



THE
NEW WORLD

*A QUARTERLY REVIEW OF RELIGION
ETHICS AND THEOLOGY.*

VOL. IX. — MARCH, 1900. — NO. XXXIII.

JAMES MARTINEAU.

On the twelfth day of January last Dr. Martineau disappeared from among the living. With vivid memory of the great part he had borne, the cry of many hearts may well have been, "My father, my father, the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof." To the mind grown calm, however, exultation could but have succeeded the pang, at thought of the moral beauty and tireless consecration of his life. If clear moral insights were given him, his career had irradiated their splendor; if great powers of intellect, he had taxed them to the utmost in the service of God and man. One event in his long life, together with its sequel, we may recall for the illustration it affords. In the summer of 1885, now an octogenarian, he announced his purpose to surrender the Principalship of Manchester New College at the coming commencement. It was determined to make the occasion one of congratulation and regret; and former pupils, many of them with temples gray with age though green with laurel, together with scholars and thinkers who had been the companions of his long walk, gathered about him. One after another bore testimony to his great service, and at length he rose to speak. Behind him was a retrospect of forty-five years of continuous service with the college, toiling at the problems of Plato and Descartes, and taking up with knightly valor any gage of battle that a Tyndall or a Mansel might throw down; also forty-two years of severest clerical labor, answering in connection with it the multitudinous calls which great talent and recognized ability are sure to bring; also a literary record, of itself a substantial life work. With all this

THE DATE OF THE EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO
THE GALATIANS.

THE Epistle to the Galatians is receiving special attention from scholars at the present time. But the interest is centred in the location of the Galatian churches, and the date of the epistle is exciting less notice. In a recent essay on the "Destination and Date of Galatians," by E. H. Askwith, it is claimed at the outset that "these are two distinct problems," and that "no final solution" of them "will be found, except by deciding one without any reference to the other." This is doubtless true, and yet the problems are so closely related that the answer to the one determines in a measure the answer to the other. The view that the Galatian churches were founded on the First Missionary Journey favors an early date; and scholars who hold this view agree, with few exceptions, in placing the epistle not later than the Second Missionary Journey, some of them putting it before that journey. The view that Paul visited Galatia for the first time on the Second Missionary Journey places an early date out of the question; and those who hold this view assign the epistle to the Third Missionary Journey. It is unfortunate that the question of the destination of the epistle should be constantly allowed to take precedence of the question of the date. The result is, that the latter question is not receiving the careful and unprejudiced treatment which its importance demands. The order should be reversed for a time, and the date considered without reference to the destination. Until that is done, scholars will continue to differ greatly in their views as to the date of this epistle.

The Epistle to the Galatians contains a narrative of personal experience that sets the limit for the date in one direction. The writing must be later than the latest of the events therein related. It is important, therefore, to determine, if possible, the place of these events in the life of the apostle. The final events are those related in the second chapter, namely, a visit of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem, and a visit of Peter and the Judaizers to Antioch. The point of interest in each visit is a discussion between the apostles concerning the Gentiles, brought on each time by the hostility of the Judaizers to the teaching of Paul. The Book of Acts tells of conflicts with the Judaizers at Antioch and at Jerusalem. It is important to know whether the conflicts of the Epistle to the Galatians and the Book of Acts are identical.

If they are, Galatians was written after the events described in Acts xv. If they are not, Galatians was written in all probability before those events. For, according to Paul's own account of his experiences, he had come into conflict with the Judaizers twice at the time that he wrote this epistle; and it is not likely that he would have omitted to mention a third conflict with them if such an one had taken place.

The order of events differs in Galatians ii. and Acts xv. The schism at Antioch follows the visit to Jerusalem in Galatians; it precedes that visit, and is the cause of it, in Acts. The order of Acts may be preferred, if it can be shown that the order followed in Galatians is not necessarily the chronological order. Unless this can be done, the order of Paul as eyewitness must be preferred, and only one of the incidents described in Galatians can be found in the corresponding narrative of Acts. In an article on the "Chronology of the New Testament,"¹ Mr. Turner argues that the "identification of the two Judaizing missions from Jerusalem to Antioch may be accepted side by side with the ordinary view that Gal. ii. 1 ff. = Acts xv., *if Gal. ii. 11-14 be allowed in order of time to precede Gal. ii. 1-10.* There is nothing like the *ἐπειτα* of Gal. i. 18, 21; ii. 1 to suggest that the chronological series is continued. . . . The dispute at Antioch may then be placed in the winter (A. D. 48-49) before the council."

An objection to this view is, that it makes Paul place his account of Peter's conduct at Antioch just where it would be most damaging to the character of the great apostle, and that without giving any hint that he was not relating the events in their true order. This seems of itself a sufficient reason for rejecting the proposal. It is incredible that Paul would have done such a wrong to a brother apostle. Accordingly the order of events in Galatians must be retained, and the identification of both incidents is out of the question. The case of the Gentiles must have come up for discussion a second time either in Antioch or in Jerusalem, if not in both places.

A. COMPARISON OF GAL. II. 1-10 WITH ACTS XV. 2-29. — Both of these narratives deal with a visit of Paul to Jerusalem in company with Barnabas, with a conference between Paul and Barnabas and certain of the elder apostles, and with a discussion concerning Gentile converts. In each case Paul and Barnabas receive the support of the apostles, and the party of the circumcision suffers a defeat. The majority of scholars identify the visits

¹ In Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible.*

of Gal. ii. and Acts xv. on the ground of these resemblances. But a careful examination of these accounts makes it clear that, if there is a strong likeness between them in some respects, there is a remarkable difference between them in others. Accordingly the identification of these visits of Paul to Jerusalem is generally recognized to be one of the most difficult problems in the life of the apostle.

The points on which the two narratives are at variance are the following: 1. *The Cause of the Conference.* — According to Galatians, Paul laid before the apostles the gospel which he was preaching among the Gentiles, and his reason for so doing was in his own words: *μή πως εἰς κενὸν τρέχω ἢ ἔδραμον.* The fear thus expressed was due, as he tells us, to “false brethren privily brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage: to whom we gave place in the way of subjection, no, not for an hour; that the truth of the gospel might continue with you.”¹ There are various interpretations for this passage; but whether the “false brethren” made their attempt to enslave the apostles² at Jerusalem or at Antioch, in public or in private, the fact remains that Paul was led to consult with the leaders in Jerusalem by his recognition of the danger lying in their hostility to his teaching.

Compare with this the statement of Acts, that Paul and Barnabas went up to Jerusalem as delegates of the church in Antioch, to lay before the leaders in Jerusalem the case of the Gentile converts. According to Galatians the subject of discussion was the truth of Paul’s gospel; according to Acts, it was the necessity of circumcising the Gentile members of the church in Antioch. These subjects are closely related, but they are far from identical. There is no hint in Acts that Paul and his gospel formed a point for special attack on this occasion. On the other hand, there is no reference in Galatians to the cause of Paul’s visit to Jerusalem, as stated in Acts. Although Paul is writing to churches troubled over the question of circumcision, he never alludes to the disturbance in Antioch, nor refers to the fact that he went up to Jerusalem as a delegate of that church on this very question, nor mentions that in consulting with the apostles he was but following out instructions. Instead, he gives his readers the impression that his consultation with the other apostles was a matter that concerned himself chiefly; that he sought it of his own accord,

¹ Gal. ii. 2, 4, 5.

² Barnabas seems to be included with Paul by the use of the plural pronoun.

and because of the exigence of his own situation. He conceals facts that might have been used to advantage in his argument, and concerning which he was in honor bound to speak, and so gives his readers a false impression of the cause of the conference. Thus the narratives of Galatians and Acts conflict at this point.

2. *The Character of the Conference.*—In Gal. ii. 2, Paul says : *καὶ ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ κηρύσσω ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσιν.* “Them that are of repute” he afterwards identifies with “James and Cephas and John” (v. 9). This description of the conference as a private¹ consultation with the leading apostles stands in marked contrast to the account of an assembly of “the apostles and the elders” and “the whole church” given in the Acts.² One is driven to suppose that there were two conferences, — a private one with the leading apostles as described in Galatians, and a public one before the church as described in Acts. Some scholars, indeed, find hints of both conferences in each narrative. Lightfoot, for example, argues that “while each narrative presents a different aspect of this chapter of history, each also contains indications that the other aspect was recognized, though not dwelt upon, by the writer. The very form of St. Paul’s expression, *ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς, κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσιν*, implies something besides the private conference; the transactions themselves — the dispute about Titus for instance — involved more or less of publicity: the purpose sought to be attained could scarcely be effected in any other way: and the fragmentary character of the Apostle’s account leaves ample space for the insertion of other incidents besides those given. On the other hand, St. Luke alludes in a general way to conferences and discussions preceding the congress (xv. 4, 5, 6): and the speeches there delivered, the measures there proposed, are plainly the result of much wise forethought and patient deliberation on the part of the Apostles.”³

The interpretation of a passage so obscure as Gal. ii. 1–10 will always be open to question, and no weighty argument can be built upon it. This much, however, is certain: whether the language of Paul implies that public as well as private discussions were held on this occasion or not, there is no direct mention in Galatians of

¹ This interpretation of *κατ' ἰδίαν* is the one accepted by most modern scholars, among them Sieffert, Lightfoot, Lipsius, and many other advocates of the identification of these narratives.

² Cf. Acts xv. 4, 6, 12, 22, 23.

³ Lightfoot, *Epistle to the Galatians*, 1896, p. 126.

the conference described in the Acts, in which the question of circumcision for the Gentiles was discussed by the leading apostles in the presence of the assembled church, and at the close of which a unanimous decision was reached and recorded. On any interpretation of the passage, therefore, the difficulty remains of accounting for the silence of Paul as to the fact that there was such a council, and as to the decision reached in that council. The Galatian churches were in a state of disturbance over the matter of circumcision. The Mother Church in Jerusalem, under the leadership of Peter and James, had determined that circumcision, and what was involved therein, the observance of the Mosaic law, should not be required of Gentile converts. Why does not Paul state this fact? Why does he not use it in the defense of his gospel, just as he makes use of the private conference and its decision? Some scholars suppose that the result of the public conference was unsatisfactory to Paul. In that case is it conceivable that Paul would have omitted to tell of it? He is careful to tell of his conflict with Peter. Would he have led his readers to suppose that the result of that visit to Jerusalem was the establishment of a perfect understanding and of harmonious relations between himself and the chief apostles, when in reality the result was a strained relation between them? Would it not have been deceitful in Paul to tell of the private meeting, which he could use to advantage in his argument, and to pass over the public meeting, which (according to this view) ended in a way disadvantageous to him?

Among the phrases of Paul, which have been regarded as containing allusions to a public discussion, there is nothing corresponding to the statements of Acts beyond the bare mention of "false brethren" and their attempt to enforce the Mosaic law. Thus, there is no reference to Titus in the Acts, and no hint that the question of circumcising him or any other individual was so much as raised in the council. Again, one would never suppose from the account of Acts that Paul and Barnabas were the great champions of Gentile liberty on that occasion, and that it was owing to their firmness that the rights of Gentile Christians were secured. According to the Acts, Peter and James played the leading parts in the conference, and their speeches won for Paul and Barnabas patient hearing and hearty commendation. Paul and Barnabas seem to have confined themselves to an account of their work, and of the evidences of divine approval granted to them. They "rehearsed what signs and wonders God had

wrought among the Gentiles by them." Compare with this the statement of Paul, that to the "false brethren," who were seeking to bring them "into bondage," they "gave place in the way of subjection, no, not for an hour; that the truth of the gospel might continue with" their converts.¹ This statement of Paul may refer to a particular encounter or to a series of encounters. In neither case would it correspond to the representation of Acts as to what took place at the council.

Thus there seems to be no sufficient evidence in support of the view that there is an indirect reference to the council of Acts in the narrative of Galatians. On the other hand, the lack of all direct reference to the council in this narrative is so difficult to account for, that only the clearest evidence would justify the supposition that Galatians and Acts are describing different events occurring in the same visit. Such evidence is wanting. Therefore the narratives must be treated as referring to the same conference, and hence as in conflict respecting the character of that conference.

3. *The Result of the Conference.*— Paul's own account of it is as follows: "James and Cephas and John," before whom "I laid the gospel which I preach among the Gentiles," "imparted nothing to me: but contrariwise, when they saw that I had been intrusted with the gospel of the uncircumcision, even as Peter with *the gospel* of the circumcision, . . . and when they perceived the grace that was given unto me, . . . gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship, that we should go unto the Gentiles, and they unto the circumcision: only *they would* that we should remember the poor; which very thing I was also zealous to do."² These statements of Paul are clear and emphatic. The result of his conference with the leading apostles was the recognition on their part of the truth of his gospel, and of his call to preach it among the Gentiles. Paul claims, moreover, that they "imparted nothing" to him. In making such a claim he could not truthfully pass over any recommendation on the part of the apostles. Indeed, he takes pains to mention the one thing they had suggested; and he does so, although it was a matter that had nothing to do with the subject in discussion, and although the suggestion was unnecessary, since he himself was "zealous to do" that "very thing."

¹ It is probable that *ἑμᾶς* in verse 5 refers to Paul's readers, not as Galatians but as Gentiles; for his anxiety was concerning the fruit of his labor past and present, and he must have had all his Gentile converts in mind at the time.

² Gal. ii. 1, 6-10.

Now, when Paul's statements are compared with those of Acts, it becomes clear that there is a very grave discrepancy at this point. According to Acts, the result of the conference is the recognition, not of Paul's call to preach to the Gentiles, nor of the truth of his gospel, but of Gentile exemption from the burden of the Mosaic law. The apostles and elders of Jerusalem send a letter unto "the brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia," in which they repudiate the teaching of them that have caused the schism in Antioch. At the same time, following the counsel of James, they desire the Gentiles to "abstain from things sacrificed to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication."¹ How can it be thought that Paul would have omitted to mention such recommendations as these, bearing, as they do, directly upon the subject he was discussing? How could he have said that the apostles imparted nothing to him, if they had given him any such counsel? There is no reference of any kind in Acts to "the poor," and the duty of "remembering" them: so that the one thing recommended according to Paul is not named in the Acts, and the four things recommended according to Acts are not mentioned in Galatians. There is a direct contradiction in the narratives at this point. The impossibility of bringing these passages into harmony as they now stand is generally recognized at the present day.² So long as the account of Acts is accepted without amendment, there can be no doubt that Acts xv. 2-29 and Gal. ii. 1-10 describe different visits of Paul to Jerusalem.

B. COMPARISON OF GAL. II. 11-21 WITH ACTS XV. 1-2. — These accounts of a schism in the Church of Antioch differ as a personal narration differs from a summary statement, yet they are sufficiently alike to bear comparison. It is true that Cephas, who plays a leading part in Paul's narrative, is not mentioned in the Acts. But this lack of all reference to Cephas in Acts is easily accounted for, if one may suppose that his disagreement with Paul was a temporary matter, and there is no reason for thinking the contrary. On the other hand, if the figure of Cephas be blotted out, the situation in Galatians becomes the one described in Acts.

The account in Acts relates that certain men, coming down to Antioch from Judæa, insisted upon circumcision for the Gentile

¹ Acts xv. 22-29.

² Weizsäcker, *Apostolisches Zeitalter*, pp. 174 ff.; Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, pp. 152 ff.; Sieffert, *Der Brief an die Galater*, 1899, p. 84, etc.

converts as necessary to their salvation. With these men "Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and questioning." Paul tells how certain persons "of the circumcision" came to Antioch "from James," and how under their influence the Jewish Christians separated themselves from their Gentile brethren, a change of attitude which Paul himself strenuously opposed as contrary to "the truth of the gospel." That the matter discussed on this occasion was not simply the minor question of intercourse between Jew and Gentile in the Christian church, but also the major question of the conditions of salvation, is evident from the language in which Paul describes his opponents, τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς, as well as from his argument before Cephas. What Paul relates in Galatians shows the extent to which the Judaizers were successful in their attempt to force circumcision upon the Gentiles. This we do not learn from Acts. Still, so far as it goes, the brief statement of Acts is in harmony with the fuller account of Galatians with a single exception. In the Acts Barnabas is associated with Paul as having "no small dissension and questioning" with the Judaizers; while in Galatians it is said that "even Barnabas was carried away with the dissimulation" of Peter and the rest of the Jewish Christians. The language of Paul suggests the idea that the defection of Barnabas was merely temporary. In that case, the discrepancy would disappear; for a temporary disagreement between Paul and Barnabas would hardly find its way into the brief record of the Acts. There is, indeed, mention of such a disagreement between them in Acts xv. 36-41, but it is evident that the incident owes its place in the narrative to the explanation that it affords for the failure of Barnabas to accompany Paul on the Second Missionary Journey. On the other hand, if the disagreement between the apostles lasted for a considerable time, how are we to account for the silence of Acts not only in the case of Barnabas, but also in the more important case of Peter?

The narrative of Galatians, if it is not regarded as parallel to the account in Acts, is usually assigned to the short interval between the Apostolic Council and the Second Missionary Journey.¹ The contention over Mark took place just before that journey. Paul and Barnabas must have been reconciled after the first disagreement, or they would not have been planning to revisit their Gentile churches together when the second difference occurred. Thus, whether or not Gal. ii. 11-21 is identified with Acts xv. 1-2, the same conclusion is reached; namely, that Barnabas soon re-

¹ So Sieffert, Lightfoot, McGiffert, and many others.

turned to his old position in relation to Paul and to the Gentiles. But if this was true of Barnabas, it was probably true of Peter also. There is no hint in any writing but Galatians of even a temporary disagreement between Peter and Paul. It is true that the silence of Galatians as to the effect of Paul's argument upon Peter and Barnabas leaves us uncertain as to whether they had resumed their former attitude towards the Gentile converts at the time that Paul wrote his epistle. Scholars have reached diametrically opposite conclusions in their interpretation of Paul's silence: some supposing that Peter and Barnabas were not convinced by what Paul said, or he would have strengthened his argument by mentioning the fact; others thinking that they must have been convinced, as otherwise the point of Paul's argument would be blunted. It is evident that no argument can be drawn from the silence of Galatians of sufficient strength either to confirm or to disprove the conclusion already reached, that the disagreement between Paul and Barnabas lasted but a short time. The probabilities are that both Peter and Barnabas came to an understanding with Paul not long after the incident related in Galatians. The lack of certainty on this point must be acknowledged, but it is not in itself a sufficient reason for refusing to make an identification shown to be probable on other grounds.

The chief reasons for this identification are as follows:—

1. Unless these narratives are regarded as dealing with the same occurrence, one is forced to the conclusion that there were two schisms in the church of Antioch over the same matter within a short period. This is such an unlikely supposition that only the clearest proof would justify its acceptance.

2. In Acts xv. 24 the "men from Judæa" with whom "Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension" (vs. 1-2) are described in the apostolic letter as "certain which went out from us [and] have troubled you with words, subverting your souls; to whom we gave no commandment." If these men be identified with "them that were of the circumcision," that "came from James" during Peter's visit to Antioch,¹ the conduct of James will seem perfectly consistent. Otherwise James would be guilty of sending men down to Antioch to insist upon the circumcision of the Gentiles, after having himself expressed to Paul approval of his teaching to the Gentiles, and after having allowed Titus to go uncircumcised.

3. On the supposition that the disagreement among the apos-

¹ Gal. ii. 12.

bles at Antioch followed the council, the conduct of Peter, James and Barnabas becomes as unworthy of them as it is unnatural.¹ Each of these apostles had done his part to bring the church to recognize the Gentile converts as co-heirs of the Messianic Kingdom.² Peter attributed his convictions on the matter to a divine revelation to himself; James based his upon the teaching of the Old Testament prophets; both united with the other apostles and the elders in a judgment which they ascribed to the Holy Spirit,³ repudiating the teaching of the Judaizers, and requiring of the Gentiles nothing more than abstinence from such things as would cause needless offense. How can it be supposed that these apostles would draw back from the position taken at the council, if they held such convictions, or that they would stir up further strife in Antioch after having done their utmost to restore quiet in that distracted community? How can it be thought that Barnabas, after accepting the appointment to represent the Gentiles at the council, and after pleading their cause successfully, would desert them for their enemies, or that, resisting the Judaizers before the council, he would yield to them after the council? It cannot be said in excuse for these apostles that they did not realize what they were doing. The earlier conflict in Antioch and the discussion in Jerusalem could not have failed to open their eyes to the danger threatening the church. The wrong and the folly attributed to them by this view must be acknowledged.

But their conduct has a very different look if the order of events is reversed. True, in either case Peter and Barnabas are charged with "dissimulation" by Paul, who says that they did not "walk uprightly according to the truth of the gospel." This charge seems to be based upon the fact that both apostles shared with Paul his conviction that justification is through faith in Christ, and not through the works of the law; and that, before the coming of the Judaizers, both had disregarded the law forbidding familiar intercourse between Jew and Gentile, thus showing that they did not consider that law as binding any longer upon Jews. Yet the very fact that Peter and Barnabas agreed with Paul in principle makes it unlikely that they recognized the conduct under discussion as a matter of principle. It is more probable that they regarded it as a matter of expediency. They were doubtless wrong in setting an example of compromise when a great principle was at stake; but the wrong was comparatively

¹ See Ramsay, *St. Paul, the Traveller*, pp. 164 f.

² Acts xv. 2, 7-21.

³ Acts xv. 28.

slight, if the struggle was at its beginning and the interests involved still unrecognized, and if these apostles, when they did see clearly, stood forth with Paul to plead for "the truth of the gospel."

On the other hand, the fact that James, the other apostles and the assembled church in Jerusalem, being, as they affirmed, under the influence of the Holy Spirit (Acts xv. 28), thought best, after hearing both sides, to ask something of the Gentile converts while acknowledging their freedom from all obligation to keep the law, seems to show that Peter may not have been altogether wrong in his regard for the prejudices of the Jewish Christians. It is certain that the great majority of the Christians at that time were Jews, and that the most of these Jews were only gradually learning that the barrier between Jew and Gentile had been broken down; so that the church as a whole may not have been ready to receive the Gentile on an equal footing with the Jew. Such a condition of affairs, Paul, who had lived and labored for many years outside of Judæa and in Gentile communities, was less likely to appreciate than Peter, whose sphere of labor had so far been limited almost entirely to the land of Palestine, and to his own people. In the light of after events, it seems probable that Paul learned something as well as Peter from the schism at Antioch.

4. Unless the conflict described in Gal. ii. 11 f. is regarded as occurring before the council, one must conclude that the judgment of the apostles and the Mother Church had little weight either with the church of Antioch or with the Judaizers. Yet that council was held in response to the petition of the Christians of Antioch, and its decision was received by them with satisfaction and restored peace among them, according to Acts xv. 30-35. Again, if the Judaizers ignored the action of the council and continued to excite trouble in Gentile congregations, the matter is not mentioned in Acts. For instance, there is no reference to the second outbreak in Antioch, so that we are left in the dark as to its result. These omissions are extraordinary, for the struggle following such a council must have been far more serious than the one preceding it. This order of events takes from the council and its decision all dignity and value. But when the order is reversed, it becomes clear that the decision of the council was accepted as final, and that the conflict then came to an end. If it could be thought that the trouble in Galatia also antedated the council, then there would be no reason for supposing that there was ever any repetition of the disturbance. The statements of

Acts xv. 30-40, xvi. 4-5, certainly force one to suppose that peace was restored to the Gentile churches for some time at least.

There is the same grave reason for accepting this identification that there was for rejecting the other, namely; that, unless it is accepted, the narrative of Acts cannot be brought into harmony with the Epistle to the Galatians.

C. THE AUTHENTICITY OF ACTS xv. 23-29. — Many scholars have questioned the authenticity of the decree, partly because it contradicts the statement of Gal. ii. 6, and so interferes with the identification of Gal. ii. 1-10 and Acts xv. (which identification they regard as necessary), partly on other grounds.

The first argument brought to bear against this passage is, that there is no reference to the decree in any of Paul's letters, and no indication that he taught his Gentile converts to conform to it. Before this argument can have any weight it must be shown that Paul was bound to enforce the decree, or that there was sufficient reason for him to do so. Now in the first place, although there is abundant evidence of the great influence exerted by the early apostles and of the precedence taken by the Mother Church, yet there is no evidence that either apostles or Mother Church laid claim to official authority over other churches and apostles. The so-called "decree" was sent in response to the direct and urgent appeal of the Christians of Antioch, and therefore cannot be regarded as a demand upon the church on the part of the leaders in Jerusalem. Antioch wanted an authoritative opinion, and Jerusalem gave what was asked for. However, the tone of authority in the decree is more properly explained by the reference to the Spirit in verse 28. Faith in the presence and guidance of the Spirit led the apostles to speak with authority. Yet their utterance, although it was authoritative, was no law binding upon all the churches from that time onward, but the counsel of the leaders of Christianity to churches struggling with a practical difficulty.

In the second place, the freedom of the Gentiles from bondage to the Mosaic law is implied in the condemnation of the Judaizers, and the direction to abstain from certain things as offensive to the Jews is clearly a practical counsel designed to meet a practical difficulty. Where the difficulty did not exist, there was no occasion for giving the counsel. Now, the churches to which Paul wrote were preëminently Gentile churches. There is reason for supposing that the Jews did not hold in them the position which they held in the churches of Syria and Cilicia. Moreover, all

of the churches that received letters from Paul, unless we except those of Galatia, were founded after the council at Jerusalem, and in the course of a ministry in which Paul was called upon to solve many problems peculiar to the Gentile world. The lack of all reference to the decree in Paul's letters cannot be used to prove it unauthentic, unless the difference in the condition of the churches addressed by him and the churches addressed in the decree is overlooked. There is only one epistle of Paul which seems to call for some reference to the decree, and that epistle is the one to the Galatians. It should be noticed that Paul, in his letters, repeatedly urges abstinence from such things as might cause offense, more particularly in the matter of food.¹ He therefore carried out the purpose of the decree, whether or not he taught his churches to observe it literally.

Finally, we are told in Acts xvi. 4 that Paul and Silas "delivered the decrees . . . which had been ordained of the apostles and elders that were at Jerusalem" to the churches which they were visiting. The general statement of verses 4-5 seems to refer to all the churches previously mentioned, that is to the churches of Syria and Cilicia as well as to those of Asia Minor, founded on the First Missionary Journey. They undoubtedly refer to the latter. According to this statement, Paul taught the observance of the decree, for the time at least, to such of his churches as were then in existence. Furthermore, if the churches of the First Missionary Journey be identified with those addressed in Galatians, then the decree was delivered to all the churches in which there was ever any trouble over circumcision, so far as we are informed.

The second argument against Acts xv. 23-29 is, that the decree does not meet the question of Jewish observance of the law; that it does not define the duty of the Jew to the Gentile in the church; and therefore it is not fitted to cope with the difficulties which called it forth. The question, however, that came up before the council was not as to what was to be required of the Jew, but as to what was to be required of the Gentile. The decree is addressed to Gentiles, so that the lack of all reference to the obligations of the Jew is perfectly natural under the circumstances. There would be no propriety in telling Gentiles what Jews ought to do. On the other hand, there is no reason to suppose that the Jews in Antioch were neglecting the observance of the law, excepting in so far as this was necessary in the exercise of Chris-

¹ 1 Cor. viii.-xi. 1; Rom. xiv.-xv. 6.

tian fellowship. Apparently, when they had separated themselves from the Gentiles, there was no further fault to be found with them. Also it is not likely, that the question of the observance of the law by the Jew was discussed at the council, excepting in the particular matter of intercourse with Gentile brethren. This question belongs to a later stage in the development of the church. Few besides Paul would have been prepared to discuss it at that early time. Yet the church of Jerusalem had already advanced so far that, under the guidance of Peter and James, it declined to make circumcision a condition of entrance for the Gentile, or to regard the observance of the law as necessary to salvation, and it recognized the law of love as the supreme law, to which the ceremonial law must give way whenever the two came into conflict. The law of love applied to this case required the Jew to associate with the Gentile, and the Gentile to abstain from such things as would make that intercourse hard and offensive to the Jew.

When Paul's account of the situation in Antioch is combined with the statements of Acts xv., the practical value of the decree becomes more evident. The Jews in the church of Antioch were refusing to eat with the Gentiles. The prohibitions in the decree are from that portion of the ceremonial code which bears upon the matter of eating with Gentiles. Professor Schmiedel¹ writes: "It is clear that any such arrangement, had it been come to, would have had the effect of rendering it possible for Jewish and Gentile Christians to associate with one another at meals." He himself is driven, by his view that the trouble in Antioch related by Paul followed the council, to the conclusion "that no arrangement of this nature was made at the council at all;" for, supposing that it had been made, and had been carried out at Antioch, "in that case, James and his followers had no reason for taking offense at Peter's eating with Gentile converts." This being recognized, it is plain that the decree would have served as an effective remedy for the state of things described in Galatians. So far from being inadequate to the need, it was peculiarly adapted to the particular case of the church of Antioch. There seems to be no sufficient reason for questioning the historical value of the decree.

D. COMPARISON OF GAL. II. 1-10 WITH ACTS XI. 27-30; XII. 25. — The conclusion already reached, that Galatians does not refer to the events of Acts xv. 2-29, is confirmed by the statements of Paul in Gal. i. 18-ii. 1. Both the language and the argu-

¹ Article on the "Council of Jerusalem" in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*.

ment of this passage force one to regard the visit to Jerusalem of Gal. ii. 1-10 as the second made by Paul after his conversion; while the visit of Acts xv. is the third one mentioned in the Acts. There is a brief reference to the second visit in Acts xi. 27-30; xii. 25. According to this account, Paul visited Jerusalem on this occasion also, with Barnabas, and as a representative of the church of Antioch. These apostles were the bearers of a gift for the "brethren dwelling in Judæa," then suffering from the effects of a famine. On their return to Antioch they were accompanied by John Mark. This is all that we are told in Acts concerning the second visit. There is nothing in Galatians to correspond with it excepting the request of the elder apostles that the poor should be remembered, "which very thing" Paul "was also zealous to do." This correspondence, however, is remarkable, for the mention of the second visit in Acts is the briefest possible, and the narrative of that visit in Galatians is largely if not entirely devoted to a private conference of the apostles. It is interesting to see that Von Soden,¹ who regards Acts xv. and Gal. ii. as referring to the same visit, makes use of the resemblance between Acts xi. 28 and Gal. ii. 10 as an argument for the identification of the visits of Acts xi. and xv.

The silence of Acts as to the matters related by Paul seems at first a serious difficulty in the way of identifying the visits of Gal. ii. and Acts xi.; but, as Ramsay has suggested, this silence may well have been due to the fact that the matter "never came to an open discussion, and therefore did not reach the proper level of importance." He adds: "Luke confines himself to the great steps in development. . . . The essential fact for his purpose was that relief was sent by the congregation in Antioch (xi. 30), and its distribution personally carried out by Paul and Barnabas in Jerusalem (xii. 25); and he tells us no more."² The silence of Paul concerning the purpose of this visit as stated in Acts hardly requires explanation. There was no need of mentioning his charitable work to the Galatians, and Paul was not one who liked to boast of his good works. Moreover, he says nothing at all concerning his reason for visiting Jerusalem at this time beyond the statement that he "went up by revelation."

Certainly the accounts of Gal. ii. 1-10 and Acts xi. 30; xii. 25 do not exclude one another. They differ, but they deal with different matters, whereas Gal. ii. 1-10 and Acts xv. differ while

¹ Article on "Chronology" in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*.

² *St. Paul the Traveller*, pp. 58, 59.

dealing with similar matters. The purpose, too, of the visit according to Acts is at least mentioned in Galatians as an object of Paul's zealous care. There seems to be no sufficient reason for refusing to follow the chronological arrangement of Acts, according to which Acts xi. and Gal. ii. deal with the same visit.

Paul himself makes a positive statement as to the time of his second journey to Jerusalem. But it is not clear whether he is counting from the time of his conversion or from his first journey thither, when he writes: *ἔπειτα διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν πάλιν ἀνέβην εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα*. Scholars of equal reputation differ on this point. In this state of uncertainty, the tendency must inevitably be to interpret the passage in accordance with the general view taken as to the chronology of Paul's life, rather than to let it determine any important point in that chronology. There is so much doubt and dispute at the present time over Pauline chronology that no argument based thereon can have much weight. The uncertainty as to whether the visit described in Gal. ii. 1-10 took place fourteen or seventeen years after Paul's conversion does not, however, render uncertain the identification of this visit with the one referred to in Acts xi. 30; xii. 25. This is admitted by Schmiedel,¹ who nevertheless refuses to make this identification on other grounds.

An advantage arising from this identification is the explanation it offers for the manner in which Barnabas is referred to in Galatians. This is difficult to account for on the supposition that Gal. ii. 1-10 and Acts xv. are parallel narratives. One would infer from the various references to Barnabas in the Acts² that he was better known and better liked in Jerusalem than Paul. Certainly the narrative of chapter xv. gives no preference to Paul. It represents that both gave testimony before the council, and were commended in the letter sent to the church in Antioch. In verses 12 and 25, coming, as seems most likely, from the Jerusalem source, the order of the names is "Barnabas and Paul," the reverse of what one would expect from Galatians. Judging by what Paul says, one would never suppose that Barnabas took any but a subordinate part in the discussion. Indeed, he is not mentioned by name until verse 9, where the result of the conference is stated. Then Paul says: "James and Cephas and John . . . gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship, that we should go unto the Gentiles." It is true that, in writing to the Galatians, Paul was chiefly concerned with his own experiences,

¹ Article on Council of Jerusalem, *Encyc. Biblica*.

² Acts ix. 26-30; xi. 22-26, 30; xii. 25; cf. also xiii. 1-2, 7.

and it is natural, therefore, that Barnabas should meet with bare mention in Paul's account of the conference, provided that he played no important part in that conference. But if he had been recognized as a champion of Gentile liberty, and, as such, was chosen with Paul to represent the Gentile church, and if he took an active part in the conference at Jerusalem, as the narrative of Acts represents, then it is certainly strange that Paul should have suppressed the fact. On the other hand, if these apostles visited Jerusalem on a charitable mission in which the Galatians could have no interest, and if Barnabas, while present, yet took no leading part in the private conference of the apostles, then it is easy to understand the subordinate position which he holds in the narrative of Paul.

Finally the lack of all reference to Galatia, or to any field of labor other than the provinces of Syria and Cilicia, in Gal. i. 18; ii. 1, is fully explained if the visit of Gal. ii. 1-10 is identified with the second visit of Acts; for at the time of that visit those provinces were the only ones in which Paul had labored.

In his article on the Council of Jerusalem, in the "Encyclopædia Biblica," Schmiedel recognizes that "unless we deny the genuineness of the Epistle to the Galatians we cannot but give unqualified acceptance to" the "solemn protest" of Paul that "he visited Jerusalem for the first time three years after his conversion, and for the second time fourteen years after his first visit (or, less probably, after his conversion);" and that therefore "it would seem . . . that the second journey recorded in Galatians (ii. 1) must coincide with the one in Acts xi. 30, which, according to Acts xii. 25, did extend to Jerusalem." Yet Schmiedel refuses to accept this identification, for the reason that the "narrative of Acts" might then "be charged with having passed over in complete silence the conference mentioned in Gal. ii. 1-10." He continues: "This is no trifling matter. It is remarkable that a conference upon the same subject should follow in Acts xv., for a repetition of the discussion within the next few years is not conceivable; observe, too, that no reference is made in Acts xv. to an earlier decision." But this argument is based upon the assumption that Galatians refers to a public conference; for there can be no objection either to a private consultation on the visit preceding the council, or to the silence of Acts respecting such a consultation. We have already seen that, whatever inference may be drawn from the language of Galatians with regard to a public discussion, there is no distinct reference to such a conference as

would require to be mentioned in the Acts. Therefore this objection rests upon a dubious foundation.

The identification of the journeys of Gal. ii. and Acts xi. does violence to neither narrative. The identification of those of Gal. ii. and Acts xv. is impossible without the rejection of more or less of the testimony of Acts. The comparison of Gal. ii. with the narrative of Acts leads, then, to this conclusion: Gal. ii. and Acts xv. describe different visits of Paul to Jerusalem, but the same visit of Judaizers to Antioch; the order of events being (1) the visit to Jerusalem of Gal. ii. 1-10; (2) the schism at Antioch of Gal. ii. 11-21; Acts xv. 1-2 *a*; (3) the visit to Jerusalem of Acts xv. 2 *b*-29.

We have already seen how impossible it is to account for the silence of Galatians with regard to the council, if it was held during the visit reported in the second chapter. The same arguments force us to the conclusion that the council had not taken place at the time that the epistle was written. For, at whatever date the trouble among the Galatians may have arisen, it was both advisable and necessary that Paul should inform them concerning the council and its decision. It was advisable; for he could not have found an argument in defense of himself and his gospel more likely to tell with his readers than the support which both had received at the council. It was necessary; for his regard for the state of the Galatian churches, his account of the earlier conflict, his references to Peter, James and Barnabas, and his line of argument in chapters i.-ii., all alike called for mention of the council.

We have thus reached the limits for the date of the Galatian epistle in either direction. It belongs after the schism described in the second chapter, and before the council following this schism, which would have been mentioned if it had taken place, i. e. it was written between the First and Second Missionary Journeys, and shortly before the apostolic council.

Many additional arguments could be given in support of an early date for Galatians. No use has been made of them heretofore, because they depend either upon the South Galatian theory or upon an interpretation still in dispute. Yet they are of value at this point in the discussion as confirming the conclusion already reached. These arguments will be found in the writings of McGiffert, Zahn, and Bartlet, all of whom regard Galatians as the earliest Pauline epistle, and one of whom places it before the apostolic council.¹

¹ Bartlet, *The Expositor* for October, 1899.

But the Epistle to the Galatians must be considered in its relation to the other Pauline epistles, as well as in its relation to the Book of Acts, before any conclusion with respect to its date can be accepted as final. Galatians is often included in the Roman-Corinthian group, on the ground of its resemblances to those epistles. The likeness between Galatians and the Corinthian epistles is not sufficiently strong to justify such a classification. It is the likeness between Galatians and Romans that has led many scholars to think that these epistles must have been written the one shortly after the other. It is generally agreed that Romans was written from Corinth during the Third Missionary Journey. Accordingly, the likeness of Galatians to Romans is used as an argument for assigning it to the Third Missionary Journey.

COMPARISON OF GALATIANS WITH ROMANS. — The epistles to the Galatians and to the Romans have a common theme, — salvation through faith in Jesus Christ. They have also a common author, and were written assuredly within a period of less than ten years. There is reason to expect that the doctrine of salvation will be presented by them in a similar manner. It would be strange if there were not a certain correspondence in the lines of argument and in the use of citations, as well as a certain resemblance in language and in imagery. The likeness of Galatians to Romans in all these respects is unmistakable, but it has been greatly exaggerated. Thus, in the matter of Old Testament quotation, emphasis has been laid upon the fact that these epistles use the same passages in the same sense. The number of citations used in both epistles is five. The whole number of citations in Romans is about sixty. The thing to be explained on the hypothesis that these writings date from the same year is, how there came to be so few duplications in discussions on the same subject. Three out of the five citations are used by other New Testament writers than Paul. Two only are peculiar to Galatians and Romans.

A careful examination of these five citations in their context shows that the correspondence in application is less exact than it appears to be at first sight. For instance, Gen. xv. 6, the only passage cited in the argument on justification by both epistles, is used in Gal. iii. 6 to prove that "they, which be of faith, the same are sons of Abraham;" and in Romans iv. 3, 9, to prove that Abraham was justified by faith. The general resemblance between the arguments ought not to blind one to the difference in

the use made of the citation. Hab. ii. 4 also serves a different purpose in Gal. iii. 11 and Rom. i. 17. Lev. xviii. 5 is not used in the main argument in Romans as it is in Galatians iii. 12, but in the section treating of Jewish unbelief, a subject never touched on in Galatians. In Rom. x. 5 it forms one of a long series of citations, of which this is the only one used in Galatians. Lev. xix. 18 is quoted in Gal. v. 14 and Rom. xiii. 9, also in James ii. 8. The use of this command to love one's neighbor by the apostles goes back to the use of it in the teaching of Jesus (Mark ii. 31, Matthew xxii. 39). That Paul should use it in just these epistles is easily explained, even if it be supposed that they were separated by a long interval; for the same danger had to be guarded against in each case, — the danger that his teaching concerning the freedom of the believer from the law would be understood as meaning freedom from all obligations whatsoever. He therefore urges obedience to the only law which is binding upon the believer, — the law of love. Psalms cxliii. 2 is cited in Gal. ii. 16 and Rom. iii. 20.¹ Bishop Lightfoot² has called special attention to this case as an example of close correspondence in free quotation. Yet the parallelism is not complete; and if it were so, it still would not prove that the epistles were separated by only a short interval: for there are examples in the New Testament of exact correspondence where the citation differs from both Greek and Hebrew texts, and the writings are not by the same author.³

The similarity in language in certain passages has also been misleading. For instance, the verbal correspondence between Gal. iii. 27 and Rom. vi. 3 *a*, xiii. 14 *a*, would seem to imply a cor-

¹ Neither passage follows the Septuagint closely. Both insert ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, and substitute *κᾶσα σαρξ* for *κᾶς ζῶν*. Galatians omits ἐνώπιόν σου; Romans retains it, but transfers it to the end of the clause and uses *αὐτοῦ* for *σοῦ*.

² *Galatians*, p. 47.

³ Dr. Toy, in his *Quotations in the New Testament*, p. 162, writes of the citation from Deut. xxxii. 35, given in Rom. xii. 19 and Heb. x. 30, as follows: —

“The terms of the quotation are taken from the Septuagint; and the form of the sentence follows the Septuagint in the second half, but the Hebrew in the first. It seems to be a quotation from memory, in which, while the familiar Greek words are used, the construction is in part taken from some current translation, probably the synagogal Aramaic version; and it may be that the identity of form in Romans and Hebrews points to a proverbial saying (so Weiss in Meyer), derived, of course, from current versions. The New Testament rendering is, in fact, identical with that of the Targum of Onkelos.”

Another example is the citation from Prov. iii. 34, given in James iv. 6 and 1 Peter v. 5. (See Toy, *ibid.* p. 239.) There is no reason why this explanation should not apply to the case under discussion.

respondence in thought, and, so long as each passage is separated from its context, the resemblance remains; but, as soon as each is read in the light of its context, the likeness is seen to be merely superficial, and as such to prove rather that there was a sufficient interval between the writings to permit of the attachment of a new thought to an old figure. Thus in Gal. iii. 26, 27 it is said: "Ye are all sons of God, through faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were *baptized into Christ did put on Christ.*" The phrase "baptized into Christ" reappears in Rom. v. 3 *a*, but there he who is baptized into Christ is represented as dying unto sin and walking "in newness of life." The same difference in conception is seen in Rom. xiii. 14 *a*, where the verbal coincidence is more remarkable. This passage reads: "Put ye on¹ the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh, to fulfill the lusts thereof." Here also the result of union with Christ is not a change of relation toward God, but a change in manner of life.

A second example of resemblance in language and difference in conception is found in the comparison of Gal. iii. 17, 18 with Rom. iv. 13, 14. In Galatians Paul argues that "the law doth not disannul [the covenant] so as to make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance is of the law, it is no more of promise; but God hath granted it to Abraham by promise." In Romans he affirms: "not through the law was the promise to Abraham, . . . but through the righteousness of faith. For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise is made of none effect." In Galatians there is a sharp antithesis between the inheritance as *ἐκ νόμου* and as *ἐξ ἐπαγγελίας*. The one idea excludes the other. In Romans the antithesis is between the promise as *διὰ νόμου* and as *διὰ δικαιοσύνης πίστεως*. In Galatians the antithesis between the law and the promise is made the ground for the assertion that, as the inheritance had been granted by promise, the law could not interpose to make it of none effect. In Romans the fact that, if the inheritance is through the law, "faith is made void and the promise is made of none effect," is used to show that "the promise to Abraham" could not have been "through the law." The employment of the same phraseology at such cross-purposes seems to imply a lapse of time sufficiently great for the loss of all recollection of the earlier treatment of the subject.

Other examples of this kind might be given but for lack of

¹ The use of the verb *ἐνδύω* with a person for object occurs also in Eph. iv. 24 and Col. iii. 10, epistles separated from Romans, as is generally acknowledged, by an interval of several years.

room.¹ These, however, will serve to show the need of looking beneath the surface for a real likeness. There is a stronger resemblance in language than in thought between Romans and Galatians. It is true that much of the doctrinal teaching of Galatians reappears in Romans, and this fact has been used as showing that the epistles must date from the same period. But this does not follow; for, as Zahn² has stated:—

“Diejenigen Gedanken des Gl., welche im Rm. wiederkehren, müssen ihm spätestens zur Zeit der in AG 15 und Gl. 2, 1–10 geschilderten Kämpfe vollkommen klar geworden sein. Sie wurzeln nach Gl. 2, 15–21 cf. 1, 12–16; 2 Kr. 4, 6; 5, 16 f; Rm. 7, 6–8, 2; Phl. 3, 5–12 in denjenigen Erfahrungen, welche ihn zu einem Christen gemacht haben.”

The recurrence of these thoughts in Romans is due to the fact that the same writer is there engaged with the same theme, salvation through faith in Jesus Christ.

On the other hand, there is a remarkable difference in the doctrine of salvation as presented in these two writings. This difference is doubtless due in some measure to diversity of condition in the churches addressed, and to diversity of relations to the apostle. Yet it is more than a matter of proportion: it is a matter of development. If it be granted that there was such a thing as development in Paul's thinking during the period of his literary activity, then the development in his conception of salvation, as set forth in these epistles, must be recognized; for in no other case is it more marked. There is space for only the briefest mention of the more striking signs of progress along this line of thought.

The conception of salvation as a deliverance from sin is unfolded in Romans as it is in no other New Testament writing; so that this epistle has been the great reservoir from which theologians have drawn their doctrines of justification and sanctification. The salvation from sin set forth in Galatians is such as the believer enjoys in this life. He is dead to the law and alive to God. But he lives only as Christ lives in him. Being under the influence of the Spirit, he is enabled to bring forth the “fruits of the Spirit” and to forego the works of the flesh. But in Romans salvation from sin is nothing short of conformity to the image of the Son of God, who is to be as the first-born among many bre-

¹ Notice the difference in meaning of “seed” in Gal. iii. 16 and Rom. iv. 13, 16 f. Compare Rom. ix. 8 b with Gal. iii. 29; and see Sanday, *Romans*, p. 242. See also Lipsius on Gal. iv. 6 as compared with Rom. viii. 15, *Hand-Commentar z. N. T.*, Bd. II., p. 43.

² *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Bd. I., p. 144.

thren (viii. 29). The work of salvation is to go on until, as Professor Briggs has said, "the Messiah will no longer be unique and alone in his possession of the favor of God as a man well-pleasing to him and entirely conformed to his holy will. Such he is, and such he remains during his mediatorial reign. But at his second advent he will be able to present to God many brethren conformed to his image and like him in holiness and glory, so that he will be the first-born among a multitude of sons of God, no longer covered by him and justified by him, but themselves recognized as holy and glorious sons of God."¹

There is a further advance in the scope of the doctrine, the work of Christ being regarded as a redemption of the human race. This conception appears also in 1 Corinthians, but there is nothing like it in Galatians. In Romans, however, Paul advances even beyond the teaching of 1 Corinthians, for he includes within the compass of salvation the whole creation, which is to share in "the glory which shall be revealed."² But the teaching of Romans concerning salvation is an advance on the teaching of Galatians, not merely in that it sets forth the doctrine in its length and breadth and in its true proportion, but also in that it lays bare the rock foundation on which the structure rests, — the love of God which is in Christ Jesus. The emphasis laid in this epistle upon the love of God as the sure ground of the hope of glory gives a wonderful increase of strength and persuasive force to this doctrine. There is a similar increase in power in all those doctrines which hold a prominent place in both epistles, and the advance is always in the direction of Romans.

There is also a change of tone observable in the references to the law. Professor Stevens³ calls attention to this fact. He thinks that it "finds a sufficient explanation in the differing occasion and purpose of the two letters." This may be, but it is certainly easier to explain the change if the epistles are regarded as separated by an interval that would permit of a change or development in Paul's view of the law, especially if the experiences related in Acts 15 are allowed to intervene.

There is nothing in Galatians to correspond with the yearning love for his people⁴ which finds expression in Paul's letter to the

¹ *Messiah of the Apostles*, pp. 164, 165.

² Romans viii. 18 f.

³ *The Pauline Theology*, pp. 168 f.

⁴ "Israel," in this epistle, is "the Israel of God," including uncircumcised as well as circumcised. "Israel" in Romans stands in antithesis with "the Gentiles," and is used repeatedly in the technical sense.

Romans.¹ One would never conclude from Galatians that the writer felt any sympathy with the Jews and their zeal for the law.

These are some of the differences in thought and tone between Galatians and Romans. However they may be regarded, they certainly favor the view that a considerable length of time should be allowed to intervene between the two epistles. On the other hand, those who admit that there is a doctrinal development in these writings are forced to the conclusion that Galatians was one of the earliest of the Pauline epistles, antedating the Epistle to the Romans by a number of years.

COMPARISON OF GALATIANS WITH THESSALONIANS.—It is sometimes claimed that the Epistles to the Thessalonians must have preceded the Galatian epistle, because their doctrinal teaching is of a simpler type. But in making such a claim the fact is overlooked that these epistles do not treat of the same doctrines. There was a great difference in the state of the churches addressed, and there is a corresponding difference in the form and in the substance of the doctrines set forth in these writings. The Galatian churches, which were suffering from the teaching of the Judaizers, needed instruction in the doctrine of Justification. The church of Thessalonica, which was suffering persecution, needed encouragement and was comforted with the doctrine of the Parousia. The comparative simplicity of the soteriological teaching of the Thessalonians is matched by the comparative simplicity of the eschatological teaching of Galatians. These epistles differ, but they treat of different subjects. Galatians and Romans differ in their treatment of the same subject. It is quite possible that Galatians and the Thessalonians were written within a few months of each other. It is not likely that Galatians and Romans were so written. Thus the comparison of Galatians with these writings confirms the conclusion already reached that Galatians is the earliest of the Pauline epistles, and was written shortly before the Apostolic Council.

This is as far as an independent investigation will carry us. We have already seen how intimately the problems of the date and destination of Galatians are related, and that the acceptance of an early date for this epistle involves the acceptance of the South Galatian theory. Accordingly, those who hold the opposite theory have still an argument to bring against the early date. Lack of space prevents the consideration of this argument here; but it may be said that the number of those who think that the

¹ Rom. ix. 1 f., x. 1 f.

Galatian churches were founded on the First Missionary Journey is steadily on the increase, and that the most recent writers on the subject have, with few exceptions, upheld this view.¹ It may also be said that the South Galatian theory strongly favors, if it does not necessitate, an early date for Galatians, as Dr. McGiffert has shown in his volume on the "Apostolic Age" (pp. 226 f.).

In conclusion, the advantages arising from this view of the date of Galatians may be summed up briefly as follows:—

1. It explains the otherwise unaccountable silence of Galatians respecting the council and its decision.

2. It places the schism in Galatia, as well as the one in Antioch, before the Apostolic Council, thus making the decision of that council the means of bringing the conflict over circumcision to an end.

3. It does justice to the characters of Peter, James, Barnabas and Paul, and corresponds with the representation of the New Testament that these apostles did their work under the guidance and inspiration of the Divine Spirit.

4. It brings the Epistle to the Galatians into harmony with the Book of Acts, recognizing the value of that writing as an historical document.

5. It sets Galatians in its true place among the Pauline epistles, correcting the tendency to overestimate its importance as an exponent of Paul's gospel, and to draw from it a distorted idea of the Pauline doctrine of salvation.

EMILIE GRACE BRIGGS.

NEW YORK.

¹ See Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, 1893; *St. Paul the Traveller*, 1896; *Expositor*, 1898-99, etc.; Sanday, *Expositor*, 1893; Clemen, *Chronologie der paul. Hauptbriefe*, 1893; Rendall and Gifford, *Expositor*, 1894; Zahn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Bd. 1, 1897; McGiffert, *The Apostolic Age*, 1897; Askwith, *Epistle to the Galatians*, 1899; Bartlet and Bacon, *Expositor*, 1899.