The Christian religion grew out of Judaism. Its Founder was a Jew who was conscious that the unique Divine revelation which had been given to Israel was destined to culminate in Himself. Though He was far from sharing the ideals and hopes of the Jewish Messianic belief, He did identify Himself with the Messiah. The Old Testament was for Him Holy Scripture. The God of Israel was the one true God. But within a very brief time not only had the religion passed beyond the bounds of Palestine and spread among the Jews of the Dispersion, but it had gained great success among the Gentiles. And these Gentiles were not required to become proselytes, to accept the yoke of the Jewish Law and submit to its indispensable ceremony of initiation. When we remember the tenacity with which the Jews held to the Law and circumcision we shall realise that such a development calls for explanation. Our records show that while the emancipation of Christianity from Judaism was effected more rapidly than we might have anticipated, it was at the cost of not a little internal friction. Presumably the new religion would in any case have finally achieved its detachment from Judaism; but that its independence was gained so quickly and so decisively was due pre-eminently to the Apostle Paul.

But the reconstruction of the stages through which the movement passed is a matter of exceptional difficulty. The problems are created by critical questions touching our documentary sources, by

1 An amplification of the lecture delivered in the John Rylands Library, the 14th Nov., 1928. I have included in it a note on the Apostolic Decree previously published in the Holborn Review.

2 On this see The Messiah and the Son of Man, pp. 4-16.
grave doubts as to text and interpretation, by the difficulty of attaining certainty as to chronological sequence, and by the adjustment of our different sources of information to each other. Our chief sources of knowledge are the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistle to the Galatians; but other epistles of Paul have been drawn into the controversy and other New Testament books, especially the Book of Revelation. At one time the Clementine Homilies and Recognitions played a considerable part in the debate.¹

The issue had arisen to some extent before the conversion of Paul. It is not unlikely that the dispute between the Hebrews and the Hellenists, that is the Aramaic- and the Greek-speaking members of the Church, went deeper than the mere neglect of the widows of the latter section in the administration of the charitable fund. This may well have been the point on which the difference came to a head; but it is probable that there was a tendency to liberalism on the part of the Hellenists which seemed dangerous to the narrower Hebrew Christians. No schism resulted; but it is possible that, while the relations between the two sections remained cordial, they may have thought it wisest to hold separate meetings. It is noteworthy that though the Seven were appointed to administer relief, the two of whom further information is preserved to us—Stephen and Philip—were specially noteworthy for their aggressive evangelism. Stephen defended the Christian case in the Hellenist synagogues of Jerusalem. His propaganda provoked an opposition much more serious than that with which the apostles had been confronted. This culminated in the trial and death of Stephen and a persecution which scattered the Hellenists, while it left the apostles and presumably their section of the Church untouched.² It seems to follow from this that there was an

¹I have not thought it necessary to discuss either the Revelation of John or the Clementine literature. These were prominent in the Tübingen theory; but the view that the Apostle John attacked Paul in the former has long been obsolete, while the Clementine literature is later than Baur thought, and of little if any value for estimating the relations between the original apostles and Paul. E. Meyer denies that at any point in it Simon is the mask of Paul (Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums, III. pp. 301f.); but I have always felt it difficult to deny that Paul was in the author's mind in the nineteenth chapter of the Seventeenth Book of the Homilies.

²The statement that all were scattered except the apostles is scarcely credible if rigidly pressed. If the persecution was directed against the Church generally the ringleaders of the movement would not have been left
element in the preaching of Stephen which was recognised to be more
inimical to the fundamental principles of Judaism than that of the
apostles. The withdrawal of the Hellenists, who were apparently the
more liberal wing, would strengthen the reactionary element in the
community at Jerusalem.

It is often supposed that Stephen had largely anticipated the
position reached by Paul; it has indeed been asserted that he had
gone beyond it. This seems to me much exaggerated. We are not
entitled to build without caution on the testimony of the "false
witnesses." There was, no doubt, a large element of truth in their
indictment; but no device of controversialists is more familiar than to
saddle an opponent not only with the opinions which he has himself
expressed but with inferences which seem to them to follow, though no
part of his own case and perhaps explicitly disowned by him. We
have no report of Stephen's utterances in the synagogues, and are
therefore driven back on the speech he is said to have made in his
defence. In spite of the scepticism often expressed, I believe that it
faithfully indicates the general line which he took. The speech is no
random collection of incidents from Hebrew history but a skilfully
unmolested. If the apostles remained undisturbed, their immediate adherents
would presumably have been free to remain. The apostles may have gone
into hiding, but this would be equally possible for others.

1 So especially W. L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem.
Stephen's speech "amounts to the doctrine that Our Lord has revealed that
both the Law and the Temple were from the outset false developments." His
system "would have justified a much more serious accusation." His
speech is "entirely non-Pauline in its view of the O.T." He went to
"lengths which the Christian Church has never upheld" (p. 51). "The
whole implication of S. Stephen's speech is that the historical development
has been entirely false." This is only to be paralleled in the Epistle of
Barnabas. His method involves "a completely arbitrary selection of certain
passages in the O.T., and a radically false interpretation of them;" logically
it leads to a Marcionite distinction between the God of the O.T. and the God
of the N.T. (p. 54). The author charges him with "daring perversion of the
O.T." (p. 55).

I was glad to find in reading Wellhausen's Kritische Analyse der
Apostelgeschichte (1914) that he confirmed the view I had long taken, as to
the significance of the speech on this point. His conclusion is, "He seems
accordingly to have been radical in his attitude to the Temple of Solomon,
and conservative in his attitude to the Mosaic Law" (p. 13). It is im-
material for our purpose that he rejected the authenticity of the speech.
selected series of episodes designed to bring out the ingrained rebellious-
ness of the people, but also the connection of Divine revelation and
action with places outside Jerusalem and the Holy Land. The Law
is scarcely touched upon; no hostility is expressed towards it nor any
anticipation of its abolition. Stephen does not go substantially beyond
the position taken by Jeremiah, Micah, and the author of Isa. lxvi. 1.
Jesus Himself had been charged at His trial on a similar count so far
as the Temple was concerned, though probably His language was
garbled by the witnesses. But in any case He had predicted that
of the massive Temple masonry not one stone should be left upon
another.

Stephen’s colleague, Philip, is known to us chiefly for his mission
to the Samaritans and his encounter with Simon. Though the Jews
hated the Samaritans and denied the legitimacy of their sanctuary, they
could not regard them just as uncircumcised heathen. The Samaritans
accepted the rite of initiation into the Covenant and regarded the Law
as binding. Hence their admission to baptism involved no breach of
principle on the part of Philip. Peter endorses the work and bestows
the gift of the Holy Spirit on those who had been previously baptised.

A further step was taken by some of those who had been driven
from Jerusalem by the persecution which followed the death of Stephen.
According to the generally accepted text some of these, natives of

1 A saying of this kind was probably uttered by Jesus, but it has to be
reconstructed from the varying forms. Probably Jn. ii. 19 is more correct in
giving the imperative ‘Destroy’ than the prediction ‘I will destroy’. It was
this vital change which made the testimony of the witnesses false. But their
version is to be preferred in the substitution of ‘another’ and the addition of
‘made with hands’ and ‘not made with hands’ (Mk. xiv. 58). The meaning
is, ‘Destroy this temple by continuing to desecrate it more and more and in
its place I will rear another temple, spiritual and immaterial’. The statement
‘But he spake of the temple of his body’ (Jn. ii. 21) can hardly give the
original significance. This reference did not occur to the Jews (v. 20) nor
to the disciples till after the resurrection (v. 22). ‘Made with hands’ is
inappropriate to the body (it is, of course, omitted by John); and unless
Jesus pointed to His body, His words could in themselves and in this
situation refer only to the actual Temple; while if He had pointed to it there
would have been no doubt as to His meaning.

2 The best attested text in Acts xi. 20 reads ‘Ελληνιστας ‘Hellenists’
(R.V. mg. ‘Grecian Jews’), and this is accepted by Westcott and Hort,
Von Soden and Ropes, but the great majority prefer ‘Ελληνας, ‘Greeks.’
Loisy thinks that Luke wrote this but that the redactor altered it. The
Cyprus and Cyrene, when they reached Antioch made a large number of converts from the Gentiles. The report of this reached Jerusalem and Barnabas was sent to investigate. He was gladdened by what he saw, participated with great success in the work, and then went to Tarsus to enlist the cooperation of Paul.

The remaining case was that of Cornelius. He was a devout Gentile, a 'God-fearer' eminent for prayer and almsgiving. In consequence of a vision he sent for Peter who had also been instructed through a vision to visit him, waiving the scruples he would naturally have felt at doing so. While he is preaching to Cornelius and his friends they receive the baptism of the Holy Ghost and speak with tongues. Peter feels warranted by this to baptise him and when his conduct is criticised by the Apostles and brethren at Jerusalem they recognise that the gift of the Holy Ghost was sufficient justification for what he had done. It must be remembered with reference to this and other incidents that their chronological sequence is open to doubt because the author has to follow several distinct strands in this part of his story.¹

context seems to require a contrast to the action of the missioners recorded in v. 19, 'speaking the word to none save only to the Jews.' This is not provided if those mentioned in v. 20 were also Jews. Ropes suggests that the rare word means 'Greek-speaking persons' who may be non-Jews. "The specific meaning 'Greek-speaking Jews' belongs to the word only where that is clearly indicated by the context, as is certainly not the case here." (The Text of Acts, p. 106 in The Beginnings of Christianity, Part I., Vol. III.). But the contrast with 'Jews' in v. 19 suggests that the term in v. 20 carries with it an explicit racial connotation, and does not merely indicate a difference in the language spoken. Even in Jerusalem this distinction had existed from a very early period and Luke expresses it by the terms 'Hebrews' and 'Hellenists.' That he should have used 'Hellenists' in this sense in vi. 1 makes it unlikely that he would have used it in xi. 20 to mean 'Gentiles' in contrast to 'Jews.' A decisive new departure is made at this point; an unambiguous term is required to make this clear.

¹It is possible that the incidents in the career of Peter (Aeneas, Dorcas, Cornelius) related in Acts ix. 32-xi. 18 followed rather than preceded his imprisonment by Herod and release from impending execution. Some, including E. Meyer (op. cit. pp. 169 f., 196), place the conference at Jerusalem recorded in Acts xv. before the missionary tour of Barnabas and Paul recorded in Acts xiii. f. The crucial problem of the identification of Paul's visits to Jerusalem as recorded in Acts and Galatians is notorious, and will call for discussion below. It has even been argued that Peter's visit to Antioch (Gal. ii. 11) should be dated before Paul's visit to Jerusalem recorded in ii. 1.
The impression which is made on us by the story is that the Church at Jerusalem was very narrow in its outlook; and this narrowness was presumably intensified when the expulsion of the Hellenistic section took place. It must be remembered, however, that the apostles had been with Jesus, they had listened to His teaching and observed His practice. They remembered vividly His controversies with the Pharisees and had heard Him uttering far-reaching principles. But they were slow in drawing the legitimate inferences. It was nevertheless very helpful to their progress if they could see that a step which contravened their prejudices could be justified by the precept or example of their Master.

When Paul became a Christian he did not return to Jerusalem for some three years and apparently did so only because Damascus was no longer safe for him. He took the opportunity, however, to visit Peter with whom he stayed for a fortnight. He saw no other member of the Twelve; but he saw James, the brother of Jesus, who was to play so important a part in the later development. From his own account we should infer that he had but little contact with the Church in Jerusalem. This was probably the case, though the historian indicates that he saw several apostles, mingled with the brethren and disputed with the Hellenists. After a brief stay he went to Tarsus and carried on his work in Cilicia, his native country, and Syria. Barnabas brought him from Tarsus to Antioch where they began a period of fruitful collaboration.

The Acts of the Apostles proceeds to tell us that Barnabas and

The problem is further complicated by the uncertainty as to the date of Galatians, which is to some extent bound up with the question as to the locality of the Churches addressed in that Epistle.

1 Jerusalem would not be the safest place for Paul to visit after he had not merely failed to fulfil his commission from the High Priest but had gone over to the Christians. The account in Galatians suggests that Paul avoided contact even with his fellow-Christians in Jerusalem, apart from James and Peter, not to speak of the Jews. We should naturally infer from it that he remained in Jerusalem only a fortnight; but his visit to Peter may have been terminated by Peter’s departure from Jerusalem (so W. L. Knox, op. cit., pp. 103, 121 f.), but this is not the natural impression the passage makes in itself. It would make it easier to reconcile Paul’s statement with the account in Acts or at least to reduce the discrepancy. But the moral of the discrepancy ought not to be forgotten when we are considering the identification of the later visits.
Paul were sent to Jerusalem with money collected to relieve the poor Christians of the mother Church in a famine predicted at Antioch by Agabus, a prophet from Jerusalem. Whether Paul mentions this visit or not in Galatians is a subject of keen controversy. The next visit which he mentions in Galatians after his stay with Peter is that recorded in Gal. ii. 1-10. The generally accepted view has been that this visit is to be identified not with the Famine Visit of Acts xi. 30, xii. 25 but with that of Acts xv. 1-30. This view had been challenged by some earlier scholars; but the opposition to it has increased during the last thirty years. The argument which several scholars regard as decisive is that the case for his independence necessitated the mention of every visit to Jerusalem down to that recorded in Gal. ii. 1-10. If this visit is identified with that in Acts xv. it is urged that Paul would have been disingenuous in omitting the visit in Acts xi. If we assume that in Gal. ii. 1-10 Paul is still arguing for the independence of his Gospel, this objection to the identification of the visit in Gal. ii. with the visit in Acts xv. is undeniably cogent. But that it is conclusive is not at all so certain. For the inference may be evaded in various ways. It is quite possible that the apostles were one and all absent from Jerusalem at the time of the Famine Visit. It may be significant that the narrative in Acts says nothing of the apostles but simply mentions the elders (xi. 30). Or it is quite possible, though it may be improbable, that in view of its purpose Paul ignored this visit as irrelevant to his argument. It is also quite conceivable that the Famine Visit is to be identified with

1 So (very emphatically) W. L. Knox: “Either we have different incidents or two contradictory accounts of the same incident, one of which is either utterly inaccurate or else deliberately falsified. S. Paul insists that he only consulted the leaders of the Church while S. Luke insists that the whole body was consulted. . . . The identification of the visit of Gal. ii. with the Council of Jerusalem is really fatal to S. Luke’s accuracy. It also involves S. Paul in deliberate perjury, since Gal. i. 20 is entirely unjustifiable if S. Paul is in fact suppressing all mention of a visit to Jerusalem at the time of the famine” (op. cit. p. 188). But where does Paul insist that he consulted the leaders only? A few scholars, it is true, think that his language favours this. But most commentators on Galatians think that a private and a public consultation are implied, so e.g. Loisy, “Paul indicates two kinds of conference, (one) with a larger group, the whole community or the elders of this community, and (another) with a more restricted group, i.e. James, Cephas, and John (L’Épitre aux Galates, p. 164). On the reasons for this distinction see Burton, Galatians, p. 71.
that in Acts xv., if Luke drew the accounts from different sources and erroneously supposed that two distinct visits were intended.

But is the assumption that in Gal. ii. 1-10 Paul is still demonstrating his independence of the apostles so certain as is commonly assumed? I have long felt great doubt on this point. After all Paul had spent fifteen days with Peter on his first visit and it seems as if any argument for the independence of his teaching based on prolonged absence from Jerusalem after that date would be of little value. For in a fortnight there was ample time for Paul to learn everything that Peter had to teach him. If, then, the proof of the independence of his Gospel based on avoidance of contact with the apostles closed with Gal. i. there was no need for a complete enumeration of subsequent visits to Jerusalem, and the chief argument for the identification of Gal. ii. 1-10 with the Famine Visit disappears. And scrutinised more narrowly the Famine Visit seems not to satisfy the conditions. It is true that Paul mentions a private conference with "those of repute," presumably James, the Lord's brother, Peter, and John. And if this had been all, Luke might very well have omitted it in his account of the Famine Visit. But Paul's language implies that in addition to the private conference there was a discussion in which the Church generally was involved. There was obviously a heated controversy which centred around the person of Titus, and the demand was pressed upon Paul that he should be circumcised. Moreover, Paul asserts that he went

1 I assume that the usual view is correct that the struggle about Titus took place at Jerusalem. F. Rendall, however, argues that it took place at Antioch (Expositor's Greek Testament, Vol. III., pp. 143-158). He thinks the aorist answers to the English pluperfect, 'Howbeit even Titus who was with me had not been compelled to be circumcised.' He regards this sentence as simply parenthetical. The reference to the false brethren in Gal. ii. 4 is then taken as a continuation of vv. 1 f., which asserts that it was on account of the mischievous activities of the false brethren at Antioch that Paul went up to Jerusalem. In v. 5 he proceeds to state that to these agitators neither he nor Barnabas had made the slightest concession at Antioch. In so desperately difficult a passage as this all suggestions should be welcomed; but, so far as I have observed, the view that the reference to the case of Titus is to a conflict at Antioch has met with no acceptance.

2 It is not decisive against the identification with the Famine Visit, but it is at least an objection, that the occasion was not very suitable for raising a controversy as to the circumcision of Titus. Nor is it probable that on a mission of philanthropy Paul should deliberately have taken an uncircumcised Gentile to Jerusalem, and by this gratuitous challenge thrown the apple of
up by revelation to lay his Gospel of freedom before the authorities at Jerusalem; whereas on the Famine Visit he and Barnabas were deputies appointed by the Church to carry alms to Jerusalem.¹

On the other hand the identification of the visit in Gal. ii. 1-10 with that of Acts xv. is favoured by a comparison of the two narratives, if we remember that Paul is writing with the inside knowledge of one who had been a party to the discussion and who was stating his own position as he saw it, while Luke describes the events as they appeared to the community in general. Paul is not concerned with the general assembly of the Church, though his language seems to imply that the larger body met; much more important to him is the private conference at which the leaders of the mother Church recognised the vocation of himself and Barnabas and delimited their spheres of work. There is no inconsistency between the statement of Paul that he went up by revelation and of Acts that he and Barnabas were sent as a deputation by the Church. In this case the vision and the action of the Church were concerned with the same problem. And a revelation to Paul may well have accompanied the decision of the Church. The Famine Visit accordingly, if it is to be distinguished from that in Acts xv.² is irrelevant to our discussion. We are simply concerned with the visit at which the so-called Apostolic Council was held. It must be conceded that Paul, in perfect good faith, is telling the story from his own point of view, and that if we had had the discord into the Church. When the object of the deputation was to discuss the relation of the Gentiles to circumcision and the Law, as in Acts xv., it was perfectly appropriate to bring the issue out sharply by presenting it in a concrete case.

¹In itself there is, of course, no reason why Paul should not have taken the opportunity of a philanthropic mission to discuss the Gentiles and the Law with the three leaders. But Paul's language implies that this was the primary object of his visit, and that it was undertaken in consequence of a revelation. There is no difficulty in combining this with Acts xv. 2, but assuredly it was not the primary object of the visit recorded in Acts xi.

²In order not to complicate the discussion unduly I refrain from discussing this point. What is vital in the view I am taking is that the visit recorded in Gal. ii. 1-10 is identical with that recorded in Acts xv. It would mitigate some difficulties if this were identified with the Famine Visit. In that case it would perhaps be preferable to accept the date given in Acts xi. But there are real difficulties about the identification, and if we reject it we must either deny the historicity of the Famine Visit, or recognise that Paul paid two distinct visits to Jerusalem, each for a distinct purpose.
account of Peter or James the impression of the incidents and the discussion might be modified. But be this as it may, it would be perilous to use the narrative in the Acts to discredit, or even to modify, the account given by Paul. Luke had no first-hand knowledge of the facts but was dependent on what information he could collect when in Palestine; and as a Gentile he was less qualified to grasp the full significance of the events than a Jew would have been. Moreover, Paul's narrative, though written down later, seems to have been composed with a very vivid recollection of his feelings at the time. He lives through those painful hours once more while he puts the record of them on paper.

The allusiveness of the language is perhaps best explained on the hypothesis that he had already told the story to his readers. But whether this is the true explanation or not, the story is told in such a way that the action taken on the test case cannot be determined with certainty. Paul tells us that he took Titus with him. The suggestion seems to be that he selected him deliberately as an illustration of the results of his work and as a challenge to the Judaisers. He must have known perfectly well that a demand for the circumcision of Titus would be made as a condition of his admission to the fellowship. He must have deliberately intended the consequences of his act and determined to force the issue on a concrete case. If so, it is incredible that he should have surrendered the ground he had deliberately chosen or that he should have compromised his crucial principle by yielding on the individual case. It is well known, however, that some eminent scholars have argued that at this point Paul did yield to the pressure put upon him and consented to the circumcision of Titus.¹ But the better at-

¹I may mention specially J. Weiss (Das Urchristentum, pp. 202-204), W. L. Knox, and F. C. Burkitt among recent scholars who have inclined to this view. W. L. Knox thinks that Paul and Barnabas made a somewhat serious error in underestimating the influence wielded by the Judaisers at Jerusalem, when they took Titus with them (p. 181). That he was not circumcised was known to the rulers of the Church but had not been made generally public. The author's reconstruction of what follows is admittedly "largely based on conjecture"; others will regard it as largely fanciful, like some other hypotheses in this elaborate and ingenious work. Some members became suspicious and discovered the truth in what Paul felt to be a grossly dishonourable way. A vigorous demand was made that Titus should be circumcised. Paul opposed it with equal vigour. To his disgust the autocratic Paul found that the Jerusalem leaders could not control their own followers.
PAUL AND THE JEWISH CHRISTIANS

tested text is entirely unfavourable to this, and to wring this meaning out of it would require a very unnatural interpretation of some of the expressions employed. Those who adopt this view suppose that since Paul had won his case on the validity of his Gospel, it was urged by the apostles, who were with him in principle, that a graceful concession might be made in the individual instance. But it was precisely this concession which he could not afford to make. And if he had made it, it would have been very much more difficult for him to have so vehemently insisted that for the Galatians to submit to circumcision would be to forfeit their Christian freedom from the Law.

Paul's narrative accordingly may be interpreted in this way. He and Barnabas went up to Jerusalem fourteen years after his previous visit. Paul had chosen Titus, an uncircumcised Greek, to accompany them. The impulse for the journey, so far as he himself was concerned, was supplied by a revelation. Its object was to secure both his previous and his future mission from the risk of failure. By this he does not mean that he had any misgivings as to the truth of his gospel or thought that his seniors could correct any mistaken view. He had no choice but to submit and allow Titus to be circumcised that the unity of the society might be preserved. He was filled with the deepest indignation at this defeat; and the ineffectiveness of the leaders "considerably diminished his respect." Mr. Knox admits that the opposite interpretation is not impossible (pp. 182, 189 f.). Prof. Burkitt, referring to "the circumcision of Titus by Paul," adds in striking language "for who can doubt that it was the knife which really did circumcise Titus that has cut the syntax of Gal. ii. 3-5 to pieces?" (Christian Beginnings, p. 118). The thought is that the incoherence of Paul's language is due to the bitter humiliation he felt as he remembered the concession which had been wrung from him. The great majority of scholars do doubt this account of it, and suggest other explanations. And naturally we must give proper weight to Paul's actual statements, which cannot without violence be accommodated to the view that Titus was circumcised.

Eminent scholars, such as Klostermann and J. Weiss (Zahn also but with a curious interpretation) accept the text which omits the relative pronoun and the negative (οὐς οὐδὲ) getting the sense 'we yielded.' But the text without this omission is preferable. Those who accept it but hold that Titus was circumcised explain it to mean, we yielded, but not in the way of submission, we freely made a gracious concession. And similarly the unambiguous phrase, as the unsophisticated reader would feel it to be, 'But not even Titus . . . was compelled to be circumcised' has to be strained to mean, Titus was circumcised, but not by any compulsion.
which he might hold. He was indeed so certain of its truth that he pronounced an anathema on anyone who would preach another Gospel, even though it were a being so august as an archangel from heaven. But he was well aware how disastrous might be the consequences for his mission if a different form of the Gospel should be preached in the Gentile world with the prestige of the original apostles attaching to it. Had he failed to win them to his side he would no doubt have continued his apostolic labours, even if his unyielding attitude had cost him the comradeship of the more conciliatory and pliable Barnabas. But he realised how much he would be hampered if the leaders of the Church at Jerusalem, the apostles who beyond all others might be expected to know the mind of their Master, had thrown the weight of their influence against his presentation of Christianity. The situation called for very tactful handling. A larger meeting would have to settle the question; but to have thrown the whole question open in such an assembly without a previous consultation with the leaders would have been the height of folly. Paul accordingly expounded his gospel to “those of repute,” that is presumably to Peter, John, and James the Lord’s brother. His contribution to their theological education led to no corresponding enrichment of his gospel by them. They recognised that his success was a token of Divine grace and approval and gave to him and to Barnabas the right hand of fellowship with a general delimitation of spheres of influence. Paul and Barnabas were to take the Gentile world for their province, while the leaders on

1 Paul’s words are ‘Lest I should run or had run in vain’ (Gal. ii. 2). Mr. Knox says, “Gal. ii. 2 appears to mean that S. Paul would have been ready to change his attitude on this question if the older apostles could have shown that it was contrary to the teaching of Our Lord” (p. 189); also “Saul offered to revise his system, if it could be shown that it was contrary to that revealed by the Founder of the Church” (p. 182). All we know of Paul seems to me to rule out the idea that he would have admitted that his Gospel stood, or could stand, in need of revision.

2 Some experience in the conduct of delicate negotiations might perhaps have saved some too academic interpreters from finding discrepancies where they do not exist.

3 The words rendered in the R.V. “imparted nothing to me” (ii. 6) have been much discussed (see Burton’s note for possible meanings). The compound verb seems to echo the simple verb in ii. 2. “I laid before them the Gospel which I preach among the Gentiles.” Paul seems to mean that the leaders had no corresponding contribution of their own to make.
the other side were to work among the Jews. One request of a practical nature they made, that Paul and Barnabas should continue their philanthropic efforts for the poor saints at Jerusalem. During this time, presumably, the Judaisers were agitating for the circumcision of Titus. Paul's language implies that very great pressure was put upon him. It is not unlikely that the authorities at Jerusalem pressed him to yield the point. In things indifferent his temperament was conciliatory; but where principle was involved he was adamant. The result was a victory all along the line, though even after a long interval he cannot write without betraying a hot resentment at the tactics of his opponents and some resentment, not untouched I think with scorn, for the attitude of the Jerusalem leaders. It is the combination of these emotions which largely accounts for the broken and indeed incoherent style in the middle of the passage.

When we turn to the account in the Acts of the Apostles we read that Paul and Barnabas with their company were received by the Church, the apostles and the elders and related "all things that God

1Hans Achelis, whose discussion of the negotiations seems to me generally excellent, compares the collection for the poor with the Temple tax paid by Jews in the Dispersion. This would involve a recognition that the Christians in the Gentile mission were subordinate to James and the College of the Twelve Apostles. From this there followed the right of visitation of the Pauline Churches (*Das Christentum in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, 1912, pp. 47-49). This, I think, makes far too much of what was essentially a spontaneous expression of Christian philanthropy and brotherly love. The initiative in this had originally been taken by the Church of Antioch. It does not seem to have been a response to a claim that assistance to the mother Church might be rightfully demanded. The apostles knew from experience the sympathetic interest of Paul and Barnabas and the Church at Antioch, and they appeal that their help may be continued. The point is of importance for the general situation. Achelis says that this subordination "was the price Paul paid; he accepted external dependence for internal freedom" (p. 47). But, he continues, not only did the concordat suffer from internal obscurities; it meant different things to the two contracting groups, and each emphasised the point on which it had got its way—Paul the internal independence of his mission, the tribute being just an external concession, Peter and James the attachment of the Pauline mission to Jerusalem and the acknowledgment of the primacy of the mother Church. K. L. Schmidt in his contribution to the *Festgabe für Adolf Deissmann* (1927), pp. 305-307 also puts the collection for the poor Christians at Jerusalem on a similar basis to the Temple tax, and thinks that the apostles felt themselves entitled to require it. He also discusses the scene at Antioch between Peter and Paul (pp. 307-309).
Certain Christian Pharisees then insisted that the converts must be circumcised and instructed to keep the Law. The apostles and elders met to discuss the matter and after considerable debate Peter recalled the incident of Cornelius in which he had been chosen to announce the Gospel to the Gentiles. On that occasion God made no distinction between Jew and Gentile but cleansed their heart by faith. Why then, with that experience before them, should they tempt God by imposing a yoke on the disciples which they had themselves found too heavy to bear? For Jew as well as Gentile must be saved by the grace of the Lord Jesus. Peter's intervention secured a quiet hearing for Paul and Barnabas, who tactfully refrained from discussing the principle at stake and limited themselves to a recital of the signs and wonders wrought by God through them among the Gentiles. After this impressive demonstration that the Divine approval rested on their work, James pronounces the decision at which he thought the meeting should arrive. He recalls the incident of Cornelius, and quotes the Old Testament to show that the prophets had foretold the calling of the Gentiles. His judgment on the immediate problem is that they should not impose vexatious restrictions upon the Gentiles but enjoin them to abstain from pollutions of idols, from fornication, from what is strangled, and from blood. This meets with the approval of the apostles, the elders and the whole Church, and a letter is drafted to be sent to the Gentile Christians in Antioch, Syria and Cilicia. In this letter they disown the action of those who had troubled the Church at Antioch and explain that they had given them no such instructions. They have accordingly determined to send a deputation to accompany "our beloved Barnabas and Paul, men that have hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ." These representatives, Judas and Silas, will give them oral confirmation of the contents of the letter. The instructions themselves follow in these terms: "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things; that ye abstain from things sacrificed to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication; from which if ye keep yourselves it shall be well with you."

It is not to be wondered at that this account has occasioned much discussion. No objection can properly be taken to the arrangement for the debate itself. It was obviously best that the controversial side
of it should be restricted to the leaders of the Church at Jerusalem. Barnabas and Paul, and the latter especially, might easily have aroused resentment if they had dealt with the merits of the question; the most effective contribution they could make was to enumerate the striking tokens of Divine approval by which their mission had been endorsed. And it was well that the final word should rest with James. If the decision was to be on the side of liberty it was appropriate that it should be suggested by the leader who could least be suspected of a tendency to undue liberalism. Yet the debate itself has aroused considerable discussion. Peter, it is said, stands entirely on Pauline ground, and if he had reached so clear an understanding of the crucial issues his subsequent attitude at Antioch leaves a stain upon his character. This is better left over till a later point.

The question as to the decree and the four prohibitions is one of the most tangled problems in the history of the early Church. There is in the first place a serious variation of text. According to the generally accepted text we have apparently three food prohibitions combined with one ethical. But there are very early and important witnesses which omit the reference to "things strangled." If this text is correct it is still possible to suppose that, apart from the ethical, we have two food prohibitions. But the removal of "things strangled" makes it possible to take all three as ethical, that is as prohibitions of idolatry, murder and impurity. Most of the authorities which make the omission read the Golden Rule in its negative form, "and whatsoever ye do not wish to happen to yourselves not to do to another," and after "ye shall do well" continue "being borne along by the Holy Spirit." Gotthold Resch, in 1905, published a very thorough investigation in which he reached the result that the text which omitted "things strangled" and added the Golden Rule in its negative form was original. In this he had been anticipated by Hilgenfeld. This form is commonly spoken of as the Western Text. Harnack, who in 1899 had argued elaborately for the text with four prohibitions and without the Golden Rule (commonly called the Eastern Text), changed his view as a result of Resch's arguments, except that he took the Golden Rule to be a later insertion. In spite of some support, the verdict on Harnack's conclusion has been generally unfavourable.

1 Das Aposteldekret nach seinen ausserkanonischen Textgestalt.
His arguments are given in his *Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 193-196 (*The Acts of the Apostles*, pp. 255-259). They may be summarised as follows:—

(1) Elsewhere in sections dealing with the Gentile-Christian controversy Luke makes no reference to prohibited meats, but only to questions of capital importance, circumcision and the Law as a whole.

(2) The combination of the prohibition of meats with that of fornication is unintelligible, not so that of idolatry, fornication, murder.

(3) Food prohibitions form part of the Law, but it has just been said (xv. 19 f.) that nothing of the Law was to be imposed. Ethical prohibitions, it is true, were also in the Mosaic Law, but they were recognised as a part of the universal moral Law.

(4) Why should just these abstinences from forms of food be regarded as essential, and the necessary condition of their doing well? This suits moral precepts.

(5) “Things sacrificed to idols” is defined by xv. 20 where we read of “the pollutions of idols”; the reference is therefore to idolatry in general, and in xv. 29 the part is put for the whole. Participation in idol feasts is singled out for special mention as the crassest form of idolatry.

(6) The prohibition of murder is not strange and superfluous, for the combination of the three elements depends formally on the Decalogue and the Two Ways; moreover there were refined forms of murder (exposure of children, infanticide, abortion, murder of slaves), and Jewish teaching held that murder included every injury to the life of one’s neighbour, cf. 1 Peter, iv. 15, 1 John, iii. 15, Rev. xxii. 15, Jas. iv. 2. Irenaeus says that the heathen needed to be taught the very rudiments of morality.

(7) No law against partaking of blood is to be found in the earliest Christian documents before the Epistle from Lugdunum. This Epistle is not based on the Apostolic Decree which was in that part of the world regarded as a code of ethical precepts.

(8) The whole Western Church understood the decree as an ethical rule, even those who (like Tertullian) regarded the prohibition of blood and things strangled as binding.

There are, however, weighty arguments in favour of the generally accepted text. Resch is probably wrong in accepting the Golden Rule in its negative form as part of the original text. For it is introduced in the most awkward way possible between the relative pronoun and its antecedents. But if the Western text as generally attested (though Tertullian omits the Golden Rule) is wrong in its addition, it lies under
suspicion of being wrong in its omission. For the two hang together; and although they may have originated separately, the more natural view is that both are connected with the attempt to change ritual into ethical prohibitions.

Further, in spite of what Harnack says, it can scarcely appear as other than extraordinary that the Gentile disciples should be told that nothing more would be required from them than to abstain from idolatry, murder and fornication. The reference to murder in particular is difficult to accept. It is hardly credible that it should be necessary to prohibit this in Christian Churches!

Moreover, it is hard to explain why the reference to "things strangled" was added if it was absent from the original text. It is much easier to think that it was dropped than to imagine the circumstances which would have suggested its insertion. As the conditions radically changed and the Judaistic problem became remote, it was not unnatural to drop the word and add the Golden Rule, and thus make of the decree a universally applicable moral rule; whereas it is not easy to see why a moral should be changed into a ceremonial rule, when the circumstances which had made ceremonial regulations so important had for ever passed away.

The weight of the textual evidence lies on the side of the Eastern Text, though the evidence for the Western Text is undeniably important. It is possible, however, that the original text may have been without "and things strangled" and "the Golden Rule."  

1 So Ropes, The Text of the Acts (The Beginnings of Christianity, Part I., Vol. III.). After his statement and discussion of the textual phenomena he continues: "The history of the text seems to have been as follows. In the East the decree was correctly understood in the second century and later to relate to food, and under the influence of current custom the text was at first expanded by the addition of καὶ πυκτῶν" (p. 269). Other scholars who regard the decree as containing food prohibitions think the reference to "things strangled" is just an explanatory addition to bring out explicitly what was really involved in the prohibition of "blood." So Wellhausen, Kritische Analyse der Apostelgeschichte, 1914, p. 28; Preuschen, Die Apostelgeschichte, 1912, p. 95. The latter leaves the possibility open that "blood" was added to explain "things strangled"; but in that case we should have expected some trace of the original absence of blood to have been preserved in the textual evidence. But probably neither should be omitted. Loisy says quite rightly that it is only from a theoretical and abstract point of view that the two terms appear as superfluous repetition. While from the point of view of Jewish ritual the prohibition of blood logically involves that of what is strangled,
so we should still interpret "things sacrificed to idols" and "blood" as food prohibitions and not as standing for idolatry and murder. The vague term "pollutions of idols" ought not to determine the sense to be put upon "things sacrificed to idols." Primarily the decree refers to meats offered to idols, as to which there was far more room for doubt in the Christian community than as to idolatry itself.\(^1\) To turn from idols to a God of life and reality (1 Thess. i. 9) was among the very first requirements in missionary preaching, and to prohibit idolatry as such was quite superfluous. Further, the sense imposed by Harnack on "blood" is not that which naturally suggests itself. In view of the stress laid by the Jews on the strictest avoidance of any eating of blood, it is much the most obvious view that this is intended here.

We may conclude then that the text with four prohibitions is correct, three of these having definitely to do with forbidden forms of food, and that the difficulty occasioned by the conflict with the account in Galatians cannot be removed by the acceptance of the Western form of the text and interpretation of the prohibitions as ethical. In Galatians Paul asserts that the 'pillar' apostles added nothing to him except the wish that he and Barnabas should remember the poor. Paul would not feel that the demand for abstinence from murder, idolatry and fornication was an additional requirement, since it would be taken for granted by all in charge of Gentile congregations. But the food prohibitions might be so regarded. W. Sanday argues that Paul gave a careless passive consent, "he was indifferent," but "would not stand in the way of an agreement that made for peace." It was addressed to a limited area, and in that area it may well have soon fallen into comparative disuse. It had a temporary success, but soon became a dead letter. "The tide of events ebbed away from it, and it was left on the beach stranded and lifeless—lifeless at least for the larger half of the Church, for that Gentile Church which soon began to advance by leaps and bounds."\(^2\) It is difficult to believe that this is the true account. If the prohibitions were laid down and yet from the practical, i.e. the culinary point of view, the distinction is quite justified (Les Actes des Apôtres, 1919, p. 587). E. Meyer (p. 187), and Jacquier (Les Actes des Apôtres, 1926, p. 458), also retain both terms.

\(^1\) This is clear from the fact that Paul devotes so much attention to this question in 1 Corinthians. We could not imagine him discussing whether Christians might participate in idolatry.

\(^2\) Theologische Studien Theodor Zahn dargebracht, 1908, p. 332.
accepted as terms of a concordat, Paul could scarcely have passed them by; and certainly when the Epistle to the Galatians was written they could hardly have become a dead letter, at least if the account in Acts xxii. 25 is correct. Moreover, according to Acts xvi. 4 the decrees were delivered by Paul and Silas to the Churches of South Galatia to keep; and these were probably the very Churches to which the Epistle to the Galatians was written. The statement may be incorrect, and certainly is so if the decree is fictitious or if it was enacted at a later time; but if we are arguing for the historicity of Acts xv. 28 f., we can hardly take the line of assuming that xvi. 4 is incorrect.

Another objection is that if the question had been settled at Jerusalem and on the initiative of James, it is more difficult to understand the situation described in Gal. ii. 11-13. Peter and even Barnabas and indeed all the Jewish Christians except Paul, withdrew from communion with the Gentile Christians at Antioch, and withdrew under pressure of those who came from James. Some avoid this difficulty by placing the incident at Antioch before the Council at Jerusalem. This is a possible solution; but that Paul should have inverted the chronological order is so contrary to the impression which his narrative makes upon us that I must regard it as highly improbable.¹ The best line to take in dealing with this difficulty is to argue that the compact at Jerusalem did not really cover the situation which subsequently arose at Antioch. The Jerusalem compact recognised that Gentiles did not need to accept the Law and circumcision in order to be regarded as genuine Christians and members of the Church; but Jewish Christians were in the same position as before and might argue that, though they did not question the status of the Gentiles in the Church, they would yet compromise their own position by sharing table communion with them.

A further question is raised by Paul's silence with reference to the

¹ This was the view of Augustine, and in modern times it has been advocated by Schneckenburger, Zahn and C. H. Turner. It is interesting to compare Sanday's reaction to this suggestion with that of W. L. Knox. The latter brushes it aside contemptuously. It "hardly needs serious discussion" (p. 191). The former says: "I confess that to me this solution is so attractive as to seem almost probable. I certainly do not think that in any case it can be excluded. There is nothing to make the sequence in Galatians stringently a sequence of time." (p. 333).
decrees when he dealt with the question of meats offered to idols. His general position was not so much at variance with the decree; but his silence needs explanation. It may be a sufficient explanation that he did not attach importance to its observance in his own churches, so far away from Jerusalem and under his own control. The letter from the Council was, it must be remembered, addressed simply to the churches of Syria, Cilicia and Antioch.

The fact, however, that these difficulties have to be explained has not unnaturally created a suspicion that no such decree was issued by the Council. This view may take different forms; the decree may be regarded as one of the redactor's countless fictions (so Loisy), or as historical but misplaced. The natural impression made by xxii. 25 is that the terms of the decree are here communicated to Paul for the first time. In that case the decree is historical; but made by the authorities at Jerusalem, for the observance of the churches to which it was sent, at some time during the period between the Council and Paul's last visit to Jerusalem. These churches may have been those of Syria and Cilicia. This solution has been adopted by several scholars. It would be easier to accept if the theory of J. Weiss were admitted that only Acts xv. 1-4, 12, relates to the Council held with Paul and Barnabas at Jerusalem, the narrative of which is preserved only in a fragment, while xv. 5-11, 13-33 belongs to another situation. This, however, is a rather drastic expedient and it is perhaps better to recognise that no quite satisfactory solution of the difficulty has yet been discovered.

The next stage in the development was occasioned by a visit of Peter to Antioch and the subsequent arrival of some Jewish Christians who had been sent by James. It is supposed by some that they arrived in Paul's absence, but there is nothing to indicate this and the natural assumption is that Paul was in Antioch all the time. The unity of the Church was not infringed by the separation of the Jewish from the Gentile Christians in their table communion. But the arrival of the emissaries of James changed the situation for the worse. Intimidated by these strict zealots Peter withdrew from the common meal, and the leaven of his example spread rapidly till even Barnabas caught the infection. Then Paul before the whole Church expostulated with

1 *Das Urchristentum*, pp. 195-197, 235-238. E. Meyer, on the other hand, regards the narrative as a unity and the decree, with four prohibitions, as authentic (pp. 185 ff.).
Peter. Peter had obviously been betrayed into inconsistency at Antioch. If his former unfettered fellowship with the Gentile Christians had been legitimate, then he was wrong in breaking off communion with them. The result of such conduct would either be that a split would develop in the Church itself, or that unity would have to be purchased by the submission of the Gentile Christians to circumcision and the Law. So Paul confronts him with the unanswerable question: If you, a born Jew, give up the Law and live like a Gentile, why do you insist that Gentile Christians should accept the Law and live like Jews?

It is important to realise that the question at issue was not that which had been decided at the Council of Jerusalem. At this the Gentiles in the churches addressed had been exempted from circumcision and obedience to the Law. But nothing had been said as to the relation in which the Jewish Christians stood to the Law. In a purely Jewish church the members would go on keeping it. In a purely Gentile church they would be released from obligation to it. But the question had not been considered what course should be followed in a church with both Jews and Gentiles in its membership. The church at Antioch had solved the question by the abandonment of the scruples which would have prevented complete communion. Peter, who was temperamentally generous and impulsive, and who in principle had been brought into sympathy with Paul's standpoint, had followed his better instincts and shared in the full fellowship mindful, we may believe, of his vision and his visit to Cornelius. His retreat from this liberal attitude may be attributed partly to a deficiency in moral courage but partly also to the fact that he did not see his way in confronting this new problem with the same clearness as Paul. The exposition of principle which follows (Gal. ii. 15 ff.) is of such uncertain interpretation that it is impossible to discuss it in my space; but Paul is defending the position that the Christian experience of justification carries with it the renunciation of the Law as necessary to salvation. Judaism confers no advantage, the practice of the Law creates no merit.

It is a singular misfortune that Paul drifts away from the scene at Antioch without telling us how it ended. On this very important question the most divergent views are taken. Presumably his readers were aware how the controversy had ended, just as they knew whether
Titus had been circumcised or not, so that inferences from Paul's silence on this point ought not to be too confidently drawn. Forgetful of this, some have argued that his failure to claim victory implies that he had been obliged to own defeat. Some have thought that Peter having no reply to make accepted his colleague's rebuke, or that he may have been silenced but not convinced. Some suppose that to relieve the situation he and the Judaisers went back to Jerusalem leaving Paul in possession of the field. Loisy believes that Paul found little support for his extreme views and soon abandoned Antioch as his headquarters, striking out now on an independent mission. It was the view of the Tübingen School that the collision created an irreparable breach between Peter and Paul; and Eduard Meyer, though at many points far removed from the Tübingen position, has revived this view.

There is indeed no certain answer to the question whether Peter or Paul remained in possession of the field at Antioch or indeed whether the result was inconclusive. It is, however, significant that in the later stages of the controversy between Paul and the Judaisers this issue disappears. We may perhaps infer that victory on this point remains with Paul.

Before passing on to the campaign against Paul conducted by the Judaisers in his own churches, it will be convenient to touch on the question how far Peter was personally engaged in the attack. E. Meyer supposes that Peter took the field against Paul and followed him into his churches. In fact one is reminded of the activity of Peter as depicted in the Clementine literature where he is represented as following Simon Magus to confute his doctrine, expose his character, and neutralise his baneful activities. It is interesting that Meyer, unlike the Tübingen critics who made much of this literature in their presentation of the case, entirely rejects the view that Simon is at any point to be identified with Paul (pp. 301 f.). He affirms that the passion with which Paul attacks Peter in the Epistle to the Galatians clearly demonstrates that he and no other was the leader of the Judaistic agitation and that there can be no doubt that Peter himself visited the Galatian churches and resumed the conflict which had originated in Antioch (p. 434). It was the fact that the chief of the apostles led the attack on Paul which accounted for the rapid falling away of the

Galatians. So too with the Church of Corinth. Meyer has no doubt that Peter visited Corinth, and unquestionably with a swarm of adherents, in order to oppose the false teaching of Paul. It is to him incomprehensible how any one can doubt that Peter came to Corinth (p. 441). Here too the battle was fought with embittered passion. The opponents regarded each other not as apostles of Christ but as instruments of Satan (p. 459). Peter was also in Rome during Paul's imprisonment there. When he reached the capital is uncertain, but in all probability he was already there when Paul arrived. The absence of any greeting to him in the Epistle to the Romans or reference to him in Philippians or Colossians proves nothing to the contrary, since their personal relations were of such a character as to forbid all intercourse between them (pp. 497-500).

This reconstruction seems to me most improbable in itself and to rest on extremely slender support. That Peter ever visited the Galatian churches is a hypothesis confirmed by no shred of evidence. Paul's narrative of the collision at Antioch is amply accounted for by the way in which the Judaists pitted Peter's authority against his own. More, indeed, might be said for the supposition that Peter had visited Corinth. Others have argued for this from the fact that a party called itself by his name, as there were also parties of Paul and of Apollos who had both laboured in that city; but there is no tangible reason to suppose that the presence of such a party implies that Peter himself had been in Corinth. That Peter was in Rome before his martyrdom is probable; but that he was there when Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans or when he wrote Colossians and Philippians—assuming that they were written from Rome—is most unlikely. Meyer's argument for the opposite view is that in Col. iv. 10 Mark sends greetings, but since Mark was the "interpreter of Peter" his presence in Rome proves the presence of Peter. But really the passage, if used to support Meyer's hypothesis, proves altogether too much. For if Paul and Peter were at daggers drawn is it conceivable that Mark, Peter's trusted assistant, should have stood in such friendly relations with Paul? And if Mark was as inseparable from Peter as his shadow, why should he be contemplating a visit to Colossæ and be so warmly commended to the Colossians? Was Peter intending to visit Colossæ?

But apart from the flimsiness of the positive arguments the hypothesis is intrinsically improbable. It would do far too little honour to
the character of either apostle to suppose that the scene at Antioch had poisoned their relations so deeply and irretrievably. We have not the slightest proof that it led to a personal breach between them at all. But that for all the years which remained to them they were animated by such implacable hostility is in itself very difficult to believe. Peter may have been hasty and hot-tempered, but he strikes us as a generous soul, who would not harbour malice and who would be quite ready to admit that he had been in the wrong. All we know of Paul suggests that he too was magnanimous and incapable of nursing a grudge for the rest of a lifetime. And the way in which he refers to Peter in 1 Corinthians does not bear out Meyer's view. So high and unfettered an authority as Weizsäcker says on this point "Paul never mentions Peter except with the greatest respect" (Apostolic Age, Vol. I., p. 328).

Moreover, Paul's relations to the Church at Jerusalem are hard to reconcile with the attitude towards Peter which Meyer attributes to him. He pays one visit to Jerusalem after leaving Greece and salutes the Church (Acts xviii. 22). He organises with great care a collection in his churches for the poor saints of Jerusalem. In spite of prophetic warnings of disaster and his own forebodings, he insists on taking the offering to Jerusalem himself. He is received with gladness by the Christians of Jerusalem and has a friendly interview with James and the elders of the Church. Now these were the men who, even more than Peter, represented the extreme Judaistic tendency among the responsible authorities. James was, in fact, partly responsible for the conduct of Peter which had brought about his collision with Paul. How are these friendly relations possible with Mark and with James, if for years there had been this bitter feud between Paul and Peter? Moreover, the later references betray no consciousness of this antagonism. Paul and Peter are represented as fellow-labourers and fellow-sufferers who by their combined efforts built up the Church in Rome. We need have no hesitation then in setting aside this theory of irreconcilable antagonism between the two apostles.

We must now return to the developments which followed on the public rebuke to Peter at Antioch. The date of this was presumably in the interval between the return from the council at Jerusalem and Paul's departure with Silas on a fresh missionary tour. For it is scarcely likely to have been later than the rupture between Paul and
Barnabas which led to their separation, since it is questionable if they were ever together again at Antioch. The dispute which led to their separation was, we may well suppose, so sharp as it was because Paul had been deeply annoyed by the defection of Barnabas, while Barnabas might not unnaturally resent the public castigation of Peter which affected all who had followed his example. In itself, however, this had not led to an estrangement, since Paul himself proposed that they should revisit their churches and Barnabas consented to do so. But for the difference about Mark the earlier episode would probably have had no permanent results. But this difference, acting on the suppressed irritation with each other, precipitated the rupture. Distressing as the separation was, it was perhaps all to the good, since, hampered by his senior colleague, Paul might never have struck out into new fields as he did.

The controversy seems to have broken out first in Galatia. That Peter visited the Galatian churches and initiated a campaign against Paul we have already seen to be highly improbable. But Judaising agitators had invaded the Church. They professed a warm interest in Paul's converts, they fascinated their simple susceptible victims who now desired to be under the Law, to submit to the rite of initiation into the Jewish covenant. Misguided simpletons! do they not realise that to accept circumcision is to renounce all benefit from Christ, to surrender their Christian freedom, to commit themselves to a complete fulfilment of the Law? They made an excellent beginning in the Spirit, and are now seeking perfection in the flesh! Faith had supplied them with all that they needed, why turn aside to the Law by which no man can be justified? So strongly does Paul feel on this perversion of the Gospel that he launches his solemn and repeated anathema against any, be it himself or an angel from heaven, who should dare to pervert it.

But intimately associated with this attempt to impose on his converts a new version of the Gospel, was an attack on the apostle himself. His peculiar position lent itself easily to malicious misrepresentation. His opponents could urge with plausibility and force that the obvious source for an accurate knowledge of the true teaching of Jesus was the band of apostles whom He had trained during His lifetime. Certainly it was not to be learnt from an upstart like Paul, who had begun his career as a persecutor, and who owed whatever correct
information he possessed on the subject to the genuine apostles. Where he diverged from them or added to them he was simply per-
vert ing by his own fancies the genuine truth as it was taught by Jesus. His claim to be an apostle was entirely illegitimate.

In his reply Paul begins by affirming his apostleship derived directly from Christ and God. He next asserts the independence of his Gospel. He had received it from no human source but by revelation from Jesus Christ. Till the time of his conversion he had been a persecutor of the Church and wholly devoted to the Jewish religion. Then God, who had from his birth set him apart for His service, revealed His Son within him. The Divine intention in this had been that he should preach Christ among the Gentiles. But instead of returning to Jerusalem to those who had been apostles before him he had gone away into Arabia and then returned to Damascus. We are probably to understand that during this period he had been preaching, so that his message was clearly not derived from the earlier apostles. Having thus secured the independence of his teaching, he went up to Jerusalem and stayed with Peter for a fortnight. Of the other leaders he saw none with the exception of James the Lord's brother. After this brief stay he left for Syria and Cilicia to prosecute his work and remained unknown to the Judean Churches.

Paul has thus completed his proof of the independence of his Gospel, and for this purpose an account of any further visits to Jerusalem is irrelevant. With the second chapter he passes on to a new stage in his argument. He now proceeds to show that his presentation of the Gospel was endorsed by the leaders of the Church at Jerusalem who had no addition to suggest to it, who recognised his mission among the Gentiles, and gave to him and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship. He then advances to a third stage and relates how when Peter had been intimidated by the strict Judaists and had been followed in his retreat from the gospel of freedom by the other Jewish Christians and Barnabas, he had pressed home on Peter his inconsistency and demonstrated that justification came not by the law but through faith.

The Acts of the Apostles preserves no record of this Galatian episode and we are not definitely informed as to the issue. Some uncertainty must rest on the matter owing to the uncertainty of the date to which the Epistle should be assigned. But the probability that Paul won the churches back to their allegiance is great. The very
preservation of the Epistle favours this; and at a later date, as it would seem, Paul speaks of the churches in Galatia as sharing in the collection for the poor Christians at Jerusalem (1 Cor. xvi. 1, cf. Acts xx. 4).

We must now turn to the condition of things in the Church of Corinth. According to the usual and probably correct view there were four parties in the Church of Corinth calling themselves by the names of Paul, Apollos, Peter and Christ. We are not concerned with the first two of these. The party of Peter was probably composed of Judaizing Christians who had possibly been in personal contact with Peter, but in any case appealed to him as the real leader of the Church. They do not, however, appear to have followed the tactics adopted by the agitators in Galatia. They did not, it would seem, insist on circumcision and submission to the Law. The real significance of the "Christ party" has been much debated, and despairing of reaching any tenable interpretation some have resorted to the expedient of striking out the words "and I of Christ." So drastic an expedient, however, is scarcely required by the real difficulty of the phrase. I do not feel that I can accept any view with confidence but I may repeat what I have said elsewhere: "Possibly the party consisted of those who had known Jesus during His early life, though we should perhaps have expected, 'I of Jesus' rather than 'I of Christ.' Possibly their watchword expressed their dislike of the position accorded to human leaders, and disowned every leader but Christ. Since, however, this intrinsically sound attitude apparently falls under the same blame as the rest, they must have asserted their freedom from partisanship in a partisan way."¹ But there is nothing in the First Epistle to justify the view that there was any specifically Judaistic agitation in Corinth at this time. In 2 Corinthians the presence and activity of the Judaizers in the Church of Corinth is evident. It is especially in the last four chapters (x. i-xiii. 10) that the references to them occur. These chapters probably form part of the severe Epistle sent to Corinth as Paul's ultimatum to the Church which caused him so much anxiety when it had been sent, as he relates in 2 Cor. i-vii. He does not mince his words in speaking of his opponents. They are "false apostles, deceitful workers, fashioning themselves into apostles of

¹Peake's Commentary, p. 833.
Christ.” They preach another Jesus and impart a different spirit. They are the ministers of Satan. They taunt the apostle with the courage he displays in his absence and the humble tone he adopts when he is face to face with the Church. “His letters, they say, are weighty and strong; but his bodily presence is weak and his speech of no account.” His refusal to accept any support from them was explained in a sinister way. His failure to visit Corinth, as he had promised, is set down to cowardice. They do not seem to have put circumcision and the Law forward as had been done in Galatia. These requirements they probably kept in reserve, meaning first to undermine the authority of Paul and then to press them on the Church.

Paul’s reply is unparalleled in his letters. Nowhere else in his correspondence can we match the wealth of irony, sarcasm and invective. If his other letters could be characterised as weighty and strong, this letter goes far beyond them in these features. But his exasperation with his opponents is combined with mingled feelings towards his converts. They do not escape the lash, but the love which Paul feels for them finds tender expression. And though he is too proud to vindicate himself except with reluctance, yet he feels that he is forced to meet the depreciation, falsehood and innuendo of his critics by a detailed statement of his labours, his sufferings and the visions and revelations by which he has been favoured. So eminent indeed had these been that a tormenting physical affliction had been Divinely sent that he might not be unduly exalted. He deserved better from his converts than he had received from them. It is to him that they owe their knowledge of Christ and yet they are treating him with less consideration than they give to his enemies. He has been no burden to them nor will he be; rather will he spend his substance and himself in their service.

This letter brought the majority at least of the Church back to its allegiance and this glad news brought by Titus restored to the distracted apostle the peace of mind which he had lost since the letter went irretrievably out of his hands. That it was preserved by the Church is further proof that it had not failed of its desired effect.

There are echoes of the controversy in the Epistle to the Romans written about the same time. The systematic exposition of his doctrine is conditioned by the controversy, and at various points explicit
reference is made to the criticisms and even the slanders of his opponents. The community to which the letter was addressed seems to have consisted for the most part of Gentile Christians, though it would naturally contain some Jewish Christians or proselytes. At the close he refers to those who cause divisions and occasions of stumbling contrary to the doctrine which the readers had been taught. He charges them with self-seeking and with beguiling the simple by their insinuating speech. It is the Judaisers, presumably, whom he has in mind.

After the writing of this Epistle Paul carried out his purpose of visiting Jerusalem, taking the collection for the poor Christians of the mother Church, to which he had devoted so much attention. He had a friendly reception from James and the other authorities of the Church; but in view of the reports which were in circulation about him that he taught the Jews in Gentile communities to refrain from circumcising their children and observing the Jewish mode of life, they suggested that he should participate in the completion of a Nazirite vow which had been taken by four Christian Jews and thus demonstrate the falsity of the rumours and his own adhesion to the Law. They communicated to him the four prohibitions which, in the Apostolic Decree, they had imposed on Gentile Christians. Paul accepted this advice, and on the false suspicion that he had taken a Gentile, Trophimus, into the Temple he was seized in the Temple and, but for the intervention of Claudius Lysias, the chief captain, he would have been killed. We are not concerned with his trouble with the Jews, but he was kept in confinement for two years and on appealing to Caesar was sent to Rome. His reception by members of the Roman Church was friendly, from which we may infer that the Church was not, under Peter's influence, dominated by hostility to Paul.

In the Epistles generally believed to have been written by Paul from Rome it is only in Philippians that we have an attack on the Judaisers. This occurs in a section iii. 2-iv. 1 which has been thought by several scholars to be a fragment of another Epistle.\(^1\) Moreover, the Epistle to the Philippians itself has been believed by some

authorities to have been written at Caesarea. To add to our uncertainties the theory is rapidly growing in favour that the Epistle to the Philippians was written during Paul's stay at Ephesus and belongs therefore to the same period of his life as the letters to Corinth and Rome. If the generally accepted view is correct it would seem either that Paul had been specially provoked by the Judaisers in Rome itself or had received some intimation that his readers might experience trouble from them. It is in favour of the former view that earlier in the Epistle he complains of those who preach Christ out of envy and strife, hoping by their factious conduct to make Paul's lot in his imprisonment more burdensome to him. In any case the outburst in Phil. iii. 2-iv. 1 is one of the fiercest which has come to us from his pen. He describes the Judaisers as dogs and evil workers, enemies of the cross of Christ, with their minds set on earthly things, self-seekers who are destined to perdition.

We know nothing in detail of any further conflict with the Judaisers. Whether Paul's imprisonment in Rome closed with his release or his execution is still in dispute. In any case his race was now nearly run. We cannot overestimate the service which in his steadfast struggle with the legalists he rendered to Christianity and the Church. But for his clear insight into the grave issues which were at stake, his freedom from the fear of men and undue deference to authority, his courage and tenacity, the new religion might have been fatally stranded in a backwater of Judaism. It was of great moment that before the destruction of Jerusalem he had disengaged Christianity from Judaism and liberated Gentile Christianity from the bondage of the Law. That the Church has but imperfectly learnt the lesson its

1 Two points are involved: (a) Did Paul suffer an imprisonment during his residence at Ephesus? (b) Was Philippians written during that imprisonment? E. Meyer (p. 482) says the hypothesis of an Ephesian imprisonment rests simply on modern invention, but it has gained a considerable vogue in recent years. See in particular the elaborate list of books and articles in Deissmann's *Paul*, second ed., pp. 17 f. For the English reader the best discussion is probably C. R. Bowen's *Are Paul's Prison Letters from Ephesus?* in the "American Journal of Theology" for 1920. Those who believe that Paul was imprisoned at Ephesus are not agreed as to whether all the Imprisonment Epistles were composed during that confinement, and if not all, then which? A. H. McNeile (*op. cit.*, pp. 170-172), and in much fuller detail J. H. Michael (*op. cit.*, pp. 12-21), have recently advocated the view that Philippians was written by Paul while in prison at Ephesus.
greatest theologian taught it is only too evident from its history; but in his glorious writings we can still refresh our spirits and renew our flagging energy. Across the centuries which separate us from him we can still hear his ringing challenge: “For freedom did Christ set us free, stand fast therefore and be not entangled again in a yoke of bondage.”
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