

# 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)

by the hope of that new and yet unseen world. Peter, in like manner, says to us: "Seeing that we look for these things, give diligence that we may be found without spot and blameless in His sight." John, looking to the manifestation of Christ, exclaims, "Every one that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as He is pure." Christ Himself strikes the key-note of all this in His frequent references to His second coming, and in the last chapter of the Apocalypse He is represented as grasping the whole of the present and the coming age in the significant proclamation: "I am the First and the Last, the Beginning and the End. Blessed are they that wash their robes, that they may have the right to the Tree of Life, and may enter in by the gates into the city." Here we have the Divine unity of nature and of grace, of the beginnings of humanity, and the final revelation of the sons of God and restitution of all things; and all this in the Redeemer and His second coming and glorious kingdom: "Even so, come, Lord Jesus."

J. WILLIAM DAWSON.

*ON THE INTERPRETATION OF TWO PASSAGES  
IN THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.<sup>1</sup>*

ONE of the many injurious results of the dominant North-Galatian theory is that it has led to a general misinterpretation of the Epistle to the Galatians. When the Epistle was supposed to refer to certain historical facts, there was produced an unconscious bias in the direction of finding references to these facts. It is proposed here to give two examples of such misinterpretation of the Greek of the Epistle.

<sup>1</sup> Probably the two interpretations here advocated are not new: it is difficult to find anything that has not been said before about Paul. But they were novel to some excellent authorities to whom I mentioned them.

I. It is a necessary consequence of the North-Galatian theory that *Galatians* ii. 1-10 describes the same events as *Acts* xv. ; and the words of Paul have been tortured to read them into some sort of misfitting reference to those events. In accordance with the belief (which I shall try soon to establish conclusively) that *Acts* is one of the few great first-rate historical works which have as yet been written, and that it stands in remarkably close agreement with the other records, direct or indirect, which have come down to us, it is of course necessary for me to hold that, when Paul declares his second visit to Jerusalem to have taken place in the fourteenth year after his conversion,<sup>1</sup> and describes it, his words must be applied to what Luke expressly declares to have been his second visit, and not to what Luke describes as his third visit. If this point is abandoned, then it becomes vain to seek for synchronisms or agreements. Anything in early Christian history can be made to agree with anything else, if Paul's second visit in *Galatians* ii. 1-10 is his third visit in *Acts* xv. ; and we should have to acquiesce in the conclusion that Luke as an historian stands little above a common witness in a court of law, who will describe an event that occurred in his own presence so loosely and inaccurately and unintelligently, that it is not quite easy to reconcile his description with that of another eye-witness. Such a conclusion is fatal to the position which I am eager to defend. I frankly admit that the account given of any incident by a great historian must seize the critical points in its evolution, and represent these in their proper proportions, and that the account given by a sensible and honest witness must always confirm in a

<sup>1</sup> Some prefer to understand "after his first visit." The point is for our present purpose immaterial (though the entire chronology of the period depends on it); and it is therefore unnecessary to defend my interpretation here. The paper will not be affected, if those who prefer the other sense (which is of course grammatically justifiable), substitute it in the above sentence.

striking and conclusive way the great historian's narrative. If they are hard to reconcile, or if their resemblance is lame and inconclusive, then either the historian is second- (or third) -rate, or the witness is incompetent or dishonest.

It will be best to begin by quoting the Greek of *Epist. Gal.* ii. 1-10, on the left as it is given by Westcott and Hort, and on the right as I think it should be punctuated.

ἔπειτα διὰ ἰδ' ἐτῶν πάλιν ἀνέβην εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα μετὰ Βαρνάβα, συμπαραλαβὼν καὶ Τίτον· ἀνέβην δὲ κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν· καὶ ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ κηρύσσω ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσιν, μή πως εἰς κενὸν τρέχω ἢ ἔδραμον. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Τίτος ὁ σὺν ἐμοί, Ἕλλην ὢν, ἠναγκάσθη περιτμηθῆναι· διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους, οἵτινες πάρεσιήλθον κατασκοπῆσαι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῶν ἢν ἔχομεν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα ἡμᾶς καταδουλώσουσιν, οἷς οὐδὲ πρὸς ὄραν εἴξαμεν τῇ ὑποταγῇ, ἵνα ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου διαμείνῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς· ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναι τι ὅποιοι ποτε ἦσαν οὐδέν μοι διαφέρει, πρόσωπον Θεοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐ λαμβάνει· ἐμοὶ γὰρ οἱ δοκοῦντες οὐδὲν προσανέθεντο, κτλ.<sup>1</sup>

ἔπειτα διὰ ἰδ' ἐτῶν πάλιν ἀνέβην εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα μετὰ Βαρνάβα, συμπαραλαβὼν καὶ Τίτον—(ἀνέβην δὲ κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν)—, καὶ ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ κηρύσσω ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν—(κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσιν)—, μήπως εἰς κενὸν τρέχω ἢ ἔδραμον—(ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Τίτος ὁ σὺν ἐμοί Ἕλλην ὢν ἠναγκάσθη περιτμηθῆναι)— διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους, οἵτινες πάρεσιήλθον κατασκοπῆσαι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῶν ἢν ἔχομεν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα ἡμᾶς καταδουλώσουσιν· οἷς οὐδὲ πρὸς ὄραν εἴξαμεν τῇ ὑποταγῇ, ἵνα ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου διαμείνῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς. ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναι τι (ὅποιοί ποτε ἦσαν οὐδέν μοι διαφέρει—πρόσωπον Θεοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐ λαμβάνει)—ἐμοὶ γὰρ οἱ δοκοῦντες οὐδὲν προσανέθεντο, ἀλλὰ τοῦνάντιον ἰδόντες ὅτι πεπίστευμαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας καθὼς Πέτρος τῆς περιτομῆς (ὁ γὰρ ἐνεργήσας Πέτρῳ εἰς ἀποστολὴν τῆς περιτομῆς ἐνήργησεν καὶ ἐμοὶ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη), καὶ γνόντες τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθείσαν μοι, Ἰάκωβος καὶ Κηφᾶς καὶ Ἰωάννης, οἱ δοκοῦντες στύλοι εἶναι, δεξιὰς ἔδωκαν ἐμοὶ καὶ Βαρνάβα κοινωνίας, ἵνα ἡμεῖς εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, αὐτοὶ δὲ εἰς τὴν περιτομὴν μόνον τῶν πτωχῶν ἵνα μνημονεύωμεν, ὃ καὶ ἐσπούδασα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι.

<sup>1</sup> Below this point it is unnecessary to quote Westcott and Hort's text, as the difference is slight.

It is advisable to give first a translation of the passage without the parenthetic clauses, which make its construction so awkward, though they add so much to its argumentative power when properly comprehended.

“Then after fourteen years I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, taking Titus as companion;<sup>1</sup> and I laid before them [*i.e.* the Apostles]<sup>2</sup> the gospel which I have continued preaching<sup>3</sup> among the Gentiles, with the purpose that neither the work of my life nor my past work might be rendered ineffective, and [*taking this step*] by reason of the insinuating pseudo-Christians who crept in covertly to be spies on our liberty, which we [*the right-thinking Christians*] enjoy in Christ Jesus, in order to enslave us; but to them we did not for one hour yield by our submission, to the end that the gospel truth might remain safe unto you. But from the recognised<sup>4</sup> leaders—the recognised leaders, I repeat, imparted to me no further instruction, but, on the contrary, seeing that I hold in trust the gospel of the non-circumcision as Peter [*does the gospel*] of the circumcision, and knowing the grace given me, they—James, and Cephas, and John—the recognised pillars [*of the Church*], gave the right hand of fellowship to me and to Barnabas that we [*go*] to the Gentiles, and they themselves to the circumcision. Only [*they charged us*] to remember the poor [*brethren at Jerusalem*], which very duty I zealously discharged.”

The great difficulty of the whole narrative in i. and ii. lies

<sup>1</sup> The insertion of “me” in A.V. and R.V. imparts an egoistic touch, which is wanting in the Greek.

<sup>2</sup> *i.e.*, with a view to obtain their approval, and secure unanimity, and avoid conflict with independent and inconsistent schemes, which might make my own work vain.

<sup>3</sup> The present tense is to be taken as *present-continuous*.

<sup>4</sup> I cannot agree with Lightfoot that *δοκῶντες* “is depreciatory”; that does not lie in the Greek (in his examples the depreciatory sense comes from the context), and is diametrically opposed to my conception of Paul’s lofty and punctiliously courteous tone towards the elder apostles (on which see below).

in its intermingling in the most subtle way argument with narrative. It is a narrative, but a narrative given because of its bearing on the question at issue in the Galatian churches. Paul's point lies in this, that to prove his case and to establish his position, all that is necessary is to recount the facts in their true character and sequence. His case is that he is the Apostle charged by God to the Gentiles, and accepted as such by the elder apostles. He brings this out in his narrative by a very subtle device, viz., he distinguishes carefully between those actions which belonged to a definite point in the series of past events (*aorist*), those actions which continued for a period but are not thought of as continuing at the moment of writing (*imperfect*), and those actions which are marked as permanent and true down to the moment of writing (*present*). This distinction is well brought out in i. 15: "And when it seemed fit (*aorist*) to God, who set me apart from my birth and called me through His grace (*aorists*) to reveal His Son in me (*aorist*), so that I preach Him (*present*) among the Gentiles." When the due moment arrived, God revealed His will to Paul and called him. These are definite acts which produced certain lasting consequences, but were themselves momentary. But the purpose and the result of the call was that Paul became, and continued until the moment of writing to be, the preacher among the Gentiles. Again in i. 22, "I continued unknown (*imperfect*) by face to the churches of Judea" (this is not said to be true at the time of writing, though it lasted for many years); "and they continued to hear reports (*imperfect*) that 'our persecutor'<sup>1</sup> is now preaching (*present*) the gospel which formerly he was attempting to destroy' (*imperfect*), and they continually expressed their (*imperfect*) admiration of God's

<sup>1</sup> The participle διώκων permits no inference; present and imperfect coincide in the participle. The only distinction in the participle is between *aorist* ii. 1, 7, 9, and present-imperfect.

action in my case." Such was their conduct for a number of years: the writer does not indicate that they continue now to do so (partly, such reports were no longer needed, and his conduct was no longer a cause of wonder and special recognition, partly, many in the Judæan churches were now opposed to him, and would no longer praise or admire what he was doing for the Church).

When we apply this principle to the hard passage ii. 1-10, several of the difficulties disappear, and some misconceptions are cleared away.

A special contrast is indicated between a *present* and an *aorist* in the following cases:—

v. 2, "I submitted to them (*aorist*) the gospel which I continue preaching to the present day among the Gentiles (*present*)."

v. 2, "To prevent the work of my whole life (*present*), or my work then (*aorist*), from being ineffectual."

v. 10, "Only (they instructed me) to remember permanently (*present*) the poor, which I then made it my object to do (*aorist*)."

A difficult contrast between *present* and *imperfect* occurs in v. 6: "it matters not in my estimation (now or then, or at any time, *present*) by what conduct and character they were marked out before the world for their dignified and influential position (*imperfect*)."

The necessity for the *imperfect* here becomes clearer if we substitute the *present*, and observe that the change gives an inadmissible sense. "What their permanent character is matters not to me" (*ὅποιοί ποτε εἶσιν οὐδὲν μοι διαφέρει*) would be a sentiment unsuitable to the argument, and hardly becoming in Paul's mouth. The sense of what he says is, "I grant that their conduct had been noble and their prominent position was deserved, but God, who respects not persons, had chosen to communicate directly

with me and through me to the Gentiles; and I could not put myself under their directions."

Still more clear does the necessity for the imperfect become if we take the sense preferred by Lightfoot: he says, "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 many aorists of this passage are clear: each of them denotes an act in the drama, which is described. They need no elucidation or comment except the following in v. 5: "we resisted them then that the truth of the Gospel might continue for you" (*aorist*). Here it may seem that the aorist expresses an action that continues to the moment of writing. That, however, is not so: the action belonged to the moment, though its result lasts down to the time of writing; and this becomes clear if we put the proposition in another form, "we resisted them then that the truth might not by our compliance be interrupted and prevented from continuing for you." The *aorist* is required to express "might not be interrupted," and it is therefore required to express "might continue."

Now we may give a paraphrase of the passage, expanding the concise language a little and introducing the parenthetic additions.

"Then in the fourteenth year *after it pleased God to call me*, I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took Titus also as companion. Now *I may explain that I went up on account of a revelation (which shows how completely my action was guided directly by the Divine will, and how independent it was of any orders or instructions from the apostles)*. And I communicated to them with a view to consultation the gospel which I continue preaching among the Gentiles; but I did so privately to those who were recognised as the leading spirits, *not publicly to the whole*

*body of the apostles ; since the latter course would have had the appearance of consulting the official governing body, as if I felt it a duty to seek advice from them, whereas private consultation was a purely voluntary act. My purpose in this consultation was to carry with me the leading spirits of the Church, since misunderstanding or want of complete approval on their part might endanger or frustrate my evangelistic work whether in the future or the past, if doubt or dispute arose as to the rights of my converts to full membership in the Church without further ceremony. Now, as I have touched on this point, I may mention parenthetically that not even was my companion Titus, Greek as he was, required to submit to circumcision, much less was the general principle laid down that the Jewish rite was a necessary preliminary to the full membership of the Church. Further, the occasion of my consulting the leading Apostles was because of certain insinuating sham brethren, who crept into our society in an unavowed way to act the spy on our freedom (which we free Christians have been enjoying throughout my ministry), in order to make us slaves to the ritual which they count necessary. But not for an hour did we yield to these false brethren by complying with their ideas, or expressing agreement with them ; and our firmness then was intended to secure that the gospel in its true form should continue in lasting freedom for you to enjoy. But from the recognised leaders — how distinguished soever was their character matters not to me ; God accepteth not man's person—the recognised leaders, I say, imparted no new instruction to me ; but, on the contrary, perceiving that I throughout my ministry am charged specially with the mission to foreign (non-Jewish) nations as Peter is with the Jewish mission—for he that worked for Peter to the apostolate of the circumcision worked also for me to be the missionary to the Gentiles—and perceiving from the actual facts the grace that had*

been given me, they, James and Cephas and John, the recognised pillars of the Church, gave pledges to me and to Barnabas of a joint scheme of work, ours to be directed to the Gentiles, while theirs was to the Jews. One charge alone they gave us, to remember the poor brethren at Jerusalem, a duty which as a matter of fact I bestirred myself to perform then."

It is apparent that in the passage as thus punctuated and translated, all the few slight points of resemblance to the narrative of *Acts xv.* have disappeared. The same persons are mentioned, but the actions are quite different. The question between the Judaizing party and the Pauline party is never formally raised here, whereas it was the whole reason for the visit of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem in *Acts xv.*, when a council of the apostles and elders was the marked feature of the proceedings. This visit then belongs to a period before the question had actually come to the front; it was already imminent, but was not yet actually the subject of contention. The apostles therefore were not called on at that time to give any public decision; and privately, in communication with Paul, they recognised fully his deserts and his call, and approved his method.

The concluding sentence is in some respects the most remarkable and interesting in this passage, containing the only positive charge given to Paul by the elder apostles. The *aorist* (*ἐσπούδασα ποιῆσαι*) prevents us from understanding (as Lightfoot does) that Paul's "subsequent zeal in the same cause was the answer to their appeal." If Paul had here been referring to his permanent conduct and feeling or to something which he is carrying into effect at the time of writing, he would, according to the rule of tenses in this passage, have used the *present* tense; but, since he uses the *aorist*, he must be referring to "an act in the drama which then occurred." On the visit in question,

therefore, Paul made it a special object to aid<sup>1</sup> the poor brethren in Jerusalem. We find then that on the second visit of the Galatian Epistle Paul was busied in the duty which is stated in *Acts* xi., xii. to have been the primary object of his second journey. Thus the two accounts of the journey are found to be in the most singular agreement, which may be expressed thus: the second journey in *Epist. Gal.* is said to have been made "according to revelation," and in *Acts* the exact circumstances of the revelation are narrated; the object of the second visit is defined in *Acts* as being to relieve the distress of the poor brethren in Jerusalem, and in *Epist. Gal.* Paul says he directed his attention specially to helping the poor brethren; another purpose is said in *Epist. Gal.* to have been achieved on this second journey, *v.* 3, but Paul immediately adds that this other purpose was carried out as a mere private piece of business, and implies thereby that it was not the primary or official purpose of the journey.<sup>2</sup>

How graceful and delicate is the compliment which the older apostles paid to Paul! "the only advice which we have to give is that you make it your rule (*present*) to do what you have been zealously doing," so they spoke at the conclusion of his visit! And in what a gentlemanly spirit does Paul refer to that visit. His object is to prove to the Galatians that, on his visits to Jerusalem, he received nothing in the way of instruction or commission from the older apostles; and to do this he gives an account of his visits. When he comes to the second visit he might have said in the tone of downright and rather coarse candour, "So far from receiving on this occasion, I was sent by Divine revelation to be the giver." But not even in this hot

<sup>1</sup> ἐσπούδασα ποιῆσαι here as σπουδάζοντες τηρεῖν τὴν ἐνότητα τοῦ πνεύματος (*Eph.* iv. 3), "making it a special object to maintain the unity of the Spirit."

<sup>2</sup> The analogy of *Eph.* iv. 3, quoted above, might be alleged as a proof that ἐσπούδασα in *Gal.* ii. 10, defines the principal object of the visit.

and hasty letter does he swerve from his tone of respect and admiration, or assume in the slightest degree a tone of superiority to Peter and James. The facts are all there to show the real situation; but they are put so quietly and allusively (the revelation in *v.* 2, the object in *v.* 10), as to avoid all appearance of boasting in what was really a very legitimate cause of satisfaction, and even of self-gratulation. It is precisely because on his second visit Paul was so obviously not the recipient that he appeals to it with such perfect confidence as proving his independence. On the other hand no one can read over *Acts* xv. and say that a champion of Paul's independence would appeal to it as an argument in his favour; and the opinion that Paul appealed to that visit as proving his independence, and gave its history without ever alluding to the object of the visit and to the Council in which the older apostles acted as judges and decided in his favour, seems in my judgment to attribute to him a remarkable power of hiding the facts that might tell against him. He appeals to God in the most solemn manner that he is telling the truth in this narrative, *Gal.* i. 20.

In conclusion it may be pointed out that, on the North-Galatian theory, it has been practically necessary to assume that the author of *Acts* was not acquainted with Paul's Epistle to the Galatians.<sup>1</sup> For those who hold that the author was the intimate friend, disciple, and medical attendant in the closest personal relations with Paul for many years, it is of course hard to believe that he did not know that Epistle,—still harder when we consider that he was making his teacher the hero of a historical work. It will hereafter be recognised as one of the greatest gains from the South-Galatian theory that it recognises in *Acts* a work

<sup>1</sup> The Tübingen scholars stand almost alone in maintaining that the author of *Acts* was acquainted with the Epistle to the Galatians; but they draw from the apparent discrepancies the conclusion that he garbled the facts for the purpose of producing a false impression.

written to explain, to supplement, and to render more thoroughly intelligible, the epistles, and that it succeeds in doing so. In this case it is obvious that *Acts* xi. 27-30 makes *Gal.* ii. 1-10 clearer and more significant; but no one has ever ventured to maintain that *Acts* xv. makes Paul's argument more intelligible, and the utmost that Lightfoot aims at is to show that there is no absolute contradiction between them.

One difficulty in the correspondence between *Acts* xi., xii. and *Galatians* ii. 1-10, will at once occur to every reader. In *Acts* nothing is said as to any companion of Barnabas and Paul, whereas Titus is said in *Epist. Gal.* to have accompanied them. But in the latter place Titus is only mentioned incidentally, and is expressly said to have been an unofficial companion, not sent by the Church, but merely taken by Paul with him;<sup>1</sup> while in *Acts* we are told only what was done officially by the church of Antioch. In fact, the narrative of *Acts* never describes the visit; it merely tells the arrangements made in Antioch for collecting a contribution and despatching the proceeds to Jerusalem, and that the collection took place<sup>2</sup> and was sent up in charge of two official representatives. There is, therefore, no opportunity for mentioning Titus in *Acts* xi. 27-30. At the next reference to Paul and Barnabas, xii. 25, we find them in Jerusalem, ready to start for Antioch

<sup>1</sup> In the same way John Mark accompanied Paul and Barnabas on their missionary journey to Cyprus, xiii. 5, but was not selected by the Spirit or sent forth by the Church as one of the official envoys, and is, therefore, only mentioned incidentally. The same term is used in *Acts* xii. 25 to describe the private act of taking John Mark as a companion, and in *Galatians* ii. 1 to describe the act of taking Titus as companion.

<sup>2</sup> The collection would, of course, require some considerable time, as we see from the better known case in later history, when the churches in Achaia, Macedonia, Asia, and Galatia joined in a similar contribution for the poor central church. Moreover, nobody will suppose that the aid was sent till it was needed, and in *Acts* xi. 27 the famine is still a future event known only by revelation and prophecy. It occurred in A.D. 46, as is clearly stated by Josephus, not in 44, as is often assumed. The distribution of relief was made by Paul and Barnabas personally, xii. 25.

after completing the administration of the fund. On this occasion they take with them back to Antioch a companion whom they found in Jerusalem, viz., John Mark; but it is obvious that he is here mentioned solely to give the reader information which he requires to be able to understand xiii. 5.

With regard to Titus, an interesting and important question may be suggested, which is equally hard for the North-Galatian and the South-Galatian theorists to answer. Why is Titus never mentioned in *Acts*? There are two persons who played highly important parts in the drama described in *Acts*, and yet are never mentioned in that book, Titus and Luke; and, on my conception of the author's historical insight and power of selecting and grouping details, the silence must be intentional. In Luke's case the reason is too obvious to need statement; but what is the reason in Titus's case? He that answers that question (which I confess to have found insoluble) will throw a wide-reaching light on the history of the time. The suggestion which has been made on 2 *Corinthians* viii. 18, that the two delegates there mentioned (who were in all probability Luke and Titus) were brothers, would give a satisfactory reason; but it seems difficult on other grounds to accept the suggestion.

II. Paul says to the Galatians (i. 6-7): *θαυμάζω ὅτι οὕτως ταχέως μετατίθεσθε ἀπὸ τοῦ καλέσαντος ὑμᾶς ἐν χάριτι Χριστοῦ εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον, ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο· εἰ μὴ τινὲς εἰσὶν οἱ ταρασσόντες ὑμᾶς καὶ θέλοντες μεταστρέψαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ.* In the Revised Version this is rendered, "I marvel that ye are so quickly removing from Him that called you in the grace of Christ unto a different gospel: which is not another (*gospel*); only there are some that trouble you and would pervert the gospel of Christ."<sup>1</sup> This seems to me to be a false translation, being founded

<sup>1</sup> Westcott and Hort read *Χριστοῦ* as a common noun here, "the gospel of the anointed one."

on a mistaken idea of the meaning of the Greek words ἄλλος and ἕτερος when contrasted with one another. It is obvious that the force depends on the pointed antithesis of ἕτερος and ἄλλος: the Galatians have gone over to a gospel which is ἕτερον but not ἄλλο.<sup>1</sup>

On these two words Lightfoot remarks, "ἕτερον involves a difference of kind which is not involved in ἄλλο." This appears to me an absolutely incorrect distinction. It is unnecessary to quote the rest of his remarks, in which he devotes himself to proving (what no one is likely to deny) that ἄλλος can be used in the sense of "another example of a class," and that ἕτερος can be used to imply difference.<sup>2</sup> But the point is this,—when ἕτερος and ἄλλος are pointedly contrasted, which of the two indicates the greater amount of difference? I think that ἕτερος indicates the difference between *species* of the same *genus*, ἄλλος the difference between two *genera*; and ἄλλος therefore indicates a much broader difference than ἕτερος.<sup>3</sup> It is difficult to find examples in point; but my friend Mr. R. A. Neil supplies me with an excellent instance from Thucydides ii. 40, 2-3, where ἐτέροις indicates those Athenians that belong to the industrial class (as distinguished from the military or statesman class), while ἄλλοις denotes all other nations as distinguished from the Athenians. Another example may

<sup>1</sup> At present I am assuming that the construction preferred by the Revisers and by Lightfoot is right: the different construction, given by the American Revisers in the margin, is noticed at the end of the paper (it requires a milder punctuation, or none at all, at ἄλλο).

<sup>2</sup> These usages, though quite good, are not the original and fundamental senses. Lightfoot quotes 2 *Corinthians* xi. 4, to show the difference between ἄλλον Ἰησοῦν and ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον or ἕτερον πνεῦμα, but if the words are not mere synonyms in that place, I should say that "another Jesus" is more pointedly and absolutely "a different and false Jesus," while "another gospel" is not necessarily a false gospel (see below).

<sup>3</sup> I have talked to several excellent scholars, who all said that they did not remember a passage that was decisive, but their impression as to the natural difference between ἄλλος and ἕτερος was like what I stated. Recently, Mr. Neil has sent me the reference to Thucydides. I do not quote any names, as the opinions were merely given in conversation.

be taken from the technical term *ἐτερόπλους*, denoting an insurance effected on a vessel for the outward, but not for the return voyage: if *ἀλλόπλους* were used, it could only mean "sailing on a different course, or in a different direction."<sup>1</sup>

If we keep the exact construction preferred by Lightfoot and followed in the Revised Version, the sense of Paul's words to the Galatians would be, "I marvel that you are so soon going over to another gospel, which is not different (*from mine*), except in so far as certain persons pervert the gospel of the anointed One." In other words, "I marvel that you are going from the gospel as announced by me to the gospel as announced by the older apostles, not that it is really different from mine, except in so far as it is distorted by the emissaries who are troubling you." Now that appears to be precisely Paul's position. The gospel, as preached by him, was a *ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον* from the gospel as preached by the older apostles, but there was no real difference between these two members of the same class. Peter and James agreed with him on every important or critical point. But there were many Jews who came as emissaries from the church in Jerusalem, and yet preached a totally different gospel.<sup>2</sup> These are condemned in the strongest terms as distorting and perverting the gospel.

<sup>1</sup> Many examples might be given to show that in *ἄλλος* there lies originally the sense of difference, and not in *ἕτερος*, though they often become almost equivalent. In *Iliad*, xiii. 64, a falcon pursues *δρνεον ἄλλο*, a bird of a different kind (where *τὸ ἕτερον* would mean the bird's mate). Compare *Iliad*, xxi. 22, where the fish of other species (*ἰχθυες ἄλλοι*) are terrified and chased by the dolphin. Again *ἄλλος* frequently means hostile or unfortunate or unsuitable, *i.e.* different from what is desired or intended. But this seems so familiar that it need not be insisted on: the very derivation makes it clear, for *ἕτερος* is a comparative degree of the pronominal stem meaning "one" or "same," while *ἄλλος* is connected with words which bear the sense of "other" or "different" in many languages, *e.g.*, *else* in English, *alius* in Latin (*e.g.* *aliud sentit ille, aliud ego sentio*, means "his opinion is quite different from mine"). I can only suppose that Lightfoot's fundamental misconception as to the Galatian churches biased, in this case, his usually fine and delicate sense of language.

<sup>2</sup> For example, those who had come from the apostles in Jerusalem, *Ac's* xv. 1, 24, *Gal.* ii. 12, and troubled the church in Antioch,

But a simpler and thoroughly Greek rendering is that which the American Revision Committee add in the margin, "unto a different gospel which is nothing else save that there are some that . . . would pervert the gospel of Christ:"<sup>1</sup> in other words, "another gospel, which is merely a perversion of the gospel." This avoids the unusual and perhaps precarious emphasis on the contrast between *ἄλλος* and *ἕτερος*, and would certainly be preferable in a classical Greek writer. It also gives a sense which is quite Pauline; and probably most scholars will prefer it. I confess, however, that the harsh and strained use of the words on the other interpretation, and the close packed meaning that is forced into the words, almost beyond what they can bear, seems to me—so far as I may judge—more characteristic of Paul's style; and I incline towards it, unless the verdict of scholars be that it strains the sense of the words too far. In that event, the interpretation of the American Revisers would be the only possible one.

W. M. RAMSAY.

## *JEREMIAH: THE MAN AND HIS MESSAGE.*

### IV. DEGENERATION.

THE average man in every age is tolerably content with the world as he finds it and looks upon the institutions and customs by which he is surrounded as belonging to an order of things which has always existed and never can be materially changed. But there are exceptional individuals who, either through fuller information or on account of a gift of nature, carry in their minds an ideal image of what human life ought to be, with which they are continually contrasting, to their disadvantage, existing conditions and

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Thayer, of Harvard, told me that he had always urged this to be the correct translation. It, of course, implies a slighter punctuation after *ἄλλο*.