would hardly have waited for the prompting of others to pronounce his condemnation of him. I therefore prefer the former: **he was [self] convicted:** convicted  
of inconsistency by his conduct.

**12.]** These certain men from James have  
been softened by some Commentators into  
persons who merely *gave themselves out* as  
from James, or who merely came from  
Jerusalem where James presided. But the  
candid reader will I think at once recognize in the words a *mission* from James:  
and will find no difficulty in believing that  
that Apostle, even after the decision of the  
council regarding the Gentile converts, may  
have retained (characteristically, see his  
recommendation to St. Paul, in Acts xxi.  
18 ff.) his strict view of the duties of Jewish  
converts,—for that is perhaps all that the  
present passage requires. And this mission may have been for the very purpose  
of admonishing the Jewish converts of  
*their* obligations, from which the Gentiles  
were free. Thus we have no occasion to  
assume that James had in the council been  
over-persuaded by the earnestness and  
eloquence of Paul, and had afterwards  
undergone a reaction: for his course will be  
consistent throughout. And my view seems  
to me to be confirmed by his own words,  
Acts xv. 19, where the emphatic expression, “*them which from among the Gentiles  
are turning unto God,*” tacitly implies,  
that the Jews would be bound as before.

**he ate with the Gentiles]** As he had  
done, Acts x., on the prompting of a heavenly  
vision ; and himself defended it, Acts xi. See  
below.

**he withdrew and separated  
himself]** The original expresses that there  
were more cases than one where he did  
this: it was the course he took.

**fearing  
them which were of the circumcision]**  
The whole incident is remarkably characteristic of Peter—ever the first to recognize, and the first to draw back from, great  
principles and truths.

**13. joined in his  
hypocrisy]** The word is not (as De Wette  
says) too strong a one to describe their  
conduct. They were aware of the liberty  
in Christ which allowed them to eat with  
Gentiles, and had practised it: and now,  
being still aware of it, and not convinced  
to the contrary, from mere fear of man  
they adopted a contrary course. The case  
bore but very little likeness to that discussed  
in 1 Cor. viii.—x.; Rom. xiv. There, it was  
a mere matter of *licence* which was in  
question: here, the very foundation itself.  
It was not now a question of using a  
liberty, but of asserting a truth, that of  
justification by the faith of Christ, and  
not by the works of the law.

**was  
carried away]** “Besides the antagonism in  
which this passage represents the two  
great Apostles, it throws an important  
light on the history of the apostolic church  
in the following respects:—1] As exhibiting Peter’s relation to James, and his fear  
of those who were of the circumcision,  
whose leader we should have naturally supposed him to have been. 2] Also as  
pourtraying the state of indecision in  
which all, except St. Paul, even including  
Barnabas, were in reference to the observance of the Jewish law.” Jowett.

**14. before them all]** i.e. ‘before the  
church assembled.’ The words require  
this, and the reproof would otherwise have  
fallen short of its desired effect on the  
Jewish converts.—The speech which