

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

his perfecting. The object in the New Testament was the salvation of the sinner, that, on his repentance, his soul might be saved in the day of the Lord and have infinite blessings. In the Old Testament, when Job has undergone his godly discipline, the Lord accepts Job, as He will accept every true penitent, and blesses his latter end more than his beginning. In this way the comparison between the story of Job and the directions of St. Paul to the Corinthian Church can be drawn out. The resemblance, of course, is not exact; just as type and anti-type never exactly correspond. But enough has surely been said to show that there is apparently some connection between St. Paul's mode of dealing with the open transgressors of his time and the mode of action in the heavenly Court as depicted in the Book of Job.

HENRY A. REDPATH.

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

XXIV. GREEK LAW IN GALATIAN CITIES.

IN the preceding section we noticed that Paul assumes among his Galatian readers familiarity with a certain system and state of legal procedure. They are expected to catch at once the sense of an allusion to the identity and equivalence of the ideas Adoption and Heirship. There must therefore have existed around them in actual practice a system of law, according to which an heir was called a son in ordinary language and usage. To what part of Asia Minor does this fact point?

The mere fact that a regular testamentary system is implied proves that the old native condition of society had been replaced in the Galatian territory by a western civilization: the system of wills and will-making, wherever

it is traceable at that period, was derived either from Greece or from Rome.¹ This consideration shuts out those parts of Asia Minor where there is reason to think that the native Anatolian society still continued almost wholly free from admixture of western manners. Such parts were, *e.g.*, Cappadocia, inner Pontus (*i.e.* Galatic Pontus and Cappadocic Pontus), Cilicia Tracheia, and, in general, all the country districts—as distinguished from the cities—over almost the whole of Asia Minor (except perhaps the Ægean coast-lands, where even the rustics may perhaps have been to a certain extent Græcized at an early time). Western manners and ideas were confined to the cities, and hardly penetrated into the rustic parts until they were carried there by Christianity. Paul, therefore, must have been addressing churches situated in the cities, not in the rural portions of Asia Minor.

Again, Roman manners had not been superimposed directly on native ways among the people whom Paul addressed. They were familiar with Greek rather than with Roman procedure; and Paul's illustration is drawn from Greek legal expression. It is therefore obvious that, as Greek law would not be introduced after the Romans had occupied the country, there must have been a period before the Roman conquest when Greek law ruled in the Galatic territory.

Such would be the case with the country ruled by the Seleucid, or the Pergamenian, or the Bithynian kings. All of them, including even the Bithynian princes, had, beyond a doubt, established the Greek principles of society and law in their dominions. These principles, of course, were pretty much confined to the cities, and did not affect the rural population. But in these countries it is clear

¹ The excellent paper of Dr. W. E. Ball, already quoted, suffers from the assumption that a system of will-making must have been learned from Rome. He forgot Greece. See *Contemporary Review*, Aug., 1891, p. 278.

from the inscriptions that the cities possessed an organized municipal government of the Greek type, cultivated Greek manners and education, and used the Greek language.

The Pontic and Cappadocian kings are more doubtful; but, in all probability, Greek civilization was spread very little by their influence in their dominions. It is true that Greek was spoken at their courts to a certain (or uncertain) extent, and their coins bore Greek legends, but hardly the slightest trace of Greek city organization, except in the Greek colonies of the coast, can be detected dating from their time. Amasia is called a city by Strabo (about A.D. 19), and a *polis* may probably be understood to have enjoyed something of a Greek organization; but this was probably due rather to the natural expansion of Greek manners and trade than to the intention of any Mithridates. Similarly, in Cappadocia, Mazaka and Tyana are called cities by Strabo.

But as to Galatia Proper, the country of the Gauls, the case is almost free from doubt. The sketch of Galatian administration drawn by Strabo as existing before the Roman conquest is purely Gallic, and shows not a trace of the Greek character. Even Ancyra, the Galatian capital, he speaks about as a "fortress" (*φρούριον*), avoiding the title *polis*. So far as natural probability and formal evidence go, we must say that in Galatia Roman principles of organization were superinduced directly on the Gallic social customs without the intervention of a period of Greek society and law.

The only time during which any attempt to introduce Greek law into Galatia can possibly be looked for is during the reign of Amyntas, 37-25 B.C. But Amyntas was a dependent and creature of Rome; he was intended to prepare the country for absorption by Rome; and his reign was spent in making conquests and waging wars rather than in spreading Greek among the Gauls.

Naturally, even in North Galatia, Greek trade had probably spread Greek manners to some degree in the towns, but none of them except Pessinus¹ seems to have any Greek municipal organization. The whole evidence, such as it is, points to the view that the Græco-Roman constitution was first imparted to them under Roman government. It is the natural and probable view that the character of North-Galatian institutions was more like the condition of Roman Gaul than that of the surrounding Asiatic districts. Hence Galatia Proper long continued to hold a unique position in Asia; and, as we see in Basil of Cæsarea and Gregory of Nyssa,² the Galatians were disliked and despised by their neighbours as being rude, *i.e.* less Greek than the other nations. Ancyra was one of the greatest and most splendid cities of Asia Minor, but it seems to have been far more western and Roman than the cities of Asia. The evidence of Jerome, who recognised the Gallic dialect spoken in North Galatia as similar to that spoken among the Treveri, is one of those conclusive pieces of evidence which cannot be eluded or minimized. The only way open to those who refuse to accept the necessary inference from it is to say that Jerome deserves no credit, and to treat his statement as a blunder or a falsehood; but this unscientific and "barbarian" method of treating historical evidence will probably not be persisted in, since Mommsen has accepted and justified Jerome's testimony.

A writer who had lived among the Galatians would not be likely to draw his illustrations from Greek law, but from

¹ Strabo calls Pessinus an *emporion* and a *polis*; but any municipal organization that existed in the town would be due to its partial freedom from Gallic rule. Strabo describes it as ruled formerly after the Anatolian fashion by priest-dynasts: in his own time the priests had lost much of their power, and we may suppose that Greek and Gallic fashions had both come in alongside of the native. Half of the priests at this late time were Gauls, and half, presumably, of the old families (see art. *Galatia* in Hastings' *Dict. Bib.*, and Körte in *Philolog. Wochenschrift*, 1898, p. 3).

² See *Histor. Geogr. of Asia Minor*, p. 288, and Basil, *Ep.* 207, 1.

Roman law ; and the Roman law that was known in Galatia must have been that which was current in the period after the province was constituted, B.C. 25.

From this point of view, as from every other, we find that the Epistle was not addressed to a people of Gallic origin, but to the cities of Southern Galatia, Antiocheia, the Seleucid foundation, and the neighbouring cities, ruled for a century by the Greek kings, lying on one of the main thoroughfares of Greek trade, and exposed to Greek influence almost continuously after the conquest by Alexander the Great.¹ It is indeed probable (as I believe, though no one else as yet has expressed the opinion) that the Galatian chiefs, and thereafter the Pontic kings, ruled Iconium in the latter part of the second and the early part of the first century B.C. ; but Greek customs, once established, were too vigorous to yield to barbarism, and were maintained by the trading connexion.

XXV. THE METAPHOR IN ROMANS IV. 11.

The objection will, perhaps, be made that in the Epistle to the Romans there occurs the same idea, that the common possession of faith constitutes a relationship of father and sons between Abraham and the Gentile Christians. Hence it may be argued that, if the idea could be expressed to a people who lived in Rome, its statement to the Galatians does not imply that they lived under Greek law.

But the analogy between the language of *Galatians* and *Romans* in this point is only apparent ; and the difference between them furnishes a conclusive proof of our case.

Paul has to explain the same idea in both letters ; but he does it in different ways and by different illustrations. To the Galatians he says, Your possession of Abraham's property proves that you are his sons. To the Romans he

¹ Even in the time of Xenophon, Iconium was a *polis*, Anab. I. 2, 19.

says, Abraham's possession of the same quality that you possess fits him to be your father; and "circumcision was given to Abraham, like a seal affixed to a document; the reason being that he might be the spiritual father alike of two divergent classes—believing Gentiles and believing Jews."¹

The two expressions are only different metaphors to express the same fact; but the metaphor in each case is chosen to suit the reader—for the Galatians, a metaphor founded on Greek law; for the Romans, a metaphor founded on the customary usage of the word *pater*. Both in law and in common language *pater* in Rome had a much wider sense than "father" in English: the *pater* is the chief, the lord, the master, the leader. Æneas is the *pater* of all his followers. He who has the proper qualifications becomes the *pater* of all to whom his qualifications constitute him a guide and leader and protector.

XXVI. Οἱ ἐκ πίστεως.

In this phrase and the opposite, οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς, we have two remarkable expressions, which we can trace in their genesis, until they gradually harden almost into technical terms and badges of two opposite parties. In fact, that is entirely the case with οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς in *Acts* xi. 2, where a long history is concentrated in a phrase.

The following words are practically only an expansion and re-expression, after it has passed through the medium of my own mind, of a letter, which Dr. Gifford kindly sent in answer to my questions, reviewing the stages of the development of the two phrases.

The phrase ἐκ πίστεως is used only once in the Septuagint—*Habakkuk* ii. 4—"The just shall live by his faith." Paul took this saying, connected it with *Genesis* xv. 6—

¹ Sanday and Headlam, p. 106.

“Abraham believed in the Lord, and He counted it to him for righteousness”—and founded on the two his doctrine of the righteousness that is of faith—*δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ πίστεως*.

It is plain that Paul had used these two sayings in his former preaching to the Galatians, for they are quoted as familiar truths, whose origin does not need to be formally mentioned, iii. 6–11. His doctrine, therefore, must have been explicitly set forth to them orally, and in the letter was merely recalled to their memory: faith is the source or root in man of righteousness and of life, which is an expression from a different point of view of the principle studied in Section XXII., that the belief in Christ becomes a life-giving power, ruling the nature of him who feels it.

Comparing the language of the whole passage, beginning ii. 15, we see that *οἱ ἐκ πίστεως* is an abbreviated expression equivalent to *οἱ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιωθέντες*; see ii. 16, *ἵνα δικαιωθῶμεν ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου*; iii. 2, *ἐξ ἔργων νόμου τὸ πνεῦμα ἐλάβετε ἢ ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως*; iii. 8, *ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοὶ τὰ ἔθνη ὁ θεός*. Already the phrase seems to have a stereotyped form, and to imply a suppressed thought with which the readers were familiar. Paul, therefore, in his teaching to the Galatians, must already have insisted on the distinction *ἐκ πίστεως* and *ἐξ ἔργων νόμου* (or *ἐκ περιτομῆς*); and hence he could use such concise and pregnant language to those who already had heard, when he desired to revivify in their mind the early lessons.¹

But in writing to the Roman Church, Paul was addressing a body of Christians who had never listened (except a few individuals) to his doctrine; and he therefore explained his meaning more fully to them. In that letter we read what was the kind of teaching which Paul in his preaching set before the Galatians, and which he assumes

¹ See above.

in his Epistle as familiar to them.¹ His Gospel was evidently exactly the same, and quite as fully thought out in Galatia in A.D. 47-48, as in Corinth in January or February A.D. 57. He saw the truth at his conversion at once and for ever. Thereafter there was no further progress or development in his Gospel, though there was undoubtedly a great development on the practical side, as regards the way and the accompaniments by which the Gospel was to be spread through the Gentile world, to which he was from the first commissioned to preach it.

In *Romans* i. 17, Paul declares that the revelation in man of "the righteousness of God begins from faith and leads on to fuller faith," ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν, and he quotes *Habakkuk* ii. 4.

It is noteworthy that He gives the last words as a formal quotation, when writing to those who had not heard his teaching; but to the Galatians He uses them as a familiar axiom.

Faith, then, is the beginning and the end of man's part in the reception of the righteousness of God; and this is emphasized in iii. 21-22, "apart from the law righteousness hath been manifested," and iii. 28, "a man is justified by faith apart from the works of the Law."

Paul had always in mind the idea of his opponents that faith was only one element in the reception of righteousness, that "apart from the Law righteousness is not fully manifested," that "a man is justified fully by faith conjoined with the works of the Law." Against that view Paul always appealed to the authority "by works of Law shall no flesh be justified" (*Gal.* ii. 16, *Rom.* iii. 20.) The Law is a preliminary, aiding to produce that profound conviction of sin, which is a necessary step towards justification, because it exhibits so clearly to man his own sin.

¹ *Romans* is thus on a logical earlier stage than *Galatians*, but the circumstances show that logical priority does not (as some scholars assume) imply chronological priority.

Another pair of antithetical phrases is *διὰ πίστεως* and *διὰ νόμου* (*Gal.* ii. 16, 19, *Rom.* iii. 25, 30). This seems to indicate the indispensable condition or means for the continued operation of the cause or source.

The exact point in dispute between Paul and the Judaizing Christians must be kept in mind. Both sides were Christians. Both held that belief in Christ was indispensable to salvation, that righteousness in man could not exist without faith. But the Judaizers held that the Law and Circumcision were also indispensable to at least the fullest stage of righteousness. They were the party of believers who set the Law alongside of faith; and it would appear from *Galatians* ii. 16 that Paul represents His opponents' view as being that in the Jew righteousness came from works of Law through (*i.e.* on condition of) faith, *ἐξ ἔργων νόμου διὰ πίστεως*. Hence the Judaistic part of the Christians were *οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς πιστοί*, as they are called in *Acts* x. 45.¹

In regard to the Gentiles the view of Paul's opponents was expressed in the form that righteousness in them comes *ἐκ πίστεως διὰ νόμου*.

In both cases alike Paul maintained the origin *ἐκ πίστεως καὶ διὰ πίστεως*. His formula agrees always with half of theirs; and when he contradicts them, he only contradicts the discrepant half of their formula. Hence we find the contradictions thus :

	JUDAISTIC.	PAULINE.
Jews .	<i>ἐκ νόμου διὰ πίστεως.</i>	<i>ἐκ πίστεως (καὶ διὰ πίστεως).</i>
Gentiles	<i>ἐκ πίστεως διὰ νόμου.</i>	<i>(ἐκ πίστεως καὶ) διὰ πίστεως.</i>

¹ In *Acts* xi. 2, the title is used in a still further abbreviated form *οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς*: but the meaning is the same, and the idea *πιστοί* has to be supplied in thought.

Accordingly, in Rom. iii. 30, God *δικαιώσει περιτομήν ἐκ πίστεως καὶ ἀκροβυστίαν διὰ τῆς πίστεως*, *i.e.* the Gentiles (from faith and) through the continued operation of their faith.

Finally, the motive power in the process is expressed by the dative, *χάριτι*, *Romans* iii. 24; *Ephesians* ii. 8.

As the distinction between an indispensable condition and a source is very fine, the use of *διὰ* and *ἐκ* is hard to keep apart. But it is noteworthy that we never find the party names *οἱ διὰ*, but only *οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς*, *οἱ ἐκ νόμου*, *οἱ ἐκ πίστεως*. In most places *ἐκ* expresses the fundamental thought; and *διὰ* is used much more rarely.

In the two passages quoted from *Acts* the Pauline expression has crystallized into a title and the badge of a party. But in that case it is clear that the author of *Acts* understood the two opposing parties to be already constituted when he applies to one of them the technical term. They who hold the view that the author was a remarkably accurate describer of events must conclude that he intentionally chose the technical term in order to show that the antithesis between the two views was already clear and definite.

XXVII. GALATIANS III. 15-18.

An illustration from the ordinary facts of society, as it existed in the Galatian cities, is here stated. The Will (*διαθήκη*) of a human being is irrevocable when once duly executed: hence the Will of God, formally pledged to Abraham, that all nations should be blessed in his seed, *i.e.* in Christ,¹ cannot be affected by the subsequent act of God executed 430 years later, *viz.*, the giving of the Law. The inheritance of blessing comes from the original Will, and not from the subsequent Law.

¹ EXPOSITOR, March, 1896, p. 178 f.

The sense of *διαθήκη* in this passage has been much debated; and many excellent scholars declare that it does not mean Will or Testament (as we have rendered it), but either denotes a Covenant, *Bund* in German (so Calvin, Beza, Flatt, Hilgenfeld, Meyer, Lightfoot), or has the general sense of Determination, *Willensverfügung* or *Bestimmung* (so Zöckler, Philippi, Lipsius, Hofmann, Schott, Winer).¹

But, in the first place, *διαθήκη* here is proved to indicate a Will by the fact that what the *διαθήκη* determines is an inheritance, *κληρονομία*, iii. 18.

Secondly, there are really only two senses in which the Greek word *διαθήκη* might be used by Paul; and the supposition that he understood it, and expected the Galatians to understand it, in some vague, general, half-poetic sense, is quite unjustifiable: the passage demands a sharp, clear, and technical sense for the prominent word. Paul might employ it in the ordinary meaning in which it was current in the cities of Asia and Galatia; and he could also use it with the peculiar force of Covenant, which is given to it in the Septuagint.² In the present case there is no opening for doubt: he says that he is speaking "after the manner of men," iii. 15. He therefore is employing the word in the sense in which it was commonly used as part of the ordinary life of the cities of Asia.

What this sense was there can be no doubt. The word is often found in the inscriptions, and always in the same sense which it bears in the classical Greek writers,³ Will, or Testament. But we must not take this to indicate a will as understood in modern law; and it is the unsuitability of

¹ I quote from Zöckler's statistics.

² See Section xxviii.

³ Lightfoot, who takes *διαθήκη* in the Septuagint sense, quotes in his favour Arist. Av. 439, and says there are a few other examples; they are not, however, given in the latest edition of *Stephani Thesaurus*, and we must require exact quotations to support such a rare sense in prose.

the modern idea of a Will in the passage that has led the Commentators to reject it almost unanimously. We must interpret *διαθήκη* according as the idea was understood in the Asiatic Provinces at the time when Paul was writing. It was a provision to maintain the family with its religious obligations; and, though it sometimes included bequests of money to the State or to individuals, these bequests seem to be always regarded in the light of provisions for the honour and privileges of the testator and his family.

It is here plainly stated that when the Will has been properly executed with all legal formalities, no person can make it ineffective or add any further clause or conditions. It is not a complete explanation to say that "no person" means "no other," for the argument is that a subsequent document executed by the same person does not invalidate the former. We are confronted with a legal idea that the duly executed Will cannot be revoked by a subsequent act of the testator. The appointment of an heir was the adoption of a son, and was final and irrevocable in the Galatian territory. The testator, after adopting his heir, could not subsequently take away from him his share in the inheritance or impose new conditions on his succession.

That is a totally different conception of a Will from our modern ideas. We think of a Will as secret and inoperative during the life-time of the testator, as revocable by him at pleasure, and as executed by him only with a view to his own death. A Will of that kind could have no application to God, and no such analogy could have been used by Paul. But the Galatian Will is irrevocable and unalterable; it comes into operation as soon as the conditions are performed by the heir; it is public and open.

Such was the original Roman Will;¹ but that kind of Will had become obsolete in Roman law. It could have been familiar to no one except a legal antiquary; and

¹ Maine, *Ancient Law*, ch. vi.

neither Paul nor any other Provincial is likely to have known anything about that ancient Roman idea. The Prætorian Will had become usual, and it was secret and revocable, and took effect only after the testator's death. But Greek law retained that character much longer, and Galatian law, as we have seen, was under the influence of Greek law.

The Græco-Syrian Law-Book—which we have already quoted as an authority for the kind of legal ideas and customs that obtained in an Eastern Province, where a formerly prevalent Greek law had persisted under the Roman Empire — well illustrates this passage of the Epistle.¹ It actually lays down the principle that a man can never put away an adopted son, and that he cannot put away a real son without good ground. It is remarkable that the adopted son should have a stronger position than the son by birth; yet it was so. Mitteis illustrates this by a passage of Lucian,² where a son, who had been put away by his father, then restored to favour, and then put away a second time, complains that this second rejection is illegal, inasmuch as his restoration to favour put him on a level with an adopted son, who cannot be turned away in that fashion.

In the Gortynian procedure, this principle of the Greek law was relaxed, and the adoptive father could put away his adoptive son by a public act, declared from the stone in the market-place before the assembled citizens, but he must give him two staters as a guest-gift. Evidently the gift is a sort of substitute for the inheritance; the adopted son had an indefeasible claim to share the property, and, by a legal fiction, the testator gives him his inheritance, and sends him away.

¹ The following remarks are taken from Mitteis' *Reichsrecht und Volksrecht*, p. 213 ff., who does not notice the confirmation by Paul's words of the view which he states.

² ἀποκηρυττόμενος, 12.

The adopted son and heir was adopted by the will and authority of the whole community, to keep up the existence of one of the families constituting the community. The father, therefore, had less power over the adopted son than over the born son; the latter was subject to his solitary will, the former had the will of the whole community on his side.

When *διαθήκη* is understood thus, the paragraph becomes full of meaning; but this sense could hardly have existed in Gallic Galatia, but only in Southern Galatia.

To make this subject clear, we must look at the use of *διαθήκη* in an Epistle addressed to readers among whom Greek law had never exercised much, if any, influence, and to whom the Will of the Roman type, as current in the first century, alone was likely to be known. The use of the term *διαθήκη* was to them encumbered by the difficulty that a Will does not become valid until the death of the testator (*Heb. ix. 16*). This requires a special section.

The exact sense of v. 15 must be observed. Paul does not say that a supplementary Will, *ἐπιδιαθήκη*, cannot be made; but that the new Will cannot interfere with or invalidate the old Will. A man can adopt a second son and heir by a subsequent Will. Then the two adopted sons jointly carry on the family in its religious and social aspect. Inheritance was not simply a claim to property, as we now regard it. Inheritance was the right to take the father's place in all his relations to the gods and the State; and two or more sons can take the father's place jointly, each being the heir.¹

W. M. RAMSAY.

¹ Mr. Grenfell publishes an *ἐπιδιαθήκη* (*Alex. Erot. Pap.*, no. 21); it confirms and quotes the *διαθήκη*. See next section. Nature might necessitate changes in the details; new children and heirs may be born, and so on; but in essence the *ἐπιδιαθήκη* confirms the previous will.