

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Melanchthon the Theologian

ROBERT D. PREUS

Luther and Melanchthon

ERWIN L. LUEKER

Melanchthon the Churchman

GILBERT A. THIELE

Galatians 2:1-10 and the Acts of the Apostles

ROBERT G. HOERBER

Brief Studies

Theological Observer

Homiletics

Book Review

VOL. XXXI

August 1960

No. 8

Galatians 2:1-10 and the Acts of the Apostles

By ROBERT G. HOERBER

NO doubt the chief crux in the comparison of Paul's Epistle to the Galatians with the Acts of the Apostles is the relating of Gal. 2:1-10 to the account of Acts. To equate Gal. 2:1-10 with Acts 15 raises such serious difficulties in the judgment of many scholars that they have proposed various explanations. The essential difficulties of course would be: (1) Paul in Galatians, although concerned about every connection with Jerusalem in order to prove that his Gospel did not come from men, would be omitting the visit at the time of the famine recorded in Acts 11:27-30 and 12:25 and thus would be exposing himself to the charge of deceiving his readers. (2) It would seem strange, to say the least, that Paul in Galatians would fail to refer to the decree of the Council of Jerusalem, which could be one of his weightiest arguments for the thesis he develops in that epistle. (3) Several inconsistencies would appear between Gal. 2:1-10 and Acts 15 — e. g., the private nature of the conference between Paul and James, Peter, and John in Galatians as against the public council described in Acts 15; the provision to abstain from certain foods in Acts (15:20, 28 f.; 21:25) as against Paul's claim in Galatians (2:6 ff.) that the leaders in Jerusalem imposed on his work of converting the Gentiles no obligations concerning the Jewish Law; the strangeness of the incident with Peter at Antioch reported in Gal. 2:11-14 both concerning Peter, if his defection occurred after the decree of the council, and concerning Paul, since he fails

to cite the decree, which again could be his weightiest argument before Peter.

Some of the attempts to explain the difficulties between Acts 15 and Gal. 2:1-10 may be cited briefly: (1) Paul does not refer to the decree and letter of Acts 15 because he had nothing to do with their composition.¹ (2) Galatians 2:1-10 describes merely a private conference at Jerusalem on the "eve" of the council.² (3) Paul ignores the visit of Acts 11 because he saw only the "elders" at Jerusalem at the time of the famine, for the apostles were absent at that time as a result of the persecution of Herod Agrippa I.³ (4) The council took place later than Acts 15 — possibly at the visit of Paul to Jerusalem mentioned in Acts 18:22.⁴ (5) Acts omits the visit of Gal. 2:1-10, which really occurred before Paul and Barnabas departed for Cyprus and Asia Minor.⁵ (6) Acts 11:27-30 and 15:2 ff. are in reality one visit, but the author made two visits out of

¹ H. Windisch, *Beginnings of Christianity*, ed. Foakes-Jackson and Lake (London, 1922), II, 328; H. Lietzmann, *The Beginnings of the Christian Church* (London, 1949), pp. 108 ff.; O. Cullmann, *Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr* (London, 1953), pp. 42 ff.

² J. B. Lightfoot, *Galatians* (London, 1890), pp. 125 f.; H. N. Ridderbos, *Galatians* (Grand Rapids, 1953), pp. 78 ff.

³ J. B. Lightfoot, p. 127.

⁴ John Knox, *Chapters in a Life of Paul* (Nashville, 1950), pp. 64 ff.; D. T. Rowlingson, "The Jerusalem Conference and Jesus' Nazareth Visit" in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXI (1952), 69 ff.

⁵ T. W. Manson, "The Problem of the Epistle to the Galatians" in *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, XXIV (1940), 59 ff.

one because he drew from two sources.⁶ (7) The dislocation of the text of Acts has caused the apparent inaccuracy, the original order being 11:25 f.; 13:1—15:2; 11:27-30; 15:3-33 (?34); 12:25; 12:1-24; 15:35-41.⁷

The failure of the attempts to parallel Acts 15 with Gal. 2:1-10 raises the question of the advisability of equating Gal. 2:1-10 with the visit at the time of the famine recorded in Acts 11:27-30. Such a thesis is not new. Ramsay is cited frequently as the first to suggest it (1895), but John Calvin made the identification in his commentary on Galatians (1548). A number of scholars in the 20th century have held this thesis,⁸ usually, however, offering only one or several arguments and

treating only a few of the points involved.⁹ We may attempt, therefore, to examine anew the evidence available, since the problem is not only a chief crux in the comparison of Galatians with Acts but also has wide implications in such questions as the reliability of Acts, the date of Galatians, the Northern or Southern Galatian theories, and the portrayal of the personal convictions of Paul.

Since Paul in Galatians is concerned particularly with each of his visits to Jerusalem, in order to prove his point on the source of his message (1:1, 11, 12), the more logical parallelism between Galatians and Acts would be:

Galatians 1:18-24 coincides with Acts 9:26-29,¹⁰

Galatians 2:1-10 coincides with Acts 11:27-30.

The equation of Gal. 2:1-10 and Acts 15, on the other hand, both involves the serious difficulties and necessitates one or two of the various explanations referred to above.

In Gal. 2:2 Paul states that a "revelation" prompted his visit to Jerusalem. Acts 11:27-30 describes Paul's visit to Jerusalem as a result of Agabus' prophecy concerning the famine, while in Acts 15:1, 2 Paul's visit stemmed from dissension with Judaizers.

The same verse in Galatians states that Paul conferred *privately* with the prom-

⁶ J. Wellhausen in *Nachrichten d. kgl. Gesellschaft d. Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* (1907), pp. 1 ff.; E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, pp. 263 ff.; K. Lake, *Beginnings of Christianity* (London, 1933), V, 199 ff.; H. Windisch, *ibid.*, II, 322; H. W. Beyer, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen, 1951), *ad loc.*

⁷ R. Eisler, *The Enigma of the Fourth Gospel* (London, 1938), p. 80.

⁸ K. Lake, *Earlier Epistles of Paul* (London, 1911), pp. 297 ff. (a view he changes in *Beginnings of Christianity*); V. Weber, *Die Abfassung des Galaterbriefs vor dem Apostelkonzil* (Ravensburg, 1900); D. Round, *The Date of St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians* (Cambridge, 1906); W. M. Ramsay, *Teaching of Paul* (London, 1913), pp. 372 ff., and *St. Paul the Traveler* (London, 1920), pp. xxii, xxxi; C. W. Emmet, *Galatians* (London, 1912), pp. xiv ff., and in *Beginnings of Christianity*, II, pp. 269 ff.; A. W. F. Blunt, *Acts* (Oxford, 1922), pp. 182 ff., and *Galatians* (1925), pp. 22 ff., 77 ff.; F. C. Burkitt, *Christian Beginnings* (London, 1924), pp. 116 ff.; H. N. Bate, *A Guide to the Epistles of St. Paul* (London, 1926), pp. 45 ff.; G. S. Duncan, *Galatians* (London, 1934), pp. xxii ff.; W. L. Knox, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Cambridge, 1948), pp. 40 ff.; R. Heard, *Introduction to the New Testament* (London, 1950), p. 183; H. F. D. Sparks, *The Formation of the New Testament* (London, 1952), pp. 60 f.

⁹ Emmet, for example, in *Beginnings of Christianity*, II 265—297, omits any treatment of the date and addressees of Galatians, because "a full discussion . . . obviously belongs to a commentary on that Epistle" (p. 282).

¹⁰ That Gal. 1:18-24 and Acts 9:26-29 are parallel seems to be the consensus of opinion among students of the New Testament. That some minor differences, either apparent or real, exist is another problem and has no essential bearing on the topic at hand.

inent men. Acts 11:27-30, it is true, does not mention such a conference, but there is nothing in the passage to exclude it, while Acts 15 definitely describes a *public* meeting of the church in Jerusalem.

Gal. 2:10 refers to only one condition between Paul (and Barnabas) and the prominent leaders in Jerusalem. A close observation of the tenses in Greek reveals that the condition was "that we continue to remember the poor—the very matter I was careful to do."¹¹ Charitable relief was the chief purpose of the visit of Acts 11:27-30, while Acts 15 makes no mention of any charity. Thus the condition placed upon Paul and Barnabas suits well the fact that they just had brought a gift to Jerusalem.

The defection of Peter related in Gal. 2:11-14 raises a serious difficulty if Gal. 2:1-10 were paralleled with Acts 15; for it then would have to be placed after the full agreement of the council at Jerusalem, or Paul would be relating events out of chronological order, either solution entailing manifest objections. If Gal. 2:1-10, however, equates Acts 11:27-30, Peter's defection may be placed easily before the council, probably at Antioch during the description of Acts 15:1. In fact ἐλθεῖν τινας ἀπὸ

Ἰακώβου (Gal. 2:12) tallies very closely with Καὶ τινες κατελθόντες ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας (Acts 15:1).

Gal. 2:6 implies that the leaders in Jerusalem imposed no restrictions concerning the Jewish Law on Paul's activity in converting the Gentiles. Acts 15:20, 28,¹² however, definitely gives restrictive clauses concerning certain foods, while the silence of Acts 11:27-30 does not present the same problem.

According to Gal. 1:6, the trouble in Galatia with the Judaizers occurred "so soon," or "so quickly," that Paul is "surprised" at the attitude of the Galatians. Paul is not specific, it is true, whether he means "so soon" after the conversion of the Galatians or after his last visit to them. But if Gal. 2:1-10 refers to the council, would the threatening defection of the Galatians be so soon as to cause surprise, since the Judaizers had been active in Jerusalem and Antioch already several years previously? If, however, Gal. 2:1-10 is parallel to Acts 11:27-30, the threatening defection of the Galatians could be placed soon after their conversion on Paul's first journey—the suddenness of which naturally would cause Paul to be surprised.

¹¹ Or "—the very matter I was making every effort to do"; or "—the very matter I was hastening to do." The present tense of the subjunctive for "remember" is missed by most translations; but cf. A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (New York, 1931), p. 933. For the tense of "careful" (or "making every effort," or "hastening") cf. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (London, 1908), I, 148: ". . . and the aorist which simply states that the event happened is generally quite enough to describe what we should like to define more exactly as preceding the time of the main verb."

¹² Cf. Acts 21:25 for another reference to the restrictive clauses concerning certain foods. This passage gives no basis, however, for arguing that Paul was not at the council, because James seems to be informing him of the restrictive clauses as though Paul had never heard them. The statement of James does not represent necessarily new information given to Paul, but may recall information Paul already knew. Or the author of Acts may have included the statement mainly for the benefit of the readers, in lieu of the use of a footnote, which ancient authors did not employ, and somewhat to the confusion of modern critics. For arguments that the decree was a food law, cf. *Beginnings of Christianity* (London, 1922), II, 324—325.

The implication of Gal. 4:20 is that Paul at the time of writing to the Galatians is anxious to revisit them, is temporarily hindered, but will appear in person in the not too distant future. Of course a number of occasions might fit such a situation. But in connection with the point of the previous paragraph it would suit remarkably well to place the composition of Galatians at Antioch just prior to his visit to Jerusalem for the council. Paul then not only would be surprised at the suddenness of the trouble with the Judaizers but also would feel it extremely important to attend the council at Jerusalem, even if it meant the postponement of another urgent matter — the trouble in the Galatian churches — a matter which he could try to deal with in a letter, necessarily composed with some haste and anger, as the undertone of the epistle clearly implies.

The last two points broach two problems closely related to the topic of the present study — the addressees of Galatians and the date of that epistle. We may begin by summarizing the complicated historical data on the territory involved in the possible addressees of Galatians.

In 278 B. C., when a tribe of Gauls invaded Asia Minor, King Attalus of Pergamum confined them to the north central portion of Asia Minor. This area became known as GALATIA, with the leading towns of Ancyra, Pessinus, and Tavium. During the reign of the Gaulish King Amyntas the Roman Emperor Augustus allowed him to control a large dominion called the Kingdom of Galatia, which included GALATIA, part of Phrygia, Lycaonia, Pisidia, Pamphylia, and western Cilicia. After the death of Amyntas (25 B. C.), when the Romans took over this "kingdom," Pamphylia became a Roman prov-

ince, western Cilicia and part of Lycaonia became "the Kingdom of Attalus" by the time of Paul's first journey, and the remaining territory formed a Roman province called *Galatia*, which included such cities in the south as Antioch, Lystra, Derbe, and Iconium, as well as northern GALATIA. After approximately three centuries the wider meaning of *Galatia* was abandoned, and the term reverted merely to the northern part of the area (referred to in these paragraphs for convenience and clarity as GALATIA). The research of William Ramsay, who discovered the wider use of the term (referred to in the present study as *Galatia*), raised the question of the addressees of Paul's Epistle to the Galatians — the northern GALATIANS or the southern *Galatians*. There are a number of points which may throw light on this question.

There was a considerable Jewish population in south *Galatia*, and the Judaizers, therefore, in all likelihood would have caused there the trouble which Paul combats in his letter. This point, however, is not too strong, since there were some Jews also in north GALATIA, and the opposition of the Judaizers conceivably could have arisen in north GALATIA.

On the southern theory we have an extant letter of Paul to the churches he visited at least on his first and second journeys. On the basis of the northern theory there would be extant no letter to these congregations. Again, this point is not decisive, but it should be taken into account in discussing the evidence as a whole.

Does Acts refer to any work of Paul in northern GALATIA? Three passages are cited by those who favor the northern theory: (a) "And they went through the region of Phrygia and Galatia, having been

forbidden by the Holy Spirit to speak the word in Asia" (Acts 16:6); (b) "After spending some time there [i. e., Antioch in Syria] he departed and went from place to place through the region of Galatia and Phrygia, strengthening all the disciples" (Acts 18:23); (c) "While Apollos was at Corinth, Paul passed through the upper country and came to Ephesus. There he found some disciples" (Acts 19:1). Each of these verses merits closer study in the original.

Acts 16:6 employs the phrase τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν. The single article and the position of χώραν favors the view that one district is indicated, "the region which is Phrygia and Galatia." For evidence on the adjectival use of Φρυγία, apparently questioned by some commentators, one needs to consult merely the lexicon of Liddell-Scott-Jones and Aeschylus' *Suppliants* (547, 548): δι' αἴας . . . Φρυγίας.¹³ The parallel phrase in Luke 3:1, τῆς Ἰτουραίας καὶ Τραχωνίτιδος χώρας, is also a case in point, for Ἰτουραία appears to be used as an adjective, although elsewhere it is a substantive. According to Ramsay, part of the old Kingdom of Phrygia belonged to the province of Galatia and part to the province of Asia, known respectively as *regio Phrygia Galatia* and *regio Phrygia Asia*.¹⁴

¹³ Liddell-Scott-Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford, 1940). Doubt seems to be cast on the adjectival use of the word by F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Grand Rapids, 1953), p. 310, and by K. Lake, *Beginnings of Christianity* (London, 1953), V, 231. It is also confusing that the word is listed only as a noun by W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago and Cambridge, 1957).

¹⁴ *The Church in the Roman Empire before A. D. 170* (London, 1893), pp. 59—111.

Acts 18:23 contains the phrase τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν. The position of χώραν here favors the substantive use of Φρυγία and the translation "through the region of Galatia and through Phrygia." The difference in the order of the words as compared with Acts 16:6 probably denotes a different route. In Acts 18:23, because he received no warning to the contrary, Paul passed through the region of Galatia (i. e., Galatic Lycaonia, so called to distinguish it from eastern Lycaonia, which lay in the territory of King Antiochus) and through Phrygia—including both the part which lay in Galatia and the section which was in Asia—or continuing west instead of going north as in Acts 16:6.

In Acts 19:1 the phrase τὰ ἄνωτερά μέρη, "the upper country," probably denotes that Paul traveled across the high ground west of Pisidian Antioch instead of along the lower main road through Colossae and Laodicea. Or as Ramsay states, Paul took "the higher-lying and more direct route, not the regular trade route on the lower level down the Lycus and Maeander valleys."¹⁵ Acts 19:1 apparently continues the description of Acts 18:23, and the part of Asian Phrygia through which Paul traveled was known as Upper Phrygia. According to Col. 2:1, Paul was a stranger to the people in the Lycus valley.

Thus there appears to be in Acts no clear reference to any work of Paul in northern GALATIA. The interpretation presented in the previous paragraphs on the three passages of Acts is the view of such scholars as William Ramsay and W. M. Calder. K. Lake held to the view in *The*

¹⁵ *St. Paul the Traveller* (London, 1920), p. 265.

Earlier Epistles of St. Paul (1911), but later in *Beginnings of Christianity* (V, 231 to 237) he proposed that the ethnic sense of Galatia may be preferable and that the phrase "the region of Phrygia and Galatia" possibly means "the territory in which sometimes Phrygian and sometimes Gaulish was the language of the villagers." According to a recent study of this subject, however, that view seems to be impossible.¹⁶

In Gal. 2:1 and 2:9 Paul mentions Barnabas, apparently as a person known to the readers. Now Barnabas definitely was with Paul on the first journey when they established congregations in southern *Galatia*, but there is no record of Barnabas accompanying Paul on the other journeys. In fact, the separation of the two missionaries Acts records before the beginning of the second journey. (Acts 15:36-41)

In 1 Cor. 16:1-5 (written from Ephesus on the third journey) Paul refers to his instructions to "the churches of Galatia" concerning the contribution to those in Jerusalem and speaks of possible delegates to accompany him. He no doubt has in mind southern *Galatia*, for in Acts 20:1-4 (which traces Paul's steps from Ephesus to Corinth on the same journey) there is a list of delegates accompanying Paul — there is no delegate from northern GALATIA, but two delegates from cities in southern *Galatia* are present: "Gaius of Derbe and Timothy," who of course was from Lystra. (Acts 16:1)

According to Gal. 4:14, the addressees received Paul when he first came to them

"as an angel of God" — or as the Greek text might be translated, "as a messenger of a god." The reference seems to point to the reception at Lystra in southern *Galatia*, where the people called Barnabas Zeus and Paul Hermes, who of course was the messenger of Zeus in Greek mythology.

Gal. 4:13 states that Paul first preached to the addressees because of a physical ailment. The southern theory offers a reasonable reconstruction of events by deducing that Paul left the swampy lands of the Mediterranean coast and traveled north to the mountains of south *Galatia*. North GALATIA, however, does not have swamps and mountains so close together.

According to Acts 16:1-5, the Judaizers, about whom Paul is writing in Galatians, were active in south *Galatia*. There is no evidence in Acts that Judaizers went to northern GALATIA.

The Gauls of northern GALATIA, according to Jerome, seem to have spoken their native tongue as late as A. D. 400. Some critics question whether the inhabitants of northern GALATIA at the time of Paul understood Greek — the language in which he wrote the Epistle to the Galatians.¹⁷

Does Paul employ (ever or usually) geographical names in their ethnic sense or with their official Roman significance? We might note in passing that 1 Peter 1:1 and Rev. 1:4 (cf. 1:11) appear to use "Asia" in its official sense. The lexicon of Arndt-Gingrich, furthermore, raises no question concerning "Achaia," "Asia," and "Mace-

¹⁶ "The Boundary of Galatic Phrygia" by W. M. Calder in *Proceedings of the Orientalist Congress* (Istanbul, 1951) as cited by F. F. Bruce, *The Book of the Acts* (Grand Rapids, 1956), p. 326.

¹⁷ The statement of Jerome, however, in his Preface to Book II of his *Commentary on Galatians* reads: "While the Galatians, in common with the whole East, speak Greek, their own language is almost identical with that of the Treviri"; cf. *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (Grand Rapids, 1954), VI, 497.

donia," merely equating these names with the respective Roman provinces. Whether "Galatia," however, is to be taken as ethnic or official, the disagreement among scholars is very manifest. Von Dobschütz, Jülicher, M. Dibelius, Feine, H. Lietzmann, J. Moffatt, Goguel, Sickenberger, Lagrange, Meinerz, Oepke, A. Steinmann, and Mommsen favor the ethnic sense. Zahn, Ramsay, E. Meyer, E. D. Burton, G. S. Duncan, and V. Weber conclude that Paul meant "Galatia" in the official sense. Such disagreement would be unlikely if Paul's use of geographical names in general were decisive; nor would the disagreement of scholars be possible if it could be proved that the official Roman significance of "Galatia" is not tenable. Scholars, therefore, must base their conclusions regarding the meaning of "Galatia" ultimately on the other points presented in the previous paragraphs. To me it seems that on the basis of the previous points the official sense of "Galatia" is more probable—particularly in view of 1 Cor. 16:1-5 (which speaks of "Galatia" and probable delegates) compared with Acts 20:1-4 (which lists two delegates from southern *Galatia* but none from northern GALATIA).

If the addressees of Galatians can be the churches in southern *Galatia*, the date of the epistle—the second of the two problems closely related to the topic of the present study—could be earlier than on the basis of the northern theory. The chief passage for study is Gal. 4:13, particularly the implication of τὸ πρότερον. Does the comparative degree necessarily imply two former visits? After Homer the neuter frequently was used as an adverb meaning "before," "earlier," both with and without the article. Three examples from classical Greek, one from the Apostolic Fathers, and

three from the New Testament may be cited.

Ἄλλ' ἄρα μουσικὴ ὄσση τὸ πρότερον διήλθομεν; — Plato, *Republic* 522a

Ἄριστίππου δὲ ἐπιχειροῦντος ἐλέγχειν τὸν Σωκράτην, ὥσπερ αὐτὸς ὑπ' ἐκείνου τὸ πρότερον ἠλέγγετο . . . — Xenophon, *Memorabilia* 3.8.1

ὄσοι δὲ ὅτε τὸ πρότερον ἀπῆσαν τὰς οἰκίας ἐνέπρηναν ὑπὸ ἀτασθαλίας, δίκην ἐδίδοσαν κακῶς σκηνοῦντες. — Xenophon, *Anabasis* 4.4.14

Ἐπά σοι, φησίν, καὶ τὸ πρότερον, καὶ ἐκζητεῖς ἐπιμελῶς. — Hermas, *Visions* 3.3.5

ἐὰν οὖν θεωρῆτε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀναβαίνοντα ὅπου ἦν τὸ πρότερον; — John 6.62

Οἱ οὖν γείτονες καὶ οἱ θεωροῦντες αὐτὸν τὸ πρότερον, ὅτι προσαίτης ἦν, ἔλεγον . . . — John 9.8

Χάριν ἔχω τῷ ἐνδυναμώσαντί με Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν, ὅτι πιστόν με ἠγάσασθε θέμενος εἰς διακονίαν, τὸ πρότερον ὄντα βλάσφημον καὶ διώκτην καὶ ὑβριστήν . . . — 1 Timothy 1.12, 13

One need not, therefore, on the basis of lexicography, explain the comparative degree to τὸ πρότερον as referring to the two visits of Paul to each city (except Derbe) in southern *Galatia* on his first journey. (Cf. John 7:50; 2 Cor. 1:15; Eph. 4:22; Heb. 4:6; 7:27; 10:32; 1 Peter 1:14)

An early date for Galatians has a definite advantage. Its composition shortly before the council at Jerusalem implies that the great controversy over circumcision broke out and was settled once and for all. A later date, however, must presume that the controversy, supposedly settled by the Jerusalem council, broke out anew to be settled by Paul in Galatians—a premise which, while possible, is not equally prob-

able. Peter's defection of Gal. 2:11-14, as stated above, is more logical before the council at Jerusalem.

Several minor objections have been raised to the equating of Gal. 2:1-10 with Acts 11:27-30. Each apparent difficulty seems to vanish, however, on closer investigation.

Since Gal. 2:1-10 speaks of James, Cephas, and John as being in Jerusalem, while Acts 11:27-30 mentions only the presbyters, some have assumed that the apostles at the time of Acts 11:27-30 had left Jerusalem as a result of Herod's persecution. But the reception of the relief fund by the presbyters is merely in line with Acts 6, which states that it was not the task of the apostles to "serve tables," and there is no necessary implication that the apostles were not present in Jerusalem. There is no reason, furthermore, to assume the absence of the apostles if Acts is taken chronologically, for then Paul and Barnabas reach Jerusalem before the persecution by Herod. But the order of events in Acts is no doubt not chronological. After relating the events at Antioch to the famine (A. D. 46), the author resumes the story at Jerusalem with chapter 12, leading up to the death of Herod (A. D. 44). Also, one must admit, Acts does not suggest that all the apostles fled from Jerusalem to escape persecution in A. D. 44; nor does Acts necessarily state that Peter left Jerusalem—*ἕτερον τόπος* (Acts 12:17) may mean "another house," not "another city" (cf. Acts 4:31). Even on the assumption that Peter and the other apostles left Jerusalem in A. D. 44, they easily could have returned by A. D. 46-47, because the persecution ceased at the death of Herod.

The difficulty of chronology concerning Paul, which some have assumed, disappears

merely by taking "after 14 years" of Gal. 2:1 to mean 14 years after Paul's conversion, as the phrase "after three years" of Gal. 1:18 no doubt means. Even if the 14 years is to be calculated from the first visit to Jerusalem (Gal. 1:18), one must bear in mind two idiosyncrasies of calculation among the ancients: (a) inclusive calculation as, for example, in expressing Roman days of the month—three days before the Kalends (first) of February would be January 30; (b) fractions of a year referred to as a while year—

"after three years" could be $a + 1$ yr.
+ b ;

"after fourteen years" could be $c +$
12 yrs. + d ;

thus, taking a , b , c , and d as an unknown number of months, the total could be approximately 14 years. Another possible but not too probable explanation is to assume a corruption in the text of Gal. 2:1—the corruption of "4" to "14" by the addition of a single *iota*.¹⁸ The first explanation—"14 years" means after Paul's conversion—seems the most logical because of its simplicity and the parallelism with Gal. 1:18.

Romans and Galatians (and to a certain extent 1 and 2 Corinthians) are so close in language, subject, and style, some say, that they must belong to the same period. But the argument from similarity of style to identity of date is quite misleading. Galatians, moreover, is a hasty sketch, written with clear traces of anger under the pressure of an immediate crisis, while the Epistle to the Romans is a mature, philosophical treatment, composed at a time when the most pressing danger had passed

¹⁸ Cf. K. Lake, "The Date of Herod's Marriage with Herodias" in *Expositor* (November 1912), 462-477; cf. p. 473.

away. Nor does Galatians mention the later collection for Jerusalem.

The silence of Acts, likewise, concerning the defection of the Galatians offers no serious objection. Acts is silent also about the troubles in Corinth — a fact even more significant. All scholars recognize omissions in Acts, moreover, of numerous matters which readers of today might wish had been included — compare, for example, 2 Cor. 11:23-27 with Acts; and also the paucity of information which Acts relates concerning Paul's three years at Ephesus (Acts 19:1-20). The same objection, furthermore, would remain regardless of the date and addressees of the Epistle to the Galatians. It seems, then, that Acts records the beginning (Cornelius' incident) and the end (Jerusalem council) of the movement toward Gentile Christianity, but omits the intermediate stages which led to no decisive result and possibly could arouse painful memories.

The circumcision of Timothy (Acts 16:3), according to some, is inconceivable after the writing of Galatians. Special circumstances, however, attended the case of Timothy, as Acts informs us. Nor is the meaning of Gal. 2:3 clear as to whether Titus was circumcised or not. In neither case did Paul yield to the pressure of the Judaizers. Thus the circumcision of Timothy could have occurred after the writing of Galatians as well as after the decision of the council in Acts 15.

If Gal. 2:1-10 equates Acts 11:27-30, why, some ask, were fresh negotiations necessary in Acts 15? There are good reasons for the Judaizers' rejection of the decision of the leaders in Gal. 2:1-10 if it occurred during the famine visit. Peter's defection in Gal. 2:11-14, which then also would be before the council met, reveals

that the decision of the leaders (Gal. 2:1-10) failed to produce a final settlement. Also, the decision of Gal. 2:1-10 occurred when Paul's missionary work was limited to a relatively small area in Syria and Cilicia — regions close enough to Jerusalem that the influence of the Jewish Christians might be hoped to counteract that of the smaller number of Gentile Christians. After Paul's first journey, however, the greater number of Gentiles and their greater distance from Jerusalem would make it extremely more difficult for them to be absorbed into the church without a serious danger to the Jewish standard of morality. In the face of this danger the Judaizers no doubt renewed their perfectly sincere attempt to save Christianity from the danger of Gentile vices — not to mention the racial prejudice which no doubt was also active.

An extremely pertinent point, and in the final analysis one of the best tests, is the possible development of events on the basis of the equation of Gal. 2:1-10 with Acts 11:27-30. We may consider, then, a possible and even probable, though not the only possible, reconstruction of events, to see whether the account of Acts easily dovetails with Galatians on the basis of the equation proposed.

The church at Jerusalem sends Barnabas to Antioch to investigate the news concerning the preaching of the Gospel to Gentiles on a relatively large scale (Acts 11:20-22). Barnabas, recognizing the grace of God in the new movement, fetches Paul from Tarsus and both work with the church at Antioch for a whole year (Acts 11:23-26). During this time Agabus, also from Jerusalem, comes to Antioch and predicts a famine, which causes the Christians at Antioch to collect a purse and send it

to Jerusalem through Barnabas and Paul (Acts 11:27-30). At Jerusalem Barnabas and Paul both deliver the purse and report privately and informally on the Gentile movement around Antioch—Acts records the relief fund (Acts 11:30) to show that the center of gravity is shifting to the Gentile churches, while Paul recalls the private and informal discussion because it suits his purpose (Gal. 2:1-10). Acts is silent about the private conference because its importance is dwarfed by the later Jerusalem council. Accompanied by Barnabas, a most respected representative of Hellenistic Christianity, Paul no doubt receives a recognition at Jerusalem, which he had not enjoyed formerly; he and Barnabas might have discussed even their projected tour to south *Galatia*. (Gal. 2:9)

Returning to Antioch with John Mark (Acts 12:25), Paul and Barnabas set out on the first journey (Acts 13:1-3), which occupied one or two years (Acts 13, 14), returning again to Antioch, relating their successes among the Gentiles in south *Galatia* and remaining at Antioch "no little time" (Acts 14:26-28). The vigorous Gentile mission in *Galatia* brings to a head two related problems: (a) Some ultra-Judaizers come from Jerusalem and insist on the circumcision of Gentile converts (Acts 15:1,2), observing apparently that the Gentile Christians soon (if they had not done so already) would outnumber the Jewish Christians. The Judaistic propaganda, that Baptism is not a complete substitution for circumcision, spreads to the newly founded church of *Galatia*. (b) Social intercourse between Jewish and Gentile Christians—a related problem—arises about the same time at Antioch, possibly brought to a head by the inconsistency of Peter himself (Acts 2:11-14). It also

is a serious problem because it involves either division or unity at the common meals of the churches with combined membership of Jews and Gentiles. Since unity could come only if the Gentiles observe Jewish customs on "clean" and "unclean" foods, Paul can say that the Jews were compelling the Gentiles to live as Jews (Gal. 2:14). Both problems are closely related and both problems are so important that a meeting at Jerusalem seems imperative; but before leaving Antioch, Paul in haste and with anger writes to the churches of south *Galatia*, not being able to visit them immediately because of the coming council.

Paul and Barnabas, together with others, go again to Jerusalem for the council (Acts 15:2-5), which decides both of these important and related problems. Although the problem of circumcision had been discussed and decided privately in Gal. 2:1-10, it now is raised in more acute form as a result of the implications of Paul's first journey. The decree of the council concerns both problems: (a) "Not to trouble those of the Gentiles who turn to God" (Acts 15:19) decides the first problem against the Judaizers, in line with the informal discussion of some previous years (Gal. 2:1-10). The second problem results in a compromise, with the Gentiles urged to concede to the conscience of the Jews who are loyal to the Law of Moses (Acts 15: 20, 21, 28, 29).¹⁹

Fulton, Mo.

¹⁹ Paul in 1 Cor. is silent about the decree because the question there is different. In 1 Cor. the problem is the relation between the Gentile Christians and pagan society, while the decree of Acts 15 concerns the imposition of Jewish obligations on Gentile Christians.