

What else could this mean, but that he had received a mission from God to preach to the Gentiles the Christ revealed to him? After three years, he says, I came to Jerusalem. Then he adds the reason: *to see Peter*. For if the foundation of the church, as is written in the gospel,<sup>71</sup> has been laid in Peter, to whom all things were revealed, Paul knew he ought to see Peter. Indeed, he says *to see Peter*, to see, so to speak, the person to whom so much authority was entrusted—not that I would learn something from him. What does Paul include next? *And I stayed with him for fifteen days*. So I just stayed with him, I just saw him. Would I have been able to learn so much knowledge about God from Peter in so little time?<sup>72</sup>

*But I saw no one else of the apostles, except James the Lord's brother* (1: 19). Paul, with a great teaching and great ingenuity, has also added this. First off, in that he spoke in this manner: Of the apostles, I saw no one else. For the Symmachians<sup>73</sup> make out James as a twelfth apostle; and those who add the observation of Judaism to our Lord Jesus Christ follow him, although the Symmachians also confess Jesus Christ differently. They say that he is Adam himself,<sup>74</sup>

<sup>71</sup> See Matt. 16: 18.

<sup>72</sup> Jerome makes the same point (PL 26, 330A [354C]). Both exegetes share the odd sensibility that the extent of Paul's knowledge can be accounted for only by a divine revelation of such immensity that such a short (!) period of fifteen days would not suffice for it to have been transmitted humanly.

<sup>73</sup> The Symmachians, mentioned again in comments on 2: 12, were a Jewish-Christian sect (see above, Ch. 5, Sect. C, n. 173 and Ch. 6, nn. 47–8). Ambrosiaster refers to them in the preface to his Galatians commentary, stating that they 'take their origin from the Pharisees' and maintain the whole Law (CSEL 83/1, 3, 4–5). Augustine mentions that they are also called Nazoreans in *Contra Faustum* 19. 4 and *Contra Cresconium* 1. 31. 36 (all texts mentioning Symmachians are gathered in Klijn and Reinink, *Patristic Evidence*, 197, 232–9). Klijn and Reinink consider the Symmachians 'a product of the imagination of early Christian authors' (p. 68, see also pp. 50–4) and plausibly suggest that the name was a label applied to Jewish-Christian sectarians on account of their use of Symmachus' late-second-century CE translation of the Hebrew Bible into Greek. It is not improbable that Victorinus had read some Jewish-Christian works; after all, he refers to the legend of Simon Magus flying (found in the *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies*, 2. 32; ET: ANF, 8, 235) in his commentary on Cicero (Halm, 249, 12): 'It is true that Simon flew, but it is none the less unbelievable' (*Verum est, quod Simon volavit, sed tamen incredibile est*; discussed by Hadot, *Marius Victorinus*, 51–2).

<sup>74</sup> Victorinus' statement that these Jewish Christians believe Christ to be Adam fits with what Epiphanius claims about Ebionite and Elkesaite doctrine (Klijn and Reinink, *Patristic Evidence*, 33). Klijn and Reinink are inclined to follow the patristic sources which present Symmachus as an Ebionite, at any event a Jewish Christian (*ibid.* 52–4). However, Epiphanius states that he was a Samaritan convert to Judaism, was re-circumcised, and proceeded to translate the Scriptures (*De mensuris et ponderibus*, 16). For the possible identification of Symmachus with a certain Sûmkhôs ben Josef of rabbinic reports (a fervent disciple of the Tannaitic rabbi Méir), see Dominique Barthélemy, 'Qui est Symmaque?', *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 36 (1974), 451–65.

and is the universal soul,<sup>75</sup> and other blasphemies of this sort. Therefore, Paul denies here that James is an apostle by saying: *But I saw no one else of the apostles*. Because when he said he saw no one else of the apostles *except James*, the reason was also included why he saw James: *the Lord's brother*, the one regarded as his brother according to the flesh.<sup>76</sup> Now, when he called him *his brother*, he denied that James is an apostle. This man too deserved an honorary visit. Yet Paul could not have learned anything from James (obviously, because he has a different conception of the gospel), nor on the other hand from Peter. He was unable to learn from either man, whether because he remained with Peter for just a few days, or because James is not an apostle and may also be in heresy.<sup>77</sup> But Paul did include that he also saw James. Therefore, I saw the new thing that James was bandying about and preaching; but because that blasphemy was known to me and rejected by me, so too it ought to be rejected by you, you Galatians! You people are unable to say, 'Paul, you would<sup>78</sup> deny that James is an apostle, and accordingly you reject the things which we practice, because you did not see James.' So this is why Paul included that he saw James too. That's no mistake. Which James? *The Lord's brother*, he says, the author of your way of thinking. Thus he had no sway over me. I did not follow him, but I knew his way of thinking. So since there is no big unknown to me, and James had no power to persuade me, consequently, it is in vain that you follow him.

*But what I write to you, look—before God I am not lying! (1: 20).* His credibility was to be established even by swearing an oath.<sup>79</sup> It

<sup>75</sup> *dicunt enim eum ipsum Adam esse et esse animam generalem*. Gori offers an alternative translation (on the basis of the otherwise needless repetition of *esse*, I assume): 'indeed, they say that he is Adam himself and that there is a universal soul'.

<sup>76</sup> Like modern scholars, Victorinus maintains that James was Jesus' blood brother (his comment on 2: 12 states this without ambiguity). The later Latin commentators—Ambrosiaster (CSEL 81/3, 16, 3–16), Jerome (PL 26, 330A–331A [354–55C]), Augustine (*Exp. ad Gal.* 8. 5; CSEL 84, 63, 5–7), Pelagius (Souter, 311, 5–8)—all deny that James could have been Mary's son. This fits with the fact that, as David Hunter has noted, 'the doctrines of Mary's virginity *post partum* and *in partu* have only a fragile basis in the tradition of the first three centuries' ('Helvidius, Jovinian, and the Virginity of Mary in Late-Fourth Century Rome', *JECs* 1 (1993), 47–71, 69).

<sup>77</sup> Victorinus switches to the subjunctive to soften this last assertion (*vel quod Iacobus non apostolus est et in haeresi sit*), perhaps because he is unwilling to condemn James in the same manner as he does the Jewish Christians who honoured and followed him. Whether his unwillingness stems from uncertainty about making a historical judgement or from ecclesiastical piety is unclear.

<sup>78</sup> I follow the reading of both manuscripts which have the subjunctive *neges*, not the indicative *negas*, printed by Mai and followed by Locher and Gori.

<sup>79</sup> *Adserenda fides erat etiam iureiurando*: alternatively, 'The faith was to be established . . .'. Augustine agrees this was an oath and takes issue with those who