

scripts, the hieratic of the Middle Empire, and a very much older hieratic of the Early Empire, preserved in the Papyrus Prisse found in a tomb of the eleventh dynasty. Some forty-five of the hieroglyphic signs had acquired a kind of alphabetic character. The famous French Egyptologist, De Rouge, promulgated the theory that a Semitic people took twenty-one of these, in the form which they have in the ancient hieratic script, and adding another non-Egyptian sign, formed the first alphabet, generally called the Phœnician alphabet, from which that of Greece and Rome and our own were derived. It remained an open question what people did this, whether a race in South Arabia (Hommel's *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, p. 77) or a Phœnician trading colony on the Delta, whose original home was Caphtor, usually identified with Crete. (See article 'Alphabet' in *H.D.B.*) Such was De Rouge's theory. In 1894 Mr. Evans, an Oxford archæologist, by comparing the symbols engraved on ancient stones worn by the women of Crete as charms, with others on the walls of Knossos, in Crete, discovered that two systems of writing, a hieroglyphic and a linear, existed in Crete and the early Ægean world. In a letter to the *Times* of 30th October last, Messrs. Evans and Hogarth gave an account of their discovery at Knossos of a palace, vases, the famous Labyrinth,

and masses of tablets. Mr. Evans in the *Archæological Report*, and Mr. Hogarth in the *Contemporary Review* for December, give a fuller description of these tablets. They are in two scripts. The hieroglyphics, however, have little, and the cursive has even less, resemblance to the Egyptian scripts of the same name. Evidently we have two developments from an earlier original. Now, if the original of the letters of the (so-called) Phœnician alphabet be compared with the scripts just discovered, it is found that 'two-thirds of the former correspond with actual types of one or other of the Cretan systems. It is not too much to say that De Rouge's theory must be definitely abandoned,' and that it was from the Cretan script the Phœnician alphabet was derived.

Egypt had, as is well known, not merely a connexion with Babylon and Crete, but with Rome. More than twenty years ago a colossal group was discovered at Alexandria. Maspero has now shown that it represented Anthony and Cleopatra, and that the statue of the queen is a real portrait. It is evident that the scientists have begun, not a moment too soon, to take care of the treasures on the banks of the Nile. On 31st October 1899 eleven columns of the hypostyle hall at Karnak fell, but measures have been taken to preserve the pillars that remain, and restore those that have fallen.

A New Theory as to the Date of the Epistle to the Galatians.

BY PROFESSOR W. M. RAMSAY, LL.D., D.C.L., ABERDEEN.

EARLY in the year 1900 Mr. Bartlet of Mansfield College, Oxford, in his excellent book on *The Apostolic Age*, assumed the theory (which he had stated and defended at length in the *Expositor*, 1899) that the Epistle to the Galatians was written by St. Paul after returning from his first missionary journey and immediately before the Apostolic Council described in Ac 15. Unfortunately he united this theory with certain unnecessary concomitants, which seem to have prevented it from finding serious consideration or fair discussion. (1) He supposed that St. Paul made a journey to

Jerusalem between the two which are described in Ac 9 and 11, 12; and that this journey, about which Luke is silent (and presumably ignorant), was the one which Paul describes in Gal 2¹⁻¹⁰. Such a complex hypothesis was not likely to find much favour. (2) Further, he leaned to the supposition that Galatians was written on the journey through Phœnicia to Jerusalem, as described in Ac 15³; and (3) he explained Paul's reference in Gal 4¹³ to his 'former visit,' either as not necessarily implying that there had been a second visit (which, though stated by many commentators,

cannot be approved), or as sufficiently justified by the return after an interval to Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch, Ac 14²¹ (which seems a justifiable interpretation).

These additions sprang probably from the tendency to retain as much as possible from current views. That is certainly and professedly (see p. 85) the case with (2), which is the least satisfactory detail in the whole theory; a bad explanation needed to suit the current theory is needlessly adopted by Mr. Bartlet and worked into his own theory.

Professor Valentin Weber of the (Catholic) University of Würzburg has, during the present year, published several papers and an elaborate book,¹ in which he supports a similar theory to Mr. Bartlet's about the date of the Epistle; but he has not encumbered it with the needless complications which the English scholar has attached to it; and he has worked it out in such elaboration as to make his work a complete re-study of the early years in Christian history, and of a large part of Pauline biography. The work demands, and is sure to receive, careful and prolonged consideration. His most salient results—but not his most important, for some, which are not so easily quotable in a short notice, are really of the greatest importance—are these—

1. The Epistle to the Galatians was written from Antioch, while Paul was resident there after returning from his first journey, and before the necessity for his third visit to Jerusalem arose: *i.e.* Galatians coincides with the period of Ac 14²⁸, and belongs to 49 A.D. (or perhaps even the last months of 48 A.D.).

2. The second visit of Paul to the Galatians (Gal 4¹³) is described in Ac 14²¹.

3. The second visit of Paul to Jerusalem after his conversion is described in Gal 2¹⁻¹⁰ and in Ac 11³⁰ 12²⁵.

4. A new construction and interpretation of the portentous sentence, Gal 2²⁻¹⁰, is proposed: the novelty lies mainly in v.⁶: 'Whatever character, originating from the accepted leaders,

they (*i.e.* the false brethren) bore matters not to me.'

5. Professor Weber has a new argument to prove that Gal 2¹⁻¹⁰ cannot be a description of the visit to Jerusalem described in Ac 15, which appears as conclusive as an argument can be. Paul describes in Gal 1²¹⁻²⁴ his action during the interval between his first and second visits to Jerusalem: he was in the province of Syria-Cilicia during the whole of that time, and his conduct there was the subject of reports in Jerusalem. That Syro-Cilician period of eleven (or fourteen)² years was concluded by his second visit to Jerusalem. Now, on the common hypothesis that the visit described as the second in Gal 2¹ was really the third,—being the one described in Ac 15,—the whole of the first missionary journey would have to be placed in that period of eleven (or fourteen) years, which would be a flagrant contradiction of Gal 1²¹⁻²⁴.

It cannot be said that I am, as yet, convinced by Mr. Bartlet (even setting aside what seem to me blemishes in his argument) and Professor Weber. I am not yet able to see that all the development in the Galatian Christianity implied (as it seems to me) in the Epistle could have occurred within the few months allowed by their ingenious theory. The 'quick removing' of Gal 1⁶ seems to me not to imply what is claimed for it. The Galatians are not addressed, like the Corinthians, as struggling with the difficulties natural to raw pagans in the first steps of Christianity; they are rather treated as well advanced on their path and in face of a fork in the road. But their rapid development in Christianity might be explained, perhaps, as due to their having been already strongly influenced by Judaism (as taught them by the many thousands of Jews settled in the great cities of Southern Phrygia). I am far from pressing the objection as a really serious one.

But it is not my intention to argue against a new theory. Such a procedure seems to me right only when one is persuaded that a theory is pernicious. At the first glance one is too apt to see with a prejudiced and unsympathetic eye. A year ago, in the *Historical Commentary on Galatians*, p. 286, I spoke of Mr. Bartlet's view as 'a fair theory, which at present I dare neither accept nor reject.' Far more emphatically may one say that of the

² Professor Weber (like me) has no doubt that the period is not fourteen, but eleven years.

¹ (1) *Die Abfassung des Galaterbriefs vor dem Apostelkonzil*. Ravensburg: Kitz, 1900. Pp. xvi, 402. (2) *Die Adressaten des Galaterbriefes: Beweis der rein-südgälatischen Theorie*. Ravensburg: Kitz, 1900. Pp. iv, 80. (3) *Der heilige Paulus vom Apostelübergang (Gal. ii.) bis zum Apostelkonzil (Acts xv.)*, to appear in the next number of the *Biblische Studien* of Bardenhewer. (4) *Erklärung von Gal. ii. 6*. Mainz: Kirchheim, 1900. Pp. 20.

improved theory ; it is a fair and reasonable theory, and a fair critic must recommend it to others for the same careful study and consideration which I intend to give it. A long time of thought is needed before any one can safely say that he has judged it and condemned it absolutely without prejudice ; and if one is firmly resolved to clear one's mind of prejudice, the process may well end in accepting it. The best way to shake off one's prejudice is to suppose that the theory is true, to judge it from the author's point of view, to see what one can learn from it, and what results will follow from it. Perhaps the most useful conclusion to this article will be for me to put myself in that position. Suppose Professor Weber is right : what bearing will that have on my own views ? So far as I am conscious, little change would be needed in my Commentary except in § xlv. f., where the comparison of the accounts in the Epistle and in Acts of the second visit to the Galatian Churches would fall to the ground, as would also the remark (p. 404) that Ac 18²³, 'stablishing all the disciples,' is the natural sequel to the situation in which the Epistle was written : 'the stablishing is mentioned because it was an important fact.' Paul wrote the Epistle, 'and then at the earliest opportunity visited them, and stablished all the disciples. The fight was ended, and Paul was victorious.' All that, amounting to three or four pages, would have to be partly modified, partly abandoned. But, for the most part, my book was rewritten after reading Mr. Bartlet's article, and anything assuming a late date for the Epistle was cut out. Those two sections, however, were left practically unchanged from their first printed form ; and parts of them are inconsistent with the new dating. Section viii. p. 257 ff. also assumes the later date for the Epistle ; and at present it seems that the real *crux* lies there, as will be shown at the end of this review. There may also be a few other cases ; but, as a whole, the Commentary would suit Professor Weber's dating better than Professor Zahn's ; the latter dates the Epistle only a year, or eighteen months, earlier than I do, but he supposes it was written in Corinth, which changes the atmosphere of composition.

Otherwise, the agreement between us is in many respects quite striking. That the Epistle was written from Antioch seems to me of the utmost consequence for the right understanding of it : Professor Weber is agreed. The chronology which I have supported in a series of

studies from many points of view is the same as his. The exactness of agreement between the Epistle and the Acts, and the thorough trustworthiness of the Acts in all that concerns the controversy between the Judaistic and the Gentile parties, are points on which we come to the same conclusion. There are many details of interpretation and of historical situation in which he disagrees with me ; but none of them are, I think, essential to my theory, nor is his disagreement essential to his.

A good example of the mingled agreement between us as regards general historical theory, and difference as to the interpretation of details and circumstances, is furnished by the dispute between St. Peter and St. Paul (Gal 2^{11ff.}). We are agreed that it occurred after Paul's second visit to Jerusalem, 46 A.D. (Gal 2¹⁻¹⁰), when Peter, James, and John approved his attitude to the Gentiles, and before the third visit, 49-50 A.D. (Ac 15). But we differ as to the interpretation of the circumstances. Professor Weber vehemently disapproves my view that the 'certain (who) came from James' (Gal 2¹²) are the 'certain (who) came down from Judæa and taught, "if ye be not circumcised, ye cannot be saved" (Ac 15¹).' He explains the situation differently, but is ready to accept the dating.

A specially striking agreement, however, lies in this, that while we were both quite clear as to the dispute having occurred after 46 A.D. and before 49-50, we both hesitated long whether to place it in the beginning or the end of that period, whether at the time of Ac 13¹ or of Ac 15¹, *i.e.* immediately before or immediately after the first missionary journey to the Galatian cities.

Professor Weber tells of his hesitation on pp. 27 and 248 ff. He leaves both datings open. A correspondence between Rev. F. Warburton Lewis and myself went on for some time on that question while I was writing *St. Paul the Traveller*. At first we both inclined to the earlier date ; but finally the marked agreement in situation and expression between Ac 15¹⁻² and Gal 2^{11ff.} determined my choice of the latter date. Mr. Lewis, I think, regretted my choice, and has always favoured the earlier date, towards which on the whole Professor Weber seems, perhaps, more inclined, though he leaves both alternatives open, and does not decide. I have never felt clear on the point, and have often doubted in the last few

years whether the early date should not after all be preferred.

Professor Weber has not in every case noticed the agreements between him and myself. It seems clear that he worked out his own theory in almost perfect independence, and I should suppose that he had elaborated it before he had looked into my *St. Paul the Traveller*. If that be so, it may fairly be regarded as a confirmation of the truth of our joint views that he has in so many important points arrived independently at the same result. This opinion as to his essential independence of my second work is founded partly on the fact that he introduces a modification on his theory as a sort of afterthought (p. 250, note), after reading the German translation of *St. Paul the Traveller*, but still more on his pointed criticism of several opinions expressed in my *Church in the Roman Empire*, part i., which were changed in the latter work.

It is only natural, then, that he is struck with the incompleteness of the form in which I stated the South-Galatian theory. The book on the *Church in the Roman Empire* was planned and partly written (as is stated in it) on the North-Galatian theory; and it was only in the course of composition that the falseness of that theory became clear to me. But it took a long time before all the consequences of the true theory opened up before me; and there clung to my first exposition of it many traces of the original error. With marvellous ratiocination several of my critics have pounced on these traces, and held up to ridicule and scorn the inconsistencies between them and my maturer thoughts, as if these were a disproof of the South-Galatian theory.

The least successful part of Professor Weber's reasoning seems to be, in i. § 17, p. 77 ff., where he discusses the incident recorded in Ac 16³, the circumcision of Timothy. The most serious

difficulty, perhaps, in his dating of the Epistle to the Galatians lies here. Paul says to the Galatians, 'If ye receive circumcision, Christ will profit you nothing' (Gal 5²). It is not easy to think that, after he had uttered such a strong sentiment, whether to them or to anyone, he could have himself circumcised Timothy. Professor Weber tries to interpret this as an argument on his own side. He thinks that Paul would not have uttered such a sentiment after he had circumcised Timothy; but, as yet, I cannot see from, or sympathize with, his point of view. The truth is that the act was one which is not easy to understand or to justify. It seems to have misled the Galatians, as I have argued in my Commentary, § viii. They honestly thought that Paul thereby sanctioned the principle that the full acceptance of the Mosaic Law was the highest and most difficult and advanced stage in Christian life. It appears to me that Gal 5² states practically the same principle as 1 Co 7¹⁸: 'Hath any been called in uncircumcision, let him not be circumcised.' These express the final rule which Paul laid down on the subject. My view has been that the action towards Timothy was performed before Paul was perfectly clear as to the serious danger of allowing his new converts to adopt the rite; but that afterwards he emphasized the rule to both Galatians and Corinthians. Professor Weber holds that he first laid down the rule to the Galatians, then treated Timothy as a special and exceptional case, and then again laid down the rule to the Corinthians. I do not consider that this is necessarily fatal to his theory, but it is at least a difficulty in it.

The book is full of new and often striking views and interpretations. In this notice most attention has been given to the points of agreement between us; but many will probably find that the points of difference are among the best things in Professor Weber's work.