

became imperceptible. But although the significance of the perfect sometimes sank towards, or even sank to, the level of the aorist, the significance of the aorist never rose in the least degree towards that of the perfect. Winer well says, in his *New Testament Grammar* (section 40. 5a): "There is no passage [in the New Testament] in which it can be certainly proved that the aorist stands for the perfect." In conclusion I may add that we have no nobler monument of the thoughtfulness of the Greek mind than the Greek perfect tense.

I hope to illustrate in another paper, by examples from the New Testament, the distinction I have here attempted to set forth; and to discuss in a third paper the rendering and exposition of the Greek aorist and perfect by the best English commentators.

JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

WAS TITUS CIRCUMCISED?

GALATIANS II. 3-5.

WE have been led to make this question the subject of a brief discussion, by the answer given to it by Canon Farrar in his recently published work on *The Life and Work of St. Paul*. In common with many Biblical students, we hailed the announcement of this work as giving sure promise of a valuable contribution to the literature of a subject of first-class importance. We have read the work, and have not been disappointed. We have found in it a book of genuinely religious and theological, and not merely antiquarian, interest; a book not on the countries through which the Apostle

of the Gentiles happened to pass, but on the Apostle himself, written by one who adequately appreciates the man and his work; a book in which is given, in popular readable form, the results of extensive research and reading, replete with interesting information, and containing many valuable exegetic hints and didactic reflections. But it was not to be expected that Canon Farrar should write a book on such a theme containing nothing from which any one could dissent. The esteemed author will therefore not be surprised to learn that on some points the views expressed by him appear to us doubtful. Among these is the question above indicated, viz., whether or not Titus, whom Paul took with him to the Jerusalem conference, at which the circumcision of Gentile converts was discussed, was subjected to the necessity of undergoing the Jewish rite. The point is worthy of serious consideration; for it is not a mere question of fact, but one involving the whole question of the state of parties in the Church at the time.

Canon Farrar's view is that Titus *was* circumcised; that his circumcision was desired by "nearly the whole body of the Church at Jerusalem, including almost certainly all who were living of the twelve apostles and their three leaders;" that Paul resisted for a while, but at length yielded; not, however, to mere *compulsion*, but out of regard to considerations of expediency; that when the Apostle says, "Neither was Titus compelled to be circumcised," the meaning is, Compulsion was indeed attempted, but it was not successful. I did circumcise Titus, but not because of the pressure brought to bear on me, but because I wanted to remove this preliminary difficulty out of the way, and so get to the discussion

of the general question, and because I was even afraid that my friend's life might be endangered if I endeavoured "to introduce an uncircumcised Gentile as a full partaker of all religious rites in a Judæo-Christian community." In proof that such a risk was really to be apprehended, the author refers to the effect produced some years later by the appearance of Trophimus in Paul's company in Jerusalem, an element which, he says, has been universally overlooked in the discussion.¹

Now, with reference to the excitement created by the presence of Trophimus, to begin with that point, it may fairly be asked whether universal disregard of it as an element in the case may not be due to a conviction, that it is not legitimate to take the state of feeling in Jerusalem seven or eight years later as an index of the state of feeling which prevailed in the holy city among the members of the Christian Church at the time of the Conference. We are not to assume that the humour of the people of Jerusalem was unchangeable, any more than the humour of men generally is found to be. It is intrinsically probable that there were fluctuations of mood and variations of bias in the Jewish Church of the apostolic period, partly arising from internal causes, partly due to varying phases of general Jewish politics. Thus Hausrath is of opinion that the intercourse of the disciples of Jesus with the heathen and with Samaritans was much less reserved in the first time after Jesus than after the two persecutions by Saul and Herod Agrippa. He thinks that about the year 40 a period of reaction in the direction of Pharisaic rigour set in, and, as an evidence of its

¹ *The Life and Work of St. Paul*, vol. i. pp. 412-420.

existence, he points to the fact that thereafter not Peter but James appears as the leading man in the Church.¹ He finds traces of the ascendancy of James even at the council or conference in Jerusalem, and this may seem to justify Canon Farrar's reference to the events recorded in Acts xxi. in illustration of the state of feeling at the earlier period. But this is not a necessary inference. Reactions, like all other movements, are gradual, and take time to develop. We may conceive of a state of feeling hostile to the Gentiles as in the incipient stage at the time of the Conference, and as increasing until, seven years afterwards, it had developed into a wide-spread and intense antagonism, such as seems to be revealed in the riot occasioned by the appearance of Trophimus in Paul's company. Such a growth and intensification of Judaistic bigotry, after it had once been brought in contact with Pauline universalism, would be in strict accordance with the usual course of religious controversy, and may almost be taken for granted. To these observations it may be added, that if the state of matters in Jerusalem at the time of the Conference was such as Canon Farrar supposes, it is difficult to understand how Paul thought of taking Titus with him at all.

Canon Farrar thinks it clear that Paul was "most vehemently urged" to take the step of circumcising Titus, not merely by the general body of the Church at Jerusalem, but by all who remained of the twelve apostles, including their three leaders, Peter, James, and John. What evidence is there for this rather serious statement? None is produced except the

¹ *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, ii. 324-27.

rugged and incoherent structure of the sentences in which the Apostle speaks of the subject. "Perhaps the extraordinary convulsiveness of his expressions is only due to the memory of all that he must have undergone in that bitter struggle."¹ The passage is certainly difficult enough to construe or expound in accordance with ordinary grammatical rules, resembling one of the sentences in Oliver Cromwell's speeches, which Carlyle compares to a serpent of eternity, "the head of it eating the tail of it." It is not too much to say of it, as Bishop Lightfoot does say, that "the thread of the sentence is broken, picked up, and again broken," insomuch that the grammar is utterly shipwrecked.² But is this so exceptional and isolated a phenomenon in the Pauline literature that it may be regarded as a sure index of extraordinary agitation in the writer's mind caused by the recollection of some peculiarly bitter experience? Is not crowding of thought and emotion, giving rise to sudden transitions, long parentheses, changes of construction, and consequent obscurity in the sense and "shipwreck" of the grammar, rather a fixed characteristic of Paul as an author? On this point let us hear Renan: "The language" [of Paul's letters] "is, if I may venture to say it, pulverized—not a single consecutive phrase. It is impossible to violate more audaciously, I say not the genius of the Greek language, but the logic of human speech. One might describe it as a rapid conversation stenographed and reproduced without corrections."³ If this be even approximately true, as it undoubtedly is, it is not admissible to lay so much

¹ *Life and Work of St. Paul*, vol. i. p. 413.

² *Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*, in loc.

³ *Saint Paul*, p. 252.

stress on the shipwreck of grammar in this particular case as is done both by Canon Farrar and by Bishop Lightfoot, and to infer from it, as the only possible cause of the shipwreck, the existence of a hidden rock in the shape of "the counsels of the apostles of circumcision."¹ The rock is certainly a hidden one, for it nowhere appears on the surface of the narrative; and we take leave respectfully to doubt its existence altogether, for as we read Paul's statement, he appears to indicate with tolerable plainness, notwithstanding the faulty grammar, that the apostles were not inclined to give any such counsels. Our reading of the passage in dispute is, in brief, this: I went up to Jerusalem, taking Titus with me as a sample of Gentile converts, and as a concrete embodiment of Gentile liberties; and I laid before them (the members of the Jerusalem Church generally) the Gospel which I am in the habit of preaching among the Gentiles, but privately also to those in authority, the apostles, especially the pillar apostles, Peter, James, and John: for I was full of anxiety lest my work as a preacher among the heathen should have been in vain. But my anxiety turned out to be happily without cause, for so far were the Church in Jerusalem and their leaders from objecting to my Gospel, that they did not even so much as insist on the circumcision of Titus; and of course Titus was not circumcised. There were indeed certain false brethren who demanded his circumcision, but I declined utterly to listen to them even for a moment, knowing full well how much was at stake, even nothing less than the truth of the gospel in its integrity as a gospel for Jews and Gentiles alike on

¹ Lightfoot on Galatians.

equal terms. In this construction of the disputed passage we are happy to find ourselves in accord with Keim, who in his recently published work, *Aus dem Urchristenthum*, has a valuable paper on *The Apostolic Conference*, the general drift of which is to reduce to a minimum the discrepancy between Paul's account of the transactions and that given in the Acts. Keim says: "The Church exacted of him [Paul] neither a general promise of future circumcision of Gentile converts, nor even the preliminary circumcision of Titus. He owed the victory [over the false brethren] to himself, but also to the moderation of the Church, and the conscientiousness and wisdom of the leaders who, in the public meeting, as in the private conference, made no demands; not only none such as he could submit to, but none such as in their view he ought to submit to; so conclusively proving to him that he had not run in vain."¹ As against the impression that the whole passage bears the stamp of bitter recollections, Keim remarks that Paul's narrative is visibly optimistic, not pessimistic. "For whereas he came to Jerusalem fearing that his mission might be deemed chargeable with serious defect, he begins his report with the tranquillizing assurance that not even the least pressure—the demand to circumcise Titus—had been brought to bear, and he concludes with the certainly not 'cold,' but joyous warm declaration, that, in place of a negation to the smallest extent of his gospel, a positive understanding had been come to with the influential men. The less pleasant element which preceded both acts he makes an appendix of the first act, so that his annoyance on account of it appears neutralized by the

¹ *Aus dem Urchristenthum*, p. 71.

favourable result. To the unpleasant fact itself he assigns modest dimensions. For it is only Jewish-Christian spies who attempt the enslavement of the heathen Christians. There is not a single trace of evidence that in this attempt either the Jerusalem Church or the influential apostles were implicated.”¹

But Canon Farrar finds a trace of such implication in the verb *ἠναγκάσθη*, which he rightly assumes to refer to the Church and the apostles, and interprets so as to imply that they desired the circumcision of Titus. Compulsion was attempted, and the thing was done, but not *under* compulsion: so he reads the facts. The question, therefore, comes up, Is this a right interpretation of the verb? Does the denial of compulsion refer to the cause of a certain action supposed to be done, or does it refer to the attitude of the Church and its leaders? Does the statement signify; Compulsion was not the reason of the action, or, There was no compulsion attempted? We maintain the latter view, and in support of it we simply refer to the way in which Paul uses the very same verb further on in the same Chapter, in his account of his remonstrance with Peter at Antioch. On that occasion, he tells us, he said to Peter, among other things, “If thou, being a Jew, livest after the ethnic fashion, and not Judaistically, why compellest thou (*ἀναγκάζεις*) the Gentiles to Judaize?”² The reference here is undoubtedly to the attitude of Peter. Whether his conduct did or did not as a matter of fact cause the Gentiles to Judaize is not the thing of importance—probably it did not; but the thing Paul wished to emphasize was that that conduct was in its intention or tendency compulsory

¹ *St. Paul*, p. 73.

² Gal. ii. 14.

in the direction of Judaistic practice. He says in effect to Peter, In withdrawing from social fellowship with Gentile Christians, you are virtually assuming the attitude of one who says to these brethren, Except ye be circumcised ye must be as good as excommunicated. In other words, the verb ἀναγκάζεις has a subjective, not an objective reference; it points out not the cause of a certain course of conduct on the part of the Gentiles, but the significance of a certain attitude assumed towards them by Peter. Transferring this sense of the verb to the place where it is previously used, what sense does the sentence yield? This: that neither the Church as a whole, nor the apostles, took up the position of demanding the circumcision of Titus, or did anything which might be construed as compulsion to that effect. What Paul negatives is *intention* on the part of those referred to in the previous verse, not the *causality* of their supposed intention. And that being so, we may safely infer that the apostles did not even so much as hint at the odious proposal. For a hint from such as they would, in Paul's view, and in truth, have been seriously compulsory. If it was compulsion in Peter simply to withdraw from social intercourse with Gentiles out of cowardly deference to the men who came down from Jerusalem, would it have been less than compulsion in the pillar apostles to have said to Paul, We think, brother, that you ought to consent to the circumcision of Titus, as a measure required at once by Jewish law and custom and by considerations of expediency? And if there was no compulsion, even to the extent of the utterance of such a suggestion, it goes without saying that in point of fact Titus was not circumcised.

Assuming that the contrary was the fact, Canon Farrar apologizes for Paul's yielding to supposed pressure by the remark that he "cared for *ideas*, not for forms." It is most true; but just because he cared for ideas, he cared also for forms or facts which involved or embodied ideas or principles. In proof of this statement we have but to turn once more to the account the Apostle gives of his altercation with Peter at Antioch. With what tremendous ideal significance he charges the weak behaviour of his poor brother apostle! In that behaviour he discovers at least three very grave offences: (1) virtual excommunication of the Gentile Christians; (2) self-stultification; (3) frustration of the grace of God. To withdraw from the company of the Gentile believers was in effect to say to them, Unless ye be circumcised ye cannot be members in full communion with the Church of Christ. A most unjust and tyrannical position to take up in any case, but peculiarly offensive in one who had not himself been a strict and consistent observer of Jewish custom. And in that very inconsistency Peter, according to Paul, was guilty of a second offence of a serious nature, viz., self-stultification. If he was right in withdrawing from the Gentiles, he had been wrong all the time he had practised laxity in regard to the Jewish ritual laws. In building again the things he had formerly destroyed he made himself a transgressor. To some it might seem as if for a Jew to take his place beside Gentile "sinners," as needing salvation by grace not less than they, made Christ a minister of sin. But that was only a superficial view of the matter. Peter and Paul, in calling themselves sinners, by believing in a gospel of grace, did not make

themselves worse than they were, but only acknowledged their true position before God. But for a man to act to-day as if circumcision and ceremonial cleanliness were nothing, and to-morrow as if they were of fundamental moment, was a very serious matter. It was serious for himself, for he could not be right in both ways of acting; and it was serious in relation to the gospel, for it involved in effect and in principle—and this was Paul's third charge against Peter—the frustration of the grace of God. The charge is not brought directly, but it is brought with even more effect indirectly by a personal repudiation of the offence on the part of the speaker. In saying "*I do not frustrate the grace of God by making the law joint saviour with Christ; I have done with the law for ever,*" Paul says in effect to his brother apostle: "You, Peter, do what I for my part solemnly protest I do not." And his ground for bringing so serious a charge is just that unhappy withdrawal from the company of the Gentiles. The act meant, or ought to mean, the law indispensable to, though not sufficient for, salvation; Christ and the law together the way of salvation. But the combination is illegitimate; Christ must be all or nothing; you must choose between Him and the law—"If by the law, in any measure, righteousness, then Christ died in vain."

So much did Paul care for "forms" or facts when principles were involved. But were principles involved in the circumcision of Titus? Canon Farrar seems to think they were not—it was a mere case of accommodation similar to the circumcision of Timothy. And yet he almost seems to think they were, for he represents Paul as afterwards bitterly regretting the step, as if he

regarded it as a great mistake. A great mistake it certainly would have been, which we can hardly conceive being committed by a man so quick to discern when important interests were involved, and so resolute in his attitude in such cases, though ever ready to yield in affairs of subordinate consequence in obedience to considerations of Christian wisdom and charity. In the account which he gives of Paul's conduct on this critical occasion, Canon Farrar seems to us unconsciously to transform the Apostle of the Gentiles into a Peter or a Barnabas—soft-hearted, good-natured, generous men both; men of excellent amiable character, only not Pauls; more amiable, perhaps, than Paul, but far less firm, fearless, and forceful; wanting his "passion for the absolute,"¹ to which is owing at once the logical thoroughness of Paulinism as a theoretical system, and the uncompromising heroic defence by Paul of Christian universalism; that is, of a Christianity independent of Judaism. In our view, only a Barnabas-like character could have acted as Paul is supposed to have acted in the case of Titus. For if ever there was an occasion for being unyielding it was then. It was a crisis in which all depended on there being one man who knew his own mind, and meant to adhere to it. For in the Christian community at Jerusalem at that crisis there was hardly anywhere, save in Paul's mind, a clear understanding of the situation. There was no hostility against his views except among the false brethren who smuggled themselves in, but neither was there decided sympathy, based on principle and intelligent conviction, but rather a general confusion of mind, and consequent readiness to be led

¹ A phrase used by Sabatier in his admirable work, *L'Apôtre Paul*.

by any one who had no doubt as to the right way. That leader they found in Paul, who conducted the Church into the path of Christian liberty from the law, and who took the best way of exhibiting to the Church the nature of Christianity, "the truth of the Gospel," by insisting that Titus should be recognized as a brother, though uncircumcised. It is to overlook entirely the difference between a great crisis and an ordinary occasion for the exercise of Christian prudence to class together the cases of Titus and Timothy. We are happy to be able to support this statement by the weighty authority of Pfleiderer, who, in his able and important work on Paulinism, refers to the topic in a chapter on the Acts of the Apostles, designed to defend the good faith of the writer as one who honestly used the sources of information at his command, against the charge of deliberate invention in the interest of a theological tendency brought by Baur and Zeller, and others members of the Tübingen critical school. Pfleiderer remarks: "Inventions in the interest of tendency have been discovered in the repeated instances in which Paul, according to the Acts, accommodates himself to the law and custom of the Jews. But here it ought first to be shewn that these cases could not be historical. When appeal is made to Paul's refusal to comply with the suggestion to circumcise Titus, in order to prove the unhistorical character of the circumcision of Timothy, a twofold difference between the two cases is overlooked. Titus was a purely heathen Christian; Timothy, as son of a Jewish mother, by birth half a Jew; and, what is more important, in the case of Titus the matter on hand was by a decisive example to guard the principle of the freedom from

the law of heathen Christians ; in the case of Timothy, on the other hand, there was not only no ground of that kind for the strict carrying out of the Antinomian principle, but such strictness would have been suicidal, because the offence given to the Jews by the presence of an uncircumcised half-Jewish companion to the Apostle in his missionary work would have everywhere acted as a hindrance." ¹

The foregoing are the principal grounds on which we venture to call in question the views expressed by Canon Farrar, in his valuable work, on the subject of this paper. We have said nothing of the various readings in the fifth verse, because these, as is generally admitted, do not bear decisively on the question in dispute. We may remark, however, that the retention of the words *οἱ οὐδὲ* seems favoured by the rule: the more difficult reading is to be preferred. For the omission of the words does certainly lighten the difficulty of construing the sentence, as we then get the grammatically simple statement: "But on account of false brethren we yielded for an hour that the truth of the gospel might abide permanently with you;" whereas, retaining the two disputed words, the sentence begun in Verse 4 is broken off in the middle, and we can only guess what the writer meant to say. It was thus, as is well known, that Tertullian understood the passage, his idea being that Paul did yield to the false brethren, deeming a momentary concession the way to permanent victory. It was an ingenious construction put upon a reading of the text, in favour of which he was biassed by his Antimarcionite animus. Marcion read verse 5 with the *οἱ οὐδὲ* retained, and turned it to

¹ *Paulinismus*, pp. 507-8.

his own purposes. That was enough to condemn it in the judgment of his fiery opponent. It was a *vitiatio scripturæ* for the nefarious purpose of giving to Paulinism an aspect of exaggerated antagonism to everything Judaistic. And so, the arch-heretic having gone to one extreme, the defender of the faith must needs go to the opposite extreme, and represent Paul as seeking the patronage (*patrocinium*) of Peter and the other apostles, and as exceedingly desirous to gain their approval and confirmation of his views; ¹ the real truth being that in the first two chapters of his Epistle to the Galatians the Apostle is evidently bent on making clear three things: (1) that he did not *learn* his gospel from the original apostles; (2) that they did not give him any additional instructions as to how to *preach* the gospel; and (3) that he had on the contrary to teach one of their number how to preach, or at least the true import of the gospel which he did preach, but did not carry into consistent practice.

A. B. BRUCE.

"AS OLD AS METHUSELAH."

A CHAPTER IN POSTDILUVIAN CHRONOLOGY.

IN a former paper in THE EXPOSITOR ² I have already explained and discussed the theory that, of the two dates attached to each name, and descriptive of the age, of the antediluvian patriarchs, in "the book of the generations of Adam" (Gen. v.), the former represents the natural and the latter the dynastic life of these "fathers of the world:" Adam, Sheth, and

¹ Ades ab illis probari et constabiliiri desiderarat.—*Adv. Marcionem*, lib. v. 3.

² Vol. viii. pp. 449 *seqq.*