

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

*PAUL'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS PETER AND
JAMES.*

It was not my intention to reply to the arguments advanced by Dr. Sanday in the EXPOSITOR for April. I do not like to thrust myself into the position of arguing against him. I am too conscious of my debt to him, both as a scholar from whom I have learned much, and as a friend who has given me sympathy and encouragement to attempt the problems of history, and accorded much generous recognition and praise to the little that I have done. It seemed better, and it was pleasanter, to drop the subject. But a letter from Rev. E. P. Boys-Smith (from whom on other occasions I have received very useful and encouraging communications) reminds me that there is another aspect of the situation. It is almost a betrayal of the truth to be silent at this stage.

To keep this subject rightly before the reader's mind, it must not be treated as isolated; it should not be discussed as if the real question were whether Dr. Sanday or I be right on this single point; it should be considered in its relation to the development of modern historical criticism. The "Tübingen theory"¹ was founded upon the discrepancy between *Galatians* ii. 1-10 and *Acts* xv., considered as descriptions of the same event. Starting from that evident discrepancy, and relying on the perfectly correct principle that the description given by the eye-witness Paul must be preferred to that given confessedly at second hand in *Acts*, it arrived by a singularly able and luminous argument, which seemed to compel assent inexorably at every step, at the conclusion that the discrepant and inharmonious narra-

¹ For brevity I use a rough and unscientific term to describe a class of views varying in many details, but having certain general characteristics common to all. The looseness of the term does not affect my argument.

tive in *Acts* xv. could not be the work of the friend, pupil, and year-long companion of Paul; that that narrative, and the book as a whole, showed such signs of knowledge of the real facts mingled with attempts to misrepresent and gloss them over, as proved it to be written in the second century by some one who desired to colour past history so as to suit later views and controversies.

On the other hand, scholars like Bishop Lightfoot and Dr. Sanday rightly conceived that the book of the *Acts*, as a whole, has the first-century tone: they caught the ring of genuineness in it, and they felt also that it was the unified work of a single author. In all this they showed true historical insight and literary feeling. I confess, and have always frankly acknowledged, that for years I was on the wrong side; I had a natural love for, and confidence in, a clear and definite chain of reasoning, in which one advanced by firm and easy steps; and I lacked either the sense, or the knowledge, or both, that could seize the tone of the book as a whole.

Bishop Lightfoot and Dr. Sanday were right in the most important parts of the problem; but their method of eluding the Tübingen argument from the discrepancy of *Acts* xv. and *Galatians* ii., by simply minimizing, or denying the existence of,¹ the discrepancy, was not, in my judgment, successful. But it was a great achievement to restore credit and authenticity to the work of an historian, whereas a wrong theory as to a single passage is a slight and venial error. That they upheld the right dating of *Acts* was an immense service to history, rendered at a time when the decided preponderance of learned authority was leaning in the other direction. Perhaps, if the alternative were now

¹ Lightfoot minimizes too far: Dr. Sanday, in his edition of *Galatians*, acknowledges its existence more frankly and definitely than Lightfoot, though in his *Bampton Lectures*, p. 329, he does "not include among the number of serious difficulties the differences between *Acts* xv. and *Galatians* ii. They are no doubt great, but," etc.

presented to me between on the one hand accompanying them unreservedly, and on the other hand following the Tübingen direction, I should, as the least of two difficulties, now go with them. But my contention is that as that alternative is not presented, it is possible to follow them in the general question, and to eliminate the difficulty which they left.

In his earlier paper in February, Dr. Sanday "took the broad ground that *Gal. ii. 1-10* implied a more advanced stage of the controversy than could have been reached about the year 46,¹ and before St. Paul's first Galatian journey."² In his second paper, with that fairness and honesty which characterize all his writing, he acknowledges that he stated his case "with rather too little qualification,"³ but he still thinks it impossible "that the situation of *Gal. ii.* could really have been reached by the year 46";⁴ and he still holds "that the language of St. Paul in *Ep. Galatians* is satisfied by nothing short of the events of the first missionary journey." He now derives his weightiest argument from *Galatians ii. 7-9*; and he

¹ I substitute always the date for which I contend. To do my theory justice, it must be taken as a whole and with its own date. Paul and Barnabas went to Jerusalem about Nov., 45, and the private communications took place naturally near the end of the visit.

² To the argument which I advanced to prove that in the case of Cornelius the antithesis of circumcision and non-circumcision was already fully developed (whereas Dr. Sanday had maintained that that antithesis, with the watchwords, "Jew" and "Gentile," began only in A.D. 50), it may be added that Peter and James in *Acts xv.* treat the case of Cornelius as conclusive and complete with regard to the relations of the Gentiles to the Church; they avoid using the term "circumcision," which was calculated to rouse ill-feeling; but their speeches imply that the antithesis of Gentile and Jew was explicit in the case. It may be said that they interpret the case in the light of later events; but, if there be anything in that, it is just as true of Paul in *Galatians ii.*

³ Considering that he had chosen the argument as being "in the strictly Baconian sense crucial," the admission is significant.

⁴ Acknowledging that some qualification is needed, he qualifies his position by the insertion of "really." Dr. Sanday is a master in the art of delicate gradation in strength of statement.

states his reason in the following words, which are so important for my purpose that I must beg leave to quote them.¹ "Surely this 'gospel of the circumcision' 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, and the founding of the Galatian Churches . . . On this ground I take my stand. If I am dislodged from it, then it will be time to consider Prof. Ramsay's ingenious combinations. But, as it is, I am stopped at the threshold."

The reason why Dr. Sanday finds the sentiment of *Galatians* ii. 7-9 so impossible in the year 46 is not clear to me; much as I try, I fail to see where lies the difficulty, and Dr. Sanday never states it definitely. Apparently he holds that the Apostles Peter and James could not possibly recognise Paul as being called to the Apostolate of the Gentiles in 46, but could recognise him as such in 50 or 51 A.D. It may be granted that no human being, however obtuse or slow-witted he was, could fail, in A.D. 50, to recognise that Paul was the Apostle of the Gentiles; but I see no difficulty in believing that men like Peter and James, after Paul had expounded to them privately his aims, his method, and his call, could have recognised his great mission as early as 46. Let us consider this point a little.

Were Peter and James men who could only recognise the logic of events? Were they men who could not feel Paul's greatness, recognise his mission, "know the grace that was given him" (*Gal.* ii. 9), until these had been demonstrated so effectually that no one could deny his command-

¹ I leave a lacuna in the middle; but this does not alter the effect. I give the words selected by an unprejudiced onlooker, Mr. Boys-Smith, as representing Dr. Sanday's argument.

ing position in the Church? Dr. Sanday seems to assume their inability to do this in 46. I am far from agreeing with him. How did Peter and James gain their great position and influence in the early Church? Was it not that they earned it by their power, by their sympathetic insight into the qualifications of men, and by their appreciation of the needs of the Church, by "the grace that was given them?" And does not grace recognise grace intuitively? Is not the Divine naturally attracted to the Divine, wherever they meet? In great questions leaders grasp the situation and see the solution long before most people appreciate it. On my theory Peter and James were leaders.

But we have a history of the period, setting forth the critical steps in the development of the Church. What evidence does Luke give as to the recognition of Paul's charge to the Gentiles? As early as 42, or the very beginning of 43, when Barnabas went to Antioch, and saw the character of the congregation there, which contained a considerable proportion of Greeks,¹ he bethought himself at once of Paul, and went to fetch him to Antioch. He had come in contact with him only for fifteen days at Paul's first visit to Jerusalem in 35, and had since then heard of his successful work in Cilicia; but he knew at once that Paul was needed in Greek Antioch. Luke's conception clearly is that Barnabas had from the first recog-

¹ Dr. Sanday will not admit this argument, for he holds to the reading *Ἑλληνιστᾶς* for *Ἕλληνας*. In my view, the longer word makes the passage meaningless, and distorts Luke's whole conception of the development of the Church. An important step is here indicated: the preachers at Antioch went beyond those in Phœnicia and Cyprus, and even addressed Greeks. Now the preachers in Cyprus certainly addressed Hellenistai—how could they avoid it in the synagogues of Cyprus?—and Hellenistai had formed part of the Church in Jerusalem from the earliest times (*Acts* vi. 1; ix. 29). The character of the Antiochian Church is wholly misunderstood, unless we recognise that from the first it contained a considerable (and a steadily growing) proportion of Greeks; but they were Greeks who came into relations with the Jews, and the preaching was still regularly connected with the synagogue.

nised that Paul "was called by the good pleasure of God to preach Him among the Gentiles (*Gal.* i. 16).

It is apparent that Dr. Sanday's point of view is far removed from mine, as he says, p. 257, he "can only understand this (*Gal.* ii. 2) . . . of a practice which the Apostle had begun"; and again, he sees in ii. 7-9 "the ratification of a success already gained." On this the reader will judge. To me the view that Paul imparted to the leading Apostles beforehand the wider and freer plans which had been growing in his mind amid and through his work in Cilicia and Antioch, that he went forth to Cyprus, strong not merely in his private conviction of the reality of the Divine commission given him, but also in the consciousness that the great leaders, who stood in the eyes of the world as the pillars of the Church,¹ were in full agreement with him²—that view, I say, appears not merely a nobler conception of the mind of the three leaders, Peter, James, and Paul, but also one which is needed to explain Paul's attitude, his perfect confidence in the unity of feeling between Peter, and James, and himself, and his perfect confidence that the incident of *Galatians* ii. is a conclusive and final confirmation of his point of view.

Further, it was on account of private communication and intercourse (*Gal.* ii. 2) that James and Peter perceived the working of the Divine Spirit in Paul: private explanation was required in 46, but in 50 the Galatian Churches had made clear to all Paul's power and his mission. Paul represents that James and Peter came over to his side, and approved of him purely on account of his private statement of his gospel, and because "they saw the grace that was given him"; and he does not give the slightest hint that

¹ οἱ δοκοῦντες στήλοι εἶναι, *Gal.* ii. 9, where (as I have argued in the *EXPOSITION*, Third Series, vol. ii. p. 106) it is a misapprehension, shared even by Lightfoot, that any depreciation is implied.

² On this see a paragraph near the close of this article.

their action was due to such striking achievements as the foundation of the Galatian Churches.

Contrast with the words of Paul in this passage the words of Luke describing the visit and action of Paul in Jerusalem in 50 A.D., after the Galatian Churches were founded: "they hearkened unto Paul and Barnabas, rehearsing what signs and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them." We have here a distinctly later stage, as is clearly seen on a comparative view.

A.D. 46, GAL. ii.

ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὁ
κηρύσσω¹ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (v. 2).
ἴδοντες ὅτι πεπίστευμαι¹ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον
τῆς ἀκροβυστίας (v. 7). ἐνήργησε²
καὶ ἐμοὶ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη (v. 8). γνόντες
τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθείσαν μοι (v. 9).

A.D. 50, ACTS xv.

ἤκουον Βαρνάβαν καὶ Παύλου ἐξηγου-
μένων ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς σημεῖα καὶ
τέρατα ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν δι' αὐτῶν (v.
12). ἀνήγγειλαν ὅσα ὁ θεὸς ἐποίησεν
μετ' αὐτῶν (v. 4).

In the later case the evidence is objective, and entirely based on accomplished fact, and on the marvels which attested God's action among the Galatian converts. In the earlier, the evidence is subjective, and based purely on the recognition by Peter and James of Paul's personal qualifications, the message entrusted to him, and the power and grace that were given him.

Parallel cases may be cited to confirm this comparative view. Wherever a Church has been founded amid a new class of persons, making an extension of the Gospel, the justification rests in the new Church itself, and in the signs of God's action among its members: so in the case of Cornelius's household (x. 45), "they of the circumcision which believed were amazed, because on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Spirit: for they heard them speak with tongues."³ So again at Antioch, "when

¹ On the tenses κηρύσσω and πεπίστευμαι, which are vital, see below.

² On the sense of ἐνήργησε see below.

³ Compare the argument of Peter in defence, xi. 5-17, and its effect on his audience. See also my *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 115. At Pisidian Antioch

Barnabas had come and had seen the grace of God, he was glad" (xi. 23). So at Ephesus, Paul's question, when he "found certain disciples," was, "Did ye receive the Spirit when ye believed?" (xix. 1, 2). That was the one single sufficient proof, and it was also the necessary and indispensable proof: Paul could not omit it in *Galatians* ii. except for the one reason that there had yet been no opportunity for it. If the incident in *Galatians* ii. 1-10 had occurred in A.D. 50, the question would have been, "Did these converts receive the Spirit?" When Barnabas and he went up to Jerusalem in A.D. 50, they at once addressed themselves to that question.

Now Dr. Sanday, evidently, recognises fully that if the interview with Peter and James in *Galatians* ii. occurred in A.D. 50-51, Paul must necessarily have anticipated this question and appealed to the proof furnished by his Galatian converts; and he proceeds to discover it in Paul's words. So far as I may judge, however, it does not lie in the words, but is read into them by Dr. Sanday through his feeling that it must be there. He considers that in *vv.* 7-9 we have something that "corresponds exactly to that 'rehearsing of what God had done' among the Gentiles," which was given at Jerusalem in A.D. 50-51. I cannot see the correspondence, and I have therefore placed the critical words side by side on a preceding page, in order that the reader may judge for himself. But can the words in *v.* 9, "wrought for me also to the Gentiles," be taken as a "retrospect of work done" among the Gentiles?¹ That can hardly be maintained:² the conjunction of *ἐνήργησε* in

"the disciples were filled with joy and with the Holy Spirit," xiii. 52; and this must be understood of all the Churches in order, as is confirmed by the marvels, *e.g.*, at Lystra, for such signs involve a reciprocal action (see my *St. Paul*, p. 39, lines 7-9).

¹ ὁ γὰρ ἐνεργήσας Πέτρῳ εἰς ἀποστολὴν τῆς περιτομῆς ἐνήργησεν καὶ ἐμοὶ εἰς τὴν ἔθνην (*Gal.* ii. 9).

² I do not imply that Dr. Sanday maintains this: I quite believe that he would not think so; but it is well to bring out the point clearly.

9 and χάρις in 10 points beyond question to the parallelism between this passage and iii. 5 in regard to the sense of the verb. In iii. 5 Paul asks, "He therefore that bountifully supplieth to you the Spirit, and worketh miraculous power in you,¹ doeth He it by the works of the law or by the hearing of faith?" The allusion in both passages is to the indwelling God-given power, not to the resulting effects in external action. The two Apostles were aware of the power in Paul and the grace: Paul was aware of the Spirit and the God-given powers in the Galatians. Compare the note of Dr. Zöckler (whom I quote, partly because of the clear, precise words that he uses, partly because he is strongly on the opposite side from me in this question): "*nicht die äusseren Wunderaffekte, sondern die geistgewirkten Kräfte zur Vollbringung solcher Wunder (= χάρισματa, Rom. xii. 6; 1 Cor. xii. 4) sind gemeint,*" iii. 5.

This sense of the verb ἐνήργησε is not likely to be disputed, and I need not go into an examination of Paul's use of the verb, and of the noun ἐνέργεια.² But I shall quote a few words from Mr. Boys-Smith, who treats this passage as conclusive in evidence against Dr. Sanday. He renders, "He that empowered Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, empowered me also for the nations"; and he adds the paraphrase, "He that commissioned Peter for the circumcision in the words, 'feed my sheep,' commissioned me for the uncircumcision, saying, 'I will send thee far hence unto the nations.'" He puts the force of ἐνέργεια well: "ἐνέργεια always stands for a spiritual force entering into the realm of human life, and operating within the person of him who feels its influence." And similarly,

¹ The Revised Version is admittedly seriously erroneous here. I have intentionally used Lightfoot's words in the translation given of ὁ οὖν ἐπιχορηγῶν ὑμῖν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν κτλ.

² The words are characteristically, but not quite exclusively, Pauline: they, with ἐνέργημα, occur a little over thirty times in N.T.

“the idea of *ἐνεργεῖν* is that of subjective activity, not of objective operation, the infusion of energy into the person, not the accomplishment by him of external results.” The thought of ii. 8 is, as he says, actually expressed a few verses before (i. 15), “to reveal His Son in me, that I might preach Him among the nations.” The parallel in ii. 8, 9, of *ἐνήργησε* and *χάριτι δοθεῖσαν* is in itself a piece of evidence: the God-given power and grace stand on the same level.

We are, I think, forced to the conclusion that Paul describes himself in *Galatians* ii. 1-9 as convincing the Apostles privately that a Divine mission was entrusted to him, and that indwelling power and grace had been given him for that mission. Henceforth he knew that the leaders were with him, and all the arguments of the Tübingen school about disagreement between them and Paul are vain imaginings, vain as were the attempts of the extreme Judaistic party (“certain of the believing Pharisees,” xv. 5) to effect any disagreement between them and Paul.

On the other hand in *Acts* xv. Paul appeals to results, to the practical effect of his mission, the outward marvels wrought in its course, and the conversion of the nations.

Galatians ii. is therefore the earlier stage; *Acts* xv. the subsequent stage.

In treating the whole passage, *Gal.* ii. 1-10, Dr. Sanday seems to me not to attend sufficiently to the force of the tenses (which I tried to bring out in an article in *EXPOSITOR*, Third Series, vol. ii. pp. 104 ff.). There is an extraordinary variety in the tenses used, and the variation is exceedingly significant; in fact the whole force of the passage depends on the use of the tenses. The series of events which took place at the time described are expressed by *aorists*: those ideas which are spoken of as true down to the moment when Paul was writing are rendered by *presents*. Hence v. 2, “I submitted (*aorist*) to the apostles

the gospel which I continue preaching now (*present*) among the Gentiles"; "to prevent the work of my whole life down to the present time (*present*) or my work then (*aorist*) from being ineffectual." But his commission to preach had been given to him before 46, and Paul therefore expresses it in the *perfect* tense, which here has the force of *pluperfect* (the tense of the direct speech being retained in the indirect according to a common grammatical form). When one follows the tenses closely, the historical interpretation for which I contend is seen to be necessary.

In saying that Paul in 46 submitted to the Apostles his mission and his commission and his aims among the Gentiles, I do not of course mean that he either spoke to them of, or even contemplated, all the development of events. Doubtless he looked forward, as Peter and James did, to a peaceful unification of Jews and Gentiles in the one Church, and it is certain that he would have been horrified to think of the breach with his own people that he was approaching. He saw, indeed, a serious danger threatening; but all three leaders agreed as to the best means of meeting it. Nor is it meant that he was already clear as to all his method: on the contrary, I think the scene in the proconsul's house at Paphos (xiii. 5 ff.) was a new step made on the inspiration of the moment.

Further, it is clear and certain that James and Peter, and also Paul, looked forward to the Gentiles, as they were converted, entering into relations with the Jews and observing those minor conditions of purity that would qualify them for doing so. A unified Church of Jews and Gentiles was possible on no other footing; and the Decree of the Apostles and Elders in A.D. 50-51 was merely a legal and formal expression of the action required to hold together the single Jewish-Gentile Church. Paul in his later development made only this modification, that he looked on these

conditions as being mere concessions to the weakness of the Jews, and not in themselves essential (except in so far as a moral principle was partially involved in some of them).

I touch only the ground on which Dr. Sanday has taken his stand in refusing even "to consider my ingenious combinations." Admitting my faults of disrespect in standing up against a scholar so much more experienced, to whom I ought to be a listener merely, I say with Themistocles, "Strike, but hear me." At present he uses the same kind of reasoning against me as has been employed already by some other scholars in regard to the South-Galatian theory. One single fact (or, as I should call it, one single mistaken pre-conception) is regarded as barring out my theory; and my arguments, "my ingenious combinations," are not even considered. This attitude is one which, I confess, I find it difficult to sympathize with. In ancient history, where disputed problems are so numerous, there is, as a rule, no safe and trustworthy method except that of weighing the case as a whole, contemplating it from all sides, and judging from the widest possible examination. It has been my experience, repeatedly, that the method of trusting to one apparently strong reason, and suffering oneself to be "stopped at the threshold" from weighing with a sympathetic mind a different theory,¹ betrays the scholar who follows it: an impression gained from one point of view is often deceptive. My chief aim in my previous article was to persuade Dr. Sanday to look at the subject from a new point of view before he pronounced judgment; but as yet he merely reiterates that he finds himself barred from doing so, and concludes by saying that he will not reply to

¹ It is not a fair hearing of a theory involving a delicate interpretation of historical evidence to begin with a strong prepossession on the other side; the judge is then practically a critic on the look-out for evidence on which to rest a condemnation; and the finest points of a theory are certain to escape those who do not study it with sympathy.

any arguments I may have to advance further—a promise from which I would gladly absolve him.

As to “the imputation of apologetic harmonizing,” which Dr. Sanday seems to consider that I have unjustly brought against him, such terms are liable to bear a different sense in the minds of different persons. I did not use the term or make the charge;¹ though I see no crime even if he had deserved it, and I see no reason to think that the distinguished scholar who is quoted on p. 262 is more free from the charge than he himself or Lightfoot is. Further, when Dr. Sanday asserts that he has not “given to the sacred writers any different measure from that which he would have given them if they had been profane,” I recognise no merit in his claim: rather, as a diligent and grateful student of his writings, I feel on every page that he does give a different measure, that it is inseparable from his nature and mind to do so, and that it would be unfortunate for the world, for his pupils, and for his readers, if it were not so. But it is quite consistent with this that he should be perfectly fair and just to all; and the first quality which attracted me in Lightfoot and also in himself was their manifest eager and limitless desire to be scrupulously honest and just in their judgments.

A brief reference is needed to Dr. Sanday's argument on p. 261. He holds that *διακονίαν πληρώσαντες* in xii. 25 denotes simply the handing over of the Antiochian money to the authorities in Jerusalem; and quotes *Romans* xv. 31, where he holds that *διακονία* means only the presentation of sums to the authorities. His argument implies that the large representative deputation which carried those sums, was intended by Paul simply to go to Jerusalem, hand over the money, and depart. But surely that is a very inadequate conception: surely the same aim as in A.D. 45–46

¹ My charge was that he did not fully realize the force of an objection. If that is a charge of crime, what writer on these subjects is free from it?

(according to my view) was in Paul's mind. The deputation was to impress the Church in Jerusalem with its personal services; it was to hand over the money to the authorities (as in xi. 30), to be at their orders for service in connection with it, even though the opportunity of a famine was not open at the second visit, and to bring home to the mass of Christians in Jerusalem the reality of the Church in Lystra, Beroëa, etc. (and *vice versâ*). No such further service is mentioned by Luke, but Paul's capture disarranged all plans.

W. M. RAMSAY.

LIKE Prof. Ramsay, I had not thought to write any more on the subject in debate between us at present. But the invitation which he gives me is so friendly, and the opening which his article offers seems to me so satisfactory, and so really conducive to an understanding, not only between our two selves, but among those who are interested in the subject generally, that I have not hesitated to take him at his word, and I have asked the editor to allow me to append a few remarks to his paper.

It has unfortunately happened—I hardly know how—that besides the necessary and inevitable differences between us in regard to the interpretation of this section of Church History, others had gathered round them which did not seem to me so necessary, and which I am afraid must have encumbered our discussion to the reader. These, I am glad to think, have now nearly all been cleared up, and the one that remains may, I hope, soon be removed.

I can assure Prof. Ramsay that I had no wish to stand in the way of the full consideration of his case. If I proposed to restrict our discussion to certain lines, my motives in doing so were quite on the surface. Partly, they were a

very prosaic desire to economize time and space, and partly a certain mental habit which impels me whenever I can to simplify a complicated question by going straight to what seems to me the most vital part of it, where a decision once taken carries with it all the rest. Of course, I may have been wrong in singling out the part I did as vital. There are other considerations which I should myself have liked to take up when that had been disposed of. But as the question stood it seemed to me sufficient to deal with the one main point at once. That was all I meant by putting in my plea as it were *in limine*; it was a short cut to a decision, such as I am afraid one is obliged to have recourse to in this crowded life of ours, and nothing more.

I hope there was nothing unjust in this. It seemed to me that the particular question did admit of being isolated, that it did admit of a definite answer Yes, or No, and that the one general answer carried with it other subordinate answers. I am quite open to correction, and merely state my case for what it is worth.

However this may be, Prof. Ramsay has now been good enough to meet me on the ground of my choosing. I thank him for it, and I thank him for bringing to bear his unique power of giving to the details of a question definiteness and reality. There can be no doubt that his article is calculated to advance our debate a long step forward. I shall have no reason to complain if, when I have said my say, the votes are taken, and the decision goes against me.

Prof. Ramsay has stated his case, and I will say at once that I do not think it could be better stated. The view which he takes of clause after clause of the crucial passage seems to me (on his premises) the most reasonable that could be taken. If he should end by making a convert of me, I should myself take the same view. But I cannot say that as yet the argument, as a whole, seems to me convincing.

It is important that we should have the text of the passage (Gal. ii. 6-9) before us; and as some exception has been taken to my renderings (which I believe were usually those of the Revised Version), it may be most satisfactory if I adopt the paraphrase given by Prof. Ramsay himself (*St. Paul the Traveller, etc.*, p. 56).

"But from the recognised leaders—how distinguished soever was their character is not now to the point; God accepteth not man's person—the recognised leaders, I say, imparted no new instruction to me; but perceiving that I throughout my ministry am charged specially with the mission to foreign (non-Jewish) nations, as Peter is with the Jewish mission—for he that worked (*ὁ ἐνεργήσας*) for Peter to the Apostolate of the circumcision worked (*ἐνήργησε*) also for me to be the missionary to the Gentiles—and perceiving [from the actual facts] the grace that had been given me, they, James and Cephas and John, the recognised pillars of the Church, gave pledges to me and to Barnabas of a joint scheme of work, ours to be directed to the Gentiles, while theirs was to the Jews."

Prof. Ramsay thinks that these verses have reference to a point of time corresponding to that of Acts xi. 30 (the mission of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem with succour against the famine). This he would date in the year 46. I would rather place the events described in the epistle in the longitude of Acts xv., *i.e.*, about the year 50. The great difference between us is that on Prof. Ramsay's view the first missionary journey and the founding of the Galatian Churches (Acts xiii. xiv.) are subsequent to the situation implied by the Epistle, whereas on my view they precede it. I have maintained that St. Paul makes a direct appeal to the successes of the Galatian mission, and this Prof. Ramsay denies. The issue between us is, therefore, as clear and simple as possible, and it should not be difficult for the reader to make up his mind about it.

Prof. Ramsay rests his case mainly on the force of *ἐνέργησε*, which—as he rightly urges—is subjective rather than objective. When St. Paul says that God “worked for” him towards the Gentiles as He “worked for” Peter towards the Jews, the Greek lays stress rather on the powers implanted, the gifts and energies bestowed upon the two Apostles, than upon the results which they obtained. The inference drawn from this is that when we are told that James and Peter and John “perceived the grace” that was given to their colleague, they perceived it rather through their private intercourse with him and their “sympathetic insight into the qualifications of men,” than through the witness of events. Their confidence in St. Paul is prophetic rather than in retrospect of work done.

I should not think of contesting the perfect tenability of this as an interpretation of the Greek. At the same time I am a little surprised that Mr. Boys-Smith, who has expressed his adhesion to Prof. Ramsay’s view, should think it “conclusive” as against my argument. I note by the way that Prof. Ramsay can hardly have so regarded it at the time when he wrote his paraphrase. He inserts there the words which I have placed in square brackets (in the original they are in smaller type) “perceiving [from the actual facts] the grace that had been given me.” Perhaps his view has developed since the paraphrase was written. I do not mean to press the words against him further than to show how very naturally they are introduced, and how entirely the Greek admits of my construction of the history as well as of his. The words chosen no doubt lay stress on the God-given energies of the Apostles. But these might be inferred either directly or indirectly, either by personal contact and insight into character, or by the news of effects produced; the context leaves both methods open, and I should not wish to exclude either.

One little phrase at least makes for the wider reference. If St. Paul had written no more than "He who worked for Peter worked also for me," the working might well have been only inward. But then he adds "He who worked for Peter *to the apostleship of the circumcision* worked also for me *towards the Gentiles.*" The appeal is transferred from the inward to the outward. It was the actual success of Peter among Jews, and the actual success of Paul among Gentiles that supplied proof of their endowment and fitness for their respective missions.

It thus appears that Prof. Ramsay was not wrong in inserting "from the actual facts," and that I am (so far) not wrong in following him. The next question that comes up is, What are these facts? The context seems to show that they are facts upon a certain scale, facts upon a considerable scale. When St. Paul ascribes to his brother Apostle "the apostleship of the circumcision," he implies, though he leaves the word to be understood, that "the apostleship of the Gentiles," had fallen to himself. What evidence had he of this?

Prof. Ramsay insists on a point which I had waived. He claims that the right reading in Acts xi. 20 is *Ἕλληνας*, and not *Ἑλληνιστάς*; he thinks that this proves the presence of Greeks (Gentiles) in some numbers in the Church at Antioch, and that St. Paul had exercised his ministry among these.

It is a dangerous thing in textual criticism to take at once the reading which seems to give the best *prima facie* sense, especially where that sense is required by a particular theory. Has Prof. Ramsay weighed the reading as a question of such difficulty ought to be weighed? The mass of MSS., including B, the Laudian Acts, and the important cursive 61, has *Ἑλληνιστάς*; a small but important group, the third hand of N, the first hand of D and A, have *Ἕλληνας*. The first hand of N has the clerical error

εὐαγγελιστάς. It is commonly assumed that \aleph is really a witness for *Ἑλληνιστάς*, the first syllables being evidently due to the influence of *εὐαγγελιζόμενοι* which follows. It may, however, be urged (as it was by Prof. Warfield in the *Journal of Biblical Exegesis* for 1884, p. 114) that a substantive suggested by *εὐαγγελιζόμενοι* could only be *εὐαγγελιστάς*. The evidence of \aleph^* has to be taken with so much reserve, which in a case like this is not without importance. On the other hand, one of the two leading witnesses on the other side, A, is discredited by reading *Ἕλληνας* for *Ἑλληνιστάς* in ix. 29, where D is not extant, and therefore cannot be tested.

Into the scale in favour of *Ἑλληνιστάς* must be thrown the strong temptation to editor or scribe to substitute an easy and familiar word for one which was by no means familiar. There is no like temptation to set against this, so that the argument drawn from it seems to me a strong one. Generally speaking, textual considerations in the strict sense tell decidedly for *Ἑλληνιστάς*.

Are they overthrown by considerations of exegesis? I greatly doubt it. The words "Hellenist," "Hellenistic," etc., are with us in constant use; they occupy a convenient place in the language of scholarship, and a meaning has been attached to them which is well understood. This is apt to make us forget that the case was very different in antiquity. The three places where the word *Ἑλληνιστής* occurs in the Acts, and certain comments upon the Acts are said to be the only instances of its occurrence. It is not, I believe, found in the whole of Josephus, or in the whole of Philo. Hence the meaning of it is really far from certain. I suspect that it is to be taken strictly of the Jews who habitually used the Greek language. In the places where they are mentioned the Hellenists always seem to be in a minority. Even at Antioch they would be, although it is described as "a Greek city"; the main body of the Jews

would use their own Aramaic, which did not differ greatly from that of the native Syrians. We may suppose that only a few synagogues were set apart for the Jews who were in the stricter sense "Hellenists."

The Jews in these synagogues would doubtless be in closer touch with Gentiles; and I am ready to believe that there may have been at Antioch a certain number of proselytes or inquirers who had embraced Christianity as Cornelius did. But I am not prepared to think that these existed at Antioch in such numbers by the date of Acts xi. 30 that St. Paul could speak of himself as holding an *ἀποστολήν εἰς τὰ ἔθνη*. I cannot think that as yet there was a clear demarcation of spheres between himself and St. Peter. It seems to me an anachronism to speak at this date of *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας*. All these expressions would be perfectly in place after the first journey. I cannot think that they could be in place before it.

There are three great steps in a steady and gradual ascent. The handful of converts of Gentile birth at Antioch and St. Paul's dealings with them is the first; the scene before Sergius Paulus (Acts xiii. 8-12) is the second; the third and greatest is the definite turning to the Gentiles at Antioch in Pisidia (Acts xiii. 46 ff.). This is the real turning-point. "It was necessary that the word of God should first be spoken to you. Seeing ye thrust it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles." With these words St. Paul announced his assumption of the true "apostleship of the Gentiles." From this day onwards he may be said to preach a real "gospel of the uncircumcision." To use either of these phrases at any earlier period seems to me to antedate them; it seems to me to introduce confusion into a history the main lines of which stand out with wonderful clearness.

The two phrases, *ἀποστολή εἰς τὰ ἔθνη* and *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*

τῆς ἀκροβυστίας, both seem to me to imply a certain scale in their contents — deliberate preaching, systematically directed over a considerable extent of time and with considerable results. I still fail to see that these conditions are satisfied by the view put forward by Prof. Ramsay.

I will only add a word of explanation in reference to the discrepancies which seem to arise if my view is adopted. Prof. Ramsay thinks that I minimize these, though I quite understand that the charge is not pressed, as my error is set down as a natural and pardonable consequence of my position as a teacher. I am grateful for the indulgence, but I am afraid that I cannot avail myself of it. What Prof. Ramsay would call a minimizing of discrepancies is with me a matter of deliberate principle, applicable equally to secular writings as to sacred. I would formulate the principle thus: Where we have reason to think that two writers are each singly deserving of credit, discrepancies between them are more likely to be apparent than real: even where the discrepancies may seem to be serious, and the methods suggested for resolving them are open to some objection, it is still better to accept the testimony than to discard it, because our knowledge is almost sure to be too limited to exhaust the possibilities of reconciliation. *Subtilitas naturæ subtilitatem sensus et intellectus multis partibus superat.*¹ I sometimes wish that a lawyer with competent knowledge would collect for us instances in which verdicts more or less confidently given had been afterwards, by the confession of the real culprit, or by the production of new evidence, proved to be wrong. I believe that if this were done, and if the instances in question were duly weighed, our ideas as to the possibilities of things would be considerably enlarged.

In the particular case before us I have little doubt that, as conceived by Prof. Ramsay, they are really too narrow.

¹ Bacon, *Novum Organum*, i. 10.

As at present advised, the sum total of the difficulties on my reconstruction of the history seems to me less than on his. I do not pledge myself to the whole of the reconstruction, but I think that there are certain fixed points in it; the filling up between those points is only put forward as speculative and conjectural. For the first I should contend somewhat strenuously; for the second I do not much care to contend. But I hope that Prof. Ramsay will believe that, even while I am arguing against him, I am weighing his case as well as I can, and that no mere obstinacy in debate will prevent me, if I am satisfied with it, from coming over to his opinion.

W. SANDAY.