

perplexities, are content to remain in doubt, and live depressed and weakened. How seldom do you see a Christian exulting like a strong man rejoicing to run a race, taking all duty and hardship easily and lightly, as one who has abundant strength to spare! Liker are most Christians to the weary, hard-driven beasts, that drag their age-and-toil-stiffened limbs out of the stall with a groan, as they are led to their daily task. But instead of this reluctance and conscious weakness, and pain and despondency, there will be in God's presence, and there ought to be now in all who are God's people, a full consciousness of His love and of the glory of serving Him, and of the fairness of His government, which make men exult in present strength, and feel glad that life is eternal.

MARCUS DODS.

PAUL AND TITUS AT JERUSALEM.

GALATIANS ii. 1-5.

BAUR says in his *Paulus*,¹ "The *παρεισάκτοι ψευδαδέλφοι* (of Gal. ii. 4) are those *τινὲς κατελθόντες ἀπὸ τ. Ἰουδαίας*, of whom Acts xv. speaks. They were thus called because they came to Antioch as members of the Church of Jerusalem, in order to investigate on the spot the report which had reached Jerusalem, that in Antioch the Mosaic law was completely shaken off; and then that they might immediately bring to bear their own stringent Jewish principles."

Now as a description of the *character* of the men in question this statement is most inadequate. The supposition that Paul's Judaizing opponents were genuine representatives of Jewish Christian orthodoxy, on which the Tübingen reconstruction of the New Testament so largely

¹ English translation, pp. 127, 128, *note*.

depends, has no real support in the Galatian epistle. Not "because they came to Antioch as members of the Church at Jerusalem," does Paul brand them as "false brethren," but as being, whether at Antioch or Jerusalem, mere nominal Christians, professed believers in Jesus, yet unchanged Pharisees at heart, unscrupulous, self-seeking men, who made of Christ and His cross a means subordinate to Jewish party ends.¹

Of the *sphere of their operations* however we are persuaded that Baur has given the true account. His explanation applies well to the accompanying terms, "privily brought in . . . who (such as) came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus." Where was this "liberty" exercised or to be seen but in the Churches of the heathen mission? To the Galatians the words of *v. 4b* could only signify the liberty possessed by themselves in common with other Gentile Christians, in which Paul has identified himself with them. For this in truth the whole epistle is a vehement contention.² The Apostle is not speaking of the manner in which, or the purpose for which, these "deceitful workers" had originally entered the Church at Jerusalem (how did this concern himself or his readers?), but of their stealthy intrusion into the free Pauline Churches. They had crept into the Gentile Christian fold, invited no doubt by Jewish sympathisers, to take hostile observation of the liberty practised there, on purpose to destroy it. Unquestionably these intriguers had at their back a party in Jerusalem. Probably they followed the Gentile missionaries thither when the latter "went up about this question"; so that Paul and Barnabas were confronted by the same faction, and in part by the same opponents, in the Jewish as already in the Syrian capital.

¹ Chap. vi. 11-13. Comp. 2 Cor. ii. 17; iv. 2; xi. 13-15, 20, 26; Phil. iii. 2.

² Chap. i. 7, 8; ii. 12; iv. 9, 12—v. 3 (*the free Jerusalem above is our mother*); vi. 12.

But in *v.* 4, as we read his words, St. Paul is not thinking of his old adversaries as he met them at Jerusalem, but of their previous action in his own field of labour, which had occasioned this journey and conference with the Jewish Christian chiefs.

This view accords precisely with the situation given in Acts xv. The later interference of the "certain from James" (*v.* 12) bore a similar character. Moreover, the words of *v.* 4, thus understood, are equally pertinent to the proceedings of the Judaising emissaries infesting heathen Christianity at the time of the Apostle's writing. In the light of their own present experience, and after the denunciation of chap. i. 7, 8, the Galatians could be at no loss to identify the class of men St. Paul here intends, nor to understand the ground of his indictment. "The troublers" now trying to fasten the Jewish yoke on the neck of Gentile Christendom were men of just the same colour and stamp, and pursued the same crooked policy, as the Judaisers of seven years ago. "These false brethren, smuggled in amongst us, to filch away our liberty in Christ—I have met them before," he says; "I never yielded to them one inch; I carried the struggle to Jerusalem, and there, once for all, in the person of Titus, I vindicated your imperilled Christian rights."

On this interpretation, *v.* 4 stands connected, not with the foregoing verse, taken by itself,¹ but with the entire context of *vv.* 1-3. The full stop should follow, not precede, *v.* 3. Vers. 4, 5 then relate the occasion which brought about the memorable visit to Jerusalem just described: "And because of the false brethren . . . *I took the course I did* (or, *these things came to pass*)"—in some

¹ "Because of the false brethren Titus was not compelled to be circumcised," is an inconsequence defying explanation. It was they, and they alone, who insisted upon this. As well say, "Because of the enemy the city was not compelled to surrender."

such fashion, we imagine, Paul intended to conclude; but as he dilates on the conduct of these former adversaries, the precursors of such an army of "troublers," his eye kindles, his heart takes fire, and with a rush of indignant emotion he breaks off the half-finished sentence—"to whom," he cries, "not even for an hour did we yield by subjection, that the truth of the gospel might abide with you!" Through the shipwreck of the grammar, the meaning of the sentence comes off safe enough. "Not yielding for an hour" supplies the ellipsis negatively, and with heightened animation and effect. Vividly does this phrase portray the course Paul adopted and the spirit of his action at this juncture, from the hour that he and Titus set out for Jerusalem, in company with Barnabas (*v.* 1), until the hour when, with Titus standing by his side, he had won from the mother Church the endorsement of his "gospel of the uncircumcision," and the full recognition of his Gentile ministry (*vv.* 2, 3).

Titus forms the centre of interest in *vv.* 1-3. Paul had indeed taken up to Jerusalem with him the very subject-matter in dispute.¹ In the person of Titus, his "true child according to the common faith," and doubtless a noble specimen of Gentile Christianity, his "gospel of the uncircumcision" stood incarnate before the Jewish Church. The Apostle's challenge,² "Am I running, or have I run, in vain?" was now no mere question of words or topic for doctrinal discussion; it must be answered at once, and in the most practical and unmistakable form. By bringing

¹ The *σύν* in *συνπαραλαβών* refers to *Paul* himself: compare *ὁ σύν ἐμοί* (*v.* 3). There were "certain others" in the deputation (Acts xv. 2); but these were probably Jews, or if Gentiles, persons of less distinction than Titus, so that his case became practically the *test case*.

² With Meyer, Hofmann, Wieseler, we read *μή πως, κ.τ.λ., interrogatively*: "I put before them the gospel which I preach amongst the Gentiles, (putting it to them, asking them) whether haply I am running or had run in vain." St. Paul did not go up to Jerusalem to resolve a doubt in his own mind, but to compel the Church there to express its mind.

Titus to Jerusalem, Paul had staked the controversy on his single person, and brought it to a crisis. The Judaistic party, here in its native seat, where everything was in its favour, bent its whole strength, we may be sure, to compel the circumcision of Titus—and it failed! Had there been any yielding on this point, the Gentile mission would have been stultified; Paul would have seemed in that case truly to have “run in vain,” to have preached a defective gospel that could not stand the test. Had the authorities in Jerusalem on their part sustained the demand of Paul’s opponents and insisted on Titus’ circumcision, refused by the envoys from Antioch, then there must have been an open rupture, which nobody alleged to have taken place. The fact that, in spite of the utmost compulsion, Titus remained by his side, in the presence of the renowned heads of the Church at Jerusalem, uncircumcised, was itself an answer—a triumphant answer to St. Paul’s appeal. His purpose in taking this Greek disciple to the Jewish metropolis was fully realized. The step was however one so critical, involving so many risks, that, as the Apostle’s careful wording in *v.* 1 seems to suggest, it was taken on his own distinct responsibility, unshared by Barnabas; and he was guided in it, as in other supreme moments of his life, “by a revelation,”¹ his course was prompted immediately from heaven.

The mention of Titus in this connexion was calculated to awaken a keen interest in the minds of Galatian readers. From the Corinthian letters we know that this eminent disciple and friend of the Apostle was in attendance upon him during the latter period of the third missionary tour; probably therefore in its former part, when he made his

¹ Κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν, Paul says, reminding us of the words of chap. i. 11, 12, οὐ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον . . . ἀλλὰ δι’ ἀποκαλύψεως. The same Power which had imparted Paul’s gospel intervened to preserve it at this perilous crisis. Compare Acts xxi. 27–36, for one of the many dangers this proceeding involved.

second visit to Galatia (Acts xviii. 23). At any rate, Titus' name is introduced as that of one known to the readers, and known therefore to be a Gentile brother, like themselves. Its introduction at this point raised at once the burning question of the hour. Titus going up to Jerusalem with Paul—to the mother-city of believers, as “the troublers” said (chap. iv. 25, 26), where the faith of Christ is held in its pristine purity, where every Christian is circumcised and keeps the law—how could he be admitted or tolerated there? Ver. 3 meets this tacit inquiry: it gives the answer to Paul's challenge to the Jerusalem Church in the form most telling for the Galatians themselves. The question *now* pending was, Shall the Galatians be circumcised? (chap. v. 1-3.) *Then* it was, Shall Titus be circumcised, or not? Paul's readers were surely quick enough of wit to perceive that their case was one with that of Titus, as in a moment they would see their own “troublers” mirrored in the “false brethren” of v. 4. “After preaching in Gentile regions for fourteen years,” Paul seems to say, “I went up to Jerusalem, and moreover took along with me *Titus*. He is my son in Christ, as you know, and an embodiment of your own Gentile faith. I did this under God's immediate direction. I thus laid before the Church there, especially before its chiefs, whose authority is so often quoted against me, the gospel which I preach amongst the Gentiles, and asked them what they thought of it? What, you wish to know, was the result? Well, *Titus remained uncircumcised*, despite compulsion, in the very citadel of Judaism. His status as a free Gentile Christian was maintained, with the consent of the leaders of the Jewish Church. So the battle of your liberty was fought and won.” Such a paraphrase, as we think, puts nothing more into the Apostle's words than they imported to the original readers. The link we have attempted to supply, connecting v. 2 with vv. 1 and 3 on either hand, lies in the

fact that Titus was Paul's "gospel of the uncircumcision" *in concreto*.

Vers. 1-3 are therefore complete in themselves. The assertion of Gentile Christian freedom from the Mosaic law in the crucial instance¹ of Titus was the event of this second recorded visit of Paul to Jerusalem after his conversion. When he has said, "But not even Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised," the Apostle must have paused for a moment, and his readers may well have paused and drawn a long breath of relief or of astonishment at this momentous announcement. Vers. 4, 5 go on to add—what was very necessary in itself, and suitable to put the Galatians on their guard—that it was the action of dishonest Jewish interlopers that made this previous vindication needful. Through the whole passage there runs an undercurrent of tacit reference to the events transpiring in Galatia, where the conflict now going on raised anew the great question already settled years ago in agreement with the Church at Jerusalem. Vers. 6-10 conclude the account of the matter, by showing on what footing Paul and Barnabas now stood with the "pillars" at Jerusalem. This sentence, though much longer than the foregoing, is logically and grammatically parallel to it. Each begins with *δέ* and a prepositional phrase; each, singularly enough, breaks down in an *anacoluthon*. Vers. 4, 5 define Paul's relation at this crisis to the Judaisers, now making their first appearance in the province of the Gentile mission; *vv.* 6-10, his relation to the leaders of the Jewish Church, from whom he claimed recognition and support. The Judaistic propaganda, and the Jewish apostolic Church—these were the two parties between

¹ "But not even Titus who was with me"—in the Holy City, in the presence of the *δοκῶντες*. This is a more natural explanation of the *οὐδὲ* than to suppose, with Meyer, that the fact of Titus being a *teacher* made his uncircumcision specially offensive to conservative Jewish Christians. For *ἀλλ' οὐδὲ* after a question, comp. Acts xix. 2; Æschylus, *Persæ* 792; also 1 Cor. iii. 2, iv. 3.

whom Paul and Titus placed themselves, as we find them in *vv.* 1-3 of this chapter. From the former they appealed to the latter, and happily not in vain.

GEORGE G. FINDLAY.

THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD
TESTAMENT.

THE BOOK OF ISAIAH.—I.

Two distinguished literary laymen have made the Book of Isaiah their own. Mr. Matthew Arnold in 1883 published some remarkable papers on "Isaiah of Jerusalem" in *The Nineteenth Century*; he had already made a benevolent attempt to revise and annotate the A.V. of the "great Prophecy of Israel's Restoration" (Isa. xl.-lxvi.) for Government elementary schools, to which he prefixed a stimulative and finely written introduction. Sir Edward Strachey, the friend of Maurice and popularizer of *Morte Darthur*, went much more thoroughly into the subject, I am afraid to say how many years ago, in his *Jewish History and Politics*, to which in the second edition (1874) he appended a revision of the A.V. of the Book of Isaiah. Reading over again the words in which these authors have expressed themselves towards the A.V., one realizes the better the enormous difficulties of the task which the Revisers of Isaiah had before them. Both are lovers of their native tongue and of the glories of its literature; both regard the A.V. of Isaiah primarily as a masterpiece of English, and would have only those alterations made in it which could not be evaded by the utmost ingenuity of an advocate. It would have been no use to reply to these writers (not known as Hebraists) that the Authorized Version is an admirable *testo di lingua*, but no longer adequate as a translation. The retort would