

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

The proposition with which Ecclesiastes ends his account of the rivers is: "unto the place whither the rivers go thither they go again." The meaning is that it is the same water which is repeatedly carried to the sea by the rivers, and not new water; and on this fact Aristotle insists also.¹

In the Aristotelian system every part is linked to every other, and the theory of the winds and rivers is part of the system which makes the universe eternal, and its circular motion unending. Ecclesiastes continues: "No man can say: All things are weary," for owing to the circular motion of the universe being "according to nature" the universe wearies not.² And for the eternity of the heavenly bodies in the case of organisms recurrence, an imitation of the circular motion, is substituted, as the next best thing.³

This last aphorism, "No one can say: All things are weary," from its form is clearly polemical, and indeed directed against the Epicurean doctrine that things *are* weary, and the earth is hurrying to its destruction: the earth is even now worn out and "effete."⁴ The Greek for the aphorism rejected by Ecclesiastes is evidently πάντα κάμνει, and this he refutes by the observation that this supposed weariness does not show itself; nothing is really new, but the spectator treats things as if they were new.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

THE GENTILE INFLUENCES ON PAUL.

I AM grateful for the kind way in which Sir William Ramsay deals with the difference of opinion between us in regard to the extent to which Paul was influenced by his Tarsian environment; and heartily welcome as an honour the friendship for me he expresses. Our purpose and method in dealing with the great apostle are so much alike that what

¹ 360 b. ² *Metaphysics*, 1050 a 24. ³ *De Generatione, etc.*, 336 b.

⁴ Lucretius, ii. 1151 etc.

disagreement still remains would seem easy of adjustment. It is not, therefore, to attack his position, or to defend my own, that I write this brief reply to his article ; but rather to promote a mutual understanding. We are agreed that Paul was influenced by his Gentile environment, that he presents to us in his letters a Hellenic as well as a Judaic side. I cannot, therefore, be justly charged with emptying of meaning the passage Galatians 1. 15, 16, to which Sir William Ramsay refers. Paul's belief in his predestination to be the Apostle to the Gentiles cannot be regarded as determining the exact amount of Greek culture he possessed, or as proving that he had received "an education in Greek philosophy," or as fixing the period in his history when the Gentile influences were strongest. To me it seems more probable that Paul was more affected by the Tarsian environment on his visit after his conversion than during his early years.

My difficulties in accepting Sir William Ramsay's contention are the following, and I shall be glad if he can remove them : (1) Paul describes himself in Acts xxii. 3 as "a Jew born in Tarsus of Cilicia, but brought up in this city, at the feet of Gamaliel, instructed according to the strict manner of the law of our fathers." While it is true that we do not know the exact age at which he came to Jerusalem, yet surely it must have been as a boy of twelve or thirteen at the very latest, if the words are not to be emptied of all meaning. Was there time before that removal from Tarsus for an education in Greek philosophy at the University of Tarsus ? (2) In Philippians iii. 5 he describes himself as "a Hebrew of Hebrews, as touching the law a Pharisee." Lightfoot's note may be quoted : "a man . . . was not *Ἑβραῖος* unless he spoke the Hebrew tongue and retained Hebrew customs. Though St. Paul was born in Tarsus, he was yet brought up under a great Hebrew teacher in the Hebrew metro-

polis (Acts xxii. 3); he spoke the 'Hebrew' language fluently (xxi. 40, xxii. 2); he quotes frequently from the Hebrew Scriptures which he translates for himself, thus contrasting with his contemporaries the Jewish Philo and the Christian writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who commonly use the Hellenistic version of the Seventy." If his home in Tarsus was one in which Aramaic was spoken, as surely the phrase, "a Hebrew of Hebrews" must mean, if, as is not improbable, his being sent to Jerusalem for his education shows that his father, if not a Pharisee himself, inclined to the strictest Judaism, is it likely that the Jewish boy would be allowed to come to any considerable extent under Gentile influences, or to get a Greek education? As far as I can judge from such knowledge of the subject as I have, Jewish exclusiveness would have prevented what Sir William Ramsay assumes. (3) If it was not during his boyhood, but at a subsequent date that he made himself familiar with Greek philosophy, at what period could it be? Was he as a strict Pharisee likely to expose himself to what he must have regarded as a corrupting influence? (4) Paul appeals to his Roman citizenship when it was practically advantageous to him; but there is no reference to any Greek culture he had acquired in all his letters to the Gentiles such as the allusions to his Jewish training and standpoint. This seems inexplicable if Gentile influences had been so potent in shaping his view and outlook as the Apostle to the Gentiles, as Sir William Ramsay represents. (5) The distinctive features of Paul's attitude to the law, and of his insistence on justification by faith alone are, to me at least, inexplicable unless as a violent reaction against a rigid Jewish legalism unmodified by such influences of Hellenism as are insisted on.

This universalism was implicit in his Gospel, which resulted from his experience of Christ's saving grace apart from the

Jewish law, and this his Tarsian environment might have confirmed but could not have produced. So also was his view of freedom. This would be the answer I should offer to Sir William Ramsay's challenge: "How was it, and in virtue of what education and character was it, that Paul caught this feature in the teaching of Jesus?" (EXPOSITOR for October, 1911, p. 293). It was not Paul's previous education, but his present experience of Christ as Saviour and Lord, which so vitalised for him features of the teaching of Jesus which others had failed to appreciate. As Sir William Ramsay with me regards the conversion of Paul as brought about by an objective appearance of Jesus, and not as merely the resultant of previous subjective conditions of Paul's thought and life, I can with him use this argument. As it is possible that James was influenced by Paul, I do not press my appeal to his phrase, "the law of liberty," nor does my argument require it, as even if Paul alone appreciated Christ's teaching on this subject, I have already offered an alternative explanation of the fact. Paul's familiarity with Greek and Roman life as shown in his metaphors, the last argument that Sir William Ramsay offers, seems to me adequately accounted for by what I have freely conceded of Gentile influence on Paul in his early years, in his travels, in his visits to his native city. For these reasons I must confess that I am not yet convinced that Sir William Ramsay has not overstated the case; but I should gladly welcome any further light on the subject.

I may add an explanation of two minor matters. In a note on p. 289 Sir William Ramsay writes: "this and some following quotations are taken by Principal Garvie from (as I think) my *Cities of St. Paul*." The words suggest at least that I had failed to give the proper references; but I find that in each case I have given the page of this book from which a quotation is taken. I had passed for the press the proofs of

the book in which the article Sir William Ramsay refers to is being republished before I read his article ; and it was, therefore, impossible for me to deal with his reply to my statements there. This omission in the book where it appears is not to be regarded as any discourtesy to an author, for whose contributions to New Testament scholarship I feel so great an admiration and gratitude that I regret to have to persist in a difference of opinion from him.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

ST. MATTHEW XVI. 18.

In the Greek version of our Lord's words a distinction seems to be drawn between Peter, which is by interpretation "a stone," and the Rock on which Christ would build His Church. The probability that our Lord intended such a distinction is apparently strengthened by the fact that the term "Rock," when used metaphorically, in the Old Testament always refers to God and in the New Testament to Christ. Accordingly a large number of writers consider that our Lord in this passage uses the expression "Rock" as a paraphrase for Himself. "On this Rock, that is, on Me." Indeed, Zwingli declared himself unable to understand how there could be any doubt on the point : "There is no doubt He is speaking of Himself, and there is not the least ambiguity."

Many, however, have entertained considerable doubts. It has been pointed out that elsewhere, where our Lord refers to Himself in this indirect manner (as e.g. in John ii. 19), the context makes His meaning perfectly clear. We find similar expressions in classical authors, but in no case is any name introduced which would render the allusion at all doubtful. Moreover, in the passage before us our Lord is plainly promising St. Peter something in return for his profession of faith, and we expect a statement about Peter