

*SOME POINTS IN PAULINE HISTORY AND
CHRONOLOGY.*

THE Epistle to the Galatians is so central in our knowledge of the apostolic age; so much defines itself, directly or indirectly, by its help; that one may be pardoned for adding one to the many discussions that have sprung into being since Prof. Ramsay's stimulating rehandling of the Galatian question, if haply some fresh point may be fixed or some old error be yet further discredited. Recently a new interest has been aroused in Pauline chronology through the concentration of attention upon the date of Paul's release from his imprisonment at Cæsarea in consequence of the coming of Porcius Festus to succeed Felix as procurator. But though O. Holtzmann, Harnack, and McGiffert have satisfied themselves that they have here hit on a really fixed point in Pauline chronology, yet the fixity claimed is open to the gravest doubts. The data on which they build are themselves precarious. Tacitus and Josephus are at variance: next, Josephus is at variance with himself; and lastly, as was well shown in the *EXPOSITOR* for February (1898) by Prof. B. W. Bacon, the statement in Josephus on which the whole synchronism depends is probably a wild guess to explain the difficulty of a rascal like Felix escaping the reward of his crimes. Such being apparently the state of the case, we return once more to see what can be made of old "fixed points" like the Judæan famine under the procurator Tiberius Alexander (46-48), taken in connexion with the Epistle to the Galatians, when this is read steadily in the light of the now dominant South-Galatian theory.

Prof. Ramsay has re-opened several important questions relating to this Epistle by his vigorous assault on the current identification of the second visit named in it with the third visit of Acts, and by his strong plea for identifying it

with the second of Acts, namely, that occasioned by the Judæan famine. On both these points he has failed as yet to convince the body of Biblical scholars, and notably Dr. Sanday amongst ourselves. It is the fear lest the well-earned weight of the latter's name should tend to paralyse earnest, independent reflexion in others—the last thing he himself would countenance, but a danger which has been proved real in the analogous case of Bishop Lightfoot—that partly urges me to make confession of a belief that the truth lies more with his opponent in their friendly contention.¹ Yet not the complete truth. There is too much of a deadlock in the situation as conceived by the two sides, and too little of truth's equilibrium. To show what is meant, it may be best to say outright that each side seems stronger critically than constructively; so that I can accept neither Acts xv. nor Acts xi. 30 as an adequate parallel to Galatians ii. 1–10. Further, while quite at one with Ramsay in insisting that it was with the origin of his Gospel, *when he evangelized* the Galatians, that Paul was primarily concerned in *Galatians*,² I am equally at one with Dr. Sanday in holding it incumbent on him to refer, if only to refute misrepresentation, to the Jerusalem compact of Acts xv., *assuming that Galatians was written subsequent to that event.* From which it will be seen that my purpose is (1) To assert the need of assuming a visit to the Jerusalem apostles unrecorded in Acts; (2) To find an appropriate date for Galatians prior to the Concordat of Acts xv.,

¹ EXPOSITION, V. iii. pp. 81 foll.

² For the proof of this, the words, "I marvel that ye are so quickly changing" (i. 6), are far more crucial than "Now, at any rate, is it men rather than God whom I am trying to win over" (i. 10), to which alone Dr. Sanday refers in this connexion. Lightfoot is here on our side; while, as to the general question, it is to be noted that in holding that Paul's second visit coincided with Acts xv. he did so on the assumption that Acts xv. had preceded the first preaching to the "North Galatians." The "South-Galatian" theory changes all that, and leaves Lightfoot's judgment with Ramsay as to the logic of the situation, though against his denial that Paul had (on his dating of the Epistle) any need to refer to the Concordat at all.

so making it the earliest of the extant Pauline letters; (3) To draw out one or two corollaries of the theory suggested.

One preliminary objection may be named and speedily dismissed. "Is it allowable to fall back on a visit of which the author of Acts tells us nothing?" It is, because there is a clear analogy, namely, the absence from Acts of any hint that Paul retired soon after his conversion "into Arabia," and did not at once begin his preaching in Damascus. In the one case as in the other the reason is probably the same, and that is, unacquaintance with the more private side of the Apostle's life prior to the beginning of the "we" passages. If it be said that the assumed visit was too much a part of Paul's public history to come under this law; that, on the contrary, it was just such a crisis in the Gentile mission as must have found a place in Acts; one may reply, first, that we do not know enough of Luke's sources to say confidently that it must have stood in them; and next, that its exact significance for the *outward* history of the Gentile mission is just the point at issue. Paul himself speaks of the matter as in purpose and scope a *private* conference, and nothing more; and some attempt will be made to justify the expression both historically and exegetically.

1. Ramsay, as I have said, seems to hold the field in his attack on the equation, Galatians ii. 1-10 equals Acts xv. Surely "Paul's argument (in Gal. i. ii.) is founded on the rarity of his visits"; and either his candour or his credit for ability to anticipate an enemy's retort must suffer, if he really passed over in silence a visit to Jerusalem in so formal an enumeration without explaining why he did so.¹

¹ To suppose that he omitted the visit of Acts xi. 30 because the famine relief was actually conveyed to the Elders and not the Apostles, does not really meet the point as to expediency: for the Galatians could not be assumed to know anything about the visit and its true nature. Further, the assumption that the visit coincided with the date at which the apostles might be thought to be in hiding, *i.e.* the early months of 44 A.D., is untenable, seeing that we

And what shall we say of the bold assertion in Galatians ii. 6, that the recognised authorities imposed no extra conditions on his Gospel, if we suppose that on the same visit Paul agreed to the four abstinences of Acts xv. 20 and proceeded to promulgate them among his own Galatians, who were not even included in the primary scope of the conference (Acts xvi. 4)? The very fact that Paul does name a matter of practical piety as having been agreed to on the occasion described in Galatians ii. 10—but that something different from the points named in Acts xv. 20—only serves to clinch the contradiction. But when Ramsay would have us see in Galatians ii. 1–10 a natural account (in another context) of the visit recorded in Acts xi. 30, xii. 25, we can only murmur a *non possumus*. Why should Paul not have said outright that what took him up to Jerusalem the second time was nothing implying dependence on the apostles for his teaching, but a charitable mission on behalf of the Antiochene Church? This would have met Judaizing insinuation quite as effectively, to say the least, as the explanation given of the motive of his first visit. Instead of this, he ignores all but the personal occasion of his visit; for I cannot be sure that he means the Galatians to see in Galatians ii. 10 a direct reference to the famine fund. We have no right to assume the Galatians in a position to take up the hint involved, even though Ramsay's exegesis of the passage were correct, which we may later take occasion to question. Hence the one explicit clue as to the situation is the circumstance emphasized by Paul himself, namely, that it was "in pursuance of a revelation" that he, Barnabas, and Titus then visited the leaders in Jerusalem. Beyond this the conditions described are just such as might have held good of a conference between the same persons

have no right to place the famine before 45 (46)–47. Hence there was nothing to hinder the insinuation that on this occasion, too, Paul had been a learner from apostles.

during any part of the period between the first preaching to Gentiles at Antioch (which is the only view that satisfies the antithesis to "Jews" in the context of Acts xi. 20) and the Jerusalem compact itself. Paul and Barnabas, the leading apostles, certain Pharisaically-minded interlopers, Paul's unique grace visible in his call, his insight, and his successful work—as exemplified in Titus (who was probably an Antiochene)—such factors were peculiar to no date between about 43 and 49 A.D. And while we seem precluded from putting this visit, determined by revelation, after the second visit in Acts, I see no valid objection to placing it not long prior to that event.

Dr. Sanday, indeed, considers "that Galatians ii. 1-10 implies a more advanced stage of the controversy with the Judaists than could have been reached" so early as 43-46, which, with the exception of the early months of 44, when Peter was in hiding, is the period open for a visit prior even to that recorded in Acts xi. 30. But not only does he take the contextually unsatisfactory view of Acts xi. 20 (against many good critics), but he also seems to exaggerate or misconstrue such advance as took place in Paul's own mind touching "his gospel," which he always conceived to have been substantially one in principle. To ignore or minimize this is to run in the teeth of the whole argument of Galatians, as well as of a passage like Acts xxii. 17-21. To sum up his "gospel of the uncircumcision" prior to the so-called first missionary journey as nothing more than "occasional preaching to proselytes," is surely unwarranted. But even were it the case that in Syria-Cilicia, and subsequently at Antioch, Paul had preached only to proselytes, as contrasted with pure heathen, yet the proselytes were many of them uncircumcised (like Cornelius and his friends); and *when once these became a large proportion of any ecclesia* the problem of the Uncircumcision already began to stare the leaders of the Church in the face. Galatians ii. 1-10 does

not suggest to my mind "a cleavage, a great and deep cleavage, in the Church: the Christians of Gentile origin being on one side, those of Jewish origin on the other." It is not as yet a question of the rank and file at all, and of their consciousness of the two gospels.¹ The question is one as to how far the leaders, or more correctly St. Paul, then saw into the coming issue as to uncircumcised Gentiles. And Galatians ii. 1-10, read on its own merits, conveys the impression of a conference meant to be one of leaders alone, in which the difficulties foreseen by the most far-sighted man in the Church were anticipated. And so, by a private understanding between the "Pillars" of either Mission, the way was safeguarded for further development, such as Paul himself was probably already contemplating. In fact the first Missionary Journey is best viewed as the firstfruits of the private compact of Galatians ii. 1-10, while the relief visit of Acts xi. 30 is its earlier seal. In this light too it is easier to see how Paul could agree to refer the controversy of Acts xv. 1, 2 to the Apostles and Elders in Jerusalem without really running the seeming risk of staking his Gospel on the result (in the face of Gal. i. 1).

The way being so far freed from objections, a positive consideration, pointing to a date prior to the visit of Acts xi. 30, may now be advanced for what it is worth. Ramsay, in considering the phrase "in pursuance of a revelation," observes that the wonderful revelation referred to by Paul in 2 Corinthians xii. 2-4 probably occurred in 43 or 44, namely the fourteenth year before 56 A.D. "But," he adds, "all speculation is barred by the description": Paul "heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for man to utter." This is pressing Paul's words to absurdity. For what was the use of a revelation that revealed nothing that could in any form be com-

¹ I see no evidence that the "false brethren" of Galatians ii. 4 had ever been out of Jerusalem, as Dr. Sanday assumes.

municated? The *ipsissima verba*, no doubt, could not be reproduced; but the lesson brought home would affect his subsequent thought and teaching on the subjects involved. What the burden of the "revelation" actually was, can perhaps be inferred, not only from the interest round which his whole apostolate centred, but also from another passage in which he refers to his exceptional insight into the mysteries of the gospel. In Ephesians iii. 4 ff. he speaks of "the dispensation of the grace of God" that had been given to him towards the Gentiles, in that by way of revelation had been made known to him "the mystery," to wit, that the Gentiles are fellow-heirs, co-members in a body, and co-sharers in the promise in Christ Jesus through the gospel, whereof he had been made a minister according to the free bounty of the grace of God given unto him "according to the inworking of His power." Is it really hazardous to maintain that the revelation of 2 Corinthians xii. 2-4 marked a fresh and overwhelming glimpse into the scope of his distinctive gospel, "the mystery hidden during the ages in God"? If so, this experience came to him about 43-44 (or even 42-43, if 55 be the better date for 2 Cor.), and may well have caused him to brood upon the steps needful to give this secret of the intrinsic oneness of Jew and Gentile in Christ yet further effect than that already realized at Antioch.

The suggestion then is, that it was during this season of deep meditation on the practical problems involved in full obedience to this revelation (in which the original "heavenly vision" found maturer interpretation), that the *ἀποκάλυψις* or intimation of the Divine will, spoken of in Galatians ii. 1, led him to take the step of conferring with the Jerusalem apostles. He went up in order that the unity of the Ecclesia or Body of the Christ might be safeguarded by an explicit mutual understanding. And he went with Barnabas, whose witness to the practical

side of Paul's case for a Gentile gospel would be most weighty with the apostles. But it is noteworthy that it is the grace of revelation or insight manifest in himself and his gospel (as fulfilment of the essence of the Prophets) on which he lays most stress in describing the impression produced on the Pillar apostles. He went to lay before them his gospel rather than its results (v. 2). Hence Barnabas at once drops out of account in this connexion. It was to Paul that no fresh suggestion was made (v. 6); it was he whom the apostles saw to be entrusted with the gospel of the uncircumcision (v. 7); and there is the same reference to the "inworking" and "grace" of God as manifest in Paul that meets us in his own words in Ephesians iii., where the reference is surely to tokens visible in himself and not to the results of his preaching.¹ All this points rather away from Acts xv. and towards an earlier date.

But if these combinations be provisionally accepted, they enable us to render a more rational account of the incident at Antioch which follows immediately in Galatians ii. 11-14. Many have found the vacillation of Peter unintelligible as following on the carefully considered solution of the problem of Jew and Gentile within the same Ecclesia of Christ.² The impulsive Peter may not have been quick-witted, as his apologists generally allege in his

¹ Dr. Sanday's words, "in both cases the argument which carried the day was the appeal of St. Paul to the hand of God *as seen in the success* of his own missions (Acts xv. 3, 4, 12, 26=Gal. ii. 7-9)," seem to me open to doubt. What reference there may be to grace visible in Paul's labours rather than in himself, is amply satisfied by the Antiochene work, of which Titus was probably a sample.

² McGiffert asserts that "the compact provided only for the distinct and separate existence of Jewish and Gentile Christianity, and did not contemplate their relation one to the other" (p. 206). I could admit this thesis only by excising Acts xv. 20, 21. When we recall that the Judaizers of Acts xv. 1 must have criticised the common meals between Jewish and Gentile Christians usual in Antioch, we feel that the subject must have come before Peter during the conference.

defence; but it is hard to believe that he came down to Antioch soon after all the troubles raised there and echoed in Jerusalem, touching the status of Gentile Christians, without having made up his mind to a policy in relation to the intercourse of Jewish and Gentile Christians. Personally, however, I cannot see the object of his coming down at all on the heels of Judas and Silas.¹ But surely he would have foreseen that his presence could only do harm if he was not quite clear on this issue. Further, Barnabas' action, if subsequent to the Jerusalem Conference of Acts xv., is even less defensible.

But is not a more natural solution possible? Suppose that Paul and Barnabas had followed up the earlier private visit of Galatians ii. 1-10 with a practical proof that they and their converts were indeed mindful of the poor, and those the poor of the mother-Church. What more likely than that Peter, with his quick feeling for that which was generous and brotherly, could not refrain from going to see face to face the men who had done this loving deed? And in what mood would he be more likely to go in practice beyond what he had carefully considered in all its consequences (especially for the future of his own work) than when fraternizing with men who had just acted so fraternally? In this light his subsequent rebound into the realm of ordinary Jewish thought, at least in relation to the expediency of preserving some distinction, does him far less discredit. In this way we can form a more kindly estimate of Barnabas also in the matter. Finally, we can explain the fact that the believing Jews, in spite of their more liberal feelings and previous practice, followed Peter's

¹ If Peter came down after the compact and caused such a crisis as Paul describes, I cannot see how Luke, whose source here seems complete and continuous, could write as he does in Acts xv. 32, 33; and after these verses there seems no time (during the "certain days" between v. 33 and v. 36) for Peter to come and for the unsettling effects of his visit to subside sufficiently for Paul to leave Antioch for a long mission.

lead rather than Paul's. For they were of course ignorant of the private compact as to the Pauline gospel and as to the division of spheres between the two missions, which Peter's action was virtually transgressing by the moral compulsion it was putting on Gentile Christians. Had it been subsequent to Acts xv. and the comfortable words of Judas and Silas as to the attitude of the Jerusalem authorities, it is very doubtful whether they would have done the like.

Such then is our reading of Galatians ii. It has in its favour the fact that, like Ramsay's theory, it deals strictly with Paul's calm transition from the statement that "he remained unknown in person to the churches of Judæa" (which must include Jerusalem in particular, as his logic requires) to his words, "Next after an interval of fourteen years I went again up to Jerusalem." It has likewise the merit of placing the whole of chapters i.-ii. prior to the evangelization of the Galatians, as best satisfies the argument of the Apostle in the face of Judaizers in Galatia.

2. But if this be so, how is one to account for Paul's total silence in Galatians as to the Jerusalem Conference, which, whether as a signal triumph or as an ambiguous episode to be cleared up, could not be simply ignored? It is here that Ramsay fails to realize that his own argument excludes a date for the Epistle subsequent to Acts xv. If, however, it be not subsequent to the Jerusalem compact, we cannot admit a second visit to Galatia as implied in the Epistle, save on the hypothesis of an unrecorded visit very soon after the first. Does then the Epistle presuppose two visits? Several scholars have alleged that the exegesis of the Epistle does not require them; and this is my own view.

Lightfoot candidly recognises that in the words "I marvel that so quickly are ye turning renegades from Him

who called you in Christ's grace" (cf. v. 8), the interval must count from their first knowledge of the gospel. So that, even if a second visit intervened, the force of "so quickly" is not affected by it. But when he tries to water down that phrase itself by remarking that "quickness and slowness are relative terms"; and that relative to truths so momentous "a whole decade of years" might be regarded as a short period in which to change one's mind, one cannot but be conscious of a note of special pleading. Paul thinks of his converts as still immature "little children" in whom the Christ-life has in fact not yet taken definite embryonic shape; so that Paul has again to undergo, as it were, a mother's pangs in anxious and sympathetic imagination (iv. 19). And when we recollect that the transference of allegiance, as contemplated by the Galatians, was not from the Gospel to something other in nature, but only to a completed gospel, we should rather consider a year or so since their evangelization far nearer the mark as an outside limit for a marvellously speedy change of the sort. Hence we must insist on the full force of Paul's surprise at their inexperience in being "so speedily" moved by plausible words (cf. 2 Thess. ii. 2).

Nor can I see any reason to admit the existence of an unrecorded second visit prior to the writing of the Epistle. "Unrecorded," I say, because the visit in Acts xvi. seems quite excluded, for the reason that Paul could not have failed to make known to the Galatians in some form at least the decision of the Jerusalem conference, as Acts xvi. definitely asserts; and this would have taken away nearly all the force of the Judaizing insinuations in relation to the attitude of the apostles, especially as Silas had been at hand to corroborate what Paul had to say. To suppose that he had neglected to state the *principles*, too, upon which he had fought their cause of freedom at Jerusalem would be to suppose that he was not Paul, but some inferior

person altogether.¹ Hence the second visit, to meet the conditions, must (if not a mere figment) fall also before the Jerusalem Conference, and be one unrecorded in Acts. But is it implied at all in Galatians? Lightfoot answers affirmatively, denying that i. 9 ("As we have said before, so now again I say") is a solemn reiteration of i. 8: but on slender grounds. Nor has he noticed a grammatical argument on the other side, in the fact that whereas in v. 21 the reference to words spoken some time before (at the time of evangelization) is made by the aorist (*καθὼς προεῖπον*), in i. 9 we have the perfect (*ὡς προεῖρήκαμεν*), "I have already said," in contradistinction to "I said on that occasion."²

Again, if in i. 10 he turns to meet the charge that he is an unprincipled man, suiting his message to his hearers' wishes, this surely would have had its maximum plausibility early in his career, when he had been doing much preaching to Jews. And the same applies to v. 11., where he cries, "If I am still preaching circumcision"—in the sense meant by Judaizers, namely, as incumbent upon all—"why, then, am I the victim of persecution?"³ In that case the offensiveness of the Cross (as of a Redeemer "from the

¹ Ramsay, indeed, argues to the contrary effect, but unconvincingly. "Why," it may be asked, "is Galatians silent about the Jerusalem Concordat of Acts xv.?" He boldly replies that it, and the fact that Paul had communicated its resolutions to the Galatians on his second visit, had been already used against him in Galatia, as if he were "merely the messenger and subordinate of the Twelve." But, then, there was surely all the greater need for him to correct this version of the Conference and his relation to it, if such talk was current among his converts. It is contrary to the genius of the Epistle itself not to have met the insinuation fairly and squarely.

² This moreover is the only sense compatible with the present indicative (*εἰ τις ... εὐαγγελίζεσθαι*), which, in contrast to the hypothetical subjunctive in verse 8, implies that he is now referring to some one actually engaged in preaching in this fashion, as he writes. This he cannot have said on his second visit; whereas, as an advance by way of emphasis on the hypothetical form of v. 8, it can be correlated with "as I have already seen," as well as with "so here and now I repeat."

³ *i.e.* "as you know me to have been at the hands of your Jewish neighbours." Paul's experiences at Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, seem to have left a deep mark on his mind (2 Tim. iii. 11; cf. Gal. vi. 17).

curse of the Law," ii. 19, iii. 13, vi. 12) vanishes. Such insinuations would soon cease to deceive even the Galatians, once Paul's distinctive labours in other Gentile centres became matter of common knowledge.

But what, it may be asked, of iv. 13? "I personally have never suffered any wrong at your hands. In fact ye are aware that it was a bodily infirmity that led to my preaching the gospel to you at the first." Does not this, at least, presuppose a second visit? Lightfoot, while admitting, on the analogy of John vi. 62, ix. 8, 1 Timothy i. 13 (of which 1 Tim. i. 13 is quite decisive), that "formerly" is a possible rendering of the adverbial phrase rendered "at the first" in A.V., and "the first (former) time" in R.V. (*τὸ πρότερον*), yet prefers the sense of R.V. in order to explain the emphasis of the expression where it stands. But this receives its best explanation in the fact that it is needed as a *qualifying* adverb to render what is said about Paul's having evangelized them *in consequence of a physical infirmity* strictly accurate. For though the beginning of his work among the Galatians (in Pisidian Antioch) was due to this circumstance, yet its continuance was due to other causes; and he had probably got over the effects of his malady long before reaching a large section of his converts. Hence the statement only becomes correct when "evangelization due to physical infirmity" is qualified by the addition of "at the first," "to begin with," "in the first instance," very much as in 1 Timothy i. 13.¹ In corroboration one may note an observation of Zahn, himself an upholder of the theory of a second visit; namely, that "evangelization" (*εὐαγγελίζεσθαι*) in New Testament usage means "bringing the message of salvation to those who do not yet know it, or have not yet received it." Hence it is a word that will not enter naturally into union with the sup-

¹ For there, too, *τὸ πρότερον* has a limited duration, namely the *short* period of his being a persecutor of Christians.

posed latent correlative to "on the former visit," namely, "the second time" (*πάλιν* or *τὸ δεύτερον*). Zahn himself evades this difficulty by supposing the evangelization to have reached the one region in two waves, as it were, corresponding to two distinct visits, the former alone being occasioned by physical infirmity. This has no support in Acts, and is not so plausible as McGiffert's suggestion that the journey from Antioch to Derbe counted as one occasion of evangelization, and the return journey as another. Nor does it really satisfy the passage. For one is left asking why Paul says nothing about the character of his reception on the second visit, so broadly hinted at on this showing. To refer to their consistency of attitude would surely have added much to the contrast drawn to the present attitude, which he pictures his letter as likely to discover in them.¹

On the whole, then, we see no good reason to distrust the first impression conveyed by the Apostle's almost incredulous surprise, expressed in his opening words, at the instability of his young converts. He writes in the accents of one who feels that his back was hardly turned before the children of whose impulsive affection he has had such recent and moving tokens allowed themselves to be fascinated by some inferior attraction. And with this agrees the final appeal to be spared further trouble from such trivial challenges as those echoed in the doubting hearts of his converts. For when he wrote "for I bear in my body the brand-marks of Jesus," was he not pointing to what was fresh in their memories and in his own, the suffering endured in doing the work of a faithful apostle, as implied and partly described in Acts xiii. 50-xiv. 22?² Quite prob-

¹ This is the sense in which Zahn takes v. 16, refusing to see in *ὥστε ἕχθρὸς ὑμῶν γέγονα ἀληθεύων ὑμῖν* any reference to a second visit. The words echo an expression already applied to Paul by his Judaizing opponents in Galatia.

² "Does not this seem like the language of one who has lately passed through a fiery trial, and who, looking back upon it . . . while the recollection is still fresh upon him, sees in his late struggles a new consecration . . . and

ably those are right who see in the simple phrase "all the brethren who are with me" (i. 2) the description of a band of fellow-travellers; and an occasion on which this and the notable absence of reference to one or other of his Churches as joining in salutations would alike be natural, will be suggested in the sequel.

We are left, then, with the question as to the exact date and place of Galatians. Dr. Lightfoot has written at length to prove this Epistle later than those to the Corinthians. But he assumes what seems to me the false notion that terse, allusive, aphoristic references to a subject precede the explicit and argumentative treatment of the same. To many, on the contrary, the confident *obiter dicta* of Corinthians on the Law and Circumcision¹ will appear as the tokens of a victory already won and put beyond direct challenge. At any rate, recent writers like Zahn and McGiffert agree from different standpoints in upholding the conclusion that Galatians is actually the earliest of Paul's extant epistles. But when we ask how long before the Thessalonian Epistles it was written, they begin to differ. Zahn assigns it to the early months of Paul's first European mission, say during his stay at Thessalonica. McGiffert, on the other hand, denies that any point in this journey is possible.² For "if Paul saw the Galatian Christians during the interval that elapsed between the Conference at Jerusalem and the writing of his Epistle, it is exceedingly difficult to understand why he should be obliged to give them in his letter so full an account of that conference [yet saying so much, he should have said

an additional seal set upon his apostolic authority?" How aptly these words of Lightfoot suit the situation soon after his first visit to Galatia! far more so than that presupposed in 2 Cor. i. 3-11, which would not be before the minds of his readers.

¹ e.g. 1 Cor. vii. 18 f. (Gal. v. 2, 6, vi. 15); xv. 56; and for Justification 1 Cor. i. 30, iv. 4, vi. 11; 2 Cor. iii. 9, v. 19-21.

² *History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, p. 227.

more] and of the events that followed. It seems clear that in Galatians ii. Paul is telling his readers of events about which they had before heard nothing, at any rate from him." But this could hardly have been the case after his second visit, recorded in Acts xvi. 4 f. Such an argument tells heavily against Zahn, who identifies the visit of Galatians ii. 1-10 with that of Acts xv. When, however, McGiffert goes on to infer that the Epistle was written at Antioch on the eve of Paul's second mission, he falls victim to the counter-criticism that Galatians iv. 20 ("Yea, I would that I could be present with you at this very moment, and change my present tone; for I am perplexed about you") expresses an *impotent* wish to go straightway to them, instead of writing. Had he in fact been on the eve of going in person, he must have hinted at his intentions, to say the least.

Thus, on the theory that Galatians ii. agrees with Acts xv. —beset with difficulties as the theory itself is—there seems no intelligible stage in the second missionary journey, from its inception to its close, at which we can imagine Paul sitting down to write the Epistle; while a date later than that journey seems ruled out by the fact that the rapidity of the Galatians' change from the state in which their conversion left them called forth the writer's indignant surprise. Ramsay, indeed, argues that Galatians was written at Antioch in the summer of 53, on the eve of the third journey. But his evasion of the plain fact, as Lightfoot rightly regards it, that it is from the date of their call by God, *i.e.* his first visit, that their rapid defection is reckoned, is not successful; while the answers he suggests to the query, "Why did Paul not start at once himself?" does not here suffice any more than if one assumes the situation advocated by McGiffert. There is point, however, in his turning on the objector and asking, "Why Paul did not make some explanatory statement of

the reasons that compelled him at such a crisis to be content with a letter, and to do without a visit?" And the true reply must be, that the reason was of so obvious or notorious a nature that he could safely leave it to the messenger (the one probably who had brought the news from Galatia) to report in his own words to the Galatians. Such a reason, adequate to explain both the silence and the expressed inability to come forthwith, would lie in the nature of the case, if the news found Paul already involved in the Judaistic controversy nearer home, in Antioch, or already on his way up to Jerusalem to fight the battle of Christian freedom. If this was the case, then the Epistle would fall somewhere between the latter part of 48 (49) and the beginning of 49 (50) A.D., according to the time one allows for the first journey, begun early in 47, and for Paul's stay at Antioch between the two journeys.

The foregoing theory as a whole appears to me to correlate more known facts than any other. If it involves latent fallacies, their detection will probably advance the problems at least a little.

3. Several conclusions attach themselves as corollaries to this discussion.

First, and most obviously, comes the literary corollary, already probable from his ignorance of Paul's retirement into Arabia, that the author of Acts did not use Galatians among his sources.

Next the chronological consequences, the chief of which is a very early date for Paul's conversion. Putting the second visit between 43-46, viz., before the Famine of 46-47, we get two approximate dates. Reckoning back thirteen years, as involved in Galatians ii. 1, we get 30-33; reckoning fifteen—the alternative reached by adding the two years before the first visit—we arrive at the period between 28 and 31, *i.e.*, at latest within two years and a half of Pentecost. Against the latter reckoning, save for 30-31,

there are strong objections; and we are glad to see that Ramsay is very emphatic in preferring the former reading of Galatians ii. 1 as best according with the central significance of the Conversion in the argument.¹ And so we regard 30-33 A.D. as its probable date.

Thirdly, the general effect is to minimize the difference between the attitude of the leading apostles towards the reception of uncircumcised Gentiles and that of Paul himself. A common understanding, based on the coexistence of two branches in the one Ecclesia—if with a certain superiority attaching to the Jewish type in the older apostles' minds—seems to have arisen early; their chief anxiety being to secure a similar type of piety or of religious and ethical feeling. This was certainly the case at the time when the "four abstinences" were laid down at the Jerusalem Concordat. On another occasion we shall try to show that it was so some four years earlier.

VERNON BARTLET.

THE DOCTRINES OF GRACE.

VIII.

SANCTIFICATION.

ACCORDING to the Catholic faith, the religious life has one supreme moment never to be repeated nor annulled, and afterwards it has a varied history whose chapters often repeat themselves, and sometimes annul one another. The conscious moment occurs when one who has been frivolous, unbelieving, and worldly is arrested and bethinks himself, when the mist rolls away in which he has been walking as in a vain show, and he sees the austere and beautiful reality of the spiritual world,—when he is moved by a sudden and irresistible influence to reverse his course and to

¹ EXPOSITOR, July, 1898.