**James]** placed first, as being at the  
head of the church at Jerusalem, and presiding (apparently) at the conference in  
Acts xv. The expression **seemed to be** alludes to vv. 2 and 6; see there.

**pillars**,  
i.e, principal supporters of the church, men  
of distinction and weight; afterwards the  
word came to be used directly in a personal  
sense, without metaphor. Clement of Rome  
says that “the most righteous pillars were  
persecuted.” The words **should be apostles** are not expressed in the Greek. Some  
supply “*should go*,” or “*should preach*,”  
which come to much the same. ‘This division of labour was not, and could not  
be, strictly observed. Every where in the  
Acts we find St. Paul preaching ‘to the  
Jews first,’ and every where the Judaizers  
followed on his track.

**10.] which  
very thing I was also forward to do,**—  
viz., then and always: it was my habit.  
He uses the singular, because the plural  
could not correctly be predicated of the  
whole time to which the verb refers: for  
he parted from Barnabas shortly after the  
council in Acts xv. The proofs of this  
*forwardness* on his part may be found,  
Rom. xv. 15—27; 1 Cor. xvi. 1—4; 2 Cor.  
viii. ix.; Acts xxiv. 17: which, though  
they probably happened after the date of  
our Epistle, yet shew the bent of his  
habitual wishes on this point.

**11—17.]***He further proves his independence, by relating how he rebuked  
Peter for temporizing at Antioch.* This  
proof goes further than any before: not  
only was he not taught originally by  
the Apostles,—not only did they impart  
nothing to him, rather tolerating his  
view and recognizing his mission,—but  
he on one occasion stood aloof from and  
reprimanded the chief of them for conduct unworthy the Gospel: thus setting  
his own Apostleship in *opposition* to Peter,  
for the time.

**11.]** This visit of Peter  
to Antioch, not related in the Acts, will fall  
most naturally (for our narrative follows  
the order of time) in the period described,  
Acts xv. 35, seeing that (ver. 18) Barnabas  
also was there. See below.

**Cephas]**  
Eusebius quotes out of Clement a story  
that this Cephas was not the Apostle, but  
one of the Seventy, of the same name.  
This was manifestly invented to save the  
credit of St. Peter. One of the most  
curious instances of ecclesiastical ingenuity  
on record has been afforded in the interpretation of this passage by the Fathers.  
They try to make it appear that the reproof was only an apparent one—that  
St. Peter was entirely in the right, and  
St. Paul withstood him **to the face,** i.e.  
as they explain it, ‘*in appearance merely*,’  
because he had been blamed by others. So  
Chrysostom: so Theodoret also: and Jerome.  
—This view of Jerome’s met with strong  
opposition from Augustine, who writes to  
him, nobly and worthily, maintaining that  
if St. Paul wrote thus, he was *lying*, in  
the very passage in which he says, “The  
things which I write unto you, behold,  
before God, I lie not.” Afterwards, Jerome  
abandoned his view for the right one.

**because he was condemned]** not,  
*‘because he was to be blamed,’* A. V.:  
no such meaning can be extracted from  
the original word. He was ‘a condemned  
man,’ as we say: by whom, does not  
appear: possibly, *by his own act:* or, *by  
the Christians in Antioch*: but St. Paul