

*A HISTORICAL COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE
TO THE GALATIANS.*

XLIII. CAUSE OF THE FIRST GALATIAN VISIT.

It was because of bodily disease, "infirmity of the flesh," that the Apostle had first preached the Gospel to the Galatians. Taking this expression by itself, we see that two explanations of it are possible:

1. When I was in your country, but not intending to preach there, a disease caused me to change my intention and preach to you.

2. When I was not intending to enter your country, but had other plans of work, a disease caused me to change my plans, and thus led to my visiting you and preaching to you.

No third explanation seems open.

1. The first of these explanations has been adopted by all adherents of the North-Galatian theory. It is perhaps not absolutely necessary for them to have recourse to it; but as they have unanimously adopted it, we need not discuss whether the other explanation would not be open to them.

Put in this bare and severely simple form, this explanation seems awkward. It is not at first sight probable that Paul would go across a country without any thought of evangelizing there, unless there were some distinct impediment. He twice crossed, evidently without preaching in it, the land ruled by King Antiochus of Commagene and Cilicia Tracheia. But that was not Roman territory, and was therefore outside of his plans;¹ and, moreover, on both occasions he was passing on to carry out a

¹ As Principal A. Robertson says in *EXPOSITOR*, Jan., 1899, p. 2: "I assume that the evangelization of the Roman world as such was an object consciously before his mind and deliberately planned."

pressing work among his own Churches (*Acts* xv. 36, xvi. 1, xviii. 23). Again, he crossed Asia without preaching in it, but his plan of preaching there had been expressly prohibited by the Spirit (*Acts* xvi. 6).

But, it is said, when he was at Lystra or Iconium, and found that his plan of preaching in Asia was prevented, he formed a new plan of preaching in Bithynia, and, as he was going thither, while crossing North Galatia, he was detained by illness, and to this detention "the Galatians owed their knowledge of Christ."¹

But the road from Iconium to Bithynia never touches North Galatia. It lies in Phrygia as far as Dorylaion, and then enters Bithynia. It is marked out by nature, and by immemorial usage. That is beyond dispute. If Paul formed at Lystra or Iconium the plan of preaching in Bithynia, he would never see North Galatia as he went to his goal.

When this undeniable fact is pointed out, the reply is that Paul was going to eastern Bithynia and Pontus—"the east of Bithynia and of Pontus."²

But our one authority says only Bithynia, and we have no right to add Pontus and to make Paul travel to Pontus, dropping Bithynia out of notice. The obvious meaning of our one authority is that Paul, prevented from his first aim of evangelizing Asia with its great and civilized cities, bethought himself of the nearest country to it—Bithynia, with its great and civilized cities, Nicomedia, Nicæa, Cæsarea, etc. He would never select second-rate remote places in the far corner of the Roman Empire, such as Tion, Sinope, and Amisos. There is no conceivable reason

¹ Lightfoot, p. 22. He, however, holds (as I have always done) that Paul traversed the Galatic region before he touched Asia or learned that he was not to preach there. But other supporters of the North-Galatian theory take the view stated in the above paragraph.

² EXPOSITION, Dec., 1893, p. 415.

why he should traverse and neglect North Galatia in order to reach unimportant towns like those.

The course of the second missionary journey is quite too extraordinary on this supposition. First, Paul aims at Asia; then he aims at Pontus; then he falls ill on the way, and proceeds to evangelize North Galatia, founding there several Churches—a process which requires long time and much travel. Then he proceeds to carry out his previous intention and goes on towards Pontus; and in doing this he finds himself *κατὰ τὴν Μυσίαν*! Whether we translate this “to the border of Mysia” or “opposite Mysia,” the statement is a plain impossibility, for the traveller going from North Galatia into “eastern Bithynia and Pontus” would be going north-east, with his back turned towards Mysia.

But it is needless to proceed, as one might do, in the enumeration of the absurdities in which this hypothesis is involved.

Those who cling to the first explanation must be content to recognise here one of those “gaps” in the narrative of Luke which they so often find. They maintain that the “gaps” are numerous and puzzling, and one more added to the number will not be a serious addition.

2. On the second explanation there must have been some occasion, during Paul's travels, when he changed his plans of work under compulsion of illness. He twice changed his plans on the second journey—first when he entered Asia, and next when he was approaching Bithynia; but in both cases the reason is distinctly assigned by Luke as the Divine guidance and orders; and we cannot admit, with Lightfoot,¹ that the same action is sometimes attributed to Divine command and sometimes to the pressure of external conditions: none of his examples will bear examination.

¹ On *Gal.*, p. 125.

On the first journey, however, there was an occasion when Paul changed his plans. The scope of that journey, as originally contemplated, embraced the lands which were naturally in closest relation with Syrian Antioch, viz., Cyprus and the Pamphylian coast. So long as these were the scene of work, John was a willing companion. But when Paul and Barnabas resolved to abandon Pamphylia and cross Taurus into the Galatic Province, John left them, and left the work. Luke does not state the motives of either party: he does not explain either why the two Apostles resolved to go to Pisidian Antioch, or why John refused to go. The reasons for his silence we can only conjecture; but two causes, both of which might be combined in his mind, seem both natural and adequate; he is little concerned with personal details, and he did not desire to dwell on an occasion when John had played a part which he probably afterwards regretted, and which deeply wounded Paul.

With regard to the situation, we may regard the following three statements as highly probable:

(1) There was no express Divine command, for we can hardly believe that John would have disobeyed it; and, if he had disobeyed such a command, Barnabas would not afterwards have insisted that John was a useful companion and minister for a similar journey (*Acts* xv. 37).

(2) John considered the move into the Galatic Province as a change of plan, and justified his refusal by this plea. He was willing to go to Pamphylia, but not across the mountains; the former sphere of work had been contemplated from the first, the latter had not.

(3) The cause that made Paul and Barnabas change their original plan must have appeared to them strong and compelling. It was not simply that they began to think the north side of Taurus likely to be a better field than the south; they had been sent forth by the Spirit, and given

leave of absence by the Church, with an eye to a distinct sphere of work, and their own calculation of probable advantage would not have seemed to them a sufficient reason for changing the sphere.

It was not that Pamphylia was found to be a hopeless district, for when they returned they preached there.

There must, then, have been some reason which made work in Pamphylia impossible at the time, but which afterwards, on their return, was not operative.

Thus we see what were the actual facts. They changed their plan, and they entered the Galatic Province; but the reason was not simple desire to evangelize there, it was some other compelling motive. Here the Epistle clears away all doubt. In it Paul clearly intimates, as his words must be interpreted, that his first visit had been caused not by a desire to preach to the Galatians, but by bodily disease. This cause satisfies all the conditions.

Thus, the way in which these two accounts mutually supplement and explain one another is a most conclusive proof of the honesty and direct simplicity of both.

Other points, as, for example, that Paul's circumstances in Pamphylia were such as to bring out any inherent weakness in his body, do not directly arise out of the Epistle, and have been sufficiently treated elsewhere.¹

XLIII. THE THORN IN THE FLESH.

From the Epistle we can gather something as to the nature of the disease. Lightfoot's discussion of the subject is excellent (*Gal.* p. 186 ff.), and we adopt his conclusions, except his final opinion that the disease was epilepsy, and his suggestion that "the meanness of his personal appearance (2 *Cor.* x. 10) was perhaps due to" the permanent effects of his painful malady.

¹ *Church in Rom. Emp.*, p. 63; *St. Paul the Trav.*, p. 93 ff.

First, the disease was active during Paul's residence in Galatia, and yet it was quite compatible with long journeys. That is implied alike on the North and the South Galatian theories. The disease was active, because the Galatians saw it and did not despise the sufferer; it is implied that the Galatian Churches in general, and not some single one alone, witnessed the Apostle's condition. Yet he was able to make long journeys; on the North-Galatian theory he went about between Ancyra, Tavium, and Pessinus, then proceeded towards Bithynia (or, as some say, Pontus), then went through Mysia to Troas; and all these journeys must have been made very quickly, for no chronological system leaves free a long period for this work. On the South-Galatian theory Paul went from Perga to Syrian Antioch, and then to Iconium, etc. These journeys need not be supposed to have been performed with the speed and exertion implied in the North-Galatian theory, but still they involve much work, and one is very long.

It follows that the disease did not take the form of one single attack of illness. It was intermittent. At one time Paul was prostrated by an attack, at another he was able for considerable exertion, both in travel and in preaching.

Second, the disease was such as to be naturally regarded by the people of Asia Minor with contempt or loathing; but, far from so regarding him, they received him as an angel of God. The verbal contrast is so pointed as to suggest that the disease was one which the people ordinarily regarded as due to the direct action and curse of God. We need not understand that it caused any loathsome external effect; but a sufferer was usually regarded as one under the Divine curse on account of some crime.

Now, the inscriptions show that one disease was regarded in Asia Minor as due to the immediate action of God. These show that, when a native of the country

prayed to the god or the goddess to avenge him on his enemy, he asked that his enemy should be "burnt up" with fever, "in which strength wastes away without any visible affection of a part of the body. This kind of disease was understood to be caused by fire sent from the world of death by direct act of the god, which consumed the inner life and spirit of the sufferer."¹ A full description of an attack of fever, with its recurring paroxysms and characteristic symptoms, is given in a late curse: "may he suffer fevers, chill, torments, pallors, sweatings, heats by day and by night."²

Every one who is familiar with the effect of the fevers that infest especially the south coasts of Asia Minor, but are found everywhere in the country, knows that they come in recurring attacks, which prostrate the sufferer for the time, and then, after exhausting themselves, pass off, leaving him very weak; that a common remedy familiar to all is change to the higher lands; and that, whenever any one who has once suffered has his strength severely taxed, physically or mentally, the old enemy prostrates him afresh, and makes him for a time incapable of work. Apart from the weakness, one of the most trying accompaniments is severe headache, like a hot bar thrust through the head, the "stake in the flesh."

Now, the tradition about Paul was, for some reason, far more closely concerned with his personal appearance and physical history than was the case with any other Apostle. This must undoubtedly be due to the immense personal influence that he exerted on Asia Minor, where the tradition had best chance of being preserved owing to the very early general adoption of the new religion in

¹ See *Expository Times*, Dec., 1898, p. 110; comp. Wunsch in *Corp. Inscr. Att.*, Appendix, p. xii.

² Wunsch, *Sethianische Verfluchungstafeln*, 1898, p. 7. These were found in Rome; but embody magic of indubitably oriental type and origin.

several parts of the country.¹ His personal appearance, his age at conversion and at death, are recorded in Asia Minor tradition, and, as I believe, with trustworthiness. The common opinion, current as early as the second century, was that the extreme physical pain, which he describes elsewhere as "the stake in the flesh," the accompaniment of his disease, was severe headache. Lightfoot rightly recognises that, if we give any weight at all to ancient opinion, we must follow this statement, which was ordinarily accepted in the second century, and which may confidently be taken as forming part of the Asia Minor tradition, continuously preserved from his own time, like the minute description of his face and figure.

When Paul was among the Galatians, this disease was "the thing that tried them in his body"; it tested the reality of their love for him and their respect for him: it constituted a temptation to regard him as a person cursed by God. But they stood the test; they resisted the temptation; and they regarded him as a messenger come from God.

XLIV. THE ALLEGORY OF HAGAR AND SARAH

(iv. 21-31).

This paragraph is one of the most difficult in the whole Epistle to understand aright; and it is the one which would probably outrage Jewish prejudice more than any other.

The children of Abraham are divided into two classes: the descendants of Sarah free, and the descendants of Hagar slave. The Jews, Sarah's sons, are described as the offspring of Hagar, because they, like Ishmael, are descendants by nature; the Gentile Christians are described

¹ The Phrygian saint of the second century, Avircius Marcellus, travelled "with Paul in his hands"; he mentions no other Apostle or teacher in his epitaph (*Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, ii. p. 723).

as the offspring of Sarah, because they, like Isaac, are descendants by promise of God.

It must be at once admitted that, if this passage were to be taken simply in its relation to the preceding and following parts of the Epistle, as rising spontaneously in Paul's mind in the sequence of his own philosophic argument, it would be unnecessarily insulting and offensive to the Jews, weak as an argument, and not likely to advance his purpose of changing the current of feeling among the Galatians.

Now Lightfoot's interpretation of verse 21 is, "Will ye not listen to the Law?"—explained by him thus, "Ye who vaunt your submission to the Law, listen while I read you a lesson out of the Law"—and if we follow this interpretation, we must regard the passage as arising in the free development of Paul's argument within his own mind.

The rival interpretation, adopted both in the Authorised and the Revised Version, "Do ye not hear the Law?" *i.e.* "Is not the Law constantly read to you?" (comp. *Acts* xv. 21; *2 Cor.* iii. 14),¹ must therefore be preferred. This leaves it quite open to take the passage as forced on Paul from the outside, *i.e.* as a reply to an argument either used in Galatia by his opponents (and reported to him by Timothy),² or employed in the letter which we hypothetically assume as having perhaps been sent by the Churches to Paul (§ XL.).

This opposition argument must have taken the following form: The Jews are the true sons of Abraham, descended by birth from Sarah, and granted to her by a special promise of God, after hope of offspring in the natural course had ceased; Gentile Christians cannot be regarded as in any way on an equal footing with the true sons, unless

¹ I quote *verbatim* Lightfoot's exposition of this interpretation. Zöckler's interpretation, "Do ye not obey the Law?" misses the real point of the passage. All three interpretations are grammatically possible.

² On the theory stated in § xxxix.

they comply with all the obligations imposed on the true sons. Further, this argument may perhaps have been united with the anti-Pauline view (so often referred to in the Epistle) that the Gentile Christians stood on an inferior platform, but could rise to the higher platform of perfection (iii. 3), as true sons, by accepting the Law and its prescribed ritual.

It may be doubted whether the Judaic emissaries in Galatia were prepared to go quite so far as this argument implies in the direction of admitting Gentiles to the full right of sons of Abraham. Hence it seems more probable that this argument was stated in a letter to Paul by the Churches, explaining their views and doubts.

Accordingly, the paragraph may perhaps be read best as quoting from a letter: "Tell me, you who express to me your desire¹ to come under the Law, do you not know what the Law says? Do you not hear it read regularly in your assembly? You say that the Jews are the true sons, and you are outsiders; and on this ground you justify your desire to come under the Law; but this reasoning is not supported by a correct understanding of the Scripture as contained in the Law. Hagar, the Arabian slave, and her son, the slave—when the allegory is properly interpreted—belong to the same category with the present Jerusalem and her children the Jews, all enslaved to the Law as it was delivered from the Arabian mountain. You, as free from the Law, inheriting through the free Diatheke of God, are classed to the heavenly Jerusalem, your true city and your true home,² of which all we Christians are the children.

¹ "Θέλονται, *desiring*, and not merely being willing": c. xii. 17. Westcott's note on Hebrews xiii. 18.

² The contrast between an earthly city, Derbe or Iconium, where one is a citizen according to the world, and the heavenly city, the real city of all Christians, is implicit here. Similarly it is implicit (and disregarded by most scholars) in the epitaph of Avircius Marcellus (*Cities and Bishoprics*, ii. p. 724).

Thus you, my brothers, are children of promise (not of mere natural, fleshly birth) like Isaac. You are persecuted by the fleshly children now, just as Isaac, the child of promise, was persecuted by the fleshly child, Ishmael of old. And, just as the slave child Ishmael was cast out and lost his inheritance, so now——¹ We Christians, all, Jew like me or Gentile like you, my brothers, are sons of the free woman, not of the slave woman."

Thus, as we see, Paul was not voluntarily dragging into his letter a gibe at the Jews. He was saying to the Galatians, "The view you state that the Jews are the true sons of Abraham, and that you ought to make yourselves like them, shows that you do not rightly read the Law. The passages to which you refer are to be interpreted allegorically, not verbally—by the spirit, not by the letter. Literally, the Jews are the sons of Sarah; but, in the spiritual interpretation, you are become the free woman Sarah's children, and the Jews are the sons of the slave woman."

This paragraph seems to assume as a fact of law and society in Galatia that the son of a slave mother by the master of the house is a slave. That was not the old Hebrew custom, for Ishmael, Dan, Asher, etc., are not described as of servile station in the Old Testament.² But it was both Greek and Roman custom; and it was also probably both Galatian and old native Anatolian custom, for Gallic and Phrygian fathers were in the habit of selling into slavery even their free-born children,³ and are not likely to have regarded the son of a slave mother as anything but a slave. Both in North and in South Galatia, therefore, the same custom probably existed.

¹ Paul does not express the analogy fully.

² In Mohammedan law such a son ennobles the slave mother.

³ See Mommsen in *Juristische Abhandlungen: Festgabe für G. Beseler*, 1885, p. 268, quoting Tacitus, *Ann.* iv. 72; Philostratus, *Vit. Apollon.* viii. 7, 12.

XLV. THE CONCLUSION (v. 1).

Paul now sums up the argument of chapters iii. and iv. in the brief conclusion: "It was with a view to our full freedom (and not for any new kind of slavery) that Christ has set us Christians free from the bondage of sin.¹ Stand firm, then, and do not submit yourselves anew to the yoke of slavery."

The rapid variation between "we" and "you" in the passage iv. 21-v. 1 is full of meaning. The MSS. vary a good deal on this point; but the preponderance of evidence is so clear that all the chief editors adopt the same text so far as that variation is concerned, and A.V. and R.V. agree with them therein.

At this point Paul would naturally proceed to the warnings set forth in v. 13 ff.; but he turns away for the moment to a digression, v. 2-12.

XLVI. PERSONAL RECAPITULATION (v. 2-12).

This paragraph is purely personal and parenthetical. The allusion to the yoke of bondage which the Galatians were about to put on themselves leads Paul to insist once more on the terrible danger of the step and the ruinous consequences that must follow from it. The paragraph is very closely akin to iii. 1-6.

You know, says Paul, that your salvation comes through faith. The proof that you have faith lies—in having faith. But, if you yield to their persuasion, and suffer yourselves to be circumcised, you cease to have faith in Christ, you cease to benefit by His grace, and Christ will no longer

¹ The marginal reading in R.V. (preferred by the American Revisers) is undoubtedly right. Lightfoot reads: "Sons of her who is free with the freedom with which Christ set us free. Stand firm, then, etc." It is difficult to sympathize with Lightfoot in discarding the text preferred by R.V., Tischendorf, Zöckler, B. Weiss, etc., and in saying that that text "is so difficult as to be almost unintelligible." A third kind of text in A.V.

profit you, as I protest and reiterate: in that case you put your trust in the Law, and you must trust to it alone, and be a slave to it in its entirety. In itself the act of circumcision has no effect; it is nought; but your accepting it now is a proof that you no longer trust to Christ, that you no longer have faith.

Lightfoot is, indubitably, right in taking the emphatic "I, I Paul"¹ as "an indirect refutation of calumnies." "I, Paul, who have myself preached circumcision forsooth, who say smooth things to please men, who season my doctrine to the taste of my hearers, I tell you, etc."

Verses 7-9. How has this awful change happened, when you were running the race so excellently? Who has had such influence over you? Who has bewitched you? I marvel that you are so inconsequent and inconsistent with yourselves (compare iii. 1). You may be sure that no person who has thus prevented your progress can be a messenger of God (as you once thought that I was). It is not a strong party that is acting thus; but if they once establish a footing among you, then, you know the proverb—*a little leaven!*

Verse 10. But Paul then goes on to express his firm confidence in the judgment and faith of the Galatians. They have been momentarily deceived, but they assuredly will not permanently entertain different views from those which they recently had. Thus the doubt and perplexity which he expressed, iv. 20, the apprehension lest his work among them had been in vain, iv. 11, are dissipated. He knows whom he is addressing; he sees into their soul; and, as he looks, his doubts about the issue disappear.

Verse 10. Punishment must follow: he that has troubled the Galatians has earned his reward, and must submit to it: he has perverted the Gospel of Christ (i. 7),

¹ Ἐγὼ Παῦλος is stronger than "I Paul"; to use ἐγὼ in Greek is emphatic, but to use "I" in English is necessary, and carries no emphasis.

and will pay the penalty, however great and important a position he occupies in the Church. This last expression favours Lipsius' view that a single Jew of some standing had come to Galatia and caused the whole trouble.

Verse 11. Being thus carried back to the same topic as in the opening paragraph, i. 6 ff.—the presence of the disturber—Paul glances, as in that passage, at the charge which had wounded him so deeply—viz., that in his conduct to Timothy (*Acts* xvi. 3) he had been a timeserver, shifting his principles to suit his surroundings, preaching circumcision to some, though he refused it to others. As for me, he says, if I preach it, why do they go on to persecute me? Of course, if I am preaching it, then the cross which so scandalizes them, the cross which is their stumbling-block, has been done away, and they have nothing to complain of in my preaching.

Does verse 10 point to punishment from man, and hint that the offender should be dealt with publicly by the Galatian Churches? Surely not. The judgment is left to the hand of God. Then in v. 12 Paul recurs to this thought of the punishment awaiting the guilty party. "I wish," he says, "that they who are turning your moral constitution¹ topsy-turvy would inflict the proper penalty on themselves, and cut themselves off.

In spite of the almost complete unanimity of the recent authorities that v. 12 refers to a different kind of self-inflicted injury, viz., mutilation such as was practised in the worship of the Phrygian goddess, I venture to recur to the rendering of the Authorised Version.² I doubt whether even in this point—the only one about which Paul shows real anger—he would have yielded so completely to mere ill-temper as to say what this favourite interpretation attributes to him. It is true that the ancient

¹ Ἀναστατούντες carries a political metaphor, as Lightfoot rightly sees.

² Printed by the Revised Version in text, with the other interpretation in the margin.

peoples, and many of the modern peoples in the same regions, resort to foul language when they express anger, in circumstances where Anglo-Saxons have recourse to profane language.¹ It would be mere affectation to try to deny or conceal that, on the current interpretation, Paul uses a piece of bad language in the ordinary style of the enraged Oriental, who, regardless of the utter unsuitability of the expression he employs, heaps insult on his enemy, animate or inanimate, man or brute, seeking only to be insulting, and all the better content the more thoroughly he attains this end.

There would be nothing suitable, nothing characteristic, nothing that adds to the force of the passage, in the act which, on the ordinary interpretation, Paul desires that this grave Jew of high standing should perform upon himself. It was expressly forbidden by the Law of Moses. The scornful expression would be a pure insult, as irrational as it is objectionable.

But the Authorised Version gives an excellent sense, adding distinctly to the force of the paragraph. The proper punishment for disturbing the Church was that the offender should be cut off like a useless member: and the wish is expressed that he would cut himself off.

But the objection is advanced that this sense cannot be justifiably elicited in Greek from ἀποκόπτεσθαι: the word in the middle voice is quoted only in the sense of "mutilate oneself," or "cut oneself (in mourning), *i.e.* mourn for."²

¹ The traveller in the East knows that the use of profane language, objectionable as it is, constitutes a really great step in civilization and refinement, compared with the unutterable hatefulness of the style of objurgation used by the angry Oriental. The same style was used in ancient times; and it is almost amusing to observe how, from ignorance of this fact, the commentators treat, for example, Catullus's objurgations against those whom he disliked as sober testimony to their moral character. Catullus would have said much the same about his *petorrita*, if it broke a wheel, as he says about his enemy, regardless of the meaninglessness of the expression.

² In the latter sense the simple κόπτεσθαι is usual: the force of ἀπό is lost in it.

The objection has good ground, but is, I think, not conclusive. The word *σκάνδαλον* in v. 11 suggests¹ to Paul the words of the Saviour (Mark ix. 43) *ἐὰν σκανδαλίση σε ἡ χεῖρ σου, ἀπόκοψον αὐτήν*.² He therefore continues in v. 12 the thought of v. 10, "I wish they would cut themselves off." If he presses further than was customary the use of the middle form of the verb, he is not out of harmony with the spirit of the middle voice, and he perhaps trusted to the Galatians also recognising the reference to the Saviour's words.

But those who maintain the customary interpretation must recognise frankly what is the character of the thought and language thus attributed to Paul, and should not try, with Lightfoot, to explain it away by saying that this mutilation "must at times have been mentioned by a Christian preacher." Certainly he must have sometimes mentioned it along with other enormities of the pagan ritual; but that would not justify Paul in expressing the hope and wish that a fellow-member of the Christian Church would voluntarily commit this crime upon himself. Dr. Sanday rightly sees that the expression is indefensible, and can only be regretted.³

W. M. RAMSAY.

¹ The fact that the word is used in a different relation in the one case and in the other furnishes no argument against the suggestion. In v. 10 the thought of the suitable punishment, severing from the Church which the offender has wronged, is in Paul's mind. In v. 11 the word *σκάνδαλον* comes in. The juxtaposition suggests that saying of Jesus in which *σκανδαλίω* is in juxtaposition with cutting off.

² Compare verse 45 (of the foot). Matt. xviii. 8 reports the same saying, but uses *ἐκκόπτειν* in place of *ἀποκόπτειν*. Paul thought of the saying in Mark's form.

³ I have not quoted so often as I should like his commentary (in which many things are put with admirable clearness), because the author has protested against its opinions being taken as his mature views so long after they were written.