

manifested against the new Lectionary. Faults were considered to be patent in all parts; pamphlets were written against it; resolutions never to use it were freely announced in several quarters. In the end, however, the opposition died out, and the new Lectionary became silently accepted, and used throughout the Church.

There seem now many reasons for thinking that, in due time, it will be thus also with the Revision of the Authorised Version of the Scriptures.

C. J. GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL.

THE EARLY VISITS OF ST. PAUL TO JERUSALEM.

I SHALL hope to be forgiven if, in offering a few words of reply to my friend Prof. Ramsay's criticism in the last number of the *EXPOSITOR*, I say very little about that part of it which is personal to myself. If I were to go more fully into this, I should have to deduct much from my friend's praise, but I should also have to deduct something from his blame. I fear it is true that I had overlooked some points in his argument—not wholly, for I find most of them marked in my copy of his book, but at the time of writing my article. I did not intend this to be in any sense exhaustive, and I stated the case in the form in which it still held possession of my own mind. I shall do my best to repair omissions; and I hope that at least, after Prof. Ramsay's own clear and incisive restatement, the readers of the *EXPOSITOR* will have had the data for forming a judgment sufficiently set before them.

I think that in some ways my friend expects rather too much. It is true that I am one of those who have given in adherence to his view about the Galatian Churches; that is, on a balance of the evidence, I believe it to be somewhat more probable than the view which is opposed to it; but I

should not as yet be prepared to treat it as quite axiomatic. There must be an intermediate stage after the first acceptance of a new view in which it lies in the mind (so to speak) still upon its trial and in process of adjustment to other data.¹ I cannot claim to have got beyond this point; and I do not think that Prof. Ramsay, who has for some time been giving concentrated attention to the subject, should expect the rest of us to keep quite even pace with him. In the present instance, however, this backwardness is of less importance, because the particular argument affected by it does not seem to me to be valid.

I have no wish to deprecate reasonable criticism, but my friend will allow me to say that I do rather deprecate some parts of his recent article. At the present stage of the inquiry we are, as it seems to me, concerned mainly with premises and data. I should have thought that these were fit subjects for the "dry light" of judicial investigation. But my friend is like a hound who, when once he has got upon the scent, goes off at full cry. He hunts down the statements of his opponents into what seem to him to be their consequences; and as these are nearly always either morally or intellectually discreditable they are held up to ignominy. It is not only I who have this fate, but Bishop Lightfoot, and, on certain hypotheses for which we are responsible, even St. Luke and St. Paul. I know that my friend does not think us quite so bad as would appear (p. 189). At the end of his paper he pronounces over me an absolution for which I am most sincerely grateful; but if he would ask himself rather earlier whether his opponents (for the nonce) really meant to do or to countenance all these wicked and stupid things, I believe that he would lower his note, and

¹ Though complaining of me for not being at the level of his own latest arguments, Prof. Ramsay confronts me with quotations from a popular work which I wrote eighteen years ago, and have hardly looked into since. I should express myself now rather differently.

the process would be less harrowing. I would suggest, with all deference, that while we are still in the region of construing and comparing texts we can afford to keep our equanimity. We are as yet only sketching in the outlines of our picture in pencil: the colour can be put in later.

I take it that we are both, Professor Ramsay and I, not aiming simply to establish a thesis, but co-operating together in the attempt to find out the truth. I therefore gladly go over the ground again with my friend's renewed statement before me, and with the help of this I shall endeavour to revise my own.

There are two main questions on which it is necessary to make up our minds: (1) Is it possible to identify the visit of St. Paul to Jerusalem described in Galatians ii. 1-10 with that of Acts xi. 30, xii. 25? (2) If these two visits are not to be identified and Galatians ii. 1-10 corresponds rather to Acts xv. 3-29, can any adequate account be given of the silence of St. Paul in regard to the second visit of Acts xi. 30?

1. On the first point I took the broad ground that Galatians ii. 1-10 implied a more advanced stage of the controversy with the Judaists than could have been reached at the time of the second visit, *i.e.*, about the year 44 (46 Ramsay) and before St. Paul's Galatian journey.

In reply to this Prof. Ramsay quite rightly calls attention to the attack made on St. Peter by "them of the circumcision" for his dealings with Cornelius (Acts xi. 2), and he also lays stress on the extreme sensitiveness of the Jews on any point connected with the religious status of those who had not undergone circumcision. Along with this he notes a coincidence of language in the description of the situation in Acts xi. 3 and Galatians ii. 12. St. Peter was accused in both instances of "eating with Gentiles."

By all means let these arguments have their due weight. I think it is true that I stated the case on the other side

with rather too little qualification. But I am still some way from acknowledging that Prof. Ramsay has proved his case, and that the situation of Galatians ii. could really have been reached by the years 44-46. I go further, and it seems to me that the language of St. Paul in *Ep. Gal.* is satisfied by nothing short of the events of the first missionary journey.

Prof. Ramsay makes it clear in his book that down to the departure of St. Paul on this journey the Gentiles who had been admitted to the Church were all drawn from the class of proselytes—of the second class, if not of the first. Speaking of the case of Cornelius, he says: "But this step, though an important one, was only the first stage in a long advance that was still to be made. Cornelius was a proselyte; and Peter in his speech to the assembly in his house laid it down as a condition of reception into the Church that the non-Jew must approach by way of the synagogue (x. 35), and become 'one that fears God'" (*St. Paul*, p. 42f.). Again: "The Church of Antioch . . . contained a number of Greeks,¹ who were in the position of 'God-fearing proselytes,' but had not conformed to the entire law; and the question was still unsettled, what was their status in the Church" (*ibid.*, p. 44). It is not until the first journey that St. Paul takes the next step forward, and offers the Gospel directly to Gentiles. At Salamis, in Cyprus, St. Paul "was appealing direct for the first time to the Græco-Roman world as himself a member of that world. This is put plainly in [Acts xiv. 27] as the great innovation and the great fact of the journey. As soon as Paul and Barnabas returned to Syrian Antioch they made a report to the assembled Church 'of all things that God had done with them, and how He had opened a door of faith

¹ This would be still clearer if the reading of Acts xi. 20 were, as I am inclined to think it should be, 'Ἑλληριστάς and not Ἕλληνας (see especially Hort, *Introd.*, *ad loc.*, and *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 59 f.).

unto the Gentiles'" (*ibid.*, p. 85). Of the two stages into which the preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles is divided, this is the second: "and the historian fixes the psychological moment [of the change] precisely at the point where the Apostles faced the Magian in the presence of the proconsul of Cyprus" (*ibid.*). This is brought out by Prof. Ramsay in a very striking way.

But then we have to ask ourselves, Which of these two stages is presupposed in Galatians ii. 1-10? I cannot for myself have any hesitation in replying, the same later stage, —the second. The turning point is already behind the Apostle and not before. When he speaks of himself as laying before the leaders of the Church the Gospel which he preached among the Gentiles (Gal. ii. 2, ὃ κηρύσσω, "what I am in the habit of preaching"), I can only understand this of Gentiles in the fullest sense of the word, and of a practice which the Apostle had begun and not was about to begin. A little lower down he tells his readers how the actual success of his preaching was accepted as proof of the genuineness of his commission: "When they saw that I had been intrusted with the gospel of the uncircumcision, even as Peter with the gospel of the circumcision (for He that wrought for Peter unto the apostleship of the circumcision wrought for me also unto the Gentiles); and when they perceived the grace that was given unto me, James, and Cephas and John, they who were reputed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship, that we should go unto the Gentiles, and they unto the circumcision" (Gal. ii. 7-9). Surely this "gospel of the uncircumcision" is something more than occasional preaching to proselytes; and surely the acceptance of it is the ratification of a success already gained. It seems to me to point as clearly as anything could point to the events of the first journey, the founding of the Galatian Churches. As I said in my previous article, it corresponds exactly to

the "rehearsing of what God had done" through the instrumentality of the two Apostles among the Gentiles (Acts xv. 4, 12). The conclusive argument in the narrative is the same as that in the epistle; the promise of work still to do is based upon the retrospect of work done. And if words are to bear their natural construction, that retrospect can only, I think, be of the successes of the first mission.

On this ground I take my stand. If I am dislodged from it, then it will be time to consider Prof. Ramsay's highly ingenious combinations. But, as it is, I am stopped at the threshold.

Prof. Ramsay has, however, an argument on the other side which he appears to consider decisive. He thinks that if we adopt (as I do provisionally) his own South-Galatian theory and identify the Churches founded on the first missionary journey with the Galatians of the Epistle, it becomes an "argumentative absurdity" for St. Paul to refer at all to his third visit to Jerusalem, on the ground that he is proving the independence of his Gospel *as first preached* in Galatia, and this third visit did not occur until after that first preaching. "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 unadvisable to speak of that visit when he was discussing the origin of, and authority for, his original message to the Galatians" (p. 176).

All depends on the validity of this last phrase. Is it only the authority of the *original* message to the Galatians that is in question? In assuming that it is I believe that Prof. Ramsay presses too rigorously the phrase used by St. Paul—not anywhere in the near context, but—in Galatians i. 10: "I make known to you, brethren, as touching the Gospel which was preached by me, that it is not after man." No doubt St. Paul begins at the beginning; he begins by speaking of his gospel as he first obtained it and as he first

preached it. But his general argument has to do not merely with this initial step but with its authority in the abstract—its authority at the time at which he is writing, its authority at the moment when it was deserted by the Galatians. These later moments cannot, I think, be excluded; and in reference to them the experience of the third visit is as much in point as that of the second.

For these reasons—not to speak of others which he will find concisely stated in a source to which I will refer later—Prof. Ramsay has neither removed the stumbling-blocks which prevent me from accepting his identification of the visit of Galatians ii. 1-10 with the second visit of the Acts, nor overborne the difficulties in the way of this view by the statement of others still greater.

2. But he will say, "If the visit of Galatians ii. is the third visit of the Acts, then the second visit mentioned in that work must be passed over by St. Paul without mention—which is incredible." There is, I am inclined to think a better case to be made out for this proposition than for the other. It does not, however, in my opinion amount to anything decisive, and the *ἀπορία* raised in connexion with it seem to me to arise mainly from our want of knowledge. I took my stand here on the negative ground that whereas St. Paul's purpose in *Ep. Gal.* required him to mention—not all his visits to Jerusalem but—all the occasions on which he had had any substantial intercourse with the Judæan Apostles, there was nothing in the Acts to show that on his second visit he had such intercourse. In the two verses which alone are devoted to this visit (Acts xi. 30, xii. 25) there is no allusion whatever to the Apostles. It is natural to ask, Why is this? I offered as a possible explanation one put forward by Bishop Lightfoot, by myself years ago, and probably by others—I have not looked up the history of it—that the Apostles may have been absent from Jerusalem owing to the persecution of Herod Agrippa

I., the account of which falls in the Acts just in the verses which intervene between that which describes the arrival of the mission and that which describes its departure. But this, no doubt, is pure conjecture. It is not conjecture to which I attach any importance. The most I would say for it is that there are one or two indications (the position of the account of the persecution in the Acts, the silence as to any contact of Paul and Barnabas with the Apostles, the traces of secrecy in the description of the meeting in the house of Mary, Acts xii. 12-17) which seem to point in that direction. So it still seems to me; the insufficiency of the data prevent me from saying more. I sit loosely to this hypothesis, as I do to all hypotheses which have so little direct evidence to commend them. The last thing that I would do would be to pledge myself to a precise reconstruction of details.

Here Prof. Ramsay strikes in. He has his own theory clear and sharply defined as usual. He will not allow it to be supposed that the mission of Paul and Barnabas was brief and hurried. Stress is laid on the accomplishment of a *διακονία*; and *διακονία* in the Acts means a prolonged and carefully conducted personal ministrations. The gathering in the house of Mary was not a gathering of the whole Church. There is nothing to show that the Apostles were in hiding (Acts xii. 17 does not prove this). The persecution was not wide-spread or severe. To suppose that the Apostles fled from it would be a disgrace to them. On the other hand, the stay of Paul and Barnabas probably lasted or some time; and into that time may be packed the events of Galatians ii. 1-10.

There is much in this position which I should not care to contest. I never pretended—it would be wrong to pretend—that there is proof demonstrative of the flight and hiding of the Apostles. All I would say is that Prof. Ramsay's arguments do not seem to me decidedly to disprove

it. I think that he lays too much stress on St. Luke's use of *διακονία*. In the two Lucan writings together the word occurs in all but nine times. This is not enough to sustain a negative induction. Besides, there is a parallel in Romans xv. 31 so exact as, it would seem, quite to justify the opinion of those who would take it of a short visit. The Apostle there prays that on his approaching journey (A.D. 58) he may be delivered from his unbelieving countrymen in Judæa, *καὶ ἡ διακονία μου ἢ εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ εὐπρόσδεκτος τοῖς ἁγίοις γένηται*. The ministration in question is the presenting of the sums collected in Macedonia and Greece for the poor of the Mother Church, so that the word is in a sense rightly glossed by the Western reading *δωροφορία*.

An argument to which I quite assent is that the meeting in the house of Mary (Acts xii. 12) is a private meeting for prayer, not a public assembly of the whole Church. I never thought of maintaining the contrary; and I have never to my knowledge spoken of St. Luke as a "rough narrator." But though a private meeting, the house in which it was held would seem to have been an important Christian centre, both from what we know of the position of St. Mark, the son of its owner, and also from the fact that St. Peter, on his release, at once makes his way there. This may suggest that there was some significance in the absence of St. James, and in St. Peter's sending a message and not proposing to go to him. But these are of course mere trifles, and very far from stringent proof that the leaders of the Church were in hiding. The most I should say would be that they may have been.

As to the morality of retiring before persecution it is hardly worth while to argue. No doubt there were unreasonable ways of doing this as well as reasonable; but to suppose that the Apostles (if they withdrew) withdrew from cowardice would be most gratuitous. The early Church

had a deliberate policy in such matters which history has approved, and not condemned. Its leaders did not court martyrdom, though they met it cheerfully when it came. The instances of Polycarp, Cyprian, and Dionysius of Alexandria, will occur to every one.

I might go on in this strain for some time, partly accepting and partly rebutting Prof. Ramsay's arguments; but I should take up more space than either the editor or the readers of the EXPOSITOR would care to give me. The result would, I freely admit, be inconclusive; just as I believe that Prof. Ramsay's case on the other side is inconclusive against me. The building up of imaginary situations where the data are so slight seems to me not very profitable. The facts may have been so, but they may have been quite different. A grain of positive evidence would outweigh much speculation. But the grain is wanting.

What I do contend for is only that we have no sufficient reason either (1) to throw over the definite statements which St. Luke makes as unhistorical,¹ or (2) to desert the preponderating indications that the visit which St. Paul has in his mind in Galatians ii. 1-10 is the third and not the second.

In conclusion I would venture to suggest to my friend and to others who may care to pursue the subject further, that they would find it worth while to consult the little commentary on Galatians by Dr. James Drummond, principal of Manchester College: the publishers are The Sunday School Association (Unitarian), Essex Hall, Essex Street, Strand, W.C. The preface is dated December, 1892; so that it was given to the world before the South-Galatian theory had been stated with so much force in Prof. Ramsay's *Church in the Roman Empire* (1893). It

¹ Dr. Drummond adopts this alternative as to the visit of Acts xi. 30, and I should not refuse to do so if the arguments for it were stronger.

therefore gives what is substantially the old view in regard to the Epistle; but it gives this with conspicuous clearness, independence, and impartiality. The author is at least removed from the imputation, which neither Bishop Lightfoot nor I have escaped, of apologetic harmonizing; though, speaking for myself, my conscience is clear of having given to the sacred writers any different measure from that which I should have given them if they had been profane.

I think that I have said enough; and I shall leave it to Prof. Ramsay, if he wishes it, to have the last word.

W. SANDAY.

THE SEPTUAGINT VERSION :

ITS BEARING ON THE TEXT AND INTERPRETATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.¹

I.

THE Septuagint Version presents a vast field of varied interest to students of the Old Testament, of the New Testament, and of Church History. Much labour has been spent upon it; but much more must be spent before we can hope to solve many of the problems connected with it, and utilise it to the full for the purposes of Biblical criticism and interpretation. The Manual Edition of the Cambridge Press, edited by Dr. Swete with a painstaking care and laborious accuracy which leave nothing to be desired, has at length placed in the hands of students the text of the Vatican MS. so far as it is extant, together with the various readings of all the important uncial MSS.: and the same Press now has in preparation the larger edition, for which the Manual Edition was meant to be preparatory. This edition will reproduce the text printed in the Manual Edition, with as full a critical apparatus as can be con-

¹ A paper read at Sion College, December 17, 1895.