

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

from which it is regarded in this whole section. This conception of salvation as future is not the exclusive, though it is the predominant view-point of the epistle. In some places the *summum bonum* appears as a present good. The way into the most holy place is already consecrated, and we may boldly come even now into the very presence of God (x. 19-22). We are come unto Mount Zion (xii. 22). The same truth is implied in the exhortation in chap. iv. 16 to come with boldness unto the throne of grace. The Christian faith not only has a promise of lordship in the world to come, but possesses that world now. Christianity, in fact, is the future world. This paradox, as Pfeiderer has remarked,<sup>1</sup> expresses in the most pregnant form the peculiar point of view of the epistle, and gives to its teaching a place intermediate between the Jewish-Christian conception, according to which salvation was purely future, and the Johannine, according to which it is, as an ideally perfect thing, present: eternal life, not merely in prospect, but now enjoyed to the full by believers.

A. B. BRUCE.

---

## ST. PAUL AND THE GALATIAN JUDAIZERS.

### I.

THE Epistle to the Galatians is the most thoroughly controversial in the New Testament. For it was written at a critical moment with a distinct purpose; and this purpose is apparent throughout the epistle. A current of Jewish prejudice against the Apostle and his teaching was sweeping over the Galatian Churches; and a special effort was required to stem the tide. No means exist outside the epistle for dating this reaction, or discovering any special

<sup>1</sup> *Paulinismus*, pp. 329, 330.

causes for its rise. It must however have been of recent origin, for the Apostle refers to it as a sudden surprise (Gal. i. 6). At his first visit (A.D. 51 or 52) they had welcomed him with enthusiasm, though his detention among them was the involuntary result of illness, and his stay appears to have been brief. Two or three years after he visited the Churches in order (A.D. 54), and confirmed them in the faith (Acts xviii. 23); but no intimation is given of any opposition at that time.<sup>1</sup> But the Galatians were a Celtic people, proverbially restless and excitable in natural disposition.<sup>2</sup> The visits of the Apostle had been too few and transient, either to confirm them thoroughly in the Christian faith, or to establish a lasting personal influence. At the date of this epistle, written about A.D. 57 or 58, rival teachers had so successfully gained their ear, that he found it necessary to vindicate his life and doctrine by a formal defence. The great issue at stake was the freedom of Gentile converts from the obligation of circumcision and the yoke of the law; and he keeps this issue steadily in view. But the conflict was personal as well as doctrinal: his rivals had attacked his apostolic authority and his per-

<sup>1</sup> It is stated in Bishop Lightfoot's *Epistle to the Galatians* (Introduction, p. 25) that cause for uneasiness had even then arisen; but I cannot discover any ground for this assertion. Allusion is twice made in the epistle to previous warnings on this subject (i. 9, v. 21); but the language and context of i. 9 point to recent warnings, and the use of the plural *προειρήκαμεν*, in contrast with the singular *λέγω*, suggests that they were conveyed through ministers, and not by word or letter of the Apostle himself. Moreover in iv. 18-20 he ascribes the present estrangement of his Galatian children directly to his own absence.

<sup>2</sup> The original Galatians were a body of Celtic invaders, and their tribes remained distinct from the surrounding population, under government of their own chieftains, after the Roman conquest of Asia Minor till the time of the Cæsars. Their territory was less extensive than the proconsular province of Galatia constituted by Augustus Cæsar, and did not comprehend the Christian Churches of Derbe and Lystra, Iconium and the Pisidian Antioch. For as St. Luke distinguishes Galatia from Phrygia, Lycaonia, and Pisidia, St. Paul doubtless limits the term in like manner to the Celtic district, the principal cities of which were Ancyra, Pessinus, and Tavium, afterwards well-known Christian Churches. (See Bishop Lightfoot's Introduction to the epistle.)

sonal consistency, as well as his opinions. Accordingly the epistle takes the shape, after the first opening sentences, of a personal narrative, down to ii. 16. Travelling as it does over the most critical events of primitive Church history, and proceeding from the pen of a chief actor in those scenes, this autobiography possesses great historical importance. The account of his two visits to Jerusalem has been repeatedly compared with the parallel record of St. Luke; and some theologians have claimed to discover considerable discrepancy between them. The independence of the two records is indeed conspicuous; but the alleged discrepancy does not in my opinion exist at all in the original language of St. Paul, though some slight traces of it do perhaps appear in our Bible.

I proceed now to examine the portion of the epistle which deals with his life and personal relations to the Judaizing party.

i. 6. Our version expresses surprise that the Galatians were "*so soon removed*," as though the estrangement from the Apostle were already complete, and had taken place very soon after their conversion, whereas the latter event had occurred fully six years before; and the Apostle now writes in eager haste to counteract the progress of a rapid change of opinion which had only just alarmed him by its suddenness. '*I marvel*,' he writes, '*that ye are so quickly removing from him that called you . . . unto a different gospel.*' Our version misses also the force of ἐν χάριτι Χριστοῦ. Those words prefer his own apostolic claim: 'he had called them *in virtue of Christ's grace* bestowed upon him.'

i. 7. Our version translates, *which is not another; but there be some . . .* But if ὅ be taken here, as often elsewhere, in an adverbial sense, = *as to which* (compare ii. 10), the language gains greatly in force and clearness, and εἰ μὴ can then be translated literally, 'unless': '*Whereas there is no other gospel, unless there be some that trouble you,*

who have a mind even to pervert the gospel of Christ.' The emphatic protest of the first clause against the possibility of any other gospel than that which he had preached, and the ironical suggestion of the second that there might be if these agitators had their way and introduced a distorted gospel of their own in place of the gospel of Christ, are quite in the spirit of St. Paul.

i. 9. Our version renders *προειρήκαμεν* *we have said before*, making the word *before* denote past time in contrast to *now* in the subsequent clause. But *προλέγειν* means *foretell* or *forewarn*, without reference to past time; and *καὶ ἄρτι* should be joined to it, the comma being placed after those words, as the rhythm of the Greek sentence also suggests. 'As we have forewarned you of late also, so I say again.' The word *ἄρτι*, when used strictly to denote a point of time, points to the immediate past rather than the present, though it often is used loosely, *e.g.* in the next verse, to comprehend both, in contrast with the future or remote past, and may then be properly rendered *now*. *θ. ἄρτι ἐτελεύτησεν* means *my daughter died just now* (Matt. ix. 18); *ἄρτι ἐλθ. Τιμ.*, *when Timothy came of late* (1 Thess. iii. 6). So here the Apostle is reminding the Galatians of his recent warnings. They had perhaps been conveyed by the ministers whom he had sent to solicit the alms of the Galatian Churches for their brethren in Judæa (1 Cor. xvi. 1); and these may not improbably have brought back the alarming reports which prompted him to write the epistle.

i. 10. St. Paul is here repeating apparently the actual charges made against him by the Judaizers, and presenting them as matter for inquiry, before proceeding to refute them: "Am I" (as they say) "now trying to win men rather than God, or seeking to please men?" The prominence given to *ἄρτι* first demands attention: his present teaching had been contrasted unfavourably with his former zeal for the law, and his motives for the change had been

impugned. His change of opinions was imputed to an inordinate desire on his part to win converts. For this is the true meaning of *πειθω* in this place: the word "*persuade*" adopted in our version is incorrect, for it implies success, whereas no one can persuade God; the Greek implies simply an effort to win. Again, the emphatic alternative, *do I now persuade men or God?* is out of place: *ἢ* seems to mean *rather than*, as it does in 1 Corinthians xiv. 19, *μᾶλλον* being understood: his enemies charged him with comparative neglect of God's truth, and excessive eagerness to please men. His own language elsewhere, "I became to them that were without law as without law, that I might gain them that were without law," shows how readily his conduct was open to misconstruction of this sort. Adversaries easily misinterpreted his earnest desire to win the Gentiles to Christ; they denounced it as a sacrifice of principle for the sake of pleasing men, and stigmatized his vindication of Christian freedom in regard to Mosaic observance as an unjustifiable concession to Gentile prejudices. The answer to these imputations is given by a sketch of his Christian life from his conversion to his open rebuke of St. Peter's inconsistency at Antioch. But first the special charge of pleasing men is dismissed with scorn: the retort derives much force from the emphatic *still*. This implies that there had been a time when his conduct was really open to such a charge—a time of blind partisanship, when he had been a zealot for the law, as his rivals were now. "If" (he argues) "I were *still* bent on pleasing men, I should have remained a Jew, and not have sacrificed everything for the service of Christ."

i. 14. The language which our version puts into the mouth of St. Paul, "*I profited in the Jews' religion above many mine equals in mine own nation*," betrays a lurking self-satisfaction with his own successful career as a Pharisee quite at variance with the grievous self-reproach which he

expresses elsewhere for having then persecuted and wasted the Church of Christ. Nor would he have designated the Israelite worship of Jehovah as *the Jews' religion*. This is in fact a mistranslation of *Ἰουδαϊσμός*: for *Ἰουδαΐζειν* signifies to "adopt Jewish customs" (see ii. 14), or "side with a Jewish party." The statement here made is that Saul advanced in Jewish partisanship beyond many of his own age, and made himself conspicuous amongst his fellows by a more fiery zeal than others.

i. 18. St. Luke records St. Paul's first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion from the historian's point of view. It is interesting to compare the two accounts. The historian brings out forcibly the isolation of the Apostle, avoided by Christians, while he was hunted for his life by Jews, his danger, and his courage. The autobiography ignores all this; it corrects incidentally one detail in the history by mentioning that the Apostles, to whom Barnabas is said to have introduced him, were in fact only Cephas and James, the rest being probably then absent from Jerusalem; and it informs us of the motive which took him to Jerusalem at that time. This last addition is interesting; for the narrative of St. Luke leaves the reader at a loss to understand why, after his narrow escape from Jewish hatred at Damascus, he ventured into the stronghold of his deadly enemies at Jerusalem. In his circumstances this was the most dangerous place he could go to: and he could not have chosen it without some strong motive. The epistle discloses this: '*I went up . . . to inquire of Cephas.*' The Greek word is *ἰστορήσαι*, our version has rendered it *to see Peter*, giving the impression of a personal visit to a friend. But *ἰστορήσαι* does not mean *visit*, except in the sense that travellers are said to visit persons or places of special interest for the sake of information. It implies that he wanted to consult Cephas on some particular subject; and the previous context suggests what the subject was on

which he desired to consult him; *viz.* the conduct of his mission to the Gentiles. Now the history entirely explains this earnest desire to take counsel with St. Peter. The enforced flight from Damascus had closed that city against him; he urgently needed Christian advice and co-operation for the continuance of his mission. Now to whom could he turn so naturally at that time as to St. Peter? For he had been the first under the direction of the Spirit to open the door of Christian baptism to the uncircumcised, had successfully defended this new departure when challenged by members of the Church at Jerusalem, and obtained the public recognition by that Church of Gentile Christianity.<sup>1</sup> We can well understand therefore the special desire of St. Paul to consult with him. He obtained through him the advice and recognition which he needed from the brethren, and was by them sent down to Tarsus, whether as the most promising sphere of labour, or because he was more likely to find protection there from relatives and former friends against the malice of Jewish enemies. The next words, *ἐπέμεινα πρὸς αὐτόν*, cannot mean "*I abode with him.*" The preposition naturally expresses the purpose with which he prolonged his stay at Jerusalem fifteen days, in spite of the perils which encompassed him; he did this with a view to consultation with Cephas; "*I tarried to see him,*" is the literal translation of the passage, harmonizing entirely with the narrative of St. Luke, which mentions the difficulty and delay he encountered in gaining the confidence of the Apostles.

ii. 1-10. St. Paul makes no reference here to his second visit to Jerusalem, in company with Barnabas, recorded in

<sup>1</sup> The baptism of Cornelius is mentioned *after* St. Paul's return to Jerusalem in the Acts of the Apostles, because the historian desires to complete the sequel of St. Paul's conversion before he returns to the apostolic labours of St. Peter; but there can scarcely be a doubt that the events recorded in Acts ix. 31-xi. 18 took place during the three years that followed Saul's conversion, and preceded his return to Jerusalem.



Acts xi. 30, xii. 25. Apparently none of the Apostles were then at Jerusalem ; and Paul and Barnabas only stayed long enough to deposit in the hands of the elders the alms with which they had been entrusted. There can be no doubt that the visit here recorded was his third, to the meeting at Jerusalem of the council of Apostles and elders ; at which he and Barnabas attended as representatives of the Church of Antioch. The proceedings of the apostolic council are related in Acts xv. 1-33. The issue there decided was of vital importance to the Christian Church : for its future independence of Judaism was once more endangered by the persistent demand that Gentile converts should be circumcised, and keep the law. Accordingly the divisions of opinion in the council, and the views of different apostles, have been scanned with attention. The language of St. Paul, as interpreted in our Bible, gives a different impression from that conveyed by the narrative of St. Luke. For the latter represents the Judaizing party as a Pharisaic section of extreme partisans without any leader of eminence in the Church, whose whole strength lay in popular prejudice, and whose opinions sustained an ignominious collapse at the council in consequence of the decisive support given by the leading Apostles to Paul and Barnabas ; whereas this epistle, as translated in our Bible, relates first the necessity of private conferences to overcome the hesitation of the leaders of the Church, then a severe struggle for the circumcision of Titus, which was with difficulty resisted, though St. Paul secured in the end the personal support and cordial adhesion of the leading Apostles. Now the language of St. Paul is admitted on all hands to be exceptionally obscure ; and I cannot help thinking that this is an entire misconception of his meaning, founded on the mistranslation of certain sentences in these verses.

In ver. 2 the Apostle is in our version made to say, "*I . . . communicated . . . that gospel which I*

preach among the Gentiles, but privately to them which were of reputation, lest by any means I should run, or had run, in vain." Now a doubt at once suggests itself whether this can be a correct rendering of his language: for it is almost incredible that he should either have felt the success of his gospel to depend on private negotiation with men of reputation, or have expressed such an apprehension to the Galatian Judaizers.<sup>1</sup> And this doubt is more than confirmed by an examination of the Greek text. For the rendering here given to τοῖς δοκοῦσιν, *them which were of reputation*, appears to me quite unexampled. Some poetical passages are alleged in favour of this meaning: e.g. Eur., *Hec.* 294, λόγος γὰρ ἔκ τ' ἀδοξούντων ἰὼν κὰκ τῶν δοκούντων, but there the context and preceding ἀδοξούντων give it a special meaning; and Eur., *Heracl.* 897, εὐτυχίαν τῶν πάρος οὐ δοκούντων, but there the context readily suggests εὐτυχεῖν as understood after δοκούντων. I know no place where δοκεῖν bears anything like the meaning here ascribed to it.<sup>2</sup> Furthermore the combination of μήπως τρέχω with the narrative tense ἀνεθέμην is contrary to the principles of Greek construction. Now all these difficulties disappear at once, if μήπως be taken in connexion with δοκοῦσιν instead of ἀνεθέμην. The present participle is naturally followed by the present indicative τρέχω, and the conjunction μήπως retains its habitual sense, and expresses the actual apprehensions of the Apostle's failure, felt not by himself, but by the Judaizing party in the Church. The private conferences

<sup>1</sup> This apprehension of possible failure is even more distinctly expressed in the Greek phrase μήπως τρέχω ἢ ἔδραμον than in the corresponding English; for the force of μή and μήπως followed by an indicative is as clearly expressive of an actual apprehension on his own part in the language of St. Paul as in other Greek writers (Rom. xi. 21, Gal. iv. 11, 1 Thess. iii. 5). Attempts have been made to evade the natural force of the words (*Winer*, § lvi.), but with indifferent success.

<sup>2</sup> It is clearly an error to quote Herodian vi. 1 in support of such a translation; for the meaning of τ. δοκούντας καὶ ἡλικία σεμνοτάτους καὶ βίω σωφρονοτάτους ἑκκαίδεκα is *the sixteen who seemed (to the imperial ladies) at once most venerable in age and most respectable in life.*

Acts xi. 30, xii. 25. Apparently none of the Apostles were then at Jerusalem ; and Paul and Barnabas only stayed long enough to deposit in the hands of the elders the alms with which they had been entrusted. There can be no doubt that the visit here recorded was his third, to the meeting at Jerusalem of the council of Apostles and elders ; at which he and Barnabas attended as representatives of the Church of Antioch. The proceedings of the apostolic council are related in Acts xv. 1-33. The issue there decided was of vital importance to the Christian Church : for its future independence of Judaism was once more endangered by the persistent demand that Gentile converts should be circumcised, and keep the law. Accordingly the divisions of opinion in the council, and the views of different apostles, have been scanned with attention. The language of St. Paul, as interpreted in our Bible, gives a different impression from that conveyed by the narrative of St. Luke. For the latter represents the Judaizing party as a Pharisaic section of extreme partisans without any leader of eminence in the Church, whose whole strength lay in popular prejudice, and whose opinions sustained an ignominious collapse at the council in consequence of the decisive support given by the leading Apostles to Paul and Barnabas ; whereas this epistle, as translated in our Bible, relates first the necessity of private conferences to overcome the hesitation of the leaders of the Church, then a severe struggle for the circumcision of Titus, which was with difficulty resisted, though St. Paul secured in the end the personal support and cordial adhesion of the leading Apostles. Now the language of St. Paul is admitted on all hands to be exceptionally obscure ; and I cannot help thinking that this is an entire misconception of his meaning, founded on the mistranslation of certain sentences in these verses.

In ver. 2 the Apostle is in our version made to say, "*I . . . communicated . . . that gospel which I*

*preach among the Gentiles, but privately to them which were of reputation, lest by any means I should run, or had run, in vain.*" Now a doubt at once suggests itself whether this can be a correct rendering of his language: for it is almost incredible that he should either have felt the success of his gospel to depend on private negotiation with men of reputation, or have expressed such an apprehension to the Galatian Judaizers.<sup>1</sup> And this doubt is more than confirmed by an examination of the Greek text. For the rendering here given to *τοῖς δοκοῦσιν*, *them which were of reputation*, appears to me quite unexampled. Some poetical passages are alleged in favour of this meaning: e.g. Eur., *Hec.* 294, *λόγος γὰρ ἔκ τ' ἀδοξούντων ἰὼν κὰκ τῶν δοκούντων*, but there the context and preceding *ἀδοξούντων* give it a special meaning; and Eur., *Heracl.* 897, *εὐτυχίαν τῶν πάρος οὐ δοκούντων*, but there the context readily suggests *εὐτυχεῖν* as understood after *δοκούντων*. I know no place where *δοκεῖν* bears anything like the meaning here ascribed to it.<sup>2</sup> Furthermore the combination of *μήπως τρέχω* with the narrative tense *ἀνεθέμην* is contrary to the principles of Greek construction. Now all these difficulties disappear at once, if *μήπως* be taken in connexion with *δοκοῦσιν* instead of *ἀνεθέμην*. The present participle is naturally followed by the present indicative *τρέχω*, and the conjunction *μήπως* retains its habitual sense, and expresses the actual apprehensions of the Apostle's failure, felt not by himself, but by the Judaizing party in the Church. The private conferences

<sup>1</sup> This apprehension of possible failure is even more distinctly expressed in the Greek phrase *μήπως τρέχω ἢ ἔδραμον* than in the corresponding English; for the force of *μή* and *μήπως* followed by an indicative is as clearly expressive of an actual apprehension on his own part in the language of St. Paul as in other Greek writers (Rom. xi. 21, Gal. iv. 11, 1 Thess. iii. 5). Attempts have been made to evade the natural force of the words (*Winer*, § lvi.), but with indifferent success.

<sup>2</sup> It is clearly an error to quote Herodian vi. 1 in support of such a translation; for the meaning of *τ. δοκούντας καὶ ἡλικία σεμνοτάτους καὶ βίῳ σωφροσετάτους ἑκατάδεκα* is *the sixteen who seemed (to the imperial ladies) at once most venerable in age and most respectable in life*.

are thus no longer presented as negotiations with “*men of reputation*,” in the Church, but in a truer light as attempts to convince prejudiced opponents. I propose then to translate as follows: “*I . . . communicated unto them that gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but privately to those who were thinking that possibly I was running, or had run, in vain.*” The word *δοκεῖν*, followed by an infinitive or by *ὄτι*, often means *think* in the Greek Testament, and it seems to me naturally to acquire a tone of suspicious apprehension from the following *μήπως*, and become expressive of doubt and fear, though I am not prepared to adduce other instances of an exactly similar use. It will be seen however presently that *δοκεῖν* recurs with a kindred sense in ver. 6. In both cases it aptly describes the hesitating attitude of unreasonable prejudice or honest doubt with which many, possibly the larger number, of the Jewish converts regarded the disuse of circumcision and the latitude allowed to Gentile converts.

ii. 3. A great deal has been written about the struggle that took place over the position of the Gentile convert Titus, who accompanied St. Paul to Jerusalem. Some have even suggested that Titus for peace' sake actually submitted to circumcision, though not acknowledging any absolute obligation. This suggestion ignores the whole history of the crisis, in which the liberty of Gentile converts was but weakly assailed and triumphantly maintained; it ignores also the order of the Greek text, which must have run *ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἠναγκάσθη Τίτος . . .* if stress had been laid on Titus' submission not being compulsory. It is indeed said with truth that the verse implies a struggle and an attempt to enforce the circumcision of Titus. But the words “*Ἐλλην ὧν*” show distinctly when and how that struggle took place; for the name of “*Ἐλλην*” is not applied in the New Testament to baptized Christians but to Gentiles. It was therefore not at Jerusalem, but years before,

when the Gentile Titus was converted to Christianity and sought for Christian baptism, that a debate had arisen whether he should first be circumcised. As St. Paul speaks of him elsewhere as his true child (Tit. i. 4), we may conclude that he had himself converted Titus, and had taken a principal part in resisting this pressure and admitting Titus to baptism, like Cornelius and his friends, without circumcision. Accordingly I translate this verse, '*Nevertheless even Titus, who was with me, had<sup>1</sup> not, though a Greek, been compelled to be circumcised.*' The Apostle marks by this verse the limits of his concession to Judaizers at Jerusalem: he had consented to debate the question in public and in private, but he had taken a Gentile convert, who had never been circumcised, as his special minister and companion to Jerusalem.

ii. 4. The next verse proceeds to explain his motive in these public and private conferences. '*But it was because of the false brethren . . . that I did this.*' No verb is expressed, nor do the subsequent relative clauses, or the parenthetic reference to past history in ver. 3, suggest one; it is natural therefore to connect the verse with the previous verb ἀνεθέμην in ver. 2. The delegation of Paul and Barnabas is in like manner attributed in Acts xv. i. 2 to the interference of Pharisaic partisans from Judæa.<sup>2</sup>

ii. 6. In ver. 6 we meet again with οἱ δοκοῦντες, followed by εἶναί τι, and our version translates, *those who seemed to be somewhat*, making εἶναί τι equivalent to τι εἶναι. But it is well known that τις, τι cannot have this emphatic meaning *a somebody*, or *somewhat*, i.e. some great one, unless stress be laid on the enclitic by position or otherwise. Hence δοκεῖ τις (τι) εἶναι derives its whole force from the

<sup>1</sup> The Greek language would naturally use the aorist here, the English the pluperfect.

<sup>2</sup> By παρεισάκτους and παρεισήλθον is intimated apparently that they had crept into the Church by a side door, being Pharisees at heart and not true Christians.

peculiar position of *τις* (*τι*), which intimates that the person in question had some special dignity and importance (either in his own mind or that of others), and thought a good deal of himself or was so thought of by others. But when *τι* follows *εἶναι*, as here, the phrase has quite a different meaning. Plato, for instance, speaks of the worthlessness of many false witnesses against a man who is really innocent, *καὶ δοκούντων εἶναι τι*, *even though they fancy there is something in the charge*, and are not guilty of wilful falsehood (*Gorg.* 472 A). Here then *τῶν δοκούντων εἶναι τι* describes the men who fancied there was something in these doubts about the gospel which Paul preached. They are described farther on as *οἱ δοκοῦντες*, *the men who had thoughts*; and the word exactly describes the vague dissatisfaction which existed in the Church of Jerusalem after the admission of Gentiles to baptism had cut away all solid ground for argument from under the advocates of circumcision. The phrase recurs in Galatians vi. 3; its sense in that passage will be examined hereafter. Gamaliel also in Acts v. 36 speaks of Theudas as *λέγων εἶναι τινα ἑαυτόν*: but this does not mean that Theudas “boasted” himself to be somebody, but that he called himself somebody, *i.e.* pretended to be some prophet or other; and *τινα* expresses Gamaliel’s contemptuous indifference what name he had assumed.

After this fresh reference to the unbelieving doubts which he encountered at Jerusalem, the Apostle interrupts his sentence to declare his utter indifference *what manner of men they were* who thus doubted, and by *ποτε* he expresses his amazement that there could be any Christians who still doubted the success of the gospel among the Gentiles. He further repudiates the idea of yielding to personal authority; it is probable therefore that the Galatian Judaizers had appealed to the authority of some members of the Church of Jerusalem against the Apostle. After this parenthesis

he proceeds to finish the sentence which he had begun, but in a new shape: 'to me I say these men who had thoughts made no further communication.' This seems the obvious meaning of *προσανέθεντο* following *ἀνεθέμην* in ver. 2. So we are told in the Acts that St. Paul laid his case before the brethren at Jerusalem; and there ensued much questioning (Acts xv. 7, *ζητήσεως*, not *disputing* as in our version): but the opposition were silenced: they had no real answer to make, but buried their doubts in silence.<sup>1</sup> This last clause of ver. 6 contains, in fact, the conclusion of the first, expressed in different words. Instead of saying that *from those who thought there was something amiss there came no further communication*, he alters the sentence so as to insert *ἐμοί* with emphasis: *to me I say they made no further communication*.

ii. 7, 8. The next two verses describe the behaviour of the three leading Apostles, James, Cephas, and John, on the same occasion. Their feeling was the very reverse of this half-hearted spirit of doubt; and their conduct is accordingly introduced by the opening words *ἀλλὰ τοὐναντίον*, in order to express an emphatic contrast to the preceding picture. They welcomed with enthusiasm the tidings of St. Paul's successful preaching among the uncircumcised: this abundant blessing of God upon His work was to them an evident token of a Divine appointment; they saw that God had chosen him for this special ministry; they recognised the grace bestowed upon him, and in the fulness of Christian fellowship bid him God-speed upon his mission to the Gentiles as his own proper field of work. These Apostles are described as *the men who are thought to be pillars of the Church*, evidently by way of contrast with

<sup>1</sup> *προσανεθέμην* in i. 16 has a similar meaning: 'When it pleased God to reveal His Son in me, . . . I made no further reference to flesh and blood.' He intimates that he did not appeal from God to man, but communed with God and himself.



the previous *δοκοῦντες*, the men who had thoughts of their own.<sup>1</sup>

When once the correct translation of *δοκεῖν* is adopted, it becomes impossible to confound the temper of the Apostles with that of the opponents of St. Paul. The account here given of their sentiments and conduct corresponds exactly to the report made of their language in Acts xv. 13-29. While suggesting a consideration for the Jewish section of the Church which St. Paul himself constantly advocated, they cordially approved his principles, and rejoiced at the success of his labours. It is true indeed that this mutual agreement between the Apostles to divide their spheres of labour produced a subsequent tendency amidst the partisans of circumcision to set up the authority of St. Peter against St. Paul: some said, "*I am of Cephas*" (1 Cor. i. 12). Even the Apostles themselves had their sympathies gradually drawn by it in opposite directions: St. Peter was tempted at Antioch thoughtlessly to wound the feelings of uncircumcised Christians; St. Paul ignored the decision of the apostolic council about eating meats offered to idols in his directions to Gentile Christians (Rom. xiv. 3; 1 Cor. x. 25-27). But this epistle agrees with the Acts in describing the perfect harmony of the two Apostles up to this time: the advocates of Gentile liberty could hitherto appeal with confidence to the example of St. Peter as supporting their views against the Pharisaic party; the Churches of Jerusalem and of Antioch could rejoice together over the unbroken unity of the Christian Church.

F. RENDALL.

<sup>1</sup> The fourfold repetition of *δοκεῖν* suggests a strong probability that there is an intentional play upon the word in this place. One body *had thoughts of their own* about St. Paul's preaching; the others *were thought to be pillars of the Church*. The two sections however are not identified, but contrasted with each other.