

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

by its absence, its universalism. Melchisedec, though priest of the most high God, did not belong to the Jewish race. The order of priesthood named after him ought therefore to exist, not for Jews only, but for humanity. The Priest after that order must be the great High Priest of mankind. The writer here, as throughout the epistle, is silent on this point, but doubtless he has it in his mind.

A. B. BRUCE.

---

ST. PAUL AND THE GALATIAN JUDAIZERS.

II.

II. 11-14. The open rebuke which St. Paul addressed to St. Peter at Antioch is the only existing trace of personal collision between the two Apostles. He had been hitherto, with the one exception of St. Paul, the most prominent champion of Gentile freedom from the law. On three successive occasions, first at Cæsarea, then at Jerusalem upon his return, and again at the apostolic council, he had stood forward to vindicate the rights of the uncircumcised. But at Antioch the question was revived in a more insidious form. The right of Gentile converts to Christian baptism was no longer directly disputed after the decision of the council. But a fresh appeal was made to Jewish scruples on the plea of reverence for the law of uncleanness; it was represented that, though Gentile Christians were themselves free, yet Jewish Christians were forbidden by the law to associate with uncircumcised brethren. This was not, it appears, St. Peter's own view; but he first, and Barnabas after his example, were tempted in moments of weakness to yield so far to the prejudices of Jewish brethren as to withdraw from the free and unrestricted intercourse

which they had hitherto maintained with the whole body of brethren. By this course the unity of the Christian Church was seriously endangered; Christian baptism was placed below circumcision, as unable to cleanse its recipient; for uncircumcised Christians were treated as unclean; and a stamp of inferiority was set upon those who did not keep the whole law. This must have resulted in the division of Jewish and Gentile Christians into two mutually jealous, and probably hostile, camps. The danger was averted by the farsighted wisdom of St. Paul, and the outspoken rebuke which he addressed to his brother Apostle.

Its effect is not recorded; and some theologians have interpreted this silence as indicative of a permanent schism between the Petrine and Pauline parties in the Church. The continued co-operation of Paul and Barnabas during their stay at Antioch, and the terms in which he is mentioned in St. Paul's epistles after their agreement to work apart, evince the contrary. And this passage itself indicates how temporary was the vacillation of St. Peter; the imperfect tenses in ver. 12, *ὑπέστειλλεν καὶ ἀφώριζεν*, denote some lack of firmness for the moment, rather than any new convictions or decisive change of principles or policy on his part. His timid and hesitating conduct wears the aspect of an unworthy concession to the strong prejudices of a partisan society. He was naturally anxious to preserve harmony in the Church of the circumcision, which had become his especial charge; and for peace' sake *he began to withdraw and separate himself* from the Gentile converts, without reflection on the fatal consequences of this separatist policy. When however the contagion of his example drew all the other Jewish converts, including even Barnabas himself, after him, and he was openly challenged by his brother Apostle, he must have seen his mistake and retraced his steps. Had it been otherwise, had he persisted in his course and become an avowed adherent to the views

of the Judaizers, the incident could never have found a place in this epistle; for it would have furnished them with the very handle which they desired against the Apostle. He maintained that there was "no other gospel of Christ" than his own. No answer could have been more effectual than to show that the foremost of the Twelve preached and practised a different gospel. It would have enabled them to set up the authority of a rival Apostle, and range themselves under the banner of St. Peter against St. Paul. This frank record of a difference at Antioch shows how fully St. Paul could still depend on the support of his brother Apostle.

ii. 11. According to our version, St. Paul vindicates his open rebuke of Cephas on the ground that "*he was to be blamed.*" But *κατεγνωσμένος* cannot possibly mean this; it signifies *condemned*, and that rather by the silent verdict of conscience or opinion than by any outward judgment (see 1 John iii. 20). It seems here to have the force of the middle voice; "*he had condemned himself,*" i.e. by the inconsistency of his own conduct, as the epistle proceeds to show.

ii. 13. The words *dissembled*, *dissimulation* do not give the exact force of *ὑπεκρίθησαν*, *ὑποκρίσει*. For their insincerity did not take the shape of suppression of the truth, but of hypocritical *pretences*; they professed scruples in regard to association with the uncircumcised, which were quite inconsistent with their previous conduct. It is therefore said that they *acted a part* (*ὑπεκρίθησαν*) before the Jerusalem brethren.

ii. 14. Our version taxes these Jewish Christians with "*not walking uprightly according to the truth of the gospel,*" as if they had been accused of not being upright in their own lives. The real charge is, that they were not straightforward in the views of truth which they conveyed to others; they were by their behaviour insinuating false doctrines. This

is the ground taken up by the ensuing rebuke. Cephas had been living as do the Gentiles; he had mixed freely with Gentile Christians, sharing their meals and taking part in their daily life: yet he was now treating them as unclean before his fresh companions, and so putting a pressure upon them to adopt Jewish habits (*Ἰουδαϊζειν*), to be circumcised and keep the law, though he had before admitted them to be entitled to the full privileges of Christian brethren. The expostulation with Cephas ends here; the ironical tone of the next sentence forbids its being taken as an address to a brother Apostle.

ii. 15, 16. The argument against the Galatian Judaizers follows without a break; for there was, in fact, no difference between them and the Judaizers at Antioch. Both alike pressed the claims of circumcision and legal observance as social obligations upon all Christians, though they could no longer enforce them as necessary to Christian baptism. The Apostle contrasts, with obvious irony, the arrogant tone of superiority, which they affected as *Jews by nature* over *sinners of the Gentiles*, with the humility which seeks to be justified through faith in Christ only, and renounces all hope of being justified by works. He further quotes Psalm cxliii. 2 (with slight verbal variations) in support of this principle. The use of ἐξ before the indefinite substantives ἔργων and πίστεως arises from good works and faith being viewed as a fund *out of* which are drawn pleas for justification before God. The phrase therefore denotes merely justification *upon* works, *upon* faith; that is to say, a justification based upon some kind of works, some kind of faith. It differs but little in sense from the alternative expressions ἐν νόμῳ, διὰ πίστεως, πιστεῖ, which are also used by St. Paul with the verb δικαιῶν. But the absence of articles is important, as showing that the difference between the two methods of justification is a broad question of principle, applicable to every kind of obedience to any out-

ward law, and not restricted (as it is in our version) to the Mosaic law alone. The passage stands as a comprehensive principle, that man is justified by faith alone, and not by any legal works.

ii. 17, 18. Our version introduces here an emphatic interrogation ( $\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha$  . . .), "*Is Christ the minister of sin?*" But St. Paul never uses  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha$ ,<sup>1</sup> while he does again and again conclude an argument with the simple  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha$ , *then*. It is used in ii. 21 and iii. 29 exactly as it is here. By this rendering the connexion with the previous verses becomes more simple and direct. It has been pointed out that the Jewish Christians, headed by Cephas himself, had long habitually transgressed the law by living with Gentile Christians in the closest communion; they had, in fact, as the direct consequence of their belief in Christ, brought themselves down to the level of men whom the law treated as sinful and unclean. Accordingly the Apostle argues, "*If through seeking to be justified in Christ we ourselves also were found sinners, then Christ was minister of sin*"—a truly monstrous suggestion. "*For*" (he adds) "*if I build again those things which I pulled down* (i.e. restore the authority of the law), *I do declare myself a transgressor.*"

ii. 19-21. The Apostle proceeds, in ver. 19, to explain why he had thus pulled down the authority of the law. "*I died to law* (not *I am dead*), *that I might live unto God.*" He had long lived to law; it had been his sole guide, the supreme authority for his life, it had been sovereign over his spirit, and he had placed all his hope of salvation in implicit obedience to it. But in a moment this dominion was overthrown; suddenly, as he saw Jesus in the way and heard

<sup>1</sup> In comparison with this decisive evidence of St. Paul's usage, the argument, that in the Epistle to the Romans  $\mu\eta\ \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota\tau\omicron$  repeatedly follows a previous question, has scarcely any weight. For the monstrous suggestions, which  $\mu\eta\ \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota\tau\omicron$  indignantly repudiates, are from the nature of the case most often introduced as questions; but they may with equal propriety form the conclusion of a false argument and be employed as a *reductio ad absurdum*.

His voice, the revelation of a new life flashed upon him ; and the whole man was changed. From that hour he knew no authority but the voice of God and the Spirit ; the hope of fuller life in Christ became his guiding star : while he died to law, to its obligation, its promises, and its penalties.

But now what is to be said of *διὰ νόμον*, translated in our version *through the law* ? Ingenious efforts have been made to explain those words by dwelling on the value of law as God's instrument for educating the conscience and leading men to Christ. Doubtless the law had been to Saul, as to other Jews, an educator unto Christ (iii. 24). But any such testimony to the previous value of law is utterly out of place in this verse. Law educates the conscience, but it does not liberate it also. That is Christ's own peculiar work. It was by no process of gradual education, but in a moment, by the sight and the voice of Christ, that Saul died to law and became for ever free from its bondage. The true explanation is to be sought in correct translation ; *διά* is not here instrumental, but expresses the condition in which Saul was at the time he died to law. In Romans ii. 27 *διὰ γράμματος κ. περιτομῆς* really means *under the letter and circumcision*, and in Romans iv. 11 *δι' ἀκροβυστίας* in a *state of uncircumcision*. So here the sense is, *For I, when under law, died to law*. Saul was still *under law*, a devout believer in its authority, and an ardent supporter of its claims, when Christ met him in the way, and the great spiritual revelation took place by which he died at once and for ever to law, and became wholly Christ's.

This truth he develops further in the words, "*I have been (not I am) crucified with Christ*"; Christ has made me partner in His death—as dead to law, as He became to all bonds of flesh by His own death upon the cross: "*I have a life, but it is no longer I that live, but Christ that liveth in me : what life I now have in the flesh, I live in faith of the Son of God. . .*" To give up this life in Christ, and

seek again to be justified by legal works, would *make void the grace of God*, who gave him life in His Son: *for if righteousness came through law, then Christ died for nought.*

iii. 1-5. The Apostle protests against the folly of the Galatians in yielding to a malignant influence like that of an evil eye, after their own eyes had been so clearly enlightened to see the truth. He borrows a figure from the public notices of new laws posted up in the market-places of their cities, to remind them how plainly he had set before their eyes the doctrine of Christ crucified. The subject of *προεγράφη* must include *ἑσταυρωμένος*, as well as *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*; for such official notices did not announce the mere name of a person, but some fact or rule of action. The crucifixion of Christ with its consequences to ourselves was the doctrine which he had proclaimed, and which they were now forgetting. Again, the words *ἐν ὑμῖν* appear to be a later addition to the text: if they were genuine, they must be taken in connexion with *προεγράφη*, not with *ἑσταυρωμένος*, as in our version.

In ver. 2 he appeals to their remembrance of the way in which they had received the Spirit of God: had it been the result of works done in conformity with law, or of listening in a spirit of faith?

In ver. 3 our version by its passive rendering, "*are ye made perfect?*" ignores at once the true meaning of *ἐπιτελεῖν* and the contrast between *ἐνάρχῃσθαι*, to *begin* a work, and *ἐπιτελεῖν*, to *carry it out*; which occurs three times elsewhere in St. Paul's epistles (2 Cor. viii. 6, 11; Phil. i. 6). The active verb is there used because he is speaking of work to be carried on in others; the middle voice here, because it is in themselves: "*having begun in the Spirit, are ye now completing in the flesh?*"<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The only other passage where the middle or passive forms of *ἐπιτελεῖν* occur in the New Testament is 1 Peter v. 9; there also the sense suggests to me the middle voice: "*Knowing that ye are completing the same sufferings as your*



In ver. 4 he reminds the Galatians of actual sufferings in time past: "*Did ye suffer so many things to no purpose? if it be indeed to no purpose.*" All record of these sufferings is lost: but since the second clause implies that they had been endured to no purpose, if the Judaizers succeeded in re-establishing the authority of the law, it appears that the Galatian Churches had been persecuted, like the neighbouring Churches of Lycaonia and Pisidia, by Jewish zealots, after their conversion, as unfaithful to the law; whereas now they were admitting that their earlier assertion of Christian independence had been an error.

iii. 6-14. Abraham was accepted for his faith: *ye perceive therefore that they which are of faith, the same are sons of Abraham.*<sup>1</sup> The Gentiles also were made sharers in the promised blessing (Gen. xii. 3, xviii. 18). Again, whereas the prophet said, *The righteous shall live by faith* (Hab. ii. 4), the law made life depend on obedience, cursed all who disobey, even pronounced a special curse on those who die the death of malefactors, as Christ died for us upon the cross.

iii. 15-22. The relation of the law to God's earlier promise is investigated:

1. That promise was a covenant. Now, even a man's covenant, once duly executed, is sacred: how much more must God's covenant be unalterable and irrevocable!

2. *To Abraham were the promises spoken, and to his seed. He saith not, And to his seeds.* The omission of the pronoun "*his*" in our version, though expressed in Greek by the article, τοῖς, helps to disguise the meaning of a somewhat obscure expression. A contrast is pointed between Abraham's one seed of promise and his many children after the

*brethren in the world*"; i.e. completing the same work of suffering which your brethren have begun.

<sup>1</sup> I take γινώσκετε in ver. 7 to be certainly indicative. The emphatic imperative "*know*" could only have been expressed by the aor. imp. γνῶτε.

flesh. For all the children of Israel, however ungodly and unbelieving, even the children of Midian, Ishmael, or Esau, were numbered among the seeds of Abraham and claimed him as their father after the flesh. The Jews maintained that they were the seed of Abraham in whom the Gentiles should be blessed. No, it is said; you are amongst the seeds: but Christ is the real seed of promise in whom cometh the blessing. The same argument is repeated in Romans ix. 7, 8: "*Neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children: but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, they which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God; but the children of promise are counted for the seed.*" Isaac there represents the children of promise, whereas here Christ Himself is designated as the one chosen seed. It is not however thereby intended to exclude the members of Christ, or to limit the seed of Abraham to the unity of Christ's person. The unity is one of spirit, binding together in one body in Christ all true children of Abraham (defined in ver. 7 as *of faith*), all, in fact, who are in truth members of Christ as well as Christ Himself.

iii. 17-23. The relation of the law to the promise is further developed in the following verses, as is intimated by the introductory clause, *Now this I mean*. The argument of vers. 17, 18, that the law could not possibly make void God's earlier covenant, and that inheritance by law differs essentially from a gift by promise, is clear enough. What follows must be examined in detail. The specific purpose, for which the law was added, is described as τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν: our version makes this a mere deduction from the nature of law in the abstract, "*it was added because of transgressions.*" But this is clearly wrong; for *transgressions*, as distinct from sin, did not exist before the law; they are, in fact, the creation of law, as stated in Romans iv. 15, "*Where no law is, there is no transgression.*" A more

exact translation brings out the real meaning of St. Paul: *It was added with a view to the transgressions which it forbids.* The actual contents of the law are taken as evidence of its intention; and rightly so. There can be no doubt that the sixth commandment, for instance, was directed against murder, the seventh against adultery, the eighth against theft, and so on. The same argument is repeated in 1 Timothy i. 9, "*Law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and unruly, for the ungodly and sinners, for the unholy and profane, for murderers. . . .*"

Furthermore, the law was not intended for the seed of promise; it was a temporary dispensation, designed to deal with the children of Abraham after the flesh *till the seed should come to whom the promise hath been made.* Hence it took the form of positive command through the subordinate ministry of angels, with the further interposition of a mediator (*διαταγείς . . . μεσίτου*). It did not, like the promise, deal with Abraham's seed as children of God, to be brought near in heart to a loving Father, but as children of the flesh, to be restrained by fear from fleshly lusts and passions.

The translation of ver. 20 in our version, "*Now a mediator is not a mediator of one,*" suggests to the reader that the institution of a mediator belonged specially to the law—surely a strange doctrine to attribute to a Christian Apostle, and utterly inconsistent with the context, which has insisted strongly on the promise being a covenant (vers. 15, 17), which of necessity involves the idea of a mediator. There can, I think, be no doubt that St. Paul is speaking here not of *a mediator* in the abstract, but of *the mediator* just mentioned, *viz.* Moses; and that he contrasts the mediator of the law with the Mediator of the promise as not representing the one chosen seed, but all the children of Abraham after the flesh. He has still in mind the distinction which he drew in ver. 16 between the many seeds and the one seed: and *ένός* means here *ένός σπέρματος*,

just as τὰ πάντα in ver. 22 means τὰ πάντα σπέρματα.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly I translate ver. 20: *But the mediator (i.e. of the law) is not a mediator of one seed (as the Mediator of the promise was shown to be), but the God (i.e. of the law) is one and the same with the God of Abraham who gave the promise.* This interpretation of εἰς ὁ Θεός corresponds closely to its use in Romans iii. 30; both passages assert the essential unity of God, though manifesting Himself in different ways to different classes of men. The promise deals with the spiritual Israel, the law with a carnal Israel: therefore the two methods differ; but both proceed from one and the same God. The connexion with ver. 21 now becomes clear. *Is the law then against His promises?* (the words τοῦ Θεοῦ are unnecessary, and probably a later addition to the text.) Nay, by no means; for if a law had been given able to quicken spiritual life, righteousness would really have been by law. But the law could not quicken, and therefore could not justify before God: it was merely an authoritative command resting on fear; but by denouncing sin, and enforcing outward holiness, it prepared the way, that the promise might be given upon faith in Jesus Christ to them that believe. This it did by convicting the carnal Israel of sin. *The Scripture*, i.e. the law of God contained in the Old Testament, *shut up all under sin.* By *all* is not meant "*all things*," as rendered in the Revised Version, but all the children of Abraham after the flesh (τὰ πάντα σπέρματα); as is made clear by the next verse, where the Jews are said to be συγκλειόμενοι. "*But before the faith came, we were kept in ward under law, shut up unto the faith which was to be revealed.*" The Jews before Christ were as prisoners kept under the control of an external law, which forbade the indulgence of their fleshly

<sup>1</sup> Several of these points are fully argued with much force by Dr. Davidson in THE EXPOSITOR (vii., pp. 377-386) from his own point of view, which does not much differ from mine in regard to this verse.

lusts and passions. Our version obscures the meaning by the translation "*before faith came.*" For Abraham himself was faithful, and many of his children in every generation were men of faith; the date referred to by the Apostle here and in ver. 25 is the coming of *the* faith in Christ.

iii. 24.-iv. 11. The position of Israel under the law is further illustrated by the figure of a child; who, though eventual heir of all, is subject to the control of a household servant (*παιδαγωγός*), but in due time puts on the dress of manhood, and is entirely emancipated. So Christians are all now sons of God: at their baptism they all put on Christ, and were made wholly free; no further room was left for such distinctions as those of Jew and Greek, for all are now one in Christ. But Israel in earlier days of spiritual childhood was in bondage to the same elementary rules as the world (*τ. στοιχέα τ. κόσμου*), till the full time was come for their emancipation, and God sent His own Son to confer on them the full rights of adopted sons. Meanwhile the Galatians were slaves to idolatry; they too have been brought to know God and acknowledged by Him; why turn back to this childish bondage of ceremonies?

iv. 12-20. In ver. 12 the arbitrary introduction of a verb after *καγώ* produces so strange a sentence, "*Be ye as I am, for I am as ye are, brethren, I beseech you,*" that our version has transposed the clauses in order to remedy it. To supply *ἐγενόμην* with *καγώ* and interpret the clause, *I was once as ye are now*, does greater violence still to the original. The only rendering I can find consistent with the Greek text is to connect *καγώ* with *δέομαι*. The whole passage then becomes clear: "Deal with me, as I with you; for I in my turn beseech you, as ye besought me: grant my prayer, as I granted yours." There had been a time when the Galatians were suppliants to St. Paul, as he now was to them: he had listened to them formerly; it is now his turn to present his petition, and throw himself upon their

love. The subsequent context now becomes intelligible. The mention of their petition carries back his mind to his last visit in A.D. 54, paid in consequence of their earnest desire. He marks that occasion by referring to his first visit in A.D. 51 or 52, as *the former time*, for he had been but those two times to Galatia. His first stay had been brief and reluctant; he had done scarcely anything then to earn their gratitude: on the contrary, his state of health might well have tempted them to reject him with utter loathing; yet, when he did return, they received him "as an angel, as Christ Jesus." The genius of the English language requires the pluperfect for rendering ἠδικήσατε and εὐηγγελισάμην, for in comparing two successive incidents of past time English employs a pluperfect, Greek an aorist. I render therefore: *Ye had done me no wrong* (i.e. the Galatians had not driven him away by persecution, as so many others had done; he might have stayed to preach the gospel, if he had chosen): *but ye know that it was owing to an infirmity of the flesh that I had preached the gospel unto you the former time: and ye did not, yielding to the temptation to you in my flesh, set me at naught or loathe me, but received me as an angel of God.* . . . Such had been his past experience: he had preached to them awhile during involuntary detention by a loathsome sickness; yet on his return they welcomed him with enthusiasm, congratulated themselves on the blessing of his coming, and would fain have plucked out their own eyes, and given them to him. With this treatment he contrasts their present estrangement, due to faithful speaking of the truth, and their preference for jealous rivals *who are minded* (he says) *to shut you out from me*. He pleads with them, as a mother with her little children, that he ought to be an object of proper affection (ζηλοῦσθαι ἐν καλῶ) at all times, and not only when he is present with them; and complains that he has again to travail for their spiritual birth: *I could wish,*

(or perhaps) *I had a mind* (he concludes), *to be present with you now, and to change my pen into my voice; for I am in despair over you.* The occasion of all that intense devotion on their part cannot have been his first visit when he arrived as an unknown stranger, but his second visit, when he was recognised as an Apostle of Christ. Nor did the estrangement begin then; for he ascribes it to the intrigues of rivals in his absence, and speaks of a renewed visit as the most hopeful remedy.

iv. 21-v. 1. The allegory which identifies Hagar and her children with the Jews as children of Abraham after the flesh, and Sarah and Isaac with Christians as the seed of promise, besides reviving the argument of iii. 7-29, gives occasion to proclaim the doctrine of Christian liberty. For according to the best authenticated reading of v. 1, lost sight of in our division of the chapters, it winds up, *οὐκ ἐσμὲν παιδίσκης τέκνα, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἐλευθέρης τῆ ἐλευθ. ἡμᾶς Χρ. ἠλευθέρωσεν* *We are not children of a bondwoman; but Christ freed us with the freedom of the freewoman: stand fast therefore.*

v. 2-12. After urging the loss of Christian liberty entailed by the adoption of an ordinance of the flesh, like circumcision, he concludes his repudiation of this doctrine with words of bitter scorn: *Those who are subverting your faith will have actually to mutilate themselves*, like the priests of Cybele, who was the chief object of Gentile worship in Galatia. This seems the only possible interpretation of St. Paul's words. The etymology of *ὄφελον* and the future indicative which follows it show that it does not express a wish, as translated in our version, "*I would,*" but scornfully indicates the obligation on these idolaters of circumcision to proceed to all the lengths of Gentile idolatry, if they were consistent with their own principles.

v. 13-24. Christian liberty itself is however subordinate to a Christian law of love (*by love be ye slaves one to*

another). The Spirit and the will of the flesh are two great antagonists, ever battling within us for the mastery: the contrast of their respective fruits makes a fit climax to a protest against the undue exaltation of a carnal ordinance like circumcision.

v. 25-vi. 10. But the life of the Spirit must be manifest in our practice;

1. In the banishment of personal rivalry and illwill (v. 26).

2. In considerate treatment of real offenders (vi. 1, 2).

3. In controlling suspicious tempers (vi. 3).

4. In self-examination and amendment (vi. 4).

5. In gratitude to teachers, and liberality to all men, specially Christians (vi. 6-10).

*καταρτίζετε*, in vi. 1, is rendered in our version "restore"; it really means *correct*, when used with reference to an offender. In Matthew iv. 21 the word is used in the homely sense of *mending* nets. *καί* after *ἐάν* (omitted in our version) suggests the contingency of a real trespass as distinguished from an imaginary. *If a man be really overtaken in a trespass, ye which are spiritual, correct such an one in the spirit of meekness.* In ver. 3 our version gives, "*If a man think himself to be something when he is nothing, he deceiveth himself*": which is no better than a truism, with little point in connexion with the context. I have already pointed out at ii. 6, that *δοκεῖ εἶναι τι* cannot mean the same as *δοκεῖ τι εἶναι*, but denotes, in fact, a disposition to find imaginary faults in others: which is the very danger suggested by ver. 1. This faultfinder deludes himself with sophistry (*φρεναπατᾶ ἑαυτόν*), while he lacks in reality the spirit of brotherly love. *φρεναπάται* is similarly applied in Titus i. 10, in conjunction with *ματαιολόγοι*, to vain displays of intellectual subtlety, made "specially by those of the circumcision." Pride of moral and religious superiority specially fostered this temper amidst the Judaizers. As for



*μηδὲν ὄν*, a slight early corruption of the text from *ὄν* to *ὄν* is so strongly suggested by the context, that I venture to give the translation of the verse with the reading *μηδὲν ὄν* : *For if a man thinks there is something amiss when there is nothing, he deludeth himself.*

Self-examination is the proper corrective to this temper, for it leads each man to glory in the discovery of his own faults instead of another's: and in this way each will bear his own burden; for whatever help we may render in bearing each other's loads (ver. 2), each must still amend his own faults.

vi. 11-18. The final summary of the argument, with its decisive condemnation of the motives, the practice, and the principles of the Judaizers, needs no comment here.

F. RENDALL.

### THE PRODIGAL AND HIS BROTHER.

MOST of the evangelical Parables are, to a greater or less extent, not mere "parables from nature," but stories of human action; and for this reason they admit of external illustration, and give scope for analysis to an almost indefinite extent as regards the outward story, even before we begin to study their spiritual meaning and application. Human nature itself is a complex thing, and it manifests itself under social conditions still more complex; if the social conditions be those of a long past time, their history may need much study before the human action as conditioned by them can be understood.

For, while the human nature of the Parables is that of all time, the social conditions are those of Palestine at the Christian era. These were, indeed, when we understand them, less unlike those of other times and other countries