermingling of strong protest and courteous reserve, the alternation of respectful concession and uncompromising rebuke — the grammar being meanwhile dislocated, and the incidents obscured in this struggle of opposing thoughts — such a combination of features reflects one mind alone, and can have proceeded but from one author. On the other hand, looking at the passage as a narrative of events, it seems wholly impossible that the conceptions of a later age should have taken this form. The incidents are too fragmentary and indirect, they are also smothered in the expression of the writer's feelings, there is altogether a want of system in the narrative

¹ One exception is recorded, which may serve to point a moral.

wholly unlike the story of a romancer. Nor, indeed, would it serve any conceivable purpose which a forger might be supposed to entertain. The Gnostic, who wished to advance his antipathy to Judaism under cover of St. Paul's name, would have avoided any expression of deference to the apostles of the circumcision. The Ebionite would have shrunk with loathing from any seeming depreciation of the cherished customs or the acknowledged leaders of his race, as the tone of the author of the Clementines shows.¹ The Catholic writer, forging with a view to "conciliation," would be more unlikely than either to invent such a narrative, anxious as he would be to avoid any appearance of conflict between the two great teachers of the church. The very unevenness of the incidents is the surest token of their authenticity.

On the other hand, the external evidence, though not very considerable, is perhaps as great as might be expected from the paucity of early Christian literature, and the nature of the few writings still extant.

1. The *Apostolic Fathers* in whose ears the echoes of the apostle's voice still lingered, while blending his thoughts almost insensibly with their own, were less likely to quote directly from his written remains. Allusions and indirect citations are not wanting.

CLEMENT'S words (§ 2), "His sufferings were before your eyes," with the implied rebuke, may perhaps be a faint reflection of Gal. iii. 1. In the second epistle ascribed to Clement (§ 2), which though not genuine is a very early work, Isa. liv. 1 is quoted, and applied as in Gal. iv. 27.

IGNATIUS *Polyc.* § 1, found in the Syriac, "Bear all men, as the Lord beareth thee Bear the ailments of all men," resembles Gal. vi. 2. (See however Matth. viii. 17; Rom. xv. 1.) *Romans*, § 7, "My passion is crucified," also found in the Syriac, recalls Gal. v. 24; vi. 14.

The Greek text, which, if not genuine, at all events cannot date late in the second century, offers besides one or two coincidences too striking to be accidental.

Compare *Philad.* 1 with Gal. i. 1; *Trall.* 10 with Gal. ii. 21; *Magnes.* 8 with Gal. v. 3, 4.

¹ See p. 66.

POLYCARP more than once adopts the language of this epistle: c. 5. "Knowing then that" ¹ 'God is not mocked,' we ought," etc. from Gal. vi. 7; c. 3. "Builled up unto the faith given you, 'which is the mother of us all,' " from Gal. iv. 26; c. 6. "Zealous in what is good," may be taken from Gal. iv. 18; cf. Tit. ii. 14; 1 Pet. iii. 13 (v. l.); c. 12. "Qui credituri sunt in Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum et in ipsius patrem, qui resuscitavit eum a mortuis," resembles Gal. i. 1; cf. Rom. iv. 24.

2. The *Miscellaneous Writings of the Subapostolic Ages* present one or two vague resemblances on which no stress can be laid.

BARNABAS. A passage in the epistle bearing his name, c. 19, "Thou shalt communicate in all things with thy neighbor," reflects Gal. vi. 6.

HERMAS (c. 140 A.D.?) *sim.* ix. 13 has "They that have believed in God through his Son and put on these spirits." Cf. Gal. iii. 26, 27.

3. The Epistle to the Galatians is found in all the known *Canons of Scripture* proceeding from the Catholic church in the second century. It is contained in the SYRIAC and OLD LATIN versions, completed, it would appear, some time before the close of the century. It is distinctly recognized also in the canon of the MURATORIAN FRAGMENT (probably not later than 170 A.D.).

4. The *Apologists*, writing for unbelievers, naturally avoided direct quotations from the sacred writers, which would carry no weight of authority with those they addressed. Their testimony therefore is indirect.

THE EPISTLE TO DIOGNETUS, c. 4, has the expression, "The observance (*παρτήρησις*) of months and of days," derived apparently from Gal. iv. 10: "Ye observe (*παρτηρέισθε*) days and months, etc." In another passage, c. 8, 9, the writer reproduces many of the thoughts of the Epistles to the Galatians and Romans.

¹ The expression "knowing that" (*εἰδότες ὅτι*) in Polycarp seems to be a form of citation. In c. 1 it introduces a passage from Ephes. ii. 8, in c. 4 one from 1 Tim. vi. 7. It occurs once again in c. 6, "knowing that we all are debtors of sin." Though these words are not found either in the canonical scriptures or in any other extant writing, they seem in force and point so far above the level of Polycarp's own manner, that I can scarcely doubt that he is quoting the language of one greater than himself. They ring almost like a sentence of St. Paul.

JUSTIN MARTYR seems certainly to have known this epistle.¹ In the *Dial. c. Tryph.* cc. 95, 96, he quotes consecutively the two passages, "Cursed is every one that continueth not," etc. (Deut. xxvii. 26), and "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree" (Deut. xxi. 23), and applies them as they are applied in Gal. iii. 10, 13. Moreover, he introduces the first in language closely resembling that of St. Paul, "Every race of men will be found under a curse (ὑπὸ κατάραν) according to the law of Moses;" and cites both passages exactly as St. Paul cites them, though they differ both from the Hebrew and the LXX.² Again in the *Apol.* i. c. 53, Justin applies Isa. liv. 1: "Rejoice, thou barren," etc., exactly as St. Paul applies it in Gal. iv. 27. See the notes on iii. 10, 13, 28; iv. 27.

MELITO in a passage in the "Oration to Antoninus," lately discovered in a Syriac translation,³ uses language closely resembling Gal. iv. 8, 9.

ATHENAGORAS, *Suppl.* c. 16, speaks of sinking down "to the weak and beggarly elements," quoted from Gal. iv. 9.

5. The evidence of *Heretical writers*, while it is more direct, is also more important, as showing how widely the epistle was received. Most of the references quoted below seem to belong to the first half of the century.

THE OPHITES appear to have made great use of this epistle. Several direct quotations from it were found in their writings; e.g. Gal. iv. 26, see Hippol. *Haeres.* v. 7, p. 106; Gal. iv. 27, see Hippol. v. 8, p. 114; Gal. iii. 28; vi. 15, see Hippol. v. 7, p. 99.

JUSTIN the Gnostic, alludes to Gal. v. 17. Cf. Hippol. v. 26, p. 155

THE VALENTINIANS made use of it, Iren. i. 3, 5. A comment on

¹ In c. 5 of the *Orat. ad Græcos*, often ascribed to Justin and generally assigned to the second century, there are two indirect quotations from this epistle, iv. 12 and v. 20, 21. A recension of this treatise however, discovered of late years in a Syriac translation (Cureton's *Spicil. Syr.* p. 61), bears the name of Ambrose, by whom probably is meant the friend and pupil of Origen.

² In Deut. xxvii. 26, ὅς οὐκ ἔμμ. ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ π. αὐτὰ, for the LXX. (which is nearer to the Hebrew) πᾶς ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὅστις οὐκ ἔμμ. ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς λόγους τοῦ ν.

τουτοῦ τοῦ π. αὐτοῖς: in Deut. xxi. 23, Ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς, where the LXX, following the Hebrew, has Κεκατηραμένος ὑπὸ θεοῦ πᾶς.

³ Cureton's *Spicil. Syr.* p. 49; see also p. 41. Melito's treatise is printed also in the *Spicil. Solesm.* See vol. ii. p. 1; cf. p. xxxix. A close parallel to Gal. iv. 8 appears also in "the doctrine of Addaeus" (Cureton's *Anc. Syr. Doc.* p. 9; comp. ib. p. 56); but this may be accidental, as there is no other recognition of St. Paul in the work. See also *Clem. Rom.* ix. 1.

Gal. vi. 14, is given by Irenaeus from their writings, apparently from the works of Ptolemaeus.¹

MARCION included it in his Canon, and attached great importance to it. See p. 35, note 1. Comp. also the note on iii. 19.

TATIAN recognized it, quoting vi. 8 in support of his ascetic views. Hieron. *Comm. ad Gal. ad loc.*²

6. Neither is the testimony of *Adversaries* of the second century wanting to the authenticity of this epistle.

CELSUS, writing against the Christians, says contemptuously: "Men who differ so widely among themselves, and inveigh against each other most shamefully in their quarrels, may all be heard using the words (λεγόντων τὸ) 'The world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world'" (Gal. vi. 14). "This is the only sentence," adds Origen, "that Celsus seems to have recollected from Paul" (Orig. *c. Cels.* v. 64).

THE EBIONITE AUTHOR of the CLEMENTINE HOMILIES, writing in a spirit of bitter hostility to St. Paul, who is covertly attacked in the person of Simon Magus, represents St. Peter addressing Simon thus, "Thou hast confronted and withstood me (ἐναντίος ἀνθέστηκες μοι). If thou hadst not been an adversary, thou wouldest not have calumniated and reviled my preaching If thou callest me condemned (κατεγνωσμένον), thou accusest God who revealed Christ to me": *Hom.* xvii. 19. See Gal. ii. 11, to which the allusion is obvious, and from which even the expressions are taken. Again, where Simon is accused of "allegorizing the words of the law to suit his own purpose" (ii. 22), we can hardly mistake the reference to Gal. iv. 21 sqq. In a third passage also St. Peter maintaining the observance (παρτήρησιν) complains that "One who had learned from the tradition of Moses, blaming the people for their sins, contemptuously called them sons of new-moons and sabbaths" (xix. 22); comp. Gal. iv. 10. Other resemblances, noted in Legarde's edition (p. 31), are less striking: viii. 4 to Gal. i. 6; xviii. 21 to Gal. i. 8; viii. 18 (δὲ ἀγγέλου νόμος ὤρισθη) to Gal. iii. 19; ix. 1 to Gal. iv. 8. See more on this subject in the dissertation on "St. Paul and the Three" at the end of this volume.

7. Of *Apocryphal Acts* relating to St. Paul one extant work at least seems to date from the second century:

¹ See the Latin of Iren. i. 8, 5 ad fin., (Potter), where Gal. iii. 19, 20, is quoted: and cf. Westcott, *Canon*, p. 339. but the date and authorship of these

² To this list should be added Theodotus, *Erc. ap. Clem. Alex.* c. 53, p. 982 excerpts are uncertain.

ACTS OF PAUL AND THECLA § 40 (apparently the work referred to by Tertullian, *de baptism*, § 17). The sentence, "For he that wrought with thee unto the gospel wrought with me also unto baptism," is moulded on Gal. ii. 8.

8. Owing to the nature of the earliest Christian writings, the testimony hitherto brought forward has been for the most part indirect. As soon as a strictly *Theological literature* springs up in the church, we find the epistle at once quoted distinctly and by name. This is the case with the writers of the close of the second century, IRENAEUS, CLEMENT of ALEXANDRIA, and TERTULLIAN. From their position as representatives of widely separate branches of the church, and their manner of quotation, which shows that the writings thus cited were recognized and authoritative, the importance of their testimony is much greater than might be inferred from their comparatively late date.¹

¹ In compiling this account of the external evidence in favor of the epistle I have made use of Lardner's *Credibility*, of Kirchhofer's *Quellensammlung*, and especially of Westcott's *History of the Canon*. I have however gone over the ground independently, and added to the references.

V.

CHARACTER AND CONTENTS OF THE EPISTLE.

IN discussing the relation of this epistle to the contemporaneous letters, I have dwelt on those features which it shares in common with them. It remains to point out some characteristics which are peculiarly its own.

1. The Epistle to the Galatians is especially distinguished among St. Paul's letters by its unity of purpose.¹ The Galatian apostasy in its double aspect, as a denial of his own authority and a repudiation of the doctrine of grace, is never lost sight of from beginning to end. The opening salutation broaches this twofold subject. The name "Paul" has no sooner passed from his lips, than he at once launches into it. The long historical explanation which succeeds is instinct with this motive in all its details. The body of the letter, the doctrinal argument, is wholly occupied with it. The practical exhortations which follow, all, or nearly all, flow from it, either as cautions against a rebound to the opposite extreme, or as suggesting the true rule of life, of which the Galatians were following the counterfeit. Lastly, in the postscript he again brings it prominently forward. The two closing sentences reflect the twofold aspect of the one purpose, which has run through the letter. "Henceforth let no man trouble me. The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit." Thus his last words echo his first: "Paul an apostle, not from men"; "God who called you in the grace of Christ."

In this respect it contrasts strongly with the two letters to

¹ Ewald, *Paulus*, p. 55, "Kein anderes sendschreiben ist so sehr wie dieses mächtig stürmischen aber unaufhalt-samen und ununterbrochenen strome."

Corinth with which it possesses so many features in common. Like the First Epistle to the Corinthians, it was written with an immediate purpose to correct actual errors. But the difference is striking. The factions at Corinth were manifold, the irregularities were irregularities of detail not founded on any one broad principle of error, and the epistle necessarily reflects this varied character. Like the Second Epistle to the Corinthians again, it is a complete reflection of the apostle's inner life. Yet the contrast is not less marked than before. In the one epistle he pours out his feelings without restraint recurring to his own experiences, his own sorrows, freely and without any definite purpose. In the other the mention of himself is always subordinated to the purpose of the letter; however tumultuous may be the workings of his soul, they are all forced into this one channel. He never speaks of himself but to enforce the authority of his office or the liberty of the gospel.

2. The sustained severity of this epistle is an equally characteristic feature with its unity of purpose. The Galatians are not addressed as "the saints in Christ," "the faithful brethren." The apostle has no congratulations, no word of praise for this apostate church. Even on the Corinthians, in spite of all their short-comings, he could lavish expressions of commendation and love. But the case is different here. The charity which "hopeth against hope" seems to be strained to the utmost. For this once only the pervading type of his epistles is abandoned in the omission of the opening thanksgiving. The argument is interrupted every now and then by an outburst of indignant remonstrance. He is dealing with a thoughtless, half-barbarous people. They have erred like children, and must be chastised like children. Rebuke may prevail where reason will be powerless.

The body of the letter seems to have been written by an amanuensis, but the final sentences were in the apostle's own hand-writing. It was his wont to add a few words at the close of his epistles, either to vouch for their authorship, or to impress some truth more strongly on his readers. Here the urgency of the case leads him to do more. In a few eager rugged sentences he gives an epitome of the contents of the

epistle.¹ These sentences are condensed beyond the ordinary compression of the apostle's style. The language almost bursts with the surcharge of feeling. The very forms of the letters too bear witness to his intense earnestness. He writes in large, bold characters to arrest the eye and rivet the mind. He has been accused of vacillation. There has been no want of firmness in the tone of the letter, and there shall be none in the hand-writing. No man can henceforth question or misapprehend the apostle's meaning.

A rough analysis of the epistle separates it into three sections, of two chapters each ; the first couplet (i. ii.) containing the personal or narrative portion, the second (iii. iv.) the argumentative or doctrinal, and the third (v. vi.) the hortatory or practical. It will be borne in mind, however, that in a writer like St. Paul any systematic arrangement must be more or less artificial, especially where as in the present instance, he is stirred by deep feelings and writes under the pressure of an urgent necessity. The main breaks however, occurring at the end of the second and fourth chapters, suggest this threefold division ; and though narrative, argument, and exhortation are to some extent blended together, each portion retains for the most part its own characteristic form.

The following is a more exact analysis of the contents of the Epistle.

I. PERSONAL, chiefly in the form of a narrative.

1. The salutation and ascription of praise so worded as to introduce the main subject of the letter (i. 1-5).

2. The apostle rebukes the Galatians for their apostasy, denounces the false teachers, and declares the eternal truth of the gospel which he preached (i. 6-10).

3. This gospel came directly from God.

- (i.) He received it by special revelation (i. 11, 12).

- (ii.) His previous education indeed could not have led up to it, for he was brought up in principles directly opposed to the liberty of the gospel (i. 13, 14).

- (iii.) Nor could he have learned it from the apostles of the circumcision, for he kept aloof from them for some time after his conversion (i. 15-17).

¹ Gal. iv. 11-18. See notes, pp. 301-306, on *πηλικοῖς γράμμασιν ἔγραψα*.

(iv.) And when at last he visited Jerusalem, his intercourse with them was neither close nor protracted, and he returned without being known even by sight to the mass of the believers (i. 18-24).

(v.) He visited Jerusalem again, it is true, after a lapse of years, but he carefully maintained his independence. He associated with the apostles on terms of friendly equality. He owed nothing to them (ii. 1-10).

(vi.) Nay more; at Antioch he rebuked Peter for his inconsistency. By yielding to pressure from the ritualists, Peter was substituting law for grace, and so denying the fundamental principle of the gospel (ii. 11-21).

[This incident at Antioch forms the link of connection between the first and second portions of the epistle. The error of the Galatians was the same with that of the ritualists whom St. Peter had countenanced. Thus St. Paul passes insensibly from the narrative to the doctrinal statement.]

II. DOCTRINAL, mostly argumentative.

1. The Galatians are stultifying themselves. They are substituting the flesh for the Spirit, the works of the law for the obedience of faith, forgetting the experience of the past and violating the order of progress (iii. 1-5).

2. Yet Abraham was justified by faith, and so must it be with the true children of Abraham (iii. 6-9).

3. The law, on the contrary, so far from justifying, did but condemn, and from this condemnation Christ rescued us (iii. 10-14).

4. Thus he fulfilled the promise given to Abraham, which being prior to the law could not be annulled by it (iii. 15-18).

5. If so, what was the purpose of the law (iii. 19)?

(i.) It was an inferior dispensation, given as a witness against sin, a badge of a state of bondage, not as contrary to, but as preparing for, the gospel (iii. 19-23).

(ii.) And so through the law we are educated for the freedom of the gospel (iii. 24-29).

(iii.) Thus under the law we were in our nonage, but now we are our own masters (iv. 1-7).

(iv.) Yet to this state of tutelage the Galatians are bent on returning (iv. 8-11).

At this point the argument is broken off, while the apostle reverts to his personal relations with his converts, and reprobates the conduct of the false teachers (iv. 12-20).

6. The law indeed bears witness against itself. The relation of the two covenants of law and of grace, with the triumph of the latter, are typified by the history of Hagar and Sarah. The son of the bondwoman must give place to the son of the free (iv. 21-31).

"We are the children of the free." This word "free" is the link of connection with the third part of the epistle.

III. HORTATORY. Practical applications.

1. Hold fast by this *freedom*, which your false teachers are endangering (v. 1-12).

2. But do not let it degenerate into license. Love is the fulfilment of the law. Walk in the Spirit and the Spirit will save you from licentiousness, as it saves you from ritualism, both being carnal. Your course is plain. The works of the Spirit are easily distinguished from the works of the flesh (v. 13-26).

3. Let me add two special injunctions:

(i.) Show forbearance and brotherly sympathy (vi. 1-5).

(ii.) Give liberally (vi. 6-10).

Conclusion in the apostle's own hand-writing (vi. 11).

4. Once more: beware of the Judaizers for they are insincere. I declare to you the true principles of the gospel. Peace be to those who so walk (vi. 12-16).

5. Let no man deny my authority, for I bear the brand of Jesus my master (vi. 17).

6. Farewell in Christ (vi. 18).

The armory of this epistle has furnished their keenest weapons to the combatants in the two greatest controversies which in modern times have agitated the Christian church; the one a struggle for liberty within the camp, the other a war of defence against assailants from without; the one vitally affecting the doctrine, the other the evidences, of the gospel.

When Luther commenced his attack on the corruptions of the mediæval church, he chose this epistle as his most efficient engine in overthrowing the mass of error which time had piled on the simple foundations of the gospel. His Commentary on the Galatians was written and re-written. It cost him more labor and was more highly esteemed by him than any of his works.¹ If age has diminished its value as an aid to the study

¹ "The Epistle to the Galatians," See Seckendorf *de Lutheran*. L. i. said Luther, "is my epistle; I have § lxxxv. p. 139. betrothed myself to it; it is my wife."

of St. Paul, it still remains, and ever will remain, a speaking monument of the mind of the reformer, and the principles of the reformation.

Once again, in the present day, this epistle has been thrust into prominence by those who deny the divine origin of the gospel. In this later controversy, however, it is no longer to its doctrinal features, but to its historical notices, that attention is chiefly directed. "The earliest form of Christianity," it is argued, "was a modified Judaism. The distinctive features of the system current under this name were added by St. Paul. There was an irreconcilable opposition between the apostle of the Gentiles and the apostles of the Jews, a personal feud between the teachers themselves, and a direct antagonism between their doctrines. After a long struggle St. Paul prevailed, and Christianity — our Christianity — was the result." The Epistle to the Galatians affords at once the ground for, and the refutation of, this view. It affords the ground, for it discovers the mutual jealousy and suspicions of the Jew and Gentile converts. It affords the refutation, for it shows the true relations existing between St. Paul and the twelve. It presents not indeed a colorless uniformity of feeling and opinion, but a far higher and more instructive harmony, the general agreement amidst some lesser differences and some human failings, of men animated by the same divine Spirit, and working together for the same hallowed purpose, fit inmates of that Father's house in which are many mansions.

DISSERTATIONS.

I.

WERE THE GALATIANS CELTS OR TEUTONS?

FOLLOWING the universal tradition of ancient writers, I have hitherto assumed that the remarkable people who settled in the heart of Asia Minor were members of the great Celtic family, and brothers of the Gauls occupying the region west of the Rhine. And this tradition is confirmed in a striking way by the character and temperament of the Asiatic nation. A Teutonic origin, however, has been claimed for them by several writers, more especially commentators on this epistle; and this claim it will be necessary now to consider.

How or when this theory arose I do not know; but it seems, in some form or another, to have been held as early as the beginning of the sixteenth century; for Luther takes occasion by it to read his countrymen a wholesome lesson. "Some think," he says, "that we Germans are descended from the Galatians. Neither is this divination perhaps untrue; for we Germans are not much unlike them in temper. And I also am constrained to wish there were in my countrymen more steadfastness and constancy; for in all things we do, at the first brunt we be very hot; but when the heat of our first affections is burnt out, anon we become more slack, and look, with what rashness we begin things, with the same we throw them aside again and neglect them;"¹ and he goes on to reproach them with their waning interest in the cause of the

¹ Luther's later commentary on Gal. i. 6.

Reformation. Doubtless the rebuke was well deserved; but Luther did injustice to his countrymen in representing this as a special failing of the Teutonic race. The Roman historians, at all events, favorably contrast the constancy of the Germans with the fickleness of the Gauls.

More recently a skirmishing battle has been fought over the carcass of this extinct nation, as if it were a point of national honor to claim possession. "For ourselves," says a French traveller, "we cannot remember without a sentiment of national pride that the Gauls penetrated to the very centre of Asia Minor, established themselves there, and left in that country imperishable monuments of themselves. If the name of Franks is the general term by which Eastern nations designate the inhabitants of Europe, it is because our ancestors have influenced in a remarkable manner the destinies of the East from the earliest ages of our history."¹ Contrast with this the language held by German commentators. "Thus," says Wieseler, after summing up the arguments in favor of his view, "it can scarcely be doubtful that the Galatians are indeed the first German people to whom the word of the cross was preached."² "The Epistle to the Galatians," writes Ols-hausen, "is addressed to Germans; and it was the German Luther who in this apostolical epistle again recognized and brought to light the substance of the gospel."

The question is not so simple as at first sight it might appear. Accustomed ourselves to dwell on the distinctive features of Celts and Germans, and impressed with the striking contrasts between the two races, we can scarcely imagine any confusion possible. But with the ancients the case was different. In their eyes Gauls and Germans alike were savage and lawless tribes, living in the far north, beyond the pale of civilization, and speaking in an unknown language. The contrast to Greeks and Romans, which they observed in both alike, obscured the minor differences between one barbarian and another. As time opened out new channels of communication, they became more and more alive to the distinction between

¹ Texier, in the *Revue des deux Mondes*, 1841, iv. p. 575. ² *Galater*, p. 528.

the two races.¹ In Caesar the line of separation is roughly traced; in Tacitus it is generally sharp and well-defined. But without doubt the two were sometimes confused; and this fact alone rescues the theory of the Teutonic origin of the Galatians from the imputation of a mere idle paradox.

Still, historical scepticism must have some limit; and it would require a vast mass of evidence on the other side to overcome the very strong presumption from the agreement of ancient authorities, both Greek and Roman. Classical writers uniformly regard the ruthless hordes who poured into Italy and sacked Rome, the sacrilegious invaders who attacked the temple at Delphi, and the warlike immigrants who settled in the heart of Asia Minor, as belonging to one and the same race, as Gauls sprung from that Celtic nation whose proper home was north of the Alps and west of the Rhine. On this point there is little or no wavering, I believe, from first to last. It would not be strange that an incorrect view of the affinities of some obscure tribe, springing up in the early twilight of history, when the intercourse between distant nations was slight and intermitted, should pass unchallenged. But it is less easy to understand how, when a wide-spread race had played so important a part in the history of the world for some centuries, when civilized nations had been brought into close contact with them in the far East and West and at different points along a line extending, with some interruptions, across the whole of Europe, and even into Asia, when the study of their language and manners had long been within the reach of the curious, so vital an error should still have held its ground.

¹ The authorities will be found in Diefenbach's *Celtica*, ii. They are very fairly and clearly stated also in Brandes, *Kelten und Germanen* (Leipz. 1857). See especially his summary, p. ix. The only really important exception among ancient authors is Dion Cassius, who persistently makes the Rhine the boundary-line between the *Gauls* on the left bank, and the *Celts* on the right bank. See Brandes, p. 202. Thus he identifies the Celts with the Germans, and distinguishes them from the Gauls. Extreme

paradoxes have been held by some recent writers. On the one hand, Holtzmann, *Kelten und Germanen* (1853), maintains that the Celts and Germans of the ancients (the inhabitants of Gaul as well as of Germany) were Teutonic in the language of modern ethnography (see esp. p. 157); on the other, Mone, *Celtische Forschungen* (1857), is of opinion that Germany, as well as Gaul, was of old occupied by races which we should call Celtic.

All ethnology would become hopeless, if testimony so strong were lightly set aside. There must have been many who for purposes of commerce or from love of travel or in discharge of some official duty or through missionary zeal had visited both the mother country of the Gauls and their Asiatic settlement, and had seen in the language and physiognomy and national character of these distant peoples many striking features which betokened identity of race.

The testimony of one of these witnesses is especially valuable. Jerome, who writes at the close of the fourth century, had spent some time both in Gaul proper and in Galatia.¹ He had thus ample opportunities of ascertaining the facts. He was, moreover, eminently qualified by his critical ability and linguistic attainments for forming an opinion. In the preface to his Commentary on the Galatians² he expresses himself to the following effect: "Varro and others after him have written voluminous and important works on this race. Nevertheless, he will not quote heathen writers; he prefers citing the testimony of the Christian Lactantius. This author states that the Galatae were so called from the whiteness of their complexion (*γάλα*), described by Virgil (*Aen.* viii. 660), *Tum lactea colla auro innectuntur*, informing us also that a horde of these Gauls arrived in Asia Minor and there settled among the Greeks, whence the country was called Gallo-Graecia, and afterwards Galatia. No wonder, adds Jerome, after illustrating this incident by other migrations between the East and the West, that the Galatians are called fools and slow of understanding,³ when Hilary, the Rhone of Latin eloquence, himself a Gaul and a native of Poitiers, calls the Gauls stupid

¹ Jerome mentions his visit to Galatia (totius Galatiae iter), and his sojourn in Gaul (Rheni semibarbarae ripae) in the same letter (*Epist.* iii. T. i. pp. 10, 12). While in Gaul he appears to have stayed some time "apud Treveros" (*Epist.* v. T. i. p. 15). Elsewhere he tells us that he paid this visit to Gaul when a very young man (adolescens *Adv. Jovin.* ii. 7, T. ii. p. 335). Lastly, in his Commentary on this Epistle (T. vii. 430), he expressly mentions hav-

ing seen Ancyra, the capital of Galatia.

² T. ii. p. 425.

³ It is scarcely necessary to say that Jerome here misses the point of St. Paul's rebuke. The Galatians were intellectually quick enough (see p. 22, note 2). The "folly" with which they are charged arose not from obtuseness, but from fickleness and levity; the very versatility of their intellect was in fact their snare. The passage of Hilary to which Jerome refers is not extant

(indociles). It is true that Gaul produces orators; but then Aquitania boasts a Greek origin, and the Galatians are not descended from these, but from the fiercer Gaulish tribes (*de ferocioribus Gallis sint profecti*).” Though betraying the weakness common to all ancient writers when speculating on questions of philology, this passage, taken in connection with its context, implies a very considerable knowledge of facts; and if Jerome agreed with the universal tradition in assuming the Galatians to be genuine Gauls, I can hardly doubt that they were so.

But, beyond the testimony borne to Jerome’s personal knowledge and conviction, this passage suggests another very important consideration. The influence of the Christian church must have been largely instrumental in spreading information of this kind. The Roman official was under no obligation to learn the language of the people whom he governed; but the Christian missionary could not hope for success unless he were able to converse freely with his hearers. In this way the practical study of languages was promoted by the spread of the gospel far more than it had ever been by the growth of the Roman empire.¹ At the same time the feeling of brotherhood inspired by Christianity surmounted the barriers of race and language, and linked together the most distant nations. There is no more striking phenomenon in the history of the early centuries than the close and sympathetic intercourse kept up between churches as far apart as those of Asia and Gaul. These communications could scarcely have failed to clear up the error as to the origin of the Galatian people, if any error existed.

But great reliance has been placed by those who advocate the Teutonic descent of the Galatians on the words with which Jerome concludes the passage above quoted: “Besides the Greek,” he says, “which is spoken throughout the East, the Galatians use as their native tongue a language almost identi-

¹ “The science of language,” says Prof. Max Müller, “owes more than its first impulse to Christianity. The pioneers of our science were those very apostles who were commanded to go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature; and their true successors, the missionaries of the whole Christian church” (*Science of Language*, 1st series, p. 121).

cal with that of the Treveri; for any corruption they may have introduced need not be taken into account.”¹ The Treveri, it is affirmed, were Germans and spoke a German tongue.²

This question is not free from difficulty. The fact that German is now spoken, and has been spoken for many centuries, in the district corresponding to the ancient Treveri (Treves) is in itself a presumption in favor of this view. Nor is the testimony of ancient writers so decisive as to remove every shadow of doubt.

Yet the balance of evidence is doubtless on the side of the Celtic extraction of this tribe. Tacitus indeed in one passage says that they, like the Nervii, eagerly affected a German origin, but he expresses no opinion of his own; and by distinguishing certain races whom he mentions immediately after as “ unquestionably Germans,” he evidently throws some doubt on the validity of their claims.³ Elsewhere he speaks of them plainly as Belgians and Gauls.⁴ The testimony of Caesar leans the same way, though here again there is some indistinctness; “ Being harassed by constant wars, owing to their proximity to Germany, they did not differ much in their warlike habits from the Germans ”; ⁵ but he too expressly calls them Gauls or Belgians elsewhere.⁶

¹ See above, p. 20, note 1. The correct form is *Treveri*, not *Treviri*; see Glück, *Die bei Caesar vorkommenden Keltischen Namen* (1857), p. 155.

² Even Niebuhr, who maintained the Celtic origin of the Galatians, considered that German was the language of the Treveri, and accounted for Jerome's statement by supposing him to have heard some Germans who had recently settled in Galatia (*Vorträge über Röm. Gesch.* ii. p. 181). This view is opposed by Dr. Latham (*Germania of Tacitus*, p. 98, comp. p. cxlv), who upholds the testimony of Jerome. In a later work (Prichard's *Celtic Nations*, p. 106 sqq.) he somewhat impugns that testimony, suggesting that Jerome was mistaken, and starting the theory that the Galatians were neither Gauls nor Germans, but Slavonians.

³ Tac. *Germ.* 28, “ Treveri et Nervii circa adfectionem Germanicæ originis ultro ambitiosi sunt, tanquam per hanc gloriam sanguinis a similitudine et inertia Gallorum separentur. Ipsam Rheni ripam haud dubie Germanorum populi colunt, Vangiones, Triboci, Nemetes.” Strabo (iv. p. 194), says *Τρηούροις δὲ συνεχεῖς Νερουῖοι καὶ τοῦτο Γερμανικὸν ἔθνος*. If *καὶ τοῦτο* here refers to *Τρηούροις*, which however is very questionable (see Ukert. ii. 2, p. 361, note 65), it would seem that Strabo did not care to dispute their claims.

⁴ *Ann.* i. 43, 44; iii. 44; *Hist.* iv. 71, 73.

⁵ *Bell. Gall.* viii. 25, “ Treveros quorum civitas propter Germaniæ vicinitatem quotidianis exercitata bellis cultu et feritate non multum a Germanis differebat.”

⁶ *Bell. Gall.* ii. 4, 24; v. 3, 45; vi. 2, 7, 8; vii. 63. So too Mela, iii. 2,

And this is fully borne out by the less questionable evidence supplied by the names of places and of persons among the Treveri, which equally with other Belgian names betoken their Celtic origin.

The country of the Treveri indeed has long been occupied by a German-speaking population, but history is not silent as to the change. About the close of the third century a colony of Franks settled in the waste lands of the Nervii and Treveri.¹ This was somewhat more than half a century before Jerome visited the place. The old Celtic language cannot have died out in so short a time. Gradually it was displaced by the

calls them "clarissimi Belgarum." Dion Cassius in like manner, xxxix. 47; xl. 31; li. 20, separates them from his Κελτοί (i.e. Germans). See Diefenb. *Celt.* ii. p. 80 sq. In some of these passages they (as well as the Nervii) are spoken of as Gauls, in others as Belgians. This latter designation cannot be regarded as conclusive, inasmuch as some writers have maintained that the Belgians were themselves a German race. The evidence however is irresistibly strong in favor of their Gallic parentage. The facts of the case seem to be as follows: (1) The names of places, and what is more important, of persons among the Belgae are Celtic. Thus we find proper names having well-known Celtic terminations, and occasionally even identical with the names of Gallic places and heroes; see Zeuss, *Die Deutschen*, etc. p. 189. This is true even of the Treveri, e.g. Cingetorix (*Bell. Gall.* v. 3) compared with Vercingetorix (*ib.* vii. 4); see Brandes, p. 84. (2) Caesar relates that the maritime parts of Britain were peopled by the Belgae (v. 12, comp. ii. 4), and the British on the sea-coasts were certainly Celts. These facts seem decisive. On the other hand (3) Caesar speaks of a difference of language between the three divisions of Gaul, the Belgae, the Aquitani, and the Celtae ("hi omnes lingua institutis legibus inter se differunt," i. 1), but this is most naturally explained of various dialects

of the same language, as in fact Strabo represents it (who, however, excepts the Aquitani), δημογλώττους δ' οὐ πάντας, ἀλλ' ἐνίοις μικρὸν παραλλάττοντας ταῖς γλώτταις, iv. p. 176. (4) Caesar relates "plerisque Belgas esse ortos ab Germanis" (ii. 4; comp. Tac. *Germ.* 2); but this very expression implies that the staple of the population was Celtic, and it becomes simply a question to what extent they were leavened by the infusion of a German element. The statement of this question by Brandes, p. 80 sqq., seems very fair and reasonable.

Of the two great branches of the Celtic family philologists for the most part assign the ancient Belgae to the Cymric (see Diefenbach, ii. p. 58 sqq.; Thierry, i. p. 153; 4me ed.; Brandes, p. 85 sqq.), and as the tradition seems to connect the Galatians with the Belgae, we may, in the absence of any direct evidence, look for their modern affinities rather in the Welsh than in the Irish or the Gael. A careful examination of local words and names in Galatia might even now clear up some difficulties.

¹ Eumen. *Paneg. Constantio Caes.* c. 21, "Tuo, Maximiane Augustae, nutu Nerviorum et Treverorum arva jacentia laetus postliminio restitutus et receptus in leges Francus excoluit," Gruter, *Paneg. Vet.* p. 207; comp. *ib.* *Paneg. Constantino Aug.* cc. 5, 6, Gruter, p. 181. See Brandes, pp. 243, 267; Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, c. xiii.; comp. *ib.* c. xix.

German of the Frankish immigrants, re-enforced by fresh hordes of their fellow-countrymen; but in the cities especially, where the remnants of the old population were gathered together, it would still continue to be the vulgar tongue; and Jerome's acquaintance with the inhabitants would naturally be confined for the most part to the towns.

But the evidence for the Celtic parentage of the Galatians is not confined to the testimony of ancient writers, however well informed. The Galatian language itself is a witness free from all suspicion of ignorance or perjury. And considering that a mere handful of words, chiefly proper names, has alone survived, the evidence thence derived is far fuller than might have been anticipated.¹

(1) Several Galatian names of places and persons exhibit Celtic terminations. These are as follows:

Of *places*:

-BRIGA. Eccobriga (*Itin. Ant.* p. 203, ed. Wess, *Tab. Peut.*); Ipetobrigen (*Itin. Hieros.* p. 574). It signifies "a hill"; see Zeuss, *Gr. Celt.* p. 101, Glück. p. 126.

-IACUM. Rosologiaeum (*Itin. Ant.* p. 143); Acitoriliacum (*Tab. Peut.*); Teutobodiaci (Plin. v. 42); Timoniacenses (? Plin. v. 42). On this very common Celtic termination see Zeuss, *G. C.* p. 772.

Of *persons*:

-GNATUS. Eposognatus (Polyb. xxii. 20), compare Critognatus, Boduognatus (Caesar), and several Celtic names in inscriptions; (gnath, "consuetus"; Zeuss, *G. C.* p. 82, and compare *ib.* p. 19).

-MARS. Combolomarus (Liv. xxxviii. 19); Chiomara (Polyb. xxii. 21); compare Virdumarus, Indutiomarus (Caesar), and other names in Gallic inscriptions; (mar, "magnus"; see Zeuss, *G. C.* p. 19, Glück, p. 77.

-ORIUS. Acichorius (Paus. x. 19. 4); Orestorius (Paus. x. 22. 2); Comontorius (Polyb. iv. 46. 3); see Zeuss. *G. C.* p. 741.

¹ The account which follows perhaps needs some apology from one who has no pretension to Celtic scholarship and may possibly betray great ignorance. But the investigation could not well be avoided, while the facts seemed to lie very much on the surface. At all events the general result will not, I think, be invalidated by any inaccuracy or weakness that there may be in the details.

-RIX. *Adiatorix*¹ (Cic. *Fam.* ii. 12, Strabo, xii. p. 534); *Albiorix*, *Ateporix* (Boeckh, *inscr.* 4039); a very common Celtic termination, e.g. *Dumnorix*, *Ambiorix*, *Vercingetorix*, etc.; ("rex," "princeps," Zeuss, *G. C.* p. 25, where instances are given).

-TARUS, -TORUS; *Bogodiatorus* (Strabo, xii. p. 567); *Brogi-tarus* (Cic. *Harusp. resp.* 28); *Deiotarus* (Cic. *pro. reg. Deiot.* comp. Boeckh, *inscr.* 4072). See Zeuss, *G. C.* p. 823.

(2) But it is not only in the terminations that the Celtic origin of the language is seen. It appears unmistakeably also in a large proportion of the Galatian names and words which have been preserved.

Strabo tells us (xii. p. 567) that the great council of the Galatian people met at a place called *DRYNAEMETUM* (*Δρυναίμετον*). Now *nemetum* ("nemed") is a good Celtic word for a temple: we meet with it for instance in *Augustonemetum*, "the temple of Augustus," at Claremont in the Auvergne; in *Vernemetum*, "the great temple," in the province of Bordeaux, of which it is said

Nomine Vernemetis voluit vocitare vetustas,
Quod quasi *fanum ingens* Gallica lingua refert;²

in another *Vernemetum* also in Britian (*Itin. Ant.* p. 479); and in several other names: comp. Diefenb. *Celt.* i. p. 83, ii. p. 329; Zeuss, *G. C.* pp. 11. 186; Glück, p. 75. The first syllable of *Drynaemetum* again represents the Celtic (Welsh) *derw*, "quercus," whence Druid ("derwydd"), Derwent, etc.: see Zeuss, *G. C.* pp. 8, 16, and Diefenb. i. p. 160. Thus *Drynaemetum* is the "oak-shrine" or the "grove temple," recalling a characteristic feature of the old Celtic worship which prevailed in Britian and Gaul.

Again, the names of several of the Galatian chieftains betray their Celtic extraction. The leader of the expedition against Greece, of which the Galatian immigration was an offshoot, bears the same name with the Gaulish captain who sacked Rome; he too, like his predecessor, is a BRENNUS — no proper

¹ The first element in this word also occurs in several Celtic names, *Adiatunus*, *Adiatumarus*, etc., Glück, p. 1.

² Venant. Fortun. i. 9.

name, but a good Celtic word signifying a "prince" or "chieftain" (Thierry, *Hist. des Gaul.* i. p. 160; Zeuss, *G. C.* p. 101). A second name assigned to this same king was PRAUSTS, "the terrible" (Strab. iv. p. 187; see Thierry, i. p. 218, and especially Diefenb. ii. p. 252). Again, another commander in this expedition is called CERETHRIUS, "the famous, the glorious," (Pausan. x. 19. 4; *certh*, "celebrated," *certhrwyz*, "glory"; Thierry, i. p. 219, from Owen's *Welsh. Dict.*). BOLGITS, again (Pausan. *ib.*), also written Belgius (Justin. xxiv. 5), presents the same Celtic root which appears in "Belgae" (comp. Diefenb. i. p. 200; ii. p. 61 sqq., 267). The name of ACICHORUS (Pausan. l. c.) too, or Cichorius (Diod. xxii. fragm.), who is associated with Brennus in the command, taken as a Celtic word, describes his office (*cyçwiawr*, "colleague," Thierry, i. p. 255).

Among later Galatian names of persons we meet with GAEZATODIASTUS (Boeckh, *inscr.* 4039), doubtless to be connected with the "Gesatae" of whom we read among the western Gauls, and whose name, signifying "warriors," is derived from the Gallic word *gesum*, "a spear" (Caes. *B. G.* iii. 4; comp. Serv. in Virg. *Aen.* viii. 662, Diefenb. i. p. 126); and BROGORIS (Boeckh, *inscr.* 4118), the root of which appears in Brogitarus. Allobroges, etc.; Zeuss, *G. C.* p. 106; Glück, p. 27. Again the name BITUTUS, Bitovitus, or Bitoctus, seems to occur both in Asiatic (Appian, *Mithr.* iii.) and in European Gaul (*ib. Celt.* 12; Liv. *Epit.* lxi.); for the reasons given (Wernsdorff, p. 164) for assigning the first of these, who slew Mithridates, to the western nation seem insufficient. Nor is this the only proper name which links the two countries together. Strabo (xiii. p. 625) mentions one ADOBOGIOM, a Galatian; the name Adbogius appears on an inscription relating to Rhenish Gaul (Steiner, *Cod. inscr. Rom. Rhen.* no. 440).

Again, of the three tribes which composed the Galatian people two at least proclaim their Celtic descent in their names. The TECTOSAGAE or Tectosages bear identically the same name with a tribe of western Gauls (Caes. *B. G.* vi. 24) whom we find moving eastward and occupying a district which was properly German (see Diefenb. ii. p. 264 sqq.). Similarly both

the component parts of *TOLISTOBOGII*, the name of the second of these tribes, claim a Celtic affinity. The word is variously written, but its original Celtic form would seem to be represented by *Tolosatobogii*. Tolosa was a common Gallic name for places (Diefenb. ii. p. 339) and has survived both in the French Toulouse and in the Spanish Tolosa. It is connected moreover with the name and history of the other Galatian tribe already discussed. "*Tolosa Tectosagum*" is especially mentioned (Mela, ii. 5; comp. Plin. iii. 5); and according to the ancient legend a portion of the Tectosages returning from the Delphic expedition "to their ancient country Tolosa," and being afflicted by a pestilence, bethought them of averting the wrath of heaven by sinking their ill-gotten gains in the neighboring lake (Justin. xxxii. 3; comp. Strab. iv. p. 188, Dion Cass. *Exc.* i. p. 133, ed. L. Dind.). The riddle of this legend I shall not attempt to read; I simply quote it to show the connection of the Gallic Tolosa with the Asiatic settlement. Indeed this name occurs in Galatia itself under the form *Tolosocorium* (*Tab. Peut.*), and *Τόλαστα χωρίον* (Ptol. v. 4). The second element in the composition of *Tolostobogii* or *Tolostoboi* is no less Celtic. It is the name borne by the tribe of the Boii which plays so prominent a part in early Gallic history, and is not uncommon as a termination of other Celtic names (see instances in Zeuss, *G. C.* p. 69, comp. p. 58, and compare the proper name *Adobogius* already referred to). Even in the third and remaining tribe the *TROCM*i Celtic affinities have been pointed out (Diefenb. i. p. 256; Zeuss, *G. C.* p. 28), but these are obscure and far from convincing.¹

¹ Diefenbach, *Celt.* ii. p. 248, quotes Solinus (c. 42) as mentioning a Galatian tribe "*Ambiani*," this being the ancient Gaulish name for the modern "*Amiens*." But there seems to be an accidental error here. In the most recent and most critical edition of Solinus (c. 41, ed. Mommsen, 1864) the word is "*Ambitoti*," and in the corresponding passage of Pliny (v. 42), from which Solinus borrowed, Sillig reads "*Ambitouti*." Though the MSS in both authors present

some variations, there seems to be no authority for *Ambiani*.

I notice also that the names of several Galatian places begin with *Reg-*, as *Reganagalla*, *Regemnezzus*, *Regemaurecium*, *Regetmoeata*, *Regomori*; see Wernsdorff, pp. 232, 233. This may be the same word which appears in many Gallic names, as *Rigodulun*, *Rigomagus*, etc.; see Diefenbach, i. p. 53; ii. p. 331; Zeuss, *G. C.* p. 25.

Of Galatian words besides proper names very few indeed have been recorded. The explanations given of these may be found in Diefenbach (see his references, ii. p. 251). Among others which are less patent, one is certainly a good Celtic word; *μάρκα*, mentioned by Pausanias (x. 19) as the name for a horse among the Gauls of the Delphic expedition (Diefenb. i. p. 67).

In gathering together the evidence in favor of the Celtic extraction of the Galatians as afforded by their language I have omitted many questionable affinities; and even of those which are given some perhaps will appear uncertain. But taken as a whole the evidence, if I mistake not, places the result beyond a doubt; and the few German etymologies, real or imagined, which have been alleged on the other side, will be quite insufficient to turn the scale. Thus it is asserted that the names of the leaders of the Asiatic expedition, LUTARIUS and LEONNORIUS, are both German; and that the Galatian tribe TEUTOBODIACI and the Galatian town GERMANOPOLIS point very clearly to the same origin. On these four words the whole stress of the Teutonic theory may be said to rest.

And if they had stood alone, the German affinities of these names might perhaps have been accepted. But with the vast mass of evidence on the other side, it becomes a question whether some more satisfactory account cannot be given of them. Thus Lutarius (or Luturius) is said to be the same name with the Frankish *Lothaire* and the Saxon *Luther*, and therefore Teutonic (see Graff, *Althochd. Sprachsch.* iv. p. 555); but among the Gallic chieftains one Lucterius is mentioned (Caesar, *B. G.* vii. etc.), and the identity of the names Lutarius and Lucterius is at least not improbable (Diefenb. ii. p. 253; Zeuss, *Gr. C.* p. 78, derives the name Lucterius from *luct*, "agmen," "pars"; see also p. 180). Again the other Galatian commander Leonnorius has certainly a namesake in a genuine Celtic saint, a native of Britain (*Acta Sanct.* Jul. i., see Diefenb. ii. p. 254), and there seems to be no reason for assigning a Teutonic parentage to this word. In the name Teutobodiaci, indeed, the first component seems very plainly to mean "German"; but, even granting that this is not one of those very

specious but very deceptive affinities which are the snares of comparative philology, the word need not imply that the tribe itself was Teutonic. If the second component is rightly taken to denote victory ("buad," "buaid," comp. Boadicea, Bodiocasses, Bodiontici, Bodicus, etc. ; see Zeuss, *G. C.* p. 27, Glück, p. 53), then the Teutobodiaci were not necessarily Teutons any more than Thessalonica was Thessalian. The remaining word Germanopolis seems in its very form to betray its later origin, or at all events to mark some exceptional occupants other than the main population of the country.

It is quite possible indeed, as Thierry supposes (i. p. 225), that swept away with the hordes of Gaulish invaders a small body of Germans also settled in Asia Minor, and this may be the true account of the names Lutarius and Teutobodiaci. We know that of all the Gauls the Belgians were most mixed up with the Germans, and it is with the Belgian members of the Celtic family especially that the Gauls of the Asiatic settlement seem to be connected. But the evidence is scarcely strong enough to bear the strain of the German theory, even when pared down to these very meagre dimensions. Beyond this we cannot go without doing violence to history.

There is every reason, then, for believing that the Galatian settlers were genuine Celts, and of the two main subdivisions into which modern philologists have divided the Celtic race, they seem rather to have belonged to the Cymric, of which the Welsh are the living representatives. Thus in the age when St. Paul preached, a native of Galatia spoke a language essentially the same with that which was current in the southern part of Britain. And if—to indulge a passing fancy—we picture to ourselves one of his Asiatic converts visiting the far West to barter the haircloths of his native country for the useful metal which was the special product of this island, we can imagine, that finding a medium of communication in a common language, he may have sown the first seeds of the gospel and laid the foundations of the earliest church in Britain.

II.

THE BRETHREN OF THE LORD.¹

IN the early ages of the church two conflicting opinions were held regarding the relationship of those who in the Gospels and apostolic Epistles are termed “the brethren of the Lord.”

¹ The interest in this subject, which was so warmly discussed towards the close of the fourth century, has been revived in more recent times by the publication of Herder's *Briefe Zwener Brüder Jesu in unserm Kanon* (1775), in which the Helvidian hypothesis is put forward. Since then it has formed the subject of numberless monographs, dissertations, and incidental comments. The most important later works, with which I am acquainted, are those of Blom, *De τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς et ταῖς ἀδελφαῖς τοῦ Κυρίου* (Leyden, 1839); of Schaf, *Das Verhältniss des Jakobus Bruders des Herrn zu Jakobus Alphäi* (Berlin, 1842); and of Mill, *The Accounts of our Lord's Brethren in the New Testament vindicated, etc.* (Cambridge, 1843). The two former adopt the Helvidian view; the last is written in support of St. Jerome's hypothesis. Blom gives the most satisfactory statement which I have seen of the patristic authorities, and Schaf discusses the scriptural arguments most carefully. I am also largely indebted to the ability and learning of Mill's treatise, though he seems to me to have mistaken the general tenor of ecclesiastical tradition on this subject. Besides these monographs I have also consulted, with more or less advantage, articles on the subject in works of ref-

erence or periodicals, such as those in *Studien u. Kritiken* by Wieseler; *Die Söhne Zebedäi Vettern des Herrn* (1840, p. 648); and *Ueber die Brüder des Herrn, etc.* (1842, p. 71). In preparing for this 2d edition I have looked over the careful investigation in Laurent's *Neutest. Studien*, p. 155 sqq. (1866), where the Helvidian hypothesis is maintained, but have not seen reason to make any change in consequence. The works of Arnaud, *Recherches sur l'Épître de Jude*, and of Goy (Mont. 1845), referred to in Bishop Elliott's *Galatians* i. 19, I have not seen. My object in this dissertation is mainly twofold: (1) To place the Hieronymian hypothesis in its true light, as an effort of pure criticism unsupported by any traditional sanction; and (2) To say a word on behalf of the Epiphanian solution, which seems, at least of late years, to have met with the fate reserved for τὰ μέσα in literature and theology, as well as in politics, ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων ἢ ὅτι οὐ ξυνηγωνίζοντο ἢ φθόνῳ τοῦ περιεῖναι διεφθείροντο. I suppose it was because he considered it idle to discuss a theory which had no friends, that Prof. Jowett (on Gal. i. 19), while balancing the claims of the other two solutions, does not even mention the existence of this, though in the early centuries it was the received account.

On the one hand it was maintained that no blood relationship existed; that these brethren were in fact sons of Joseph by a former wife, before he espoused the Virgin; and that they are therefore called the Lord's brethren only in the same way in which Joseph is called his father, having really no claim to this title but being so designated by an exceptional use of the term adapted to the exceptional fact of the miraculous incarnation. On the other hand certain persons argued that the obvious meaning of the term was the correct meaning, and that these brethren were the Lord's brethren as truly as Mary was the Lord's mother, being her sons by her husband Joseph. The former of these views was held by the vast majority of orthodox believers and by not a few heretics; the latter was the opinion of a father of the church here and there to whom it occurred as the natural inference from the language of scripture, as Tertullian for instance, and of certain sects and individuals who set themselves against the incipient worship of the Virgin or the one-sided asceticism of the day, and to whom therefore it was a very serviceable weapon of controversy.

Such was the state of opinion, when towards the close of the fourth century Jerome struck out a novel hypothesis. One Helvidius, who lived in Rome, had attacked the prevailing view of the superiority of virgin over married life, and in doing so had laid great stress on the example of the Lord's mother, who had borne children to her husband. In or about the year 383 Jerome, then a young man, at the instigation of "the brethren" wrote a treatise in reply to Helvidius, in which he put forward his own view.¹ He maintained that the Lord's brethren were his cousins after the flesh, being sons of Mary the wife of Alphaeus and sister of the Virgin. Thus, as he boasted, he asserted the virginity not of Mary only, but of Joseph also.

These three accounts are all of sufficient importance, either from their real merits or from their wide popularity, to deserve consideration, and I shall therefore investigate their several

¹ *Adv. Helvidium de Perpetua Virginitate B. Mariæ*, T. ii. p. 206 (ed. Vall.).
Comp. *Comment. ad Gal.* i. 19.

claims. As it will be convenient to have some short mode of designation, I shall call them respectively the *Epiphanian*, the *Helvidian*, and the *Hieronymian* theories, from the names of their most zealous advocates in the controversies of the fourth century, when the question was most warmly debated.

But besides the solutions already mentioned, not a few others have been put forward. These, however, have been for the most part built upon arbitrary assumptions or improbable combinations of known facts, and from their artificial character have failed to secure any wide acceptance. It is assumed, for instance, that two persons of the same name, James the son of Alphaeus and James the Lord's brother, were leading members of the church of Jerusalem, though history points to one only;¹ or that James the Lord's brother mentioned in St. Paul's Epistles is not the same James whose name occurs among the Lord's brethren in the Gospels, the relationship intended by the term "brother" being different in the two cases;² or that "brethren" stands for "foster-brethren," Joseph having undertaken the charge of his brother Clopas' children after their father's death;³ or that the Lord's brethren has a double parentage, a legal as well as an actual father, Joseph having raised seed to his deceased brother Clopas by his widow according to the levirate law;⁴ or lastly, that the cousins of Jesus were rewarded with the title of his brethren, because they were his steadfast disciples, while his own brothers opposed him.⁵

All such assumptions it will be necessary to set aside. In themselves, indeed, they can neither be proved nor disproved. But it is safer to aim at the most probable deduction from known facts than to build up a theory on an imaginary foundation. And, where the question is so intricate in itself, there

¹ e.g. Wieseler, *Ueber die Brüder etc.*, l. c., p. 80 sqq. According to this writer the James of Gal. ii. 9 and of the Acts is the son of Alphaeus, not the Lord's brother, and therefore different from the James of i. 19. See his notes on Gal. i. 19; ii. 9. An ancient writer, the pseudo-Dorotheus (see below p. 123, note) had represented two of the name

as bishops of Jerusalem, making the son of Alphaeus the successor of the Lord's brother.

² e.g. the writers mentioned in Schaf, p. 11.

³ Lange in *Herzog's Real-Encykl.* in the article "Jakobus im N. T."

⁴ Theophylact; see below, p. 127.

⁵ Renan, *Vie de Jésus*, p. 24.

is little temptation to introduce any fresh difficulties by giving way to the license of conjecture.

To confine ourselves, then, to the three accounts which have the greatest claim to a hearing. It will be seen that the hypothesis which I have called the Epiphanian holds a middle place between the remaining two. With the Helvidian it assigns an intelligible sense to the term "brethren"; with the Hieronymian it preserves the perpetual virginity of the Lord's mother. Whether or not, while uniting in itself the features which have recommended each of these to acceptance, it unites also their difficulties, will be considered in the sequel.

From a critical point of view, however, apart from their bearing on Christian doctrine and feeling, the Helvidian and Epiphanian theories hang very closely together, while the Hieronymian stands apart. As well on account of this isolation, as also from the fact which I have hitherto assumed, but which I shall endeavor to prove hereafter, that it was the latest born of the three, it will be convenient to consider the last-mentioned theory first.

St. Jerome then states his view in the treatise against Helvidius somewhat as follows:

The list of the twelve apostles contains two of the name of James—the son of Zebedee and the son of Alphaeus. But elsewhere we read of one James the Lord's brother. What account are we to give of this last James? Either he was an apostle, or he was not. If an apostle, he must be identified with the son of Alphaeus, for the son of Zebedee was no longer living; if not an apostle, then there were three persons bearing this name. But in this case how can a certain James be called "the less," a term which implies only one besides? And how, moreover, can we account for St. Paul's language, "Other of the apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother" (Gal. i. 19)? Clearly, therefore, James the son of Alphaeus and James the Lord's brother are the same person.

And the Gospel narrative explains this identity. Among the Lord's brethren occur the names of James and Joseph. Now it is stated elsewhere that Mary the mother of James the less and of Joseph (or Joses) was present at the crucifixion

(Matth. xxvii. 56; Mark xv. 40). This Mary, therefore, must have been the wife of Alphaeus, for Alphaeus was the father of James. But again in St. John's narrative (xix. 25) the Virgin's sister "Mary of Cleophas" (Clopas) is represented as standing by the cross. This carries us a step in advance. The last-mentioned Mary is to be identified with the wife of Alphaeus and mother of James. Thus James the Lord's brother was in reality the Lord's cousin.

But if his cousin, how is he called his brother? The following is the explanation: The term "brethren" is used in four different senses in holy scripture; it denotes either (1) actual brotherhood, or (2) common nationality, or (3) kinsmanship, or (4) friendship and sympathy. These different senses St. Jerome expresses by the four words, "natura, gente, cognatione, affectu." In the case of the Lord's brethren the third of these senses is to be adopted. Brotherhood here denotes mere relationship, just as Abraham calls his nephew Lot brother (Gen. xiii. 8), and as Laban uses the same term of Jacob his sister's son (Gen. xxix. 15).

So far St. Jerome, who started the theory. But, as worked out by other writers, and as generally stated, it involves two particulars besides.

(i.) *The identity of Alphaeus and Clopas.* These two words, it is said, are different renderings of the same Aramaic name חֲלַפַּי or ܚܠܦܝ (Chalphai), the form Clopas being peculiar to St. John, the more completely grecized Alphaeus taking its place in the other evangelists. The Aramaic guttural *Cheth*, when the name was reproduced in Greek, might either be omitted, as in Alphaeus, or be replaced by a κ (or χ) as in Clopas. Just in the same way Aloysius and Ludovicus are recognized Latin representatives of the Frankish name Clovis (Clodovicus, Hludovicus, Hlouis).¹

This identification, however, though it materially strengthens his theory, was unknown to Jerome himself. In the course of his argument he confesses plainly that he does not know why Mary is called Clopae (or Cleophae, as he writes it). It may

¹ This illustration is taken from Mill, p. 236.

be, he suggests, after her father, or from her family surname ("gentilitate familiae"), or for some other reason.¹ In his treatise of Hebrew names, too, he gives an account on the word Alphaeus which is scarcely consistent with this identity.² Neither have I found any traces of it in any of his other works, though he refers several times to the subject. In Augustine, again, who adopts Jerome's hypothesis and his manner of stating it, it does not anywhere appear, so far as I know. It occurs first, I believe, in Chrysostom, who incidentally speaks of James the Lord's brother as "son of Clopas," and after him in Theodoret, who is more explicit (both on Gal. i. 19).³ To a Syrian Greek, who, even if he were unable to read the Peshito version, must at all events have known that Chalphai was the Aramaean rendering, or rather the Aramaean original of Ἀλφᾱῖος, it might not unnaturally occur to graft this identification on the original theory of Jerome.

(ii.) *The identity of Judas the apostle and Judas the Lord's brother.* In St. Luke's catalogues of the twelve (Luke vi. 16; Acts i. 13) the name "Judas of James" (Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου) occurs. Now we find a Judas also among the four brethren of the Lord (Matth. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 3); and the writer of the epistle, who was doubtless the Judas last mentioned, styles himself "the brother of James" (Jude 1). This coincidence suggests that the ellipsis in "Judas of James" should be supplied by *brother*, as in the English version, not by *son*, which would be the more obvious word. Thus Judas the Lord's brother, like James, is made one of the twelve. I do not know when the Hieronymian theory received this fresh accession, but, though the gain is considerable in apparent strength at least, it does not appear, so far as I have noticed, to have occurred to Jerome himself.

¹ *Adv. Helvid.* § 15, T. ii. p. 219.

² "Alphaeus, fugitivus [אֶלְפָּאִי; the Greek of Origen was doubtless αἰχόμενος, see p. 626], sed melius millesimus [אֶלְפָּאִי] vel doctus" [אֶלְפָּאִי]. T. iii. p. 89; and again, "Alphaeus, millesimus, sive super os [עַל פֶּה?] ab ore non ab osse." ib. p. 98. Thus he deliberately rejects

the derivation with a *Clath*, which is required in order to identify "Alphaeus" with "Clopas." Indeed, as he incorrectly wrote Cleopas (or Cleophas) for Clopas with the Latin version, this identification was not likely to occur to him.

³ See below, p. 126.

And some have gone a step further. We find not only a James and a Judas among the Lord's brethren, but also a Symeon or Simon. Now it is remarkable that these three names occur together in St. Luke's lists of the twelve: James (the son) of Alphæus, Simon called Zelotes, and Judas (the brother) of James. In the lists of the other evangelists, too, these three persons are kept together, though the order is different, and Judas appears under another name, Lebbaeus or Thaddæus. Can this have been a mere accident? Would the name of a stranger have been inserted by St. Luke between two brothers? Is it not therefore highly probable that this Simon also was one of the Lord's brethren? And thus *three* out of the four are included among the twelve.¹

Without these additions the theory is incomplete; and, indeed, they have been so generally regarded as part of it that advocates and opponents alike have forgotten or overlooked the fact that Jerome himself nowhere advances them. I shall, then, consider the theory as involving these two points; for indeed it would never have won its way to such general acceptance, unless presented in this complete form, where its chief recommendation is that it combines a great variety of facts and brings out many striking coincidences.

But, before criticising the theory itself, let me prepare the way by divesting it of all fictitious advantages, and placing it in its true light. The two points to which attention may be directed as having been generally overlooked, are these:

(1) *Jerome claims no traditional support for his theory.* This is a remarkable feature in his treatise against Helvidius. He argues the question solely on critical and theological grounds. His opponent had claimed the sanction of two older writers, Tertullian and Victorinus of Pettaw. Jerome in reply is obliged to concede him Tertullian, whose authority he invalidates as "not a member of the church," but denies him

¹ It is found in Sophronius(?), who, however, confuses him with Jude: "Simon Cananaeus cognomento Judas, frater Jacobi episcopi, qui et successit illi in episcopatum," etc.; Hieron. *Op.* ii. p. 958. Compare the pseudo-Hippolytus (i. App. p. 30, ed. Fabric.). Perhaps the earliest genuine writing in which it occurs is Isidor. Hispal. *de rit et ob. Sanct.* c. 81. See Mill, p. 248.

Victorinus. Can it be doubted that if he could have produced any names on his own side he would only too gladly have done so? When, for instance, he is maintaining the virginity of the Lord's mother, a feature possessed by his theory in common with the Epiphonian, he is at no loss for authorities. Ignatius, Polycarp, Irenaeus, Justin, and many other "eloquent apostolic men" occur to him at once.¹ But in support of his own account of the relationship he cannot, or at least does not, name a single writer; he simply offers it as a critical deduction from the statements of scripture.² Again, in his later writings, when he refers to the subject, his tone is the same: "*Some* suppose them to have been sons of Joseph; it is *my* opinion, *I* have maintained in my book against Helvidius, that they were the children of Mary the Virgin's sister."³ And the whole tenor of patristic evidence, as I shall hope to show, is in accordance with this tone. No decisive instance can be produced of a writer holding Jerome's view before it was propounded by Jerome himself.

(2) *Jerome does not hold his theory stanchly and consistently.* The references to the subject in his works taken in chronological order, will speak for themselves. The theory is first propounded, as we saw, in the treatise against Helvidius, written about 383, when he was a young man. Even here his main point is the perpetual virginity of the Lord's mother, to which his own special solution is quite subordinate; he speaks of himself as not caring to fight hard ("*contentiosum funem non traho*") for the identity of Mary of Cleophas with Mary the mother of James and Joses, though this is the pivot of his theory. And as time advances, he seems to hold to his hypothesis more and more loosely. In his Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians (i. 19), written about 387, he speaks very vaguely. He remembers, he says, having when

¹ See however below, p. 115, note 1.

² He sets aside the appeal to authority thus: "*Verum nugas terimus, et fonte veritatis omissio opinionum rivulos consectamur,*" *Adv. Helvid.* 17.

³ *De vir illustr.* 2, "*ut nonnulli existimant, Joseph ex alia uxore; ut au-*

tem mihi videtur Mariae sororis matris Domini filius;" *Comment. in Matth.* xii. 49 (T. vii. p. 86), "*Quidam fratres Domini de alia uxore Joseph filios suspiciantur nos autem, sicut in libro quem contra Helvidium scripsimus continetur,*" etc.

at Rome written a treatise on the subject, with which, such as it is, he ought to be satisfied ("qualiacunque sunt illa quae scripsimus his contenti esse debemus"); after which he goes on, inconsistently enough: "Suffice it now to say that James was called the Lord's brother on account of his high character, his incomparable faith, and extraordinary wisdom; the other apostles also are called brothers (John xx. 17; comp. Ps. xxii. 22), but he pre-eminently so, to whom the Lord at his departure had committed the sons of his mother (i.e. the members of the church of Jerusalem)," with more to the same effect; and he concludes by showing that the term apostle, so far from being confined to the twelve, has a very wide use, adding that it was "a monstrous error to identify this James with the apostle the brother of John."¹ In his catalogue of illustrious men (A.D. 392) and in his Commentary on St. Matthew (A.D. 398) he adheres to his earlier opinion, referring in the passages already quoted² to his treatise against Helvidius, and taunting those who considered the Lord's brethren to be the sons of Joseph by a former wife with "following the ravings of the apocryphal writings, and inventing a wretched creature (mulierculam) Melcha or Escha by name."³ Yet after all, in a still later work, the Epistle to Hedibia (about 406 or 407), enumerating the Maries of the Gospels, he mentions Mary of Cleo-

¹ "Quod autem exceptis duodecim quidam vocentur apostoli, illud in causa est, omnes qui Dominum viderant et eum postea praedicabant fuisse apostolos appellatos;" and then, after giving instances (among others 1 Cor. xv. 7), he adds, "Unde vehementer erravit qui arbitratus est Jacobum hunc de evangelio esse apostolum fratrem Johannis; . . . hic autem Jacobus episcopus Hierosolymorum primus fuit cognomento Justus," etc. (T. vii. p. 396). These are just the arguments which would be brought by one maintaining the Epiphanian account. Altogether Jerome's language here is that of a man who has committed himself to a theory of which he has misgivings, and yet from which he is not bold enough to break loose.

² See p. 95, note 3.

³ "Sequentes deliramenta apocryphorum et quandam Melcham vel Escham mulierculam confingentes." *Comm. in Matth.* l. c. "Nemo non videt," says Blom, p. 116, "illud nomen אשה [wife, woman] esse mere fictitium, nec minus posterius [prius] מלכה [queen]." (Comp. Julius Africanus in Routh's *Rel. Sacr.* ii. pp. 233, 339). If so, the work must have been the production of some Jewish Christian. But Escha is not a very exact representation of אשה [Ishah]. On the other hand, making allowance for the uncertain vocalization of the Hebrew, the two daughters of Haran (Gen. xi. 29) bear identically the same names: "the father of Milcah (LXX Μελαχά) and the father of Iscah (יִסְכָּה LXX 'Ιεσχα)." Doubtless these names were borrowed thence.

phas the maternal aunt of the Lord and Mary the mother of James and Joses as distinct persons, adding, "although others contend that the mother of James and Joses was his aunt."¹ Yet this identification, of which he here speaks with such indifference, was the keystone of his own theory. Can it be that by his long residence in Bêthlehem, having the Palestinian tradition brought more prominently before him, he first relaxed his hold of, and finally relinquished, his own hypothesis?

If these positions are correct, the Hieronymian view has no claim to any traditional sanction; in other words, there is no reason to believe that time has obliterated any secondary evidence in its favor; and it must therefore be investigated on its own merits.

And compact and plausible as it may seem at first sight, the theory exposes, when examined, many vulnerable parts.

(1) The instances alleged notwithstanding, the sense thus assigned to "brethren" seems to be unsupported by biblical usage. In an affectionate and earnest appeal intended to move the sympathies of the hearer, a speaker might not unnaturally address a relation or a friend, or even a fellow-countryman, as his "brother." And even when speaking of such to a third person he might through warmth of feeling and under certain aspects so designate him. But it is scarcely conceivable that the cousins of any one should be commonly, and indeed exclusively, styled his "brothers" by indifferent persons; still less, that one cousin in particular should be singled out and described in this loose way: "James the Lord's brother."

(2) But again: the Hieronymian theory when completed supposes two, if not three, of the Lord's brethren to be in the number of the twelve. This is hardly reconcilable with the place they hold in the evangelical narratives, where they appear sometimes as distinct from, sometimes as antagonistic to, the twelve. Only a short time before the crucifixion they are disbelievers in the Lord's divine mission (John vii. 5). Is it likely that St. John would have made this unqualified statement, if it were true of one only, or at most of two, out of the four? Jerome sees the difficulty, and meets it by saying that

¹ *Epist. exx. T. i. p. 826. Comp. Tischendorf's Evang. Apocr. p. 104.*

James was "not one of those that disbelieved." But what if Jude and Simon also belong to the twelve? After the Lord's ascension, it is true, his brethren appear in company with the apostles, and apparently by this time their unbelief has been converted into faith. Yet even on this later occasion, though with the twelve, they are distinguished from the twelve; for the latter are described as assembling in prayer "with the women and Mary the mother of Jesus and [with] his brethren" (Acts i. 14).

And scarcely less consistent is this theory with what we know of James and Jude in particular. James, as the resident bishop or presiding elder of the mother church, held a position hardly compatible with the world-wide duties which devolved on the twelve. It was the essential feature of his office that he should be stationary; of theirs, that they should move about from place to place. If, on the other hand, he appears sometimes to be called an apostle (though not one of the passages alleged is free from ambiguity), this term is by no means confined to the twelve and might therefore be applied to him in its wider sense, as it is to Barnabas.¹ Again, Jude on his part seems to disclaim the title of an apostle (ver. 17); and if so, he cannot have been one of the twelve.

(2) But again: the Lord's brethren are mentioned in the Gospels in connection with Joseph his reputed father and Mary his mother, never once with Mary of Clopas (the assumed wife of Alphaeus). It would surely have been otherwise, if the latter Mary were really their mother.

(4) Jerome lays great stress on the epithet *minor* applied to James, as if it implied *two only*, and even those who impugn his theory seem generally to acquiesce in his rendering. But the Greek gives not "James the Less," but "James the *little*" (ὁ μικρός). Is it not most natural, then, to explain this epithet of his height?² "There were many of the name of James," says Hegesippus, and the short stature of one of these might well serve as a distinguishing mark. This interpretation, at

¹ See the note, p. 316.

² As in Xen. *Mem.* i. 4, 2 Ἀριστόδημον τὸν μικρὸν ἐπικαλούμενον, referring

to stature, as appears from Plato, *Symp.* 173 B; and in Arist. *Ran.* 708 Κλειγένης ὁ μικρός.

all events, must be regarded as more probable than explaining it either of his comparative youth, or of inferior rank and influence. It will be remembered that there is no scriptural or early sanction for speaking of the son of Zebedee as "James the great."

(5) The manner in which Jude is mentioned in the lists of the twelve is on this hypothesis full of perplexities. In the first place it is necessary to translate *Ἰακώβου*, not "the son," but "the brother of James," though the former is the obvious rendering, and is supported by two of the three earliest versions, the Peshito-Syriac and the Thebaic, while the remaining version, the Old Latin, leaves the ellipsis unsupplied, and thus preserves the ambiguity of the original. But again, if Judas were the brother of James, would not the Evangelist's words have run more naturally, "James the son of Alphaeus and Jude his brother," or "James and Jude the sons of Alphaeus," as in the case of the other pairs of brothers? Then again, if Simon Zelotes is not a brother of James, why is he inserted by St. Luke between the two? If he also is a brother, why is the designation of brotherhood (*Ἰακώβου*) attached to the name of Judas only?

Moreover, in the different lists of the three Evangelists the apostle in question is designated in three different ways. In St. Matthew (x. 3) he is called Lebbaeus (at least according to a highly probable reading); in St. Mark (iii. 18), Thaddaeus; and in St. Luke, "Jude of James." St. John again having occasion to mention him (xiv. 22) distinguishes him by a negative, "Judas, not Iscariot."¹ Is it possible, if he were the

¹ The perplexity is increased by the Curetonian Syriac, which for *Ἰούδας οὐχ*

ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης reads *ܝܫܥܝܐ ܝܗܘܨܐܦ*, "Judas Thomas," i.e. "Judas the twin." It seems therefore that the translator took the person intended by St. John to be not the *Judas Jacobi* in the list of the twelve, but the *Thomas Didymus*, for Thomas was commonly called Judas in the Syrian Church; e.g. Euseb. *H. E.* i. 13 *Ἰούδας ὁ καὶ Θωμάς*, and *Acta Thomae* i. *Ἰούδα Θωμά τῷ καὶ Διδύμῳ* (ed. Tisch.

p. 190); see Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* i. pp. 100, 318; Cureton's *Syriac Gospels*, p. li; *Anc. Syr. Documents*, p. 33. As Thomas (*Διδυμος*), "the twin," is properly a surname, and this apostle must have had some other name, there seems no reason for doubting this very early tradition that he also was a Jude. At the same time it is highly improbable that St. John should have called the same apostle elsewhere Thomas (Jno. xi. 16; xiv. 5; xx. 24, etc.) and here Judas, and we may therefore conclude

Lord's brother Judas, he would in all these places have escaped being so designated, when this designation would have fixed the person meant at once?

(6) Lastly; in order to maintain the Hieronymian theory it is necessary to retain the common punctuation of John xix. 25, thus making "Mary of Clopas" the virgin's sister. But it is at least improbable that two sisters should have borne the same name. The case of the Herodian family is scarcely parallel, for Herod was a family name, and it is unlikely that a humble Jewish household should have copied a practice which must lead to so much confusion. Here it is not unlikely that a tradition underlies the Peshito rendering, which inserts a conjunction: "His mother and his mother's sister, and Mary of Cleophas and Mary Magdalene."¹ The Greek at all events admits, even if it does not favor, this interpretation, for the arrangement of names in couples has a parallel in the lists of the apostles (e.g. Matt. x. 2-4).

I have shown, then, if I mistake not, that St. Jerome pleaded no traditional authority for his theory, and that therefore the evidence in its favor is to be sought in scripture alone. I

that he is speaking of different persons in the two cases. The name of the other brother is supplied in *Chm. Hom.* ii. 1, προσέτι δὲ Θωμᾶς καὶ Ἐλιέξερὸς οἱ δίδουμοι.

The Thebaic version again for οὐχ ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης substitutes ὁ κανανίτης. Similarly in Matt. x. 3 for Θαδδαῖος some of the most important MSS. of the Old Latin have "Judas Zelotes;" and in the Canon of Gelasius Jude, the writer of the epistle, is so designated. This points to some connection or confusion with Simon Zelotes. See above, p. 94, note.

¹ See Wieseler, *Die Söhne Zebedäi*, etc. p. 672. This writer identifies the sister of the Lord's mother (John xix. 25) with Salome (Mark xv. 40; xvi. 1), who again is generally identified with the mother of Zebedee's children (Matt. xxvii. 56); and thus James and John, the sons of Zebedee, are made cousins

of our Lord. Compare the pseudo-Papias, p. 109, note; and see the various reading ἰωάννης for ἰωσήφ in the list of the Lord's brethren in Matth. xiii. 55. But as we are told that there were *many other women* present also (Mark xv. 41; comp. Luke xxiv. 10), — one of whom, Joanna, is mentioned by name — both these identifications must be considered precarious. It would be strange that no hint should be given in the Gospels of the relationship of the sons of Zebedee to our Lord, if it existed.

The Jerusalem Syriac lectionary gives the passage Jno. xix. 25 not less than three times. In two of these places (pp. 387, 541, the exception being p. 445) a stop is put after "His mother's sister," thus separating the words from "Mary of Cleophas" and suggesting by punctuation the same interpretation which the Peshito fixes by inserting a conjunction.

have examined the scriptural evidence, and the conclusion seems to be, that though this hypothesis, supplemented as it has been by subsequent writers, presents several striking coincidences which attract attention, yet it involves, on the other hand, a combination of difficulties—many of these arising out of the very elements in the hypothesis which produce the coincidences—which more than counterbalances these secondary arguments in its favor, and, in fact, must lead to its rejection, if any hypothesis less burdened with difficulties can be found.

Thus, as compared with the Hieronymian view, both the Epiphanian and the Helvidian have higher claims to acceptance. They both assign to the word brethren its natural meaning; they both recognize the main facts related of the Lord's brethren in the Gospels—their unbelief, their distinctness from the twelve, their connection with Joseph and Mary—and they both avoid the other difficulties which the Hieronymian theory creates.

And moreover, they both exhibit a coincidence which deserves notice. A very short time before the Lord's death his brethren refuse to accept his mission—they are still unbelievers. Immediately after his ascension we find them gathered together with the apostles, evidently recognizing him as their master. Whence comes this change? Surely the crucifixion of one who professed to be the Messiah was not likely to bring it about. He had claimed to be King of Israel, and he had been condemned as a malefactor; he had promised his followers a triumph, and he had left them persecution. Would not all this confirm, rather than dissipate, their former unbelief? An incidental statement of St. Paul explains all: "Then he was seen of James." At the time when St. Paul wrote, there was but one person eminent enough in the church to be called James simply, without any distinguishing epithet—the Lord's brother, the bishop of Jerusalem. It might therefore reasonably be concluded that this James is here meant. And this view is confirmed by an extant fragment of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the most important of all the apocryphal gospels, which seems to have preserved more than one true tradition,

and which expressly relates the appearance of our Lord to his brother James¹ after his ascension.

This interposition, we may suppose, was the turning-point in the religious life of the Lord's brethren; the veil was removed at once and for ever from their hearts. In this way the antagonistic notices in the Gospels — first the disbelief of the Lord's brethren, and then their assembling together with the apostles — are linked together; and harmony is produced out of discord.

Two objections, however, are brought against both these theories, which the Hieronymian escapes.

(1) They both, it is objected, assume the existence of two pairs of cousins bearing the same names, James and Joseph the sons of Alphaeus, and James and Joseph the Lord's brothers. If, moreover, we accept the statement of Hegesippus² that James was succeeded in the bishopric of Jerusalem by Symeon son of Clopas, and also admit the identification of Clopas with Alphaeus, we get a third name, Symeon or Simon, common to the two families. Let us see what this objection really amounts to.

It will be seen that the cousinhood of these persons is represented as a cousinhood on the mothers' side, and that it depends on three assumptions: (1) The identification of James the son of Alphaeus in the list of the twelve with James the little the son of Mary: (2) The identification of "Mary of Clopas" in St. John with Mary the mother of James and Joses in the other evangelists: (3) The correctness of the received punctuation of John xix. 25, which makes "Mary of Clopas" the virgin's sister. If any one of these be rejected, this cousinhood falls to the ground. Yet of these three assumptions the second alone can safely be pronounced more likely than not (though we are expressly told that "many other women" were present), for it avoids the unnecessary multiplication of Mariës. The first must be considered highly doubtful, seeing that James was a very common name; while the third is most improbable, for it gives two sisters both called Mary — a difficulty far surpassing that of supposing two, or even three, cousins bearing

¹ See below, p. 110.

² See below, p. 113.

the same name. On the other hand, if, admitting the second identification, and supplying the ellipsis in "Mary of Clopas" by "wife,"¹ we combine with it the statement of Hegesippus² that Clopas the father of Symeon was brother of Joseph, we get three cousins, James, Joses, and Symeon, *on their fathers' side*. Yet this result again must be considered on the whole improbable. I see no reason, indeed, for doubting the testimony of Hegesippus, who was perhaps born during the lifetime of this Symeon, and is likely to have been well informed. But the chances are against the other hypotheses, on which it depends, being both of them correct. The identification of Clopas and Alphaeus will still remain an open question.³

¹ As ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ may mean either the *daughter* or the *wife* or the *mother* of Clopas, this expression has been combined with the statement of Hegesippus in various ways. See for instance the apocryphal gospels, *Pseudo-Matth. Evang.* 32 (ed. Tisch. p. 104), *Evang. Inf. Arab.* 29 (ib. p. 186) and the marginal note on the Philoxenian version, Jno. xix. 25, besides other references which will be given in the account of the patristic authorities.

² The statement of Hegesippus suggests a solution which would remove the difficulty. We might suppose the two Mariæ to have been called sisters, as having been married to two brothers; but is there any authority for ascribing to the Jews an extension of the term "sister" which modern usage scarcely sanctions?

³ Of the three names *Alphaeus* (the father of Levi or Matthew, Mark ii. 14, and the father of James, Matt. x. 3; Mark iii. 18; Luke vi. 15; Acts i. 13), *Clopas* (the husband or father or son of Mary, Jno. xix. 25), and *Cleopas* (the disciple journeying to Emmaus, Luke xxiv. 18), it is considered that the two former are probably identical, and the two latter certainly distinct. Both positions may be disputed with some reason. In forming a judgment, the following points deserve to be considered; (1) In

the Greek text there is no variation of reading worth mentioning; Clopas is certainly the reading in St. John, and Cleopas in St. Luke. (2) The versions however bring them together, Cleopæ (or Cleophae) is read in the Peshito, Old Latin, Memphitic, Vulgate, and Armenian texts of St. John. (3) Of these the evidence of the Peshito is particularly important in a matter relating to Aramaic names. While for 'Αλφαῖος in all five places it restores what was doubtless the original Aramaic form ܠܚܦܝܐ (Chalphai); on the other hand, it gives the same word ܠܟܠܦܐ (Kleopha, i.e. Κλεόπας) in Luke xxiv. 18 and in John xix. 25, if the printed texts may be trusted. The Jerusalem Syriac too renders Κλωπᾶς by ܠܚܦܝܐ

(Kleophas), and 'Αλφαῖος by ܠܚܦܝܐ (Chalphai). (4) The form Κλωπᾶς, which St. John's text gives, is confirmed by Hegesippus (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 11), and there is every reason to believe that this was a common mode of writing some proper name or other with those acquainted with Aramaic; but it is difficult to see why, if the word intended to be represented were Chalphai, they should not have reproduced it more exactly in Greek. The name Χαλφί, in fact, does

But, whether they were cousins or not, does the fact of two families having two or three names in common constitute any real difficulty? Is not this a frequent occurrence among ourselves? It must be remembered too that the Jewish names in ordinary use at this time were very few, and that these three, James, Joses, and Symeon, were among the most common, being consecrated in the affections of the Jews from patriarchal times. In the list of the twelve the name of James appears twice, Symeon twice. In the New Testament no less than twelve persons bear the name of Symeon or Simon, and nearly as many that of Joseph or Joses.¹

occur in 1 Macc. xi. 70. (5) It is true that Κλεόπας is strictly a Greek name contracted from Κλεόπατρος, like Ἀντίπας from Ἀντίπατρος, etc. But it was a common practice with the Jews to adopt the genuine Greek name which bore the closest resemblance in sound to their own Aramaic name, either side by side with it or in place of it, as Simon for Symeon, Jason for Jesus; and thus a man, whose real Aramaic name was Clopas, might grecize the word and call himself Cleopas. On these grounds it appears to me that, viewing the question as one of names merely, it is quite as reasonable to identify Clopas with Cleopas as with Alphacus. But the identification of names does not carry with it the identification of persons. St. Paul's Epaphras for instance is probably a different person from his Epaphroditus.

A Jewish name "Alfius" occurs in an inscription ALFIVS . JVDA . ARCON . ARCOSINAGOGVS (Inscr. Gudii, p. cclxiii, 5), and possibly this is the Latin substitute for Chalphai or Chalphi, as Ἀλφαῖος is the Greek; Alfius being a not uncommon Latin name. One would be tempted to set down his namesake also, the "funerary Alfius" or "Alphius" of Horace (*Epod.* ii. 67, see Columella, i. 7. 2) for a fellow-countryman, if his talk were not so pagan.

¹ I am arguing on the supposition that Joses and Joseph are the same

name, but this is at least doubtful. In St. Matthew, according to the best authorities, the Lord's brother (xiii. 55) is Ἰωσήφ, the son of Mary (xxvii. 56) Ἰωσήs. In St. Mark, on the other hand, the latter word is found (the genitive being differently written Ἰωσήτος or Ἰωσή, though probably Tregelles is right in preferring the former in all three passages), whether referring to the Lord's brother (vi. 3) or to the son of Mary (xv. 40, 47). Thus if existing authorities in the text of St. Mark are to be trusted, there is no distinction between the names. Yet I am disposed to think with Wieseler (*die Söhne Zebedäi* etc. p. 678) that St. Matthew's text suggests the real difference, and that the original reading in Mark vi. 3, was Ἰωσήφ; but if so, the corruption was very ancient and very general, for Ἰωσήφ is found in **S** alone of the uncial manuscripts. A similar confusion of these names appears in the case of Barsabbas, Acts i. 23, and Barnabas, iv. 36; in the former case we should probably read "Joses," in the latter almost certainly "Joseph," thus interchanging the readings of the received text. I am disposed to think the identification of the names Joses and Joseph improbable for two reasons: (1) It seems unlikely that the same name should be represented in Greek by two such divergent forms as Ἰωσήs, making a genitive Ἰωσήτος, and Ἰωσήφ or Ἰωσήπος, which perhaps (replaced by a genuine Greek name) became

In the index to Josephus may be counted nineteen Josephs, and five Simons.¹

And moreover is not the difficulty, if difficulty there be, diminished rather than increased on the supposition of the cousinhood of these two families? The name of a common ancestor or a common relative naturally repeats itself in households connected with each other. And from this point of view it is worthy of notice that the names in question actually occur in the genealogies of our Lord. Joseph's father is Jacob or James in St. Matthew (i. 15, 16); and in St. Luke's table, exclusively of our Lord's reputed father, the name Joseph or Joses occurs twice at least² in a list of thirty-four direct ancestors.

(2) When a certain Mary is described as "the mother of James," is it not highly probable that the person intended should be the most celebrated of the name — James the Just, the bishop of Jerusalem, the Lord's brother? This objection to both the Epiphanian and Helvidian theories is at first sight not without force, but it will not bear examination. Why, we may ask, if the best known of all the Jameses were intended here, should it be necessary in some passages to add the name of a brother Joses also, who was a person of no special mark in the church (Matt. xxvii. 56; Mark xv. 40)? Why again in others should this Mary be designated "the mother of Joses" alone (Mark xv. 47); the name of his more famous brother being suppressed? In only two passages is she called

Ἡγήσιππος. (2) The Peshito in the case of the commoner Hebrew or Aramaic names restores the original form in place of the somewhat disfigured Greek equivalent, e.g. Juchanon for Ἰωάννης, Zabdai for Ζεβεδαῖος. Following this rule, it ought, if the names were identical, to have restored ܝܫܘܥ (Joseph) for the Greek Ἰωσήφ, in place of which it has ܝܫܐ (Josī, Jausī, or Jusī). [On the other hand, similar instances of abbreviation, e.g. Ashe for Asher, Jochana for Jochanan, Shabba for Shabbath, are produced; see Delitzsch in Laurent,

Neutest. Stud. p. 168].

¹ The popularity of this name is probably due to Simon Maccabaeus.

² And perhaps not more than twice Ἰωσήφ (vv. 24, 30). In ver. 26 Ἰωσήχ seems to be the right reading, where the received text has Ἰωσήφ; and in ver. 29 Ἰησοῦ, where it has Ἰωσή. Possibly Ἰωσήχ may be a corruption for Ἰωσήφ through the confusion of ϣ and ϣ̣, which in their older forms resemble each other closely; but if so, it is a corruption not of St. Luke's text, but of the Hebrew or Aramaic document from which the genealogy was derived.

simply "the mother of James"; in Mark xvi. 1, where it is explained by the fuller description which has gone before "the mother of James and Joses" (xv. 40); and in Luke xxiv. 10, where no such explanation can be given. It would seem, then, that this Mary and this James, though not the most famous of their respective names, and therefore not at once distinguishable when mentioned alone, were yet sufficiently well known to be discriminated from others, when their names appeared in conjunction.

The objections, then, which may be brought against both these theories in common are not very serious; and up to this point in the investigation they present equal claims to acceptance. The next step will be to compare them together, in order to decide which of the two must yield to the other.

1. The Epiphanian view assumes that the Lord's brethren had really no relationship with him; and so far the Helvidian has the advantage. But this advantage is rather seeming than real. It is very natural that those who called Joseph his father should call Joseph's sons his brethren. And it must be remembered that this designation is given to Joseph not only by strangers from whom at all events the mystery of the incarnation was veiled, but by the Lord's mother herself, who knew all (Luke ii. 48). Nor, again, is it any argument in favor of the Helvidian account as compared with the Epiphanian, that the Lord's brethren are found in company of Mary rather than of Joseph. Joseph appears in the evangelical history for the last time when Jesus is twelve years old (Luke ii. 43); during the Lord's ministry he is never once seen, though Mary comes forward again and again. There can be little doubt, therefore, that he had died meanwhile.

2. Certain expressions in the evangelical narratives are said to imply that Mary bore other children besides the Lord, and it is even asserted that no unprejudiced person could interpret them otherwise. The justice of this charge may be fairly questioned. The context in each case seems to suggest another explanation of these expressions, which does not decide anything one way or the other. St. Matthew writes that Joseph "knew not" his wife "till (*ἄχρις οὖν*) she brought forth a son"

(i. 25);¹ while St. Luke speaks of her bringing forth her *first-born* son" (ii. 7). St. Matthew's expression, however, "*till* she brought forth," as appears from the context, is intended simply to show that Jesus was not begotten in the course of nature; and thus, while it denies any previous intercourse with her husband, it neither asserts nor implies any subsequent intercourse.² Again, the prominent idea conveyed by the term "first-born" to a Jew would be, not the birth of other children, but the special consecration of this one. The typical reference, in fact, is foremost in the mind of St. Luke, as he himself explains it, "*Every male that openeth the womb* shall be called holy to the Lord" (ii. 23). Thus "first-born" does not necessarily suggest "later-born," any more than "son" suggests "daughter." The two words together describe the condition under which in obedience to the law a child was consecrated to God. The "first-born son" is in fact the evangelist's equivalent for the "male that openeth the womb."

It may indeed be fairly urged that, if the evangelist's had considered the perpetual virginity of the Lord's mother a matter of such paramount importance as it was held to be in the fourth and following centuries, they would have avoided expressions, which are at least ambiguous, and might be taken to imply the contrary; but these expressions are not in themselves fatal to such a belief.

Whether in itself the sentiment on which this belief was founded be true or false, is a fit subject of inquiry; nor can the present questions be considered altogether without reference to it. If it be true, then the Epiphanian theory has an advantage over the Helvidian, as respecting, or at least not disregarding it; if false, then it may be thought to have suggested that theory, as it certainly did the Hieronymian, and to this extent the theory itself must lie under suspicion. Into this inquiry, however, it will not be necessary to enter. Only let me say that it is not altogether correct to represent this belief as suggested solely by the false asceticism of the early

¹ τὸν πρωτότοκον ought to be rejected from St. Matthew's text, having been interpolated from Luke ii. 7. ² For parallel instances, see Mill, p. 304 sqq.

church, which exalted virginity at the expense of married life. It appears, in fact, to be due quite as much to another sentiment which the fathers fantastically expressed by a comparison between the conception and the burial of our Lord. As after death his body was placed in a sepulchre "wherein never man before was laid," so it seemed fitting that the womb consecrated by his presence should not thenceforth have borne any offspring of man. It may be added also, that the Epiphanian view prevailed especially in Palestine where there was less disposition than elsewhere to depreciate married life, and prevailed too at a time when extreme ascetic views had not yet mastered the church at large.

3. But one objection has been hurled at the Helvidian theory with great force, and as it seems to me with fatal effect, which is powerless against the Epiphanian.¹ Our Lord in his dying moments commended his mother to the keeping of St. John: "Woman, behold thy son." The injunction was forthwith obeyed, and "from that hour that disciple took her unto his own home" (John xix. 26, 27). Yet according to the Helvidian view, she had no less than four sons, besides daughters, living at the time. Is it conceivable that our Lord would thus have snapped asunder the most sacred ties of natural affection? The difficulty is not met by the fact that her own sons were still unbelievers. This fact would scarcely have been allowed to override the paramount duties of filial piety. But even when so explained, what does this hypothesis require us to believe? Though within a few days a special appearance is vouchsafed to one of these brethren, who is destined to rule the mother church of Jerusalem, and all alike are converted to the faith of Christ; yet she, their mother, living in the same city and joining with them in a common worship (Acts i. 14), is consigned to the care of a stranger, of whose house she becomes henceforth the inmate.

Thus it would appear that, taking the scriptural notices alone, the Hieronymian account must be abandoned; while of

¹ This argument is brought forward who all held the view which I have not only by Jerome, but also by Hilary designated by the name of the last of the of Poitiers, Ambrose, and Epiphanius, three.

the remaining two the balance of the argument is against the Helvidian, and in favor of the Epiphonian. To what extent the last-mentioned theory can plead the prestige of tradition, will be seen from the following catena of references to the fathers and other early Christian writings.¹

¹[The testimony of Papias is frequently quoted at the head of the Patristic authorities, as favoring the view of Jerome. The passage in question is an extract, to which the name of this very ancient writer is prefixed, in a Bodleian MS., no. 2397, of the date 1302 or 1303. It is given in Grabe's *Spicil.* ii. p. 34, Routh's *Rel. Sacr.* i. p. 16, and runs as follows: "Maria mater Domini: Maria Cleophae, sive Alphei uxor, quae fuit mater Jacobi episcopi et apostoli et Symonis et Thadei et ejusdam Joseph: Maria Salome uxor Zebedei mater Joannis evangelistae et Jacobi: Maria Magdalene: istae quatuor in Evangelio reperiuntur. Jacobus et Judas et Joseph filii erant materterae Domini; Jacobus quoque et Joannes alterius materterae Domini fuerunt filii. Maria Jacobi minoris et Joseph mater, uxor Alphei, soror fuit Mariae matris Domini, quam Cleophae Joannes nominat vel a patre vel a gentilitatis familia vel alia causa. Maria Salome a viro vel a vico dicitur: hanc eandem Cleophae quidam dicunt quod duos viros habuerit. Maria dicitur illuminatrix sive stella maris, genuit enim lumen mundi; sermone autem Syro Domina nuncupatur, qui genuit Dominum." Grabe's description "ad marginem expresse adscriptum lego *Papia*" is incorrect; the name is not in the margin but over the passage, as a title to it. The authenticity of this fragment is accepted by Mill, p. 238, and by Dean Alford on Matth. xiii. 55. Two writers also in *Smith's Biblical Dictionary* (s. vv. "Brother" and "James"), respectively impugning and maintaining the Hieronymian view, refer to it without suspicion. It is strange that able and intelligent critics should not have seen through a fabrication which is so mani-

festly spurious. Not to mention the difficulties in which we are involved by some of the statements, the following reasons seem conclusive; (1) The last sentence "*Maria dicitur*," etc., is evidently very late, and is, as Dr. Mill says, "justly rejected by Grabe." Grabe says, "*addidit is qui descripsit ex suo*"; but the passage is continuous in the MS., and there is neither more nor less authority for assigning this to Papias than the remainder of the extract. (2) The statement about "*Maria uxor Alphei*" is taken from Jerome (*adv. Helvid.*) almost word for word, as Dr. Mill has seen; and it is purely arbitrary to reject this as spurious and accept the rest as genuine.

(3) The writings of Papias were in Jerome's hands, and, eager as he was to claim the support of authority, he could not have failed to refer to testimony which was so important, and which so entirely confirmed his view in the most minute points. Nor is it conceivable that a passage like this, coming from so early a writer, should not have impressed itself very strongly on the ecclesiastical tradition of the early centuries, whereas, in fact, we discover no traces of it].

For these reasons the extract seemed to me manifestly spurious; but I might have saved myself the trouble of examining the Bodleian MS. and writing these remarks, if I had known at the time, that the passage was written by a mediaeval namesake of the bishop of Hierapolis, Papias the author of the "*Elementarium*," who lived in the 11th century. This seems to have been a standard work in its day, and was printed four times in the 15th century under the name of the *Lexicon* or *Vocabulist*. I have not had access to a printed copy,

1. The GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE HEBREWS, one of the earliest and most respectable of the apocryphal narratives, related that the Lord after his resurrection "went to James and appeared to him; for James had sworn that he would not eat bread from that hour in which the Lord had drunk the cup (*biberat calicem Dominus*), till he saw him risen from the dead." Jesus therefore "took bread, and blessed it and brake it and gave it to James the Just, and said to him, "My brother, eat thy bread. for the Son of Man has risen from the dead" (*Hieron. de vir. illustr.* 2). I have adopted the reading "Dominus," as the Greek translation has *Κύριος*, and it also suits the context better; for the point of time which we should naturally expect is not the institution of the eucharist, but the Lord's death.¹ Our Lord had more than once spoken of his sufferings under the image of draining the cup (*Matt.* xx. 22. 23; xxvi. 39, 42; *Mark* x. 38, 39; xiv. 36; *Luke* xxii. 42): and he is represented as using this metaphor here. If, however, we retain "*Domini*," it must be allowed that the writer represented James the Lord's brother as present at the last supper, but it does not follow that he regarded him as one of the twelve. He may have assigned to him a sort of exceptional position such as he holds in the Clementines, apart from, and in some respects superior, to the twelve, and thus his presence at this critical time would be accounted for. At all events this passage confirms the tradition that the James mentioned by St. Paul (*1 Cor.* xv. 7) was the Lord's brother; while at the same time it is characteristic of a Judaic writer, whose aim it would be to glorify the head of his church at all hazards, that an appearance, which seems in reality to have been vouchsafed to this James to win him over from

but there is a MS. of the work (marked Kk. 4. 1) in the Cambridge University Library, the knowledge of which I owe to H. Bradshaw, Esq., Fellow of King's College. The variations from the Bodleian extract are unimportant. It is strange that though Grabe actually mentions the later Papias, the author of the Dictionary, and Routh copies his note, neither the one nor the other got on the

right track. I made the discovery while the first edition of this work was passing through the press.

¹ There might possibly have been an ambiguity in the Hebrew original owing to the absence of case-endings, as Blom suggests (p. 83); but it is more probable that a transcriber of Jerome carelessly wrote down the familiar phrase "the cup of the Lord."

his unbelief, should be represented as a reward for his devotion.

2. The GOSPEL ACCORDING TO PETER was highly esteemed by the Docetæ of the second century. Towards the close of that century, Serapion, Bishop of Antioch, found it in circulation at Rhossus a Cilician town, and at first tolerated it; but finding on examination that, though it had much in common with the Gospels recognized by the catholic church, there were sentiments in it favorable to the heretical views that were secretly gaining ground there, he forbade its use. In the fragment of Serapion preserved by Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 12),¹ from which our information is derived, he speaks of this apocryphal work as if it had been long in circulation, so that its date must be about the middle of the second century at the latest, and probably somewhat earlier. To this gospel Origen refers, as stating that the Lord's brethren were Joseph's sons by a former wife, and thus maintaining the virginity of the Lord's mother.²

3. PROTEVANGELIUM JACOBI, a purely fictitious, but very early narrative, dating probably not later than the middle of the second century, represents Joseph as an old man when the Virgin was espoused to him, having sons of his own (§ 9, ed. Tisch. p. 18), but no daughters (§ 17, p. 31), and James the writer of the account apparently as grown up at the time of Herod's death (§ 25, p. 48). Following in this track, subsequent apocryphal narratives give a similar account with various modifications, in some cases naming Joseph's daughters or his wife. Such are the *Pseudo-Matthæi Evang.* (§ 32, ed. Tisch. p. 104), *Evang. de Nativ. Mar.* (§ 8, *ib.* p. 111), *Historia Joseph.* (§ 2, *ib.* p. 116), *Evang. Thomæ* (§ 16, p. 147), *Evang. Infant. Arab.* (§ 35, p. 191), besides the apocryphal gospels mentioned by Jerome (*Comm. in Matth.* T. vii. p. 86), which were different from any now extant.³ Doubtless these accounts, so far as they step beyond the incidents narrated in the canonical Gospels, are pure fabrications; but the fabrica-

¹ For this fragment see Routh's *Rel. Sacr.* i. p. 452, and Westcott, *History of the Canon*, p. 444.

² See below, p. 118.

³ As appears from the fact mentioned by Jerome; see above, p. 96, note 3.

tions would scarcely have taken this form if the Hieronymian view of the Lord's brethren had been received, or even known, when they were written. It is to these sources that Jerome refers when he taunts the holders of the Epiphanian view with following "deliramenta apocryphorum."

4. The EARLIEST VERSIONS, with the exception of the Old Latin, which translated the Greek literally and preserved the same ambiguities, give renderings of certain passages bearing on the subject, which are opposed to the Hieronymian view. The CURETONIAN SYRIAC translates *Μαρία Ἰακώβου* (Luke xxiv. 10) "Mary the *daughter* of James." The PESHITO in John xix. 25 has, "His mother and his mother's sister *and* Mary of Cleopha and Mary Magdalene"; and in Luke vi. 16, Acts i. 13, it renders "Judas *son* of James." The oldest of the Egyptian versions, again, the THEBAIC, in John xix. 25, gives "Mary *daughter* of Clopas," and in Acts i. 13, "Judas *son* of James."

5. The CLEMENTINE HOMILIES, written, it would appear, not late in the second century to support a peculiar phase of Ebionism, speak of James as being "*called* the brother of the the Lord," (ὁ λεχθεὶς ἀδελφὸς τοῦ Κυρίου, xi. 35), an expression which has been variously interpreted as favoring all three hypotheses (see Blom, p. 88; Schliemann, *Clement*, pp. 8, 213), and is indecisive in itself.¹ It is more important to observe that in the Epistle of Clement prefixed to this work and belonging to the same cycle of writings, James is styled not apostle, but bishop of bishops, and seems to be distinguished from, and in some respects exalted above, the twelve.

6. In the portion of the Clementine Recognitions which seems to have been founded on the ASCENTS OF JAMES, another very early Ebionite writing,² the distinction thus implied in the Homilies is explicitly stated. The twelve apostles, after disputing severally with Caiaphas, give an account of their conference to James the chief of bishops; while James the

¹ The word *λεχθεὶς* is most naturally taken, I think, to refer to the *reputed* brotherhood of James, as a consequence of the reputed fatherhood of Joseph,

and thus to favor the Epiphanian view. See the expressions of Hegesippus, and of Eusebius, pp. 269, 274.

² See the next dissertation.

son of Alphaeus is distinctly mentioned among the twelve as one of the disputants (i. 59).

7. HEGESIPPUS (about 160), a Hebrew Christian of Palestine, writes as follows: "After the martyrdom of James the Just, on the same charge as the Lord, his paternal uncle's child, Symeon the son of Clopas, is next made bishop, who was put forward by all as the second in succession, being cousin of the Lord" (μετὰ τὸ μαρτυρηῆσαι Ἰάκωβον τὸν δίκαιον ὡς καὶ ὁ Κύριος ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ, πάλιν ὁ ἐκ τοῦ θείου αὐτοῦ Συμεὼν ὁ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ καθίσταται ἐπίσκοπος, ὃν προέθεντο πάντες ὄντα ἀνεψιὸν τοῦ Κυρίου δεύτερον, Euseb. *H. E.* 22). If the passage be correctly rendered thus (and this rendering alone seems intelligible¹), Hegesippus distinguishes between the relationship of James the Lord's brother and Symeon his cousin. So, again, referring apparently to this passage, he in another fragment (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 32) speaks of "the child of the Lord's paternal uncle, the aforesaid Symeon son of Clopas" (ὁ ἐκ θείου τοῦ Κυρίου ὁ προειρημένος Συμεὼν υἱὸς Κλωπᾶ), to which Eusebius adds, "For Hegesippus relates that Clopas was the brother of Joseph." Thus in Hegesippus Symeon is never once called the Lord's brother, while James is always so designated. And this argument, powerful in itself, is materially strengthened by the fact that where Hegesippus has occasion to mention Jude, he too, like James, is styled "the Lord's brother": "There still survived members of the Lord's family (οἱ ἀπὸ γένους τοῦ Κυρίου), grandsons of Judas, who

¹ A different meaning, however, has been assigned to the words; πάλιν and δεύτερον being taken to signify "another child of his uncle, another cousin," and thus the passage has been represented as favoring the Hieronymian view. So, for instance, Mill, p. 253, Schaf, p. 64. On the other hand, see Credner, *Eint.* p. 575, Neander, *Pflanz.* p. 559 (4th Aufl.). To this rendering the presence of the definite article alone seems fatal (ὁ ἐκ θείου, not ἕτερος τῶν ἐκ θείου); but indeed the whole passage appears to be framed so as to distinguish the relationship of the two persons; whereas,

had the author's object been to represent Symeon as a brother of James, no more circuitous mode could well have been devised for the purpose of stating so very simple a fact. Let me add that Eusebius (*l. c.*) and Epiphanius (*Haeres.* pp. 636, 1039, 1046, ed. Petav.) must have interpreted the words as I have done.

Whether αὐτοῦ should be referred to Ἰάκωβον or to Κύριος is doubtful. If to the former, this alone decides the meaning of the passage. This seems the more natural reference of the two, but the form of expression will admit either.

was called his brother according to the flesh" (τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα λεγομένου αὐτοῦ ἀδελφοῦ); Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 20. In this passage the word "called" seems to me to point to the Epiphanian rather than the Helvidian view; the brotherhood of these brethren, like the fatherhood of Joseph, being reputed, but not real. In yet another passage (Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 23) Hegesippus relates that "the church was committed, in conjunction with the apostles,¹ to the charge of (διαδέχεται τὴν ἐκκλησίαν μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων) the Lord's brother James, who has been entitled Just by all from the Lord's time to our own day; for many bore the name of James." From this last passage, however, no inference can be safely drawn; for, supposing the term "apostles" to be here restricted to the twelve, the expression μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων may distinguish St. James not *from*, but *among* the apostles; as in Acts v. 29, "Peter and the apostles answered."

Thus the testimony of Hegesippus seems distinctly opposed to the Hieronymian view, while of the other two it favors the Epiphanian rather than the Helvidian. If any doubt still remains, the fact that both Eusebius and Epiphanius, who derived their information mainly from Hegesippus, gave this account of the Lord's brethren, materially strengthens the position. The testimony of an early Palestinian writer who made it his business to collect such traditions is of the utmost importance.

8. TERTULLIAN's authority was appealed to by Helvidius, and Jerome is content to reply that he was not a member of the church ("de Tertulliano nihil amplius dico quam ecclesiae hominem non fuisse," *adv. Helvid.* § 17). It is generally assumed in consequence that Tertullian held the Lord's brethren to be sons of Joseph and Mary. This assumption, though probable, is not absolutely certain. The point at issue in this passage is not the particular opinion of Helvidius respecting the Lord's brethren, but the virginity of the Lord's mother. Accordingly, in reply, Jerome alleges on his own side the

¹ Jerome (*De Vir Illustr.* § 2) care- μετὰ τοὺς ἀποστόλους. Rufinus has it lessly renders it "post apostolos," as if correctly "cum apostolis."

authority of others,¹ whose testimony certainly did not go beyond this one point, and had no reference to the relationship of the Lord's brethren. Thus too the more distinct passages in the extant writings of Tertullian relate to the virginity only (*de carn. Christ.* c. 23, and *passim*, *de monog.* c. 8). Elsewhere, however, though he does not directly state it, his argument seems to imply that the Lord's brethren were his brothers in the same sense in which Mary was his mother (*adv. Marc.* iv. 19; *de carn. Christ.* 7). It is therefore highly probable that he held the Helvidian view. Such an admission from one who was so strenuous an advocate of asceticism is worthy of notice.

9. CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA (about A.D. 200) in a passage of the Hypotyposeis preserved in a Latin translation by Cassiodorus (the authorship has been questioned but without sufficient reason²) puts forward the Epiphanian solution; "Jude, who

¹ "Numquid non possum tibi totam veterum scriptorum seriem commovere: Ignatium, Polycarpum, Irenaeum, Justinum Martyrem, multosque alios apostolicos et eloquentes viros?" *adv. Helvid.* 17). I have elsewhere (p. 335, note 3) mentioned an instance of the unfair way in which Jerome piles together his authorities. In the present case we are in a position to test him. Jerome did not possess any writings of Ignatius which are not extant now; and in no place does this apostolic father maintain the perpetual virginity of St. Mary. In one remarkable passage, indeed (*Ephes.* 19), which is several times quoted by subsequent writers, he speaks of the virginity of Mary as a mystery, but this refers distinctly to the time before the birth of our Lord. To this passage, which he elsewhere quotes (*Comment. in Matth.* T. vii. p. 12), Jerome is doubtless referring here.

In Cowper's *Syriac Miscell.* p. 61, I find an extract, "Justin, one of the authors who were in the days of Augustus and Tiberius and Gaius, wrote in the third discourse: That Mary the Gali-

lean, who was the mother of Christ who was crucified in Jerusalem, had not been with a husband. And Joseph did not repudiate her, but Joseph continued in holiness without a wife, he and his five sons by a former wife: and Mary continued without a husband." The editor assigns this passage to Justin Martyr; but, not to mention the anachronism, the whole tenor of the passage and the immediate neighborhood of similar extracts show that it was intended for the testimony (unquestionably spurious) of some contemporary heathen writer to the facts of the gospel.

² We read in Cassiodorus (*de inst. div. lit.* 8); "In epistolas autem canonicas Clemens Alexandrinus presbyter, qui et Stromateus vocatur, id est, in epistola (-am?) S. Petri prima (-am?) S. Johannis prima (-am?) et secunda (-am?) et Jacobi quaedam Attico sermone declaravit. Ubi multa quidem subtiliter sed aliqua incaute loquutus est, quae nos ita transferri fecimus in Latinum, ut exclusis quibusdam offendiculis purificata doctrina ejus securior possit hauriri." If "Jude" be substituted for "James" this description

wrote the catholic epistle, being one of the sons of Joseph and [the Lord's] brother, a man of deep piety, though he was aware of his relationship to the Lord, nevertheless did not say he was his brother; but what said he? *Jude the servant of Jesus Christ*, because he was his Lord, *but brother of James*: for this is true; he was his brother, being Joseph's [son]"¹ (ed. Potter, p. 1007). This statement is explicit. On the other hand, owing to an extract preserved in Eusebius, his authority is generally claimed for the Hieronymian view; "Clement," says Eusebius, "in the sixth book of the Hypotyposeis gives the following account: *Peter and James and John*, he tells us, *after the resurrection of the Saviour were not ambitious of honor, though the preference shown them by the Lord might have entitled them to it, but chose James the Just bishop of Jerusalem*. The same writer too, in the seventh book of the same treatise, gives this account also of him (James the Lord's brother): "*The Lord after the resurrection delivered the gnosis to James the Just*² *and John and Peter*. These

exactly applies to the Latin notes extant under the title *Adumbrationes*. This was a very easy slip of the pen, and I can scarcely doubt that these notes are the same to which Cassiodorus refers as taken from the Hypotyposeis of Clement. Mr. Westcott (*Canon*, p. 401) has pointed out in confirmation of this, that while Clement elsewhere directly quotes the Epistle of St. Jude, he never refers to the Epistle of St. James. Bunsen has included these notes in his collection of fragments of the Hypotyposeis, *Annot. Auten.* i. p. 325. It should be added that the statement about the relationship of Jude must be Clement's own, and cannot have been inserted by Cassiodorus, since Cassiodorus, in common with the Latin Church, would naturally hold the Hieronymian hypothesis.

¹ "Frater erat ejus [filius] Joseph." The insertion of "filius" (with Bunsen) is necessary for the sense, whether Cassiodorus had it or not. Perhaps the Greek words were ἀδελφός αὐτοῦ τῶν Ἰωσήφ, which would account for the omission.

² Credner, *Einkl.* p. 585, condemns the words τῷ δικαίῳ as spurious. Though it might be inferred from the previous extract given by Eusebius that the son of Zebedee is meant here, I believe nevertheless that they are genuine. For (1) They seem to be required as the motive for the explanation which is given afterwards of the different persons bearing the name James. (2) It is natural that a special prominence should be given to the same three apostles of the circumcision who are mentioned in Gal. ii. 9 as the pillars of Jewish Christendom. (3) Eusebius introduces the quotation as relating to James the Just (περὶ αὐτοῦ), which would not be a very good description if the other James were the prominent person in the passage. (4) I find from Hippolytus that the Ophite account singled out James the Lord's brother as a possessor of the esoteric gnosis, ταῦτά ἐστιν ἀπὸ πολλῶν πάντων λόγων τὰ κεφάλαια ἃ φησιν παραδεδωκέναι Μαριάμην τὸν Ἰάκωβον τοῦ κυρίου τὸν ἀδελφόν, *Heres.* x. 6, p. 95. Clement seems to

delivered it to the rest of the apostles, and the rest of the apostles to the seventy, of whom Barnabas was one. Now there are two Jameses, one, the Just, who was thrown down from the pinnacle (of the temple) and beaten to death with a club by a fuller, and another who was beheaded" (*H. E.* ii. 1). This passage however proves nothing. Clement says that there were two of the name of James, but he neither states nor implies that there were two only. His sole object was to distinguish the son of Zebedee from the Lord's brother; and the son of Alphaeus, of whom he knew nothing and could tell nothing, did not occur to his mind when he penned this sentence. There is in this passage nothing which contradicts the Latin extract; though, indeed, in a writer so notoriously uncritical in his historical notices,¹ such a contradiction would not be surprising.²

10. ORIGEN († A.D. 253) declares himself very distinctly in favor of the Epiphanian view, stating that the brethren were sons of Joseph by a deceased wife.³ Elsewhere, indeed, he

have derived his information from some work of a Jewish gnostic complexion, perhaps from the Gospel of the Egyptians, with which he was well acquainted (*Strom.* iii. pp. 529 sq., 553, ed. Potter); and as Hippolytus tells us that the Ophites made use of this gospel (τὰς δὲ ἐξαλλὰς ταύτας τὰς ποικίλας ἐν τῷ ἐπιφραγομένῳ κατ' Αἰγυπτίους εὐαγγελίῳ κειμέναις ἔχουσιν, *Ib.* v. 7, p. 98), it is probable that the account of Clement coincided with that of the Ophites. The words τῷ δικαίῳ are represented in the Syriac translation of Eusebius of which the existing MS. (Brit. Mus. add. 14,639) belongs to the sixth century.

I hold τῷ δικαίῳ, therefore, to be the genuine words of Clement; but I do not feel so sure that the closing explanation δύο δὲ γεγέννησαν Ἰάκωβον κ.τ.λ. is not an addition of Eusebius. This I suppose to be Bunsen's opinion, for he ends his fragment with the preceding words, i. p. 321.

¹ For instance he distinguished Cephas of Gal. ii. 11 from Peter see (above, p. 328), and apparently confused Philip

the deacon with Philip one of the twelve (*Euseb. H. E.* iii. 30).

² On the supposition that Clement held the Hieronymian theory, as he is represented even by those who themselves reject it, the silence of Origen, who seems never to have heard of this theory, is quite inexplicable. Epiphanius moreover, who appears equally ignorant of it, refers to Clement while writing on this very subject (*Haeres.* p. 119, Petav.). Indeed Clement would then stand quite alone before the age of Jerome.

³ *In Joann.* ii. 12 (*Catenæ Cordæ.* p. 75). ἀδελφούς μὲν οὐκ εἶχε φύσει, οὔτε τῆς παρθένου τεκούσης ἕτερον οὐδὲ αὐτὸς ἐκ τοῦ Ἰωσήφ τυγχάνων· νομῶ τοιγαροῦν ἐξημέρισαν αὐτοῦ ἀδελφοί, υἱοὶ Ἰωσήφ ὅντες ἐκ προτεθνηκίας γυναικός: *Hom. in Luc.* 7 (T. iii. p. 940, ed. Delarue), "Hi enim filii qui Joseph dicebantur non erant orti de Maria, neque est ulla scriptura quae ista commemoret."

In this latter passage either the translator has been confused by the order in the original, or the words in the trans-

says that St. Paul "calls this James the Lord's brother, not so much on account of his kinsmanship or their companionship together, as on account of his character and language,"¹ but this is not inconsistent with the explicit statement already referred to. In one passage he writes at some length on the subject; "Some persons, on the ground of a tradition in the Gospel according to Peter, as it is entitled, or the Book of James (i.e. the Protevangelium), say that the brothers of Jesus were Joseph's sons by a former wife, to whom he was married before Mary. Those who hold this view wish to preserve the honor of Mary in virginity throughout And I think it reasonable that as Jesus was the first-fruit of purity and chastity among men, so Mary was among women; for it is not seemly to ascribe the first-fruit of virginity to any other woman but her" (*in Matth.* xiii. 55, T. iii. p. 462).² This passage shows not only that Origen himself favored the Epiphanian view which elsewhere he has directly maintained, but that he was wholly unaware of the Hieronymian, the only alternative which presented itself being the denial of the perpetual virginity.³

lation itself have been displaced accidentally; but the meaning is clear.

¹ *C. Cels.* i. 47 (T. i. p. 363), οὐ τοσούτων διὰ τὸ πρὸς αἵματος συγγενὲς ἢ τὴν κοινὴν αὐτῶν ἀναστροφὴν ὅσον διὰ τὸ ἴθους καὶ τὸν λόγον.

² *Op.* iii. p. 462 sq. Mill, pp. 261, 273, has strangely misunderstood the purport of this passage. He speaks of Origen here as "teaching the opinion of his (James the Just) being the son of Joseph, both as the sentiment of a minority among right-minded Christians and as founded on apocryphal traditions"; and so considers the note on John ii. 12, already referred to, as "standing strangely contrasted" to Origen's statement here. If Dr. Mill's attention, however, had been directed to the last sentence, καὶ οἶμαι λόγον ἔχειν κ.τ.λ., which though most important, he has himself omitted in quoting the passage, he could scarcely have failed to see Origen's real meaning.

³ The authority of Hippolytus of Portus, a contemporary of Origen, has sometimes been alleged in favor of Jerome's hypothesis. In the treatise *De XII. Apostolis* ascribed to this author (ed. Fabric. i. app. p. 30) it is said of James the son of Alphaeus, κηρύσσων ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων καταλευσθῆς ἀναιρείται καὶ θάπτεται ἐκεῖ παρὰ τῷ ναφί. He is thus confused or identified with James the Lord's brother. But this blundering treatise was certainly not written by the bishop of Portus; see La Moynes in Fabricius, i. p. 84, and Bunsen's *Hippol.* i. p. (456, ed. 2). On the other hand, in the work *De LXX. Apostolis* (Fabricius, i. app. p. 41), also ascribed to this writer we find among the seventy the name of Ἰάκωβος ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου Ἱεροσολύμων, who is thus distinguished from the twelve. This treatise also is manifestly spurious. Again Nicephorus Callistus, *II. E.* ii. 3,

11. THE APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS, the main part of which may perhaps be regarded as a work of the third century, though they received considerable additions in later ages, distinguish James the Lord's brother from James the son of Alphaeus, making him, like St. Paul, a supernumerary apostle, and thus counting fourteen in all (vi. 12, 13, 14; compare ii. 55; vii. 46; viii. 4).

12. VICTORINUS PETAVIONENSIS (about 360) was claimed by Helvidius as a witness in his own favor. Jerome denied this, and put in a counter-claim. It may perhaps be inferred from this circumstance that Victorinus did little more than repeat the statements of the evangelists respecting the Lord's brethren (*adv. Helvid.* 17).

13. EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA († about 340) distinguished James the Lord's brother from the twelve, representing him as a supernumerary apostle like St. Paul (*Comm. in Isai.* in Montfaucon's *Coll. Nov. Patr.* ii. p. 422; *Hist. Eccl.* i. 12; comp. vii. 19). Accordingly in another passage he explains that this James was called the Lord's brother because Joseph was his reputed father (*Hist. Eccl.* ii. 1).¹

14. CYRIL OF JERUSALEM († 386) comments on the succes-

cites as from Hippolytus of Portus an elaborate account of our Lord's brethren, following the Epiphanian view (Hippol. *Op.* i. app. 43, ed. Fabric.); but this account seems to be drawn either from Hippolytus the Theban, unless as Bunsen (*l. c.*) supposes this Theban Hippolytus be a mythical personage, or from some forged writings which bore the name of the older Hippolytus.

¹ Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ κυρίου λεγόμενον ἀδελφόν, ὅτι δὴ καὶ οὗτος τοῦ Ἰωσήφ ὀνόμαστο παῖς τοῦ δὲ Χριστοῦ πατήρ ὁ Ἰωσήφ, ᾧ μνηστευθεῖσα ἡ παρθένος κ.τ.λ. On the whole, this passage seems to be best explained by referring οὗτος to κύριος. But this is not necessary; for ὀνομάζεσθαι (or καλεῖσθαι) παῖς τινός is a good Greek phrase to denote real as well as reputed sonship; as Aesch. *Frugm.* 285 αἶδ' ἔπρ' Ἀτλαντος παῖδες ὀνομασμένα, Soph. *Trach.* 1105 ὦ τῆς

ἀρίστης μητρὸς ὀνομασμένους, Eur. *Elect.* 935; comp. Ephes. iii. 15 τὸν πατέρα ἐξ οὗ πάντα πατριά ὀνομάζεται. The word ὀνόμαστο cannot at all events, as Mill (p. 272) seems disposed to think, imply any doubt on the part of Eusebius about the parentage of James, for the whole drift of the passage is plainly against this. The other reading, ὅτι δὴ καὶ οὗτος τοῦ Ἰωσήφ τοῦ νομιζομένου οἰοῦναι πατὴρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, found in some MSS. and in the Syriac version, and preferred by Blom, p. 98, and Credner, *Eind.* p. 585, I cannot but regard as an obvious alteration of some early transcriber for the sake of clearness.

Compare the expressions in i. 12, εἰς δὲ καὶ οὗτος τῶν φερομένων ἀδελφῶν ἦν, and iii. 7, τοῦ κυρίου χρηματίζων ἀδελφός. He was a *reputed* brother of the Lord, because Joseph was his *reputed* father.

sive appearances of our Lord related by St. Paul, first to Peter, then to the twelve, then to the five hundred, then to James his own brother, then to Paul his enemy; and his language implies that each appearance was a step in advance of the testimony afforded by the former (*Catech.* xiv. 21, p. 216, ed. Touttée). It may be gathered thence that he distinguished this James from the twelve. As this, however, is only an inference from his language, and not a direct statement of his own, too much stress must not be laid on it. In another passage also (*Catech.* iv. 28, p. 65, καὶ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις καὶ Ἰακώβῳ τῷ ταύτης τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπισκόπῳ) Cyril seems to make the same distinction, but here again the inference is doubtful.

15. HILARY OF POITIERS († 368) denounces those who “claim authority for their opinion (against the virginity of the Lord’s mother) from the fact of its being recorded that our Lord had several brothers”; and adds, “yet if these had been sons of Mary and not rather sons of Joseph, the offspring of a former marriage, she would never at the time of the passion have been transferred to the apostle John to be his mother.” (*Comm. in Matt.* i. T. i. p. 671, ed. Bened.) Thus he not only adopts the Epiphanian solution, but shows himself entirely ignorant of the Hieronymian.

16. VICTORINUS THE PHILOSOPHER (about 360) takes εἰ μὴ in Gal. i. 19 as expressing not *exception* but *opposition*, and distinctly states that James was not an apostle: “Cum autem fratrem dixit, apostolum negavit.”

17. The AMBROSIAN HILARY (about 375) comments on Gal. i. 19 as follows; “The Lord is called the brother of James and the rest in the same way in which he is also designated the son of Joseph. For some in a fit of madness impiously assert and contend that these were true brothers of the Lord, being sons of Mary, allowing at the same time that Joseph, though not his true father, was so called nevertheless. For if these were his true brothers, then Joseph will be his true father; for he who called Joseph his father also called James and the rest his brothers.” Thus his testimony entirely coincides with that of his greater namesake. He sees only the alternative of denying the perpetual virginity as Helvidius did,

or accepting the solution of the *Protevangelium*; and he unhesitatingly adopts the latter.

18. BASIL THE GREAT († 379) while allowing that the perpetual virginity is not a necessary article of belief, yet adheres to it himself "since the lovers of Christ cannot endure to hear that the mother of God ever ceased to be a virgin" (*Hom. in Sanct. Christ. Gen. ii. p. 600*, ed. Garn.).¹ As immediately afterwards he refers, in support of his view, to some apocryphal work which related that Zacharias was slain by the Jews for testifying to the virginity of the mother of Jesus (a story which closely resembles the narrative of his death in the *Protevang.* §§ 23, 24), it may perhaps be inferred that he accepted that account of the Lord's brethren which ran through these apocryphal gospels.

19. His brother GREGORY NYSSEN († after 394) certainly adopted the Epiphanian account. At the same time he takes up the very untenable position that the "Mary who is designated in the other evangelists (besides St. John) the mother of James and Joses is *the mother of God* and none else,"² being so called because she undertook the education of these her stepsons; and he supposes also that this James is called "the little" by St. Mark to distinguish him from James *the son of Alphaeus* who was "great because he was in the number of the twelve apostles," which the Lord's brother was not (*In Christ. Resurr. ii. Op. T. iii. pp. 412, 413*, ed. Paris, 1638).

20. The ANTIDICOMARIANITES, an obscure Arabian sect in the latter half of the fourth century, maintained that the Lord's

¹ This very moderate expression of opinion is marked by the editors with a *caute legendum* in the margin; and in Garnier's edition the treatise is consigned to an appendix as of doubtful authenticity. The main argument urged against it is the passage here referred to. (See Garnier, T. ii. prae. p. xv.)

² Similarly Chrysostom, see below, p. 126, note 1. This identification of the Lord's mother with the mother of James and Joses is adopted and similarly explained also in one of the apocryphal gospels: *Hist. Joseph. 4* (Tisch.

p. 117). Possibly Gregory derived it from some such source. It was also part of the Helvidian hypothesis, where it was less out of place, and gave Jerome an easy triumph over his adversary (*adv. Helvid. 12* etc.). It is adopted moreover by Cave (*Life of St. James the Less, § 2*), who holds that the Lord's brethren were sons of Joseph, and yet makes James the Lord's brother one of the twelve, identifying Joseph with Alphaeus. Fritzsche also identifies these two Marias (*Matth. p. 822, Marc. p. 637*).

mother bore children to her husband Joseph. These opinions seem to have produced a reaction, or to have been themselves reactionary, for we read about the same time of a sect called *Collyridians* likewise in Arabia, who going to the opposite extreme paid divine honors to the Virgin (Epiphan. *Haeres* lxxviii. lxxix.¹).

21. EPIPHANIUS a native of Palestine became bishop of Constantia in Cyprus in the year 367. Not very long before Jerome wrote in defence of the perpetual virginity of the Lord's mother against the Helvidians at Rome, Epiphanius came forward as the champion of the same cause against the Antidicomarianites. He denounced them in an elaborate pastoral letter, in which he explains his views at length, and which he has thought fit to incorporate in his subsequently written treatise against Heresies (pp. 1034-1057, ed. Petav.). He moreover discusses the subject incidentally in other parts of his great work (pp. 115, 119, 432, 636), and it is clear that he had devoted much time and attention to it. His account coincides with that of the apocryphal gospels. Joseph, he states, was eighty years old or more when the virgin was espoused to him; by his former wife he had six children, four sons and two daughters: the names of the daughters were Mary and Salome, for which names by the way he alleges the authority of Scripture (p. 1041); his sons, St. James especially, were called the Lord's brethren because they were brought up with Jesus; the mother of the Lord remained for ever a virgin; as the lioness is said to exhaust her fertility in the production of a single offspring (see Herod. iii. 108), so she who bore the Lion of Judah could not in the nature of things become a mother a second time (pp. 1044, 1045). These particulars with many other besides he gives, quoting as his authority

¹ The names are plainly terms of ridicule invented by their enemies. Augustine supposes the "Antidicomarianitæ" of Epiphanius (he writes the word "Antidicomaritæ") to be the same as the Helvidians of Jerome (*adv. Haeres.* 84, T. viii. p. 24). They held the same tenets, it is true, but there seems to have been otherwise no connection between the two. Considerations of

time and place alike resist this identification.

Epiphanius had heard that these opinions, which he held to be derogatory to the Lord's mother, had been promulgated also by the elder Apollinarius, or some of his disciples; but he doubted about this (p. 1034). The report was probably circulated by their opponents, in order to bring discredit upon them.

“the tradition of the Jews” (p. 1039). It is to be observed, moreover, that though he thus treats of the subject several times and at great length, he never once alludes to the Hieronymian account; and yet I can scarcely doubt that one who so highly extolled celibacy would have hailed with delight a solution which, as Jerome boasted, saved the virginity not of Mary only but of Joseph also, for whose honor Epiphanius shows himself very jealous (pp. 1040, 1046, 1047).

22. Somewhere about the year 380 HELVIDIUS, who resided in Rome, published a treatise in which he maintained that the Lord's brethren were sons of Joseph and Mary. He seems to have succeeded in convincing a considerable number of persons, for contemporary writers speak of the Helvidians as a party. These views were moreover advocated by BONOSUS, bishop of Sardica in Illyria, about the same time, and apparently also by JOVINIANUS a monk probably of Milan. The former was condemned by a synod assembled at Capua (A.D. 392), and the latter by synods held at Rome and at Milan (about A.D. 390; see Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* ii. pp. 47, 48).¹

In earlier times this account of the Lord's brethren, so far as it was the badge of a party, seems to have been held in conjunction with Ebionite views respecting the conception and person of Christ.² For, though not necessarily affecting the belief in the miraculous incarnation, it was yet a natural accompaniment of the denial thereof. The motive of these later impugnors of the perpetual virginity was very different. They endeavored to stem the current which had set strongly

¹ The work ascribed to Dorotheus Tyrius is obviously spurious (see Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. p. 163); and I have therefore not included his testimony in this list. The writer distinguishes James the Lord's brother and James the son of Alphaeus, and makes them successive bishops of Jerusalem. (See Combefis in Fabricius, *Hippol.* i. app. p. 36.)

² [I fear the statement in the text may leave a false impression. Previous writers had spoken of the Ebionites as holding the Helvidian view, and I was betrayed into using similar language. But there is, so far as I am aware, no

evidence in favor of this assumption. It would be still more difficult to substantiate the assertions in the following note of Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, c. xvi. “This appellation (‘brethren’) was at first understood in the most obvious sense, and it was supposed that the brothers of Jesus were the lawful issue of Joseph and Mary. A devout respect for the virginity of the mother of God suggested to the Gnostics, and afterwards to the orthodox Greeks, the expedient of bestowing a second wife on Joseph, etc.”] 2d ed.

in the direction of celibacy; and, if their theory was faulty, they still deserve the sympathy due to men, who in defiance of public opinion, refused to bow their necks to an extravagant and tyrannous superstition.

We have thus arrived at the point of time when Jerome's answer to Helvidius created a new epoch in the history of this controversy. And the following inferences are, if I mistake not, fairly deducible from the evidence produced. First: there is not the slightest indication that the Hieronymian solution ever occurred to any individual or sect or church, until it was put forward by Jerome himself. If it had been otherwise, writers like Origen, the two Hilaries, and Epiphanius, who discuss the question, could not have failed to notice it. Secondly: the Epiphanian account has the highest claims to the sanction of tradition, whether the value of this sanction be great or small. Thirdly: this solution seems especially to represent the Palestinian view.

In the year 382 (or 383) Jerome published his treatise; and the effect of it is visible at once.

AMBROSE in the year 392 wrote a work *De Institutione Virginis*, in which he especially refutes the impugnors of the perpetual virginity of the Lord's mother. In a passage, which is perhaps intentionally obscure, he speaks to this effect: "The term brothers has a wide application; it is used of members of the same family, the same race, the same country. Witness the Lord's own words: *I will declare thy name to my brethren* (Ps. xxii. 22). St. Paul too says: *I could wish to be accursed for my brethren* (Rom. ix. 3). Doubtless they might be called brothers as sons of Joseph, not of Mary. And if any one will go into the question carefully, he will find this to be the true account. For myself, I do not intend to enter upon this question; it is of no importance to decide what particular relationship is implied; it is sufficient for my purpose that the term "brethren" is used in an extended sense (i.e. of others besides sons of the same mother)."¹ From this I infer that St. Ambrose

¹ The passage, which I have thus paraphrased, is "Fratres autem gentis, et generis, populi quoque consortium nuncupari docet Dominus ipse qui dicit: *Narrabo nomen tuum fratribus meis; in medio ecclesiae laudabo te.* Paulus quoque

had heard of, though possibly not read, Jerome's tract, in which he discourses on the wide meaning of the term; that, if he had read it, he did not feel inclined to abandon the view with which he was familiar, in favor of the novel hypothesis put forward by Jerome; and lastly, that seeing the importance of co-operation against a common enemy, he was anxious not to raise dissensions among the champions of the perpetual virginity by the discussion of details.

PELAGIUS, who commented on St. Paul a few years after Jerome, adopts his theory and even his language, unless his text has been tampered with here (Gal. i. 19).

At the same time Jerome's hypothesis found a much more weighty advocate in ST. AUGUSTINE. In his commentary on the Galatians indeed (i. 19), written about 394 while he was still a presbyter, he offers the alternative of the Hieronymian and Epiphanian accounts. But in his later works he consistently maintains the view put forward by Jerome in the treatise against Helvidius (*In Joh. Evang.* x. T. iii. P. 2, p. 368, *ib.* xxviii. T. iii. P. 2, p. 508; *Enarr. in Ps.* cxxvii. T. iv. P. 2, p. 1443; *Contr. Faust.* xxii. 35, T. viii. p. 383; comp. *Quaest.* xvii. in *Matth.* T. iii. P. 2, p. 285).

Thus supported, it won its way to general acceptance in the Latin Church; and the WESTERN SERVICES recognize only one James besides the son of Zebedee, thus identifying the Lord's brother with the son of Alphaeus.

In the East it also met with a certain amount of success; but this was only temporary. CHRYSOSTOM wrote both before and after Jerome's treatise had become generally known, and his expositions of the New Testament mark a period of transition. In his Homilies on the earlier books he takes the Epiphanian view: St. James, he says, was at one time an unbeliever, with the rest of the Lord's brethren (on Matt. i. 25, T. vii. p. 77; John vii. 5, T. viii. p. 284; see also on 1 Cor. ix. 4,

ait: *Optabam ego anathema esse pro fratribus meis. Potuerunt autem fratres esse ex Joseph, non ex Maria. Quod quidem si quis diligentius prosequatur inveniet. Nos ea prosequenda non putavimus, quoniam fratrum nomen liquet pluribus*

esse commune" (T. ii. p. 260, ed. Ben.). St. Ambrose seems to accept so much of Jerome's argument as relates to the wide use of the term "brothers," and nothing more.

T. x. p. 181 E); the resurrection was the turning-point in their career; they were called the Lord's brethren as Joseph himself was reputed the husband of Mary (on Matt. i. 25, l. c.).¹ Hitherto he betrays no knowledge of the Hieronymian account. But in his exposition of the Epistle to the Galatians (i. 19), he not only speaks of James the Lord's brother as if he were an apostle (which proves nothing), but also calls him the son of Clopas.² Thus he would appear meanwhile to have accepted the hypothesis of Jerome, and to have completed it by the identification of Clopas with Alphaeus. And THEODORET, who for the most part closely follows Chrysostom, distinctly repudiates the older view: "He was not, as some have supposed, a son of Joseph, the offspring of a former marriage, but was son of Clopas and cousin of the Lord; for his mother was the sister of the Lord's mother."

But with these exceptions, the Epiphanian view maintained

¹ A comment attributed to Chrysostom in Cramer's *Catena* on 1 Cor. ix. 4-7, but not found in the Homilies, is still more explicit: 'Ἀδελφούς τοῦ Κυρίου λέγει τοὺς νυμφισθέντας εἶναι αὐτοῦ ἀδελφούς· ἐπειδὴ γὰρ οὗτος ὁ χρηματίζων καὶ αὐτὸς κατὰ τὴν κοινὴν δόξαν εἶπεν αὐτούς· τοὺς δὲ υἱοὺς Ἰωσήφ λέγει, οἱ ἀδελφοὶ τοῦ Κυρίου ἐχρημάτισαν διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὴν θεοτόκον μνηστείαν τοῦ Ἰωσήφ. λέγει δὲ Ἰακώβον ἐπίσκοπον Ἱεροσολύμων καὶ Ἰωσήφ ὁμώνυμον τῷ πατέρι καὶ Σίμωνα καὶ Ἰούδα. I give the passage without attempting to correct the text. This note reappears almost word for word in the Occumenian *catena* and in Theophylact. If Chrysostom be not the author, then we gain the testimony of some other ancient writer on the same side. Compare also the pseudo-Chrysostom, *Op.* T. ii p. 797.

The passages referred to in the text show clearly what was Chrysostom's earlier view. To these may be added the comments on 1 Cor. xv. 7, T. x. 355 D, where he evidently regards James as not one of the twelve; on Matt. x. 2 (vii. pp. 368, 369), where he

makes James the son of Alphaeus a tax-gatherer, like Matthew, clearly taking them to be brothers; and on Matt. xxvii. 55, (vii. p. 827 A) where, like Gregory Nyssen, he identifies Μαρία Ἰακώβου with the Lord's mother. The accounts of Chrysostom's opinion on this subject given by Blom, p. 111 sqq., and Mill, p. 284, note, are unsatisfactory.

The Homilies on the Acts also take the same view (ix. pp. 23 B, 26 A), but though these are generally ascribed to Chrysostom, their genuineness is very questionable. In another spurious work, *Opus imp. in Matth.* T. vi. p. clxxiv E, the Hieronymian view appears; "Jacobum Alphaei lapidantes: propter quae omnia Jerusalem destructa est a Romanis."

² τὸν τοῦ Κλοπᾶ, ὅπερ καὶ ὁ εὐαγγελιστὴς ἔλεγεν. He is referring, I suppose, to the lists of the apostles which mention James the son of Alphaeus. See above, p. 104. This portion of his exposition, however, is somewhat confused, and it is difficult to resist the suspicion that it has been interpolated.

its ground in the East. It is found again in CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA for instance (*glaphyr. in Gen.* lib. vii. 221), and seems to have been held by later Greek writers almost, if not quite, universally. In THEOPHYLACT, indeed, (on Matt. xiii. 55, Gal. i. 19), we find an attempt to unite the two accounts. James, argues this writer, was the Lord's reputed brother as the son of Joseph, and the Lord's cousin as the son of Clopas; the one was his natural, the other his legal father; Clopas having died childless, Joseph had raised up seed to his brother by his widow, according to the law of the levirate.¹ This novel suggestion, however, found but little favor, and the Eastern churches continued to distinguish between James the Lord's brother and James the son of Alphaeus. The GREEK, SYRIAN, and COPTIC CALENDARS assign a separate day to each.

The table on the next page gives a conspectus of the patristic and early authorities.

¹ See the remarks of Mill, p. 228.

CONSPECTUS OF THE PATRISTIC AND EARLY AUTHORITIES.

A. <i>Sons of Joseph and Mary.</i>	{ TERTULLIAN, HELVIDIUS, BONOSUS, JOVINIANUS (?), ANTIDICOMARIANITES. }		
B. <i>Sons of Joseph by a former wife.</i>	{ GOSPEL OF PETER. PROTEVANGELIUM, etc. CLEMENT OF ALEX., ORIGEN, EUSEBIUS, HILARY OF POITIERS, AMBROSIASTER, GREGORY OF NYSSA, EPIPHANIUS, AMBROSE, [CHRYSOSTOM], CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA EASTERN SERVICES, (Greek, Syrian, and Coptic). LATER GREEK WRITERS. }	A. or B. " <i>Brethren</i> " in a strict <i>sense. James the</i> <i>Just not one of</i> <i>the Twelve.</i>	{ EARLY VERSIONS, CLEMENTINE HOMILIES (?), ASCENTS OF JAMES, HEGESIPPUS, APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTION, CYRIL OF JERUSALEM (?), VICTORINUS THE PHILOSOPHER. }
C. <i>Sons of the Virgin's sister.</i>	{ JEROME, PELAGIUS, AUGUSTINE, [CHRYSOSTOM], THEODORET, WESTERN SERVICES, LATER LATIN WRITERS }	B. or C. <i>Perpetual virginity of Mary.</i>	{ BASIL, CATHOLIC WRITERS GENERALLY. }

Uncertain. HEBREW GOSPEL, VICTORINUS PETAVIONENSIS.

Levirate. THEOPHYLACT.

III.

ST. PAUL AND THE THREE.

THREE, and three only, of the personal disciples and immediate followers of our Lord hold any prominent place in the apostolic records—James, Peter, and John; the first the Lord's brother, the two latter the foremost members of the twelve. Apart from an incidental reference to the death of James the son of Zebedee, which is dismissed in a single sentence, the rest of the twelve are mentioned by name for the last time on the day of the Lord's ascension. Thenceforward they disappear wholly from the canonical writings.

And this silence also extends to the traditions of succeeding ages. We read, indeed, of St. Thomas in India, of St. Andrew in Scythia; but such scanty notices, even if we accept them as trustworthy, show only the more plainly how little the church could tell of her earliest teachers. Doubtless they labored zealously and effectively in the spread of the gospel; but, so far as we know, they have left no impress of their individual mind and character on the church at large. Occupying the foreground, and, indeed, covering the whole canvas of early ecclesiastical history, appear four figures alone,—St. Paul and the three apostles of the circumcision.

Once, and it would appear not more than once, these four great teachers met together face to face. It was the one great crisis in the history of the church, on the issue of which was staked her future progress and triumph. Was she to open her doors wide, and receive all comers, to declare her legitimate boundaries co-extensive with the limits of the human race? Or was she to remain forever narrow and sectarian,

a national institution at best, but most probably a suspected minority even in her own nation?

Not less important, so far as we can see, was the question at issue when Paul and Barnabas arrived at Jerusalem to confer with the apostles of the circumcision on the subject of the Mosaic ritual which then distracted the youthful church. It must therefore be an intensely interesting study to watch the attitude of the four great leaders of the church at this crisis, merely as a historical lesson. But the importance of the subject does not rest here. Questions of much wider interest are suggested by the accounts of this conference: What degree of coincidence or antagonism between Jewish and Gentile converts may be discerned in the church? What were the relations existing between St. Paul and the apostles of the circumcision? How far do the later sects of Ebionites on the one hand and Marcionites on the other, as they appear in direct antagonism in the second century, represent opposing principles, cherished side by side within the bosom of the church and sheltering themselves under the names, or (as some have ventured to say) sanctioned by the authority, of the leading apostles? What, in fact, is the secret history — if there be any secret history — of the origin of catholic Christianity?

On this battle-field the most important of recent theological controversies has been waged; and it is felt by both sides that the Epistle to the Galatians is the true key to the position. In the first place, it is one of the very few documents of the apostolic ages whose genuineness has not been seriously challenged by the opponents of revelation. Moreover, as the immediate utterance of one who himself took the chief part in the incidents recorded, it cannot be discredited as having passed through a colored medium or gathered accretions by lapse of time. And lastly, the very form in which the information is conveyed — by partial and broken allusions, rather than by direct and continuous statement — raises it beyond the reach of suspicion, even where suspicion is most active. Here, at least, both combatants can take their stand on common ground. Nor need the defenders of the Christian faith hesitate

to accept the challenge of their opponents, and try the question on this issue. If it be only interpreted aright, the Epistle to the Galatians ought to present us with a true, if only a partial, solution of the problem.

Thus the attempt to decipher the relations between Jewish and Gentile Christianity in the first ages of the church is directly suggested by this epistle; and, indeed, any Commentary would be incomplete which refused to entertain the problem. This must be my excuse for entering upon a subject about which so much has been written, and which involves so many subsidiary questions. It will be impossible within my limits to discuss all these questions in detail. The objections, for instance, which have been urged against the genuineness of a large number of the canonical and other early Christian writings, can only be met indirectly. Reasonable men will hardly be attracted towards a theory which can only be built on an area prepared by this wide clearance of received documents. At all events, there is, I think, no unfairness in stating the case thus: that, though they are supported by arguments drawn from other sources, the general starting-point of such objections is the theory itself. If, then, a fair and reasonable account can be given both of the origin and progress of the church generally, and of the mutual relations of its more prominent teachers, based on these documents assumed as authentic, a general answer will be supplied to all objections of this class.

I purpose, therefore, to sketch in outline the progressive history of the relations between the Jewish and Gentile converts in the early ages of the church, as gathered from the apostolic writings, aided by such scanty information as can be got together from other sources. This will be a fit, and indeed a necessary, introduction to the subject with which the Epistle to the Galatians is more directly concerned — the positions occupied by St. Paul and the three apostles of the circumcision respectively.

This history falls into three periods, which mark three distinct stages in its progress: (1) The Extension of the

Church to the Gentiles; (2) The Recognition of Gentile Liberty; (3) The Emancipation of the Jewish Churches.¹

1. *The Extension of the Church to the Gentiles.*

It appears from the apostolic history that the believers in the earliest days conformed strictly to Jewish customs in their religious life, retaining the fixed hours of prayer, attending the temple worship and sacrifices, observing the sacred festivals. The church was still confined to one nation, and had not yet broken loose from the national rites and usages. But these swathing bands, which were perhaps needed to support its infancy, would only cripple its later growth, and must be thrown off if it were ever to attain to a healthy maturity. This emancipation, then, was the great problem which the apostles had to work out. The Master himself had left no express instructions. He had charged them, it is true, to preach the gospel to all nations; but how this injunction was to be carried out, by what changes a national church must expand into an universal church, they had not been told. He had, indeed, asserted the sovereignty of the spirit over the letter; he had enunciated the great principle, as wide in its application as the law itself, that "Man was not made for the Sabbath, but the Sabbath for man"; he had pointed to the fulfilment of the law in the gospel. So far he had discredited the law, but he had not deposed or abolished it. It was left to the apostles themselves, under the guidance of the Spirit, moulded by circumstances and moulding them in turn, to work out this great change.

And soon enough the pressure of events began to be felt.

¹ Important works treating of the relations between the Jewish and Gentile Christians are Lechler's *Apostolisches und Nachapostolisches Zeitalter* (2te aufl. 1857) and Ritschl's *Entstehung der Altkatholischen Kirche* (2te aufl. 1857). I am indebted to both these works, but to the latter especially, which is very able and suggestive. Ritschl should be read in his second edition, in which, with a noble sacrifice of consistency to truth, he has abandoned many of his former positions, and placed himself in more direct antagonism to the Tübingen school, in which he was educated. The historical speculations of that school are developed in Baur's *Paulus und Christenthum und die Christliche Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte*, and in Schweigler's *Nachapostolisches Zeitalter*.

The dispersion was the link which connected the Hebrews of Palestine with the outer world. Led captive by the power of Greek philosophy at Athens and Tarsus and Alexandria, attracted by the fascinations of Oriental mysticism in Asia, swept along with the busy whirl of social life in the city and court of the Caesars, these outlying members of the chosen race had inhaled a freer spirit and contracted wider interests than their fellow-countrymen at home. By a series of insensible gradations, — proselytes of the covenant, proselytes of the gate,¹ superstitious devotees who observed the rites without accepting the faith of the Mosaic dispensation, curious lookers on, who interested themselves in the Jewish ritual as they would in the worship of Isis or of Astarte — the most stubborn zealot of the law was linked to the idolatrous heathen whom he abhorred and who despised him in turn. Thus the train was unconsciously laid, when the spark fell from heaven, and fired it.

The very baptism of the Christian church opened the path for its extension to the Gentile world. On the first day of Pentecost were gathered together Hellenist Jews from all the principal centres of the dispersion. With them were assembled also numbers of incorporated Israelites, proselytes of the covenant. The former of these by contact with Gentile thought and life, the latter by the force of early habits and associations,² would accept and interpret the new revelation in a less rigorous spirit than the Hebrew zealot of Jerusalem. Each successive festival must have been followed by similar though less striking results. The stream of Hellenists and proselytes, constantly

¹ The distinction between proselytes of the covenant or of righteousness and proselytes of the gate is found in the Gemara. The former were circumcised, and observed the whole law; the latter acknowledged the God of Israel, and conformed to Jewish worship in some respects, but stood without the covenant, not having been incorporated by the initiatory rite. The former alone, it would appear, are called *προσήλυτοι* in the New Testament; the latter, who

hardly form a distinct class, are *οἱ σεβόμενοι τὸν Θεόν, οἱ εὐσεβεῖς*, etc. In speaking, therefore, of "proselytes of the gate," I am using a convenient anachronism.

² "Trust not a proselyte," said one of the rabbis, "till twenty-four generations; for he holds his heaven." Yalkut (Shimoni) on Ruth i. 11, 12, § 601. See also the passages given by Danz in Meuschen, *Test. Illustr.* p. 651.

ebbing and flowing, must have swept away fragments at least of the new truth, purging it of some local encumbrances which would gather about it in the mother country, and carrying it, thus purged, to far distant shores.

Meanwhile at Jerusalem some years passed away before the barrier of Judaism was assailed. The apostles still observed the Mosaic ritual; they still confined their preaching to Jews by birth, or Jews by adoption, the proselytes of the covenant. At length a breach was made, and the assailants, as might be expected, were Hellenists. The first step towards the creation of an organized ministry was also the first step towards the emancipation of the church. The Jews of Judea, "Hebrews of the Hebrews," had ever regarded their Hellenist brethren with suspicion and distrust; and this estrangement reproduced itself in the Christian church. The interests of the Hellenist widows had been neglected in the daily distribution of alms. Hence "arose a murmuring of the Hellenists against the Hebrews" (Acts vi. 1), which was met by the appointment of seven persons specially charged with providing for the wants of these neglected poor. If the selection was made, as St. Luke's language seems to imply, not by the Hellenists themselves, but by the church at large (vi. 2), the concession when granted was carried out in a liberal spirit. All the names of the seven are Greek, pointing to a Hellenist rather than a Hebrew extraction, and one is especially described as a proselyte, being doubtless chosen to represent a hitherto small but growing section of the community.

By this appointment the Hellenist members obtained a status in the church; and the effects of this measure soon became visible. Two out of the seven stand prominently forward as the champions of emancipation, Stephen the preacher and martyr of liberty, and Philip the practical worker.¹

¹ In Nicolas, the only one of the remaining five whose name reappears in history, liberty is degraded into license. I see no valid reason for doubting the very early tradition that the Nicolaitanes (Apoc. ii. 6, 15) derived their name from him. If there was a traitor among the

twelve, there might well be a heresiarch among the seven. Nor is it likely that an account so discreditable to one who in the New Testament is named only in connection with his appointment to an honorable office would have been circulated, unless there were some foun-

STEPHEN is the acknowledged forerunner of the apostle of the Gentiles. He was the first to "look steadfastly to the end of that which is abolished," to sound the death-knell of the Mosaic ordinances and the temple worship, and to claim for the gospel unfettered liberty and universal rights. "This man," said his accusers, "ceaseth not to speak words against the holy place and the law; for we have heard him say that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered us (vi. 13, 14)." The charge was only false, as misrepresenting the spirit which animated his teaching. The accused attempts no denial, but pleads justification. To seal this testimony the first blood of the noble army of martyrs is shed.

The indirect consequences of his martyrdom extend far beyond the immediate effect of his dying words. A persecution "arose about Stephen." The disciples of the mother church "were scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria" (viii. 1). Some of the refugees even "travelled as far as Phenice and Cyprus and Antioch" (xi. 19). This dispersion was, as we shall see, the parent of the first Gentile congregation. The church of the Gentiles, it may be truly said, was baptized in the blood of Stephen.

The doctrine, which Stephen preached and for which he died, was carried into practice by PHILIP. The sacred narrative mentions two incidents in his career, each marking an

dation in fact. At the same time the Nicolaitanes may have exaggerated and perverted the teaching of Nicolas. Irenaeus (i. 26, 3) and Hippolytus (*Haer.* vii. 36) believe him to have been the founder of the sect; while Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* ii. p. 411; iii. p. 522, Potter) attributes to him an ambiguous saying that "the flesh must be abused (δεῖν παραχρῆσθαι τῇ σαρκί)," of which these Nicolaitanes perverted the meaning; and, in attempting to clear his reputation, relates a highly improbable story, which, if true, would be far from creditable. In another passage of Hippolytus, a fragment preserved in Syriac (Lagarde's *Anecd. Syr.* p. 87, Cowper's

Syr. Miscell. p. 55), and taken from the "Discourse on the Resurrection" addressed to Mammaea, this writer again represents Nicolas as the founder of the sect, speaking of him as "stirred by a strange spirit," and teaching that the resurrection is past (2 Tim. ii. 18), but not attributing to him any directly immoral doctrines. A common interpretation, which makes Nicolas a Greek rendering of Balaam, is not very happy; for Νικόλαος does not altogether correspond with any possible derivation of Balaam, least of all with בלעם "the destroyer of the people," generally adopted by those who so explain Νικόλαος. See below, p. 146, note 1.

onward stride in the free development of the church. It is therefore not without significance that years afterwards we find him styled "*the evangelist*" (xxi. 8), as if he had earned this honorable title by some signal service rendered to the gospel.

1. The Samaritan occupied the border land between the Jew and the Gentile. Theologically, as geographically, he was the connecting link between the one and the other. Half Hebrew by race, half Israelite in his acceptance of a portion of the second canon, he held an anomalous position, shunning and shunned by the Jew, yet clinging to the same promises and looking forward to the same hopes. With a bold venture of faith Philip offers the gospel to this mongrel people. His overtures are welcomed with joy, and "Samaria receives the word of God." The sacred historian relates moreover, that his labors were sanctioned by the presence of the chief apostles, Peter and John, and confirmed by an outpouring of the Holy Spirit (viii. 14-17). "He who eats the bread of a Samaritan," said the Jewish doctor, "is as one who eats swine's flesh."¹ "No Samaritan shall ever be made a proselyte. They have no share in the resurrection of the dead."² In opening her

¹ *Mishnah Shabbith*, viii. 10.

² *Pirke Rabbi Elieser*, 38. The passage so well illustrates the statement in the text, that I give it in full: "What did Ezra and Zerubbabel the son of Shealtiel and Jehoshua the son of Jehozadak? (They went) and they gathered together all the congregation into the temple of the Lord, and they brought three hundred priests, and three hundred children, and three hundred trumpets, and three hundred scrolls of the law in their hands, and they blew, and the Levites sang and played, and they banned the Cuthaeans (Samaritans) by the mystery of the ineffable name, and by the writing which is written on the tables, and by the anathema of the upper (heavenly) court of justice, and by the anathema of the nether (earthly) court of justice, that no one of Israel should eat the bread of a Cuthaeon for ever. Hence, they (the elders) said: Whosoever eats

the bread of a Cuthaeon is as if he ate swine's flesh; and no Cuthaeon shall ever be made a proselyte; and they have no share in the resurrection of the dead; for it is said (Ezra iv. 3) *Ye have nothing to do with us to build an house unto our God*, (that is) neither in this world nor in the future. And that they should have neither portion nor inheritance in Jerusalem, as it is said (Neh. ii. 20), *But ye had no portion nor right nor memorial in Jerusalem*. And they communicated the anathema to Israel which is in Babylon. And they put upon them anathema upon anathema. And King Cyrus also decreed upon them an everlasting anathema, as it is said (Ezra vi. 12), *And the God that has caused his name to dwell there*," etc. Several passages bearing on this subject are collected in the article "Samaritan Pentateuch," by Mr. E. Deutsch, in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*.

treasures to this hated race, the church had surmounted the first barrier of prejudice behind which the exclusiveness of the nation had entrenched itself. To be a Samaritan was to have a devil, in the eyes of a rigid Jew (John viii. 48, comp. iv. 9).

2. Nor was it long before Philip broke through a second and more formidable line of defence. The blood of the patriarchs, though diluted, still flowed in the veins of the Samaritans. His next convert had no such claim to respect. A descendant of the accursed race of Ham,¹ shut out from the congregation by his physical defect (Deut. xxiii. 1), the Ethiopian chamberlain labored under a twofold disability. This double line is assailed by the Hellenist preacher and taken by storm. The desire of the Ethiopian to know and to do God's will is held by Philip to be a sufficient claim. He acts boldly and without hesitation. He accosts him, instructs him, baptizes him, then and there.

The venture of the subordinate minister, however, still wanted the sanction of the leaders of the church. At length this sanction was given in a signal way. The apostles of the circumcision, even St. Peter himself, had failed hitherto to comprehend the wide purpose of God. With their fellow-countrymen they still "held it unlawful for a Jew to keep company with or to come near an alien" (x. 28). The time when the gospel should be preached to the Gentiles seemed not yet to have arrived; the manner in which it should be preached was still hidden from them. At length a divine vision scatters the dark scruples of Peter, teaching him to call no man "common or unclean." He goes himself and seeks out the devout Roman centurion Cornelius, whose household he instructs in the faith. The Gentile church, thus founded on the same "rock" with the Jewish, receives also the same divine confirmation. As Peter began to speak, "the Holy Ghost fell on them, as it did" on the Jewish disciples on the first day of Pentecost (xi. 15). As if the approval of God could not be too prompt or too manifest, the usual sequence

¹ Amos ix. 7, "Are ye not as the children of the Ethiopians unto me, O children of Israel."

is reversed and the outpouring of the Spirit precedes the rite of baptism (x. 44-48).

The case of Cornelius does not, I think, differ essentially from the case of the Ethiopian eunuch. There is no ground for assuming that the latter was a proselyte of the covenant. His mutilation excluded him from the congregation by a Mosaic ordinance, and it is an arbitrary conjecture that the definite enactment of the law was overruled by the spiritual promise of the prophet (Isa. lvi. 3-5). This liberal interpretation at all events accords little with the narrow and formal spirit of the age. Both converts alike had the inward qualification of "fearing God and working righteousness" (x. 35); both alike were disabled by external circumstances, and the disabilities of the Ethiopian eunuch were even greater than those of the Roman centurion. If so, the significance of the conversion of the latter consists in this, that now in the case of the Gentile, as before in the case of the Samaritan, the principle asserted by the Hellenist Philip is confirmed by the apostles of the circumcision in the person of their chief, and sealed by the outpouring of the Spirit.

Meanwhile others were asserting the universality of the church elsewhere, if not with the same sanction of authority, at all events with a larger measure of success. With the dying words of Stephen, the martyr of Christian liberty, still ringing in their ears, the persecuted brethren had fled from Jerusalem, and carried the tidings of the gospel to distant lands. At first they "preached the word to none but to the Jews only" (xi. 19). At length others bolder than the rest, "when they were come to Antioch, spake unto the Gentiles, preaching the Lord Jesus." Probably this was an advance even on the conversions of the Ethiopian eunuch and of Cornelius. These two converts at all events recognized the God of the old covenant. Now for the first time, it would seem, the gospel was offered to heathen idolaters. Here, as before, the innovators were not Hebrews, but Hellenists, "men of Cyprus and Cyrene" (xi. 20). Their success was signal: crowds flocked to hear them; and at Antioch first the brethren were called by a new name—a term of ridicule and contempt

then ; now the pride and glory of the civilized world. Hitherto the believers had been known as "Galileans" or "Nazarenes" ; now they were called "Christians." The transition from a Jewish to a heathen term marks the point of time when the church of the Gentiles first threatens to supersede the church of the circumcision.

Thus the first stage in the emancipation of the church was gained. The principle was broadly asserted that the gospel received all comers, asking no questions, allowing no impediments, insisting on no preliminary conditions, if only she were satisfied that the petitioner "feared God and worked righteousness."

2. The Recognition of Gentile Liberty.

It is plain that the principle, which had thus been asserted, involved consequences very much wider than were hitherto clearly foreseen and acknowledged. But between asserting a principle and carrying it out to its legitimate results, a long interval must necessarily elapse, for many misgivings have to be dissipated and many impediments overcome.

So it was with the growth of Gentile Christendom. The Gentiles were no longer refused admission into the church unless first incorporated with Israel by the initiatory rite. But many questions remained still unsettled. What was their exact position, when thus received ? What submission, if any, must they yield to the Mosaic law ? Should they be treated as in all respects on an equality with the true Israelite ? Was it right for the Jewish Christian so far to lay aside the traditions of his race, as to associate freely with his Gentile brother ? These must necessarily in time become practical questions, and press for a solution.

At this point in the history of the church a new character appears on the scene. The mantle of Stephen has fallen on the persecutor of Stephen. SAUL has been called to bear the name of Christ to the Gentiles. Descended of pure Hebrew ancestry, and schooled in the law by the most famous of living teachers, born and residing in a great university town, second

to none in its reputation for Greek wisdom and learning, inheriting the privileges and the bearing of a Roman citizen, he seemed to combine in himself all those varied qualifications which would best fit him for this work. These wide experiences, which had lain dormant before, were quickened into thought and life by the lightning flash on the way to Damascus; and stubborn zeal was melted and fused into large-hearted and comprehensive charity. From his conversion to the present time we read only of his preaching in the synagogues at Damascus (ix. 20, 22) and to the Hellenists at Jerusalem (ix. 29). But now the moment was ripe, when he must enter upon that wider sphere of action for which he had been specially designed. The Gentile church, founded on the "rock" must be handed over to the "wise master-builder" to enlarge and complete. So at the bidding of the apostles, Barnabas seeks out Saul in his retirement at Tarsus, and brings him to Antioch. Doubtless he seemed to all to be the fittest instrument for carrying out the work so auspiciously begun.

Meanwhile events at Jerusalem were clearing the way for his great work. The star of Jewish Christendom was already on the wane, while the independence of the Gentiles was gradually asserting itself. Two circumstances especially were instrumental in reversing the positions hitherto held by these two branches of the church.

1. It has been seen that the martyrdom of Stephen marked an epoch in the emancipation of the church. The martyrdom of James the son of Zebedee is scarcely less important in its influence on her progressive career. The former persecution had sown the disciples broad-cast over heathen lands; the latter seems to have been the signal for the withdrawal of the apostles themselves from Jerusalem. The twelve years, which according to an old tradition our Lord had assigned as the limit of their fixed residence there, had drawn to a close.¹ So, consigning the direction of the mother church to James the Lord's brother and the presbytery, they depart thence to enter upon a wider field of action. Their withdrawal must have deprived the church of Jerusalem of half her prestige

¹ See p. 331, note 1.

and more than half her influence. Henceforth she remained indeed the mother church of the nation, but she was no longer the mother church of the world.

2. About the same time another incident also contributed to lessen her influence. A severe famine devastated Palestine and reduced the Christian population to extreme want. Collections were made at Antioch, and relief was sent to the brethren in Judea. By this exercise of liberality, the Gentile churches were made to feel their own importance; while the recipients, thus practically confessing their dependence, were deposed from the level of proud isolation which many of them would gladly have maintained. This famine seems to have ranged over many years, or at all events its attacks were several times repeated. Again and again the alms of the Gentile Christians were conveyed by the hands of the Gentile apostles, and the churches of Judea laid themselves under fresh obligations to the heathen converts.

Events being thus ripe, Saul, still residing at Antioch, is set apart by the Spirit for the apostleship of the Gentiles, to which he had been called years before.

The gospel thus enters upon a new career of triumph. The primacy of the church passes from Peter to Paul — from the apostle of the circumcision to the apostle of the Gentiles. The centre of evangelical work is transferred from Jerusalem to Antioch. Paul and Barnabas set forth on their first missionary tour.

Though they give precedence everywhere to the Jews, their mission is emphatically to the Gentiles. In Cyprus, the first country visited, its character is signally manifested in the conversion of the Roman proconsul, Sergius Paulus. And soon it becomes evident that the younger church must supplant the elder. At Antioch in Pisidia matters are brought to a crisis: the Jews reject the offer of the gospel; the Gentiles entreat to hear the message. Thereupon the doom is pronounced: "It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you; but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles" (xiii. 46). The incidents at Pisidian Antioch foreshadow the

destiny which awaits the gospel throughout the world. Everywhere the apostles deliver their message to the Jews first, and everywhere the offer rejected by them is welcomed by the heathen. The mission of Paul and Barnabas is successful, but its success is confined almost wholly to the Gentiles. They return to Antioch.

Hitherto no attempt had been made to define the mutual relations of Jewish and Gentile converts. All such questions, it would seem, had been tacitly passed over, neither side perhaps being desirous of provoking discussion. But the inevitable crisis at length arrives. Certain converts, who had imported into the church of Christ the rigid and exclusive spirit of Pharisaism, stir up the slumbering feud at Antioch, starting the question in its most trenchant form. They desire to impose circumcision on the Gentiles, not only as a condition of equality, but as necessary to salvation (xv. 1). The imposition of this burden is resisted by Paul and Barnabas, who go on a mission to Jerusalem to confer with the apostles and elders.

I have already given what seems to me the probable account of the part taken by the leading apostles in these controversies,¹ and shall have to return to the subject later. Our difficulty in reading this page of history arises not so much from the absence of light as from the perplexity of cross lights. The narratives of St. Luke and St. Paul only then cease to conflict, when we take into account the different positions of the writers and the different objects they had in view.

At present we are concerned only with the results of this conference. These are twofold: *First*, the settlement of the points of dispute between the Jewish and Gentile converts: *Secondly*, the recognition of the authority and commission of Paul and Barnabas by the apostles of the circumcision. It will be necessary, as briefly as possible, to point out the significance of these two conclusions, and to examine how far they were recognized and acted upon subsequently.

1. The arrangement of the disputed points was effected by a mutual compromise. On the one hand, it was decided, once and forever, that the rite of circumcision should not be imposed

¹ See p. 330 sq.

on the Gentiles. On the other, concessions were demanded of them in turn; they were asked to "abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication."

The first of these decisions was a question of principle. If the initiatory rite of the old dispensation were imposed on all members of the Christian church this would be in effect to deny that the gospel was a new covenant; in other words, to deny its essential character.¹ It was thus the vital point on which the whole controversy turned. And the liberal decision of the council was not only the charter of Gentile freedom, but the assertion of the supremacy of the gospel.

On the other hand, it is not so easy to understand the bearing of the restrictions imposed on the Gentile converts. Their significance, in fact, seems to be relative rather than absolute. There were certain practices into which, though most abhorrent to the feelings of their Jewish brethren, the Gentile Christians from early habit and constant association would easily be betrayed. These were of different kinds: some were grave moral offences, others only violations of time-honored observances, inwrought in the conscience of the Israelite. After the large concession of principle made to the Gentiles in the matter of circumcision, it was not unreasonable that they should be required in turn to abstain from practices which gave so much offence to the Jews. Hence the prohibitions in question. It is strange, indeed, that offences so heterogeneous should be thrown together and brought under one prohibition; but this is, perhaps, sufficiently explained by supposing the decree framed to meet some definite complaint of the Jewish brethren. If, in the course of the hot dispute which preceded the speeches of the leading apostles, attention had been specially called by the Pharisaic party to these detested practices, St. James would not unnaturally take up the subject and propose to satisfy them by a direct condemnation of the offences in question.²

¹ See Ritschl, p. 127.

² This seems to me much simpler than explaining the clauses as enforcing

the conditions under which proselytes of the gate were received by the Jews. In this latter case *προπηλα* will perhaps

It would betray great ignorance of human nature to suppose that a decision thus authoritatively pronounced must have silenced all opposition. If therefore we should find its provisions constantly disregarded hereafter, it is no argument against the genuineness of the decree itself. The bigoted minority was little likely to make an absolute surrender of its most stubborn prejudices to any external influence. Many even of those, who at the time were persuaded by the leading apostles into acquiescence, would find their misgivings return, when they saw that the effect of the decree was to wrest the sceptre from their grasp, and place it in the hands of the Gentile church.

Even the question of circumcision, on which an absolute decision had been pronounced, was revived again and again. Long after, the Judaizing antagonists of St. Paul in Galatia attempted to force this rite on his Gentile converts. Perhaps, however, they rather evaded than defied the decree. They may, for instance, have no longer insisted upon it as a condition of salvation, but urged it as a title to preference. But, however this may be, there is nothing startling in the fact itself.

But while the *emancipating* clause of the decree, though express and definite, was thus parried or resisted, the *restrictive* clauses were with much greater reason interpreted with latitude. The miscellaneous character of these prohibitions showed that, taken as a whole, they had no binding force independently of the circumstances that dictated them. They were a temporary expedient, framed to meet a temporary emergency. Their object was the avoidance of offence in mixed communities of Jew and Gentile converts. Beyond this recognized aim, and the general understanding implied therein, the limits of their application were not defined. Hence there was room for much latitude in individual cases. St. James, as the head of the mother church, where the diffi-

refer to unlawful marriage, e.g. within the prohibited degrees of kindred (Lev. xvii. 18), as it is interpreted by Ritschl, p. 129 sq., who ably maintains this view. These difficulties of interpretation are to my mind a very strong evidence of the genuineness of the decree.

culties which it was framed to meet were most felt, naturally refers to the decree seven years after as still regulating the intercourse between Jewish and Gentile converts (xxi. 25). At Antioch, too, and in the neighboring churches of Syria and Cilicia, to which alone the apostolic letter was addressed, and on which alone, therefore, the enactments were directly binding (xv. 23), it was doubtless long observed. The close communication between these churches and Jerusalem would at once justify and secure its strict observance. We read also of its being delivered to the brotherhoods of Lycaonia and Pisidia, already founded when the council was held, and near enough to Palestine to feel the pressure of Jewish feeling (xvi. 4). But as the circle widens, its influence becomes feebler. In strictly Gentile churches it seems never to have been enforced. St. Paul, writing to the Corinthians, discusses two of the four practices which it prohibits without any reference to its enactments. Fornication he condemns absolutely, as defiling the body which is the temple of God (1 Cor. v. 1-13; vi. 18-20). Of eating meats sacrificed to idols he speaks as a thing indifferent in itself, only to be avoided in so far as it implies participation in idol-worship or is offensive to the consciences of others. His rule, therefore, is this: "Do not sit down to a banquet celebrated in an idol's temple. You may say that in itself an idol is nothing, that neither the abstaining from meat nor the partaking of meat commends us to God. All this I grant is true; but such knowledge is dangerous. You are running the risk of falling into idolatry yourself; you are certainly by your example leading others astray; you are, in fact, committing an overt act of treason to God; you are a partaker of the tables of devils. On the other hand, do not officiously inquire when you make a purchase at the shambles, or when you dine in a private house; but if, in such cases, you are plainly told that the meat has been offered in sacrifice, then abstain at all hazards. Lay down this rule, to give no offence either to Jews or Gentiles or to the churches of God" (1 Cor. viii. 1-13; x. 14-22). This wise counsel, if it disregards the letter, preserves the spirit, of the decree, which was framed for the avoidance of offence. But St.

Paul's language shows that the decree itself was not held binding, perhaps was unknown, at Corinth. Otherwise the discussion would have been foreclosed. Once again we come across the same topics in the apocalyptic message to the churches of Pergamos and Thyatira. The same irregularities prevailed here as at Corinth. There was the temptation, on the one hand, to impure living; on the other, to acts of conformity with heathen worship which compromised their allegiance to the one true God. Our Lord, in St. John's vision, denounces them through the symbolism of the Old Testament history. In the church of Pergamos were certain Nicolaitanes, "holding the doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balac to cast a stumbling-block before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed to idols, and to commit fornication" (ii. 14). At Thyatira the evil had struck its roots deeper. The angel of that church is rebuked because he "suffers his wife Jezebel, who calls herself a prophetess, and she teacheth and seduceth God's servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed to idols." I see no reason for assuming a reference here to the apostolic decree. The two offences singled out are those to which Gentile churches would be most liable, and which at the same time are illustrated by the Old Testament parallels. If St. Paul denounces them independently of the decree, St. John may have done so likewise. In the matter of sacrificial meats, indeed, the condemnation of the latter is more absolute and uncompromising. But this is owing partly to the epigrammatic terseness and symbolic reference of the passage; partly, also, we may suppose, to the more definite form which the evil itself had assumed.¹ In both cases the

¹ The coincidence of the two apostles extends also to their language. (1) If St. John denounces the offence as a following of Balaam, St. Paul uses the same Old Testament illustration, 1 Cor. x. 7, 8, "Neither be ye idolaters, as were some of them; as it is written, The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play; neither let us commit fornication, as some of them committed, and fell in one day three and twenty thousand." (2) If St. John speaks "of

casting a stumbling-block (*σκάνδαλον*) before the children of Israel," the whole purport of St. Paul's warning is "to give no offence" (*μη σκανδαλιζειν* viii. 13, *ἀπρόσκοποι γίνεσθαι*, x. 32). With all these coincidences of matter and language, it is a strange phenomenon that any critic should maintain, as Baur, Zeller, and Schweigler have done, that the denunciations in the Apocalypse are directed against St. Paul himself.

practice was justified by a vaunted knowledge which held itself superior to any such restrictions.¹ But at Corinth this temper was still immature, and under restraint; while in the Asiatic churches it had outgrown shame, and broken out into the wildest excesses.²

Thus, then, the decree was neither permanently nor universally binding. But there was also another point which admitted much latitude of interpretation. What was understood to be the design of these enactments? They were articles of peace, indeed; but of what nature was this peace to be? Was it to effect an entire union between the Jewish and Gentile churches—a complete identity of interests; or only to secure a strict neutrality—a condition of mutual toleration? Were the Gentiles to be welcomed as brothers, and admitted at once to all the privileges of sons of Israel? Or was the church hereafter to be composed of two separate nationalities, as it were, equal and independent? Or, lastly, were the heathen converts to be recognized, indeed, but only as holding a subordinate position, like proselytes under the old covenant? The first interpretation is alone consistent with the spirit of the gospel; but either of the others might honestly be main-

¹ Comp. Apoc. ii. 24 *ἄσοι οὐκ ἔχουσιν τὴν διδαχὴν ταύτην, οἵτινες οὐκ ἐγνωσαν τὰ βάθρα τοῦ Σατανᾶ, ὡς λέγουσιν.* The false teachers boasted a knowledge of the deep things of God; they possessed only a knowledge of the deep things of Satan. St. John's meaning is illustrated by a passage in Hippolytus (*Haeres.* v. 6, p. 94) relating to the Ophites, who offer other striking resemblances to the heretics of the apostolic age; *ἐπεκάλεσαν ἑαυτοὺς γνωστικούς, φάσκοντες μόνοι τὰ βάθη γινώσκειν.* St. Paul's rebuke is very different in form, but the same in effect. He begins each time in a strain of noble irony. "We all have knowledge"; "I speak as to wise men." He appears to concede, to defer, to sympathize, even to encourage; and then he turns round upon the laxity of this vaunted wisdom, and condemns and crushes it:

"I will eat no flesh while the world, standeth, lest I make my brother to offend"; "I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils."

² The subject of *εἰδωλόθυτα* does not disappear with the apostolic age. It turns up again, for instance, in the middle of the second century, in Agrippa Castor (Euseb. *II. E.* iv. 7) writing against Basilides, and in Justin (*Dial.* 35, p. 253 D), who mentions the Basilideans among other Gnostic sects as "participating in lawless and godless rites." Comp. *Orac. Sib.* ii. 96. Both these writers condemn the practice, the latter with great severity. When the persecutions began, and the Christians were required to deny their faith by participating in the sacrifices, it became a matter of extreme importance to avoid any act of conformity, however slight.

tained without any direct violation of the letter of the decree. The church of Antioch, influenced doubtless by St. Paul, took the larger and truer view; Jewish and Gentile converts lived freely together as members of one brotherhood. A portion, at least, of the church of Jerusalem, "certain who came from James," adopted a narrower interpretation, and still clung to the old distinctions, regarding their Gentile brethren as unclean, and refusing to eat with them. This was not the truth of the gospel, it was not the spirit of Christ; but neither was it a direct breach of compact.

2. Scarcely less important than the settlement of the disputed points was the other result of these conferences, the recognition of St. Paul's office and mission by the apostles of the circumcision. This recognition is recorded in similar language in the narrative of the Acts and in the Epistle to the Galatians. In the apostolic circular, inserted in the former, Paul and Barnabas are commended as "men who have hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" (xv. 26). In the conferences, as related in the latter, the three apostles, James, Peter, and John, seeing that "the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto him," and "perceiving the grace that was given unto him, gave to him and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, that they should go unto the heathen" (ii. 7-10).

This ample recognition would doubtless carry weight with a large number of Jewish converts; but no sanction of authority could overcome in others the deep repugnance felt to one who, himself a "Hebrew of the Hebrews," had systematically opposed the law of Moses, and triumphed in his opposition. Henceforth St. Paul's career was one life-long conflict with Judaizing antagonists. Setting aside the Epistles to the Thessalonians, which were written too early to be affected by this struggle, all his letters addressed to churches, with but one exception,¹ refer more or less directly to such opposition. It assumed different forms in different places. In Galatia it

¹ This exception, the Epistle to the Ephesians, may be explained by its character as a circular letter to the Asiatic churches, in which special references would be out of place.

was purely Pharisaic; in Phrygia and Asia it was strongly tinged with speculative mysticism; but everywhere, and under all circumstances zeal for the law was its ruling passion. This systematic hatred of St. Paul is an important fact, which we are too apt to overlook, but without which the whole history of the apostolic ages will be misread and misunderstood.

3. *The Emancipation of the Jewish Churches.*

We have seen hitherto no signs of waning affection for the law in the Jewish converts to Christianity as a body. On the contrary, the danger which threatened it from a quarter so unexpected seems to have fanned their zeal to a red heat. Even in the churches of St. Paul's own founding his name and authority were not powerful enough to check the encroachments of the Judaizing party. Only here and there, in mixed communities, the softening influences of daily intercourse must have been felt, and the true spirit of the gospel insensibly diffused, inculcating the truth that "in Christ was neither Jew nor Greek."

But the mother church of Jerusalem, being composed entirely of Jewish converts, lacked these valuable lessons of daily experience. Moreover, the law had claims on a Hebrew of Palestine wholly independent of his religious obligations. To him it was a national institution, as well as a divine covenant. Under the gospel he might consider his relations to it in this latter character altered, but as embodying the decrees and usages of his country, it still demanded his allegiance. To be a good Christian he was not required to be a bad citizen. On these grounds the more enlightened members of the mother church would justify their continued adhesion to the law. Nor is there any reason to suppose that St. Paul himself took a different view of their obligations. The apostles of the circumcision, meanwhile, if, conscious themselves that the law was fulfilled in the gospel, they strove nevertheless by strict conformity to conciliate the zealots both within and without the church, were only acting upon St. Paul's own maxim, who "became to the Jews a Jew, that he might gain the

Jews." Meanwhile, they felt that a catastrophe was impending, that a deliverance was at hand. Though they were left in uncertainty as to the time and manner of this divine event, the mysterious warnings of the Lord had placed the fact itself beyond a doubt. They might well, therefore, leave all perplexing questions to the solution of time, devoting themselves, meanwhile, to the practical work which lay at their doors.

And soon the catastrophe came which solved the difficult problem. The storm which had long been gathering burst over the devoted city. Jerusalem was razed to the ground, and the temple-worship ceased, never again to be revived (A.D. 70). The Christians foreseeing the calamity had fled before the tempest; and at Pella, a city of the Decapolis, in the midst of a population chiefly Gentile, the church of the circumcision was reconstituted. They were warned to flee, said the story, by an oracle:¹ but no special message from heaven was needed at this juncture; the signs of the times, in themselves full of warning, interpreted by the light of the Master's prophecies plainly foretold the approaching doom. Before the crisis came, they had been deprived of the counsel and guidance of the leading apostles. Peter had fallen a martyr at Rome; John had retired to Asia Minor; James the Lord's brother was slain not long before the great catastrophe; and some thought that the horrors of the Flavian war were the just vengeance of an offended God for the murder of so holy a man.² He was succeeded by his cousin Symeon, the son of Clopas and nephew of Joseph.

Under these circumstances the church was reformed at Pella. Its history in the ages following is a hopeless blank;³ and it

¹ Euseb. *II. E.* iii. 5, *κατά τινα χρησμόν τοῖς αὐτοῖς δοκιμοῖς δι' ἀποκαλύψεως ἐκδοθέντα κ.τ.λ.*

² Hegesippus in Euseb. *II. E.* ii. 23, *καὶ εὐθὺς Οὐεσπασιανὸς πολιορκεῖ αὐτούς*, and the pseudo-Josephus also quoted there, *ταῦτα δὲ συμβέβηκεν Ἰουδαίοις κατ' ἐκδίκησιν Ἰακώβου τοῦ δικαίου κ.τ.λ.*

³ The church of Pella however contributed one author at least to the ranks of early Christian literature in Ariston,

the writer of an apology in the form of a dialogue between Jason, a Hebrew Christian, and Papiseus, an Alexandrian Jew; see Routh, i. p. 93. One of his works however was written after the Bar-cochba rebellion, to which it alludes (Euseb. *II. E.* iv. 6); and from the purport of the allusion we may infer that it was this very dialogue. The expulsion of the Jews by Hadrian was a powerful common-place in the treatises of the

would be vain to attempt to fill in the picture from conjecture. We cannot doubt, however, that the consequences of the fall of Jerusalem, direct or indirect, were very great. In two points especially its effects would be powerfully felt, in the change of opinion produced within the church itself and in the altered relations between the converted and unconverted Jews.

(1) The loss of their great leaders at this critical moment was compensated to the church of the circumcision by the stern teaching of facts. In the obliteration of the temple services they were brought at length to see that all other sacrifices were transitory shadows, faint emblems of the one Paschal Lamb, slain once and for ever for the sins of the world. In the impossibility of observing the Mosaic ordinances except in part, they must have been led to question the efficacy of the whole. And besides all this, those who had hitherto maintained their allegiance to the law purely as a national institution, were by the overthrow of the nation set free henceforth from any such obligation. We need not suppose that these inferences were drawn at once, or drawn by all alike; but slowly and surely the fall of the city must have produced this effect.

(2) At the same time it wholly changed their relations with their unconverted countrymen. Hitherto they had maintained such close intercourse that in the eyes of the Roman the Christians were as one of the many Jewish sects. Henceforth they stood in a position of direct antagonism. The sayings ascribed to the Jewish rabbis of this period are charged with

Apologists; see e.g. Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 47. On the other hand, it cannot have been written long after, for it was quoted by Celsus (*Orig. c. Cels.* iv. 52, p. 544, Delarue). The shade of doubt which rests on the authorship of this dialogue is very slight. Undue weight seems to be attributed to the fact of its being quoted anonymously; e.g. in Westcott's *Canon*, p. 106, Donaldson's *Christian literature*, etc. ii. p. 58. If I am right in conjecturing that the reference to the banishment of the Jews was taken from this dialogue, Eusebius himself directly

attributed it to Ariston. The name of the author, however, is of little consequence, for the work was clearly written by a Hebrew Christian not later than the middle of the second century. Whoever he may have been, the writer was no Ebionite, for he explained Gen. i. 1, "In Filio fecit Deus coelum et terram" (*Hieron. Quæst. Hebr. in Gen.* T. iii. p. 305, ed. Vall.); and the fact is important, as this is the earliest known expression of Hebrew Christian doctrine after the canonical writings, except perhaps the Testaments of the twelve Patriarchs.

the bitterest reproaches of the Christians, who are denounced as more dangerous than the heathen, and anathemas against the hated sect were introduced into their daily prayers.¹ The probable cause of this change is not far to seek. While the catastrophe was still impending, the Christians seem to have stood forward and denounced the national sins which had brought down the chastisement of God on their country. In the traditional notices at least this feature may be discerned. Nor could they fail to connect together as cause and effect the stubborn rejection of Messiah and the coming doom which he himself had foretold. And when at length the blow fell, by withdrawing from the city and refusing to share the fate of their countrymen, they declared by an overt act that henceforth they were strangers, that now at length their hopes and interests were separated.

These altered relations both to the Mosaic law and to the Jewish people must have worked as leaven in the minds of the Christians of the circumcision. Questions were asked now, which from their nature could not have been asked before. Difficulties hitherto unfelt seemed to start up on all sides. The relations of the church to the synagogue, of the gospel to the law, must now be settled in some way or other. Thus diversities of opinion, which had hitherto been lulled in a broken and fitful slumber suddenly woke up into dangerous activity. The apostles, who at an earlier date had moderated extreme tendencies, and to whom all would have looked instinctively for counsel and instruction, had passed away from the scene. One personal follower of the Lord, however, still remained. Symeon, the aged bishop who had succeeded James.² At length he too was removed. After a long tenure of office he was martyred at a very advanced age, in the ninth year of Trajan (A.D.106). His death, according to Hegesippus, was the signal for a shameless outbreak of multitudinous heresies, which had

¹ See especially Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, iv. p. 112 sqq. The antagonism between the Jews and Christians at this period is strongly insisted upon by this writer, whose account is the more striking as given from a Jewish point of view.

² Hegesippus in Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 22. This writer also mentions grandsons of Jude the Lord's brother as ruling over the churches and surviving till the time of Trajan. *H. E.* iii. 32.

hitherto worked under-ground, the church having as yet preserved her virgin purity undefiled.¹ Though this early historian has interwoven many fabulous details in his account, there seems no reason to doubt the truth of the broad statement, confirmed as it is from another source,² that this epoch was the birth-time of many forms of dissent in the church of the circumcision.

How far these dissensions and diversities of opinion had ripened meanwhile into open schism, to what extent the majority still conformed to the Mosaic ordinances (as for instance in the practice of circumcision and the observance of the Sabbath), we have no data to determine. But the work begun by the fall of Jerusalem was only at length completed by the advent of another crisis. By this second catastrophe the church and the law were finally divorced; and the malcontents who had hitherto remained within the pale of the church became declared separatists.

A revolution of the Jews broke out in all the principal centres of the dispersion (A.D. 132-135). The flame thus kindled in the dependencies spread later to the mother country. In Palestine a leader started up, professing himself to be the long promised Messiah, and in reference to the prophecy of Balaam styling himself "Bar-cochba," "the Son of the Star." We have the testimony of one who wrote while these scenes of bloodshed were still fresh in men's memories, that the Christians were the chief sufferers from this rebel chieftain.³ Even without such testimony this might have been safely inferred. Their very existence was a protest against his claims: they must be denounced and extirpated, if his pretensions were to be made good. The cause of Bar-cochba was taken up as the cause of the whole Jewish nation, and thus the antagonism between Judaism and Christianity was brought to a head. After a

¹ Euseb. *II. E.* iii. 32, ἐπιλέγει ὡς ἔρα μέχρι τῶν τότε χρόνων παρθένος καθαρὰ καὶ ἀδιάφθορος ἔμεινεν ἡ ἐκκλησία, ἐν ἀδῆλφ που σκότει φωλευόντων εἰσέτι τότε τῶν, εἰ καὶ τινες ὑπῆρχον, παραφθείρειν ἐχειρουντων κ.τ.λ. comp. iv. 22.

² See below, p. 163, note 3.

³ Justin, *Apol.* i. 31, p. 72 E, ἐν τῷ νῦν γεγεννημένῳ Ἰουδαϊκῷ πολέμῳ Βαρχυχέβας ὁ τῆς Ἰουδαίων ἀποστάσεως ἀρχηγέτης Χριστιανοὺς μόνους εἰς τιμωρίας δεινὰς, εἰ μὴ ἀρνοῦντο Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ βλασφημοῦεν, ἐκέλευεν ἀπάγεσθαι.

desperate struggle the rebellion was trampled out, and the severest vengeance taken on the insurgents. The practice of circumcision and the observance of the Sabbath — indeed all the distinguishing marks of Judaism — were visited with the severest penalties. On the other hand, the Christians, as the avowed enemies of the rebel chief, seem to have been favorably received. On the ruins of Jerusalem Hadrian had built his new city Aelia Capitolina. Though no Jew was admitted within sight of its walls, the Christians were allowed to settle there freely.¹ Now for the first time a Gentile bishop was appointed, and the church of Jerusalem ceased to be the church of the circumcision.²

The account of Eusebius seems to imply that long before this disastrous outbreak of the Jews the main part of the Christians had left their retirement in Pella, and returned to their original home. At all events, he traces the succession of bishops of Jerusalem in an unbroken line from James the Lord's brother until the foundation of the new city.³ If so, we must imagine the church once more scattered by this second catastrophe, and once more reformed when the terror was past. But the church of Aelia Capitolina was very differently constituted from the church of Pella or the church of Jerusalem; a large proportion of its members, at least, were Gentiles.⁴ Of the Christians of the circumcision not a few doubtless accepted the conqueror's terms, content to live henceforth as Gentiles, and settled down in the new city of Hadrian. But there were others who clung to the law of their forefathers with a stubborn grasp, which no force of circumstances could loosen; and henceforward we read of two distinct sects of Judaizing Christians, observing the law with equal rigor, but observing it on different grounds.⁵

¹ Justin, *Apol.* i. 47, p. 84 B, *Dial.* 110, p. 337 D; Ariston of Pella in Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 6; Celsus in Orig. *c. Cels.* viii. 69.

² Sulpicius Severus (*H. S.* ii. 31), speaking of Hadrian's decree says: "Quod quidem Christianae fidei proficiebat, quia tum pene omnes Christum Deum sub legis observatione credebant; nimirum id Domino ordinante disposi-

tum, ut legis servitus a libertate fidei atque ecclesiae tolleretur."

³ *H. E.* iii. 32, 35; iv. 5. Eusebius seems to narrate all the incidents affecting the church of the circumcision during this period, as taking place not at Pella, but at Jerusalem.

⁴ Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 6 τῆς αὐτοῦ ἐκκλησίας ἐξ ἐθνῶν συγκροτηθείσης.

⁵ As early as the middle of the second

1. The NAZARENES appear at the close of the fourth century as a small and insignificant sect dwelling beyond the Jordan in Pella and the neighboring places.¹ Indications of their existence, however, occur in Justin two centuries and a half earlier; and both their locality and their name carry us back to the primitive ages of Jewish Christianity. Can we doubt that they were the remnant of the fugitive church, which refused to return from their exile with the majority to the now

century Justin Martyr distinguishes two classes of Judaizers; those who retaining the Mosaic law themselves did not wish to impose it on their Gentile brethren, and those who insisted upon conformity in all Christians alike as a condition of communion and a means of salvation (*Dial. c. Tryph.* § 47; see Schliemann, *Clement.* p. 553 sqq.). In the next chapter Justin alludes with disapprobation to *some* Jewish converts who held that our Lord was a mere man; and it seems not unreasonable to connect this opinion with the second of the two classes before mentioned. We thus obtain a tolerably clear view of their distinctive tenets. But the first direct and definite account of both sects is given by the fathers of the fourth century, especially Epiphanius and Jerome, who distinguish them by the respective names of "Nazarenes" and "Ebionites." Irenaeus (i. 26. 2) Tertullian (*de Praeser.* 33), and Hippolytus (*Haer.* vii. 34, p. 257) contemplate only the second, whom they call Ebionites. The Nazarenes, in fact, being for the most part orthodox in their creed, and holding communion with catholic Christians, would not generally be included in the category of heretics: and, moreover, being few in number and living in an obscure region, they would easily escape notice. Origen (*c. Cels.* v. 61) mentions two classes of Christians who observe the Mosaic law, the one holding with the catholics that Jesus was born of a Virgin, the other, that he was conceived like other men; and both these he calls Ebionites. In

another passage he says, that both classes of Ebionites (Ἐβιωναῖοι ἀποδότριοι) reject St. Paul's Epistles (v. 65). If these two classes correspond to the "Nazarenes" and "Ebionites" of Jerome, Origen's information would seem to be incorrect. On the other hand, it is very possible that he entirely overlooks the Nazarenes, and alludes to some differences of opinion among the Ebionites properly so called; but in this case it is not easy to identify his two classes with the Pharisaic and Essene Ebionites, of whom I shall have to speak later. Eusebius, who also describes two classes of Ebionites (*H. E.* iii. 27), seems to have taken his account wholly from Irenaeus and Origen. If, as appears probable, both names, "Nazarenes" and "Ebionites," were originally applied to the whole body of Jewish Christians indiscriminately, the confusion of Origen and others is easily explained. In recent times, since Gieseler published his treatise *Ueber die Nazaräer und Ebioniten* (Stäudlin. u. Tzschirner, *Archiv. für Kirchengesch.* iv. p. 279 sqq. 1819), the distinction has been generally recognized. A succinct and good account of these sects of Judaizers will be found in Schliemann, *Clement.* p. 449 sqq. where the authorities are given; but the discovery of the work of Hippolytus has since thrown fresh light on the Essene Ebionites. The portion of Ritschl's work (p. 152 sqq.) relating to these sects should be consulted.

¹ Epiphanius. *Haeres.* xxix. 7; comp. Hieron. *de vir. ill.* § 3.

Gentile city, some because they were too indolent, or too satisfied to move, others because the abandonment of the law seemed too heavy a price to pay for Roman forbearance?

The account of their tenets is at all events favorable to this inference.¹ They held themselves bound to the Mosaic ordinances, rejecting, however, all Pharisaic interpretations and additions. Nevertheless, they did not consider the Gentile Christians under the same obligations, or refuse to hold communion with; and in the like spirit—in this distinguished from all other Judaizing sectarians—they fully recognized the work and mission of St. Paul.² It is stated, moreover, that they mourned over the unbelief of their fellow-countrymen, praying for and looking forward to the time when they too should be brought to confess Christ. Their doctrine of the person of Christ has been variously represented; but this seems, at all events, clear that, if it fell short of the catholic standard, it rose above the level of other Judaic sects. The fierce and indiscriminate verdict of Epiphanius, indeed, pronounces these Nazarenes “Jews, and nothing else”:³ but his contemporary Jerome, himself no lenient judge of heresy, whose opinion was founded on personal intercourse, regards them more favorably. In his eyes they seem to be separated from the creeds and usages of catholic Christendom chiefly by their retention of the Mosaic law.

Thus they were distinguished from other Judaizing sects by a loftier conception of the person of Christ, and by a frank recognition of the liberty of the Gentile churches and the commission of the Gentile apostle. These distinguishing features may be traced to the lingering influence of the teaching of the apostles of the circumcision. To the example of these same apostles also they might have appealed in defending their rigid

¹ See the account in Schliemann, p. 445 sqq., with the authorities there given, and compare Ritschl. p. 152 sqq.

² Hieron. *in Is.* ix. 1 (T. iv. p. 130), “Nazaraci hunc locum ita explanare conantur: Adveniente Christo et prædicatione illius coruscante prima terra Zabulon et terra Nephthali scribarum et Phariseorum est erroribus libe-

rata et gravissimum traditionum Judæicarum jugum excussit de cervicibus suis. Postea autem per evangelium apostoli Pauli, qui novissimus apostolorum omnium fuit, ingravata est, id est, multiplicata prædication; et in terminos gentium et viam universi maris Christi evangelium splenduit.”

³ *Hæres.* xxx. 9.

observance of the Mosaic law. But herein, while copying the letter, they did not copy the spirit of their model; for they took no account of altered circumstances.

Of this type of belief, if not of this very Nazarene sect, an early document still extant furnishes an example. The book called the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs"¹ was certainly written after the capture of Jerusalem by Titus, and probably before the rebellion of Bar-cochba, but may be later.² With some alien features, perhaps stamped upon it by the individual writer, it exhibits generally the characteristics of this Nazarene sect. In this respect, at least, it offers a remarkable parallel, that to a strong Israelite feeling it unites the fullest recognition of the Gentile churches. Our Lord is

¹ It is printed in Grabe's *Spicil. SS. Patr.* i. p. 145 sqq. (ed. 2, 1700), and in Fabricius, *Coel. Pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* i. p. 519 sqq. (ed. 2, 1722). Ritschl in his first edition had assigned this work to a writer of the Pauline school. His opinion was controverted by Kayser in the *Strasburg. Beitr. z. den Theol. Wissenschaft.* iii. p. 107 (1851), and with characteristic honesty he withdrew it in his second edition, attributing the work to a Nazarene author (p. 172 sqq.). Meanwhile Ritschl's first view had been adopted in a monograph by Vorstman, *Disquis. de Test. XII. Patr.* (Roterod. 1857), and defended against Kayser. The whole tone and coloring of the book, however, seem to show very plainly that the writer was a Jewish Christian, and the opposite view would probably never have been entertained but for the preconceived theory that a believer of the circumcision could not have written so liberally of the Gentile Christians and so honorably of St. Paul. Some writers, again, who have maintained the Judaic authorship (Kayser, for instance, whose treatise I only know at second hand) have got over this assumed difficulty by rejecting certain passages as interpolations. On the other hand, Ewald pronounces it "mere folly to assert that Benj. c. 11 (the prophecy

about St. Paul) was a later addition to the work" (*Gesch. d. Volkes Isr.* vii. p. 329), and certainly such arbitrary assumptions would render criticism hopeless.

Whether Ritschl is right or not in supposing that the author was actually a Nazarene, it is difficult and not very important to decide. The really important feature in the work is the complexion of the opinions. I do not think, however, that the mere fact of its having been written in Greek proves the author to have been a Hellenist (Ewald, *ib.* p. 333).

² The following dates have been assigned to it by recent critics: A.D. 100-135 (Dorner), 100-120 (Wieseler), 133-163 (Kayser), 100-150 (Nitzsch, Lücke), 117-193 (Gieseler), 100-200 (Hase), about 150 (Reuss), 90-110 (Ewald). These dates, except the last, are taken from Vorstman, p. 19 sqq., who himself places it soon after the fall of Jerusalem (A.D. 70). The frequent references to this event fix the earliest possible date, while the absence of any allusion to the rebellion of Bar-cochba seems to show that it was written before that time. It is directly named by Origen (*Hom. in Jos.* xv. 6), and probably was known to Tertullian (*c. Marc.* v. 1, *Scorpiae* 13).

represented as the renovator of the law;¹ the imagery and illustrations are all Hebrew; certain virtues are strongly commended, and certain vices strongly denounced, by a Hebrew standard; many incidents in the lives of the patriarchs are derived from some unknown legendary Hebrew source.² Nay, more: the sympathies of the writer are not only Judaic, but Levitical. The Messiah is represented as a descendant not of Judah only, but of Levi also. Thus he is High-priest as well as King;³ but his priestly office is higher than his kingly, as Levi is greater than Judah;⁴ the dying patriarchs one after another enjoin obedience to Levi; to the Testament of Levi are consigned the most important prophecies of all; the character of Levi is justified, and partially cleansed of the stain which in the Old Testament narrative attaches to it.⁵ Yet, notwithstanding all this, the admission of the Gentiles into the privileges of the covenant is a constant theme of thanksgiving with the writer, who mourns over the falling away of the Jews, but looks forward to their final restitution. And into the mouth of the dying Benjamin he puts a prophecy foretelling an illustrious descendant, who is to "arise in after days, beloved of the Lord, listening to his voice, enlightening all the Gentiles with new knowledge"; who is to be "in the synagogues of the Gentiles until the completion of the ages, and among their rulers as a musical strain in the mouth of all"; who shall "be written in the holy books, he and his work and his word, and shall be the elect of God forever."⁶

¹ *Levi* 10, ἀνακαινοποιῶντα τὸν νόμον ἐν δυνάμει ὑψίστου. "The law of God," "the law of the Lord," are constant phrases with this writer: *Levi* 13, 19; *Judas* 18, 26; *Issach.* 5; *Zabul.* 10; *Dan* 6; *Gad* 3; *Aser* 2, 6, 7; *Joseph* 11; *Benj.* 10; see also *Nephth.* 8. His language in this respect is formed on the model of the Epistle of St James, as Ewald remarks (p. 329). Thus the law of God with him "is one with the revealed will of God, and he never, therefore, understands it in the narrow sense of a Jew, or even of an Ebionite."

² See Ewald, *Gesch.* i. p. 490.

³ *Simcon* 5, 7; *Issach.* 5; *Dan* 5; *Nephth.* 6, 8; *Gad* 8; *Joseph* 19; besides the passages referred to in the next note.

⁴ *Ruben* 6, πρὸς τὸν Λευὶ ἐγγίσατε αὐτὸς γὰρ εὐλογήσει τὸν Ἰσραὴλ καὶ τὸν Ἰούδαν; *Judas* 21, καὶ νῦν τέκνα μου ἀγαπήσατε τὸν Λευὶ ἐμοὶ γὰρ ἔδωκε Κύριος τὴν βασιλείαν καὶ κέλευσεν τὴν ἱερατείαν καὶ ὑπέταξε τὴν βασιλείαν τῇ ἱερωσύνῃ. ἐμοὶ ἔδωκε τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐν οὐρανοῖς; *ib.* 25, Λευὶ πρῶτος, δεῦτερος ἐγώ; *Nephth.* 5, Λευὶ ἐκράτησε τὸν ἥλιον καὶ Ἰούδας φθάσας ἐπιάσε τὴν σελήνην.

⁵ *Levi* 6, 7.

⁶ *Benj.* 11. Besides this prophecy the

2. But, besides these Nazarenes, there were other Judaizing sects, narrow and uncompromising, to whose principles or prejudices language such as I have just quoted would be most abhorrent.

The EBIONITES were a much larger and more important body than the Nazarenes. They were not confined to the neighborhood of Pella, or even to Palestine and the surrounding countries, but were found in Rome, and probably, also, in all the great centres of the dispersion.¹ Not content with observing the Mosaic ordinances themselves, they maintained that the law was binding on all Christians alike, and regarded Gentile believers as impure because they refused to conform. As a necessary consequence they rejected the authority and the writings of St. Paul, branding him as an apostate, and pursuing his memory with bitter reproaches. In their theology, also, they were far removed from the catholic church, holding our Lord to be a mere man, the son of Joseph and Mary, who was justified, as any of themselves might be justified, by his rigorous performance of the law.²

If the Nazarenes might have claimed some affinity to the apostles of the circumcision, the Ebionites were the direct spiritual descendants of those false brethren, the Judaizers of the apostolic age, who first disturbed the peace of the Antiochene church, and then dogged St. Paul's footsteps from city to city, everywhere thwarting his efforts and undermining his authority. If Ebionism was not primitive Christianity, neither was it a creation of the second century. As an organization, a distinct sect, it first made itself known, we may suppose, in the reign of Trajan; but as a sentiment it had been harbored within the church from the very earliest days. Moderated by

the work presents several coincidences of language with St. Paul (see Vorstman, p. 115 sqq.), and at least one quotation, *Levi* 6, ἐφθασε δὲ ἡ ὀργὴ Κυρίου ἐπ' αὐτοὺς εἰς τέλος, from *1 Thess.* ii. 16. On the whole, however, the language in the moral and didactic portions takes its color from the Epistle of St. James, and in the prophetic and apocalyptic from the Revelation of St. John.

¹ Epiphan. *Haeres.* xxx. 18.

² For the opinions of these Ebionites, see the references in Schliemann, p. 481 sqq., and add Hippol. *Haer.* vii. 34, εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἕτερός τις πεποιήκει τὰ ἐν νόμῳ προστεταγμένα, ἦν ἂν ἐκεῖνος ὁ Χριστός· δύνασθαι δὲ καὶ ἑαυτοὺς ὁμοίως ποιήσαντας Χριστοὺς γενέσθαι· καὶ γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸν ὁμοίως ἄνθρωπον εἶναι πᾶσιν λέγουσιν.

the personal influence of the apostles, soothed by the general practice of their church, not yet forced into declaring themselves by the turn of events, though scarcely tolerant of others, these Judaizers were tolerated for a time themselves. The beginning of the second century was a winnowing season in the church of the circumcision.

The form of Ebionism¹ which is most prominent in early writers, and which I have hitherto had in view, is purely Pharisaic; but we meet also with another type, agreeing with the former up to a certain point, but introducing at the same time a new element, half ascetic, half mystical.

This foreign element was probably due to Essene influences. The doctrines of the Christian school bear so close a resemblance to the characteristic features of the Jewish sect as to place their parentage almost beyond a doubt;² and, moreover, the head-quarters of these heretics—the countries bordering on the Dead Sea—coincide roughly with the head-quarters of their prototype. This view, however, does not exclude the working of other influences more directly Gnostic or Oriental; and as this type of Ebionism seems to have passed through different phases at different times, and, indeed, to have comprehended several species at the same time, such modifications ought probably to be attributed to forces external to Judaism. Having regard, then, to its probable origin, as well as to its typical character, we can hardly do wrong in adopting the name *Essene* or *Gnostic Ebionism*, to distinguish it from the common type, *Pharisaic Ebionism* or *Ebionism Proper*.

If Pharisaic Ebionism was a disease inherent in the church of the circumcision from the first, Essene Ebionism seems to have been a later infection caught by external contact. In

¹ The following opinions were shared by all Ebionites alike: (1) The recognition of Jesus as Messiah; (2) The denial of his divinity; (3) The universal obligation of the law; (4) The rejection and hatred of St. Paul. Their differences consisted in (1) Their view of what constituted the law, and (2) Their conception of the person of Christ; e.g. whether he was born of a virgin or in

the course of nature; what supernatural endowments he had, and at what time they were bestowed on him—whether at his birth or at his baptism, etc.

The Ebionites of earlier writers, as Irenaeus and Hippolytus, belong to the Pharisaic type; while those of Epiphanius are strongly Essene.

² See especially the careful investigation of Ritschl, p. 204 sqq.

the Palestinian church, at all events, we see no symptoms of it during the apostolic age. It is a probable conjecture that, after, the destruction of Jerusalem, the fugitive Christians, living in their retirement in the neighborhood of the Essene settlements, received large accessions to their numbers from this sect, which thus inoculated the church with its peculiar views.¹ It is at least worthy of notice that in a religious work emanating from this school of Ebionites, the "true gospel" is reported to have been first propagated "after the destruction of the holy place."²

This younger form of Judaic Christianity seems soon to have eclipsed the elder. In the account of Ebionism given by Epiphanius the Pharisaic characteristics are almost entirely absorbed in the Essene. This prominence is probably due in some measure to their greater literary capacity, a remarkable feature doubtless derived from the speculative tendencies and studious habits of the Jewish sect³ to which they traced their parentage. Besides the Clementine writings which we possess whole, and the book of Elchasai of which a few fragmentary notices are preserved, a vast number of works which, though no longer extant, have yet moulded the traditions of the early church, emanated from these Christian Essenes. Hence doubtless are derived the ascetic portraits of James the Lord's brother in Hegesippus, and of Matthew the apostle in Clement of Alexandria,⁴ to which the account of St. Peter in the extant Clementines presents a close parallel.⁵

And with greater literary activity they seem also to have united greater missionary zeal. To this spirit of proselytism

¹ Ritschl (p. 223), who adopts this view, suggests that this sect, which had stood aloof from the temple-worship and abhorred sacrifices, would be led to welcome Christ as the true prophet when they saw the fulfilment of his predictions against the temple. In *Clem. Hom.* iii. 15, great stress is laid on the fulfilment of these prophecies; comp. also *Clem. Recogn.* i. 37 (especially in the Syriac).

² *Clem. Hom.* ii. 17, μετὰ καθαίρεσιν

τοῦ ἁγίου τόπου εὐαγγέλιον ἀληθὲς κρύφα διαπεμφθῆναι εἰς ἐπανόρθωσιν τῶν ἐσομένων αἰρέσεων: comp. *Clem. Recogn.* i. 37, 64; iii. 61 (in the Syriac, as below, p. 167, note 3). See also Epiphanius. *Haeres.* xxx. 2.

³ Joseph. *B. J.* ii. 8. 6.

⁴ *Pædag.* ii. 1 (p. 174 Potter), where St. Matthew is said to have lived on seeds, berries, and herbs, abstaining from animal food. See Ritschl, p. 224.

⁵ *Clem. Hom.* xii. 6, comp. viii. 5; xv. 7.

we owe much important information relating to the tenets of the sect.

One of their missionaries early in the third century brought to Rome a sacred book bearing the name of Elchasai or Elxai, whence also the sect were called Elchasaites. This book fell into the hands of Hippolytus, the writer on heresies,¹ from whom our knowledge of it is chiefly derived. It professed to have been obtained from the Seres, a Parthian tribe, and to contain a revelation which had been first made in the third year of Trajan (A.D. 100). These Seres hold the same place in the fictions of Essene Ebionism, as the Hyperboreans in Greek legend: they are a mythical race, perfectly pure and therefore perfectly happy, long-lived, and free from pain, scrupulous in the performance of all ceremonial rites and thus exempt from the penalties attaching to their neglect.² Elchasai, an Aramaic word signifying the "hidden power,"³ seems to be the name of the divine messenger who communicated the revelation, and probably the title of the book itself: Hippolytus understands it of the person who received the revelation, the founder of the sect. "Elchasai," adds this father, "delivered it to a certain person called Sobiai." Here again he was led astray by his ignorance of Aramaic: Sobiai is not the name of an individual but signifies "the sworn members,"⁴ to whom

¹ *Haeres.* ix. 13. See a valuable paper on the Elchasaites by Ritschl in Niedner's *Zeitschrift*, iv. p. 573 sqq. (1853), the substance of which is given also in the second edition of his *Altkatholische Kirche*. Hilgenfeld has recently edited the fragments of the book of Elxai in his *Novum Testamentum extra Canonem Receptum*, fasc. iii. p. 153 sqq. (1866). The use made of it by Epiphanius is investigated by Lipsius, *Quellenkritik des Epiphani.* p. 143 sqq.

² *Chm. Recogn.* viii. 48; ix. 19. Even in classical writers the Seres or Chinese are invested with something of an ideal character: e.g. Plin. vi. 24; Strabo, xv. p. 701; Mela, iii. 7. But in the passage which most strikingly illustrates this fact (*Geogr. Græc. Min.* ii. p. 514, ed.

Müller) the name disappears when the text is correctly read ("se regentes," and not "Serae gentes").

³ חֵלְסַי. Epiphanius correctly explains it *δύναμις κεκαλυμμένη*, *Haeres.* xix. 2. See Ritschl, *l. c.* p. 581, and *Altkath. Kirche*, p. 245. Other explanations of the word, given in Hilgenfeld *l. c.* p. 156, in M. Nicolas, *Évangiles Apocryphes*, p. 108 (1866), and by Geiger, *Zeitsch. der deutsch. morgenl. gesellsch.* xviii. p. 824 (1864), do not recommend themselves. The name is differently written in Greek, *Ηλχασσαι*, *Ελκεσαι*, and *Ηλξαι*. The first, which is most correct, is found in Hippolytus who had seen the book.

⁴ From שְׂבָיָה. Accordingly Hippolytus (ix. 17) relates that the Elchasaite mis-

alone the revelation was to be communicated and who, perhaps, like their Essene prototypes,¹ took an oath to divulge it only to the brotherhood. I need not follow this strange but instructive notice further. Whether this was the sacred book of the whole sect or of a part only, whether the name Elehasaism is co-extensive with Essene Ebionism or not, it is unimportant for my purpose to inquire. The pretended era of this revelation is of more consequence. Whether the book itself was really as early as the reign of Trajan, or whether the date was part of the dramatic fiction, it is impossible to decide.² Even in the latter case, it will still show that according to their own tradition this epoch marked some striking development in the opinions or history of the sect; and the date given corresponds, it will be remembered, very nearly with the epoch mentioned by Hegesippus as the birthtime of a numerous brood of heresies.³

Without attempting to discriminate the different forms of doctrine which this Essene Ebionism comprised in itself—to point out for instance the distinctive features of the book of Elehasai, of the Homilies, and of the Recognitions, respectively—it will be sufficient to observe the broad line of demarcation which separates the Essene from the Pharisaic type.⁴ Laying almost equal stress with the others on the observance of the law as an essential part of Christianity, the Essene Ebionites undertook to settle by arbitrary criticism what the law was. By this capricious process they eliminated from the Old Testament all elements distasteful to them—the doctrine of sacrifices

sionary Alcibiades made a mystery of his teaching, forbidding it to be divulged except to the faithful. Ritschl, *l.c.* p. 589.

¹ Joseph. *B. J.* ii. 8. 7.

² Hilgenfeld (p. xxi.) maintains the early date very positively against Ritschl. Lipsius (*l.c.*) will not pronounce an opinion.

³ See above, p. 153. In the passage there quoted, Hegesippus speaks of these heresies “as living underground, burrowing (*φωλευόντων*)” until the reign of Trajan. This agrees with the statement in the Homilies (ii. 17) already referred to (p. 161, note 2), that the true

gospel (i.e. Essene Ebionism) was first “*secretly* propagated” after the destruction of the temple. The opinions which had thus been progressing stealthily now showed a bold front: but whether the actual organization of the sect or sects took place now or at a still later date (after the rebellion of Bar-cochba), it is impossible to say.

⁴ The chief authorities for the Essene Ebionites are Epiphanius (*Hæc.* xix., xxx.); Hippolytus (*Hæc.* ix. 13–17) and Origen (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 38), whose accounts refer especially to the book of Elehasai; and the Clementine writings.

especially, which was abhorrent to Essene principles — cutting down the law to their own standard, and rejecting the prophets wholly. As a compensation, they introduced certain ritual observances of their own, on which they laid great stress; more especially lustral washings and abstinence from wine and from animal food. In their Christology also they differed widely from the Pharisaic Ebionites, maintaining that the Word or Wisdom of God had been incarnate more than once, and that thus there had been more Christs than one, of whom Adam was the first and Jesus the last. Christianity in fact was regarded by them merely as the restoration of the primeval religion: in other words, of pure Mosaism before it had been corrupted by foreign accretions. Thus equally with the Pharisaic Ebionites they denied the gospel the character of a new covenant; and, as a natural consequence, equally with them, they rejected the authority and reviled the name of St. Paul.¹

If the Pharisaic Ebionites are the direct lineal descendants of the “false brethren” who seduced St. Paul’s Galatian converts from their allegiance, the Essene Ebionites bear a striking family likeness to those other Judaizers against whom he raises his voice as endangering the safety of the church at Colossae.

Of the hostility of these Christian Essenes to St. Paul, as of their other typical features, a striking example is extant in the fictitious writings attributed to the Roman bishop Clement. These are preserved in two forms: the *Homilies*, extant in the Greek, apparently an uniform and original work, which perhaps may be assigned to the middle or latter half of the second century; and the *Recognitions*, a composite production, later than the *Homilies*, founded, it would appear, partly on them and partly on other documents, and known to us through the Latin translation of Ruffinus, who avowedly altered his original with great freedom.²

¹ See Epiphan. *Haer.* xxx. 16, 25; Orig. ap. Euseb. *l. c.* τὸν ἀπόστολον τέλειον ἄθετεῖ; besides the passages in the Clementine writings quoted in the text.

² The only complete editions of the *Homilies* are those of Dressel, *Clementis*

Romani quae feruntur Homiliae Vingt (1853), and of de Lagarde, *Clementina* (1865); the end of the nineteenth and the whole of the twentieth homily having been published for the first time by Dressel. The *Recognitions* which have

In the Homilies Simon Magus is the impersonation of manifold heresy, and as such is refuted and condemned by St. Peter. Among other false teachers, who are covertly denounced in his person, we cannot fail to recognize the lineaments of St. Paul.¹ Thus St. Peter charges his hearers: "Shun any apostle, or teacher, or prophet, who does not first compare his preaching with James called the brother of my Lord, and entrusted with the care of the Church of the Hebrews in Jerusalem, and has not come to you with witnesses;² lest the wickedness, which contended with the Lord forty days, and prevailed not, should afterwards fall upon the earth as lightning from heaven, and send forth a preacher against you, just as he suborned Simon against us, preaching in the name of our Lord and sowing error under the pretence of truth; wherefore he that sent us said, *Many shall come to me in sheep's clothing, but within they are ravening wolves*" (xi. 35). The allusions here to St. Paul's rejection of "commendatory letters" (2 Cor. iii. 1) and to the scene on the way to Damascus (Acts ix. 3) are clear. In another passage St. Peter, after explaining that Christ must

been printed several times may be read most conveniently in Gersdorf's edition (Lips. 1838). A Syriac version lately published by de Lagarde (*Clementis Romani Recognitiones Syriacæ*, Lips. et Lond. 1861) is made up partly of the Recognitions (i., ii., iii., iv.), and partly of the Homilies (x., xi., xii., xiii., xiv., the tenth book being imperfect). The older of the two extant MSS. of this version was actually written A.D. 411, the year after the death of Rufinus; but the errors of transcription, which it exhibits, show that it was taken from an earlier MS. We are thus carried back to a very remote date. The first part, containing the early books of the Recognitions, is extremely valuable, for it enables us to measure the liberties which Rufinus took with his original. An important instance of his arbitrary treatment will be given below, p. 167, note 3. Two abridgments of the Homilies are extant. These have been edited by Dressel, *Clementinorum Epitomæ duæ* (Lips. 1859),

one of them for the first time. Of the many able monographs which have appeared on the relations between the different Clementine writings, the treatise of Uhlhorn, *Die Homilien und Recognitionen*, etc. (Göttingen, 1854), seems to me on the whole the most satisfactory. It is dangerous to express an opinion where able critics are so divided; and the remarks in the text are not hazarded without some hesitation. Baur, Schliemann, Schwegler, and Uhlhorn give the priority to the Homilies, Hilgenfeld and Ritschl to the Recognitions, while Reuss and others decline to pronounce a decided opinion.

¹ See on this subject Schliemann, *Clement.* pp. 96 sqq., 534 sqq.; comp. Stanley's *Corinthians*, p. 366 sqq. (2d ed.).

² Καὶ μετὰ μαρτύρων προσελθυσθότα. It is needless to insert μή with Schliemann and Schwegler: the negative is carried on from the former clause μή πρότερον ἀντιβάλλοντα.

be preceded by Antichrist, the true prophet by the false, and applying this law to the preaching of Simon and himself, adds: "If he had been known (εἰ ἐγινώσκετο) he would not have, been believed, but now being not known (ἄγνοούμενος) he is wrongly believed being death, he has been desired as if he were a saviour and being a deceiver he is heard as if he spake the truth" (ii. 17, 18). The writer seems to be playing with St. Paul's own words, "as deceivers and yet true, as unknown and yet well known, as dying and behold we live" (2 Cor. vi. 8, 9). In a third passage there is a very distinct allusion to the apostle's account of the conflict at Antioch in the Galatian epistle: "If then," says St. Peter to Simon, "our Jesus was made known to thee also and conversed with thee, being seen in a vision, he was angry with thee as an adversary, and therefore he spake with thee by visions and dreams, or even by outward revelations. Can any one be made wise unto doctrine by visions? If thou sayest he can, then why did the Teacher abide and converse with us a whole year when we were awake? And how shall we ever believe thee in this, that he was seen of thee? Nay, how could he have been seen of thee, when thy thoughts are contrary to his teaching? If having been seen and instructed of him for a single hour thou wast made an apostle, then preach his words, expound his teaching, love his apostles, do not fight against me his companion. For thou hast withstood and opposed me (ἐναντίος ἀνθέστηκάς μοι), the firm rock, the foundation of the church. If thou hadst not been an adversary, thou wouldest not have calumniated and reviled my preaching, that I might not be believed when I told what I had heard myself in person from the Lord, as though forsooth I were condemned (καταγνωσθέντος) and thou wert highly regarded.¹ Nay, if thou callest me condemned (κατεγνωσμένον), thou accusest God who revealed Christ to me, and assailest him that called me blessed in my revelation"² (xvii. 19). In this same bitter spirit the writer would rob him

¹ The existing text has καὶ ἐμοῦ ἐνδοκίμου, for which some have proposed to read καὶ μὴ ἐνδοκίμου. It is better perhaps to substitute σοῦ or οὐδαμοῦ for ἐμοῦ, though neither is a neat emenda-

tion. Some change however is absolutely needed.

² τοῦ ἐπὶ ἀποκαλύψει μακαρίσαντός με. The allusion is to Matt. xvi. 17, μακάριος εἶ κ.τ.λ.

of all his missionary triumphs and transfer them to his supposed rival: the apostleship of the Gentiles, according to the Homilies, belongs not to St. Paul but to St. Peter; Barnabas is no more the companion nor Clement the disciple of St. Paul, but of St. Peter.¹

Again in the letter of Peter to James prefixed to the Homilies, emanating from the same school, though perhaps not part of the work itself, and if so, furnishing another example of this bitterness of feeling, St. Peter is made to denounce those Gentile converts who repudiate his lawful preaching, welcoming a certain lawless and foolish doctrine of the enemy (τοῦ ἐχθροῦ ἀνθρώπου ἄνομόν τινα καὶ φλυαρώδη διδασκαλίαν), complaining also that "certain persons attempted by crafty interpretations to wrest his words to the abolishing of the law, pretending that this was his opinion, but that he did not openly preach it," with more to the same effect (§ 2).

In the Recognitions, a later patch-work,² the harsher features of the Essene-Ebionite doctrine, as it appears in the Homilies, are softened down, and these bitter though indirect attacks on St. Paul omitted; whether by the original redactor or by his translator Ruffinus, it is not easy to say.³ Thus in the portions corresponding to, and probably taken from, the Homilies no traces of this hostility remain. But in one passage adopted from another work, probably the "Ascents of James,"⁴ it can

¹ See also other references to St. Paul noted above, p. 66.

² Not much earlier than the beginning of the third century; for a portion of the treatise *de Fato*, discovered of late in a Syriac version, and written either by Bardesanes or by one of his disciples, is worked up in the later books.

³ In one instance at least the change is due to Ruffinus himself. His translation of *Clem. Recogn.* iii. 61 contains a distinct recognition of St. Paul's apostleship, "Nonum (par) omnium gentium et illius qui mittetur seminare verbum inter gentes." (On these *συζυγίαι* of the false and the true, see above, p. 166). But the corresponding passage in the Syriac version (p. 115, l. 20, Lagarde)

is wholly different, and translated back into Greek will run thus; ἡ δὲ ἐννάτη (συζυγία) τοῦ σπέρματος τῶν ζιζανίων καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ πεμπομένου εἰς ἐπιστροφὴν, ὅταν ἐκριζωθῇ τὸ ἅγιον καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐρήμωσιν αὐτοῦ θήσουσι τὸ βδέλυγμα; see Dan. ix. 27, and compare *Clem. Hom.* ii. 17 (quoted above p. 161, note 2). Thus the commendation of St. Paul, which is wholly alien to the spirit of these Clementine writings, disappears.

⁴ Uhlhorn, p. 366. Epiphanius mentions this book, ἀναβαθμοὶ Ἰακώβου, as being in circulation among the Ebionites (xxx. 16). It was so called doubtless as describing the *ascents* of James up the temple stairs, whence he harangued the people. The name and the description

still be discerned, the allusion having either escaped notice or been spared because it was too covert to give offence. It is there related that a certain enemy (*homo quidam inimicus*) raised a tumult against the apostles and with his own hands assaulted James, and threw him down from the steps of the temple, ceasing then to maltreat him, only because he believed him to be dead; and that after this the apostles received secret information from Gamaliel, that this enemy (*inimicus ille homo*) had been sent by Caiaphas on a mission to Damascus to persecute and slay the disciples, and more especially to take Peter who was supposed to have fled thither (i. 70. 71).¹ The original work, from which this portion of the Recognitions seem to have been borrowed, was much more violent and unscrupulous in its attacks on St. Paul; for in the "Ascents of James" Epiphanius read the story, that he was of Gentile parentage, but coming to Jerusalem and wishing to marry the high-priest's daughter, he became a proselyte and was circumcised; then, being disappointed of his hope, he turned round and furiously attacked the Mosaic ordinances (*Haeres.* xxx. 16).

In the earlier part of the third century these Gnostic Ebionites seem to have made some futile efforts to propagate their views. An emissary of the sect, one Alcibiades of Apamea in Syria, appeared in Rome (A.D. 219-223) with the pretended revelation of Elchasai, and (thinking himself the better juggler of the two, says Hippolytus) half succeeded in cajoling the pope Callistus, but was exposed and defeated by the zealous bishop of Portus, who tells the story (*Haeres.* ix. 13-17). Not many years after, another emissary, if it was not this same Alcibiades, appears to have visited Caesarea, where he was confronted and denounced by Origen² (A.D. 247?).

This display of activity might lead to an exaggerated estimate of the influence of these Judaizing sects. It is not

of its contents in Epiphanius alike favor the view that it was the original of this portion of the Recognitions. But if so, the redactor of the Recognitions must have taken the same liberties with it as he has done with the Homilies.

¹ This passage is substantially the

same in the Syriac.

² Euseb. *II. E.* vi. 38. This extract is taken from Origen's Homily on the Eighty-second Psalm, which appears to have been delivered in Caesarea about A.D. 247. See Redepenning, *Origines*, ii. 72.

probable that they left any wide or lasting impression west of Syria. In Palestine itself they would appear to have been confined to certain localities lying for the most part about the Jordan and the Dead Sea. After the reconstitution of the mother church at Aelia Capitolina, the Christianity of Palestine seems to have been for the most part neither Ebionite nor Nazarene. It is a significant fact, implying more than appears at first sight, that in the Paschal controversy, which raged in the middle and later half of the second century, the bishops of Caesarea and Jerusalem, of Tyre and Ptolemais, ranged themselves, not with the churches of Asia Minor, which regulated their Easter festival by the Jewish passover, without regard to the day of the week, but with those of Rome and Alexandria and Gaul, which observed another rule; thus avoiding even the semblance of Judaism.¹ But we have more direct testimony to the main features of Palestinian doctrine about the middle of the second century, in the known opinions of two writers who lived at the time — Justin as representative of the Samaritan, and Hegesippus of the Hebrew, Christianity of their day. The former of these declares himself distinctly against the two characteristic tenets of Ebionism. Against their humanitarian views he expressly argues, maintaining the divinity of Christ.² On the universal obligation of the law he declares, not only that those who maintain this opinion are wrong, but that he himself will hold no communion with them, for he doubts whether they can be saved.³ If, as an apologist for the gospel against Gentile and Jew, he is precluded by the nature of his writings from quoting St. Paul,⁴ whose name would be received by the one with indifference and by the other with hatred, he still shows by his manner of citing and applying the Old Testament, that he is not unfamiliar with this apostle's writings.⁵ The testimony of Hegesippus is still more important, for his extant fragments prove him to have

¹ Euseb. *H. E.* v. 23, 24. See below, *non*, p. 135 sqq.) drawn from the usage of other apologists, Tertullian, for instance, who does not quote even the Gospels in his apology.

² *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 48, p. 267 c; c. 127, p. 357 B.

³ *Dial. c. Tryph.* cc. 47, 48.

⁴ See Mr. Westcott's argument (*Ca-*

⁵ See the Introduction, p. 65, and the notes, pp. 263 and 280, on iii. 28, iv. 27.

been a thorough Hebrew in all his thoughts and feelings. This writer made a journey to Rome, calling on the way at Corinth, among other places. He expresses himself entirely satisfied with the teaching of the churches which he thus visited: "Under each successive bishop," he says, "and in each city, it is so as the law and the prophets and the Lord preach."¹ Was the doctrine of the whole Christian world at this time (A.D. 150) Ebionite, or was the doctrine of Hegesippus catholic? There is no other alternative. We happen to possess information which leaves no doubt as to the true answer. Eusebius speaks of Hegesippus as "having recorded the unerring tradition of the apostolic preaching" (*H. E.* iv. 8), and classes him with Dionysius of Coriath, Melito, Irenaeus, and others, as one of those in whose writings "the orthodoxy of sound faith derived from the apostolic tradition had been handed down."² In this Eusebius could not have been mistaken, for he himself states that Hegesippus "left the *fullest record* of his own opinions in five books of memoirs," which

¹ In Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 22. The extract ends, *γενόμενος δὲ ἐν Ῥώμῃ διαδοχὴν ἐποιήσαμην μέχρις Ἀνικητοῦ οὐ διὰ κοινῶς ἢν Ἐλεούθερος· καὶ παρὰ Ἀνικητοῦ διαδέχεται Σωτήρ, μεθ' ὃν Ἐλεούθερος ἐν ἐκάστῃ δὲ διαδοχῇ καὶ ἐν ἐκάστῃ πόλει οὕτως ἔχει ὡς ὁ νόμος κηρύττει καὶ οἱ προφητῆται καὶ ὁ Κύριος.* If the text be correct, *διαδοχὴν ἐποιήσαμην* must mean "I drew up a list or an account of the successive bishops" (see Pearson in *Routh*, i. p. 268 sqq.); and in this case Hegesippus would seem to be referring to some earlier work or earlier portion of this work, which he now supplements. Possibly, however, the conjectural reading *διατριβήν ἐποιήσαμην*, "I continued to reside," may be correct; but the translation of Rufinus, "permansi inibi (i.e. Romae) donec Aniceto Soter et Soteri succedit Eleutherus," is of little or no weight on this side; for he constantly uses his fluency in Latin to glose over his imperfect knowledge of Greek, and the evasion of a real difficulty is with him the rule rather than the exception.

If we retain *διαδοχήν*, the words of Hegesippus would still seem to imply that he left Rome during the episcopate of Anicetus. Eusebius indeed (*H. E.* iv. 11) infers, apparently from this passage, that he remained there till Eleutherus became bishop; and Jerome (*de vir ill.* 22), as usual, repeats Eusebius. This inference, though intelligible, seems hardly correct; but it shows almost conclusively that Eusebius did not read *διατριβήν*. The early Syriac translator of Eusebius (see above, p. 117, note) certainly read *διαδοχήν*. The dates of the successive bishops, as given by Dean Milman, are, Pius, 143; Anicetus, 157; Soter, 168; Eleutherus, 176 or 177; Victor, 190 (?) ; Zephyrinus, 202 (?) ; Callistus, 219; Urbanus, 223. But there is considerable variation, the accession of Anicetus being placed by some as early as A.D. 150; see the lists in Clinton's *Fasti Romani*, ii. p. 534 sqq.

² *H. E.* iv. 21, *ὡν καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς τῆς ἀποστολικῆς παραδόσεως ἡ τῆς υἱοῦ πίστεως ἔγγραφος κατήλθεν ὀρθοδοξία.*

were in his hands (*H. E.* iv. 22). It is surely a bold effort of recent criticism, in the face of these plain facts, to set down Hegesippus as an Ebionite, and to infer thence that a great part of Christendom was Ebionite also. True, this writer gives a traditional account of St. James, which represents him as a severe and rigorous ascetic; ¹ but between this stern view of life and Ebionite doctrine the interval may be wide enough; and on this showing how many fathers of the church — Jerome and Basil, for instance, in the fourth century, Bernard and Dominic and Francis of Assisi in later ages — must plead guilty of Ebionism. True, he used the Hebrew Gospel; but what authority he attributed to it, or whether it was otherwise than orthodox, does not appear. True, also, he appeals, in a passage already quoted, to the authority of “the law and the prophets and the Lord” ²; but this is a natural equivalent for “the Old and New Testament,” and corresponding expressions would not appear out of place even in our own age. True; lastly, he condemns the use made of the text, “Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard,” etc., ³ as contradicting our Lord’s words,

¹ Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 23. See the account of St. James below.

² See the passage quoted above, p. 170, note 1. For the inferences of the Tübingen school, see Schwegler, *Nachapost. Zeitalter*, i. p. 355; Baur, *Christenthum*, etc. p. 78. A parallel instance will serve the purpose better than much argument. In a recent poem (*Winifrid, afterwards called Boniface*, Camb. 1864) the hero is spoken of as “Printing heaven’s message deeper in his soul, by reading holy writ, Prophet and Law, and fourfold Gospel.” Here, as in Hegesippus, the law is mentioned, and “the apostle” is not. Yet who would say that this passage savors of Ebionism? Compare Irenæus in *Spicil. Solesm.* i. p. 3.

³ The fragment to which I refer is preserved in an extract from Stephanus Gobarus, given in Photius, *Bibl.* 232. After quoting the words τὰ ἡτοιμασμένα τοῖς δικαίοις ἀγαθὰ οὕτε ὀφθαλμοὺς εἶδεν οὕτε οὖς ἤκουσεν οὕτε ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώ-

που ἀνέβη, Stephanus proceeds, Ἡγήσιππος μέντοι, ἀρχαῖός τε ἀνὴρ καὶ ἀποστολικός, ἐν τῷ πέμπτῳ τῶν ὑπομνημάτων, οὐκ οἶδ’ ὅτι καὶ παθὼν, ματὴν μὲν εἰρῆσθαι ταῦτα λέγει καὶ καταψεύδεσθαι τοὺς ταῦτα φαιμένους τῶν τε θείων γραφῶν καὶ τοῦ Κυρίου λέγοντος Μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ὑμῶν κ.τ.λ. It is not surprising that this writer, who lived when Gnosticism had passed out of memory, should be puzzled to “know what had come to Hegesippus”; but modern critics ought not to have gone astray. Hegesippus can hardly be objecting to the passage itself, which is probably a quotation from Isa. lxiv. 4. His objection, therefore, must be to some application of it. But whose application? Even had there been no direct evidence, it might have been gathered from the argument which follows that he referred to the esoteric teaching of the Gnostics; but the lately discovered treatise of Hippolytus establishes the fact that it was a favorite text of these heretics, being introduced

“Blessed are your eyes, for ye see,” etc.; but he is here protesting against its perverted application by the Gnostics, who employed it of the initiated few, and whom elsewhere he severely denounces; and it is a mere accident that the words are quoted also by St. Paul (1 Cor. ii. 9). Many of the facts mentioned point him out as a Hebrew; but not one brands him as an Ebionite. The decisive evidence on the other side is fatal to this inference. If Hegesippus may be taken as a type of the Hebrew church in his day, then the doctrine of that church was catholic.

And if the Palestinian churches of the second century held catholic doctrine, we shall see little or no reason to fix the charge of Ebionism on other communities further removed from the focus of Judaic influences. Here and there, indeed, Judaism seems to have made a desperate struggle, but only to sustain a signal defeat. At Antioch this conflict began earlier, and probably continued longer, than elsewhere; yet the names of her bishops—Ignatius, Theophilus, and Serapion—vouch for the doctrine and practice of the Antiochene church in the second century. In Asia Minor the influence first of St. Paul and then of St. John must have been fatal to the ascendancy of Ebionism. A disproportionate share, indeed, of the faint light which glimmers over the church of the second century is concentrated on this region; and the notices, though occasional and fragmentary, are sufficient to establish this general fact. The same is true with regard to Greece. Similar influences were at work, and with similar results. The churches of Gaul took their color from Asia Minor, which furnished

into the form of initiation; see v. 24, 26, 27 (of Justin the Gnostic), vi. 24 (of Valentinus). This is the opinion of Lechler, p. 463; Ritschl, p. 267; Westcott, *Canon*, pp. 233, 315; Bunsen, *Hippolytus*, i. p. 132 (2d ed.), and Hilgenfeld, *Apost. Väter*, p. 102. Yet Baur (*Christenthum*, p. 77, *Paulus*, p. 221), and Schweigler (i. p. 352), forcing an unnatural meaning on the words, contend that Hegesippus is directly denying St. Paul's claim to a revelation, and as-

serting that this privilege belongs only to those who have seen and heard Christ in the flesh. It is worth noticing that the same quotation, “eye hath not seen,” etc., is found in the Epistle of Clement (c. 34); and this epistle was referred to by Hegesippus, as the notice of Eusebius seems to imply (*H. E.* iv. 22), with approval. This very mention of Clement's epistle is in itself a secondary evidence that Hegesippus recognized the authority of St. Paul.

their greatest teachers; Irenaeus bears witness to the catholicity of their faith. In Alexandria, when at length the curtain rises, Christianity is seen enthroned between Greek philosophy and Gnostic speculation, while Judaism is far in the background. The infancy of the African church is wrapt in hopeless darkness; but when she too emerges from her obscurity, she comes forward in no uncertain attitude, with no deep scars as of a recent conflict, offering neither a mutilated canon nor a dwarfed theology. The African Bible, as it appears in the old Latin version, contains all the books which were received without dispute for two centuries after. The African theology, as represented by Tertullian, in no way falls short of the standard of catholic doctrine maintained in other parts of Christendom.

But the church of the metropolis demands special attention. At Rome, if anywhere, we should expect to see very distinct traces of these successive phenomena, which are supposed to have extended throughout, or almost throughout, the Christian church — first the supremacy of Ebionism — then the conflict of the Judaic with the Pauline gospel — lastly, towards the close of the second century, the triumph of a modified Paulinism and the consequent birth of catholic Christianity.¹ Yet even if this were the history of catholicity at Rome, it would still be an unfounded assumption to extend the phenomenon to other parts of Christendom. Rome had not yet learned to dictate to the church at large. At this early period she appears for the most part unstable and pliant, the easy prey of designing or enthusiastic adventurers in theology, not the originator of a policy and a creed of her own. The prerogative of Christian doctrine and practice rests hitherto with the churches of Antioch and Asia Minor.

But the evidence lends no countenance to the idea that the

¹ The episcopate of Victor (A.D. 190–202?) is fixed by the Tübingen critics (see Schwegler, ii. p. 206 sqq.) as the epoch of the antijudaic revolution in the Roman church. This date follows necessarily from their assumption that Hegesippus was an Ebionite; for his

approval of this church extends to the episcopate of Eleutherus, the immediate predecessor of Victor: see above, p. 170, note 1. They suppose, however, that the current had been setting in this direction some time before.

tendencies of the Roman church during this period were towards Ebionism. Her early history indeed is wrapt in obscurity. If the veil were raised, the spectacle would probably not be very edifying, but there is no reason to imagine that Judaism was her characteristic taint. As late heathen Rome had been the sink of all pagan superstitions, so early Christian Rome was the meeting-point of all heretical creeds and philosophies. If the presence of Simon Magus in the metropolis be not a historical fact, it is still a carrying out of the typical character with which he is invested in early tradition, as the father of heresy. Most of the great heresiarchs—among others Valentinus, Marcion, Praxeas, Theodotus, Sabellius—taught in Rome. Ebionism alone would not be idle, where all other heresies were active. But the great battle with this form of error seems to have been fought out at an early date, in the life-time of the apostles themselves and in the age immediately following.

The last notice of the Roman church in the apostolic writings seems to point to two separate communities, a Judaizing church and a Pauline church. The arrival of the Gentile apostle in the metropolis, it would appear, was the signal for the separation of the Judaizers, who had hitherto associated with their Gentile brethren coldly and distrustfully. The presence of St. Paul must have vastly strengthened the numbers and influence of the more liberal and catholic party; while the Judaizers provoked by rivalry redoubled their efforts, that in making converts to the gospel they might also gain proselytes to the law.¹ Thus “in every way Christ was preached.”

If St. Peter ever visited Rome, it must have been at a later date than these notices. Of this visit, far from improbable in itself, there is fair if not conclusive evidence; and once admitted, we may reasonably assume that important consequences flowed from it. Where all is obscurity, conjecture on one side is fairly answered by conjecture on the other. We may venture therefore to suggest this, as a not unlikely result of the presence of both apostles in Rome. As they had done before in the world at large, so they would agree to do now in the metropolis;

¹ The inferences in the text are drawn iv. 11, “These only (i.e. of the circumcision) are my fellow-workers” etc. from Phil. i. 15-18, compared with Col.

they would exchange the right hand of fellowship, devoting themselves the one more especially to the Jewish, the other to the Gentile converts. Christian Rome was large enough to admit two communities, or two sections in one community, until the time was ripe for their more complete amalgamation. Thus either as separate bodies with separate governments, or as a confederation of distinct interests represented each by their own officers in a common presbytery, we may suppose that the Jewish and Gentile brotherhoods at Rome were organized by the combined action of the two apostles. This fact seems to underlie the tradition that St. Peter and St. Paul were joint founders of the Roman church: and it also explains the discrepancies in the lists of the early bishops, which point to a double succession. At all events the presence of the two apostles must have tended to tone down antipathies and to draw parties closer together. The Judaizers seeing that the apostle of the circumcision, whose name they had venerated at a distance, but whose principles they had hitherto imperfectly understood, was associating on terms of equality with the "hated one," the subverter of the law, would be led to follow his example slowly and suspiciously; and advances on the one side would be met eagerly by advances on the other. Hence, at the close of the first century we see no more traces of a twofold church. The work of the apostles, now withdrawn from the scene, has passed into the hands of no unworthy disciple. The liberal and catholic spirit of Clement eminently fitted him for the task of conciliation; and he appears as the first bishop or presiding elder of the one Roman church. This amalgamation, however, could not be effected without some opposition; the extreme Judaizers must necessarily have been embittered and alienated; and, if a little later we discern traces of Ebionite sectarianism in Rome, this is not only no surprise, but the most natural consequence of a severe but short-lived struggle.

The Epistle to the Corinthians written by Clement in the name of the Roman church cannot well be placed after the close of the first century, and may possibly date some years earlier (A.D. 97). It is not unreasonable to regard this as a

typical document, reflecting the comprehensive principles and large sympathies which had been impressed upon the united church of Rome, in great measure, perhaps, by the influence of the distinguished writer. There is no early Christian writing which combines more fully than this the distinctive features of all the apostolic epistles, now asserting the supremacy of faith with St. Paul, now urging the necessity of works with St. James, at one time echoing the language of St. Peter, at another repeating the very words of the Epistle to the Hebrews.¹ Not without some show of truth, the authority of Clement was claimed in after generations for writings of very different tendencies. Belonging to no party, he seemed to belong to all.

Not many years after this epistle was written, Ignatius, now on his way to martyrdom, addresses a letter to the Roman brethren (A.D. 107 ?). It contains no indications of any division in the church of the metropolis or of the prevalence of Ebionite views among his readers. On the contrary, he lavishes epithets of praise on them in the opening salutation; and throughout the letter there is not the faintest shadow of blame. His only fear is that they may be too kind to him, and deprive him of the honor of martyrdom by their intercessions. To the Ephesians, and even to Polycarp, he offers words of advice and warning; but to the Romans he utters only the language of joyful satisfaction.²

But in a church thus formed we might expect to meet with other and narrower types of doctrine than the Epistle of Clement exhibits. Traditional principles and habits of thought would still linger on, modified indeed, but not wholly transformed, by the predominance of a catholicity, which comprehended all elements in due proportion. One such type is represented by

¹ See Westcott, *History of the Canon*, p. 29 sqq.

² I assume that the Syriac represents the genuine Ignatius. The interpolator of the short Greek recension distinctly acquits the Romans of any participation in heresy; he speaks of them as "united in flesh and spirit with every commandment of Christ, filled with the grace of God inseparably, and strained clear of

every foreign color (*ἀποδιωλισμένοις ἀπὸ παντὸς ἁλλοτρίου χρώματος*).” This interpolator appears in other passages as a stubborn opponent of Judaism, *Magn.* 8, 10; *Philad.* 6. His date seems to be about A.D. 140, as it is fixed by Lipsius *Ueber die Aechtheit*, etc. in *Niedner's Zeitschrift*, i. p. 3 sqq. (1856). If so, his testimony supplies a gap in our knowledge of the Roman church.

an extant work which emanated from the Roman church during the first half of the second century.¹

In its general tone the Shepherd of Hermas (c. A.D. 145) confessedly differs from the Epistle of Clement; but on the other hand, the writer was certainly no Ebionite, as he has been sometimes represented. If he dwells almost exclusively on works, he yet states that the "elect of God will be saved through faith";² if he rarely quotes the New Testament, his references to the Old Testament are still fainter and scantier; if he speaks seldom of our Lord, and never mentions him by name, he yet asserts that the "Son of God was present with his Father in counsel at the founding of creation,"³ and holds that the world is "sustained by him."⁴ Such expressions no Ebionite could have used. Of all the New Testament writings the Shepherd most resembles in tone the Epistle of St. James, whose language it sometimes reflects; but the teaching of St. James appears here in an exaggerated and perverted form. The author lays great stress on works, and so far he copies his model: but his interpretation of works is often formal and ritualistic, and in one passage he even states the doctrine of supererogation.⁵ Whether the tone of this writing is to be ascribed to the traditional feelings of Judaism yet lingering in the church, or to the influence of a Judaic section still tolerated, or to the constitution of the author's own mind, it is impossible to say. The view of Christian ethics here presented deviates considerably, it is true, from St. Paul's teaching; but the deviation is the same in kind and not greater in degree than marks a vast number of mediæval writings, and may in fact

¹ On the date of the Shepherd see p. 322, note 3.

² *Vrs.* iii. 8; comp. *Mand.* viii

³ *Sim.* ix. 12. The whole passage is striking: Πρώτον, φημί, πάντων, κύριε, τοῦτό μοι δῆλωσον· ἡ πέτρα καὶ ἡ πύλη τίς ἐστιν; Ἡ πέτρα, φησὶν, αὕτη καὶ ἡ πύλη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστί. Πῶς, φῆμι, κύριε, ἡ πέτρα παλαιὰ ἐστίν, ἡ δὲ πύλη καινὴ; Ἀκούε, φησί, καὶ σύνοιε, ἀσύνετε. ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ πάσης τῆς κτίσεως αὐτοῦ προγενέστερός ἐστιν, ὥστε σύμβουλον αὐτὸν γένεσθαι τῷ πατρὶ τῆς κτίσεως

αὐτοῦ· διὰ τοῦτο καὶ παλαιός ἐστιν. Ἡ δὲ πύλη διὰ τί καινὴ, φημί, κύριε; Ὅτι, φησὶν, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν τῆς συντελείας φανερός ἐγένετο, διὰ τοῦτο, καινὴ ἐγένετο ἡ πύλη, ἵνα οἱ μέλλοντες σώξωσθαι δι' αὐτῆς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν εἰσέλθωσι τοῦ Θεοῦ.

⁴ *Sim.* ix. 14 τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ μέγα ἐστὶ καὶ ἀχώρητον καὶ τὸν κόσμον ὅλον βαστάζει. On the whole subject see Dorner, *Lehre*, etc. i. p. 186 sqq.; Westcott *Canon*, p. 220 sqq.

⁵ *Sim.* v. 3; comp. *Mand.* iv. 4.

be said to characterize more or less distinctly the whole mediæval church. Thus it affords no ground for the charge of Ebionism. Hermas speaks of law indeed, as St. James speaks of it; yet by law he means not the Mosaic ordinances, but the rule introduced by Christ. On the other hand, his very silence is eloquent. There is not a word in favor of Judaic observances, properly so called, not a word of denunciation, direct or indirect, against either the doctrine or the person of St. Paul or his disciples. In this respect the Shepherd presents a marked contrast to the truly Ebionite work which must be taken next in order.

The Clementine writings have been assigned with great confidence by most recent critics of ability to a Roman authorship.¹ Of the truth of this view I am very far from convinced. The great argument — indeed almost the only argument — in its favor is the fact that the plot of the romance turns upon the wanderings of this illustrious bishop of Rome, who is at once the narrator and the hero of the story. But the fame of Clement reached far beyond the limits of his own jurisdiction. To him, we are specially told by a contemporary writer, was assigned the task of corresponding with foreign churches.² His rank and position, his acknowledged wisdom and piety, would point him out as the best typical representative of the Gentile converts; and an Ebionite writer, designing by a religious fiction to impress his views on Gentile Christendom, would naturally single out Clement for his hero, and by his example enforce the duty of obedience to the church of the circumcision, as the prerogative church and the true standard of orthodoxy. At all events it is to be noticed that, beyond the use made of Clement's name, these writings do not betray any familiarity with or make any reference to the Roman church in particular.³ On the contrary, the scenes are all laid

¹ So for instance Baur, Schliemann, Ritschl, Hilgenfeld: and this view is adopted by Dean Milman, *Latin Christianity*, i. p. 31, who speaks of it as "the unanimous opinion of those, who in later days have critically examined the Clementina." Uhlhorn is almost alone

among recent critics in raising his voice against this general verdict; p. 370 sqq.

² Hermas, I^{rs}. ii. 4 πέμψει οὖν Κλήμης εἰς τὰς ἑξω πόλεις· ἐκεῖνον γὰρ ἐπιτέτραπται.

³ The epistle of Clement to James, prefixed to the work, is an exception;

in the East ; and the supreme arbiter, the ultimate referee in all that relates to Christian doctrine and practice, is not Peter, the Clementine apostle of the Gentiles, the reputed founder of the Roman church, but James the Lord's brother, the bishop of bishops, the ruler of the mother church of the circumcision.

If the Roman origin of these works is more than doubtful, the time of writing also is open to much question. The dates assigned to the Homilies by the ablest critics range over the whole of the second century, and some place them even later. If the Roman authorship be abandoned, many reasons for a very early date will fall to the ground also. Whenever they were written, the Homilies are among the most interesting and important of early Christian writings ; but they have no right to the place assigned them in the system of a modern critical school, as the missing link between the Judaism of the Christian era and the catholicism of the close of the second century, as representing, in fact, the phase of Christianity taught at Rome, and generally throughout the church, during the early ages. The very complexion of the writer's opinions is such that they can hardly have been maintained by any large and important community, at least in the West. Had they presented a purer form of Judaism, founded on the Old Testament scriptures, a more plausible case might have been made out. But the theology of the Clementines does not lie in a direct line between the Old Testament and catholic Christianity ; it deviates equally from the one and the other. In its rejection of half the Mosaic law and much more than half of the Old Testament, and in its doctrine of successive avatars of the Christ, it must have been as repugnant to the religious sentiments of a Jew trained in the school of Hillel, as it could possibly be to a disciple of St. Paul in the first century, or to a catholic Christian in the third. Moreover the tone of the writer is not at all the tone

for it gives an elaborate account of the writer's appointment by St. Peter as his successor. The purpose of this letter, which is to glorify the see of Rome, shows that it was no part of and probably is later than, the Homilies themselves.

If the Homilies had really been written

by a Roman Christian, the slight and incidental mention of St. Peter's sojourn in Rome (i. 16, comp. *Recogn.* i. 74) would have thrown considerable doubt on the fact. But if they emanated from the East, from Syria for instance, no explanation of this silence is needed.

of one who addresses a sympathetic audience. His attacks on St. Paul are covert and indirect ; he makes St. Peter complain that he has been misrepresented and libelled. Altogether there is an air of deprecation and apology in the Homilies. If they were really written by a Roman Christian, they cannot represent the main body of the church, but must have emanated from one of the many heresies with which the metropolis swarmed in the second century, when all promulgators of new doctrine gathered there, as the largest, and therefore the most favorable, market for their spiritual wares.

There is another reason, also, for thinking that this Gnostic Ebionism cannot have obtained any wide or lasting influence in the church of Rome. During the episcopate of Callistus (A.D. 219-223) a heretical teacher appears in the metropolis, promulgating Elchasaite doctrines, substantially, though not identically, the same with the creed of the Clementines, and at first seems likely to attain some measure of success, but is denounced and foiled by Hippolytus. It is clear that this learned writer on heresies regarded the Elchasaite doctrine as a novelty, against which, therefore, it was the more necessary to warn the faithful Christian. If the Ebionism of the Clementines had ever prevailed at Rome, it had passed into oblivion when Hippolytus wrote.

The few notices of the Roman church in the second century point to other than Ebionite leanings. In their ecclesiastical ordinances the Romans seem anxious to separate themselves as widely as possible from Jewish practices. Thus they extended the Friday's fast over the Saturday, showing thereby a marked disregard of the sabbatical festival.¹ Thus, again, they observed Easter on a different day from the Jewish passover ; and so zealous were they in favor of their own traditional usage in this respect, that in the Paschal controversy their bishop Victor resorted to the extreme measure of renouncing communion with those churches which differed from it.² This controversy affords a valuable testimony to the

¹ Tertull. *de Jejun.* 14. See Neander, Euseb. *H. E.* v. 23-25. Polykrates on behalf of the Asiatic churches claimed

² On the Paschal controversy see the sanction of St. John ; and there seems

catholicity of Christianity at Rome in another way. It is clear that the churches ranged on different sides on this question of ritual are nevertheless substantially agreed on all important points of doctrine and practice. This fact appears when Anicetus of Rome permits Polycarp of Smyrna, who had visited the metropolis in order to settle some disputed points, and had failed in arranging the Paschal question, to celebrate the eucharist in his stead. It is distinctly stated by Irenaeus when he remonstrates with Victor for disturbing the peace of the church by insisting on non-essentials.¹ In its creed the Roman church was one with the Gallic and Asiatic churches; and that this creed was not Ebionite the names of Polycarp and Irenaeus are guarantees. Nor is it only in the Paschal controversy that the catholicity of the Romans may be inferred from their intercourse with other Christian communities. The remains of ecclesiastical literature, though sparse and fragmentary, are yet sufficient to reveal a wide network of intercommunication between the churches of the second century; and herein Rome naturally holds a central position. The visit of Hegesippus to the metropolis has been mentioned already. Not very long after, we find Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, whose "orthodoxy" is praised by Eusebius, among other letters addressed to foreign churches, writing also to the Romans in terms of cordial sympathy and respect.² On the catholicity of the African church I have already remarked; and the African church was a daughter of the Roman, from

no reason to doubt the validity of this claim. On the other hand, a different rule had been observed in the Roman church at least as far back as the episcopate of Nystus (about 120-129), and perhaps earlier. It seems probable, then, that the Easter festival had been established independently by the Romans and those who followed the Roman practice. Thus, in the first instance, the difference of usage was no index of Judaic or anti-Judaic leanings; but when once attention was called to its existence, and it became a matter of controversy, the observance of the Christian

anniversary on the same day with the Jewish festival would afford a handle for the charge of Judaism; and where it was a matter of policy or of principle to stand clear of any sympathy with Jewish customs (as, for instance, in Palestine after the collision of the Jews with the Romans), the Roman usage would be adopted in preference to the Asiatic.

¹ In Euseb. *II. E.* v. 24, ἡ διαφωνία τῆς νηστείας τὴν ὁμόνοιαν τῆς πίστεως συνίστησιν, and the whole extract.

² In Euseb. *II. E.* iv. 23.

whom, therefore, it may be assumed she derived her doctrine.¹

The gleams of light which break in upon the internal history of the Roman church at the close of the second and beginning of the third century, exhibit her assailed by rival heresies, compromised by the weakness and worldliness of her rulers, altogether distracted and unsteady, but in no way Ebionite. One bishop, whose name is not given, first dallies with the fanatical spiritualism of Montanus, then, suddenly turning round, surrenders himself to the patripassian speculations of Praxeas.² Later than this two successive bishops, Zephyrinus and Callistus, are stated, — by no friendly critic, indeed, but yet a contemporary writer, — the one from stupidity and avarice, the other from craft and ambition, to have listened favorably to the heresies of Noetus and Sabellius.³ It was at this point in her history that the church of Rome was surprised by the novel doctrines of the Elehasaite teacher, whom I have already mentioned more than once. But no one would maintain that at this late date Ebionism predominated either at Rome or in Christendom generally.

Ebionites, indeed, there were at this time, and very much later. Even at the close of the fourth century they seem to have mustered in considerable numbers in the east of Palestine, and were scattered through the great cities of the empire. But their existence was not prolonged much later. About the middle of the fifth century they had almost disappeared.⁴ They would gradually be absorbed either into the catholic church or into the Jewish synagogue; into the latter, probably, for their attachment to the law seems all along to have been stronger than their attachment to Christ.

¹ Tertull. *de præs.* 36. Cyprian, *Epist.* 48 (ed. Fell.) writing to Cornelius speaks of Rome as “*Ecclesiae catholicae radicem et matricem*,” in reference to the African churches.

² Tertull. *adv. Prax.* i. Tertullian, now a Montanist, writes of Praxeas, who had persuaded this nameless bishop of Rome to revoke his concessions to Montanism, “*Ita duo negotia diaboli Praxeas Romae procuravit, prophetiam*

expulit et haeresim intulit, paraclitum fugavit et patrem crucifixit.” For speculations as to the name of this bishop, see Wordsworth’s *Hippolytus*, pp. 131, 132.

³ Hippol. *Haer.* ix. 7 sqq.

⁴ Theodoret, *Haer. Fab.* ii. 11, mentions the Ebionites and the Elehasaites among those of whom οὐδὲ βραχὺ διέμεινε λείψανον.

Thus, then, a comprehensive survey of the church in the second century seems to reveal a substantial unity of doctrine and a general recognition of Jewish and Gentile apostles alike throughout the greater part of Christendom. At the same time it could hardly happen that the influence of both should be equally felt, or the authority of both estimated alike, in all branches of the church. St. Paul and the twelve had by mutual consent occupied distinct spheres of labor; and this distribution of provinces must necessarily have produced some effect on the subsequent history of the church.¹ The communities founded by St. Paul would collect and preserve the letters of their founder with special care; while the brotherhoods evangelized by the apostles of the circumcision would attribute a superior, if not an exclusive, value to the writings of these "pillars" of the church. It is therefore no great surprise to find that in different writers of the second century, and in different parts of the early church, the Epistles of St. Paul on the one hand,² the Apocalypse of St. John or the letter of St. James on the other, should be seldom or never appealed to as authorities. The equable circulation of all the apostolic writings was necessarily the work of time.

The foregoing account of the conflict of the church with

¹ Gal. ii. 9; see Westcott's *History of the Canon*, p. 84 sqq.

² Westcott, *loc. cit.* "Though he (Papias) was the friend of Polycarp, he nowhere alludes to any of the Pauline writings. It cannot be an accident that he omits all these,—the Epistles of St. Paul, the Gospel of St. Luke, and the Acts of the Apostles,—and these only, of the acknowledged books of the New Testament." At the same time the silence of Eusebius is not conclusive. His account of Polycarp's Epistle (*H. E.* iv. 14) shows how far from exhaustive his statements may be in such cases. He there says that "Polycarp employs some testimonies from the former (first) Epistle of Peter." Though some recent writers have doubted the genuineness of the existing letter ascribed to Polycarp,

it is allowed to be the same to which Eusebius refers; and yet this letter abounds in quotations from the Apostolic writings—more especially the Epistles of St. Paul. The phenomenon exhibited in the *Ancient Syriac Documents* (edited by Cureton, 1864) is remarkable. Though they refer more than once to the Acts of the Apostles (pp. 15, 27, 35) as the work of St. Luke, and as possessing canonical authority, and though they allude incidentally to St. Paul's labors (pp. 35, 61, 62), there is yet no reference to the Epistles of this apostle, where the omission cannot have been accidental (p. 32); and the most important churches founded by him, as Ephesus, Thessalonica, Corinth, etc., are stated to have received "the Apostles' Hand of Priesthood from John the Evangelist" (p. 34).

Judaism has been necessarily imperfect, and in some points conjectural; but it will prepare the way for a more correct estimate of the relations between St. Paul and the leading apostles of the circumcision. We shall be in a position to view these relations no longer as an isolated chapter in history, but in connection with events before and after; and we shall be furnished also with means of estimating the value of later traditional accounts of these first preachers of the gospel.

ST. PAUL himself is so clearly reflected in his own writings that a distorted image of his life and doctrine would seem to be due only to defective vision. Yet our first impressions require to be corrected, or rather supplemented, by an after consideration. Seeing him chiefly as the champion of Gentile liberty, the constant antagonist of Jew and Judaizer, we are apt to forget that his character has another side also. By birth and education he was a Hebrew of the Hebrews, and the traditions and feelings of his race held him in honorable captivity to the very last.

Of this fact the narrative of the Acts affords many striking examples. It exhibits him associating with the apostles of the circumcision on terms of mutual respect and love, celebrating the festivals and observing the rites of his countrymen, everywhere giving the precedence to the Jew over the Gentile.

But the character of the witness has been called in question. This narrative, it is said, is neither contemporary nor trustworthy. It was written long after the events recorded, with the definite purpose of uniting the two parties in the church. Thus the incidents are forged or wrested to subserve the purpose of the writer. It was part of his plan to represent St. Peter and St. Paul as living on friendly terms, in order to reconcile the Petrine and Pauline factions.

The Acts of the Apostles, in the multiplicity and variety of its details, probably affords greater means of testing its general character for truth than any other ancient narrative in existence; and in my opinion it satisfies the tests fully. But this is not the place for such an investigation. Neither shall I start from the assumption that it has any historical value. Taking common ground with those whose views I am con-

sidering, I shall draw my proofs from St. Paul's Epistles alone in the first instance, nor from all of these, but from such only as are allowed even by the extreme critics of the Tübingen school to be genuine—the Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians.¹ It so happens that they are the most important for my purpose. If they contain the severest denunciations of the Judaizers, if they display the most uncompromising antagonism to Judaism, they also exhibit more strongly than any others St. Paul's sympathies with his fellow-countrymen.

These, then, are the facts for which we have St. Paul's direct personal testimony in the epistles allowed by all to be genuine.

(1) *The position of the Jews.* He assigns to them the prerogative over the Gentiles—a prior right to the privileges of the gospel, involving a prior reward if they are accepted and, according to an universal rule in things spiritual, a prior retribution if they are spurned (Rom. i. 16; ii. 9, 10). In the same spirit he declares that the advantage is on the side of the Jew, and that this advantage is “much every way” (Rom. iii. 1, 2). (2) *His affection for his countrymen.* His earnestness and depth of feeling are nowhere more striking than when he is speaking of the Jews: “Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved: for I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge” (Rom. x. 1, 2). Thus, in spite of their present stubborn apostasy, he will not allow that they have been cast away (xi. 1), but looks forward to the time when “all Israel shall be saved” (xi. 26). So strong, indeed, is his language in one passage, that commentators, regarding the letter rather than the spirit of the apostle's prayer, have striven to explain it away by feeble apologies and unnatural interpretations: “I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost,

¹ These four Epistles alone were accepted as genuine by Baur and Schweigler. Hilgenfeld, who may now be regarded as the chief of the Tübingen school, has in this, as in many other points, deserted the extreme position of Baur, whom he calls the “great master.”

He accepts as genuine 1 Thessalonians, Phillippians, and Philemon; thus substituting, as he expresses it, the sacred number seven for the heathen Tetractys of his master. See *Zeitsch. Für wissenschaft. Theol.* v. p. 226 (1862).

that I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart: for I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ (*ἀνάθεμα εἶναι αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ*) for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh" (Rom. ix. 1-3). (3) *His practical care for his countrymen.* The collection of alms for the poor brethren of Judea occupies much of his attention, and suggests messages to various churches (Rom. xv. 25, 26; 1 Cor. xvi. 1-6; 2 Cor. viii., ix.; Gal. ii. 10). It is clear not only that he is very solicitous himself on behalf of the Christians of the circumcision, but that he is anxious also to inspire his Gentile converts with the same interest. (4) *His conformity to Jewish habits and usages.* St. Paul lays down this rule — "to become all things to all men, that he may by all means save some" (1 Cor. ix. 22). This is the key to all seeming inconsistencies in different representations of his conduct. In his epistles we see him chiefly as a Gentile among Gentiles; but this powerful moral weapon has another edge. Applying this maxim, he himself tells us emphatically that "unto the Jews he became as a Jew, that he might gain the Jews; unto them that are under the law as under the law, that he might gain them that are under the law" (ix. 20). The charges of his Judaizing opponents are a witness that he did carry out his maxim in this direction, as in the other. With a semblance of truth they taunt him with inconsistency, urging that in his own practice he had virtually admitted their principles, that, in fact, he had himself preached circumcision.¹ (5) *His reverence for the Old Testament Scriptures.* This is a strongly marked feature in the four epistles which I am considering. They teem with quotations, while there are comparatively few in his remaining letters. For example, metaphor, allegory, argument, confirmation, he draws upon this inexhaustible store. However widely he may have differed from his rabbinical teachers in other respects, he at least did not yield to them in reverence for the "law and the prophets and the psalms."

These facts being borne in mind (and they are indisputable) the portrait of St. Paul in the Acts ought not to present any

¹ See above, p. 34 sq., and notes, pp. 322, 332, 284, 287, on i. 10, ii. 3, v. 2, 11.

difficulties. It records no one fact of the apostle, it attributes no sentiment to him, which is not either covered by some comprehensive maxim, or supported by some practical instance in his acknowledged letters. On the other hand, the tone of the history confessedly differs somewhat from the tone of the epistles. Nor could it possibly have been otherwise. Written in the heat of the conflict, written to confute unscrupulous antagonists and to guard against dangerous errors, St. Paul's language could not give a complete picture of his relations with the apostles and the church of the circumcision. Arguments directed against men, who disparaged his authority by undue exaltation of the twelve, offered the least favorable opportunity of expressing his sympathy with the twelve. Denunciations of Judaizing teachers, who would force their national rites on the Gentile churches, were no fit vehicle for acknowledging his respect for and conformity with those rites. The fairness of this line of argument will be seen by comparing the differences observable in his own epistles. His tone may be said to be graduated according to the temper and character of his hearers. The opposition of the Galatian letter to the Mosaic ritual is stern and uncompromising. It was written to correct a virulent form of Judaism. On the other hand, the remonstrances in the Epistle to the Romans are much more moderate, guarded by constant explanations, and counterpoised by expressions of deep sympathy. Here he was writing to a mixed church of Jews and Gentiles, where there had been no direct opposition to his authority, no violent outbreak of Judaism. If, then, we picture him in his intercourse with his own countrymen at Jerusalem, where the claims of his nation were paramount, and where the cause of Gentile liberty could not be compromised, it seems most natural that he should have spoken and acted as he is represented in the Acts. Luther denouncing the pope for idolatry, and Luther rebuking Carlstadt for iconoclasm writes like two different persons. He bids the timid and gentle Melancthon "sin, and sin boldly"; he would have cut his right hand off sooner than pen such word to the antinomian rioters of Munster. It is not that the man or his principles were changed; but the same words addressed to

persons of opposite tempers would have conveyed a directly opposite meaning.

St. Paul's language, then, when in this epistle he describes his relations with the three, must be interpreted with this caution, that it necessarily exhibits those relations in a partial aspect. The purport of this language, as I understand it, is explained in the notes; and I shall content myself here with gathering up the results.

(1) There is a general recognition of the position and authority of the elder apostles, both in the earlier visit to Jerusalem when he seeks Peter apparently for the purpose of obtaining instruction in the facts of the gospel, staying with him a fortnight, and in the later visit which is undertaken for the purpose, if I may use the phrase, of comparing notes with the other apostles, and obtaining their sanction for the freedom of the Gentile churches. (2) On the other hand, there is an uncompromising resistance to the extravagant and exclusive claims set up on their behalf by the Judaizers. (3) In contrast to these claims, St. Paul's language leaves the impression (though the inference cannot be regarded as certain), that they had not offered a prompt resistance to the Judaizers in the first instance, hoping perhaps to conciliate them, and that the brunt of the contest had been borne by himself and Barnabas. (4) At the same time they are distinctly separated from the policy and principles of the Judaizers, who are termed false brethren, spies in the Christian camp. (5) The apostles of the circumcision find no fault with St. Paul's gospel, and have nothing to add to it. (6) Their recognition of his office is most complete. The language is decisive in two respects: it represents this recognition *first* as thoroughly mutual; and *secondly* as admitting a perfect equality and independent position. (7) At the same time a separate sphere of labor is assigned to each: the one are to preach to the heathen, the other to the circumcision. There is no implication, as some have represented, that the gospel preached to the Gentile would differ from the gospel preached to the Jew. Such an idea is alien to the whole spirit of the passage. Lastly, (8) Notwithstanding their distinct spheres of work, St. Paul is requested by the apostles of the

circumcision to collect the alms of the Gentiles for the poor brethren of Judea, and to this request he responds cordially.

With the exception of the incident at Antioch, which will be considered presently, the Epistle to the Galatians contains nothing more bearing directly on the relations between St. Paul and the apostles of the circumcision. Other special references are found in the Epistles to the Corinthians, but none elsewhere. These notices, slight though they are, accord with the view presented by the Galatian letter. St. Paul, indeed, says more than once that he is "not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles" (τῶν ὑπὲρ λίαν ἀποστόλων, 2 Cor. xi. 5, xii. 11), and there is in the original a slight touch of irony which disappears in the translation; but the irony loses its point unless the exclusive preference of the elder apostles is regarded as an exaggeration of substantial claims. Elsewhere St. Paul speaks of Cephas and the Lord's brethren as exercising an apostolic privilege which belonged also to himself and Barnabas (1 Cor. ix. 5), of Cephas and James as witnesses of the Lord's resurrection like himself (1 Cor. xv. 5, 7). In the last passage he calls himself (with evident reference to the elder apostles, who are mentioned immediately before) "the least of the apostles, who is not worthy to be called an apostle." In rebuking the dissensions at Corinth, he treats the name of Cephas with a delicate courtesy and respect which has almost escaped notice. When he comes to argue the question, he at once drops the name of St. Peter: "While one saith, I am of Paul, and another, I am of Apollos, are ye not carnal? What then is Apollos, and what is Paul?" Apollos was so closely connected with him (see xvi. 12), that he could use his name without fear of misapprehension. But in speaking of Cephas he had to observe more caution: certain persons persisted in regarding St. Peter as the head of a rival party, and therefore he is careful to avoid any seeming depreciation of his brother apostle.

In all this there is nothing inconsistent with the character of St. Paul as drawn in the Acts, nothing certainly which represents him as he was represented by extreme partizans in ancient times, by Ebionites on the one hand, and Marcionites on the other, and as he has been represented of late by a

certain school of critics, in a position of antagonism to the chief apostles of the circumcision. I shall next examine the scriptural notices and traditional representations of these three.

1. The author of the Clementine Homilies makes ST. PETER the mouthpiece of his own Ebionite views. In the prefatory letter of Peter to James, which, though possibly the work of another author, represents the same sentiments, the apostle complains that he has been misrepresented as holding that the law was abolished, but fearing to preach this doctrine openly. "Far be it," he adds; "for to act so is to oppose the law of God which was spoken by Moses, and to which our Lord bare witness that it should abide forever. For thus he said: *Heaven and earth shall pass away: one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law.* And this he said that all things might be fulfilled. Yet these persons professing to give my sentiments (τὸν ἐμὸν νοῦν ἐπαγγελλόμενοι) I know not how, attempt to interpret the words that they have heard from me more cleverly (φρονιμώτερον) than myself who spoke them, telling their pupils that this is my meaning (φρόνημα), though it never once entered into my mind (ὃ ἐγὼ οὐδὲ ἐνεθυμήθην). But if they dare to tell such falsehoods of me while I am still alive, how much more will those who come after me venture to do it when I am gone" (§ 2). It has been held by some modern critics that the words thus put into the apostle's mouth are quite in character; that St. Peter did maintain the perpetuity of the law; and that therefore the traditional account which has pervaded catholic Christendom from the writing of the Acts to the present day, gives an essentially false view of the apostle.

I think the words quoted will strike most readers as betraying a consciousness on the part of the writer that he is treading on hollow and dangerous ground. But without insisting on this, it is important to observe that the sanction of this venerated name was claimed by other sectarians of opposite opinions. Basilides (about A.D. 130), the famous Gnostic teacher, announced that he had been instructed by one Glaucias an "interpreter of St. Peter."¹ An early apocryphal writing,

¹ Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vii. p. 898, Potter.

moreover, which should probably be assigned to the beginning of the second century, and which expressed strong anti-Judaic views,¹ was entitled the "Preaching of Peter." I do not see why these assertions have not as great a claim to a hearing as the opposite statement of the Ebionite writer. They are probably earlier; and in one case, at least, we have more tangible evidence than the irresponsible venture of an anonymous romance writer. The probable inference, however, from such conflicting statements would be, that St. Peter's true position was somewhere between the two extremes.

But we are not to look for trustworthy information from such sources as these. If we wish to learn the apostle's real attitude in the conflict between Jewish and Gentile converts,

¹ On this work, the *κίρυγμα Πέτρου*, see Schwegler, *Nachap. Zeit.* ii. p. 20 sqq. Its opposition to Judaism appears in an extant fragment preserved in Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi p. 730, *μηδὲ κατὰ Ἰουδαίους σέβεσθε ὥστε καὶ ὑμεῖς δόσιως καὶ δικαίως μανθάνοντες & παραδίδομεν ὑμῶν φυλάσσεσθε, καινῶς τὸν Θεὸν διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σεβόμενοι· εὐρομεν γὰρ ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς καθὼς ὁ Κύριος λέγει· Ἰδοὺ διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν καινὴν διαθήκην κ.τ.λ.* The fragments of this work are collected by Grabe, *Spicil.* i. p. 62 sqq. It was made use of by Heraclion the Valentinian, and is quoted more than once, apparently as genuine, by Clement of Alexandria.

The identity of this work with the *Praedicatio Pauli* quoted in the treatise *De Baptismo Haereticorum* printed among Cyprian's works (App. p. 30, Fell) seems to me very doubtful, though maintained by several able critics. The passage there quoted is strangely misinterpreted by Baur (*Christenthum*, p. 53). I give his words, lest I should have misunderstood him: "Auch die kirchliche Sage, welche die Apostel wieder zusammenbrachte, lässt erst am Ende nach einer langen Zeit der Trennung die gegenseitige Anerkennung zu Stande kommen. Post tanta tempora hiess es in der Praedicatio Pauli in der Stelle, welche sich

in der Cyprian's Werken angehängten Schrift de rebaptismate erhalten hat (Cypr. *Opp.* ed. Baluz. s. 365. f.) Petrum et Paulum post conlationem evangelii in Jerusalem et mutuum cogitationem [?] et altercationem et rerum agendarum dispositionem postremo in urbe, quasi tunc primum, invicem sibi esse cognitos," Baur thus treats the comment of the writer as if it were part of the quotation. In this treatise the writer denounces the *Praedicatio Pauli* as maintaining "adulterinum, imo internecinum baptisma"; in order to invalidate its authority, he proceeds to show its thoroughly unhistorical character; and among other instances he alleges the fact, that it makes St. Peter and St. Paul meet in Rome as if for the first time, forgetting all about the congress at Jerusalem, the collision at Antioch, and so forth. Schwegler takes the correct view of the passage, ii. p. 32.

Other early apocryphal works attributed to the chief apostle of the ciriecuncision, are the Gospel, the Acts, and the Apocalypse of Peter; but our information respecting these is too scanty to throw much light on the present question: on the Gospel of Peter, see above, p. 111.

the one fragmentary notice in the Epistle to the Galatians will reveal more than all the distorted and interested accounts of later ages: "But when Cephas came to Antioch I withstood him to the face, for he was condemned [his conduct condemned itself]. For before that certain came from James he did eat with the Gentiles, but when they came he withdrew and separated himself, fearing those of the circumcision: and the rest of the Jews also dissembled with him, so that even Barnabas was carried away with their dissimulation (συναπῆχθη αὐτῶν τῇ ὑποκρίσει). But when I saw that they walked not straight according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Cephas before all, If thou, being born a Jew (Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων), livest after the manner of the Gentiles, and not after the manner of the Jews, how compellest thou the Gentiles to live like the Jews," etc. (ii. 11-14).

Now the point of St. Paul's rebuke is plainly this: that in sanctioning the Jewish feeling which regarded eating with the Gentiles as an unclean thing, St. Peter was *untrue to his principles*, was acting hypocritically and from fear. In the argument which follows, he assumes that it was the normal practice of Peter to live as a Gentile (ἐθνικῶς ζῆς and not ἐθνικῶς ἔξῆς), in other words, to mix freely with the Gentiles, to eat with them, and therefore to disregard the distinction of things clean and unclean; and he argues on the glaring inconsistency and unfairness that Cephas should claim this liberty himself, though not born to it, and yet by hypocritical compliance with the Jews should practically force the ritual law on the Gentiles, and deprive them of a freedom which was their natural right.¹

¹ I do not see how this conclusion can be resisted. According to the Tübingen view of St. Peter's position, his hypocrisy or dissimulation must have consisted not in withdrawing from, but in holding intercourse with the Gentiles; but this is not the view of St. Paul on any natural interpretation of his words; and certainly the Ebionite writer already quoted (p. 190), did not so understand his meaning. Schwegler (i. p. 129) explains συνυπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ "were hypocritical enough to side with him," thus forcing the expression itself, and severing it from

the context; but even then he is obliged to acquit the other Jewish Christians at Antioch of Ebionism. Hilgenfeld (*Galater*, p. 61 sq.) discards Schwegler's interpretation and explains ὑπόκρισις of the self-contradiction, the unconscious inconsistency of Jewish Christian or Ebionite principles; but inconsistency is not dissimulation or hypocrisy, and this interpretation, like the former, loses sight of the context which denounces St. Peter for abandoning a certain line of conduct *from timidity*.

How St. Peter came to hold these liberal principles, so entirely opposed to the narrow traditions of his age and country, is explained by an incident narrated in the Acts. He was at one time as rigid and as scrupulous as the most bigoted of his countrymen: "nothing common or unclean had at any time entered into his mouth" (x. 14. xi. 8). Suddenly a light bursts in upon the darkness of his religious convictions. He is taught by a vision "not to call any man common or unclean" (x. 28). His sudden change scandalizes the Jewish brethren; but he explains, and, for the moment at least, convinces (xi. 18).

And if his normal principles are explained by the narrative of the Acts, his exceptional departure from them is illustrated by his character as it appears in the Gospels. The occasional timidity and weakness of St. Peter will be judged most harshly by those who have never themselves felt the agony of a great moral crisis, when not their own ease and comfort only, which is a small thing, but the spiritual welfare of others seems to clamor for a surrender of their principles. His true nobleness — his fiery zeal and overflowing love and abandoned self-devotion — will be appreciated most fully by spirits which can claim some kindred, however remote, with his spirit.

Thus the fragmentary notices in the Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles of St. Paul, combine to form a harmonious portrait of a character, not consistent, indeed, but — to use Aristotle's significant phrase — consistently inconsistent (*ὁμαλῶς ἀνώμαλον*); and this is a much safer criterion of truth. But there is yet another source of information to be considered — his own letters. If the deficiency of external evidence forbids the use of the second epistle in controversy, the first labors under no such disabilities; for very few of the apostolical writings are better attested.

To this epistle, indeed, it has been objected that it bears too manifest traces of Pauline influence to be the genuine writing of St. Peter. The objection, however, seems to overlook two important considerations. *First*. If we consider the prominent part borne by St. Paul as the chief preacher of Christianity in countries Hellenic by race or by adoption; if

we remember further that his writings were probably the first which clothed the truths of the gospel and the aspirations of the church in the language of Greece: we shall hardly hesitate to allow that he "had a great influence in moulding this language for Christian purposes, and that those who afterwards trod in his footsteps could hardly depart much from the idiom thus moulded."¹ *Secondly*. It is begging the whole question to assume that St. Peter derived nothing from the influence of the apostle of the Gentiles. The one was essentially a character to impress; the other to be impressed. His superior in intellectual culture, in breadth of sympathy, and in knowledge of men, his equal in love and zeal for Christ, St. Paul must have made his influence felt on the frank and enthusiastic temperament of the elder apostle. The weighty spiritual maxims thrown out during the dispute at Antioch, for instance, would sink deep into his heart;² and, taking into account the many occasions when, either by his writings or by personal intercourse, St. Paul's influence would be communicated, we can hardly doubt that the whole effect was great.

But, after all, the epistle bears the stamp of an individual mind, quite independent of this foreign element. The substratum of the thoughts is the writer's own. Its individuality, indeed, appears more in the contemplation of the life and sufferings of Christ, in the view taken of the relations between the believer and the world around, in the realization of the promises made to the chosen people of old, in the pervading sense of a regenerate life, and the reiterated hope of a glorious advent, than in any special development of doctrine; but it would be difficult to give any reason why, prior to experience, we should have expected it to be otherwise.

Altogether, the epistle is anything but Ebionite. Not only is the "law" never once named, but there is no allusion to

¹ Schleiermacher, *Einkl. ins. N. T.* p. 402 sqq.

² See 1 Pet. ii. 24, τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτὸς ἀνήνεγκεν ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον, ἵνα ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἀπογενόμενοι τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ ζήσωμεν. This is the most striking instance which the epistle

exhibits of coincidence with St. Paul's doctrinal teaching (though there are occasionally strong resemblances of language). With it compare Gal. ii. 20, Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι· ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγὼ ζῇ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστὸς κ.τ.λ.

formal ordinances of any kind. The writer, indeed, is essentially an Israelite, but he is an Israelite after a Christian type. When he speaks of the truths of the gospel, he speaks of them through the forms of the older dispensation; he alludes again and again to the ransom of Christ's death, but the image present to his mind is the paschal lamb without spot or blemish; he addresses himself to Gentile converts, but he transfers to them the cherished titles of the covenant race; they are the true "dispersion" (i. 1); they are a "chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people" (ii. 9). The believer in Christ is the Israelite; the unbelieving, the Gentile (ii. 12).

Corresponding to the position of St. Peter as he appears in the apostolic history, this epistle in its language and tone occupies a place midway between the writings of St. James and St. Paul. With St. James it dwells earnestly on the old; with St. Paul it expands to the comprehension of the new. In its denunciation of luxurious wealth, in its commendation of the simple and homely virtues, in its fond reference to past examples in Jewish history for imitation or warning, it recalls the tone of the head of the Hebrew church; in its conception of the grace of God, of the ransom of Christ's death, of the wide purpose of the gospel, it approaches to the language of the apostle of the Gentiles.

With St. Paul, too, the writer links himself by the mention of two names, both Christians of the circumcision, and both companions of the Gentile apostle — Mark, who, having accompanied him on his first missionary tour, after some years of alienation is found by his side once more (Col. iv. 10), and Silvanus, who shared with him the labors and perils of planting the gospel in Europe. Silvanus is the bearer or the amanuensis of St. Peter's letter; Mark joins in the salutations (v. 12, 13).

Thus the churches of the next generation, which were likely to be well informed, delighted to unite the names of the two leading apostles as the greatest teachers of the gospel, the brightest examples of Christian life. At Rome, probably, at Antioch, certainly, both these apostles were personally known.

We have the witness of the one church in Clement; of the other in Ignatius. The former classes them together, as the two "noble ensamples of his own generation." "the greatest and most righteous pillars" of the church, who "for hatred and envy were persecuted even unto death" (§ 5). The latter will not venture to command the Christians of Rome, "as Peter and Paul did; they were apostles, he a convict; they were free, he a slave to that very hour."¹ Clement wrote before the close of the first century, Ignatius at the beginning of the second. It seems probable that both these fathers had conversed with one or other of the two apostles. Besides Antioch and Rome, the names of St. Peter and St. Paul appear together also in connection with the church of Corinth (1 Cor. iii. 22). This church, again, has not withheld her voice, though here the later date of her testimony detracts somewhat from its value.² Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, writing to the Romans during the episcopate of Soter (168-177), claims kindred with them, on the ground that both churches alike had profited by the joint instruction of St. Peter and St. Paul.³

But, though the essential unity of these two apostles is thus recognized by different branches of the catholic church, a disposition to sever them seems early to have manifested itself in some quarters. Even during their own lifetime the religious agitators at Corinth would have placed them, in spite of themselves, at the head of rival parties. And when death had removed all fear of contradiction, extreme partisans boldly claimed the sanction of the one or the other for their own

¹ *Rom.* 4. The words οὐχ ὡς Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος διατάσσομαι ὑμῖν gain force, as addressed to the Romans, if we suppose both apostles to have preached in Rome.

² The language of Clement, however, implicitly contains the testimony of this church at an earlier date; for he assumes the acquiescence of the Corinthians when he mentions both apostles as of equal authority (§§ 5, 47).

³ In Euseb. *II. E.* ii. 25, τὴν ἀπὸ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου φυτεῖαν γενηθεῖσαν Ῥωμαίων τε καὶ Κορινθίων συνεκέρσαστε

καὶ γὰρ ἄμφω καὶ εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν Κόρινθον φοιτήσαντες ἡμᾶς ὁμοίως ἐδίδαξαν, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν ὁμοσε διδάξαντες ἐμαρτύρησαν κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν. All the MSS. and the Syriac version here have φυτεύσαντες; but φοιτήσαντες is read by Georgius Syncellus, and Rufinus has "adventantes"; the sense too seems to require it. In any case, it is hardly a safe inference that Dionysius erroneously supposed the churches of Rome and Corinth to have been *founded* by both apostles jointly.

views. The precursors of the Ebionites misrepresented the Israelite sympathies of St. Peter, as if he had himself striven to put a yoke upon the neck of the Gentiles which neither their fathers nor they were able to bear. The precursors of Marcionism exaggerated the antagonism of St. Paul to the Mosaic ritual, as if he had indeed held the law to be sin, and the commandment neither holy nor just nor good. It seems to have been a subsidiary aim of St. Luke's narrative, which must have been written not many years after the martyrdom of both apostles, to show that this growing tendency was false, and that in their life, as in their death, they were not divided. A rough parallelism between the career of the two reveals itself in the narrative when carefully examined. Recent criticism has laid much stress on this "conciliatory" purpose of the Acts, as if it were fatal to the credit of the narrative. But, denying the inference, we may concede the fact, and the very concession draws its sting. Such a purpose is at least as likely to have been entertained by a writer if the two apostles were essentially united, as if they were not. The truth or falsehood of the account must be determined on other grounds.

2. While St. Peter was claimed as their leader by the Judaizers, no such liberty seems to have been taken with the name of St. JOHN.¹ Long settled in an important Gentile city, surrounded by a numerous school of disciples, still living at the dawn of the second century, he must have secured for his teaching such notoriety as protected it from gross misrepresentation.

His last act recorded in St. Luke's narrative is a visit to the newly founded churches of Samaria, in company with St. Peter

¹ In the portion of the first book of the *Recognitions*, which seems to have been taken from the "*Ascents of James*," the sons of Zebedee are introduced with the rest of the twelve confuting heresies, but the sentiments attributed to them are in no way Ebionite (i. 57). It is this work, perhaps, to which Epiphanius refers (xxx. 23), for his notice does not imply anything more than a casual introduction of St. John's name

in their writings. In another passage Epiphanius attributes to the sons of Zebedee the same ascetic practices which distinguished James the Lord's brother (*Haer.* lxxviii. 13); and this account he perhaps derived from some Essene or Ebionite source. But I do not know that they ever claimed St. John in the same way as they claimed St. Peter and St. James.

(viii. 14). He thus stamps with his approval the first movement of the church in its liberal progress. From the silence both of St. Paul and St. Luke, it may be inferred that he took no very prominent part in the disputes about the Mosaic law. Only at the close of the conferences we find him, together with St. Peter and St. James, recognizing the authority and work of St. Paul, and thus giving another guarantee of his desire to advance the liberties of the church. This is the only passage where he is mentioned in St. Paul's Epistles. Yet it seems probable that, though he did not actually participate in the public discussions, his unseen influence was exerted to promote the result. As in the earliest days of the church, so now we may imagine him ever at St. Peter's side, his faithful colleague and wise counsellor, not forward and demonstrative, but most powerful in private, pouring into the receptive heart of the elder apostle the lessons of his own inward experience, drawn from close personal intercourse and constant spiritual communion with his Lord.

At length the hidden fires of his nature burst out into flame. When St. Peter and St. Paul have ended their labors, the more active career of St. John is just beginning. If it has been their task to organize and extend the church, to remove her barriers, and to advance her liberties, it is his special province to build up and complete her theology. The most probable chronology makes his withdrawal from Palestine to Asia Minor coincide very nearly with the martyrdom of these two apostles, who have guided the church through her first storms and led her to her earliest victories. This epoch divides his life into two distinct periods. Hitherto he has lived as a Jew among Jews; henceforth he will be as a Gentile among Gentiles. The writings of St. John in the canon probably mark the close of each period. The Apocalypse winds up his career in the church of the circumcision; the Gospel and the Epistles are the crowning result of a long residence in the heart of Gentile Christendom.

Both the one and the other contrast strongly with the leading features of the Ebionite doctrine; and this fact alone would deter the Judaizers from claiming the sanction of a name so revered.

Of all the writings of the New Testament the Apocalypse is most thoroughly Jewish in its language and imagery. The whole book is saturated with illustrations from the Old Testament. It speaks not the language of Paul, but of Isaiah and Ezekiel and Daniel. Its tone may be well described by an expression borrowed from the book itself: "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy" (xix. 10). The doctrine of Balaam, the whoredoms of Jezebel, the song of Moses, the Lion of Judah, the key of David, the great river Euphrates, the great city Babylon, Sodom and Egypt, Gog and Magog, these and similar expressions are but the more striking instances of an imagery with which the Apocalypse teems. Nor are the symbols derived solely from the canonical Scriptures: in the picture of the New Jerusalem the inspired apostle has borrowed many touches from the creations of rabbinical fancy. Up to this point the Apocalypse is completely Jewish, and might have been Ebionite. But the same framing serves only to bring out more strongly the contrast between the pictures themselves. The two distinctive features of Ebionism — its mean estimate of the person of Christ and its extravagant exaltation of the Mosaic law — are opposed alike to the spirit and language of St. John. It might have been expected that the beloved disciple, who had leaned on his Master's bosom, would have dwelt with fond preference on the humanity of our Lord; yet in none of the New Testament writings, not even in the Epistles of St. Paul, do we find a more express recognition of his divine power and majesty. He is "the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning (the source) of the creation of God" (iii. 14). "Blessing, honor, glory, and power" are ascribed not "to him that sitteth on the throne" only, but "to the Lamb forever and ever" (v. 13). His name is "the Word of God" (xix. 13). Therefore he claims the titles and attributes of Deity. He declares himself "the Alpha and Omega, the first and last, the beginning and the end" (xxii. 13; i. 11; comp. i. 8). He is "the Lord of lords and the King of kings" (xvii. 14; xix. 16). And so, too, the Ebionite reverence for the law as still binding has no place in the Apocalypse. The word does not occur from

beginning to end, nor is there a single allusion to its ceremonial as an abiding ordinance. The Paschal Lamb, indeed, is ever present to St. John's thought; but with him it signifies not the sacrifice offered in every Jewish home year by year, but the Christ who once "was slain, and hath redeemed us to God by his blood out of every kindred and tongue and people and nation" (vii. 9). All this is very remarkable, since there is every reason to believe that up to this time St. John had in practice observed the Jewish law.¹ To him, however, it was

¹ Certain traditions of St. John's residence at Ephesus, illustrating his relation to the Mosaic law, deserve notice here. They are given by Polykrates, who was himself Bishop of Ephesus (Euseb. *II. E.* v. 24). Writing to pope Victor, probably in the last decade of the second century, he mentions that he "numbers (ἐξέων) sixty-five years in the Lord" (whether he refers to the date of his birth or of his conversion is uncertain, but the former seems more probable), and that he has had seven relations bishops, whose tradition he follows. We are thus carried back to a very early date. The two statements with which we are concerned are these. (1) St. John celebrated the Paschal day on the 14th of the month, coinciding with the Jewish passover. It seems to me, as I have said already (see p. 180), that there is no good ground for questioning this tradition. The institution of such an annual celebration by this apostle derives light from the many references to the Paschal Lamb in the Apocalypse; and in the first instance it would seem most natural to celebrate it on the exact anniversary of the passover. It is more questionable whether the Roman and other churches, whose usage has passed into the law of Christendom, had really the apostolic sanction, which they vaguely asserted, for celebrating it always on the Friday. This usage, if not quite so obvious as the other, was not unnatural, and probably was found much more convenient.

(2) Polykrates says incidentally of St. John that he was "a priest wearing the mitre and a martyr and teacher (ὁς ἐγενήθη ἱερεὺς τὸ πέταλον πεφορεκὼς καὶ μαρτύς καὶ διδάσκαλος)." The reference in the πέταλον is doubtless to the metal plate on the high-priest's mitre (Exod. xxviii. 36, πέταλον χρυσοῦν καθάρων), comp. Protevangel. c. 5, τὸ πέταλον τοῦ ἱερέως; but the meaning of Polykrates is far from clear. He has perhaps mistaken metaphor for matter of fact (see Stanley, *Apostolical Age*, p. 285); in like manner as the name Theophorus assumed by Ignatius gave rise to the later story that he was the child whom our Lord took in his arms and blessed. I think it probable, however, that the words as they stand in Polykrates are intended for a metaphor, since the short fragment which contains them has several figurative expressions almost, if not quite, as violent: e.g. μεγάλα στοιχεῖα κεκοίμηται (where στοιχεῖα means "luminaries," being used of the heavenly bodies); Μελίτωνα τὸν εἰνοῦχον (probably a metaphor, as Ruffinus translates it, "propter regnum, dei eunuchum"; see Matt. xix. 12, and comp. Athenag. *Suppl.* 33); τὸν μικρόν μου ἄνθρωπον ("my insignificance"; comp. Rom. vi. 6, ὁ παλαῖς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος; 2 Cor. iv. 16, ὁ ἔξω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος). The whole passage is a very rude specimen of the florid "Asiatic" style, which even in its higher forms Cicero condemns as suited only to the ears of a people wanting in polish and good taste

only a national custom, and not an universal obligation; only one of the many garbs in which religious worship might clothe itself, and not the essence of religious life. In itself circumcision is nothing, as uncircumcision also is nothing; and therefore he passes it over as if it were not. The distinction between Jew and Gentile has ceased; the middle wall of partition is broken down in Christ. If, preserving the Jewish imagery which pervades the book, he records the sealing of twelve thousand from each tribe of Israel, his range of vision expands at once, and he sees before the throne "a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations and kindreds and peoples and tongues" (vii. 9). If he denounces the errors of heathen speculation, taking up their own watchword, "knowledge (*γνώσις*)," and retorting upon them that they *know* only the depths of Satan" (ii. 24),¹ on the other hand, he condemns in similar language the bigotry of Jewish prejudice, denouncing the blasphemy of those "who say they are Jews, and are not, but are a synagogue of Satan" (ii. 9; comp. iii. 9).

A lapse of more than thirty years spent in the midst of a Gentile population will explain the contrast of language and imagery between the Apocalypse and the later writings of St. John, due allowance being made for the difference of subject.² The language and coloring of the Gospel and Epistles

("minime politae minimeque elegantes," *Orator*, 25), and which is described by another writer as *κομπώδης καὶ φρυαγματίας καὶ κενοῦ γαυριάματος καὶ φιλοτιμίας ἀνωμάλου μεστός*, *Plut. Vit. Anton.* 2; see Bernhardt, *Græch. Litt.* i. p. 465. On the other hand, it is possible—I think not probable—that St. John did wear this decoration as an emblem of his Christian privileges; nor ought this view to cause any offence, as inconsistent with the spirituality of his character. If in Christ the use of external symbols is nothing, the avoidance of them is nothing also. But whether the statement of Polycrates be metaphor or matter of fact, its significance, as in the case of the Paschal celebration, is to be learned

from the apostle's own language in the Apocalypse, where not only is great stress laid on the *priesthood* of the believers generally (i. 6; v. 10; xx. 6), but even the special privileges of the *high-priest* are bestowed on the victorious Christian (Rev. ii. 17, as explained by Züllig, Trench, and others; see Stanley, *l.c.* p. 285). The expression is a striking example of the lingering power, not of Ebionite tenets, but of Hebrew imagery.

¹ See above, p. 147, note 1.

² Owing to the difference of style, many critics have seen only the alternative of denying the apostolic authorship either of the Apocalypse or of the Gospel and Epistles. The considerations urged in the text seem sufficient to meet the

are no longer Hebrew; but so far as a Hebrew mind was capable of the transformation, Greek or rather Greco-Asiatic. The teaching of these latter writings it will be unnecessary to examine; for all, I believe, will allow their general agreement with the theology of St. Paul; and it were a bold criticism which should discover in them any Ebionite tendencies. Only it seems to be often overlooked, that the leading doctrinal ideas which they contain are anticipated in the Apocalypse. The passages which I have quoted from the latter relating to the divinity of Christ are a case in point: not only do they ascribe to our Lord the same majesty and power: but the very title "the Word," with which both the Gospel and the first Epistle open, is found here, though it occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. On the other hand, if the Apocalypse seems to assign a certain prerogative to the Jews, this is expressed equally in the sayings of the Gospel that Christ "came to his own" (i. 11), and that "Salvation is of the Jews" (iv. 22), as it is involved also in St. Paul's maxim, "to the Jew first, and then to the Gentile." It is indeed rather a historical fact than a theological dogma. The difference between the earlier and the later writings of St. John is not in the fundamental conception of the Gospel, but in the subject and treatment and language. The Apocalypse is not Ebionite, unless the Gospel and Epistles are Ebionite also.

3. ST. JAMES occupies a position very different from St. Peter or St. John. If his importance to the brotherhood of Jerusalem was greater than theirs, it was far less to the world at large. In a foregoing essay I have attempted to show that he was not one of the twelve. This result seems to me to have much more than a critical interest. Only when we have learned to regard his office as purely local, shall we appreciate the traditional notices of his life, or estimate truly his position in the conflict between Jewish and Gentile Christians.

A disbeliever in the Lord's mission to the very close of his

difficulties, which are greatly increased if a late date is assigned to the Apocalypse. Writers of the Tübingen school reject the Gospel and Epistles but accept the Apocalypse. This book, alone, if its apostolical authorship is conceded, seems to me to furnish an ample refutation of their peculiar views.

earthly life, he was convinced, it would seem, by the appearance of the risen Jesus.¹ This interposition marked him out for some special work. Among a people who set a high value on advantages of race and blood, the Lord's brother would be more likely to win his way than a teacher who would claim no such connection. In a state of religious feeling where scrupulous attention to outward forms was held to be a condition of favor with God, one who was a strict observer of the law, if not a rigid ascetic, might hope to obtain a hearing which would be denied to men of less austere lives and wider experiences. These considerations would lead to his selection as the ruler of the mother church. The persecution of Herod, which obliged the twelve to seek safety in flight, would naturally be the signal for the appointment of a resident head. At all events it is at this crisis that James appears for the first time with his presbytery in a position though not identical with, yet so far resembling, the "bishop" of later times, that we may without much violence to language give him this title (Acts xii. 17 ; xxi. 18).

As the local representative, then, of the church of the circumcision we must consider him. To one holding this position the law must have worn a very different aspect from that which it wore to St. Peter or St. John or St. Paul. While they were required to become "all things to all men," he was required only to be "a Jew to the Jews." No troublesome questions of conflicting duties, such as entangled St. Peter at Antioch, need perplex him. Under the law he must live and die. His surname of the Just² is a witness to his rigid observance of the Mosaic ritual. A remarkable notice in the Acts shows how he identified himself in all external usages with those "many thousands of Jews which believed and were all zealous of the law" (xxi. 20). And a later tradition, somewhat distorted, indeed, but perhaps in this one point substantially true,

¹ See above, p. 101.

² In the account of Hegesippus, referred to in the following note, *ὁ δίκαιος* "Justus" is used almost as a proper name. Two later bishops of Jerusalem in the early part of the second century

also bear the name "Justus" (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 5), either in memory of their predecessor or in token of their own rigid lives: compare also Acts i. 23 ; xviii. 7 ; Col. iv. 11.

related how by his rigid life and strict integrity he had won the respect of the whole Jewish people.¹

A strict observer of the law he doubtless was; but whether to this he added a rigorous asceticism, may fairly be questioned. The account to which I have just referred, the tradition preserved in Hegesippus, represents him as observing many formalities not enjoined in the Mosaic ritual. "He was holy," says the writer, "from his mother's womb. He drank no wine nor strong drink, neither did he eat flesh. No razor ever touched his head: he did not anoint himself with oil; he did not use the bath. He alone was allowed to enter into the holy place (εἰς τὰ ἅγια). For he wore no wool, but only fine linen. And he would enter into the temple (ναόν) alone, and be found there kneeling on his knees and asking forgiveness for the people, so that his knees grew hard like a camel's knees, because he was ever upon them worshipping God and asking forgiveness for the people." There is much in this account which cannot be true: the assigning to him a privilege which was confined to the high-priest alone, while it is entangled with the rest of the narrative, is plainly false, and can only have been started when a new generation had grown up which knew nothing of the temple services.² Moreover, the account of his testimony and death, which follows, not only contradicts the brief contemporary notice of Josephus,³ but is in itself so

¹ Hegesippus in Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 23.

² It is, perhaps, to be explained like the similar account of St. John; see above, p. 200, note. Compare Stanley, *Apostolical Age*, p. 324. Epiphanius (*Hæc.* lxxviii. 14) makes the same statement of St. James, which Polycrates does of St. John, πέταλον ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐφόρεσε.

³ Josephus (*Antiq.* xx. 9. 1) relates that in the interregnum between the death of Festus and the arrival of Albinus, the high-priest Ananus the younger, who belonged to the sect of the Sadducees (notorious for their severity in judicial matters), considering this a favorable opportunity καθίζει συνέδριον κριτῶν, καὶ παραγαγὼν εἰς αὐτὸ τὸν ἀδελφὸν

Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λεγομένου Χριστοῦ, Ἰάκωβος ὄνομα αὐτῷ, καὶ τινὰς ἑτέρους, ὡς παρανομησάντων κατηγορίαν ποιησάμενος παρέδωκε λευσθησομένους. This notice is wholly irreconcilable with the account of Hegesippus. Yet it is probable in itself (which the account of Hegesippus is not), and is such as Josephus might be expected to write if he alluded to the matter at all. His stolid silence about Christianity elsewhere cannot be owing to ignorance, for a sect which had been singled out years before he wrote as a mark for imperial vengeance at Rome, must have been only too well known in Judea. On the other hand, if the passage had been a Christian interpolation, the notice of James would have

melodramatic and so full of high improbabilities, that it must throw discredit on the whole context.¹

been more laudatory, as is actually the case in the spurious passage of Josephus read by Origen and Eusebius (*H. E.* ii. 23, see above, p. 150, note 2), but not found in existing copies. On these grounds I do not hesitate to prefer the account in Josephus to that of Hegesippus. This is the opinion of Neander (*Planting*, i. p. 367, Eng. Trans.), of Ewald (*Geschichte*, vi. p. 547), and of some few writers besides (so recently Gerlach, *Römische Statthalter*, etc. p. 81, 1865); but the majority take the opposite view.

¹ The account is briefly this. Certain of the seven sects being brought by the preaching of James to confess Christ the whole Jewish people are alarmed. To counteract the spread of the new doctrine, the scribes and Pharisees request James, as a man of acknowledged probity, to "persuade the multitude not to go astray concerning Jesus." In order that he may do this to more effect, on the day of the Passover they place him on the pinnacle (πτερύγιον) of the temple. Instead of denouncing Jesus however, he preaches him. Finding their mistake, the scribes and Pharisees throw him down from the height; and as he is not killed by the fall, they stone him. Finally he is despatched by a fuller's club, praying meanwhile for his murderers. The improbability of the narrative will appear in this outline, but it is much increased by the details. The points of resemblance with the portion of the Recognitions conjectured to be taken from the "Ascents of James" (see above, p. 167) are striking, and recent writers have called attention to these as showing that the narrative of Hegesippus was derived from a similar source (Uhlhorn, *Clement*. p. 367; Ritschl, p. 226 sq.). May we not go a step further and hazard the conjecture that the story of the martyrdom, to which Hegesippus is indebted, was the grand *finale* of these "Ascents," of which the earlier portions

are preserved in the Recognitions? The Recognitions record how James, with the twelve, refuted the Jewish sects; the account of Hegesippus makes the conversion of certain of these sects the starting-point of the persecution which led to his martyrdom. In the Recognitions James is represented ascending the stairs which led up to the temple, and addressing the people from these; in Hegesippus he is placed on the pinnacle of the temple, whence he delivers his testimony. In the Recognitions he is thrown down the flight of steps, and left as dead by his persecutors, but is taken up alive by the brethren; in Hegesippus he is hurled from the still loftier station, and this time his death is made sure. Thus the narrative of Hegesippus seems to preserve the consummation of his testimony and his sufferings, as treated in this romance, the last of a series of "Ascents," the first of these being embodied in the Recognitions.

If Hegesippus, himself no Ebionite, has borrowed these incidents (whether directly or indirectly, we cannot say) from an Ebionite source, he has done no more than Clement of Alexandria did after him (see above, p. 161), than Epiphanius, the scourge of heretics, does repeatedly. The religious romance seems to have been a favorite style of composition with the Essene-Ebionites: and in the lack of authentic information relating to the apostles, catholic writers eagerly and unsuspectingly gathered incidents from writings of which they repudiated the doctrines. It is worthy of notice that though the *Essenes* are named among the sects in Hegesippus, they are not mentioned in the Recognitions; and that, while the Recognitions lay much stress on baptisms and washings (a cardinal doctrine of Essene Ebionism), this feature entirely disappears in the account of James given by Hegesippus.

We are not, therefore, justified in laying much stress on this tradition. It is interesting as a phenomenon, but not trustworthy as a history. Still it is possible that James may have been a Nazarite; may have been a strict ascetic. Such a representation perhaps some will view with impatience, as unworthy an apostle of Christ. But this is unreasonable. Christian devotion does not assume the same outward garb in all persons, and at all times; not the same in James as in Paul; not the same in mediaeval as in protestant Christianity. In James, the Lord's brother, if this account be true, we have the prototype of those later saints, whose rigid life and formal devotion elicits, it may be, only the contempt of the world; but of whom, nevertheless, the world was not and is not worthy.

But to retrace our steps from this slippery path of tradition to firmer ground. The difference of position between St. James and the other apostles appears plainly in the narrative of the so-called apostolic council in the Acts. It is Peter who proposes the emancipation of the Gentile converts from the law; James who suggests the restrictive clauses of the decree. It is Peter who echoes St. Paul's sentiment that Jew and Gentile alike can hope to be saved only "by the grace of the Lord Jesus"; James who speaks of Moses having them that preach him, and being read in the synagogue every Sabbath-day. I cannot but regard this appropriateness of sentiment as a subsidiary proof of the authenticity of these speeches recorded by St. Luke.

And the same distinction extends also to their own writings. St. Peter and St. John, with a larger sphere of action and wider obligations, necessarily took up a neutral position with regard to the law, now carefully observing it at Jerusalem, now relaxing their observance among the Gentile converts. To St. James, on the other hand, mixing only with those to whom the Mosaic ordinances were the rule of life, the word and the thing have a higher importance. The neutrality of the former is reflected in the silence which pervades their writings, where "law" is not once mentioned.¹ The respect

¹ As regards St. John this is true only of the Epistles and the Apocalypse; in the Gospel the law is necessarily mentioned by way of narrative. In 1 John iii. 4 it is said significantly, *ἡ ἀμαρτία ἐστίν ἡ ἀνομία*. In St. Peter neither *νόμος* nor *ἀνομία* occurs.

of the latter appears in his deferential use of the term, which he employs almost as a synonyme for "gospel."¹

But while so using the term "law," he nowhere implies that the Mosaic ritual is identical with or even a necessary part of Christianity. On the contrary, he distinguishes the new dispensation as the perfect law, the law of liberty (i. 25; ii. 12), thus tacitly implying imperfection and bondage in the old. He assumes, indeed, that his readers pay allegiance to the Mosaic law (ii. 9, 10; iv. 11), and he accepts this condition without commenting upon it. But the mere ritual has no value in his eyes. When he refers to the Mosaic law, he refers to its moral, not to its ceremonial ordinances (ii. 8-11). The external service of the religionist who puts no moral restraint on himself, who will not exert himself for others, is pronounced deceitful and vain. The external service, the outward garb, the very ritual, of Christianity is a life of purity and love and self-devotion.² What its true essence, its inmost spirit, may be, the writer does not say, but leaves this to be inferred.

Thus, though with St. Paul the new dispensation is the negation of law, with St. James the perfection of law, the ideas underlying these contradictory forms of expression need not be essentially different. And this leads to the consideration of the language held by both apostles on the subject of faith and works.

The real significance of St. James's language, its true relation to the doctrine of St. Paul, is determined by the view taken of the persons to whom the epistle is addressed. If it is intended to counteract any modification or perversion of St. Paul's teaching, then there is, though not a plain contradiction, yet at all events a considerable divergence in the mode of dealing with the question by the two apostles. I say the mode of dealing with the question, for antinomian inferences from his teaching are rebuked with even greater severity by St. Paul himself, than they are by St. James.³ If, on the other hand,

¹ The words *εὐαγγέλιον*, *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι*, do not occur in St. James.

² James i. 26, 27. Coleridge directs attention to the meaning of *θρησκεία* and the consequent bearing of the text, in a well-known passage in *Aids to Reflection*, Introd. Aphor. 23. For the

signification of *θρησκεία* both in the New Testament and elsewhere, as the "cultus exterior," see Trench, *Synon.* 1st series, § xlviii.

³ e.g. Rom. vi. 15-23; 1 Cor. vi. 9-20; Gal. v. 13 sqq.

the epistle is directed against an arrogant and barren orthodoxy, a Pharisaic self-satisfaction, to which the churches of the circumcision would be most exposed, then the case is considerably altered. The language of the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians at once suggests the former as the true account. But further consideration leads us to question our first rapid inference. Justification and faith seem to have been common terms, Abraham's faith a common example, in the Jewish schools.¹ This fact, if allowed, counteracts the *prima facie* evidence on the other side, and leaves us free to judge from the tenor of the epistle itself. Now, since in this very passage St. James mentions as the object of their vaunted faith, not the fundamental fact of the gospel, "Thou believest that God raised Christ from the dead,"² but the fundamental axiom of the law "Thou believest that God is one:"³ since, moreover, he elsewhere denounces the mere ritualist, telling him that his ritualism is nothing worth; since, lastly, the whole tone of the epistle recalls our Lord's denunciations of the scribes and Pharisees, and seems directed against a kindred spirit,—it is reasonable to conclude that St. James is denouncing not the moral aberrations of the professed disciple of St. Paul (for with such he was not likely to be brought into close contact), but the self-complacent orthodoxy of the Pharisaic Christian, who, satisfied with the possession of a pure monotheism and vaunting his descent from Abraham, needed to be reminded not to neglect the still "weightier matters" of a self-denying love. If this view be correct, the expressions of the two apostles can hardly be compared, for they are speaking, as it were, a different language. But in either case we may acquiesce in the verdict of a recent able writer, more free than most men both from traditional and from reactionary prejudices, that in the teaching of the two apostles "there exists certainly a striking difference in the whole bent of mind, but no opposition of doctrine."⁴

¹ See p. 253.

² Rom. x. 9.

³ ii. 19. *Comp. Clem. Hom. iii. 6*
sqq.

⁴ Bleek (*Eint. in das N. T.* p. 550), who, however, considers that St. James is writing against perversions of St. Paul's teaching.

Thus the representation of St. James in the canonical scriptures differs from its Ebionite counterpart as the true portrait from the caricature. The James of the Clementines could not have acquiesced in the apostolic decree, nor could he have held out the right hand of fellowship to St. Paul. On the other hand, the Ebionite picture was not drawn entirely from imagination. A scrupulous observer of the law, perhaps a rigid ascetic, partly from temper and habit, partly from the requirements of his position, he might, without any very direct or conscious falsification, appear to interested partisans of a later age to represent their own tenets, from which he differed less in the external forms of worship than in the vital principles of religion. Moreover, during his lifetime he was compromised by those with whom his office associated him. In all revolutionary periods, whether of political or religious history, the leaders of the movement have found themselves unable to control the extravagances of their bigoted and short-sighted followers; and this great crisis of all was certainly not exempt from the common rule. St. Paul is constantly checking and rebuking the excesses of those who professed to honor his name and to adopt his teaching. If we cannot state this of St. James with equal confidence, it is because the sources of information are scantier.

Of the Judaizers who are denounced in St. Paul's epistles this much is certain: that they exalted the authority of the apostles of the circumcision; and that, in some instances at least, as members of the mother church, they had direct relations with James the Lord's brother. But when we attempt to define these relations, we are lost in a maze of conjecture.

The Hebrew Christians whose arrival at Antioch caused the rupture between the Jewish and Gentile converts are related to have "come from James" (Gal. ii. 12). Did they bear any commission from him? If so, did it relate to independent matters, or to this very question of eating with the Gentiles? It seems most natural to interpret this notice by the parallel case of the Pharisaic brethren, who had before troubled this same Antiochene church, "going forth" from the apostles, and insisting on circumcision and the observance of the law, though

they "gave them no orders" (Acts xv. 24). But on the least favorable supposition it amounts to this, that St. James, though he had sanctioned the emancipation of the Gentiles from the law, was not prepared to welcome them as Israelites, and admit them, as such, to full communion; that, in fact, he had not yet overcome scruples which even St. Peter had only relinquished after many years and by a special revelation; in this, as in his recognition of Jesus as the Christ, moving more slowly than the twelve.

Turning from Antioch to Galatia, we meet with Judaic teachers who urged circumcision on the Gentile converts, and, as the best means of weakening the authority of St. Paul, asserted for the apostles of the circumcision the exclusive right of dictating to the church. How great an abuse was thus made of the names of the three, I trust the foregoing account has shown. Yet here again, the observance of the law by the apostles of the circumcision, especially by St. James, would furnish a plausible argument to men who were unscrupulous enough to turn the occasional concessions of St. Paul himself to the same account. But we are led to ask, Did these false teachers belong to the mother church? had they any relation with James? is it possible that they had ever been personal disciples of the Lord himself? There are some faint indications that such was the case; and, remembering that there was a Judas among the twelve, we cannot set aside this supposition as impossible.

In Corinth again we meet with false teachers of a similar stamp; whose opinions are less marked, indeed, than those of St. Paul's Galatian antagonists, but whose connection with the mother church is more clearly indicated. It is, doubtless, among those who said "I am of Peter, and I of Christ," among the latter especially, that we are to seek the counterpart of the Galatian Judaizers.¹ To the latter class St. Paul alludes again

¹ Several writers, representing different schools, have agreed in denying the existence of a "Christ party." Possibly the word "party" may be too strong to describe what was rather a sentiment than an organization. But if admissible

at all, I cannot see how, allowing that there were three parties, the existence of the fourth can be questioned. For (1) the four watchwords are co-ordinated, and there is no indication that ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ is to be isolated from the others

in the second epistle. These must have been the men who "trusted to themselves that they were *of Christ*" (x. 7); who invaded another's sphere of labor, and boasted of work which was ready to hand (x. 13-16); who were "false apostles, crafty workers, transforming themselves into apostles of Christ" (xi. 13); who "commended themselves" (x. 12, 18); who vaunted their pure Israelite descent (xi. 21-23). It is noteworthy that this party of extreme Judaizers call themselves by the name not of James, but of Christ. This may, perhaps, be taken as a token that his concession to Gentile liberty had shaken their confidence in his fidelity to the law. The leaders of this extreme party would appear to have seen Christ in the flesh; hence their watchword "I am of Christ"; hence, also, St. Paul's counter-claim that "he was of Christ" also, and his unwilling boast that he had himself had visions and revelations of the Lord in abundance (xii. 1 sqq.). On the other hand, of the party of Cephas no distinct features are preserved; but the passage itself implies that they differed from the extreme Judaizers, and we may, therefore, conjecture that they took up a middle position with regard to the law, similar to that which was occupied later by the Nazarenes. In claiming Cephas as the head of their party they had probably neither more nor less ground than their rivals, who sheltered themselves under the names of Apollos and of Paul.

Is it to these extreme Judaizers that St. Paul alludes when he mentions "certain persons" as "needing letters of recommendation to the Corinthians and of recommendation from them"? (iii. 1) If so, by whom were these letters to Corinth given? By some half-Judaic, half-Christian brotherhood of the dispersion? By the mother church of Jerusalem? By any of the primitive disciples? By James the Lord's brother himself? It is wisest to confess plainly that the facts are too scanty to supply an answer. We may well be content to rest

and differently interpreted. (2) The remonstrance immediately following (*μεμέρισται ὁ Χριστός*;) shows that the name of Christ which ought to be common to all, had been made the badge of a party. (3) In 2 Cor. x. 7, the words *εἰ τις*

πέποιθεν ἑαυτῷ Χριστοῦ εἶναι and the description which follows gain force and definiteness on this supposition. There is, in fact, more evidence for the existence of a party of Christ than there is of a party of Peter.

on the broad and direct statements in the Acts and Epistles, which declare the relations between St. James and St. Paul. A habit of suspicious interpretation, which neglects plain facts and dwells on doubtful allusions, is as unhealthy in theological criticism as in social life, and not more conducive to truth.

Such incidental notices, then, though they throw much light on the practical difficulties and entanglements of his position, reveal nothing, or next to nothing, of the true principles of St. James. Only so long as we picture to ourselves an ideal standard of obedience, where the will of the ruler is the law of the subject, will such notices cause us perplexity. But, whether this be a healthy condition for any society or not, it is very far from representing the state of Christendom in the apostolic ages. If the church had been a religious machine : if the apostles had possessed absolute control over its working ; if the manifold passions of men had been for once annihilated ; if there had been no place for misgiving, prejudice, treachery, hatred, superstition, then the picture would have been very different. But then also the history of the first ages of the gospel would have had no lessons for us. As it is, we may well take courage from the study. However great may be the theological differences and religious animosities of our own time, they are far surpassed in magnitude by the distractions of an age which, closing our eyes to facts, we are apt to invest with an ideal excellence. In the early church was fulfilled, in its inward dissensions, no less than in its outward sufferings, the Master's sad warning, that he came "not to send peace on earth, but a sword."

ΠΡΟΣ ΓΑΛΑΤΑΣ.

Why seek ye the living among the dead?

The old order changeth, yielding place to new,
And God fulfils himself in many ways.

GALATIANS.

ΠΑΥΛΟΣ ἀπόστολος οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου,
ἀλλὰ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἐγείραντος

1-5. The two threads which run through this Epistle—the defence of the apostle's own authority, and the maintenance of the doctrine of grace—are knotted together in the opening salutation. By expanding his official title into a statement of his direct commission from God (ver. 1), St. Paul meets the *personal* attack of his opponents; by dwelling on the work of redemption in connection with the name of Christ (ver. 4), he protests against their *doctrinal* errors. See the Introduction, p. 68.

1. οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου] “*not of men, nor yet by man.*” The first preposition denotes the fountain-head whence the apostle's authority springs, the second, the channel through which it is conveyed. Thus in the first clause he distinguishes himself from the false apostles, who did not derive their commission from God at all; in the second he ranks himself with the twelve, who were commissioned directly from God. The prepositions, therefore, retain their proper sense. Διὰ, as distinguished from ἀπό, is used consistently in the New Testament to denote the *means* or *instrument*, especially as describing either (1) the operations of our Lord, as the Word of God, e.g. 1 Cor. viii. 6 εἰς Κόριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς δι' οἷ τὰ πάντα, or (2) the human agency employed in carrying out the divine purpose, e.g. 1 Cor. iii. 5

διάκονοι δι' ᾧ ἐπιστεύσατε. The change of preposition (“of,” “by”) in this passage carries with it the change of number also (“men,” “man”). Titles and offices which emanate from a body of men will be conferred by their single representative. The acts of the Senate took effect through the prince, those of the Sanhedrin through the high-priest. The transition to the singular, moreover, independently of its own fitness, would suggest itself in anticipation of the clause διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, which was to follow.

ἀλλὰ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ] To what event does the apostle here refer? When did he receive his commission from Christ himself? In 1 Cor. ix. 1, he speaks of his having “seen the Lord Jesus,” as a token of his apostleship; and this seems naturally to refer to the appearance on the way to Damascus, Acts ix. 3 sqq. From this point of time, therefore, his commission dated. It was essentially this revelation of our Lord which set him apart for his high office, though the outward investiture may have taken place, through human agency, at a later date: see Acts ix. 15-17; xiii. 2, 3. The intervention of the prophets and church of Antioch may, perhaps, have given a coloring to the false representation that he was an “apostle of men.” See p. 321.

καὶ Θεοῦ πατρὸς] It might be expected that the first preposition (ἀπό) would

αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, ²καὶ οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ πάντες ἀδελφοί, ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατίας. ³χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ

have been resumed here, as more appropriate. It is incorrect, however, to say that *διὰ* is loosely used; for if there be any laxity of expression, it is rather in the connection of the sentences than in the use of the prepositions. At the same time the apostle's language, as it stands, is more forcible. By including both clauses under the same preposition, he expresses with greater emphasis the *directness* of his divine commission. The channel of his authority (*διὰ*) coincides with its source (*ἀπὸ*). The point of the sentence would have been blunted by inserting *ἀπὸ*. Nor, indeed, is the extension of *διὰ* to the second clause a violation of its strict meaning, which is observed, perhaps, with greater precision in the New Testament than elsewhere, owing to its recognized function, as describing the *mediatorial* office of the Son. *Ἀπὸ* though by far the most common, is not the only preposition which may be used in speaking of the Father. He is the beginning, middle, and end of all his works (*ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτόν*, Rom. xi. 36), and may, therefore, be regarded as the instrument, no less than the source, in the fulfilment of his own purposes. This mode of expression will be adopted, especially, where the writer is speaking of God's manifestation of himself in some special act, as here in the raising of Jesus from the dead. Comp. iv. 7; 1 Cor. i. 9, and see Winer, *Gramm.* § xlvii. p. 379. Marcion (Hieron. *ad l.*) cut the knot by omitting *καὶ Θεοῦ πατρός*, and apparently reading *ἐαυτὸν* for *αὐτόν*.

Here the apostle's words are "By Jesus Christ *and* God the Father:" immediately after he writes "*From* God the Father, *and* our Lord Jesus Christ." The one expression supplements the other: "Thou Father in me, and I in thee" (John xvii. 21).

τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν] "*who*

raised him from the dead." This expression occurs elsewhere with a more general reference to Christian faith or Christian life: Rom. iv. 24; viii. 11; comp. 1 Cor. xv. 15. Here it has a special bearing on St. Paul's apostleship, as the context shows. "I was commissioned by the risen and glorified Lord: I am in all respects an apostle, a qualified witness of his resurrection, and a signal instance of his power."

2. οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ πάντες ἀδελφοί] "*all the brethren who are with me.*" Probably the small band of his fellow-travellers is meant. See Phil. iv. 20, where he distinguishes "the brethren who are with him" from "all the saints," i.e. from the resident members of the church of Rome, from which he is writing. For the bearing of this phrase on the date of the epistle, see p. 61. This company, perhaps, included Timothy (2 Cor. i. 1) and Erastus (Acts xix. 22). He may also at this time have been rejoined by Titus with the two brethren from Corinth (2 Cor. viii. 16-24), and may have had with him besides some of those who accompanied him afterwards on his return to Asia, as Tychicus and Trophimus for instance (Acts xx. 4, 5), if, indeed, they are not to be identified with the two brethren already mentioned.

The patristic writers, followed by several modern commentators, see in this expression a desire on the part of the apostle to fortify his teaching by the sanction of others: "Faciens eis pudorem, quod contra omnes sentiunt," says Victorinus. Such a motive seems alien to the whole spirit of this epistle, in which all human authority is set aside. The apostle in fact dismisses the mention of his companions as rapidly as possible in one general expression. He then returns to the singular, "*I* marvel," which he retains throughout the epistle. Paul's authority has been challenged,

κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ⁴ τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, ὅπως ἐξέλθῃται ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος

4. ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν.

and Paul alone answers the challenge.

ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατίας] “to the churches of Galatia.” On this mode of address, as marking the earlier epistles, see 1 Thess. i. 1. The abruptness of the language here is remarkable. Elsewhere the apostle adds some words of commendation. The church of the Thessalonians, for instance, is “in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ” (1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1); that of the Corinthians is composed of those “sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints” (1 Cor. i. 2; comp. 2 Cor. i. 1). The omission of any expression of praise in addressing the Galatians shows the extent of their apostasy; see p. 69.

3. Χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη, κ. τ. λ.] On this form of salutation, see the notes 1 Thess. i. 1.

4. τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν κ. τ. λ.] “who gave himself for our sins.” A declaration of the true ground of acceptance with God. The Galatians had practically ignored the atoning death of Christ; comp. ii. 21; v. 4.

περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν] The MSS. here, as in several other passages, are divided between *περὶ* and *ὑπὲρ*, though here the balance of authority is, perhaps, in favor of *περὶ*. Generally it may be said that *περὶ* is used of *things*, *ὑπὲρ* of *persons*, as 1 Pet. iii. 18 ὅτι καὶ Χριστὸς ἅπαξ περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπέθανεν δικαίως ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων, but exceptions are very numerous, and in Heb. v. 3 we have *περὶ* ἑαυτοῦ προσφέρειν περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν (not *ὑπὲρ* ἁμαρτιῶν, as some read), thought just before (ver. 1) the expression used is *προσφέρειν ὑπὲρ* ἁμαρτιῶν. Where *περὶ* is used of persons, it is frequently explained by some clause added, e.g. Matt. xxvi. 28, τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. With this compare the parallel passages Luke xxii. 19, 20 (*ὑπὲρ* ὑμῶν), Mark xiv. 24 (*ὑπὲρ* πολλῶν, the correct reading), where

there is no explanatory clause. All this follows from the meaning of the prepositions, *ὑπὲρ* having a sense of “interest in,” which is wanting to *περὶ*. Neither conveys the idea of a vicarious act (*ἀντί*), though such will frequently appear in the context. On *ὑπὲρ* and *περὶ* see Winer, § xlvii. p. 382, and especially Wieseler’s note here.

ἐξέλθῃται] “deliver” strikes the key-note of the epistle. The gospel is a rescue, an emancipation from a state of bondage. See esp. iv. 9, 31; v. 1, 13.

τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος πονηροῦ] the correct reading, in which the detached position of *πονηροῦ* is emphatic; “with all its evils.” Comp. Arist. *Eth. Nic.* i. 13 καὶ γὰρ τὰ γὰθον ἀνθρώπινον ἐξήτοῦμεν καὶ τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν ἀνθρωπίνην, *Polit.* ii. 9 τῶν γ’ ἐδικημάτων ἐκουσίαν τὰ πλεῖστα συμβαίνει κ. τ. λ. The reading of the received text, *τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος αἰῶνος πονηροῦ*, is grammatically simpler, but less forcible.

The author of the Clementines, who was certainly acquainted with this epistle (see p. 66), seems to have St. Paul’s expression in mind, *Epist. Jac.* i. ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος πονηροῦ τὸν ἐσόμενον ἀγαθὸν ὕλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ μνηύσας βασιλεία (where *αἰῶνος* found in some texts after *πονηροῦ* is evidently an interpolation). If so, he appears to have interpreted the words “from the æon, the dominion, of the present evil one;” comp. 1 John v. 19 ὁ κόσμος ὅλος ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ κεῖται: Barnab. § 2. At all events a possible interpretation is thus suggested. Comp. Polyb. xviii. 38. 5 τὸν ἐνεστῶτα βασιλεία.

τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος] The present transitory world, elsewhere ὁ νῦν αἰὼν, e.g. 1 Tim. vi. 17 ὁ αἰὼν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, Eph. ii. 2, and most frequently ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος, e.g. Rom. xii. 2, as opposed to the other world, the world of eternity, ὁ αἰὼν ἐκείνος Luke xx. 35, ὁ αἰὼν ὁ

πονηροῦ κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν, ^δ ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων· ἀμήν.

ἐρχόμενος Luke xviii. 20, αἶὼν μέλλον Heb. vi. 5, and often in the plural, οἱ αἰῶνες οἱ ἐπερχόμενοι Eph. ii. 7, οἱ αἰῶνες τῶν αἰώνων, and οἱ αἰῶνες simply. This age, this world, is under a "god" (2 Cor. iv. 4), or "rulers" (1 Cor. ii. 6) of its own, who are opposed to the Eternal God, the King of the ages, ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν αἰώνων, 1 Tim. i. 17. See especially Eph. ii. 2-7, and comp. Pseudo-Clem. 2 Cor. § 6 ἔστιν δὲ οὗτος ὁ αἶων καὶ ὁ μέλλον δύο ἐχθροί. The apostles speak of themselves and their generation as living on the frontier of two aeons, the gospel transferring them as it were across the border. The distinction of time between the two, which is the primary distinction, becomes lost in the moral and spiritual conception.

It has been proposed to take ἐνεστώς here in the sense of "impending" as referring to the final apostasy. In other passages, however, ἐνεστώτα is plainly "present" as opposed to μέλλοντα "future," Rom. viii. 38; 1 Cor. iii. 22 (comp. Heb. ix. 9), in accordance with the sense it bears in the language of grammar, where ὁ χρόνος ὁ ἐνεστώς is "the present tense." Comp. Philo. *de plant.* No. ii. § 27, p. 346 M τριμεροῦς χρόνου, ὅς εἰς τὸν παρεληλυθότα καὶ ἐνεστώτα καὶ μέλλοντα τέμνεσθαι πέφυκεν. Even in passages where it seems at first sight to have the sense "impending, soon to come," as in 1 Cor. vii. 26 διὰ τὴν ἐνεστώσαν ἀνάγκην, 2 Thess. ii. 2 ἐνέστηκεν ἡ ἡμέρα, its proper meaning is more appropriate.

κατὰ τὸ θέλημα] "by the will of God" and not by our own merits. St. Paul is still insisting on the dispensation of grace impugned by the false teachers. Compare τοῦ καλέσαντος, ver. 6.

τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν.] Comp. Phil. iv. 20. Does ἡμῶν refer to Θεοῦ as well as πατρός, "Our God and Father"? On the whole this seems probable; for

the article, not being necessary before Θεοῦ, seems to be added to bind the two clauses together and connect both with ἡμῶν. The same construction is justified in the case of the similar expression, ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (2 Cor. i. 3; Eph. i. 3), by John xx. 17, "I ascend to my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God." See Fritzsche, Rom. iii. p. 233. In ver. 1 the word "Father" refers especially though not solely to Christ, in ver. 4 to mankind, while in ver. 3 it seems to be used absolutely.

5. Speaking of the mercy of God, as shown in man's redemption through the death of Christ, the apostle bursts out in an ascription of praise. "Infinitis beneficiis infinita gloria debetur," says Pelagius. For similar outbursts of thanksgiving, see Rom. vii. 25; ix. 5; xi. 36; 2 Cor. ix. 15; Eph. iii. 20.

ἡ δόξα] "the glory, which is pre-eminently such, the glory which belongs to him"; comp. John. xvii. 5. The article is almost universally found with δόξα in these doxologies. Contrast with this the absence of the article in Rom. ii. 10; 1 Cor. xi. 15. It is probable, therefore, that we should supply ἔστιν in such cases rather than ἔστω. It is an affirmation rather than a wish. Glory is the essential attribute of God. See 1 Pet. iv. 11 ᾧ ἔστιν ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος, and the doxology added to the Lord's prayer, Matt. vi. 13.

εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων] "for endless ages," opposed to the present finite and transitory age (ver. 4). Comp. Eph. ii. 2, 7, where this opposition is brought out more strongly.

6, 7. An indignant expression of surprise takes the place of the usual thanksgiving for the faith of his converts. This is the sole instance where St. Paul omits to express his thankfulness in addressing any church. See the Introduction, p. 69.

Ἦ Θαναμάζω ὅτι οὕτως ταχέως μετατίθεσθε ἀπὸ τοῦ καλέσαντος ὑμᾶς ἐν χάριτι Χριστοῦ εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον, ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο,

"I marvel that ye are so ready to revolt from God who called you, so reckless in abandoning the dispensation of grace for a different gospel. A different gospel, did I say? Nay, it is not another. There cannot be two gospels. Only certain men are shaking your allegiance, attempting to pervert the gospel of Christ. A vain attempt, for the gospel perverted is no gospel at all."

6. οὕτως ταχέως] "so quickly." If by "so quickly" we understand "so soon," it must mean "so soon after your conversion," as the words following show. For the bearing of this expression on the date of this epistle, see p. 47. It is possible, however, that ταχέως here may signify "readily, rashly," i.e. quickly after the opportunity is offered, a sense which the present tense (μετατίθεσθε) would facilitate. See 1 Tim. v. 22, χεῖρας ταχέως μηδενὶ ἐπιτίθει, 2 Thess. ii. 2, εἰς τὸ μὴ ταχέως σαλευθῆναι. In this case there will be no reference to any independent point of time.

μετατίθεσθε] "are turning renegades"; the middle voice, as may be seen from the passages quoted below. Μετατίθεσθαι is used (1) of desertion or revolt, i.e. of military or political defection, as in Polyb. xxvi. 2, 6, ταχέως καὶ τοὺς πολιτευομένους μεταθέσθαι πρὸς τὴν Ῥωμαίων αἵρεσιν, and frequently (2) of a change in religion, philosophy, or morals, 1 Kings xxi. 25, ὡς μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν Ἰεζάβελ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ; Iambl. *Protrept.* c. 17, μεταθέσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀπλήστως καὶ ἀκολάστως ἔχοντος βίου ἐπὶ τὸν κοσμίως. Dionysius of Heraclea, who from being a Stoic became an Epicurean, was called μεταθέμενος, "turncoat" (ἀντικρυς ἀποδοὺς τὸν τῆς ἀρετῆς χιτῶνα ἀνθινὰ μετημφιάσατο, Athen. vii. p. 281 D). The word is frequently used, however, of "conversion" in a good sense, as in Justin, *Apol.* i. pp. 83 B, 91 D, etc.

τοῦ καλέσαντος ὑμᾶς ἐν χάριτι] "*Him who called you in grace.*" St. Paul here states the distinctive features of the true gospel which the Galatians had set aside: *first*, as regards its *source*, that conversion comes of God ("Him that called you"), and not of themselves; and *secondly*, as regards the *instrument*, that it is a covenant of grace, not of works. For the omission of Θεοῦ, see the note on i. 15.

Χριστοῦ] is generally omitted in the Latin authorities, while some others read Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, and even Θεοῦ. All these may possibly have been glosses to explain τοῦ καλέσαντος. Certainly the passage seems to gain in force by the omission. The implied antithesis between the true gospel of grace and the false gospel of works thus stands out in bolder relief: comp. Eph. ii. 8, τῇ χάριτί ἐστε σέσωσμένοι. It is found, however, in the best MSS., and is supported by such passages as Acts xv. 11, διὰ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ πιστεύομεν σωθῆναι. If retained, it must be taken after χάριτι, and not with τοῦ καλέσαντος as in the Peshito, for ὁ καλέσας in St. Paul's language is always the Father.

6, 7. εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγ. κ.τ.λ.] "*to a second, a different gospel, which is not another.*" This is not an admission in favor of the false teachers, as though they taught the one gospel, however perverted (comp. Phil. i. 15, 18). Such a concession would be quite alien to the spirit of this passage. "It is not another gospel," the apostle says, "for there cannot be two gospels, and as it is not the same, it is no gospel at all." The relative ὃ cannot without harshness be referred to anything else but ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον.

ἕτερον] implies a difference of kind, which is not involved in ἄλλο. The primary distinction between the words

εἰ μὴ τινές εἰσιν οἱ ταρασσόντες ὑμᾶς καὶ θέλοντες μεταστρέψαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ. ὁ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐὰν ἡμεῖς ἢ ἄγγελος ἐξ

appears to be that ἄλλος is another as "one besides," ἕτερος another as "one of two." The fundamental sense of ἕτερος is most clearly marked in its compounds, as ἑτερόφθαλμος, "one-eyed." Thus ἄλλος adds, while ἕτερος distinguishes. Now, when our attention is confined to two objects, we naturally compare and contrast them; hence ἕτερος gets to signify "unlike, opposite," as Xen. *Cyrop.* viii. 3, 8, ἥν μου κατηγορήσης εἰσαῦθις ὅταν διακονῶ, ἐτέρῳ μοι χρήσῃ διακόνῳ, i.e. "changed," where ἄλλος could not stand. In Ex. i. 8, ἀνέστη δὲ βασιλεὺς ἕτερος ἐπ' Αἴγυπτον, it is a translation of מִן הַמִּצְרִי "novus"; and the idea of *difference* is frequently prominent in the word as used in the LXX. Thus, while ἄλλος is generally confined to a negation of identity, ἕτερος sometimes implies the negation of resemblance. See 2 Cor. xi. 4, where the two words are used appropriately, as they are here. In many cases, however, they will be interchangeable: comp. Matt. xi. 3 with Luke vii. 20. Hesychius explains ἕτερον ἄλλον ἢ ἁλλοῖον ἢ ἐν τοῖν δυοῖν ἢ ἀριστερόν, νέον, δεύτερον.

7. εἰ μὴ τινές κ.τ.λ.] "Only in this sense is it another gospel, in that it is an attempt to pervert the one true gospel." Εἰ μὴ seems always to retain, at least in this stage of the language, its proper *exceptive* sense, and is not simply *oppositive*, though it frequently approaches nearly to ἀλλά; see the note on i. 19. Here the following θέλοντες, which is slightly emphatic ("attempting to, though without success"), justifies the exception taken by εἰ μὴ.

Τινές ἔσιν οἱ ταρασσόντες] a somewhat unusual construction for οἱ ταρασσουσιν. It occurs, however, even in classical writers, e.g. Soph. *Oed. Col.* 1023, ἄλλοι γὰρ οἱ σπεύδοντες, Lysias *pro Arist. bon.* § 57, εἰσὶ δὲ τινες οἱ προ-

αναλίσκοντες (the latter passage is quoted with others by Winer, § xviii. p. 109), and more commonly in the New Testament, e.g. Col. ii. 8, βλέπετε μὴ τις ἔσται ὁ συλαγωγῶν; Luke xviii. 9. See the note on iii. 21. For τινές applied by St. Paul to his adversaries, see ii. 12; 1 Cor. iv. 18; 2 Cor. iii. 1; x. 2. Other interpretations of this clause have been proposed, all of which seem to do violence either to the sense or the grammar.

ταράσσοντες] not "troubling your minds," but "raising seditions among you, shaking your allegiance," a continuation of the metaphor of μετατίθεσθε. The phrase ταραττειν τὴν πόλιν is commonly used of factions, e.g. Aristoph. *Eg.* 863. See the note on v. 10.

μεταστρέψαι] properly, "to reverse, to change to the opposite," and so stronger than διαστρέψαι, which is simply κ "distort," "wrench"; comp. Arist. *Met.* i. 15, καὶ τὸ τοῦ Ξενοφάνους μεταστρέψαντα φατέον κ.τ.λ. What was the idea prominent in the apostle's mind when he called this heresy a "reversal" of the gospel may be gathered from iii. 3.

τοῦ Χριστοῦ] On the genitive see the notes on 1 Thess. ii. 2.

8, 9. The difference of moods in these two verses is to be noticed. In the former, a pure hypothesis is put forward, in itself highly improbable (εὐαγγελίζηται); in the latter, a fact which had actually occurred and was occurring (εὐαγγελίζεται).

καὶ ἂν] preserves its proper sense of "etiamsi," as distinguished from ἔαν καὶ "etsi." See Hermann, *Vögel*, p. 832, Jelf, *Gramm.* § 861. In other words, it introduces a highly improbable supposition. With this passage contrast the meaning of ἔαν καὶ as it occurs vi. 1, ἐὰν καὶ προλημφθῇ.

ἡμεῖς] "we." St. Paul seems never

οὐρανοῦ εὐαγγελίζεται [ὑμῖν] παρ' ὃ εὐηγγελισάμεθα ὑμῖν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. ὥς προειρήκαμεν καὶ ἄρτι πάλιν λέγω, εἴ τις ὑμᾶς

to use the plural when speaking of himself alone. Here it would include those who had been his colleagues in preaching to the Galatians, such as Silas and Timothy. The latter especially would be referred to, as he seems to have been with the apostle on both visits to Galatia, and was probably in his company when this letter was written. See the note on i. 2.

ὑμῖν] is doubtful, being found both before and after εὐαγγελίζεται in different texts, and in some omitted entirely.

παρ' ὃ] On the interpretation of these words a controversy on "tradition" has been made to hinge, Protestant writers advocating the sense of "besides" for παρὰ, Roman Catholics that of "contrary to." The context is the best guide to the meaning of the preposition. St. Paul is here asserting the oneness, the integrity of his gospel. It will not brook any rival. It will not suffer any foreign admixture. The idea of "contrariety," therefore, is alien to the general bearing of the passage, though independently of the context the preposition might well have this meaning.

ἀνάθεμα] is the common (Hellenistic), ἀνάθημα the classical (Attic), form. See Lobeck, *Phryg.* pp. 249, 445; *Paralip.* p. 417. But, though originally the same, the two forms gradually diverged in meaning, ἀνάθημα getting to signify "devoted" in a good, and ἀνάθεμα in a bad, sense. See Trench, *N. T. Synon.* 1st ser. § 5; Fritzsche on Rom. ix. 3. This is a common phenomenon in all languages, e.g. in English "cant," "chant," "human," "humane," with other examples given in Trench, *Study of Words*, p. 156; see also M. Müller's *Science of Language*, 2d ser. p. 262 sqq. Such divergences of meaning are generally to be traced to the different sources from which the varying forms

are derived. In the present instance the distinction seems to have arisen from the fact that the sense "an accursed thing" would be derived chiefly through the Hellenist writers of the LXX, the sense "an offering" mostly through classical authors. The distinction of meaning, however, is only general, not universal. Pseudo-Justin, *Quaest. et resp.* 121 (p. 190, Otto), assigns both meanings to Ἀνάθεμα, as Theodoret (on Rom. ix. 3) does to ἀνάθημα. Ἀνάθημα occurs only once in the New Testament, Luke xxi. 5, and there in the sense of "an offering," in accordance with the distinction given above.

It is doubted whether ἀνάθεμα here means "excommunicated" or "accursed," i.e. whether it refers to ecclesiastical censure or spiritual condition. The latter alone seems tenable; for (1) It is the LXX translation of the Hebrew אָרָם, e.g. Josh. vii. 1, 12. This word is used in the Old Testament of a person or thing set apart and devoted to destruction, because hateful to God. Hence in a spiritual application it denotes the state of one who is alienated from God by sin. But, on the other hand, it seems never to signify "excommunicated," a sense which is not found till much later than the Christian era. (2) In no passage is the sense of ecclesiastical censure very appropriate to ἀνάθεμα, ἀναθεματίζειν, where they occur in the New Testament, and in some, as in Rom. ix. 3, 1 Cor. xii. 3, it is obviously excluded. Here, for instance, it is inconsistent with the ἄγγελος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ. In course of time ἀνάθεμα, like the corresponding אָרָם underwent a change of meaning, getting to signify "excommunicated," and this is the common patristic sense of the word. It was not unnatural, therefore, that the fathers should attempt

εὐαγγελίζεται παρ' ὃ παρελάβετε, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. ¹⁰ ἄρτι γὰρ ἀνθρώπους πείθω ἢ τὸν Θεόν; ἢ ζητῶ ἀνθρώποις ἀρέσκειν; εἰ ἔτι ἀνθρώποις ἡρεσκον, Χριστοῦ δοῦλος οὐκ ἂν ἦμην.

to force upon St. Paul the ecclesiastical sense with which they were most familiar, as Theodoret does, for instance, on 1 Cor. xvi. 22, explaining ἀνάθεμα ἔστω by ἀλλότριος ἔστω τοῦ κοινου σώματος τῆς ἐκκλησίας.

9. ὡς προειρήκαμεν] “as we have told you before,” probably on the occasion of his second visit, when he already discerned unhealthy symptoms in the Galatian church. See p. 31. The distinction between the singular (λέγω) where St. Paul is writing in his own person, and the plural (προειρήκαμεν), where he is speaking of the joint labors of himself and his colleagues, is to be observed. See the note on ἡμεῖς, ver. 8.

καὶ ἄρτι πάλιν] “so now again.” ἄρτι here denotes strictly present, as opposed to past time—a late use of the word. See Lobeck, *Phryg.* p. 18 sqq.

πάλιν] “again,” is not to be referred, as it is taken by some, to the preceding verse, in the sense, “I repeat what I have just said.” Against this interpretation two objections lie: (1) St. Paul in that case would have used the singular προείρηκα (which, indeed, is found in some texts), as throughout the epistle he writes in his own person alone; and (2) the words καὶ ἄρτι mark some greater distinction of time than this interpretation would allow.

ὡς εὐαγγελίζεται] In classical writers this verb takes only a dative of the person; in later Greek it has indifferently a dative or an accusative. See Lobeck, *Phryg.* p. 266 sqq. and Ellicott on 1 Thess. iii. 6.

10. “Let him be accursed, I say. What, does my boldness startle you? Is *this*, I ask, the language of a time-server? Will any say *now* that, careless of winning the favor of God, I seek to conciliate men, to ingratiate myself with men? If I had been content thus

to compromise, I should have been spared all the sufferings, as I should have been denied all the privileges, of a servant of Christ.”

ἄρτι γάρ] What is the opposition implied in this *now*? It can scarcely be referred, as some refer it, to the time before his conversion. “Conciliation” is no fit term to apply to the fierce bigotry of Saul the persecutor of the church of Christ. The errors of his early career are the offspring of blind zeal, and not of worldly policy (1 Tim. i. 13). The explanation is doubtless to be found in the charges of inconsistency brought against him by the Judaizers. They had misrepresented certain acts of his past life, and branded him as a temporizer. There shall be no doubt about his language *now*. He had formerly, they said, preached the Mosaic law, because, forsooth, he had become as a Jew to the Jews. Let them judge *now* whether he would make concessions to conciliate those who had a leaning towards Judaism. This ἄρτι, therefore, has no connection with the ἄρτι of ver. 9. The suppressed allusion to the Judaizers also explains the particle γάρ: “I speak thus strongly, *for* my language shall not be misconstrued, shall wear no semblance of compromise.”

ἀνθρώπους πείθω ἢ τὸν Θεόν] “do I conciliate, make friends of, men or of God? Though the idea of persuasion is not strictly applicable in the case of God (comp. 2 Cor. v. 11, ἀνθρώπους πείθωμεν, Θεῷ δὲ πεφανερῶμεθα), yet πείθω is fitly extended to the second clause in reference to the language of his enemies. “You charge me with a policy of conciliation. Yes: I conciliate God.” “De humano usu sump-tum est,” says Jerome. On the article Bengel pointedly remarks: “ἀνθρώπους, homines; hoc sine articulo; at mox τὸν

¹¹ Γνωρίζω δὲ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν κατὰ ἄνθρωπον. ¹² οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγὼ παρὰ ἀνθρώ-

11. γνωρίζω γάρ.

12. οὐδὲ ἐδιδάχθην

Θεόν, *Deum* cum articulo. *Dei solius habenda est ratio.*" See also the note on iv. 31.

ἀνθρώποις ἀρέσκειν] So 1 Thess. ii. 4; comp. ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι, Eph. vi. 6; Col. iii. 22.

ἔτι] "*still.*" After what? "After all that has befallen me; after all the experiences I have had." Compare the ἔτι of v. 11. Both passages find an explanation in vi. 17: "*Henceforth let no man trouble me.*" See the Introduction, p. 57. The ἔτι does not imply that St. Paul ever had been a time-server. It is equivalent to "at this stage, at this late date." The insertion of γάρ after εἰ in the received text is one of the many attempts of transcribers to smooth down the ruggedness of St. Paul's style.

Χριστοῦ δοῦλος οὐκ ἂν ἤμην] "*I should not have been a servant of Christ,*" perhaps with an indirect reference to the marks of persecution which he bore on his body (τὰ στίγματα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, vi. 17): "I should not have been branded as his slave, I should not have suffered for him." Comp. v. 11: "If I yet preach circumcision, why am I yet persecuted?"

11, 12. "I assure you, brethren, the gospel you were taught by me is not of human devising. I did not myself receive it from man, but from Jesus Christ. I did not learn it, as one learns a lesson, by painful study. It flashed upon me as a revelation from heaven."

11. Γνωρίζω ὑμῖν] "*I declare to you*" introduces some statement on which the apostle lays special emphasis, 1 Cor. xii. 3; xv. 1; 2 Cor. viii. 1. (Compare the similar phrase, "I would not have you ignorant"). Both this phrase and the following, κατὰ ἄνθρωπον, are confined to the epistles of this chronological group.

The best authorities are nearly equally

divided between δέ and γάρ. The former, resuming the subject which has been interrupted by his defence of himself, is more after the apostle's manner; while the latter would seem the obvious connecting particle to transcribers. On the other hand, δέ may possibly have been substituted for γάρ here, because it is found with γνωρίζω (-ζομεν) in 1 Cor. xv. 1; 2 Cor. viii. 1.

ἔστιν] is here only the copula. The present tense is used instead of the imperfect to show the permanence and unchangeableness of his gospel. See ii. 2.

κατὰ ἄνθρωπον] "after any human fashion or standard." See on iii. 15.

12. οὐδέ γὰρ ἐγὼ] "For, to go a step further back, *neither did I myself* receive it from man." The force of the particle οὐδέ is best sought for in the context. Οὐδέ ἐγὼ παρέλαβον answers to τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν, as παρὰ ἀνθρώπου answers to κατὰ ἄνθρωπον. Others explain it "*I as little as the twelve,*" "I, in whom perhaps it might have been expected"; but such interpretations are not reflected in the context.

παρὰ ἀνθρώπου παρέλαβον] The idea in the preposition is sufficiently wide to include both the ἀπό and διὰ of ver. 1. I do not think the distinction given by Winer, § xlvii. p. 370, and others, between λαμβάνειν παρὰ Κυρίου and λαμβάνειν ἀπὸ Κυρίου (1 Cor. xi. 23), as denoting respectively direct and indirect communication can be insisted upon. It is true that, while ἀπό contemplates only the giver, παρὰ in a manner connects the giver with the receiver, denoting the *passage* from the one to the other; but the links of the chain between the two may be numerous, and in all cases where the idea of transmission is prominent παρὰ will be used in preference to ἀπό, be the communication direct or indirect; so Phil. iv. 18, δεξά-

που παρέλαβον αὐτὸ οὔτε ἐδιδάχθην, ἀλλὰ δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. ¹³ ἡκούσατε γὰρ τὴν ἐμὴν ἀναστροφὴν ποτε ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ, ὅτι καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἐδίωκον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ

μενος παρὰ Ἐπαφροδίτου τὰ παρ' ἡμῶν: comp. Plat. *Sympr.* 202 E. The verb *παραλαμβάνειν* may be used either of the ultimate receiver or of any intermediate agent, provided that the idea of transmission be retained, i.e. it may be either (1) to receive as transmitted to one's self, 2 Thess. iii. 6, or (2) to receive so as to transmit to others. In this latter sense it is used of the apostles, who, receiving the gospel directly from the Lord, passed it to others. See 1 Cor. xi. 23; xv. 1, 3, and compare *παραγγελλία*.

οὔτε ἐδιδάχθην] The authorities being nearly equally divided between *οὔτε* and *οὐδέ*, I have with some hesitation retained the former in the text, as being the less regular collocation (*οὐδὲ οὔτε*), and therefore more likely to be altered. In this case another *οὔτε* is to be understood before *παρέλαβον*, the *δέ* of *οὐδέ* having reference to the former sentence. See Winer, § lv. 6, p. 492. and esp. A. Buttmann, p. 315.

ἐδιδάχθην is added to explain and enforce *παρ' ἀνθρώπου παρέλαβον*, and thus to bring out the contrast with *δι' ἀποκαλύψεως*: "I received it not by instruction from man, but by revelation from Christ." For a somewhat similar contrast see Cic. *pro Mil.* c. iv.: "Est enim, hæc iudices, non scripta sed nata lex; quam non didicimus accepimus, legimus, verum ex natura ipsa arripimus, hausimus expressimus."

13, 14. "My early education is a proof that I did not receive the gospel from man. I was brought up in a rigid school of ritualism, directly opposed to the liberty of the gospel. I was from age and temper a staunch adherent of the principles of that school. Acting upon them, I relentlessly persecuted the Christian brotherhood. No human agency, therefore, could have brought

about the change. It required a direct interposition from God."

13. ἡκούσατε] "*ye heard*," "I told you when I was with you." The history of his past career as a persecutor formed part of his preaching; see Acts xxii. 2-21; xxvi. 4-23; 1 Cor. xv. 8-10; comp. Phil. iii. 6; 1 Tim. i. 13. The A. V., "*ye have heard*," gives a wrong meaning.

ἀναστροφὴν ποτε] for the more usual *ποτε ἀναστροφὴν*, as ver. 23, *ὁ διώκων ἡμᾶς ποτε*. Similar displacements of words which would ordinarily come between the article and substantive are frequent in the New Testament. See on 1 Thess. i. 1; and Winer, § xx. p. 135 sqq.

Ἰουδαϊσμῷ] "*observance of Jewish rites*." The word does not in itself imply any disparagement. Comp. 2 Macc. ii. 21, *τοῖς ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ φιλοτίμως ἀνδραγαθήσασιν*; xiv. 38, *σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ παραβεβλημένος*, and *Ἰουδαΐζειν* Gal. ii. 14. Though perhaps originally coined by the heathen, and, as used by them, conveying some shadow of contempt, it would, when naturalized among the Jews themselves, lose this idea, and even become a title of honor. The case of *Χριστιανός*, likewise a term of reproach in the first instance, is a parallel.

ἐπόρθουν κ.τ.λ.] "*I devastated the church*," as Acts ix. 21, *οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ πορθήσας ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ τοὺς ἐπικαλουμένους κ.τ.λ.* Compare *ἐλυμαίνετο τὴν ἐκκλησίαν*, Acts viii. 3.

14. *συνηλικιώτας*] "*of my own age*," who embraced the religion of their fathers with all the ardor of youthful patriotism. The Attics use the simple form *ἡλικιώτης*, while the compound belongs to the later dialect. Compare the similar instances of *πολίτης* (*συμπολίτης*, Eph. ii. 19), *φυλέτης* (*συμ-*

Θεοῦ καὶ ἐπόρθουν αὐτήν, ¹⁴ καὶ προέκοπτον ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ ὑπὲρ πολλοὺς συνηλικιώτας ἐν τῷ γένει μου, περισσοτέρως ζηλωτὴς ὑπάρχων τῶν πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων. ¹⁵ ὅτε δὲ εὐδόκησεν

φυλῆτης, 1 Thess. ii. 14), etc. In this class of words the later language aims at greater definiteness. The rule, however, is not absolute, but only expresses a general tendency. See Lobeck, *Phryn.* pp. 172, 471.

ἐν τῷ γένει μου] “in my race,” i.e. among the Jews, an incidental proof that St. Paul is addressing Gentile converts. See p. 33, note 1. In the same way, Rom. xvi. 7, 21, he mentions certain Jews as his “kinsmen” (συγγενεῖς). Comp. also Rom. ix. 3, ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα.

περισσοτέρως ζηλωτὴς ὑπάρχων] The adverb *περισσοτέρως*, which is frequent in St. Paul, seems always to retain its comparative force. Here it is explained by ὑπὲρ πολλοὺς. For *ζηλωτὴς ὑπάρχων*, comp. Acts xxi. 20, πάντες ζηλωταὶ τοῦ νόμου ὑπάρχουσιν. St. Paul seems to have belonged to the extreme party of the Pharisees (Acts xxii. 3; xxiii. 7; xxvi. 5; Phil. iii. 5, 6), whose pride it was to call themselves “zealots of the law, zealots of God.” To this party also had belonged Simon, one of the twelve, thence surnamed the zealot, *ζηλωτὴς* or *καναναῖος*, i.e. *ἰσὶρ*. A portion of these extreme partizans, forming into a separate sect under Judas of Galilee, took the name of “zealots” *par excellence*, and distinguished themselves by their furious opposition to the Romans. Joseph. *Antiq.* xviii. 1, i. 6. See Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Isr.* v. p. 25 sqq., p. 322, vi. p. 340.

τῶν πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων] “of the traditions handed down from my fathers.” It is doubtful whether the law of Moses is included in this expression. In Josephus τὰ ἐκ παραδόσεως τῶν πατέρων (*Antiq.* xiii. 10, 6), ἡ πατρία παράδοσις (*Ib.* 16, 2), are the Pharisaic traditions, as distinguished from the

written law. See also Matt. xv. 2, 3, 6; Mark vii. 3, 5, 8, 9, 13. These passages seem to show that the word *παράδοσις*, which might in itself include equally well the written law, signified in the mouth of a Jew the traditional interpretations and additions (afterwards embodied in the Mishna) as distinguished from the text on which they were founded, and which they professed to supplement.

15, 16. “Then came my conversion. It was the work of God’s grace. It was foreordained before I had any separate existence. It was not therefore due to any merits of my own; it did not spring from any principles of my own. The revelation of his Son in me, the call to preach to the Gentiles, were acts of his good pleasure. Thus converted, I took no counsel of human advisers. I did not betake myself to the elder apostles, as I might naturally have done. I secluded myself in Arabia, and when I emerged from my retirement, instead of going to Jerusalem, I returned to Damascus.

15. ὁ ἀφορίσας] “who set me apart, devoted me to a special purpose.” Rom. i. 1 ἀφορισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον Θεοῦ. See also Acts xiii. 2 ἀφορίσατε δὴ μοι κ. τ. λ. The words ὁ Θεὸς of the received text are to be struck out as a gloss, though a correct one. Similar omissions are frequent in St. Paul; see i. 6, ii. 8, iii. 5, v. 8, Rom. viii. 11, Phil. i. 6, 1 Thess. v. 24.

Observe how words are accumulated to tell upon the one point on which he is insisting — the sole agency of God as distinct from his own efforts; εὐδόκησεν, ἀφορίσας, ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου, καλέσας χάριτος αὐτοῦ.

ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου] “from before my birth, before I had any impulses, any principles of my own.” For the expression, see Judges xvi. 17 ἅγιος Θεοῦ ἐγώ

ὁ ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου καὶ καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ ¹⁶ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ ἵνα εὐαγγελίζωμαι αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, εὐθέως οὐ προσανεθέμην σαρκὶ καὶ αἵματι,

εἰμι ἀπὸ κοιλίας μητρός μου, Is. xliv. 2, 24. xlix. 1. 5 ὁ πλάσας με ἐκ κοιλίας δούλου ἐαυτῷ, Psalm lxx. 6 ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου σύ μου εἰ σκεπαστής, and frequently in the LXX. The preposition seems to be merely temporal. The A.V., "who separated me from my mother's womb," obscures, if it does not misinterpret, the sense.

καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ] See the note on i. 6.

16. Three separate stages in the history of the apostle's consecration to his ministry seem to be mentioned here. *First*, the predestination to his high office, which dated from before his birth (ὁ ἀφορίσας με κ.τ.λ.); *Secondly*, the conversion and call to the apostleship, which took place on the way to Damascus, Acts ix. 3 sqq. (καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ); and *Thirdly*, the entering upon his ministry in fulfilment of this call, Acts ix. 20 sqq. xiii. 2, 3 (ἀποκαλύψαι ἐν ἐμοὶ ἵνα εὐαγγελίζωμαι).

The distinction of these three stages seems well marked; and if so, this determines the meaning of ἐν ἐμοὶ. It does not speak of a revelation made *inwardly to himself*, but of a revelation made *through him to others*. The preposition ἐν is used in preference to διὰ, because St. Paul was not only the instrument in preaching the gospel, but also in his own person bore the strongest testimony to its power. He constantly places his conversion in this light; see ver. 24 ἐδόξαζον ἐν ἐμοὶ τὸν Θεόν, 1 Tim. i. 16 διὰ τοῦτο ἡλεήθην ἵνα ἐν ἐμοὶ πρώτῳ ἐνδείξηται Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς τὴν ἅπασαν μακροθυμίαν πρὸς ὑποτύπωσιν τῶν μελλόντων πιστεῦειν κ.τ.λ., 2 Cor. xiii. 3 τοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ λαλοῦντος Χριστοῦ, Phil. i. 30. The rendering of ἐν ἐμοὶ "within me," *i.e.* "in my heart," seems neither to suit the context so well, nor to be so natural in itself.

εὐθέως οὐ προσανεθέμην κ.τ.λ.] "*forthwith, instead of conferring with flesh and blood, etc., I departed to Arabia.*" Ὁ ἀνατίθεσθαι see the note ii. 2. In the double compound προσανατίθεσθαι the idea of *communication* or *consultation* is stronger. The use of the word in heathen writers indirectly illustrates its sense here. It is employed especially of consulting soothsayers, and the like, as in Chrysippus (in Suidas, s. v. νεοτρός) προσαναθέσθαι ὀνειροκρίτῃ. Diod. Sic. xvii. 116 τοῖς μάντεσι προσαναθέμενος περὶ τοῦ σημείου. Comp. Lucian, *Jur. Trag.* § 1 (ii. p. 642) ἐμοὶ προσανθῶν, καθε με συμβουλευον πόνων. See the note ii. 6.

For σαρκὶ καὶ αἵματι, compare our Lord's words to St. Peter, Matt. xvi. 17: "Flesh and blood did not reveal it unto thee."

17. ἀνῆλθον] "*I came up.*" This verb and ἀναβαίνειν are used especially of visiting Jerusalem, situated in the high lands of Palestine, as κατέρχασθαι, καταβαίνειν, are of leaving it. See Luke x. 30, Acts xi. 27, xii. 19, xv. 1, 2, xxi. 15, xxv. 1, 6, 7, and especially Acts xviii. 22, xxiv. 1. In the two last passages ἀναβαίνειν and καταβαίνειν are used absolutely, without any mention of Jerusalem, this being implied in the expressions "going up," "going down." Here the various reading ἀπῆλθον has great claims to a place in the text. Both words occur in the context, and it is difficult to say in favor of which reading the possible confusion of transcribers may more justly be urged. Perhaps, however, it is improbable that St. Paul should have written ἀπῆλθον twice consecutively, as the repetition makes the sentence run awkwardly; though in Rom. viii. 15, 1 Cor. ii. 13, Heb. xii. 18, 22 something of the kind occurs.

τοὺς πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἀποστόλους] "*those who were apostles before me*" possibly includ-

17 οὐδὲ ἀνῆλθον εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα πρὸς τοὺς πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἀποστόλους, ἀλλὰ ἀπῆλθον εἰς Ἀραβίαν, καὶ πάλιν ὑπέστρεψα εἰς Δαμασκόν.
18 ἔπειτα μετὰ ἑτῆ τρία ἀνῆλθον εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἱστορῆσαι Κηφᾶν.

17. οὐδὲ ἀπῆλθον εἰς Ἱερ.

18. μετὰ τρία ἔτη.

ing others besides the twelve, especially James. See below, p. 317, note 3. For the expression compare Rom. xvi. 7, οἷτινές εἰσιν ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις οἱ καὶ πρὸ ἐμου γέγοναν ἐν Χριστῷ, where, however, the construction is doubtful.

εἰς Δαμασκόν] A danger which threatened St. Paul's life on this occasion seems to have left a deep impression on his mind, and is mentioned by him in another epistle, nearly contemporaneous with this, 2 Cor. xi. 32.

18. ἔπειτα μετὰ ἑτῆ τρία] From what point of time are these three years reckoned? Probably from the great epoch of his life, from his conversion. The "straightway" of ver. 16 leads to this conclusion; "At first I conferred not with flesh and blood, it was only after the lapse of three years that I went to Jerusalem."

Ἱεροσόλυμα) is generally a neuter plural. In Matt. ii. 3, however, we have πᾶσα Ἱεροσόλυμα. See A. Buttmann, *Gramm.* p. 16. On the forms Ἱεροσόλυμα and Ἱερουσαλήμ see note on iv. 25.

ἱστορῆσαι Κηφᾶν) "to visit Cephas." ἱστορῆσαι is somewhat emphatic: "A word used," says Chrysostom, "by those who go to see great and famous cities." It is generally said of things and places, less commonly, as here, of persons: comp. Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* vi. 1, 8, ἀνὴρ ὃν ἐγὼ κατ' ἐκεῖνον ἱστύρησα τὸν πόλεμον, and *Chon. Hom.* viii. 1, etc. St. Peter is mentioned by St. Paul only in this epistle and 1 Corinthians. Κηφᾶν is the right reading here, though there is respectable authority for Πέτρον. If the existing authorities are to be trusted, St. Paul seems to have used the Aramaic and Greek name indifferently. Allowance ought to be made, however, for the tendency to substitute the more usual Πέτρος for the less common Κηφᾶς, e.g.

here and ii. 9, 11, 14. In the Peshito Version Cephas, as the Aramaic name, is not unnaturally adopted throughout this epistle.

δεκαπέντε) A latter form for the more classical πεντεκαίδεκα. This and the analagous forms of numerals occur frequently in the MSS. of Greek authors of the post-classical age, but in many cases are doubtless due to the transcribers writing out the words at length, where they had only the numeral letters before them. The frequent occurrence of these forms have, however, in the *Tabulae Herculeenses* is a decisive testimony to their use, at least in some dialects, much before the Christian era. They are found often in the LXX.

St. Paul's visit on this occasion was abruptly terminated. He left an account of a plot against his life (Acts ix. 29) and in pursuance of a vision (Acts xxii. 17-21).

18-24. "Not till three years were past, did I go up to Jerusalem. My object in doing so was to confer with Cephas. But I did not remain with him more than a fortnight; and of all the other apostles I saw only James the Lord's brother. As in the sight of God, I declare to you that every word I write is true. Then I went to the distant regions of Syria and Cilicia. Thus I was personally unknown to the Christian brotherhood in Judea. They had only heard that their former persecutor was now preaching the very faith which before he had attempted to destroy; and they glorified God for my conversion."

19. εἰ μὴ Ἰάκωβον] Is James here styled an apostle or not? Are we to translate "I saw no other apostle save James," or "I saw no other apostle, but only James"? It will be seen that the question is not whether εἰ μὴ retains its

καὶ ἐπέμεινα πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡμέρας δεκαπέντε· ¹⁹ ἕτερον δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων οὐκ εἶδον, εἰ μὴ Ἰάκωβον τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυρίου.
²⁰ ἃ δὲ γράφω ὑμῖν, ἰδοὺ ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅτι οὐ ψεύδομαι.
²¹ ἔπειτα ἦλθον εἰς τὰ κλίματα τῆς Συρίας καὶ τῆς Κιλικίας.

exception force or not, for this it seems always to do (see note on i. 7), but whether the exception refers to the whole clause or to the verb alone. That the latter is quite a possible construction will appear from Matt. xii. 4; Luke iv. 26, 27; Gal. ii. 16; Rev. xxi. 27; see Fritzsche on Rom. iii. p. 195. But on the other hand, the sense of ἕτερον naturally links it with εἰ μὴ, from which it cannot be separated without harshness, and ἕτερον carries τῶν ἀποστόλων with it. It seems, then, that St. James is here called an apostle, though it does not therefore follow that he was one of the twelve (see the detached note p. 317). The plural in the corresponding account Acts ix. 27, "He brought (Paul) to the apostles," is also in favor of this sense, but this argument must not be pressed.

20. ἰδοὺ ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ] A form of asseveration equivalent to "I call you to witness," and so followed by ὅτι. See 2 Tim. ii. 14, iv. 1 διαμαρτύρεσθαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ. For ἰδοὺ elsewhere in the New Testament is an interjection or adverb, never a verb, so that there is an objection to making it govern ὅτι here. Perhaps, however, the occurrence of ἴδε ὅτι in the LXX, Ps. exix. 159; Lam. i. 20, may justify such a construction here. The strength of St. Paul's language is to be explained by the unscrupulous calumnies cast upon him by his enemies. See the note 1 Thess. v. 27.

21. In the corresponding narrative of St. Luke it is related that the brethren at Jerusalem, discovering the plot against St. Paul's life, "took him down to Caesarea and despatched him to Tarsus" (Acts ix. 30); and later on, that Barnabas went to Tarsus and sought out Saul, and having found him brought him to Antioch, where they taught for a whole year before returning to Jeru-

salem (xi. 25-30). The Caesarea mentioned there is doubtless *Stratonis*, and not *Philippi*, as some maintain. Not only was this the more probable route for him to take, but St. Luke's language requires it; for (1) the words κατήγαγον, ἐξαπέστειλαν imply a seaport and an embarkation; and (2) Caesarea without any addition to distinguish it is always the principal city of the name. It appears, therefore, that St. Luke represents St. Paul as sailing from Caesarea on his way to Tarsus; and, comparing this account with the notice here, we must suppose either (1) that St. Paul did not go direct to Tarsus, but visited Syria on the way; or (2) that he visited Syria from Tarsus, and, after preaching there, returned again to Tarsus, where he was found by Barnabas; St. Luke having, on either of these hypotheses, omitted to record this visit to Syria; or (3) that St. Paul's words here, "Syria and Cilicia" are not intended to describe the *order* in which he visited the two countries. This last is the most probable supposition. Cilicia has geographically a greater affinity with Syria than with Asia Minor. See Conybeare and Howson, i. p. 130. The less important country is here named after the more important. "Cilicia," says Ewald, "was constantly little better than an appendage of Syria," *Gesch. des. V. Isr.* vi. p. 406. At this time, however, it was under a separate administration. The words τὰ κλίματα seem to show that "Syria and Cilicia" are here mentioned under one general expression, and not as two distinct districts.

τὰ κλίματα] Rom. xv. 23; 2 Cor. xi. 10. A comparatively late word, see Lobeck, *Paral.* p. 418. It is found in Pseudo-Aristot. *de mundo*, c. x., and several times in Polybius.

²² ἤμην δὲ ἀγνοούμενος τῷ προσώπῳ ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Ἰουδαίας ταῖς ἐν Χριστῷ, ²³ μόνον δὲ ἀκούοντες ἤσαν ὅτι Ὁ διώκων ἡμᾶς ποτὲ νῦν εὐαγγελίζεται τὴν πίστιν ἣν ποτε ἐπόρθει, ²⁴ καὶ ἐδόξαζον ἐν ἐμοὶ τὸν Θεόν.

22. ἤμην ἀγνοούμενος κ.τ.λ.] “*I remained personally unknown.*” A strong form of the imperfect, as ἀκούοντες ἤσαν, “they kept hearing” (ver. 23): see Winer, § xlv. 5, p. 348.

ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις κ.τ.λ.] “*unknown to the churches of Judea*” generally, as distinguished from that of Jerusalem. To the latter he could not have failed to be known, as might be inferred from the account here, even without the narrative of his energetic preaching in the Acts. From Jerusalem he was hurried off to Caesarea, and there embarking, he left the shores of Palestine. The other churches of Judea, therefore, had no opportunity of knowing him. Judea is here distinguished from Jerusalem, as Italy is frequently distinguished from Rome, e.g. probably Heb. xiii. 24. The addition ταῖς ἐν Χριστῷ was necessary when speaking of the Christian brotherhood of Judea; for the unconverted Jewish communities might still be called “the churches of Judea.” See the note on 1 Thess. ii. 14, τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ τῶν οὐσῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

23. Ὁ διώκων ἡμᾶς ποτέ] “*Our per-*

secutor of former times”: δ διώκων being used as a substantive, i.e. without reference to time, as Matt. xxvii. 40, ὁ καταλύων τὸν ναόν; see Winer, § xlv. 7, p. 353. On the position of ποτέ see the note on ver. 13.

ὅτι] introduces an abrupt change from the oblique to the direct mode of speaking, e.g. Acts xiv. 22; xxiii. 22. So it is used frequently in introducing a quotation, e.g. Gal. iii. 10.

τὴν πίστιν] It is a striking proof of the large space occupied by “faith” in the mind of the infant church, that it should so soon have passed into a synonyme for the gospel. See Acts vi. 7. Here its meaning seems to hover between the gospel and the church. For the various senses of πίστις, see the notes on iii. 23; vi. 10; and the detached note on the term “faith.”

24. ἐν ἐμοί] See the note ver. 16, and comp. Isa. xlix. 3, δοῦλός μου εἰ σὺ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἐν σοὶ δοξασθήσομαι. “He does not say,” adds Chrysostom, “they marvelled at me, they praised me, they were struck with admiration of me; but he attributes all to grace. They glorified God, he says, in me.”

II. ¹Ἐπειτα διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν πάλιν ἀνέβην εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα μετὰ Βαρνάβαν, συνπαραλαβὼν καὶ Τίτον· ²ἀνέβην δὲ

II 1, 2. "An interval of fourteen years elapsed. During the whole of this time I had no intercourse with the apostles of the circumcision. Then I paid another visit to Jerusalem. My companion was Barnabas, who has labored so zealously among the Gentiles, whose name is so closely identified with the cause of the Gentiles. With him I took Titus also, himself a Gentile. And here again I acted not in obedience to any human adviser. A direct revelation from God prompted me to this journey."

διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν] Are the fourteen years to be counted from St. Paul's conversion, or from the visit to Jerusalem just recorded? The following considerations seem to decide in favor of the latter view: (1) The stress of the argument lies on the length of the interval during which he had held no communication with the Judaic apostles; and (2) individual expressions in the passage tend the same way. The use of διὰ δ. ἐτῶν in preference to μετὰ δ. ἔτη, implies that the whole interval was a blank so far as regards the matter in hand, the intercourse of St. Paul with the twelve; and the words πάλιν ἀνέβην, "again I went up," refers us back to the former visit as the date from which the time is reckoned. As the later visit (supposing it to be the same with that of Acts xv.) is calculated independently to have taken place about A.D. 51, the date of the first visit will, according to this view, be thrown back to about A.D. 38, and that of the conversion to about A.D. 36, the Jewish mode of reckoning being adopted. For διὰ, "after the lapse of," see Acts xxiv. 17, and Winer, § xlvii. p. 380.

καὶ Τίτον] Titus is included in the "certain others" of Acts xv. 2, and is specially named here on account of the dispute to which he gave rise (ver. 3). He was sent from Antioch with others

whose names are not mentioned, probably as a representative of the Gentile Christians; just as on the return of the mission the apostles of the circumcision sent back Judas and Silas to represent the Jewish believers, Acts xv. 27. The incident would present itself all the more vividly to St. Paul's mind, inasmuch as Titus was much in his thoughts, if not actually in his company, at the time when this epistle was written. See 2 Cor. ii. 13; vii. 6, 13-15; viii. 16, 23; xii. 18.

κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν] "by revelation." In St. Luke's narrative (Acts xv. 2) he is said to have been sent by the church at Antioch. The revelation either prompted or confirmed the decision of the church. See the detached note, p. 329.

2. "Arrived at Jerusalem, I set forth the principles of the gospel, as I had preached it and still preach it to the Gentiles—the doctrine of grace, the freedom from the ceremonial law. This explanation I gave in a private conference with the leading apostles of the circumcision. In all this I had one object in view; that the gospel might have free course among the Gentiles, that my past and present labors might not be thwarted by opposition or misunderstanding."

ἀνέθémην] The middle ἀνατίθεσθαι has the sense "to relate with a view to consulting," "to refer," as 2 Macc. iii. 9; see also Acts xxv. 14, τῷ βασιλεῖ ἀνέθετο τὰ κατὰ τὸν Παῦλον, where the idea of consultation is brought out very clearly in the context, vv. 20, 26. "Interferentes," says Jerome here, "acqualitas est; inter docentem et discitentem minor est ille, qui discit." See the notes on προσανατίθεσθαι, i. 16; ii. 6.

ὃ κηρύσσω] "I preach," not ἐκήρυσσον, "I preached," for his gospel had not changed. See the note on οὐκ ἔστιν, i. 11.

κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν, καὶ ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ κηρύσσω ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσιν, μὴ πως εἰς κενὸν τρέχω

κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσιν] “*but in private to those of repute.*” The foregoing αὐτοῖς is best referred to the Christians of Jerusalem generally, as implied from Ἱεροσόλυμα (ver. 1). If so, this clause, which follows, is inserted not to exclude a public conference, but to emphasize his private consultations. These private communications probably preceded the general congress, which occupies the prominent place in St. Luke’s narrative (Acts xv. 6 sq.), and seem to be alluded to in the Acts, though not very distinctly, in the words (xv. 4), “they declared what things God had done with them.” The private consultation was a wise precaution to avoid misunderstanding; the public conference was a matter of necessity, to obtain a recognition of the freedom of the Gentile churches.

τοῖς δοκοῦσιν] “*the men of repute, of position.*” See Eur. *Hec.* 294, λόγος γὰρ ἐκ τ’ ἀδοξούντων, ἰὼν καὶ τῶν δοκούντων, with Pfugk’s note; *Herocl.* 897, εὐτυχίαν ιδέσθαι τῶν πάρος οὐ δοκούντων, Herodian, vi. 1, τῆς συγκλήτου βουλῆς τοὺς δοκοῦντας καὶ ἡλικία σεμνοτάτους κ.τ.λ. The expression itself, therefore, is a term of honor, and conveys no shadow of depreciation. So far as it is colored with any tinge of disparagement here, this is due (1) to the repetition of the word δοκοῦντες, (2) to the addition of στυλοὶ εἶναι. εἶναι τι, the latter especially, and (3) to the contrast implied in the whole passage between the estimation in which they were held and the actual services they rendered to him. On the other hand, it will be seen (1) that this disparagement is relative, not absolute—a negation of the exclusive claims urged for them by the Judaizing party, not a negation of their apostolic rank and worth; (2) that the passage itself contains direct evidence of mutual respect and recognition between St. Paul and the twelve (vv. 8, 9, 10).

On the tense of τοῖς δοκοῦσιν, see the note on ver. 6.

μήπως εἰς κενὸν τρέχω κ.τ.λ.] “*lest I might be running, or had run, to no purpose.*” The kindred passage, 1 Thess. iii. 5, μήπως ἐπείρασεν ὑμᾶς ὁ πειράζων καὶ εἰς κενὸν γένηται ὁ κόπος ἡμῶν, seems to show that τρέχω is here the subjunctive rather than the indicative, this being, moreover, the more likely mood in itself. See the note there. The use of the subjunctive (τρέχω) here, rather than the optative (τρέχοιμι), is in accordance with the spirit of the later Greek, which prefers the more direct mode of speech in all such cases. In the New Testament the optative seems never to occur with particles of design, etc.; see Winer, § xli. p. 288. In the second clause the change of mood from the subjunctive (τρέχω) to the indicative (ἐδραμον) is rendered necessary by the change of tense, since the consequences of the past were no longer contingent, but inevitable; comp. iv. 11.

τρέχω] is a reference to St. Paul’s favorite metaphor of the stadium: see v. 7, and the note there. For the expression εἰς κενὸν τρέχειν comp. Phil. ii. 16, where, as here, it refers to his missionary career.

But what is the drift of the passage? Is it a natural expression of misgiving on the part of St. Paul, who was not altogether satisfied with the soundness of his teaching until he had consulted with the apostles of the circumcision? So Tertullian takes it, *adv. Marc.* i. 20, v. 3, and esp. iv. 2. This is perhaps the *prima facie* sense of the passage, slightly favored by οὐδὲν προσανέθεντο, ver. 6. But, on the other hand, such an admission would be so entirely alien to the spirit of the passage, so destructive of St. Paul’s whole argument, and so unlikely under the circumstances, that this interpretation must be abandoned. The —

ἡ ἔδραμον. ³ ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Τίτος ὁ σὺν ἐμοὶ Ἑλλην ὦν ἡναγκάσθη

taken to express his fear lest the Judaic Christians, by insisting on the Mosaic ritual, might thwart his past and present endeavors to establish a church on a liberal basis. By conferring with them, and more especially with the apostles of the circumcision, he might not only quiet such lurking anxiety (*μήπως*) as he felt, but also, if there were any lack of unanimity, win them over to his views.

3. St. Paul is here distracted between the fear of saying too much and the fear of saying too little. He must maintain his own independence, and yet he must not compromise the position of the twelve. How can he justify himself without seeming to condemn them? There is need of plain speaking and there is need of reserve. In this conflict of opposing aims and feelings the sense of the passage is well-nigh lost. The meaning of individual expressions is obscure. The thread of the sentence is broken, picked up, and again broken. From this shipwreck of grammar it is even difficult to extricate the main incident, on which the whole controversy hinges. Was Titus circumcised, or was he not? This is not only a reasonable question, but a question which thoughtful writers have answered in different ways. On the whole, the following reasons seem to decide for the negative: (1) The incident is apparently brought forward to show that St. Paul had throughout contended for the liberty of the Gentiles—that he had not, as his enemies insinuated, at one time conceded the question of circumcision. It is introduced by way of evidence, not of apology. (2) It is difficult to reconcile the view that Titus was circumcised with individual expressions in the passage. St. Paul could scarcely say “we yielded, no, not for an hour” in the same breath in which he confessed to this most important of all concessions; he could hardly claim for such an act

the merit of preserving “the truth of the gospel,” i.e. the liberty of the Gentile Christians, which it was most calculated to compromise. In order to maintain that view, it is necessary to lay undue stress on the words *ἡναγκάσθη* and *τῇ ὑποταγῇ*, which from their position seem quite unemphatic; as if the former signified that the circumcision of Titus was an act of grace, not of compulsion; and the latter, that the apostle in yielding was not doing homage to superior authority. (3) Taking into account the narrative in the Acts, both the occasion and the person were most inopportune for such a concession. There was an agitation among the Judaizers to force the rite of circumcision on the Gentile converts. Paul and Barnabas had gone up from Antioch in order to protect them from this imposition. They were accompanied by certain representatives of the Gentile church, of whom Titus was one. No act could be conceived more fatal to the interests of St. Paul’s clients at such a moment, or less likely to have been permitted by him. Accordingly the vast majority of early writers take the view that Titus was not circumcised, even though in many instances they adopted a reading (the omission of *οὐδὲ* in ver. 5) most unfavorable to this conclusion. See p. 326.

St. Paul is here indirectly meeting a charge brought against him. Shortly before he visited Galatia the first time, he had caused Timothy to be circumcised (Acts xvi. 3). This fact, which can scarcely have been unknown to the Galatians, for Timothy accompanied him on his visit, may have afforded a handle to the calumnies of his enemies. There was a time, they said, when he himself insisted on circumcision. Comp. v. 11 and the note on i. 10. By stating how he acted in the case of Titus, who was truly a Gentile, he rebuffs this assertion.

περιτμηθῆναι· ⁴διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους, οἵτινες

3-5. "But, while I held conferences with the apostles of the circumcision, I did not yield to the clamors of the disciples of the circumcision. An incident which occurred will show this. Titus, as a Gentile who was intimately associated with me, was singled out as a mark for their bigotry. An attempt was made to have him circumcised. Concession was even urged upon me in high quarters as a measure of prudence to disarm opposition. The agitators who headed the movement were no true brethren, no loyal soldiers of Christ. They were spies who had made their way into the camp of the gospel under false colors, and were striving to undermine our liberty in Christ, to reduce us again to a state of bondage. I did not for a moment yield to this pressure. I would not so compromise the integrity of the gospel, the freedom of the Gentile churches."

3. οὐδὲ Τίτος] "*not even Titus.*" Why "*not even*"? Is it (1) "*not even Titus, who as my fellow-laborer would be brought constantly in contact with the Jews, and therefore might well have adopted a conciliatory attitude towards them*"? Compare the case of Timothy, Acts xvi. 3, "*Him would Paul have go forth with him, and took and circumcised him on account of the Jews,*" etc. In this case *ὁ σὺν ἐμοὶ* is emphatic. Or is it (2) "*not even Titus, though the pressure exerted in his case was so great*"? A more exact knowledge of the circumstances than we possess would alone enable us to answer this question. Perhaps both ideas may be combined here.

"Ἑλλήν ὢν] "*being a Greek,*" perhaps giving the reason why the point was not conceded. There seems to be a tacit allusion to the case of Timothy. "You maintain," St. Paul seems to argue, "that I allowed the validity of the Mosaic law in circumcising Timothy (Acts

xvi. 1, 3). But Timothy was half of Jewish parentage. How did I act in the case of Titus, a true Gentile? I did not yield for a moment."

In "Ἑλλήν all idea of nationality is lost: comp. Mark vii. 26, Ἑλληνὶς Συροφουνίκισσα (or Σύρα Φουνίκισσα) τῷ γένει. Thus the Peshito, sacrificing the letter to the spirit, frequently translates "Ἑλλήν" "an Aramaean," e.g. here and iii. 28.

ἡναγκάσθη] "*was compelled,*" though the pressure was extreme. This pressure doubtless came from the more bigoted Judaizers, the converted Pharisees mentioned Acts xv. 5.

4. What part was taken in the dispute by the apostles of the circumcision? This question, which forces itself upon us at this stage of St. Paul's narrative, is not easily answered. On the whole, it seems probable that they recommended St. Paul to yield the point as a charitable concession to the prejudices of the Jewish converts; but, convinced at length by his representations that such a concession at such a time would be fatal, they withdrew their counsel and gave him their support. Such an account of the transaction seems to accord alike with the known facts and with the probabilities of the case. It is consistent with the timid conduct of Peter at Antioch shortly after (Gal. ii. 11), and with the politic advice of James at a later date (Acts xxi. 20). It was the natural consequence of their position, which led them to regard tenderly the scruples of the Jewish converts. It supplies probable antecedents to the events of the apostolic congress. And lastly, it best explains St. Paul's language here. The sensible undercurrent of feeling, the broken grammar of the sentence, the obvious tenor of particular phrases, all convey the impression that, though the final victory was complete, it was not attained without

παρεισῆλθον κατασκοπῆσαι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῶν, ἣν ἔχομεν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα ἡμᾶς καταδουλώσουσιν, οἷς οὐδὲ πρὸς ὥραν

a struggle, in which St. Paul maintained at one time almost single-handed the cause of Gentile freedom.

εἰδ. δὲ τοῖς παριστάτοις κ.τ.λ.] "But to satisfy, to disarm, the false brethren, the traitorous spies of the gospel" — At this point the connection of the sentence is snapped, and we are left to conjecture as to the conclusion. It seems as if St. Paul intended to add, "the leading apostles urged me to yield." But instead of this a long parenthesis interposes, in the course of which the main proposition of the sentence is lost sight of. It is again resumed in a different form, "from those, then, who were held in repute," ver. 6. Then again it disappears in another parenthesis. Once more it is taken up and completed; transformed by this time into a general statement, "well, they of reputation added nothing to me in conference." The counsels of the apostles of the circumcision are the hidden rock on which the grammar of the sentence is wrecked. For διὰ τοὺς παρ. ψευδ. compare Acts xvii. 3, περιέτῃμεν αὐτὸν διὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους.

Of other possible explanations two deserve to be considered: (1) That there is an ellipsis of οὐκ ἠναγκάσθη περιτμηθῆναι or οὐ περιετμήθη after διὰ τοὺς παρεισ. ψευδᾶδ. So Fritzsche, *Opusc.* p. 181. (2) That the parenthesis flows back into the main proposition, so that the regular construction would have been διὰ τοὺς παρεισ. ψευδᾶδ. οὐδὲ πρὸς ὥραν ἐξάμεν, the οἷς being redundant. See the note, ver. 6. So Winer, § lxiii. p. 568, 569. But, as Titus would not have been circumcised under any circumstances, the refusal to yield could scarcely be attributed to the pressure from the false brethren. If either of these explanations were adopted, St. Paul's meaning must be: "To the scruples of the weaker brethren I would

have conceded the point, but the teaching of the false brethren made concession impossible." So, in fact, Augustine takes it, *de mendac.* § 8 (vi. p. 424, ed. Ben.).

παρεισάκτους, παρεισῆλθον] The metaphor is that of spies or traitors introducing themselves by stealth into the enemy's camp, as in Jude 4. παρεισέυσαν γὰρ τινες ἄνθρωποι. See Plut. *Popl.* 17, ἐπιβουλεύων δὲ τὸν Πορσίαν ἀνελεῖν παρεισῆλθεν εἰς τὸ στρατόπεδον. Polyb. i. 7, 3; ii. 55, 3. For παρεισάγειν, see 2 Pet. ii. 1. The adjective occurs in Strabo, xvii. p. 794, παρείσακτος ἐπικληθεὶς Πτολεμαῖος. The camp thus stealthily entered is the Christian church. Pharisees at heart, these traitors assume the name and garb of believers.

κατασκοπῆσαι] "to act as spies on." κατασκοπεῖν generally signifies "to examine carefully," the form κατασκοπεύειν being most frequently used where the notion of treachery is prominent. For instances of the sense in the text, however, see 2 Sam. x. 3; 1 Chron. xix. 3.

καταδουλώσουσιν] "reduce to abject slavery." The reading of the received text, καταδουλώσονται, is a correction of some classicist, introduced for two reasons: (1) To substitute the middle voice, which is more common in classical writers; the transcriber not seeing that the sense here requires the active: "enslave not to themselves, but to an external power, the law of Moses." (2) To restore the usual classical government of ἵνα with the conjunctive. ἵνα, however, is found several times in the New Testament with the indicative future, and sometimes, even with the indicative present, as in iv. 17; see Winer, § xli. p. 289. This, though not a classical usage, is justified by similar constructions of ὅπως, ὅφρα in classical writers.

5. οἷς οὐδὲ κ.τ.λ.] "to whom we," Paul

εἴξαμεν τῇ ὑποταγῇ, ἵνα ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου διαμεῖνῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς· ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναι τι· ὅποιοί ποτε ἦσαν, οὐδέν

and Barnabas, who were sent to Jerusalem to plead the cause of the Gentile Christians, "*yielded, no, not for an hour.*" For the omission of οἷς οὐδέ in some texts, see the detached note, p. 324.

τῇ ὑποταγῇ] "*by the submission which was required of us,*" or, possibly, "*the submission with which we are taunted,*" as in 2 Cor. i. 17, *μητι ἄρα τῇ ἐλαφρίᾳ ἐχρησάμην*;

ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου] "*the truth of the gospel,*" i.e. the gospel in its integrity. This expression in St. Paul's language denotes the doctrine of grace, the maintenance of Christian liberty, as opposed to the false teaching of the Judaizers. See ii. 14, and comp. Col. i. 5, 6, where the same idea seems to be indirectly involved.

διαμεῖνῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς] "*may abide with you,*" the Gentile churches. See the Introduction, p. 32. The idea of *firm possession* is enforced by the compound verb, by the past tense, and by the preposition.

6. "The elder apostles, I say, who are so highly esteemed, whose authority you so exclusively uphold,—for myself, I care not that they once knew Christ in the flesh; God does not so judge men; he measures them, not by the outward advantages they have had, not by the rank they hold, but by what they are, by what they think and do,—well, these highly esteemed leaders taught me nothing new; they had no fault to find with me. On the contrary, they received me as their equal; they recognized my mission."

Much force is lost in the A.V. by translating οἱ δοκούντες throughout this passage as a past tense, instead of a present. St. Paul is speaking, not of the esteem in which the leading apostles of the circumcision were held by the Christians of Jerusalem at the time of the conferences, but of the esteem in

which they are held while he is writing, by his Galatian converts. The mistake seems to have arisen from following the Vulgate "*qui videbantur.*" The Old Latin apparently had the present in most recensions, though not consistently in all four places. Of the older English versions, Tyndale's alone translates by a present in this verse, and the Geneva in verse 9.

τῶν δοκούντων εἶναι τι] "*those who are looked up to as authorities.*" The expression is sometimes used in a depreciatory way, as in Plat. *Alpol.* 41 E, *ἐὰν δοκῶσι τι εἶναι μηδὲν ὄντες*; *Euthyd.* 303 C, *τῶν πολλῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τῶν σεμνῶν δὴ καὶ δοκούντων τι εἶναι οὐδὲν ὑμῶν μέλει*, *Corih.* 472 A, *ἐνίοτε γὰρ ἂν καὶ καταψευδομαρτυρηθεῖη τις ὑπὸ πολλῶν καὶ δοκούντων εἶναι τι*, and passages from later writers quoted in Wetstein: comp. Gal. vi. 3, *εἰ γὰρ δοκεῖ τις εἶναι τι μηδὲν ὄν*, and Ignat. *Pol.* 3 (Syr.). The exact shade of meaning which it bears must always be determined by the context. Here it is depreciatory, not indeed of the twelve themselves, but of the extravagant and exclusive claims set up for them by the Judaizers. Thus it is nearly an equivalent to οἱ ὑπερλίαν ἀπόστολοι of 2 Cor. xi. 5; xii. 11.

ὅποιοί ποτε ἦσαν] Does ὅποιοί ποτε here mean "*qualescunque,*" or has ποτέ its proper temporal sense "*in times past*"? In a classical writer we should decide for the former; in St. Paul the latter seems more probable, as ποτέ never occurs with the meaning "*cunque*" in the New Testament, and accordingly it is rendered in the Latin versions "*aliquando.*" This decides the import of the whole phrase. It does not mean "*what reputation they enjoyed,*" but "*what was their position, what were their advantages in former times,*" referring to their personal intercourse with the Lord. The "*knowing*

μοι διαφέρει, πρόσωπον Θεὸς ἀνθρώπου οὐ λαμβάνει· ἐμοὶ γὰρ οἱ δοκούντες οὐδὲν προσανέθεντο, ἡ ἀλλὰ τοῦναντίον ἰδόντες ὅτι πεπίστευμαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας καθὼς Πέτρος τῆς περιτομῆς, ὁ γὰρ ἐνεργήσας Πέτρῳ εἰς ἀποστολὴν τῆς περιτομῆς

Christ after the flesh" (2 Cor. v. 16) is in itself valueless in the sight of God. The same reproach is conveyed by the words here as in 2 Cor. x. 7, τὰ κατὰ πρόσωπον βλέπετε.

πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν] A translation of the Hebrew פָּנִים נָשָׂא which signifies properly "to accept the face" (Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 916, s.v. נָשָׂא), or perhaps better "to raise the face" of another (opposed to פָּנִים לִפְנֵי "to make the countenance fall," e.g. Job xxix. 24; comp. Gen. iv. 5), and hence "to receive kindly," "to look favorably upon one." In the Old Testament, accordingly, it is a neutral expression involving no subsidiary idea of *partiality*, and is much oftener found in a good than in a bad sense. When it becomes an independent Greek phrase, however, the bad sense attaches to it, owing to the secondary meaning of *πίσωπον* as "a mask," so that *πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν* signifies "to regard the external circumstances of a man," his rank, wealth, etc., as opposed to his real intrinsic character. Thus in the New Testament it has always a bad sense. Hence a new set of words, *προσωπολήμπτης*, *προσωπολημπτεῖν*, etc., which appear to occur there for the first time.

Θεὸς ἀνθρώπου] The natural order is altered for two reasons: (1) To give Θεὸς an emphatic position, and (2) to keep the contrasted words Θεὸς ἀνθρώπου together.

ἐμοὶ γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] The sentence, which was begun in ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναι τι and then broken off by the parenthesis, is here resumed, but in a different form, "well, to me those of reputation communicated nothing." See the note on ver. 4. Otherwise the γὰρ may be attached to ὁποῖοι ποτε ἦσαν οὐδὲν μοι διαφέρει, the parenthesis running back

into the main proposition of the sentence, "whatever position they once held makes no matter to me; *for to me they communicated nothing*": Winer, § lxiii. p. 568. But the interposition of the words πρόσ. Θ. ἀνθρ. οὐ λαμβ. is an objection to this construction.

προσανέθεντο] "*communicated*," see the note on i. 16. *προσανατίθεσθαι* is "to communicate, to impart," whether for the purpose of giving or of obtaining instruction. In this passage the former meaning prevails; in i. 16, the latter. The context here decides its sense: "they imparted no fresh knowledge to me; they saw nothing defective or incorrect in my teaching; but, *on the contrary*, they heartily recognized my mission."

7. πεπίστευμαι τὸ εὐαγγ.] "*I have been entrusted with the gospel*," a common construction in St. Paul; see the note on 1 Thess. ii. 4. The perfect here, implying a permanent commission, contrasts with the aorist in Rom. iii. 2, ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ.

τὸ εὐαγγ. τῆς ἀκροβυστίας] denotes a distinction of sphere, and not a difference of type: see Tertull. *praescr. lavr.* 23, "Inter se distributionem officii ordinauerunt, non separationem evangelii, nec ut *alind* alter sed ut *aliis* alter praedicarent."

8. ὁ ἐνεργήσας Πέτρῳ] "*He that worked for Peter*." For the omission of ὁ Θεὸς comp. i. 6, 15: for ἐνεργεῖν see the note on 1 Thess. ii. 13. The dative Πέτρῳ ought probably to be translated "for Peter," not "in Peter"; comp. Prov. xxxi. 12 ἐνεργεῖ γὰρ τῷ ἀνδρὶ (γυνὴ ἀνδρεία) εἰς ἀγαθὰ πάντα τὸν βίον. As ἐνεργεῖν in an inseparable compound, it is doubtful whether the preposition could govern Πέτρῳ, and accordingly the construction elsewhere is ἐνεργεῖν ἐν τινι.

ἐνῆργησεν καὶ ἐμοὶ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, ⁹ καὶ γνόντες τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖ-
σάν μοι. Ἰάκωβος καὶ Κηφᾶς καὶ Ἰωάννης, οἱ δοκοῦντες στύλοι
εἶναι, δεξιὰς ἔδωκαν ἐμοὶ καὶ Βαρνάβαν κοινωνίας, ἵνα ἡμεῖς εἰς

Comp. *Acta Paul. et Thecl.* § 40 ὁ γὰρ σοὶ
συνεργήσας εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον κάμω συνή-
ργησεν εἰς τὸ λούσασθαι.

9. Of the two words ἰδόντες and γνόν-
τες, the former describes the *apprehension*
of the outward tokens of his commission,
as evinced by his successful labors; the
latter the *conviction* arrived at in conse-
quence that the grace of God was with
him; see iv. 8, 9.

Ἰάκωβος καὶ Κηφᾶς καὶ Ἰωάννης]
The best supported and doubtless the
right reading. The variation Πέτρος καὶ
Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης arose from the desire
of maintaining the precedence of St. Pe-
ter. On the other hand, the correct text
presents two coincidences with the nar-
rative of the Acts, which deserve notice.
First. In i. 19 James is styled the Lord's
brother, while here and in ver. 12 this
designation is dropped. St. Luke's nar-
rative explains this omission. In the
interval between St. Paul's two visits
James the son of Zebedee had been put
to death. No term of distinction, there-
fore, was now needed, as there was no
likelihood of confusion, James the son
of Alphaeus, though an apostle, not hold-
ing any very prominent rank. *Secondly.*
The relative positions here assigned to
Peter and James accord exactly with
the account in the Acts. When St.
Paul is speaking of the missionary office
of the church at large, St. Peter holds
the foremost place (ver. 7, 8): when he
refers to a special act of the church of
Jerusalem, St. James is mentioned first
(ver. 9). See Acts xii. 17, xv. 13,
xxi. 18.

στύλει] "*pillars.*" A natural meta-
phor occurring now and then in classical
writers (e.g. Eur. *Iph. T.* 57 στυλοὶ γὰρ
οἴκων εἰσὶ παῖδες ἄρσενες, and Aesch.
Agam. 897), but commonly used by the
Jews in speaking of the great teachers
of the law. See the examples given in

Schöttgen: comp. *Clem. Rom.* xviii. 14
ἐπὶ στυλοῖς ὑπάρχοντας κόσμῳ, said of
the patriarchs. So in *Clem. Rom.* § 5
the apostles Peter and Paul are called
οἱ μέγιστοι καὶ δικαιοτάτοι στυλοὶ. In this
metaphor the church is regarded as the
house or temple of God; as Rev. iii. 12,
ποιήσω αὐτὸν στυλὸν ἐν τῷ ναῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ
μου: comp. 1 Tim. iii. 15. The accent
of στυλός is doubtful. On the one hand,
the υ is universally long in poetry even
of a late date (see Rost u. Palm. *Griech.*
Wörterb. s. v.). On the other, the author-
ity of the oldest accents in the MSS., and
the quantity of the Latin "*stylus*," are
in favor of στέλος. The latter not im-
probably represents the common pro-
nunciation of the apostolic age. See
Lipsius, *gramm. unters.* p. 43.

δεξιὰς ἔδωκαν] "*gave pledges.*" The
outward gesture is lost sight of in this
expression, as appears from the fact that
the plural δεξιὰς δοῦναι, δεξιὰς λαμβάνειν,
is often used of a single person; 1 Mace.
xi. 50, 62, xiii. 50. As a symbol of
contract or friendship this does not
appear prominently in the Old Testa-
ment, (Esr. x. 19, and perhaps 2 Kings
x. 15; see below on κοινωνίας), nor is it
especially Jewish. In the patriarchal
times the outward gesture which con-
firmed an oath was different, Gen. xxiv. 2.
The giving the right hand, however,
was a recognized pledge of fidelity with
other Eastern nations, with the Persians
especially (Corn. Nep. *Int.* c. 10 "*fidem-
que de ea re more Persarum dextra
dedisset.*" Diod. xvi. 43 ἐστὶ δὲ ἡ πίστις
αὕτη βεβαιωσάτη παρὰ τοῖς Πέρσiais, comp.
Justin. xi. 15. 13); and from Persian
influence the symbol and the phrase may
have become more common among the
Jews. Even Josephus (*Ant.* xviii. 9. 3)
speaks of this not as a Jewish practice,
but as μέγιστον παρὰ πᾶσι τοῖς ἐκείνη
βαρβάροις παράδειγμα τοῦ θαρσεῖν τοῖς

τὰ ἔθνη. αὐτοὶ δὲ εἰς τὴν περιτομὴν.¹⁰ μόνον τῶν πτωχῶν ἵνα μνημονεύωμεν, ὃ καὶ ἐσπούδασα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι.

¹¹ Ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν Κηφᾶς εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν, κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ

δαίλοισιν, in reference to Artabanus the Parthian king. Where personal communication was inconvenient, it was customary to send images of right hands clasped, as a token of friendship: Xen. *Anab.* ii. 4.1 δεξιὰς παρὰ βασιλέως φέροντες, *Agcs.* 3. 4; comp. Tacit. *Hist.* i. 54; ii. 8.

κοινωνίας] “of fellowship,” not a superfluous addition, for “to give the hand” (יד יד) in the language of the Old Testament, like the Latin “do manus,” generally signifies “to surrender,” e.g. Lam. v. 6; 2 Chron. xxx. 8; see Gesen. *Thes.* p. 566.

ἵνα ἔτις] The ellipsis of the verb occurs in St. Paul under various conditions. A foregoing ἵνα is one of these; see 1 Cor. i. 31; 2 Cor. viii. 13; Rom. ix. 16; comp. 2 Cor. viii. 11.

10. “Henceforth our spheres of labor were to be separate. One reservation, however, was made. They asked me to continue, as I had done hitherto, to provide for the wants of the poor brethren of Judaea. Independently of their request, it was my own earnest desire.”

μόνον] “only they asked us”: comp. Ignat. *Rom.* 5. μόνον ἵνα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐπιτύχω. For similar instances of an ellipsis after μόνον, see vi. 12; 2 Thess ii. 7 μόνον ὃ κατέχων ἄρτι ἕως ἐκ μέσου γένηται. The latter passage presents an exact parallel also in the derangement of the order for the sake of emphasis.

Two occasions are recorded, on which St. Paul was the bearer of alms from the Gentile converts to the poor of Jerusalem; (1) on his second journey to Jerusalem (Acts xi. 29, 30), some years before the interview of which he is speaking; and (2) on his fifth and last journey. (Rom. xv. 26, 27; 1 Cor. xvi. 3; 2 Cor. ix. 1 sqq.; Acts xxiv. 17), shortly after this letter was written. These facts throw light on the incident in the text.

His past care for their poor prompted this request of the elder apostles. His subsequent zeal in the same cause was the answer to their appeal.

ὃ καὶ ἐσπούδασα κ.τ.λ.] “this was my own heartfelt desire,” “I needed no prompting to do this.” The Galatians had personal experience of this zeal, for their own alms had been solicited by St. Paul for this very purpose shortly before (1 Cor. xvi. 3). See the Introduction, pp. 31, 60.

The transition from the plural (μνημονεύωμεν) to the singular (ἐσπούδασα) is significant. Before St. Paul had any opportunity of fulfilling this request, he had parted from Barnabas (Acts xv. 39.

αὐτοῦ τοῦτο] is best taken in apposition with ὃ, see Winer, § xxii. p. 149; a construction not without example in classical Greek, but more frequent in the LXX and New Testament, inasmuch as it reproduces the common Hebrew idiom; comp. Mark vii. 25; Acts xv. 17; 1 Pet. ii. 24.

11. “At Jerusalem, I owed nothing to the apostles of the circumcision. I maintained my independence and my equality. At Antioch I was more than an equal. The leading apostle of the circumcision betrayed the cause of the Gentiles by his inconsistency. He timidly yielded to pressure from the ritualists. The rest were carried away by his example. Even Barnabas, my colleague, the friend and apostle of the Gentiles, went astray. Alone I stood up in defence of the liberty of the gospel. This was not done in a corner. The whole church of Antioch is my witness.”

Ὅτε ἐξί] This occurred probably during the sojourn of Paul and Barnabas at Antioch, immediately after the apostolic congress (Acts xv. 30–40). The inconsistency which St. Peter thus appears to have shown so soon after his

ἀντέστην. ὅτι κατεγνωσμένος ἦν. ¹²πρὸ τοῦ γὰρ ἔλθειν τινὰς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν συνήσθιεν· ὅτε δὲ ἦλθον, ὑπέστελλεν

12. ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν.

championship of Gentile liberty at the congress is rather in favor of than against this view; for the point of St. Paul's rebuke is his inconsistency. But, in fact, there is scarcely an alternative. An earlier residence at Antioch (Acts xiii. 1-3) is out of the question, for St. Paul is plainly narrating events in chronological order. Neither, again, is it probable that a later occasion (Acts xviii. 23) can be intended; for after the separation of Paul and Barnabas, there is no notice of their meeting again.

To this passage is probably to be attributed the ecclesiastical tradition that St. Peter founded the church of Antioch (Euseb. *Chron.* A.D. 44). Jerome (ad loc.) states still more definitely that he was bishop of this see first, whence he was translated to Rome. See also Euseb. *H.E.* iii. 22, 36; Chrysost. *Op.* iii. p. 70, ed. Ben.

κατεγνωσμένος] not "reprehensible," but "condemned." His conduct carried its own condemnation with it, as St. Paul shows, vv. 15 sqq.: comp. Rom. xiv. 23, ὁ διακρινόμενος, ἐὰν φάγῃ, κατακεκρίται: Jno. iii. 18, ὁ μὴ πιστεύων ἤδη κέκρίται. The condemnation spoken of is not the verdict of the bystanders, but the verdict of the act itself.

This passage was made the ground for an attack on St. Paul in an Ebionite fiction of the second century, where St. Peter is represented saying to Simon Magus (whose name is used as a mask for St. Paul), "Thou hast withstood me to the face. . . . If thou callest me condemned, thou accusest God, who revealed Christ to me." See the whole passage, *Clem. Hom.* xvii. 19; comp. p. 66. and the notes on ii. 13; iv. 16, 24.

12. ἔλθειν τινὰς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου] "certain came from James." Of these nothing more can safely be inferred than that they belonged to the church of Jeru-

salem. It is not improbable, however, that they came invested with some powers from James which they abused. Compare the expression in the apostolic letter (which seems to have been drawn up by him), Acts xv. 24, τινὲς ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξεληθόντες ἐτάραξαν ὑμᾶς . . . οἷς οὐ διεστείλαμεθα; and xv. 1, τινὲς κατελθόντες ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας. The terms on which St. James stood with believers of this stamp may be gathered from his language in Acts xxi. 20 sqq.

συνήσθιεν] The Judaizers who troubled the church at this time are described, Acts xv. 5, as converts belonging to the sect of the Pharisees. The prohibition against eating meat with the impure was one of the leading principles of this sect, Luke xv. 2. As the agape was the recognized bond of brotherhood in the infant church, this separation struck at the very root of Christian life. St. Peter's vision (see especially Acts x. 27; xi. 3) had taught him the worthlessness of these narrow traditions. He had no scruples about living ἐθνικῶς. And when in this instance he separated himself from the Gentiles, he practically dissembled his convictions.

ὅτε δὲ ἦλθον] "but when they came." The reading ἦλθεν yields no good sense, whether we refer it to St. James with Origen (c. *Cels.* ii. 1, ἐλθόντος Ἰακώβου), or to St. Peter with other writers. I have given it a place, nevertheless, as an alternative reading, on account of the weight of authority in its favor; for, though it can scarcely have been the word intended by St. Paul, it may possibly be due to an error of the original amanuensis. For a similar instance of a manifestly false reading, highly supported, and perhaps to be explained in this way, see Phil. ii. 1, εἰ τις σπλάγχνα καὶ οἰκτιρμοί. Such readings are a valuable testimony to the scrupulous exact-

καὶ ἀφώριζεν ἑαυτὸν. φοβούμενος τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς, ¹³ καὶ συν-
υπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ [καὶ] οἱ λοιποὶ Ἰουδαῖοι, ὥστε καὶ Βαρνάβας
συναπήχθη αὐτῶν τῇ ὑποκρίσει. ¹⁴ ἀλλ' ὅτε εἶδον ὅτι οὐκ

ness of the older transcribers, who thus reproduced the text as they found it, even when clearly incorrect. In this passage the occurrence of the same words, ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν, ver. 11, is the probable cause of the mistake.

ὑπέστελλεν καὶ ἀφώριζεν] "*gradually withdrew and separated himself.*" Both verbs govern ἑαυτὸν: compare Polyb. vii. 17, 1, ὑπέστειλαν ἑαυτοὺς ὑπὸ τινα προπετικυαίαν ὀφρύν. The words describe forcibly the cautious withdrawal of a timid person who shrinks from observation, ὑπέστελλεν denoting the partial, ἀφώριζεν the complete and final separation. The word ὑποστέλλειν is frequently used, as in the passage quoted, in describing strategical operations; and so far as it is metaphorical here, the metaphor seems to be derived from military rather than from nautical matters. Comp. στέλλεσθαι, 2 Thess. iii. 6.

τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς] not "Jews," but "converts from Judaism," for this seems to be the force of the preposition: Acts x. 45; xi. 2; Col. iv. 11; Tit. i. 10.

13. οἱ λοιποὶ Ἰουδαῖοι] i.e. the rest of the Jewish converts resident at Antioch, who, like St. Peter, had mixed freely with the Gentiles until the arrival of their brethren from Jerusalem. The observance of pharisaic practices with the latter was a genuine expression of bigotry, but with the Jews of Antioch and with St. Peter it was ὑπόκρισις, the assumption of a part which masked their genuine feelings, and made them appear otherwise than they were. The idea at the root of ὑπόκρισις is not a false motive entertained, but a false impression produced. The writer of the epistle prefixed to the Clementines, doubtless alluding to this passage, speaks of some who misrepresented Peter, as though he believed that the law was abolished,

but did not preach it openly"; Ep. Petr. § 2. See on ver. 11.

καὶ Βαρνάβας] "*Even Barnabas, my own friend and colleague, who so lately had gone up to protect the interests of the Gentiles against the pressure of the Pharisaic brethren.*" It is not impossible that this incident, by producing a temporary feeling of distrust, may have prepared the way for the dissension between Paul and Barnabas which shortly afterwards led to their separation (Acts xv. 39).

From this time forward, they never again appear associated together. But, on the other hand, whenever St. Paul mentions Barnabas, his words imply sympathy and respect. This feeling underlies the language of his complaint here, "*even Barnabas.*" In 1 Cor. ix. 6, again, he connects Barnabas with himself, as one who had labored in the same disinterested spirit, and had the same claims upon the Gentile converts. Lastly, in Col. iv. 10, he commends Mark to the Colossian church, as being the cousin of Barnabas.

συναπήχθη αὐτῶν τῇ ὑποκρίσει] "*was carried away with their dissimulation,*" as the A.V. rightly. Their dissimulation was as a flood which swept everything away with it. Comp. 2 Pet. iii. 17, ἵνα μὴ τῇ τῶν ἀθέσμων πλάνῃ συναπαχθέντες ἐκπέσητε, etc., Zosimus, Hist. v. 6, καὶ αὐτὴ δὲ ἡ Σπάρτη συναπήγετο τῇ κούῃ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀλώσει. In all these passages the dative seems to be governed by the preposition, and cannot without harshness be taken as the instrumental case.

14. οὐκ ὀρθοδοδοῦσιν πρὸς κ.τ.λ.] i.e. "they diverge from the straight path of the gospel truth." The word ὀρθοδοδεῖν appears not to occur elsewhere, except in later ecclesiastical writers, where its use may be traced to

ὀρθοποδοῦσιν πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, εἶπον τῷ Κηφῇ ἔμπροσθεν πάντων Εἰ σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων ἐθνικῶς καὶ οὐχ Ἰουδαϊκῶς ζῇς, πῶς τὰ ἔθνη ἀναγκάζεις Ἰουδαΐζειν ; ¹⁵ ἡμεῖς φύσει

this passage of St. Paul. Its classical equivalent is *εὐθυπορεῖν*. The preposition *προς* here denotes not the goal to be attained, but the line of direction to be observed : see Winer, § xlix. p. 405. For ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου see the note on ii. 5.

εἶπον] Were all the concluding verses of the chapter actually spoken by St. Paul at the time, or is he adding a comment while narrating the incident afterwards to the Galatians ; and if so, where does the text cease, and the comment begin ? To this question it seems impossible to give a definite answer. St. Paul's narrative, in fact, loses itself in the reflections suggested by it. Text and comment are so blended together that they cannot be separated without violence. The use of the word *ἀμαρτωλοί*, vv. 15, 17, marks the language of one speaking as a Jew to Jews, and therefore may be regarded as part of the original remonstrance ; and yet, though there is no break in the continuity from that point onward, we find at the end of the chapter that St. Paul's thoughts and language have drifted away from Peter at Antioch to the Judaizers in Galatia. For similar instances of the intermingling of the direct language of the speaker and the after comment of the narrator, see John i. 15-18, where the testimony of the Baptist loses itself in the thoughts of the evangelist, and Acts i. 16-21, where St. Peter's allusion to the death of Judas is interwoven with the after explanations of St. Luke.

Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων] almost equivalent to *φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι* below ; see i. 14. In such cases *ὑπάρχων* implies a contrast between the original and the after state, e.g. in Phil. ii. 6. Here it is very emphatic : " If you, *born and bred* a Jew, discard Jewish customs, how unreasonable to impose them on Gentiles."

ἐθνικῶς ζῇς] i.e. mix freely with the Gentiles, and thus of necessity disregard the Jewish law of meats. The present tense describes St. Peter's general principles, as acted upon long before at Caesarea (Acts x. 28), and just lately at Antioch (ver. 12), though at the exact moment when St. Paul was speaking, he was living Ἰουδαϊκῶς, and not ἐθνικῶς.

οὐχ Ἰουδαϊκῶς] The best MSS. agree in reading the aspirated form *οὐχ*. For other examples of anomalous aspirates in the Greek New Testament, see Winer, § v. p. 45, and comp. the note on Phil. ii. 23, *ἀφίδω*. In this particular instance the aspirate may perhaps be accounted for by the *gh* with which the Hebrew word (יְהוּדָיִם) represented by Ἰουδαῖοι commences.

ἀναγκάζεις] i.e. practically oblige them, though such was not his intention. The force of his example, concealing his true principles, became a species of compulsion.

Ἰουδαΐζειν] "*to adopt Jewish customs,*" opposed to ἐθνικῶς ζῇς, which, in connection with Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων is equivalent to ἐλληνίζεις : comp. Esth. viii. 17, καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν περιετέμοντο καὶ Ἰουδαΐζον διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν Ἰουδαίων. See the note on Ἰουδαῖσμός, i. 13.

15, 16. " For, take our own ease. We were born to all the privileges of the Israelite race ; we were not *sinners*, as we proudly call the Gentiles. What then ? We saw that the observance of law would not justify any man, that faith was the only means of justification. Therefore we turned to a belief in Christ. Thus our Christian profession is in itself an acknowledgment that such ritual observances are worthless and void."

Of many constructions proposed, the simplest and best is to understand the

Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἐθνῶν ἁμαρτωλοί,¹⁶ εἰδότες δὲ ὅτι οὐ δικαιοῦνται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν, ἵνα

16. διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ.

substantive verb in ver. 15, "We (are) Jews by birth," etc. The δέ of ver. 16, which is omitted in the received text, is certainly genuine.

15. φύσαι Ἰουδαῖοι] "*Jews by birth* : not only not Gentiles, but not even proselytes. We inherited the Jewish religion. Everything was done for us which race could do." See especially Phil. iii. 4, 5.

ἐξ ἐθνῶν] Not "of Gentile descent," but "taken from, belonging to the Gentiles"; comp. Acts xv. 23.

ἁμαρτωλοί] "*sinners*." The word was almost a synonyme for ἔθνη in the the religious phraseology of the Jews. See 1 Macc. ii. 44, *Chm. Hom.* xi. 16, οὕτως ὡς οὐχὶ Ἰουδαῖος, ἁμαρτωλὸς κ.τ.λ.; and compare Luke vi. 32, 33 with Matt. v. 47, and especially Matt. xxvi. 45 with Luke xviii. 32. Here ἁμαρτωλοί is used in preference to ἔθνη, not without a shade of irony, as better enforcing St. Paul's argument. See the note on ver. 17.

16. ἐὰν μὴ] retains its proper meaning, but refers only to οὐ δικαιοῦνται, "He is not justified from works of law; he is not justified *except* through faith." See the note on i. 19.

καὶ ἑμεῖς] "*we ourselves*," notwithstanding our privileges of race. Compare καὶ αὐτοί, ver. 17.

ἐπιστεύσαμεν] "*became believers*." See the note on 2 Thess. i. 10. The phrase πιστεύειν εἰς or ἐπὶ τινα is peculiarly Christian; see Winer, § xxxi. p. 213. The constructions of the LXX are πιστεύειν τινί, rarely πιστεύειν ἐπὶ τινί or ἐν τινί, and once only ἐπὶ τινα, Wisd. xii. 2, πιστεύειν ἐπὶ Θεόν. The phrase, which occurs in the revised Nicene and other creeds, πιστεύειν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν, though an intelligible, is yet a lax expression, the propriety of which was

rightly disputed by many of the fathers, who maintained that πιστεύειν εἰς should be reserved for belief in God or in Christ. See the passages in Suicer, *Thesaur.* s.v. πιστεύειν, and Pearson, *On the Creed*, Art. ix.

ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ] It seems almost impossible to trace the subtle process which has led to the change of prepositions here. In Rom. iii. 30, on the other hand, an explanation is challenged by the direct opposition of ἐκ πίστεως and διὰ τῆς πίστεως. Both prepositions are used elsewhere by St. Paul with δικαιοῦν, δικαιοσύνη, indifferently; though where very great precision is aimed at, he seems for an obvious reason to prefer διὰ, as in Eph. ii. 8, 9; Phil. iii. 9, μὴ ἔχων ἐμὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ νόμου ἀλλὰ τὴν διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ κ.τ.λ., which words present an exact parallel to the former part of this verse, οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Faith is, strictly speaking, only the *means*, not the *source*, of justification. The one preposition (διὰ) excludes this latter notion, while the other (ἐκ) might imply it. Besides these we meet also with ἐπὶ πίστει (Phil. iii. 9), but never διὰ πίστιν, "*propter fidem*," which would involve a doctrinal error. Compare the careful language in the Latin of our Article xi., "*per fidem, non propter opera*."

ἔτι] is the best supported, and doubtless the correct reading. The reading of the received text διότι has probably been imported from the parallel passage, Rom. iii. 20.

ὅτι ἐξ ἔργων κ.τ.λ.] A quotation from the Old Testament, as appears from the Hebraism οὐ πάσα, and from the introductory ὅτι. This sentence, indeed, would be an unmeaning repetition of what has gone before, unless the apostle

δικαιωθῶμεν ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, ὅτι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ. ¹⁷ εἰ δὲ ζητοῦντες δικαιωθῆναι ἐν Χριστῷ εὐρέθημεν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἁμαρτωλοί, ἄρα

were enforcing his own statements by some authoritative declaration. The words are therefore to be regarded as a free citation of Ps. cxliii. 2, οὐ δικαιωθήσεται ἐνώπιόν σου πᾶς ζῶν. For πᾶς ζῶν, a very common Hebrew synonyme, πᾶσα σὰρξ (פֶּשַׁע בָּשָׂר), is substituted by St. Paul. In Rom. iii. 20 the passage is quoted in the same form as here. In both instances St. Paul adds ἐξ ἔργων νόμου as a comment of his own, to describe the condition of the people whom the Psalmist addressed. In the context of the passage in the Romans (iii. 19) this comment is justified by his explanation, that "whatever is stated in the law applies to those under the law."

For οὐ πᾶσα, see Winer, § xxvi. p. 171 sq.

17, 18, 19. "Thus, to be justified in Christ, it was necessary to sink to the level of Gentiles, to become 'sinners,' in fact. But are we not thus making Christ a minister of sin? Away with the profane thought! No; the guilt is not in abandoning the law, but in seeking it again when abandoned. Thus, and thus alone, we convict ourselves of transgression. On the other hand, in abandoning the law we did but follow the promptings of the law itself.

17. Among a vast number of interpretations which have been given of this verse, the following alone deserve consideration.

First. We may regard Χριστὸς ἁμαρτίας διάκονος as a conclusion logically inferred from the premises, supposing them to be granted: "If, in order to be justified in Christ, it was necessary to abandon the law, and if the abandonment of the law is sinful, then Christ is made a minister of sin." In this case ἄρα is preferable to ἄρα.

If the passage is so taken, it is an

attack on the premises through the conclusion, which is obviously monstrous and untenable. Now the assumptions in the premises are twofold: (1) "To be justified in Christ it is necessary to abandon the law," and (2) "To abandon the law is to become sinners"; and as we suppose one or other of these attacked, we shall get two distinct meanings for the passage, as follows: (1) It is an attempt of the Judaizing objector to show that the abandonment of the law was wrong, inasmuch as it led to so false an inference: "To abandon the law is to commit sin; it must therefore be wrong to abandon the law in order to be justified in Christ, for this is to make Christ a minister of sin"; or (2) it is an argument on the part of St. Paul to show that to abandon the law is not to commit sin: "It cannot be sinful to abandon the law, because it is necessary to abandon the law in order to be justified in Christ, and thus Christ would be made a minister of sin."

Of these two interpretations, the latter is adopted by many of the fathers. Yet, if our choice were restricted to one or other, the former would seem preferable, for it retains the sense of ἁμαρτωλοί ("sinners," from a Jewish point of view), which it had in ver. 15, and is more consistent with the indicative εὐρέθημεν, this proposition being assumed as absolutely true by the Jewish objector. But, on the other hand, it forms an awkward introduction to the verse which follows.

It is probable, therefore, that both should be abandoned in favor of another explanation. For

Secondly, We may regard Χριστὸς ἁμαρτίας διάκονος as an illogical conclusion deduced from premises in themselves correct: "Seeing that in order to be justified in Christ it was necessary

Χριστὸς ἁμαρτίας διάκονος ; μὴ γένοιτο· ¹⁸ εἰ γὰρ ἂ κατέλυσα ταῦτα πάλιν οἰκοδομῶ, παραβάτην ἑμαυτὸν συνιστάνω· ¹⁹ ἐγὼ γὰρ

to abandon our old ground of legal righteousness, and to become sinners (i.e. to put ourselves in the position of the heathen), may it not be argued that Christ is thus made a minister of sin ? This interpretation best develops the subtle irony of ἁμαρτωλοί: "We Jews look down upon the Gentiles as sinners; yet we have no help for it but to become sinners like them." It agrees with the indicative ἐρέθημεν, and with St. Paul's usage of μὴ γένοιτο, which elsewhere in argumentative passages always negatives a false but plausible inference from premises taken as granted. And lastly, it paves the way for the words διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπεθانون which follow. In this case ἄρα is to be preferred to ἄρα, because it at once introduces the inference as a questionable one. It may be added also in favor of ἄρα, that elsewhere μὴ γένοιτο follows an interrogation. Ἄρα expresses bewilderment as to a possible conclusion. Any attempt further to define its meaning seems not to be justified either by the context here, or by its usage elsewhere. Ἄρα hesitates, while ἄρα concludes.

ἐρέθημεν involves more or less prominently the idea of a *surprise*; comp. Rom. vii. 10; 2 Cor. xi. 12; xii. 20. Its frequent use, however, must be traced to the influence of the Aramaic dialect; see Cureton, *Corp. Ign.* p. 271.

ἁμαρτίας διάκονος while yet he is δικαιοσύνης διάκονος, thus making a direct contradiction in terms.

μὴ γένοιτο "Nay, verily," "Away with the thought." This is one out of several LXX renderings of the Hebrew פָּרָא ("ad profana," and so "absit," see Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 478). Another rendering of the same is יָלֵעַס (sc. ὁ θεός), which occurs Matt. xvi. 22, יָלֵעַס σοι Κύριε, "far be it from thee, Lord"; see Glass, *Phil. sacr.* p. 538. Μὴ γένοιτο is not, however, confined to Jewish and

Christian writings, but is frequent, for instance in Arrian; see Raphael, *Annot.* Rom. iii. 4.

18. "If, after destroying the old law of ordinances, I attempt to build it up again, I condemn myself, I testify to my guilt in the work of destruction." The pulling down and building up have reference doubtless to the Mosaic law, though expressed as a general maxim (ταῦτα). The difficulty, however, is to trace the connection involved in γάρ.

With the interpretation of ver. 17 adopted above, it seems simplest to attach γάρ to μὴ γένοιτο, "Nay, verily, for, so far from Christ being a minister of sin, there is no sin at all in abandoning the law; it is only converted into a sin by returning to the law again." For this use of γάρ after μὴ γένοιτο comp. Rom. ix. 14, 15; xi. 1.

παραβάτην ἑμαυτὸν συνιστάνω] "I make myself out, establish myself, a transgressor." It will have been seen that much of the force of the passage depends on the sense which the Jews attached to ἁμαρτωλός. Having passed on from this to ἁμαρτία, St. Paul at length throws off the studied ambiguity of ἁμαρτωλός ("a non-observer of the law," and "a sinner") by substituting the plain term παραβάτης.

ἑμαυτὸν συνιστάνω is opposed to Χριστὸς ἁμαρτίας διάκονος, though from its position ἑμαυτὸν cannot be very emphatic.

συνιστάνω] "I prove," like συμβιβάζω, as Rom. iii. 5; v. 8; comp. 2 Cor. iii. 1.

19. Establishing the statement of the foregoing verse: "For, in abandoning the law, I did but follow the leading of the law itself."

ἐγὼ] Not "I Paul," as distinguished from others, for instance, from the Gentile converts, but "I Paul, the natural man, the slave of the old covenant." The emphasis on ἐγὼ is explained by

διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον, ἵνα Θεῷ ζήσω· ²⁰ Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι· ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγώ, ζῆ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός· ὃ δὲ νῦν ζῶ ἐν

the following verse, ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγώ κ.τ.λ.

διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον] In what sense can one be said *through law* to have died to law? Of all the answers that have been given to this question, two alone seem to deserve consideration. The law may be said in two different ways to be παιδαγωγὸς εἰς Χριστόν. We may regard

i. *Its economical purpose.* "The law bore on its face the marks of its transitory character. Its prophecies foretold Christ. Its sacrifices and other typical rites foreshadowed Christ. It was therefore an act of obedience to the law when Christ came to take him as my Master in place of the law." This interpretation, however, though quite in character with St. Paul's teaching elsewhere, does not suit the present passage; For (1) the written law—the Old Testament—is always ὁ νόμος. At least, it seems never to be quoted otherwise. Νόμος without the article is "law" considered as a principle, exemplified, no doubt, chiefly and signally in the Mosaic law, but very much wider than this in its application. In explaining this passage, therefore, we must seek for some element in the Mosaic law which it had in common with law generally, instead of dwelling on its special characteristics as a prophetic and typical dispensation. Moreover (2) the interpretation thus elicited makes the words διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον an appeal rather to the reason and intellect than to the heart and conscience; but the phrases "living unto God," "being crucified with Christ," and, indeed, the whole tenor of the passage, point rather to the moral and spiritual change wrought in the believer. Thus we are led to seek the explanation of this expression rather in

ii. *Its moral effects.* The law reveals sin; it also provokes sin; nay, in a

certain sense, it may be said to create sin, for "sin is not reckoned where there is no law" (Rom. v. 13). Thus the law is the strength of sin (1 Cor. xv. 56). At the same time it provides no remedy for the sinner. On the contrary, it condemns him hopelessly; for no one can fulfil all the requirements of the law. The law, then, exercises a double power over those subject to it; it makes them sinners, and it punishes them for being so. What can they do to escape? They have no choice but to throw off the bondage of the law, for the law itself has driven them to this. They find the deliverance which they seek in Christ. See Rom. vii. 24, 25, and, indeed, the whole passage, Rom. v. 20–viii. 11. Thus, then, they pass through three stages, (1) Prior to the law—sinful, but ignorant of sin; (2) Under the law—sinful, and conscious of sin, yearning after better things; (3) Free from the law—free, and justified in Christ. This sequence is clearly stated, Rom. v. 20. The second stage (διὰ νόμου) is a necessary preparation for the third (νόμῳ ἀπέθανον). "Proinde," says Luther on iii. 19 (the edition of 1519), "ut remissio propter salutem, ita praevaricatio propter remissionem, ita lex propter transgressionem."

What the Mosaic ordinances were to the Jews, other codes of precepts and systems of restraints were, in an inferior degree and less efficaciously, to other nations. They, too, like the Jews, have felt the bondage of law in some form or other. See iv. 9; v. 1, and the note on iv. 11.

νόμῳ ἀπέθανον] "I died to law." For the dative comp. Rom. vi. 2, 11 (τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ); and for the idea of "dying to the law" Rom. vii. 1–6, esp. ver. 4, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ; and ver. 6, καταργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου ἀποθανόντες ἐν ᾧ κατειχόμεθα (literally, "we were

σαρκί, ἐν πίστει ζῶ τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ. ²¹ οὐκ ἀθετῶ τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ· εἰ γὰρ διὰ νόμου δικαιοσύνη, ἅρα Χριστὸς δωρεὰν ἀπέθανεν.

20. τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντος.

nullified, i.e. discharged by death from the law in which we were held").

20. An expansion of the idea in the last verse.

Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι] "*I have been crucified with Christ.*" A new turn is thus given to the metaphor of death.

In the last verse it was the release from past obligations; here it is the annihilation of old sins. The two, however, are not unconnected. Sin and law loose their hold at the same time. The sense of feebleness, of prostration, to which a man is reduced by the working of the law, *the process of dying*, in fact, is the moral link which unites the two applications of the image; see Rom. vii. 5, 9-11. Thus his death becomes life. Being crucified with Christ, he rises with Christ and lives to God.

The parallel passage in the Romans best illustrates the different senses given to death. See, also, for a similar and characteristic instance of working out a metaphor, the different applications of ἡμέρα in 1 Thess. v. 2-8.

For the idea of dying with Christ, etc., see Rom. vi. 6, ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος συνεσταύρωθῇ; comp. Gal. v. 24; vi. 14; Rom. vi. 8; Col. ii. 20, ἀποθανεῖν σὺν Χριστῷ; and Rom. vi. 4, Col. ii. 12, συνταφῆναι. Comp. Ignat. Rom. § 7, ὁ ἐμὸς ἔρως ἐσταύρωται. The correlative idea of rising and reigning with Christ is equally common in St. Paul.

ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγώ] The order is significant: "When I speak of living, I do not mean myself, my natural being; I have no longer a separate existence; I am merged in Christ." See on ἐγώ vs. 19.

ὁ δὲ νῦν ζῶ] Not exactly ἦν νῦν ζῶ ζωὴν, but δ limits and qualifies the idea of life: "*So far as I now live in the flesh, it is a life of faith*"; comp. Rom. vi. 10, ὁ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν, τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθα-

νεν ἐφάπαξ, ὁ δὲ ζῇ, ζῇ τῷ Θεῷ: Plut. Mor. p. 100 F, ὁ καθεύδουσι, τοῦ σώματος ὕπνος ἐστὶ καὶ ἀνάπαυσις.

νῦν] "*now*"; his new life in Christ, as opposed to his old life before his conversion; not his present life on earth, as opposed to his future life in heaven; for such a contrast is quite foreign to this passage.

ἐν πίστει] "*in faith*," the atmosphere, as it were, which he breathes in this his new spiritual life.

The variation of reading here is perplexing. For τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ may be pleaded the great preponderance of the older authorities; for τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ, the testimony of a few ancient copies, and the difficulty of conceiving its substitution for the others simpler reading.

με . . . ἐμοῦ] "*loved me*, gave himself for me." He appropriates to himself, as Chrysostom observes, the love which belongs equally to the whole world. For Christ is indeed the personal friend of each man individually; and is as much to him as if he had died for him alone.

21. οὐκ ἀθετῶ κ.τ.λ.] "*I do not set at nought the grace of God.*" Setting at nought, I call it; *for*, if righteousness might be obtained through law, then Christ's death were superfluous." For ἀθετῶ, "*to nullify*," see Luke vii. 30; 1 Cor. i. 19; its exact sense here is fixed by δωρεὰν ἀπέθανεν. "The grace of God" is manifested in Christ's death. The connection of γὰρ is with the idea of ἀθετῶ, and may be explained by a supplied clause, as above.

δωρεάν] not "*in vain*," but "*uselessly*, without sufficient cause," or, as we might say, "*gratuitously*." Jno. xv. 25, ἐμίσσησάν με δωρεάν (Ps. xxxiv. 19); comp. LXX of Ps. xxxiv. 7, δωρεὰν ἐκρυψάν μοι διαφθοράν, Hebr. צדק, where Symmachus had ἀνατιώσ; Eccles. xx. 23.

III. Ὡ ἀνόητοι Γαλάται, τίς ὑμᾶς ἐβάσκανεν, οἷς κατ' ὄφθαλμοὺς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς προεγράφη ἐσταυρωμένος; ²τοῦτο μόνον

III. 1. In the last paragraph of the foregoing chapter St. Paul began by speaking of the incident at Antioch, but his thoughts have been working round gradually to the false teachers in Galatia, and have moulded his language accordingly. He is thus led to dwell on the direct antagonism to the gospel involved in the conduct of the Judaizers, which tacitly assumes that a man may be justified by his own works. It is a practical denial of the efficacy of Christ's death. This thought is intolerable to him, and he bursts out into the indignant remonstrance with which this chapter opens.

"Christ's death in vain? O ye senseless Gauls, what bewitchment is this? I placarded Christ crucified before your eyes. You suffered them to wander from this gracious proclamation of your King. They rested on the withering eye of the sorcerer. They yielded to the fascination, and were riveted there. And the life of your souls has been drained out of you by that envious gaze."

ἐβάσκανεν] "*fascinated you*." St. Paul's metaphor is derived from the popular belief in the power of the evil eye. Comp. Ignat. *Rom.* § 3, οὐδέποτε ἐβασκάνετε οὐδενά (or οὐδενί), *Wisd.* iv. 12, βασκανία γὰρ φανλότητος ἁμαυροῖ τὰ κακά, and see especially the discussion in Plutarch, *Sympos.* v. 7, p. 680 c, περὶ τῶν καταβασκαίνειν λεγομένων καὶ βάσκανον ἔχειν ὀφθαλμῶν ἐμπεσόντος λόγου κ.τ.λ. If the derivation of βασκαίνειν now generally adopted (see Benfey, *Wortl.* ii. p. 104), from βάζω, βάσκω (φάσκω), be correct, the word originally, referred to witchery by spells or incantations ("mala fascinare lingua"); but as it occurs in actual use it denotes the blighting influence of the evil eye, of which meaning indeed the popular but now exploded derivation (διὰ φάεων καίνουσιν, Tzetz.) is an evidence. See

Bacon's *Essays*, ix. This belief is not confined to the East or to ancient times, but is common in some countries of Europe even now. In parts of Italy the power of the "occhio cattivo," or "jettatura," is said to be a deeply rooted popular superstition. On its wide prevalence see the references in Winer's *Realwörterb.* s.v. Zauberei, and in an article by O. Jahn, *über den Aberglauben des bösen Blicks*, etc. in the *Verhandl. der Sächs. Gesellsch.* 1855, p. 31. The word βασκαίνειν, then, in this passage involves two ideas: (1) The baleful influence on the recipient, and (2) the envious spirit of the agent. This latter idea is very prominent in the Hebrew עֵינַי עָלֶיךָ ("envious" or "covetous," e.g. Prov. xxiii. 6; Tobit iv. 16; Eccles. xiv. 10; and compare the ὀφθαλμὸς πονηρός of the Gospels); and in the Latin *invideo* it has swallowed up every other meaning. The false teachers envy the Galatians this liberty in Christ, have an interest in subjecting them again to bondage; see iv. 17; vi. 12; and 2 Cor. xi. 20. This idea, however, is subordinate to the other, for where βασκαίνειν signifies directly "to envy," it generally takes a dative, like the Latin "*invideo*"; see Lobeck, *Phryg.* p. 463. Jerome besides sees in the metaphor here an allusion to the spiritual "infancy" of the Galatians. It is true, indeed, that children were regarded as most susceptible of βασκανία (διότι πολλὰν ἔχουσιν εὐπάθειαν καὶ τροπὴν τῆς φύσεως, Alex. Aphrod. *probl. Phys.* ii. 53; see also the passages in Jahn, p. 39), and such an allusion would be very significant here; but the metaphor must not be overcharged.

ἐβάσκανεν (for which some copies read ἐβάσκηεν) is probably the first aorist with α; see Ignat. *l.c.* On forms in η and α see Buttmann, *Ausf. Sprachl.* § 101, 4, A. Buttmann, p. 35, and Lobeck, *Phryg.* p. 25, *Paral.* p. 22.

θέλω μαθεῖν ἀφ' ὑμῶν, ἐξ ἔργων νόμου τὸ πνεῦμα ἐλάβετε ἢ ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως; ³οὕτως ἀνόητοί ἐστε; ἐναρξάμενοι πνεύματι νῦν

The words τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πείθεσθαι of the received text have no place here, but are added from v. 7.

οἷς κατ' ὀφθαλμούς] “before whose eyes”: comp. Arist. *Ran.* 626, ἵνα σοι κατ' ὀφθαλμούς λέγῃ. This expression is slightly stronger than πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν, as bringing out the idea of a *confronting*.

As the blighting influence passed from the eye of the bewitcher, so also was the eye of the recipient the most direct channel of communication; see esp. Alexand. *Aphrod. probl. phys.* ii. 53, ὥσπερ ἰώδη τιὰ καὶ φθοροποιὸν ἀκτῖνα ἐξιῶσιν ἀπὸ τῆς κόρης αὐτῶν καὶ αὕτη εἰσιούσα διὰ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν τοῦ φθονομένου τρέφει τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ τὴν φύσιν κ.τ.λ.; Heliod. *Aeth.* iii. 7, διὰ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν τὰ πάθη ταῖς ψυχαῖς εἰστοξεύονται (these references I owe to Jahn, p. 33); and comp. *Eccles.* xviii. 18, δόσις βασκάνου ἐκτῇκει ὀφθαλμούς; xiv. 8. To let the eye rest on the sorcerer, therefore, was to yield to the fascination. This the Galatians had done: “So deeply had they drunken in That look, those shrunken serpent eyes, That all their features were resigned To this sole image in their mind.”

προεγράφη] “was posted up, placarded.” The verb προγράφειν is capable of two meanings: (1) “To write beforehand,” as *Rom.* xv. 4, ὅσα γὰρ προεγράφη εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν διδασκαλίαν ἐγράφη. This sense, however, is excluded here, as the words κατ' ὀφθαλμούς forbid the supposition that the apostle is here speaking of the *predictions* of the Old Testament, even if such a sense were otherwise likely. (2) “To write up in public, to placard.” It is the common word to describe all public notices or proclamations, e.g. Arist. *Ar.* 450, ὅ τι ἂν προγράψωμεν ἐν τοῖς πινακίοις; comp. Justin, *Apol.* ii. p. 52 B, εἰὰν δὲ ὑμεῖς τοῦτο προγράψητε, ἡμεῖς τοῖς πᾶσι φανερὸν ποιήσομεν. These

would sometimes be notices of a trial or condemnation; comp. *Jude* 4, οἱ πάλοι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα; with *Demosth.* p. 1151, τοὺς πρυτάνεις προγράφειν αὐτῷ τὸν κρίσιν ἐπὶ δύο ἡμέρας; *Plut. Camill.* 9, τῆς δίκης προγεγραμμένης; and this meaning is assigned to the word here by several ancient commentators. The context, however, seems to require rather the sense “placarded, publicly announced, as a magisterial edict or proclamation.” This placard ought to have kept their eyes from wandering, and so to have acted as a charm (βασκάνιον or προβασκάνιον, *Epist. Jer.* 69) against all Judaic sorceries. The compound verb προγράφειν seems never to be used of *painting*, as some take it here.

ἐν ὑμῖν is omitted after προεγράφη in deference to the best authorities. It is difficult, however, to account for its insertion in some early copies, unless it crept in from ver. 5. If retained, it ought probably to be regarded as a redundant expression, enforcing the idea of οἷς κατ' ὀφθαλμούς, and to be taken with προεγράφη.

2, 3, 4. “I have only one question to ask you: The gifts of the Spirit which ye have received, to what do ye owe them? To works performed in bondage to law, or to the willing hearing that comes of faith? What monstrous folly is this, then! Will you so violate the divine order of progress? After taking your earliest lessons in the *Spirit*, do you look to attaining perfection through the *flesh*? To what purpose, then, did ye suffer persecution from these carnal teachers of the law? Will ye now stultify your past sufferings? I cannot believe that ye will.”

ἀκοῆς] in itself may mean either “a hearing” or “a report.” For the latter sense see *Rom.* x. 16, quoted from the LXX of *Isa.* liii. 1. The former mean-

σαρκὶ ἐπιτελεῖσθε ; ⁴ τοσαῦτα ἐπάθετε εἰκῇ ; εἴ γε καὶ εἰκῇ. ⁵ ὁ οὖν ἐπιχορηγῶν ὑμῖν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν, ἐξ

ing, however, is more probable here, as presenting a better contrast to ἔργων, which requires some word expressing the part taken by the Galatians themselves.

πίστως] “*which comes of faith*,” the subjective genitive. The parallelism of Rom. x. 17, ἀρα ἡ πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς, ἡ δὲ ἀκοὴ διὰ ῥήματος, is only apparent. A true parallel is the phrase ὑπακοὴ πίστews, Rom. i. 5 ; xvi. 26. At all events, πίστews cannot be considered equivalent to τῆς πίστews (see on i. 23) taken as an objective genitive, with the sense “*listening to the doctrines of the faith*.”

3. οὕτως] refers to what follows : “*How senseless to reverse the natural order of things !*”

ἐναρξέμενοι ἐπιτελεῖσθε] These words occur together 2 Cor. viii. 6 ; Phil. i. 6. Both of them, the former especially, are employed of religious ceremonials, and it is possible that the idea of a sacrifice may underlie their use here. For ἐνάρχεσθαι of the initiatory rites, see Pollux viii. 83, and comp. e.g. Enr. *Iph. Aut.* 1471 ; for ἐπιτελεῖν Herod. ii. 63 (θυσίας, εὐχολάς) ; iv. 186 (νηστείας καὶ δρτάς).

ἐπιτελεῖσθε is perhaps the middle voice, rather than the passive, as in Clem. Rom. § 55, πολλὰ γυναῖκες ἐνδυναμωθείσαι ἐπετελέσαντο πολλὰ ἀνδρεῖα, and frequently in classical writers, e.g. Plat. *Phil.* 27 c, κάλλιον ἂν καὶ τὴν κρίσιν ἐπιτελεσαίμεθα. A comparison of the parallel passages, 2 Cor. viii. 6, Phil. i. 6, seems to point to a transitive verb. On the other hand, the middle voice is not found elsewhere in the LXX or New Testament.

4. τοσαῦτα ἐπάθετε εἰκῇ] “*did ye suffer so much in vain*,” referring to the persecutions endured by them. For similar appeals to sufferings undergone, see Gal. v. 11 ; 1 Cor. xv. 32, and comp. 1 Thess. ii. 14. The history, indeed, says nothing of persecutions in Galatia ;

but then it is equally silent on all that relates to the condition of the Galatian churches ; and, while the converts to the faith in Pisidia and Lycaonia, on the one side (Acts xiv. 2, 5, 19, 22), and in proconsular Asia, on the other (2 Cor. i. 8 ; Acts xix. 23 sqq.), were exposed to suffering, it is improbable that the Galatians alone should have escaped. If we suppose, as is most likely, that the Jews were the chief instigators in these persecutions, St. Paul’s appeal becomes doubly significant.

On the other hand, ἐπάθετε has been interpreted in a good sense, as if referring to the spiritual blessings of the Galatians ; but πάσχειν seems never to be so used in the New Testament ; and, indeed, such a rendering would be harsh anywhere, unless the sense were clearly defined by the context, as it is, for instance, in Jos. *Ant.* iii. 15, 1, τὸν θεὸν ὑπομνήσαι μὲν ὅσα παθόντες ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ πηλικῶν εὐεργεσιῶν μεταλαβόντες κ.τ.λ.

εἰκῇ] “*in vain*.” “*You despise that liberty in Christ for which you then suffered ; you listen to those teachers whom you then resisted even to persecution*.”

εἴ γε καὶ εἰκῇ] “*if it be really in vain*.” It is hard to believe this ; the apostle hopes better things of his converts. Εἴ γε leaves a loophole for doubt, and καὶ widens this, implying an unwillingness to believe on the part of the speaker. Hermann’s distinction (*ad Tit.* p. 834), that εἴγε assumes the truth of a proposition, while εἴπερ leaves it doubtful, requires modifying before it is applied to the New Testament, where εἴπερ is, if anything, more directly affirmative than εἴγε. The alternative rendering, “*If it is only in vain, and not worse than in vain*,” seems harsh and improbable.

5. The question asked in ver. 2 in-

ἔργων νόμου ἢ ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως; ⁶ καθὼς Ἀβραάμ ἐπίστευσεν τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. Ἰγνώ-

voled the contrast of faith and works. This contrast suggests two other thoughts: (1) The violation of the law of progress committed by the Galatians (ver. 3); (2) Their folly in stultifying their former sufferings (ver. 4). The question has meanwhile been lost sight of. It is now resumed, and the particle οὖν marks its resumption: "Well, then, as I said," etc.

ἐ ἐπιχορηγῶν] "*He that supplieth liberally*": comp. Phil. i. 19, ἐπιχορηγίας τοῦ πνεύματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Even the simple word implies more or less of *liberality*, and the compound ἐπιχορηγεῖν expresses this idea more strongly. See 2 Pet. i. 5, ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν τὴν ἀρετὴν, and compare the use of the substantive ἐπιχορηγία in Athen. iv. p. 140 c, ἐπάκλα μὲν λέγεται ταῦτα, ὅντα οἷον ἐπιχορηγήματα τοῦ συντεταγμένου τοῖς φειδίταις ἀέκλου, i.e. the luxuries, the superfluities or the meal.

ἐνεγίνετο δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν] Comp. 1 Cor. xii. 10, ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων (with vv. 28, 29); Matt. xiv. 2, αἱ δυνάμεις ἐνεργοῦσιν ἐν αὐτῷ (comp. Mark vi. 14). These passages favor the sense "worketh miraculous powers *in* you," rather than "worketh miracles *among* you"; and this meaning also accords better with the context: comp. 1 Cor. xii. 6, ὁ δὲ αὐτοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν. What was the exact nature of these "powers," whether they were exerted over the physical or the moral world, it is impossible to determine. The limitations implied in 1 Cor. xii. 10, and the general use of δυνάμεις, point rather to the former. It is important to notice how here, as in the Epistle to the Corinthians, St. Paul assumes the possession of these extraordinary powers by his converts as an acknowledged fact.

The verb which disappears in the

ellipsis is to be supplied from the foregoing participles: "does he do so from works," etc., as in 2 Cor. iii. 11; Rom. xii. 7 seqq.

6. The following passage, vv. 6-9, was omitted in Marcion's recension of the epistle, as repugnant to his leading principle of the antagonism between the Old and New Testaments: see Tertull. *adv. Mar.* v. 3, "ostenditur quid supra haeretica industria enaserit, mentionem scilicet Abrahae", and Hieron. *ad loc.*

καθὼς] The answer to the question asked in the former verse is assumed, "Surely of faith; and so it was with Abraham." Καθὼς, though not a good Attic word, is common in later Greek; see Lobeck, *Phlegm.* p. 425.

Ἀβραάμ ἐπίστευσεν κ.τ.λ.] from the LXX of Gen. xv. 6. The Hebrew has in the second clause וַיִּימָן לוֹ וַיִּשְׁבַּחַהּ "and (he) imputed it to him (for) righteousness." It is quoted as in the LXX also in Rom. iv. 3; James ii. 23; Clem. Rom. § 10; Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph.* § 119. The passage is cited also in Barnab. § 13, but too loosely, and with too obvious an infusion of St. Paul's language to allow of any inference as to the text used by the writer.

On the use made of this passage by Jewish writers, and on the faith of Abraham, see pp. 346, and 350.

7. The promise to Abraham, which in the passage of Genesis introduces the words just quoted, is the link of connection with what follows.

"An off-spring countless as the stars was promised to Abraham. Abraham believed, and his faith was accepted as righteousness. Who, then, are these promised sons of Abraham? Those, surely, who inherit Abraham's faith. Hence the declaration of the scripture that all the *Gentiles* should be blessed in him. These are the words of foresight,

σκετε ἄρα ὅτι οἱ ἐκ πίστεως, οὗτοι υἱοὶ εἰσιν Ἀβραάμ. ⁸προϊδούσα δὲ ἡ γραφὴ ὅτι ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοὶ τὰ ἔθνη ὁ Θεός, προενηγγελίστατο τῷ Ἀβραάμ ὅτι ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. ⁹ὥστε οἱ ἐκ πίστεως εὐλογοῦνται σὺν τῷ πιστῷ Ἀβραάμ. ¹⁰ὅσοι γὰρ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσίν, ὑπὸ κατάραν εἰσίν. γέγραπται

7. ὅτοί εἰσιν υἱοὶ Ἀβραάμ.

discerning that God justifies the Gentiles by *faith*; for so only could they be blessed in Abraham. We conclude, therefore, that the faithful, and the faithful alone, share the blessing with him."

γινώσκετε] "*ye perceive*," the indicative, rather than the imperative. The former mood is perhaps more suited to the argumentative character of the sentence generally, as well as to the special argumentative particle ἄρα, and possibly, also, to the meaning of the verb γινώσκειν ("to perceive," rather than "to know"; see the note iv. 8, 9); comp. 1 John ii. 29, εἰδῆτε ὅτι δικαῖός ἐστιν, γινώσκει ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεγέννηται. On the other hand, for the imperative see Heb. xiii. 23.

οἱ ἐκ πίστεως] "they whose starting-point, whose fundamental principle, is faith." Comp. Rom. ii. 8, οἱ ἐξ ἐριθείας; Rom. iv. 14, οἱ ἐκ νόμου.

8. ἡ γραφὴ] "*the scripture*" personified. This instance stands by itself in the New Testament, the personification elsewhere not going beyond λέγει or εἶπεν, or such expressions as συνέκλεισεν, ver. 22. The attributing "sight" to the sacred writings is however found in a not uncommon Jewish formula of reference, **כִּי רָאָה**, "Quid vidit?" see Schöttgen here. On the meaning of γραφή, "a passage of Scripture," see the note iii. 22.

δικαιοί] The tense denotes the certainty of God's dealings, the sure accomplishment of his purpose as if it were actually present: see on 1 Thess. v. 2, and Winer § xl. 2, p. 265.

προενηγγελίστατο] The promise to Abraham was an *anticipation of the*

gospel, not only as announcing the Messiah, but also as involving the doctrine of righteousness by faith.

ἐνευλογηθήσονται κ.τ.λ.] A fusion of the two passages, Gen. xii. 3, καὶ [ἐν] εὐλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς, and Gen. xviii. 18, καὶ ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν αὐτῷ (Ἀβραάμ) πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς, in both of which the LXX agrees with the Hebrew. Comp. Clem. Rom. § 10.

ἐν σοὶ] "*in thee*," as their spiritual progenitor.

10, 11, 12. Having shown by *positive* proof that justification is of faith, he strengthens his position by the *negative* argument derived from the impossibility of maintaining its opposite, justification by law. This negative argument is twofold: *First*, it is impossible to fulfil the requirements of the law, and the non-fulfilment lays us under a curse (ver. 10): *Secondly*, Supposing the fulfilment possible, still the spirit of the law is antagonistic to faith, which is elsewhere spoken of as the source of life vv. 11, 12.

ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσίν] "*those who are of works of law*," whose character is founded on works of law.

ἐπικατάρατος κ.τ.λ.] a quotation from Deut. xxvii. 26. The passage is the closing sentence of the curses pronounced on Mount Elbal, and, as it were, the summary of the whole. The words run in the LXX, ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ὃς οὐκ ἐμμένει ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς λόγοις τοῦ νόμου τούτου τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτούς. For τοῖς λόγοις τοῦ νόμου τούτου, a slight modification is introduced by St. Paul, that the sentence may explain itself. The words πᾶς, πᾶσιν, are absent in the Hebrew, though the former

γὰρ ὅτι επικατάρατος πᾶς, ὃς οὐκ ἐμμένει πᾶσιν τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου, τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτὰ. ¹¹ὅτι δὲ ἐν νόμῳ οὐδεὶς δικαιόθαι παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ δῆλον, ὅτι ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται. ¹²ὁ δὲ νόμος οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ πίστεως, ἀλλ' ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς.

is found in the Peshito, and the latter in the Samar. Pentat. Jerome in this passage, referring to the Samaritan reading, attributes the omission to a wilful corruption of the text on the part of the Jews, "ne viderentur esse sub maledicto." The charge is of course unfounded, but it is an interesting notice of the state of the text in his day. Justin, *Dial.* § 95, p. 322 c, quotes the passage exactly in the words of St. Paul, though differing from Hebrew, Greek, Syriac, and Samaritan texts, and applies it in the same way: see above, p. 65, and the note on ver. 13.

11. The same proposition proved in another way; δέ, "then again."

ὁ δίκαιος κ.τ.λ.] From Habak. ii. 4, quoted also Rom. i. 17; Heb. x. 38. In the Hebrew the words run, "Behold, his soul is uplifted (proud, stubborn), it is not right (calm, even); but the just man shall live by his steadfastness (fidelity), *וְיָשָׁב בְּאֵמֶת*." What is the correct rendering of the first clause, whether it refers to the Chaldean invader or to the heedless Jew, may be questioned; but the second clause, without doubt, describes the attitude of the faithful Israelite in the season of danger. The LXX have, *ἐὰν ὑποστείλῃται, οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐν αὐτῷ, ὁ δὲ δίκαιός μου ἐκ πίστεως* (or *ἐκ πίστεώς μου*) *ζήσεται*: see below, p. 343. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who gives both clauses of the verse, though reversing the order, quotes from the LXX (see Bleek, *Heb.* l.c.).

It will thus be seen that in the first clause of the verse the LXX, though it makes excellent sense, differs widely from the Hebrew. In the second clause, again, the Hebrew word *אֱמֶת* is not directly "faith," meaning "trust, be-

lief," but "steadfastness, faithfulness." The context, however, justifies *πίστις*, even in the sense "trust," as a paraphrastic rendering, and it was so translated by Symmachus, Aquila, and Theodotion, and in the other Greek versions. See p. 343, note 4. Targum Jon. has *יְהוֹשֻׁעַ*, "their truth." In its original context the passage has reference to the temporal calamities inflicted by the Chaldean invasion. Here a spiritual meaning and general application are given to words referring primarily to special external incidents. Another portion of this same prophecy of Habakkuk (i. 15; comp. ii. 5) relating to the Chaldeans is similarly applied in a speech of St. Paul, Acts xiii. 41, in which context (ver. 39, *ἐν τούτῳ πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων δικαιόυται*) there is perhaps a tacit allusion to the words *ὁ δίκαιος κ.τ.λ.* quoted here.

12. "Faith is not the starting-point of the law. The law does not take faith as its fundamental principle. On the other hand, it rigidly enforces the performance of all its enactments."

ὁ ποιήσας κ.τ.λ.] quoted from Lev. xviii. 5, substantially the same as in Heb., Syr., Samar. Pent., and LXX. The Targums define the meaning of "living" by "life eternal." The *αὐτὰ* is explained by the words which in the original text precede the passage quoted, *πάντα τὰ προστάγματα μου καὶ πάντα τὰ κρίματά μου*, and with which St. Paul assumes a familiarity in his readers.

13. *ἐξηγόρασεν*] This verb has two meanings. (1) "To redeem, ransom," especially from slavery. This is its general signification; see the references in Dindorf's *Stroph. Thes.* (2) "To buy up," as Polyb. iii. 42, 2, a somewhat exceptional sense. The former meaning

¹³ Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου, γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα, ὅτι γέγραπται ἐπικατάρματος πᾶς ὁ κρεμύμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου. ¹⁴ ἵνα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ἡ εὐλογία τοῦ

is required here, and iv. 5; the latter seems best suited to Eph. v. 16; Col. iv. 5, τὸν καιρὸν εξαγοραζόμενοι.

ἡμᾶς] The apostle is here thinking of the deliverance of himself and the Jewish race: see τὰ ἔθνη, ver. 14.

κατάρα] as 2 Cor. v. 21, τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν: comp. *Protoc. Jac.* § 3, where Anna, complaining of her barrenness, says, κατάρα ἐγενήθην ἐγὼ ἐνώπιον τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ. The expression is to be explained partly by the Hebrew idiom, the paucity of adjectives frequently occasioning the use of a substantive instead, but still more by the religious conception which it involves. The victim is regarded as bearing the sins of those for whom atonement is made. The curse is transferred from them to it. It becomes in a certain sense the impersonation of the sin and of the curse. This idea is very prominent in the scape-goat, Lev. xvi. 5 sqq.; see especially the language of the Epistle of Barnabas, § 7, where the writer explains the scape-goat as a type of Christ. Compare also Lev. iv. 25 ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ τῆς ἁμαρτίας, and iv. 29 ἐπιθήσει τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ ἁμαρτήματος αὐτοῦ. In Hebrew חטאת is both a "sin" and a "sin-offering." Counterparts to these types of the Great Sacrifice are found also among heathen nations, e.g. the Athenians, *Arist. Ran.* 733, *Lysias Indoc.* p. 108 φάρμακον ἀποπέμπειν καὶ ἀλιτηρίου ἀπαλλάττεσθαι, and especially the Egyptians, *Herod.* ii. 39 κεφαλῇ δὲ κείνῃ (i.e. of the victim) πολλὰ καταρυσάμενοι φέρουσι . . . καταρύνται δὲ τάδε λέγοντες τῇσι κεφαλῇσι, εἴ τι υἱλοὶ ἢ σφίσι τοῖς θύουσι ἢ Αἰγύπτῳ τῇ συναπάσῃ κακὸν γενέσθαι, εἰς κεφαλὴν ταύτην τραπέσθαι.

γέγραπται] in Deut. xxi. 23, where the LXX. runs κεκατηραμένος ὑπὸ Θεοῦ

πᾶς κρεμύμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου. The passage is quoted by Justin, *Dial.* p. 323 c, exactly as by St. Paul; see p. 65, and the note on ver. 10. Our Lord had died the death of the worst malefactors: He had undergone that punishment, which under the law betokened the curse of God. So far he had become κατάρα. But he was in no literal sense κατάρματος ὑπὸ Θεοῦ, and St. Paul instinctively omits those words which do not strictly apply, and which, if added, would have required some qualification.

14. "The law, the greater barrier which excluded the Gentiles, is done away in Christ. By its removal the Gentiles are put on a level with the Jews; and, thus united, they both gain access through the Spirit to the Father." The sequence of thought here is exactly the same as in Eph. ii. 14-18; see also Gal. iv. 5.

As regards the construction, either (1) The two clauses introduced by ἵνα are co-ordinate, as in 2 Cor. ix. 3, expressing the *coincidence in time* of the extension of the blessing to the Gentiles and the introduction of the dispensation of the Spirit; or (2) The second clause with ἵνα is attached to the first, expressing the *moral dependence* of the one on the other. The passage from the Ephesians already referred to favors the latter.

τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν κ.τ.λ.] *ων*, i.e. "all the faithful, whether Jews or Gentiles, may receive the promise." The divine promise in the New Testament is always ἐπαγγελία not ὑπόσχεσις, "pollicitum," not "promissum," a gift graciously bestowed, and not a pledge obtained by negotiation. Indeed the substantive ἐπαγγελία is scarcely ever used (Acts xiii. 21 is an exception) of anything else but the divine promise. The phrase λαμβάνειν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν is employed not of those to whom the promise is

Ἀβραὰμ γενηται ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος λάβωμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως.

¹⁵ Ἀδελφοί, κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λέγω. ὅμως ἀνθρώπου κεκυρωμένην

14. ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ.

given, but of those to whom it is fulfilled; as Acts ii. 33; Heb. ix. 15. So also ἐπιτυχάνειν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας Heb. vi. 15, περιμένειν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν Acts i. 4. With this use of ἐπαγγελία, compare that of ἐλπίς, πίστις, etc., for the object of faith, of hope, etc.

15-18. "Brethren, let me draw an illustration from the common dealings of men. Even a human covenant duly confirmed is held sacred and inviolable. It cannot be set aside, it cannot be clogged with new conditions. Much more, then, a divine covenant. Now the promise of God was not given to Abraham alone, but to his seed. What is meant by 'his seed?' The form of expression denotes unity. It must have its fulfilment in some *one* person. This person is Christ. Thus it was unfulfilled when the law came. Between the giving of the promise, then, and the fulfilment of it, the law intervened. And coming many hundred years after, it was plainly distinct from the promise, it did not interpret the terms of the promise. Thus the law cannot set aside the promise. Yet this would be done in effect, if the inheritance could only be obtained by obedience to the law; since the promise itself imposed no such condition."

Ἀδελφοί.] "*brethren*." There is a touch of tenderness in the appeal here, as if to make amends for the severity of the foregoing rebuke, iii. 1 sqq.; comp. iv. 31; vi. 1.

κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λέγω] "*I speak after the manner of men*," I argue from the practice of men"; see Rom. iii. 5; 1 Cor. ix. 8, and Rom. vi. 19 ἀνθρώπινον λέγω. Comp. also 1 Cor. iii. 3 κατὰ ἄνθρωπον περιπατεῖτε, Gal. i. 11; 1 Cor. xv. 32 εἰ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον ἐθηριομάχησα κ.τ.λ., "if from nothing more than worldly motives

I fought with beasts," etc., where the false interpretation of κατὰ ἄνθρωπον, "metaphorically," has been supported by the mistaken analogy of the passage in our text. For the usage of κατὰ ἄνθρωπον in profane authors see the quotations in Weststein on Rom. iii. 5.

ὅμως ἀνθρώπου] The force is well given in the A. V., "though it be but a man's covenant," i.e. καίπερ ἀνθρώπου οὖσαν, ὅμως κ.τ.λ.; comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 7 ὅμως τὰ ἄψυχα φωνὴν δίδοντα, Pausan. i. 28, 1 Κύλωνα . . . ἀνέθεσαν τυραννίδα ὅμως βουλευσάντα. In classical writers this displacement of ὅμως, so as to connect it with the word or clause to which it applies, appears to occur chiefly, if not solely, with participles, and not as here and 1 Cor. xiv. 7.

The argument is here an *a fortiori* argument, as those of our Lord drawn from the affection of a human father (Luke xi. 11 sqq.) and from the compliance of a human judge (Luke xviii. 1 sqq.). See esp. Heb. vi. 16. The *a fortiori* character of the reasoning, however, is dismissed in the single words ὅμως, except so far as it is picked up again in τοῦ Θεοῦ (ver. 17), and does not reappear, as some have thought, in ὅς ἐστιν Χριστός.

διαθήκη, γ] "*a covenant*." This word (frequently in the plural διαθήκαι) in classical writers almost always signifies "a will, a testament." There are some few exceptions, however, e.g. Arist. *Ar.* 439 ἦν μὴ διάθωνται γ' οἶδε διαθήκην ἐμοί. On the other hand, in the LXX it is as universally used of a covenant (most frequently as a translation of כְּבָרִית), whether as a stipulation between two parties (συνθήκη, "a covenant," in the strict sense) or as an engagement on the part of one. Nor in the New Testament is it ever found in any other

διαθήκην οὐδεὶς ἀθετεῖ ἢ ἐπιδιατάσσεται. ¹⁶ τῷ δὲ Ἀβραὰμ ἐρρέθησαν αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι, καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ. οὐ λέγει καὶ τοῖς σπέρμασιν ὡς ἐπὶ πολλῶν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐφ' ἑνὸς καὶ τῷ

sense, with one exception. Even in this exceptional case, Heb. ix. 15-17 the sacred writer starts from a sense of a "covenant" and glides into that of a "testament," to which he is led by two points of analogy (1) the *inheritance* conferred by the covenant, and (2) the *death* of the person making it. "The disposition in this case," he says in effect, "was a testamentary disposition, a will." In the passage before us on the other hand, the mere mention of the inheritance (ver. 18) is not sufficient to establish the sense "a testament," which is ill-suited to the context: comp. Justin *Dial. c. Tryph.* § 11, p. 228 B. Owing partly to the passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and partly to the influence of the Latin version, which ordinarily rendered the word by "testamentum," (as here), the idea of a *testament* connected itself inseparably with *διαθήκη*. As a name for the sacred books "testamentum" had not firmly established itself at the close of the second century, and Tertullian frequently uses "instrumentum" instead; see esp. *adv. Marc.* iv. 1, and comp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, p. 299. The LXX translators and the New Testament writers probably preferred *διαθήκη* to *συνθήκη*, when speaking of the divine dispensation, because the former term, like *ἐπαγγελία*, better expresses the *free grace* of God. The later Greek translators frequently substituted *συνθήκη*, where the LXX has *διαθήκη*, sometimes perhaps not without a polemical aim.

ἀθετεῖ] Comp. Philo, *Fragm.* ii. p. 675 M. ἀλλὰ ὅτι ἡ διαθήκη ἀθετεῖται.

ἐπιδιατάσσεται] "*adds fresh clauses.*" Virtually the doctrine of the Judaizers was the annulling of the promise (*ἀθέτησις*); apparently it was but the imposing new conditions (*ἐπιδιατάξις*). On either showing it was a violation

of the covenant. The meaning of *ἐπιδιατάσσεσθαι* is partially illustrated by *ἐπιδιαθήκη*, which signifies "a second will," Joseph. *B. J.* ii. 2, 3, ἀξίων τῆς ἐπιδιαθήκης τὴν διαθήκην εἶναι κυριωτέραν, and § 6, *Ant.* xvii. 9, 4.

16. ἐρρέθησαν] For the form see Lobeck, *Phryg.* p. 447, Buttman *Ausf. Sprachl.* ii. p. 165.

ἐπαγγελίαι] The plural, for the promise was several times repeated to Abraham: comp. Rom. ix. 4, and esp. Clem. Rom. § 10. A question has been raised as to the particular passage to which St. Paul refers. In answering this question, it should be observed, (1) That the words must be spoken to Abraham himself, and not to one of the later patriarchs, (2) That *καὶ* must be part of the quotation. These considerations restrict the reference to Gen. xiii. 15; xvii. 8, either of which passages satisfies these conditions. It is true that in both alike the inheritance spoken of refers primarily to the possession of the land of Canaan; but the spiritual application here is only in accordance with the general analogy of New Testament interpretation. See above on ver. 11.

οὐ λέγει] seems to be used impersonally, like the Attic *φησί*, in quoting legal documents, the nominative being lost sight of. If so, we need not inquire whether *ὁ Θεός* or *ἡ γραφή* is to be understood. Comp. λέγει, Rom. xv. 10; Eph. iv. 8; v. 14; and *φησίν*, 1 Cor. vi. 16; 2 Cor. x. 10 (v. 1.).

καὶ τοῖς σπέρμασιν κ.τ.λ.] This comment of St. Paul has given rise to much discussion. It has been urged that the stress of the argument rests on a grammatical error—that, as the plural of *σπέρμα* (the word here rendered *σπέρμα*) is only used to signify "grain" or "crops," e.g. 1 Sam. viii. 15, the sacred writer could not under any circum-

σπέρματί σου, ὅς ἐστιν Χριστός. ¹⁷ τοῦτο δὲ λέγω· διαθήκην προκεκυρωμένην ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ μετὰ τετρακόσια καὶ τριάκοντα

stances have said "seeds as of many." Nor is it a complete answer to this objection that the same word in Chaldee is several times used in the plural in the sense which it has here: Gen. x. 18; Josh. vii. 14; Jer. xxxiii. 34. But the very expression in St. Paul which starts the objection supplies the answer also. It is quite as unnatural to use the Greek σπέρματα with this meaning as to use the Hebrew זרע. No doubt by a forced and exceptional usage σπέρματα might be so employed, as in 4 Macc. § 17, ὁ τῶν Ἀβραμιαίων σπερμάτων ἀπόγονοι παῖδες Ἰσραηλῆται, but so might the corresponding word in almost any language. This fact points to St. Paul's meaning. He is not laying stress on the particular word used, but on the fact that a singular noun of some kind, a collective term, is employed, where τὰ τέκνα or οἱ ἀπόγονοι, for instance, might have been substituted. Avoiding the technical terms of grammar, he could not express his meaning more simply than by the opposition, "not to thy *seeds*, but to thy *seed*." A plural substantive would be inconsistent with the interpretation given; the singular collective noun, if it admits of plurality (as it is interpreted by St. Paul himself, Rom. iv. 18; ix. 7), at the same time involves the idea of unity.

The question, therefore, is no longer one of grammatical accuracy, but of theological interpretation. Is this a legitimate sense to assign to the seed of Abraham? Doubtless by the seed of Abraham was meant in the first instance the Jewish people, as by the inheritance was meant the land of Canaan; but, in accordance with the analogy of Old Testament types and symbols, the term involves two secondary meanings. *First*. With a true spiritual instinct, though the conception

embodied itself at times in strangely grotesque and artificial forms, even the rabbinical writers saw that "the Christ" was the true seed of Abraham. In him the race was summed up, as it were. In him it fulfilled its purpose, and became a blessing to the whole earth. Without him its separate existence as a peculiar people had no meaning. Thus he was not only the representative, but the embodiment, of the race. In this way the people of Israel is the type of Christ; and in the New Testament parallels are sought in the career of the one to the life of the other. (See especially the application of Hosea xi. 1 to our Lord in Matt. ii. 15.) In this sense St. Paul uses the "seed of Abraham" here. But *Secondly*. According to the analogy of interpretation of the Old Testament in the New, the spiritual takes the place of the natural; the Israel after the flesh becomes the Israel after the spirit; the Jewish nation denotes the Christian church. So St. Paul interprets the seed of Abraham, Rom. iv. 18; ix. 7, and above, ver. 7.

These two interpretations are not opposed to each other: they are not independent of each other. Without Christ the Christian people have no existence. He is the source of their spiritual life. They are one in him. By this link St. Paul at the close of the chapter (vv. 28, 29) connects together the two senses of the "seed of Abraham," dwelling once more on the unity of the seed: "Ye are all *one man* in Christ; and if ye are *part of Christ*, then are ye *Abraham's seed* and heirs according to promise."

See especially the remarks of Tholuck, *Das Alte Test. im Newen Test.* p. 44 seq.

ἐπὶ πολλῶν] See Winer, § xlvii. p. 375.

ὅς ἐστιν Χριστός] For the attraction see Winer, § xxiv. p. 166.

ἐτη γεγονὸς νόμος οὐκ ἄκυροί εἰς τὸ καταργῆσαι τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν.
¹⁸ εἰ γὰρ ἐκ νόμου ἢ κληρονομία, οὐκέτι ἐξ ἐπαγγελίας· τῷ δὲ
 Ἀβραὰμ δι' ἐπαγγελίας κεχάρισται ὁ Θεός. ¹⁹ τί οὖν ὁ νόμος;

17. τοῦτο δὲ λέγω] "Now what I mean, what I wish to say, is this." The inference has been hitherto only hinted at indirectly; it is now stated plainly. Comp. 1 Cor. i. 12, λέγω δὲ τοῦτο, ὅτι ἕκαστος κ.τ.λ. In both passages the A.V. gives a wrong turn to the expression; translating it, "this I say."

προκεκυρωμένῃ] The confirmation spoken of is not an act separate in time and subsequent to the covenant itself. The idea present to St. Paul's mind is explained by Heb. vi. 17, 18.

εἰς Χριστόν, found in the received text after τοῦ Θεοῦ, must be struck out as a gloss. The balance of authority is decidedly against it.

τετρακόσια κ.τ.λ.] In the prophetic passage, Gen. xv. 13, the length of the sojourn in Egypt is given in round numbers as 400 years; in the historical statement, Ex. xii. 40 sqq., it is defined more exactly as 430 years. The Hebrew text in both passages implies that the residence in Egypt occupied the whole time. In the latter, however, the LXX inserts words so as to include the sojourn of the patriarchs in Canaan before the migration, thus reducing the actual term of residence in Egypt to about half this period. In the Vat. MS. the passage runs, ἡ δὲ κατοίκησις τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἦν κατ'ἐκκλησίαν ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ ἐν γῇ Χαναάν ἔτη τετρακόσια τριάκοντα πέντε (the last word, however, being erased). The Alex. MS. reads παροίκησις, παρέκκησαν, adds after Χαναάν the words αὐτοὶ καὶ οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν, so as to bring out the revised chronology more clearly, and omits πέντε. The Samar. Pent. takes the same view, agreeing in its reading with the Alex. MS. This seems, in fact, to have been the received chronology. It is adopted not only by St. Paul here, but by Josephus, *Ant.* ii. 15,

2, by the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan, and substantially by the book of Jubilees (Ewald, *Jahrb.* iii. p. 77). On the other hand, in St. Stephen's speech (*Acts* vii. 6), and in Philo (*Quis rer. div. her.* § 54, p. 511 M), Gen. xv. 13 is referred to, which extends the sojourn in Egypt over 400 years; and this is the chronology adopted in other passages of Josephus (*Ant.* ii. 9, 1; *B. J.* v. 9, 4), who is thus inconsistent with himself. The LXX translators may have inserted the explanatory clause on grounds of internal criticism, or in deference to chronological records to which they had access in Egypt. The difficulties which attend both systems of chronology need not be considered here, as they do not affect St. Paul's argument, and cannot have entered into his thoughts.

18. εἰ γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] "To abrogate and annul the promise, I say, for this is the effect of making the inheritance dependent on law." The γὰρ justifies the expressions "abrogate," "annul," of the previous verses. Νόμος and ἐπαγγελία are used without the article, as describing two opposing principles.

οὐκέτι] is here logical, "this being once granted, it is not," etc., as Rom. vii. 17; xi. 6. Ἔτι is so used frequently.

κεχάρισται] "*hath bestowed it* (the inheritance) as a free gift." The perfect tense marks the permanence of the effects.

19, 20. "Had the law, then, no purpose? Yes; but its very purpose, its whole character and history, betray its inferiority to the dispensation of grace. In four points this inferiority is seen. *First*; Instead of justifying, it condemns; instead of giving life, it kills; it was added to reveal and multiply transgressions. *Secondly*; It was but temporary. When the seed came to

τῶν παραβάσεων χάρις προσετέθη, ἄχρις οὗ ἔλθῃ τὸ σπέρμα ᾧ ἐπήγγελται, διαταγείς δι' ἀγγέλων ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου. ²⁰ ὁ δὲ

whom the promise was given it was annulled. *Thirdly*: It did not come direct from God to man. There was a double interposition, a twofold mediation, between the giver and the recipient. There were the angels, who administered it as God's instruments; there was Moses (or the high-priest), who delivered it to man. *Fourthly*: As follows from the idea of mediation, it was of the nature of a contract, depending for its fulfilment on the observance of its conditions by the two contracting parties. Not so the promise, which, proceeding from the sole fiat of God, is unconditional and unchangeable."

τί οὖν ὁ νόμος;] *what then is the law?* as 1 Cor. iii. 5, τί οὖν ἐστὶν Ἀπολλῶς; τί δὲ ἐστὶν Παῦλος; the correct reading. Comp. also Rom. iii. 1.

τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν] How is this to be interpreted? Is it (1) "To check transgressions"? comp. *Clem. Hom.* xi. 16, παραπτωμάτων χάριν ἢ τιμωρία ἔπεται; or is it rather (2) "To create transgressions"? for "where there is no law there is no transgression" (Rom. iv. 15). Thus law reveals (Rom. iii. 20), provokes (Rom. vii. 7, 13), multiplies (Rom. v. 20) sin or transgression. The use of χάρις (comp. 1 Jno. iii. 12) is sufficiently wide to admit either meaning. But the latter is to be preferred here; for (1) The language of the Epistle to the Romans shows this to be St. Paul's leading conception of the purposes and functions of the law; and (2) This sense seems to be required by the expressions in the context, "able to give life" (ver. 21), "included all under sin" (ver. 22). Comp. ii. 19.

προσετέθη] This reading, which is somewhat better supported than ἐτέθη, expresses more strongly the *adventitious* character of the law; comp. ἐπιδιατάσσεται ver. 15, and Rom. v. 20 νόμος δὲ παρεισῆλθεν ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παραπτῶμα.

ἐλθῇ] For the omission of ἂν see A. Buttmann, § 33, p. 198; for the conjunctive, the note on τρέχω ii. 2.

τὸ σπέρμα κ.τ.λ.] "*the seed to whom the promise has been given*," i.e. Christ. ἐπήγγελται is probably a passive, as 2 Macc. iv. 27.

διαταγείς δι' ἀγγέλων] "*ordered, or administered by the medium of angels*." The first mention of angels in connection with the giving of the law is in the benediction of Moses, Deut. xxxiii. 2, שְׂרָף מִרְבָּבִים, literally, "and he came from (amidst) myriads of holiness," i.e. countless angels who attend him. Some modern commentators (see Knobel *in loc.*) obliterate the mention of angels by translating, "He came from the heights of Kadesh," pointing the word שְׂרָף with the LXX; but, though the parallelism gains by this, the sense thus assigned to מִרְבָּבִים is unsupported; and Ewald, *Gesch. des V. Isr.* ii. 257, still further changes מִרְבָּבִים into מִרְיָבִים. The LXX render the words σὺν μυριάδι Κάδης, but introduce the angels in the following clause, ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ ἄγγελοι μετ' αὐτοῦ, where they must have had a different reading from our present Hebrew text (see Gesen. *Thes.* p. 358). Aquila, Symmachus, the Targums, and Jewish expositors generally, agree in the common rendering of שְׂרָף מִרְבָּבִים. Other allusions in the New Testament to the angels as administering the law are Acts vii. 53, ἐλάβετε τὸν νόμον εἰς διατάγας ἀγγέλων (comp. vv. 35, 38); Heb. ii. 2. See also Joseph. *Ant.* xv. 5, 3, ἡμῶν δὲ τὰ κάλλιστα τῶν δογμάτων καὶ τὰ δσιώτατα τῶν ἐν τοῖς νόμοις δι' ἀγγέλων παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ μαθόντων Philo *de somn.* p. 642 M, and the book of Jubilees, c. 1 (Ewald's *Jahrb.* ii. p. 233; iii. p. 74). The angels who assisted in the giving of the law hold a very important place in the later rabbinical

μεσίτης ἐνὸς οὐκ ἔστιν, ὁ δὲ Θεὸς εἷς ἐστίν. ²¹ ὁ οὖν νόμος κατὰ τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν [τοῦ Θεοῦ]; μὴ γένοιτο. εἰ γὰρ ἐδόθη νόμος

speculations. See the interpretation of Deut. xxxiii. 2 in the Jerusalem Targum, and the passages cited by Gfrörer, *Jahrh. des Heils*, i. p. 226, p. 357 sqq., and by Wetstein here. The theology of the schools having thus enlarged upon the casual notices in the Old Testament, a prominence was given to the mediation of angels which would render St. Paul's allusion the more significant.

In St. Stephen's speech (Acts vii. 53), as in the passage of Josephus, the angel's are mentioned to glorify the law, being opposed to mere human ministers. Here the motive is different. The interposition of created beings is contrasted with the direct agency of God himself. So also in Heb. ii. 2, where an *a fortiori* argument is drawn from the superiority of the salvation spoken by the Lord over the word spoken by angels (δὲ ἀγγέλων). St. Paul's contrast here between the directness of the one ministration and the indirectness of the other has a parallel in 2 Cor. iii. 12 sqq.

ἐν χειρὶ] A Hebraism or Aramaism, nearly equivalent to διὰ: comp. Acts vii. 35. It is a frequent LXX translation of בִּיד, occurring especially in the expression ἐν χειρὶ Μωϋσῆ, e.g. Num. iv. 37, 41, 45, etc. In Syriac we meet with such phrases as ܠܝܕܝܢܐ (i.e. ἐν χειρὶ πνεύματος, Acts iv. 25, Pesh.), ܠܝܕܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܬܐ (i.e. ἐν χειρὶ πίστεως, Hab. ii. 4, Hexapl.)

μςίτου] The mediator is Moses. This is his common title in Jewish writers. In the apocryphal ἀνάβασις or ἀνάληψις Moses says to Joshua, προεθεάσατό με ὁ Θεὸς πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου εἶναί με τῆς διαθήκης αὐτοῦ μεσίτην, Fabric. *Cod. Pseud. V.T.* i. p. 845. See the rabbinical passages in Wetstein,

and Philo, *Vit. Moys.* iii. 19, p. 160 M, οἷα μεσίτης καὶ διαλλάκτης. There would appear to be an allusion to this recognized title of Moses also in Heb. viii. 6 (comp. ix. 15; xii. 24), where our Lord is styled "a mediator of a better covenant." Though the word itself does not occur in the Mosaic narrative, the mediatorial functions of Moses appear clearly, e.g. Ex. xx. 19, and Deut. v. 2, 5, Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ὑμῶν διέθετο πρὸς ὑμᾶς διαθήκην. καὶ ἐποίησεν ἡμεῖς ἐν μέσῳ Κυρίου καὶ ὑμῶν κ.τ.λ. The reference in St. Paul seems to be to the first giving of the law; if extended to its after administration, the μεσίτης would then be the high-priest; see Philo, *Mon.* ii. 12, p. 230 M, μεθόριον ἀμφοῖν ἵνα διὰ μέσου τινὸς ἀνθρώπου ἰλάσκωνται ὁδόν; but this extension does not seem to be contemplated here.

On the other hand Origen (iv. p. 692, ed. Delarue), misled by 1 Tim. ii. 5, understood the mediator of Christ, and, as usual, carried a vast number of later commentators with him. Thus it is taken by Victorinus, Hilary, Jerome, Augustine, and Chrysostom. So also Concil. Antioch. (Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* iii. p. 295), Euseb. *Ecl. Th.* i. 20, 11; Athan. c. *Apoll.* i. 12. Much earlier than Origen, Marcion would seem to have entertained this view, Hippol. *Haer.* vii. 31, p. 254. Basil, however, clearly showed that Moses was meant, referring to Exod. xx. 19, *de Spir. Sanct.* xiv. 33 (iii. p. 27, Garnier), and it was perhaps owing to his influence that the correct interpretation was reinstated. So Theodore Mops., Theodoret, Gennadius; and comp. Didym. in *Ps.* pp. 1571, 1665 (Migne). Pelagius gives the alternative.

It will be seen that St. Paul's argument here rests in effect on our Lord's divinity as its foundation. Otherwise he would have been a mediator in the same sense in which Moses was a media-

ὁ δυνάμενος ζωοποιῆσαι, ὄντως ἐκ νόμου [ἀν] ἦν ἡ δικαιοσύνη.
 22 ἀλλὰ συνέκλεισεν ἡ γραφὴ τὰ πάντα ὑπὸ ἁμαρτίαν, ἵνα ἡ

tor. In another and a higher sense St. Paul himself so speaks of our Lord (1 Tim. ii. 5).

20. The number of interpretations of this passage is said to mount up to 250 or 300. Many of these arise out of an error as to the mediator, many more disregard the context, and not a few are quite arbitrary. Without attempting to discuss others which are not open to any of these objections, I shall give that which appears to me the most probable. The meaning of the first clause seems tolerably clear, and the range of possibility with regard to the second is not very great.

ὁ δὲ μεσίτης ἑνὸς οὐκ ἔστιν] "*no mediator can be a mediator of one.*" The very idea of mediation supposes two persons at least, between whom the mediation is carried on. The law, then, is of the nature of a contract between two parties, God on the one hand, and the Jewish people on the other. It is only valid so long as both parties fulfil the terms of the contract. It is therefore contingent, and not absolute. The definite article with μεσίτης expresses the idea, the specific type, as 2 Cor xii. 12 τὰ σημεῖα τοῦ ἀποστόλου, John x. 11 ὁ ποιῶν ὁ καλὸς: see Winer, § xviii. p. 106.

ὁ δὲ Θεὸς εἷς ἐστίν] "*but God (the giver of the promise) is one.*" Unlike the law, the promise is absolute and unconditional. It depends on the sole decree of God. There are not two contracting parties. There is nothing of the nature of a *stipulation*. The giver is everything, the recipient nothing. Thus the primary sense of "one" here is numerical. The further idea of unchangeableness may perhaps be suggested; but if so, it is rather accidental than inherent. On the other hand this proposition is quite unconnected with the fundamental statement of the Mosaic law, "The Lord thy God is one God," though resembling it in form.

21. "Thus the law differs widely from the promise. But does this difference imply antagonism? Did the law interfere with the promise? Far otherwise. Indeed we might imagine such a law, that it would take the place of the promise, would justify and give life. This was not the effect of the law of Moses. But still it was a preparatory discipline; it led the way to Christ."

τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν] the plural. See the note on ver. 16.

νόμος ὁ δυνάμενος] "*a law, such as could.*" For the position of the article see note i. 7, and comp. Acts iv. 12.

ζωοποιῆσαι] including alike the spiritual life in the present and the glorified life in the future, for in the apostle's conception the two are blended together and inseparable. The "inheritance" applies to both. Compare the scriptural use of "salvation" "the kingdom of heaven," etc.

22, 23. In this metaphor which describes the position of the Jews before Christ, two ideas are involved. *First*, that of *constraint or oppression*. They were brought under the dominion of sin, were locked up in its prison-house, and so were made to feel its power. *Secondly*, that of *watchful care*. They were fenced about as a peculiar people, that in due time they might become the depository of the gospel and the centre of its diffusion. The first idea is prominent in ver. 22, the second appears in ver. 23.

22. "On the contrary, as the passage of Scripture testifies, the law condemned all alike, yet not finally and irrevocably, but only as leading the way for the dispensation of faith, the fulfilment of the promise."

συνέκλεισεν ἡ γραφὴ] The scripture is here represented as doing that which it declares to be done.

The passage, which St. Paul has in mind, is probably either Ps. cxliii. 2,

ἐπαγγελία ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοθῇ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν.
²³ πρὸ τοῦ δὲ ἐλθεῖν τὴν πίστιν, ὑπὸ νόμον ἐφρουρούμεθα συνκλει-
 όμενοι εἰς τὴν μέλλουσαν πίστιν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι. ²⁴ ὥστε ὁ νόμος
 παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν γέγονεν εἰς Χριστόν, ἵνα ἐκ πίστεως δικαιωθῶ-

quoted above ii. 16, or Deut. xxvii. 26, quoted iii. 10. In Rom. iii. 10-18, indeed, the apostle gathers together several passages to this same purport, and it might therefore be supposed that he is alluding here rather to the general tenor of Scripture than to any special text. But the following facts seem to show that the singular *γραφὴ* in the New Testament always means a *particular passage* of Scripture: (1) Where the reference is clearly to the sacred writings as a whole, as in the expressions "searching the scriptures," etc., the plural *γραφαί* is universally found, e.g. Acts xvii. 11; xviii. 24, 28. (2) We meet with such expressions as "another scripture" (John xix. 37), "this scripture" (Luke iv. 21), "every scripture" (2 Tim. iii. 16). (3) Ἡ *γραφὴ* is most frequently used in introducing a particular quotation, and in the very few instances where the quotation is not actually given, it is for the most part easy to fix the passage referred to. These instances are John ii. 22 (Ps. xvi. 10; see Acts ii. 27); John xvii. 12 (Ps. xli. 10; see John xiii. 18); John xix. 28; Ps. lxix. 22; John xx. 9 (Ps. xvi. 10). The biblical usage is followed also by the earliest fathers. The transition from the "Scriptures" to the "Scripture" is analogous to the transition from τὰ βιβλία to the "Bible."

συνέκλεισεν ὑπὸ ἁμαρτίαν] i.e. subjected to the dominion of sin without means of escape, a pregnant expression: comp. Rom. xi. 32 συνέκλεισεν γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς τοὺς πάντας εἰς ἀπείθειαν ἵνα τοὺς πάντας ἐλείψῃ. The word *συγκλείειν* seems never to mean simply "to include." The A. V. has the more correct, but somewhat ambiguous, rendering "conclude" here. *συγκλείειν* εἰς is a common construction; see Fritzsche, *Rom.* ii. p. 545.

τὰ πάντα] The neuter is naturally used where the most comprehensive term is wanted: comp. 1 Cor. i. 27; Col. i. 20; Eph. i. 10.

ἵνα] The consciousness of sin is a necessary step towards justification. See note ii. 19, and comp. Rom. i. c.

ἐκ πίστεως κ.τ.λ.] Not a mere tautology after τοῖς πιστεύουσιν. St. Paul's opponents agreed with him that only a believer could obtain the promise. They differed in holding that he obtained it not by his faith, but by his works.

23. ἐφρουρούμεθα συνκλειόμενοι.] "*were shut up and kept in ward*: comp. Wisd. xvii. 15 ἐφρουρεῖτο εἰς τὴν ἀσιδηρον εἰρκτὴν κατακλείσθεις, Plut. *de def. orac.* p. 426 b οὐδὲ φρουρεῖν συγκλείσαντας τῇ ὕλῃ.

The use of *πίστις* in these verses (vv. 22, 23, 25) links together its extreme senses, passing from the one to the other, (1) Faith, the subjective state of the Christian, (2) *The* faith, the gospel, the objective teaching, the system of which "faith," is the leading feature. See the note i. 23, and p. 353.

24. παιδαγωγός] Comp. 1 Cor. iv. 15. The paedagogus or tutor, frequently a superior slave, was entrusted with the moral supervision of the child. Thus his office was quite distinct from that of the διδάσκαλος, so that the English rendering, "schoolmaster," conveys a wrong idea. The following passage of Plato (*Lysis*, p. 208 c) is a very complete illustration of the use which St. Paul makes of the metaphor; Σὲ αὐτὸν ἐῷσω ἄρχειν σεαυτοῦ, ἢ οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἐπιτρέπουσί σοι; Πῶς γάρ, ἔφη, ἐπιτρέπουσιν; Ἄλλ' ἄρχει τίς σου; Ὅδε παιδαγωγός, ἔφη. Μῶν δούλος ὢν; Ἀλλὰ τί μήν; ἡμέτερός γε, ἔφη. Ὡ δεινόν, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, ἐλεύθερον ὄντα ὑπὸ δούλου ἄρχεισθαι. τί δὲ ποιῶν αὐτοῦ οὗτος ὁ παιδαγωγός σου ἄρχει;

μεν· ²⁵ ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς πίστεως οὐκέτι ὑπὸ παιδαγωγόν ἐσμεν.
²⁶ πάντες γὰρ υἱοὶ Θεοῦ ἐστέ διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ·
²⁷ ὅσοι γὰρ εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε, Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε. ²⁸ οὐκ

Ἀγων δῆπον, ἔφη, εἰς διδασκάλου. Μῶν μὴ καὶ οὗτοι σου ἄρχουσιν, οἱ διδασκαλοι; Πάντως δῆπον. Παμπόλλους ἄρα σοι δεσπότας καὶ ἄρχοντας ἐκάν ὁ πατὴρ ἐφίστησιν. On the "paedagogus" see Becker and Marquardt, *Röm. Alt.* v. 1 p. 114. and Smith's *Dict. of Antiq.* s.v. As well in his inferior rank as in his recognized duty of enforcing discipline, this person was a fit emblem of the Mosiac law. The rabbinical writers naturalized the word παιδαγωγός, פֶּדָיָה (see Schöttgen here), and in the Jerusalem Targum it is used to translate פֶּדֶן (A. V. "a nursing father") Numb. xi. 12.

The tempting explanation of παιδαγωγός εἰς Χριστόν, "one to conduct us to the school of Christ," ought probably to be abandoned. Even if this sense did not require πρὸς Χριστόν or εἰς Χριστοῦ, the context is unfavorable to it. There is no reference here to our Lord as a teacher. "Christ" represents the freedom of mature age, for which the constraints of childhood are a preparation; compare Eph. iv. 13 εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον ("full grown") εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ. The metaphor of the paedagogus seems to have grown out of ἐφρουρούμεθα, and thus the main idea is that of strict supervision. The παιδαγωγός had the whole moral direction of the child, so that παιδαγωγία became equivalent to "moral training," and the idea conveyed by the term need not be restricted to any one function. Compare Plut. *Num.* 15 ἐκ δὲ τοιαύτης παιδαγωγίας πρὸς τὸ θεῖον οὕτως ἡ πόλις ἐγγεγόνει χειροθήνη κ.τ.λ., and Libani. iv. 437, ed. Reiske (quoted in Wetstein), πρῶτον μὲν νόμῳ παιδαγωγήσομεν αὐτῶν τὴν προαίρεσιν, ὥς ἂν τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου ζημίαν ἀναδυόμεναι σωφρονεῖν ἀναγκάζονται.

25, 26. ἐσμέν, ἐστέ] See a similar

instance of the interchange of the first and second persons in 1 Thess. v. 5 πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς υἱοὶ φωτός ἐστε καὶ υἱοὶ ἡμέρας· οὐκ ἐσμέν νυκτός οὐδὲ σκότους.

26. πάντες γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] "*for ye all are sons of God by your faith, sons of God in Christ Jesus.*" The stress of the sentence lies on πάντες and υἱοί; "all," Jews and Gentiles alike, those under the law and those without the law; "sons" (υἱοί), claiming therefore the privileges, the liberty of sons, so that the rigorous supervision of the tutor (παιδαγωγός) ceases when you cease to be children (παῖδες).

υἱοὶ Θεοῦ] In St. Paul the expressions "sons of God," "children of God," mostly convey the idea of *liberty*, as iv. 6, 7; Rom. viii. 14 sqq. (see, however, Phil. ii. 15), in St. John of *guiltlessness* and *love*, e.g. 1 John iii. 1, 2, 10. In accordance with this distinction St. Paul uses υἱοὶ as well as τέκνα, St. John τέκνα only.

ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ] The context shows that these words must be separated from διὰ τῆς πίστεως. They are thrown to the end of the sentence so as to form in a manner a distinct proposition, on which the apostle enlarges in the following verses: "You are sons by your union with, your existence in, Christ Jesus."

27. "In Jesus Christ, I say, *for all ye, who were baptized into Christ, did put on Christ*:" γὰρ introduces the explanation of the foregoing ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

ἐνεδύσασθε] The metaphor has been supposed to be taken from the white garments in which the newly baptized were clothed; see Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* xi. 11, § 1. It is scarcely probable, however, that the ceremonial of baptism had become so definitely fixed at this early date, that such an allusion would speak for itself. The metaphor in fact is very common in the LXX, e.g. Job viii. 22 (αἰσχύνην), xxix. 14 (δικαιο-

ἐν Ἰουδαίῳ οὐδὲ Ἕλλην, οὐκ ἐν δούλῳ οὐδὲ ἐλεύθερῳ, οὐκ ἐν ἄρσεν καὶ θήλῃ· πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἰς ἐστὲ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.
 29 εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ, ἄρα τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ σπέρμα ἐστέ, κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν κληρονόμοι.

28. ἅπαντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς.

σύνην). xxxix. 19 (φόβον), Ps. xxxiv. 26 (αἰσχύνην καὶ ἐντροπήν), xcii. 1 (εὐπρέπεια, δύναμιν), ciii. 1, etc., comp. ἐγκομβούσθαι 1 Pet. v. 5. See also Schöttgen on Rom. xiii. 14. On the other hand in the context of the passage of Justin quoted below (ver. 28) there is apparently an allusion to the baptismal robes.

28. "In Christ ye are all sons, all free. Every barrier is swept away. No special claims, no special disabilities, exist in him, none *can* exist. The conventional distinctions of religious caste or of social rank, even the natural distinction of sex, are banished hence. One heart beats in all: one mind guides all: one life is lived by all. Ye are all *one man*, for ye are members of Christ."

οὐκ ἐν] "there is no room for, no place for," negating not the fact only, but the possibility, as James i. 17 παρ' ᾧ οὐκ ἐν παραλλαγῇ. The right account of ἐν seems to be given by Winer, § xiv. p. 79. It is not a contraction of ἐνεστι, but the preposition ἐν, ἐνί, strengthened by a more vigorous accent, like ἐπι, πάρα, and used with an ellipsis of the substantive verb.

Ἕλλην] See the note ii. 3.

ἄρσεν καὶ θήλῃ] The connecting particle is perhaps changed in the third clause, because the distinction now mentioned is different in kind, no longer social but physical. There may be an allusion to Gen. i. 27 ἄρσεν καὶ θήλῃ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς, and if so, this clause will form a climax: "even the primeval distinction of sex has ceased." Comp. Col. iii. 11.

Either on this passage, or on some unrecorded saying of our Lord similar in import (comp. Luke xx. 35), may have been founded the mystical language attributed to our Lord in the

apocryphal gospel of the Egyptians (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iii. p. 553, ed. Potter). Being asked by Salome when his kingdom should come, he is reported to have answered, "When the two shall be one, and the male with the female, neither male nor female." These obscure words were much discussed in early times and diversely interpreted, e.g. by the Ophites (Hippol. *Haer.* v. 7), by the Pseudo-Clement of Rome (Epist. 2, § 12), by Cassianus (Clem. Alex. l. c.), and by Theodotus (Clem. Alex. p. 985). See also the remarks of Clement of Alexandria himself, pp. 532, 539, sq., besides the passage first cited. For another coincidence of St. Paul's language with a saying attributed to our Lord, but not found in the gospels, see 1 Thess. v. 21.

εἰς ἐστὲ] "are one man." Comp. Eph. ii. 15 τοὺς δύο κτίσῃ ἐν ἑαυτῷ εἰς ἓνα καὶ ἓν ἄνθρωπον, and Justin *Dial.* § 116, p. 344 B οὕτως ἡμεῖς οἱ διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ δνόματος ὡς εἰς ἄνθρωπος πιστεύσαντες . . . τὰ ῥηπαρὰ ἡμῶν ἀπημφισμένον κ.τ.λ., which seems to be a reminiscence of this passage of St. Paul. The neuter ἐν, found in some texts, destroys the point of the expression, the oneness as a *conscious agent*.

29. Χριστοῦ] "are part of Christ, are members of Christ," not merely "are the property of Christ, are servants of Christ." The argument turns on the entire *identity* of the Christian brotherhood with Christ.

ἄρα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ] "then being one with Christ, ye are Abraham's seed"; for he is that seed of Abraham to whom the promise was given. See the note on ver. 16.

κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν] emphatic; "heirs indeed, but heirs *by promise*, not by law." See ver. 18.

IV. ¹Λέγω δέ, ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ὁ κληρονόμος νήπιός ἐστιν, οὐδὲν διαφέρει δούλου κύριος πάντων ὢν, ²ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ ἐπιτρόπους

IV. 1-7. In the former paragraph St. Paul, starting from the figure of the paedagogus, had been led to speak of the sonship of the faithful in Christ. The opening verses of this chapter are an expansion of the same image. The heir in his nonage represents the state of the world before the gospel. In drawing out the comparison, St. Paul seems to include Gentiles as well as Jews under this "tutelage," all having more or less been subject to a system of positive ordinances, and so far gone through a disciplinary training. In the image itself, however, there are two points to be cleared up.

First. Is the father of the heir represented as dead or living? On the one hand individual expressions point to the decease of the father; a very unnatural meaning must otherwise be forced upon the words, "heir," "guardian," "lord of all." On the other hand, the metaphor in its application refers to a living Father. The latter consideration must yield to the former. The point of the comparison lies not in the circumstances of the father, but of the son. All metaphors must cease to apply at some point, and the death of the father is the limit here imposed by the nature of the case. Our Father never dies; the inheritance never passes away from him; yet nevertheless we succeed to the full possession of it.

Secondly. It has been questioned whether St. Paul borrows the imagery here from Roman or from Jewish law, or even, as some maintain, from a special code in force in Galatia. In the absence of very ample information, we may say that, so far as he alludes to any definite form of the law of guardianship, he would naturally refer to the Roman; but, as the terms are not technically exact (e.g. νήπιος, προθεσμία), he seems to put forward rather the general

conception of the office of a guardian than any definite statute regulating it. His language, indeed, agrees much better with our simpler modern practice than with Roman law, which in this respect was artificial and elaborate.

1. λέγω δέ] "But what I would say is this," introducing an expansion or explanation of what has gone before: see v. 16; Rom. xv. 8, and for the more definite τοῦτο δὲ λέγω, Gal. iii. 17 (with the note), 1 Cor. i. 12.

νήπιος] "*an infant.*" As this does not appear to have been a technical term in Greek, or at least in Attic law (where the distinction is between παῖς and ἀνήρ), it probably represents the Latin "*infans.*" If so, its use here, though sufficiently exact for the purposes of the comparison, is not technically precise. The "*infantia*" of a Roman child ended with his seventh year, after which he was competent to perform certain legal acts, but he was not entirely emancipated from a state of tutelage till he entered on his twenty-fifth year, having passed through several intermediate stages. See Savigny, *Leöm. Recht.* iii. p. 25 sqq. Νήπιος seems to be here "a minor" in any stage of his minority. The word is opposed to ἀνήρ, 1 Cor. xiii. 11; Eph. iv. 13, 14; comp. Dion. Hal. *R. H.* iv. 9; Gruter, *Inscr.* p. 682, no. 9.

οὐδὲν διαφέρει δούλου] The minor was legally in much the same position as the slave. He could not perform any act except through his legal representative. This responsible person, the guardian in the case of the minor, the master in the case of the slave, who represented him to the state, and whose sanction was necessary for the validity of any contract undertaken on his behalf, was termed in Attic law κήριος, Meier, *Att. Proc.* p. 450. Prospectively, however, though not actually, the minor

ἐστὶν καὶ οἰκονόμους ἄχρι τῆς προθεσμίας τοῦ πατρός. ³ οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς, ὅτε ἡμεν νήπιοι, ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἡμεν δεδου-

was κύριος πάντων, which the slave was not.

2. ἐπιτρόπους καὶ οἰκονόμους] "*controllers of his person and property.*" The language is intended, as the plurals show, to be as comprehensive as possible. It is therefore vain to search for the exact technical term in Roman law corresponding to each word. The Latin fathers translate them variously: "*curatores et actores*" *Vict., Hil., Interp. Orig.*; "*tutores et actores*," *Pelag., Hier.*; "*procuratores et actores*," *Aug.*; "*tutores et dispensatores*," *Interp. Theod. Mops.* The distinction given in the above translation seems the most probable. The ἐπίτροποι are the boy's legal representatives, his guardians (whether "*curatores*" or "*tutores*" in Roman law); the οἰκονόμοι, stewards or bailiffs appointed to manage his household or property. The word ἐπίτροπος elsewhere in the New Testament, Matt. xx. 8; Luke viii. 3, is "a steward." Adopted into the Rabbinical language (אפיטרופוס) it has a comprehensive meaning, signifying sometimes a guardian, sometimes a steward: see Schöttgen here, and on Luke viii. 3.

τῆς προθεσμίας] sc. ἡμέρας, "*the day appointed beforehand*," generally 'as a limit to the performance or nonperformance of an action; in this case as the time at which the office of guardian ceases. A difficulty, however, presents itself in πατρός. In Roman law the term was fixed by statute, so that the father did not generally exercise any control over it. It has been supposed, indeed, that St. Paul refers to some exceptional legislation by which greater power was given to the Galatians in this respect; but this view seems to rest on a mistaken interpretation of a passage in Gaius (i. § 55). It would appear, however, that by Roman law some discretion was left to the father, at all

events, in certain cases; see Gaius, § 186, "*Si cui testamento tutor sub conditione aut ex die certo datus sit*"; comp. Justinian's *Instit.* i. xiv. 3; and probably more exact information would show that the law was not so rigorous as is often assumed. Considering, then, (1) That, though the term of guardianship was not generally settled by the will of the testator, the choice of persons was, and (2) That in appointments made for special purposes this power was given to the testator; the expression in question will perhaps not appear out of place, even if St. Paul's illustration be supposed to be drawn directly from Roman law.

3. ἡμεῖς] "*we*," Jews and Gentiles alike, as appears from the whole context. See the note on ver. 11.

τὰ στοιχεῖα] "*the elements*," originally "*the letters of the alphabet*," as being set in rows. From this primary sense the word gets two divergent meanings among others, both of which have been assigned to it in this passage; (1) "*The physical elements*" (2 Pet. iii. 10, 12; Wisd. vii. 17), as earth, fire, etc. (Hermas, *Vis.* iii. 13), and especially the heavenly bodies: comp. *Clem. Rom.* x. 9, 25; Justin, *Apol.* ii. p. 44 A, τὰ οὐράνια στοιχεῖα; *Dial.* p. 285 c. They were probably so called chronologically, as the elements of time (Theoph. *ad Aut.* i. 4, ἡλιος καὶ σελήνη, καὶ ἀστέρες στοιχεῖα αὐτοῦ εἰσιν, εἰς σημεῖα καὶ εἰς καιροὺς καὶ εἰς ἡμέρας καὶ εἰς ἐνιαυτοὺς γεγονότα); (2) "*The alphabet of learning, rudimentary instruction*"; comp. Heb. v. 12.

The former sense is commonly adopted by the fathers, who for the most part explain it of the observance of days and seasons, regulated by the heavenly bodies. So Hilary, Pelag., Chrysost., Theod. Mops., Theodoret; comp. *Ep. ad Diogn.* § 4. Victorinus strangely interprets it of the influence of the stars on the

λωμένοι. ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός, γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον,

heathen not yet emancipated by Christ; and Augustine supposes that St. Paul is referring to the Gentile worship of the physical elements. The two latter interpretations are, at all events, excluded by *ἡμεῖς*, which must include Jews. The agreement in favor of this sense of *στοιχεῖα* may, I think, be attributed to the influence of a passage in the *Prædication Petri*, quoted in Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi. (p. 760, Potter). Orig. in *Joann.* iv. 22 (iv. p. 226, Delarue), in which the worship of the Jews is classed with that of the heathen; inasmuch as, professing to know God, they were in fact by this observance of days and seasons *λατρεύοντες ἀγγέλοις καὶ ἀρχαγγέλοις, μηνὶ καὶ σελήνῃ*. At all events, I can scarcely doubt that this interpretation of *στοιχεῖα* became current through Origen's influence. It seems to be much more in accordance with the prevailing tone of Alexandrian theology than with the language and teaching of St. Paul. Comp. Philo *de migr. Abr.* p. 464 M.

On the other hand, a few of the fathers (Jerome, Gennadius, Primasius) adopt the other sense, "elementary teaching." This is probably the correct interpretation, both as simpler in itself and as suiting the context better. St. Paul seems to be dwelling still on the rudimentary character of the law, as fitted for an earlier stage in the world's history. The expression occurs again in reference to formal ordinances, Col. ii. 8, *κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*; and ii. 20, *εἰ ἀπεθάνετε σὺν Χριστῷ ἀπὸ τῶν στοιχείων τοῦ κόσμου, τί ὡς ζῶντες ἐν κόσμῳ δογματίζεσθε*. In these passages the words of the context which are emphasized seem to show that a *mode of instruction* is signified by *τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*.

τοῦ κόσμου] "*of the world*," i.e. having reference to material and not to spiritual

things, formal and sensuous. The force of *τοῦ κόσμου* is best explained by the parallel passages already cited, Col. ii. 8, 20. See below vi. 14.

4. τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου] The ideas involved in this expression may be gathered from the context. It was "the fulness of time." *First*. In reference to the *Giver*. The moment had arrived which God had ordained from the beginning, and foretold by his prophets for Messiah's coming. This is implied in the comparison *ἡ προθεσμία τοῦ πατρὸς*. *Secondly*. In reference to the *recipient*. The gospel was withheld until the world had arrived at mature age. Law had worked out its educational purpose, and now was superseded. This educational work had been twofold: (1) *Negative*. It was the purpose of all law, but especially of the Mosaic law, to deepen the conviction of sin, and thus to show the inability of all existing systems to bring men near to God. This idea, which is so prominent in the Epistle to the Romans, appears in the context here, vv. 19, 21. (2) *Positive*. The comparison of the child implies more than a negative effect. A moral and spiritual expansion, which rendered the world more capable of apprehending the gospel than it would have been at an earlier age, must be assumed, corresponding to the growth of the individual; since otherwise the metaphor would be robbed of more than half its meaning.

The primary reference in all this is plainly to the Mosaic law; but the whole context shows that the Gentile converts of Galatia are also included, and that they too are regarded as having undergone an elementary discipline, up to a certain point analogous to that of the Jews. See the remarks on ver. 11.

πλήρωμα] "*the complement*." On this word see Fritzsche, Rom. xi. 12.

⁵ ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ, ἵνα τὴν υἰοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν.
⁶ ὅτι δέ ἐστε υἱοί, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ

ἐξαπέστειλεν] "*He sent forth from himself*," as his representative"; *ex caelo a sese*," says Bengel. This word assumes the pre-existence of the Son, but must not be pressed to imply also the unity with the Father, for it is commonly used in later Greek in speaking of any mission.

γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός] i.e. taking upon himself our human nature; comp. Job. xiv. 1; Matt. xi. 11. These passages show that the expression must not be taken as referring to the miraculous incarnation. See Basil, *de Spir. Sanct.* v. 12.

γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον] not τὸν νόμον; for, though Christ was born under the Mosaic law, the application of the principle is much wider. See the note on the next verse.

5. The two clauses correspond to those of the foregoing verse in an inverted order, by the grammatical figure called Chiasm: "The Son of God was born a man, that in him all men might become sons of God; he was born subject to law, that those subject to law might be rescued from bondage." At the same time the figure is not arbitrarily employed here, but the inversion arises out of the necessary sequence. The abolition of the law, the rescue from bondage, was a prior condition of the universal sonship of the faithful. See the note on iii. 14.

τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον] again not τὸν νόμον. St. Paul refers primarily to the Mosaic law, as at once the highest and most rigorous form of law, but extends the application to all those subject to any system of positive ordinances. We seem to have the same extension, starting from the law of Moses, in 1 Cor. ix. 20, ἐγενόμην τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ὡς Ἰουδαῖος τοῖς ὑπὸ νόμον ὡς ὑπὸ νόμον.

ἐξαγοράσῃ] See the note on iii. 13.

ἵνα, ἵνα] For the repetition of ἵνα, and for the general connection of thought, see the note iii. 14. In this passage it is perhaps best to take the two as independent of each other, inasmuch as the two clauses to which they respectively refer, are likewise independent. Comp. Eph. v. 26, 27.

τὴν υἰοθεσίαν] not "the sonship," but "the adoption as sons." Υἰοθεσία seems never to have the former sense: see Fritzsche on Rom. viii. 15. Potentially, indeed, men were sons before Christ's coming (ver. 1), but actually they were only slaves (ver. 3). His coming conferred upon them the privileges of sons: "Adoptionem propterea dedit," says Augustine with true appreciation, "ut distincte intelligamus unicum Dei filium." We are sons by grace; he is so by nature.

ἀπολάβωμεν] The exact sense of the preposition will depend on the meaning assigned to υἰοθεσίαν. If υἰοθεσία be taken as adoption, ἀπολάβωμεν must signify "receive as destined for, as promised to us," or, as Augustine says, "nee dixit accipiamus, sed recipiamus, ut significaret hoc nos amisisse in Adam, ex quo mortales sumus." At all events, it cannot be equivalent to λάβωμεν. The change to the first person plural marks the universality of the sonship: "we, those under law and those free from law, alike."

6. ὅτι ἐστε υἱοί] "*because ye are sons.*" The presence of the Spirit is thus a witness of their sonship. The force of this clause is best explained by the parallel passage, Rom. viii. 15, 16. St. Paul seems here to be dwelling on the same idea as in iii. 2. Their reconciliation with God was complete without works of law, the gift of the Spirit being a proof of this. See also Acts x. 44; xi. 15-18; xv. 8.

κράζον] The word denotes earnest

εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν, κραῶζον Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ. ὥστε οὐκέτι εἰ δοῦλος, ἀλλὰ υἱός· εἰ δὲ υἱός, καὶ κληρονόμος διὰ Θεοῦ. ἔλλα

and importunate prayer, as in Isa. xix. 20; comp. James v. 4.

Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ] Abba is the Aramaic equivalent to the Greek πατήρ. The combination of the two words seems to have been a liturgical formula. It occurs in St. Mark xiv. 36 in the mouth of our Lord, and also in Rom. viii. 15 in a passage closely resembling this. The origin of this formula may be explained in two ways. *First*. It originated in the Hellenistic Jews, who would naturally adhere with fondness to the original word, consecrated in their prayers by long usage, and add to it the equivalent in the Greek language, which they ordinarily spoke. In this case, in the passage of St. Mark the words ὁ πατήρ may perhaps be an addition of the evangelist himself, explaining the Aramaic word, after his wont. *Secondly*. It may have taken its rise among the Jews of Palestine after they had become acquainted with the Greek language. In this case it is simply an expression of importunate entreaty, illustrating the natural mode of emphasizing by repetition of the same idea in different forms. This latter explanation seems simpler, and best explains the expression as coming from our Lord's lips. It is, moreover, supported by similar instances given in Schöttgen, ii. p. 252: e.g. a woman entreating a judge addresses him אֲדֹנָי, the second word being κύριε, the Greek equivalent to the Aramaic אֲדֹנָי, "my lord." For other examples see Rev. ix. 11 (Ἀπολλύων, Ἀβδδών); xii. 9; xx. 2 (Σατανᾶς, Διάβολος). Whichever explanation be adopted, this phrase is a speaking testimony to that fusion of Jew and Greek which prepared the way for the preaching of the gospel to the heathen. Accordingly, St. Paul in both passages seems to dwell on it with peculiar emphasis, as a type of the

union of Jew and Gentile in Christ: comp. iii. 28.

Ἀββᾶ] In Chaldee אבא; in Syriac, ܐܒܐ. In the latter dialect it is said to

have been pronounced with a double *b* when applied to a spiritual father, with a single *b* when used in its first sense: see Bernstein's *Lex. s.v.* and comp. Hoffman, *Gram. Syr.* i. 1, § 17. With the double letter, at all events, it has passed into the European languages as an ecclesiastical term, "abbas," "abbot." The Peshito in rendering Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ can only repeat the word, "Father our Father," in all three passages where the expression occurs.

ὁ πατήρ] The nominative with the article is here used for an emphatic vocative, as e.g. Luke viii. 54, ἦ παῖς ἔγειρε. See Winer, § xxix. p. 182. This is a Hebraism; comp. Gesen. *Heb. gramm.* § 107.

7. ὥστε] "therefore," in reference to all that has gone before: "Seeing (1) that this naturally follows when your minority has come to an end; and (2) that you have direct proof of it in the gift of the Spirit, the token of sonship."

οὐκέτι εἰ] "thou art no longer," now that Christ has come. The appeal is driven home by the successive changes in the mode of address: *first*, "we, all Christians, far and wide, Jews and Gentiles alike" (ἀπολάβωμεν, ver. 5); *next*, "you, my Galatian converts" (ἔστε, ver. 6); *lastly*, "each individual man who hears my words" (εἰ, ver. 7).

εἰ δὲ υἱός καὶ κληρονόμος] comp. Rom. viii. 17, εἰ δὲ τέκνα καὶ κληρονόμοι. It has been made a question whether St. Paul is here drawing his illustrations from Jewish or from Roman law. In answer to this it is perhaps sufficient to say that, so far as he has in view any special form of law, he would naturally refer to the Roman, as most familiar to

τότε μὲν οὐκ εἰδότες Θεὸν ἐδουλεύσατε τοῖς φύσει μὴ οὖσιν θεοῖς· ἡνὺν δὲ γνόντες Θεόν, μάλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ Θεοῦ,

his readers. And, indeed, the Roman law of inheritance supplied a much truer illustration of the privileges of the Christian, than the Jewish. By Roman law all the children, whether sons or daughters, inherited alike (comp. iii. 28, οὐκ ἐνὶ ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ); by Jewish, the sons inherited unequally, and, except in default of male heirs, the daughters were excluded; Michaelis, *Laws of Moses*, iii. 3, § 1. See a paper of C. F. A. Fritzsche in *Fritsch. Opusc.* i. p. 143.

διὰ Θεοῦ] “*heir*, not by virtue of birth, or through merits of your own, but *through God*, who adopted you.” For διὰ see the note on i. 1. This is doubtless the right reading, having the preponderance of authority in its favor. All other variations, including that of the received text, κληρονόμος Θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ, are apparently substitutions of a common expression for one which is unusual and startling.

8. “Nevertheless, in an unfilial spirit, ye have subjected yourselves again to bondage, ye would fain submit anew to a weak and beggarly discipline of restraint. And how much less pardonable is this now! For then ye were idolaters from ignorance of God; but now ye have known God, or rather have been known of him.”

ἔτι] “*yet still*, in spite of your sonship,” referring not to ἐδουλεύσατε, with which it stands in close proximity, but to the more remote ἐπιστρέφετε (ver. 9); comp. Rom. vi. 17, χάρις δὲ τῷ Θεῷ, ὅτι ἦτε δοῦλοι, ὑπακούσατε δὲ ἐκ καρδίας κ.τ.λ. The intervening words (ver. 8) are inserted to prepare the way for πάλιν.

τότε μὲν οὐκ εἰδότες] “Then it was through ignorance of God that ye were subject,” etc.; a partial excuse for their former bondage. For the expression εἰδέναι Θεόν, see 1 Thess. iv. 5; 2 Thess. i. 8.

τοῖς φύσει μὴ οὖσιν θεοῖς] “to those

who by nature were not gods,” i.e. μὴ οὖσιν θεοῖς ἀλλὰ δαιμονίοις; comp. 1 Cor. x. 20, ἃ θύουσιν [τὰ ἔθνη], δαιμονίοις καὶ οὐ Θεῷ θύουσιν. This is the correct order. On the other hand, in the reading of the received text, τοῖς μὴ φύσει οὖσιν θεοῖς, the negative affects φύσει, i.e. μὴ φύσει ἀλλὰ λόγῳ, “not by nature, but by repute”; comp. 1 Cor. viii. 5, εἰσὶν λεγόμενοι θεοί.

9. γνόντες] “*having discerned, recognized*,” to be distinguished from the preceding εἰδότες. See 1 Jno. ii. 29, ἐὰν εἰδῇτε ὅτι δίκαιός ἐστιν, γινώσκετε ὅτι καὶ πᾶς κ.τ.λ., Jno. xxi. 17; Eph. v. 5; 1 Cor. ii. 11; comp. Gal. ii. 7, 9. While οἶδα, “I know,” refers to the knowledge of facts absolutely, γινώσκω, “I recognize,” being relative, gives prominence either to the attainment or the manifestation of the knowledge. Thus γινώσκειν will be used in preference to εἰδέναι; (1) where there is reference to some earlier state of ignorance, or to some prior facts, on which the knowledge is based; (2) where the ideas of “thoroughness, familiarity,” or of “approbation,” are involved: these ideas arising out of the stress which γινώσκειν lays on the process of reception. Both words occur very frequently in the First Epistle of St. John, and a comparison of the passages where they are used brings out this distinction of meaning clearly.

γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ Θεοῦ] added to obviate any false inference, as though the reconciliation with God were attributable to a man's own effort. See 1 Cor. viii. 2, εἰ τις δοκεῖ ἐγνωσκέναι τι, οὕτω ἔγνω καθὼς δεῖ γνῶναι· εἰ δὲ τις ἀγαπᾷ τὸν Θεόν, οὗτος ἔγνωσται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ: comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 12. God knows man, but man knows not God, or knows him but imperfectly. See also 1 Jno. iv. 10, οὐχ ὅτι ἡμεῖς ἠγαπήσαμεν τὸν Θεόν, ἀλλ' ὅτι αὐτὸς ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς.

πὼς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα, οἷς πάλιν ἄνωθεν δουλεῦν θέλετε; ¹⁰ ἡμέρας παρατηρεῖσθε καὶ

πὼς ἐπιστρέφετε] The apostle's eagerness to remonstrate leads him to interrupt by an interrogation the natural flow of the sentence as marked out by the foregoing words. A present tense is used, for the change was still going on; comp. i. 6, μετατίθεσθε.

ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ] "*weak*," for they have no power to rescue man from condemnation: "*leggarily*," for they bring no rich endowment of spiritual treasures. For ἀσθενῆ see Rom. viii. 3 τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου (comp. Gal. iii. 21), Heb. vii. 18 τὸ ἀσθενὲς καὶ ἀνωφελές.

πάλιν ἄνωθεν] a strong expression to describe the completeness of their relapse.

10. ἡμέρας κ.τ.λ.] Comp. Col. ii. 16 ἐν μέρει ἑορτῆς ἢ νομηνίας ἢ σαββάτων, which passage explains the expressions here, stopping short, however, of ἐνιαυτοί. The ἡμέραι are the days recurring weekly, the Sabbath: μῆνες, the monthly celebrations, the new moons: καιροί, the annual festivals, as the passover, pentecost, etc.; ἐνιαυτοί, the sacred years, as the sabbatical year and the year of jubilee. Comp. Judith viii. 6 χωρὶς προσαββάτων καὶ σαββάτων καὶ προνομηνιῶν καὶ νομηνιῶν καὶ ἑορτῶν καὶ χαρομηνῶν οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ, Philo *de sept.* p. 286 M ἵνα τὴν ἑβδομάδα τιμῇσιν κατὰ πάντας χρόνους ἡμερῶν καὶ μηνῶν καὶ ἐνιαυτῶν κ.τ.λ. For μῆνες in the sense it has here comp. Isa. lxvi. 13 καὶ ἔσται μῆν ἐκ μῆνος καὶ σαββάτων ἐκ σαββάτων. On this use of καιρός for an *annually* recurring season see Moeris, p. 214 (Bekker), "*Ὡρα ἔτους*, *Ἀττικοί*· καιρὸς ἔτους, *Ἕλληνες*; and Hesychius, *Ὡρα ἔτους*· καιρὸς ἔτους· τὸ ἔαρ καὶ τὸ θέρος.

ἐνιαυτοί] It has been calculated (Wieseler, *Chron. synops.* p. 204 sq., and here) that the year from autumn 54 to autumn 55 was a sabbatical year; and an inference has been drawn from this as to the date of the epistle. The

enumeration however seems to be intended as general and exhaustive, and no special reference can be assumed.

On the Christian observance of days in reference to this prohibition of St. Paul, see the excellent remarks of Origen c. *Cels.* viii. 21-23.

παρατηρεῖσθε] "*ye minutely, scrupulously observe*," literally "*ye go along with and observe*": comp. Ps. cxxix. 3 ἐὰν ἀνομίας παρατηρήσης, Joseph. *Ant.* iii. 5, 5 παρατηρεῖν τὰς ἑβδομάδας. *Clem. Rom.* xix. 22 ἀμελήσαντες τὴν παρατήρησιν. In this last passage, which enjoins the observance of days (ἐπιτηρησμοὶ ἡμέραι), there is apparently an attack on St. Paul; see above, p. 66. There seems to be no authority for assigning to παρατηρεῖν the sense "*wrongly observe*," nor is the analogy of such words as παρακοῦεν sufficiently close to bear it out. Here the middle voice still further enforces the idea of interested, assiduous observance; comp. Luke xiv. 1.

11. κεκοιτάκα] the indicative mood, because the speaker suspects that what he fears has actually happened. Herm. on Soph. *Aj.* 272 says, "*μή ἐστι verentis quidem est sed indicantis simul putare se ita esse ut veretur*." See Winer, § lvi. p. 503.

In the above passage St. Paul expressively describes the Mosaic law, as a rudimentary teaching, the alphabet, as it were, of moral and spiritual instruction. The child must be taught by definite rules, learned by rote. The chosen race, like the individual man, has had its period of childhood. During this period the mode of instruction was tempered to its undeveloped capacities. It was subject to a discipline of absolute precepts, of external ordinances.

It is clear, however, from the context, that the apostle is not speaking of the Jewish race alone, but of the heathen world also before Christ—not of the

μῆνας καὶ καιρὸς καὶ ἐνιαυτοὺς ; ¹¹ φοβοῦμαι ὑμᾶς, μή πως εἰκῇ κεκοπίλακα εἰς ὑμᾶς.

Mosaic law only, but of all forms of law which might be subservient to the same purpose. This appears from his including his Galatian hearers under the same tutelage. Nor is this fact to be explained by supposing them to have passed through a stage of Jewish proselytism on their way to Christianity. St. Paul distinctly refers to their previous idolatrous worship (ver. 8), and no less distinctly and emphatically does he describe their adoption of Jewish ritualism, as a *return* to the weak and beggarly discipline of childhood, from which they had been emancipated when they abandoned that worship.

But how, we may ask, could St. Paul class in the same category that divinely ordained law which he elsewhere describes as "holy and just and good" (Rom. vii. 12), and those degraded heathen systems which he elsewhere reprobates as "fellowship with devils" (1 Cor. x. 20) ?

The answer seems to be that the apostle here regards the higher element in heathen religion as corresponding, however imperfectly, to the lower element in the Mosaic law. For we may consider both the one and the other as made up of two component parts, the *spiritual* and the *ritualistic*.

Now viewed in their *spiritual* aspect there is no comparison between the one and the other. In this respect the heathen religions, so far as they added anything of their own to that sense of dependence on God which is innate in man, and which they could not entirely crush (Acts xiv. 17 ; xvii. 23, 27, 28 ; Rom. i. 19, 20), were wholly bad ; they were profligate and soul-destroying, were the prompting of devils. On the contrary, in the Mosaic law the spiritual element was most truly divine. But this does not enter into our reckoning here. For Christianity has appropri-

ated all that was spiritual in its predecessor. The Mosaic dispensation was a foreshadowing, a germ of the gospel ; and thus, when Christ came, its spiritual element was of necessity extinguished, or rather absorbed by its successor. Deprived of this, it was a mere mass of lifeless ordinances, differing only in degree, not in kind, from any other ritualistic system.

Thus the *ritualistic* element alone remains to be considered, and here is the meeting-point of Judaism and heathenism. In Judaism this was as much lower than its spiritual element, as in heathenism it was higher. Hence the two systems approach within such a distance of each other that they can, under certain limitations, be classed together. They have at least so much in common that a lapse into Judaism can be regarded as a relapse to the position of unconverted heathenism. Judaism was a system of bondage, like heathenism. Heathenism had been a disciplinary training, like Judaism.

It is a fair inference, I think, from St. Paul's language here, that he does place heathenism in the same category with Judaism in this last respect. Both alike are στοιχεῖα, "elementary systems of training." They had at least this in common, that as ritual systems they were made up of precepts and ordinances, and thus were representatives of "law" as opposed to "grace," "promise," that is, as opposed to the gospel. Doubtless in this respect even the highest form of heathen religion was much lower and less efficient than the Mosaic ritual. But still in an imperfect way they might do the same work ; they might act as a restraint, which multiplying transgressions, and thus begetting and cherishing a conviction of sin, prepared the way for the liberty of manhood in Christ.

¹² Γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγώ, ὅτι καὶ γὰρ ὡς ὑμεῖς, ἀδελφοί, δέομαι ὑμῶν· οὐδὲν με ἡδικήσατε. ¹³ οἴδατε δὲ ὅτι δι' ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς

Thus comparing the two together from the point of view in which St. Paul seems to consider them, we get as the component parts of each: JUDAISM: (1) The *spiritual*—absolutely good, absorbed in the gospel; (2) The *ritualistic*—relatively good, *στοιχεῖα*; HEATHENISM: (1) The *ritualistic*—relatively good, *στοιχεῖα*; (2) The *spiritual*—absolutely bad, antagonistic to the gospel.

If this explanation of St. Paul's meaning be correct, it will appear on the one hand that his teaching has nothing in common with Goethe's classification, when he placed Judaism at the head of Ethnic religions. On the other hand it will explain the intense hatred with which the Judaizers, wholly unable to rise above the level of their sectarian prejudices and take a comprehensive view of God's providence, regarded the name and teaching of St. Paul.

12-16. "By our common sympathies as brethren I appeal to you. I laid aside the privileges, the prejudices of my race; I became a Gentile, even as ye were Gentiles. And now I ask you to make me some return. I ask you to throw off this Judaic bondage, and to be free, as I am free. Do not mistake me; I have no personal complaint; ye did me no wrong. Nay, ye remember, when detained by sickness I preached the gospel to you, what a hearty welcome ye gave me. My infirmity might well have tempted you to reject my message. It was far otherwise. Ye did not spurn me, did not loathe me; but received me as an angel of God, as Christ Jesus himself. And what has now become of your felicitations? Are they scattered to the winds? Yet ye *did* felicitate yourselves then. Yea, I bear you witness, such was your gratitude, ye would have plucked out your very eyes and have given them to me. What then?

Have I made you my enemies by telling the truth?"

12. Γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγώ κ.τ.λ.] Of the meaning of the first clause there can be but little doubt; "Free yourself from the bondage of ordinances as I am free." Of the second, two interpretations deserve to be considered; (1) "For I was once in bondage as ye are now," i.e. καὶ γὰρ ἡμῶν Ἰουδαῖος ὡς ὑμεῖς νῦν Ἰουδαίεστε. So Lucebins (of Emesa?), Chrysostom, Jerome, and apparently Pseudo-Justin, *Orat. ad Græc.* § 5; see p. 65, note 1: (2) "For I abandoned my legal ground of righteousness, I became a Gentile like you," i.e. καὶ γὰρ ἐγενόμην Ἕλλην ὡς ὑμεῖς ἦτε Ἕλληνες; comp. ii. 17; 1 Cor. ix. 21. This latter sense is simpler grammatically, as it understands the same verb which occurs in the former clause, ἐγενόμην, not ἡμῶν. It is also more in character with the intense personal feeling which pervades the passage. The words so taken involve an appeal to the affection and gratitude of the Galatians; "I gave up all those time-honored customs, all those dear associations of race, to become like you. I have lived as a Gentile that I might preach to you Gentiles. Will you then abandon me when I have abandoned all for you?" This sense is well adapted both to the tender appeal "Brethren, I beseech you," and to the eager explanation which follows, "ye did me no wrong." For the expression comp. Ter. *Eun.* i. 2, 115, "mens fac sis postremo animus, quando ego sum tuus."

οἴδεν με ἡδικήσατε] To these words two different meanings have been assigned: (1) "Ye never disobeyed me before, do not disobey me now"; (2) "I have no personal ground of complaint." The latter seems better adapted to the context. Possibly, however, the real explanation is hidden under some

ἐνηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν τὸ πρότερον· ¹⁴ καὶ τὸν πειρασμὸν ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου οὐκ ἐξουθενήσατε οὐδὲ ἐξεπτύσατε, ἀλλ' ὡς ἄγγελου

unknown circumstances to which St. Paul alludes; see below on δι' ἀσθένειαν.

13. οὐδατε δέ] “on the contrary ye know.”

δι' ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκός] “on account of an infirmity in my flesh.” St. Paul seems to have been detained in Galatia by illness, so that his infirmity was the cause of his preaching there; see pp. 29, 30. The fact that his preaching among them was thus in a manner compulsory made the enthusiastic welcome of the Galatians the more commendable. If this interpretation seems somewhat forced, it is only because we are ignorant of the circumstances to which St. Paul refers; nor is it more harsh than any possible explanation which can be given of the preceding οὐδὲν με ἡδικήσατε. For the expression compare Thucyd. vi. 102, αὐτὸν δὲ τὸν κύκλον [αἰρεῖν] Νικίας διεκάλυσεν· ἔτυχε γὰρ ἐν αὐτῷ δι' ἀσθένειαν ὑπολελειμμένος. Alluding to this afterwards in an impassioned appeal, Nicias might well have said, δι' ἀσθένειαν ἔσωπα τὸν κύκλον. At all events this is the only rendering of the words which the grammar admits. No instance has been produced, until a much later date, which would at all justify our explaining δι' ἀσθένειαν as if it were δι' ἐσθιενείας or ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ, as is frequently done. The ambiguity of the Latin “per infirmitatem,” gave the Latin fathers a license of interpretation which the original does not allow; Jerome, however, recognizes the proper meaning of the preposition, though wrongly explaining it “propter infirmitatem carnis vestre.” Of the Greek fathers, Chrysost., Theodoret, and Theod. Mops. slur over the preposition, interpreting the passage, however, in a way more consonant with the sense ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ. Photius (? ap. Oecum.) is the first, so far as I have noticed, who boldly gives the ungrammatical rendering μετὰ ἀσθενείας.

τὸ πρότερον] “on the former of my two visits.” Τὸ πρότερον, which derives a certain emphasis from the article, cannot be simply equivalent to πάλαι, “some time ago.” It may mean either (1) “formerly,” with a direct and emphatic reference to some later point of time; comp. John vi. 62; ix. 8; 1 Tim. i. 13; or (2) “on the former of two occasions.” In the present passage it is difficult to explain the emphasis, if we assign the first of these two meanings to it, so that we have to fall back upon the second as the probable interpretation. The expression therefore seems to justify the assumption of two visits to Galatia before this letter was written; see pp. 30, 47.

14. τὸν πειρασμὸν ὑμῶν κ.τ.λ.] “your temptation which was in my flesh,” i.e. St. Paul's bodily ailment, which was a trial to the Galatians, and which might have led them to reject his preaching. Πειρασμός, like the corresponding English word “temptation,” is employed here by a laxity of usage common in all languages for “the thing which tempts or tries.” On this concrete sense of substantives in -μός, see Buttm. *Ausf. sprachl.* § 119, 22. *ann.* 11. The apparent harshness of the expression here, “your temptation ye did not despise nor loathe,” is explained, and in some degree relieved, by the position of τὸν πειρασμὸν ὑμῶν at the beginning of the sentence. These words are used without a distinct anticipation of what is to follow, the particular sense of the verb to be employed being yet undecided, and only suggested afterwards, as the sentence runs on, by the concrete sense which the intervening words ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου have given to πειρασμὸν.

For ὑμῶν some texts have μου τόν, the received reading, others simply τόν. Considering, however, that the weight of authority is strongly in favor of ὑμῶν

Θεοῦ ἐδέξασθέ με, ὡς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν. ¹⁵ ποῦ οὖν ὁ μακαρισμὸς ὑμῶν ; μαρτυρῶ γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι, εἰ δυνατόν, τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν

15. τίς οὖν ὁ μακαρισμός.

(see below, p. 354, note 1) and that the transcribers were under every temptation to soften a harsh, and at first sight unintelligible, phrase by altering or omitting the pronoun, this reading ought certainly to be retained. On the other hand, supposing *μου* to be the original reading, some have accounted for the variation *ὑμῶν* (Reiche, *Comm. crit.* ii. p. 54) by supposing that it was substituted by some scribe who was jealous for the honor of St. Paul: but an emendation, which introduced so much confusion in the sense, was not likely to be made. As for *τόν*, it seems to be merely the insertion of a classicist.

οὐκ ἐξουθενήσατε οὐδὲ ἐξέπτύσατε] “ye did not treat with contemptuous indifference or with active loathing.” *Ἀποπτύειν* is more usual than *ἐκπτύειν* in this metaphorical sense, the latter seems to be preferred here for the sake of the alliteration.

15. ποῦ οὖν ὁ μακαρισμὸς ὑμῶν ;] The reading of the received text differs from this in two points: (1) It inserts *ἦν* after *οὖν*. This is certainly to be omitted, as very deficient in authority, and perhaps also as giving a wrong sense to the passage. (2) It reads *τίς* for *ποῦ*. On this point there is more difficulty. The weight of direct evidence is certainly in favor of *ποῦ*, but, on the other hand, it is more probable that *ποῦ* should have been substituted for *τίς* than conversely; especially as several Greek commentators (Theod. Mops., Theodoret, Severianus) who read *τίς* explain it by *ποῦ*.

If the reading *τίς* be adopted, the choice seems to lie between two out of many interpretations which have been proposed: (1) “How hollow, how meaningless was your rejoicing” (understanding *ἦν*); (2) “What has become of your rejoicing? where has it vanished?” (understanding *ἐστίν*). In the

latter sense it would coincide in meaning with *ποῦ οὖν ὁ μακαρισμός*, which can only be taken in one way. This interpretation seems more natural than the former.

ὁ μακαρισμὸς ὑμῶν] “*your felicitation of yourselves*,” “your happiness in my teaching,” as the sense seems to require. *ὑμῶν* is probably the subjective genitive, though the Galatians were at the same time also the object of the *μακαρισμός*. Others understand by these words, either their felicitation of St. Paul, or his felicitation of them, but neither of these meanings is so appropriate to the context; not the former, because the word *μακαρισμός* would ill express their *welcoming* of him; not the latter, for St. Paul is dwelling on the change of feeling which *they themselves* had undergone. For *μακαρισμός*, “beatitudo,” see Rom. iv. 6, 9, and Clem. Rom. § 50.

μαρτυρῶ] “*I bear witness*,” see the note on 1 Thess. ii. 12.

εἰ δυνατόν κ.τ.λ.] “*if it had been possible, if you could have benefited me thereby, you would have plucked out your very eyes, would have given me that which is most precious to you.*” For *καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς* compare the Old Testament phrase to “keep as the apple of one’s eye” (e.g. Ps. xvii. 8), and the references in Wetstein. See below, p. 360, note.

ἐδώκατε] “*ye had given*.” The suppression of the condition expresses more vividly their readiness; see Winer, § xlii. p. 305. The insertion of *ἂν* in the received text enfeebles the sense.

16. ὥστε] “*therefore*” ought naturally to be followed by a direct assertion: but shunning this conclusion and hoping against hope, the apostle substitutes an interrogative: “Can it be that I have become your enemy?”

ἐχθρὸς ὑμῶν] “*your enemy*.” It was a term by which the Judaizers of a later age, and perhaps even at this time, des-

ἐξορύξαντες ἐδώκατέ μοι. ¹⁶ ὥστε ἐχθρὸς ὑμῶν γέγονα ἀληθεύων ὑμῖν ; ¹⁷ Ζηλοῦσιν ὑμᾶς οὐ καλῶς, ἀλλὰ ἐκκλείσαι ὑμᾶς θέλουνσιν, ἵνα αὐτοὺς ζηλοῦτε. ¹⁸ καλὸν δὲ ζηλοῦσθαι ἐν καλῷ πάντοτε, καὶ

ignated St. Paul; *Clem. Rom. Ep. Petr.* § 2, τοῦ ἐχθροῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀνομόν τινα καὶ φλυαρώδη προσηκόμενοι διδασκαλίαν, *Clem. Rec.* i. 70 : see p. 66. This quotation suggests that ἀνομος was another of these hostile names which he is parrying in 1 Cor. ix. 21, μὴ ὢν ἀνομος Θεοῦ.

ἐληθεύων] probably referring to some warnings given during his second visit. See the Introduction, p. 30. Compare the proverb Ter. *Andr.* i. 1, 41, "obsequium amicos, veritas odium parit."

17. From speaking of the former interchange of affection between himself and his Galatian converts, he goes on to contrast their relations with the false teachers ; "I once held the first place in your hearts. Now you look upon me as an enemy. Others have supplanted me. Only inquire into their aims. True, they pay court to you, but how hollow, how insincere is their interest in you ! Their desire is to shut you out from Christ. Thus you will be driven to pay court to them."

Ζηλοῦσιν] "they pay court to." As ζηλοῦν would seem to have one and the same sense throughout this passage, its more ordinary meanings with the accusative, as "to admire, emulate, envy," must be discarded. It signifies rather "to busy oneself about, take interest in," a sense which lies close to the original meaning of ζῆλος, if correctly derived from ζέω. See 2 Cor. xi. 2 ζῆλῳ γὰρ ὑμᾶς Θεοῦ ζήλω; so also Plut. *Mor.* p. 448 Εὐπὶ χρείας τὸ πρῶτον ἔπονται καὶ ζελοῦσιν, ὕστερον δὲ καὶ φιλοῦσιν : 1 Cor. xii. 31 ; xiv. 1, 39 ; Ezek. xxxix. 25.

ἀλλὰ] is connected not with ζηλοῦσιν, but with οὐ καλῶς : comp. Aesch. *Eum.* 458 ἔφθιθ' οὗτος οὐ καλῶς, μολῶν ἐς οἶκον, ἀλλὰ νιν κελευνόμενον ἐμὴ μήτηρ κατέκτα.

ἐκκλείσαι ὑμᾶς] "to exclude, to debar you." If it is asked "from what ?" the

reply is to be sought in the tendency of the false teaching. By insisting on ceremonial observances, they were in fact shutting out the Galatians from Christ. The idea is the same as in v. 4 κατηγορήθητε ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τῆς χάριτος ἐξέπεσατε. The reading ἡμᾶς, though it gives a good sense, is almost destitute of authority.

ἵνα αὐτοὺς ζηλοῦτε] "that, having no refuge elsewhere, you may pay court to them." For the present indicative after ἵνα comp. 1 Cor. iv. 6, ἵνα μὴ φυσιοῦσθε : a usage quite unclassical, but often found in later writers ; see Winer, § xli. p. 289. The future indicative with ἵνα is comparatively common, as, e.g. ii. 4. The attempt to give ἵνα with the indicative a local sense (quo in statu) as opposed to a final (e.g. Fritzsche on Matt. p. 836 sqq.), may mislead, as seeming to assume that there is an essential difference between the local and the final ἵνα. The final sense is derived from the local, the relation of cause and effect in all languages being expressed by words originally denoting relations in space. Thus the difference of meaning between ἵνα ποιεῖτε and ἵνα ποιῇτε is not in the adverb, which is of constant value, but in the moods.

ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ κρείττω Χαρίσματα is interpolated here in many copies from 1 Cor. xii. 31 ; comp. iii. 1, note.

18. καλὸν δὲ ζηλοῦσθαι κ.τ.λ.] The number of possible explanations is limited by two considerations : (1) That ζηλοῦν must have the same sense as in the preceding verse, a paranomasia, though frequent in St. Paul, being out of place here ; (2) That ζελοῦσθαι must be passive, and not middle ; a transitive sense of ζηλοῦσθαι, even if it were supported by usage elsewhere, being inapplicable here in the immediate neighborhood of the active ζηλοῦν.

μη̄ μόνον ἐν τῷ παρεῖναι με̄ πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ¹⁹τεκνία μου, οὓς πάλιν ὠδίνω μέχρις οὗ μορφωθῇ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν· ²⁰ἦθελον δὲ παρεῖναι

19. τέκαν μου. ἄχρις οὔ.

With these limitations only two interpretations present themselves, which deserve to be considered. *First*; "I do not grudge the court which is paid to you. I do not desire a monopoly of serving you. It is well that in my absence your interests should be looked after by others. Only let them do it in an honorable cause." *Secondly*; "I do not complain that they desire your attentions, or you theirs. These things are good in themselves. I myself am not insensible to such attachments. I remember how warm were your feelings towards me when I was with you. I would they had not grown cold in my absence." The difference between the two consists mainly in the turn given to *μη̄ μόνον ἐν τῷ παρεῖναι με̄*. The objection to the latter sense is that it *supplies too much*. But this abrupt and fragmentary mode of expression is characteristic of St. Paul when he is deeply moved; and this interpretation suits the general context so much better—especially the tender appeal which immediately follows, "my little children"—that it is to be preferred to the other.

The reading *ζηλοῦσθε*, found in the two best MSS., is in itself but another way of writing the infinitive *ζηλοῦσθαι*, the sounds *ε* and *αι* being the same. It was, however, liable to be mistaken for an imperative, and is so translated in the Vulgate.

19. This verse should be taken with the preceding, and the punctuation regulated accordingly. It is difficult to explain *δέ*, ver. 20, if *τεκνία μου* be made the beginning of a new sentence. The connection of thought seems to be as follows: "I have a right to ask for constancy in your affections. I have a greater claim on you than these new teachers. They speak but as strangers to strangers; I as a mother to her children with whom she has travailed."

Comp. 1 Cor. iv. 14, "Though ye have ten thousand tutors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers."

τεκνία μου] "*my little children*," a mode of address common in St. John, but not found elsewhere in St. Paul. This, however, is no argument for the reading *τέκνα* in preference to *τεκνία*, for St. Paul does not elsewhere use the vocatives *τέκνα*, *τέκνον*, except in Eph. vi. 1, Col. iii. 20, where he could not possibly have had *τεκνία*, and in 1 Tim. i. 18; 2 Tim. ii. 1, where *τεκνίον* would have been inappropriate. Here the diminutive, expressing both the tenderness of the apostle and the feebleness of his converts, is more forcible. It is a term at once of affection and rebuke. The reading *τέκνα*, however, is very highly supported, and may perhaps be correct.

πάλιν ὠδίνω] "I travailed with you once in bringing you to Christ. By your relapse you have renewed a mother's pangs in me." There is no allusion here, as some have thought, to the new birth in the Spirit (*παλιγγενεσία*) as opposed to the old birth in the flesh.

μορφωθῇ ἐν ὑμῖν] i.e. "until you have taken the form of Christ," as the embryo develops into the child. Compare the similar expression of "growing up into the full stature of Christ," Eph. iv. 13. The words *μορφωθῇ ἐν ὑμῖν* have been otherwise explained as a different application of the former metaphor, the apostle's converts being put no longer in the place of the child, but of the mother. Such inversions of a metaphor are characteristic of St. Paul (see the notes on 1 Thess. ii. 7; v. 4), but here the explanation is improbable. St. Paul would have shrunk instinctively from describing the relation of Christ to the believer by that of the unborn child to its mother, thereby suggesting, however indirectly, the idea of subordination.

πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἄρτι καὶ ἀλλάξαι τὴν φωνήν μου, ὅτι ἀποροῦμαι ἐν ὑμῖν.

²¹ Λέγετέ μοι, οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον θέλοντες εἶναι, τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε ;
²² γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι Ἀβραὰμ δύο υἱοὺς ἔσχευ, ἓνα ἐκ τῆς πα-

For an elaborate application of the metaphor in the text, see the epistle of the churches of Vienne and Lyons, Euseb. v. 1, §§ 40, 41, especially the words οἱ πλείους ἀνεμητροῦντο καὶ ἀνεκῦσκοντο κ.τ.λ.

20. ἤθελον δὲ κ.τ.λ.] *but, speaking of my presence, I would I had been present with you now.* The δέ catches up the passing thought of παρῆναι (ver. 18) before it escapes; comp. 1 Cor. i. 16, ἐβάπτισα δὲ καὶ τὸν Στεφᾶν ὁκον. The connection of this clause with the previous παρῆναι requires that the sentence should be continuous, and that there should be no full stop after πρὸς ὑμᾶς (ver. 18); see the note on ver. 19. All other explanations seem harsh. Δέ has been connected, for instance, with the vocative, but there is here no abrupt transition from one person to another, which alone would justify such an expression as *τεκνία μου, ἤθελον δέ*.

ἤθελον, as ἠὲχόμεν, Rom. ix. 3; ἐβουλόμην, Acts xxv. 22. The thing is spoken of in itself, prior to and independently of any conditions which might affect its possibility; see Winer, § xli. 283, and Fritzsche on Rom. ii. p. 245.

ἄρτι] see the note on i. 9.

ἀλλάξαι τὴν φωνήν μου] not "to modify my language from time to time as occasion demands," for this is more than the phrase will bear, but "to change my present tone." The change meant is surely from severity to gentleness, and not from less to greater severity, as it has often been taken. His anxiety to mitigate the effects of his written rebuke has an exact parallel in his dealings with the Corinthian offender; see esp. 2 Cor. ii. 5 sqq.

ἀποροῦμαι ἐν ὑμῖν] "*I am perplexed about you, I am at a loss how to deal*

with you"; comp. 2 Cor. vii. 16. θαρῶν ἐν ὑμῖν. The idea of inward questioning is expressed more strongly by ἀπορεῖσθαι than by ἀπορεῖν. It is probably a middle rather than a passive; though ἀπορεῖν is found as a transitive verb in *Clem. Hom.* i. 11, ἀπορεῖν αὐτὸν πειρώμενοι ὡς βαρβαρόν τινα δαιμονῶντα, if the text be not corrupt.

21. οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον κ.τ.λ.], "*ye, who would be subject to law,*" who must needs submit to bondage in some way or other." Observe here again the distinction between νόμος and ὁ νόμος, and see the notes on ii. 19; iv. 4, 5.

τὸν νόμον] "*the law,*" when referring to the written word, either comprises the whole of the Old Testament writings (e.g. Rom. iii. 19), or is restricted to the Pentateuch (e.g. Rom. iii. 21; Luke xxiv. 44).

οὐκ ἀκούετε] "*will ye not listen to?*" Matt. x. 14; xiii. 13; Luke xvi. 29. The other interpretation, "Is not the law constantly read to you?" (comp. Acts xv. 21; 2 Cor. iii. 14), is less probable, because less simple. The various reading ἀναγινώσκετε, which has respectable authority, is evidently a gloss on this latter sense assigned to the word.

γέγραπται] "*it is stated in the Scriptures,*" introducing a general reference, and not a direct quotation; as in 1 Cor. xv. 45. See Gen. xvi. xxi.

τῆς παιδίσκης] "*the bondmaid*"; comp. Gen. xvi. 1, ἣν δὲ αὐτῇ παιδίσκη Αἰγυπτία, ἥ ὄνομα Ἀγαρ. The word seems to have exclusively the sense of a *servant* in the New Testament and later Greek; not so in classical writers. See Lobeck on *Phryg.* p. 239, παιδίσκη τοῦτο ἐπὶ τῆς θεραπαίνης οἱ νῦν τιθέασιν, οἱ δ' ἀρχαῖοι ἐπὶ τῆς νεάνιδος.

δίσκης καὶ ἓνα ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας. ²³ ἄλλ' ὁ [μὲν] ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης κατὰ σάρκα γεγέννηται, ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας. ²⁴ ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα. αὗται γὰρ εἰσιν δύο διαθήκαι,

23. ἀλλά] “but,” i.e. although sons of the same father. The opposition implied in ἀλλά is illustrated by Rom. ix. 7, οὐδ' ὅτι εἰσιν σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ, πάντες τέκνα, and ix. 10, ἐξ ἐνὸς κοίτην ἔχουσα.

κατὰ σάρκα] i.e. “in the common course of nature.” In some sense Ishmael was also a child of promise (Gen. xvi. 10); but in his case the course of nature was not suspended, as the promise was made after his conception. It must be remembered, however, that in his choice of words here, St. Paul regards not only the original history, but the typical application, the Jews being the children of Abraham after the flesh, the Christians his children by the promise.

γεγέννηται] the perfect, “is recorded as born,” “is born, as we read.”

24. ἅτινα] “now all these things”; not simply ἃ “which particular things,” but ἅτινα “which class of things”: comp. Col. ii. 23, ἅτινά ἐστιν λόγον μὲν ἔχοντα σοφίας, i.e. precepts of this sort.

ἀλληγορούμενα] The word has two senses: (1) “To speak in an allegory,” e.g. Joseph. *Ant.* prooem. 4, τὰ μὲν αἰνιτομένον τοῦ νομοθέτου δεξιῶς τὰ δὲ ἀλληγορῶντος κ.τ.λ.; (2) “To treat or interpret as an allegory,” e.g. Philo *de vit. cont.* § 3, ii. p. 475 M, ἐντυγχάνοντες γὰρ τοῖς ἱεροῖς γράμμασι φιλοσοφοῦσι τὴν πάτριον φιλοσοφίαν ἀλληγοροῦντες, ἐπειδὴ σύμβολα τὰ τῆς ῥητῆς ἐρμηνείας νομίζουσι φύσεως ἀποκεκρυμμένης ἐν ὑπονοίαις δηλουμένης; *Clem. Hom.* vi. 18, 20: comp. *Plint. Op. Mor.* p. 363 D, ὥσπερ Ἑλληνες Κρόνον ἀλληγοροῦσι τὸν Χρόνον κ.τ.λ. It is possible that St. Paul uses the word in this latter sense, referring to some recognized mode of interpretation. Comp. the note on συνστοιχεῖ, ver. 25, and see the remarks p. 268.

St. Paul uses ἀλληγορία here much in

the same sense as he uses τύπος 1 Cor. x. 11, ταῦτα δὲ τυπικῶς συνέβαινεν, not denying the historical truth of the narrative, but superposing a secondary meaning. By a stricter definition ἀλληγορία and τύπος were distinguished as denoting, the former a fictitious, the latter a true, narrative. See the definition of ἀλληγορία Heracl. *Alleg. Hom.* 5, ὁ ἄλλα μὲν ἀγορεύων τρόπος ἕτερα δὲ ὧν λέγει σημαίνων. Hence the jealousy of the Antiochene fathers (Chrysostom, Severianus, Theod. Mops.) in explaining that St. Paul uses the word καταχρηστικῶς here, and does not deny the historical truth of the narrative.

The author of the *Clem. Hom.* (ii. 22) indirectly attacks this allegory: see the Introduction, p. 66.

αὗται γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] “for these women are (represent) two covenants.” Εἰσίν, “are,” not actually, but mystically or typically; Matt. xiii. 39; xxvi. 26-28; 1 Cor. x. 4. The article before δύο must be omitted.

μία μὲν] “one of them, which was given from Mount Sinai, bearing children unto bondage.” The true antithesis would have been ἕτερα δέ, but it melts away in the general fusion of the sentence, vv. 25, 26. For γεννώσα used of a mother, see Luke i. 13: it occurs so in Xen. *de Rep. Lac.* i. 3, and occasionally elsewhere, especially in later writers.

ἥτις] “inasmuch as she.” ἥ would simply declare the fact; ἥτις places it in dependence on the context.

25. τὸ γὰρ Σινᾶ κ.τ.λ.] “for Sinai is a mountain in Arabia,” i.e. in the land of bondsmen, themselves descended from Hagar. The stress lies on ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ, not on ἔρος, which is unemphatic. Perhaps the order is against taking the words, “Mount Sinai is in Arabia”; though this would yield a better sense. The Arabians are called “sons of Ha-

μία μὲν ἀπὸ ὅρους Σινᾶ, εἰς δουλείαν γεννώσα, ἥτις ἐστὶν Ἀγαρ.
²⁵ τὸ γὰρ Σινᾶ ὅρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ· συνστοιχεῖ δὲ τῇ νῦν
 Ἱερουσαλὴμ, δουλεύει γὰρ μετὰ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς· ²⁶ ἡ δὲ ἄνω

gar, Baruch iii. 23 : see Ewald, *Gesch. des V. Isr.* i. p. 418. St. Paul's language here is further illustrated by the prominence given to Hagar in the national legends of the Arabs, where she is represented as the lawful wife of Abraham ; see d'Herbelot, *Bibl. Or.* s.v. Hagiar. The word is preserved also in the name of several Arab tribes, e.g. the Hagarenes or Hagarites of the Old Testament (Ps. lxxxiii. 7, אַגָּרִי, 'Αγαρηνοί; and 1 Chron. v. 19; אַגָּרִי, 'Αγαραῖοι, comp. ver. 10), and the Ἀγαῖοι of heathen writers (Eratosth. ap. Strab. xvi. p. 767), if these be not the same. A place on the Persian Gulf is still so called. It is to the Sinaitic peninsula apparently that Hagar flees (Gen. xvi. 7, 14), and possibly some portion of it may have borne her name in St. Paul's time ; see below, p. 367.

The clause τὸ γὰρ Σινᾶ κ.τ.λ is parenthetical, and the nominative to συνστοιχεῖ is μία διαθήκη.

For the various readings in this passage, and for different interpretations of the word "Hagar," see the detached notes, p. 361 sqq.

συνστοιχεῖ] "answers to"; literally, "belongs to the same row or column with." In military language συστοιχία denotes a *file*, as συζυγία does a *rank* of soldiers : comp. Polyb. x. 21, 7. The use of this word here is best illustrated by the Pythagorean συστοιχία of opposing principles (Arist. *Eth. N.* i. 6, *Metaph.* i. 5), which stood thus :

Good,	Bad,
Finite,	Infinite,
One,	Many,
Permanent,	Changing,
etc.	etc.

Similar also were the συστοιχίαι of grammarians, who so arranged the letters of the alphabet according to the organs of speech (comp. Athen. xi. p.

501 B), or the words derived from the same root according to the ending (Arist. *Rhet.* i. 7 ; *Top.* ii. 9). The allegory in the text then may be represented by συστοιχίαι thus :

Hagar, the bond-woman.	Sarah, the free-woman.
Ishmael, the child after the flesh.	Isaac, the child of promise.
The old covenant.	The new covenant.
The earthly Jerusalem.	The heavenly Jerusalem.
etc.	etc.

The old covenant is thus σύστοιχος with the earthly Jerusalem, but ἀντίστοιχος to the heavenly. It is not improbable that St. Paul is alluding to some mode of representation common with Jewish teachers to exhibit this and similar allegories. Strangely enough the fathers, with but few exceptions, translate συνστοιχεῖ "borders upon," "is contiguous to," which is scarcely true even in the most forced sense of contiguity.

τῇ νῦν Ἱερουσαλὴμ] The metropolis of the Jews is taken to represent the whole race.

δουλεύει γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] "is in spiritual bondage with her children," just as Hagar was in social bondage with her child Ishmael. For τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς, see Matt. xxiii. 37.

26. ἡ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλὴμ] St. Paul here uses an expression familiar to rabbinical teachers, but detaches it from those sensuous and material conceptions with which they invested it. See the treatise *de Hieros. corlest.* in Schöttgen's *Hor. Hebr.* i. p. 1205. With them it is an actual city, the exact counterpart of the earthly Jerusalem in its topography and its furniture : with him it is a symbol or image, representing that spiritual city of which the Christian is even now a denizen (Phil. iii. 20). Comp. Heb. xii. 22 Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐπουράνιος, Rev. iii. 12 ; xxi. 2 καὶ ἡ Ἱερουσαλὴμ : comp.

Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐλευθέρα ἐστίν, ἥτις ἐστὶν μήτηρ ἡμῶν. ²⁷ γέγραπται γάρ εὐφράνθητι στείρα ἢ οὐ τίκτουςα, ῥήξον καὶ βύησον ἢ οὐκ ὠδίνουσα, ὅτι πολλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς

Clem. Rec. i. 51. The contrast between the two scenes, as they appeared to the eye, would enhance, if it did not suggest, the imagery of St. Paul here. On the one hand, Mount Zion, of old the joy of the whole earth, now more beautiful than ever in the fresh glories of the Herodian renaissance, glittering in gold and marble (*Joseph. Bell. Jud.* v. 5, 6); on the other, Sinai with its rugged peaks and barren sides, bleak and desolate, the oppressive power of which the apostle himself had felt during his sojourn there (see p. 309) — these scenes fitly represented the contrast between the glorious hopes of the new covenant and the blank despair of the old. Comp. *Heb.* xii. 18–22.

The apostle instinctively prefers the Hebrew form Ἱερουσαλὴμ here for the typical city, as elsewhere in this epistle (i. 17, 18; ii. 1) he employs the Graecised form Ἱεροσόλυμα for the actual city. “Ἱερουσαλὴμ est appellatio Hebraica, originaria et sanctior: Ἱεροσόλυμα, deinceps obvia, Graeca, magis politica,” says Bengel on *Rev.* xxi. 2, accounting for the usage of St. John (“in evangelio Ἱεροσόλυμα, in apocalypsi Ἱερουσαλὴμ”), and referring to this passage in illustration. In his other epistles St. Paul has always Ἱερουσαλὴμ; *Rom.* xv. 19, 25, 26, 31; 1 *Cor.* xvi. 3.

μήτηρ ἡμῶν] “the mother of us Christians.” St. Paul’s expression was borrowed and adapted by Polycarp § 3 τὴν δοθεῖσαν ὑμῖν πίστιν ἥτις ἐστὶ μήτηρ πάντων ἡμῶν. From a confusion of this loose quotation with the original text, the word πάντων was early interpolated in St. Paul; e.g. in *Iren.* (interp.) v. 35, 2. This at all events is not an improbable account of the origin of the received reading πάντων ἡμῶν; or perhaps πάντων crept in from *Rom.* iv. 16, ὅς ἐστιν πατὴρ πάντων ἡμῶν.

27. St. Paul here illustrates the allegory by reference to a passage in *Isaiah* liv. 1. This passage in its context is a song of triumph anticipating the deliverance of God’s afflicted people Israel from a foreign yoke. Zion has been deserted by her Lord (xlix. 14), and is mourning in her widowhood: she will be restored to favor and become the mother of a large and prosperous people. The image of conjugal union, as representing the relation of Jehovah to his people, is drawn out at some length in the context, see esp. liv. 5, 6. In order, moreover, fully to understand St. Paul’s application here, it must be remembered that in another part of the same prophecy (li. 2) God’s dealings with Abraham and Sarah are pointed to as a type of his dealings with their descendants. Accordingly Jewish writers connected li. 2 with liv. 1; “sterilitas Abrahæ et Saræ figura fuit sterilitatis Sion,” *Ir Gibborim* fol. 49, 2 quoted in *Schöttgen*. Here then Sarah = the chosen people = the church of Christ.

γέγραπται γάρ] from the LXX, where some few texts add καὶ τέρπου after βύησον with the Hebrew. It is quoted as St. Paul quotes it in *Pseudo-Clem. Epist.* ii. § 2, and *Justin, Apol.* i. c. 53, p. 88 c, and similarly applied. On the coincidence of *Justin’s* quotations with St. Paul’s, see p. 65, and the notes iii. 10, 13; comp. *Semisch, Just. Mart.* i. p. 258 sqq. (Eng. trans.). The Hebrew differs somewhat, as do the other Greek versions (see *Jerome* and *Procopius in Is.* l. c.). Γάρ links the quotation with μήτηρ ἡμῶν.

πολλὰ τὰ τέκνα μᾶλλον ἢ] for the usual Greek πλείονα ἢ, the Hebrew idiom (כִּי רַב־בְּנֵי), which has no comparative, being followed.

τῆς ἑχούσης τὸν ἄνδρα] in St. Paul’s application, Hagar, who for a time pos-

ἐρήμου μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς ἐχούσης τὸν ἄνδρα. ²⁸ ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀδελφοί, κατὰ Ἰσαὰκ ἐπαγγελίας τέκνα ἐστέ. ²⁹ ἀλλ' ὥσπερ τότε ὁ κατὰ σάρκα γενηθεὶς ἐδίωκεν τὸν κατὰ πνεῦμα, οὕτως καὶ νῦν.

28. ἡμεῖς δέ — τέκνα ἐσμέν.

sessed the affection of Abraham, and conceived by him. She thus represents the Jewish people at one time enjoying the special favor of Jehovah.

ἡ στείρα] The barren one is not Gentile Christendom as opposed to Jewish, but the new dispensation as opposed to the old. At the same time the image of barrenness derives its force from the introduction of the Gentile element into the Christian church. Compare the metaphor of the ἀγρίελαος, Rom. xi. 17.

28. ὑμεῖς δέ] resuming the main subject, ver. 27 being in a manner parenthetical.

κατὰ Ἰσαὰκ] See Rom. ix. 7-9. The Gentiles were sprung from one "as good as dead": they had no claims of race or descent. Thus they were sons not κατὰ σάρκα, but, like Isaac, ἐξ ἐπαγγελίας.

The reading ἡμεῖς ἐσμέν, for ὑμεῖς ἐστέ, is very highly supported, but perhaps was a transcriber's correction to conform to ver. 26, 31. The direct appeal of ὑμεῖς is more forcible, and the change of persons is characteristic of St. Paul; see the note ver. 7.

29. ἐδίωκεν τὸν κ.τ.λ.] The Hebrew text, Gen. xxi. 9, has simply "laughing" (צחק). This single word the LXX expands into παίζοντα μετὰ Ἰσαὰκ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ. From this it may be conjectured that the verse originally ended [צחק צחק] צחק (comp. Gen. xxxix. 14, 17), the words in brackets having dropped out owing to the homoeotelenon. At all events the word seems to mean "mocking, jeering"; "Lusio illa illusio erat," says Augustine pertinently (*Serm.* 3). The anger of Sarah taken in connection with the occasion, a festival in honor of the weaning of Isaac, seems to require it. Such also would appear to be the force of the rendering in the older Targum, צחק.

[Lr.] 36

On the other hand the Book of Jubilees paraphrases the passage, "When Sarah saw that Ishmael was merry and danced, and that Abraham also rejoiced greatly thereat, she was jealous, etc." (Ewald's *Jahrb.* iii. p. 13). But beyond the text itself two circumstances must be taken into account as affecting St. Paul's application of it: (1) This incident which is so lightly sketched in the original narrative had been drawn out in detail in later traditions, and thus a prominence was given to it, which would add force to the apostle's allusion, without his endorsing these traditions himself. For the rabbinical accounts of Ishmael's insolence to his brother, see Beer *Leben Abraham's*, pp. 49, 170. (2) The relations between the two brothers were reproduced in their descendants. The aggressions of the Arab tribes (of the *Hagarenes* especially, see Ps. lxxxiii. 7; 1 Chron. v. 10, 19) on the Israelites, were the antitype to Ishmael's mockery of Isaac. Thus in Ishmael the apostle may have indirectly contemplated Ishmael's progeny; and he would therefore be appealing to the national history of the Jews in saying "he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit." For the conflicts with the Arabs in the time of Herod see esp. Joseph. *Ant.* xv. 5, 1.

οὕτω καὶ νῦν] "So now the church of God is persecuted by the children after the flesh." St. Paul's persecutors were at first Jews, afterwards Judaizers; but both alike were "born after the flesh," for both alike claimed to inherit the covenant by the performance of certain material carnal ordinances.

30. ἡ γραφή] Gen. xxi. 10, taken from the LXX, which again is a close translation of the Hebrew. At the end of the quotation, however, St. Paul has

³⁰ ἀλλὰ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή; ἔκβαλε τὴν παιδίσκην καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς· οὐ γὰρ μὴ κληρονομήσει ὁ υἱὸς τῆς παιδίσκης μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἐλευθέρας. ³¹ διό. ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἐσμὲν παιδίσκης τέκνα, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἐλευθέρας [V] ¹ τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἥ

iv. 31, v. 1. τῆς ἐλευθέρας. τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἡμῶς κ.τ.λ.

substituted τῆς παιδίσκης μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἐλευθέρας for the LXX τῆς παιδίσκης ταύτης μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ μου Ἰσαάκ, in order to adapt it to his own context and to save explanation. For instances of adapted quotations, which are frequent, see iii. 10 and Acts vii. 43.

The words are spoken by Sarah to Abraham, but her demand is confirmed by the express command of God, Gen. xxi. 12, "hearken unto her voice"; to which the later Targum adds, "for she is a prophetess."

οὐ μὴ κληρονομήσει] "*shall in no wise inherit*"; comp. John viii. 35 ὁ δοῦλος οὐ μένει ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κ.τ.λ. The law and the gospel cannot co-exist; the law must disappear before the gospel. It is scarcely possible to estimate the strength of conviction and depth of prophetic insight which this declaration implies. The apostle thus confidently sounds the death-knell of Judaism at a time when one half of Christendom clung to the Mosaic law with a jealous affection little short of frenzy, and while the Judaic party seemed to be growing in influence, and was strong enough, even in the Gentile churches of his own founding, to undermine his influence and endanger his life. The truth which to us appears a truism must then have been regarded as a paradox.

κληρονομήσει should probably be read, not κληρονομήση, as being better supported here and in the LXX; comp. Winer, § lvi. p. 528, and A. Buttmann, p. 183.

31. διό.] "*wherefore*," as the inference from this allegorical lesson. The particle is chosen rather with a view to the obligation involved in the statement, than to the statement itself; "*wherefore* let us remember that we are not sons of

a bondswoman, let us not act as bond-slaves." There are many variations of reading, but διό is probably correct. Some copies have ἡμεῖς δέ, others ἡμεῖς οὖν, others ἔρα or ἔρα οὖν, and one at least entirely omits the connecting particle. The difficulty in διό was evidently felt, but sufficient allowance was not made for St. Paul's freedom in the employment of connecting particles.

οὐ παιδίσκης ἀλλὰ κ.τ.λ.] Observe the omission of the article before παιδίσκης; "not of *any* bondswoman" whether Judaism or some form of heathenism, for there are *many* (see the note iv. 11), but of *the* freewoman, the lawful spouse, the church of Christ, which is *one*." See on i. 10, ἀνθρώπους πείθω ἢ τὸν θεόν;

V. 1. τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἥ κ.τ.λ.] If this reading be adopted (see the detached note, p. 371), the words are best taken with the preceding sentence. They may then be connected either (1) with τέκνα ἐσμὲν τῆς ἐλευθέρας, "we are sons of the free, by virtue of the freedom which Christ has given us"; or (2) with τῆς ἐλευθέρας alone, "of her who is free with that freedom which Christ," etc. The latter is perhaps the simpler construction. In either case τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ κ.τ.λ. serves the purpose of an explanatory note.

If on the other hand we read τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἡμῶς Χριστοῦς ἡλευθέρωσεν, the force of this detached sentence will be, "Did Christ liberate us that we might be slaves? no; but that we might be free." Compare v. 13 ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ ἐκλήθητε, and especially John viii. 36 εἰάν οὖν ὁ υἱὸς ὑμῶν ἐλευθερώσῃ, ὅπως ἐλεύθεροι ᾖσθε. The abruptness of the sentence, introduced without a connected particle, has a fair parallel in Ephes.

ἡμᾶς Χριστὸς ἠλευθέρωσεν. στήκετε οὖν καὶ μὴ πάλιν ζυγῷ δουλείας ἐνέχεσθε.

ii. 5, χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι; but the dative, "*with*" or "*in*" or "*for* freedom," is awkward, in whatever way it is taken; see A. Buttman, p. 155.

στήκετε] "*stand firm, stand upright, do not bow your necks to the yoke of slavery*"; comp. 2 Thess. ii. 15 ἄρα οὖν, ἀδελφοί, στήκετε κ.τ.λ. The form στήκω appears not to occur earlier than the New Testament, where with one excep-

tion (Mark xi. 25) it is found only in St. Paul.

πάλιν] "*again*." Having escaped from the slavery of heathenism, they would fain bow to the slavery of Judaism. Compare the similar expressions iv. 9 πῶς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν, πάλιν ἄνωθεν δουλεύειν θέλετε. For the force of these expressions, see the Introduction, p. 36, and the note on iv. 11.

² Ἰδε ἐγὼ Παῦλος λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι, ἐὰν περιτέμνησθε, Χριστὸς ὑμᾶς οὐδὲν ὠφελήσει. ³ μαρτύρομαι δὲ πάλιν παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ περιτεμνομένῳ, ὅτι ὀφειλέτης ἐστὶν ὅλον τὸν νόμον ποιῆσαι. ⁴ καταργήθητε ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ, οἷτινες ἐν νόμῳ δικαιούσθε, τῆς

2. At this point St. Paul assumes a severer tone in condemning the observance of the law. It is not only a useless imposition, a slavish burden; it is pernicious and fatal in itself.

Ἰδε] so to be accented rather than ἰδέ. According to the ancient grammarians the pronunciation of common dialect was ἴδε. λάβε, of the Attic ἰδέ, λαβέ. See Winer, § vi. p. 49.

ἐγὼ Παῦλος] What is the exact force of this? Is it (1) *An assertion of authority?* "I Paul, who received a direct commission from Christ, who have done and suffered so much for the gospel and for you, who have so strong a claim on your hearing"? Or is it rather (2) *An indirect refutation of calumnies?* "I Paul, who have myself preached circumcision forsooth, who say smooth things to please men, who season my doctrine to the tastes of my hearers"? For the latter sense see 2 Cor. x. 1, where the words αὐτὸς δὲ ἐγὼ Παῦλος are used in combating the contemptuous criticism of his enemies; and compare his tone in i. 10 of this epistle: "do I *now* persuade men?" See also the notes on ii. 3: v. 11, and the Introduction, p. 34. For the former sense compare perhaps Eph. iii. 1. The two ideas are not incompatible; they are equally prominent elsewhere in this epistle, and may both have been present to St. Paul's mind when he thus asserts *himself* so strongly.

περιτέμνησθε] "*suffice yourselves to be circumcised*": see the note on περιτεμνομένῳ, ver. 3.

3. The argument is this: "Circumcision is the seal of the law." He who willingly and deliberately undergoes circumcision, enters upon a compact to fulfil the law. To fulfil it therefore he is bound, and he cannot plead the grace

of Christ; for he has entered on another mode of justification."

μαρτύρομαι δὲ πάλιν] "Christ benefit you? *no*, I protest again." The adverbative sense of δέ is to be explained by the idea of ὠφελήσει. Πάλιν refers to the preceding λέγω: "I have said it, and I repeat it with protestation."

μαρτύρομαι] "*I protest*," i.e. I assert as in the presence of witnesses. The word signifies properly "to call to witness," and is never, except perhaps in very late Greek, equivalent to μαρτυρῶ, "I bear witness." See the notes on 1 Thess. ii. 12. For the dative ἀνθρώπῳ compare Acts xx. 26. This use of the dative is a remnant of the fuller construction μαρτύρεσθαι τινί τι (Judith vii. 28, μαρτυρόμεθα ὑμῖν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν), the accusative being suppressed, and the verb used absolutely, without reference to the person of the witness.

περιτεμνομένῳ] "*who undergoes circumcision*," as περιτέμνησθε, ver. 2, and οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι, vi. 13 (the better reading). In all these cases the present tense is more appropriate than the past. It is not the fact of their *having been circumcised* which St. Paul condemns (for this is indifferent in itself), but the fact of their *allowing themselves to be circumcised*, being free agents.

4. καταργήθητε, ἐξεπέσατε] Theorists represent the consequences as instantaneous: "Ye are *then and there* shut out from Christ." For similar instances see Jno. xv. 6, ἐὰν μὴ τις μείνῃ ἐν ἐμοί, ἐβλήθη ἐξω ὡς τὸ κλῆμα, Rev. x. 7; comp. Winer, § 40 p. 276.

καταργήθητε ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ] a pregnant expression for καταργήθητε καὶ ἐχωρίσθητε ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ, "Ye are nothing as regards Christ; ye are entirely separate from him"; as Rom. vii. 2, 6;

χάριτος ἐξεπέσατε. ⁵ ἡμεῖς γὰρ πνεύματι ἐκ πίστεως ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης ἀπεκδεχόμεθα. ⁶ ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ [Ἰησοῦ] οὔτε περιτομή τι ἰσχύει οὔτε ἀκροβυστία, ἀλλὰ πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη.

comp. 2 Cor. xi. 3, φθαρῇ τὰ νοήματα ὑμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀπλότητος, Col. ii. 20.

οἵτινες δικαιοῦσθε] “all ye who seek your justification.” See on περιτεμνομένη, ver. 3.

ἐξεπέσατε] “are driven forth, are banished with Hagar your mother”: see iv. 30, ἐκβαλε τὴν παιδίσκην. The words ἐκπίπτειν and ἐκβάλλειν are correlatives in this sense; e.g. Thucyd. vi. 4, ὑπὸ Σαμίων καὶ ἄλλων Ἰώνων ἐκπίπτουσιν τοὺς δὲ Σαμίου Ἀναξίλας Ῥηγίνων τύραννος οὐ πολλῷ ὕστερον ἐκβαλὼν κ.τ.λ. For the form ἐξεπέσατε see Loebck, *Phryn.* p. 274, Winer, § xliii. p. 86.

5. ἡμεῖς γάρ] “for we, who are in union with Christ, we who cling to the covenant of grace.” γάρ introduces an argument from the opposite, as in iii. 10.

πνεύματι] “spiritually” or “by the Spirit.” It is almost always difficult, and sometimes, as here, impossible, to say when πνεῦμα refers directly to the Holy Spirit, and when not. From the nature of the case, the one sense will run into the other; the spiritual in man, when rightly directed, being a manifestation, an indwelling, of the Divine Spirit.

ἐλπίδα] here used in a concrete sense, “the thing hoped for”; comp. Col. i. 5, τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἀποκειμένην ὑμῖν; Tit. ii. 13, προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα; Heb. vi. 18; and see the note on ἐπαγγελία, iii. 14.

ἐπεκδεχόμεθα] “wait eagerly,” or perhaps “patiently”; used especially in speaking of the future redemption; comp. Rom. viii. 19, 23, 25; 1 Cor. i. 7; Phil. iii. 20. Compare the ἀπό in ἀποκαταδοκία, and see a paper by C. F. A. Fritzsche in *Fritsch. Opusc.* p. 156.

6. γάρ] explaining the emphatic πνεύματι ἐκ πίστεως, which has gone before: “By the Spirit, for the dispositions of

the flesh, such as circumcision or uncircumcision, are indifferent; from faith, for faith working by love is all powerful in Christ Jesus.”

St. Paul had before pronounced a direct and positive condemnation of circumcision. He here indirectly qualifies this condemnation. Circumcision is neither better nor worse than uncircumcision in itself (see especially 1 Cor. vii. 18-20; Gal. vi. 15). The false sentiment which attends it, the glorying in the flesh, makes the difference, and calls down the rebuke.

πίστις κ.τ.λ.] “In his stat totus Christianismus,” says Bengel.

ἐνεργουμένη] “working”; the middle voice, according to the general usage of St. Paul. The Spirit of God or the spirit of evil, ἐνεργεῖ; the human agent or the human mind, ἐνεργεῖται; see the note on 1 Thess. ii. 13. On the other hand, ἐνεργεῖσθαι is never passive in St. Paul (as it seems to be taken here by Tertullian, *adv. Marc.* v. 4, “dicendo per dilectionem perfici”), and therefore this passage does not express the doctrine of “fides caritate formata.”

These words δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη bridge over the gulf which seems to separate the language of St. Paul and St. James. Both assert a principle of practical energy, as opposed to a barren, inactive theory.

Observe in these verses the connection between the triad of Christian graces. The same sequence—faith, love, hope—underlies St. Paul's language here which appears on the surface in 1 Thess. i. 3; Col. i. 4, 5. See the note on the former of these two passages.

7-11. “Ye were running a gallant race. Who has checked you in your mid-career? Whence this disloyalty to the truth? Be assured this change of

Ἔτρεχετε καλῶς· τίς ὑμᾶς ἐνέκοψεν ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πείθεσθαι ;
 ἢ πεισμονῇ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος ὑμᾶς. ⁹ μικρὰ ζύμη ὅλον τὸ

opinion comes not of God by whom ye are called. The deserters are only few in number? Yes, but the contagion will spread; for what says the proverb? *A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump.* Do not mistake me; I do not confound *you* with *them*: I confidently hope in Christ that *you* will be true to your principles. But the ringleader of this sedition — I care not who he is, or what rank he holds — shall bear a heavy chastisement. What, brethren? A new charge is brought against me? I preach circumcision, forsooth? If so, why do they still persecute me? It is some mistake, surely! Nay, we shall work together henceforth; there is no difference between us now! I have ceased to preach the cross of Christ! The stumbling-block in the way of the gospel is removed!"

ἐτρέχετε καλῶς] "*Ye were running bravely*," again a reference to St. Paul's favorite metaphor of the stadium. See ii. 2; 1 Cor. ix. 24-27; Phil. iii. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 7.

ἐνέκοψεν] a metaphor derived from military operations. The word signifies "to break up a road" (by destroying bridges, etc.) so as to render it impassable, and is therefore the opposite of *προκόπτειν*, "to clear a way," "to act as pioneer"; comp. Greg. Naz. *Or.* xiv. 31 (i. p. 279 ed. Ben) ἡ κακίας ἐγκοπτομένης δυσπαθεία τῶν ποιηρῶν ἢ ἀρετῆς ὁδοποιουμένης εὐπαθεία τῶν βελτιῶνων. Hence it originally took a *dative* of the person, e.g. Polyb. xxiv. 1, 12; but the metaphor being subsequently lost sight of, the dative was replaced by an accusative, as always in the New Testament, e.g. Acts xxiv. 4; 1 Thess. ii. 18. Compare the passive, Rom. xv. 22; 1 Pet. iii. 7. See the note on *φθονοῦντες*, ver. 26.

The testimony in favor of ἐνέκοψεν is overwhelming. Otherwise the received reading ἀνέκοψεν suits the metaphor of

the stadium better; for ἀνακόπτειν "to beat back" would apply to the *βαβδούχοι* (Thuc. v. 50) who kept the course: comp. Lucian, *Nigr.* § 35 (i. p. 77), ἐξέπιπτόν τε καὶ ἀνεκοπτόμεν; Polyg. § 5, ἀνακόπτεσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν. The word ἐγκόπτειν seems to have given offence to transcribers. In 1 Thess. ii. 18, as here, ἀνακόπτειν stands as a various reading; in Acts xxiv. 4 and 1 Pet. iii. 7, ἐκκόπτειν.

8. πεισμονῇ] with a faint reference to the preceding πείθεσθαι; "You have refused to *obey* the truth; you have rendered another *obedience* which is not of God." πεισμονῇ (Ignat. *Rom.* 3; Justin, *Apol.* i. c. 53, p. 17 E; comp. *πλησμονῇ*, Col. ii. 23), like the English "persuasion," may be either active or passive; "the act of persuading," referring to the false teachers; or "the state of one persuaded," referring to the Galatians themselves. The latter is perhaps simpler.

τοῦ καλοῦντος] i.e. God, as always in St. Paul; see Usteri, *Paul. Lchrbegr.* p. 269, and comp. i. 6, 15. The present is preferred here to the aorist, because the stress is laid on the *person* rather than the *act*: see the note on 1 Thess v. 24, and comp. Winer, § xlv. p. 353.

9. This proverb is quoted also in 1 Cor. v. 6. Compare Hosea vii. 4.

Does it apply here (1) To the *doctrine*? "If you begin by observing the law in a few points, you will end by selling yourselves wholly to it" (comp. v. 3); or (2) To the *persons*? "Though the Judaizers may be but few now, the infection will spread to the whole body." The latter is far more probable: for the prominent idea in the context is that of a small and compact body disturbing the peace of the church; and the metaphor is thus applied also in 1 Cor. v. 7, where again it refers to the contagious example of a few evil-doers.

The leaven in scripture is always a

φύραμα ζυμοῖ. ¹⁰ ἐγὼ πέποιθα εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐν Κυρίῳ, ὅτι οὐδὲν ἄλλο φρονήσετε· ὁ δὲ ταράσσω ὑμᾶς βαστάσει τὸ κρίμα, ὅστις ἐὰν ᾖ.
¹¹ ἐγὼ δέ, ἀδελφοί, εἰ περιτομὴν ἔτι κηρύσσω, τί ἔτι διώκομαι ; ἄρα

symbol of evil, with the single exception of the parable (Matt. xiii. 33; Luke xiii. 20, 21), as it is for the most part also in rabbinical writers; see Lightfoot on Matt. xvi. 6, and Schöttgen on 1 Cor. v. 6. Heathen nations also regarded heaven as unholy. Philarch, *Quaest. Rom.* 109 (p. 289 E) in answer to the question why the Flamen Dialis was not allowed to touch heaven, explains it ἡ ζύμη καὶ γέγονεν ἐκ φθορᾶς αὐτῇ καὶ φθείρει τὸ φύραμα μὴ γινόμενῃ. See Trench, *On the Parables*, p. 111.

For the expression ζυμοῦν τὸ φύραμα see Exod. xii. 34.

10. ἐγὼ] emphatic, "I, who know you so well, who remember your former zeal: iv. 14, 15.

πέποιθα] still dwelling on the same word, πείθεσθαι, πισμονή; see Winer, § lxviii. p. 636 sqq.

εἰς ὑμᾶς] "in regard to you"; see Winer, § xlix. p. 396: comp. 2 Cor. viii. 22 πεποιθήσει πολλῇ τῇ εἰς ὑμᾶς, 2 Cor. ii. 3 πεποιθὼς ἐπὶ πάντας ὑμᾶς ὅτι κ.τ.λ. 2 Thess. iii. 4 πεποίθαμεν ἐν Κυρίῳ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ὅτι κ.τ.λ. As in the passage last cited, ἐν Κυρίῳ here denotes not the object of the writer's confidence, but the sphere in which it is exercised.

οὐδὲν ἄλλο φρονήσετε] "none otherwise minded," either (1) "than I bid you," for though no direct command immediately precedes these words, there is one implied; or, as seems more probable, (2) "than ye were before this disorder broke out"; see ἐτρέχετε καλῶς, ver. 7.

ταράσσω] "raises seditions, excites tumults among you," the metaphor being continued in ἀναστατούντες ver. 12. See the note on i. 7.

βαστάσει] "shall bear as a burden: it shall press grievously on him: see vi. 2, 5.

ὅστις ἐὰν ᾖ] i.e. "whatever may be

his position in the church, however he may vaunt his personal intercourse with the Lord." See 2 Cor. x. 7.

κρίμα] On the accent of this word, which is κρίμα in classical writers, see Lobeck, *Paral.* p. 418, Fritzsche, *Rom.* i. p. 96, Lipsius, *Gramm. univers.* p. 40. Compare the note on σπύλοι, ii. 9.

11. At this point the malicious charge of his enemies rises up before the apostle: "Why you do the same thing yourself; you caused Timothy to be circumcised." To this he replies: "What do I, who have incurred the deadly hatred of the Judaizers, who am exposed to continual persecution from them, do I preach circumcision?"

ἔτι κηρύσσω] For an explanation of this ἔτι, see the note i. 10. Perhaps, however, it should be explained rather by the form which the slander of his enemies would take: "You still preach circumcision, though you have become a Christian; why should not we continue to do the same?"

τί ἔτι] The second ἔτι is probably argumentative, "this being the case," as in Rom. iii. 7; ix. 19.

ἄρα] "so it appears!" ἄρα introduces a false statement or inference also in 1 Cor. v. 10: xv. 14, 15, 18; 2 Cor. i. 17. It is here ironical: "So I have adopted their mode of justification; I am silent about the cross of Christ? no one takes offence at my preaching now; all goes on pleasantly enough!" The σταῖρος here stands for the atoning death of Christ. The crucifixion of Messiah was in itself a stumbling-block to the Jews, but preached as the means of atonement, it became doubly so: comp. 1 Cor. i. 23.

σκάνδαλον] almost confined, it would appear, to biblical and ecclesiastical Greek. σκανδάλητρον, however, is a classical word, e.g. Arist. *Ach.* 687.

κατήργηται τὸ σκάνδαλον τοῦ σταυροῦ. ¹² ὄφελον καὶ ἀποκόψονται οἱ ἀναστατοῦντες ὑμᾶς.

¹³ Ὑμεῖς γὰρ ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ ἐκλήθητε, ἀδελφοί· μόνον μὴ τὴν

12. After this abrupt digression St. Paul returns again to the false brethren: "Why do they stop at circumcision?" he asks indignantly, "why do they not mutilate themselves, like your priests of Cybele?" The severity of the irony may be compared with 2 Cor. xi. 19, "Ye suffer fools gladly, seeing ye yourselves are wise."

Circumcision under the law and to the Jews was the token of a covenant. To the Galatians under the gospel dispensation it had no such significance. It was merely a bodily mutilation, as such differing rather in degree than in kind from the terrible practices of the heathen priests. Compare Phil. iii. 2, 3, βλέπετε τὴν κατατομήν· ἡμεῖς γὰρ ἐσμεν ἡ περιτομή, where the same idea appears, clothed in similar language.

ὄφελον] Comp. 1 Cor. iv. 8; 2 Cor. xi. 1, in both of which passages the irony is plain. In this construction with the indicative, which appears only in later writers, the original meaning of ὄφελον is lost sight of, and it is treated as a mere particle; see Winer, § xli. p. 317; A. Buttmann, § 139, 10, p. 185.

ἀποκόψονται] will not admit the rendering of the A.V. "I would they were even cut off." On the other hand the meaning given above is assigned to ἀποκόψονται by all the Greek commentators, I believe, without exception (the Latin fathers, who read "abscindantur" in their text, had more latitude), and seems alone tenable. See for instance ἀποκεκομμένος, Deut. xxiii. 1, and indeed ἀποκόπτεσθαι was the common term for this mutilation. If it seems strange that St. Paul should have alluded to such a practice at all, it must be remembered that as this was a recognized form of heathen self-devotion, it could not possibly be shunned in conversation, and must at times have been mentioned

by a Christian preacher. For the juxtaposition of περιτέμνειν and ἀποκόπτειν, see Dion. Cassius, lxxix. 11 (quoted by Bentley, *Crit. Sacr.* p. 48), and compare Diod. Sic. iii. 31. The remonstrance is doubly significant as addressed to Galatians, for Pessinus one of their chief towns was the home of the worship of Cybele, in honor of whom these mutilations were practised: comp. Justin, *Apol.* i. p. 70 E, ἀποκόπτονται τινες καὶ εἰς μητέρα θεῶν τὰ μυστήρια ἀναφέρουσι. See also Bardesanes, *de Futo*, § 20, in Cureton's *Syr.* p. 32. Thus, by "glorying in the flesh" the Galatians were returning in a very marked way to the bondage of their former heathenism. See iv. 9; v. 1.

ἀναστατοῦντες] stronger than τὰρδσοντες: "They not only incite you to sedition, but they overthrow the whole framework of your heavenly polity." For ἀναστατοῦν, a word unknown to classical writers, who would use ἀναστάτους ποιεῖν instead, see Acts xvii. 6; xxi. 38. "Well does he say ἀναστατοῦντες," remarks Chrysostom, "for abandoning their country and their freedom and their kindred in heaven, they compelled them to seek a foreign and a strange land; banishing them from the heavenly Jerusalem and the free, and forcing them to wander about as captives and aliens."

13. This is the justification of the indignant scorn poured on their offence: "They are defeating the very purpose of your calling: ye were called not for bondage, but for liberty."

ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ] For καλεῖν ἐπὶ see 1 Thess. iv. 7: comp. Ephes. ii. 10, and Winer, § xlviii. p. 394.

μόνον μὴ] Here he suddenly checks himself, to avoid misunderstanding; "Liberty, and not license." It may be that here, as in the Corinthian church,

ἐλευθερίαν εἰς ἀφορμὴν τῇ σαρκί, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης δουλεύετε ἀλλήλοις. ¹⁴ὁ γὰρ πᾶς νόμος ἐν ἐνὶ λόγῳ πεπλήρωται, ἐν τῷ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν. ¹⁵εἰ δὲ αλ-

a party opposed to the Judaizers had shown a tendency to Antinomian excess. At all events, such an outburst was ever to be dreaded in a body of converted heathens, whether as a protest against or a rebound from the strict formalism which the Judaic party sought to impose on the church; and in this case the passionate temperament of a Celtic people would increase the apostle's uneasiness. Compare Rom. vi. 1 sqq.

μόνον μὴ κ.τ.λ.] “only turn not your liberty.” Some MSS. supply δῶτε, which is perhaps a retranslation from “detis” of the Latin versions. For similar instances of ellipsis see the notes ii. 9, 10. The omission of the verb after the prohibitive μὴ is common in animated passages in classical writers: e.g. Arist. *Arh.* 345 ἀλλὰ μὴ μοι πρόφασιν. See the instances in Jeff's *Gramm.* § 897. Comp. Matt. xxvi. 5 μὴ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ.

ἀφορμῇ] The word is peculiar to St. Paul among the New Testament writers, occurring Rom. vii. 8, 11; 2 Cor. v. 12; xi. 12 (twice); 1 Tim. v. 14.

δ.α τῆς ἀγάπης δουλεύετε] Both ἀγάπης and δουλεύετε are emphatic. St. Paul's meaning may be expressed by a paraphrase thus: “You desire to be in bondage: I too recommend to you a *bondage*, the subservience of mutual love. Temper your liberty with this bondage, and it will not degenerate into license.” A similar contrast between true and false servitude appears in 1 Pet. ii. 16, ὡς ἐλεύθεροι καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐπικάλυμμα ἔχοντες τῆς κακίας τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἀλλ' ὡς Θεοῦ δούλοι.

14. “Ye profess yourselves anxious to fulfil the law; I show you a simple and comprehensive way of fulfilling it.” See vi. 2. The idea of completeness is brought out by an accumulation of separate expressions, “the entire law,” “a single precept,” “is fulfilled already.”

ὁ πᾶς νόμος] “the entire law.” The idea of *totality* is expressed more strongly by the exceptional position of the article, instead of the more usual order, πᾶς ὁ νόμος; comp. 1 Tim. i. 16 τὴν ἅπασαν μακροθυμίαν, Plat. *Gorg.* p. 470 ε ἐν τούτῳ ἡ πᾶσα εὐδαιμονία ἐστίν, Ignat. (?) *Magn.* 1 τὴν πᾶσαν ἐπήρειαν.

πεπλήρωται] “is summarily fulfilled” For the force of the perfect see Winer, § xl. p. 272, A. Buttmann, p. 172. Tertullian (*adv. Marc.* v. 4) hints that Marcion perverted the meaning of the tense to suit his purpose, “si sic vult intelligi *adimpleto est*, quasi jam non *adimplenda*.” The present πληροῦται in the received text enfeebles the sense. The meaning of πληροῦν here is not “to sum up, comprehend,” but “to perform, complete,” as appears from the parallel passage, Rom. xiii. 8, ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἕτερον, νόμον πεπλήρωκεν; so that ἐν ἐνὶ λόγῳ “in one maxim or precept,” means “in the observance of one maxim or precept.”

ἐν τῷ] probably neuter, in apposition to the sentence; comp. Rom. xiii. 9, 10. See above on iv. 25.

τὸν πλησίον] In the original text (Levit. xix. 18) the word “neighbor” is apparently restricted to the Jewish people; “Thou shalt not bear any grudge against the *children of thy people*, but thou shalt love *thy neighbor* as thyself.” From the question of the lawyer (Luke x. 29) it may be inferred that the meaning of this term was a common theme for discussion. Our Lord extends and spiritualizes its meaning, and in this comprehensive sense, as applying to the universal brotherhood of men, St. Paul here uses it. See Tholuck, *Beygepredigt*, v. 43.

σεαυτόν] The received text has ἐαυτὸν which some would retain, against the authority of the best MSS., on the ground that it was altered by scribes

λίλους δάκνετε καὶ κατεσθίετε, βλέπετε μὴ ὑπ' ἀλλήλων ἀναλωθῇτε.

¹⁶ Λέγω δέ, πνεύματι περιπατεῖτε, καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκὸς οὐ μὴ τελέσητε. ¹⁷ ἢ γὰρ σὰρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, τὸ δὲ

ignorant of this usage of *ἑαυτοῦ* for the first and second persons. The case, however, with respect to the New Testament seems to stand thus: that whereas (1) in the plural we always find *ἑαυτῶν* etc., never *ἡμῶν αὐτῶν*, *ὕμῶν αὐτῶν* etc., as mere reflexives, yet (2) in the singular there is not one decisive instance of *ἑαυτοῦ* in the first or second persons; the authority of the best MSS. being mostly against it. See A. Buttmann, p. 99; and for the testimony of the MSS. in this text (Levit. xix. 18) as quoted in the N. T., Tischendorf on Rom. xiii. 9.

15. βλέπετε κ.τ.λ.] A sort of parenthetical warning; "The contest will not end in a victory to either party, such as you crave. It will lead to the common extinction of both." St. Paul returns to his main subject again in ver. 16. See the Introduction, p. 39, note 3.

16-18. "This is my command. Walk by the rule of the Spirit. If you do so, you will not, you cannot, gratify the lusts of the flesh. Between the *Spirit* and the *flesh* there is not only no alliance; there is an interminable, deadly feud. (You feel these antagonistic forces working in you: you would fain follow the guidance of your conscience, and you are dragged back by an opposing power). And if you adopt the rule of the *Spirit*, you thereby renounce your allegiance to the *law*."

In this passage the Spirit is doubly contrasted; first, with the *flesh*, and secondly, with the *law*. The flesh and the law are closely allied; they both move in the same element, in the sphere of outward and material things. The law is not only no safeguard against the flesh, but rather provokes it; and he who would renounce the flesh must

renounce the law also. We have here germs of the ideas more fully developed in the Epistle to the Romans.

16. πνεύματι] the dative of the rule or direction: see the notes v. 25; vi. 16. οὐ μὴ τελέσητε] "*ye shall in no wise fulfil.*" A strong form of the future, especially frequent in later Greek; see Lobeck, *Phryg.* p. 724.

17. τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα] "*but the Spirit strives, fights against the flesh.*" As ἐπιθυμεῖν cannot apply to the Spirit, some other verb must be supplied in the second clause. Throughout this passage the πνεῦμα is evidently the Divine Spirit; for the human spirit in itself and unaided does not stand in direct antagonism to the flesh. See Müller's *Doctrine of Sin*, i. p. 354 sqq. (Engl. trans.)

ταῦτα δέ κ.τ.λ.] A parenthetical clause, suggested by what has gone before, but not bearing on the main argument. It is an appeal to their own consciousness: "Have you not evidence of these two opposing principles in your own hearts? How otherwise do you not always obey the dictates of your conscience?"

ἵνα] here seems to denote simply the *result*, whereas in classical writers it always expresses the *purpose*. For this late use of the word, see the note on 1 Thess. v. 4.

ἃ ἔαν θέλητε] The parallel passage, Rom. vii. 15, 16 determines the meanings of θέλειν here. It denotes the promptings of the conscience: "*video meliora proboque.*"

18. πνεύματι ἄγεσθε] Comp. Rom. viii. 14, ὅσοι γὰρ πνεύματι Θεοῦ ἄγονται.

οὐκ ἐστὲ ὑπὸ νόμον] "You have escaped from the dominion of law." See on ver.

23. An anonymous writer in Cramer's

πνεῦμα κατὰ τῆς σαρκός· ταῦτα γὰρ ἀλλήλοις ἀντίκειται, ἵνα μή, ἂ ἐὰν θέλητε, ταῦτα ποιῇτε. ¹⁸ εἰ δὲ πνεύματι ἄγεσθε, οὐκ ἐστὲ ὑπὸ νόμον. ¹⁹ φανερά δέ ἐστιν τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκός, ἅτινά ἐστιν πορνεία, ἀκαθαρσία, ἀσέλγεια, ²⁰ εἰδωλολατρεία, φαρμακεία, ἔχθραι,

Catena, p. 81 (where the words are wrongly assigned to Chrysostom) says, οὐ νόμος τῶ ἀπειλοῦντι δοῦλοισι, πνεύματι δὲ τῷ ἄγοντι τέκνα Θεοῦ. For νόμος without the article, see the notes iii. 18; iv. 4, 5.

19. "Would you ascertain whether you are walking by the Spirit? Then apply the plain, practical test."

ἅτινα] "such as are," not ἅ "which are"; the list not being exhaustive, but giving instances only. See on iv. 24.

Though no systematic classification is to be looked for in the catalogue which follows, yet a partial and unconscious arrangement may perhaps be discerned. The sins here mentioned seem to fall into four classes: (1) *Sensual passions*, "fornication, uncleanness, licentiousness"; (2) *Unlawful dealings in things spiritual*, "idolatry, witchcraft"; (3) *Violations of brotherly love*, "enmities . . . murders"; (4) *Intemperate excesses*, "drunkenness, revellings." From early habit and constant association a Gentile church would be peculiarly exposed to sins of the first two classes. The third would be a probable consequence of their religious dissensions, inflaming the excitable temperament of a Celtic people. The fourth seems to be thrown in to give a sort of completeness to the list, though not unfitly addressed to a nation whose Gallic descent perhaps disposed them too easily to these excesses; see the Introduction, p. 21.

πορνεία &c.] The same three words occur together in a different order, 2 Cor. xii. 21. The order here is perhaps the more natural: πορνεία, a special form of impurity; ἀκαθαρσία, uncleanness in whatever guise; ἀσέλγεια, an open and reckless contempt of propriety.

ἀκαθαρσία] Comp. Rom. i. 24. There

is no sufficient ground for assigning to this word the sense "covetousness"; see the note on 1 Thess. ii. 3.

ἀσέλγεια] "*wantonness*." A man may be ἀκάθαρτος and hide his sin; he does not become ἀσελγής until he shocks public decency. In classical Greek the word ἀσέλγεια generally signifies insolence or violence towards another, as it is defined in Bekker's *Anecd.* p. 451, ἡ μετ' ἐπηρεασμοῦ καὶ θρασύτητος βία. In the later language, in the New Testament, for instance, the prominent idea is sensuality, according to the loose definition in Etym. Magn., ἐτοιμότης πρὸς πᾶσαν ἡδονήν: comp. Polyb. xxxvii. 2, πολλὴ δέ τις ἀσέλγεια καὶ περὶ τὰς σωματικὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῷ συνεξηκολούθει. Thus it has much the same range of meaning as *libris*.

20. In spiritual things two sins are named: εἰδωλολατρεία, the open recognition of false gods; and φαρμακεία, the secret tampering with the powers of evil.

φαρμακεία] not "poisoning" here, but "*sorcery, witchcraft*," as its association with "idolatry" shows: comp. Rev. xxi. 8, φαρμακοὶ καὶ εἰδωλολάτραις. On the different kinds of φαρμακεία, see especially Plato, *Legg.* xi. pp. 932, 933. Comp. Philo de *Migr. Abr.* p. 449 M, ἢ οὐχ ὅρας τοὺς ἐπασιδοὺς καὶ φαρμακευτὰς ἀντισοφιστεύοντας τῷ θεῷ λόγῳ: *Quod det. pot.* p. 198 M, τοὺς ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ τῷ σώματι σοφιστὰς οὓς φαρμακείας ὀνομάζει; Plato, *Symp.* p. 203 D, δεινὸς γόης καὶ φαρμακεὺς καὶ σοφιστής. This is a common sense of φαρμακεὺς, φαρμακεία in the LXX. It is a striking coincidence, if nothing more, that φαρμακεῖαι were condemned by a very stringent canon of the council held at Ancyra the capital of Galatia (about A.D. 314); see Hefele, *Concilieng.* i. p. 209. For the

ἔρις, ζήλος, θυμοί, ἐριθείαι, διχοστασίαι, αἵρέσεις, ²¹ φθόνοι, [φόνου]. μέθαι, κῶμοι, καὶ τὰ ὅμοια τούτοις· ἃ προλέγω ὑμῖν καθὼς [καὶ] προείπον, ὅτι οἱ τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντες βασιλείαν

20. ἔχθραι, ἔρεις.

prevalence of *γοητεία* in Asia Minor see Greg. Naz. *Orat.* iv. 31 (i. p. 91); comp. 2 Tim. iii. 13.

20, 21. ἔχθραι κ.τ.λ.] A principle of order may be observed in the enumeration which follows: (1) ἔχθραι, a general expression opposed to ἀγάπη, breaches of charity in feeling or in act; from this point onward the terms are in an ascending scale: (2), (3) ἔρις "strife," not necessarily implying self-interest; ζήλος "rivalry," in which the idea of self-assertion is prominent; (4), (5) θυμοί "wraths," a more passionate form of ἔρις; ἐριθείαι "factious cabals," a stronger development of ζήλος; (6), (7) hostility has reached the point where the contending parties separate; such separation is either temporary (διχοστασίαι "divisions") or permanent (αἵρέσεις "sects, heresies"). (8) φθόνοι, a grosser breach of charity than any hitherto mentioned, the wish to deprive another of what he has; (9) φόνου, the extreme form which hatred can take, the deprivation of life.

The first four words, ἔρις, ζήλος, θυμοί, ἐριθείαι, occur in the same order, 2 Cor. xii. 20; comp. Rom. xiii. 13.

ζήλος] "*emulation, rivalry*," not necessarily, like φθόνος, in a bad sense, and, in fact, with classical writers, it is generally used otherwise. But, as it is the tendency of Christian teaching to exalt the gentler qualities, and to depress their opposites, ζήλος falls in the scale of Christian ethics (see Clem. Rom. §§ 4-6), while, ταπεινότης, for instance, rises.

Θυμοί] "*outbursts of wrath*." On θυμός in its relation to ὀργή, as the outward manifestation to the inward feeling, see Trench, *N.T. Syn.* 1st ser. § xxxvii. The plural is frequent even in classical writers: see Lobeck on Soph. *Aj.* 716.

ἐριθείαι] "*caballings*." Derived from ἔριθος, the word signifies properly "working for hire"; hence it gets to mean "the canvassing of hired partizans" (Suidas, ἐριθέυσθαι ὁμοῖόν ἐστι τῷ δεκάεσθαι, καὶ γὰρ ἡ ἐριθεία εἴρηται ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ μισθοῦ δόσεως), and hence more generally "factiousness": comp. Arist. *Polit.* v. [viii.] 3, μεταβάλλουσι δ' αἱ πολιτεῖαι καὶ ἄνευ στάσεως διὰ τε τὰς ἐριθείας ὥσπερ ἐν Ἑραΐᾳ· ἐξ αἰρετῶν γὰρ διὰ τοῦτο ἐποίησαν κληρωτάς, ὅτι ἡροῦντο τοὺς ἐριθευομένους. Thus it has no connection with ἔρις, unless, indeed, both are to be referred ultimately to the same root, ἔρω, ἔρδω, as is maintained by Lobeck, *Patrol.* p. 365. Comp. Fritz-sche, *Rom.* i. p. 143. For ἐριθεία following upon ζήλος, see James iii. 14, εἰ δὲ ζήλον πικρὸν ἔχετε καὶ ἐριθείαν, and ib. ver. 16.

αἵρέσεις] A more aggravated form of διχοστασίαι, when the divisions have developed into distinct and organized parties: comp. 1 Cor. xi. 18, ἀκούω σχίσματα ἐν ὑμῖν ὑπάρχειν καὶ μέρος τι πιστεύω, δεῖ γὰρ καὶ αἵρέσεις ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι, and the remarks of Tertullian, *de praeser. haer.* § 5, thereon.

21. φθόνοι] On the distinction of ζήλος the desire to be as well off as another, and φθόνος the desire to deprive another of what he has, see Aristotle, *Rhet.* ii. 9, 10, 11, who says, διὸ καὶ ἐπικέες ἔπιν ὁ ζήλος καὶ ἐπικῶν, τὸ δὲ φθονεῖν φαῖλον καὶ φαῦλον. Compare Trench, *N.T. Syn.* 1st ser. § xxvi., and to the references there given add Aesch. *Agam.* 939 ὁ δ' ἀφθόνητός γ' οὐκ ἐπὶ ζήλος πέλει, and Thucyd. ii. 64.

φόνου] is omitted by some editors with a few of the most ancient texts, as an interpolation from Rom. i. 29, where φθόνου φόνου occur together. The fact, however, of the same alliteration occur-

θεοῦ οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν. ²² ὁ δὲ καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματος ἐστὶν ἀγάπη, χαρά, εἰρήνη, μακροθυμία, χρηστότης, ἀγαθωσύνη, πίστις, ²³ πραῦτης, ἐγκράτεια. κατὰ τῶν τοιούτων οὐκ ἐστὶν νόμος.

ing in another epistle written about the same time is rather in its favor, and the omission in some texts may be due to the carelessness of a copyist transcribing words so closely resembling each other. The reading must therefore remain doubtful. Comp. Eur. *Troil.* 763 φθόνου φόνου τε. For the paronomasia see Winer, § lxviii. p. 636.

μέθαι, κῶμοι] as Rom. xiii. 13; comp. Dion Cassius lxx. 3 μέθαι τε καὶ κῶμοι.

ἀ προλέγω κ.τ.λ.] For the construction comp. John viii. 54 ὃν ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι Θεὸς ἡμῶν ἐστιν.

προεῖπον] probably on the occasion of his second visit. See i. 9; iv. 13, 16, and the Introduction p. 31.

βασιλεύειν κ.τ.λ.] Comp. 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10; xv. 50.

22. ὁ δὲ καρπός] The apostle had before mentioned the *works* of the flesh; he here speaks of the *fruit* of the spirit. This change of terms is significant. The flesh is a rank weed which produces no fruit properly so called; and St. Paul's language here recalls the contrast of the fig and vine with the thorn and the thistle in the parable, Matt. vii. 16, seq.

22, 23. The difficulty of classification in the list which follows is still greater than in the case of the works of the flesh. Nevertheless some sort of order may be observed. The catalogue falls into three groups of three each. The first of these comprises Christian habits of mind in their more general aspect, "love, joy, peace"; the second gives special qualities affecting a man's intercourse with his neighbor, "long-suffering, kindness, beneficence"; while the third, again general in character, like the first, exhibits the principles which guide a Christian's conduct, "honesty, gentleness, temperance."

ἀγάπη κ.τ.λ.] The fabric is built up, story upon story. Love is the founda-

tion, joy the superstructure, peace the crown of all.

μακροθυμία κ.τ.λ.] This triad is again arranged in an ascending scale: μακροθυμία is *passive*, "patient endurance under injuries inflicted by others": χρηστότης, *neutral*, "a kindly disposition towards one's neighbors," not necessarily taking a practical form; ἀγαθωσύνη, *active*, "goodness, beneficence," as an energetic principle. For the first two words compare 1 Cor. xiii. 4 ἡ ἀγάπη μακροθυμεῖ χρηστεύεται. The second is distinguished from the third, as the *ἦθος* from the *ἐνέργεια*; χρηστότης is potential ἀγαθωσύνη, ἀγαθωσύνη, energizing χρηστότης. They might be translated by "benignitas" and "bonitas" respectively, as Jerome renders them here, or by "benevolentia" and "beneficentia." Other distinctions which have been given of these words are discussed in Trench's *N. T. Syn.* 2d ser. § xiii.

πίστις] seems not to be used here in its theological sense "belief in God." Its position points rather to the passive meaning of faith, "trustworthiness, fidelity, honesty," as in Matt. xxiii. 23; Tit. ii. 10; comp. Rom. iii. 3. See above, p. 344. Possibly, however, it may here signify "trustfulness, reliance" in one's dealings with others; comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 7 ἡ ἀγάπη πάντα πιστεύει.

23. πραῦτης] "*meekness*" is joined with πίστις (used apparently in the same sense as here) in Eccles. xlv. 4 ἐν πίστει καὶ πραύτητι αὐτοῦ ἠγάσεν (-c. Μωϋσῆν]. On the meaning of πραύτης see Trench *N. T. Syn.* 1st ser. §§ xlii., xliii.; and on the varying forms πρᾶος (-ότης), πρᾶς (-ότης), Lobeck *Phryg.* p. 403; Lipsius *Gram. inters.* p. 7. The forms in *v* are the best supported in the New Testament: see A. Buttmann, pp. 23, 24.

24 οἱ δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τὴν σάρκα ἐσταύρωσαν σὺν τοῖς παθήμασιν καὶ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις. 25 εἰ ζῶμεν πνεύματι, πνεύματι

κατὰ τῶν τοιοῦτων κ.τ.λ.] “*against such things.*” Law exists for the purpose of restraint, but in the works of the Spirit there is nothing to restrain; comp. 1 Tim. i. 9 εἰδὼς τοῦτο, ὅτι δικαίῳ νόμῳ οὐ κείται, ἀνόμοις δὲ καὶ ἀνυποτάκτοις κ.τ.λ. Thus, then, the apostle substantiates the proposition stated in ver. 18, “If ye are led by the Spirit ye are not under law.”

24. οἱ δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ] “*now they that are of Christ Jesus.*” Several of the Greek fathers strangely connected τοῦ Χριστοῦ with τὴν σάρκα, “these persons have crucified the flesh of Christ,” explaining it in various ways; see e.g. Clem. Alex. *Fragn.* 1015 (Potter). Origen, however, who so took it, seems not to have had δέ in his text, and therefore made of a relative agreeing with τῶν τοιούτων, which he took as masculine. See Jerome’s note here.

Ἰησοῦ, which is struck out in the received text, ought probably to be retained. It is found in several of the oldest texts, and the omission in others is easily accounted for by the unusual order ὁ Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς. This order occurs also in Ephes. iii. 1; Col. ii. 6, but in both passages with some variation of reading.

ἐσταύρωσαν] “*crucified.*” The aorist is to be explained either (1) By reference to the time of their becoming members of Christ in baptism, as Rom. vi. 6 ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος συνεσταυρώθη; or (2) As denoting that the change is complete and decisive, without reference to any distinct point of time; see the note on ver. 4, κατηργήθητε.

τοῖς παθήμασιν κ.τ.λ.] “*the afflictions and the lusts*”: comp. Col. iii. 5; 1 Thess. iv. 5, and see Trench, *N. T. Syn.* 2d ser. § xxxvii. The two words are chiefly distinguished as presenting vice on its passive and its active side respectively. Comp. Joseph. [?] *Mucc.* § 3. At the

same time παθήματα perhaps retains something of the meaning which it has in Greek philosophy; and, if so, it is more comprehensive than ἐπιθυμία; see, for instance, Arist. *Eth. Nic.* ii. 4 λέγω δὲ πάθη μὲν ἐπιθυμίας ὀργὴν φόβον θράσος κ.τ.λ.

25. “You have crucified your old selves: you are dead to the flesh and you live to the Spirit. Therefore conform your conduct to your new life.” See Gal. ii. 19, 20, and especially Rom. vi. 2-14, where the same thoughts are expanded.

The “life to the Spirit,” of which the apostle here speaks, is an ideal rather than an actual life; it denotes a state which the Galatians were put in the way of attaining, rather than one which they had already attained. Otherwise the injunction “walk also by the Spirit” were superfluous. Comp. Col. iii. 1; Eph. iv. 30. This is always St. Paul’s way of speaking. Members of the Christian brotherhood are in his language the “saints,” the “elect,” by virtue of their admission into the church. It remains for them to make their profession a reality.

εἰ ζῶμεν πνεύματι] “*if we live to the Spirit.*” The dative here is safest interpreted by the corresponding datives in the parallel passage, Rom. vi. 2, 10, τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀποθανεῖν, ver. 11 νεκροὺς μὲν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ζῶντας δὲ τῷ Θεῷ; comp. also Rom. xiv. 6, 8, κυρίῳ ζῶμεν, κυρίῳ ἀποθνήσκομεν; 2 Cor. v. 15.

πνεύματι καὶ στοιχῶμεν] “*let us also walk by the Spirit.*” The dative with στοιχεῖν, περιπατεῖν, etc., marks the line or direction: as Polyb. xxviii. 5, 6, βουλόμενοι στοιχεῖν τῇ τῆς συγκλήτου προθέσει. Comp. Frizsche, Rom. iii. p. 142, and A. Buttmann, p. 160. See above v. 16 (with the note), vi. 16.

26. St. Paul works round again to the subject of ver. 15, and repeats his

καὶ στοιχῶμεν. ²³ μὴ γινώμεθα κενόδοξοι, ἀλλήλους προκαλούμενοι, ἀλλήλους φθονοῦντες.

VI. Ἀδελφοί, ἐὰν καὶ προλημφθῇ ἄνθρωπος ἐν τινι παρα-

26. ἀλλήλοις φθονοῦντες.

warning. It is clear that something had occurred which alarmed him on this point. See the Introduction, p. 21.

There is a gradation in the phrases used here. Vainglory provokes contention; contention produces envy.

γινώμεθα] not ἔμεν. This vainglorying was a *departure* from their spiritual standard.

κενόδοξοι] “*vainglorious*.” So κενόδοξία, Phil. ii. 3, and occasionally in Polybius and later writers. In Wisd. xiv. 4 κενόδοξία seems to mean rather “*vain opinion*,” “*folly*.”

προκαλούμενο.] “*provoking, challenging to combat*.” Both this word and φθονεῖν are ἀταξ λεγόμενα in the New Testament. In the LXX φθονεῖν occurs once only, Tob. iv. 16; προκαλέσθαι never.

ἀλλήλους φθονοῦντες] I have ventured to place the accusative in the text rather than the dative, in deference to a few excellent authorities, though I am not aware of any other example of φθονεῖν with an accusative of the person. It seems to be one out of many instances of the tendency of later Greek to produce uniformity by substituting the more usual case of the object for the less usual; see the note on ἐγκόπτειν ver. 7. Comp. also Heb. viii. 8 μεμφόμενος αὐτούς (the correct reading). So too πολεμεῖν takes an accusative, e.g. Ignat. *Troll.* 4.

VI. 1-5. “As brethren, I appeal to you. Act in a brotherly spirit. I have just charged you to shun vain-glory, to shun provocation and envy. I ask you now to do more than this. I ask you to be gentle even to those whose guilt is flagrant. Do any of you profess to be spiritually-minded? Then correct the offender in a spirit of tenderness. Correct and reinstate him. Remember your own weakness; reflect that you too may

be tempted some day, and may stand in need of like forgiveness. Have sympathy one with another. Lend a ready hand in bearing your neighbor's burdens. So doing you will fulfil the most perfect of all laws — the law of Christ. But if any one asserts his superiority, if any one exalts himself above others, he is nothing worth, he is a vain self-deceiver. Nay, rather let each man test *his own work*. If this stands the test, then his boast will be his own, it will not depend on comparison with others. Each of us has his own duties, his own responsibilities. Each of us must carry his own load.”

1. ἀδελφοί] “*Brothers*.” “A whole argument lies hidden under this one word,” says Bengel. See iii. 15; iv. 12, and especially vi. 18.

The fervor and pathos of this appeal are perhaps to be explained by certain circumstances which engaged St. Paul's attention at this time. A grave offence had been committed in the church of Corinth. St. Paul had called upon the Corinthian brethren to punish the offender; and his appeal had been promptly and zealously responded to. He had even to protest against undue severity, to interpose for the pardon of the guilty one. The remembrance of this incident still fresh on his mind may be supposed to have dictated the injunction in the text. The striking resemblance in his tone here to 2 Cor. ii. 6-8, where he is speaking of the Corinthian offender, bears out this conjecture. See the Introduction, p. 59.

ἐὰν καί] see the note on i. 8.

προλημφθῇ] “*be surprised, detected in the act of committing any sin*,” so that his guilt is placed beyond a doubt. For this sense of προλαμβάνειν, “*to take by surprise, to over-power before one can*

πτώματι, ὑμεῖς οἱ πνευματικοὶ καταρτίζετε τον τοιοῦτον ἐν πνεύματι πραΐτητος, σκοπῶν σεαυτὸν μὴ καὶ σὺ πειρασθῆς. ² ἀλλήλων τὰ βάρη βαστάζετε, καὶ οὕτως ἀναπληρώσετε τὸν νόμον τοῦ

2. οὕτως ἀναπληρώσατε.

escape," see Wisd. xvii. 16 προλημφθεὶς τὴν δυσάλυκτον ἔμενεν ἀνάγκην; comp. κατελήμφθη, John viii. 4. The word cannot here mean "be betrayed into sin," for neither will the preposition ἐν admit this meaning, nor is it well suited to the context.

ὑμεῖς οἱ πνευματικοί] St. Paul had once and again urged them to walk by the Spirit (v. 16. 25). This explains the form of address here: "Ye who have taken my lesson to heart, ye who would indeed be guided by the Spirit." Their readiness to forgive would be a test of their spirituality of mind. It might indeed be supposed that the apostle was here addressing himself especially to the party of more liberal views, who had taken his side against the Judaizers, and in their opposition to ritualism were in danger of paying too little regard to the weaker brethren; comp. Rom. xv. 1 ἡμεῖς οἱ δυνατοί. In this case there would be a slight shade of irony in πνευματικοί. The epistle, however, betrays no very distinct traces of the existence of such a party in the Galatian churches (see v. 13), and indeed the context here is far too general to apply to them alone. For οἱ πνευματικοί, see 1 Cor. ii. 13, 15; iii. 1.

καταρτίζετε] "correct, restore." The idea of punishment is quite subordinate to that of amendment in καταρτίζετε, which on this account is preferred here to κολάζετε or even ρουθετεῖτε, though the latter occurs in a similar passage, 2 Thess. iii. 15 ὡς ἄς ἐχθρὸν ἡγείσθε ἀλλὰ ρουθετεῖτε ὡς ἀδελφόν. On καταρτίζειν see the note 1 Thess. iii. 10. It is used especially as a surgical term, of setting a bone or joint; see the passages in Wetstein on Matt. iv. 21.

ἐν πνεύματι πραΐτητος] Comp. 1 Cor. iv. 21 ἐν ἀγάπῃ πνεύματι τε πραΐτητος.

Gentleness is a characteristic of true spirituality. By their conduct towards wrong-doers their claim to the title of πνευματικοί would be tested.

σκοπῶν] The transition from the plural to the singular gives the charge a direct personal application; "each one of you individually." Compare the καὶ σὺ, and see the note on iv. 7.

2. "If you must needs impose *burdens* on yourselves, let them be the burdens of mutual sympathy. If you must needs observe a *law*, let it be the law of Christ." The apostle seems to have used both βάρη and νόμον (the latter certainly), with a reference to the ritualistic tendencies of the Galatians; see above v. 13, 14. For the idea of the *burden* of the Mosaic law compare especially Luke xi. 46 φορτίζετε τοὺς ἀνθρώπους φορτία δυσβάστακτα, Acts xv. 10 ἐπιθεῖναι ζυγὸν ὃν οὔτε οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν οὔτε ἡμεῖς ἰσχύσαμεν βαστάσαι, ver. 28 μηδὲν πλέον ἐπιθεσθαι ὑμῖν βάρος. For the "law of Christ," always in contrast to the law of Moses, see 1 Cor. ix. 21 ἔννομος Χριστοῦ, Rom. iii. 27 διὰ ποίου νόμου; τῶν ἔργων; οὐχί, ἀλλὰ διὰ νόμου πίστεως, viii. 2 ὁ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς κ.τ.λ.; comp. James i. 25; ii. 12.

ἀλλήλων τὰ βάρη κ.τ.λ.] Comp. Matt. viii. 17; Rom. xv. 1, τὰ ἀσθενήματα τῶν ἀδυνάτων βαστάζειν; Ignat. Polye. 1, πάντας βάσταζε ὥς σε ὁ Κύριος, and again πάντων τοὺς νόσους βάσταζε; Epist. ad Diogn. § 10, ὅστις τὸ τοῦ πλησίον ἀνδέχεται βάρος. Here the position of ἀλλήλων is emphatic: "These are the burdens I would have you bear—not the vexations ritual of the law, but your neighbor's errors and weaknesses, his sorrows and sufferings."

ἀναπληρώσατε] "ye will rigorously fulfil," the idea of completeness being contained in the preposition. It is

Χριστοῦ. ³εἰ γὰρ δοκεῖ τις εἶναι τι μηδὲν ὄν, φρεναπατᾷ ἑαυτόν·
⁴τὸ δὲ ἔργον αὐτοῦ δοκιμαζέτω ἕκαστος, καὶ τότε εἰς ἑαυτὸν

difficult to decide here between the readings ἀναπληρώσετε and ἀναπληρώσατε, the external authority for either being nearly balanced. On the whole, the preference may perhaps be given to ἀναπληρώσατε as having the versions for the most part in its favor; such testimony being in a case like the present less open to suspicion than any other. On the other hand, ἀναπληρώσατε makes excellent sense; the past tense, so far from being an objection, is its strongest recommendation; for this tense marks the completeness of the act, and thus adds to the force of the preposition, "fulfil the law *then and there*." See the passages in Winer, § xliii. p. 313.

τοῦ Χριστοῦ] is added in a manner παρὰ προσδοκίαν: "the law not of Moses, but of Christ."

3. These words are connected with the first verse of the chapter, the second being an amplification of and inference from the first.

εἰ γὰρ δοκεῖ τις κ.τ.λ.] Comp. Plat. *Apol.* p. 41 E, ἐὰν δοκῶσι τι εἶναι μηδὲν ὄντες; Arrian, *Epiet.* ii. 24, δοκῶν μὲν τις εἶναι ὦν δ' οὐδεὶς; and for οὐδὲν εἶναι, see 1 Cor. xiii. 2; 2 Cor. xii. 11.

μηδὲν ὄν] "being nothing," i.e. "seeing that he is nothing," not "if he is nothing"; for the very fact of his thinking highly of himself condemns him. "His estimate," says Chrysostom, "is a leading proof of his vileness." In Christian morality self-esteem is vanity and vanity is nothingness. With the Christian it is "not I, but the grace of God which is with me"; see 1 Cor. iii. 7; xv. 9, 10; 2 Cor. iii. 5.

φρεναπατᾷ] *deceives by his fancies*." comp. Tit. i. 10, ματαιολόγοι καὶ φρεναπάται. More is implied by this word than by ἀπατᾷν, for it brings out the idea of *subjective fancies*, and thus enforces the previous δοκεῖ. It was possibly coined by St. Paul; for it seems

not to be found in any earlier writer, and at a later date occurs chiefly, if not solely, in ecclesiastical authors.

4. τὸ δὲ ἔργον αὐτοῦ] "*his own work*"; ἔργον, emphatic by its position, stands in contrast to δοκεῖ and φρεναπατᾷ; and this contrast is enhanced by the addition of αὐτοῦ.

δοκιμαζέτω] "*let him test, examine*"; see the notes on 1 Thess. ii. 4; v. 21.

τὸ καύχημα] "*his ground for boasting*"; καύχημα is the matter of καύχησης; compare Rom. iii. 27 with iv. 2, and 2 Cor. i. 12, ἡ γὰρ καύχησης ἡμῶν αὕτη ἐστὶν κ.τ.λ. with i. 14, ὅτι καύχημα ἡμῶν ἐσμέν.

εἰς ἑαυτὸν κ.τ.λ.] "*in himself, and not by comparison with others*." "Prohibitas in re, non in collatione," says Castalio. For the preposition compare Eph. iii. 16, κραταιωθῆναι εἰς τὸν ἑωαυτοῦ; Rom. iv. 20; xv. 2; xvi. 6, etc.; Winer, § xlix. p. 397.

τὸν ἑτέρον] "*his neighbor*." For the article compare. Rom. ii. 1; xiii. 8; 1 Cor. vi. 1; x. 24, 29.

5. Having started from the precept "bear one another's loads," the apostle has worked round to an apparent contradictory statement, "each man must bear his own burden." This expression of complementary truths under antagonistic forms is characteristic of St. Paul. For instances of similar paradoxes of expression, see Phil. ii. 12, 13, "work out *your own* salvation, for it is *God* that worketh in you," or 2 Cor. xii. 10, "when I am weak, then I am strong." Compare also his language in speaking of the law, Rom. vi., vii.

τὸ ἴδιον φορτίον] It is difficult to establish any precise distinction between φορτίον here and βάρη, ver. 2. This much difference, however, there seems to be, that the latter suggests the idea of an adventitious and oppressive burden, which is not necessarily implied in the

μῶνον τὸ καύχημα ἔξει, καὶ οὐκ εἰς τὸν ἕτερον· ἕκαστος γὰρ τὸ ἴδιον φορτίον βαστάσει.

Ἐκκωννείτω δὲ ὁ κατηχούμενος τὸν λόγον τῷ κατηχούντι ἐν

former; so that *βάρη* points to a load of which a man may fairly rid himself when occasion serves; *φορτίον* to a load which he is expected to bear. Thus *φορτίον* is a common term for a man's pack, e.g. Xen. *Mem.* iii. 13, 6. Here it is perhaps an application of the common metaphor of Christian warfare, in which each soldier bears his own kit (*φορτίον*), as each is supplied with his own provisions (*ἐφόδια*, Clem. Rom. 2), and each receives his proper pay (*ὀψώνια*, 1 Cor. ix. 7, Ignat. *Pol.* 6). The soldier of Christ sets out on his march, "Non seems ac patriis acer Romanus in armis Injusto sub fasce viam cum carpit." If so, *βαστάζειν τὸ ἴδιον φορτίον* refers rather to the discharge of the obligations themselves than to the punishment undergone for their neglect.

Ἐξαστάσει] "is appointed to bear, must bear." Each man has certain responsibilities imposed on him individually, which he cannot throw off. For the future tense see ii. 16; Winer, § xl. p. 280.

6. "I spoke of bearing one another's burdens. There is one special application I would make of this rule. Provide for the temporal wants of your teachers in Christ." *Δέ* arrests a former topic before it passes out of sight; see the note iv. 20. Otherwise it might be taken as qualifying the clause which immediately precedes: "Each man must bear his own burden; but this law does not exempt you from supporting your spiritual teachers." Such a turn of the sentence, however, inasmuch as it is not obvious, might be expected to be marked in some more important way than by the very faint opposition implied by *δέ*.

6. *κοινωνεῖτω*] *let him impart to,* literally, "let him go shares with." The word is properly intransitive, and equivalent to *κοινωνὸς εἶναι*, "to be a partner

with." It may be construed with all three cases: (1) The genitive of the thing which is participated in; once only in the New Testament, Heb. ii. 14. *κεκοινῶνκεν αἵματος καὶ σαρκός*; comp. Prov. i. 11; 2 Macc. xiv. 25. In this case the verb may denote either the person who gives or the person who receives. (2) The accusative of the thing imparted, as Aesch. *c. Ctes.* p. 63, *οἱ ἀποδόμενοι καὶ κατακοινῶνῆσαντες τὰ τῆς πόλεως ἰσχυρά*, a rare construction, not found perhaps with the simple verb, and due in the passage quoted to the preposition. (3) The dative, which is explained by the idea of *partnership* implied in *κοινωνός*, and expresses the person or thing *with* which the other makes common cause. He who *κοινωνεῖ* in this case may be either the receiver, as Rom. xv. 27, *τοῖς πνευματικοῖς αὐτῶν ἐκοινῶνησαν τὰ ἔθνη*, or the giver, as Rom. xii. 13, *ταῖς χρεῖαις τῶν ἀγίων κοινωνοῦντες*. Here the latter is intended.

κατηχούμενος] "*instructed.*" The word in this sense is not peculiar to biblical Greek. *κατήχησις*, "oral instruction," occurs as early as Hippocrates, p. 28, 25, *κατηχῆσιος ἰδιωτεων*, and probably *κατηχεῖν* "to instruct" was in common use in the other dialects, though it would seem to have been banished from the Attic of the classical period. See the remarks on *ἀπόστολος*, p. 99, note 1. *ἐν πᾶσιν ἀγαθοῖς*] "*in all good things.*"

The obligation of the hearers of the word to support the ministers of the word is again and again insisted upon by St. Paul, though he seldom asserted his own claims; see 1 Thess. ii. 6, 9; 2 Cor. xi. 7 sqq.; Phil. iv. 10 sqq.; 1 Tim. v. 17, 18, and especially 1 Cor. ix. 11. The resemblance of language in this last passage leaves no doubt that St. Paul is here speaking of imparting temporal goods. The metaphor of sow-

πασιν ἀγαθοῖς. Ἦ μὴ πλανᾷσθε, θεὸς οὐ μυκτηρίζεται· ὁ γὰρ ἐὰν σπείρῃ ἄνθρωπος, τοῦτο καὶ θερίσει· ὅτι ὁ σπείρων εἰς τὴν σάρκα ἑαυτοῦ ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς θερίσει φθοράν, ὁ δὲ σπείρων εἰς τὸ

ing and reaping both there and in the very close parallel, 2 Cor. ix. 6, has reference to liberality in almsgiving. The more general sense which has been assigned to this passage, "let the taught sympathize with the teacher in all good things," is not recommended either by the context or by St. Paul's language elsewhere. For ἀγαθοῖς, "temporal blessings," see Luke i. 53; xii. 18, 19; xvi. 25. Compare Barnabas § 19 *κοινωνήσεις ἐν πᾶσι τῷ πλησίον σου*.

7, 8. "What? you hold back? Nay, do not deceive yourselves. Your niggardliness will find you out. You cannot cheat God by your fair professions. You cannot mock *him*. According as you sow, thus will you reap. If you plant the seed of your own selfish desires, if you sow the field of the flesh, then when you gather in your harvest you will find the ears blighted and rotten. But if you sow the good ground of the spirit, you will of that good ground gather the golden grain of Life eternal."

7. οὐ μυκτηρίζεται] "*is not mocked*." *Μυκτηρίζειν*, which is properly "to turn up the nose at," "to treat with contempt," involves as a secondary meaning the idea of contradicting one's language by one's gesture or look, and so implies an outward avowal of respect neutralized by an indirect expression of contempt. In other words it conveys the idea of *irony*, whether this irony be dissembled or not. Thus *μυκτηρ* is frequently connected with *εἰρωνεία*, as in Lucian *Prom.* c. 1; compare Pollux ii. 78, καὶ τὸν εἰρωνά τινες μυκτηῖρα καλοῦσι. In writers on rhetoric *μυκτηρισμός* is ordinarily treated as a species of *εἰρωνεία*; see for instance four different treatises on "tropes" in the *Rhet. Græc.* iii. pp. 205, 213, 235, 254 (ed. Spengel). Similarly Quintilian, viii. 6, 59, well defines it, "dissimulatus quidam sed non latens

risus." Such is the force of *μυκτηρίζεται* in this passage: "you cannot with impunity turn your professions to contempt, you cannot with God indulge in a *rustica simula*."

ὁ γὰρ ἐὰν κ.τ.λ.] A common proverb not only in the Bible (Job. iv. 8), but elsewhere; e.g. Cic. *de Orat.* ii. 65 "ut sementem feceris, ita metes," and Arist. *Rhet.* iii. 3 ὃν δὲ ταῦτα αἰσχροῦς μὲν ἔσπειρας κακῶς δὲ ἐθέρισας. It occurs in 2 Cor. ix. 6, in reference to the contributions for the poor brethren of Judea. To this object the Galatians also had been asked to contribute (1 Cor. xvi. 1). We may therefore conjecture that niggardliness was a besetting sin with them (see p. 21); that they had not heartily responded to the call; and that St. Paul takes this opportunity of rebuking their backwardness, in passing from the obligation of supporting their ministers to a general censure of illiberality. See the Introduction, p. 60.

8. The former verse speaks of the kind of seed sown (ὁ ἐὰν σπείρῃ). In the present, the metaphor is otherwise applied, and the harvest is made to depend on the nature of the ground in which it is cast (εἰς), as in the parable of the sower. In moral husbandry sowers choose different soils, as they choose different seeds. The harvest depends on both the one and the other. For St. Paul's diversified application of metaphors, see the notes on ii. 20; iv. 19.

ἑαυτοῦ] which disturbs the equilibrium of the clauses, is added to bring out the idea of selfishness.

φθοράν] "*rotteness, corruption*." The field of the flesh yields not full and solid ears of corn, which may be gathered up and garnered for future use, but only blighted and putrescent grains. Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 42 σπείρεται ἐν φθορᾷ, Col. ii. 22 ἃ ἐστὶν πάντα εἰς φθοράν τῇ ἀποχρῇ-

πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος θερίσει ζωὴν αἰώνιον. ⁹ τὸ δὲ καλὸν ποιοῦντες μὴ ἐγκακῶμεν· καιρῷ γὰρ ἰδίῳ θερίσομεν μὴ ἐκλυόμενοι. ¹⁰ ἄρα οὖν ὡς καιρὸν ἔχομεν, ἐργαζόμεθα τὸ ἀγαθὸν πρὸς πάντας, μάλιστα δὲ πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους τῆς πίστεως.

σει. The metaphor suggests that *φθοράν* should be taken in its primary physical sense. At the same time in its recognized secondary meaning as a moral term, it is directly opposed to life eternal, and so forms the link of connection between the emblem and the thing signified. In *ζωὴ αἰώνιος* the metaphor is finally abandoned.

9. Having passed from a particular form of beneficence (ver. 6) to beneficence in general (vv. 7, 8) the apostle still further enlarges the compass of his advice: "Nay, in doing what is honorable and good let us never tire." Compare 2 Thess. iii. 13 *μὴ ἐγκακήσητε καλοποιῶντες*. The word *καλοποιεῖν* includes *ἀγαθοποιεῖν* and more, for while *τὰ ἀγαθὰ* are beneficent actions, kind services, etc., things good in their results, *τὰ καλὰ* are right actions, such as are beautiful in themselves, things absolutely good. In this passage, as in 2 Thess. *i. e.* the antithesis of *καλὸν* and *κακόν* seems to be intended, though it can scarcely be translated into English: "in *well* doing let us not show an *ill* heart."

ἐγκακῶμεν ["*turn towards, lose heart*": *ἐγκακεῖν* or *ἐνκακεῖν* is the correct word in the New Testament, not *ἐκκακεῖν*. It is read persistently in a few of the best MSS., though in all six passages where it occurs *ἐκκακεῖν* is found as a various reading; see the note on 2 Thess. iii. 13, *καιρῷ ἰδίῳ*] "*at its proper season*," i.e. the regular time for harvest; comp. 1 Tim. ii. 6; vi. 15; Tit. i. 3.

10. *ὡς καιρὸν ἔχομεν*] "*as we find a seasonable time, as opportunity presents*." The *καιρὸς* here answers to the *καιρὸς* of the former verse. There is a time for sowing as there is a time for harvest. 'Ως is perhaps best translated as above.

There is, however, no objection to rendering it "*while we have time*"; comp. e.g. John xii. 35 *ὡς τὸ φῶς ἔχετε* (as it is read in the best MSS.) Ignat. (?) *Smyrn.* § 9 *ὡς ἔτι καιρὸν ἔχομεν*, [Clem. Rom.] ii. 8 *ὡς οὖν ἔσμεν ἐπὶ γῆς*. The distinction is introduced by translation; the original *ὡς* covers both meanings.

μὴ ἐκλύεσθαι ["*if we faint not*," as husbandmen overcome with heat and fatigue. Comp. James v. 7. For *ἐκλύεσθαι* comp. 1 Macc. iii. 17; Matt. xv. 32; Mark viii. 3. On the synonymes here used, Bengel remarks: *ἐκκακεῖν* [rather *ἐγκακεῖν*] est in *vella*, *ἐκλύεσθαι* est in *posse*." To this it may be added that *ἐκλύεσθαι* is a consequence of *ἐγκακεῖν*; the prostration of the powers following on the submission of the will.

τοὺς οἰκείους κ.τ.λ.] "*the members of the household of the faith*": compare Ephes. ii. 19 *συνπολιταὶ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ οἰκεῖοι τοῦ Θεοῦ*. Similarly the church is elsewhere spoken of as the *house* of God; 1 Tim. iii. 15; 1 Pet. iv. 17; comp. 1 Pet. ii. 5; Hebr. iii. 6. We need not therefore hesitate to assign this meaning to *οἰκεῖοι* here. Comp. Clem. Rec. p. 45 l. 31 (Syr). In this case *τῆς πίστεως* will probably be nearly equivalent to *τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*; see above, p. 344. On the other hand, *οἰκεῖός τινος* is not an uncommon phrase in profane writers for "*acquainted with*" e.g. *φιλοσοφίας, γεωγραφίας, ὀλιγαρχίας, τυραννίδος, τρυφῆς*; see the passages in Wetstein: but this sense would be insipid here.

11. At this point the apostle takes the pen from his amanuensis, and the concluding paragraph is written with his own hand. From the time when letters began to be forged in his name (2 Thess. ii. 2; iii. 17), it seems to have been his practice to close with a few

¹¹ Ἴδετε πηλίκους ὑμῖν γράμμασιν ἔγραψα τῇ ἐμῇ χειρί. ¹² ὅσοι θέλουσιν εὐπροσωπῆσαι ἐν σαρκί, οὗτοι ἀναγκάζουσιν ὑμᾶς

words in his own handwriting as a precaution against such forgeries. Frequently he confined himself to adding the final benediction (2 Thess. iii. 17, 18), with perhaps a single sentence of exhortation, as "If any one love not the Lord Jesus Christ, etc." (1 Cor. xvi. 21-24), or "Remember my bonds" (Col. iv. 18). In the Epistle to the Romans he seems to have appended the ascription of praise which reads like a postscript (xvi. 25-27). In the present case he writes a whole paragraph, summing up the main lessons of the Epistle in terse, eager, disjointed sentences. He writes it too in large bold characters, that his handwriting may reflect the energy and determination of his soul (see above, p. 70). To this feature he calls attention in the words which follow.

[Ἴδετε κ.τ.λ.] "*Look you in what large letters I write with mine own hand.*" In the English version the words are translated "*How large a letter I have written with mine own hand.*" It is true, indeed, that γράμματα sometimes signifies "a letter" (Acts xxviii. 21; 1 Mace. v. 10; comp. Ignat. (?) *Polyc.* 7; *Clem. Rom.* xii. 10), and therefore πηλικά γράμματα might mean "how long a letter"; but on the other hand it seems equally clear that γράμμασιν γράφειν "to write *with letters*" cannot be used for γράμματα γράφειν "to write *a letter*." On this account the other interpretation must be preferred. But what is the apostle's object in calling attention to the handwriting? Does he, as Chrysostom and others have supposed, point to the rude, ill-formed characters in which the letter was written, as though he gloried in his imperfect knowledge of Greek? But where is there any mention of rudeness of form? and is it at all probable that St. Paul who had received a careful education at Jerusalem and at Tarsus, the great centres of Jewish and of Greek

learning, should have betrayed this child-like ignorance, and even gloried in it? Or again, does he, as others imagine, refer to the physical difficulties under which he was laboring, the irregularity of the handwriting being explained by his defective eyesight or by his bodily suffering? But here again πηλίκους denotes size only, not irregularity; and altogether this explanation is forced into the passage from without, nor does the sentence in this case contain the key to its own meaning. Theodore of Mopsuestia has caught the point of the expression, explaining it, ἄγαν μείζουσιν ἐχρήσατο γράμμασιν ἐμφαίνων ὅτι οὔτε αὐτὸς ἐρυθριᾷ οὔτε ἀρνείται τὰ λεγόμενα. The boldness of the handwriting answers to the force of the apostle's convictions. The size of the characters will arrest the attention of his readers in spite of themselves.

ὑμῖν] Its right place is after πηλίκους, though a few MSS. have transposed the words. Standing therefore in this position, it cannot well be taken with ἔγραψα, "I write" or "I wrote *to you*"; but is connected rather with πηλίκους, which it emphasizes, "how large, *mark you*"; see e.g. Plat. *Theat.* p. 143 ε ἀκούσαι πᾶν ἄξιον ὅφρ ὑμῖν τῶν πολιτῶν μειρακίῳ ἐντετύχηκα.

ἔγραψα] "*I write,*" the epistolary aorist, conveniently translated by a present. According to the view here adopted, it marks the point at which St. Paul takes the pen into his own hand. For other instances of this epistolary ἔγραψα see Philem. 19, 21; 1 Pet. v. 12; 1 John ii. 14, 21, 26; v. 13; comp. ἐπέστειλα, Heb. xiii. 22. The objection, that the aorist cannot be so used except at the close of a letter and in reference to what goes before, seems to be groundless; for (1) it fails to recognize the significance of the epistolary aorist, the explanation of the past tense

περιτέμεσθαι, μόνον ἵνα τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μὴ διώκωνται.
 13 οὐδὲ γὰρ οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι αὐτοὶ νόμον φυλάσσουν, ἀλλὰ

being that events are referred to *the time at which the letter is received*: (2) There are clear instances of the past tense used as here, e.g. in *Mart. Polyc.* § 1, ἐγράψαμεν ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὰ κατὰ τοὺς μαρτυρήσαντας, these words occurring immediately after the opening salutation; comp. ἐπεμψα, Acts xxiii. 30; 2 Cor. ix. 3; Eph. vi. 22; Col. iv. 8. The usage of the epistolary past (the imperfect and pluperfect) is still more marked in Latin, and is clearly explained by Madvig, *Gr.* § 345. Thus ἔγραψα in no way prejudices the question whether the whole letter or the last paragraph only was written by St. Paul.

12, 13. "Certain men have an *object* in displaying their zeal for carnal ordinances. These are they who would force circumcision upon you. They have no sincere belief in its value. Their motive is far different. They hope thereby to save themselves from persecution for professing the cross of Christ. For only look at their inconsistency. They advocate circumcision, and yet they themselves neglect the ordinances of the law. They would make capital out of your compliance; they would fain boast of having won you over to these carnal rites."

It was not against bigotry alone that St. Paul had to contend; his opponents were selfish and worldly also; they could not face the obloquy to which their abandonment of the Mosaic ordinances would expose them; they were not bold enough to defy the prejudices of their unconverted fellow-countrymen. And so they attempted to keep on good terms with them by imposing circumcision on the Gentile converts also, and thus getting the credit of zeal for the law. Even the profession of Jesus as Messiah by the Christians was a less formidable obstacle to their intercourse with the Jews than their abandonment of the law.

12. εὐπροσώπησαι κ.τ.λ.] "*to show fair in the flesh*," i.e. "to make a pretensions display of their religion in outward ordinances." The emphasis seems to lie as much on εὐπροσώπησαι as on ἐν σαρκί, so that the idea of *insincerity* is prominent in the rebuke. Thus the expression is a parallel to our Lord's comparison of the whited sepulchres, οἵτινες ἔξωθεν φαίνονται ἁραῖοι (Matt. xxiii. 27). The adjective εὐπρόσωπος is not uncommon in classical Greek, and generally has this sense, "specious, plausible," e.g. Demosth. p. 277, λόγους εὐπρόσωπους καὶ μύθους συνθεῖς καὶ διεξελθών. The verb εὐπροσώπιζεν (?) occurs in Symmachus, Ps. cxli. 6.

ἐν σαρκί] "*in the flesh*," i.e. in external rites. It has been taken by some as equivalent to σαρκικοί ὄντες; but, besides that this interpretation is harsh in itself, ἐν σαρκί here cannot well be separated from ἐν τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ σαρκί of the following verse.

μόνον ἵνα] seemingly elliptical: "only (their object in doing so is) that they may not," etc. See the note on ii. 10.

τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ] not as it is sometimes taken, "with the sufferings of Christ," but "for professing the cross of Christ." A comparison with ver. 14 and v. 11 seems to place this beyond a doubt. The cross of Christ and the flesh are opposed, as faith and works. They are two antagonistic principles, either of which is a denial of the other. For the dative of the *occasion*, compare Rom. xi. 20, 30; 2 Cor. ii. 13.

διώκωνται] The reading διώκονται, however well supported, can only be regarded as a careless way of writing διώκωνται. In the same way in ver. 9 many texts read ἐργαζόμεθα for ἐργαζόμεθα; compare Rom. v. 1, ἔχομεν and ἔχαμεν.

13. οὐδὲ γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] "*for even the*

ἐξουσιῶν ὑμᾶς περιτέμνεσθαι, ἵνα ἐν τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ σαρκὶ καυχῶνται. ¹⁴ ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχᾶσθαι, εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ

advocates of circumcision themselves do not keep the law." The allusion here is not to the impossibility of observing the law, the distance from Jerusalem, for instance, preventing the due sacrifices, for this would argue no moral blame; but to the *insincerity* of the men themselves, who were not enough in earnest to observe it rigorously.

οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι] "*the circumcision party, the advocates of circumcision.*" See the apt quotation from the apocryphal book, *Act. Petr. et Paul.* § 63 (p. 28, ed. Tisch.), where Simon says of the two apostles, οὗτοι οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι πανούργοι εἰσιν, to which St. Paul replies, πρὸ τοῦ ἡμᾶς ἐπιγινῶναι τὴν ἀλήθειαν σαρκὸς ἔσχομεν περιτομήν· ὅτε δὲ ἐφάνη ἡ ἀλήθεια, ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ περιτομή καὶ περιτεμνόμεθα καὶ περιτέμνομεν; and compare the somewhat similar classical usage in the expression οἱ βέοντες, *Plat. Theat.* p. 181 A. See the note i. 23. If this interpretation be correct, the present tense leaves the question open whether the agitators were converted Jews or converted proselytes. The former is more probable; for proselytes would not be so dependent on the good opinion of the unconverted Jews. The balance of authority is perhaps in favor of reading *περιτεμνόμενοι* rather than *περιτετμημένοι*, as the versions which have a present tense may safely be urged in favor of the former, while those which have a past cannot with the same confidence be alleged to support the latter; but, independently of external authority, a preference must be given to *περιτεμνόμενοι*, as probably the original reading of which *περιτετμημένοι* is so obvious a correction.

νόμον] "They are no rigorous observers of law," regarded as a principle. On the absence of the article, see the references in the note on v. 18.

ὑμᾶς, ὑμετέρᾳ] opposed to αὐτοῖς;

"Indifferent themselves, they make capital out of *you*."

ἐν τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ κ.τ.λ.] i.e. that they may vaunt your submission to this carnal rite, and so gain credit with the Jews for proselytizing. *Comp. Phil. iii. 3, καυχώμενοι ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἐν σαρκὶ πεποιθότες.*

14. "For myself—God forbid I should glory in anything save in the cross of Christ. On that cross I have been crucified to the world, and the world has been crucified to me. Henceforth we are dead each to the other. In Christ Jesus old things have passed away. Circumcision is not, and uncircumcision is not. All external distinctions have vanished. The new spiritual creation is all in all."

μὴ γένοιτο] with the infinitive. This is the common construction in the LXX, *Gen. xlv. 7, 17; Josh. xxii. 29; xxiv. 16; 1 Kings xxi. 3; 1 Mace. ix. 10; xiii. 5.*

ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ] Again, not "in my sufferings for Christ" (2 Cor. xii. 9, 10), but "in his sufferings for me" (*Plal. iii. 3*). The offence of the cross shall be my proudest boast.

ἐγὼ σὺ] probably refers to σταυρῷ: "The cross of Christ is the instrument of my crucifixion, as of his; for I am crucified with him" (ii. 20). If the relative had referred to Χριστῷ, we should have expected rather ἐν ᾧ or σὺν ᾧ. For the same image as here, compare *Col. ii. 14, αὐτὸ ἤρκεν ἐκ τοῦ μέσου προσηλώσας αὐτὸ τῷ σταυρῷ* (i.e. it was nailed with Christ to the cross, and rent as his body was rent); and for the general purport of the passage, *Col. ii. 20: "If ye died with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as if living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances?"* This κόσμος, the material universe, is the sphere of external ordinances.

κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται καὶ γὰρ κόσμῳ. ¹⁵ οὔτε γὰρ περιτομή τι ἔστιν οὔτε ἀκροβυστία, ἀλλὰ καινὴ κτίσις. ¹⁶ καὶ ὅσοι τῷ κανόνι τούτῳ στοιχήσουσιν, εἰρήνην

Some texts insert the article before *κόσμος* and *κόσμῳ*—before either or both. It should be expunged in both places with the best MSS. The sentence thus gains in terseness.

15. This verse has been variously lengthened out and interpolated from the parallel passage, v. 6. Some of these interpolations have very considerable MS. authority. The reading adopted is the shortest form, and doubtless represents the genuine text.

οὔτε γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] In this annihilation of the world all external distinctions have ceased to be. This sentence occurs again, v. 6 and 1 Cor. vii. 19, in substantially the same words.

Nevertheless, this passage is said by several ancient authors (Photius, *Ampel.* Qu. 183; G. Syncellus, *Chronogr.* p. 27; see also Cotel. on *Apost. Const.* vi. 16; Cod. Bodl. Aethiop. p. 24) to be a quotation from the "Revelation of Moses." A sentiment, however, which is the very foundation of St. Paul's teaching was most unlikely to have been expressed in any earlier Jewish writing, and, if it really occurred in the apocryphal work in question, this work must have been either written or interpolated after St. Paul's time; see Lücke, *Uebers. d. Jobann.* i p. 232. Cedrenus (*Hist. Comp.* p. 4) states that the Revelation of Moses was identified by some persons (φασί τινες) with the "Little Genesis." This latter title is another name for the Book of Jubilees, which of late years has been discovered in an Ethiopic translation. In the Book of Jubilees, however, the words in question do not occur; see Ewald's *Jahrb.* iii. p. 74.

καινὴ κτίσις] "a new creature." Compare the parallel passage, 2 Cor. v. 17, *εἴ τις ἐν Χριστῷ, καινὴ κτίσις*. This phrase, *καινὴ κτίσις*, בריה חדשה, is a

common expression in Jewish writers for one brought to the knowledge of the true God. See the passages in Schöttgen, i. p. 704. The idea of spiritual enlightenment as a creating anew appears also in *παλιγγενεσία* "regeneration"; see also Eph. iv. 24, *καὶ νῦν ἄνθρωπον κτισθέντα*; comp. Eph. ii. 10, 15; Col. iii. 10; and 2 Cor. iv. 16, *ἀνακαινοῦσθαι*.

16. "On all those who shall guide their steps by this rule may peace and mercy abide; for they are the true Israel of God."

ὅσοι] "as many as; no matter whether they are of the circumcision or of the uncircumcision."

στοιχήσουσιν] "shall walk." This reading is to be preferred to *στοιχοῦσιν*, both as having somewhat higher support and as being slightly more difficult. It is at the same time more expressive, as implying the *continuance* of this order. Compare ii. 16; Rom. iii. 30; and see Winer, § xl. p. 280.

τῷ κανόνι τούτῳ] "by this line," corresponding to the meaning of *στοιχεῖν*. *Κανὼν* is the carpenter's or surveyor's line by which a direction is taken. In 2 Cor. x. 13, 16, it is used metaphorically, where the image is taken from surveying and mapping out a district, so as to assign to different persons their respective parcels of ground. For the several senses through which this word has passed, and for its ecclesiastical meaning especially, see Westcott on the *Canon*, App. A, p. 541 sqq. On the dative see the notes, v. 16, 25; comp. Phil. iii. 16 *τῷ αὐτῷ στοιχεῖν*, where *κανόνι* is interpolated in some texts from this passage.

καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ κ.τ.λ.] "yea upon the Israel of God." Israel is the sacred name for the Jews, as the nation of the Theocracy, the people under God's cov-

ἐπ' αὐτοὺς καὶ ἔλεος, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ Θεοῦ. ¹⁷ τοῦ λοιποῦ κόπους μοι μηδεὶς παρεχέτω· ἐγὼ γὰρ τὰ στίγματα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματί μου βαστάζω.

enant: see Trench's *N. T. Syn.* 1st ser. § xxxix., and compare Eph. ii. 12 ἀπῆλλοτριωμένοι τῆς πολιτείας τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ. Rom. ix. 4 οἵτινές εἰσιν Ἰσραηλίται, ὧν ἡ νιοθεσία κ.τ.λ. (comp. 2 Cor. xi. 22; Phil. iii. 5), John i. 48 ἶδε ἀληθῶς Ἰσραηλῆτης, compared with ver. 50 σὺ βασιλεὺς εἶ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ. St. Paul is perhaps referring here to the benediction εἰρήνῃ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ, which closes Psalm cxxv., cxxviii., and must have been a familiar sound in the ears of all devout Israelites.

The "Israel of God" is in implied contrast to the "Israel after the flesh" (1 Cor. x. 18); comp. Rom. ix. 6 οὐ γὰρ πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ οὗτοι Ἰσραὴλ, Gal. iii. 29; Phil. iii. 3. It stands here not for the faithful converts from the circumcision alone, but for the spiritual Israel generally, the whole body of believers whether Jew or Gentile; and thus καὶ is *epexegetic*, i.e. it introduces the same thing under a new aspect, as in Heb. xi. 17, etc.; see Winer. § liii. p. 437.

17. St. Paul closes the epistle as he had begun it, with an uncompromising assertion of his office; "Henceforth let no man question my authority: let no man thwart or annoy me. Jesus is my Master, my Protector. His brand is stamped on my body. I bear this badge of an honorable servitude."

τοῦ λοιποῦ] "henceforth," differs from τὸ λοιπόν, as "in the time to come," from "throughout the time to come." Compare νυκτός and νύκτα. In the New Testament it occurs only here and Eph. vi. 10, where, however, the received reading is τὸ λοιπόν.

τὰ στίγματα] "the brands," i.e. the marks of *ownership* branded on his body. These στίγματα were used; (1) In the case of *domestic slaves*. With these, however, branding was not usual, at least

among the Greeks and Romans, except to mark such as had attempted to escape, or had otherwise misconducted themselves, hence called στίγματιαι, "literati" (see the ample collection of passages in Wetstein), and such brands were held a badge of disgrace; Pseudo-Phocyl. 212 στίγματα μὴ γράψῃς ἐπονειδίζων θεράποντα. (2) *Slaves attached to some temple* (ιερόδουλοι) or persons devoted to the service of some deity were so branded: Herod. ii. 113 ὅτεφ' ἀνθρώπων ἐπιβάληται στίγματα ἰρὰ ἑωυτὸν δίδους τῷ θεῷ, οὐκ ἔξεστι τούτου ἄψασθαι, Lucian. *de dea Syr.* § 59 στίζονται δὲ πάντες οἱ μὲν ἐς καρπὸς οἱ δὲ ἐς αὐχένas; Philo *de mon.* ii. p. 221 M; comp. 3 Macc. ii. 29. The passage of Lucian is a good illustration of Rev. xiii. 17. (3) *Captives* were so treated in very rare cases. (4) *Soldiers* sometimes branded the name of their commander on some part of their body; see Jac. Lydus *de re milit.* p. 27 sqq. The metaphor here is most appropriate, if referred to the second of these classes. Such a practice at all events cannot have been unknown in a country which was the home of the worship of Cybele. A ἱερὸς δοῦλος is mentioned in a Galatian inscription, Texier, *Asie Mineure*, i. p. 135.

The brands of which the apostle speaks were doubtless the permanent marks which he bore of persecution undergone in the service of Christ; comp. 2 Cor. iv. 10 τὴν νέκρωσιν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι περιφέροντες, xi. 23. See the Introduction, p. 56.

Whether the stigmata of St. Francis of Assisi can be connected by any historical link with a mistaken interpretation of the passage, I do not know. Bonaventura, in his life of this saint (§ 13, 4), apostrophizes him in the language of St. Paul, "Jam enim propter stigmata Domini Jesu quae in corpore

¹⁸ Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοί. ἀμήν.

tuo portas, nemo debet tibi esse molestus"; and the very use of the word "stigmata" (which is retained untranslated in the Latin Versions) points to such a connection. On the other hand, I am not aware that this interpretation of the passage was current in the age of St. Francis. A little later Aquinas paraphrases the words, "protabat insignia passionis Christi," but explains this expression away in the next sentence.

Ἰησοῦ] So it is read in the majority of the older MSS. All other variations, including the received reading τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, are inferior, for the personal name of the owner alone is wanted.

βαστάζω] St. Chrysostom has prob-

ably caught the right idea, οὐκ εἶπεν ἔχω ἀλλὰ βαστάζω ὥσπερ τις ἐπὶ τροπαίῳ μέγα φρονῶν. Compare the use of περιφέροντες in 2 Cor. iv. 10 already quoted. For βαστάζω see Acts ix. 15.

18. μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν] "with your spirit"; probably in reference to the carnal religion of the Galatians, as Chrysostom suggests. This allusion, however, must not be pressed, for the same form of benediction occurs in Philem. 25; 2 Tim. iv. 22.

ἀδελφοί] "brothers," in an unusual and emphatic position; comp. Philem. 7. St. Paul's parting word is an expression of tenderness; "Ita mollitur," says Bengel, "totius epistolae severitas." See the note on vi. 1.

NOTES.

I. ST. PAUL'S SOJOURN IN ARABIA.

A VEIL of thick darkness hangs over St. Paul's visit to Arabia. Of the scenes among which he moved; of the thoughts and occupations which engaged him while there; of all the circumstances of a crisis which must have shaped the whole tenor of his after life, absolutely nothing is known. "Immediately," says St. Paul, "I went away into Arabia." The historian passes over the incident without a mention. It is a mysterious pause; a moment of suspense in the apostle's history; a breathless calm, which ushers in the tumultuous storm of his active missionary life.

Yet it may be useful to review the speculations to which this incident has given rise, even though we cannot hope to arrive at any definite result; for, if such a review bears no other fruit, it will at least bring out more clearly the significance of the incident itself.

Of the place of the apostle's sojourn various opinions have been held. Arabia is a vague term, and affords scope for much conjecture.

1. The Arabic translator,¹ whose language gives him a fictitious claim to a hearing on such a point, renders the passage "Immediately I went to El Belka." In like manner, in Gal. iv. 25 he translates, "This Hagar is Mount Sinai in El Belka, and is contiguous to Jerusalem." Now the only district, so far as I can discover, which bears or has borne the name of El Belka, is the region lying to the east and northeast of the Dead Sea.² If so, how are we to account for this translation of Ἀραβία by El Belka? That the same rendering of the word in both passages arose from the translator's connecting them

¹ The Arabic version of the Polyglotts, which was made directly from the Greek. The translator not unfrequently gives geographical comments. See Hug, *Einleit.* § cix. l. p. 431. The other Arabic

version, the Erpenian, translated from the Syriac, retains "Arabia."

² See Burckhardt, *Trav. in Syria*, App. iii; Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xii. p. 426 sqq.; Stanley's *Sinai and Palestine*, pp. 95, 319.

together in some way, can scarcely be doubted. Was his starting-point, then, a misapprehension of the meaning of *συνστοιχῇ* in the second passage, which he renders "is contiguous to,"¹ and arguing from this, did he suppose that part of Arabia to be meant in both passages, which was nearest to Jerusalem? Or, on the other hand, did he start from some tradition of St. Paul's preaching in "El Belka," and having thus defined from the first passage the meaning of "Arabia," did he apply it to the second passage also? But in any case, how could he talk of Mount Sinai in "El Belka"? Was this ignorance of geography? or must we resort to the improbable supposition that some wandering Arab tribe, which gave its name to the country in the neighborhood of the Dead Sea, at one time occupied the region about Sinai? At all events the tradition here preserved about St. Paul, if it be a tradition, is of little worth, as the translator seems to have lived at a comparatively late date.²

2. Arabia, in the widest use of the term, might extend to the gates of Damascus, and even include that city itself. "You cannot any of you deny," says Justin, arguing against his Jew as to the interpretation of a passage in one of the prophets, "that Damascus belongs, and did belong, to Arabia, though now it has been assigned to Syrophœnicia."³ Thus no very distant journey would be necessary to reach Arabia. A retirement in the immediate neighborhood of Damascus would suffice, and such a visit, especially if it were brief, might well be passed over by the historian as a merely temporary interruption of the apostle's long residence in that city, which was unknown to him, or which knowing, he did not care to record. Into these wild regions, then,

¹ For this rendering, however, he might plead the authority of several ancient commentators. See the notes, pp. 278, 279.

² Hug, i. e. states that the translator has unexpectedly revealed his country by his rendering of Acts ii. 10, τὰ μέρη τῆς Λιβύης τῆς κατὰ Κυρήνην, "and the territories of Africa, which is our country." There can scarcely be a doubt, however, that here كورنا, "our country" is a corrupt reading of كورينا, "Cyrene," the change involving only a slight alteration in one letter. See De Lagarde *de N. T. ad vers. Orient. fidem edendo*,

Berl. 1857, p. 3, referred to in Bleek's *Eint.* p. 737. Such geographical notices as that of El Belka point to a more eastern origin.

³ *Dial. c. Tryph.* p. 305 A. See also other authorities in Conybeare and Howson, i. pp. 117, 118. Tertullian (*adv. Jud.* c. 9 and *adv. Marc.* iii. 13) obviously copies Justin, and must not be considered an independent authority. The words of Justin εἰ καὶ νῦν προσενέχεται τῇ Συροφονικῇ λεγομένῃ seem to refer to the arrangement of these provinces by Hadrian. See Becker and Marquardt, *Rom. Alterth.* iii. 1. p. 195 sqq. and comp. Bardesanes *de Fato*, Cureton's *Spicil. Syr.* p. 30.

beyond the sway of Roman dominion, beyond the reach of civilization, far away from all his old haunts and associations, it is thought that the apostle plunged himself in the first tumult of his newly-acquired experiences.¹

This explanation, however, is open to objection. It gives to "Arabia" an extension, which at all events seems not to have been common, and which even the passage of Justin shows to have required some sort of justification. It separates the Arabia of the first chapters from the Arabia of the fourth. And lastly, it deprives this visit of a significance which, on a more probable hypothesis, it possesses in relation to this crisis of St. Paul's life.

3. For if we suppose that the apostle at this critical moment betook himself to the Sinaitic peninsula, the scene of the giving of the law, then his visit to Arabia becomes full of meaning. He was attracted thither by a spirit akin to that which formerly had driven Elijah to the same region.² Standing on the threshold of the new covenant, he was anxious to look upon the birthplace of the old, that, dwelling for a while in seclusion in the presence of "the mount that burned with fire," he might ponder over the transient glories of the "ministration of death," and apprehend its real purpose in relation to the more glorious covenant which was now to supplant it. Here, surrounded by the children of the desert, the descendants of Hagar the bondwoman, he read the true meaning and power of the law.³ In the rugged and barren region whence it issued he saw a fit type of that bleak desolation which it created, and was intended to create, in the soul of man. In the midst of such scenes and associations his spirit was attuned to harmony with his divine mission, and fitted to receive fresh "visions and revelations of the Lord." Thus in the wilderness of Sinai, as on the Mount of the transfiguration, the three dispensations met in one. Here Moses had received the tables of the law amid fire and tempest and thick darkness. Here, again, Elijah,

¹ See the instructive passage in Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Isr.* vi. p. 398. Ewald, however, though he takes St. Paul into this region, guards against the objections which I have alleged in the text, by supposing him to travel as far as Sinai, also (p. 400).

² 1 Kings xix. 8-18. It is worth noticing that this region is connected with Damascus in the history of Elijah as well as of St. Paul; "Go, return on

thy way to the wilderness of Damascus" (ver. 15).

³ A stronger argument for St. Paul's visit to Sinai might be drawn from his reference to Hagar, the supposed Arabic name of Sinai (Gal. iv. 25), which he was not likely to have heard anywhere but on the spot; comp. Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 50. But the reading and the interpretation alike are highly doubtful. See the notes there.

the typical prophet, listened to the voice of God, and sped forth refreshed on his mission of righteousness. And here, lastly, in the fulness of time, St. Paul, the greatest preacher of him of whom both the law and the prophets spoke, was strengthened and sanctified for his great work, was taught the breadth as well as the depth of the riches of God's wisdom, and transformed from the champion of a bigoted and narrow tradition into the large-hearted apostle of the Gentiles.¹

What was the length of this sojourn, we can only conjecture. The interval between his conversion and his first visit to Jerusalem, St. Paul here states to have been three years. The notices of time in St. Luke are vague, but not contradictory to this statement.² From Damascus St. Paul tells us he went away into Arabia, whence he returned to Damascus. St. Luke represents him as preaching actively in this city after his conversion, not mentioning, and apparently not aware, of any interruption, though his narrative is not inconsistent with such. It seems probable, then, that St. Paul's visit to Arabia took place early in this period, before he commenced his active labors.³ "Immediately," he says, "instead of conferring with flesh and blood, I went into Arabia." The silence of the historian is best accounted for on the supposition that the sojourn there was short: but as St. Luke's companionship with the apostle commenced at a much

¹ The significance of Sinai, as the holy place of inspiration, will be felt by readers of Tancred.

² The notices of time in the narrative of the Acts are these: He remained with the disciples in Damascus *some days* (*ἡμέρας τινάς*) and *straightway* (*εὐθέως*) he began to preach (*ἐκήρυσσεν*) and Saul was the more strengthened and when *many days* (*ἡμέραι ἱκαναί*) were accomplished (*ἐπληροῦντο*) the Jews took counsel to slay him, in consequence of which he left and went to Jerusalem (ix. 20-26). *Ἡμέραι ἱκαναί* is an indefinite period in St. Luke, which may vary according to circumstances; Acts ix. 43; xviii. 18; xxvii. 7. Certainly the idea connected with *ικανός* in his language is that of largeness rather than smallness; comp. Luke vii. 12; Acts xx. 37 (*ικανὸς κλαυθμός*). In the LXX. it is frequently employed to translate מְרִיב "mighty" e.g. Ruth i. 20, 21. Again the wide use of the Hebrew מְרִיב,

which St. Luke is copying, allows of almost any extension of time. Hence *πολλαὶ ἡμέραι* in the LXX. denotes any indefinite period, however long; Gen. xxxvii. 34; 2 Sam. xiv. 2; 1 Kings iii. 11 ("a long life"). Even Demosthenes, *de Cor.* p. 258, can speak of the interval between the battles of Iliartus and Corinth as *οὐ πολλὰ ἡμέραι*, though they were fought in different years, and many important occurrences happened in the mean time. The difference between the vague "many days" of the Acts and the definite "three years" of the Epistle is such as might be expected from the circumstances of the two writers.

³ It must in this case be placed before the notice of his active preaching, ix. 20 καὶ εὐθέως κ.τ.λ. Some have put it later and seen an indirect allusion to it in the expression μάλλον ἐνεδυναμοῦτο, ver. 22; but there is no trace of a chronological notice in these words, and such an allusion is scarcely natural.

later date, no great stress must be laid on the omission. Yet, on the other hand, there is no reason for supposing it of long duration. It was probably brief—brief enough not to occupy any considerable space in the apostle's history, and yet not too brief to serve the purpose it was intended to serve.

For can we doubt that by this journey he sought seclusion from the outer world, that his desire was to commune with God and his own soul amid these hallowed scenes, and thus to gather strength in solitude for his active labors? His own language implies this: "I conferred *not with flesh and blood*, but departed into Arabia." The fathers for the most part take a different view of this incident. They imagine the apostle hurrying forth into the wilds of Arabia, burning to impart to others the glad tidings which had so suddenly burst upon himself. "See how fervent was his soul," exclaims Chrysostom; "he was eager to occupy lands yet untilled; he forthwith attacked a barbarous and savage people, choosing a life of conflict and much toil."¹ This comment strikes a false note. Far different at such a crisis must have been the spirit of him, whose life henceforth was at least as conspicuous for patient wisdom and large sympathies as for intense self-devotion. He retired for a while, we may suppose, that,

"Separate from the world, his breast
Might duly take and strongly keep
The print of heaven."²

And what place more fit for this retirement than that holy ground,

"Where all around, on mountain, sand, and sky,
God's chariot-wheels have left distinctest trace."³

¹ Similarly also Victorinus, Hilary, Theodore Mops., Theodoret, Primasius, and the Oecumenian commentator. Some of the Latin fathers might have been helped to this view, by a curious blunder, arising out of the Latin translation "*non acquievi carni et sanguini*," "I did not *rest in* flesh and blood," which Victorinus explains, "Omnino laboravi carnaliter," adding "*Caro enim et sanguis homo exterior totus est*." Tertullian, however, *de resurr. carn.* c. 50, quotes the passage, "*statim non retulerit ad carnem et sanguinem*," explaining it, "*id est ad circumcisionem, id est ad Judaismum*." Jerome supposes that St. Paul preached in Arabia, but that his preaching was unsuccessful. His

comment is curious. Why, he asks, is this visit to Arabia, of which we know nothing, which seems to have ended in nothing, recorded at all? It is an allegory from which we must extract a deep meaning. Arabia is the Old Testament. In the law and the prophets St. Paul sought Christ, and having found him there, he returned to Damascus, "*hoc est ad sanguinem et passionem Christi*." So fortified, he went to Jerusalem, "*locum visionis et pacis*." This interpretation is doubtless borrowed from Origen.

² *Christian Year*, 13th Sunday after Trinity; said of Moses.

³ *Christian Year*, 9th Sunday after Trinity; said of Elijah.

II. ST. PAUL'S FIRST VISIT TO JERUSALEM.

The visit to Jerusalem mentioned at the close of the first chapter of this Epistle is doubtless the same with that recorded in the ninth chapter of the Acts.¹ Whatever difficulties seem to stand in the way of our identifying them, the fact that in each narrative this is stated to have been St. Paul's first appearance in Jerusalem since his conversion, and to have followed after a sojourn in Damascus, must be considered conclusive. Nor, indeed, is there any inconsistency in the two narratives. Though they contain but few incidents in common, they for the most run parallel with each other; and even in particulars in which there is no coincidence, there is at least no direct contradiction. On the other hand, the *aspect* of events presented in the two accounts is confessedly different. And this will almost always be the case in two independent narratives. In the case of St. Paul and St. Luke this divergence is due to two causes:

First. The different *position* of the two writers; the one deriving his information at second-hand, the other an eye-witness and an actor in the scenes which he describes. In such cases the one narrator will present rather the external view of events, while the other dwells on their inner history, on those relations especially which have influenced his own character and subsequent actions; the former will frequently give broad and general statements of facts, where the latter is precise and definite.

Secondly. The different *objects* of the two writers. The one sets himself to give a continuous historical account; the other introduces incidents by way of allusion, rather than of narrative, singling out those especially which bear on the subject in hand. In the particular instance before us, it is important to observe this divergence of purpose. St. Luke dwells on the change which had come over Saul, transforming the persecutor of the gospel into the champion of the gospel. St. Paul asserts his own independence, maintaining that his intercourse with the leaders of the church of the circumcision had been slight. The standing-point of the historian is determined by the progress of events, that of the apostle by the features of the controversy. Thus, occupying different positions, they naturally lay stress each on a different class of facts, for the most part opposite to, though not inconsistent with, each other.

¹ ix. 26-30. Compare St. Paul's later reference to this residence at Jerusalem, Acts xxii. 17-21.

The narratives may best be compared by considering the incidents under two heads:

1. *St. Paul's intercourse with the apostles.* The narrative of the Acts relates that when St. Paul visited Jerusalem he was regarded with suspicion by the disciples; that Barnabas introduced him to the "the apostles," relating the circumstances of his conversion and his zeal for the gospel when converted; and that after this he moved about freely in their company. These are just the incidents which would strike the external observer as important. On the other hand, St. Paul says nothing of Barnabas. His relations with Barnabas had no bearing on the subject in hand — his obligations to the apostles of the circumcision. In all that relates to that subject he is precise and definite, where the author of the Acts is vague and general. He states the exact time of his sojourn — fifteen days. He mentions by name the members of the apostolate whom alone he saw — Peter, in whose house he resided, and James, to whom, as the head of the church, he would naturally pay a visit. This is sufficient to explain the account of his "going in and out" with the apostles in the Acts, though the language of the historian is not what would have been used by one so accurately informed as the apostle himself. It is probable that the other apostles were absent on some mission similar to that of Peter to Lydda and Joppa which is recorded just after (ix. 32-43); for there were at this time numberless churches scattered throughout "Judea and Galilee and Samaria" (ix. 31) which needed supervision.

2. *St. Paul's intercourse with the Jewish church at large.* At first sight there appears to be a wide difference between the two accounts. St. Luke tells of his attempting to "join himself to the disciples," of his "going in and out," of his "speaking boldly in the name of the Lord Jesus, and disputing," while St. Paul himself states that he was unknown by face unto the churches of Judea." Yet, on examining the narratives more closely, this discrepancy is reduced to very narrow limits. St. Luke confines his sojourn especially to Jerusalem, and his preaching to a small section of unbelievers, not the genuine Jews, but the Hellenists.¹ He relates, moreover, that St. Paul's visit terminated abruptly,² owing to a plot against his life, and that he was hurried off to Caesarea, whence he forthwith embarked. To a majority, therefore, of the Christians at Jerusalem he *might*, and to the churches of Judea

¹ ix. 28. The restrictions ἐν [or εἰς] Ἱερουσαλήμ and πρὸς τοὺς Ἑλληριστάς are the more noticeable, in that they interfere with the leading feature of St. Luke's nar-

rative, the publicity of Saul's conversion.

² ix. 29. Compare Acts xxii. 18, "Make haste, and get thee quickly out of Jerusalem."

at large he *must*, have been personally unknown. But, though the two accounts are not contradictory, the impression left by St. Luke's narrative needs correcting by the more precise and authentic statement of St. Paul.

III. THE NAME AND OFFICE OF AN APOSTLE.

The word *ἀπόστολος* in the first instance is an adjective, signifying "despatched" or "sent forth." Applied to a person, it denotes more than *ἄγγελος*. The "apostle" is not only the messenger, but the delegate of the person who sends him. He is entrusted with a mission, has powers conferred upon him.¹ Beyond this the classical usage of the term gives no aid towards understanding the meaning of the Christian apostolate. Its special sense, denoting "a naval expedition, a fleet despatched on foreign service," seems to have entirely superseded every other meaning in the Attic dialect; and in the classical Greek of a later period also, except in this sense, the word appears to be of very rare occurrence.

A little more light, and yet not much more, is thrown on the subject by the use of the term among the Jews. It occurs but once in the LXX., in 1 Kings xiv. 6, as a translation of מַלְאָכִים, where it has the general sense of a messenger, though with reference to a commission from God.² With the later Jews, however, and it would appear also with the Jews of the Christian era, the word was in common use. It was the title borne by those who were despatched from the mother city by the rulers of the race on any foreign mission,³ especially such

¹ It occurs of a person in Herod. i. 21; v. 38. With this exception, no instances are given in the Lexicons of its use by classical authors even of a late date with any other but the Attic meaning; nor have I succeeded in finding any myself, though Hesychius explains *ἀπόστολος*: στρατηγὸς κατὰ πλοῦν πεμπόμενος. This is probably an instance where the Attic usage has ruled the literary language, the word having meanwhile preserved in the common dialect the sense which it has in Herodotus, and which reappears in the LXX. and New Testament and in the official language of the Jews. See the note on *κατηχεῖν*, vi. 6, p. 298; see also my notes on the Epistle to the Philippians: *πτύρεσθαι* (i. 28); *γογγυσμός* (ii. 14).

² It was also used by Symmachus to translate מַלְאָכִים in Isa. xviii. 2; see below. The word *ἀποστολή* occurs in a few passages in the LXX., and *ἀποστελλω* is the common translation of מַלְאָכִים. Justin, therefore (*Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 75, p. 300 D), is so far justified in saying that the prophets are called apostles, καὶ ἄγγελοι καὶ ἀπόστολοι τοῦ Θεοῦ λέγονται οἱ ἄγγελοι τὰ παρ' αὐτοῦ ἀποστελλόμενοι προφηταί λέγει γὰρ ἐκεῖ ὁ Ἡσαΐας: ἀποστεῖλ ὁν με. The Syriac renders *ἀπόστολος* by the word corresponding to the Hebrew.

³ Such, for instance, as the bearers of the instructions contemplated in Acts xxviii. 21, οὔτε γράμματα περὶ σοῦ ἐδεξάμεθα ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας οὔτε παραγενόμενός τις τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἀπήγγειλεν.

as were charged with collecting the tribute paid to the temple service.¹ After the destruction of Jerusalem the "apostles" formed a sort of council about the Jewish patriarch, assisting him in his deliberations at home, and executing his orders abroad.² Thus, in designating his immediate and most favored disciples "apostles," our Lord was not introducing a new term,³ but adopting one which from its current usage would suggest to his hearers the idea of a highly responsible mission.⁴

At the first institution of the office the apostles were twelve in number. According to the prevailing view this limit was strictly observed; an exception, however, being made in the case of St. Paul. Nay, so far has the idea of this restriction of number been carried by some, that they hold the election of Matthias to have been a hasty and ill-advised act, and to have been subsequently reversed by an

Eusebius (*Montf. Coll. Nov.* ii. 425), evidently thinking of this passage, says: ἀποστόλους δὲ εἰσέτι νῦν ἔθος ἔστιν Ἰουδαίοις ὀνομάζειν τοὺς ἐγκύκλια γράμματα παρὰ τῶν ἀρχόντων αὐτῶν ἐπικομιζομένους. The passage in Isaiah xviii. 1, 2, which is read in the LXX., Οὐαὶ . . . ὁ ἀποστέλλων ἐν θαλάσῃ ὕμνηρα καὶ ἐπιστολὰς βιβλίνας ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος, and in which for ὕμνηρα Symmachus had ἀποστόλους, was interpreted to refer to these "apostles" of the Jews who instigated the people against the Christians; and some even thought that in the words following, πορεύσονται γὰρ ἄγγελοι κούφῳ πρὸς ἔθνος κ.τ.λ., the true apostles were referred to in contrast with the false. See Procopius, in *Isaiam*, l. c., and Eusebius, l. c. The LXX. version is entirely wrong, and the comment worthless in itself, but it affords a valuable illustration of St. Paul's references to the "false apostles," and especially to the commendatory letters, 2 Cor. iii. 1. See also Jerome, *Comm. ad Gal.* i. 1, "Usque hodie a patriarchis Judaeorum apostolos mitti," etc.

¹ See Cod. Theodos. xvi. *Tit.* viii. 14, "Superstitionis indignae est, ut archisynagogi sive presbyteri Judaeorum vel quos ipsi apostolos vocant, qui ad exigendum aurum atque argentum a patriarcha certo tempore diriguntur," etc.,

with the learned comment of J. Gothofred. The collection of this tribute was called ἀποστολή, Julian, *Epist.* 25, τὴν λεγομένην παρ' ὑμῖν ἀποστολὴν κωλυθῆναι.

² See the important passage in Eriphanius, *Haer.* xxx. p. 128, τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς ἀξιωματικῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐναρίθμιος ἦν. εἰσὶ δὲ οὗτοι μετὰ τὸν πατριάρχην ἀπόστολοι καλούμενοι, προσεδρεύουσι δὲ τῷ πατριάρχῃ κ.τ.λ.; and p. 134, συμβέβηκε . . . γέρας τῷ Ἰωσήφῳ τῆς ἀποστολῆς δοῦναι τὴν ἐπικαρπίαν· καὶ μετ' ἐπιστολῶν οὗτος ἀποστέλλεται εἰς τὴν Κιλικίαν γῆν, κ.τ.λ.

³ There is no direct evidence, indeed, that the term was in use among the Jews before the destruction of Jerusalem; but it is highly improbable that they should have adopted it from the Christians, if it had not been current among them before; and, moreover, Christian writers speak of this Jewish apostolate as an old institution which still lingered on.

⁴ Our Lord himself is so styled, Heb. iii. 1, "The apostle and high-priest of our profession"; the best comment on which expression is Jno. xvii. 18: "As thou hast sent (ἀπέστειλας) me into the world, even so have I also sent (ἀπέστειλα) them into the world." Comp. Justin, *Apol.* i. c. 63, pp. 95 D, 96 c.

interposition of God, St. Paul being substituted in his place.¹ It is needless to say that the narrative of St. Luke does not betray the faintest trace of such a reversal. And with regard to the general question, it will, I think, appear that neither the canonical Scriptures nor the early Christian writings afford sufficient ground for any such limitation of the apostolate.

In the Gospels the word "apostle is of comparatively rare occurrence. Those whom it is customary with us to designate especially "the apostles," are most often entitled either generally "the disciples," or more definitely "the twelve." Where the word does occur, it is not so used as to lend any countenance to the idea that it is in any way restricted to the twelve. In St. Matthew it is found once only, and there it is carefully defined, "the *twelve* apostles" (x. 2). In St. Mark, again, it occurs in one passage alone, where it has a special reference to the act of *sending them forth* (vi. 30, οἱ ἀπόστολοι, compare ἀποστέλλειν, verse 7). In St. John, likewise, it appears once only, and there in its general sense of a messenger, a delegate, without any direct reference to the twelve (xiii. 16). St. Luke uses the word more frequently, and, indeed, states explicitly that our Lord gave this name to the twelve,² and in his Gospel it is a common designation for them. But, if we are disposed to infer from this that the title was in any way restricted to them, we are checked by remembering that the same evangelist elsewhere extends it to others — not to Paul only, but to Barnabas also.³

In the account of the foundation of the apostolate, then, and in the language used in the Gospels of the twelve, there is no hint that the number was intended to be so limited. It is true that twelve is a typical number, but so is seven also. And if the first creation of the diaconate was not intended to be final as regards numbers, neither is there any reason to assume this of the first creation of the apostolate. The qualification for, and the nature of, the office in the latter case necessarily imposed a severer limit than in the former, but otherwise they stand on the same footing with respect to an increase in their numbers. The twelve were primarily the apostles of the circumcision, the representatives of the twelve tribes.⁴ The extension of the church

¹ See Schaff, *History of the Apostolic Church*, ii. p. 194.

² Luke vi. 13, ἐκλεξάμενος ἀπ' αὐτῶν δώδεκα οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν.

³ Acts xiv. 4, 14. The word ἀπόστολος occurs seventy-nine times in the

New Testament, and of these sixty-eight instances are in St. Luke and St. Paul.

⁴ ἀποστολή occurs four times only, thrice in St. Paul and once in St. Luke.

⁵ Matth. xix. 28; Luke xxii. 30; comp. Barnab. § 8, οὓσιν δεκάδ'ο εἰς μαρτύριον

to the Gentiles might be accompanied by an extension of the apostolate. How far this extension was carried, it may be a question to consider; but the case of St. Paul clearly shows that the original number was broken in upon. In the figurative language of the Apocalypse, indeed, the typical number twelve still remains.¹ But this is only in accordance with the whole imagery of the book, which is essentially Jewish. The church there bears the name of Jerusalem. The elect are sealed from the twelve tribes, twelve thousand from each. It would be as unreasonable to interpret the restriction literally in the one case, as in the other. The "twelve apostles of the Lamb" in the figurative language of St. John represent the apostolate, perhaps the general body of Christian pastors, as the elect of the twelve tribes represent the elect of Christendom.

And, as a matter of fact, we do not find the term apostle restricted to the twelve with only the exception of St. Paul.² St. Paul, himself, seems in one passage to distinguish between "the twelve" and "all the apostles," as if the latter were the more comprehensive term (1 Cor. xv. 5, 7). It appears, both there and in other places,³ that James the Lord's brother is styled an apostle. On the most natural interpretation of a passage in the Epistle to the Romans, Andronicus and Junias, two Christians, otherwise unknown to us, are called

τῶν φυλῶν ὅτι δεκαδύο αἱ φυλαὶ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. See Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph.* 42, p. 260 c. An Ophite writing represented the twelve as actually taken from the twelve tribes; Hippol. *Haer.* v. 8, p. 109.

¹ Rev. xxi. 14, "And the walls of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb."

² Those instances are here disregarded, where the term is used in the sense of an apostle or delegate of a church, e.g. the brethren (2 Cor. viii. 23, ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν) and Epaphroditus (Phil. ii. 25, ἑμῶν δὲ ἀπόστολος). Such persons are not spoken of as apostles of Christ. Yet this free use of the term seems to show, that it had not such a rigid and precise application as is generally supposed.

³ In 1 Cor. xv. 7, "After that he was seen of James, then of all the apostles," St. Paul certainly appears to include James among the apostles. See note p.

227, on Gal. i. 19, where he is apparently so entitled. In 1 Cor. ix. 5, ἄς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Κηφᾶς, it seems probable that St. Paul is singling out certain apostles in "the brethren of the Lord" as well as in "Cephas," whether we suppose λοιποὶ to be used in distinction to the persons thus specified, or to Paul and Barnabas who are mentioned just after. Still it is a question which of the "brethren of the Lord" are meant. Jude is said to have been married (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 20), but he seems to disclaim for himself the title of an apostle (Jude 17, 18). Whether Hegesippus (Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 23) considered James as an apostle or not, may be questioned: his words are, Διαδέχεται δὲ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν μετὰ τῶν ἐποστόλων ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ κυρίου Ἰάκωβος (comp. Acts v. 29). The Clementines seem certainly to exclude him, as do also the *Apost. Const.* viii. 46. See below note 1, p. 323.

distinguished members of the apostolate, language which indirectly implies a very considerable extension of the term.¹ In 1 Thess. ii. 6 again, where, in reference to his visit to Thessalonica, he speaks of the disinterested labors of himself and his colleagues, adding "though *we* might have been burdensome to you, being *apostles* of Christ," it is probable that under this term he includes Silvanus, who had labored with him in Thessalonica, and whose name appears in the superscription of the letter.²

But, if some uncertainty hangs over all the instances hitherto given, the apostleship of Barnabas is beyond question. St. Luke records his consecration to the office as taking place at the same time with, and in the same manner as, St. Paul's (Acts xiii. 2, 3). In his account of their missionary labors again, he names them together as "apostles," even mentioning Barnabas first (Acts xiv. 4, 14). St. Paul, himself, also in two different epistles holds similar language. In the Galatian

¹ Rom. xvi. 7, Ἀσπάσασθε Ἀνδρόνικον καὶ Ἰουνίαν τοὺς συγγενεῖς μου καὶ συναίχμαλώτους μου, οἵτινές εἰσιν ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, οἱ καὶ πρὸ ἐμοῦ γέγοναν ἐν Χριστῷ. Except to escape the difficulty involved in such an extension of the apostolate, I do not think the words οἵτινές εἰσιν ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις would have been generally rendered, "who are highly esteemed by the apostles." The Greek fathers took the more natural interpretation. Origen says, "Possible est et illud intelligi quod fortassis ex illis septuaginta duobus qui et ipsi apostoli nominati sunt, fuerint;" Chrysostom still more decisively, τὸ ἀποστόλους εἶναι μέγα· τὸ δὲ ἐν τοῦτοις ἐπισήμους εἶναι, ἐννόησον ἡλικὸν ἐγκώμιον, and similarly Theodoret. In this case Ἰουνίαν (or Ἰουνίαν) is probably a man's name, Junias contracted from Junianus, as it is taken by Origen (*on Rom.* xvi. 21, T. iv. p. 682 D, and especially on xvi. 39, *ib.* p. 686 E) and by several modern critics. Chrysostom, however, in spite of his interpretation, considers that it is a woman's name; βαβαί, πόση τῆς γυναικὸς ταύτης ἡ φιλοσοφία, ὡς καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ἀξιωθῆναι προσηγορίας.

² Not Timothy, though Timothy also had been with him at Thessalonica, and

his name, like that of Silvanus, is joined to the apostle's own in the opening salutation. But Timothy is distinctly excluded from the apostolate in 2 Cor. i. 1; Col. i. 1, "Paul an apostle and Timothy the brother;" and elsewhere, when St. Paul links Timothy's name with his own, he drops the title of apostle, e.g. Phil. i. 1, "Paul and Timotheus, *servants* of Jesus Christ."

In 1 Cor. iv. 9, "I think that God hath set forth us the apostles last," etc., he might seem to include Apollos who is mentioned just before, ver. 6. But Apollos is distinctly excluded from the apostolate by one who was a contemporary, and probably knew him. Clement of Rome, § 47, speaking of the dissensions of the Corinthians in St. Paul's time, says, προσεκλήθητε ἀποστόλοις μεμαρτυρημένοις (i.e. St. Peter and St. Paul) καὶ ἀνδρὶ δεδοκιμασμένῳ παρ' αὐτοῖς (Apollos). If, therefore, there is a reference in 1 Cor. iv. 9 to any individual person besides St. Paul (which seems doubtful), I suppose it to be again to Silvanus, who had assisted him in laying the foundation of the Corinthian church (2 Cor. i. 19). For the circumstance which disqualified Apollos and Timotheus from being apostles, see below, p. 226.

letter he speaks of Barnabas as associated with himself in the apostleship of the Gentiles (ii. 9); in the first to the Corinthians he claims for his fellow-laborer all the privileges of an apostle, as one who, like himself, holds the office of an apostle, and is doing the work of an apostle (ix. 5, 6). If, therefore, St. Paul has held a larger place, than Barnabas, in the gratitude and veneration of the church of all ages, this is due not to any superiority of rank or office, but to the ascendancy of his personal gifts, a more intense energy and self-devotion, wider and deeper sympathies, a firmer intellectual grasp, a larger measure of the Spirit of Christ.¹

It may be added also, that only by such an extension of the office could any footing be found for the pretensions of the false apostles (2 Cor. xi. 13; Rev. ii. 2). Had the number been definitely restricted, the claims of these interlopers would have been self-condemned.

But, if the term is so extended, can we determine the limit to its extension? This will depend on the answer given to such questions as these: What was the nature of the call? What were the necessary qualifications for the office? What position did it confer? What were the duties attached to it?

The facts gathered from the New Testament are insufficient to supply a decisive answer to these questions; but they enable us to draw roughly the line, by which the apostolate was bounded.

(i.) The apostles comprised the *first order* in the church (1 Cor. xii. 28, 29; Ephes. iv. 11). They are sometimes mentioned in connection with the prophets of the old dispensation,² sometimes with the prophets of the new.³ It is in the latter sense that the church is said to be built "on the foundation of the apostles and prophets." The two orders seem to have been closely allied to each other in the nature of their spiritual gifts, though the apostle was superior in

¹ In the printed texts of *Clem. Rec.* i. 60 Barnabas is identified with Matthias, and thus made an apostle, without extending the number beyond twelve; "Post quem Barnabas qui et Matthias qui in locum Judæ subrogatus est apostolus." But the correct reading is doubtless "Barsabas," which is found in the MS. in Trinity College Library at Cambridge, as well as in several mentioned by Cotelier. Thus the account is a confused version of the incident in the Acts. The Syriac translation strangely enough has "Barabbas" in two places.

² Luke xi. 49; 2 Pet. iii. 2, and so perhaps Rev. xviii. 20; compare Polye. § 6.

³ Ephes. ii. 20; iii. 5. That the "prophets" in these passages are to be so understood, appears, (1) from the order, the apostles being named before the prophets; (2) from the expression in Ephes. iii. 5 *ὡς ν ὁ ν ἀπεκαλύφθη τοῖς ἁγίοις ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ προφήταις*. It is in this same epistle also (iv. 11) that the prophets are directly mentioned as the next order to the apostles in the Christian church.

rank, and had administrative functions which were wanting to the prophet.

(ii.) In an important passage (1 Cor. ix. 1, 2), where St. Paul is maintaining his authority against gainsayers and advancing proofs of his apostleship, he asks, "Have I not seen the Lord Jesus Christ? Are not ye our work in the Lord?" It would appear then:

First, that the having seen Christ was a necessary condition of the apostolic office. It may be urged, indeed, that St. Paul is here taking the ground of his Judaizing opponents, who affected to lay great stress on personal intercourse with the Lord, and argues that even on their own showing he is not wanting in the qualifications for the apostleship. This is true. But independently of St. Paul's language here, there is every reason for assuming that this was an indispensable condition (Luke xxiv. 48; Acts i. 8). An apostle must necessarily have been an eye-witness of the resurrection. He must be able to testify from direct knowledge to this fundamental fact of the faith. The two candidates for the vacant place of Judas were selected, because they possessed this qualification of personal intercourse with the Saviour, and it is directly stated that the appointment is made in order to furnish "a witness of his resurrection" (Acts i. 21-23). This knowledge, which was before lacking to St. Paul, was supplied by a miraculous interposition, so as to qualify him for the office. All the others, who are called, or seem to be called, apostles in the New Testament, may well have satisfied this condition. Andronicus and Junias were certainly among the earliest disciples (Rom. xvi. 7), and may have seen the Lord, if not while his earthly ministry lasted, at all events, during the forty days after the resurrection. Barnabas was a well-known and zealous believer in the first days of the Christian church (Acts iv. 36), and is reported to have been one of the seventy. James and the other brethren of the Lord were, at least, so far qualified. Silas also, who was a leading man in the church of Jerusalem (Acts xv. 22), might well have enjoyed this privilege.

On the other hand, it is not probable that this qualification was possessed either by Apollos or by Timothy, who were both comparatively late converts, and lived far away from the scenes of our Lord's ministry, the one at Alexandria (Acts xviii. 24), the other at Lystra (Acts xvi. 1, 2). And to these, as has been pointed out, the name of an apostle is indirectly denied, though from their prominent position in the church, and the energy and success of their missionary labors, they of all men, after St. Paul and the twelve, might seem to lay claim to this honorable title.

But, though it was necessary that an apostle should have been an eye-witness of the Lord's resurrection, it does not follow that the actual *call to the apostleship* should come from an outward, personal communication with our Lord, in the manner in which the twelve were called. With Matthias it certainly was not so. The commission in his case was received through the medium of the church. Even St. Paul himself, seems to have been invested with this highest office of the church in the same way. His conversion, indeed, may be said, in some sense, to have been his call to the apostleship. But the actual investiture, the completion of his call, as may be gathered from St. Luke's narrative, took place some years later at Antioch (Acts xiii. 2). It was then, at length, that he, together with Barnabas, was set apart by the Spirit acting through the church, for the work to which God had destined him, and for which he had been qualified by the appearance on the way to Damascus. Hitherto, both alike, are styled only "prophets." From this point onward both alike are "apostles."

But *secondly*, in the passage already referred to, St. Paul lays much more stress on his possessing the powers of an apostle, as a token of the truthfulness of his claims. "If I be not an apostle to others," he says to the Corinthians, "at least I am to you." Their conversion was the seal of his apostleship (1 Cor. ix. 2). In another passage he speaks in like manner of his having wrought the *signs* of an apostle among them (2 Cor. xii. 12). The signs, which he contemplates in these passages, our modern conceptions would lead us to separate into two classes. The one of these includes moral and spiritual gifts—patience, self-denial, effective preaching; the other comprises such powers as we call supernatural, "signs, wonders, and mighty deeds." St. Paul himself, however, does not so distinguish them, but with more of reverence, regards them rather as different manifestations of "one and the self-same Spirit."

But essential as was the possession of these gifts of the Spirit to establish the claims of an apostle, they seem to have been possessed, at least in some degree, by all the higher ministers of the church, and, therefore, do not afford any distinctive test, by which we are enabled to fix the limits of the apostleship.

Such, then, is the evidence yielded by the notices in the New Testament—evidence which, if somewhat vague in itself, is sufficient to discountenance the limitation of the apostolate in the manner generally conceived.

And such, for the most part, is the tendency of the notices found in

Christian writers of the ages immediately following. They use the term, indeed, vaguely and inconsistently, sometimes in a narrower, sometimes in a wider sense, than the New Testament writings would seem to warrant; but on the whole the impression is left from their language, that no very rigid limitation of the office was present to their minds.

The allusions in the writings of the apostolic fathers are for the most part too general to build any inference upon. They all look upon themselves as distinct from the apostles.¹ Several of them include St. Paul by name in the apostolate. Clement, moreover, speaks of the apostles as having been sent forth by Christ himself (§ 42), and in another passage he obviously excludes Apollos from the number.² More important, however, as showing the elasticity of the term, is a passage in Hermas, where he represents the "apostles and teachers" under one head, as forty in number,³ selecting this doubtless as a typical number in accordance with the figurative character of his work.

Writers of the subsequent ages are more obviously lax in their use of the title. At a very early date we find it applied to the seventy, without, however, placing them on the same level with the twelve. This application occurs even in Irenaeus and Tertullian,⁴ the earliest extant writers who dwell on this or kindred subjects. About the same time Clement of Alexandria not only calls Barnabas an apostle, but confers the title on Clement of Rome also.⁵ Philip the Evangelist,

¹ Clem. § 42; Ignat. *Rom.* § 4; Polye. § 6; Barnab. §§ 5, 8; *Ep. ad Diogn.* § 11.

² § 47. See above, note 2, p. 318. Eusebius, iii. 39, infers that Papias distinguished Aristion and John the Presbyter, who had been personal disciples of the Lord, from the apostles. This may be so; but from his language as quoted it can only be safely gathered that he distinguished them from the twelve.

³ Hermas, *sim.* ix. 15, 16; comp. *vis.* iii. 5; *sim.* ix. 25. The data with regard to the age of Hermas are (1) that he was a contemporary of Clement (*vis.* ii. 4), and (2) that his work was written while his brother Pius was bishop of Rome (circ. 140). *Fragm. Murat.* in Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* i. p. 396. He cannot therefore have been the Hermas mentioned by St. Paul (*Rom.* xvi. 14), as several ancient writers suppose.

⁴ Iren. ii. 21, 1; Tertull. *adv. Marc.* iv. 24, "Adlegit et alios septuaginta apostolos super duodecim," referring for an illustration of the numbers to Exod. xv. 27, "And they came to Elim, where were twelve wells of water, and three-score and ten palm-trees." See also Origen quoted above, p. 318. In the Gospel the seventy are not indeed called "apostles," but the verb ἀποστέλλειν is applied to them, and they are spoken of as "seventy others" (Luke x. 1), in reference to the mission of the twelve. In the *Ancient Syriac Documents*, edited by Cureton, this extension is distinctly and repeatedly given to the term; e.g. p. 3, "Thaddaeus the apostle, one of the seventy;" p. 34, "Addaeus the apostle, one of the seventy-two apostles."

⁵ For Barnabas, see *Strom.* ii. pp. 445, 447 (ed. Potter); for Clement of Rome,

is so styled by many early writers; but in some instances, at least, he has been confused with Philip, one of the twelve.¹ Origen discusses the term as capable of a very wide application;² and Eusebius, accounting for St. Paul's expression (1 Cor. xv. 7), speaks of "numberless apostles" besides the twelve.³

Nor will it weigh as an argument on the other side, that many writers speak of the twelve as the founders of the church, or argue on the typical significance of this number in the apostolate:⁴ for some of those, who hold this language most strongly, elsewhere use the term apostle in a very extended application; and the rest either distinctly acknowledge the apostolic office of St. Paul, or indirectly recognize his authority by quoting from his writings or endorsing his teaching.

The passages referred to are, I think, sufficient to show that ancient writers, for the most part, allowed themselves very considerable latitude in the use of the title. Lower down than this it is unnecessary to follow the stream of authority. The traditions of later ages are too distant to reflect any light on the usage of apostolic times.

Strom. iv. p. 609. Elsewhere Clement calls Barnabas ἀποστολικός, adding that he was one of the seventy, *Strom.* ii. p. 489.

¹ Even Papias, who had conversed with his daughters, speaks of him as Philip the apostle, if Eusebius (iii. 39) is quoting his exact words, which, however, is very doubtful. In the *Apost. Const.* (vi. 7) he is called Φίλιππος ὁ συναπόστολος ἡμῶν. Polycrates (Euseb. iii. 31) clearly mistakes, and calls him one of the twelve. See the note of Cotelier on the *Apost. Const.* l. c.

² Origen in *Joann.* Tom. iv. p. 430, ed. Delarue.

³ *H. E.* i. 12. Εἴθ' ὡς παρὰ τούτους, κατὰ μίμησιν τῶν δώδεκα πλείστων ὄσων ὑπαρξάντων ἀποστόλων, οἷος καὶ αὐτοῦ ὁ Παῦλος ἦν, προστίθῃσι λέγων· Ἐπειτα ὡφθῇ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις πᾶσι. Comp. Theodoret on 1 Cor. xii. 28. There is, however, no authority for the statement of the latter, 1 Tim. iii. 1, that the order afterwards called bishops were formerly called apostles.

Certain early commentators on Isaiah xvii. 6 saw a reference to fourteen apostles, making up the number by including Paul and Barnabas, or Paul and James

the Lord's brother; see Euseb. in *Is.* xvii. 6, and Hieron. in *Is.* T. iv. pp. 194, 280, ed. Vallarsi. The *Apost. Const.* (viii. 46) recognize thirteen, including St. Paul and excluding St. James. Of really early writings, the Clementine Homilies and Recognitions alone seem to restrict the number to twelve. This restriction served the purpose of the writers, enabling them to exclude St. Paul. At the same time the exclusion of St. James is compensated by assigning to him the title of "bishop of bishops."

⁴ Barnab. § 8, referred to above, p. 222, note 3; Justin, *Dial.* p. 260c; comp. *Apol.* i. p. 78 A, ἀπὸ γὰρ Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἄνδρες δεκαδύο τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἐξήλαθον εἰς τὸν κόσμον: Iren. iv. 21. 3, "dodecastylum firmamentum Ecclesiae," ib. *Fragm.* p. 843 (Stieren); Tertull. *adv. Marc.* iv. 13, asks "Cur autem duodecim apostolos elegit et non alium quemlibet numerum?" and refers in answer to the twelve springs at Elim, the twelve jewels on Aaron's breastplate, etc. Comp. Theodot. *ap. Clem. Alex.* p. 975 (Potter). In *Clem. Hom.* ii. 23 the apostles are compared to the twelve months of the year; comp. *Clem. Recogn.* iv. 35, 36.

IV. VARIOUS READINGS IN GAL. II. 5.

The reading (which is given in the text) οἷς οὐδὲ πρὸς ᾧραν, is doubtless correct. Two variations, however, occur, which deserve notice.

1. The omission of οὐδὲ.

The negative is found in all the Greek uncial MSS. (i.e. in 8 ABC EFGKLP) except D, in which, however, it is inserted by a later hand, and apparently in all or nearly all the Greek cursive MSS. It is expressly mentioned by the Ambrosian Hilary,¹ and by Jerome,² as the reading of the Greek copies. It is found also in the Gothic, Memphitic, both Syriac, and other versions, and was unquestionably the original reading of the Vulgate, as it appears in all the best manuscripts of this version. It was read, moreover, by Marcion,³ Ephraem Syrus, Epiphanius,⁴ Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, the Pseudo-Ignatius,⁵ and perhaps also by Origen,⁶ among the Greeks; and by Ambrose,⁷ Augustine,⁸ Jerome, Pelagius (in his text, though he comments on the other reading), and Primasius, among the Latins.

On the other hand, it is omitted in D (both Greek and Latin), and in the Latin of E; and the text is read without it by the translator of Irenaeus,⁹ by Tertullian,¹⁰ Victorinus, the Ambrosian Hilary, Pelagius (in his commentary), and apparently Sulpicius Severus.¹¹ We have it, moreover, on the authority of Jerome,¹² of Primasius,¹³ and of Sedulius,¹⁴ that the negative was not found in the Latin copies; and the same is implied by the language of the Ambrosian Hilary.

In the face of this testimony, the statement of Victorinus, that it was omitted "in plurimis codicibus et Latinis et *Græcis*," is not worthy of credit. He may, indeed, have found the omission in some Greek MS. or other, but even this is doubtful. No stress can be laid on the casual statement of a writer so loose and so ignorant of Greek.

¹ *ad loc.* "Græci e contra dicunt: Nec ad horam cessimus, et hoc aiant convenire causae," etc.

² *ad loc.* "Juxta Græcos codices est legendum: Quibus neque," etc.

³ Tertull. *adv. Marc.* v. 3.

⁴ *Haer. s.* p. 112 and p. 814.

⁵ *Ep. ad Tars.* § 2.

⁶ Origen, *c. Cels.* vii. 21 (i. p. 709, Delarue), οὐδέποτε ἐν χώρῃ ὑποταγμένος ἀνθρώποις ὡς κρείττων γενόμενος, where the conjecture οὐδὲ πρὸς ᾧραν is possibly correct.

⁷ *Epist.* 37.

⁸ *ad loc.* and *Epist.* lxxxii. (ii. p. 194, ed. Bened.).

⁹ Iren. *Haer. s.* iii. 13, 3.

¹⁰ *adv. Marc.* v. 3.

¹¹ *Dial.* iii. 13, p. 219 B (Migne).

¹² *ad loc.* "Hoc esse quod in codicibus legitur Latinis: Quibus ad horam," etc.

¹³ *ad loc.* "Latinus habet, Quibus ad horam cessimus." Primasius does not himself omit it, as represented in Tisch.

¹⁴ *Magn. Bibl. Vet. Patr.* v. 498, "Male in Latinis codicibus legitur, Quibus ad horam cessimus."

It appears, from these facts, that the omission is due to some Western MS. or MSS. alone. The author of the old Latin version used one of these. And to the old Latin version all, or nearly all, the existing authorities for the omission may be traced. Its absence in the Greek text of D is an exception, unless the charge of Latinizing sometimes brought against this MS. can be substantiated. Irenaeus is also to be accounted for; but in this case the omission may perhaps be ascribed not to the author himself, but to his translator.

A correction, however, would appear to have been made in that rescension which was circulated in North Italy; for the negative is found both in Ambrose and in Augustine, the former of whom used the "Itala" as a matter of course, and the latter by choice.¹

Tertullian, indeed, accuses Marcion of interpolating the negative; but no weight attaches to his assertion. The African father, not finding it in his own Latin copy, and finding it in Marcion's recension, caught at what appeared the simplest way of accounting for the variation. He would not stop to consider whether his own copy was correct. It was enough for him that the text with the negative was more favorable to Marcion's peculiar views than without it. Tertullian makes no appeal to MSS. or external authority of any kind. He argues solely on grounds of internal evidence.

The omission in the first instance is not easily accounted for. It may have been an oversight. Or, possibly, the Latin translator, or the transcriber of the MS. which he used, intentionally left it out, thinking, as some later critics thought, that the sense of the passage or the veracity of the apostle required the omission. At all events, the expedient of dropping the negative as a means of simplifying the sense is characteristic of the Latin copies. For other instances in St. Paul, see Gal. v. 8; Rom. v. 14; 1 Cor. v. 6; [Col. ii. 18]; comp. Jno. vi. 64; ix. 27.²

The omission once made, arguments were not wanting to support it. Tertullian found that the negative vitiated the sense of the passage. He objected to it, moreover, as at variance with history, which showed that St. Paul did yield on occasions: in circumcising Timothy, for instance, and in paying the expenses of those who had taken Nazarite vows. The same arguments are brought forward by Victorinus and the Ambrosian Hilary.³ With much greater justice Jerome maintains that it is required for the sense. But, feeble as were his reasons,

¹ *De Doctr. Christ.* c. 15.

² For these references I am indebted to Reiche, *Commun. Crit.* ii. p. 13.

³ "Litterae enim hoc indicant quia cessit, et historia factum exclamat." The passage is based on Tertullian.

doubtless the authority of Tertullian, and the prejudice thus raised against this as the reading of Marcion, were fatal to its reception with many who otherwise would have conformed to the Greek text.

It is not uninteresting to observe how little influence this important various reading has had on the interpretation of the passage. The omission or insertion of οὐδὲ might have been expected to decide for or against the circumcision of Titus. This, however, is not the case. The Latin Fathers, who left out the negative, generally maintained that he was not circumcised.¹ Several modern critics who retain it hold that he was.

2. The omission of οὐ.

The relative is omitted in some few texts which retain οὐδέ, and retained in some few which want οὐδέ; but for the most part the two are omitted or retained together. Here, again, the Greek texts are as unanimous as in the former case. The obvious motive of this omission is the improvement of the grammar by the removal of a redundant word.

This assumed necessity of altering the text somehow in order to correct the grammar may have been the first step towards the more important omission of the negative.

V. THE LATER VISIT OF ST. PAUL TO JERUSALEM.

The later of the two visits to Jerusalem mentioned in the Epistle has from the earliest times been identified with the visit recorded in Acts xv. This view is taken by Irenaeus,² the first writer who alludes to the subject; and, though it has not escaped unchallenged either in ancient³ or modern days, the arguments in its favor are sufficiently strong to resist the pressure of objections to which it is fairly exposed.⁴

¹ So Victorinus and the Ambrosian Hilary. This is also the opinion of Tertullian (*adv. Marc.* v. 3), if I understand him rightly; though Baur, *Paulus*, p. 122, interprets him differently. The only exception that I have remarked is Pelagius, who, however, has not the same reading in the text as in the notes.

² Iren. iii. 13, 3, "Si quis igitur diligenter ex Actibus Apostolorum scrutetur tempus de quo scriptum est, *ascendi Hierosolymam*, propter praedictam quaestionem, inveniet eos, qui praedicti sunt a Paulo, annos concurrentes,"

etc. So also apparently Tertullian, *adv. Marc.* v. 2, 3.

³ This visit is placed *after* the third in the Acts by Chrysostom, but not further defined. It is identified with the *5th* by Epiphanius, *Haeres.* xxviii. 4, p. 112. The *Chron. Pasch.* (i. p. 435 sq. ed. Dind.) places it after the incidents of Acts xiii. 1-3, and before those of Acts xv., thus apparently interpolating it before the second and third visits of the Acts.

⁴ The view adopted is that of most recent critics. It is well maintained by

I. In support of this view may be urged the positive argument from the striking coincidence of circumstances, and the negative argument from the difficulty of finding any equally probable solution, or, indeed, any probable solution at all besides.

(i.) The later visit of the Galatian Epistle coincides with the third visit of the Acts, when the so-called Apostolic Council was held, in all the most important features. The *geography* is the same. In both narratives the communications take place between Jerusalem and Antioch; in both, the head-quarters of the false brethren are at the former place, their machinations are carried on in the latter; in both, the Gentile apostles go up to Jerusalem, apparently from Antioch, and return thence to Antioch again. The *time* is the same, or, at least, not inconsistent. St. Paul places the events fifteen or sixteen years after his conversion; St. Luke's narrative implies that they took place about the year 51.¹ The *persons* are the same: Paul and Barnabas appear as the representatives of the Gentile churches, Cephas and James as the leaders of the circumcision. The agitators are similarly described in the two accounts: in the Acts, as converted Pharisees who had imported their dogmas into the Christian church; in the Epistle, as false brethren, who attempt to impose the bondage of the law on the Gentile converts. The two apostles of the Gentiles are represented in both accounts as attended. "Certain other Gentiles" (ἐξ αὐτῶν) are mentioned by St. Luke; Titus, a Gentile, is named by St. Paul. The *subject of dispute* is the same — the circumcision of the Gentile converts. The *character of the conference* is in general the same — a prolonged and hard-fought contest.² The *result* is the same — the exemption of the Gentiles from the enactments of the law, and the recognition of the apostolic commission of Paul and Barnabas by the leaders of the Jewish church.

Schott, DeWette, Conybeare and Howson, Jowett, and others. The arguments in favor of the *second* visit of the Acts are best stated by Fritzsche, *Opusc.* p. 223 sqq. The *fourth* visit of the Acts finds its ablest champion in Wieseler, *Galat.* p. 553 sqq. The *fifth* visit has been abandoned by modern critics, as the Epistle was clearly written before that time. Some few, e.g. Paley, *Horæ Paulinae*, ch. v. no. 10, suppose this to be a journey to Jerusalem omitted in the Acts.

¹ This is calculated by a back reckoning of the time spent from the Apostolic Council to the appointment of Festus, the date of which is fixed independently at A.D. 60. See Wieseler, *Chronol.* p. 66 sqq.

² St. Luke's notices are, xv. 2, γενομένης στάσεως καὶ ζητήσεως οὐκ ὀλίγης τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ τῷ Βαρνάβᾳ πρὸς αὐτοὺς, at Antioch; xv. 5, ἐξανέστησαν δέ τινες, at Jerusalem before the congress; xv. 7, πολλῆς δὲ συνζητήσεως γενομένης, at Jerusalem at the congress.

A combination of circumstances so striking is not likely to have occurred twice within a few years.

(ii.) Nor, indeed, can this visit be identified with any other recorded in St. Luke. It has been taken by some, for instance, for the *second* visit of the Acts. To this supposition the date alone is fatal. The second visit of the Acts synchronizes, or nearly so,¹ with the persecution and death of Herod, which latter event happened in the year 44. But at least twelve or thirteen, probably fifteen or sixteen, years had elapsed since St. Paul's conversion before he paid the visit in question. And no system of chronology at all probable will admit of so early a date for his conversion as would thus be required. But, again, according to the narrative of the Acts, St. Paul's apostolic mission commenced *after* the second visit,² whereas the account in the Epistle clearly implies that his apostolic office and labors were well known and recognized before this conference.

More serious objections still lie against identifying it with any later visit in the Acts — the *fourth*, for instance. It is, perhaps, a sufficient answer to such a solution, that St. Paul's connection with Barnabas seems to have ceased before. A more fatal difficulty still would be his silence respecting the third visit, so marked with incidents, and so pregnant with consequences bearing directly on the subject of which he is treating.

II. On the other hand, the identification adopted involves various difficulties, which, however, when weighed, do not seem sufficient to turn the scale. These difficulties are of two classes :

(i.) Discrepancies appearing to exist between the two narratives.

¹ The order of events in St. Luke's narrative is as follows: (1) The notice of St. Paul's setting out from Antioch for Jerusalem, xi. 30; (2) the persecution of Herod, the death of James, and the imprisonment and escape of Peter, xii. 1-19; (3) the death of Herod, and the spread of the word, xii. 20-24; (4) St. Paul's business at Jerusalem, and his departure thence, xii. 25. The narrative itself suggests the motive of this order, which is not directly chronological. Having mentioned in (1) St. Paul's mission to Jerusalem, the writer is led in (2) to describe the condition of the church there, *κατ' ἐκείνον τὸν καιρὸν*. This obliges him to pass on to (3) in order to show that God defeated

the purposes of man, the persecutor dying ignominiously, and the persecuted church continuing to flourish. He then resumes the subject of (1) in (4). Thus it may be assumed, I think, that the church was suffering from Herod's persecutions when St. Paul arrived, but not that Herod was already dead. In other words, the chronological order was probably (2), (1), (4), (3).

² His career as an apostle commences with Acts xiii. He had before this held a subordinate place, and his preaching had been confined to Damascus (ix. 22), Jerusalem (ix. 28), and the neighborhood of Tarsus and Antioch (ix. 30; xi. 25 sqq.; comp. also Gal. i. 21).

On the whole, however, the circumstances of the writers and the different purposes of the narrators seem sufficient to explain the divergences, real or apparent, in the two accounts; and the remarks made in comparing the two records of the former visit apply with even more force to this (see p. 312). The alleged discrepancies are these:

(a) In the Acts St. Paul is represented as sent to Jerusalem by the Christians of Antioch to settle some disputes which had arisen there; in the Epistle he states that he went up by revelation. Here, however, there is no contradiction. The historian naturally records the external impulse which led to the mission; the apostle himself states his inward motive. "What I did," he says, "I did, not owing to circumstances, not as yielding to pressure, not in deference to others, but because the Spirit of God told me it was right." The very stress which he lays on this revelation seems to show that other influences were at work.

The following parallel cases suggest how the one motive might supplement the other.

(a) In Acts ix. 29, 30, it is said, "They went about to slay him, which when the brethren knew, they brought him down to Caesarea, and sent him forth to Tarsus." St. Paul's own account of this incident, Acts xxii. 17 seq., is as follows: "While I prayed in the temple I was in a trance, and saw him saying unto me, Make haste, and get thee quickly out of Jerusalem, for they will not receive thy testimony concerning me." etc.

(β) In Acts xiii. 2-4, the mission of Paul and Barnabas is attributed both to the Holy Spirit and to the church of Antioch: "The Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them; and when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, *they sent them away* (ἀπέλυσαν). So they, being *sent forth by the Holy Ghost* (ἐκπεμφθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος)." etc.

(γ) Acts xv. 28. "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us."

(b) St. Paul speaks of his communications as made to the apostles in private; St. Luke's narrative describes a general congress of the church.

The divergence is due to the different aims of the two writers. St. Paul is dwelling on what he owed, or did not owe, to the twelve. St. Luke describes the results as affecting the interests of the church at large. St. Paul mentions, or rather alludes to, the private history which led to the public transactions—the secret springs, as it were,

which set the machinery in motion. This history can have been but partially known to St. Luke, nor did it lie within his province to record it.

But, in fact, while each narrative thus presents a different aspect of this chapter of history, each also contains indications that the other aspect was recognized, though not dwelt upon, by the writer. The very form of St. Paul's expression, ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς, κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσιν, implies something besides the private conference. The transactions themselves — the dispute about Titus, for instance — involved more or less of publicity; the purpose sought to be attained could scarcely be effected in any other way; and the fragmentary character of the apostles account leaves ample space for the insertion of other incidents besides those given. On the other hand, St. Luke alludes in a general way to conferences and discussions preceding the congress (xv. 4, 5, 6); and the speeches there delivered, the measures there proposed, are plainly the result of much wise forethought and patient deliberation on the part of the apostles.

(c) Again, it is said, the account of St. Luke leaves the impression of perfect and unbroken harmony between St. Paul and the twelve; while St. Paul's narrative betrays, or seems to betray, signs of dissatisfaction with their counsels. In the Acts the leading apostles of the circumcision stand forth as the champions of Gentile liberty; the writer of the Epistle, on the other hand, implies, or appears to imply, that they owed to himself and Barnabas alone their emancipation from the bondage sought to be imposed upon them.

But here, again, the difficulty diminishes when we try to picture to ourselves what was likely to have been the course of events. The articles of the so-called Apostolic Council were "Articles of Peace." To infringe no principle, and yet to quiet opposition, to concede as much as would satisfy one party, and not enough to press heavily on the other, — this was the object to be obtained. Thus the result was a compromise. Long discussions, many misgivings, some differences of opinion, must have arisen on a question so delicate and yet so momentous; and, though the unanimity of the final decision was indeed the prompting of the Holy Ghost, it would be not less contrary to all analogies of the apostolic history, than to all human experience, to suppose that no error or weakness or prejudice had revealed itself in the process. It would seem, moreover, that by the time the congress met St. Paul's work was already done. His large experience, gained in contact with the Gentile churches, had told upon the twelve. If they hesitated at first, as they may have done,

they hesitated now no longer. Opinions in favor of liberal measures towards the Gentiles would come with more force from the leading apostles of the circumcision. His own voice raised in their cause might only inflame the passions of the bigoted, and prejudice the result. So we find that when the council meets Paul and Barnabas confine themselves to narrating the success of their labors among the Gentiles. As regards the matter under dispute, they are entirely passive.

(ii.) More startling, at first sight, than these apparent discrepancies, are the direct omissions of St. Paul, on the supposition that he is speaking of the visit of Acts xv.

(a) Above all, how comes it that, while enumerating his visits to Jerusalem, St. Paul should mention the first and third, and pass over the second recorded in the Acts?

The answer is to be sought in the circumstances under which that visit was paid. The storm of persecution had broken over the church of Jerusalem. One leading apostle had been put to death; another, rescued by a miracle, had fled for his life. At this season of terror and confusion Paul and Barnabas arrived. It is probable that every Christian of rank had retired from the city. No mention is made of the twelve; the salutations of the Gentile apostles are received by "the elders." They arrived charged with alms for the relief of the poor brethren of Judea. Having deposited these in trustworthy hands, they would depart with all convenient speed. Any lengthened stay might endanger their lives. Nor, indeed, was there any motive for remaining. Even had St. Paul purposed holding conferences with the apostles or the church of the circumcision, at this moment of dire distress it would have been impossible.¹ Of this visit, then, so brief and so hurried, he makes no mention here. His object is not to enumerate his journeys to Jerusalem, but to define his relations with the twelve; and on these relations it had no bearing.

¹ St. Luke dismisses this visit in a very few words: xi. 30, ἀποστείλαντες πρὸς τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους διὰ χειρὸς Βαρνάβας καὶ Σαῦλου; xii. 25, Βαρνάβας δὲ καὶ Σαῦλος ὑπέστρεψαν ἐξ Ἱερουσαλὴμ, πληρώσαντες τὴν διακονίαν, συμπαραλαβόντες καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἐπικληθέντα Μάρκον. It seems probable, then, that all the apostles, perhaps even James, were away. Of Peter this is all but directly stated, xii. 17. This inference accords with an ancient tradition, that twelve years was the limit of time pre-

scribed by our Lord for the apostles to remain at Jerusalem. It is mentioned by Apollonius (circ. A.D. 200, ap. Euseb. *II. E.* v. 18, ὡς ἐκ παραδόσεως), and by Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi. p. 762, ed. Potter. The latter gives as his authority, the *Prædicationis Petri*, and quotes the words μετὰ δώδεκα ἔτη ἐξέλθετε εἰς τὸν κόσμον. This carries the tradition back to an early date. On the sequence of events in this portion of the Acts, see above, p. 328, note 1.

(3) The omission of all mention of the apostolic decree is a less considerable difficulty. The purport of the decree itself, and the form of opposition which St. Paul encountered in Galatia, sufficiently explain his silence.¹

(1) The provisions of this decree seem to have been, as I have already mentioned, "Articles of Peace." The apostolic letter was only addressed to the Gentile brethren "in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia" (xv. 23), that is, to the churches more directly in communication with Palestine, and therefore materially affected by the state of feeling and practice among the Jewish Christians. There is no reason for supposing that the decree was intended to be permanent and universal. It was drawn up to meet a special emergency, and its enactments, accordingly, are special. The Gentile apostles seem to have delivered it scrupulously in those churches which had been already founded, and which had felt the pressure of Jewish prejudice (Acts xvi. 4). But in the brotherhoods afterwards formed, and lying beyond the reach of such influences, no notice was taken of it. St. Paul's instructions, for instance, to the Corinthians and to the Romans² entirely ignore one of its provisions, the prohibition against eating meats offered to idols. He speaks of this as a matter of indifference in itself, only important as it affected each man's conscience.

(2) The object of the decree was to *relieve* the Gentile Christians from the burden of Jewish observances. It said, "Concede so much, and we will protect you from further exactions." The Galatians sought no such protection. They were willing recipients of Judaic rights; and St. Paul's object was to show them, not that they need not submit to these burdens against their will, but that they were wrong and sinful in submitting to them.

(3) The power of the apostles of the circumcision and the pre-eminence of the mother church had been unduly and exclusively exalted by the Judaizers in Galatia at the expense of St. Paul's authority. The Epistle to the Galatians is from beginning to end a protest against these exaggerated claims. He refuses to acknowledge any human interference; he takes his stand throughout upon his direct commission from the Lord. By appealing to a decree of a council held at Jerusalem for sanction on a point on which his own decision as an apostle was final, he would have made the very concession which his enemies insisted upon.³

¹ Paley has some good remarks on this decree, *Hor. Paul.* ch. v. § 11. at length in the dissertation on "St. Paul and the Three." See p. 129.

² 1 Cor. x. 27 sqq.; Rom. xiv. 2 sqq. ³ The accounts of this crisis in the apostolic history given by Neander,

VI. PATRISTIC ACCOUNTS OF THE COLLISION AT ANTIOCH.

The conduct of St. Peter at Antioch has been a great stumbling-block, both in ancient and modern times. It has been thought strange that the very apostle to whom was specially vouchsafed the revelation that there is nothing common or unclean, and who only a short time before this meeting at Antioch had declared himself plainly in favor of Gentile liberty, should have acted in a manner so inconsistent with all that had gone before. Accordingly, some have sought to wrest St. Paul's language here, and others have denied the accuracy of the narrative in the Acts. But, in fact, St. Peter's character, as it is drawn in the Gospels, explains every difficulty. It is, at least, no surprise that he who at one moment declared himself ready to lay down his life for his Lord's sake, and even drew his sword in defence of his Master, and the next betrayed him with a thrice-repeated denial, should have acted in this case as we inferred he acted from the combined accounts of St. Luke and St. Paul. There is the same impulsive courage, followed by the same shrinking timidity. And, though St. Paul's narrative stops short of the last scene in this drama, it would not be rash to conclude that it ended as the other had ended, that the revulsion of feeling was as sudden and complete, and that again he went out and wept bitterly, having denied his Lord in the person of these Gentile converts.

The history of the patristic interpretations of this passage is painfully instructive. The orthodox fathers of the early church were sore pressed both by heretics and unbelievers. On the one hand, Ebionite writers, like the author of the Clementines, made it a ground for a personal attack on St. Paul.¹ On the other, extreme Gnostics, such as Marcion, used it to prove the direct antagonism of Christianity to Judaism, as represented by the opposition of the Gentile to the Jewish apostle.² And lastly, Porphyry and other writers availed themselves

Pflanz. i. p. 205 sqq., and de Pressensé, *Trois premiers siècles* 1re série, i. p. 437 sqq., seem to me, on the whole, among the most truthful, preserving a just mean between exaggerations on either side. Other references to important recent works are given in the notes to the dissertation on "St. Paul and the Three." See p. 129. Since the 1st edition of this volume was published I have read the articles of Reuss, *La*

Conférence de Jérusalem, in the *Nouvelle Revue de Théologie*, xii. p. 324, xiii. p. 52. Though they contain many things with which I cannot agree, I gladly recognize the spirit of fairness in which they are written.

¹ See above, p. 66, and the notes on ii. 11, 13.

² Tertull. *adv. Marc.* i. 20, v. 3, *de Præscr.* c. 23; comp. Iren. iii. 12, 15.

of the incident as an engine of assault on Christianity itself, impugning the characters of both apostles in language which the fathers describe as coarse and blasphemous.¹ How were these diverse attacks to be met? Tertullian, arguing against the Marcionites, resisted all temptation to wrest the plain meaning of the passage.² Cyprian and Ambrose, moreover, took it in its obvious sense.³ The same is done also by the commentators Victorinus and Hilary. But the majority of early writers fell into the snare. Two disingenuous explanations were put forward to meet the attacks of heretics and unbelievers; each originating, it would appear, in one of the great fathers of Alexandria, and dividing between them the allegiance of subsequent writers.

1. Clement of Alexandria maintained that the Cephas here mentioned was not the apostle Peter, but one of the seventy disciples bearing the same name. Though the passage itself absolutely excludes such a view, it nevertheless found several adherents, and is mentioned by Eusebius⁴ without condemnation. Even in modern

¹ See esp. Hieron. in *Ep. ad Gal. praef.* (vii. p. 371, ed. Vallarsi): "Volens et illi maculam erroris inurere et huic procacitatis, et in commune fidei dogmatis accusare mendacium, dum inter se ecclesiarum principes discrepent," and p. 410.

² See the passages of Tertullian referred to, p. 333, note 2.

³ Augustin. *ap. Hieron. Op.* T. 1, Epist. cxvi. The passage in Cyprian, to which Augustine appears to refer, is in Epist. 71. At the Council of Carthage, too (held under Cyprian), "Zosimus a Tharassa dixit: Revelatione facta veritatis cedat error veritati, quia et Petrus, qui prius circumcidebat, cessit Paulo veritatem praedicanti"; *Concil. Carthag.* lvi. Cypriani, *Op.* p. 239, ed. Fell.

⁴ Euseb. *H. E.* i. 12, referring to the 5th book of Clement's *Hypotyposeis*. The amount of support that this view obtained may be gathered from Hieron. T. vii. p. 408, "*Sunt qui Cepham . . . non putent Apostolum Petrum*," etc., Chrysost. T. iii. p. 374, *πὺς οὖν τινὲς τὴν ζήτησιν ταύτην ἔλυσαν*, Gregor. Magn. in *Ezech.* Lib. ii. H. 6, "*Sunt vero non-*

nulli qui," etc. Jerome, Chrysostom, and Gregory all show from St. Paul's context how untenable this view is. Claudius Altriss. (ad loc.) simply copies the words of Gregory, and his language must not be taken as evidence of the prevalence of the opinion in his time. Oecumenius, however, or a commentator in the Oecumenian Catena, favors this view, which he incorrectly attributes to Eusebius. On the authority of Clement it became customary to insert the name Cephas in the lists of the seventy disciples, e.g. those ascribed to Hippolytus (ed. Fabricius, T. i. app. p. 42) and to Dorotheus Tyrius (printed in Dindorf's *Chron. Pasch.* ii. p. 120), and that of the *Chron. Pasch.* (i. p. 400, ed. Dind.).

Other attempts, also, were made in the same direction. In the Armenian Calendar Cephas is called a disciple of St. Paul: Sept. 25, "*Apollo et Cephae discipulorum Pauli*," Asseman. *Bibl. Orient.* iii. p. 648. In the Apostolic Constitutions of the Egyptian church he is represented as one of the twelve, but distinguished from Peter (ed. Tatam, p. 2).

times it has been revived,¹ but has not been received with any favor.

2. Origen started the theory² that the dispute between Peter and Paul was simulated. In other words, being of one mind in the matter, they got up this scene that St. Paul might the more effectually condemn the Judaizers through the chief of the apostles, who, acknowledging the justice of the rebuke, set them an example of submission. Thus he, in fact, substituted the much graver charge of dishonesty against both apostles, in order to exculpate the one from the comparatively venial offence of moral cowardice and inconsistency. Nevertheless, this view commended itself to a large number of subsequent writers, and for some time may be said to have reigned supreme.³ It was enforced with much perverse ingenuity and misapplied eloquence by Chrysostom, in his exposition of this epistle, and in a separate homily devoted specially to the subject.⁴ And about the same time that these

¹ By the Jesuit Harduin. See Harduin *Op. Sel.* (Amst. 1709) p. 920. The treatise is entitled "Cephæ a Paulo reprehensum Petrum non esse," a strange specimen of criticism. It provoked replies from Boileau, *Disquisit. Theolog. in Galat.* ii. 10, Paris, 1713; Calmet, *Dissert.* T. iii. p. 519, Paris, 1720; Deyling, *Obs. Sacr.* ii. p. 520, Lips. 1737. The first of these I have not seen; the last two might be called satisfactory, if there were any case on the opposite side.

² Hieron. *Epist.* cxii. T. i. p. 740, "Hanc explanationem quam primus Origenes in decimo Stromateon libro ubi epistolam Pauli ad Galatas interpretatur, et cæteri deinceps interpretes sunt secuti," etc. In an extant work, however (*c. Cels.* ii. 1), where Origen alludes to the incident, there is no trace of this interpretation.

³ See Hieron. *l. c.* In this letter, addressed to Augustine, he defends himself by appealing to the authority of previous writers. He also quotes the passage in his preface to the Galatians, where he mentions that in writing his commentary he has made use, besides Origen, of Didymus of Alexandria, of the Laodicene (*i. e.* Apollinaris), of one Alexander, "an ancient heretic" (see Cave,

Hist. Lit. i. p. 101), of Eusebius of Emesa, and of Theodore of Heraclea. Augustine in reply (Hieron. *Op. Epist.* cxvi. p. 775) understands him to say that the view of Origen was held by all these writers, whom he confesses himself never to have read. In the case of Jerome's master Didymus, however, this seems questionable; for in two passages in his extant works he speaks of St. Peter's conduct as an instance of human infirmity, *de Trin.* ii. 13, p. 168; iii. 19, p. 387. Another of Jerome's masters, also, Gregory Nazianzen, had taken the honest view, attributing St. Peter's error, however, not to cowardice, but to mistaken policy, *Carm.* T. ii. p. 522, ed. Caillaud, ὡς συντράπεζος οὐ καλῶς ἦν ἔθνεσιν, εἰ καὶ τὸδ' ὥστ' ὠφελήσειν τὸν λόγον. Unless his text is here mutilated, Gregory's memory has failed him as to the particular act which called forth St. Paul's rebuke.

Still, there was doubtless a vast array of authorities on Jerome's side. He challenges Augustine to produce a single writer in his favor. Augustine in reply can only name Cyprian and Ambrose.

⁴ The Latin title of this homily is "In illud, in faciem Petro restiti" (iii. p. 362, ed. Ben.). The opinion of

discourses were delivered, it found another independent and equally able advocate in Jerome, who maintained it in his commentary on the Galatians with characteristic vigor. The advocacy of Jerome gave rise to a controversy between the two great Latin fathers, which became famous in the history of the church.¹ Augustine wrote to remonstrate with Jerome. To admit that the two leading apostles conspired to act a lie, he represented, was, in fact, to undermine the whole authority of scripture. He therefore entreated Jerome, like Stesichorus of old, to sing a palinode: adding that the truth of Christendom is incomparably more beautiful than the Helen of Greece, for offending whom the heathen poet had been struck blind.² Jerome replied by another classical allusion. Let Augustine beware of provoking a contest, so he hinted, in which the crushing blows of aged Entellus, if once provoked, might prove more than a match for the youth and nimbleness of Dares.³ In the correspondence which ensued Augustine had much the best of his adversary both in argument and in temper. It closes with a letter from Augustine, in which he exposes Jerome's subterfuges and demolishes his appeal to authority.⁴ The glory of Augustine's victory, however, is somewhat tarnished by a feeble attack made at the same time on those noble labors in biblical criticism which have earned for Jerome the gratitude of after ages.

To this letter of Augustine Jerome seems to have made no reply. His pride had been deeply wounded by the successful assaults of a younger rival, as he regarded Augustine; and a direct confession of wrong could only be expected from a nature more frank and chivalrous than Jerome's. But at a later date he tacitly adopted Augustine's view, and, whether from accident or design, in the same writing, though on a different topic, made honorable mention of his former opponent.⁵ With this sequel the whole controversy, as well in the

Chrysostom is alluded to by Jerome, *Epist.* cxii., and by Augustine in reply, Hieron. *Op. Epist.* cxvi.

¹ An account of this controversy is given in Mühlcr, *Gesammelte Schriften*, p. 1 sqq. For a summary of the points of dispute, see the commentary of Thomas Aquinas on this Epistle. The correspondence itself may be found in any edition of the works either of Jerome or of Augustine. The references here given are to Vallarsi's edition of Jerome. Owing to the extraordinary delay and consequent complication in the corre-

spondence, it is not easy to determine the order of the letters, and in this respect none of the editions which I have consulted seem altogether satisfactory. Augustine discusses the passage again more briefly, *de Manducio*, § 8, T. vi. p. 424.

² Hieron. *Op.* T. i. *Ep.* lxxvii.

³ *Ib.* *Ep.* cii. See Augustine's reply, *Ep.* cx.

⁴ *Ib.* *Ep.* cxvi.

⁵ Hieron. *c. Pelag.* i. 22 (ii. p. 718). This treatise (iii. 19; *ib.* p. 804) ends with an honorable mention of Augus-

nature of the dispute itself, as in the courageous rebuke of the younger father and the humble penitence of the elder, has seemed to some to reflect the original dispute of the apostles at Antioch, and thus to be a striking illustration of and comment on the text out of which it arose.¹

The great name of Augustine seems to have swayed later writers towards the reasonable view of the incident; and from this time forward the forced explanation of Origen finds but little support.² Theodore of Mopsuestia, indeed, a contemporary of the two Latin fathers, does not pretend to arbitrate between their opinions, and perhaps not more than this was to be expected from the friend of Chrysostom. And by Greek commentators even of a later date the false interpretation is once and again revived.³ But in the West the influence of Augustine was more powerful; and it is much to the credit of writers of the Latin church that, even when directly interested in maintaining the supremacy of St. Peter, they for the most part reject this perverted account of the passage, content to draw from it the higher lesson of the paramount claims of truth over respect for rank and office, and to dwell on St. Peter's conduct as a noble example of humility in submitting to rebuke from an inferior in age and standing.⁴

tine, who had written against the same heresy which Jerome is combating. It is just possible that Jerome, while writing this, had in mind the tribute of respect paid to St. Paul in 2 Pet. iii. 15. Other passages in which Jerome has been thought tacitly to surrender his former view are, *adv. Jovin.* i. 15 (ii. p. 264), *c. Rufin.* iii. 2 (ii. p. 532), *Comm. in Philem.* (vii. p. 755); but the inference is scarcely borne out by the passages themselves. Jerome's change of opinion did not escape Augustine, who alludes to it in a letter to Oceanus, *August. Epist.* clxxx. (i. p. 634, ed. Ben.).

¹ e.g. Möhler, *Gesamm. Schr.* p. 18.

² Primasius (c. 550), commenting on this epistle, omits to notice the opinion of Origen and Jerome. Strangely enough the commentary of Theodoret (c. 450) on these verses is wanting in the MSS. What view he took cannot with safety be gathered from the extant

context. It might be inferred, however, from another passage of Theodoret, in *Ezech.* xlviii. 35 (ii. p. 1046, ed. Schulze), that he gave a straightforward explanation of the incident. In the *Dial. de S. Trin.* i. 24, falsely ascribed to Athanasius (*Athanas. Op.* ii. p. 421, ed. Ben.), this is plainly the case, but the ground for attributing this work to Theodoret is very slender indeed; the probable author being Maximus monachus (c. 650).

³ It is maintained by one of the commentators in the Occumenian Catena, and by Theophylact. Both these writers would derive their opinions from Chrysostom, rather than from Jerome.

⁴ See especially Gregor. Magn. in *Ezech.* Lib. ii. Hom. 6, "Quatenus qui primus erat in apostolatus culmine, esset primus et in humilitate," and Pope Agapetus, *Baron. Ann.* sub. ann. 535; comp. Faundus, x. 2 (Gallandi, xi. p. 772).

VII. THE INTERPRETATION OF DEUT. XXI. 23.

This passage occupied an important place in the early controversies between the Christians and the Jews. Partly owing to this circumstance, and partly from the ambiguity of the Hebrew, it was variously interpreted and applied.

The words of the original are **בִּי קָלְלָה אֱלֹהִים הַלֵּלִי**, "for (the) curse of God (is) he that is hanged." The ambiguity arises out of the construction of **אֱלֹהִים**, since the case attached to **קָלְלָה** may denote either the person who pronounces the curse, as Judges ix. 57 (**קָלְלָה יִרְיָה**), and 2 Sam. xvi. 12 (**קָלְלָהִי** in the Q'ri), or the person against whom the curse is pronounced, as Gen. xxvii. 13 (**קָלְלָהֶךָ**); in other words, it represents either a subjective or an objective genitive. As we assign one or other sense, therefore, to the dependent case, we get two distinct interpretations.

1. "He that is hanged is accursed in the sight of God." This is the rendering of the LXX. *κεκατηραμένος. ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ*, adopted in substance, it would appear, by St. Paul, and seems to have obtained the suffrages of the most recent commentators, whatever their opinions. It is certainly supported by a more exact parallel (Judges ix. 57) than the alternative rendering, and seems to suit the context better; for the sense will then be: "Do not let the body hang after sunset; for the hanging body (of a malefactor) defiles the land, since the curse of God rests upon it."

2. The other rendering is, "He that hangeth is a contempt of, a reproach or insult to, God." This seems to have been the popular Jewish interpretation (shared, therefore, by Jewish Christians), at all events from the second century of the Christian era. The passage was so taken by the Jewish or Ebionite translators, Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus.¹ It is explained in this way in the ancient Jewish commentary on Deuteronomy, *Siphri*,² and in the so-called Targum of Jonathan.³ This rendering appeared also in the Ebionite

¹ Jerome on this passage of Galatians gives the rendering of Aquila and Theodotion as "maledictio Dei est suspensus." This is re-translated *κατάρα Θεοῦ* in Bahrds's *Orig. Hexapl.* i. p. 436. But just below, speaking of another writer, Jerome employs the same word, maledictio, to translate *λοιδορία* (see p. 339, note 2), which may therefore have been used by Aquila and Theodotion

also, and is less ambiguous than *κατάρα*. The rendering of Symmachus, as given in Latin by Jerome, was, "Quia propter blasphemiam Dei suspensus est."

² "Qua de causa iste suspenditur? Quia maledixit nomini (Dei)"; see Ugolin. *Thes.* T. xv. p. 766.

³ *קִלְיוֹתָ קֹדֶם אֱלֹהִים לְמַצְלוֹב גִּבּוֹר*, "It is contempt before God to hang a man."

Gospel.¹ And in one of the earliest Christian apologies a Jewish interlocutor brought forward this text, quoting it in the form. "He that hangeth is a reviling of God."² It is found, moreover, in the Peshito-Syriac.³ The same, also, would seem to be the interpretation adopted in the older Targum,⁴ where the passage runs, "Since for what he sinned before God he was hanged," but the paraphrastic freedom of this rendering leaves room for some doubt. Though these writers differ widely from each other as to the meaning to be put upon the words, they agree in their rendering so far as to take אֵלֶּה as the object, not the subject, of כָּלָה.

It may be conjectured that this rendering obtained currency at first owing to the untoward circumstances of the times. Jewish patriots were impaled or crucified as rebels by their masters, whether Syrians or Romans. The thought was intolerable that the curse of God should attach to these. The spirit of the passage, indeed, implied nothing of this kind; but the letter was all powerful in the schools of the day; and a rendering which not only warded off the reproach, but even, if dexterously used, turned it against the persecutor, would be gladly welcomed.⁵ An interpretation started in this way would at length become traditional.⁶

But it was especially in controversies with the Christians, as I have mentioned, that the Jews availed themselves of this passage. In whatever way interpreted, it would seem to them equally available for their purpose. The "offence of the cross" took its stand upon the

¹ At least so I understand the language of Jerome, *l.c.*, "hæc verba Ebion ille hæresiarches semichristianus et semijudaicus ita interpretatus est, ὅτι ὑβρίσ θεοῦ ὁ κρεμáμενος, id est, quia injuria Dei est suspensus."

² Hieron. *l.c.* "memini me in altercatione Iasonis et Papisei quæ Graeco sermone conscripta est ita reperisse, λοιδορία θεοῦ ὁ κρεμáμενος, id est, 'maledictio Dei qui appensus est.'" See below, p. 340, note 1.

³ "Because whosoever blasphemeth God shall be hanged."

⁴ So it may be inferred from a comparison with the translation of Symmachus, of the Peshito, and of the Ebionite Gospel. Otherwise the same meaning might be got from the other rendering, "accursed of God," and so "a sinner in

the sight of God."

⁵ Thus the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan, after rendering the passage as given above, p. 339, note 3, adds, "unless his sins have occasioned it to him." It is possible, however, that this is aimed at Christianity. At all events, it presents a curious contrast to the interpretation of the older Targum.

⁶ See the passages quoted in Schöttgen here. The following is the interpretation of a learned rabbi recently deceased: "L'impiccato è (produce) imprecazione contro Dio (cioè: il lasciare il cadavere esposto lungo tempo alla pubblica vista non può che irritare gli animi, e indurli ad escrare i giudici e le leggi): e (oltracciò) non devi rendere impura la tua terra," etc. — Luzzatto, *Il Pentateuco*, Trieste, 1858.

letter of the lawgiver's language, and counted its position impregnable. Again and again, doubtless, as he argued in the synagogues, St. Paul must have had these words cast in his teeth, "accursed of God," or "an insult to God," or "a blasphemer of God, is he that is hanged on the tree." More than once the early Christian apologists meet and refute this inference when writing against the Jews. This is the case with Ariston of Pella,¹ with Justin Martyr,² with Tertullian.³ In Jerome's time the same argument was brought by the Jews against the leading fact on which the faith of a Christian rests;⁴ and later literature shows that Christ crucified did not cease to be "to the Jews a stumbling-block."

The passage in Deuteronomy, it is true, does not refer directly to crucifixion as a means of execution, but to impaling bodies after death. It has been said, indeed, that Philo⁵ speaks of the impalement there mentioned as a mode of putting to death, but this seems to be a mistake. Philo says that Moses would have put such malefactors to death ten thousand times over, if it were possible, but not being able to kill them more than once, he *adds another penalty*, ordering murderers to be gibbeted (τιμωρίαν ἄλλην προσδιατάσσεται κελίῳ τοῖς ἀνελόντας ἀσκολοπιέσθαι). Nor, so far as I am aware, is there any evidence to show that the Jews at the time of the Christian era interpreted the passage of death by crucifixion. Crucifixion was not a Jewish punishment. The evangelist (Jno. xviii. 32) sees a providence in the delivering over of our Lord to the Romans to be put to death, that so he might die in the manner he had himself foretold. It had been employed occasionally in seasons of tumult by their own princes,⁶ but was regarded as an act of great atrocity. Even the Romans looked upon crucifixion with abhorrence.⁷ To the Jews it was especially hateful, owing in part, no doubt, to the curse attaching to this ignominious exposure of the body in the passage of Deuteronomy. For, though this passage

¹ In the "Dispute of Jason and Papisus"; see above, p. 339, note 2, and Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* i. p. 95.

² *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 96, p. 323 c.

³ *Adv. Judæos*, § 10.

⁴ Hieron. *l.c.* So too in the work of Evagrius (c. 430 A.D., see Gennad. *Vir. Ill.* 50), entitled *Altercatio inter Theophilum Christianum et Simonem Judæum* Migne's *Patr. Lat.* xx. p. 1174 B.

⁵ *De spec. leg.* § 28, ii. p. 324 M.

⁶ Joseph. *Ant.* xiii. 14, 2, referred

to in Winer, *Realw.* s. v. *Kreuzigung*. On this question see Carpzov, *Appar. Crit.* p. 591. I have not seen the treatise of Bornitius mentioned by Winer, *Diss. de cruce num. Elravoc. suppl. fuerit*, Wittenb. 1644. Those who maintain that crucifixion was a Jewish punishment rely mainly on this passage of Galatians. See Lange, *Obs. Sacr.* p. 163 sq.

⁷ Cic. *Verr.* v. 64, "crudelissimum teterrimumque supplicium."

did not contemplate death by crucifixion, the application was quite legitimate. It was the hanging, not the death, that brought ignominy on the sufferer and defilement on the land. Hence the Chaldee paraphrase of Deuteronomy employs the same word (צלב) which is used in several places in the Peshito-Syriac to describe the crucifixion of our Lord (e.g. Gal. iii. 1). Hence, also, later Jews speaking of Jesus called him by the same name of reproach (הלוי, "the gibbeted one") which they found in the original text of the lawgiver.¹ It was not that they mistook the meaning of the word, but that they considered the two punishments essentially the same. No Jew would have questioned the propriety of St. Paul's application of the text to our Lord. The curse pronounced in the law was interpreted and strengthened by the national sentiment.

VIII. THE WORDS DENOTING FAITH.

The Hebrew אֱמוּנָה, the Greek πίστις, the Latin "fides," and the English "faith," hover between two meanings—*trustfulness*, the frame of mind which relies on another; and *trustworthiness*, the frame of mind which can be relied upon. Not only are the two connected together grammatically, as active and passive² senses of the same word, or logically, as subject and object of the same act; but there is a close moral affinity between them. Fidelity, constancy, firmness, confidence, reliance, trust, belief—these are the links which connect the two extremes, the passive with the active meaning of "faith." Owing to these combined causes, the two senses will at times be so blended together that they can only be separated by some arbitrary distinction. When the members of the Christian brotherhood, for instance, are called "the faithful," οἱ πιστοί, what is meant by this? Does it imply their constancy, their trustworthiness, or their faith, their belief? In all such cases it is better to accept the latitude, and even the vagueness, of a word or phrase, than to attempt a rigid definition, which after all can be only artificial. And, indeed, the loss in grammatical precision is often more than compensated by the gain in theological depth. In the case of "the faithful," for instance, does not the one quality of heart carry the other with it, so that they who

¹ Eisenmenger's *Entd. Judenth.* i. pp. 88 sqq., 287, 496. On the Greek terms σταυροῦν, σκολοπιζειν, etc., see Lipsius, *de Cruce*, i. 4 sqq. (*Op. T.* ii. p. 769).

² Throughout this note I have used the terms "active" and "passive" in reference to the act of *believing*. If referred to the act of *persuading*, they would of course change places.

are trustful are trusty also; ¹ they who have faith in God are steadfast and immovable in the path of duty?

The history of the terms for "faith" in the three sacred languages of Christian theology is instructive from more points of view than one.

1. The Hebrew verb signifying "to believe, to trust," is the *Hiphil* **האמין**. The *Kal* **אמן** would mean "to strengthen, support, hold up," but is only found in the active participle used as a substantive, with the special sense, "one who supports, nurses, trains a child" (*παιδαγωγός*, see note, pp. 261, 262, on Gal. iii. 24), and in the passive participle "firm, trustworthy." The *Niphal* accordingly means "to be firm, lasting, constant, trusty"; while the *Hiphil* **האמין**, with which we are more directly concerned, is, "to hold trustworthy, to rely upon, believe" (taking either a simple accusative or one of the prepositions, **ב** or **ל**), and is rendered *πιστεύω* in the LXX, e.g. Gen. xv. 6. But there is in biblical Hebrew no corresponding substantive for "faith," the active principle. Its nearest representative is **אמנה**, "firmness, constancy, trustworthiness." This word is rendered in the LXX most frequently by *ἀλήθεια*, *ἀληθινός* (twenty-four times), or by *πίστις*, *πιστός*, *ἀξιώπιστος* (twenty times); once it is translated *ἐστήριγμένος* (Exod. xvii. 12), once *πλοῦτος* (Ps. xxxvi. 3, where Symm. had *διηνεκῶς*, Aq. *πίστιν*). It will thus be seen that **אמנה** properly represents the passive sense of *πίστις*, as, indeed, the form of the word shows. But it will at times approach near to the active sense; for constancy under temptation or danger with an Israelite could only spring from reliance on Jehovah. And something of this transitional or double sense it has in the passage of Habakkuk ii. 4.² The latitude of the LXX translation, *πίστις*, in that passage has helped out this meaning; and in St. Paul's application it is brought still more prominently forward.

Thus in its biblical usage the word **אמנה** can scarcely be said ever to have the sense "belief, trust," though sometimes approaching towards it. The influence of the Greek rendering, however, doubtless reacted upon the original, and in the rabbinical Hebrew it seems decidedly to have adopted this meaning (see Buxtorf, *Lex. Rabbin.* s. v.). The Aramaic dialects did something towards fixing this sense by an active form derived from the same root, **אמן**, but from the conjugation *Aphel* (corresponding to the Hebrew *Hiphil*). Thus in the Chaldee Targum of Jonathan, the word denoting the faith of Abraham

¹ "Qui fortis est, idem est fidens," says Cicero, *Tusc.* iii. 7.

² See the note, p. 252, on Gal. iii. 11.

Gen. xv. 6, is אָמַן, and the Syriac renders πίστις in the New Testament by the same word, ܐܡܢ.

2. Unlike the Hebrew, the Greek word seems to have started from the active meaning. In its earliest use it is opposed to "distrust": Hesiod. *Op.* 342, πίστεις δ' ἄρ τοι ὁμῶς καὶ ἀπισταῖαι ὤλεσαν ἄνδρας (comp. Theogn. 831, πίστει χρήματ' ἀπόλεσ' ἀπιστήν δ' ἐσάωσα); and this is perhaps the sense most favored by analogy.¹ But even if it had not originally the passive sense of faith side by side with the active, it soon acquired this meaning also, e.g. Aesch. *Fragm.* 276, οὐκ ἀνδρὸς ὅρκοι πίστις ἀλλ' ὅρκων ἀνὴρ; and πίστις became a common technical term for a "proof." The transition was aided by the indefiniteness of the grammatical form, and such phrases as πίστιν ἔχειν τινός formed a link of connection between the two. The English word "persuasion" will show how easily the one sense may pass into the other. In the same manner πιστός has both meanings; "trustworthy," as Hom. *Il.* xvi. 147, πιστότατος δέ οἱ ἔσκε, and "trustful," as Aesch. *Prom.* 917, τοῖς πεδαρσίοις κτύποις πιστός. So also ἀπιστος means both "incredulous" (Hom. *Od.* xiv. 150), and "incredible" (Aesch. *Prom.* 832).

With this latitude of use these words passed into the language of theology. In the Old Testament, there being no Hebrew equivalent to the active meaning,² πίστις has always the passive sense, "fidelity," "constancy,"³ unless the passage in Habakkuk be regarded as an exception.⁴ So, again, there is no clear instance of πιστός with any but the passive sense.

¹ Compare λήστις, μνήστις, Buttm. *Ausf. Sprachld.* § 119. 24.

² As illustrating this fact, it is worth noticing that the word "faith" occurs only twice in the authorized version of the Old Testament, Deut. xxxii. 20 ("children in whom is no faith," יֶזֶק, where it is plainly passive), and Hab. ii. 4; see note 4.

³ Besides אֱמִינָה, it occurs as a rendering of אֱמֵן, אִמְנָה, אִמֵּן, and once as a paraphrase of לִשְׁנוֹת, Prov. xv. 28. In all these words the passive sense is evident.

⁴ ii. 4. The original reading of the LXX is not clear. In the Vat. and Sin. MSS. it is δ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεώς μου; in the Alex. and others, δ δὲ δίκαιός μου ἐκ πίστεως. In Heb. x. 38, too (though not without various readings), μου fol-

lows δίκαιος. Comp. also Clem. Alex. *Strom.* ii. p. 432, Potter. With these data it is difficult to decide between two solutions; either (1) It may be inferred from the varying position of μου that the word had no place in the original text of the LXX; in this case St. Paul (Gal. iii. 11, Rom. i. 17) may have quoted directly from the LXX; or (2) Ἐκ πίστεώς μου was the original reading, afterwards altered into μου ἐκ πίστεως to remove any ambiguity as to the sense. In this latter case the LXX translators must have read בְּאֵמִינִי "my faith" (for בְּאֵמִינִי "his faith," the present Hebrew text), and perhaps intended their rendering ἐκ πίστεώς μου to be understood, "by faith in me" (see, however, Rom. iii. 3, τὴν πίστιν τοῦ Θεοῦ). That the Hebrew text was the same in the

The usage of the Apocrypha is chiefly valuable as showing how difficult it is to discriminate the two meanings, where there is no Hebrew original to act as a check, and how easily the one runs into the other; e.g. Eccus. xlv. 15 ἐν πίστει αὐτοῦ ἡκριβάσθη προφήτης καὶ ἐγνώσθη ἐν πίστει αὐτοῦ πιστὸς ὁράσεως: 1 Macc. ii. 52 Ἀβραὰμ οὐχὶ ἐν πειρασμῷ εὐρέθη πιστὸς καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην; Eccus. xlix. 10 ἐλυτρώσατο αὐτοὺς ἐν πίστει ἐλπίδος. In these passages the active sense seems to be forcing itself into notice; and the writings of Philo, to which I shall have to refer presently, show that at the time of the Christian era *πίστις*, "faith," "belief," had a recognized value as a theological term.

In the New Testament *πίστις* is found in both its passive and its active sense. On the one hand, it is used for constancy, trustworthiness, whether of the immutable purpose of God, Rom. iii. 3 τὴν πίστιν τοῦ Θεοῦ καταργήσει, or of good faith, honesty, uprightness in men. Matt. xxiii. 23 ἀφήκατε τὰ βαρύτερα τοῦ νόμου, τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τὸ ἔλεος καὶ τὴν πίστιν (see note, page 293, on Gal. v. 22). On the other hand, as "faith," "belief," it assumes in the teaching of our Lord, enforced and explained by St. Paul, the foremost place in the phraseology of Christian doctrine. From this latter sense are derived all those shades of meaning by which it passes from the abstract to the concrete: from faith, the subjective state, to *the* faith, the object of faith — the gospel; and sometimes, it would appear, the embodiment of faith — the church (see Gal. i. 23; iii. 22–26; vi. 10).

All other senses, however, are exceptional, and *πίστις*, as a Christian virtue, certainly has the active meaning, "trust," "belief." But the use of the adjective *οἱ πιστοί* for the Christian brotherhood cannot be assigned rigidly either to the one meaning or the other. Sometimes the context requires the active, as John xx. 27 μὴ γίνου ἄπιστος ἀλλὰ πιστός (comp. Gal. iii. 9), sometimes the passive, as Apoc. ii. 10 γίνου πιστὸς ἄχρι θανάτου. But when there is no context to serve as a guide, who shall say in which of the two senses the word is used? For the one it may be urged that the passive sense of *πιστός* is in other connections by far the most common, even in the New Testament; for the other, that its opposite, *ἄπιστος*, certainly means "an unbeliever." Is not a rigid definition of the sense in such a case groundless and arbitrary? For why should the sacred writers have used with this

first and second centuries as at present, may be inferred not only from St. Paul's application of the passage (supposing him to quote from the Hebrew), but

also from the fact that *all* the Greek versions collected by Origen so read it. See Jerome on Gal. iii. 11, and on Hab. ii. 4, *Op. T.* vi. p. 608 sq. (ed. Vall.).

meaning only, or with that, a term whose very comprehensiveness was in itself a valuable lesson?¹

3. It has been seen that the meaning of the Greek *πίστις* was reflected on its Hebrew original. Not less was this meaning infused into its Latin rendering. The verb *πιστεύω* was naturally translated by “credo”; but this root supplied no substantive corresponding to *πίστις*, no adjective (for “credulus” was stamped with a bad meaning) corresponding to *πιστός*. Words were therefore borrowed from another source, “fides,” “fidelis.” Now “fides,” as it appears in classical writers up to the time when it is adopted into Christian literature, is not so much “belief, trust,” as “fidelity, trustworthiness, credit.” Its connection in some expressions, however led the way toward this active meaning, at the very threshold of which it had already arrived.² In the absence, therefore, of any exact Latin equivalent to the active sense of *πίστις*,³ the coincidence of “fides” with some meanings of the Greek word, and the tendency already manifested

¹ The difficulty of exact definition in similar cases is pointed out in a suggestive Essay in Jowett's *Epistles of St. Paul*, ii. p. 101 (2d ed.). With Prof. Jowett's applications of his principles I am far from agreeing in many cases, and I consider his general theory of the looseness of St. Paul's language an entire mistake; but as a protest against the tendency of recent criticism to subtle restrictions of meaning, unsupported either by the context or by confirmed usage, this essay seems to me to be highly valuable. The use of *οἱ πιστοί* is an illustration of this difficulty. The expression *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ* is another. What is meant by “the gospel of Christ”? Is it the gospel which speaks of Christ, or the gospel which was delivered by Christ, or the gospel which belongs to Christ? or rather, does it not combine all these meanings in itself?

² Instances of such expressions are, “facere fidem alicui,” “habere fidem alieni”; comp. Ter. *Heaut.* iii. 3. 10 “*Mihi fides apud hunc est me nihil facturum.*” The trustworthiness, demonstrability, proof of the object, transferred to the subject, becomes “assurance, conviction,” and so Cicero *Parad.* 9, in ref-

erence to arguments in public speaking says: “fides est firma opinio.” See the whole passage. This sense of “conviction” is, I believe, the nearest approach to the Christian use of the term. It never, so far as I am aware, signifies trustfulness, confidence, as a quality inherent or abiding in a person. To assert a negative, however, is always dangerous, and possibly wider knowledge or research would prove this position untenable. At all events the ordinary sense of “fides” in classical writers is “trustworthiness, credit, fidelity to engagements.”

³ The Latin language indeed offered two words of a directly active meaning, “fidentia” and “fiducia;” but the former of these seems never to have obtained a firm footing in the language (see Cic. *de Inv.* ii. 163, 165, *Tusc.* iv. 80), and the signification of both alike was too pronounced for the sense required. “Fidentia” does not occur at all in the Latin translations (if the Concordance to the Vulgate is sufficient evidence); “fiducia” is not uncommon, frequently as a rendering of *παρησία*, less often of *πεποίθησις*, *θάρσος*, but never of *πίστις*.

to pass into the required sense "belief, trust," suggested it as the best rendering. Its introduction into Christian literature at length stamped it with a new image and superscription. In the case of the adjective "fideles" again, the passive sense was still more marked, but here, too, there was no alternative, and the original *πίστοι* was, as we have seen, sufficiently wide to admit it as, at all events, a partial rendering.

The English terms "faith, faithful," derived from the Latin, have inherited the latitude of meaning which marked their ancestry; and it is perhaps a gain that we are able to render *πίστις*, *πίστοι*, by comprehensive words which, uniting in themselves the ideas of "trustfulness" and "trustworthiness," of "Glauben" and "Treue," do not arbitrarily restrict the power of the original.

IX. THE FAITH OF ABRAHAM.

From the investigation just concluded it appears that the term "Faith" can scarcely be said to occur at all in the Hebrew Scriptures of the Old Testament. It is, indeed, a characteristic token of the difference between the two covenants, that under the law the "*fear* of the Lord" holds very much the same place as "*faith* in God," "*faith* in Christ," under the gospel. *Awe* is the prominent idea in the earlier dispensation, *trust* in the later. At the same time, though the word itself is not found in the Old Testament, the idea is not absent: for, indeed, a trust in the infinite and unseen, subordinating thereto all interests that are finite and transitory, is the very essence of the higher spiritual life.

In Abraham, the father of the chosen race, this attitude of trustfulness was most marked. By faith he left home and kindred, and settled in a strange land; by faith he acted upon God's promise of a race and an inheritance, though it seemed at variance with all human experience; by faith he offered up his only son, in whom alone that promise could be fulfilled.¹ Thus this one word "faith" sums up the lesson of his whole life. And when, during the long silence of prophecy which separated the close of the Jewish from the birth of the Christian Scriptures, the Hebrews were led to reflect and comment on the records of their race, this feature of their great forefather's character did not escape notice. The two languages, which having supplanted the Hebrew had now become the vehicles of theological teaching, both supplied words to express their meaning. In the Greek *πίστις*, in the Aramaic *הייתיחא*, the hitherto missing term was first found.

¹ Acts vii. 2-5; Rom. iv. 16-22; Heb. xi. 8-12, 17-19.

As early as the first Book of Maccabees attention is directed to this lesson: "Was not Abraham found faithful in temptation, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness?"¹ Here, however, it is touched upon very lightly. But there is, I think, sufficient evidence to show that at the time of the Christian era the passage in Genesis relating to Abraham's faith had become a standard text in the Jewish schools, variously discussed and commented upon, and that the interest thus concentrated on it prepared the way for the fuller and more spiritual teaching of the apostles of Christ.

This appears to have been the case in both the great schools of Jewish theology, in the Alexandrian or Græco-Judaic, and in the Rabbinical or Jewish proper, under which term we may include the teaching of the Babylonian dispersion as well as of Palestine, for there does not seem to have been any marked difference between the two.

Of the Alexandrian school, indeed, Philo is almost the sole surviving representative, but he represents it so fully as to leave little to be desired. In Philo's writings, the life and character of Abraham are again and again commented upon.² The passage of Genesis (xv. 6), doubly familiar to us from the applications in the New Testament, is quoted or referred to at least ten times.³ Once or twice Philo, like St. Paul, comments on the second clause of the verse, the imputation of righteousness to Abraham, but for the most part the coincidence is confined to the remarks on Abraham's faith. Sometimes, indeed, faith is deposed from its sovereign throne by being co-ordinated with piety,⁴ or by being regarded as the reward⁵ rather than the source of a godly life. But, far more generally, it reigns supreme in his theology. It is "the most perfect of virtues,"⁶ "the queen of virtues."⁷ It is "the

¹ 1 Macc. ii. 52. Other less distinct references in the Apocrypha to the faith of Abraham are, 2 Macc. i. 2; Eccclus. xlv. 19-21. In both passages πιστός occurs, but not πίστις.

² The history of Abraham is made the direct subject of comment in the works of Philo entitled, *De migrat. Abrah.* i. p. 436 (Mangey); *De Abrah.* ii. p. 1; *Quæst. in Gen.* p. 167 (Aucher), besides being discussed in scattered passages, especially in *Quis rer. div. her.* i. p. 473; *De mutat. nom.* i. p. 578.

³ *Leg. Alleg.* i. p. 132; *Quod Deus imm.* i. p. 273; *De migr. Abr.* i. p. 443; *Quis*

rer. div. her. i. p. 485, 486; *De mut. nom.* i. pp. 605, 606, 611; *De Abr.* ii. p. 39; *De præm. et poen.* ii. p. 413; *De nob.* ii. p. 442.

⁴ *De migr. Abr.* i. p. 456 τίς οὖν ἡ κόλλα (i.e. which unites him to God); τίς; εὐσεβεία δὴπου καὶ πίστις.

⁵ *De præm. et poen.* ii. p. 412 ἐκ τύφου μεθορμισάμενος πρὸς ἀλήθειαν, διδακτικῇ χρησάμενος ἀρετῇ πρὸς τελείωσιν ἄθλον αἰρεῖται τὴν πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν πίστιν.

⁶ *Quis rer. div. her.* i. p. 485, τὴν τελειοτάτην ἀρετῶν πίστιν.

⁷ *De Abr.* ii. p. 39, τὴν βασιλίδαν τῶν ἀρετῶν.

only sure and infallible good, the solace of life, the fulfilment of worthy hopes, barren of evil and fertile in good, the repudiation of the powers of evil, the confession of piety, the inheritance of happiness, the entire amelioration of the soul, which leans for support on him who is the cause of all things, who is able to do all things, and willing to do those which are most excellent.”¹ They that “preserve it sacred and inviolate” have “dedicated to God their soul, their senses, their reason.”² Such was the faith of Abraham, a “most steadfast and unwavering faith,” in the possession of which he was “three blessed indeed.”³

But in order to appreciate the points of divergence from, as well as of coincidence with, the apostolic teaching in Philo’s language and thoughts, it is necessary to remember the general bearing of the history of Abraham in his system. To him it was not a history, but an allegory; or, if a history as well, it was, as such, of infinitely little importance. The three patriarchs represent the human soul united to God by three different means, Abraham by instruction, Isaac by nature, Jacob by ascetic discipline.⁴ Abraham, therefore, is the type of διδασκαλική ἀρετή, he is the man who arrives at the knowledge of the true God by teaching (xii. 6).⁵ And this is the meaning of his successive migrations, from Chaldaea to Charran, from Charran to the promised land.⁶ For Chaldaea, the abode of astrology, represents his uninstructed state, when he worships the stars of heaven, and sets the material universe in the place of the great First Cause. By the divine monition he departs thence to Charran. What then is Charran? The name itself, signifying “a cave,” supplies the answer; the *senses* are denoted thereby.⁷ He must submit to be instructed by these, and thus to learn by observation the true relations and bearings of the material world. This, however, is only a half-way house on his journey towards his destined goal. From Charran he must go forward

¹ *De Abr. l. c.* I am not sure that I have caught the meaning of the words, κακοδαιμονίας ἀπόγνωσις, εὐσεβείας γνῶσις, εὐδαιμονίας κληῖρος, nor is it easy to find an adequate English rendering for them.

² *Quis rer. div. her. i. p. 487.*

³ *De praeem. et poen. ii. p. 413, ἀκλινοῦς καὶ βεβαιωτάτης πίστεως κ.τ.λ. comp. De nob. ii. p. 442.*

⁴ Διδασκαλία, φύσις, ἄσκησις, *De mut. nom. i. p. 580; De Abr. ii. p. 9; De praeem. et poen. i. p. 412.*

⁵ The change of name from Abram to Abraham betokens this progress, *De Cherub. i. p. 139; De mut. nom. i. p. 588; De Abr. ii. p. 13; Quaest. in Gen. p. 213 (Aucher).*

⁶ On the meaning of Chaldaea and Charran, see *De migr. Abr. i. p. 463 sqq.; De somn. i. p. 626 sqq.; De Abr. ii. p. 11 sq.; De nob. ii. p. 441; Quaest. in Gen. p. 167 (Aucher).*

⁷ *De Migr. Abr. l. c. p. 465 τρώγη τὸ τῆς αἰσθήσεως χάριον, comp. De somn. l. c.*

to the land of promise; from the observation of the senses, he must advance to the knowledge of the one true, invisible God. And the rest of the story must be similarly explained. For what is meant by his leaving home and kindred? Surely, nothing else but his detaching himself from the influence of the senses, from the domination of external things.¹ What, again, by the inheritance and the seed promised to him? The great nation, the numerous progeny, are the countless virtues which this frame of mind engenders:² the inheritance is the rich possession of wisdom, the lordship of the spirit over the domain of the senses.³ And are not its very boundaries significant? The region comprises all that lies between the river of Egypt on the one hand, the symbol of material, and the river Euphrates on the other, the symbol of spiritual blessings.⁴

If as full a record had been preserved of the Rabbinical schools of Palestine and Babylonia during the apostolic age, we should probably have found that an equally prominent place was assigned to the faith of Abraham in their teaching also. The interpretation put upon the passage, and the lessons deduced from it, would indeed be widely different: but the importance of the text itself must have been felt even more strongly where the national feeling was more intense. The promise to Abraham, the charter of their existence as a people, was all important to them, and its conditions would be minutely and carefully scanned.

In the fourth Book of Esdras, one of the very few Jewish writings which can be attributed with any confidence to the apostolic ages, great stress is laid on faith. In the last days it is said, "the land of faith shall be barren" (or "the land shall be barren of faith." iii. 2). The seal of eternal life is set on those who "have treasured up faith" (iv. 13). The wicked are described as "not having had faith in God's statutes, and having neglected his works" (v. 24). Immunity from punishment is promised to the man "who can escape by his works and by his faith whereby he has believed" (ix. 8). God watches over those "who have good works and faith in the Most High" (xiii. 31).⁵

There is, however, other evidence besides. For though the extant works of Rabbinical Judaism are, as written documents and in their present form, for the most part, the productions of a later age, there

¹ *De migr. Abr.* i. p. 437

⁴ *Quaest. in Gen.* p. 188 (Aucher).

² *Ib.* p. 444, comp. *Quaest. in Gen.* pp. 211, 229 (Aucher).

⁵ The references are taken from the text as printed in Gfrörer's *Prophet. Vet.*

³ *Quis rec. div. her.* i. p. 487; *Quaest. Pseudopigr.* in *Gen.* p. 216 (Aucher).

can be little doubt that they embody more ancient traditions, and, therefore, reflect fairly, though with some exceptions, the Jewish teaching at the Christian era. Thus the importance then attached to faith, and the significance assigned to Abraham's example may be inferred from the following passage in the *Mechilta* on Exodus xiv. 31:¹ "Great is faith, whereby Israel believed on Him that spake and the world was. For as a reward for Israel's having believed in the Lord, the Holy Spirit dwelt on them. . . . In like manner thou findest that Abraham, our father, inherited this world and the world to come, solely by the merit of faith, whereby he believed in the Lord: for it is said, *and he believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteousness* Rabbi Nehemiah says: He that taketh unto himself one precept in firm faith, on him the Holy Spirit dwelleth: for so we find in the case of our fathers, that as a reward for their believing on the Lord, they were deemed worthy that the Holy Spirit should dwell on them So Abraham, solely for the merit of faith, whereby he believed in the Lord, inherited this world and the other Only as a reward for their faith were the Israelites redeemed out of Egypt, for it is said, *and the people believed*. . . . What is the cause of David's joy (in Ps. xci. 1)? It is the reward of faith, whereby our fathers believed So Jeremiah (v. 3), *O Lord, thine eyes look upon faith*, and Habakkuk (ii. 4), *The righteous liveth of his faith*. . . . Great is faith:" with more to the same effect. This passage should be taken in connection with the comment in *Siphri* on Deut. xi. 13.² "The sacred text means to show that practice depends on doctrine and not doctrine on practice. And so we find, too, that (God) punishes more severely for doctrine than for practice, as it is said (in Hosea iv. 1), *Hear the word of the Lord*" etc. Gfrörer, to whom I am indebted for these passages, illustrates their bearing by reference to the opinions of later Jewish doctors who maintain that "as soon as a man has mastered the thirteen heads of the faith, firmly believing therein, he is to be loved and forgiven, and treated in all respects as a brother, and though he may have sinned in every possible way, he is indeed

¹ Ugolin, *Thes.* xiv. p. 202.

In marked contrast to these earlier comments is the treatment of the text, Gen. xv. 6, by some later Jewish writers. Anxious, it would appear, to cut the ground from under St. Paul's inference of "righteousness by faith," they interpreted the latter clause, "and Abraham

counted on God's righteousness," i.e. on his strict fulfilment of his promise. See the references in Beer's *Leben Abraham's* p. 147; comp. p. 33. Such a rendering is as harsh in itself, as it is devoid of traditional support.

² Ugolin, *Thes.* xv. p. 554.

an erring Israelite, and is punished accordingly, but still he inherits eternal life.”¹

It were unwise to overlook the coincidences of language and thought which the contemporaneous teaching of the Jews occasionally presents to the apostolic writings. The glory of the scriptural revelation does not pale because we find in the best thoughts of men “broken lights” of its own fuller splendor. Yet, on the other hand, the resemblance must not be exaggerated. It is possible to repeat the same words and yet to attach to them an entirely different meaning; it is possible even to maintain the same precept, and yet by placing it in another connection to lead it to an opposite practical issue. In the case before us the divergences are quite as striking as the coincidences.

If we look only to the individual man, faith with Philo is substantially the same as faith with St. Paul. The lessons drawn from the history of Abraham by the Alexandrian Jew and the Christian apostle differ very slightly. Faith is the postponement of all present aims and desires, the sacrifice of all material interests, to the infinite and unseen. But the philosopher of Alexandria saw no *historical* bearing in the career of Abraham. As he was severed from the heart of the nation, so the pulses of the national life had ceased to beat in him. The idea of a chosen people retained scarcely the faintest hold on his thoughts. Hence the only lesson which he drew from the patriarch's life had reference to himself. Abraham was but a type, a symbol of the individual man. The promises made to him — the rich inheritance, the numerous progeny, had no fulfilment except in the growth of his own character. The Alexandrian Jew, like the heathen philosopher, was exclusive, isolated, selfish. With him the theocracy of the Old Testament was emptied of all its meaning; the covenant was a matter between God and his own spirit. The idea of a *church* did not enter into his reckoning. He appreciated the significance of Abraham's *faith*, but Abraham's *seed* was almost meaningless to him.

On the other hand, Judaism proper was strong where Alexandrian Judaism was weak, and weak where it was strong. The oppressive rule of Syrians and Romans had served only to develop and strengthen the national feeling. “We are Abraham's sons, we have Abraham to our father”; such was their religious war-cry, full of meaning to every true Israelite. It was a protest against selfish isolation. It spoke of a corporate life, of national hopes and interests, of an out-

¹ Abarbanel, *Rosh Amanah*. p. 5 a, Maimonides on *Mishna, Sanhedr.* p. 121 a, referred to in Gfrörer, *Jahrh. des Heils*, ii. p. 162.

ward community, a common brotherhood, ruled by the same laws and animated by the same feelings. In other words, it kept alive the idea of a *church*. This was the point of contact between St. Paul's teaching and rabbinical Judaism. But their agreement does not go much beyond this. With them, indeed, he upheld the faith of Abraham as an example to Abraham's descendants. But while they interpreted it as a rigorous observance of outward ordinances, he understood by it a spiritual state, a steadfast reliance on the unseen God. With them, too, he clung to the fulfilment of the promise, he cherished fondly the privileges of a son of Abraham. But to him the link of brotherhood was no longer the same blood, but the same spirit; they only were Abraham's sons who inherited Abraham's faith.

Thus the coincidences and contrasts of St. Paul's doctrine of faith and of his application of Abraham's history with the teaching of the Jewish doctors are equally instructive. With the Alexandrian school it looked to the growth of the individual man: with the rabbinical it recognized the claims of a society. With the one it was spiritual; with the other it was historical. On the other hand, it was a protest alike against the selfish, esoteric, individualizing spirit of the one, and the narrow, slavish formalism of the other.

This sketch is very far from doing justice to St. Paul's doctrine of faith. In order fully to understand its force, or, indeed, to appreciate its leading conception, it would be necessary to take into account the atoning death and resurrection of Christ as the central object on which that faith is fixed. This, however, lies apart from the present question, for it has no direct bearing on the lesson drawn from Abraham's example. In a certain sense, indeed, the Messiah may be said to have been the object of Abraham's faith; for he, as the fulfilment of the promise, must have been dimly discerned by Abraham, as by one "looking through a glass darkly." And to this vague presentiment of a future triumph or redemption we may probably refer our Lord's words (John viii. 56), "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day: and he saw it, and was glad." But, however this may be, St. Paul, makes no such application of Abraham's example. He does not once allude to the Christ as the object of the patriarch's faith.

To return once again to the passages from Jewish writers already cited; they are important in their bearing on the interpretation of the apostolic writings in yet another point of view. The example of Abraham is quoted both by St. Paul and St. James; while the deductions which the two apostles draw from it are at first sight diamet-

rically opposed in terms. "We conclude that a man is justified by faith apart from (χωρίς) works of law," says St. Paul (Rom. iii. 28). "A man is justified of works, and not of faith only," are the words of St. James (ii. 24). Now, so long as our range of view is confined to the apostolic writings, it seems scarcely possible to resist the impression that St. James is attacking the teaching, if not of St. Paul himself, at least of those who exaggerated and perverted it. But when we realize the fact that the passage in Genesis was a common thesis in the schools of the day, that the meaning of *faith* was variously explained by the disputants, that diverse lessons were drawn from it, then the case is altered. The Gentile apostle and the pharisaic rabbi might both maintain the supremacy of faith as the means of salvation; but faith with St. Paul was a very different thing from faith with Maimonides, for instance. With the one its prominent idea is a *spiritual life*; with the other, an *orthodox creed*. With the one the guiding principle is the individual conscience; with the other, an external rule of ordinances. With the one faith is allied to liberty; with the other, to bondage. Thus it becomes a question whether St. James's protest against reliance on faith alone has any reference, direct or indirect, to St. Paul's language and teaching; whether, in fact, it is not aimed against an entirely different type of religious feeling—against the pharisaic spirit, which rested satisfied with a barren orthodoxy fruitless in works of charity. Whether this is the true bearing of the Epistle of St. James, or not, must be determined by a close examination of its contents. But inasmuch as the circles of labor of the two apostles were not likely to intersect, we have at least a *prima facie* reason for seeking the objects of St. James's rebuke elsewhere than in the disciples of St. Paul, and the facts collected above destroy the force of any argument founded on the mere coincidence of the examples chosen.¹

¹ This view of the Epistle of St. James is taken by Michaelis (vi. p. 302, Marsh's 2d ed.). It is also adopted by Neander; see especially his *Pflanzung*, p. 567 (4te Aufl.). He there refers, in illustration of this Jewish mode of thinking, against which he supposes the Epistle to be directed, to Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph.* p. 370 D, οὐχ ὡς ὑμεῖς

ἀπατᾶτε ἑαυτοὺς καὶ ἄλλοι τινὲς ὑμῶν Ἰουδαῖοι (i.e. Judaizing Christians) κατὰ τοῦτο, οἱ λέγουσιν ὅτι, κἂν ἁμαρταλοὶ ᾧσι θεὸν δὲ γινώσκουσιν, οὐ μὴ λογίσηται αὐτοῖς Κέριος ἁμαρτίαν; and to the *Chm. Hom.* iii. 6. Several later writers have maintained the same view. For more on this subject see the Dissertation on "St. Paul and the Three," p. 129.

X. ST. PAUL'S INFIRMITY IN THE FLESH.

In the Second Epistle to the Corinthians (xii. 7) St. Paul, after speaking of the abundant revelations vouchsafed to him, adds that "a thorn," or rather "a stake," was "given him in his flesh, a messenger of Satan sent to buffet him," and thus to check the growth of spiritual pride. In the Epistle to the Galatians, again (iv. 13, 14), he reminds his converts how he had preached to them through infirmity of the flesh, commending them at the same time because they "did not despise nor loathe their temptation in his flesh, but received him as an angel of God, as Christ Jesus."

In the latter passage there is a variation of reading which has some bearing on the interpretation. For "*my* temptation," which stands in the received text, the correct reading seems certainly to be "*your* temptation," as I have quoted it.¹

These passages so closely resemble each other, that it is not unnatural to suppose the allusion to be the same in both. If so, the subject seems to have been especially present to St. Paul's thoughts at the season when these two epistles were written; for they were written about the same time.

What then was this "stake in the flesh," this "infirmity of the flesh," which made so deep an impression on his mind?

Diverse answers have been given to this question,² shaped in many instances by the circumstances of the interpreters themselves, who saw in the apostle's temptation a more or less perfect reflection of the trials which beset their own lives. How far such subjective feelings have influenced the progress of interpretation, will appear from the

¹ Of the three readings, τὸν πειρασμὸν μου τὸν ἐν, τὸν πειρασμὸν τὸν ἐν (omitting μου), and τὸν πειρασμὸν ὑμῶν ἐν (omitting τόν), I have no hesitation in preferring the last; for (1) it is the most difficult of the three; (2) it accounts for the remaining two (see note on the passage, pp. 273, 274.); and (3) it has far higher support than the others in the ancient copies. To the authorities in its favor given by Tischendorf, which are already perhaps sufficient to decide the question, I must now be added. Eusebius of Emesa here (Cramer's *Catena*, p. 65) and Origen on Eph. iii. 14 (Cra-

mer's *Catena*, p. 158) have a mixed reading, τὸν πειρασμὸν ὑμῶν τὸν ἐν κ.τ.λ. Both these authorities are overlooked by Tischendorf.

² A long list of references to writers who have discussed this question is given in Wolf, *Cur. Philol.*, on 2 Cor. xii. 7. I have to acknowledge my obligations chiefly to Calov. *Bibl. illustr.* on 2 Cor. *l.c.*, and Stanley's *Corinthians*, p. 563 sqq. (2d ed.). I have had no opportunity of using Bertholdt, *Opusc.*, 134 sqq., to which I find frequent references in recent commentaries.

following list of conjectures, which I have thrown into a rough chronological order.

1. It was some bodily ailment. This, which is the natural account of the incident, is also the first in point of time. A very early tradition defined the complaint. "Per dolorem, ut aiunt, auriculæ vel capitis," says Tertullian, *de Pudic.* § 13. And this statement is copied or confirmed by Jerome (Gal. *l.c.*), "Tradunt eum gravissimum capitis dolorem saepe perpassum." The headache is mentioned also by Pelagius and Primasius (both on 2 Cor. *l.c.*). Others seem to have followed a different tradition as to the complaint in question;¹ but in some form or other *illness* was the solution which suggested itself to the earliest writers. This appears to be the idea of Irenæus, the first writer who alludes to the subject, and of Victorinus, the first extant commentator on the Epistle to the Galatians.²

2. "Nay, not so," argued Chrysostom (2 Cor., Gal.), as others, probably, had argued before him; "it cannot have been a headache; it cannot have been any physical malady. God would not have delivered over the body of his chosen servant to the power of the devil to be tortured in this way. The apostle is surely speaking of opposition encountered, of suffering endured from his enemies." And so for a time, and with a certain class of expositors, the thorn in the flesh assumed the form of persecution, whether from the direct opponents of the gospel or from the Judaizers within the pale of the church. This interpretation, again, was perhaps not uninfluenced by the circumstances of the times. At all events, it would find a ready welcome when the memory of the Diocletian persecution was fresh, and when the church was torn asunder by internal feuds. It appears at least as early as the middle of the fourth century in Eusebius of Emesa

¹ An ancient writer (Cotel. *Mon. Eccles.* i. p. 252) says *τριχῶν ἐποησάμεθα τὴν ἀφαίρεσιν· συναφέλωμεν αὐταῖς καὶ τοὺς ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ σκόλοπας· κομάσαντες γὰρ οὗτοι ἐπιπλέον ἡμᾶς ὀδυνῶσι· τὸ μὲν γὰρ τρίχωμα ἡμῶν ἦν ὁ κατὰ τὸν βίον κῶσμος, τιμὰ δόξαι, χρημάτων κτήσεις, κ.τ.λ.*, on which the editor (p. 756) absurdly enough remarks, "Ex toto contextu suspicari datur à nostro per σκόλοπα *animalcula* quæ caput pungunt intellecta esse." The context, if I mistake not, fails to bear out this remark, but Cotelier's conjectural interpretation is treated as a fact by recent writers,

and so this is added to the list of traditional accounts of St. Paul's complaint. The list is further swelled by understanding of St. Paul the maladies which Nicetas (see p. 356, note 1) attributes to Gregory Nazianzen. Aquinas mentions the opinion, "quod fuit vehementer afflictus dolore iliaco" (colic), but I have not noticed it in any earlier writer. On the whole the tradition of the headache (*κεφαλαλγία*) is fairly constant.

² Iren. v. 3, 1, but his language is obscure. Victorinus says, "infirmus carne," but this again is not free from ambiguity.

(Cramer's *Catena*, Gal. *lc.*) among the Greek, and the Ambrosian Hiliary (2 Cor., Gal.) among the Latin, fathers. It is adopted also by Augustine (Gal.), by Theodore of Mopsuestia (Gal.), by Theodoret (2 Cor., Gal.), by Photius (? *ap. Occum.*, 2 Cor., Gal.), and by Theophylact (2 Cor., Gal.).¹ Thus it is especially the interpretation of the Greek commentators, though not confined to them.

But, in spite of such strong advocacy, this account of St. Paul's thorn in the flesh, at all events, cannot be correct. The passages which allude to it point clearly to something inseparable from the apostle, to some affliction which he himself looked upon, and which was looked upon by others, as part of himself. Any calamity overtaking him from without fails to explain the intense personal feeling with which his language is charged.

The state of opinion on this subject at the close of the fourth century may be inferred from the alternative explanations which Jerome offers in his commentary on the Galatians, derived in part from tradition, but partly without doubt conjectural. These are four in number: (1) St. Paul's carnal preaching of the gospel, as addressed to babes; (2) His mean personal appearance; (3) Some bodily malady, traditionally reported as headache; (4) Persecutions endured by him.²

3. "No," thought the monks and ascetics of a somewhat later date, "not persecution. It was surely something which we can realize; something which we have experienced in ourselves. Must he not have felt those same carnal longings, by which we have been dogged in our solitude, and which rise up hydra-like with sevenfold force as we smite them down. From these Paul thrice entreated the Lord to be delivered, as we have entreated him; and was only answered, as we have been answered, by the indirect assurance, *My grace is sufficient for thee.*" This interpretation does not appear in a very tangible form before the sixth century, but earlier writers had used language which prepared the way for it.³ Throughout the middle ages it seems to

¹ It was so taken apparently also by Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xx. (*de laud. Basil.*) ad. fin. (see the note of Nicetas), and by Basil, *Reg. fus. Tract.* ad fin. (ii. p. 400, Garnier).

² Ephraem Syrus (on Gal. iv. 13), a little earlier than Jerome, says, "Firther disease of his limbs or temptation from his enemies."

³ Jerome, *Epist.* xxii. (ad Eustoch.) § 5, says: "Si apostolus vas electionis

et separatus in evangelium Christi ob carnis aculeos et incentiva vitiorum reprimat corpus suum," etc., quoting Rom. vii. 24, but he makes no reference to either of the passages in St. Paul which relate to his "thorn in the flesh," and in § 31 of the same letter he says, "Si aliquis te afflixerit dolor, legito, *datus est mihi stimulus carnis mee.*" evidently explaining it of some *bodily pain*. The passage in Augustine, Ps. lviii.

have been very generally received; and Roman Catholic writers have for the most part, adopted it. So it is taken by Aquinas, Bellarmine (*de monach.* c. 30), Corn. a Lapide,¹ and Estius. Luther is probably correct when he attributes the prevalence of this interpretation to the influence of the Latin version, which renders σκόλοψ τῇ σαρκί by "stimulus carnis."

This account, again, of St. Paul's thorn in the flesh may confidently be set aside. In such a temptation he could not have "gloried"; nor would this struggle, hidden as it must have been in his own heart, have exposed him to the contempt of others. But, indeed, from painful trials of this kind we have his own assurance that he was free: "I would," he says, "that all men were even as myself" (1 Cor. vii. 7). "Ah no," said Luther, "he was too hard pressed by the devil to think of such things."

4. And in turn Luther propounded his own view of the thorn in the flesh. He complained that the older churchmen were unable from their position to appreciate St. Paul's meaning, and thus he consciously threw into the interpretation of the passage his own personal experiences. It was certainly not carnal longing, he thought; it was not any bodily malady. It might mean external persecution, as others had maintained, but he inclined more and more to the view that *spiritual trials* were intended—faint-heartedness in his ministerial duties, temptations to despair or to doubt, blasphemous suggestion of the devil.²

Serm. ii. (Tom. iv. pp. 572, 573), is vague, and need not necessarily refer to this kind of temptation. Pelagius gives, as one interpretation, "naturalem infirmitatem"; Primasius more definitely, though still only as an alternative explanation, "alii dicunt titillatione carnis stimulum." Gregory the Great, *Mor.* viii. c. 29, writes, "sic Paulus ad tertium coelum raptus ducitur, paradisi penetrans secreta considerat, et tamen ad semetipsum rediens contra carnis bellum laborat, legem aliam in membris sustinet." Comp. also x. 10. And thus, as time went on, this opinion gained strength, till at length it assumed the coarsest and most revolting form.

¹ Corn. a Lapide on 2 Cor. xii. 7 almost exalts this interpretation into an article of faith: "Videtur communis fidelium sensus, qui hinc libidinis tentationem

stimulum carnis vocant: vox autem populi est vox dei."

² In his shorter and earlier commentary on the Galatians (1519) Luther explains it of "persecution"; in his later and fuller work (1535) he combines spiritual temptations with persecution; and, lastly, in the Table-talk he drops persecution and speaks of spiritual trials only, xxiv. § 7 (vol. xxii. p. 1092 of the Halle edition). This last passage forms a striking contrast to the language of a Lapide quoted in the last note. "Those were high spiritual temptations," says Luther, "which no papist has understood," with more in the same strain. Thus each of these writers makes his own interpretation in a manner a test of orthodoxy. Other references in Luther's works to the "thorn in the flesh" are, vol. viii. p. 959; xi. p. 1437; xii. p. 561.

This view naturally commended itself to the leaders of a new form of religious belief, owing to the difficulties of their position; and spiritual temptation was the account of St. Paul's trial in which the Reformers generally acquiesced. From them it found its way into Protestant writers of a later date, subject, however, to some modifications which adapted it to the more equable temper and the more settled opinions of their own day.

Lastly, having thus travelled round the entire circle of possible interpretation, criticism has returned to the point from which it started. *Bodily ailment* of some kind has been felt by most recent writers to be the only solution which meets all the conditions of the question.

These conditions are as follows: (1) The apostle speaks of physical pain of a very acute kind; for nothing less can be implied by his metaphor of a stake driven through his flesh.¹ (2) The malady, whatever its nature, was very humiliating to himself, for he speaks of it as a set-off against his spiritual privileges, and a check to his spiritual pride. (3) He seems to regard it, as he could not but regard such suffering, as a great trial to his constancy and resolution, a grievous hinderance to the gospel in itself, a powerful testimony to the gospel when overcome as he was enabled to overcome it. (4) His suffering was such that he could not conceal it from others. It seems to have attacked him in the course of his public ministrations, so that he feared it might expose him to the contempt and even loathing of his hearers. (5) In the meanness of his personal presence, of which he was so acutely sensible (2 Cor. x. 10), we may perhaps trace the permanent effects of his painful malady. (6) His disease was recurring. We first read of it in connection with his visions and revelations fourteen years before the Second Epistle to the Corinthians was written. If the two were nearly coincident, as his language seems to imply, he must have had an attack about the year 44, and this, as it would appear, for the first time. Again we hear of it about the year 51 or

¹ This seems to be the meaning of *σκόλοψ*: see the notes of Meyer and Stanley on 2 Cor. xii. 7. Robertson, *Lectures on the Corinthians*, lix., lx. speaks of the thorn as peculiarly suggestive of some "secret sorrow"; for "a thorn is a small invisible cause of suffering." The Greek word, however, suggests no such idea; nor is it consistent with the fear of contempt or loathing expressed in the Galatian epistle. This slight

blemish, occurring where it does, may well be overlooked in the latest utterance of one who spoke from deep personal experience, having himself maintained a hard struggle against "fightings without" and "fears within," and "borne about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus." The lesson of St. Paul's sufferings is nowhere more powerfully brought out than in this exposition of the thorn in the flesh.

52, when he first preached in Galatia. On this occasion, at least, it would seem to have hung about him for some time. For from Greece he writes to the Thessalonians, that he had desired to visit them more than once, but "Satan had hindered him" (1 Thess. ii. 18), an expression which may perhaps be connected with the "messenger of Satan, the thorn in the flesh" in one of the passages under consideration; and writing afterwards to the Corinthians of this same period of his life, he reminds them that he came among them "in infirmity and in fear and in much trembling" (1 Cor. ii. 3). Lastly, from the twin references to his malady, in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians and in the Epistle to the Galatians, it may be inferred that he had a fresh attack about the years 57, 58, when these letters were written, and to this he may allude, in part, when he speaks in the former of these epistles of having "despaired even of life," of having "had the sentence of death in himself" (2 Cor. i. 8, 9).

The life of the greatest and best of English kings presents so close a parallel to the apostle's thorn in the flesh, that I cannot forbear quoting the passage at length, though the illustration is not my own.¹

"It was in the midst of these rejoicings (on the occasion of his marriage) that Alfred was *suddenly attacked* by an illness, the sight of which struck dumb the loud joy of the guests, and for which neither they nor all the physicians of the day could account. . . . Others thought it was the unexpected return of a painful malady to which he had been subject at an early age.

"We are informed what the malady really was in an account which is not quite clear. . . . On passing from childhood to youth . . . he begged for some protection against his passions, for some corporal suffering which might arm him against temptation, so that his spirit might be enabled to raise him above the weakness of the flesh. On this, we are told, heaven sent him his illness, which Asser describes as a kind of eruption. For many years it caused him the most horrible torture, which was so intense that *he himself began to despair of his life*. One day . . . the royal youth . . . prostrated himself in silent devotion and prayed to God for pity. The fear of being rendered by his bodily infirmities, or perhaps by leprosy *or blindness*, incapable of exercising the royal power, or *despicable in the sight of the world*, had long obtained possession of his soul and induced him to *pray for his deliverance* from such a plague. Every other lighter trial he was willing to undergo, provided it only spared him for what he was accustomed to look on as his destined office. Not long after . . . in

¹ The passage is quoted in Jowett, i. p. 368 (2d ed.).

consequence of his fervent prayers, we are informed that all signs of his malady disappeared.

"And now in the very moment that he had taken to himself a wife, in the very moment that the marriage-guests were drinking and carousing noisily in the festive halls, the evil against which (? warum) he had prayed overtook him. He was *suddenly seized with fear and trembling*; and to the very hour that Asser wrote, to a good old age, *he was never sure of not being attacked by it*. There were instants when this visitation seemed to *render him incapable of any exertion*, either intellectual or bodily; but the repose of a day, a night, or even an hour, would always raise his courage again. Under the weight of this bodily infirmity, which was probably of an epileptic nature, he learned, by the force of his unyielding will, to overcome the heaviest cares that ever weighed upon any ruler engaged in a contest with a most terrible foe, and under the weight of corporeal weakness, and the cares of the outer world, to prosecute unceasingly his great purpose." — Pauli's *Life of Alfred*, pp. 122-125 (Engl. transl.).

In the mystery which hangs over the whole subject, in its physical symptoms, and in its influence on his own character and feelings, Alfred's malady is a most striking counterpart to the infirmity of St. Paul; and the coincidence is the less open to suspicion, since neither Asser, who is the original authority for the fact, nor Pauli, whose account I have quoted, seems to have been struck by the parallel.

Unless then we accept the earliest tradition of this infirmity, and assume that the apostle suffered from acute pain in the head (an account which considering his nervous sensibility is perhaps sufficient to explain the feeling of humiliation and the fear of contempt which his malady inspired), we should be tempted by the closeness of the parallel to conjecture that it was of the nature of epilepsy. Recent criticism has offered other conjectures in abundance. Of these, the view that it was a complaint in the eyes deserves especially to be mentioned, as having been supported by the most ingenious advocacy and found the largest number of adherents; but it does not, I think, sufficiently recognize the conditions of the problem, as stated above; while the direct arguments, on which it is founded, seem to melt away under the light of careful examination.¹

¹ It is put forward in a lively and interesting paper in Dr. J. Brown's *Horæ Subsecivæ*. But the foundation on which this opinion is built seems to

me scarcely strong enough to bear it; for (1) The stress of the argument rests on what I cannot but think a mistaken interpretation of Gal. iv. 15, "If it had

XI. THE VARIOUS READINGS IN GAL. IV. 25.

The following are the variations of text which the opening clause of this verse presents.

(i.) τὸ γὰρ Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστίν. So it is read in \aleph CFG, 17; in the Old Latin (f.g.), Vulgate, Ethiopic, and Armenian versions; in Origen,¹ Epiphanius,² Cyril,³ and Damascene; in Victorinus, the Ambrosian Hilary ("Sina autem mons," in his text), Augustine, Jerome, Pelagius, Primasius, and probably all the Latin fathers. This is also the reading of the Gothic version, except that it omits γὰρ. The Thebaic version reads similarly, "quae vero mons Sina est." The MS. \aleph after ἐστίν adds ὄν, in which respect it stands alone (except, perhaps, the Memphitic version); and Epiphanius transposes Σινᾶ and ὄρος.

been possible, ye would have plucked out your eyes and have given them to me." Here the English version has "your own eyes," which lends some countenance to the idea that St. Paul intended to say they would have replaced his eyes with their own, if it could have been done; but the Greek is τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν, where ὑμῶν is as unemphatic as possible, so that the meaning is not "your eyes," but "your eyes." (2) The expression πηλίκᾳ γράμματα (vi. 11) is thought to be illustrated by this view of St. Paul's complaint, as though his defective eyesight explained the allusion to the size of the letters or the length of the epistle, whichever way we take it. It seems to me that a much better account can be given of that expression: see the note on the passage. (3) It is supposed that this defective eyesight was a permanent effect of the temporary blindness which seized the apostle on the way to Damascus; and that thus his thorn in the flesh was eminently fitted to be a check on spiritual pride produced by his "visions and revelations." But the narrative of the Acts implies, if it does not state, that this blindness was completely healed; and the passage in 2 Corinthians, refers to incidents which occurred only fourteen years before the letter was written, and, therefore, much later than the apostle's conversion.

(4) To the arguments already considered, some have added the expression ἀτενίζειν, "to look steadfastly," twice used of St. Paul (Acts xiii. 9; xxiii. 1), as indicating a defective vision; but, not to mention that the word occurs frequently in the Acts of others besides St. Paul, this "steadfast gaze" would seem, if anything, to imply a powerful eye. Thus it may be connected with the tradition or fiction, dating, at least, from the second century, that St. Paul was σύνοφρυς (Acta Paul. et Thecl. § 3). The overhanging brows and piercing glance make up at least a consistent and characteristic portrait of the apostle, if not a true likeness. On the other hand, it is possible that he suffered from weak eyes, and this may account for the incident of Acts xxiii. 5; but it is not implied in Gal. iv. 15, and does not explain the strong expressions used of his "stake in the flesh," though perhaps it might be one of the consequences of that infirmity. St. Paul's language implies some more striking complaint.

¹ In Cant. ii. (iii. p. 52, ed. Delarue), extant only in a Latin translation.

² Haeres. p. 695.

³ Glyphyr. i. p. 75 (ed. Auberti). Cyril is said in other passages to read τὸ δὲ Ἀγαρ and τὸ γὰρ Ἀγαρ, but I am unable to verify the statement.

(ii.) τὸ δὲ Ὑγάρ Σαῶ ὁπος ἐστίν. Such is the reading of ABDE, 37, 73, 89, lectionary 40, and of the Memphitic version.

(iii.) τὸ γὰρ Ὑγάρ Σαῶ ὁπος ἐστίν. So KLP, with the vast majority of cursive manuscripts, with both Syriac versions, and with the Greek commentators generally, Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, Theophylact, and the Oecumenian Catena. This also is apparently the reading of Ephraem Syrus.

(iv.) τὸ γὰρ Ὑγάρ ὁπος ἐστίν is found only in the Latin of D and E.¹

It will thus be seen that the strongest, because the most varied, testimony is in favor of the first of these readings. And there is also this weighty argument on the same side, that, supposing it to have been the original reading, we have on the whole a more probable explanation of the variations in the text than on any other hypothesis. By the negligence or confusion of a scribe τὸ Ὑγάρ might easily be substituted for τὸ γὰρ, the word Ὑγάρ occurring in the immediate context.² As a next step a connecting particle must be supplied; and δέ or γάρ was inserted, according to the caprice or judgment of the transcriber, thus producing the second and third readings. Lastly, the word Σαῶ, now rendered superfluous, was expelled, to relieve the passage, and hence arose the fourth variation, which, indeed, is too feebly supported to deserve consideration. The reading which I am here advocating is adopted by the two great masters of textual criticism, Bentley³ and Lachmann.

Such seems to be the most probable account of the passage. Otherwise the earlier conjecture of Bentley, that we have here a gloss transferred from margin to text, has much to recommend it. Bentley himself, indeed, read it τὸ δὲ Ὑγάρ συνοισχεῖ τῇ γῇ Ἱερουσαλὴμ, but it seems simpler, if any such solution be adopted, to erase the whole clause τὸ γὰρ . . . ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ. This hypothesis derives some color

¹ The Ambrosian Hilary (in his commentary) is also quoted in favor of this reading, but his words do not bear out the inference.

² The commentary of Theodore Mops. on this passage shows how easily Ὑγάρ might be foisted in. The Greek text of this writer (in Cramer's *Catena*) has ἀλλ' Ὑγάρ ἢ τε ἔρημος πᾶσα κ.τ.λ., which makes no sense. The Latin translation runs "*sed et solitudo omnis*," which doubtless represents the original reading, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἢ τε ἔρημος πᾶσα. Windischmann's conjecture to account

for the insertion of Ὑγάρ in the text of St. Paul is more ingenious than probable. He supposes a critical note, εἰ γὰρ (i.e. ἄλλου γὰρ), marking a various reading in the connecting particle, to have been transferred from the margin to the text.

³ In his text of the epistle as given in *Bentley's Crit. Sacra*, p. 108. This text is much later than his "Epistola ad Millium" (Ibid. p. 45), in which he starts the hypothesis of a gloss. This hypothesis was adopted by Mill and others.

from the fact that there is a slight variation of reading in the connecting particles of the following clauses, as if the connection had been disturbed by the insertion of the gloss.

XII. THE MEANING OF HAGAR IN GAL. IV. 25.

If the word Hagar be omitted, the passage is capable of a very easy and natural interpretation. "Sinai," St. Paul argues, "is situated in Arabia, the country of Hagar's descendants, the land of bond-slaves." And such, too, seems to be the most probable account of his meaning, even if, with the received text, we retain Hagar: "This Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia," i.e. it represents Mount Sinai, because Mount Sinai is in Arabia, the land of Hagar and her descendants. It is not ἡ Ἀγαρ, the woman Hagar, but τὸ Ἀγαρ, the thing Hagar, the Hagar of the allegory, the Hagar which is under discussion.¹

Such substantially was the interpretation put upon the passage by some of the ablest among the Greek commentators. "The law was given in the very place," says Theodore of Mopuestia (the sense is somewhat distorted through the medium of a bad Latin translation), "which belongs to that race whence Hagar also was." "About that mountain," says Theodoret, "are the tents of the descendants of Hagar (τὸ τῆς Ἀγαρ ἐσκήρωται γένος)." "The Saracens," remarks a third writer, perhaps Severianus,² "the descendants of Ishmael, dwell in the desert which reaches as far as Mount Sinai." Similarly Ephraem Syrus: "For this Hagar is Mount Sinai which is in the land of the Arabs, and it is a type of (a likeness to) Jerusalem, for it is in subjection and bondage with its sons under the Romans."

This, however, is not the interpretation generally adopted by those who retain the received reading. They suppose the apostle to be calling attention not to the locality of Sinai, but to the meaning of the word Hagar: "The word Hagar in the language of the Arabians denotes Mount Sinai." This interpretation, which prevails widely, is

¹ τὸ denotes that "Hagar" is regarded not as a person, but as an object of thought or of speech. For this use of the neuter article, see Winer, § xviii. p. 121; A. Buttmann, p. 84. It need not necessarily mean "the word Hagar"; compare for instance Eph. iv. 9, τὸ δὲ ἀνέβη τί ἐστίν; where τὸ is the statement, for the preceding word was not ἀνέβη, but ἀναβάς. The Ambrosian

Hilary (after the middle of the fourth century) explains it "causam Agar"—a very early example of the sense which this word bears in the Romance languages, "cosa," "chose."

² In Cramer's *Catena*. It is anonymous (ἄλλος πάλιν φησὶν), but in the immediate neighborhood there is a note assigned to Severianus.

put in its most attractive form by Dean Stanley. "There is another traveller through Arabia," he writes "at this time, on whose visit to Mount Sinai we should look with still greater interest. *I went into Arabia*, says St. Paul, in describing his conversion to the Galatians. It is useless to speculate; yet when, in a later chapter of the same epistle, the words fall upon our ears, *This Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia*, it is difficult to resist the thought that he too may have stood upon the rocks of Sinai, and heard from Arab lips the often repeated "Hagar," "rock," suggesting the double meaning to which that text alludes."¹ "Hagar"² in Arabic means "a rock," or rather "a stone"; and it is maintained that this Arabic word "Hagar" was a common local name for Sinai, or, at all events, was appropriated to it in some special way.

Independently of any questions that may arise on the interpretation, I have endeavored to show that "Hagar" ought to be expelled from the text on the ground of external authority alone. Yet, if it be a fact that Hagar is really another name for Sinai, this fact will go some little way towards reinstating *Ἀγάρ*; and on this account, as well as in deference to the advocacy it has found, it will be worth while to consider the difficulties which beset this interpretation.

1. The evidence on which the assumed fact rests is both deficient in amount and suspicious in character. Not more than two independent witnesses, if they be independent, have, so far as I know, been produced.

(i.) Chrysostom, at the close of the fourth century, in his exposition of this epistle, writes somewhat obscurely: "Hagar was the name of the bondmaid; and Mount Sinai is so interpreted in their native tongue (τὸ δὲ Σινᾶ ὄρος οὕτω μεθερμηνεύεται τῇ ἐπιχωρίῳ αὐτῶν γλώττῃ)"; and afterwards he speaks of the mountain as "bearing the same name with the bondmaid (ὁμώνυμον τῇ δούλῃ)." To the same effect writes Theophylact, who is often a mere echo of Chrysostom, as do one or

¹ *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 50. See above, p. 309.

² حَجَر pronounced "*Chagar*" (or rather "*Chajar*"). The Arabic alphabet has two letters, ح and خ, a softer and a harsher sound, corresponding to the one Hebrew guttural כ (Cheth). The initial letter of "Hagar," "a stone,"

is the former of these, a soft guttural *Ch*, and not a simple aspirate. The second letter of the word is ج, corresponding to the Hebrew ג, our G, but generally pronounced by the Arabs softly like the English J, as we pronounce it in *gem*. I shall in this note represent ح by *Ch*, ج by *G*, both in Italics.


two anonymous commentators in the Oecumenian Catena, without doubt deriving their information from the same source.¹

(ii.) The Bohemian traveller Harant, who visited Sinai in the year 1598, says: "The Arabian and Mauritanian heathen call Mount Sinai *Agar* or *Tur*."² Though, for anything that is found in the context, this might have been written without a thought of the passage of St. Paul, yet I think it hardly probable. Luther, following Erasmus, had maintained this interpretation; and, from the enormous popularity of his commentaries on the Galatians, it is likely that they were known to Harant, who himself ultimately became a Protestant. If so, he did not necessarily derive his information from the Arabs on the spot, but may have accepted without question the popular statement, as more recent travellers have done.

In later works of travel I have not found any direct personal testimony to this assumed fact. If there be any, it will, from the nature of the case require careful sifting. The word "Hagar" (*Chagar*) "a rock," or "a stone," must be heard again and again from native lips in this wild region;³ and a traveller once possessed of the idea might easily elicit the word from his Arab guide by a leading question, and, on the strength of an answer thus obtained, unsuspectingly confirm the statement that it was a local name for the mountain.

Thus the independent testimony to this supposed fact is confined to Chrysostom and Harant, or, if my supposition with regard to Harant be correct, to Chrysostom alone. To Chrysostom, then, if I mistake

¹ Chrysostom's interpretation of the passage in St. Paul may perhaps underlie the account of the word "Hagar," given in Bar Bahlul's *Syriac Lexicon*,

p. 417:  This extract, which is taken from the MS. in the Cambridge University Library, I owe to the kindness of R. L. Bensley, Esq., of Caius College.

² Harant's authority is generally quoted at second hand through Büsching's *Erdbeschr.* 1, i. p. 603 (Hamb. 1792). In Harant's work itself, *Der Christliche Ulysses* (Nürnb. 1678), the passage runs: "Den Berg. Synai nennen die Arabische und Mauritanische Heyden *Agar* oder *Tur*: Weissenberg, wie auch *Tucla*, wie *Odoardo Barbosa nel*

summ. del' Ind. Orient. bezenget." The work was written in Bohemian, but translated into German by his brother, and published by his nephew (see Balbinus, *Bohem. Doct.* ii. p. 104). What Harant means by "Weissenberg" and "Tucla," I do not understand. I give the passage of Barbosa to which he refers, as it stands in the copies which I have consulted. The title is *Primo volume delle Navigazioni e Viaggi* (Venet. 1550 and 1554); *Libro di Odoardo Barbosa or Barbosa*, p. 313 (325), "passato il detto monte Sinai, il quale i Mori dimandano Turla (sic)."

³ The index to Ritter's *Erdkunde*, Sinai, etc. ii. p. 1331, s. v. "Hadschar," "Hadjar," etc., names several "stones" on and about Sinai: "Hadschar Elma," "Hadsjar räkkäbe," "Hadj Musa," etc.

not, or to some earlier writer whom he copied, this statement is due. Nor should we be doing any injustice to one who makes St. Paul speak of Sinai as "contiguous to Jerusalem," were we to suppose that having heard of some place bearing the name "Hagar" whether in Arabia Petraea or in some district bordering upon the Sinaitic mountains (for the name seems to have been not uncommon¹), he compressed the geography of the whole region and assigned this name to Mount Sinai itself, imagining that he had thus found the key to St. Paul's meaning.² It is, at least, worthy of notice that, neither his friend, Theodore of Mopsuestia, nor Theodoret the pupil of Theodore, both natives of Antioch and both acquainted with his work, makes any mention whatever of this assumed fact, or the interpretation based on it. Probably they were better informed on the subject, and for this reason tacitly abandoned Chrysostom's explanation.

2. But supposing it were proved that Sinai were so called by the Arabs, this word "*Chagar*" is not written or pronounced in the same way as the proper name "Hagar," and etymologically the two are entirely distinct. The proper name "Hagar," with the simple aspirate (הגַר, in Arabic **هاجر**), signifies "a wanderer or fugitive," being

¹ Older critics, as Bochart and others (le Moyne, *Var. Sacr.* p. 854; Pfeiffer, *Op.* i. p. 504), assert that Petra itself bears the name Hagar (*Chagar*) in Arabic writers, just as in Greek it is called Πέτρα, and in Hebrew **צֶהַר**, words having the same meaning "rock." This statement, however, is founded on a twofold error; (1) The vocalization of the proper name referred to is not "*Chagar*," but "*Chigr*"; and (2) The place which bears this name "El *Chigr*" in Arabic writers is not Petra itself, but a station several days south of Petra on the pilgrims' route between Damascus and Mecca. See Ewald, *Poebus*, p. 493 sq.; Robinson's *Palestine*, etc., ii. p. 522. There is no evidence that Petra itself was so called.

There is a place **חַגְרָה**, "*Chagra*," mentioned four times in the Targum of Onkelos, Gen. xvi. 7, 14; xx. 1; Exod. xv. 22. In the second passage it is substituted for "Bered," in the remaining three for "Shur," of the original text. It must, therefore, have lain somewhere at the south of Palestine, in the desert

on the way to Egypt. In Gen. xvi. 7 it occurs in connection with the flight of Hagar.

I venture to conjecture that there was also a place "Hagar" (whether **هاجر** or **حاجر**) in Belka, and that the appearance of "Belka" in the Arabic version of Gal. i. 17 and iv. 25 (see above, p. 307) is to be explained by this fact.

² Wieseler explains Chrysostom's meaning in a different way, insisting on the strict sense of *μεθερμηνεύεται*. According to Fürst, *Concord.* and *Hebr. Handb.* s. v., **סִינִי** signifies "rocky," so that *interpreted* in Arabic it would be **حاجر**, and to this identity of meaning in "Sinai" and "Hagar" he supposes Chrysostom to allude. But even if the account which Fürst gives of the word **סִינִי** were altogether satisfactory. It would still remain in the highest degree improbable that Chrysostom should be acquainted with an etymology so abstruse.

connected with the Arabic "Hegira" the familiar term for the flight of Mahomet (compare also the Hebrew הגירה and הגיר). Thus it has nothing in common with "*Chagar*," "a stone" (حجر), which if it occurred in Hebrew would be written הגיר. It is true that the gutturals are closely allied and were sometimes confounded;¹ and this circumstance would deserve to be considered, if the supposed name for Sinai were supported by sufficient testimony; but where this is wanting, the false etymology throws an additional obstacle, to say the least, in the way of our accepting the explanation in question. Nor will it appear very probable that St. Paul should have set aside the true derivation, when it is given and allegorized by his contemporary Philo.²

It seems much more probable, indeed, if St. Paul is alluding to any local name of Sinai, that he should have regarded the true etymology, and that the name in question was not הגיר "rock," but הגיר "wanderer." This latter name was, at least, not uncommon among the Arab tribes; and it is far from unlikely, though direct evidence is wanting, that a settlement of these "wanderers," these children of "Hagar," occupied the country about Sinai in St. Paul's day, and gave it their name for the time.

¹ The close alliance between the gutturals is shown. (1) By their interchange in the same language in different words connected or identical in meaning and obviously derived from the same root, e.g. בחר and בחר, צחר and צחר; (2) By their interchange in different languages of the Semitic family, e.g. Heb. בחר and Syr. ܠܚܚ (Hoffmann, *Gramm. Syr.* p. 123), or in different dialects of the same language, e.g. in the Aramaic dialects the Syriac ܠܚܚ compared with the Chaldee ܠܚܚ, (see Gesen. *Theo.* p. 359, Fürst, *Aram. Idiom.* § 45); (3) By the confusion of sound in the same language or dialect, e.g. a Judæan in the story professes himself unable to distinguish between אֵזֶר, "a lamb," אֵזֶר, "wool," אֵזֶר, "wine," and אֵזֶר, "an ass," as pronounced by a Galilean, when the latter wants to make a purchase; see Fürst, *ib.* § 15. There was the same confusion also in the Samaritan pronunciation of the gutturals; Gesen. *Lehrgeb.* § 32. 1. On the relation of the

gutturals to each other, see Ewald, *Ausf. Lehrb. d. Heb. Spr.* § 39 seqq.

Assemani, indeed, (*Bibl. Or.* iii. 2, p. 753) gives an instance of the interchange of the gutturals *He* and *Cheth* in this very word Hagar: "Hagar ܠܚܚ, Arabibus حجر Hagiar, hoc est, Petra; Ptolemaeo *Agra*, unde *Agræi* populi *Arabiae* juxta sinum Persicum," etc. But is there not a misprint or an error here? Was this place ever written in Arabic otherwise than with a simple aspirate as in Syriac? At all events Winer (*Realw. s. v. Hagariter*) is wrong in understanding Assemani's remark of the station between Damascus and Mecca (see p. 366, note 1), and has been blindly followed by others.

² *παροιμία*, *Leg. alleg.* i. p. 135 (Mangey), *Sacr. ab. et Ca.* i. p. 170 (*παροιμεί σοφία, οὐ κατοικεί*). Another derivation of Hagar, or rather a play upon the word, was הא אגיר, "here is thy wages"; see Beer, *Leben Abraham's*, p. 148.

3. But, lastly, is it probable, supposing this to have been St. Paul's meaning, that he would have expressed himself as he has done? If in writing to a half-Greek half-Celtic people he ventured to argue from an Arabic word at all, he would at all events be careful to make his drift intelligible. But how could his readers be expected to put the right interpretation on the words "this Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia"? How could they possibly understand, knowing nothing of Arabic, that he meant to say, "this word Hagar in the Arabic tongue stands for Mount Sinai"? Even if it be granted that his readers were acquainted with the fact which was the key to his meaning, is ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ at all a likely expression to be used by any writer for ἐν τῇ Ἀραβικῇ γλώσσῃ or Ἀραβιστί, unless it were made intelligible by the context? Yet this is the meaning generally assigned to ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ by those commentators, ancient or modern, who adopt the interpretation in question, and, indeed, seems to be required to justify that interpretation.

In the face of these difficulties, it seems at least improbable that the point of the passage is the identity of "Hagar" and "Sinai" as different names of the same mountain, and the reading which retains "Hagar" in the text loses any support which it may seem to draw from this identity, assumed as a fact.

XIII. PHILO'S ALLEGORY OF HAGAR AND SARAH.¹

In giving an allegorical meaning to this passage of the Old Testament narrative, St. Paul did not stand alone. It might be inferred, indeed, from his own language, that such applications of the history of Hagar and Sarah were not uncommon in the schools of his day.² But, however this may be, it is more than once so applied in the extant works of Philo. I have already pointed out the contrast presented by his treatment of the history of Abraham in general to the lessons which it suggests to the apostle of the Gentiles. This contrast extends to his application of the allegorical method to this portion of the sacred narrative. Philo's allegory is as follows:

Abraham — the human soul progressing towards the knowledge of God — unites himself first with Sarah and then with Hagar. These

¹ For Philo's allegory of Hagar and Sarah, see esp. *De congr. quær. crud. gr.* *De prof.* i. p. 546; *De Abr.* ii. p. 52; *De i.* p. 519 sqq.; esp. pp. 521, 522, 530, 592, and *Quærst. in Gen.* p. 189 sqq.; *De somn.* i. p. 656. ² See the notes on συνοστοιχεῖ and ἀλληγορούμενα.

two alliances stand in direct opposition the one to the other.¹ Sarah, the princess—for such is the interpretation of the word²—is divine wisdom. To her, therefore, Abraham is bidden to listen in all that she says. On the other hand, Hagar, whose name signifies “sojourning” (*παροίκησις*), and points, therefore, to something transient and unsatisfying, is a preparatory or intermediate training—the instruction of the schools—secular learning, as it might be termed in modern phrase.³ Hence she is fitly described as an Egyptian, as Sarah’s handmaid. Abraham’s alliance with Sarah is at first premature. He is not sufficiently advanced in his moral and spiritual development to profit thereby. As yet he begets no son by her. She therefore directs him to go in to her handmaid, to apply himself to the learning of the schools. This inferior alliance proves fruitful at once. At a later date, and after this preliminary training he again unites himself to Sarah; and this time his union with divine wisdom is fertile. Not only does Sarah bear him a son, but she is pointed out as the mother of a countless offspring.⁴ Thus is realized the strange paradox, that “the barren woman is most fruitful.” Thus in the progress of the human soul are verified the words of the prophet, spoken in an allegory, that “the desolate hath many children.”⁵

But the allegory does not end here. The contrast between the mothers is reproduced in the contrast between the sons. Isaac represents the wisdom of the wise man, Ishmael the sophistry of the sophist.⁶ Sophistry must in the end give place to wisdom. The son

¹ *De Abr.* ii. p. 15, ἐναντιώτατοι δὲ ἀλλήλοις εἰσὶν οἱ λεχθέντες γάμοι.

² In some passages Philo still further refines on the change in her name (*Gen.* xvii. 15): e.g. *De mut. nom.* i. p. 590; *Quaest. in Gen.* p. 229 (Aucher), *de Cherub.* i. p. 139. Her first name Σάρα (שָׂרָה) is ἀρχή μου, her aftername Σάρρα (שָׂרָה) is ἀρχουσα; (see Hieron. *Quaest. in Gen.* T. iii. p. 331). Thus they are related to each other as the special to the general, as the finite and perishable to the infinite and imperishable.

³ ἡ μέση καὶ ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία is Philo’s favorite phrase, e.g. *De Cherub.* i. p. 139.

⁴ *De congr. quæst. erud. gr.* i. p. 519 ταύτην Μωϋσῆς, τὸ παραδοξότατον, καὶ στείραν ἀποφαίνει καὶ πολυγονωτάτην: comp. *De mut. nom.* i. pp. 599, 600, where he adds κατὰ τὸ ἀδόμενον ἄσμα ὑπὸ τῆς

χάριτος Ἀννης ἢ φησιν, Στεῖρα ἔτεκεν ἐπὶ τὰ ἡ δὲ πολλὰ ἐν τέκνοις ἡσθένησε (*1 Sam.* ii. 5).

⁵ *De exor.* ii. p. 434 ἡ γὰρ ἔρημος, ἣ φησὶν ὁ προφήτης, εὐτεκνός τε καὶ πολύπαις, ὅπερ λόγιον καὶ ἐπὶ ψυχῆς ἀλληγορεῖται (*Isa.* liv. 1). The coincidence with St. Paul is the more striking inasmuch as Philo very rarely goes beyond the Pentateuch in seeking subjects for allegorical interpretation. There is, indeed, no mention of Sarah and Hagar here, but it appears, both from the context and from parallel passages, that they are present to his mind.

⁶ *De sobr.* i. p. 394 σοφίαν μὲν Ἰσαὰκ, σοφιστείαν δὲ Ἰσμαὴλ κεκλήρωται: comp. *de Cherub.* i. p. 140, and other passages referred to in p. 368, note 1. The names give Philo some trouble. Isaac,

of the bondwomen must be cast out, and flee before the son of the princess.¹

Such is the ingenious application of Philo—most like, and yet most unlike, that of St. Paul. They both allegorize, and in so doing they touch upon the same points in the narrative, they use the same text by way of illustration. Yet in their whole tone and method they stand in direct contrast, and their results have nothing in common. Philo is, as usual, wholly unhistorical. With St. Paul, on the other hand, Hagar's career is an allegory, because it is a history. The symbol and the thing symbolized are the same in kind. This simple passage of patriarchal life represents in miniature the workings of God's providence, hereafter to be exhibited in grander proportions in the history of the Christian church. The Christian apostle and the philosophic Jew move in parallel lines, as it were, keeping side by side, and yet never once crossing each other's path.

And there is still another point in which the contrast between the two is great. With Philo the allegory is the whole substance of his teaching; with St. Paul it is but an accessory. He uses it rather as an illustration than an argument, as a means of representing in a lively form the lessons before enforced on other grounds. It is, to use Luther's comparison, the painting which decorates the house already built.

At the same time we need not fear to allow that St. Paul's mode of teaching here is colored by his early education in the rabbinical schools. It were as unreasonable to stake the apostle's inspiration on the turn of a metaphor or the character of an illustration or the form of an argument, as on purity of diction. No one now thinks of maintaining that the language of the inspired writers reaches the classical standard of correctness and elegance, though at one time it was held almost a heresy to deny this. "A treasure contained in earthen vessels," "strength made perfect in weakness," "rudeness in speech, yet not in knowledge," such is the far nobler conception of inspired teaching which we may gather from the apostle's own language. And this language we should do well to bear in mind. But, on the other

of course, signifies "laughter," betokening the joy which comes of divine wisdom; see, besides, the passages just referred to, *Leg. alleg.* i. p. 131, *Quod det. pot.* i. pp. 203, 215. Ishmael he contrasts with Israel, the one signifying the *hearing* God, the other the *seeing* God (אִשְׁמָאֵל וְיִשְׂרָאֵל,

"vir videns deum"; comp. Hieron. in *Gen.* T. iii. p. 357). Thus they are opposed to each other, as ἀκοή to ὕπασις, as the fallacious to the infallible, as the σοφιστής to the σόφος, *De prof.* i. p. 577; *De met. nom.* i. p. 609.

⁵ *De Cherub.* i. p. 140.

hand, it were mere dogmatism to set up the intellectual standard of our own age or country as an infallible rule. The power of allegory has been differently felt in different ages, as it is differently felt at any one time by diverse nations. Analogy, allegory, metaphor—by what boundaries are these separated the one from the other? What is true or false, correct or incorrect, as an analogy or an allegory? What argumentative force must be assigned to either? We should at least be prepared with an answer to these questions, before we venture to sit in judgment on any individual case.

XIV. THE VARIOUS READINGS IN GAL. V. 1.

The variations of reading in this verse are the more perplexing, in that they seriously affect the punctuation, and thereby the whole texture of the passage. The main variations are threefold.

1. The position of οὖν.

(i.) It stands after *στήκετε* in \aleph ABCFGP and a few of the better cursive MSS.; in f.g., the Vulgate, Gothic, Memphitic, Ethiopic, Armenian, and perhaps the Peshito-Syriac¹ versions, in Origen,² Basil,³ and Cyril,⁴ in Victorinus, Augustine, and others. The Memphitic version also inserts *γάρ* after *ἐλευθερία*.

(ii.) Its position is after *ἐλευθερία* in C (by a third hand), KL, and very many cursive MSS.; in Marcus Monachus,⁵ Damascene, Theophylact, and Oecumenius.

(iii.) It is omitted in DE (both Greek and Latin); in the Vulgate and later Syriac; in Ephraem Syrus; in Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret; in Jerome, Pelagius, the Ambrosian Hilary, and others. It is wanting also in Chrysostom, who, however, supplies a connecting particle, reading *τῇ γὰρ ἐλευθερίᾳ κ.τ.λ.*

In Asterius⁶ and in the Thebaic version οὖν is absent after *ἐλευθερία*, but as the context is wanting in both, it is impossible to say whether it occurred after *στήκετε*, or not.

Thus it will be seen that the balance of authority is decidedly in favor of placing οὖν after *στήκετε*; and this is probably the correct

¹ This is doubtful, the order of the words being altered in this version. after *ἐλευθερία*. In the *de Bapt.* (ii. p. 641, Garnier), a treatise ascribed to Basil, but of doubtful authorship, its place is after *στήκετε*.

² In *Exod.* II. 3 (ii. p. 139), In *Jud.* II. 9 (ii. p. 477), both extant only in Latin.

³ *Mor.* 14 (ii. p. 247, Garnier), according to some of the best MSS. In the printed editions, however, it stands

⁴ *Glaphyr.* i. p. 75.

⁵ Gallandi, viii. p. 47.

⁶ In *Ps.* v. Hom. v. Cotel. *Mon. Eccl.* ii. p. 46.

reading. The displacement (ii.) and the omission (iii.) were, it would seem, different expedients to relieve the awkwardness in the position of the connecting particle, on the supposition that the sentence began with $\tau\eta\ \epsilonλευθερίῳ$.

2. The position of $\eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$. It is found,

(i.) Before $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ in \aleph ABDEFGP and some cursive MSS., in Origen (Latin translation), Theodore of Mopsuestia (Latin Translation), and Cyril.¹

(ii.) After $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ in CKL and many cursive MSS., and in Chrysostom, Theodoret, Asterius, Marcus Monachus, and Damascene.

(iii.) After $\eta\lambdaευθέρωσεν$ in Theophylact.

The versions and the Latin fathers vary, the majority placing it after $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$; but this is plainly a case where no great stress can be laid on such evidence. The transposition would be made unintentionally in the course of translation ($\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma\ \eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ being perhaps the more natural order), so that one authority in favor of $\eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ is of more weight than a number against it. The order $\eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ may therefore be retained with confidence.

3. Besides these, there still remains a third and more important variation.

(i.) $\tau\eta\ \epsilonλευθερίῳ\ \eta$ is read in D (by the correction of later hands²), EKL, and the great majority of cursives, in both Syriac versions, in Basil, Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia (Latin), Theodoret (twice), Cyril, Asterius, Marcus Monachus, Theophylact, and Oecumenius. The Ethiopic has "quia Christus nos liberavit; etstate igitur."

(ii.) $\tau\eta\ \epsilonλευθερίᾱ$ alone is found in \aleph ABCDP and a few cursive MSS., in the Thebaic and Memphitic versions, and in Damascene and others.

(iii.) $\eta\ \epsilonλευθερίᾱ$ in FG, in the old Latin, Vulgate, and Gothic versions, in Marcion (or rather Tertullian³), Origen (Latin translation⁴), in Victorinus, Augustine, Jerome, and others.

Thus our choice seems to lie between (i.) and (ii.), and on the whole the first seems more probable than the second. For though the balance of direct evidence is against it, the following considerations may be urged in its favor.

¹ The Latin of D has "qua libertate nostra." It has been suggested to me that *tra* was originally a direction to transpose "nos."

² "D** et D*** praeposuerunt η , praetereaue D** addidit signa quibus $\eta\ \chi\acute{\varsigma}$ ante $\eta\mu\alpha\varsigma$ ponendum esse significaret, sed videntur ea signa rursus deleta esse." — Tischendorf, *Cod. Clarom.*

³ *Adv. Marc.* v. 4.

⁴ *In Gen.* H. 7 (ii. p. 78), *In Cant.* i. 6 (iii. p. 52).

First. The reading $\tau\eta\ \epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\theta\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$ without η is so difficult as to be almost unintelligible. At a certain point Bengel's rule, "proclivi scriptioni praeſtat ardua," attains its maximum value; beyond this point it ceases to apply. And in the present instance it is difficult to give any interpretation to the words which is not either meaningless or ungrammatical.

Secondly. Supposing $\tau\eta\ \epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\theta\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \eta$ to have been the original reading, the omission of η in some texts admits of a very simple explanation. Standing immediately before $\eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ (which in its proper position, as we have seen, precedes $\chi\rho\iota\varsigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$), it would easily drop out through the carelessness of transcribers. In this case, too, the transposition $\chi\rho\iota\varsigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma\ \eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ for $\eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \chi\rho\iota\varsigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ was probably made for the sake of euphony, to avoid the juxtaposition of $\eta\ \eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, which came together in the original text.

At the same time the testimony in favor of $\tau\eta\ \epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\theta\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$ alone is so strong that I have hesitated to set it aside altogether, and have therefore retained it in the margin as an alternative reading.

The third reading, $\eta\ \epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\theta\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$, found chiefly in the Latin copies, is not very easily accounted for, but was perhaps substituted for $\tau\eta\ \epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\theta\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \eta$, as a more elegant expression or as a retranslation from the loose Latin rendering, "qua libertate."

The words being thus determined, the punctuation is best decided by the position of the connecting particle, and the sentence will run, $\tau\eta\varsigma\ \epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\theta\acute{\epsilon}\rho\iota\alpha\varsigma\ \tau\eta\ \epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\theta\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \eta\ \eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \chi\rho\iota\varsigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma\ \eta\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\theta\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\sigma\epsilon\iota\upsilon\upsilon\ \Sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\kappa\epsilon\tau\epsilon\ \omicron\iota\upsilon\ \kappa\tau.\lambda.$

XV. PATRISTIC COMMENTARIES ON THIS EPISTLE.

The patristic commentaries on the Galatians, extant either whole or in part, are perhaps more numerous than on any other of St. Paul's Epistles. The earlier of these have for the most part an independent value: the latter are mere collections or digests of the labors of preceding writers, and have no claim to originality. In the list which follows, an asterisk is prefixed to the name of the author in cases where fragments only remain.

In drawing up this account I have had occasion to refer frequently to Cave's *Script. Eccles. Hist. Liter.* (Oxon. 1740), to Fabricius's *Bibliotheca Graeca* (ed. Harles), and to Schröckh's *Christliche Kirchengeschichte*. Special works relating to the subject, to which reference is also made, are Simon's *Histoire Critique des Principaux Commentateurs du N. T.* (1693), Rosenmüller's *Historia Interpretationis Librorum Sacrorum* (1795-1814), and a treatise by J. F. S. Augustin in Nösselt's *Opusc.* iii. p. 321 sqq.

1. EARLIER COMMENTARIES.

(a) *Greek and Syrian Fathers.*

(i.) *ORIGINES († 253). The recently discovered list of Origen's works drawn up by Jerome, mentions fifteen books on the Epistle to the Galatians, besides seven homilies on the same (Redepenning in Niedner's *Zeitschr.* 1851, pp. 77, 78); while the same Jerome in the preface to his Commentary (vii. p. 370, ed. Vall.) says of this father, "Scripsit ille vir in epistolam Pauli ad Galatas quinque proprie volumina et decimum Stromatum suorum librum commatico super explanatione ejus sermone complevit: tractatus quoque varios et excerpta quae vel sola possint sufficere composuit." The two accounts are not irreconcilable. Of this vast apparatus not a single fragment remains in the original, and only two or three have been preserved in a Latin dress either in the translation of Pamphilus's *Apology* (Origen, *Op.* iv. p. 690, Delarue), or in Jerome's *Commentary* (Gal. v. 13). On the other hand, there can be no doubt that all subsequent writers are directly or indirectly indebted to him to a very large extent. Jerome especially avows his obligations to this father of Biblical criticism. In my notes I have had occasion to mention Origen's name chiefly in connection with fanciful speculations or positive errors, because his opinion has rarely been recorded by later writers, except where his authority was needed to sanction some false or questionable interpretation; but the impression thus produced is most unjust to his

reputation. In spite of his very patent faults, which it costs nothing to denounce, a very considerable part of what is valuable in subsequent commentaries, whether ancient or modern, is due to him. A deep thinker, an accurate grammarian, a most laborious worker, and a most earnest Christian, he not only laid the foundation, but to a very great extent built up the fabric, of Biblical interpretation.

(ii.) EPHRAEM SYRUS († 378), the deacon of Edessa. An Armenian version of a commentary on the Scriptures, including St. Paul's Epistles, purporting to be by this author, was published at Venice in 1836.¹ If this work be genuine, it ought to be of some value for the text at all events, if not for the interpretation. On this writer see Cave, 1 p. 235; Fabricius, viii. p. 217; Schröckh, xv. p. 527; and the article by E. Rödiger in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie*, with the references there given. Lagarde (*Apost. Const.* p. vi.) very decidedly maintains the genuineness of these Armenian works; and Rödiger seems also to take this view. In the few passages which I have had the opportunity of testing, both the reading and the interpretations are favorable to their genuineness.

The five writers whose names follow, all belong to the great Antiochene school of interpreters. For its grammatical precision and for its critical spirit generally, this school was largely indebted to the example of Origen; whose principles were transmitted to it through Lucian of Antioch and Pamphilus of Caesarea, both ardent Biblical critics and both martyrs in the Diocletian persecution; but in its method of exposition it was directly opposed to the great Alexandrian, discarding the allegorical treatment of Scripture, and maintaining, for the most part, the simple and primary meaning. The criticisms of these commentators on Gal. iv. 21–31 exhibit the characteristic features of the school to which they belonged. Theodore of Mopsuestia is its best typical exponent, being at once the most original thinker and the most determined antagonist of the allegorists. On the Antiochene school generally, see Neander's *Church Hist.* ii. p. 498, iii. p. 497 sqq. (Eng. trans.) Reuss, *Gesch. d. Heil. Schr.* § 518 (3te ausg.).

¹ Zenker's *Bibl. Orient.* also mentions as published at Venice in 1833 a book by Aucher bearing the title *S. P. Ephraemi Syri Comment. in Epist. S. Pauli etc. ex antiquissima Armenica versione nunc primum latinitate donatum*. But it is not included in a recent catalogue of the works printed at the Armenian press

at Venice, and though advertised, seems never to have appeared. Through the kindness of Dr. Rieu of the British Museum, of whose knowledge of Armenian I gladly availed myself, I have been able in some important passages to give the readings and interpretations of Ephraem.

(iii.) *EUSEBIUS EMISENUS († about 360), so called from the name of his see Emesa or Emisa (Hums), a native of Edessa. A few fragments of his work are preserved in Cramer's *Cutena*, pp. 6, 8, 12, 20, 28, 32, 40, 44, 57, 62, 64, 65, 67, 91. It is described by Jerome as "ad Galatas libri decem" (*de vir. illustr.* c. 91). Eusebius enjoyed a great reputation with his contemporaries, and these scanty fragments seem to indicate an acute and careful expositor. His writings are the subject of monographs by Augusti, *Eusebii Emeseni Opusc. Graec.*, etc. 1829. and by Thilo, *Über die Schriften d. Euseb. v. Alexandrien u. d. Euseb. v. Emisa* (1832). See also Fabricius, vii. p. 412, Schröckh, v. p. 68 sqq. The publication of Cramer's *Cutena* has since added materials for an account of this writer.

(iv.) JOANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS († 407). This father's commentary on the Galatians differs from his expositions of other parts of the New Testament, in that it is not divided into separate discourses, nor interrupted by long perorations, which in his Homilies break the continuity of the subject. This gives it compactness and adds considerably to its value. At the same time it would seem from its character to have been intended for oral delivery. It is an eloquent popular exposition based on fine scholarship. The date is uncertain, except that it was written at Antioch, i.e. before A.D. 398, when St. Chrysostom became Patriarch of Constantinople (see the preface of the Benedictine edition, x. p. 655). It appears not to have been known to Jerome when he wrote his own commentary. In his controversy with Augustine, indeed, which arose out of that commentary, he alludes to the opinion of Chrysostom on the collision of the apostles at Antioch, but distinctly refers to a separate homily of the great preacher devoted to this special subject ("proprie super hoc capitulo latissimum exaravit librum." Hieron. *Epist.* cxii. See above p. 242). The exposition of the Galatians may be read in the Benedictine edition of Chrysostom's works, x. p. 657; or still better in Field's edition of the Homilies (Oxon. 1852).

(v.) *SEVERIANUS (about 400), bishop of Gabala in Syria, first the friend, and afterwards the opponent, of Chrysostom; see Schröckh, x. p. 458 sqq. He wrote an *Expositio in Epistolam ad Galatas* (Gennad. *De Vir Illustr.* c. 21. Hier. *Op.* ii. p. 981). Gennadius speaks of him as "in divinis scripturis eruditus." Several fragments of this work are preserved in Cramer's *Cutena*, pp. 16, 18, 23, 29, 39, 40, 55, 58, 59, 64, 66, 70, 82, 93. and one, at least, in the Oecumenian Commentary (Gal. i. 13). Like most writers of the Graeco-Syrian school, he maintained the literal meaning of Scripture against the allegorists. See Cave, i. p. 375; Fabricius, x. p. 507.

(vi.) THEODORUS MOPSUESTENUS († 429), a native of Tarsus, so called from the see of Mopsuestia, which he held. He wrote commentaries on all St. Paul's Epistles; see Ebed Jesu's Catalogue in Asseman. *Bibl. Orient.* iii. p. 32. Several fragments of these in the original are preserved in the *Catenae*,¹ and have been collected and edited by O. F. Fritzsche, *Theod. Mops. Comment. in N. T.* (1847). This editor had before written a monograph, *De Theodori Mopsuesteni vita et scriptis* (1836). Fritzsche's monograph and collection of fragments are reprinted in the edition of Theodore's works in Migne's *Patrol. Græc.* lxi. But, though only portions survive in the Greek, the complete commentaries on the smaller epistles, from Galatians to Philemon inclusive, are extant in a Latin translation. These commentaries, from Philippians onwards, had been long known in the compilation of Rabanus Maurus (Migne's *Patrol. Lat.* cxii.), where they are incorporated nearly entire under the name of Ambrose; and a few years since Dom Pitra, *Spicil. Solesm.* i. p. 49 sqq. (1852), printed the expositions of the Galatians, Ephesians, and Philemon complete, and supplied the omissions and corrected the errors in the extracts on the remaining Epistles in Rabanus, ascribing the work, however, to Hilary of Poitiers.

In the Corbey MS. which he used, these commentaries of Theodore on the shorter epistles were attached to the exposition of the Ambrosiaster or pseudo-Ambrose (who seems to have been one Hilary; see below, p. 380) on Romans and Corinthians, and the two together were entitled *Expositio Sancti Ambrosii in Epistolas B. Pauli*. This circumstance accounts for their being assigned to St. Ambrose in Rabanus, as it also suggested the conjecture of Dom Pitra that the great Hilary was their author. The true authorship was ascertained by the Rev. F. J. A. Hort² from a comparison with the Greek fragments of Theodore, and pointed out by him in the *Journ. of Class. and Sac. Phil.* iv. p. 302 (Camb. 1859). Though much marred by an indifferent Latin translator,³ this commentary is inferior in importance

¹ The fragments assigned to Theodore in Mai *Nov. Patr. Bibl.* vii. 1. p. 408 are none of his, but belong to Theodoret.

² Whilst the first edition of this work was going through the press my attention was directed by Mr. Hort to an article by J. L. Jacobi in the *Deutsche Zeitschr. f. Christl. Wissensch.* Aug. 1854, in which, unknown to him, his conclusions had been anticipated. A recent writer (Rein-kin, *Hilarius von Poitiers*, Schaffhausen, 1864) states fairly the objections to

Dom Pitra's view, but is apparently ignorant that the authorship of the commentary is no longer a matter of conjecture.

³ Thus, for instance, he makes Theodore fall into the common error of interpreting *συμστοιχεῖ*, Gal. iv. 25, "is contiguous to" ("affinis," "confinis"); but the context, as well as the Greek fragment which has *ισοδυναμεῖ*, shows that the blunder is the translator's own.

to the works of Jerome and Chrysostom alone among the patristic expositions now extant. Theodore was a leader of religious thought in his day, and as an expositor he has frequently caught the apostle's meaning where other commentators have failed. Among his contemporaries he had a vast reputation, and was called by the Nestorian Christians "the interpreter" *par excellence*: see Renandot. *Lit. Orient.* ii. p. 616. In the catholic church of a later date the imputation of heresy overshadowed and darkened his fame. On this writer see Fabricius, x. p. 346 sqq. (esp. p. 359), Rosenmüller, iii. p. 250 sqq., Schröckh. xv. p. 197 sqq.

(vii.) THEODORETUS († about 458), bishop of Cyrus, a native of Antioch and a disciple of Theodore. His commentaries on St. Paul are superior to his other exegetical writings, and have been assigned the palm over all patristic expositions of Scripture. See Schröckh, xviii. p. 398 sqq.; Simon, p. 314 sqq.; Rosenmüller, iv. p. 93 sqq.; and the monograph of Richter, *De Theodoro Epist. Paulin. interprete* (Lips. 1822). For appreciation, terseness of expression, and good sense, they are perhaps unsurpassed, and if the absence of faults were a just standard of merit, they would deserve the first place; but they have little claim to originality, and he who has read Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia will find scarcely anything in Theodoret which he has not seen before. It is right to add, however, that Theodoret himself modestly disclaims any such merit. In his preface he apologizes for attempting to interpret St. Paul after two such men (*μετὰ τὸν δέϊνα καὶ τὸν δέϊνα*) who are "luminaries of the world"; and he professes nothing more than to gather his stores "from the blessed fathers." In these expressions, he alludes doubtless to Chrysostom and Theodore.

(viii.) Euthalius, afterwards bishop of Sulce (supposed to have been in Egypt, but as no such place is known to have existed there, probably Sulce in Sardinia is meant; see the notitia printed in Hierocl. *Synecd.* p. 79, ed. Parthey), wrote his work while a young man, in the year 458. On his date see Zacagni, *Collect. Mon. Vet.* i. pp. 402, 536, Fabricius, ix. p. 287. Euthalius edited the Epistles of St. Paul, dividing them into chapters (*κεφάλαια*) and verses (*στίχοι*), writing a general preface and arguments to the several epistles, and marking and enumerating the scriptural quotations. The divisions into chapters and the headings of the chapters he borrowed from some earlier writer (Zacagni, p. 528), probably the same whose date is given as A.D. 396 (ib. p. 536). Mill conjectures this person to have been Theodore of Mopsuestia; *Proleg.* pp. lxxxvi. lxxxvii. Reasons,

however, have been assigned for thinking that Euthalius in this work was largely indebted to a much earlier critic, Pamphilus the martyr († 309): see Tregelles in *Horne's Introduction*, p. 27. On the Stichometry of Euthalius, see Mill, *Proleg.* p. xc.; Scrivener's *Introduction*, pp. 45, 53, and especially Tregelles, *l.c.* Though not a commentary, the work is sufficiently important in its bearing on the criticism of St. Paul's Epistles to deserve a place here. It was first printed entire in Zacagni's *Collect. Mon. Vet.* i. p. 402 sqq., and may be found in Gallandi, x. p. 197 sqq.

(ix.) *GENNADIUS († 471), patriarch of Constantinople. A few extracts in the printed editions of the Oecumenian Catena bear the name of Gennadius, and the number might be increased by consulting the MSS. I suppose these are rightly attributed to the patriarch of Constantinople, among whose works they are included in Migne's *Patrol. Graec.* lxxxv. p. 1611, for they can scarcely be assigned to any other of the name. So far as I know, there is no record of any work on St. Paul by this or any Gennadius. The fragments on the Galatians, indeed, are so scanty that they do not in themselves warrant us in assuming a special work on this epistle, but the numerous extracts on the Epistle to the Romans in Cramer's *Catena* must certainly have been taken from a continuous exposition.

(x.) *PHOTIUS († about 891), patriarch of Constantinople. For the fullest information on the writings of this great man, see Fabricius, x. p. 670 sqq. Large fragments bearing the name of Photius are preserved in the Oecumenian Catena, taken, it would appear, from a commentary on St. Paul's Epistles no longer extant. Cave, indeed, asserts (ii. p. 49) that a MS. exists in the Cambridge University Library, and this statement is repeated by Fabricius, xi. p. 33. and others. This is a mistake. The MS. in question (Ff. i. 30), which is incorrectly labelled with the name of Photius, proves — as far, at least, as relates to the Epistle to the Galatians — to contain a collection of notes identical with that of the Oecumenian Catena. It is accurately described in the new Catalogue. These fragments of Photius do not contribute much that is new to the criticism of St. Paul; but they are an additional testimony to the extensive learning and intellectual vigor of the writer.

(b.) *Latin Fathers.*

(i.) C. MARIUS VICTORINUS (about 360), an African, surnamed the Philosopher, converted to Christianity in old age, taught rhetoric at Rome when Jerome was a boy. He wrote commentaries apparently on all St. Paul's Epistles (Hieron. *de vir. illustr.* 101, *praef. ad Gal.*),

of which the expositions of the Galatians, Philippians, and Ephesians alone are extant. They were first published by Mai, *Script. Vet. Nor. Coll.* iii. 2. p. 1 (1828), and may be found in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* viii. p. 1145. It is difficult to understand the reputation which Victorinus had for eloquence. His work on the Galatians is obscure, confused, and is an exposition almost worthless; but it now and then preserves a curious fact (e.g. about the Symmachians, p. 16) and is interesting as the earliest extant commentary on this epistle. There is a lacuna from v. 18 to the end of the chapter. On this writer see Mai's Preface, p. x sqq. and the article in Smith's *Dict. of Biography*.

(ii.) AMBROSIASTER, so called because his commentary was wrongly ascribed to St. Ambrose, and is commonly printed with the works of that father; see the Benedictine edition, ii. App. p. 20 sqq. It is, however, quoted by Augustine (*cont. duas epist. Pelag.* iv. 7, T. x. p. 472, ed. Ben.) under the name "sanctus Hilarius," and is generally ascribed in consequence to Hilary, the Roman deacon, who lived about the middle of the fourth century and attached himself to the Luciferian schism. The epithet "sanctus," however, is not likely to have been applied by St. Augustine to this person, and it must remain doubtful what Hilary was intended, except that we cannot possibly ascribe these commentaries to the great Hilary of Poitiers. The author, whoever he was, wrote during the pontificate of Damasus (see his note on 1 Tim. iii. 15) who was bishop of Rome from 366 to 384. See Schröckh, vi. p. 210; xiv. p. 310. This work, which includes the thirteen epistles of St. Paul, is one of the best Latin Commentaries. A good account of it is given in Simon, p. 133 sqq.; see also Rosenmüller, iii. p. 589 sqq. I have, generally, quoted this commentator as the Ambrosian Hilary, or as Hilary simply.

(iii.) EUSEBIUS SOPHRONIUS HIERONYMUS. His *Commentarii in Epistolam ad Galatas* (ed. Vallars, T. vii. p. 367) were written about the year 387 (*Hieron. Vit.* T. xi. p. 104). In his preface he speaks of himself as undertaking a task unattempted by any Latin writer (he afterwards excepts Victorinus of whom he speaks contemptuously), and treated by very few even of the Greeks in a manner worthy of the dignity of the subject. It is clear from this that he had not seen the work of the Ambrosiaster, which, perhaps, had only been published a few years before. Of the Greeks he singles out Origen, whose labors he extols highly and whom he professes to have followed. Besides Origen he mentions having read Didymus (of Alexandria, who died in 396, at an advanced age; see Fabricius, ix. p. 269) whom in allusion to his blindness he calls "my seer" (*videntem*

meum), one Alexander whom he designates an ancient heretic (of whom nothing is known), "the Laodicene, who has lately left the church" (meaning Apollinarius; see Fabricius, viii. p. 589), Eusebius of Emisa, and Theodorus of Heraclea († about 355; see Fabricius, ix. p. 319). Of these writers he speaks loosely as having left "non-nullos commentariolos," which were not without their value. All these he read and digested before commencing his own work. Though abounding in fanciful and perverse interpretations, violations of good taste and good feeling, faults of all kinds, this is nevertheless the most valuable of all the patristic commentaries on the Epistle to the Galatians; for the faults are more than redeemed by extensive learning, acute criticism, and lively and vigorous exposition.

(iv.) AURELIUS AUGUSTINUS; "*Expositio Epistolæ ad Galatas*," written about 394, and apparently without consulting previous commentators (see p. 124, note 4), of whom he shows no knowledge. The great excellences of Augustine as an "interpreter of Scripture" are sufficiently vindicated by Archbishop Trench (in his introduction to the "*Exposition of the Sermon on the Mount*") against the attacks of writers who had too little sympathy with his tone of mind to appreciate his merits; but spiritual insight, though a far divinier gift than the critical faculty, will not supply its place. In this faculty Augustine was wanting, and owing to this defect, as a continuous expositor he is disappointing. With great thoughts here and there, his commentary on the Galatians is inferior as a whole to several of the patristic expositions.

(v.) PELAGIUS the great heresiarch wrote his commentaries on the thirteen Epistles of St. Paul in Rome, and therefore, not later than 410, before the Pelagian controversy broke out. Strangely enough in the middle of the sixth century, when Cassiodorus wrote, learned men assigned them to Pope Gelasius. Stranger still, they have at a later date been fathered upon Jerome, and are generally printed in the editions of his works (xi. 2, p. 135, ed. Vall.). The true authorship, however, is established almost beyond a doubt by the quotations and references of Augustine and Marius Mercator, the contemporaries of Pelagius. On the other hand, some of the passages given by Marius Mercator are wanting in the extant copies; but history supplies the clew to this perplexity. About the middle of the sixth century Cassiodorus (*Inst. div. lit.* c. 8), finding this commentary tainted with Pelagian errors, expurgated the Epistle to the Romans by removing the heretical passages, and thus set an example, as he tells us, which might be followed the more easily by others in the

remaining epistles.¹ In its present form then, this commentary is mutilated. The notes are pointed, and good, but meagre. The high estimation in which they were held, in spite of the cloud which hung over their author, and the fact of their being attributed both to Gelasius and to Jerome, are high testimonies to their merits. Good accounts of this commentary will be found in Simon, p. 236 sqq.; Schröckh, xiv. p. 338 sqq.; and Rosenmüller, iii. p. 503 sqq.

(vi.) MAGNUS AURELIUS CASSIODORUS († after 562). "*Complexiones in Epistolas Apostolorum, in Acta, et in Apocalypsin*," first brought to light and published by Scipio Maffei in 1721. It was reprinted by Chandler (1722 and 1723), and may be found in Migne's *Patrol. Lat.* lxx. p. 1343. This work consists of a few reflections on detached passages, utterly valueless in themselves. It has a peculiar interest, however, as containing traces of 1 John v. 7. On this work see Schröckh, xvi. p. 153; Rosenmüller, v. p. 412 sqq.

2. SECONDARY COMMENTARIES, excerpts, compilations, and collections of variorum notes, mostly of a later date.

(a) *Greek Writers.*

These are compiled from the Greek fathers already mentioned, but especially from Chrysostom.

(i.) JOANNES DAMASCENUS (about 750). A commentary on St. Paul's Epistles, being an epitome of Chrysostom (see Fabricius, ix. p. 281; Schröckh, xx. p. 207), printed in Jo. Damasc. *Op.* ii. p. 1 sqq. (ed. Le Quien).

(ii.) ANONYMOUS CATENA (date uncertain), first published by Cramer, (Oxon. 1842). The authorship of the comments is very frequently noted (though not always correctly) either in the text or in the margin, but sometimes they are anonymous. The portion of the Galatians seems to be made up entirely of extracts from four commentators. Chrysostom is by far the largest contributor; Theodore of Mopsuestia comes next; and a few fragments (enumerated above, pp. 376, 377) bear the names of Eusebius of Emisa and Severianus. Of the anonymous fragments, those which belong to Chrysostom and

¹ Migne's *Patrol. Lat.* lxx. p. 1119 sq. The identity of the work of which Cassiodorus speaks with this commentary is inferred from his description, for he does not himself mention the true author, though protesting against assigning it to Gelasius. On the other hand, Cassiodorus a little later mentions what

apparently he regards as another work, the description of which would suit this commentary equally well: "*Tertium vero codicem reperi epistolarum Sancti Pauli, qui a nonnullis beati Hieronymi adnotationes brevissimas dicitur continere, quem vobis pariter Christo largiente dereliqui.*"

Theodore can be verified; and such as remain after this verification ought probably to be assigned to either Eusebius or Severianus.

(iii.) OECUMENIUS (tenth century), bishop of Tricca in Thessaly. The work which bears his name is a catena on the Acts and Epistles, to which he is one of the less important contributors. See, especially, Simon, p. 458, and comp. Fabricius, viii. p. 693; Rosenmüller, iv. p. 263. Though this commentary seems to be anonymous in the MSS., it appears on the whole more probable than not, from internal evidence, that Oecumenius was also the compiler of the catena, adding to it a few notes of his own. The affirmative is maintained by Hentenius in the preface to his edition (Paris, 1630); the negative by J. F. S. Augustin, *de Cat. Patr. Graec.* p. 366. There are considerable variations in the different MSS. of this work; see Fabricius, *l. c.* p. 696, and Cramer's *Catena*, p. 411. The names on the margin of the printed editions in the portion relating to the Galatians are Photius (apparently by far the largest contributor), Joannes (i.e. Chrysostom), Gennadius, Severianus, Theodoret, Cyril, and Oecumenius. The MSS. in some instances supply names to extracts which in the printed editions are anonymous. The few extracts from Cyril do not appear to be taken from a commentary on this epistle.

(iv.) THEOPHYLACTUS (latter part of the eleventh century), archbishop of Acris in Bulgaria. His commentary on St. Paul's Epistles is founded chiefly on Chrysostom, with the aid of some other of the Greek fathers. The manner of execution has secured it a high reputation, but it possesses no independent value. On this commentary see Simon, p. 403; Augustin, p. 346. Comp. Fabricius, vii. p. 591.

To these should be added the commentary of EUTHYMIUS ZIGABENUS (about 1110), which is said to exist in MS., but has never been printed.

(b.) *Latin Writers.*

These are derived from the four Latin commentators. Hilary (Ambrosiaster), Jerome, Augustine, and Pelagius, directly or indirectly.

(i.) PRIMASIUS (about 550), bishop of Adrumetum in Africa, wrote a commentary on all St. Paul's Epistles, including the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Apocalypse. It is a brief and fairly executed compilation from the Latin fathers already noticed, the most successful of these secondary commentaries. The editio princeps is by Gagnée (Lyons, 1537). This work is printed also in the *Magn. Bibl. Vet. Patr.* vi. 2. p. 18 sqq. and in Migne's *Patrol. Lat.* lxxviii. p. 415. See Rosenmüller, v. p. 12; Cave, i. p. 525; Schröckh, xvii. p. 538.

It will be seen, that the majority of the commentaries which follow,

were written about the middle of the ninth century within a period of a few years. The interest in Biblical studies was evidently very keen at this time, especially in France, and may be traced to the influence of our own Alcuin. I have already had occasion to allude to a similar period of activity in the history of Biblical interpretation during the latter half of the fourth and beginning of the fifth centuries, having its head quarters at Antioch. In one respect these movements present a remarkable parallel. The first followed upon the establishment of Christianity as the religion of the Roman Empire under Constantine; the second upon the consolidation and extension of Western Christendom under Charlemagne. Thus the two most prominent epochs in the history of Biblical interpretation during the early centuries were ushered in by the two political events which exerted incomparably the greatest influence on the practical working of the church; and it seems not unreasonable to attribute them in some measure to the stimulus given by these events. In real importance, however, the second of these two epochs in Biblical criticism bears no comparison with the first. It was feeble in character and wholly unoriginal, and has, therefore, left no permanent stamp on the interpretation of Scripture. The commentaries on the Epistle to the Galatians, belonging to this period, are derived entirely from one or more of the four great Latin expositors already mentioned, either directly or through the medium of Primasius, together with the Latin translation of Theodore's work (then attributed to St. Ambrose) which was made use of in some cases, and here and there a passage culled from the writings of Gregory the Great. Yet among these commentators, who were thus content to compile from the labors of their predecessors, are found the names of some of the ablest and most famous churchmen of their day.

(ii.) SEDULIUS (Scotus? eighth or ninth century?) "*In omnes St. Pauli Epistolas Collectaneum*," compiled from the Latin fathers, a direct reference being occasionally given. This writer, whenever he lived, is certainly to be distinguished from Sedulius, the Christian poet of the fifth century, with whom he has been confused. See Cave, ii. p. 15; Simon, p. 379. This commentary is printed in *Magn. Bibl. Vet. Patr.* v. 1. p. 438; Migne's *Patrol. Lat.* ciii. p. 181.

(iii.) CLAUDIUS TAURINENSIS († about 840), less correctly called "Altissiodorensis" or "Autissiodorensis" (of Auxerre), a Spaniard by birth, but bishop of Turin. Of his commentaries on St. Paul, the exposition of the Epistle to the Galatians alone is printed (*Magn. Bibl. Vet. Patr.* ix. p. 66; Migne's *Patrol. Lat.* civ. p. 838), but other

portions exist, or did exist, in MS., and references are made to them in Simon, p. 353 sqq., where the fullest account of this writer will be found. See also Schröckh, xxiii. p. 281; Cave, ii. p. 16.

(iv.) FLORUS LUGDUNENSIS, surnamed "Magister" († after 852). A commentary on St. Paul's Epistles, being a catena from the works of Augustine. The portion relating to the Galatians is not taken from Augustine's exposition of the epistle, but is culled from his works generally. This commentary is printed among the works of Bede (vi. p. 690, ed. Basil. 1563) to whom it was ascribed; but the probable authorship was pointed out by Mabillon, *Vet. Anal.* pp. 18, 488 (1723). On this work see Simon, p. 339; Cave, ii. p. 24. It is printed in Migne's *Patrol. Lat.* cxix. p. 363.

(v.) RABANUS MAURUS († 856), archbishop of Mentz. *Enarrationum in Epistolas B. Pauli libri triginta*, a catena from the fathers, the names being given. The commentary on the Galatians in this collection is made up of large extracts from Jerome, Augustine, and Theodore of Mopsuestia (quoted under the name of Ambrose; see above, p. 377), with one or two passages from extraneous writers, e.g. Gregory the Great. In Migne's *Patrol. Lat.* cxi, cxii.

(vi.) WALAFREDUS STRABO or Strabus († 849), a disciple of Rabanus, is the reputed author of the *Glossa Ordinaria* on the Scriptures, compiled from the fathers, and especially from the catena of his master. It was the standard commentary during the middle ages, and had an immense reputation. See Rosenmüller, v. p. 135, and especially Simon, p. 377. Printed in Migne's *Patrol. Lat.* cxiv. p. 570.

(vii.) HAYMO, bishop of Halberstadt († 853), wrote a commentary on St. Paul's Epistles, which has been attributed also to his contemporary REMIGIUS (of Lyons?). See Cave, ii. pp. 28, 42; Schröckh, xxiii. p. 283; Simon, p. 365. Printed in Migne's *Patrol. Lat.* cxvii. p. 669.

Later commentaries still, differing little in character from those just enumerated, and for the most part equally unoriginal, are those of ATTO VERCELLENSIS († about 960), Migne's *Patr. Lat.* cxxxiv. p. 491; see Schröckh, xxiii. p. 302; of LANFRANC († 1089), an interlinear gloss and commentary, Migne, cl. p. 259; see Simon, p. 385; Schröckh, xxiv. p. 334; the authorship, however, has been questioned; of BRUNO CARTHUSIANUS († 1101), the founder of the order, Migne, cliii. p. 281; see Simon, p. 387; and of HERVEUS DOLENSIS (about 1130), Migne, clxxxi. p. 1129; see Cave, ii. pp. 187, 213; Simon, p. 386. The authorship of the last-mentioned work is doubtful; it has been wrongly attributed to Anselm of Canterbury, but there is some authority for assigning it to his namesake of Laon.

INDEX.

I. — ENGLISH WORDS.

- ABRAHAM, the faith of, p. 346 sq. (passim); see Hagar.
- Accusative, for other objective cases, v. 7, 26.
- Acichorius, p. 84.
- Acts of the Apostles, its scope and character, p. 184, 197; its relation to St. Paul's Epistles, ii. 1 sq.; p. 141 sq., 184 sq., 197 sq., 312 sq., 326 (passim.)
- Aelia Capitolina, foundation of, p. 154; Church of, p. 154.
- Acons, the two, i. 4.
- Africa, the Church of, p. 173, 181.
- Alcibiades of Apamea, p. 168.
- Alcuin founds a school of biblical interpretation, p. 290.
- Alexandria, the Church of, p. 173.
- Alfred's (king) malady, p. 359 sq.
- Alphæus, to be identified with Clopas? p. 92, 103, 126; with Alfius? p. 104.
- Ambrose (the friend of Origen), a treatise by, p. 65.
- Ambrose (St), commentary wrongly ascribed to, p. 377; on the Lord's brethren, p. 124 sq.
- Ambrosiaster: see Hilary.
- Ancient Syriac Documents (Cureton's), p. 183.
- Ancyra, p. 14, 15, 18, 20, 27 sq., 38, 40 sq., 78, v. 20.
- Andronicus and Junia (-as), p. 317.
- Angels administering the law, iii. 19.
- Anselm, commentary ascribed to, p. 385.
- Antidicomarianites, p. 121.
- Antioch, foundation of the Church at, p. 138; the new metropolis of Christendom, p. 141; St. Peter reputed bishop of, ii. 11; catholicity of, p. 172, 196; Judaizers at, ii. 12 sq.; p. 209; biblical school of, p. 375.
- Antioch in Pisidia, St. Paul preaches at, p. 141.
- Aorist, uses of, v. 4, 24, vi. 2; Epistolary, vi. 11.
- Apocryphal Gospels, on the Lord's brethren, p. 96, 110 sq.
- Apollos, not an Apostle, p. 318, 320.
- Apologists, references to Galatians, p. 64.
- Apostle, meaning of the term, p. 314 sq.; not limited to the Twelve, p. 96 sq., 316 sq.; qualifications and functions of, p. 320 sq. (passim.)
- Apostolic congress and decree, ii. 1 sq. (passim), p. 142 sq. (passim), 188 sq., 329 sq.
- Apostolic Constitutions, mention of Philip in, p. 323 sq.; on the Jameses, p. 119.
- Apostolic fathers, references to Galatians in, p. 63 sq.; use of the term 'Apostle' in, p. 322.
- Arabia, meaning of, p. 308; St. Paul's visit to, p. 307 sq., 364.
- Arabians, called Hagarenes, iv. 25; their enmity to the Jews, iv. 29.
- Arabic version of the New Testament, p. 307 sq.
- Ariston of Pella, p. 150 sq., 340 sq.
- Article, the definite, i. 4, 7, 10, 13, 23, iii. 20, 21, iv. 6, 31, v. 14, p. 365; see also *νόμος*.
- Artotyritæ, p. 38.
- Ascents of James, p. 112, 167, 197, 205.
- Ascodrobi, etc., p. 38.
- Asia, meaning of in N. T., p. 26.
- Aspirates, anomalous, ii. 14.
- Atto Vercellensis, his commentary on St. Paul, p. 385.

- Augustine (St.), his dispute with Jerome, p. 336 sq.; commentary on Galatians, p. 381; on the Lord's brethren, p. 125.
- Bareochba, rebellion of, p. 153.
- Barnabas, an apostle, p. 318, 322; Joseph, not *Joses*, p. 104; his estrangement from St. Paul, ii. 13.
- Barsabas, Joseph or *Joses*? p. 104; identified with Matthias, p. 319.
- Basil, (St.), on the Lord's brethren, p. 121.
- Basilides, and *εὐδαλότητα*, p. 147.
- Bede, commentary wrongly ascribed to, p. 385.
- Belgae, a Celtic people, p. 80 sq.
- Belka (el), p. 307, 366.
- Biblical Studies, Antiochene school of, p. 375; revival of, under Charlemagne, p. 384.
- Bolgius, p. 84.
- Bonosus, p. 123.
- Branding among the ancients, vi. 17.
- Brennus, p. 83.
- Brethren of the Lord, p. 88. sq. (passim).
- 'Brother,' wide use of the term, p. 92, 97, 123 sq.
- Bruno Carthusianus, commentary on St. Paul, p. 385.
- Cassiodorus, his notes on St. Paul, p. 382; he expurgates the commentary of Pelagius, *ib.*; he translates the notes of Clement of Alexandria, p. 115.
- Catena (Cramer's), on Galatians, p. 382.
- Causa, 'a thing,' early use of, p. 191, 363.
- Celsus quotes Galatians, p. 66.
- Celtae, the name, p. 10 sq.; its use in Dion Cassius, p. 77; migrations of the, p. 12 sq. (passim), 77; distinguished from Germans, p. 75 sq.
- Cephas, use of the name, i. 18; falsely assigned to different persons, p. 334.
- Cerethrius, p. 84.
- Chiasm, the figure, iv. 5.
- Christian, the name, p. 139.
- Chronology of the exodus, iii. 17; of St. Paul, see Paul.
- Chrysostom (St.), his homily on St. Peter at Antioch, p. 335, 376; his commentary on Galatians, p. 276 sq.; on St. Paul's infirmity, p. 355; on Hagar, p. 364; on the Lord's brethren, p. 93, 125.
- Cirenmeision, the question of, p. 142 sq. (passim); ii. 1 sq. (passim.)
- Claudius, Altiissiodorensis (or Taurinensis), his commentary on St. Paul, p. 384.
- Clement of Alexandria, on Cephas at Antioch, p. 334; on the Lord's brethren, p. 115 sq.; on the Nicolaitans, p. 135; his use of the word 'apostle,' p. 322; his commentary on the Catholic Epistles, p. 115.
- Clement of Rome, his position in the Church, p. 175, 178; his Epistle, p. 175 sq., 196 sq.
- Clementine Homilies, their scope and complexion, p. 178 sq.; editions and epitomes of, etc., p. 164 sq.; their Roman origin doubtful, p. 178; their representation of St. James, p. 110, 112, 209 sq.; attacks on St. Paul, ii. 11, 13, iv. 10, 16, 24, p. 66, sq., 165, 333 sq.; limitation of the term 'apostle' in, p. 323; letter of Peter prefixed to, p. 167; letter of Clement prefixed to, p. 178.
- Clementine Recognitions, composition of, p. 167; editions and translations of, p. 164; Ascents of James incorporated in, p. 112, 167, 197, 205; allusion to St. Paul in, iv. 16; arbitrary alterations of Rufinus in, p. 167.
- Cleopas, the name, p. 103.
- Clopas, p. 90 sq., 102 sq., 113; to be identified with Alphaeus? p. 92, 102, 126.
- Collection of alms for Judaea, p. 32, 60, 141, ii. 10, vi. 7.
- Collyridians, p. 122.
- Corinth, the Church of, its catholicity, p. 196; parties in, p. 210; Judaizers in, *ib.*; the offender in, p. 59, vi. 1.
- Corinthians, 1st Epistle to the, when written, p. 44; compared with Galatians, 56 sq., 69.
- Corinthians, 2d Epistle to the, when written, p. 45; tone of, p. 56; compared with Galatians, p. 49, 55.
- Cornelius, conversion of, p. 138 sq.

- Cramer's Catena, on Galatians, p. 382.
 Crescens, p. 37.
 Cross, offence of the, p. 338 sq.
 Crucifixion, not a Jewish punishment, p. 340.
 Crucifying with Christ, ii. 20, vi. 14.
 Cyril of Alexandria, on the Lord's brethren, p. 127.
 Cyril of Jerusalem, on the Lord's brethren, p. 119.
- Damascenus (Johannes), commentary on St. Paul, p. 382.
 Dative, uses of, ii. 19, v. 16, 25, vi. 12, 16.
 Didymus of Alexandria, on St. Peter at Antioch, p. 335; his commentary on St. Paul, p. 380.
 Dionysius of Corinth, p. 181.
 Dispersion, the, p. 133.
 Dorotheus Tyrius, the pseudo-, p. 123.
 Drynaemetun, p. 83.
 Dying and being buried with Christ, ii. 20.
- Eastern Churches, testimony respecting the Jameses, p. 127.
 Ebionites, different classes of, p. 155, 159 sq. (passim.)
 Egyptians, Gospel of, saying ascribed to our Lord in, iii. 28; tradition respecting gnosis in, p. 116.
 Elchasai or Elxai, book of, p. 162 sq.; see Hippolytus.
 Elieser (Rabbi), on the Samaritans, p. 136.
 Ellipsis, æfter *ἴνα*, ii. 9; with *μόνον*, ii. 10, vi. 12; with *μή*, v. 13; of the name of God, i. 6, 15, v. 8.
 Ephraem Syrus, his commentary on St. Paul, p. 375; on Hagar, p. 364.
 Epiphanius, on the Lord's brethren, p. 88 sq. (passim), 122 sq.; on the Nazarenes, p. 155.
 Esdras, 4th book of, on Faith, p. 349.
 Essene Ebionism, p. 160 sq. (passim).
 Ethiopian eunuch, conversion of, p. 137.
 Eusebius of Caesarea, Syriac translation of, p. 110, 117, 170, 196; the passage *H. E.* ii. 1 commented on, p. 117; on the Lord's brethren, p. 119; character of his statements, p. 183.
- Eusebius of Emesa, his commentary on St. Paul, p. 37, 376.
 Euthalius, his edition of St. Paul, p. 378.
 Euthymius Zigabenus, his commentary, p. 383.
 Evil eye, iii. 1.
 Exodus, see Chronology.
- Faith, words denoting, p. 341 sq.; not in the O. T., p. 342, 345 sq.; of Abraham, p. 306 sq.; Philo on, p. 347 sq., 351; rabbinical teachers on, p. 349 sq., 351; see James the Lord's brother.
 Fascination, iii. 1.
 Fides, fidelis, fidentia, fiducia, p. 345.
 First-born, meaning of, p. 106.
 Florus Magister, his commentary on St. Paul, p. 385.
 Francis, (St.), of Assissi, his stigmata, vi. 17.
 Fulness of time, iv. 4.
 Future tense, uses of, vi. 5, 16.
- Gaezatodiasius, p. 84.
 Galatae, the name, p. 10 sq.
 Galatia, geographical limits of, p. 14, 15, 25 sq.; mixed population of, p. 16 sq., Jews in, p. 17 sq., 32 sq.; Romans in, p. 14 sq., 17; trade of, p. 17; fertility of, *ib.*; used of European Gaul, p. 11, 37.
 Galatia, the people of, alien to Asia, p. 9; their origin, migrations, and early history, p. 12 sq. (passim); their language, p. 20, 82 sq.; their three tribes, p. 15, 84 sq.; their national character, p. 19 sq.; their religion, p. 16, 19, 23 sq., 27, 30, 36; mutilation among, p. 24, v. 12; witchcraft among, v. 20; were they Celts or Teutons? p. 75 sq. (passim); supposed German affinities explained, p. 86 sq.; names among, p. 83.
 Galatia, the Churches of, their locality, p. 27 sq.; composition of, p. 33; St. Paul's intercourse with, p. 28 sq. (passim), p. 46; Judaism in, 33 sq., 210 sq.; persecutions of, iii. 4; later history of, p. 30 sq.; heresies of, p. 39 sq.; martyrs of, p. 39 sq.

- Galatians, Epistle to the, date of, p. 42 sq. (*passim*); St. Paul's companions at the time, i. 2; object of, p. 37; style and features of, p. 49 sq., 68 sq., i. 1, 6; its resemblance to 2 Cor. p. 49 sq.; and to Rom. p. 50 sq.; genuineness of, p. 62 sq.; external testimony to, p. 63 sq.; analysis of, p. 70 sq.; postscript to, p. 69, vi. 11; commentaries on, p. 374 sq. (*passim*); its importance in modern controversy, p. 73, 130.
- Galli, Gallia, the names, p. 10 sq.
- Gauls. See Celtae, Galatae, Galli.
- Gelasius (Pope), commentary falsely ascribed to, p. 382.
- Gennadius, his commentary on St. Paul, p. 379.
- Gentiles, the Gospel preached to, p. 135 sq. (*passim*); emancipation and progress of, p. 139 sq. (*passim*).
- Germanopolis, p. 86 sq.
- Glossa Ordinaria, p. 385.
- Gregory Nazianzen, on St. Peter at Antioch, p. 335.
- Gregory Nyssen, on the Lord's brethren, p. 121.
- Guardianship, ancient laws respecting, iv. 1.
- Gutturals interchanged in the Shemitic languages, p. 367.
- Hadrian, his treatment of Jews and Christians, p. 304 sq.
- Hagar, meaning of, p. 90 sq.; places bearing the name, p. 366; a synonyme for Siani? p. 89, 366 sq., iv. 25; doubtful reading, p. 361 sq.
- Hagarenes, iv. 25, 29.
- Harant, der Christliche Ulysses, p. 365; on Hagar, *ib.*
- Haymo, commentary on St. Paul, p. 385.
- Hebrews, Gospel of the; account of our Lord appearing to James, p. 110.
- Hegesippus, his sojourn in Rome, p. 169; not an Ebionite, p. 170 sq.; on the Lord's brethren, p. 113 sq.; on James the Lord's brother, p. 294 sq.; on heresies in the Church of Jerusalem, p. 152, 163.
- Hellenists their influence in the Church, p. 134 sq.
- Helvidius, on the Lord's brethren, p. 89 sq. (*passim*), 122, 123.
- Hermas, the shepherd of; its date, p. 322; its character and teaching, p. 177 sq.; use of the term 'apostle' in, p. 322.
- Herod, persecution of, p. 328, 331.
- Herveus Dolensis, commentary on St. Paul, p. 385.
- Hilary (Ambrosiaster), commentary on St. Paul, p. 377, 380; on the Lord's brethren, p. 120.
- Hilary of Poitiers; on the Gauls, p. 78; on the Lord's brethren, p. 120; commentary wrongly ascribed to, p. 377.
- Hippolytus, on the Nicolaitans, p. 135; on the book of Elchasai, p. 162 sq., 168, 180; St. John illustrated from, p. 146; the pseudo-, concerning the Lord's brethren, p. 118.
- Idols, things sacrificed to, p. 145 sq.
- Ignatius, recensions of his Epistles, p. 176; his testimony to the Roman Church, *ib.*
- Imperfect tense, iv. 20.
- Irenaeus on the Paschal controversy, p. 180.
- Isaac, explained by Philo, p. 369.
- Ismael, meaning of, p. 369; rabbinical accounts of, iv. 29.
- Israel (Israelite), force of, vi. 16; explained by Philo, p. 369.
- James the Lord's brother; was he an apostle? i. 19, p. 97 sq. (*passim*), 317, 323; our Lord's appearance to him, p. 88, 101 sq., 110 sq.; his position, ii. 9, p. 91 sq. (*passim*); his asceticism, p. 90 sq.; his relation to the Judaizers, p. 35, 145, 202, 209 sq. (*passim*); to St. Peter and St. John, p. 206; to St. Paul (faith and works), p. 207, 353, v. 6; his death, p. 150, 205 sq.; account of him in the Hebrew Gospel, p. 110; in the Clementines, p. 112; among the Ophites, p. 117; see also Ascents of James.
- James the son of Alphaeus, p. 90 sq. (*passim*).
- James the son of Mary, p. 91 sq. (*passim*); why called $\delta \muικρός$, p. 98, 121.

- James the son of Zebedee, martyrdom of, p. 140; was he a cousin of our Lord? p. 99.
- Jason and Papiscus, Dialogue of, p. 339 sq.; see Ariston.
- Jerome, his commentary on the Galatians, p. 389; his dispute with Augustine, p. 336 sq.; his visit to Gaul and Galatia, p. 78; his disingenuousness, p. 114, 336; his allegorizing, p. 311; on the Galatian language, p. 20, 79; on Galatian heresies, p. 38; on the origin of the Galatian people, p. 77 sq.; on the Nazarenes, p. 155; on the Lord's brethren, p. 89 sq. (passim), 124; on the thorn in the flesh, p. 355, 357; commentary on Pelagius ascribed to him, p. 381.
- Jerusalem, the fall of, p. 150; the early Church of, p. 132 sq. (passim); outbreak of heresies in, 152 sq. reconstitution of, p. 153 sq. See also Paul (St.), collection of alms; the new, heavenly, Jerusalem, iv. 26.
- Jewish names, exchanged for heathen, p. 103 sq.; abbreviated, p. 105.
- John, (St.), was he the Lord's cousin? p. 100; his position in the Church, p. 197; on *εὐδαλότητα*, p. 147; traditions relating to, p. 200 sq.; not claimed by Ebionites, p. 197; Gospel and Epistles of, p. 201; Apocalypse of, p. 199.
- Joseph, a common name, p. 104; occurrence in our Lord's genealogy, p. 105; the same with Jesus? p. 104.
- Joseph, the Virgin's husband, early death of, p. 106.
- Josephus, on the death of St. James, p. 204 sq.; the pseudo-, p. 150.
- Joses, the son of Mary, p. 106.
- Jovinianus, p. 123.
- Judaizers, ii. 1 sq. (passim), 12, vi. 12, 13, p. 33 sq., 148 sq. (passim), 153 sq. (passim), 187 sq. (passim), 209 sq. (passim).
- Judas, the Apostle and the Lord's brother the same? p. 93, 317 sq. (passim).
- Judas, a name of Thomas, p. 99.
- Julian and the Galatians, p. 39 sq.
- Juliopolis (Gordium), p. 18, 27.
- Justin Martyr, not an Ebionite, p. 169; acquainted with St. Paul's Epistles, iii. 10, 13, iv. 27, p. 65: *Orat. ad Græc.* wrongly ascribed to, p. 65; a fragment wrongly ascribed to, p. 115.
- Justus, the name, p. 203.
- Lactantius, on the Galatian people, p. 78.
- Lanfranc, commentary on St. Paul, p. 385.
- Law, the; St. Paul's conception of, ii. 19 sq., iii. 10 sq., 19, 24, iv. 5, 11, 30, vi. 2. Our Lord's teaching as regards, p. 132; zeal for and decline of, p. 149 sq. (passim); relation of St. Peter to, p. 195, 206; of St. John to, p. 199, 206; of St. James to, p. 202 sq., 206 sq. See Paul (St.), and νόμος.
- Leaven, a symbol, v. 9.
- Leonnorius, p. 13, 86 sq.
- Lutarius, p. 13, 86 sq.
- Luther, on the Epistle to the Galatians, p. 25; on the Galatian people, p. 75; on the thorn in the flesh, p. 357 sq.; his different language at different times, p. 187.
- Marcion, the canon of; order of St. Paul's Epistles in, p. 42; Galatians in, p. 64; omissions in his text, i. 1, iii. 6.
- Mary, different persons bearing the name, p. 91, 95 sq., 98 sq., 105, 121, 126.
- Mary, the Lord's mother; her virginity, p. 106; commended to the keeping of St. John, p. 108.
- Moses, called a mediator, iii. 19; Revelation of, vi. 15.
- Muratorian Canon, order of St. Paul's Epistles in, p. 43.
- Nazarenes, p. 155 sq.
- Neighbor, meaning of, v. 14.
- Nervii, a Celtic people, p. 81 sq.
- Nicolas and the Nicolaitans, p. 134.
- Œcumenius, Catena bearing his name, p. 383.
- Old Testament, interpretation of types in, iii. 16.

- Ophites, their use of Galatians, p. 65 ; reference to, in the Apocalypse, p. 147 ; their use of the Gospel of the Egyptians, p. 117.
- Optative, not after final particles, ii. 2.
- Origen, his commentaries on Galatians, p. 374 ; on St. Peter at Antioch, p. 335 ; on the Lord's brethren, p. 117 sq. ; on the Ebionites, p. 155, 168 ; misinterpretations of, iii. 19, v. 24.
- Palestine, Churches of, p. 168 sq.
- Papias (of Hierapolis), does not refer to St. Paul, p. 183 ; confuses (?) the two Philips, p. 323 ; distinguishes other disciples from the Apostles, p. 322 ; passage wrongly ascribed to, p. 109.
- Papias (the mediaeval), his *Elementarium*, p. 109.
- Paschal controversy, p. 169 sq., 180.
- Passalorhynchitae, p. 38.
- Paul, (St.), chronology of his early life, ii. 1, p. 328 ; his qualifications and conversion, p. 139 ; date of his apostolic commission, i. 1, p. 321, 328 ; visit to Arabia, p. 307 sq. ; at Damascus, i. 17, 18, p. 310 ; first visit to Jerusalem, p. 312 sq., i. 21, 22 ; first missionary journey, p. 140 sq. ; third visit to Jerusalem, ii. 1 sq. (passim), 326 sq. (passim), 141 sq. ; conflict with St. Peter at Antioch, ii. 11 sq., p. 192 sq., 333 sq. ; preaching in Galatia, p. 29 sq. (passim), 47 ; sojourn at Ephesus, p. 43 ; history in the years 57, 58, p. 44 sq. ; his personal appearance, p. 361 ; eyesight, vi. 11, p. 360 ; thorn in the flesh, p. 40, 354 sq. (passim), iv. 13 sq. ; on the support of the ministry, vi. 6 ; on *εἰδωλόθυτα*, p. 147 ; relation to the Apostles of the Circumcision, p. 62, 313 sq., 329 sq., 330 sq. (passim), 385 sq. (passim), ii. 1. sq. (passim) (see James, Peter, John), relations to his countrymen, p. 185 sq. ; account of him in the Acts, p. 184 ; in the *Test. vii. Patr.*, p. 157 sq. ; attacks of Judaizers on, i. 10, p. 34 sq. (see Judaizers, Clementine Homilies) ; his teaching compared with Philo, p. 256, 370 ; with rabbinical writers, p. 256 ; on the law (see Law) ; his use of metaphors, ii. 20, iv. 19, vi. 8.
- Paul (St.), Epistles of ; order in different canons, p. 42 sq. ; four chronological groups of, p. 48 ; postscripts, to, vi. 11 ; partial reception of, p. 183 ; questioned by modern critics, p. 185.
- Pauli Praedicatio, p. 191.
- Pelagius, his commentary on St. Paul, p. 381 ; on the Lord's brethren, p. 125.
- Pella, Church of, p. 150, 154 See Aris-ton.
- Perfect, uses of, ii. 7, iii. 18, iv. 23, v. 14.
- Pessinus, p. 14, 15, 18, 27, 40, v. 12.
- Peter, (St.), his vision and its effects, ii. 12, 14, p. 193 ; at Antioch, ii. 11 sq., p. 191 sq., 333 sq. ; at Rome, p. 174 sq., 179 ; his character, p. 193, 333 sq. ; how regarded by St. Paul, p. 189 ; how represented by the Clementines, ii. 11, 13, p. 161, 165 sq., 190 sq. ; by Basilides, etc., p. 190 ; coupled with St. Paul in early writers, p. 191 ; writings ascribed to, p. 191.
- Peter, (St.), 1st Epistle of ; to whom written, p. 33 ; its character, etc., p. 194 ; its resemblance to St. Paul, p. 193.
- Peter, Gospel of ; its docetism, p. 111 ; account of the Lord's brethren in, *ib.*
- Peter, preaching of ; tradition preserved by, p. 331 ; influence of a passage in, iv. 3 ; not Ebionite, p. 190 sq.
- Philip, the deacon ; his work, p. 135 sq. ; confused with the Apostle, p. 117, 323.
- Philology, advanced by Christian missions, p. 79.
- Philo, his doctrine of faith, p. 347 sq. ; allegory of Abraham, p. 348 sq. ; of Hagar and Sarah, p. 368 sq. ; on the name of Hagar, p. 367 ; on those of Isaac and Ishmael, p. 369.
- Photius, his commentary on St. Paul, p. 379.
- Polycarp, the Epistle of, p. 64, 183, iv. 26 ; at Rome, p. 181.
- Polycrates (of Ephesus), his date and style, p. 200 ; traditions preserved by, p. 180, 200 sq. ; confuses the two Philips, p. 323.
- Praesus, p. 84.

- Primasius, his commentary on St. Paul, p. 283.
- Proselytes, different classes of, p. 133.
- Protevangelium, on the Lord's brethren, p. 111, 118.
- Rabanus Maurus, his commentary on St. Paul, p. 385.
- Regeneration, vi. 15.
- Romans, Epistle to the; when written, p. 48; resemblance to Galatians, p. 51 sq. (passim); contrast to Galatians, p. 187 sq.
- Rome, Church of; early history, p. 173 sq.; succession of bishops, p. 172; recognition of St. Peter and St. Paul, by, p. 195.
- Rufinus, his translation of Eusebius, p. 170; of the Clementine Recognitions, p. 164, 167.
- Salome, p. 100.
- Samaritans, how regarded by the Jews, p. 136; conversion of, *ib.*
- Sarah (Sarai), meaning of the word, p. 368; typifies Jerusalem, iv. 27. See also Hagar.
- Scripture and Scriptures, iii. 22.
- Sedulius, his commentary on St. Paul, p. 384.
- Serapion, on the Gospel of Peter, p. 111.
- Seres, mythical character of, p. 162.
- Seven, appointment of the, p. 134.
- Seventy, the; called apostles, p. 322.
- Severianus, his commentary on Galatians, p. 376; (?) on Hagar, p. 363.
- Silas, an apostle (?) p. 318.
- Simon or Symeon, different persons called, p. 94, 102; a common name, p. 104 sq.
- Sinai, St. Paul at, 308; allegorical meaning of iv. 25. See Hagar.
- Spirit and the Spirit, v. 5, 17.
- Stadium, St Paul's metaphor of the, ii. 2, v. 7.
- Stephen (St), influence and work of, p. 135, 138.
- Symeon, son of Clopas, p. 102 sq., 113 sq.; his martyrdom, p. 152; see Simon
- Syriac translations; of the Clementines, p. 165, 167; of Ignatius, p. 176; of Eusebius, see Eusebius.
- Tavium, p. 14, 15, 18, 27.
- Tectosages (-gae), 14, 84.
- Tertullian, charges against Marcion, p. 325, 334; on the Lord's brethren, p. 89, 94, 114 sq.; on St Paul's infirmity, p. 355; on Praxeas, p. 182.
- Testaments of Twelve Patriarchs, p. 157 sq.
- Tentobodiaci, p. 86 sq.
- Theodore of Mopsuestia, his commentary on St. Paul's Epistles, p. 377 sq.; error in the Greek text, p. 368; in the Latin translation, p. 378; on St Peter at Antioch, p. 337; on Hagar, p. 363, 366.
- Theodoret, his commentary on St Paul's Epistles, p. 378; on St Peter at Antioch, p. 337; on Hagar, p. 363, 366; on the Lord's brethren, p. 93, 126.
- Theophylact, his commentary on St Paul's Epistles, p. 383; on the Lord's brethren, p. 90, 127.
- Thomas (St), his name Judas, p. 99.
- Thorn in the flesh. See Paul (St.).
- Timotheus, circumcision of, ii. 3; not an apostle, p. 318, 320.
- Titus, mission of, ii. 1; circumcision of, etc. ii. 3, p. 326.
- Tolistobogii, 14, 85.
- Tolosa, p. 85.
- Transcribers, fidelity of, ii. 12.
- Treveri, the name how written, p. 80; were Celts, not Germans, p. 80 sq.; later German settlement among, p. 81 sq.
- Troemi, p. 14, 244.
- Versions, testimony respecting the Lord's brethren, p. 112; Italia, p. 325.
- Victor of Rome, p. 173, 180 sq.
- Victorinus the philosopher, his commentary on St Paul, p. 379; on the date of Galatians, p. 42; on the Lord's brethren, p. 120; he mistakes the Latin version, p. 311.

Victorinus Petavionensis, on the Lord's brethren, p. 94, 119.	Western Services, testimony respecting the Jameses, p. 125.
Walafridus Strabo, his commentary, p. 385.	Zealots, i. 14.

II. — GREEK WORDS.

ἀββᾶ, iv. 6,	268	γενῶν. iv. 24,	278
ἀγαθά, vi. 6,	298	γινώσκειν, εἰδέναι, iii. 7, iv. 9,	251, 269
ἀγαθοποιεῖν, καλοποιεῖν, vi. 9,	300	γνορίζω ὑμῶν, i. 11,	223
ἀγαθωσύνη, χρηστότης, v. 22,	293	γράμματα, vi. 11,	301
ἀδελφοί, emphatic, iii. 15, vi. 1, 18,	254, 295, 306	γραφή, iii. 8, 22,	251, 260
ἀθετεῖν, ii. 21,	246	δεκαπέντε, i. 18,	227
αἵρεσις, v. 20,	292	δεξιὰς δοῦναι, λαμβάνειν, ii. 9,	237
αἰών, i. 4,	217	διά with gen., i. 1,	215
ἀκαθαρσία, v. 19,	291	with accus., iv. 13,	273
ἀκοή, iii. 2,	248	διὰ (ἐκ) πίστεως, ii. 16,	242
ἀλήθεια, ἡ ἀλ. τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, ii. 5,	235	διαθήκη, iii. 15,	254
ἀλλεγορεῖν (-γορία,) iv. 24,	278	δοκεῖν, εἶναι τι (τις), ii. 6, vi. 3, 235,	297
ἄλλος, ἕτερος, i. 6,	219	οἱ δοκοῦντες, ii. 2,	231
ἀμαρτωλός, ii. 14, 15, 17, 18,	241, 243	δυνάμεις, iii. 5,	250
ἄν omitted, iii. 19, iv. 15,	258, 274	δωρεάν, ii. 21,	246
ἀναβαίνειν, i. 17,	226	ἐὰν καί, καὶ ἐάν, i. 8,	220
ἀνάθεμα, ἀνάθημα, i. 8,	221	ἐαυτοῦ, v. 14,	289
ἀνακύπτειν, v. 7,	286	ἐγκακεῖν, vi. 9,	300
ἀναστατοῦν, v. 12,	288	ἐγκόπτειν, v. 7,	286
ἀνατίθεσθαι, ii. 2,	230	εἴ γε, ἑπερ, iii. 4,	249
ἀνέρχεσθαι, i. 17,	226	εἰ μὴ (ἐὰν μὴ), i. 19, ii. 16,	227, 242
ἀπεκδέχεσθαι, v. 5	285	εἰδέναι, see γινώσκειν.	
ἀπό, διά, i. 1,	215	εἰδωλόθυτα,	147
ἀπό, παρά, i. 12,	223	εἰς, v. 10, vi. 4,	287, 297
ἀποκύπτειν, v. 12,	288	ἐκ, διά, with πίστεως, ii. 16,	242
ἀπολαμβάνειν, iv. 5,	267	οἱ ἐκ πίστεως, iii. 7,	251
ἀπορεῖν (-ρεῖσθαι), iv. 20,	277	ἐκ κοιτίας, i. 15,	225
ἀπόστολος,	316 sq.	ἐκκλησία, i. 22,	229
ἄρα, v. 11,	287	ἐκλύεσθαι, vi. 10,	300
ἄρα, ii. 17,	243	Ἑλλην, ii. 3,	232
ἄρτι, i. 9,	222	ἐλπὶς, v. 5,	285
ἀσέλγεια, v. 19,	291	ἐν ἐμοί, i. 16,	226
ἀτενίξειν,	361	ἐνάρχεσθαι, iii. 3,	249
αὐτὸ τοῦτο, ii. 10	238	ἐνδύεσθαι (ἐνεδύσασθαι), iii. 27,	262
ἀφορίζειν, i. 15,	225	ἐνεργεῖν, ii. 8, iii. 5, v. 6,	236, 250, 285
ἀφορμή, v. 13,	289	ἐνεστώς, i. 4,	217
βασκαίνειν, iii. 1,	247	ἐνι, iii. 28,	263
βαστάζειν, vi. 17,	306	ἐξαγοράζειν, iii. 13,	252

ἐπαγγελία, iii. 14,	253	κλίμα, i. 21,	228
ἐπιδιατάσσεσθαι, iii. 15,	255	κοιλίας (ἐκ), i. 15,	225
ἐπιτελεῖσθαι, iii. 3,	249	κοινωνεῖν, vi. 6,	298
ἐπίτροπος, iv. 2,	265	κράζειν, iv. 6,	267
ἐπιχορηγεῖν, iii. 5,	250	κρίμα (κρίμα), v. 10,	287
ἐριθεία, v. 20,	292		
ἐρρέθη, iii. 16,	255	λέγειν, λέγει impersonal, iii. 16,	255
ἕτερος, ἄλλος, i. 6, ὁ ἕτερος, vi. 4, 219, 297		λέγω δέ, iv. 1,	264
ἔτι, i. 10, v. 11,	223, 287	λοιπός, difference of τὸ λοιπὸν and	
εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, i. 9,	222	τοῦ λοιποῦ, vi. 17,	355
εὐπροσωπεῖν, vi. 12,	302		
εὐρεθῆναι, ii. 17,	244	μακαρισμός, iv. 15,	274
		μαρτύρομαι, v. 3,	284
ζῆλος, v. 20, 21,	292	μεσίτης, iii. 19,	259
ζηλοῦν, iv. 17,	275	μεταστρέφειν, i. 7,	220
ζηλωτής, i. 14,	225	μετατίθεσθαι, i. 6,	219
		μή with indic., iv. 11,	270
ἡμέραι,	310	μήπως, construction with, ii. 2,	231
		μή γένοιτο, ii. 17, vi. 14,	244, 303
θυμοί (plural), v. 20,	292	μυκτηρίζειν, vi. 7,	299
ἴδε (ἴδου) ὅτι, i. 20,	228	νήπιος, iv. 1,	264
ἴδε or ἴδέ, v. 2,	284	νόμος and ὁ νόμος, ii. 19, iv. 4, 5, 21,	
Ἱερουσόλυμα, i. 18, (Ἱερουσαλήμ), iv.		v. 18, vi. 13,	245, 267, 277, 290, 303
26,	227, 279		
ἱκανός,	310	ο and ω confused, vi. 12,	302
ἴνα, with indic., ii. 4, iv. 17,	234, 275	οἰκείως, vi. 10,	300
ellipsis with, ii. 9,	238	οἰκονόμος, iv. 2,	265
repeated, iii. 14, iv. 5,	253, 267	ὅμως, iii. 15,	254
Ἰουδαίειν, ii. 14,	241	ὀνομάζεσθαι,	119
Ιουδαϊκῶς, with aspirate, ii. 14,	241	ὀρυσσοῦν, ii. 14,	240
Ἰουδαϊσμός, i. 13,	224	ὅστις, ὅς, distinguished, iv. 24, 26,	
ἰστορεῖν, i. 18,	227	v. 19,	278, 280, 291
		ὅτι with quotations, i. 23,	229
καθώς, iii. 6,	250	οὐδὲ . . . οὕτε, i. 12,	224
καὶ ἕαν, ἕαν καί, i. 8,	220	οὐκέτι logical, iii. 18,	257
καινὴ κτίσις, vi. 15,	304	οὐ μή with fut. ind., iv. 30	282
καιροί, iv. 10,	270	οὐ πᾶς for οὐδεὶς, ii. 16,	243
καλεῖν, ὁ καλῶν (καλέσας), i. 6, v. 8,	219, 286	ὕφελον, v. 12,	288
καλεῖν ἐπί, v. 13,	288	παθήματα, ἐπιθυμία, v. 24,	294
καλυποῖν, vi. 9,	300	παιδαγωγός, iii. 24,	261
κανών, vi. 16,	304	παιδίσκη, iv. 22,	277
κατὰ ἄνθρωπον, i. 2, iii. 15,	223, 254	παρά, ἀπό, i. 12,	223
καταβαίνειν, i. 17,	226	παράδοσις, i. 14,	225
καταρτίζειν, vi. 1,	296	παραλαμβάνειν, i. 12,	223
κατασκοπεῖν, ii. 4,	234	παρατηρεῖν, iv. 10,	270
κατέρχεσθαι, i. 17,	226	παρείσκατος, παρεισελθεῖν, ii. 4,	224
κατηχεῖν, vi. 6,	298	πάσχειν, iii. 4,	249
καύχησις, καύχημα, vi. 4,	297	πέιθω, i. 10,	222
κενόδοξος (-δοξία), v. 26,	295	πέποιθα εἰς (ἐπί), v. 10,	287

πειρασμός, iv. 14,	273	συγγενεῖς, i. 14,	225
πεισμονή, v. 8,	286	συγκλείειν εἰς (ὑπό), iii. 22,	260
περί, ὑπέρ, i. 4,	217	συν- superfluous (συνηλικιώτης), i. 14,	224
περισσότερος, i. 14,	225	συναπάγεσθαι with dative, ii. 13,	240
περιτέμνεσθαι, οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι, vi. 13,	303	συνιστάνειν, ii. 18,	244
περιτομή, οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς, ii. 12,	240	συνστοιχεῖν (-χία), iv. 24,	278, 378
πιστεύειν, constructions with, ii. 16 ;			
πιστεύεσθαι τι, ii. 7,	242, 236	ταράσσειν, i. 7, v. 10,	220, 287
πίστις, i. 23, iii. 23, v. 22, (passim)	229, 261, 293	ταχέως, i. 6,	47, 219
πιστός,	343	τέκνα (υἱοὶ) Θεοῦ, iii. 26,	262
πληροῦν, v. 14,	289	τεκνία, iv. 19,	276
πλήρωμα, τὸ π. τοῦ χρόνου, iv. 4,	266	τρέχειν, see stadium.	
ποτε, meaning, ii. 6 ; displaced, i.			
13, 23,	235, 224, 229	νιοθεσία, iv. 5,	267
πραΰτης (πραότης), v. 23,	293	υἱοὶ Θεοῦ, iii. 26,	262
προγράφειν, iii. 1,	248	ὑπάρχειν, ii. 14,	241
προθεσμία, iv. 2,	265	ὑπέρ, περί, i. 4,	217
προκαλεῖσθαι, v. 26,	295	ὑποστέλλειν, ii. 12,	240
προλαμβάνειν, vi. 1,	295	φαρμακεία, v. 20,	291
πρός, ii. 14,	240	φθονεῖν, v. 26,	295
προσανατίθεσθαι, i. 16, ii. 6,	226, 236	φθονός, ζῆλος, v. 21,	292
πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν, ii. 6,	236	φθορά, vi. 8,	299
πρότερον, τὸ πρ., iv. 13,	273	φορτίον, βάρος, vi. 5,	297
πρωτότοκος,	107	φρεναπατᾶν, vi. 3,	297
		χάρις, iii. 19,	258
σκάνδαλον, v. 11,	287	χεῖρ, ἐν χειρί, iii. 19,	259
σπέρματα (plural), iii. 16,	255	χρηστότης (ἀγαθωσύνη), v. 22,	293
στήκειν, v. 1,	283	ὥς, 'while,' vi. 10,	300
στίγματα, vi. 17,	305		
στοιχεῖα, iv. 3,	265		
στύλοι, usage and accent, ii. 9,	237		

III. — PASSAGES COMMENTED ON.

Gen. xv. 6,	p. 347 sq.	Acts xvi. 6,	p. 27, 29.
Gen. xv. 13,	iii. 17,	Acts xxviii. 21,	p. 314.
Gen. xxi. 9, 10,	iv. 29, 30,	Rom. xvi. 7,	p. 318.
Exod. xii. 40,	iii. 17,	1 Cor. i. 12,	p. 210.
Deut. xxi. 23,	p. 338 sq.	1 Cor. ii. 9,	p. 172.
Deut. xxvii. 26,	iii. 10,	1 Cor. viii. 1-13,	} p. 145.
Deut. xxxiii. 2,	iii. 19,	x. 14-22,	
Habak. ii. 4,	p. 343, iii. 11,	Ephes. ii. 20,	} p. 319.
1 Mac. viii. 2,	p. 17.	iii. 5,	
John xix. 25,	p. 100, 102 sq.	2 Tim. iv. 10	p. 11, 37.
Acts ix. 20-26,	p. 310.	1 Pet. i. 1,	p. 26, 33.
Acts xv. 1-29,	p. 142 sq.	Apoc. ii. 24,	p. 147.

Date Due

[illegible]

227.4162

CLAPP



3 5002 00147 2146

St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians :

BS 2685 .L54 1870

Bible.

St. Paul's Epistle to the
Galatians

