

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

*ST. PAUL AND THE JEWISH CHRISTIANS*  
IN A.D. 46.

DR. SANDAY, in his kind notice of my *St. Paul*,<sup>1</sup> refers to the mention of my two masters, Mommsen and Lightfoot. It has been my misfortune that the right to add a third to that list has been denied me by my distance from himself. I know from some occasional conversations, as well as from the testimony of others, how much I have lost by not having the opportunity of carrying my difficulties to him, to be discussed with his knowledge and sympathy and fairness of judgment. Every one who knows Oxford knows how much he has done for the younger generation of Oxford students; but we who live far from Oxford sometimes feel that he has "to college given up what was meant for mankind," and has given the world in general only the too scanty residue of his time and work.

It is not my desire to take up the position of arguing with him; but the question to which he has devoted most of his paper in the last *EXPOSITOR* is so important and of such wide-reaching consequences that it seems right to add a short statement on the other side. Especially it seems advisable, in respect of his statement, that I have not seen clearly enough the arguments that tell on the side opposed to myself (p. 83), to remind the reader that I was by my plan confined to the statement of my own view, according the minimum of notice to contrary arguments.<sup>2</sup> I wished to write only a short book. I transgressed my intended

<sup>1</sup> My thanks are due for his courtesy in sending me his proofs early in January, and allowing me to suggest to him some places where in my book I had indicated my attitude. But I did not begin to reply till I had seen his article finally in the bound number of the *Expositor*.

<sup>2</sup> My case can be estimated only from the whole run of history 40-50 A.D. Many paragraphs in Chapters I. and III.-IX. embody a reply in non-controversial form to the arguments opposed to me.

limits by sixty pages ; but had I given a full consideration of other opinions and the reasons that compelled me to reject them, two large volumes would have been required. Dr. Sanday has evidently considered that, in particular, I have not seen sufficiently the force of the arguments that are advanced in favour of identifying the visit of Paul to Jerusalem described in *Galatians* ii. 1-10 with that described in *Acts* xv. ; and he "states a case on the other side." Perhaps his impression is true ; perhaps I have not realized the strength of the other side ; but at least I was long a believer in it and in the consequences that rise from it (which neither he nor Lightfoot have been willing to accept). His statement of the arguments on this question in the last EXPOSITOR, apart from a few incidental and unessential phrases, might have been written before my book appeared. Though he intends "to weigh the minor arguments for and against," he hardly notices the reasons which are given in my book for my view, and I cannot find that he touches on any of those which seemed to me most telling. The view which he states had been read by me many times, as stated by himself previously, by Lightfoot, and by others, and had been considered by me as carefully as I am capable of considering anything ; and it seems best now to state the reasons that weighed with me in rejecting it.

For my own part I regret for more than one reason that Dr. Sanday has preferred the plan of re-stating the case as it presented itself to him of old. Not merely am I thus deprived of what I should have highly valued, viz., the criticism which he would have had to offer on my arguments after weighing them—and there is no person whose criticism I should have esteemed more highly,—but further, Dr. Sanday seems to me to re-state from memory opinions and reasons which commended themselves to him formerly, when he thought differently on at least one fundamental

and universally transforming fact in early Christian history. When he weighed the whole question and decided it formerly, at the time that he was preparing his edition of *Galatians* (1878), he held unhesitatingly the North-Galatian view. Now while it seems to be not wholly impossible for a "North-Galatian" to think as I do about *Galatians* ii. 1-10,<sup>1</sup> at least he is deprived of most of the arguments that seem to me strongest. On the North-Galatian view Paul had paid the visit of *Acts* xv. before he ever saw Galatia; and he was therefore bound to mention that visit in describing to the Galatians the influences that had affected his mind before he first preached to them. If he omitted that visit from his autobiographical sketch, he would be leaving out the fact that told most strongly against him, and common honesty forbade the omission. Dr. Sanday, naturally, was unwilling to admit a view that was so fatal to Paul's fairness in argument.

Now in regard to the present question, the South-Galatian view seems to me to effect a vital transformation. Whereas the North-Galatian theory makes it an imperative duty for Paul to speak of the third visit (*Acts* xv.) in the opening of his argument to the Galatians, chapters i., ii., the South-Galatian theory, on the contrary, makes it an argumentative absurdity for him to touch on the third visit; on the South-Galatian theory the third visit to Jerusalem was later than the conversion of the Galatians, and it would therefore be not merely unnecessary, but meaningless, to speak of that visit when he was discussing the origin of, and authority for, his original message to the Galatians.

Dr. Sanday has publicly stated his withdrawal from the North-Galatian position. Now I have myself often experienced how necessary it is for an investigator and seeker

<sup>1</sup> I am under the impression that Fritzsche held the "North-Galatian" view; and yet Lightfoot says "the arguments in favour of the second visit of the *Acts* are best stated by Fritzsche, *Opusc.*, pp. 223 ff."

after truth, when he alters his view on any important point in ancient history or geography, to review carefully everything that lies around it. He must strip off from himself all his opinions on the entire subject, reconsider every point from first principles, and rebuild his whole view from the foundations. Some opinions will emerge from the process practically unchanged, but others may be found to have been materially affected by the change in the point of view. Unless one does this, it seems to me impossible to feel any confidence that one is not allowing opinions to retain their seat, which were connected with and coloured by one's former view on the point about which one has now come to think differently. The impression is conveyed to me by this article, I must confess, that Dr. Sanday has not yet gone through this process in the history of 40-50 A.D.; and considering the onerous duties and engagements that keep incessantly pressing on his time, this is not strange.

In his edition of *Galatians*, p. 466, he explained Paul's failure to allude to the Decree by supposing (as Lightfoot also did) that the Decree was not applicable to the Galatians. He says, "It would not follow that the Decree would be binding on other Gentile Churches." But Paul had actually delivered it to the South-Galatian Churches (*Acts* xvi. 4); and he therefore did consider it binding on them. But, on any theory, it is a position that seems untenable, without a larger share of theological acuteness than I possess, to maintain that its enactments were special, and that it was not "intended to be permanent and universal," or, as Dr. Sanday puts it, that it must not be taken as binding on other Gentile Churches than those to whom it was addressed. He says that it applied only to "a particular district which was in comparatively close communion with Judæa," viz., Syria and Cilicia. But Luke declares in sweeping terms that Paul, on his

second journey, "delivered them the Decrees for to keep." No one can say that Lystra or Iconium were "in comparatively close communion with Judæa." On the contrary, that long land-journey severed them; and the Jews of central Asia Minor were notoriously isolated and weak in Judaism (*St. Paul*, p. 142).

Dr. Sanday "puts in the forefront the one consideration which compels him to adhere to the older view." He believes that *Galatians* ii. 1-10 describes a state of things more advanced than we find in *Acts* xi. 30 (p. 85); and he says that, at the time described in *Acts* xi. 30, "there is no watchword 'Jew' and 'Gentile,' no antithesis of 'circumcision' and 'uncircumcision.'"<sup>1</sup> Those watchwords and that antithesis seem to him to describe, on the other hand, exactly the situation of affairs indicated in *Acts* xv. This consideration "seems to him in the strictly Baconian sense crucial."

Such is Dr. Sanday's theory. How does it agree with the facts as recorded by Luke, the only authority that it recognises for A.D. 44-46?

Two reasons seem to me to tell against this theory, and to show that "the antithesis of 'circumcision' and 'uncircumcision'" was completely developed at the stage described in *Acts* xi. 30: (1) the words of Luke himself (*Acts* xi. 2) show the antithesis in full operation at an earlier stage, probably several years before the visit alluded to in xi. 30, xii. 25; (2) human nature, and especially Jewish nature, make it plain that the antithesis would start into full life the moment that an uncircumcised Gentile was introduced into the Church.

It seems to me so natural that the strong prejudice and antipathy of the Jews should be roused when the first news

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Sanday (p. 86) claims me as his supporter in dating the origin of this antithesis so late. But in my *St. Paul*, p. 58, I speak of "two distinct and opposed opinions" in A.D. 45; and on the same page I use the term "party."

about Cornelius reached Jerusalem, that it would constitute a strong argument (in my humble judgment) against the credibility of Luke's history, if he confirmed Dr. Sanday's belief that the antithesis was not developed until the Apostolic Council, fully ten or twelve years after this uncircumcised Gentile was admitted into the Church. Throughout all history a word, or a report, of violation of the deep convictions and pride of religion of the Jews has been sufficient to rouse them: had it not been for the intense strength and fire of their convictions, the race could never have maintained its character as it has done. Luke confirms all the impression that we gather from later history. He tells that on Cornelius's baptism "the brethren that were in Judæa heard that the Gentiles also had received the word of God; and when Peter was come up to Jerusalem, they that were of the circumcision contended with him, saying, 'Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised and didst eat with them.'" That is exactly "the same stage in the controversy as to the admission of Gentile converts which had been reached by the date of" *Galatians* ii. 11-14.<sup>1</sup> Luke pointedly brings out the complete identity of feeling and conflict by using the same terms that Paul employs (*μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν συνήσθιεν* and *τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς*, compare *συνέφαγεν αὐτοῖς* and *οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς*); and in particular the use of the term *τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς* implies that the presence or absence of the sign *περιτομή* was already the mark and badge of distinction between two parties.

The consideration that Dr. Sanday "puts in the forefront" of his case, therefore, seems to me to contradict the clear evidence of Luke. The stage of *Galatians* ii. was already reached in *Acts* xi.; and Luke marks the identity by using the same terms. But in xv. he uses terms that go more into the details of the party constitution: he speaks no longer in general of *τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς*, but of *τινες τῶν*

<sup>1</sup> We are agreed that *vv.* 11-14 refer to a later period than *vv.* 1-10.

ἀπὸ τῆς αἰρέσεως τῶν Φαρισαίων (xv. 5). Dr. Sanday points out (p. 91) that, in contrast with Luke, Paul in *Galatians* ii. " writes from within, from the innermost of inner circles, of things perhaps in part known only to himself and God." Yes! and Luke applies the words of Paul in this passage to describe the state of things in xi., and uses different terms to describe the state of things in xv. 5. Even in such a slight matter of terms and words, we find that Luke's language is marked by the same accuracy as usual—that here, as elsewhere, his narrative seems to be the form in which the spirit of history naturally framed itself.

It is true that Dr. Sanday does not share in my high opinion of Luke as a historian. There, I think, lies the one advantage which I have over him in this case; but it is a great advantage. In a most obscure subject I have been led on to seize the only clue, to follow it unwaveringly, and to find how plain the seeming maze becomes, when one accepts the proffered guidance of Luke, and disregards theories framed on a low estimate of his knowledge and his skill as a historian. To test my theory of Luke's historical insight and power, the critic must assume it to be true and work out the history accordingly. But Dr. Sanday had made up his mind many years ago against Luke, and is therefore able to decide forthwith against me.

It is at this point worth while to notice how Luke conceives and expresses the further development between the situation of *Galatians* ii. 11-14, and the situation of *Acts* xv. In *Galatians* and in *Acts* xi. the one side consists of οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς: what is the extent of that party? The interpretation of Lightfoot, and Meyer-Wendt, and of Dr. Sanday himself (shared apparently by Blass also), seems to be obviously right: the whole body of the Jewish Christians are summed up as οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς. In those two chapters, then,

we are presented with a situation in which there stand on one side that body<sup>1</sup> as a whole, on the other side the uncircumcised Christians. That is precisely Dr. Sanday's definition of the two parties, which he considers to have not come into existence in *Acts* xi., but to be in existence in *Acts* xv. But what does Luke say of the parties in *Acts* xv.? If we put out of sight the three first verses, in which the scene is in Antioch, and take only verses 5 ff., which Dr. Sanday takes to correspond to *Galatians* ii. 1-10, we see that the party opposed to the Gentile Christians is now no longer the Jewish Christians as a body: a certain number of Jewish Christians have ranged themselves alongside of the uncircumcised, including Peter and Barnabas, and probably other envoys from Antioch: it is therefore no longer correct to speak of *τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς* as one of the two parties, and Luke is careful to use a more restricted term.

Again, it is a necessary part of the view against which I am pleading (and on this point Dr. Sanday, p. 93, is fully agreed) that the visit of Barnabas and Saul to Jerusalem, mentioned in *Acts* xi. 30, was paid in the early months of A.D. 44, and that the persecution described in xii. proceeded during and after the visit,<sup>2</sup> so that "the leading apostles were in some sort of hiding." The two envoys took up the money and delivered it to the presbyters; and "the Judæan Church was left to lay in stores for itself" (p. 93, note). Thus Paul did not see any of the apostles on this visit.

That view has been stated long ago in very clear and at first sight persuasive terms by Lightfoot and by Dr Sanday himself. The following reasons (in addition to some stated in my book, which would be too long to repeat) seem to

<sup>1</sup> Paul, as the narrator, is excluded in *Galatians* ii. 12; and, as not present in Jerusalem, he is excluded in *Acts* xi. 2.

<sup>2</sup> In no other way than by the supposed absence of the apostles can the failure of Paul to mention this visit be explained (to me the explanation seems quite inadequate); and their absence can be accounted for only by the persecution in the early months of 44.

me to prove that the account of Luke is inconsistent with it.

(1) Barnabas and Saul were sent to Jerusalem in charge of the money. The purpose for which the money was intended—ministration to the inhabitants of Jerusalem (*διακονίαν, κτλ.*)—is defined in xi. 29. They completed the ministration (*πληρώσαντες τὴν διακονίαν*), and returned to Antioch, xii. 25. Here Luke lays decided stress on the ministration: he first describes the general instructions given to the envoys, and afterwards emphatically says that they completely carried out the ministration. I might here institute a detailed comparison of the passages where *διακονία* occurs, in order to bring out that it implies much more than the mere handing over of a sum of money; but I need not take up space therewith, for probably the point will not be disputed. Luke's usage is too clear. In *Luke* x. 40, *Acts* vi. 1, the regular practice of personal service and personal work for the help and comfort of others is plainly demanded. By its form the word necessarily implies not a single action, but a customary process, and *τῇ διακονίᾳ τοῦ λόγου*, vi. 4 (compare i. 17, 25, xx. 24, xxi. 19), transfers the idea of continued personal service and personal ministration to another department. If Luke in xi. 29, xii. 25 applied the term *διακονία* to the mere handing over of a sum of money by two officials to a body of officials, he showed himself dull to the meaning of the word; but there is not throughout the whole of his two books any word or clause that does not seem to me to imply great delicacy in his sense for, and employment of, words.

I do not insist here on what is urged at length in my book, viz., that the value and efficacy of the action of the Antiochians lay mainly in the daily, weekly, and monthly ministration to the starving poor in Jerusalem. It was this that brought home to the Christians in Jerusalem the kindness and brotherhood of their fellow-

Christians in Antioch; it was this that unified the Church by the work of charity.

But it appears worth while insisting for a moment on a point omitted in my book. The instructions given by the Antiochian Church to Barnabas and Saul did not absolutely require that the two envoys should personally make the distribution. Their orders would not have been disobeyed, if the envoys had entrusted the money to the presbyters for distribution. Now I have pointed out how, time after time, Luke contents himself with stating that instructions were given or plans formed, and then leaves the reader by his silence to understand that the instructions were carried out and the plans executed (*St. Paul*, pp. 181, 233, 295, 342). In this case, however, Luke pointedly records that the distribution was carried out to its completion by Barnabas and Saul in person (xii. 25).

(2) As the embassy was one of a purely business kind, it was addressed only to the presbyters, for it was not fit that the apostles should serve tables (*Acts* vi. 2; *St. Paul*, p. 52). This shows that the silence about the apostles in xi. 30 gives no warrant for inferring that they were absent from Jerusalem. On the view stated by Dr. Sanday it would be necessary to suppose that, first of all, the apostles fled; next, news reached the distant Antioch that they had fled, and that there were only presbyters left in Jerusalem to receive the money; and, finally, the Antiochian Church was in such a hurry to send up the money provided against a famine which was still hid in the mists of the future, and known only from a prophecy,<sup>1</sup> that they despatched their two envoys in the midst of the persecution to deliver the money to the presbyters. Dr. Sanday tries to guard

<sup>1</sup> It will not, I imagine, be disputed by any one who reads Josephus's account that the earliest beginning of the famine consistent with his words is 45 (*i.e.* failure of the harvest in that year). Lightfoot is quite clear in recognising that in his *Biblical Essays*.

against this *reductio ad absurdum* (which I had privately mentioned to him) by the statement that xi. 30 is "a compendious expression"; and he infers from it that the money was intended to be delivered to the apostles and elders, but owing to the flight of the apostles it had to be delivered to the elders alone. I have sometimes taken a good deal of meaning from a few words of Luke, but I have never ventured to take anything like this tortuous interpretation from the simple and plain words "sending it to the elders by the hands of Barnabas and Saul"; and I still cling to the belief that Luke meant what he says, and that when they sent it to the elders, they sent it to the elders and not to the apostles.

(3) Luke shows plainly his opinion that "the apostles" remained in Jerusalem during the persecution of Herod. It is evident from his early chapters taken as a whole that he conceived that "the guidance of affairs rested with" them (*St. Paul*, pp. 53, 374, 381), and that Jerusalem was their regular station; and he speaks in such places as ix. 28 of "the apostles" merely as the permanent supreme governing body, without any implication that the whole body was in the city at that moment. He was perfectly aware that some or even many of them were often absent<sup>1</sup> (*Gal.* i. 18), but he speaks of those who remained in the city as "the apostles," in the sense of "the supreme authority." Naturally he had no detailed statistics to enable him to say how many apostles were actually present at any moment in Jerusalem; but he clearly considered that "the apostles" were always there. By him the Church in Jerusalem without "the apostles" was not thought of.

Moreover, in xii. 17, he plainly implies that the Church in Jerusalem was in its ordinary condition with James present as its resident head. In my *St. Paul*, p. 63, I have

<sup>1</sup> He doubtless understood that mission work of various kinds and in various quarters was performed by them.

been content to mention this in a line, for xii. 17 appeared to me so clear as to need only a passing reference. But on re-reading Dr. Sanday's *Galatians*, p. 465, I observe he draws the directly opposite inference from that verse. He says, "James, the Lord's brother, was in hiding (*Acts* xii. 17)." Let us consider the situation; and I think we shall have to conclude that in this case the principle of treating Luke as a rough narrator, who has to be squeezed into conformity with Paul (or rather with a theory of Paul's meaning), has led Dr. Sanday astray. His conception of the meeting in Mary's house is that it was an assembly of the Church: he speaks of "the Church assembled at the house of Mary"; and, as James was not present in the house, he infers that James had gone into hiding. But Luke plainly intimates that it was not "the Church" which had assembled at the house of Mary; he merely says that "there were a considerable number of persons assembled there, and engaged in prayer" (xii. 12).<sup>1</sup> His language is very different when he describes a formal meeting of the Church or of the brethren: here he implies that a number of persons had voluntarily gathered. Then Peter told the assembled persons to "go and tell James and the brethren"; obviously this phrase sums up "the Church in Jerusalem with its head." Why we should infer from it that "James was in hiding," is hard to understand. Shall we infer also that the brethren as a whole were in hiding? and, if not, why distinguish between James and them? Meyer concluded from *v.* 17 that the Twelve were absent from Jerusalem, and only James and the brethren remained; but Wendt rightly points out that this conclusion is unjustifiable: the phrase used simply in-

<sup>1</sup> οὗ ἦσαν ἰκανοὶ συνηθροισμένοι καὶ προσευχόμενοι: ἀθροῖζεν implies a meeting for private or accidental reasons, *xix.* 25: "to hold a meeting of the Church" is expressed by συνάγειν, *iv.* 31, *xi.* 26, *xiv.* 27, *xv.* 30, *xx.* 7, 8; συνάγειν implies a formal meeting of some other body in *iv.* 5, *xv.* 6.

dicates the whole body of the Church in Jerusalem. Peter was going into hiding, and he said, "Tell the Church the marvellous news of my release and departure." So far as I can judge, the implication is plain, that James was understood by Peter to be then in Jerusalem; and the authority to whom Luke was indebted (obviously John Mark, v. 12, as Blass says) would probably not have left the point unnoted, if Peter's impression had been wrong.

I have ventured to speak in rather strong terms of this unworthy idea that the apostles all fled, and left the presbyters to endure the storm (*St. Paul*, p. 53); on consideration, I cannot withdraw anything of what is there said; I follow Luke and follow honour. James, as Luke states, stood at his post (and one naturally infers that others stood at theirs, some in Jerusalem, and some on work outside the city). There is nothing said in xii. to show that the persecution was a very sharp one; and it was certainly very short. The language of xii. 1 and 19 implies nothing like the "great persecution" that ensued on Stephen's death; yet in that terrible time the apostles had stood firm, for "they were all scattered abroad except the apostles" (viii. 1). The plain implication of Luke is that the apostles in xii. did as they were wont to do; and nothing except a theory could lead to any other belief.

In all my work on this period of history, it has been a chief object to bring out that the early Christians were endowed with a fair amount of practical sense, nay, even that the foundations of the organized Church were laid by men of great, in some cases of consummate, practical ability. It is therefore hard for me to believe that the Antiochian Church raised a sum against a future famine, and sent the money up when they had no means of knowing at what time the famine was likely to occur. The cause of famine lies in difficulty of communication, and the consequent difficulty of fetching in food from outside

to the country where the crops have failed. It was therefore a bad method to send money to Jerusalem as provision against a future famine. When the famine occurred, it would be doubly difficult for the elders in Jerusalem to send away the money and get the food. All they could then do would be to buy in Jerusalem at famine prices, whereas, if they in Antioch waited till the famine occurred, they could buy in the cheaper market, send in supplies, and distribute them to the people. Looked at from any point, Dr. Sanday's view reveals to us conduct so strange as to excite reasonable suspicion of the whole story. At least my view makes it sensible, rational, prudent, and effective.

In one respect Dr. Sanday, in this recent article, goes beyond his former utterance, carrying out more fully a suggestion that he made briefly there (*Galatians*, p. 464). He now assumes unhesitatingly on pp. 90 f. that Luke in Acts xv. was dependent entirely on information given by one of the crowd, who had access only to the most superficial facts; and he thus explains away the want of harmony between the accounts of Paul and Luke. But surely it is impossible to suppose that Luke was ignorant of Paul's view on this all-important subject. During the long years of intercourse between them, how can we believe that they never talked of the Apostolic Council? They met when Paul was fresh from the Council, and was everywhere "delivering them the decrees for to keep, which had been ordained of the apostles and elders that were at Jerusalem" (*Acts* xvi. 4). Why should we think that Paul never related the circumstances to Luke? Is it not more natural to suppose that they had often talked over the events of the Council, and that Luke was familiar with Paul's view? Dr. Sanday seems to maintain that Paul's view was unknown to Luke, or had been forgotten by him, or was considered by him less trustworthy than

that of his "informant." In any of these cases, I think the burden of proof lies on Dr. Sanday, and that natural probability is for me.

Like all who take that view, Bishop Lightfoot and Dr. Sanday emphasize the "striking coincidence of circumstances," or "undesigned coincidences," between *Acts* xv. and *Galatians* ii. 1-10. These agreements, however, are inseparable from any stage of the dispute, and do not therefore prove identity. For example, Lightfoot emphasizes the fact that in both "Paul and Barnabas appear as the representatives of the Gentile Churches, Cephas and James as the leaders of the circumcision." But who else could at any time appear in these positions?

One "agreement" even is quoted on their side, which, properly interpreted, tells against them. In *Galatians* ii. 1 Paul took with him Titus as a subordinate<sup>1</sup> on his own responsibility and choice.<sup>2</sup> In *Acts* xv. 2 the Church in Antioch sent certain other delegates in addition to Paul and Barnabas; these are members of a delegation, on a footing of equality with Paul; and yet it is assumed that Titus, the subordinate helper chosen by Paul in *Galatians* ii. 1, is one of the co-ordinate delegates sent by the Church in *Acts* xv. 2, and this is called a coincidence.

It would be right to indicate some of the reasons which show that the second visit mentioned by Paul is the second visit mentioned by Luke. I pass over the fact already alluded to, that on the South-Galatian theory Paul could not speak of the third visit, because his purpose in his argument to the Galatians confines him to the period before he entered Galatia, *i.e.* before *Acts* xiii. 14. The consideration which I should place in the forefront is that Paul

<sup>1</sup> The term occurs several times, always with a distinct implication. See my *St. Paul*, pp. 59, 71, 170, 177.

<sup>2</sup> More strictly, I believe that Paul and Barnabas both are implied as choosing their assistant: but grammatically the form, "I, with Barnabas," involves that the verbs following are singular.

could not honestly say that the visit described in *Acts* xv. told in favour of his argument, yet he boldly appeals to the visit which he is describing, *Galatians* ii. 1-10, as conclusive in favour of his argument; he speaks as if it were sufficient to direct the attention of his readers to the facts of that visit in order that they should recognise that they proved his case. But they who maintain that he is here describing the third visit (passing over the second unnoticed) actually hold that he omits from his description all allusion to the public action which formed the one reason and purpose of the visit, and which tells so strongly against his argument. In fact they accuse Paul of suppressing all the facts that tell against him—they charge him with flagrant dishonesty in argument. This is not a case where one is free to gloss over ugly acts by delicate words. When I began to study this subject more than twenty years ago, and accepted Lightfoot's view, my sense of common honesty revolted against this passage in the Epistle and against its author, and the effect on my mind was strong and lasting. These theorists make his argument a deception and a fraud, if Luke's account is trustworthy. Naturally, therefore, they proceed to discount Luke's general accuracy: they save Paul at the expense of Luke: that is a plain and straightforward way of describing the situation.

Neither Bishop Lightfoot nor Dr. Sanday really face this difficulty. Apparently they hardly realize its force; and yet, to my commonplace, non-theological mind, it is the one great fact. Let any one, who wants to estimate the case, try to put away all previous conceptions, read over *Acts* xv., and frame from this (almost the fullest and most detailed narrative of a public question on all its sides that *Acts* contains) a conception of the council as Luke conceived it. Then let him judge whether Paul could fairly quote that council as a proof that he had received no part of his message except from the revelation of Jesus Christ. If he

thinks that Paul could quote this proof confidently on his own side, then we must agree to differ; we have reached a fundamental opposition with regard to the meaning of words; but I think that we may be able to differ on the point without abating our mutual friendship, and I shall certainly not abate my admiration for Dr. Sanday.

The strength of the Tübingen position lay in this question: the answer made by Lightfoot to the "critical" argument always seemed to me singularly unsatisfying: at the best it could only be considered "the lesser of two evils." My view furnishes a complete reply, while fully acknowledging the logical skill of the "critics."

W. M. RAMSAY.