

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

TWO WORDS IN GALATIANS.

κατεγνωσμένος.

ON κατεγνωσμένος (Gal. ii. 11) Lightfoot says, "The condemnation spoken of is not the verdict of the bystanders, but the verdict of the act itself"; and he adduces parallels (Rom. xiv. 23, John iii. 18, Barnabas 10). Farrar translates "Because he was a condemned man," and explains in a note "manifestly and flagrantly in the wrong."

In spite of Lightfoot's pertinent quotations, the verse would, I think, be felt to run easier if we could get rid of the idea of condemnation. Cyril Alex. seems to have done so, from the following words of a comment on Exodus xxii. 2. (*De Adoratione*, Book viii. ad init.), ὥστε κᾶν εἰ γένοιτο ἐν αὐτῷ τεθῆναι τῷ κλέπτει τὸν ἐπὶ τῷδε κατεγνωσμένον οὐδένα τοῖς ἀνηρηκόσι προστρίβεσθαι μῶμον, i.e., he uses κατεγν. for "manifestly and flagrantly in the wrong"; for in such a passage a metaphor from condemnation would be very improbable. *Condemn*, to judge from the instances here given, would err by excess as including the pronouncing of sentence as well as verdict, by defect as wanting the feeling of γινώσκειν apparent in them.

Here are passages from Chrysostom on Matthew.

Hom. 28 (The Storm on the Lake): διὰ τοῦτο οὐδὲ παρόντων τῶν ὄχλων τοῦτο ποιεῖ ὥστε μὴ καταγνωσθῆναι ὀλιγοπιστίας (that they might not be seen to be guilty of want of faith).

Hom. 61 (The Unmerciful Servant): προσέπεσε καὶ παρεκάλεσε καὶ κατέγνω τῶν οἰκείων ἀμαρτημάτων (saw the wrong of his own sins) καὶ ἔγνω τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ ὀφλήματος.

Δύο τοίνυν ἐνταῦθα ζητεῖ καὶ καταγινώσκειν (recognise the evil) ἡμᾶς τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων καὶ ἐτέροις ἀφίεναι.

Hom. 68 (The wicked Husbandmen): ἵνα ἐκ τῶν εἰς

ἐκείνους [τοὺς δούλους] γενομένων καταγρόντες ἑαυτῶν (coming to a sense of their blameworthiness) . . . ἐκείνον ἐντραπῶσιν ἐλθόντα.

The Vulgate connects with *reprehendo*; Galatians ii. 11, "Quia reprehensibilis erat"; 1 John iii. 20-21, "Si reprehenderit nos cor nostrum." Westcott adds as Augustine's rendering, "male senserit," and distinguishes "from the formal sentence of the judge (κατακρίνω)."

Liddell and Scott give as a classical use "to remark, discover, especially something to one's prejudice."

δικαιοῦσθαι.

The use of *δικαιοῦσθαι* in the sense of *δικαιοσύνην ποιεῖν* (epistle from Vienne and Lyons A.D. 177 ap. Euseb. *H. E.*, V. i. 53, and Rev. xxii. 11 T. R.), or something near that, may be applied to its occurrence in Galatians. This is not a forensic use.¹ Forensic justification so called is the change from guilt to non-guiltiness. It initiates a new state, after entrance into which forensic justification ceases to act. But the justification of the idiom in question is the continued habitual energy of the justified state already come into being. It moves not from guilt to innocence but at most from innocence to righteousness, or from righteousness of character to righteousness of act.

The justification of the law was not forensic. The law provided no method of absolution, the sin offering being outside the question. It did not transfer from darkness to light. It pointed out a path of light, and those were just

¹ May I refer to *EXPOSITOR*, Dec., 1910, p. 490, giving as examples Gen. xxxviii. 26; Sir. xviii. 22; xxvi. 29; xxxiv. 5; Isa. xlv. 25; also Job x. 15 (Aquila) καὶ δικαιοθεῖς (ἵΠηΓΥ), LXX ἐὰν ὦ δικαῖος οὐκ ἀρῶ κεφαλὴν: Job xxii. 3 (Symmachus) μὴ χρήσει Ἰκανὸς ἵνα δικαιοθῆς (ΠΓΥΠ Ψ, LXX ἐὰν σὺ ἦσθα τοῖς ἔργοις ἀμειπτος): Clem. Rom 30, ἔργοις δικαιοῦμενοι καὶ μὴ λόγοις, showing your righteousness by works and not words. Cf. use of *δωλοῦσθαι* Ps. xvii. 28, and of *πιστοῦσθαι* Ps. lxxvii. 8, 37; Sir. xxvii. 17; *xxix.* 3.

who kept to it; but one false step plunged the transgressor into the dark, and the law could only aggravate the error by showing the hopelessness of restoration.

The Galatians do not appear to have been in search of forensic justification. They had begun well. There is no reason to think them uneasy about that. The justification of faith had done its transitional work. What is in debate is the form the righteousness of the established Christian should take.

St. Peter's action makes this clear. He was not seeking the initial justification by his conduct at Antioch, but to exhibit a life of legal righteousness.

To go through the passages in the Epistle:—

ii. 16, *εἰδότες ὅτι οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου.* “Knowing that a man does not attain righteousness (each moment of life and action) from the works of the law.”

ἐπιστεύσαμεν ἵνα δικαιωθῶμεν ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ. “We believed in order to practise righteousness from the faith of Christ.

17. *εἰ δὲ ζητοῦντες δικαιωθῆναι ἐν Χριστῷ εὐρέθημεν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἁμαρτωλοί.*

How could it be any discovery that we were sinners if we were seeking forensic justification? How could there be any “if” about it?

20. As a contrast to legal justification, St. Paul dwells on his continued life in Christ, not on Christ's rescue of him from guilt.

21. *δικαιοσύνη* a permanent energy.

iii. 11. As in ii. 20, continued life.

iii. 24. *ὁ νόμος παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν γέγονεν εἰς Χριστὸν ἵνα ἐκ πίστεως δικαιωθῶμεν.*

Forensic justification is not an end; it is only a door to a region beyond. We should expect rather an eternal state in contrast with the temporary law (Rev. xxii. 11).

v. 4. *οἵτινες ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοῦσθε.* The life of legal righteousness.

6. In contrast, *πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη.* The life of Christian righteousness.

22, 23. The same life of righteousness shown in *ὁ καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματος.*

St. Paul in Galatians is occupying, so to say, exactly the same stronghold as St. James, only facing an attack from a different direction. There is here no disparagement of works generally, only of works of the law and of the flesh. With both Apostles a living faith includes everything, for that must be a working faith. St. Paul does not use the expression "justified by works," perhaps avoids it intentionally; but he could not reject it, for to the justification he is speaking of in Galatians works are essential, though he prefers to call them fruit, and when he is speaking of faith as inevitably thinks of it in action, as we associate practice with a man's patience, gentleness, temperance. In Romans there is disparagement of works, for his great argument there is concerned with the initial justification, in which works have no place.

St. Paul was, no doubt, in this Epistle thinking most prominently of the Jewish Law; but it is not necessary for the above argument to restrict the meaning of law. It would cover any rule of morality disconnected from the personal object of faith.

F. W. MOZLEY.