

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

phantine, they must first have ravaged the whole Nile valley; so that, literally, "from Migdol to Syene," all must have fallen into their hands. And a rich booty it would be, well worthy to be called by Ezekiel, God's wages to Nebuchadnezzar for his work at Tyre. The only point in the predictions not confirmed, is that Egypt should lie waste and uninhabited for forty years. But prophets give numbers only as the vaguest estimates, and no doubt never meant themselves to be held strictly to definite figures. The Nile valley may well have lain all but waste for a number of years during the confusions of the war, and this is all that is demanded by the prophecy.

P. THOMSON.

ST. PAUL'S USE OF ΘΡΙΑΜΒΕΩ.

THIS verb, in Biblical Greek, occurs only in 2 Corinthians ii. 14 and Colossians ii. 15. In our English Bibles we read in the former of these two passages, *causeth (us) to triumph*, and in the latter, *triumphing over*. There is no grammatical reason whatever for the variation, the difference in the two Greek forms being simply that between the present and the past participle active of the same verb; and the Latin Versions read consistently *qui triumphat* and *triumphans* in the two places respectively. This discrepancy in our own Translation is certainly not due to accident or caprice. To remove it by conforming to the Vulgate rendering in 2 Corinthians would only, as we shall see, create new difficulties; and the complications and contradictions in which the interpretation of Colossians ii. 15 is involved are also very closely con-

nected (at least such is the contention of this Paper) with the accepted and traditionally fixed Latinist sense of *θριαμβεύω*.

1. (a) *Thanks be to God who always triumphs over us in Christ* is the rendering of 2 Corinthians ii. 14 adopted by nearly all the more recent critics, chiefly on account of the Colossian passage. The verb cannot surely mean "triumphs" *there* and "makes to triumph" *here*; for we should then have two really opposite meanings attached by the same writer to the same word¹ in the only two instances in which he uses it. The factitive sense is now, moreover, pronounced on high authority to be "philologically impossible." What distinguishes *θριαμβεύω* from such verbs as *χορεύω* and *μαθητεύω*, which are capable of a secondary factitive sense (as, e.g., "to dance," in English), is that they are primarily *intransitive*, while *θριαμβεύω*, as equal to "triumpho," is already distinctly *transitive*. To ground upon this active sense a further factitive application would be somewhat strange, and suggestions of "Hebraism" and "hiphilitic usage" do not make it less so. No one finds, or expects to find, *πομπεύω*, *to lead in procession*, also meaning, *to make one lead a procession*.

(b) Yet it is no wonder that such first-rate exegetes as Calvin, Grotius, Bengel, De Wette, with our own translators, rejected the above rendering as intolerably harsh and incongruous. For it would make the Apostle *the victim of defeat*. And when the nature of a Roman triumph is considered—then, it must be remembered, existing in its grim reality—with the ignominious position of the captive, and the miserable death in which

¹ A point Holtzmann (in his *Kritik der Epheser-und-Kolossenerbriefe*) does not fail to urge as against the Pauline character of Colossians ii. 15.

the exhibition usually ended for him, the figure appears most unsuitable to express the relation between the Apostle and the gracious God to whom he renders thanks. Not *so*, surely, did God "always triumph over" his faithful servant; nor could such a triumph "manifest the savour of his knowledge in every placē." Recent commentators, it is true, do not seem to feel this difficulty; but they only avoid it by vague generalizations which rob the metaphor of all precision and vividness, or by references to the Apostle's conversion, of a nature foreign to this context,¹ even if they explained, as they fail to do, the use of so violent an image. It appears as though the one rendering were *lexically*, and the other *contextually*, all but impossible; and between two such evils it is certainly hard to choose.

2. The interpreters of Colossians ii. 15 are as completely and sharply at issue, and with equally good reason. (α) Meyer, Eadie, and Braune (in Lange's *Bibelwerk*) adhere, substantially, to the rendering of the Vulgate and the German and English Bibles. This gives a sense sufficiently clear and self-consistent, so far as Verse 15 is concerned, and that seems to harmonize very well with such passages as Matthew xii. 29; Luke x. 18; John xii. 31, 32; Hebrews ii. 14, 15.

But how can ἀπεκδυόμενος be rendered, *having spoiled*, or *disarmed*, in Chapter ii. 15, when the same participle, in precisely the same voice and tense, means something quite different in Chapter iii. 9; and when ἀπέκδυσις (the noun-form of this verb) in Verse 11, in the very sentence to which Chapter ii. 15 belongs, certainly means *putting off from one's self*? As every

¹ How differently he speaks in Chap. iv. 6, closely parallel with Chap. ii. 14, as comparison of Chaps. ii. 14—iii. 1 and iv. 1-6 will shew.

one knows, moreover, this verb in its various compounds is a part of the Apostle's familiar vocabulary, and the figure it contains one of his favourite metaphors.¹ Add to this that *to strip from another, to spoil*, is never, from Homer downwards—one doubtful instance excepted—expressed by the middle, but always, and with numerous examples, by the active voice of ἀπο- and ἐκ-δύω. If general linguistic usage, if the writer's own habitual usage is to go for anything, then *having spoiled* is out of the question, and this interpretation, attractive and time-honoured as it is, must be abandoned. At least so think Alford, Hofmann, Ellicott, Lightfoot, Wordsworth, and the majority of recent critics.

(b) The three distinguished commentators last named lead us back to the long-neglected Patristic interpretation: *Having stripped Himself of the (hostile) Principalities and Powers, He [Christ] made a show of them with boldness, triumphing over them in it [the cross]*.

But this rendering, too, highly authenticated as it is, lies open to certain grave and very decided objections that one cannot overlook; and it is hardly to be wondered at that it was for so long so completely superseded. How, pray, could Christ divest Himself of the Satanic powers? When, or how, had He *worn* them? "In wearing our mortal flesh," it is replied; "He divested Himself of their *hold* upon Him (in his being man), and so could not be held by them." So writes Theophylact, quoted by Ellicott. Here, obviously, the essential point is *read in*:² Christ is made to

¹ See, besides Col. iii. 9, 10, and the parallel Eph. iv. 22-24, Rom. xiii. 12, 14; 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54; 2 Cor. v. 1-4; Gal. iii. 27; Eph. vi. 11, 14; 1 Thess. v. 8.

² Accordingly, a group of Western MSS. do read in τῆν σάρκα, substituting it for τὰς ἀρχάς in the Greek text, a change furthered perhaps by similarity of sound

strip off his human body, and that body is all but identified with *the devilish powers* !

The obscurity and seeming inaptness of the metaphor is not greatly relieved by such illustrations as Lightfoot's of the *Nessus robe*¹ of evil powers "which had clung about his humanity," and "were torn off and cast away for ever;" or by Wordsworth's, of the *Joseph's garment* which, as a type of Christ, he left in the hands of his temptress in order to extricate himself, casting her off by parting with it.²

And this rendering labours further under serious grammatical and contextual difficulties. The subject of Verse 13 is surely "God," not "Christ;"³ and if of Verse 13, then of Verse 14; and if of Verse 14, *then of Verse 15 too*. This, says Hofmann, "is beyond doubt." Meyer and Alford, with Bengel and De Wette, speak almost as strongly to the same effect. Those who change the subject clearly would never think of doing so but for the difficulty they find in attributing to God the acts of Verse 15. 'Εν αὐτῷ, it must also be insisted, should be *in Him (Christ)*,⁴ not *in it*, which, as Alford says, "gives a very feeble meaning" after the powerfully rhetorical emphasis with

in the words themselves. The Syriac and Gothic Versions, with several Latin Fathers, translate, *Having put off the flesh, He made a show of the Principalities, &c.* This explanation is virtually adopted by Canon Barry in the *New Testament Commentary for English Readers*. He proposes, *Having unclothed Himself, He made a show, &c.* But how disjointed and tasteless!

¹ No wonder that the Docetists appropriated the text thus read. See Hippolytus, *Her.* viii. 3.

² The devout bishop's parenthesis, "(with reverence be it said)," is certainly not unneeded.

³ Ellicott's argument to the contrary is hesitating and unconvincing. And it requires the reflexive aspirated (σὺν) αὐτῷ against which see A. Buttmann's *Grammar of N. T. Greek*, p. 111, *Eng. Tr.*

⁴ So the margin of the English Bible, although, like the Syriac and Latin Versions, tacitly assuming *Christ* as subject, it reads *in Himself*, as Ellicott in Verse 13.

which every clause of Verses 9-15 dwells upon HIM. With ἐν αὐτῷ of Verse 9 the keynote is loudly struck which recurs in varying phrase in every verse, till the whole passage is complete, and concludes, as it began, *in Him* who is "all in all" to this high argument.¹ It is true, as Meyer observes, that "*God* pervades the entire sentence as subject from Verse 11 onwards;" but it is *God in Christ*. When he further objects that Christ is not mentioned in Verse 14, the reply is obvious that "the cross" of that verse is *his* cross—is but, so to speak, *Himself* in other words. At the same time, "the cross" would by no means suitably occupy the supremely emphatic position of ἐν αὐτῷ for it is the true doctrine of the Person of Christ, not of his Cross directly or primarily, that is in question here; and οὐ κατὰ Χριστόν (Verse 8) is the capital charge which the Apostle is driving home against the Colossian theosophy. On this point, therefore, Bengel, De Wette, Hofmann, and Alford appear to be in the right, though Meyer takes the other side.

Once more. One is compelled to admit as against the entire traditional reading of the Verse, whether in its popular form retained by Meyer, or its Patristic form restored by Ellicott, that "*the*² Principalities and *the* Powers" (Verse 15), by all ordinary rules of interpretation, should be none other than those of Verse 10, *of whom Christ is the Head*;³ viz., the angelic inter-

¹ Compare the way in which Chap. i. 15-20 rings the changes upon the same glorious ΑΥΤΟΣ.

² It is significant that Ellicott, in his Notes, inserts *hostile* parenthetically after the article, while his Translation, with the Authorized Version, dispenses with the inconvenient article altogether.

³ Qæmer feels so strongly the necessity of identifying the ἀρχαὶ κ. ἐξουσίαι of Verse 15 with those of Verse 10, that he even makes the latter on this account *evil* powers! See his *Lexicon*, s.v. ἀρχή.

mediaries between God and the world, known by these imposing titles in the circle of ideas through which this Epistle moves, and to whom we were already introduced in Chap. i. 16.¹ The warning against "worshipping of Angels," in Verse 18, strongly supports this presumption. And indeed the logical connection of the whole context, from οὐ κατὰ Χριστὸν (Verse 8) to οὐ κρατῶν τὴν κεφαλὴν (Verse 18), in great measure depends upon it.

And, apart from this, it is pertinently asked whether the Apostle was likely to speak of the scene of Calvary as a triumph over the powers of darkness *in the sense required here, i.e.,* as an open, public, and exultant *manifestation* of the Divine victory over them.² There, it is true, the decisive battle was fought and won; but not till the long war against "the god of this world" is fully ended can such a triumph be celebrated. In such passages as Luke xix. 11, 12, Mark xiv. 62, 1 Corinthians xv. 24-26, 54, 2 Thessalonians ii. 3-8, Hebrews x. 13, we seem to be taught that some such display is in preparation for the time "when the Son of man shall come in his glory;" but it belongs to the things that "we see not yet."

(c) For all these reasons, we are persuaded that Alford (with his English predecessor, James Peirce,³

¹ Reference to Eph. vi. 12 shews indeed that the Apostle *could* use these terms in the sense generally supposed here. But it also shews how very different that context is from this, and how, when he needs to put a sinister meaning on these current designations, he makes it quite clear that he is doing so. There he even accumulates definition, in order to mark out the Satanic powers as the dark and dreadful counterpart of the exalted Beings to whom these august titles more properly belong.

² Compare rather Luke xxii. 53, and observe that all the verbs of Col. ii. 15 are *past*.

³ In *A Paraphrase and Notes on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Colossians, with an Appendix upon Ephesians* iv. 8 (2nd ed., 1729). Mr. Peirce's exposition of

the French Sabatier,¹ and the German Ritschl²) has found the right track when he renders: *Putting off the governments and powers* (of Verse 10), *He [God] exhibited them (as subjected to Christ) in openness,³ triumphing over them in Him [Christ]*. This rendering maintains the lexical and Pauline sense of ἀπεκδυσάμενος, and, at the same time, grammatical continuity of subject with the foregoing Verses — conditions hitherto seemingly incompatible; while it preserves the concinnity and logical coherence of the whole passage in regard to ἐν αὐτῷ and τὰς ἀρχὰς κ.τ.λ. And its correctness is verified by the apposite way in which Verse 15 is now seen to link itself to Verse 14. “God has wiped out and taken away the legal χειρόγραφον that was against us”—so says the previous Verse, “while” (Verse 15 adds) “he has put off and laid aside⁴ the garb of angelic mediation in which, under the Law, he was wont to hold intercourse with men.” This transition corresponds, on the one hand, to the connection between Jewish legalism and angelolatry in the Colossian heresy,⁵ as exhibited in the following

the Epistle to the Hebrews received (according to Darling) the high compliment of a translation into Latin by J. D. Michaelis. His note on this verse is extremely valuable.

¹ In his *L'Apôtre Paul*, and Article on *Colossians* in the *Dictionnaire des Sciences Religieuses*.

² As quoted by Meyer and Holtzmann from the *Jahrbücher f. d. Theologie*, 1863.

³ *Made an exhibition*, or *show*, perhaps, comes nearer to the exact force of ἰδειγμάτισεν, and explains itself better. It need not, any more than the Greek verb, imply *disgrace*. Ἐν παρησιᾷ = *in freedom of speech, without reserve, frankly and freely* (Meyer). Ellicott's *with boldness, or without reserve*, is preferable to Alford's weaker phrase.

⁴ The double preposition of ἀπ-εκ-δυσάμενος gives the word a pregnant sense amounting to this. See Meyer on ἀπέκδυσε, Verse 11.

⁵ Theodoret, in his comment on Verse 18, says: “They who defended the Law taught men to worship angels, saying the Law was given by them. This mischievous tendency long continued in Phrygia and Pisidia.” See, on the whole subject, Lightfoot's invaluable dissertation.

Verses;¹ and, on the other, to that between the Mosaic Lawgiving and Angel-Ministration in St. Paul's theology, as decisively proved by Galatians iii. 19.² Yet this interpretation, so strongly suggested, and even, I venture to think, required by the context, and meeting every grammatical condition of the case as it does, is almost unknown. One searches the ancient commentators in vain for any hint pointing in this direction; and, except its four advocates above mentioned, later writers only state this view to treat it with summary dismissal. And the reason is plain. *It lies in θριαμβεύσας*, and in the military character which that word³ stamps on the entire representation of the Verse. With this is closely associated the fixed idea, in itself naturally welcome, that the passage describes in some way or other a triumph over the Infernal Powers. For how can God be said to have *triumphed over* "his angels, that do his commandments, hearkening unto the voice of his word"? If the figure of the Roman triumph is harsh in 2 Corinthians, it is simply unmeaning here; and Alford's remark, repeated from that passage, that "defeat by God is the only real victory," is as irrelevant as it is true, till it be pointed out wherein the assumed defeat consists."⁴

¹ See Peirce's note on Verse 18, and the analysis of Chap. ii.8—iii. 4, concluding his notes on that section. My obligations to this writer, it will be seen, are very considerable.

² Compare *Stephen* in Acts vii. 38, 53; also Heb. ii. 2. And see Meyer and Lightfoot on Gal. iii. 19, and Delitzsch on Heb. ii. 2.

³ For no other word *requires* the military idea, or the hostile character attributed to the ἀρχαὶ κ. ἐξουσίαι certainly not δειγματίζω. See Ellicott on this word.

⁴ Peirce avoids this objection by rendering θριαμβεύσας as in 2 Corinthians, *making (them) to triumph*. He is perhaps not far from the truth. So also Sophokles' *Glossary*.

Given the Roman military sense of *θριαμβεύω*, then the traditional interpretation is right in regarding "the Principalities and Powers" as hostile. And given these hostile, the Western Versions are right in forcing upon *ἀπεκδυσάμενος* the sense "having spoiled." This is, in effect, the reasoning of Meyer and Eadie, and its force is hard to escape. That is to say, consistency of sense in the Verse itself demands a rendering which grammar and context unite to disallow! Such is the position into which we are brought. And if Alford's interpretation really fails us, then it must be confessed that Holtzmann has a plausible case when he urges the "inextricable difficulties" of the Verse, and its "want of all connection with the context," in the interests of his interpolation theory.¹

Here again, just as in 2 Corinthians ii. 14, it is *θριαμβεύω* which creates the whole dilemma. The idea of the Roman triumph dominates and perplexes the entire exegesis of both passages.²

We are forced therefore to ask whether the military reference of *θριαμβεύω* in St. Paul, unquestioned apparently as it has been, is really so very certain.

In pursuing this inquiry the following facts present themselves :—

1. That the "classical usage" on which our translation rests is confined to Plutarch (*floruit* 80 A.D.), Appian (140 A.D.), and Herodian (238 A.D.)

¹ Yet the verse does not look in the least like an interpolation, nor can any satisfactory motive be assigned for its invention, if not genuine.

² Two other interpretations of Col. ii. 15 deserve to be mentioned :—

(a) That ascribed by Bloomfield (*Synopsis*, 1829) to "most recent Commentators," which sees in "the Principalities and Powers"—with a laudable desire to preserve the connection with Verse 14—the Jewish rulers whom Christ had despoiled.

(b) That of Hofmann, who identifies the *ἀρχαὶ καὶ ἔξουσίαι* with the spiritual powers ruling the heathen world and hiding God from the Gentiles.

His exposition contains much that is striking and valuable.

2. That by these authors the verb is employed only in writing of Roman affairs and as the equivalent (the *translation* in fact) of *triumpho* in its literal historical sense ; while St. Paul is supposed to have used it, not simply in this foreign Latin meaning, but with a figurative and allusive application of that meaning. Of this the writers just named shew no trace ; and indeed such an application, one would suppose, is only possible when the alien idea has become thoroughly naturalized and "at home" in the language to which it is transplanted. That this assimilation of *triumpho* has already taken place in the Greek in which St. Paul wrote is, on grounds of general probability, open to question. Quotations from Plutarch's *Lives* and Appian's *Wars*, I submit, do not prove it in the least.

3. When the Apostle wrote to the Corinthians he had not yet "seen Rome." In the second instance, though his letter probably dates from the Imperial City, its readers were obscure Asiatic provincials, most of whom in all probability knew far less about the aspect of a Roman triumph than our learned commentators, who descant on this theme so largely. Yet the Apostle's metaphors, as a rule, are "evidently set forth before the eyes" of those to whom he writes, and are the ready suggestions of his own personal observation.

4. After all, the agreement of Commentators on this point is not so complete as is supposed.

In the Greek interpreters of 2 Corinthians ii. 14, we find such paraphrases of *θριαμβεύω* as *to lead about in public ; to lead hither and thither ; to make conspicuous*.¹

¹ Chrysostom, followed by Theophylact and Cæcumenius, blends somewhat confusedly this sense with the idea of conquest—conquest effected, however, not *over*, but *by*, the Apostle. Theodoret and Damascenus ignore the military reference altogether.

Meyer even complains of them for failing to do justice to the idea of a Roman triumph. Now we might have supposed that this explanation of theirs was simply a weakening of the Latinist sense, due to exegetical difficulties, were it not that the Byzantine lexicographers give the word precisely the same meaning, and that it occurs in a number of passages from ecclesiastical and other later-Greek authors, where no military allusion is possible. In fact, the word had a considerable vogue in Mediæval Greek, bearing the sense *to make public*, also *to disgrace* (lead about in mock procession), and similar applications.¹

Now is it likely that these varied meanings should all have originated in the imported Latinist use of *θριαμβεύω*, or do they point to some earlier native signification underlying both it and them?

But is there any actual basis for such a meaning?

5. *Θριαμβεύω*, indeed, is not found in extant Greek literature earlier than St. Paul. But *θρίαμβος* is; and on this word the former depends for its meaning.

It is preserved in a curious fragment of Cratinus² (a poet of the Old Comedy, senior to Aristophanes), where it is undoubtedly equal to *διθύραμβος*, *Dithyramb*,³ the festal hymn to Dionysus. And, just as *Dithyrambus* became a title of the god in whose praise it was sung, so we find Pratinas,⁴ a still earlier dramatist, coining

¹ See Suicer's *Thesaurus*, and Sophokles' *Glossary of Byzantine Greek*, on *θριαμβεύω*.

² In Meineke's *Fragmenta Comicorum*, Crat. Διδ. 1: ὅτε σὺ τοῖς καλοῖς θρίαμβους ἀναρίπτοσ' ἀπὸ χηθάνων where a highly uncomplimentary allusion appears to be made to the singing of some lady, who "made herself odious, hauling up (like water from a well) those fine dithyrambs."

³ How large and influential a place the *Dithyramb* filled in Greek life may be judged from the fact that it became a name for the more elevated lyrical poetry in general, and formed the nucleus of the Athenian drama.

⁴ Prat. i. 18, in Bergk's *Lyrici Græci*.

the double epithet *θριαμβο-διθύραμβος* for this divinity. And Athenæus, in the third century A.D., notes the use of the two words as equivalents, in the same sense. So that *θρίαμβος* in classical Greek was primarily a synonym for *διθύραμβος*,¹ before it came to have anything to do with the Latin *triumphus*; and this older reference maintained its ground, for some time at least, side by side with the new foreign sense. Having this origin, its identification with *triumphus*² presupposes that it must also have denoted *the band of singers, the Bacchic chorus or procession*,³ just as *χορός* meant first *a dance*, then *a troop of dancers*, then *a chorus*.

An interesting philological notice in Plutarch's *Marcellus*, § 22, shews how strongly, in the latter half of the first century A.D., the native Greek associations of this word were held fast even by those familiar with the Latinist usage. He is explaining the difference between the *triumph* and the *ovation*, or minor triumph, and takes occasion to correct a current mistake that *ovatio* (*ὄβας* he calls it) was derived from *εἶα*, the Bacchic cry, as well as *triumphus* from *θρίαμβος*. "The word was modified by the Greeks," he says, "so as to take the form (*εἶα*) familiar to them, persuaded, as they are, that part of the honour belongs in this case also to Dionysus, whom we call Thriambos and Euios." Clearly the Greek of Plutarch's time read his own sense into the Latin word rather than the sense of the Latin word into his own *θρίαμβος*.

¹ Was *διθύραμβος* rather the dignified literary term, and *θρίαμβος* possibly the popular vernacular synonym? This would explain the rarity of the latter.

² The scenic-processional, religious character, and the excited cries common to the Dionysiac celebrations and the Roman triumph, with the close resemblance of the words themselves—due, no doubt, to common origin—easily account for this identification. See Polybius, xv. 8; Arrian, *Anab. Alex.* vi. 28.

³ See Schirlitz, *Wörterbuch z. N. T.*, *θριαμβεύω*.

Would not, then, the ordinary Greek reader of this period, meeting with *θριαμβεύω*, unless he had Roman history before him, be sure to fall back on the Hellenic *θρίαμβος* and *διθύραμβος* to explain it?

6. Putting together the indications we have gathered, we may, hypothetically, construct a theory of *θριαμβεύω* as the verb-form of *θρίαμβος*, which shall embrace all its applications, somewhat thus:—

(a) "To sing a dithyramb,"¹ "to go in dithyrambic (Dionysiac) procession."

(b) "To make one so sing," "to lead in dithyrambic" or "festal procession" (after the analogy of *χορεύω*, *βακχεύω*, as employed of the inspiring god leading his train of worshippers). On this meaning, when *θρίαμβος* had become the equivalent of *triumphus*, might be based the use of the word in translation of *triumpho*.

(c) As the old Pagan processional worship fell into desuetude and disgrace, the word might naturally degenerate either into the vague signification, "to lead about," "to shew in public," so becoming "to publish," "to divulge," as in Chrysostom, Suidas, &c.; or into (d) the sinister meaning, "to lead in mock procession," "to disgrace."²

The conjecture offered here is that St. Paul used the word in the *second* of the Greek senses above attributed to it, as meaning *to lead in festal or choral (dithyrambic) procession, to lead in triumph*, but as the inspiring Deity his exultant worshippers, not as the Roman conqueror his wretched captives.

¹ For this we have the parallel *διθύραμβείω*, once found in Athenæus. It is not very strange, therefore, that the verbal derivative of the rarer *θρίαμβος* should not even once occur in classical writers, in its pure Greek sense.

² Similarly *πομπή* in classical Greek means a *solemn religious procession*, and in mediæval Greek, *disgrace*.—Sophokles' *Glossary*.

7. Could this supposition be entertained as philologically possible, it would, perhaps, commend itself on other grounds. We have found St. Paul drawing illustrations from the *games*¹ and from the *theatre*² of the Greeks: it would not be strange, therefore, if he should have referred also to the *festal processions*, which were not less conspicuous and impressive features of their outer life, and hardly more strictly associated with their heathen worship.

And there was one characteristic of the Dionysiac cultus which must have particularly struck such an observer as St. Paul, and might even be said, in spite of unspeakable differences, to present a certain analogy to what is most vital in Christianity itself. It was the *ἐνθουσιασμός* (*enthusiasm*) belonging to it, the supposed *possession* of his votaries by the Deity, with the ecstasy of feeling and preternatural exaltation of their powers to which it raised them. "This character of the Bacchic festivities is meant to give the highest sensible expression to the might of Divine inspiration."³

¹ 1 Cor. ix. 24-27; Phil. iii. 11-14; Col. ii. 18 (*καταβραβεύειω*); 2 Tim. ii. 5, iv. 7, 8; also Heb. xii. 1.

² 1 Cor. iv. 9 (see Meyer), vii. 31; Heb. x. 33. Possibly there is an allusion to theatrical or processional exhibition in 2 Cor. iv. 10, 11. On the whole subject, see Farrar's *Life of St. Paul*, vol. i. Excursus iii.

³ Schöne, *Introduction to Bacchæ of Euripides*. Compare Curtius' *History of Greece*, vol. ii. pp. 523, 524, *Eng. Tr.*

It may be easily said that the Bacchic "enthusiasm" was nothing more than the inspiration of *wine*—a statement far short of the truth, for the Bacchus of the Latin poets was a very different conception from the Greek Dionysus. But even on this view of the matter, Ephesians v. 18-20 (very suitably addressed to former worshippers of Dionysus) and Acts ii. 13-18 may remind us that there may be resemblance in the midst of contrast, and that in those days men "filled with the Spirit" were often as if "drunken, but not with wine," in the exhilaration and holy transports of their joy in God. The Dionysiac cultus was extremely wide-spread, and varied in the forms it assumed. It allied itself to the grossest and darkest elements of nature-worship, and yet in other forms expressed some of the profoundest conceptions that Paganism ever attained to. See Brown's *The Great Dionysiac Myth*, Lenormant on *Bacchus* in the new *Dict. des Antiquités*, and the *Bacchæ* of Euripides *passim*.

8. Let *θριαμβεύω* be thus understood, and it assumes a *local appropriateness* wanting, as we have seen, to the ordinary explanation. For the Apostle, when writing to Corinth, had just left Ephesus after a long residence there; and Colossæ belonged to the same Greco-Lyidian and Phrygian region, which was the very seat and native soil of the "enthusiastic" worship of Dionysus (here known also as Sabazius, and made the son of Cybele).¹ "In Asia Minor we find prevailing everywhere the noisy and popular form of this cult, accompanied by a large development of scenic games, to which were devoted the guilds of 'Dionysiac artists (or craftsmen²),' which had so great an importance in Asia Minor under the kings of Pergamus, and in the early times of Roman dominion."³

Plutarch⁴ tells us that Mark Antony was regarded in this province as a kind of impersonation of Dionysus; and, while he held his court there, "All Asia was full of incense, and at once of pæans and cries of woe;" and he describes in particular the entrance of that hero *into Ephesus*,⁵ attended with all the accompaniments of a Bacchic triumph. It also appears from this quotation that the reference to *incense* generally supposed in 2 Corinthians ii. 14 *b*, may be connected with Greco-Asiatic festal ceremonies⁶ as correctly as with those of the Roman triumph.

9. It is submitted, finally, that the interpretation of

¹ The chorus of the *Bacchæ* are a troop of *Asian* women, from *Mount Tmolus*.

² *Διονυσιακοὶ τέχνηται*. Compare the "craftsmen" of Artemis, Acts xix. 24.

³ Lenormant, as above referred to, p. 598.

⁴ *Antonius*, 24.

⁵ Compare also Tacitus, *Annal.* iii. 61. Dean Blakesley, in *Smith's Bible Dict.*, Art. *Smyrna*, conjectures two distinct allusions to the Dionysiac worship of that city in Rev. ii. 8-11. Compare in this light 2 Cor. iv. 10 with Rev. ii. 8 (ὁς ἐγὼ μετὰ νεκρῶς καὶ ζῆσαν). See, however, Professor Plumpton in *THE EXPOSITOR*, vol. ii. p. 376.

⁶ See also Euripides, *Bacchæ*, 143.

θριαμβεύω here proposed makes this word fall naturally into its place in the two passages where it occurs, harmonizes them with each other, and reveals new force and fulness in the Apostle's meaning in both.

(*a*) The Second Epistle to the Corinthians is surcharged with emotion in its most intense and exalted form. The great heart of the Apostle kindles and glows as he writes, and swells uncontrollably, till again and again it bursts forth in some sudden rush of feeling that carries argument and grammatical structure away before it, and sets logical analysis at defiance. The Writer is as one possessed, "through the abundance of the revelations," the "constraint of the love of Christ," and "the terror of the Lord," and the whole weight of that immense "treasure" lodged in so frail and sensitive a body. "Whether he is sober, or beside himself," he finds it hard to say.¹ And the circumstances under which he writes have raised his agitation to the highest possible pitch. He tells us of the extreme peril through which he had recently passed in Asia;² of his anguish of mind and restless fears concerning the Corinthians themselves, and the revulsion of feeling that had followed the coming of Titus;³ of the personal affronts he had suffered, and the questioning of his apostleship;⁴ of the cruel persecutions and bitter disappointments that throng upon him,⁵ with that which is his daily burden, "the care of all the churches," every one of whose weaknesses and offences he has

¹ Compare Acts xxvi. 24-26. It is true of course, as this comparison suggests, that St. Paul's vehemence was attended with a sobriety and self-control still more marvellous in a man of his passionate temperament, and equally conspicuous in this Epistle.

² 2 Cor. i. 8. ³ *Ibid.* i. 23—ii. 4, ii. 12, 13, vii. 4-7, xi. 2, 3, xii. 20, 21.

⁴ *Ibid.* x. 10, xi. 5-7, 13, xii. 11-18, xiii. 3, 6.

⁵ *Ibid.* iv. 8, 9, xi. 24-26, xii. 15.

himself to bear ;¹ and this with a frame tormented by suffering and weakened by sickness to the last degree.² Of all this we read, and yet of the Divine strength and consolation in which he surmounts it all!³ What a picture is here of the real *ἐνθουσιασμός*! How truly he seems to be led along by God as a spectacle of one called both to suffer and to accomplish the things most beyond all human power. How he exults, while in this triumphal progress the Divine knowledge is diffused on every side,⁴ and he is made an instrument (and with what weapons!)⁵ of salvation or destruction to all who are in his path!⁶

If there was any metaphor within the range of the Greco-Asiatic world which could paint to the life the career of the Apostle as we know him in this Epistle, it was that of the mystic Dionysiac triumph, purified and transmuted by the touch of Christian use, and lifted into a region infinitely higher than its own.

(*δ*) Nor is the figure less suitable to the Colossian passage, on Peirce and Alford's general interpretation, the fatal objection to which now disappears. "God has cast off and laid aside," the Apostle seems to say, "that ancient veil of angelic intervention, which the Colossian errorists would place again between the human soul and the knowledge of Himself."⁷ Revealing Himself in Christ, He has shewn *the angels* in their true light and put them in their proper place. He has formed them into a festal chorus, who "follow

¹ 2 Cor. xi. 28, 29. ² Ibid. i. 9, iv. 7, 10-12, 16, v. 1, vi. 9, xii. 7, xiii. 4.

³ Ibid. i. 5, iii. 5, iv. 7, vii. 6, xii. 8-10, xiii. 4.

⁴ Ibid. ii. 12, 14, iv. 2, 6.

⁵ Ibid. x. 4.

⁶ Ibid. ii. 15, x. 5.

⁷ Just as they sought to interpose Jewish legalism and an ascetic ceremonialism between the soul and its salvation in Christ. Both attempts are frustrated at once by the Apostle's *ἐστέ ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι* (Verse 10): "You are *in Him*—there you possess the all-sufficient fulness of the Deity."

the Lamb whithersoever he goeth," hymning his praises, enraptured with his glory, devoted to his service, themselves Christ's first and chief *enthusiasts*.¹

This view of the relation of the angels to Christ accords, I venture to believe, with the general doctrine of the Epistle, and satisfies the exigencies of St. Paul's polemic at this particular point. It is also in harmony with Ephesians i. 20-23, iii. 10, 11. Hebrews i. 3—ii. 9 becomes a commentary on the Verse read in this light; and the "ministry of angels" in the Pauline Luke, from Gabriel, the herald of the Annunciation, to the other, unnamed, who "stood by" the Apostle in the Adriatic storm, might afford abundant illustration.²

"Are they not all ministering spirits"—to us and, above all, *to Him?* Their honour verily it was, like "the Law and the Prophets," and like the Great Forerunner, "to prepare the way of the Lord," and so to stand in some sort, till He should come, between the world and Him. Their joy also it was, when "in the fulness of time" He did come, zealously to testify to Him, humbly to wait on Him, then willingly to "decrease that He might increase,"³ to lose themselves in the rising fulness of his glory—that Christ might be ALL THINGS AND IN ALL.

¹ Instead of being the sharers, almost the *rivals*, as Colossian theosophy would have made them, of his mediatorship.

² Compare also John i. 51.

³ See *The Ministry of Angels*, by Mr. Winterbotham, in THE EXPOSITOR vol. viii. p. 409.