

ARTICLE VII.

REMARKS ON RENDERINGS OF THE COMMON VERSION
(IN THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS).*Henrich Balch*

BY H. B. HACKETT, PROFESSOR IN NEWTON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

THE object in the following remarks is not to revise the translation of this epistle, in course or minutely; but to point out some of the more obvious changes, which are regarded by interpreters as due to the sense, or to a clearer representation of the sense, of the original text. It may not be out of place to take occasion, in a few instances, to uphold the received rendering against a different view of the meaning from that adopted in our English version. Some of the changes, in the corrected translation, it will be seen, are required by the progress in textual criticism which has taken place during the two hundred and fifty years since the earlier English versions were wrought over by the revisers of A. D. 1611. An attempt has been made, in the corrections suggested, to disturb the familiar phraseology of the English scriptures as little as possible. In what follows, the current translation of the passages to be examined is presented first; and the altered form is then given, with brief explanations. The Greek has been cited, to some extent; but the force of the remarks may not always be understood without referring to the Greek Testament.

CHAPTER I.

Verse 6. *I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ, unto another gospel* (ὄρω ταχέως μετατίθεσθε ἀπὸ τοῦ καλέσαντος ὑμᾶς ἐν χάριτι Χριστοῦ εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον). 'I marvel that ye are so soon removing from him that called you in the grace of Christ, unto a different gospel.' In this passage *μετατίθεσθε* means *are removing*, turning aside (lit. *transfer oneself*); and implies, first, that the change was voluntary on their part; and,

secondly, that the defection was not yet complete, but in progress, and might be arrested. This form, as middle, was in common use to denote the act of renouncing one set of views and feelings for another, or of passing from one political party or philosophical sect to another party or sect. For this usage, see Wetstein, *Nov. Test.* vol. II., p. 216, and Kypke, *Obs.*, vol. II., p. 273. The examples are abundant, and need not be adduced here. Hence the greater familiarity of Greek readers with this sense of the expression, and the manifest pertinence of the thought, require that we so understand it in this instance. The passive form, *are turned aside*, or removed, implies that they acted not so much from their own choice as from the instigation of others, and thus suggests an apology for their conduct. But such an exculpation is not only at variance with the general tone of the epistle, but especially out of place just here, at the outset of the discussion. The common version makes the present act a past one, and confounds the middle with the passive. 'In the grace of Christ' (*ἐν χάριτι Χριστοῦ*) denotes the medium through which God extends to men the blessings of the gospel. See Rom. iii. 24 – 26. The ground of the call, which makes the believer an heir of salvation, is found in the love of the Son who was sent, as well as of the Father who sent him. The other rendering, '*unto the grace*,' can be justified only as = *called you to be partakers in the grace*, etc., which is needlessly periphrastic. Besides, we have commonly not *ἐν*, but *εἰς* or *περί*, after this verb in speaking of the privileges to which Christians are called; see v. 13; 1 Cor. i. 9; 1 Thess. ii. 14; 1 Tim. vi. 12; 1 Pet. ii. 9, 21; v. 10. Again, we should translate *εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον*, *unto a different gospel*, i.e. *different* from that which he preached. The change of the pronouns (see *ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο* in the next verse) cannot be accidental, and the translation should notify the reader of the variation. Scholars agree in this force of *ἕτερον*, whether they express it by *another*, or *different*. Compare the use of *ἕτερον* in Mark xvi. 12 and Luke ix. 29.

Verse 8. *But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach*

any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you. 'But even if we, or an angel from heaven, should preach to you any other gospel contrary to that which we preached.' *Καὶ ἐάν* is *even if*; not *although*, which would be *ἐὰν καὶ*, or *εἰ καὶ* (compare Mark xiv. 29). See Klotz, *Devarius*, II., p. 519; and Hartung, *Lehre von den Partikeln*, I., p. 139. The supposition is viewed as one but remotely possible. The translation of *εὐαγγελίζεται* should mark the future contingency involved in *ἐάν* with the subjunctive. In *παρὶ δ' εὐηγγελισάμεθα*, the preposition has the stronger sense, and not the weaker, as denoting what is merely additional or supplementary. It is worth mentioning that, at the time of the Reformation, the Protestants contended for the latter meaning, and declared that those incurred the anathema pronounced in this place who insisted upon traditions, decrees of councils, and the like, in addition to the written word; while the Catholics replied that the passage forbids nothing except what can be shown to set aside or contravene the teaching of holy scripture. The aorist of the verb goes back to the time when Paul was among the Galatians.

Verse 9. *As we said before, . . . if any man preach any other gospel contrary to that which ye have received.* 'As we have said before (*προειρήκαμεν*) . . . if any one (*τις* only in the Greek) preaches to you any other gospel contrary to that which ye received.' Wiclif, Coverdale, and the authors of the Rheims version, render the perfect correctly here. I suppose the apostle to repeat the asseveration in the previous verse; but we must render the verbal form in the same way, if, according to others, we understand that he would recall a declaration made at the time of his last visit. As Ellicott suggests, we must change 'preach' to 'preaches,' in conformity with the different moods in the original. The apostle deals here with the concrete case, which had arisen among the Galatians. The aorist in *παρέλαβετε* refers to the definite time when the readers of the letter professed to believe.

Verse 10. *If I yet pleased men.* 'If I were still pleasing (*ἤρεσκον*) men.' We have here a marked instance of the con-

tinuative imperfect. The tentative sense, *was seeking to please*, is out of place here. The apostle, before his conversion, had actually gained as well as desired the applause of men; and εἰ ἔτι supposes the case of his doing over again what he had formerly done.

Verse 12. *For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it.* 'For I also (οὐδὲ ἐγώ, i. e. as little as the other apostles) did not receive it from man, nor was taught it.' Some would express the same contrast by *neither did I* any more than they. See Wieseler's remark (*Brief an die Galater*, p. 57), and Jelf's *Gram.* § 776, Obs. 5 (ed. 1861). See, also, the elaborate note in Buttmann, *Neutest. Sprachgebr.*, p. 315. The change of οὔτε to οὐδέ is unwarranted.

Verse 14. *And profited in the Jews' religion above many my equals.* 'And went forward in Judaism beyond many companions of the same age.' The etymology of προέκοπτον (*to strike or cut forward, make one's way by blows, press onward*) might seem to justify a stronger phrase; but usage weakened the meaning, and effaced nearly all trace of the original figure. Compare Luke ii. 52; Rom. xiii. 12; 2 Tim. ii. 16; iii. 9, 13. If we say '*profited*,' as in the common version (after Wiclif, the Genevan, and Rheims versions), we are led naturally to think of some superiority, on the part of Saul, as a scholar or teacher; whereas the participial clause which follows (περισσοτέρως . . . παραδόσεων) states in what field it was that he gained such pre-eminence. This rendering presupposes or favors the false view that Ἰουδαϊσμός denotes Jewish learning and theology. Tyndale and Cranmer, with a nearer approach to accuracy, say '*prevailed*.' Συνηλικιώτας which our translators render '*my equals*' (found here only in the N. Test., and rare in the classics, but no doubt = συνήλικες), denotes *those of the same age*, and especially those who at the same time live together, or associate with each other. See the examples in Wetstein, *Nov. Test.*, Vol. II. p. 217. All the lexicons give 'comrade' as one of the senses. The apostle refers in all probability to those near his own age, with whom he was brought into contact as fellow-pupils in the school of Gamaliel (παρὰ τοὺς πόδας Γα-

μαλιήλ πεπαιδευμένος, in Acts xxii. 3), who, from the nature of the case, must have been numerous (πολλούς), and earnestly devoted to the support of Judaism. He does not say (be it observed) that he surpassed many of his contemporaries of that class, as if *some* of them might have excelled him, but that among his many youthful associates at that period, he had absolutely no superior in his fanatical zeal for the law. If now we say "many equals" simply (as in the common version), one might be led to think of nothing more than a parity of rank among them; or (which is a marginal reading, and nearer the truth) if we say "equals in years," we might think of the age as the only respect in which they were equal, without the idea of a personal association. 'The opinion entertained by many critics, that πολλούς συνηλικιωτάς were all the Jews in Palestine during the apostle's youth, his contemporaries in that wider sense, can not well be correct; first, because the construction would naturally have been πολλούς τῶν συνηλικιωτῶν; and secondly, because the statement merely that he surpassed many of his countrymen, or many countrymen (if so hard an expression could be used), would fall short both of what was true in the case, and what his argument would make it so pertinent that he should say. Our version depends here on the Rheims (A. D. 1582). It may be well, therefore, to replace essentially the vernacular rendering of the earlier periods. Tyndale, Cranmer, the Bishops' Bible (1584), and the Genevan have *many of my companions*, and Wiclif, *many of myn eune eldis*, probably with the same import.

Verse 18. *I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter.* 'I went up to Jerusalem to become acquainted with Cephas.' There is no doubt here as to the meaning of *ἱστορήσαι*. It is neither simply = *ἰδεῖν*, *to see*, nor *ἐπισκέψασθαι*, *to visit*; but implies, in addition to what these words express, that the parties met and became known to each other for the first time. Though used of things more commonly, it could be applied to a person also; as in Joseph. *Jud. Bel.* VI., 1, 8, *οὐκ ἄσημος ὦν ἀνὴρ δὲ ἐγὼ κατ' ἐκείνον ἱστόρησα τὸν πόλεμον*. See Dr. Robinson's *N. T. Lex.* s. v. The best authorities

read *Κηφᾶν* in this verse, and not *Πέτρον*. Here at Jerusalem, on Aramaean ground, Paul had often heard that name applied to Peter; and it is perfectly natural that the name should come back to him, as he recalls the events of that occasion. It is not improbable that in foreign lands the Judaizers adhered tenaciously to the Aramaic name (see 1 Cor. i. 12), and hence it may be that Peter himself, in his epistles, uses the Greek form as a silent protest against them.

Verse 23. *But they had heard only that he which persecuted us.* 'But they were only hearing that he who persecuted us.' Luther's version agrees here with the English. The idea is not, however, that '*they had heard,*' but (*ἀκούοντες ἤσαν*) *were only hearing* from time to time. All that they knew of their former persecutor, rumor brought to their ears. The participle is emphatic, as opposed to the idea of any personal acquaintance with him.

CHAPTER II.

Verse 3. *But neither Titus, who was with me.* 'But not even Titus.' 'Ἄλλ' οὐδέ is a true reading. Paul's views might have been deemed erroneous or imperfect, or some of his measures objectionable; *but*, so far from incurring any such censure, *not even Titus*, who stood before them as an impersonation, so to speak, of the whole difficulty, was *compelled to be circumcised*. Being of heathen parentage, his submission to the rite under other circumstances might have been thought advisable, as a matter of expediency (as in the case of Timothy, see Acts xvi. 3); but now, when the Judaistic party (see the next verse) would have misunderstood or perverted the act as a sanctioning of their doctrine that men must be circumcised in order to be saved (Acts xv. 1), even that other and lower view of the rite was not urged as a reason for circumcising Titus. For the force of *οὐδέ* compare Matt. xxvi. 29; Luke xxiii. 15; Acts xix. 2.

Verse 4. *And that because of false brethren.* 'And that because of the false brethren.' The article (*τοῦς*) before

ψευδαδέλφους points out the class as notorious for the part which they acted. The connection with the preceding verb may be obscure; but, on the whole, our version, which some would alter here, has dealt fairly with the case. According to the best view, the connective δέ has its iterative use here, and repeats ἡναγκάσθη περιμηθῆναι, as negatived by οὐδέ. "He was not, I say, compelled to be circumcised by the other apostles; and the reason was, that there was a party in the church who demanded it on grounds utterly subversive of the gospel as a system of grace." See Acts xv. 5. Compare δέ in Rom. iii. 22, and Philip. ii. 8. There are other views of the construction and the sense; but there is no one which the later exegesis supports to a greater extent than the current one of the English versions (from Tyndale and perhaps Wiclif, onward). For a very full discussion of the point see Fritzsche, *Opusc. Academ.*, p. 180 sq. Winer (*Gram.*, § 63, I. 1) favors Luther's version, and would begin a new sentence here. Buttmann (*Neutest. Sprachgebr.*, p. 329) is undecided.

Verse 5. *To whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour.* 'To whom we yielded the subjection (εἴξαμεν τῇ ὑποταγῇ), no, not for an hour.' Our translators make τῇ ὑποταγῇ almost a tautological repetition of εἴξαμεν. It is the *subjection* demanded in this matter of circumcision which is meant; it is the emphasized word, therefore, and forms the *punctum saliens* of the verse.

Verse 6. *But of those who seemed to be somewhat.* 'But from those reputed to be something' (ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναι τι). It is difficult to separate from the expression "who seemed to be somewhat" the idea of a "covert irony" on the part of Paul, with respect to the justice of the reputation which the three apostles (see v. 9) enjoyed. See Trench, *Authorized Version*, p. 185. The Greek affords no ground for such a reflection on his impartiality.

Verse 8. *For he that wrought effectually in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty in me toward the Gentiles.* 'For he that wrought for Peter in behalf of the apostleship of the circumcision (ὁ ἐνεργήσας

Πετρῷ εἰς ἀποστολήν) wrought also for me in behalf of the Gentiles.' The dative Πετρῷ, and so ἐμοί, is the dative of the person for whom, and not that of the sphere in which, the act was performed. With the latter meaning, the ἐν in ἐνεργήσας should be repeated before the dative, as in iii. 5; 2 Cor. iv. 12; Philip. ii. 13, etc. The translation (εἰς ἀποστολήν), *to the apostleship*, limits the declaration incorrectly to the appointment to that office, and *towards the apostleship* (as some prefer) is needlessly indefinite. The idea is that God (ὁ ἐνεργήσας, see 1 Cor. xii. 6; Phil. ii. 13) exerted his mighty power to qualify his servants for their work, and to make them successful in it. Further, our English version interpolates 'the same' as the subject of ἐνήργησε; as if the question was not whether Paul had the same evidence of his apostleship as Peter had, but whether the evidence in the two cases came from the same source. The idea is that God who accredited the commission of the one, accredited that of the other.

Verse 11. *But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed.* 'But when Cephas came to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was blamed.' The external evidence demands Κηφᾶς, instead of the received Πέτρος. See the testimonies in Tischendorf. The gerundial force which our version (Vulg. *reprehensibilis*) ascribes to the participle (κατεγνωσμένος) is incorrect. Nearly all critics discard now this sense. Winer notices the error in his *Gram.*, § 45, 1 (p. 307). See Ellicott's note *in loc.*, and Robinson's *New Test. Lex.*, s. v. The traditional incorrect translation is confessedly less obscure than the correct one. *How* or by *whom* was Peter blamed? The answers are various: by his own conscience (Rückert); by his previous conduct (Windischmann); in the sight of God (Ewald); by the Gentile converts (Wieseler); by the better part of the Jews and Gentiles (Ellicott). The meaning, in any event, is not that Paul censured Peter simply because others had done so, but that he censured him with good reason because he was so palpably in the wrong as to be already condemned (as the case may be)

by the verdict of his own conscience, or by the voice of those who were still faithful. The object was to show how greatly Peter had gone astray, and not how excusable it was in Paul to expose the error.

Verse 14. *I said unto Peter before them all.* 'I said to Peter in the presence of all.' Of course ἔμπροσθεν is local here, as in Matt. v. 16; vi. 1, etc. 'Before all' in the common version, might suggest that Paul singled out Peter as the object of his censure, instead of others who were guilty of the same offence. We are to omit '*them*' in italics, as wholly gratuitous.

Verse 18. *For if I build again the things which I destroyed, I make myself a transgressor.* 'For if the things which I pulled down, these I build up again, I make myself a transgressor.' The architectural figure in κατέλυσα and οἰκοδομῶ (see Matt. xxvi. 61; xxvii. 40; Mark xiv. 58, etc.) should be brought out in the translation of one verb as well as the other. Since the demonstrative ταῦτα repeats ἃ, the former is emphatic certainly, whether ἐμαντόν has or has not an antithetic relation to Χριστός in v. 17. The order in English should preserve that emphasis. The meaning presents itself then more clearly to the mind of the reader. In the preceding verse the apostle repels with indignation (μὴ γένοιτο) the idea that Christ can be represented as the abettor of sin. It is not so, he affirms here anew; for (γάρ) instead of having been led to do wrong by the Saviour's requiring us to give up the law, we do wrong by the opposite course, to wit, in going back to the law after having been taught to renounce it.

Verse 19. *For I through the law am dead to the law.* 'For I through the law died to the law.' The error is that of disregarding the tense of the verb (ἀπέθανον). The apostle is not setting forth his present state as such, but referring to an effect of the law which at a certain time changed his relation to it as a ground of reliance; viz., that of its having led him to see the deficiency of his own righteousness, and his need of some other way of acceptance and sanctification; see iii. 19 sq., and Rom. vii. 6 sq. Thus

the force of γάρ, as justifying what is said in the previous verse, becomes evident. "The wrong step (κατέλυσσ-παραβάνην ἐμαυτὸν συνίστημι) is taken, I say, when we reassert the obligation of the law (οἰκοδομῶ); for (γάρ) we then act at variance with the proper office and effect of the law itself, which should be our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ."

Verse 20. *I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.* 'I have been crucified with Christ; yet I live no longer, but Christ liveth in me.' The perfect (συνεσταύρωμαι) is employed here, because the apostle would evidently derive his present state as *being* crucified from his union with Christ, as *having been* himself crucified when Christ suffered on the cross, "the just for the unjust." Again, συνεσταύρωμαι is simply the negative side of θεῶ ζήσω in v. 19; for dying with Christ, in the Christian psychology, is dying unto sin, and consequently is inseparable from rising again to a new spiritual life (Rom. vi. 4). So that δέ after ζῶ is meant to oppose the apostle's living unto God (of which the intervening συνεσταύρωμαι states merely the privative ground) to the idea that Paul himself, in his natural character (ἐγώ = ὁ παλαιὸς αὐτοῦ ἄνθρωπος in Rom. vi. 6), was or could be, in any sense, the author or sustainer of this new life, for which he was indebted to his participation in Christ's death. Hence one other change is required here. The English version would lead us to put a comma after δέ in the text, as well as after ἐγώ. The objections to this are, that there is no ἀλλά before οὐκέτι, as that view assumes, and that it weakens the opposition between ἐγώ and Χριστός, if Paul must be understood to say, as it were even hastily, that he had life, and then must correct himself, and deny or modify that assertion. Point, therefore, ζῶ σὲ οὐκέτι ἐγώ, ζῆ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός. Wiclif follows the right punctuation; but Tyndale breaks up the clause, as in the current version. Nearly all scholars agree in the necessity of this correction. So Lachmann, Winer, Schott, Hahn, Rückert, Usteri, Matthies, Tischendorf, B. Crusius, De Wette, Meyer, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, Conybeare, Ellicott, Alford.

Verse 21. *I do not frustrate the grace of God; for if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain.* 'I do not set aside the grace of God; for if there be righteousness through the law, then Christ died without cause.' The sense of ἀθετῶ is *set aside*, render superfluous (compare Mark vii. 9), rather than *frustrate*. The argument is not that Peter's theory (i. e. the one upheld by his conduct) defeated the end of Christ's death, but that it made his death unnecessary. On the contrary, Paul's system recognized the gospel as the only method of man's salvation, and thus honored the wisdom and grace of which it is the evidence and fruit. We must change, also, '*is dead*' (ἀπέθανεν), to *died*, i. e. when Christ yielded up his life on the cross. The question between Peter and Paul was not in any sense whether Christ was dead or still living, but whether the condition of men demanded the sacrifice of his death. Hence follows so pertinently δωρεάν, *without cause*, as in John xv. 25 (ἐμίσησάν με δωρεάν); lit. *giftwise*, i. e. gratuitously, for nothing. See Tittmann, *de Synon. in N. T.*, p. 161. Chrysostom says: περιττὸς ὁ τοῦ Χριστοῦ θάνατος. If '*in vain*,' therefore, be understood to mean *without effect*, it misleads the reader.

CHAPTER III.

Verse 1. The words τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πείθεσθαι after ἐβάσκατε, are wanting in all the later critical editions, or are marked as spurious. They express an appropriate meaning, but have been transferred undoubtedly to this place from ~~ver.~~ 7. See Green's *Developed Criticism*, p. 146, and the digest of readings in Tischendorf, Meyer, Wieseler, and others. Hence the corresponding words in our version, '*that ye should not obey the truth*,' must be dropped from an amended translation. We pass over here the several questions relating to the sense of προεγράφη. It appears to us that our version is correct, as opposed to those who would connect ἐν ὑμῖν with the verb: *was evidently set forth among you* (which would be so unnecessary after οἷς κατ' ὀφθαλμούς), instead of joining it with the emphasized ἐσταυρωμένος,

having been crucified among you. The apostle would bring home to them yet more closely the scene of the tragic occurrence. It was among the Galatians, in the midst of themselves, that the cross with its dying victim had been reared, as it were, anew. Some critics would reject ἐν ὑμῖν, but against the probability that the apparently superfluous expression would be omitted rather than inserted. Tischendorf, Meyer, Ellicott, Wordsworth, decide that we should retain it. See the Table in Wieseler's *Appendix*.

Verse 8. *And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith.* 'And the scripture, foreseeing that God justifies the heathen (or Gentiles) through faith.' The Greek verb here (δικαιοῖ) is present, because it sets forth the divine plan of justification as an abiding fact or principle. See Winer, *Gram.* § 40, 2. Besides, as Meyer remarks, the foreseen or predicted time (προϊδούσα) was the present Christian time.

Verse 15. *Though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth or addeth thereto.* 'If a covenant has been confirmed, though it be a man's, no one sets it aside, or adds thereto.' The Greek sentence is involved, and may be recast in the translation for the sake of greater perspicuity. It is arbitrary to limit the act of ἀθετεῖ (see the use in ii. 21) to a part of the object (διαθήκην), instead of the whole, i. e. *sets aside* something from the compact. The idea, on the contrary, partakes of the nature of the argument *a minore ad majus*: the parties are bound by the compact after ratification, so as not only to have no right to break it up altogether (ἀθετεῖ), but not even to add new conditions (ἐπιδιαράσσειν), which would interfere in any way with the original purpose.

Verse 17. *And this I say, That the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, etc.* 'But this I say, that a covenant which has been confirmed before of God unto Christ,' etc. Instead of '*the covenant*' (the article is wanting in the Greek), we should say *a covenant*, i. e. one which as the apostle proceeds to mention, has a certain characteristic. If we retain εἰς Χριστόν, we must translate *unto*

Christ, i. e. in his character as the head and representative of the true seed (τῷ σπέρματι ὃς ἐστὶ Χριστός in v. 16), to whom, in that sense, were guaranteed (προκεκυρωμένην) the blessings of the mode of justification (διαθήκη), of which Abraham was the example. See Rom. iv. 16. But the genuineness of the expression is uncertain. The oldest witnesses (see Table in Wieseler's *Appendix*) testify against it. Griesbach, Lachmann, and Tischendorf discard it. Some others, as Ewald, Wieseler, Wordsworth, argue for it, but with doubtful success. Our translators, in this same verse, have 'cannot disannul' for οὐκ ἀκυροῖ, *does not disannul*. The unnecessary interpolation was taken from the Geneva version.

Verse 19. *Ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator.* 'Having been ordained (διαταγείς) through angels (δι' ἀγγέλων) by the hand of a mediator.' That is, ordained on the part of God as the legislator, and *through angels* as the medium of the promulgation; compare ὁ δι' ἀγγέλων λαλεθεὶς λόγος in Heb. ii. 2, and εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων in Acts vii. 53. Ἐν χειρὶ (= διὰ χειρός) *in the hand*, stands simply for יָד (see Lev. viii. 36; xxvi. 46; Numb. iv. 38, etc. in LXX. and Hebrew), and describes the agency or ministry of Moses (the mediator intended here) in his character as *internunciatus* or messenger between Jehovah and the people at the giving of the law (ὁ γενόμενος ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ μετὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου ἐν τῷ ὄρει Σινᾶ καὶ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν in Acts vii. 38). The common rendering '*in the hand*,' would more naturally signify that the law was under the supervision and control of the mediator. Unfounded remarks have often been made on the passage, with that view of the meaning.

Verse 20. *Now, a mediator is not a mediator of one; but God is one.* 'Now, the mediator is not of one; but God is one.' The common version borrows the italicised *mediator* (see the English Bible) from the Geneva version. We render the passage as it stands in Wiclif, Tyndale, Craumer, and others, except the obvious correction of the article. Whether ὁ μεσίτης means *the mediator*, according to the idea of the office or *the one* in a given instance (these are the only opinions), we must make the expression definite. In a

sentence of such extreme obscurity, it is desirable to adhere as closely as possible to the original. As long ago as 1829, Winer reckoned up here two hundred and fifty interpretations. Wieseler, the latest German commentator, says that the number is now three hundred. He devotes sixteen ample pages to a renewed discussion of the meaning. He inserts an extensive list of the monographs and articles which have been written on the passage. Yet none of these diverse explanations rest upon any uncertainty of the text, or (unless we confound paraphrase and translation) admit of a different representation in English.

Verse 22. *But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.* ‘But the scripture shut up all under sin, that the promise by faith in Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.’ We copy Meyer’s note here, which will justify the translation. “What God has done (see Rom. iii. 9–19), since it is testified or recorded in scripture, is represented as an act of scripture which the latter has performed by a declaration of its testimony. Scripture, i. e. (as viewed apart from its personification) God, according to the testimony of scripture, *has brought all into custody* under sin, i. e. has put all, without exception, into the relation of bondage, in which sin as a power that tyrannizes over them (compare Rom. iii. 9), holds them, as it were, locked up under bolts and bars. The *συνέκλεισεν* placed first has the emphasis, *shut up*, so that the idea of freedom, i. e. the attainment of the *δικαιοσύνη* is out of the question. But *συνέκλεισεν* does not denote shut up *together, with one another*, as Bengel, Usteri, and some others think (also not in Rom. xi. 32), against which it is conclusive that the term is very often used where *one* only, not one with others, *is shut up* (see Ps. xxxi. 9; Polyb. 11. 2, 10, etc.); but *σύν* corresponds to the idea of a *complete* imprisonment, in which the captive is held utterly and altogether by the restraints imposed on him.” It may be added that some would connect *ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* with *δοθῆ* rather than *ἡ ἐπαγγελία*; and in that case it would be clearer in

English to put 'by faith in Jesus Christ,' after 'might be given.' But what Paul means probably is that the attainment of the promised inheritance (*κληρονομία* being the object of *ἐπαγγελία*) depends, not on faith in general (as the Judaizers might in some sort admit), but more specifically *faith in Jesus Christ*; and hence the apostle, in aiming to exclude that error, must conjoin the *ἐπαγγελία* and *ἐκ πίστεως*, and then after *δοθῆ* limit the blessings to the persons who fulfil the condition (*τοῖς πιστεύουσιν*). With this view, our version is correct.

Verse 28. *There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female.* 'There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is no male and female.' The connective in the last clause is *καί*, but *οὐδέ* in the other cases. Perhaps the mode of expression merely adjusts itself to the familiar *אין אדם אחד* in Gen. i. 27. The same combination is found in Matt. xix. 4 and Mark x. 6. Others seek for a deeper principle. The alterable social distinctions are separated from each other, the natural unalterable one is left undivided (Alford, Ellicott). At all events there is no reason why the English should not conform to the Greek. The gender is neuter (*ἄρσεν, θῆλυ*), as the only one which excludes the abolished distinction. The difference between the Greek and the English idiom makes it impossible to transfer this peculiarity.