The Early Visits of St. Paul to Jerusalem.

By the Rev. R. A. Falconer, B.D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis in the Presbyterian College, Halifax, N.S.

How to reconcile Acts and Galatians, provided the former is not treated with too scant respect to be deemed worthy of the pains, is constantly taxing the ingenuity of fertile minds. And now comes the most independent solution since Professor Ramsay's fruitful suggestions, in Mr. Vernon Bartlet's *Apostolic Age*.[1] Mr. Bartlet is convinced that Ac 15 is not parallel with Gal 2^{1-10}, agreeing with Professor Ramsay that the emphasis placed by the apostle on his visit to Jerusalem is so unmistakable that to omit that recorded in Ac 11 would lay him open to a charge of concealing the facts of the case. But Mr. Bartlet also recognizes the difficulty of equating Gal 2^{1-10} with Ac $11^{29.30}$, and seeks to avoid it by explaining Gal 2^{1-10} as the account of a private visit to make sure of the sympathy of the leading spirits in the Church when the great truth of the mystery of the unity of Jew and Gentile in Christ first broke upon him in new and full splendour as the result of a heavenly revelation. This occurred before the second public visit recorded in Ac 11^{30}, and so cannot in any way be identified with that of Ac 15.

Without giving any detailed criticism of what seems to me an unnecessarily complex theory, I should like to call attention to the suggestion of another Oxford scholar, Mr. C. H. Turner, which if it can be established has the merit of simplifying the problem and of removing some of the most glaring difficulties between Acts and Galatians.

In his thorough and illuminating article on 'Chronology' in the new *Dictionary of the Bible*, Mr. Turner throws out the idea that the emissaries from James (Gal 2^{12}) may perhaps be identified with the visitors from Judæa (Ac 15^{1}). If so, 'St. Peter's desertion of the Gentile Christians at Antioch would precede and not follow his championship of their cause at Jerusalem, and would be a real point of superiority over the common view that St. Peter and St. James gave a formal pledge of brotherhood, and then violated it. This identification of the two Judaizing missions from Jerusalem to Antioch may be accepted side by side with the ordinary view that Ac 15 = Gal 2^{1}, if Gal 2^{11-14} be allowed in order of time to precede Gal 2^{1-10}.'

The structure of the first two chapters of Galatians, though at first sight opposed to the rearrangement of the chronological order of events of Gal 1^{18}–2^{10} and Gal 2^{11-16}, will, I think, be found on closer examination not to conflict in any way with Mr. Turner's suggestion.

In the opening verse of the epistle Paul plunges forthwith into his defence, and continues throughout in a strain that might be called egotistic, if he were not so terribly in earnest. His opponents are handled with a severity repeated only in his second letter to the Corinthians. They are wreckers of his Gentile churches, luring them to destruction with beacon-lights of a false gospel, for their own unholy aggrandizement. His passionate denunciation can only be explained by the fact that he knew he was face to face with the propaganda of a subtle and well-established power.

Their method seems to have been to insinuate that Paul was not consistent in the gospel he preached, modifying it to suit the varying conditions of Jerusalem and Galatia. They were the true representatives of the original mother-church, from which alone even Paul had received anything in his gospel that was of value, either by direct instruction or through the indirect delegation of Barnabas and the ordination of Peter when they came to Antioch.

The gist of Paul's answer is:—(1) My gospel is directly God-given, nor was I taught it at Jerusalem; but (2) it represents the essential belief of the Church-leaders at Jerusalem; (3) neither Peter nor Barnabas ever came to Antioch to confer ordination or apostolic authority on me. I was always in a position of equality with them as an apostle who could remind even them of the principles of the gospel.

The first two parts of his reply are outlined in the words ἀπόστολος οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων (1^{1}), and τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ οὐκ ἔστι κατ' ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

[1] *The Apostolic Age*, by J. Vernon Bartlet, M.A. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1890. 6s.

(1[11. 12]). The fuller proof of this is given in his personal experience detailed in 1[13]–2[10], which is one great argument, with the lines carrying out the independence of his gospel crossed by others, to show the essential oneness of the belief of the Christian Church. The third point of his answer stated in the words *οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου* (1[1]), *οὐδὲ ἐγὼ παρὰ ἀν ρώπου παρέλαβον αὐτό*, is supplemented by the facts of 2[11-16].

His intercourse with the authorities at Jerusalem was astonishingly meagre, and so far from sharing the traditions and being informed by the spirit of the original churches in Jerusalem and Judæa, he remained unknown by face to the latter for a few years after his conversion, and strange as it may appear to us, though Acts bears similar testimony, he seems to have dropped out of sight, except in so far as an occasional rumour revived the story of the conversion of their quondam persecutor. But they believed in his sincerity, and had no doubt that his gospel was the same as theirs, and so they glorified God in him (Gal 1[24]). The sudden, and for a time, almost total, eclipse of this particular blood-red star that had boded such ruin to the Church, while it was in the ascendant, shows that the leaders had little to do with directing attention to his reappearance until he was already a constellation of the first magnitude in the Church.

Assuming the identification of the second visit of Galatians with that recorded in Ac 15, we are bound to account for the omission from Galatians of the journey of Barnabas and Saul to Jerusalem with relief funds at the time of the famine (Ac 11[29. 30] 12[25]). Lightfoot's explanation that the apostles were absent from the city at that time may be sufficient, though one has an uneasy suspicion that, when Acts is thoroughly set upon by its opponents, they may do some damage here. But indeed, is it necessary to infer from Acts that Saul himself did go to Jerusalem at this time? Barnabas and Saul were the commission, the former being still the chief representative from Antioch, the convener, so to speak, of the distribution committee. Ac 11[29. 30] informs us that this ministry of subvention was sent to the dwellers of Judæa, more precisely to the elders of these churches. As the famine might be especially severe in the country districts among scattered and feeble communities, there would be need of a careful distribution of help. According to Ac 12[25] Barnabas and Saul returned from Jerusalem after they had fulfilled their ministry. Direct as this statement is, justice might be done to the truth of it if Barnabas, the chief commissioner, had alone undertaken the work in the city, while Saul remained among the country churches of Judæa. Their charge was to visit Judæa, which would include Jerusalem, the latter perhaps being the farthest limit, and, in view of the persecution just recorded in Ac 12, the most dangerous. The instructions of the delegation had been fulfilled, provided they brought the help to Judæa and Jerusalem its capital, the ministry of each, which was a part of the whole, being put to the credit of the commission. Possibly if the author of Acts had been narrating this as an eye-witness, he would have assigned their distinctive work more definitely to each.

If during this time Paul paid a somewhat extended visit to the churches of Judæa, it would agree with his own statement in Ac 26[20], 'I was not disobedient to the heavenly vision: but preached the gospel of repentance first to those in Damascus and Jerusalem, and to all the country of Judæa, and to the Gentiles.' A comparison with Gal 1[22] is sufficient to show that this ministry to Judæa would have taken place only after the first visit recorded in Galatians, and it fits in admirably with the incident of Ac 11 and 12. Further, if the persecution at Jerusalem was so severe that the apostles had to escape, it would be a most imprudent risk for Paul to venture into the city, when he had shortly before avoided a murderous attack (Ac 9[29]). So it is by no means improbable that the visit of relief mentioned in Ac 11[26] is passed over in Galatians for the simple reason that Paul did not enter the city on that occasion.

To come now to the second visit recorded in Galatians. The rôle is changed since the famine commission. Paul goes up to Jerusalem as the leading director, and he takes Barnabas with him as well as Titus, an emphatic assertion intended to give the quietus to hints of the Judaizers that Barnabas, as the delegate of the apostles, had conferred on Paul his status. It is now '*I* laid before them *my* gospel'—a gospel for which he is indebted neither to Barnabas nor to the Twelve. And yet there is not a suggestion that the original apostles were out of sympathy with him, however much he may have feared before he came up, perhaps from the actions of these false brethren, that

this might possibly be the case (*μή πως εἰς κενὸν τρέχω ἢ ἔδραμον*, Gal 2^2). Why should he entertain such a suspicion unless the invasion of those mentioned in Ac 15^1 were identified in some way with headquarters so as to represent their opinion? If we suppose that these men were those referred to in Gal 2^{12} as coming with certain credentials from James, the situation is explained. But this was at Antioch. It is not they but Paul who refers the question to Jerusalem. It was not the original apostles who raised the subject of circumcision, but these false brethren. At first their real nature had not been known to Paul. They were merely friends of James. Probably even James was not fully aware to what manner of people he had given letters of commendation.

As long as the church at Jerusalem was still worshipping as a part of Judaism, there had been little opportunity to detect these hangers-on of the Pharisees masquerading under a Messianic badge of the Cross, which in their dealings with the Gentiles they were found to loathe. It is improbable that Paul would speak in such mild terms (Gal 2^{12}) of men, whose work of subversion in his Antioch church was sufficiently effective to turn aside Peter and Barnabas, especially when they would be playing into the hands of those whom he has just called false brethren, who had slipped in to spy out their liberty. It was precisely this class who would be accepted by these Judaizers in Galatia as their models. And how curious, if Gal 2^{11} is subsequent in time to 2^4, is the omission on the part of the apostle of any condemnation of men who had recently been at the same kind of business in Antioch as he now denounces so vehemently in these invaders of his Galatian churches ($1^{6\text{-}9}$). But if those who came from James to Antioch were not then known to be so malignant, we can account for the growing dislike with which Paul regards them, first for raising in Antioch the whole question of the necessity of the Gentiles observing the law (false brethren, 2^4), and the more accentuated, almost passionate, reprobation of their handiwork in Galatia ($1^{6\text{-}9}$). With perfect unanimity the leaders at Jerusalem recognize Paul as an apostle, and delimit their respective spheres of influence—Paul and Barnabas to work among the Gentiles—Peter and the rest among the circumcision. This division seems to have been neither wholly geographical nor ethnographical. It was a working arrangement by which Paul and Barnabas were to labour in these countries where the Gentiles would predominate, Peter and the original apostles where the population was Jewish. Undoubtedly, Antioch would remain under the supervision of the apostles to the Gentiles.

So far the apostle has proved that in its origin his gospel was entirely independent of the original apostles, but also that these false brethren—the prototypes of these present reactionaries—found no support whatever in the Council at Jerusalem.

With the eleventh verse an entirely new argument begins in enlargement of the words *ἀπόστολος οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου* (1^1). The objection probably ran: True, you may not have gone to Jerusalem, but Jerusalem sent its delegates to you; first Barnabas brought you to Antioch, and then Peter came down; moreover, your methods were different from those you now employ in far-away Galatia (1^{10}, etc.). The answer to this is given in Gal $2^{11\text{-}16}$. Instead of receiving any authorization from Peter, and conforming to his practice, I administered to him publicly at Antioch a severe rebuke, and not only to him but to Barnabas—so that I remain unbeholden to these would-be ordainers of yours.

In the argument itself, there is nothing to determine whether the incident was earlier or later than the event of Gal $2^{1\text{-}10}$, for the first and more important objection of his relation to the church at Jerusalem had to be removed out of the way, before he could proceed to deal with matters at Antioch, even if they took place before the final adjustment in the mother-church. Any such reference to Peter or Barnabas as he now proceeds to make, would so far have been out of place.

But in the narrative itself, there are serious difficulties, if Gal $2^{11\text{-}16}$ is taken as chronological sequence to Gal $2^{1\text{-}10}$. Paul has just told us that the two spheres of work were to be kept distinct, and can we suppose that he would tolerate with such apparent equanimity a visit of some from James into the very heart of his own domain, almost directly after this solemn agreement? And would Peter the apostle to the circumcision immediately after his designation have chosen Antioch, even for a holiday,—provided the apostles were so modern? And yet Paul does not resent Peter's presence. His inconsistency in practice is what brings upon him the rebuke.

The defection of Barnabas is equally perplexing,

if it happened after he had successfully resisted the brunt of argument and prestige in Jerusalem itself, when we may be sure those Pharisees who had come down to Antioch would bring every possible leverage to bear against the innovators. It is not a sufficient reply that now a new question had emerged in actual practice which Paul had not touched on at the Council, being content to allow the social difficulty to sleep until the first demand of circumcision and the law was settled. This matter of social relation of Jew and Gentile had not now for the first time been thrown into the Church life as a source of discord. Peter and the Church had been made to face it, and, on his part at least, to give an essential answer to it, by nothing less than a divine interposition, when the apostle was led to associate on terms of equality with Cornelius; and we may be sure that never after that could the practical consequences in social life be entirely detached from the question of what obedience of the law was to be required of the Gentiles. These men whom Paul first met in Antioch (Ac 15[1]) knew full well the state of affairs in Gentile churches before the question was referred to Jerusalem; and assuredly the edge of the discussion was sharpened by what they were persuaded was bound to follow in social intercourse. It may be observed that in Ac 15 James takes this social fellowship between Jew and Gentile for granted, and in moving the decree, merely enjoins on the new Gentile converts abstinence from those common heathen practices against which the moral sense of the Jewish Christian would revolt, and which if known to be in vogue within the Christian communion, would render hopeless any further success on the part of the Church in its work among the Jews of these communities. And it is difficult to understand how, after this decree and his statement that no other burden should be laid upon the Gentiles, he could send down men with any right to use his name in restricting the fellowship between Jew and Gentile, which he must have known to exist before the decree was framed. The case of Peter and Barnabas is even more inexplicable.

But the key to the whole situation is discovered if Peter visited Antioch towards the end of Paul's first missionary journey. On the outbreak of the persecution of Herod, Peter escaped to parts unknown (Ac 12[17]). Syria, as being beyond the jurisdiction of the tyrant, would afford a most likely place of refuge. Convinced by his experience with Cornelius that he should call nothing common or unclean, he was willing to associate with Gentiles; but the belief had not yet so wrought itself into the fibre of his moral nature, that he was prepared for a bold and consistent practice in the face of the displeasure of a reluctant conservatism. So when representatives of the mother-church—probably all the more insistent because of their narrowness—came to Antioch, Peter had not the courage of his convictions, and even Barnabas, smarting perhaps from Paul's evident displeasure with Mark, capitulated to social pressure.

If the Council at Jerusalem followed this event, the theory as to the permanent estrangement of the two leading apostles, which still lingers with persistency in many quarters, may hurry towards the final resting-place of exploded hypotheses.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Trust in God and Faith in Christ.[1]

'NOTHING should be accepted as dogma which cannot be turned to practical account in preaching and in Christian fellowship'—this is one of Ritschl's fundamental principles. In his view, the ideal system of dogmatics would compel every Christian to say as he read, 'Yes, that is my belief.' A few months ago the editor of *Die christliche Welt* gave an interesting reminiscence of the days when he was studying Ritschl's *Unterricht in der christlichen Religion* at Leipzig, under the guidance of Professor Harnack: at the close of the term, the teacher asked the class to say

[1] *Das Christliche Gottvertrauen und der Glaube an Christus.* Eine dogmatische Untersuchung auf biblisch-theologischer Grundlage und unter Berücksichtigung der symbolischen Litteratur. Von E. W. Mayer, a. o. Prof. der Theologie in Strassburg. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. M.3.60.