

cended to the recognition of soul and mind. There is thus beautiful propriety in the Apostle's phraseology. He takes hold of human nature by its sensuous and most conspicuous element. And when we bear in mind that he was speaking of a genealogical derivation, we see that there is more than propriety, there is the strictest accuracy. For not only was there the complexity of the human and the Divine in the unity of our Lord's peculiar personality, there was "wheel within wheel." In his human nature there was a complexity of sub-natures. There was both soul and body.¹ And therefore, when mention is made of his descent from the stock of David, there is something finely discriminative, and discriminatively accurate, in having the reference limited, so far as concerns *the externality of phraseology*, as distinguished from *the inwardly subtending perspective of idea*, to that constituent of the being which is capable of derivation from generation to generation. J. MORISON.

A BIBLICAL NOTE.

GALATIANS I. 19.

MOST recent commentators on the Epistle to the Galatians have now arrived at the conclusion that the "James" here described as "the Lord's brother" could not have been one of the original Twelve Apostles. The reasons for this conclusion have been ably and convincingly stated by Bishop Lightfoot in his Commentary on this Epistle.² The same commentators,

¹ Isa. liii. 10; Matt. xxvi. 38.

² See his "Dissertation on the Brethren of the Lord," and the detached note "On the Name and Office of an Apostle."

however, agree in affirming that he must be regarded as one of the Apostles in the wider sense of that term which is sometimes found in the Epistles of the New Testament. Such an inference seems inevitable, if there is no other rendering possible of Galatians i. 19 than that given in our Authorized Version.

The objections to this interpretation are (1) that the whole scope of the Apostle's argument in this portion of his Letter is to establish his independence of those who were *in authority* in the Church at Jerusalem, and whom he describes, without any qualifying expression, as "*the* Apostles," or "them which were Apostles before me." Such a designation could not be applied to any but those who had received the apostolic commission from our Lord Himself, as witnesses of his resurrection, and from whom "the brethren of the Lord" are expressly distinguished in Acts i. 14.

(2) All that we know of this James from Scripture and tradition shews that he, at least, among the brethren of the Lord, was, as Bishop Lightfoot says, "a stationary ruler of the mother-church at Jerusalem, as its resident bishop or presiding elder." The term "Apostle," therefore, could not in any sense be properly applied to him as it was to Paul himself, or to Barnabas, or to those who are called "messengers (*ἀπόστολοι*) of the churches." His office was rather to send out such messengers himself, as head of the Church at Jerusalem.¹

These difficulties have induced some to favour another explanation of this Verse, by which *εἰ μὴ* is taken in the sense of "but only," and the passage is thus rendered: "Other of the Apostles I saw none,

¹ See 2 Cor. vii. 23; Gal. ii. 12.

but only James the Lord's brother." But, as Bishop Lightfoot has observed in his Note, "the sense of ἕτερον naturally links it with εἰ μὴ, from which it cannot be separated without harshness, and ἕτερον carries τῶν ἀποστόλων with it." There is, however, another use of ἕτερος with a genitive, which, so far as I know, has not been noticed by any expositor, ancient or modern. It is well known that this adjective, like ἀλλόδιος and others, may have a comparative force, and be accompanied by a genitive or by the conjunction ἢ. Thus Aristotle, in his treatise *De Mundo*, speaks of "an element other than the four (commonly so called)," στοιχείον ἕτερον τῶν τεσσάρων.¹ Why should we not, then, translate the Apostle's words: "Other *than* the Apostles I saw not, save James the Lord's brother"?

According to this view, the meaning of the writer is that he saw none on that occasion of a different class from that of "the Apostles," except James, the Lord's brother. That he should have seen him also was quite natural, and almost unavoidable, since, though not an Apostle, his name is put first in this Epistle, with those of "Cephas and John," as one of the three "pillars"² of the Church.

J. S. PURTON.

¹ Comp. Thuc. i. 28, φίλους ποιῆσαι οὓς οὐ βούλονται, ἑτέρουσ τῶν νῦν ὄντων.
See also Herodot. iv. 125.

² Gal. ii. 9.