

loyalty. The single wish that is in all our hearts is surely this: that one so true and good may continue for long years to come to occupy that place which for more than half a century she has, to the great content of us all, so worthily filled; that unclouded happiness may be hers; and that the Almighty will reward her single-hearted consecration to the good of her people, by causing them even yet to sink all their party spirit, factions, and jealousies in united, unselfish labour for the peace and prosperity of every class of their fellow-subjects.

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

---

ART. IV.—GALATIANS ii. 4.

διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους, κ. τ. λ.

I THINK the logical connection of this passage has been completely mistaken by commentators, neither has it been successfully disentangled even by the late Bishop Lightfoot. The question of the circumcision of Titus is generally treated as a leading factor in it, whereas I think I see indications that it never came on the tapis at all, but was prevented from doing so by Paul's policy.

Dr. Lightfoot writes: "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 intervenes, 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 that were held in repute,' verse 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."

But suppose it can be shown, by a different method of taking the sentence, that there is no reason for thinking that St. Paul had any idea of "satisfying" or "disarming" the false brethren, that the connection of the sentence is not "snapped off," that he wrote all that he intended to write and exhibits no sign of having been counselled by the leading Apostles to yield, that the main subject of the sentence is not "lost sight of through a long parenthesis," and that the counsels of the Apostles of the circumcision are not the "hidden rock on which

the grammar of the sentence is wrecked," since the grammar of the sentence is not wrecked at all.

Let us take the whole passage over again under the hypothesis that Paul is either explaining, or possibly justifying, his politic conduct in making sure of his ground with the Apostles of the circumcision before the false brethren had an opportunity of attacking him or sowing dissension, and that it was his knowledge of their readiness to attack him that caused him to act as he did. I hope to be able to show that, by proceeding in this way, taking διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους as the pivot of the passage, and supplying the copula, which has been omitted in eager haste, just as it has been in a speech of the same Paul in Acts xxiv. 17, 18, hereafter to be cited and commented on, there will be no difficulty, either grammatical or logical, remaining that need cause the slightest trouble. In fact, the difficulty has arisen from a preconceived opinion, not contained in the text, but read into it from without, that there was a serious discrepancy between the views of Paul on the one hand and the Apostles of the circumcision on the other.

The Apostle's words run : " Then after an interval of fourteen years I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, taking with me Titus also. And I went up by revelation, and related to them [in consultation] the Gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but *privately to those who were eminent*, lest any how I should be running or should have run in vain ; but [it was] because of the surreptitiously introduced pseudo-brethren, who made their way in to make espial of our liberty, which we possess in Christ Jesus, in order to enslave us [that I did so], to whom we did not yield even temporarily by way of submission, in order that the truth of the Gospel might remain with you. Now from those who were eminent—whatever they once were, it makes no difference to me, God does not accept a man's person—for those who were eminent gave me no additional instruction, but on the contrary, seeing that I have been entrusted with the Gospel of the uncircumcision, as Peter with that of the circumcision (for he who wrought in Peter unto apostleship of the circumcision, wrought in me also with regard to the Gentiles), and perceiving the grace which was given to me, James and Cephas and John, who were considered to be pillars, gave me and Barnabas right hands of fellowship, that we [should go] to the Gentiles and they to the circumcision."

If we take the passage in this way, we find no hint in it of a serious difference of opinion, either theoretical or practical, between Paul and the Apostles of the circumcision. We only find that, in order to prevent annoyance or attack from the pseudo-

brethren, and possibly a serious disturbance in the grand assembly of the Church, Paul made himself sure of his ground with Cephas, James and John, ascertained fully that his and their Gospel was to all intents and purposes the same, and came, as it were, into court on terms of perfect friendship with them. Whereas, if he had not thus carefully prepared his ground, the pseudo-brethren might have been able to put pressure upon him, and perhaps even have obtained a declaration from the Apostles of the circumcision, that it was desirable in the interests of peace that Titus should be circumcised. All this possible conspiracy was nipped in the bud by Paul's politic course in taking time by the forelock, and coming to a perfect understanding with the other Apostles before those who wished to make a breach between him and them had the opportunity of sowing the smallest seed of dissension.

This is extremely simple and easy, and everything runs on naturally without the introduction of propositions not in the text, which is surely much better than to complicate both logic and grammar, as Lightfoot and others have done. There has been a kind of conspiracy among certain German theologians to set the Pauline, Petrine, Jacobæan and Johannine Gospels by the ears, just in the way that the pseudo-brethren had at heart. But if the words of Paul are taken simply as they stand, I am confident that there is no reason for any such thing. In fact, the politic conduct of Paul in securing a private interview, before coming into the mixed assembly, precluded any such occurrence.

For the grammatical construction of *διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους*, without any verb expressed, I would compare a similar sentence in a speech of the same Paul in Acts xxiv. 17, 18: "Now after many years I came to bring alms to my nation and offerings, engaged in which they found me purified in the temple, with no crowd nor yet with tumult; but [*it was*]" (the R.V. gives "*there were*") certain Jews from Asia [that caused the disturbance], who ought to have been here before thee, and to be making accusation if they had aught against me." The "*there were*" of the R.V. completes the grammar, but does not exhibit the absence of the copula and effect of the clause so plainly as the words "*it was*," which I have inserted in brackets, as I have also done in my translation of *διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους* in Gal. ii. 4 above.

A. H. WRATISLAW.

