

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 31—July, 1897.

I.

ALBRECHT RITSCHL.*

ON almost any morning just before the nine o'clock hour for university lectures in the University of Göttingen, about the year 1880, there might have been seen making his way along the wall, from the Albani Gate to the Auditorium, a striking personality. Rather short and stout, he moved with a brisk, active step, alert to every impression from without. His face revealed a character in which strength predominated. Good-natured and frank in expression, bluff and hearty in address, he was imperious in his manner, and his full lips and mobile mouth suggested the capacity of sudden anger and blunt utterance, of which further acquaintance would have undoubtedly soon afforded illustrations. If the observer had followed him to the lecture-room, he would have found him earnest, rapid in his delivery, polemic in his tone, now illuminating the theme with a touch of humor, often expressing scorn of something low or contemptible, not always immediately intelligible, but upon the whole possessing an eminent power of instructive discourse, and animated by the highest intellectual and ethical ideals. In his study at home, whither an inquiring student might follow him, the reception would depend something upon the humor of the moment, but more upon the idea of the purpose of the visitor which would formulate itself, generally with too much rapidity, in his mind. If he thought him candid, docile and accessible to the new ideas which the teacher had to give, he would be suggestive, kind and helpful; but one must be

**Albrecht Ritschls Leben*. Dargestellt von Otto Ritschl. Two volumes, Freiburg, 1892 and 1896.

VII.

A RECENT CONTROVERSY IN THE HARMONY OF GALATIANS AND ACTS.

THE problem of harmonizing the Galatian Epistle and the Book of Acts is one which has always gathered around itself more than an ordinary amount of interest. Acts is so historically a framework for the Pauline letters, and Galatians is so autobiographically full of Paul, that they must either be brought into some reasonable agreement or else one or the other of them must be given up.

The significance of such an alternative came to vision really first in the position of the Tübingen school, which held Galatians, because of its polemic Paulinism, as one of the four genuine literary productions of the apostle, and then offered, as one of the proofs which confirmed the unguineness of the irenic Acts, the fact that it could not possibly be made to harmonize with the epistle.

Since the recent revival of this Hegelian criticism both Acts and Galatians have gone through an experience that has had some marks of similarity. They have both been subjected to the documentary spirit which has overflowed from the Old Testament struggle and will have to drift its tortuous New Testament way to the end of its course. The results, however, have seemed to amount to more in the case of Acts than of Galatians. Steck's partition of the epistle, though maintained with a vigorous degree of confidence, cannot be said to have commended itself to critical scholars. He has secured almost no following, even among his own school;* and, outside of Knowling's thorough discussion of this New Testament documentary movement,† which Dods thinks is more than it deserves,‡ comparatively little attention. With Acts,

* Voelter and VanManen are about the only ones of note who side with him. See also opinions of Spitta (*Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1891, pp. 204-213) and Clemen (*Die Einheitlichkeit d. Paul. Briefe*, 1894, pp. 100-125), as well as the specific reviews of Lindemann (*D. Echtheit d. Paul. Hauptbriefe*, 1889), Gloël (*D. jüngste Kritik d. Galaterbriefes*, 1890) and Schmidt (*D. Galaterbrief im Feuer d. neuesten Kritik*, 1892).

† *The Witness of the Epistles*, 1892, chap. iii, pp. 133-243.

‡ *Expositor*, Sept., 1892, pp. 232 f.

on the other hand, there was long before this school appeared on the field, a discussion of its sources which made its partition an easy possibility. Tübingenism treated it very much as it did the Gospels, placing it in the category of *Tendenzschriften* and assigning it a second-century origin; but with the passing of this criticism it came back not only to a first-century, but to a Lukan authorship, and yet, with this, it was not denied that its author had documents before him in his writing. Weiss is perhaps the representative of the conservative ideas which were the outcome of the Tübingen discussion and his view contented itself with assigning to Luke two main sources of information—one a Jewish Christian source for the prefatory half of the book, the other his own diary notes and such information as he could obtain of the travels and the work of Paul for the remainder of the narrative.* From Weiss' simple position, however, there has been a development through such critics as Sorof, Feine, Van Manen, Spitta, Clemen and Jüngst, which would not only destroy the book's integrity, but present us a scheme of partition complicated enough to make it an argument against itself.†

From this treatment both books have emerged into what may be considered a full recognition of their genuineness—by which is meant, not simply their unity, but their Pauline and Lukan composition at first hand. Jülicher, who may be said in a way to represent the latest German scholarship in the department of New Testament introduction, does not so much as consider the possibility of anything less than a full Pauline authorship for the Epistle;‡ while, though he places Acts on the border line of the second century beyond the reach of Luke's pen, partitions it and gives it only half-historic value,§ he is more than met by later scholars, Blass and Ramsay, specialists in the criticism of the book, who not only hold to its integrity, and assign it an apostolic date, but place it in the hands of Luke, as a witness of the highest order and the fullest worth.||

Of these last two critics, Prof. Ramsay stands before us with special interest because of the development of his own opinion regarding the Book of Acts—from a skepticism as to its historicity, through belief in a portion of it as of special worth, to a full

* *Einteit. in d. N. T.*, 1889, pp. 570–586.

† See comparative tables in Clemen's *Chronologie d. Paul. Briefe*, 1893, pp. 288–293, and Jüngst's own scheme in his *D. Quellen d. Apge*, 1895, pp. 221–226.

‡ *Einteit. in d. N. T.*, pp. 44–51.

§ *Ibid.*, pp. 259–271.

|| Blass' *Acta Apostolorum*, 1895, Prolegomena, pp. 2–14; Ramsay's *St. Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen*, 1896, chaps. i and xvii.

conviction of its entire and equal value.* This opinion of his regarding Luke's book is accompanied by a belief in the complete Paulinity of the Galatian epistle.†

Such a view must necessarily carry with it a very decided harmony as existing between these two books. Two writings held to be of the same general date, covering the same general events, both genuine in authorship and credible in matter, are likely to be held to harmonize. As a matter of fact, Prof. Ramsay holds that they do, but in a peculiar way that has aroused criticism. He has presented a scheme of adjustment, involving the second chapter of Galatians and the eleventh, twelfth and fifteenth chapters of Acts—not new, indeed, but newly argued—which may increase the historic value of Luke's record and give added significance to the argument of Paul, and, on the other hand, may have just the opposite effect.

We venture to present Prof. Ramsay's scheme, with the exceptions taken to it by Prof. Sanday of Oxford, and the ensuing controversy between these two scholars. It is worth while to come to clear ideas—if we can—regarding how such writers as Luke and Paul stand over against each other in the statements which they make, especially as there is involved in the discussion not merely the accuracy of the one's history and the vitality of the other's reasoning, but an understanding of the development of the great Judaistic controversy which so absorbed the thought and determined the action of the early apostolic Church. In his *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen* Prof. Ramsay held to a harmonizing of Galatians and the Book of Acts by which the visit of Gal. ii. 1–10 was identified with Paul's second visit to Jerusalem (Acts xi. 27–30, xii. 25) instead of with his third visit (Acts xv), as is usually done; while at the same time the incident of the Temple prayer and vision, mentioned by Paul in his speech from the castle stairs (Acts xxii. 17–21), was referred to this second visit instead of to his first (Acts ix. 26–30), and the Antiochian defection of Peter (Gal. ii. 11–14) was placed before the third visit (Acts xv) instead of after it.‡ The reasons advanced by Prof. Ramsay for this view were in general the negative fact of discrepancy between Gal. ii. 1–10 and Acts xv, and the positive fact of agreement between this passage of the epistle and Acts xi and xii, to which was added the claim that Gal. ii. 11–14, if placed

* *Expositor*, January, 1892, p. 30; *Church in Roman Empire*, 1893, chap. i, pp. 6–9; *St. Paul the Traveller*, chap. i, pp. 1–10, and chap. xvii, pp. 383–386.

† *Church in Roman Empire*, *passim*.

‡ *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, chaps. iii and vii (cf. *The Expositor*, August, 1895, pp. 103–118.)

after the council, produced an almost unthinkable vacillation of conduct on the part of Peter and Barnabas, but, if placed before it, gave a character to their actions which most naturally led up to the council (pp. 162-166); while Acts xxii. 17-21 finds its true significance, not in connection with the first visit of the newly converted Paul to the suspicious Jerusalem church, but with this second visit of the relief-giving apostle to the needy and cordial brethren of the mother congregation (pp. 60-64). In brief, the second visit was given a larger importance than is generally assigned to it, not only as regards the relief ministration (*diázoia*) which it involved, but more especially as regards the controversial views which were developed during its continuance (pp. 55-58). The case of Titus was referred to this visit; the idea being, in the first place, that it could be understood how he came to accompany Paul then, since assistants were necessary to accomplish the ministration, while at the third visit Paul was not likely to be accompanied by subordinates such as Titus evidently was (Acts xv. 2; Gal. ii. 1); while, in the second place, the stage of the controversy regarding the admission of the Gentiles into the church which was reached at the second visit would make it quite possible for Paul to venture on taking with him an uncircumcised Greek without feeling that any risk was being incurred in so doing; on the other hand, the stage at the third visit was too acute for the apostle to endanger the situation with such a piece of recklessness and be the prudent and diplomatic man we know him to have been (pp. 58, 170). To this second visit was referred the private conference with the "pillar" apostles (Gal. ii. 2-10), the character of which was general enough to suit the early stage of contention to which this visit belonged. Paul's purpose in this conference was provisional against probable future difficulties, and its result was that the apostles imparted to him no instruction beyond the recommendation regarding the poor which was eminently suited to the relief character of the visit Paul was then making. At the third visit, however, very distinct and authoritative instructions were given in the "decree" enacted by the council. In fact, it was quite possible to trace the development of the controversy by remembering that at the second visit the trouble was foreseen; between the second and the third visits it became acute, through the coming down to Antioch of members of the circumcision party and their opposition to the liberal method which they there found in practice and of whose even broader usage on the first missionary tour they learned; at the third visit the question was submitted for decision and a response was given which, while a victory for the party of freedom, was a victory of compromise after all (p. 169f.).

In his review of Prof. Ramsay's book in *The Expositor* * Prof. Sanday, while praising in no measured terms the author's work, dissented from the above adjustment. His reasons were mainly three. First and chiefly, that Gal. ii. 1-10 implied a stage in the controversy regarding the admission of Gentiles which had been reached by the date of Acts xv, but which had not been reached by the date of Acts xi. 30, xii. 25. The main point of decision as to the distinct spheres of labor of Peter and Paul suggested a definite cleavage in the Church between Gentile and Jewish Christians, which was accounted for by the vigorous first mission tour of Paul and by nothing less than this. But this tour occurring between Acts xi. 30, xii. 25 and Acts xv gives a preliminary condition to the situation existing at the third visit which the situation at the second visit did not have. Prof. Ramsay, it was held, minimized too much the friction witnessed to by the Galatian narrative, especially that involved in the contention concerning Titus (p. 85ff.). Secondly, Prof. Sanday, while admitting differences between Gal. ii. 1-10 and Acts xv, maintained that, in a balance of comparison between the epistle narrative and the two passages in Acts, there was small question as to where the greater agreements were. For Acts xi. 30, xii. 25 there was but one coincidence, and that was the request made of Paul and Barnabas that they should remember the poor, which request would seem to be more significant if made at a time "when the answer to it was less glaringly obvious" than it was on the occasion of this relief visit. Over against this were the facts that the "false brethren" of Gal. ii. 4 corresponded to the "certain men" who "came down from Judea" of Acts xv. 1; that the controversies referred to in the epistle and the narrative of Acts had the same subject—the Pauline gospel and the question of circumcision; that they had the same turning point—the appeal to what God had done in the apostle's mission work; that they had the same issue—a fellowship of the leaders and an agreement which left both sides all the freedom they needed (pp. 87-91). The only serious difficulty was that this arrangement made as a third visit to Jerusalem what the apostle in his epistle apparently narrated as a second, which difficulty Prof. Sanday held was more than met by the fact that Paul's argument has not to do with visits to Jerusalem so much as with intercourse with the Jerusalem apostles. That the second visit was omitted by him meant merely that on that visit there had been no such intercourse, which was confirmed by the fact that Acts xi. 30 indicated that the relief entrusted to Paul and Barnabas was given into the hands of the elders, no mention of the apostles being made in the narrative (p. 92ff.).

* February, 1896, pp. 81-94.

This, then, was Prof. Sanday's review of the book, a review which recognized its superior excellences and its special importance and significance in the criticism of Acts, but at the same time did not withhold itself from objection and made its chief point of dissent this projected harmony of the Jerusalem visits. There was no reason why this review should not have ended the matter. Prof. Ramsay had advanced a certain theory in his book and given his reasons for the position; Prof. Sanday in his notice of the book had objected to the theory and given his reasons for his objection. This was the right of any reviewer and a possible outcome in any review. But Prof. Ramsay considered the question raised too vital to be suffered to rest. In fact, if his view was not correct he was on record as asserting that he could not accept Luke as a trustworthy historian.* He consequently replied to Prof. Sanday's criticism in the following number of *The Expositor*.† His reply consisted mainly in a fuller statement of the position assumed in his book, in which he entered into a more detailed consideration of the point which Prof. Sanday had advanced as the crucial point in the case, the point that Gal. ii. 1-10 indicated a stage of controversy more advanced than that implied in Acts xi. 30, xii. 25. He maintained that the Jewish nature would make it most likely that party feeling on this question of the admission of uncircumcised Gentiles into the Church should arise very early and that the words of Luke (Acts xi. 2f.) showed that it was already in existence some years before the second visit.‡ But the stage indicated by these words was exactly the same as that evident in Gal. ii. 11-14, where the same controversial terms appeared as Luke had used in Acts xi. 2f.§ In Acts xv, however, stronger terms were employed, which indicated a development of the controversy such as had not taken place at the time of the second visit.¶ If, therefore, Gal. ii. 11-14 showed a stage of controversy which was at least as early as that of Acts xi. 30, xii. 25, and was certainly less advanced than that of Acts xv, and if Gal. ii. 1-10 preceded vers. 11-14 in time, it was quite clear that this visit of the epistle must synchronize with the second rather than with the third visit to

* *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 186.

† March, 1896, pp. 174-190.

‡ Ὅτε δὲ ἀνέβη Πέτρος εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, διεκρίνοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς λέγοντες ὅτι εἰσήλθεν πρὸς ἄνδρας ἀκροβούστιαν ἔχοντας καὶ συνέφαγεν αὐτοῖς.

§ In Gal. ii. 12 we have *συνήθειεν*, which corresponds to the *συνέφαγεν* of Acts and also *τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς* which is identical with the *οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς* of Acts.

¶ In Acts xv. 1 we have the party claim, 'Ἐὰν μὴ περιτμηθῆτε τῷ ἔθει τῷ Μωυσέως, οὐ δύνασθε σωθῆναι (cf. also ver. 5), and the party name, ver. 5, *τινες τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς αἰρέσεως τῶν Φαρισαίων πεπιστευούτες*.

Jerusalem (pp. 178-181). In addition to this, Prof. Ramsay reverted to the statement in his book that Gal. ii. 1-10 could not be held as the third visit and agree with the argument of the epistle (pp. 185-188). The purpose of the apostle's argument was to review his own actions up to the time of his first preaching among the Galatians, so as to show the apostolic independence of his original message to them; but if Gal. ii. 1-10 is no earlier than Acts xv, it must necessarily have followed and not preceded his first missionary tour, and so have lost all force as far as such an argument was concerned. In fact, just in proportion as the apostle omits from his account all mention of the public council referred to by Luke (Acts xv), in that proportion he must have been guilty of suppressing the very facts which made against his argument; for in the decree of this council he came under the authority and restraint of the Jerusalem apostles and forfeited the right to argue as he was doing in his letter (p. 188f.).

This, with some further statements regarding the character of the relief ministrations and the contention of Prof. Sanday that the apostles were not mentioned in Acts xi. 30 because they were at that time away from Jerusalem, constituted Prof. Ramsay's reply to his reviewer (pp. 181-188). It was a reply that left Prof. Sanday not much beyond the alternative of accepting its conclusions or continuing further the discussion. He chose the latter, and in the next issue of *The Expositor** made answer to Prof. Ramsay's statements. He held his argument to the two questions which in reality had been gradually forming themselves into the real point of the problem: (1) Whether it was possible to identify the visit of Gal. ii. 1-10 with that of Acts xi. 30, xii. 25; (2) Whether, if these two visits could not be identified and Gal. ii. 1-10 corresponded rather with Acts xv, it was possible to account for Paul's silence regarding the visit of Acts xi. 30, xii. 25 (pp. 255). The first question he answered briefly by saying not only that the two visits mentioned could not be identified, but the language of Paul regarding the visit of Gal. ii. 1-10 could not be satisfied by anything less than the events of the first missionary tour. He called attention to the fact that Prof. Ramsay had made it clear in his book that up to this first journey the Gentiles who had been admitted into the Church had been all taken from the proselyte class;† that it was not until this journey that the Gospel was offered to those who were full Gentiles.‡ This was the condition of affairs which he held was necessitated by Gal. ii. 1-10. The phrase τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ κηρύσσω ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (ver. 2)

* April, 1896, pp. 253-263.

† *St. Paul the Traveller*, pp. 42ff.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 85.

could refer only to this actual preaching to the Gentiles which the apostle had already begun, not to something he might in the future undertake. The evident fact that the success of his preaching was accepted as proof of the apostolicity of his commission (vers. 7-9) could point to nothing less than the events of his first journey, especially such phrases as were found in ver. 7f.; and it could not fail to be seen that they corresponded exactly to the statements in Acts xv. 4, 12.* These facts, Prof. Sanday held, were convincing, and prevented him from accepting Prof. Ramsay's suggested harmony (p. 256ff.). The second question he answered by challenging Prof. Ramsay's right to say that Paul's argument in his epistle had reference solely and alone to the apostolic independence of his first message to the Galatians. It was rather its authority in the abstract—at the time when he was writing and was being deserted by the Galatians—that he had in mind; so that the second visit was omitted from the epistle's narrative simply because there had been on its occasion no such intercourse with the apostles as would call in question this authority (pp. 259f.). He yielded somewhat from his contention as to the reason for Luke's failure to mention the apostles in his record of the second visit, but rested his case substantially on the above statements—granting to Prof. Ramsay, if he wished it, leave to have the last word (pp. 260-263).

This permission Prof. Ramsay was at first disposed to decline, but, under pressure from others who urged the critical importance of the subject under discussion, accepted it in connection with Prof. Sanday himself; so that the last word of the discussion came in the shape of a joint paper from the two scholars in the July number of *The Expositor*.†

In his part of this joint paper, Prof. Ramsay addresses himself anew to the main question—whether the language of Gal. ii. 1-10 would agree with the earlier situation of Acts xi. 30, xii. 25, as well as with the later one of Acts xv. He pointed out that, in his view, Prof. Sanday's difficulty here was not justified. The substance of this passage in the epistle was that on this visit Paul's apostolate to the Gentiles was recognized by the Jerusalem apostles. Was such a recognition impossible in 46 A.D.? If it was, then we must say that the leaders of the Christian Church were unable to convince themselves of the commission Paul had

* Compare the Galatian phrase: *ιδόντες ὅτι πεπίστευμαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας* with the Acts phrases: (ver. 4) *ἀγγεζιλάν τε ὅσα ὁ θεὸς ἐποίησεν μετ' αὐτῶν*: (ver. 12) *ἐξηγουμένων ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν δι' αὐτῶν*.

† pp. 42-64.

received from the Master or to appreciate the grace that had been given him for his work until years after his conversion and his entrance upon the practical work of the Church. They themselves were men of grace; must they not have recognized grace in Paul, without waiting for the proof of it given in the public events of his first missionary journey? In confirmation of the fact that they did was the action of Barnabas in 43 A.D., in securing Paul's service for the new work among the Gentiles in Antioch and the choice of words made by Paul himself in describing the recognition given him by the apostles on his third visit. They were words which had to do with personal character and show the subjective nature of the explanation into which he entered in his private conference with them—an explanation whose need could be easily understood in A.D. 46, but which would have seemed entirely unnecessary after the first mission tour had made evident to all the Church Paul's mission and his power to carry it out. In contrast with these terms are the ones used by Luke in the narrative of Acts xv, which made clear the objective character of the recital given by Paul and Barnabas, and show that they are speaking, not of personal qualification, but of outward facts (pp. 46-49).* Paul's explanation, therefore, at this private conference was not to tell the apostles of his commission to the Gentiles, since of this they already knew, but simply to lay before them "the wider and freer plans which had been growing in his mind amid and through his work in Cilicia and Antioch," in the strength of which he went forth upon his mission tour to experience what was beyond anything which at this time he did or could foresee (pp. 48, 53).

Prof. Sanday, before whom these statements had been laid in advance of publication, replied that it was clear there was but one point at issue between himself and Prof. Ramsay, and that was whether the first missionary journey and the founding of the Galatian churches preceded or followed the situation implied in Gal. ii. 1-10. In spite of Prof. Ramsay's statement of the case he still maintained that this passage necessarily implies the events of the Galatian mission. He was not disposed to question the subjective force of *ἐνεργεῖν* (ver. 8), but he held that the personal qualifications to which it very probably referred could be inferred either directly by personal insight into character or indirectly by knowledge of the effects which these qualifications had produced. The

* Contrast especially the objective phrases of Acts xv. 4 and 12 [Note ver. 21], with such subjective phrases as Gal. ii. 8f: *ὁ γὰρ ἐνεργήσας Πέτρος εἰς ἀποστολὴν τῆς περιτομῆς ἐνήργησεν καὶ ἐμοὶ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, καὶ γνόυτες τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι.*

connection of the verb in its passage would seem to make it impossible to exclude the latter method. This Prof. Ramsay had seemed himself to imply in the paraphrase which he had given of these verses in his book.* If, then, facts were at the basis of the apostles' recognition of Paul's qualification, the question which remained was simply what these facts could be. Prof. Sanday held that Paul's language leaves no alternative to recognizing that the facts in question were the vital ones of the first missionary tour. There were three stages in the development of Paul's Gentile work. The first was his dealings with the handful of Gentile proselytes in Antioch (Acts xi. 25f.); the second was the incident with Sergius Paulus (Acts xiii. 8-12); the third was the significant work at Antioch in Pisidia (Acts xiii. 46ff.). Here was the turning-point. Luke recognizes it in his full record of Paul's words: "It was necessary that the Word of God should first have been spoken to you: but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles." With this Paul may be said to have formally assumed his "apostleship to the Gentiles," and from this day onward to have entered into the preaching of a real "gospel of the uncircumcision." Before this time such terms would have had little or no meaning (pp. 58-62).

Here then closed the debate. To those who have followed the course of argument, it is clear that Prof. Sanday has rightly divined the crucial point. It is simply whether Gal. ii. 1-10 represents a state of affairs which was possible on Paul's second visit to Jerusalem or a state which could not antedate the council of Acts xv.

We believe the first step in deciding this question is a careful and painstaking study of the agreement between the epistle passage and Acts xv. It is a purely analytic step and analytic work must always form the basis of any theory we may reach. Of course, both Prof. Ramsay and Prof. Sanday have given themselves to this task, and the former has come from it with the conviction that the discrepancies are so great as to necessitate some other theory than that of the harmony of these two passages; while

* Prof. Ramsay renders vers. 7, 8 as follows: "But, on the contrary, perceiving that I throughout my ministry am charged specially with the mission to foreign (non-Jewish) nations as Peter is with the Jewish mission—for he that worked for Peter to the apostolate of the circumcision worked also for me to be the missionary to the Gentiles—and *perceiving from the actual facts* [italics Prof. R.'s] the grace that had been given me, they, James and Cephas and John, the recognized pillars of the church, gave pledges to me and to Barnabas of a joint scheme of work, ours to be directed to the Gentiles, while theirs was to the Jews" (*St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 56).

the latter has found it bringing him to the conclusion that, though all difficulties may not be completely removed, they are much fewer than those which exist in the case of an attempted adjustment of the passage with Acts xi. 30, xii. 25—in fact, that they are so small that they not only do not constitute themselves into contradictions, but allow a perfectly rational and critical adjustment of the two narratives. We believe Prof. Sanday's conclusion to be thoroughly justified. A careful analysis of Acts xv shows us a visit of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem, the outward occasion of which was a controversy in Antioch concerning the circumcision of Gentile converts to Christianity and a consequent delegated mission from the Antioch church, consisting of Paul and Barnabas and "certain other" of the brethren, to the apostles and elders at Jerusalem for a settlement of the question involved (vers. 1f.). On their way through Samaria and Phœnicia they announce the Gentile results of their mission tour, to the great joy of the brethren (ver. 3). They apparently do the same thing upon their arrival at Jerusalem (ver. 4), but here the announcement produces a bigoted opposition such as had manifested itself at Antioch (ver. 5). There follows upon this a gathering of the apostles and elders (ver. 6), in which Peter opens with an address most heartily supporting Paul's and Barnabas' position (vers. 7-11). This is followed by the personal statement of Paul and Barnabas themselves (ver. 12), whereupon James reiterates Peter's views and gives his own judgment, which, while of the nature of a compromise, supports Paul and Barnabas in all the essentials of their claims (vers. 13-21). An analysis of Gal. ii shows us a visit of Paul to Jerusalem in company with Barnabas and having Titus also with him (ver. 1), the inward motive of which visit was a divine revelation granted to Paul (ver. 2). At Jerusalem Paul laid before the brethren (*ἀπὸ τοῖς* having *Ἱερουσόλυμα* as its antecedent) the Gospel which he preached among the Gentiles and further, in a private conference, laid it before the leaders of the church, in order to prevent a practical undoing of the work in which he had been and was yet engaged (ver. 2). In this conference there was urged upon him, apparently at the instigation of certain false brethren in the Church, the circumcision of his companion Titus, to which urging he absolutely refused to yield because of the principle at issue (vers. 3ff.). Of the necessity of this principle he so convinced the leaders of the Church that as the outcome of the conference they were completely won over to his views (ver. 6), and cordially recognized his Gentile mission as on a level with theirs to the Jews (vers. 7-10), requesting only that he would be mindful of the poor among them, which he declares he was zealous to do.

Now these results constitute a very distinct presumption in favor of the theory that these two passages refer to one and the same visit. The background of both is the circumcision controversy in the Church. Acts presents the outward occasion of the visit; Galatians its inward motive. Acts gives the public presentations of the apostles' work—first, the informal one to the brethren, afterwards the formal one in the council; Galatians gives the private conference between Paul and the leaders, which was doubtless occasioned by the first informal rehearsal of his Gentile work, and was purposed as a means of securing the leaders' support in the formal council which was to follow. The results were the same in both cases—Acts giving that of the public council, Galatians that of the private conference which led up to it. To establish the need of any other theory, Prof. Ramsay must not only show that these above results are not forthcoming, but that another theory will produce results which are critically preferable to these. We cannot say that Prof. Ramsay has shown that these results are not forthcoming. He has said he cannot see how a reference of the passage to the third visit can agree with the apostle's purpose in his argument; but Prof. Sanday had made it clear that he is standing on very dangerous ground when he asserts that Paul's argumentative object was to prove nothing more than his apostolic independence at his first preaching of his Gospel among the Galatians. It not only devitalizes his contention at the time of his writing—the time when it was being most opposed by his readers and when the confirmation of it meant most for himself and everything for the appeals he was making in the letter—but it comes directly in conflict with such terms as *ἵνα ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου διαμείνη πρὸς ὑμᾶς* (ii. 5). How could Paul speak this way if, at the time of this discussion, the Gospel had not yet come to the Galatians? It renders also of little or no force such complaints as the fourth chapter contains (vers. 16ff.). How could Paul protest so against the present loss of influence with them if he were not arguing for a present authority of apostleship with them? Prof. Ramsay will scarcely hold that the *κατὰ ἀνθρώπων λέγω* of iii. 15 signifies a demission of office throughout the letter and that the opening address, *Παῦλος ἀπόστολος, οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων οὐδέ δι' ἀνθρώπου, ἀλλὰ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἐξείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν*, was not intended to be of present insistence as the apostle was writing. But if the apostle is arguing for an apostleship which, beginning on the Damascus road, held itself permanently down to the day of his writing, then his argument must cover during that interval all possible points of intercourse with the Jerusalem apostles from whom he was being charged by the false

teachers that his apostolic rights and Gospel had been obtained. What would it have denoted for his present authority with the Galatians, to show that his first Gospel had been independent, if they could have shown that since then he had come under the direction and dictation of the Jerusalem leaders? And where could it be better argued that he had come under such control than from this visit that he had made to the council? How would Paul explain his acquiescence in the compromise of its decree? So, even granting that Paul's reference in i. 8f. is mainly to the first preaching of his gospel to the Galatians, the purpose of his argument is not exhausted in such reference. In fact, his gospel loses all its dignity, his apostleship all its power, his letter all its efficiency on any other theory than that in his apology, i. 11-ii. 21, he is covering all his possible points of dependence upon the Jerusalem apostles up to the date of his writing.* Prof. Ramsay admits that the rebuke of Peter (vers. 11-14) took place not before, but after his first mission to the Galatians.† Is he conscious that in so doing he is taking away from his view as to Paul's purpose of argument one of its most conclusive proofs? On the theory that Paul's argument extends up to the time of the epistle's writing this Antiochian incident has a most significant climactic force. On the theory that Paul's argument has to do only with the gospel of his first preaching the incident has no force at all.‡

But Prof. Ramsay has said we cannot understand the case of Titus except on the assumption that Paul took him up to Jerusalem as his assistant in the ministrations of the second visit unconscious of any danger in so doing. This is plausible, but can we understand the fierce contention which arose concerning him if the circumcision controversy was in such a mild state as this? There may be difficulty in understanding just why Paul brought Titus with him on the council journey; it might not satisfy Prof. Ramsay to say he brought him as a specimen of the gracious results of the first missionary tour and with a determination, because of the vital principle of justification by faith involved in this contest, to stand for his freedom in the matter of circumcision firm to the end; but it seems to be fully as likely to be the case as to assume that Paul so utterly misunderstood the state of affairs at the second visit as to make a blunder which almost cost the Jerusalem

* The present tenses of ver. 10 come out conspicuously in this view.

† *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 160.

‡ See the progress of thought in Paul's mind from i. 13 to ii. 11-14.

church a schism.* But, granting both suppositions to involve difficulties, the fact of the bitter struggle over his case is a fact which we can thoroughly understand, provided we have before us the startling facts of the Gentile character of the first mission tour and the inflaming influence of the visit to Antioch of the circumcision party from Jerusalem (Acts xv. 1). Prof. Sanday has not laid any too much emphasis upon this point. The struggle can be understood at the time of the council. It simply cannot be understood before.

The *διὰ δὲ τούτους παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους, οἵτινες παρεισήλθον κατασκοπῆσαι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῶν ἣν ἔχομεν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα ἡμᾶς καταδουλώσουσιν* shows a too developed and deliberately organized partisanship to belong to a state of affairs where Paul could be innocent of any risk of feeling in taking with him an uncircumcised Greek. Besides the phrase mentioned above, *οἷς οὐδὲ πρὸς ὤραν εἰζαμεν τῇ ὑποταγῇ, ἵνα ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου διαμείνῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς* cannot in any fairness of grammar be made to refer to a time before the Gospel had been preached at all to his readers.

But Prof. Ramsay has said that Paul's purpose in his recital of his Gospel to these Jerusalem leaders was not to acquaint them with the outward facts of his mission tour, otherwise the statement would have been more in the phraseology of Acts xv. †, 12; † nor was it to lay before them the primal principles of his gospel, since with these, of course, they had been acquainted from the

* We confess it is difficult for us to understand just how it was that, at the time of this second visit—in this early stage of the Church's work, when only proselytes as yet were missionized—Paul came to have in his company an uncircumcised Gentile convert. To say it was an unconscious exceptional case would seem to be dealing in a rather high-handed way with the difficulty and not removing it after all; for the query naturally arises, how could Paul at this time have fallen into such an exception even unconsciously? In view of the immediate investigation which Peter's fellowship with Cornelius produced, it is hardly too much to say that for Paul to have admitted into the Church at the time of this second visit an uncircumcised Greek and then taken him as his assistant up to Jerusalem is something we cannot understand. It may have been a bold thing for the apostle to do at the critical time of his third visit, but we can understand how he was insistent enough upon the principle involved to have done it; but how he ever thought of doing it at the undeveloped time of the second visit and how his doing of it produced no more disturbance in the Jerusalem church than Luke's silence regarding it would seem to imply we do not comprehend.

† Prof. Ramsay can hardly be unconscious of the fact that there is a distinctive difference between the significance of *ιδόντες* (Gal. ii. 7) and *γόντες* (Gal. ii. 9) and that this difference lies in the direction of the reference of *ιδόντες* to the line of outward facts and *γόντες* to that of inward facts. What Paul wishes us to understand in these verses therefore would seem to be that, far from these leaders imparting anything to him, on the contrary, when they saw, from the outward facts of his mission work which he laid before them, that he had been entrusted with the gospel of the uncircumcision,

beginning. It was rather to unfold to them the broader and more liberal ideas that had been forming in his mind during his work in Tarsus and Antioch. He saw the trouble these ideas would involve, when once they came to be put into real and extended practice. Clouds were already in the horizon; he wished to provide against the storm by conferring with these leaders beforehand, and so securing in advance their support of his position. We might possibly be able to accept this view were it not for the fact that Paul says the subject of this conference was τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ κηρύσσω ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (ver. 2). With Prof. Sanday, we find it impossible to understand this of such work as Paul had been or was doing in Cilicia or Syria. A careful study of τὰ ἔθνη as used by Paul will show a far broader meaning than would be covered by such proselytes as Prof. Ramsay holds formed his mission constituency at this time.* With Paul's declaration at the Pisidian Antioch before us,† together with his recital of the effects of his mission upon his return to the Syrian starting-point,‡ and on his journey through Phœnicia and Samaria to the council,§ we can understand what was meant by τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ κηρύσσω ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, as the subject of the conference. And with the struggle that had arisen in Antioch from the startling results of this mission effort—its bitter spirit, its serious import, as involved in its reference to council's decision—we can understand what was meant by μή πως εἰς κενὸν τρέχω ἢ ἔδραμον, as Paul's object in the conference. Without antecedent conditions such as these, we are free to confess the apostle's statement in his epistle offers itself to us as a genuine puzzle.

Prof. Ramsay has said finally—and we believe he emphasizes this as much as, perhaps more than, other points—that to hold Gal. ii. 1–10 as synchronous with Acts xv is to accuse the Jerusalem leaders, in spite of their leadership and their character as men of grace—sympathetic with gracious character wherever they come in

just as Peter had been entrusted with the gospel of the circumcision—for he that energized (by way of miraculous operations in the mission work of Gal. iii. 5) for Peter's benefit with a view to the apostleship of the circumcision energized also for my benefit with a view to the apostleship of the nations—and, in addition to this impression from these outward facts, when they recognized the personal grace given to me, James, Cephas and John, who seemed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, in order that we should go to the nations but they to the circumcision. In other words there is everything in this Galatian narrative to make us believe that on the visit to Jerusalem which it records Paul did distinctly lay before these leaders the outward facts of his mission tour.

* See confirmation of Prof. Ramsay's view in contrast between the Synagogue Greeks and outside Gentile multitude in Acts xiv. 1f.

† Acts xiii. 46.

‡ Acts xiv. 27.

§ Acts xv. 3.

contact with it—of a failure to appreciate Paul, or understand his gospel until after he had been for years at work in the Church. We cannot help believing that Prof. Ramsay understands that they who synchronize Gal. ii. 1–10 with Acts xv, hold, just as he does, that what Paul laid before the leaders at the time of the third visit was not the primary character of his commission as it had been given him on the Damascus road. In this respect Prof. Ramsay is quite right in contending that from the first the Jerusalem apostles must have recognized Paul and his work; but it must be very clear that it was one thing theoretically to grasp the mission Christ had given to this new member of the apostolic group, and it was quite another thing practically to face the tremendous issues brought before them by the revolutionary outcome of this first mission journey which this apostle had made. In view of this outcome we can understand the conflict at Antioch; in view of this outcome and the conflict which followed it, we can understand how something like this conference was needed to bring these leaders of the Church into a full acceptance of the inevitable consequences of a gospel of justification by faith. We say, therefore, Prof. Ramsay is undoubtedly right in maintaining that Paul's views must have been known to the apostles of the circumcision long before the council of 51, though perhaps he does not give enough weight to the small opportunity Paul must have had for previous conferences with them. Practically in these seventeen years he could have met with them but twice—the first time during his fifteen days' stay in the city, and the second time during his ministry to their famine needs: yet neither Prof. Ramsay nor Prof. Sanday seems to realize that Paul's views could have become known to the other apostles without need of much conferring; in fact, without need of any conferring at all. They were not so revolutionary as to be unintelligible to them except by laborious explanation. They were really the same views that they all of them held—at least Peter says so in his address before the council; and we can understand that in proportion as all the apostles were Christians on the basis of their justifying faith, they were practically at one with this new apostle in the Gospel principle which he maintained.

On the other hand, while Paul's views must have been evident to the Jerusalem apostles very early in his apostolic life, yet neither Paul nor the other apostles knew from the beginning to what consequences they would lead; it was only when these consequences appeared in the wholesale churching of uncircumcised Gentiles in the first mission journey that the sharp struggle at Antioch and the determined position at Jerusalem became possible.

If, therefore, the conference narrated in Galatians was simply as to the views and opinions held by Paul in themselves, then we cannot understand its occurrence so late as 51; if, however, it was as to these views and opinions in their practical relation to the admission of uncircumcised Gentiles into the Church and the practical effect of this upon the Christian keeping of the law, then we cannot understand how it could have been held previous to 51. As to which of these two suppositions is correct, Paul's statement of his motive for the conference seems to leave no reasonable doubt—*μή πως εἰς κενὸν πρέχω ἢ ἔδραμον*. Such words are most significant if the apostle is thinking of his just-finished mission tour, in whose results he clearly saw were involved, not only the practical efficacy of the gospel, but the very life principles on which it was based; they do not seem to have any significance if placed earlier in his work—in fact, it seems impossible to find anywhere earlier to place them.

Prof. Ramsay lays emphasis indeed upon Barnabas' bringing Saul into the Antioch work, as though it involved a knowledge on Barnabas' part and on the part of the apostles generally of Paul's gospel principles in their relation to the Gentile work of the Church; but two things are to be remembered in connection with this action of Barnabas—first, that his going for Saul was quite likely to have been at the suggestion of the Antioch Christians, as well as because of his own knowledge of the apostle. Paul evidently visited and worked in this Antioch region on his way from Jerusalem back to Cilicia (Gal. i. 21).^{*} His gospel principles may have then hinted to the Antioch brethren the possibility of such proselyte Gentile work as now appeared among them. If so, what more natural than that, when that work began in real activity, they should suggest that he be brought to their assistance? But, even supposing the suggestion came first from Barnabas, and was based on the general knowledge at Jerusalem of where the apostle stood in these matters, it was one thing to understand the apostle's views with reference to such a local proselyte work as was being carried on at Antioch; it was quite another thing to understand them with reference to all that was involved in such a wholesale Gentile work as that of the first mission tour. Paul himself must have grown up to the idea of the universality of the gospel, much more must the Jerusalem apostles have come to a realizing sense of the significance of such a work as the first mission journey represented. They all started on the same general basis of salvation by faith. Peter had this as

^{*} See Prof. Ramsay's change of the order of the regions mentioned in Gal. i. 21.

well as Paul, and had it from the beginning of his Christian life ; but it is quite clear from the narrative of Acts itself that it took Peter some time to come into a full comprehending of what this principle of salvation by faith really involved (cf. Acts x, xi, xv, together with Gal. ii. 11-21).

It was not therefore the theoretic principles of Paul's gospel that were conferred about in Galatians. These the apostles may have known—very probably did know long before—nor was it these principles as they were practically involved in the proselyte work of Antioch ; it was these principles in their practical application to this great problem of the reception of the Gentiles free and unproselyted into the Church. This application, far-reaching and wide-sweeping as it was, they did not realize until the events of this first journey brought it vividly before their eyes. Then they awoke to the facts, and the conference followed as a most reasonable, a most necessary, a most decidedly imperative thing.

In view, therefore, of the very great difficulties involved in Prof. Ramsay's contentions, it is rather too much to say that he has removed the strong presumption for a synchronizing of Gal. ii. 1-10 and Acts xv which a careful study of the passages gives.

Prof. Ramsay, however, does not feel that these difficulties exist. He holds that he has shown that the presumption lies rather against than for this adjustment, and so he advances the theory that the epistle passage is intended by the apostle to give a record of his second visit to Jerusalem narrated by Luke in Acts xi. 30, xii. 25.* His main proof of this theory, apart from the above objections to the generally accepted view, is that the phraseology of Gal. ii. 11-14, which gives an incident subsequent to vers. 1-10, shows a stage of party controversy previous even to this second visit ; while the phraseology of Acts xv shows a stage decidedly more developed.† The similarity between Gal. ii. 12 and Acts xi. 2, is indeed quite noticeable, especially in the party term *οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς*, and the accusation (fact), *συρραβίειν*. When, however, we

* We wonder whether Prof. Ramsay has fully considered the unlikelihood of the theological discussions between Paul and the Jerusalem apostles at the time of this second visit, when the whole Church must have been in the physical distress of the famine. It does not seem to us that such a conference as Galatians narrates would have been at all natural at such a time, especially if Paul's sole purpose in remaining in Jerusalem at all was to practically minister to the brethren's distress. There is no need of holding that the apostles were away from the city. They doubtless were at their post of duty, but their duty was then something entirely apart and away from doctrinal conferences. Paul seems to have taken for granted that the Galatians understood this and so without explanation omitted this second journey as not possibly coming within the lines of his argument.

† *St. Paul the Traveller*, pp. 159f. *The Expositor*, March, 1896, pp. 178-181.

turn to Acts xv, we find no longer this undeveloped state of affairs. The terms here are stronger. Instead of the simple *οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς*, we have the stronger *τινες τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς αἰρέσεως τῶν Φαρισαίων πεπιστευκότες*, and instead of the charge (fact) *συνεσθίειν*, we have the claim *δεῖ περιτέμνειν αὐτοὺς παραγγέλλειν τε τηρεῖν τὸν νόμον Μουσέως*. In Prof. Ramsay's mind this leaves no question but that Gal. ii. 11-14—and therefore Gal. ii. 1-10—together with Acts xi. 30, xii. 25, represent an earlier stage of the circumcision struggle than is given in Acts xv. 1-5. According to his view, the term *οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς* designates the Jewish Christians as a whole over against the uncircumcised Christians, while the term *τινες τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς αἰρέσεως τῶν Φαρισαίων πεπιστευκότες*, designates a party among these Jewish Christians who held to ultra-conservative views. There was no such party at the second visit (Acts xi. 30, xi. 25; Gal. ii. 1-10), but there was one at the third (Acts xv. 1-5).

Now there can be no question that Prof. Ramsay has very properly called our attention to this difference in terms, which cannot be gainsaid; but we feel sure that, upon a careful consideration of the situation involved in Gal. ii. 11-14, it will be seen that it is a difference that makes against rather than for his position. What was it that really happened at Antioch at this time of Peter's visit? Why, in substance this: Peter, under the liberal impulse of the council, which had just been held—where, through the preliminary conference with Paul and Barnabas, he had come to broader views of the great principle of justification by faith—laid aside so much of his old conservatism that he was willing to go in and keep company with the Gentiles. There came down from James, however, certain parties who, whatever their purpose in coming may have been, gave Peter to understand that he could not go to this extent of liberty and maintain the position which he had assumed of being the apostle *εἰς τὴν περιτομήν*—that this decree which the council had promulgated was for uncircumcised Gentiles who wished to come into the Church, not for circumcised Jews who were already in the Church. To the former might be granted some concessions in the matter of keeping the law; the latter were under a law-responsibility from which they were not freed by this decree in any way. Now evidently this was not the position of the party who demanded circumcision. It was simply the view of the general body of the Jews who might be said to stand between this bigoted circumcision party on the one side, and the liberal Pauline party on the other side—who for themselves held to the keeping of the law, but for converted Gentiles were willing, because of this principle of justification by faith, to yield much of the law's demand. It was, of course, at its heart

an inconsistent position and showed how far short the leaders even yet were from fully grasping all that justification by faith involved: but its inconsistency formed the background of Paul's rebuke: "When I saw that he walked not straightly in accord with the truth of the gospel (*πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*—the same term used by Paul in ver. 5, to designate the great gospel principle for whose abiding with the Galatians he was contending), I said to Cephas before them all, If thou, though thou art a circumcised Jew, art liberal enough—believest enough in justification by faith—to live as an uncircumcised Gentile, and not in full vigor of a strict party Jew, how is it that by yielding to the demands of conservative Judaism thou bringest moral suasion upon the Gentiles to make Jews of themselves, as though after all justification by faith did not exist?"* The council's decree, compromise though it was, was based on this essential principle of justification by faith; but justification by faith meant that the Christian Gentile was just as much saved as the Christian Jew, and as long as he lived within the compromise requirements of the decree, was to be recognized by the Jew as a Christian brother in the fullest sense of the term. You hold to the decree—you admit the principle—why do you not live up to it? What sort of an admission of the Gentiles into the Church was this which called them Christians, but refused to have Christian intercourse with them?

This was Paul's position, and we quite agree with Prof. Ramsay when he says it must have had its desired effect.† But is this not a state of affairs which could have existed—must have existed—long after the second visit of Acts xi and xii, and yet is perfectly consistent with the strained condition evidently set forth in Acts xv. 1-5? In other words, is Prof. Ramsay justified in insisting that the party term, *οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς*, could not have been used at the same stage of the circumcision controversy as the term, *τινες τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρέσεως τῶν Φαρισαίων πεπιστευότες*. If he is not so justified, does there not fail him the main argument for his synchronizing

* It must not be forgotten that the hypocrisy of Peter and his companions (Gal. ii. 13) was something in addition to the inconsistency of their action and entered very distinctly into Paul's rebuke. It consisted not in the mere fact of their withdrawing from Gentile intercourse—this was the inconsistency—but in withdrawing in such a way as to give the impression that Gentile intercourse was a sin (cf. the significance of the question in ver. 17—*ἄρα Χριστὸς ἀμαρτίας διάκονος*);). This was, in fact, the moral fault with Peter and constituted the moral suasion which made itself felt upon the Gentile membership of the Church, though they resented it and doubtless refused to act in obedience to it.

† *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 161.

of Gal. ii. 1-10 with Acts xi. 30, xii. 25? * We feel that Prof. Ramsay has not made out his case. The chief points for which he contends seem all against him. If we are right in our feeling, then it seems that with these chief points decided the minor ones may be allowed to adjust themselves.

There is, therefore, no real difficulty offered by the question of Paul's primary motive in coming up to Jerusalem *κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν* (Gal.); *ἔταξαν ἀναβαίνειν Παῦλον καὶ Βαρνάβαν καὶ τινὰς ἄλλοις ἐξ αὐτῶν πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους καὶ πρεσβυτέρους εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ περὶ τοῦ ζητήματος τούτου* (Acts). Theoretically, a double motive is never impossible. It seems to have practically existed in the case of Paul's first visit to Jerusalem (*ἰστοροῦσαι Κηφᾶν*—Gal. i. 18; *συμβουλεύσαντο οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀνελεῖν αὐτόν*—Acts ix. 23). In fact, in proportion as it is contended that Gal. ii. 1-10 gives the personal and subjective side of the visit, the *κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν* of ver. 2 could hardly be referred to the public prophecy of Acts xi. 27f.

The question also as to whether the council's decree, in which Paul acquiesced, could be said to contradict his statement in Gal. ii. 6, that the leaders imparted nothing to him at the time of his conference, offers no trouble. They imparted nothing to him in the way of modifying the essential principle of his Gospel of justification by faith—they did not win him over to their law conservative side; on the contrary, it was he that won them over to his law liberal side. If the decree of Acts xv was consistent with Paul's position at all, it was consistent with this statement which he makes in Gal. ii. 6.

The further question as to whether the council's decree was intended to be permanent and universal beyond the churches to which it was addressed takes care of itself. Paul certainly delivered it to the South Galatian churches. He certainly modified it for the Corinthian Christians. But whatever its intended scope, it does not militate against the possibility of the private conference

* There is doubtless some reason for Prof. Ramsay's difficulty in understanding such a course of action on Peter's part after the stand he had taken in the council. We would not accuse him of oversensitiveness in the apostle's behalf; but we would ask him whether it is not possible to understand how Peter came to give himself to such fellowship with the Gentiles after the stimulus of the council's decision; and at the same time whether it is not possible to understand how, in spite of this decision, these members of the *οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς* should have come down to Antioch and urged upon Peter a more conservative course of action, in view of his accredited position as the apostle to the circumcision. If then Peter yielded to their urging and returned to his Jewish exclusiveness—not in the honest, manly way in which he might, but in the false-impressioning way in which he did—does not Paul's rebuke become all the more significant and carry with itself a greater force just because all this transpired after the council's action and Peter's part in it?

of Gal. ii. 1-10, leading up to and being the cause of its adoption in the council.

Besides this, the question as to the fitting in of the time statement (Gal. ii. 1) with the date of Paul's conversion is one which allows of entirely separate discussion. Prof. Ramsay has advanced a theory which, if correct, would allow the apostle to make the *ἔπειτα διὰ δεκατεσσάρων* of ii. 1 refer to the date of his second visit to Jerusalem, providing the point from which he reckons is his conversion.* But even granting this theory, it might yet possibly refer to his third journey, if the point of reckoning be the last previous date given in the epistle narrative, viz., his return from Arabia to Damascus (i. 18), as some contend it was.

So, in like manner, though they may have more or less of a bearing upon the final conclusion, we may allow to settle themselves, apart from the main problem of the visit referred to in the epistle, the correlated questions as to what did or did not constitute the relief given at the second visit and what was the extent of the *διαζωία*, which it involved; † the question as to whether Acts

* *Expositor*, May, 1896, pp. 336-345. In a note on "Peter's Sojourn in Rome" (*American Journal of Theology*, January, 1897, pp. 145-149), Dr. McGiffert, following Oskar Holtzmann, calls attention to a suggested date for Paul's arrival at Rome (55-56 A.D. instead of 60-61 A.D.), which he holds would be quite consistent with a reference of Gal. ii. 1-10 to the council visit. There would seem to be considerable in favor of the suggestion from the silence of Tacitus regarding the further relations of Pallas to Nero after his disgrace at court, as also from the definite date given the accession of Festus in the Eusebian *Chronicles*, but it stands against the statement of Acts xviii. 2, if the Claudian edict there referred to be dated in 52 A.D. (See, however, Orosius' [*History*, vii, 6] dating of it in 49, the sources for which statement unfortunately no longer exist.) Further than this it is fatally out of keeping with the question put to Paul by the captain of the guard at Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 3-6), providing Josephus' placing of the Sicarii within the reign of Nero can be relied upon. For bibliography of the discussion, with his own view in favor of the later date, cf. Schürer, *The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, 1891, American Ed., Div. i, Vol. ii, p. 182, Note 38. For discussion of the whole New Testament chronology cf. Oskar Holtzmann, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, 1895, pp. 125-135. For discussion of the general Pauline chronology, cf. Harnack's *Chronologie d. Altchristl. Litteratur*, 1897, I. Bd, pp. 233-239.

† If Prof. Ramsay be correct in assuming that Paul not only took up to Jerusalem the assistance gathered by the church at Antioch, but remained in the city in order to give himself personally to the *διαζωία* of its distribution, is it not rather strange that Paul should give such large space in his Galatian argument—which was to prove his equal dignity with the Jerusalem apostles, as well as his personal independence of them (cf. Gal. ii. 7ff.)—to the doings of this visit, the chief purpose of which and the main occupation during which was such a service as Acts vi. 2-4 would give us to suppose was unbefitting an apostle (cf. Ramsay's own admission, *St. Paul*, p. 52, and the hint of unfitness given in the statement of Acts xi. 30 that the assistance was delivered for its distribution into the hands not of the apostles but of the elders).

xxii. 17-21 refers to the apostle's first visit to Jerusalem (Acts ix. 26-30), or was an incident accompanying this second;* the textual puzzle as to the reading of *Ἑλληριστάς* (Acts xi. 20).†

On this problem Prof. Ramsay has compelled us to new and careful thinking: but we do not come from it with any persuasion toward his hypothesis. In fact, the more careful our study, the stronger grows the presumption that in this passage the apostle is giving us the private side of his visit to Jerusalem on the occasion of the council of Acts xv; and that to say he is narrating his visit at the time of the famine is not simply to bring confusion into Luke's record and devitalize Paul's all-important argument, but to mistake the natural and necessary development of the Judaistic controversy in the apostolic Church.

HARTFORD.

M. W. JACOBUS.

* In placing this in the second visit Prof. Ramsay must assure himself that he is not doing violence to the exactness of Luke's statement, xxii. 17, *Ἐγένετο δὲ μοι ὑποστρέψαντι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ κτλ.*, and Prof. Ramsay, we believe, places high value on the accurate wording of Luke's record. He must also remember there is no need that the statement of Paul's Gentile mission, in the closing words of the trance, should have been followed by an immediate work among the Gentiles; since the apostle's mission to the Gentiles was given him in his original commission on the way to Damascus, after which there came at least the three years of waiting in Arabia before any decided work of any sort was done.

† In spite of Tischendorf's (8th ed.) reading of *Ἑλληνας* and the internal probability in its favor, not only from the fact that chaps. vi and ix show the *Ἑλληρισταί* as already preached to, but from the fact that chaps. viii and x show the gospel as given even to Samaritans and proselytes, Westcott and Hort are doubtless right in their Appendix discussion (Vol. ii, p. 93f.), favoring the reading of *Ἑλληριστάς* which they have adopted into their text.