

ARTHUR E. PALUMBO, Jr

1QpHab 5:8-12. THE "PILLARS", AND PAUL

Since I am of the opinion that 1QpHab (i.e., the Habakkuk Commentary from cave I at Qumran) can be adequately explained if it is interpreted as a Jewish-Christian document, and if its historical setting is placed in the latter half of the first century AD, I would like to offer a new interpretation of 1QpHab 5:8-12 based on these ideas.

Robert Eisenman has recently theorized that the Teacher of Righteousness in 1QpHab is James the Just, the brother of Jesus and the leader of the Jewish-Christian church after the death and resurrection of Jesus.¹ Furthermore, he has theorized that the Man of Lies of the commentary is Paul, who preached freedom from the Law as opposed to James, who believed that the Law was still to be practiced.²

After careful study, I have concluded that Eisenman is indeed correct in his identifications of these individuals with the corresponding cryptic designations in 1QpHab; but I believe that a more precise interpretation of 1QpHab 5:8-12 is possible other than the one put forward by Eisenman.³ Before I can discuss 1QpHab 5:8-12, I must first explain the history and beliefs of the early church, which are relevant to this interpretation.

Not long after the resurrection appearances of Jesus mentioned by Paul in I Cor. 15:3-7,⁴ not three but four "pillars" (i.e., James the Just, Peter, and James and John, the sons of Zebedee) became the leaders of the community that believed that Jesus was the Messiah, who would return shortly to complete his mission. The three "pillars" that Paul names in Gal. 2:9 (i.e., James, Cephas, and John) are usually considered to be James the Just

(cf. Gal. 1:19), Cephas (Peter), and John, the son of Zebedee; even though throughout the Synoptic gospels, the three close associates of Jesus are Peter, and James and John, the two sons of Zebedee (Mk. 5:37, 9:2, 13:3, 14:33; Mt. 17:1, 26:37; Lk. 5:10, 9:28).⁵ What has probably happened is that on Paul's second visit to Jerusalem (Gal. 2:1-10), Cephas (Peter), and James and John, the sons of Zebedee, "added nothing" to Paul's gospel (Gal. 2:6) and gave Paul and Barnabas "the right hand of fellowship" (Gal. 2:9). However, the fourth "Pillar," James the Just, did not approve of the agreement that they made with Paul. Paul angrily called some Jewish Christians, who were associates of James the Just, "false brethren secretly brought in, who slipped in to spy out our freedom which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage" (Gal. 2:4).⁶ Because of James' opposition to the agreement, Paul chose not to include him as a "pillar" along with the other three in his letter.

In 4QpPs^a, which I believe is also a Jewish Christian document, the Teacher of Righteousness (i.e., James the Just) is not only called "the Priest" (הַכֹּהֵן), but also "the Pillar" (לְעֹמֵד). The commentary portion of this passage is quoted below:

The interpretation of it concerns the Priest (הַכֹּהֵן), the Teacher of [Righteousness, whom] God [ch]ose as the Pillar (לְעֹמֵד). F[or] he established him to build for him a congregation of [his chosen ones in truth;] his [way] is straight to the truth" (frags. 1-10, 3:15-7).

The title "pillar" (עֹמֵד) probably derives from the idea of the community being figuratively represented as a temple. The "pillars" support the temple community, but since the temple building is rectangular, four pillars are necessary to hold it up!⁸

In AD 27,⁹ after persecuting those in Judea who

believed in Jesus, Saul (Paul) received a commission from the high priest (i.e., Caiaphas) to arrest all those in Damascus, who were believers. On his way there, he had a vision, in which he saw a great flash of light; and Jesus supposedly spoke to him.¹⁰ Because of this occurrence, the one who had been a fierce persecutor of the church, became an ardent believer. Soon, he would become the great apostle to the Gentiles.

In AD 29,¹¹ Paul made his first visit to Jerusalem, where he visited Cephas (Peter), and stayed with him for two weeks. He states that he "saw none of the other apostles except James the Lord's brother" (Gal. 1:19).

At this time, two factions of Jewish Christians were emerging in Jerusalem. What could be called the liberal faction, which was led by Peter, and James and John, the sons of Zebedee, would be willing to allow Gentile believers to become members in the church without the requirement that they be circumcised and keep the entire Torah. However, Gentiles must still observe the Noahide Laws (i.e., the laws given by God to all mankind after the flood), and if they did so, they could enter the kingdom of God at the end of time.¹² Alternatively, the conservative faction, which was led by James the Just, would not be willing to allow Gentile believers to become members in the church unless they were circumcised and kept the entire Torah. This conservative faction also would not accept the Pharisaic idea that righteous Gentiles who observed the Noahide Laws could enter the kingdom of God at the end of time.¹³

In AD 42,¹⁴ Paul made his second visit to Jerusalem with Barnabas and Titus. At this meeting, three of the "pillars," i.e., Cephas (Peter), and James and John, the sons of Zebedee, "added nothing" to Paul's gospel, and gave Paul the "right hand of

fellowship." The decision was made that the three "pillars" would bring the gospel to the circumcised (i.e., the Jews), and that Paul and Barnabas would bring the gospel to the uncircumcised (i.e., the Gentiles). This division in the missionary activities of the church between Gentiles and Jews appears to be a reference to the decree in Acts 15:19-20, 28-9, and 21:25, which created two groups in the church: Gentiles practicing the Noahide Laws and Jews practicing the Torah.¹⁵ Paul was also asked to "remember the poor," i.e., to bring a financial contribution to the Jerusalem church (Gal. 2:1-10). However, as I have already explained above, the fourth "pillar," James the Just, did not approve of the agreement that the other "pillars" made with Paul. This decision on the part of James probably included a protest and a withdrawal from the meeting by him.¹⁶ Paul could accept this decision of the three "pillars," and could state that they "added nothing" to his gospel (Gal. 2:6), since his Gentile converts were allowed membership in the church without having to be circumcised or to keep the rest of the Torah.¹⁷

Towards the end of AD 42, Herod Agrippa I, the king of the Jews, "laid violent hands upon some who belonged to the church" (Acts 12:1), and had James and John, the sons of Zebedee beheaded.¹⁸ In AD 43, "during the days of Unleavened Bread," Peter was arrested by the king, and put into prison. Somehow, he was able to escape, and "he departed and went to another place" (Acts 12:3-17).¹⁹ It was probably Paul's meeting with the "pillars" in AD 42, which actually initiated the king's violent actions against the church.²⁰

With James and John, the sons of Zebedee, dead, and Peter out of the country (probably in Antioch), James the Just

became the leader of the church in Jerusalem.²¹ Under James' leadership, a new policy was made regarding the relationship of Jews and Gentiles in the church. Regarding the present situation in Antioch, James had received information that the Gentile believers there were not conforming to the decision made earlier with the "pillars" (Gal. 2-10).²² Because of this, the ritual purity of the Jewish believers was being jeopardized, and it was strongly urged that they separate from association with the Gentile believers. Furthermore, to stop this problem from continuing, the decision was made that Gentiles must be circumcised and conform to the rest of the Torah in order to be members in the church. This is the policy that the conservative faction had wanted from the beginning.²³

Those in Antioch heard about this new policy when "certain men came from James" (Gal. 2:12). Because of the contents of the message, the Jewish Christians, who were eating with the Gentiles (including the "pillar" Peter and his associate Barnabas), separated themselves from table fellowship with them. Paul was angered at their action because to his surprise, they unanimously accepted the new policy without question; and because of it, the Gentile believers would now be forced to take upon themselves the yoke of the Law.

The new policy split the church in two. Although Paul could not accept it, at the same time, he could not imagine that Jerusalem would not continue to be the spiritual center of the entire church. Therefore, he could not conceive of severing his Gentile converts completely from the Jerusalem authorities.²⁴ Somehow, he would have to heal the breach. The purpose of the contribution, which he brought to Jerusalem, was meant to do just that (Gal. 2:10, 1 Cor. 16:1-4, 2 Cor. 8-9, Rom. 15:30-1).

The reversal of the attitude by the Jerusalem leadership regarding Paul's contribution to the church there is additional evidence for the change in policy and leadership which I am describing here. At his second meeting in Jerusalem (Gal. 2:1-10), the three "pillars" actually asked Paul and Barnabas to "remember the poor," i.e., to bring a financial contribution to the Jerusalem church (Gal. 2:10). However, at a later time, when he was planning to bring the collection to Jerusalem, he tells his supporters, "to strive together with me in your prayers . . . that my service for Jerusalem may be acceptable to the saints" (Rom. 15:30-1). Paul was not certain that James would accept the collection when he was the leader of the church, but at the earlier meeting, three of the "pillars" specifically asked Paul and Barnabas to "remember the poor." According to Achtemeier, "the possible rejection of the offering indicates that the harmony achieved at the time of his second visit to Jerusalem has since been replaced by a more antagonistic outlook towards him."²⁵ What probably happened is that James did not accept Paul's contribution.²⁶

Now that I have explained the history and beliefs of the early church relevant to the interpretation of 1QpHab 5:8-12 I am suggesting, I can now discuss the passage itself. Let me first quote it below:

WHY DO YOU HEED TRAITORS, BUT ARE SILENT WHEN A WICKED ONE SWALLOWS UP ONE MORE RIGHTEOUS THAN HE? (Hab. 1:13b).

The interpretation of it concerns the House of Absalom²⁸ and the men of their persuasion,²⁹ who were reduced to silence³⁰ at the time of the protest³¹ by the Teacher of Righteousness³² and did not support him against the Man of Lies, who rejected the Law in the midst of their entire [congregation].

The "House of Absalom" is a reference to James and John, the two sons of Zebedee, who were "reduced to silence" (נָדַם),

i.e., "destroyed"³³ by Herod Agrippa I in AD 42. This verb in the commentary interprets "are silent" (חָזַק) in the biblical passage. Since the executions of the two brothers occurred in the same year that Paul met with the "pillars" (AD 42), it could be said by someone who wrote the passage about twenty-five years later,³⁴ that the "House of Absalom" was destroyed "at the time of the protest by the Teacher of Righteousness."

The "men of their (i.e., the "House of Absalom's) persuasion" were simply other members of the church who shared the same views as the "House of Absalom." They were "reduced to silence," not by executions, but by fear of persecution. They were forced to be silent in order to avoid the same fate as the "House of Absalom."

The statement that they "did not support him (i.e., the "Teacher of Righteousness") against the Man of Lies (i.e., Paul)" is a reference to the meeting between Paul and the "pillars" in AD 42 (Gal. 2:1-10). The verb "did not support" (לֹא עֲזָרוּהוּ) in the commentary interprets the verb "heed" (חָנִיטוּ) in the biblical passage.

At this meeting, Paul "rejected the Law in the midst of their entire [congregation]," because he did not agree to the interpretation of the Law as expressed by the Teacher of Righteousness, i.e., James the Just.³⁵ As James would have viewed it, sons of Abraham were Jews only;³⁶ but according to Paul, sons of Abraham were Jews and Gentiles of the faith.³⁷ At the conference, Paul probably tactfully avoided bringing up his true belief that the Law was no longer required for salvation (e.g., "a man is not justified by works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ," Gal. 2:16, cf. Rom. 3:28, 4:5, 11:6).³⁸ If "their entire

[congregation]" is the correct reading here, Paul must have stated his understanding about Gentile converts at the subsequent plenary conference, rather than the "private" conference with the "pillars" (Gal. 2:2).³⁹ The "men of their (i.e., the "House of Absalom's) persuasion" probably attended this plenary conference also.

Finally, the verb "rejected" (דָּחָה) in the commentary interprets the verb "swallows up" (בָּלְעָה) in the biblical passage.⁴⁰ Paul's rejection of James' interpretation of the Law could be said to "swallow up" or "confound"⁴¹ James, who is the quintessential Torah observer. Hegesippus states that James "was wont to go into the temple: and he used to be found kneeling on his knees, begging forgiveness for the people-so that the skin of his knees became horny like that of a camel's, by reason of his constantly bending the knee in adoration to God"⁴² Furthermore, "their tribulation and their fidelity" in the Teacher of Righteousness (i.e., James the Just) saves "all those who observe the Law in the House of Judah" from damnation (1QpHab 8:1-3).⁴³

Thus, if the above interpretation of 1QpHab 5:8-12 is correct, a precise correspondence between it and important events in the history of the early church can be discovered. The importance of this fact is obvious to everyone who has studied this subject.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Robert Eisenman, *Maccabees, Zadokites, Christians and Qumran* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1983), 97 note 183; *James the Just in the Habakkuk Peshier* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1986), VII-X, 21-2, 75-6, 87-94. For an excellent summary of Eisenman's views, see Michael Baigent and Richard Leigh, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Deception* (London: Jonathan Cope, 1991), 129-221.

² Eisenman, *James the Just* . . . , VIII, 22-5, 29-34, 52-61, 67-8.

³ Eisenman interprets 1QpHab 5:8-12 as being "the actual confrontation as viewed from the point-of-view of Jerusalem and the supporters of James" of the "Jerusalem council," which was discussed by Paul in Gal. 2:1-10 and by Luke in Acts 15:4-29 (Eisenman, 33). The three different descriptions (i.e., Gal., Acts, and 1QpHab) arose through the different biases of the three writers. Eisenman understands Gal. 2:11-21 (i.e., Paul's confrontation with Peter at Antioch after receiving the message from James) as being a similar statement of what Paul said earlier at the "Jerusalem council" (Eisenman, 30).

⁴ These various appearances occurred sometime after Jesus' crucifixion in AD 21. Paul's vision was the latest, which occurred in AD 27 (1 Cor. 15:8, see note 9). According to Eusebius [*Eusebius, The Ecclesiastical History*, Kirsopp Lake, trans. (Loeb Classical Library) 2 vols. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975) I, 73-5; II, 339, 341-3], in AD 311, emperor Maximinus Daia had "a series of Pilate's Reports" published, in which the crucifixion was dated in "the fourth consulship of Tiberius, which was the seventh year of his reign" (i.e., AD 21). Eusebius calls them forgeries. However, if they were forgeries, the forgers would doubtless have used one of the traditional dates for the crucifixion, i.e., AD 29, 30, 32, or 33 [Robert Eisler, *The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist* (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1931), 13-20]. This date for the crucifixion (i.e., AD 21) has been confirmed by "microletters" on coins dated from that time [Jerry Vardaman, "Jesus' Life: A New Chronology," *Chronos, Kairos, Christos*, Jerry Vardaman and Edwin M. Yamauchi, eds. (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1989), 55-82].

⁵ Eisler believed that the three "pillars" mentioned by Paul in Gal. 2:9 were Peter (Cephas) and James and John, the sons of Zebedee [Robert Eisler, *The Enigma of the Fourth Gospel* (London: Methuen & Co., 1938), 81-2].

⁶ These individuals were probably commissioned by James the Just to secretly go among Paul's associates while they were in Jerusalem to try to determine their true intentions regarding the Law and the relationship of Jews and Gentiles to it. The results of the effort may have been a factor which caused James to protest the decision made by the other "pillars." For more information on James' protest, see below.

⁷ Maurya P. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (Washington, D.C: Catholic Biblical Assoc. of America, 1979), 197-8.

⁸ See 2 Cor. 6:14-7:1, Eph. 2:11-22, 1QS 9:3-5, and Florilegium 1:2-7 where the community of believers is figuratively represented as a temple. However, the idea of a "pillar" is not utilized in any of these passages.

⁹ In order to arrive at AD 27, we have to calculate backwards from the date of the executions of James and John, the sons of Zebedee by Herod Agrippa I in AD 42. In doing this, the time references in Gal. 1:18 and 2:1 must be utilized: 42-13-2=27. (Eisler, 84-5). Eisler also gives evidence that both brothers were executed by the king. See note 18.

¹⁰ Acts 9:1-22, 22:4-16, 26:9-18. For Paul's persecution of the church, see Gal. 1:13-4, I Cor. 15:9, Phil. 3:6, Acts, 8:30, 9:1-2, 22:4, 26:9-11.

¹¹ See note 9: 42-13=29.

¹² For a discussion of the Noahide Laws, see Hyam Maccoby, *The Mythmaker* (New York: Harper and Row, 1986), 137-8, 140-4. Regarding the Pharisaic idea of righteous Gentiles being saved by practicing the Noahide laws, Maccoby states the following: "There were differences of opinion among the rabbis . . . about the exact details of these Noahide laws, and about how to derive them by exegesis from the relevant verses in Genesis; but they were agreed that these laws were few in number, but that by keeping them Gentiles were accounted righteous and were eligible to have 'a share in the World to Come' (Ibid, 142).

¹³ Acts 15:1: "But some men came down from Judea and were teaching the brethren, 'Unless you are circumcised according to the custom of Moses, you cannot be saved.'" The conservative faction supported the view of the School of Shammai regarding Gentiles who conformed to the Noahide Laws, whereas the liberal faction supported the School of Hillel. See Harvey Falk, *Jesus the Pharisee* (New York: Paulist Press, 1985), 24-30.

¹⁴ See notes 9, 11, and 18.

¹⁵ According to Achtemeier, the decree of Acts 15:19-29, 28-9, and 21:25 was actually formulated at the conference of Acts 15:1-29, but this conference occurred after the one mentioned in Gal. 2:1-10. At the earlier conference (i.e., Gal. 2:1-10), no restrictions at all were placed on the Gentile believers. Acts' version of Gal. 2:1-10 is Acts 11:1-18. At the later conference (i.e., Acts 15:1-29), Peter, Paul, and Barnabas were not actually present, but in Antioch. See Paul J. Achtemeier, *The Quest for Unity in the New Testament Church* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), 44-55. For several reasons which are given in this study, I do not agree with this view. Whether the changed policy authorized after the conference of Gal. 2:1-10 resulted from another conference something like that described in Acts 15:1-29 or from an executive order issued by James the Just, is not known.

¹⁶ See notes 31 and 32.

¹⁷ However, there was a difference between the two sides which was probably not even discussed at the meeting. In the view of the three "pillars," the Gentiles could only be accorded a second-class status in the church, because they could not be members of the House of Israel (i.e., sons of Abraham) unless they were circumcised and kept the rest of the Torah (i.e., became Jews). See Hugh J. Schonfield, *The Jesus Party* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co. Inc., 1974), 180-3. What Paul wanted was a church where Jew and Gentile would have equal status. Abraham "believed the Lord; and he reckoned it to him as righteousness" (Gen. 15:6), before there was a covenant of circumcision (Gen. 17:1-27). Therefore, according to Paul, "it is men of faith (Jewish and Gentile believers) who are the sons of Abraham (Israelites)" (Gal. 3:7). Faith in the Messiah was the requirement for membership, not keeping the Law. See also Rom. 4:9-12; Schonfield, 179, 182; Idem, *Those Incredible Christians* (Longmead: Element Books, 1985; repr., New York: Bernard Geis, 1966), 69-70.

¹⁸ According to Eisler, Acts 12:2 originally stated that Herod Agrippa I "killed [John and] James the brother of John with the sword." John's name had been censored out, because John, the son of Zebedee, was erroneously identified from an early date with John the Evangelist, who did not die until ca. AD 117. Eisler also gives the evidence for believing that both brothers were executed by the king (Eisler, 59-77, 95-8).

¹⁹ Ibid., 96.

²⁰ Ibid., 79.

²¹ Except for Acts 11:30, a group called the "elders" are mentioned as leading the church with James in some way (Acts 15:2, 22, 21:18), but James is clearly the leader (Acts 15:19).

²² Among other things, they were probably eating meat sacrificed to idols. See 1 Cor. 8:7-13, 10:23-11:1, and Rom. 14:13-23. The Jewish believers in Antioch were probably lax in practicing the Law also, and that is why Paul could say to Cephas (Peter) in front of the other Jewish believers, "If you, though a Jew, live like a Gentile and not like a Jew, how can you compel the Gentiles to live like Jews?" (Gal. 2:14).

²³Since Luke was so concerned "that the early church developed in internal harmony . . . by divine direction" (Achteemeier, 37), it would have been inconceivable for him to have accepted the idea that the church had been split into two factions by a decision of the Jerusalem authorities. Therefore, in the Acts, James had to be portrayed as a moderating influence between the Pauline Christians and the Pharisaic Christians. However, this portrait does not seem to be accurate for two reasons: 1. The most natural interpretation of Gal. 2:12 is that James was the leader of the "circumcision party," and 2. If James had decided that circumcision was not required of Gentile converts then why did the issues of the necessity of circumcision and of keeping the law continue to be a major problem for Paul throughout his life (Gal. 5:2-3, 11-12, I Cor. 7:17-24, Phil. 3:2-6, Rom. 2:25-29). If the issue had been decided once and for all, it is difficult to see why there was still such intense debate about it. Also, how would the Jewish Christians, who preached the circumcision and the law, have continued to infiltrate Paul's churches so easily (Gal. 1:6-9, 2:11-4, 5:10, 6:12-3, I Cor. 1:12-3, 3:4, 21-3, 9:1-7, II Cor. 3:1, 10:12-8, 9:1-11:13), and what was the point of doing so, if the issue was supposedly already settled. Certainly, their teaching would have very easily been discredited if Jerusalem had decided against them.

²⁴Maccoby, 151-2; Schonfield, 66; idem, *The Jesus Party*, 181.

²⁵Achteemeier, 26.

²⁶Ibid., 60.

²⁷The translation of this biblical passage comes from Horgan, 15.

²⁸The "House of Absalom" is a synonym for traitors. Absalom was king David's son, who revolted against his father (2 Sam. 15:1-18:33). The traitors in the biblical passage (i.e., "why do you heed traitors") are Paul and Barnabas; whereas, the other traitors (i.e., the "House of Absalom") are James and John, the sons of Zebedee. Peter is not included in the "House of Absalom," because later at the confrontation with Paul in Antioch, he sided with James (Gal. 2:11-12). All of the traitors mentioned above are the first group of traitors mentioned in 1QpHab 2:1-2: "the traitors together with the Man of the Lie . . ." (Horgan, 13).

²⁹Eisenman, *James the Just* . . . , 30 note 14; Horgan, 33.

³⁰The verb גרמו (root רמה or רמם) should not have the active sense (i.e., "kept silent"), as it is usually understood. See H. G. M. Williamson, "The Translation of 1QpHab, 5, 10, *Revue de Qumran* 9 (1977), 263-5; G. R. Driver, *The Judaean Scrolls: The Problem and a Solution* (Oxford, 1965), 271-2.

³¹Although usually translated as "reproof" or "chastisement," I translate תוכחה as "protest." See William L. Holladay, *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971), 387.

³²The word תוכחה "always has the idea of 'deserved punishment' or 'justified reprimand.' Consequently . . . the reprimand must be addressed by the Teacher" (Williamson, 264). However, even if I were to translate the phrase "at the time of the reproof of the Teacher of Righteousness," i.e., the תוכחה was directed at the Teacher rather than by him, it would not effect the rest of the interpretation of 1QpHab 5:8-12 that I am suggesting.

³³Williamson, 264; Holladay, 72.

³⁴I would date the composition of 1QpHab to the spring of AD 68. There are several internal allusions, which would place the composition of this scroll to that time, but they cannot be dealt with in this paper. Eisenman would appear to favor AD 68 as the date of composition as well (Eisenman, 28, 48-9).

³⁵Brownlee also understands this statement about the rejection of the Law as "the repudiation of a special interpretation." See William H. Brownlee, *The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979), 94.

³⁶See James 2:20-4.

³⁷Rom. 4:3-24; Gal. 3:6-14.

³⁸Maccoby, 145. Of course, since 1QpHab was written long after this event took place (see note 34), the writer could have had Paul's actual view of the Law in mind when he stated that Paul "rejected the Law."

³⁹Schonfield, 181-3; idem, *Those Incredible Christians*, 66-7.

⁴⁰The action of the verb "swallows up" in the biblical passage must be understood as continuing on at least until the deaths of the sons of Zebedee, because the meeting of Paul with the "pillars," which is alluded to in the commentary portion, occurred before the sons of Zebedee "are silent" (i.e., destroyed). However, in the biblical passage, they "are silent" (i.e., destroyed) "when" Paul "swallows up" James. But this presents no problem, since neither James nor Paul changed their opinions before or even after the deaths of the sons of Zebedee. The commentary portion refers to the beginning of the activity which "swallows up" James (i.e., the meeting of Paul with the "pillars").

⁴¹This is another meaning for the verb גלע (Holladay, 41). Brownlee translates this verb here as "overwhelms" (Brownlee, 94).

⁴²The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Rev. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, eds. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), 762.

⁴³Horgan, 17.