

PAUL'S SECOND JOURNEY TO JERUSALEM IN THE
EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS AND THE ACTS
OF THE APOSTLES: A SURVEY OF THE
PROPOSED SOLUTIONS

by Lucille B. Pummer

Thesis presented to the School of Graduate Studies
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of Master of Arts in Religious Studies

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA
OTTAWA, CANADA, 1976



UMI Number: EC55280

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI Microform EC55280
Copyright 2011 by ProQuest LLC
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
CURRICULUM STUDIORUM	v
INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter	
I. EXEGESIS	6
1. Galatians 2:1-10	7
2. Acts 11:27-30 and 15:1-30	31
A. Acts 11:27-30	31
B. Acts 15:1-30	34
II. PROPOSED SOLUTIONS	45
Introductory Remarks	45
1. No Correspondence between Gal. 2:1-10 and Acts	51
A. F. C. Baur	51
B. T. W. Manson	72
2. Gal. 2:1-10 Equals Acts 15:1-30	82
A. J. B. Lightfoot and His Supporters	82
(a) J. B. Lightfoot	82
(b) J. B. Lightfoot's Supporters	96
(i) E. de W. Burton	96
(ii) J. G. Machen	97
(iii) J. A. Allan	99
(iv) R. Ridderbos	99
(v) O. Cullmann	100
(vi) P. Parker	101
B. M. Dibelius	104
C. E. Haenchen	110
3. Gal. 2:1-10 Equals Acts 11:27-30 and 12:25. Wm. M. Ramsay	120
4. Gal. 2:1-10 Equals Acts 11:27-30 and 12:25 Plus Acts 15:1-30	129
A. Kirsopp Lake	129
B. P. Benoit	138
5. Gal. 2:1-10 Equals Acts 15:1-29 in Place of Acts 18:22	139
John Knox	139

Chapter	
III. METHODOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES	150
Introductory Remarks	150
1. F. C. Baur--"Tendency Criticism"	156
2. J. B. Lightfoot and Wm. M. Ramsay-- Traditional Approach	164
3. K. Lake--Source Criticism	176
4. M. Dibelius--Literary and Style Criticism .	179
5. E. Haenchen--Redaction Criticism	187
CONCLUSION	198
.	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	202
TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS	211

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis was prepared under the direction of Professor Carl Kazmierski of the Department of Religious Studies of the University of Ottawa. Sincere gratitude is here expressed to him for his continued assistance, advice, interest and encouragement.

CURRICULUM STUDIORUM

Lucille B. Pummer (Roth) was born November 1, 1939, in Medicine Hat, Alberta. She received her Teacher's Certificate in 1961, from Valleyfield Normal School in Valleyfield, Province of Quebec. She received the Bachelor of Arts (Honours) degree from the University of Ottawa in 1969.

INTRODUCTION

One of the most difficult problems of New Testament exegesis is the passage Gal. 2:1-10 and its relationship to the Acts of the Apostles. The literature on it is not only vast but also most variegated, comprising a great number of different theories or hypotheses. In Gal. 2:1-10 Paul speaks about his second journey to Jerusalem and the events that took place at this occasion, events that seem to be recounted also in Acts. The problems raised by these accounts concern the question of the "Apostolic Council," Paul's mission to the Gentiles, the necessity or non-necessity of circumcision, and the collection of money for the poor of Jerusalem. Numerous scholars have tried to find a satisfactory solution for the extremely complex situation presented by the differences between Paul's account in Gal. 2:1-10 and the accounts given in the Acts.

Paul's Damascus experience was not only decisive in his conversion, but also in shaping his faith and gospel. Of prime importance in connection with this gospel was his mission to the Gentiles. He had received it from Christ in a special revelation to him (Rom. 15:15 f.; Gal. 2:2-9). In proclaiming the freedom of Christianity from Judaism Paul came into conflict with those who wanted to impose the law on the Gentile converts to Christianity. These legalists

are the so-called Judaizers.

Paul's commission to preach the gospel to the Gentiles as well as his arguments with the Judaizers are thrown into sharp focus in his Epistle to the Galatians, in particular in the passage 2:1-10. Although the various explanations which try to harmonize Galatians and Acts "are hypothetical and raise as many questions as they answer,"¹ a study of Acts in connection with Gal 2:1-10 is indispensable. Not only the actual equations between Galatians and Acts must be examined, but also, and above all, the wider approach to, and the underlying and often implicit assumptions of a philosophical, theological and historical nature in, a study of the New Testament scriptures in general and the problem under discussion in particular. In this way, the study of the specific problem of possible equations between Galatians and Acts can be seen as having a wider significance, viz., that of highlighting the development of the modern critical investigation into the New Testament.

From this follows the structure of the paper. An introductory chapter will present a brief exegesis of Gal. 2:1-10 verse by verse, and of those sections of Acts which are compared with the above mentioned passage in Galatians.

The second chapter will present five different solutions to the problem delineated above. They represent the major possibilities that have been proposed in the

¹J. L. McKenzie, "Acts of the Apostles," in Dictionary of the Bible, Milwaukee, Bruce Publishing Co., 1965, p. 11.

course of the critical research into this particular problem in the New Testament. It will become apparent that scholars can be grouped according to which solution they adopt.

The first solution proposes that Gal. 2:1-10 has no counterpart in the Acts of the Apostles. Within this section two approaches emerge. F. C. Baur and his followers develop one approach while T. W. Manson presents another. Since F. C. Baur's solution was of particular significance because of his critical and historical approach as well as the fact that he initiated Tendenz criticism in New Testament studies a longer exposé will be presented.

In the second solution, viz., Gal. 2:1-10 is the same as Acts 15:1-30, there appears a continuum up to the present day of the approach applied by J. B. Lightfoot, except for differences on minor points. Parallel to Lightfoot's approach, for the last fifty years, a new method was employed. Therefore, the treatment of this solution will be extensive so as to clarify the type of continuum that exists and the possibility of arriving at the same solution from a different approach.

As for the third solution, Gal. 2:1-10 equals Acts 11:27-30 and 12:25, the proposed explanations presented by Wm. M. Ramsay will indicate the role archaeology played at this time and the influence Ramsay had and still has on British New Testament scholars. This solution, along with the second one, has been maintained by the greatest number of scholars over the years and therefore demands careful

consideration in this paper.

The remaining solutions are treated briefly; the reason for this is that, although they do suggest possible alternatives, they are less well supported and find, therefore, fewer scholars who accept them.

The authors who follow one of the major positions are listed in the footnotes so as not to overburden the text with enumerations of supporters.

In order to develop the solutions adequately some indications of the methods that were applied to arrive at the various equations were necessary; thus, there will be a slight amount of overlapping between the second chapter and the third. More specifically, Baur as the starting point of the investigation had to be discussed in a fairly detailed way. This meant that the discussion of some material which could have been included in chapter three had to be anticipated in chapter two.

Chapter three will focus on the methods used and their implicit or stated presuppositions. It will also show the logic of the sequence of the various approaches that followed each other and their strengths and weaknesses. Thus, even though the chapter is organized according to authors, the latter's names stand at the same time for a new "programme" or approach.

This survey will be based on the literature in English, with the exception of some important French and German works.

The translation of the Bible which will be used is that of the Revised Standard Version.

It is hoped that in the present work a contribution can be made by means of a clarification of the present positions and methods, pointing out their roots and the reasons for their development. A "final" solution, if there is one at all, to the many problems connected with the passages discussed is still to be found.

CHAPTER I

EXEGESIS

Exegetes, both past and present, have dealt with the difficult problem of determining the relationship of Paul's account of the second visit to Jerusalem (Gal. 2:1-10) with Acts. The question arises as to whether it is possible to find an account of a visit to Jerusalem by Paul in the Acts of the Apostles that is relating the same event as Paul does in Gal. 2:1-10. In order to understand the various suggested solutions for the above mentioned problem, it is necessary to examine Gal. 2:1-10 and the sections of Acts which are used when making comparisons. The importance of a critical analysis of the entire pericope of Gal. 2:1-10 is that Paul's own account of the council is considered herein as the primary source of the event. Thus, the exegetical study, i.e., the study of the textual problems, ambiguities, and understandings or interpretations of the section of Galatians will establish the reference point from which comparisons with Acts can be made. Furthermore, the exegesis of Galatians will highlight the areas of dispute which arise when various verses of Acts are equated with Paul's version of the Jerusalem meeting. Establishing Paul's account of the council as the primary source does not indicate that Paul's report of

the event is an absolutely objective report, i.e., not influenced by Paul's perspective or intention for writing Galatians. It is to be noted that in biblical studies as well as in history the principle that is now widely held is that all reports are interpretations of the event, "brute facts" never exist, for as soon as an event occurs it is put into a context of some kind. This is understanding interpretation in its broadest sense, thus neither establishing nor denying the historical value of the report.

The sections of Acts that are studied are selected because of their impact on the comparisons examined in the next chapter.

The method followed for the development of this section is a study of Gal. 2:1-10 verse by verse with an emphasis on those passages or words which create a difficulty. As for the part on Acts, the emphasis will be on those passages that raise problems when comparing them with Gal. 2:1-10.

1. Galatians 2:1-10

Galatians 1 and 2 are usually termed an "autobiography of Paul." It is here that Paul defends his gospel, reaffirms the divine origin of it, sets out his contacts and relationship with the Jerusalem church, and emphasizes the acceptance of his gospel by the latter.

V. 1. Then after fourteen years I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, taking Titus along with me.

(1) This is the third time, the other two being Gal. 1:18 and 1:21, that Paul uses the particle of sequence (ἔπειτα--then) which would suggest that it is the next important event in Paul's career.¹ Thus, it would indicate that since the first visit to Jerusalem recorded in Gal. 1 there was no other contact with the Jerusalem apostles until then, Gal. 2. However, the scholars who hold the North Galatian theory² explain that this exclusion of other meetings is only with regard to the apostles not the entire Jerusalem church.

(2) The word δὲ raises certain questions. What can δὲ mean here when the main verb is positive and aorist? According to J. Bligh we have "sufficient evidence that δὲ with the genitive can mean 'after' [examples from Herodotus, VI, 118 and, Deut. 9:11]."³ S. Giet believes that δὲ

¹Cf. D. Guthrie, Galatians, London, Nelson, 1969, p. 77.

²Since the reference to Galatia is ambiguous, the scholars raise the question regarding who was addressed in this Epistle. Was Paul writing his Epistle to the people who lived in the actual region of Galatia (North Galatian Theory or Territory Theory); or, to the people who lived in the southern part of the area, thus the term Galatia being a reference to the Roman province which incorporated not only the region of Galatia but Lycaonia and Pisidia as well (South Galatian Theory or Provincial Theory). See W. G. Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament, New York, Abingdon Press, 1966 (trans. from 14th rev. German ed. 1965), pp. 191-193, for a summary of the chief arguments for the above mentioned theories.

³J. Bligh, Galatians in Greek, Detroit, University of Detroit Press, 1966, p. 100.

with the genitive means "during (the course of)"⁴ as it does elsewhere in Paul's writings. Thus, according to J. Bligh, with the use of the word "again," δὲ would suggest that this visit to Jerusalem should be dated fourteen years after his conversion. As Bligh states, basing his understanding on Moule's explanation of δὲ, dia intimates a "lapse of a very long time or 'takes the mind through' a very long time. . . . If this 'council' was still a very recent event at the time of writing, δὲ would be the more natural preposition to use."⁵

However, J. B. Lightfoot, along with others, such as E. Burton⁶ and H. Ridderbos,⁷ argue that the fourteen years should be counted from the Jerusalem visit recorded in the first chapter of Galatians and not from Paul's conversion. J. B. Lightfoot bases his view on the considerations, first, that the length of the interval during which Paul does not see the Jerusalem apostles is stressed and,

⁴S. Giet, "Les trois premiers voyages de Saint Paul à Jérusalem," Recherches de Science Religieuse, Vol. 41, 1953, p. 323.

⁵Bligh, Galatians, p. 100.

⁶E. Burton, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, New York, Scribner's Sons, 1920, p. 68.

⁷H. Ridderbos, The Epistle of Paul to the Churches of Galatia, London, Marshall, Morgan and Scott (3rd ed.), 1961 (1st English ed. 1953), p. 76. H. Schlier considers it also most probable that the fourteen years are to be counted from Paul's first visit to Jerusalem (Der Brief an die Galater, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1971 [original 1949], p. 64 f.)

second, that the expressions employed in the passage indicate this.

. . . the use of διὰ δ. ἐτῶν, in preference to μετὰ δ. ἐτη, implies that the whole interval was a blank as far as regards the matter in hand, the intercourse of St Paul with the Twelve, and the words πάλιν ἀνέβην, "again I went up," refer us back to the former visit, as the date from which the time is reckoned.⁸

The considerations of Bligh and Lightfoot and others who hold similar positions are important for the reconstruction of Paul's chronology and the impact it has on Paul--Acts studies.

(3) The word πάλιν is usually understood as indicating Paul's next visit; however it does not exclude the possibility of an intervening visit. Nonetheless, as D. Guthrie mentions and G. S. Duncan and J. B. Lightfoot stressed, a complete recounting of the visits to Jerusalem seems to be demanded by Paul's argumentation.⁹

The question then arises "how is this visit to Jerusalem to coincide with Acts' accounts of Paul's visits to Jerusalem?". J. Fitzmyer indicates in the commentary of Galatians that, "Correlation of this visit to Jerusalem with the data in Acts constitutes one of the most difficult

⁸J. B. Lightfoot, The Epistles of St Paul: Galatians, London, Macmillan, 1914 (rev. text with Introduction, Notes and Dissertations), p. 102.

⁹Guthrie, Galatians, p. 77; also see G. S. Duncan, The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1955 (1st ed. 1934), p. xxiv, and Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 28 and 102. Cf. Ridderbos, Galatians, p. 77.

exegetical problems of the NT."¹⁰ Is Paul in Galatians recounting all his visits to the Jerusalem church or only those visits which would show the agreement of the apostles with him and his independence as an apostle? Are the sources to be considered historically reliable?

(4) Barnabas, (Βαρνάβας), was a Cypriote Levite named Joseph and called Barnabas (Acts 4:36) by the apostles. From Acts 13:1-14:28, it can be concluded that Barnabas accompanied Paul on his first missionary journey, that is, up to the Jerusalem council. After the council their partnership broke (Acts 15:39-40). Barnabas is presented in Gal. 2:1-10 as an equal with Paul.

(5) Titus (Τίτον), was a Gentile Christian who according to 2 Cor. 3:13; 7:6, 13-14; 8:6, 16, 23; 12:18 reconciled the Corinthian church and Paul and organized the church in Crete (Tit. 1:4). It must be considered then that Titus, an uncircumcised Christian, must have been known by a certain section of the Gentile church. The phrase "taking Titus along with me" places Titus in a subordinate position to Barnabas and Paul. Though Paul gives no reason at this point in his letter as to why he has "taken along" Titus, the following verses suggest that Titus was taken as a test case. Thus, most commentators would say that Titus is named here specifically because of the dispute which

¹⁰J. Fitzmyer, "The Letter to the Galatians," in J. Fitzmyer and R. E. Brown (Eds.), The Jerome Biblical Commentary, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice Hall, 1968, Vol. 2, p. 239.

arose over his being uncircumcised.¹¹

V. 2. I went up by revelation; and I laid before them (but privately before those who were of repute) the gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, lest somehow I should be running or had run in vain.

(1) According to Paul, in the phrase "I went up by revelation," the initiative to journey to Jerusalem came from God by a revelation. The exact method by which Paul received the revelation, i.e., directly or through some person is not stated. And further, as Burton states, it cannot be established "whether the word is here used indefinitely, referring to a (specific) revelation, or with merely qualitative force, describing revelation as the method"¹² whereby he was able to determine whether he should travel to Jerusalem. This phrase continues Paul's development of thought, that is, his statement of his independence from the Jerusalem apostles. The mentioning of the revelation shows that he was not summoned by the Jerusalem church.¹³ In Acts 15:2 the reason given for Paul's journey to Jerusalem was the community decision to do so by the church of Antioch.¹⁴ Thus, the above mentioned motivations for Paul's journey to Jerusalem cause conflict when comparing Galatians with Acts. Some see this statement

¹¹Cf. Burton, Galatians, p. 69; also, Guthrie, Galatians, p. 77 f., and Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 102. Note the discussion regarding Titus in V. 3 on pp. 11-13.

¹²Burton, Galatians, p. 70.

¹³Cf. Guthrie, Galatians, p. 78.

¹⁴See below, p. 35.

as one more proof that Gal. 2:1-10 cannot be considered as the same visit as that mentioned in Acts 15. Others, for example J. B. Lightfoot, explain this discrepancy by mentioning that "the revelation either promoted or confirmed the decision of the Church."¹⁵

(2) The words "and I laid before them" mean that Paul laid before the Jerusalem Christians the content of his preaching. Here, Paul seems to be much more concerned about presenting the gospel he preached, that is, the importance of Christ's work, the conditions of salvation and the obligations of Christian believers, than about recounting his missionary endeavours.¹⁶

(3) Fitzmyer states that Paul, in the expression "but privately before those who were of repute," tends to degrade the Jerusalem apostles, but nonetheless, acknowledges their authority,¹⁷ whereas, Lightfoot quoting Eur. Hec. 294 with Pflugk's note, Heracl. 897, and Herodian vi., explains that the expression is one of honour without any suggestion of qualification.¹⁸ Though J. Bligh considers the phrase ambiguous, i.e., Paul may or may not have been expressing disparagement or disrespect, and that Paul is

¹⁵Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 102.

¹⁶Cf. Burton, Galatians, p. 70, and Guthrie, Galatians, p. 78.

¹⁷Fitzmyer, "The Letter to the Galatians," p. 239.

¹⁸Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 103; cf. Guthrie, Galatians, p. 78, and Burton, Galatians, p. 71 f.

attempting to profit from the ambiguity,¹⁹ it seems that the evidence quoted above does not leave the phrase ambiguous. Thus, those who wish to find here another proof of opposition between Pauline and Petrine Christianity are using questionable or at the most weak evidence. The expression "those who were of repute" could be the language used by Paul's opponents. The Judaizers may have given authoritative weight to their teaching by saying that it was from the apostles, "those men of repute."²⁰

A problem arises here in the expression that Paul placed his gospel before the apostles in a private meeting. To those who wish to equate this meeting with the Acts 15 account, the difficulty lies in Paul's speaking of a private meeting with the apostles and Acts 15 speaking of a public meeting with the Jerusalem church. Those equating Acts 11:27-30 and 12:25 with Gal. 2:1-10 find the need to explain the difference of the accounts on the point of whom Paul actually contacted, i.e., elders, apostles or the entire Jerusalem church.

(4) Some commentators question whether $\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega$ is indicative or subjunctive.

¹⁹Bligh, Galatians, p. 101.

²⁰Guthrie, Galatians, p. 78; so also Ridderbos, Galatians, p. 81; and G. Kittel, " $\delta\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$," in G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (Eds.); G. W. Bromiley (Trans. and Ed.), Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, Vol. 2, 1964, p. 236.

J. B. Lightfoot observes that it is possible grammatically to take the word $\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega$ as being in the subjunctive and supply the verb of fearing, but then the sense of the statement becomes poor.²¹ Certainly Paul did not doubt or question the gospel he preached; although, as Lightfoot notes, Tertullian takes it to mean just that, adv. Marc. i. 20, v. 3, and esp. iv. 2. However, it seems better to take $\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega$ as indicative. The words must be understood in the following manner. Paul is expressing his fear that the Jewish Christians will undo his past work and hinder his present mission to establish a liberal church, i.e., one free of the Mosaic law, by demanding the fulfilment of the Mosaic ritual by all Christians.²² Certainly Paul does not indicate here that he would have altered his gospel if it had not been approved by the Jerusalem apostles.²³ Paul is not consulting the apostles but trying to convince them of his being an apostle with a mission to the Gentiles. As J. Bligh states:

He took Titus with him as a test case, gave an exposition of his gospel, and then asked: is it in any way possible that I am running or have run my course in vain? He is not seeking reassurance for himself or even for his converts; he is challenging the other apostles to come to a decision about his vocation and mission.²⁴

²¹Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 103 f.; cf. Guthrie, Galatians, p. 78 f.

²²Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 104.

²³Cf. Guthrie, Galatians, p. 79.

²⁴Bligh, Galatians, p. 103.

V. 3. But even Titus, who was with me, was not compelled to be circumcised, though he was a Greek.

(1) The question raised is whether Titus was not compelled to be circumcised but underwent circumcision on his own, or whether Paul means that Titus was not circumcised. The entire meeting was centered on the recognition by the Jerusalem church of the principle that Gentile converts were free from the Mosaic law and were recognized as full-fledged Christians. Titus is mentioned as a Greek most likely to indicate that what was demanded or not demanded of him was typical for all Gentiles.²⁵

As with most commentators, J. B. Lightfoot finds this section of Gal. 2:1-10 the most difficult.

In this conflict of opposing aims and feelings the sense of the passage is well-nigh lost. The meaning of individual expressions is obscure. The thread of the sentence is broken, picked up, and again broken. From this shipwreck of grammar it is even difficult to extricate the main incident, on which the whole controversy hinges. Was Titus circumcised or not?²⁶

²⁵Cf. Guthrie, Galatians, p. 80. See above regarding Titus as a test case, p.11. A contrasting view is that of B. Orchard who says that the controversy of circumcision had nothing to do with Titus ("The Problem of Acts and Galatians," CBQ, Vol. 7, 1945, pp. 377-384).

²⁶Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 104. Two scholars try to resolve the complexities of Gal. 2:3-6, one by stating that there is an ellipsis, cf. B. Orchard, "A New Solution of the Galatian Problem," BJRL, Vol. 28, 1944, pp. 154-174, and "The Ellipsis between Galatians 2,3 and 2,4," Biblica, Vol. 54, 1973, pp. 469-481; and the other refuting the possibility of an ellipsis, viz. A. C. M. Blommerde, "Is There an Ellipsis between Galatians 2, 3 and 2,4?" Biblica, Vol. 56, 1975, pp. 100-102.

Lightfoot's view is that Titus was not circumcised.²⁷ However, Duncan holds that Titus was circumcised but that it was not compulsory; it was a voluntary act. Duncan bases his argument on the verb being emphatic,²⁸ but according to Guthrie the verb "is not placed in an emphatic position in the Greek text."²⁹ For Paul to agree to Titus' circumcision would be to agree with his opponents. This seems very unlikely, for it would go against his own preaching. The better interpretation seems to be that Paul makes reference to Titus' case to show that the Jerusalem apostles did not demand circumcision, thus pointing out the harmonious situation. If the apostles had felt that circumcision was essential for salvation, then, at this meeting they would have had to demand that Titus be circumcised.³⁰

Once again the questions raised by this passage in Galatians affect the correlation with Acts. Acts 11:27-30 does not speak of circumcision and Acts 15:20 demands that the Gentiles keep the decree, i.e., to abstain from food

²⁷Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 104 f.; Burton, Galatians, pp. 75-82; also, S. Wilson, The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission, London, Cambridge University Press, 1973, p. 179 f., n. 7.

²⁸Duncan, Galatians, pp. 42-45. Cf. D. W. B. Robinson, "The Circumcision of Titus, and Paul's 'Liberty,'" Australian Biblical Review, Vol. 12, 1964, pp. 24-42, for an argument which states that Titus was circumcised either with Paul's consent or at his instigation. The explanation for this fact is based on Paul's doctrine of Christian liberty.

²⁹Guthrie, Galatians, p. 79.

³⁰Cf. *ibid.*, and J. Munck, Paul and the Salvation of Mankind, London, SCM Press, 1959 (German ed. 1954), p. 95 ff.

sacrificed to idols, from blood, from the meat of strangled animals and fornication.

V. 4. But because of false brethren secretly brought in, who slipped in to spy out our freedom which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage---

(1) Fitzmyer speaks of the false brethren being those mentioned in Acts 15:5, the Jewish-Christian converts from Pharisaism who demanded that the Gentiles be circumcised and observe the Mosaic law.³¹ Paul refers to the false brethren as not being true Christians thus showing they were not part of the Jerusalem leaders and ordinary members of the Jerusalem church. The passive verb implies that these false brethren were invited in by church members. As to the activity of the false brethren, that becomes their responsibility since the main verb is active. The use of "spy out our freedom" indicates that a serious intrusion was organized.³²

Burton believes that the passage referring to the "freedom we have" is only considered in relationship to circumcision since the question of food arises after the conference in Gal. 2:11-14.³³ Further to this, the "freedom we have in Christ Jesus" was the message of the Epistle to the Galatians, the very thing Paul preached.

³¹Fitzmyer, "The Letter to the Galatians," p. 240.

³²Cf. Guthrie, Galatians, p. 80; also, Burton, Galatians, p. 83 f.

³³Burton, Galatians, p. 82.

The Christians were to find salvation in Jesus not in the Mosaic law. This again raises the questions "If this account is equated with Acts 15 how can the required observance of the decrees be explained?"; "If this account is equated with Acts 11:27-30, how are the different reasons for each of the visits reconciled?"

The sentence structure in this verse is broken by two parentheses which leave the reader uncertain of Paul's meaning. Lightfoot states "the counsels of the Apostles of the Circumcision are the hidden rock on which the grammar of the sentence is wrecked."³⁴

V. 5. to them we did not yield submission even for a moment, that the truth of the gospel might be preserved for you.

(1) Paul speaks of his triumph over the taunts or demands of the Judaizers, in that he did not yield. The truth of the gospel would seem to be the doctrine of grace and the continuance of Christian liberty which was for the Gentile Christians.³⁵

However, there is a textual problem here. There is evidence that representatives of the Western text leave out

³⁴Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 106.

³⁵Cf. *ibid.*, p. 107.

the word "not" (oude).³⁶ This would have the passage read "we did yield to them for an hour." Thus, it would mean that for the expediency of that "hour" Titus was circumcised. The weight of the MS evidence though is in favour of including the word "not."

Duncan followed the Western text in that he believed that Paul conceded to the demand to have Titus circumcised so that Paul and the Gentiles could continue to have table fellowship in Jerusalem.³⁷ However, Guthrie believes that Duncan's answer is only an assumption and that in reality the evidence in Paul's Epistle suggests the opposite. Paul would never have made the concession. The inconsistency observed is on Peter's side when he refuses to continue his habit of eating with the Gentiles (Gal. 2:11 ff.).³⁸

The phrase "truth of the gospel" is Paul's stand to preserve the gospel he preached. This once again points out the contrast between Paul's gospel and the perverted one the Judaizers were spreading.³⁹

³⁶Cf. Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 122. Concerning the term "Western" text and the related problems, see now F. G. Kenyon, The Text of the Greek Bible, London, Duckworth, 1975 (3rd. ed. rev. and augmented by A. W. Adams), p. 208 and 223-244; on p. 243, Kenyon points out that many problems regarding this text family "are as yet far from solution." Also see E. J. Epp, The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1966.

³⁷Duncan, Galatians, pp. 41-45.

³⁸Guthrie, Galatians, p. 81.

³⁹Cf. *ibid.*

V. 6. And from those who were reputed to be something (what they were makes no difference to me; God shows no partiality)--those, I say, who were of repute added nothing to me;

(1) It would seem that here Paul is speaking in a depreciatory manner; however, this is not directed at the apostles but rather at the Judaizers who set up "extravagant and exclusive claims" for the apostles.⁴⁰ There is probably an allusion to the apostles' previous knowledge of Jesus in the flesh. And on these grounds Paul's opponents contend that the Jerusalem apostles are superior to Paul. Paul's reply is that this former knowledge of Jesus makes no difference now, as he also indicates in 2 Cor. 5:16. This thought is further developed by the expression "God shows no partiality."⁴¹

D. M. Hay proposes another interpretation. Paul was trying to clarify for the Galatians the concept that it was not the status of apostleship on which they should accept a judgment from the apostles but rather on the truth of the matter, that is, on the kerygma. For Paul, an essential criterion of apostleship was the preaching of the truth.⁴²

(2) The passage "added nothing to me," according to Lightfoot, shows that the apostles added no new content

⁴⁰Cf. Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 108.

⁴¹Cf. Guthrie, Galatians, p. 82; Burton, Galatians, p. 87; Fitzmyer, "The Letter to the Galatians," p. 240.

⁴²D. M. Hay, "Paul's Indifference to Authority," JBL, Vol. 88, 1969, pp. 42-44.

to Paul's gospel nor did they find his gospel defective. Rather, the apostles recognized Paul's mission.⁴³ Thus, this verse raises a question when relating Acts 15 with Gal. 2:1-10, in that, if nothing was added to Paul's gospel, how are the decrees, mentioned in Acts 15:20 and 29, to be explained?

V. 7. but on the contrary, when they saw that I had been entrusted with the gospel to the uncircumcised, just as Peter had been entrusted with the gospel to the circumcised!

(1) The use of the perfect tense implies that Paul's mission to the uncircumcised is a permanent commission, i.e., a mission entrusted to Paul by God.⁴⁴ The division of the field of labour should not be understood geographically. As Haenchen has shown, to divide the land geographically according to the categories uncircumcised and circumcised is an impossibility.⁴⁵ It is clear that Paul often began evangelizing where there were Jews (Acts 17:1 ff.; 18:4; Rom. 2:10-11).⁴⁶ Thus, it would seem that this phrase was

⁴³Cf. Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 109; see also Duncan, Galatians, p. 49. J. H. Ropes, "The Singular Problem of the Epistle to the Galatians," Harvard Theological Studies, Vol. 14, 1929, p. 32.

⁴⁴Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 109; cf. also Guthrie, Galatians, p. 83; and Burton, Galatians, p. 91.

⁴⁵E. Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1971 (trans. from 14th German ed. 1965), p. 466 f.

⁴⁶Cf. Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 109; and Fitzmyer, "The Letter to the Galatians," p. 240. For the opposite view, see W. Schmithals, Paul and James, London, SCM Press, 1965 (German ed. 1963), pp. 45-51.

to add further weight to Paul's point of view that the mission without the law to the Gentiles was not only recognized but carried authority.⁴⁷

V. 8. (for he who worked through Peter for the mission to the circumcised worked through me also for the Gentiles),

(1) This verse provides the basis for v. 7, thus, once again strengthening the idea that the motivating force was from God but that co-operation and the missionizing activity by Peter as well as himself was necessary. Paul once more stresses the equality of his apostleship. Guthrie suggests that Paul "changes the emphasis from the gospel to the apostolic office to draw more specific attention to the implication that a common apostleship must go hand in hand with a common gospel."⁴⁸

V. 9. and when they perceived the grace that was given to me, James and Cephas and John, who were reputed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, that we should go to the Gentiles and they to the circumcised;

(1) The order of the names in Gal. 2:9 has given rise to much speculation. Why does Paul mention James' name before Cephas and John?

⁴⁷Cf. Haenchen, Acts, p. 467 f.

⁴⁸Guthrie, Galatians, p. 84.

Some MSS, influenced by the superior position of Peter, substituted Πέτρος for Κηφᾶς and put his name first. Note the same substitution in some authorities at 1:18 and 2:11,14; in 2:7-8, however, Πέτρος and Πέτρῳ are the original readings. The view that Peter and Caphas were two different persons is not substantiated by the historical evidence.⁴⁹

An explanation of putting James' name first may actually have four dimensions; Paul respects James as the leader of the Jerusalem community; and in addition, respects James as the brother of Jesus; probably James chaired the meeting in Jerusalem; and maybe even more important, James' support of the Gentile Christians' freedom from the Mosaic law, despite his personal strictness and observance of the law, would have the greatest impact on those demanding the imposition of circumcision on the Gentiles.⁵⁰

As to the use of the Hebrew equivalent of Peter, the emphasis of the cordiality of the Jewish leaders to Paul's gospel seems to be evident.⁵¹ The appearance of John's name in the Pauline Epistle is noteworthy for this is the only time it is mentioned by Paul. This fact lends

⁴⁹R. T. Stamm, "Introduction and Exegesis of Galatians," in The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. X, New York, Abingdon Press, 1953, p. 475.

⁵⁰K. S. Wuest, Galatians in the Greek New Testament for the English Reader, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1966 (1st ed. 1944), p. 66. Cf. Duncan, Galatians, p. 50 f. Duncan presents the opinion that Paul sees James as the brother of Jesus, head of the Jerusalem church and leader of the Jewish-Christian parts. Thus, James' attitude on this occasion was extremely significant and it is this which motivates the order of the names.

⁵¹Cf. Duncan, Galatians, p. 51.

weight to the view that Paul is explicitly mentioning these apostles to emphasize that the most prominent of the church leaders as well as the elders approved his gospel. Once again, this seems to point to a prevailing unity. Furthermore, as Lightfoot notes, this arrangement of names is the same as that found in Acts.⁵² "When St Paul is speaking of the missionary office of the Church at large, St Peter holds the foremost place (ver. 7,8); when he refers to a special act of the Church of Jerusalem, St James is mentioned first (ver. 9)."⁵³ Examples of this arrangement are Acts 12:17, 15:13, 21:18.

(2) The three men, James, Cephas and John, are called "pillars," a word derived from στῦλος, literally meaning pillar or column of a building. It was a natural metaphor in the classics, thus, it would be false to conclude that the apostles were called "pillars" "because of their authority or jurisdiction."⁵⁴ The word most likely implied the meaning: men of distinction and prominence or supporters of the church. The use of "pillars" could be a deliberate avoidance of the term "apostle" and an equally deliberate use of a title which Paul's antagonizers employed when speaking of Peter, James and John.⁵⁵

⁵²Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 109; cf. Guthrie Galatians, p. 85.

⁵³Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 109; cf. Burton, Galatians, p. 95.

⁵⁴Bligh, Galatians, p. 111.

⁵⁵Cf. Duncan, Galatians, p. 50.

(3) The δεξιὰς ἑδωκαν "shaking of hands" or, as expressed in Gal. 2:9, the giving of right hands of fellowship, is a custom to be found in the Greek, Persian and Roman world as well as here, in the Hebrew world. Most likely the Hebrews took it over from some other culture.⁵⁶ Homer uses the expression when describing the pledge of friendship; an inscription from Pergamum (98 B.C.) describes the agreement of a treaty by the giving of hands; images depicting the right hand of fellowship were exchanged as tokens, and Roman coins have been excavated which have the symbol of joined right hands engraved on them.⁵⁷ Philo uses the expression "you will give us the hand of friendship with a bright and cheerful face."⁵⁸ A passage from Tacitus says, "The state of the Lingones had sent, according to an ancient institution, right hands, as gifts to the legions, a signal of good will."⁵⁹

As far as it is possible to determine, the evidence suggests that in all the known instances of the symbolism of joined right hands a similar meaning is implied, thus, it can be said that in the New Testament the meaning of concord and agreement seems to be indicated by the shaking of right

⁵⁶Cf. Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 110; also Burton, Galatians, p. 95 f.

⁵⁷Cf. Wuest, Galatians, p. 66.

⁵⁸Cf. Bligh, Galatians, p. 111.

⁵⁹"Miserat civitas Lingonum vetere instituto dona legionibus dextras, hospitii insigne" (Hist, I, 54). Cf. Wuest, Galatians, p. 66.

hands. Paul uses this symbolism to reemphasize the Jerusalem apostles' approval of his gospel and mission.

(4) Κοινωνία, "fellowship," meaning the agreement acknowledged and ratified by the right hands of fellowship as a partnership.⁶⁰ In this instance it would mean the mutual promise to preach the same gospel which Paul and the apostles held. Moreover, the agreement implicitly included apostolic equality⁶¹ and recognition of Gentile Christians as full-fledged Christians.⁶²

It is essential to note that "the sense required in 2:9 is 'with the understanding that' rather than 'on condition that'. St Paul is not describing a treaty of reconciliation between former antagonists."⁶³ There was not an element of subjection or enforcement of submission by the Jerusalem church leaders, but rather, fellowship, a common ground, and a mutual agreement of the division of labour (Gal. 2:9-10).

The contention that the decision to divide the missionary field into two sectors, Gentile and Circumcised, caused a split rather than unity in the Christian church cannot be maintained; nor can the view that two distinct

⁶⁰Cf. Wuest, Galatians, p. 66.

⁶¹Ibid., p. 67.

⁶²Cf. R. A. Cole, The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians: An Introduction and Commentary, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1965, p. 69.

⁶³Bligh, Galatians, p. 111.

gospels were preached. After all, as was said above,⁶⁴ Paul preached to the Jews before the Gentiles each time he began preaching in a new place. On the other hand, Peter preached to the Gentiles in Cornelius' household and in Syrian Antioch (Acts 10).

V. 10. only they would have us remember the poor, which very thing I was eager to do.

(1) μόνον, "only" in "only they would have us remember the poor" appears to indicate qualification or emphasis such that nothing additional would supplement the gospel which Paul presented at the gathering. It also implies that one point of the discussion was highlighted, that was the care of the poor.⁶⁵

(2) "Remember," from μνημονεύω in this instance means "to care for" or "benefit." The manner in which the word is used, i.e., present tense, implies that Paul and Barnabas should continue to remember the poor.⁶⁶ Now whether one can go as far as Wuest to say that "Paul and Barnabas had done this before when they brought relief to the poor at Jerusalem on a previous occasion (Acts 11:27-30)"⁶⁷ depends on how the chronological evidence in Paul's Epistles and Acts is combined. The verse may indicate

⁶⁴See p. 22.

⁶⁵Cf. Burton, Galatians, p. 99.

⁶⁶Cf. Guthrie, Galatians, p. 86; also Burton Galatians, p. 99.

⁶⁷Wuest, Galatians, p. 68.

a chronic state of poverty among the Jerusalem community as well as the hope that by supporting those of lesser material goods a bond of unity would be established between the Jerusalem community and the Gentile Christians. It was not an emergency step, since the collection took longer than a year, but rather an establishment of a custom or principle of continuous support.⁶⁸

(3) The phrase ἐσπούδασα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι "I was eager to do," is ambiguous, deliberately or undeliberately remains open to question. Either it refers to Paul's attitude of eagerness to make such collections before the agreement in Gal. 2:10 or, as Guthrie states, to his present attitude of willingness to support those in need, i.e., immediately after the Jerusalem meeting and before writing the letter to the Galatians.⁶⁹ Lightfoot feels that this phrase refers to both his past concern for the poor (Acts 11:29-30) and his present zeal to answer their request (which can be observed in Rom. 15:26-27; 1 Cor. 16:3; 2 Cor. 9:1 f.; Acts 24:17).⁷⁰

However, Duncan finds the entire tenth verse as proof that this visit of Paul to Jerusalem is the same visit as recorded in Acts 11:29-30.⁷¹ His argument is that

⁶⁸Cf. Wuest, Galatians, p. 68.

⁶⁹Guthrie, Galatians, p. 86.

⁷⁰Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 110 f.

⁷¹Duncan, Galatians, p. 52.

the verb ἐσπούδασα

. . . signifies not mere eagerness, as in the translation, but active engagement in the prosecution of a task. The tense of the verb is aorist (past), indicating probably that the apostle is looking backward--"they were only asking me to do something which had already occupied my attention."⁷²

Thus, for Duncan, Paul is recalling his endeavours to collect relief money which he is now presenting at the Jerusalem visit. In fact, part of the motivation for this visit to Jerusalem, Gal. 2:1-10, according to Duncan, is the presentation of the relief fund.⁷³ This solution once again poses the questions, "For what purpose did Paul journey to Jerusalem?" and "Why does Acts 11:27-30 not mention circumcision?" "Would Titus, an uncircumcised Gentile Christian and subordinate, have been brought along to Jerusalem if the question of circumcision was not going to be raised?"

These are the main aspects of the exegesis of the pericope Gal. 2:1-10 as they relate to the problem of comparing Paul's account with Acts. As will become clear in chapter two, different interpretations either of the text as a whole or of passages thereof, or even of single phrases and expressions, are used by various scholars to construct their respective hypotheses. As was pointed out in the Introduction, Paul's account is seen as primary. Consequently, attention has to be focused on it. This explains

⁷²Duncan, Galatians, p. 52.

⁷³Ibid.

the detailed presentation of the exegetical discussion that was given above.

The following section will deal with the relevant passages of Acts.

2. Acts 11:27-30 and 15:1-30

As to the passages of Acts that play a role in the attempted solutions of the problem "Galatians and Acts," the exegesis of only those verses that are directly relevant to the discussions in chapter two will be presented. Whereas, for obvious reasons, in Gal. 2:1-10 every verse is of importance, an exhaustive presentation of the exegesis of Acts 15:1-30 is not required since this pericope contains material that has no bearing on the question under discussion.

A. Acts 11:27-30

V. 27. Now in these days prophets came down from Jerusalem to Antioch.

In this passage Acts seems to indicate that the message of God was passed on to the apostolic church by prophets.⁷⁴ The question is, are these prophets itinerant prophets and, if so, why does Luke use the plural even though it seems that at that time itinerant prophets

⁷⁴Cf. Haenchen, Acts, p. 374; and F. F. Bruce, Commentary on the Book of Acts, London, Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 3rd. ed. 1962 (original ed. 1954), p. 242.

travelled singly.⁷⁵ Considering that Acts states that the prophets were based in Jerusalem, the reference cannot be to itinerant prophets.

It would seem that the passage Acts 11:27-30 is establishing the reason for Paul's and Barnabas' journey to Jerusalem. The difficulty with this solution arises when the Acts' passage is considered as a parallel account of Gal. 2:1-10. The understanding of the passage as a reference to a prophecy forces the account in Gal. 2:2 of the motivation for the visit, i.e., revelation, to be equated with prophecy.⁷⁶

V. 28. And one of them named Agabus stood up and foretold by the Spirit that there would be a great famine over all the world; and this took place in the days of Claudius.

This verse has caused great difficulty in that there were famines and bad harvests in the days of Claudius but none were universal.⁷⁷ Haenchen notes that the mention of Claudius is not to date the famine but to indicate that the prophecy was realized.⁷⁸

⁷⁵Cf. Haenchen, Acts, p. 376.

⁷⁶Bruce, Book of Acts, p. 244, approves of equating the expressions revelation and prophecy.

⁷⁷Ibid., p. 242, makes reference to the classical writers who wrote of famine conditions in the reign of Claudius such as "Suetonius, Life of Claudius xviii. 2. Tacitus, Annals xii. 43; Dio Cassius, History vii. 6. 17."

⁷⁸Haenchen, Acts, p. 374; G. W. H. Lampe, "Acts," Peake's Commentary of the Bible, London, Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962, p. 901.

The famine would be the reason for a collection which would then be considered as the only motivating factor for Paul's journey to Jerusalem. But, why then does Paul raise the issue of circumcision in the Gal. 2:1-10 account?

V. 29. And the disciples determined every one according to his ability to send relief to the brethren who lived in Judea;

The text speaks of a collection which has been hastily gathered to provide immediate relief, although it does not entirely exclude the notion of a lengthier undertaking⁷⁹ as Ramsay suggests.⁸⁰ If this visit by Barnabas and Paul to Jerusalem was to bring the collected monies it would indicate then an accomplished fact.⁸¹

V. 30. and they did so, sending it to the elders by the hand of Barnabas and Saul.

The introduction of the position and function of the elders is abrupt and without any historical evidence of its development. It, thus, conveys the idea that such men performed welfare and social or communitarian supervisory duties thereby releasing the apostles for the task of

⁷⁹Haenchen, Acts, p. 375.

⁸⁰Wm. M. Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 3rd ed. 1897, pp. 49-51, i.e., from winter 43/44 to 46; also, cf. Bruce, Book of Acts, p. 243 f.

⁸¹Bruce, Book of Acts, p. 244, avoids this dilemma of a contradiction between Luke and Paul by rendering Gal. 2:10 as, "Only they asked us to go on remembering their poor, and in fact I had made a special point of doing this very thing."

preaching.⁸²

B. Acts 15:1-30

V. 1. But some men came down from Judea and were teaching the brethren, "Unless you are circumcised according to the custom of Moses, you cannot be saved."

The question provoked by this text is who are these men. Luke uses the wide term "from Judea." Haenchen speaks of them as "Jerusalemite Jewish Christians,"⁸³ F. F. Bruce finds that the men spoken of here are the same as those "certain" who "came from James" as mentioned in Gal. 2:12. These men assumed greater authority than the mandate they received and insisted on the Mosaic law and circumcision as necessary for salvation.⁸⁴

As to the demand for circumcision other traditions than the one used here express it slightly differently. D and syr^{hmg} add "and walk in the ways of Moses," which broadens out the demand and thus, the requirements expected from the Gentiles. The Syriac Didascalia (24) incorporates

⁸²Haenchen, Acts, p. 375; F. F. Bruce suggests that the elders were distinct from the apostles and may have formed a type of Nazarene Sanhedrin, Book of Acts, p. 244, n. 35.

⁸³Haenchen, Acts, p. 443.

⁸⁴Bruce, Book of Acts, p. 303; cf. also C. S. C. Williams, A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles, London, Adam and Charles Black, 1957, p. 179; and Lampe, "Acts," p. 908.

the food regulations.⁸⁵

V. 2. And when Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and debate with them, Paul and Barnabas and some of the others were appointed to go up to Jerusalem to the apostles and elders about this question.

The reason for the journey to Jerusalem appears to be the request of the Antiochian church for a settlement of the circumcision issue. The discussions seem sharp and the word dissension suggests a tense climate of strife and disunity. The phrase "some others" is interpreted by some scholars as a reference to Titus as is mentioned in Gal. 2:1.⁸⁶ However, Haenchen thinks that Luke was indicating that a formal delegation was sent on this important matter.⁸⁷

V. 5. But some believers who belonged to the party of the Pharisees rose up, and said, "It is necessary to circumcise them, and to charge them to keep the law of Moses."

Luke, in this text, indicates that some of the Pharisees demanded submission of the Gentiles to circumcision and the Mosaic law; the Western text identifies the "men who came down from Judea" in verse one with those of

⁸⁵Haenchen, Acts, p. 443, n. 2; cf. also B. M. Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, London, United Bible Societies, 1971, p. 426 f.

⁸⁶Cf. Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 102. Lampe, "Acts," p. 908, states that "If there is a fusion of the story of the two visits, this group could include Titus (Gal. 2:1 ff.) but there is no evidence that Luke knew of him." Haenchen, Acts, p. 443, n. 7, remarks that "those who wish may find here a place for Titus (Gal. 2.1,3), about whom Acts is consistently silent."

⁸⁷Haenchen, Acts, p. 443.

the sect of the Pharisees in the present verse.⁸⁸

V. 6. The apostles and the elders were gathered together to consider this matter.

Luke, as J. Dupont explains,⁸⁹ gives the impression that the leaders of the community met separately. However, vv. 12 and 22 indicate that the debate took place before the entire Christian assembly. Metzger suggests that the gloss of Ephraem in the sry^h text (i.e., after *πρεσβύτεροι* the words *σὺν τῷ πλήθει* were added) was made in the light of vv. 12 and 22 where it speaks of "the assembly" and "the whole church."⁹⁰ Haenchen believes Luke simply wanted to indicate that, when the former Pharisees protested, the apostles and elders acted as the governing body at the meeting.⁹¹

V. 7. And after there had been much debate, Peter rose and said to them, "Brethren, you know that in the early days God made choice among you, that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the gospel and believe.

Peter's speech refers to the baptism of Cornelius which was a way of indicating God's desire for the entrance of the Gentiles into the Way. Lampe remarks that although the meaning of "early days" is obscure it most likely refers

⁸⁸ Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, p. 428; Haenchen, *Acts*, p. 444; and Lampe, "Acts," p. 908.

⁸⁹ J. Dupont, *Les Actes des Apôtres*, Paris, Editions du Cerf, 1958 (2nd rev. ed.), p. 135.

⁹⁰ Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, p. 428.

⁹¹ Haenchen, *Acts*, p. 444.

to the beginning of the Gentile mission.⁹² In this speech Luke has Peter intervene between the small group of dissenters, who could not comprehend the idea of Gentile freedom from the law, and Paul and Barnabas.⁹³

V. 10. Now therefore why do you make trial of God by putting a yoke upon the neck of the disciples which neither our fathers nor we have been able to bear?

Luke concludes that it would be a defilement of God if the Mosaic law were requested of the Gentiles⁹⁴ since it was God who recognized the Gentiles as possible candidates to the Christian community, if they believed in him.⁹⁵ This idea is supported in Matt. 23:4 where the scribes and Pharisees are condemned for burdening men by demanding the observance of the whole law. This same sentiment is expressed by Paul in Rom. 7.

Vv. 16-18.
 'After this I will return,
 and I will rebuild the dwelling of
 David, which has fallen;
 I will rebuild its ruins,
 and I will set it up,
 that the rest of men may seek the
 Lord,
 and all the Gentiles who are called
 by my name,
 says the Lord, who has made these
 things known from of old.'

⁹²Lampe, "Acts," p. 908.

⁹³Haenchen, Acts, p. 445.

⁹⁴Williams, Acts, p. 181.

⁹⁵Haenchen, Acts, p. 446.

The fact that the content of James' speech is derived from the Septuagint text of Am. 9:11 f. which differs from the Hebrew text (that says something contrary to James' idea) is a strong indication of Luke's authorship of the speech. James would certainly not have used the Septuagint text in Jerusalem.⁹⁶

V. 19. Therefore my judgment is that we should not trouble those of the Gentiles who turn to God,

James speaks of freedom from the law for the Gentiles just as Peter did previously in Acts 15:7-11. However, Luke has James present the idea as his personal opinion here, whereas in v. 22 it is presented as a resolution of the apostles, elders and the entire assembly.⁹⁷

V. 20. but should write to them to abstain from the pollutions of idols and from unchastity and from what is strangled and from blood.

The text presents the practices required of the Gentiles who wish to belong to the Christian community. However, the exact same version of the decree does not occur in all the manuscripts.⁹⁸ The Greek version, that is,

⁹⁶ Metzger, A Textual Commentary, p. 429; Haenchen, Acts, p. 448.

⁹⁷ Haenchen, Acts, p. 449.

⁹⁸ Metzger, A Textual Commentary, pp. 430-434; C. S. C. Williams, Alterations to the Text of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts, Oxford, B. Blackwell, 1951, pp. 72-74; and Wm. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, A Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1957 (trans. and augmented ed. 1952), αἵμα p. 32, πνικτος p. 686, πορνεία p. 699 f., χοιρος p. 891.

all unicals except D mention "what is strangled" but do not include the "golden rule," whereas Dd, Iren, and Cypr do not mention "what is strangled" but add the golden rule. Haenchen perceives the four obligations as a concession⁹⁹ and not a legal imposition on the Gentile Christians. Furthermore, Haenchen, along with others,¹⁰⁰ explains the decree in a ritual sense.

The "pollution of idols" comes about through eating flesh sacrificed to heathen gods; "fornication" here refers to marriage in prohibited degrees of relationship, which the rabbis designated as "forbidden on account of unchastity" (Billerbeck 11, 729); "what is strangled" denotes flesh slaughtered other than ritually; "blood" means partaking of blood.¹⁰¹

These conditions are most likely those which are mentioned in Lev. 17:8-13 and 18:6-18 which are prescribed for the

⁹⁹Haenchen, Acts, p. 449; so does M. Dibelius, Studies in the Acts (ed. H. Greeven), London, SCM Press, 1956, p. 97.

¹⁰⁰The following scholars maintain that the prohibitions were originally conceived of in a ritual nature: J. Weiss, Earliest Christianity, Vol. 1 (English trans. ed. with new introduction and bibliography by F. C. Grant), New York, Harper and Bros., 1959, pp. 312-315; M. Goguel, La naissance du christianisme, Paris, Payot, 1946, pp. 323-329; A. Wikenhauser, New Testament Introduction, Freiburg, Herder and Herder, 1958 (trans. German 2nd ed. 1956), p. 335 f.; Dibelius, Studies, p. 98, n. 2; Williams, Acts, p. 183; Lampe, "Acts," p. 909; J. Dupont, Etudes sur les Actes des Apôtres, Paris, Editions du Cerf, 1967, p. 140 f.; M. Simon, "The Apostolic Decree and Its Setting in the Ancient Church," BJRL, Vol. 52, 1970, pp. 438-460. For a view that explains the decrees as being ritual and ethical, see J. W. Hunkeler, "The Prohibitions of the Council at Jerusalem," JTS, Vol. 27, 1925-26, pp. 273-283.

¹⁰¹Haenchen, Acts, p. 449.

"strangers" who dwelt among the Israelites.¹⁰² Later rabbis believed that these demands were also among the seven precepts given to Noah's sons.¹⁰³

As C. S. C. Williams¹⁰⁴ states, it seems more likely that a food law, i.e., the decree understood in a ritual sense, was changed into a moral law by later writers as is seen in the Western text rather than the reverse. The words "to abstain from" are more suitable in a food law. Thus, the original text is the Greek version mentioning the four obligations. Dupont considers the problem of the interpretation of the decree as definitely resolved.

S'il est bien difficile de situer le décret apostolique par rapport au Concile de Jérusalem, une question du moins paraît définitivement résolue: les auteurs sont pratiquement unanimes aujourd'hui à considérer comme seul authentique le texte "oriental" du décret (en quatre termes) et à interpréter ses prescriptions dans un sens non pas moral mais rituel. . . . On peut se féliciter qu'un problème au moins semble définitivement élucidé!¹⁰⁵

However, there have been arguments put forward for interpreting the decree in the moral sense, thus understanding

¹⁰²Dupont, Les Actes des Apôtres, p. 141. M. D. Goulder, Type and History in Acts, London, SPCK, 1964, p. 200, thinks that the reference to Lev. 17-18 is of key importance to Luke's theology in Acts. It shows a new fulfilment of the Torah.

¹⁰³Lampe, "Acts," p. 909; Wikenhauser, New Testament Introduction, p. 336.

¹⁰⁴Williams, A Commentary on Acts, p. 183; see also, Lampe, "Acts," p. 909.

¹⁰⁵J. Dupont, Les problèmes du livre des Actes d'après les travaux récents, Louvain, Analecta Lovaniensia Biblica et Orientalia, Ser. 2, Fasc. 17, 1950, p. 70;

the decree to require refraining from idolatry, fornication and murder.¹⁰⁶ This understanding of the decrees seems to be based on a misunderstanding of the situation in the early church. As M. Simon explains, the situation confronted by the apostles and the answer provided by the decree is not that of telling "the Gentile Christians what rule of life they have to obey in order to be saved," but rather it is that of deciding "under what conditions they will be admitted to full religious fellowship with their brethren of Jewish birth."¹⁰⁷ Thus, these conditions are of a ceremonial nature.

V. 21. For from early generations Moses has had in every city those who preach him, for he is read every sabbath in the synagogues.

This verse is a justification for the observance of the decrees by the Gentiles. It argues that from ancient times these prohibitions have provided the minimum law for Gentiles living among the Jews. Dibelius speaks of this

A. Harnack, The Acts of the Apostles, New York, Putman's Sons, 1909, pp. 248-263.

¹⁰⁶K. Lake, Earlier Epistles of St. Paul, London, Revington, 1911, pp. 48-60; J. H. Ropes, "The Text of the Acts," in BC, Vol. 3, London, Macmillan, 1926, pp. 265-269; K. Lake, "Note xvi. The Apostolic Council of Jerusalem," in K. Lake and H. J. Cadbury (Eds.), BC, Vol. 5, Grand Rapids, Baker Book House, 1966 (reprint, 1st ed. 1933), pp. 205-209; A. C. Clark, The Acts of the Apostles, Oxford Clarendon Press, 1970, p. 360 f. Lake, "The Apostolic Council," p. 210, states that "the internal evidence of the decrees indicates that they, or the policy which they embody, belong to a different problem from that with which Luke has connected them."

¹⁰⁷Simon, "The Apostolic Decree," p. 438.

verse as "linguistically and textually unobjectionable" but "among the most difficult in the New Testament"¹⁰⁸ as to context and meaning.

V. 23. with the following letter: "The brethren, both the apostles and the elders, to the brethren who are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia, greeting."

This passage indicates that the letter containing the decree was directed to the Gentiles in Antioch, Syria and Cilicia; however, in Acts 16:4 Luke seems to infer that the application of the decrees had a much wider scope as it did in 15:19. If the decree was for all the Gentiles it is hard to explain then why Galatians, Romans and 1 Corinthians contain no reference to it.¹⁰⁹

V. 29. "that you abstain from what has been sacrificed to idols and from blood and from what is strangled and from unchastity. If you keep yourselves from these, you will do well. Farewell."

The four prohibitions are repeated here in a different sequence and with a varied expression from v. 20. As for the Western text, καὶ πνικτῶν is omitted. The Koine text, in conformity with v. 20, alters it to πνικτοῦ,¹¹⁰ and adds the negative Golden Rule. Bruce regards the prohibition of fornication as an ethical issue in both forms of the texts. However, he recognizes that the word could be applied more specifically, i.e., "of marriage

¹⁰⁸Dibelius, Studies, p. 97.

¹⁰⁹Haenchen, Acts, p. 449 f.

¹¹⁰Ropes, "The Text of Acts," p. 148.

within degrees of blood-relationship or affinity forbidden by the legislation of Lev. 18."¹¹¹ Bruce definitely supports the idea that the decrees were issued. He bases his view on evidence from Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History v. 1:26, where the food laws appear to be observed "as late as A.D. 177 by the churches of the Rhone valley in Gaul which were in close relation with the churches of the province of Asia."¹¹²

To sum up, with regard to Acts the situation is different from Galatians in several respects. First of all, it is not only one pericope that has to be considered as possibly referring to the same event, but two; and, secondly, textual arguments, i.e., accepted text versus Western text, are also used by certain scholars in the debate over the question of interpreting the evidence, especially with regard to the so-called apostolic decree.

The implications of the exegetical problems of the three texts, Gal. 2:1-10, Acts 11:27-30 and 15:1-30, gave rise to the various attempts at understanding the relationship between Paul's account and that of Acts which will be discussed in the following chapter. In the course of this discussion, it will become evident that, in addition to the exegetical problems, methodological assumptions of a theological, philosophical and epistemological nature

¹¹¹Bruce, Book of Acts, p. 315.

¹¹²Ibid., p. 315 f.

played an important role in shaping the theories which were or are proposed to solve the problem under discussion. This latter aspect of the influence of theological and philosophical views will be dealt with systematically in chapter three.

CHAPTER II

PROPOSED SOLUTIONS

Introductory Remarks

This chapter will present the major solutions or results of equating Gal. 2:1-10 with the various Acts' accounts. It will indicate the problems involved in comparing Gal. 2:1-10 and Acts, how the critical analysis of scripture influenced the study of this problem and how one approach and solution set in motion a reaction which resulted in another approach and solution which in turn caused further reactions.

When determining the point of departure for this survey it is necessary to establish who initially treated the question under study with a critical scholarly approach.

From a brief examination of the history of the study of the New Testament, it becomes evident that the problems arising out of the account of the council in Jerusalem in Galatians 2:1-10 and proposed parallel accounts in Acts were first critically analysed by a German scholar of the Tübingen University. Ferdinand Christian Baur (1792-1860) was the man who undertook the task. To discern this, the type of study that preceded Baur's work will be outlined.

The writings in the Early Church and the Middle Ages were basically expository and "only seldom showed interest

in the circumstances of the composition of the NT books in connection with the question of the canon."¹ It is the stage of study which is classified by J. S. Kselman as the "pre-critical period."² This era includes such writers as Marcion, Tatian, Origen, Eusebius, Augustine and Osiander. As to the Reformation years, the Roman Catholics and Reformed Churches produced works on the canon, however not from an objective approach but rather for dogmatic and polemical reasons.

Not until the end of the seventeenth century did a critical study appear. It was at this time that the French Oratorian priest, Richard Simon, introduced textual criticism. Thus, the first attempt to apply the critical method to the New Testament is observed in his works concerning the Histoire critique of the New Testament (1689-93).³ This prepared the way for the future scientific discipline called the Introduction to the New Testament, and hence, to the study of particular questions such as the one which is being examined in this thesis.

Modern criticism, as such, can be seen as the product of the eighteenth century, for the Enlightenment of

¹Kümmel, Introduction, p. 26.

²J. S. Kselman, "Modern New Testament Criticism," in The Jerome Biblical Commentary, Vol. 2, p. 8.

³R. Simon, Histoire critique des principaux commentateurs du Nouveau Testament, depuis le commencement du christianisme jusqu' à nôtre temps, Rotterdam, R. Leers, 1693.

Germany and Deism in England brought a revival of studies with radical results. Both movements were based on a rationalistic philosophy which interpreted all literature, including the Bible, from the perspective of universal laws of human reason. As G. E. Ladd summarizes it:

The religious values in the Bible were not to be found in any divine self-revelation breaking into history but only in the timeless truths contained in the Bible; and these universal truths were to be determined by human reason.⁴

It was the impact of rationalism and R. Simon's previously mentioned work that brought J. D. Michaelis to treat the problems of the origin of the individual New Testament writings historically. Thus, the first Introduction to the New Testament⁵ appeared. H. S. Reimarus (1694-1768), another notable eighteenth century scholar, also attempted to apply critical methods to the New Testament.

Although prejudiced by rationalism's rejection of the supernatural, Reimarus was the first to pierce through the Christological dogma of the Gospels to the real historical Jesus, a concern that has lost none of its urgency in the 20th cent.⁶

⁴G. E. Ladd, The New Testament and Criticism, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1967, p. 41.

⁵J. D. Michaelis, Introduction to the New Testament, 1788 (Einleitung in die göttlichen Schriften des Neuen Bundes, 1750), quoted in Haenchen, Acts, p. 15.

⁶Kselman, "Modern New Testament Criticism," p. 8.

However, it was not until D. Strauss' work, The Life of Jesus,⁷ reached the public in 1835 that we see an awakened interest in the problematics of the type of approach which should be taken when studying the Bible. The results of D. Strauss' investigation stunned and angered the orthodox conservatives and drew academic interest from others.⁸ Unfortunately, D. Strauss did not clarify his critical approach, termed "the mythical interpretation," nor did he treat the scripture texts with a careful historical and literary criticism.⁹ Critics grew in numbers due to the above mentioned inadequacies and radical results.

It is at this point in history that we find F. C. Baur resolved to disclose how unjustifiable and objectionable the prejudices held against the historico-critical method were. He wrote:

⁷D. Strauss, The Life of Jesus, Vols. 1 and 2, St. Clair Shores, Scholarly Press, 1970 (reprint, 1860). Cf. S. Neill, The Interpretation of the New Testament 1861-1961, London, Oxford University Press, 1964, p. 12. S. Neill points out how he sees the effects of Strauss' work, "If Englishmen, having dealt with the mild unorthodoxies of Mr. Pusey, imagined that they could settle down untroubled to the enjoyment of their traditional beliefs, they were destined to undergo before long a rude awakening."

⁸Cf. F. C. Baur, Paul The Apostle of Jesus Christ, His Life and Work, His Epistles and His Doctrine, Vol. 1, London, Williams and Norgate, 1876 (rev. and trans.), p. 2. (Since only one volume was used, reference to the work will omit the volume number.)

⁹Cf. Neill, Interpretation, pp. 13-18.

It must be recognized as a service which the education of the age distinctly called for, and the result of what is said in so many quarters against the work of Strauss is simply to demonstrate the necessity of going still deeper and more thoroughly into the critical process which he began.¹⁰

From the extensive works of F. C. Baur¹¹ one can only conclude as W. F. Howard did in his survey of New Testament scholarship, "the man who was to work a revolution in the study of the New Testament and to reconstruct the history of the first Christian centuries was Ferdinand Christian Baur."¹²

For Baur,¹³ no tradition was allowed to remain unquestioned even if it was considered sacred or had an impressive list of later authorities supporting it. The evidence for the sources was sought and the value or

¹⁰Baur, Paul, p. 2 f.

¹¹For an extensive bibliography of Baur's works, see P. C. Hodgson, The Formation of Historical Theology, New York, Harper and Row, 1966, pp. 285-291.

¹²W. F. Howard, The Romance of New Testament Scholarship, London, Epworth Press, 1949, p. 33; see also, V. P. Furnish, "The Historical Criticism of the New Testament: A Survey of Origins," BJRL, Vol. 56, 1974, pp. 336-370, for a survey and analysis of the works and movements which prepared the ground for the rise of New Testament criticism.

¹³Cf. Howard, Romance, pp. 33-44, for a summary of F. C. Baur's life and work. Hodgson, Formation, is the first full-length study of Ferdinand Christian Baur to appear in English. Hodgson points out in his preface, p. xi, that "This work represents an inclusive attempt to understand Ferdinand Christian Baur (1792-1860) and his conception of the nature of historical theology--its necessity, its dogmatic principles, its methodology, and its contents and results. The question which underlies the presentation concerns the place historical study should occupy in Christian theology, or the relation between historical knowledge and faith. The chief sources for this study are Baur's major books, monographs, and published lectures."

reliability of each source was weighed.¹⁴ Baur gave a new orientation to the discipline, i.e., to the Introduction to the New Testament. This science he defined as

. . . criticism of the canon or as the science whose task is to investigate the provenance and the original character of the canonical writings. The origin of the individual NT writings should be understood in respect to the great context of the spiritual conflicts of the apostolic and post-apostolic ages and their settlement in the unity of early Catholicism.¹⁵

Baur believed that the Epistles of St. Paul must be the point of departure for any critical work on the New Testament. These records, i.e., the Epistles, were considered as the earliest Christian writings and, therefore, should contain not only evidence of the earliest Christian community life but also traces of Jesus Christ which could be perceived through the author's expressions of faith and descriptions of Jesus of Nazareth. Thus, Baur believed the origins of Christianity could possibly be unveiled.

Baur emphasized that the most important study in the New Testament is the critical analysis of that material which brings to light the life of Jesus, i.e., the gospel history. Next to this in importance is the examination of how Christianity broke from Judaism and developed into a religious movement of world-wide significance. It is in this latter inquiry that Paul's Epistles provide much of the source material, as Baur strongly emphasizes.

¹⁴Cf. Baur, Paul, p. vii.

¹⁵Kümmel, Introduction, p. 27.

That Christianity, in the universal historical importance which it achieved, was the work of the Apostle Paul is undeniably a matter of historical fact; but in what manner he brought this about, how we are to conceive of his relations with the elder Apostles, whether it was in harmony with them or in contradiction and opposition to them, that he carried out these principles and opinions which he was first to enunciate, this still requires a more thorough and searching inquiry.¹⁶

The following presentation will indicate how F. C. Baur and subsequent scholars critically approached the problem of relating Paul's account of the Jerusalem visit in Gal. 2:1-10 with Acts' accounts of Paul's activities.¹⁷ It will examine the specific arguments and explanations used in arriving at a solution for the above mentioned problem.

1. No Correspondence between Gal.

2:1-10 and Acts

A. F. C. Baur

It becomes evident then that at this point in the development of the study of the New Testament we encounter the first scholar who critically analyses the topic discussed in this paper. It is a scientific inquiry in the form of an historical analysis, for which Baur was paid the honour of being called its founder, but, which he considered as having been established by his predecessors and employed

¹⁶Baur, Paul, p. 3 f.

¹⁷For a brief summary of the various solutions concerning Gal. 2:1-10 and Acts, see G. B. Caird, The Apostolic Age, London, Duckworth, 1958 (1st ed. 1955), pp. 198-210, and Orchard, "The Problem of Acts and Galatians," pp. 377-384 and pp. 384-397, for his own position.

in his work.¹⁸ Thus, this survey begins with Baur's work, Paul, His Life and Works, Vol. 1,¹⁹ which first appeared as essays in the Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie and was later extended and united with other related discussions to form a monograph on the Apostle Paul.²⁰ From this work it can be established that the question of the place of the Mosaic law, the conflict arising out of the issue of circumcision and Paul's relationship with the other apostles plays a significant role in New Testament scholarship.

The application of Baur's method and the results can be observed as his explanation and research on the problems contained in the Galatians 2:1-10 account of the Jerusalem council are delineated.

Baur's first step was to determine what material was available on the issue and, as was mentioned above, what value should be given to the different types of evidence. He felt that up to his time most scholars who approached the problem did not follow the logical view, i.e., that since there are different accounts, that of the Acts of the Apostles and that of Paul's Epistles, where Acts disagrees with Paul, Paul should be given credit for the truth. Baur states that the writers who wanted to maintain the harmony of both Paul and Acts dismissed the discrepancies in the two

¹⁸Baur, Paul, p. vi.

¹⁹See above, n. 8 on p. 48.

²⁰Ibid., pp. v-vi.

accounts as insignificant and in some instances even accepted parts of Acts though they presented a picture contrary to that which Paul clearly delineated. Thus, Baur, goes on to say, not only was justice and impartiality to Paul lacking, but some writers, in order to manifest a harmonious relationship between Paul and the other apostles, had Paul follow an ambiguous if not an inconsistently motivated pattern of activity.²¹

The historico-critical scholar according to Baur, must examine how the accounts reflect the historical materials. As regards the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline Epistles, Baur states that a comparison of the two shows that one or the other can be recognized as presenting the undisputed evidence, thus, "historical truth must be entirely on one side or entirely on the other."²² It is to be found in that account "which appears most unprejudiced and nowhere betrays a desire to subordinate its historical material to any special subjective aim."²³ Thus, for Baur, the results of the comparison indicate that the author of Acts instead of simply relating the events modified them to suit his purpose. Though Acts appears to have two distinct sections, one for Peter and one for Paul, a unity pervades the work. "The unity of the work consists in this idea;

²¹Baur, Paul, p. 4.

²²Ibid., p. 5.

²³Ibid.

its chief tendency is to represent the difference between Peter and Paul as unessential and trifling."²⁴ Peter is made as Pauline as possible and Paul as Petrine as possible with the Pauline element being strongly favoured. Considering this apologetic aim or tendency on the part of the author of Acts, Baur questions the possibility of a "purely historical narrative" for the accounts appear not only negatively altered but also positively.²⁵ "The apologetic interest of his statement does not altogether destroy its historical character, but only limits and modifies it."²⁶ Despite the unhistorical sections, other parts are historically grounded, as has been proven from other reliable historical sources. Although Baur regards Acts from a different position than most authors, in that for him, firstly, the author is not Luke, although Lukan material may have formed the foundational structure of Acts, secondly, its aim is to demonstrate harmony in the early Church and, thirdly, it is a work of the second century, Acts is still a very important source for Baur when seeking evidence for the history of the Apostolic Age.²⁷

Thus, having rid himself of any pre-conceived notion of the necessity or desirability of a harmony at

²⁴Baur, Paul, p. 6.

²⁵Ibid., p. 10.

²⁶Ibid., p. 13.

²⁷Ibid., pp. 13, and 105 f.

all times between the author of Acts and Paul,²⁸ Baur begins his critical examination of the life and work of Paul.

It is in the first two chapters of the Epistle to the Galatians that Baur discovers Paul's position paper on his stand and his relations with the apostles.²⁹ Baur was convinced that by examining these two chapters in Galatians he would be able to determine whether the visit recorded in Gal. 2:1-10 was Paul's second visit to Jerusalem as Paul declares it to be, secondly, whether the question of the law was an issue at this meeting as Paul describes it, and finally, what was the actual result of the meeting.

The importance of this study for Baur was that here was the key for understanding the history of the Christian origins and what Christianity essentially is.³⁰

In order to establish Paul's second journey to Jerusalem, Gal. 2:1-10 being Paul's account of it, Baur first examines the material of Galatians and Acts to determine which was Paul's first journey to Jerusalem and then describes what would logically follow as Paul's second trip.

²⁸Baur, Paul, p. 106. Baur has strong words for those who attempt a harmonization of Acts and Paul's Epistles. He states: "All attempts to reconcile the two accounts, such as are generally made by interpreters and critics, are but useless trouble; they not only result in forcing on the Apostle's words a sense they cannot bear, but also in concealing the truth of the historical facts, or at least placing them in a false light, and imputing to the Apostle what can only redound to the disadvantage of his character."

²⁹Ibid., p. 105.

³⁰Ibid., pp. vi, and 1-3.

Upon investigating the material which Galatians and Acts indicate as the account of the first of Paul's journeys to Jerusalem, Baur immediately finds a discrepancy. In Acts 9:19 and 9:22, Paul is shown as residing for a short interval in Damascus after his baptism by Ananias, during which time he tried to convince the people of Damascus that Jesus was the Messiah. Then, Acts 9:23-26 indicates that plots were designed against Paul and he fled to Jerusalem. Galatians 1:16-17, on the other hand, does not mention the dangers of remaining in Damascus but speaks of Paul's departure to Arabia. As to the reason for Paul's departure, the two accounts appear to agree. Baur mentions that 2 Cor. 11:32 speaks of the threat to Paul issuing from the Ethnarch of King Aretas in Damascus, which can only have occurred at this time.³¹ Later, Galatians describes Paul returning to Damascus and only after three years travelling on to Jerusalem.

Not only does Acts omit the Arabian visit, but it implies that within days after Paul's conversion he journeys to Jerusalem (Acts 9:26), yet Paul speaks of years between his conversion and journey to Jerusalem (Gal. 1:18). Acts continues in the view of a very short interval between Paul's conversion and his first visit to Jerusalem by showing the apostles as being cautious and fearful of Paul when he visits Jerusalem. If, as Paul states in Galatians, he

³¹Baur, Paul, p. 106.

laboured in Arabia, probably for a short period, and then in Damascus (Gal. 1:17-18) which was conveniently close enough to Jerusalem to have had good communications with it, how could the apostles be apprehensive about Paul after a three-year trial period?³² This contradiction leads Baur to believe that the author of Acts did not have original sources for the events he relates.³³

In Galatians, Paul defends his independence by claiming his reception of the Gospel from God, through the mediation of Christ, hence, not from man. Furthermore, Paul indicates that he did not confer with the apostles or any other human. He clearly delineates his activities after his conversion, i.e., first teaching in Damascus, then departing to Arabia, a return to Damascus and after three years a trip to Jerusalem,³⁴ thus establishing that there was no human intervention regarding his gospel or authority. Paul specifically points out that he saw none other than Peter and his brother James when he spent the fortnight in Jerusalem (Gal. 1:18-20).

Baur indicates another variance; Acts seems to reflect a recognition of Paul's mission by Peter and the brethren, for Acts 9:28-29 speaks of Paul preaching among them in Jerusalem, which idea must be rejected, for Paul,

³²Baur, Paul, p. 107.

³³Ibid., p. 108.

³⁴Ibid.

in Galatians 1:21-24 specifically indicates that he went on to Syria and Cilicia without ever meeting the Judean churches. Hence, he could not be approved by anyone. There is in the first chapter of Galatians no sign of "subordination or dependence on his part."³⁵ Paul's entire missionary work depended on the authority he could claim for his gospel and his apostolic calling.

As Baur continues his comparison of the two texts, he points out a further contradiction. Acts shows Paul leading an active life in Jerusalem during the fourteen-day visit while Galatians 1:19 speaks of a private conferral with Peter. Fourteen days hardly allows for the activity suggested by Acts 9:28. Furthermore, if Acts were correct then the churches of Judea should have known of Paul. But, more important than the above discrepancy is the suggestion in Acts 9:27 that Barnabas presented Paul and described his conversion as if to place the case of Paul before the apostles for their acceptance of Paul and their authorization of his apostolic role. With this interpretation, Baur states that, "If this account be held as authentic, it would really make the apostle a liar; and it is simply incredible that he should have given the assurance ἃ δὲ γράφω ὑμῖν ἰδοὺ ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ ὅτι οὐ ψεύδομαι."³⁶ Baur points out how Acts indicates that Paul left Jerusalem because of the difficulties which arose out of his encounter with the

³⁵Baur, Paul, p. 109.

³⁶Ibid., p. 111.

Hellenists. However, in Galatians Paul indicates that only a brief stay in Jerusalem was planned because he was eager to set off for his Gentile mission in Syria and Cilicia.³⁷ Thus, the accounts of the first journey to Jerusalem which are usually considered as referring to the same event raise difficulties.

After treating the difficulties of relating Paul's first visit to Jerusalem as recorded in Galatians and the Acts of the Apostles, Baur examines the second visit to Jerusalem. He comments on how this problem "has been endlessly treated of in modern times, as if it were an absolute impossibility to come to a certain result on the subject."³⁸

Baur notes that despite the discrepancies, Acts 9:26 "must apparently at least be assumed to be the journey in Galatians 1:18"³⁹ for Acts records two other accounts of Paul journeying from Antioch to Jerusalem, i.e., Acts 11:30 and 15:2. However, the aim of the journey in Acts 11:30 appears to be that of delivering monies collected in the missionary churches to the elders, whereas, Galatians 2:1-10 speaks of a meeting of the apostles regarding the imposition of the Mosaic law. Thus, Acts 15:2, the third journey to Jerusalem, which speaks of a similar purpose, could then be considered as the same event as that spoken

³⁷Baur, Paul, p. 112.

³⁸Ibid., p. 113 f.

³⁹Ibid., p. 114.

of in Gal. 2:1-10. But, the question arises: "Could Paul omit mentioning one of his journeys to Jerusalem if he is attempting to prove his independence, i.e., that his gospel was received from Christ?" To find the account of Paul's second journey to Jerusalem in the record of the Acts of the Apostles, is it possible to go beyond Acts 11:30? Baur emphasizes that Paul wished to prove not only the source of his gospel but also his independent apostolic authority. Thus, Baur notes that Paul was not enumerating his journeys but rather relating his encounters with the apostles so as to prove his apostolic authority. By showing that as soon as he was converted he preached the gospel and worked as a true missionary, Paul felt that it should become clear to all that he was independent of all the apostles. Baur sums up his argument by saying, it appears evident that "he does not call attention to his journey to Jerusalem (Gal. ii.1) merely as following another journey . . . but only for the sake of the particular transactions which took place in connection with it."⁴⁰ Furthermore, he thinks that the texts Gal. 1:19 and 2:1 seem to indicate that Paul did not journey to Jerusalem during that interval.

Baur then asks whether it is important or necessary to harmonize the visits to Jerusalem mentioned by Paul with

⁴⁰Baur, Paul, p. 115. Though Baur considered that his solution was clear, the fact that others after him pursued this same question and arrived at different interpretations and solutions shows that not all of Baur's argumentation is compelling. See above, pp. 11-13.

those recorded in Acts.⁴¹ Comparing Gal. 2:1 and Acts 11:30 has the advantage that both accounts are chronologically the second visit recorded. However, for Baur, the comparison ends there. The cause and object of Gal. 2:1 and Acts 11:30 do not correspond. He even goes so far as to suggest that the question could be posed "whether the journey Acts xi.30 is not a mistake, a mere fiction, which is not so very unlikely a supposition in such a narrative as the Acts of the Apostles."⁴²

Baur questions what is gained if Acts 15:2 is treated the same as Gal. 2:1. Those scholars who hold Gal. 2:1 and Acts 11:30 to be the same suggest that Acts 15:2 has different circumstances from those related in Gal 2:1. If these scholars are ready to put aside or declare invalid the second journey to Jerusalem in Acts 15:1-30, why should the other scholar have to look for an exact parallel in Acts 15:2?⁴³

Baur proceeds in his study on the basis that an idea of exact identity (Gal. 2--Acts 15) is non-existent, and thus an investigation of the two texts' relationship must be made.⁴⁴ He, therefore, sought the historical evidence which would determine which account should be

⁴¹Baur, Paul, p. 115.

⁴²Ibid.

⁴³Ibid., p. 116.

⁴⁴Ibid.

chosen as true to the event.

Baur's research revealed the following. The Acts of the Apostles speaks of a public meeting following the format of a formal convention where the entire body concerned is present to hear speeches on the issue at stake, presided over by the head representative who summarizes the debate and outlines the course to be adopted in the future. The session is concluded by the chairman putting the action suggested into a formal resolution and directing individuals to deliver the adopted convention conclusions. However, in the Galatian account it would appear that Paul is unaware of the results suggested by the Acts record. Paul speaks of a private meeting where his activities are presented to give witness to the response of the Gentile followers⁴⁵ and the meeting is concluded by a "handshake" as a sign of fellowship and agreement of the future missionizing work.

Baur agrees with two other scholars, Neander and Bohn, that the private meeting of which Paul speaks could have been one which would be necessary before a general meeting, but then, Baur goes on to state, Paul should be expected to discuss the general assembly session. However, Paul does not do this and, therefore, Baur decides that "this is only a new proof of the arbitrary and uncritical nature of such an attempt to harmonize the two accounts."⁴⁶

⁴⁵Baur, Paul, p. 116.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 117.

Thus, it is concluded by Baur that Paul does not speak of a general conference nor does he speak of any other meetings outside of the one with James, Peter and John.⁴⁷

If there had been two meetings it could be explained that the author of Acts, being at a certain distance from the time and participation in the event, would necessarily record only the public session. But the same rationalization cannot be used in the explanation of Paul not recording the public meeting. Baur concludes from Paul's silence on the matter of a public meeting that Acts includes this account for its own interests, its Tendenz and "reminds us of the formalities of later times."⁴⁸ It is in this account of Acts that Baur finds strong evidence for his theory that Acts attempted to harmonize the two groups in Christianity, i.e., the Jewish Christians and the Gentile Christians. This is further supported by the fact that Acts places the apostles in full agreement with Paul, though it is not so in Galatians. Acts has only a few Christians, with a Pharisaical background, insisting on the Mosaic law as a prerequisite for all those wishing to become Christian. The author of Acts has Peter refer to his experience of baptizing the Gentile Cornelius to prove that Gentiles without undergoing the rite of circumcision were Christians and, furthermore, uses this account to show that everyone had at that

⁴⁷Baur, Paul, p. 118.

⁴⁸Ibid.

time agreed that it was God's will. Baur feels that Acts uses Peter and James in this section. Peter is made to appear liberated from the Jewish minutiae and James is made to express the moderate view, i.e., a middle-of-the-way view between Peter and the Judaizing troublemakers. Furthermore, James, the chairman of the meeting, then delivers the settlement of the conference.⁴⁹ This, in addition to the Acts account that Peter finds the law a burdensome yoke in the Pauline sense, and not as James who sees it as burdensome to the Gentiles,⁵⁰ is used as evidence to strengthen Baur's position that Acts makes Peter appear as Pauline as possible.

When Baur turns to the information presented in Galatians 2:1-10 he finds a different picture. The conflict was not instigated by "individual, Pharisaic-minded members"⁵¹ of the Jerusalem community but rather was "a conflict between the Pauline and the Jewish Christianity."⁵² Baur held that the apostles were very much a part of this, for their horizons were limited to Judaism. In Galatians, the issue of the meeting was that of circumcision which explicitly included the observance of the whole law.⁵³ Paul

⁴⁹Baur, Paul, p. 119.

⁵⁰Ibid.

⁵¹Ibid., p. 120.

⁵²Ibid.

⁵³Ibid., p. 121.

manifested his opposition to circumcision by declaring that "even Titus had not been compelled to be circumcised."⁵⁴ Baur's argument for the interpretation of the complex text regarding Titus is based on the context of the entire passage. He maintains that Paul brought Titus to Jerusalem to make a case out of Titus' situation, thereby resisting the demand for circumcision for the whole Gentile Christian church.⁵⁵ Baur considers that Titus could be the test case since he was a Gentile and a companion of Paul in the missionary work.

Once again, Baur finds a divergence between the Acts' account and Paul's. Paul speaks of a vigorous defence against the pressing request for Titus' circumcision, whereas, Acts, with its attempt to make every stage in the development of Christianity untroubled, has the apostles readily agree with Paul.⁵⁶

Baur interprets Paul's recourse to his Gentile mission results in the Epistle to the Galatians as Paul's proof of his divine call to the apostolate, and to the genuineness of his preaching.⁵⁷ Paul's comment on obtaining an agreement as to the allotment of the missionary field

⁵⁴Baur, Paul, p. 121.

⁵⁵Ibid. See above, pp. 16 f., and 20.

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 122. Baur finds the explanation given by commentators who think Titus was circumcised absurd (p. 122, n. 1).

⁵⁷Ibid., p. 124.

is viewed by Baur as a recognition that was not fully achieved.

The κοινωνία was a separation as well as an agreement; the agreement was simply that the one party should go εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, the other εἰς τὴν περιτομήν, i.e., the Jewish Apostles could really allege nothing against the principles on which Paul founded his evangelical labors, and were obliged so far to recognise them; but this recognition was a mere outward one; they left it to him to work further on these principles in the cause of the Gospel among the Gentiles; but they would have nothing to do with these principles for themselves.⁵⁸

Hence, Baur sees the Mosaic law as binding in the Jewish sphere of Christianity and not in the Gentile system of Christianity. "These two systems simply co-existed without being in any way harmonised."⁵⁹

Acts, however, presents a different explanation for the Gentiles not being bound by the Mosaic law. Acts 15, in its council account, has Peter refer to the conversion of Cornelius and recount how God had appeared to him and showed how the Mosaic law was not to be demanded of a Gentile who wished to become a Christian. Baur sees in this the author of Acts' determination to follow a particular plan in his work. And so, Baur argues, if Peter is made to speak at the Jerusalem council as a Pauline adherent, could it not be questioned how Acts has Peter defend the Cornelius event?"⁶⁰ If the author of Acts has Peter appear in a

⁵⁸Baur, Paul, p. 125.

⁵⁹Ibid. ⁶⁰Ibid.

different light in order to achieve his plan of harmonization would he not use the Cornelius event in a similar way?

The conversion of Cornelius, which event could be doubted, implicitly proves that Christianity without the law was approved very early in the history of Christianity by Peter who, in this case, represents Jewish Christianity. However, Baur believes that at this particular time, i.e., fourteen years after Paul's conversion, the apostles with the exception of Paul see the vision of Christianity within Judaism.⁶¹

With regard to the meeting, Baur finds the apostles involved "in contradictions and inconsequences."⁶² Since they had given the "right hand of fellowship" they were bound at least "to assume as indifferent a position as possible towards Pauline Christianity."⁶³

This, according to Baur, brought about two sub-groups in Jewish Christianity, a strict and a liberal section.⁶⁴ The strict party felt obliged and unhampered to defend the obligation of the law and, thus, they became the opponents of Paul. The liberal party supported the idea of the strict section but could not oppose Paul after the concessions they made at the conference. Baur indicates, then, that the Jewish apostles are at the head of the liberal party.⁶⁵

⁶¹Baur, Paul, p. 126.

⁶²Ibid., p. 127.

⁶³Ibid. ⁶⁴Ibid.

⁶⁵Ibid., p. 128.

The conclusions of the conference according to the author of Acts do not correspond with Paul's account in Galatians. Acts has James propose the fourfold decree.⁶⁶ The Gentiles were to "abstain from eating flesh offered to idols, from blood, from things strangled, and from fornication." This was to represent a reasonable request of the Gentiles, to appease their fears of having to undergo circumcision and to observe the strict Mosaic law. Baur points out how Acts emphasizes the importance and effects of the decree. The church in Antioch rejoices, the churches visited by Paul and Silas on the second missionary journey are "established in faith, and increased in number daily."⁶⁷ Baur questions whether such an important ruling could go unmentioned in the Epistle to the Galatians.

The condition of the κοινωνία was, ἵνα ἡμεῖς μὲν εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, αὐτοὶ δὲ εἰς τὴν περιτομήν--would not this have been an opportunity of mentioning the elements of harmony and mutual understanding which existed between the ἀποστολὴ περιτομῆς and the ἀποστολὴ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη instead of placing them in such harsh opposition as is done by the words above quoted?⁶⁸

In Galatians there is not the slightest trace of the decrees, rather, we find in Gal. 2:10 the condition of assisting the poor by collecting money from the mission churches.⁶⁹

⁶⁶Baur, Paul, p. 131. See above pp. 38-41.

⁶⁷Ibid., p. 132.

⁶⁸Ibid., p. 133.

⁶⁹Ibid., p. 134. See above, pp. 28-30.

Baur strongly emphasizes that "there can be no longer any idea of a reconciliation between the two accounts, but the difference already shown rather grows wider."⁷⁰ For example, in Gal. 5:1 where Paul confronts the Judaizing opponents on the very issue of circumcision, if there had been a decree would he not have referred to it? Paul could not have placed his account in such jeopardy as presenting a false picture. Baur asks:

What influence then can such a decree, . . . ever have had, if no use at all was made of it in a case like this, in which it was so eminently fitted to maintain the ground already won?⁷¹

As to the abstaining of eating flesh offered to idols, Paul should have outruled it if the decree had been issued. However, Paul is seen as being indifferent, for the matter was neither right nor wrong and in the case of the Corinthians, 1 Cor. 8, Paul requests them to abstain only because of the weaker members.⁷² Acts (15:20, 16:4) gives the impression that the decrees were to be binding on all Gentiles. However,

There is no proof outside of the Acts of the observance of these decrees, and only such proof, if it were forthcoming, would be worthy of credit. It is not by any means likely that the Apostles even held fast to the authority of these decrees in Palestine.⁷³

⁷⁰Baur, Paul, p. 134.

⁷¹Ibid.

⁷²Ibid., p. 135.

⁷³Ibid., p. 137.

If these decrees were not enforced, Baur then wonders if they ever existed.⁷⁴

Baur refers to the Epistle of Barnabas, despite the question of authorship, and shows with what contempt circumcision is treated.⁷⁵ The Epistle of Ignatius speaks of an inner and outer circumcision and the Clementine Homilies, although influenced by Judaism, do not debate the issue of circumcision. There is only one trace of it in the mention of a circumcised believer.⁷⁶ "The very points which are mentioned in the Acts as the conditions of release from the obligation of circumcision, we find, . . . to be the standing rules of Christian conducts in the apostolic time."⁷⁷ The Clementine Homilies do not expressly forbid second marriages,

but as πορνεία or μοιχεία, is considered next to idolatry to be the greatest sin, and as the greatest stress is laid on the fact that everything in human life has a strict monarchical form and direction, we are entitled to assume that second marriages would scarcely need an express prohibition, because it would be thought self-evident that they were included under πορνεία or, μοιχεία.⁷⁸

Therefore, Baur concludes that the evidence as he interprets it in no way indicates that Galatians 2:1-10 can be equated with any of the journeys recorded in the Acts

⁷⁴Baur, Paul, p. 137.

⁷⁵Ibid., p. 138.

⁷⁶Ibid., p. 139.

⁷⁷Ibid., p. 140.

⁷⁸Ibid., p. 145.

of the Apostles. Paul's Epistle must relate the event of the Jerusalem visit since Paul is an eye witness and Acts is a work of a much later date and written from a particular viewpoint. As mentioned earlier,⁷⁹ Baur established the principle that only one text could be accurate and it was the one which did not attempt to manipulate the historical traditions to accomplish the author's aim.

Baur's disciples were Albert Schwegler and Eduard Zeller. Haenchen summarizes the two disciples' positions.

Schwegler, (Das nachapostolische Zeitalter, 1846, Vol. II, 73ff.) . . . explained Acts as a peace-offering and attempt at reconciliation "in the form of a history." He maintains that the author treated tradition as arbitrarily and high-handedly as it was treated in the Clementine homilies. Taken as a whole, Acts has the value of a historical document only for the time, the circumstances and the situation in which it arose. The period in question, according to Schwegler, was 110-50, when he says, the Jewish form of Christianity was still dominant (p. 113).⁸⁰

As for Zeller, F. C. Baur's son-in-law, a similar position was taken in his book Die Apostelgeschichte nach ihrem Inhalt und Ursprung kritisch untersucht, 1854. Haenchen states Zeller's conclusions as follows:

⁷⁹See above, p. 53.

⁸⁰Haenchen, Acts, p. 17 f.

The Peter-Paul parallelism is a scheme devised by the writer himself. He had no intention whatever of presenting a historical account, (357) but was striving to influence the conflicting parties of the Paulinists and Judaists. (p. 344) Acts has a "conciliatory tendency." (p. 358) Seeing that Acts scarcely touches on the antithesis of faith and works, and that only the practical question of the law's validity plays a part, Zeller placed Acts in a period when "the significance of dogmatic antithesis . . . had already receded." (p. 474) In this way he came to choose the first decades of the second century.⁸¹

Others who professed their allegiance to Baur were Hausrath, Hilgenfeld, Ritschl and Holtzmann.⁸² In the English speaking world only two scholars followed Baur. One was Samuel Davidson and the other was W. R. Cassels.⁸³

B. T. W. Manson

T. W. Manson proposes another solution to the equation of the journeys of Paul to Jerusalem as recorded in Galatians and Acts.⁸⁴ To understand and appreciate the difficulties which develop when attempting to make the identifications, Manson feels that "it is necessary to

⁸¹Haenchen, Acts, p. 18.

⁸²Quoted in *ibid.*, p. 18.

⁸³Quoted in *ibid.*, p. 22.

⁸⁴Cf. Dupont, "Les problèmes," p. 56. Dupont, although recognizing Manson's place in the category of "no correspondence," nevertheless subsumes him under the equation Gal. 2:1-10 equals Acts 11, because in Manson's reconstruction the second visit of Galatians must have taken place shortly before the first missionary journey, and therefore around the time indicated by Acts 11.

examine somewhat carefully Paul's own account of the visit."⁸⁵ Hence, it would appear that Manson approaches the problem first from the perspective of Paul.

To understand Manson's approach it is necessary to note that he thinks that various sections of Galatians indicate that Paul is replying to some type of communicate either from or about the Galatians.⁸⁶ This, plus the emotional factor, would account for the jerkiness and parenthetical nature of the Epistle. Thus, Manson explains, "There is consequently no need to force logical cohesion all through the letter; and indeed it is probably a mistake to try."⁸⁷

However, with all this said, and the place for principles to be outlined, it would seem that Manson's own report of his approach is rather confusing. He establishes three guidelines. First of all, Galatians is to be given preference regarding any conflict that may arise between it and Acts. Second, in any reconstruction of events the order in Gal. 1 and 2 is to be preferred. Finally, it must not be forgotten that the purpose of Galatians is Paul's apologia pro vita sua.⁸⁸

⁸⁵T. W. Manson, "St Paul in Ephesus: (2) The Problem of the Epistle to the Galatians," BJRL, Vol. 24, 1940, p. 65. (Reprinted in M. Black (Ed.), Studies in the Gospels and Epistles, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1962, pp. 168-189.)

⁸⁶Ibid., p. 61.

⁸⁷Ibid., p. 62.

⁸⁸Ibid.

All these considerations are to be taken into account when studying the difficulties that arise "from the necessity of fitting Paul's account into the narrative of Acts."⁸⁹ Though initially it appears that Galatians is considered first, the reality seems to be rather that Galatians is looked at carefully in the light of Acts. This leaves Acts with the greater weight or at least being the reference point of the study.

Manson briefly surveys Acts 1 - 9⁹⁰ outlining the swift growth (Acts 1 - 5) and persecution (Acts 6 - 9) terminating with Paul's conversion. He notes that the Galatian account (Gal. 1:18-24) of Paul's first visit to Jerusalem to meet with the church leaders has a parallel in Acts 9:26-30. He admits "there are difficulties in reconciling the two stories; enough to cast doubt on some particulars in the Acts account, but not enough to bring in question the substantial identity of the two visits (G1 = A1)."⁹¹

Manson's next procedural step is the analysis of Galatians 2:1-10 and the comparing of the results of that study with the accounts in Acts 11:27-30; 12:25 and Acts 15 (the council visit).

⁸⁹Manson, "St. Paul in Ephesus," p. 62.

⁹⁰Ibid., pp. 62-64.

⁹¹Ibid., p. 64.

In the examination of Galatians 2:1-10, Manson discusses the purpose, result and time of the visit. The reason for the visit to Jerusalem⁹² was to see that both groups, the Jerusalem leaders and Paul and Barnabas, were in agreement regarding the basic elements of the gospel. This would reassure unity and clearly establish that the Gentile converts were Christians in the full sense of the term. The result,⁹³ according to Manson, was achieved in a private meeting. The Jerusalem leaders not only recognized Paul's status and call from God but also his gospel as the same as theirs. The agreement also delineated the division of the mission field, and, on the part of Paul, the undertaking of raising financial aid for the poor in Jerusalem.

The above mentioned results, however, do not take into consideration the Galatian 2:3-5 section. Usually these verses are considered as discussing part of the conference,⁹⁴ but Manson thinks this is not exactly the case. Rather, he sees v. 3 as belonging to the conference but vv. 4 and 5 as something which occurred later.⁹⁵ The parenthetical phrase is there because the reference to circumcision brings about a recall of sensitive later events. Manson rephrases the passage to highlight its meaning in the

⁹²Manson, "St. Paul in Ephesus," p. 65 f. See above, pp. 12 f. and 15.

⁹³Ibid., p. 66 f. See above, p. 15.

⁹⁴Ibid., p. 66.

⁹⁵Ibid., p. 67.

following manner:

"The issue of compulsory circumcision did not arise on this occasion, though Titus who was with me was an obvious case being a Greek. When at a later date it was brought up it was through certain interlopers and bogus Christians . . . and in your interests we refused absolutely to make any concessions."⁹⁶

Since there is an emphasis on the refusal made in the interests of the Galatians, Manson concludes that "vv. 4 and 5 describe something posterior to the evangelization of the Galatians."⁹⁷

As to the time of the visit, Manson suggests that the type of meeting held indicates its possible timing. A private meeting carried out in a friendly atmosphere without difficulties developing and resulting in an agreed division of the missionary work (Gal. 2:1-10) would only seem likely prior to an important and new missionary endeavour. This would appear to be the occasion when Paul and Barnabas make their First Missionary Journey to Cyprus and Asia Minor. Furthermore, Manson argues that the circumstances described in the account of Gal. 2:1-10 do not coincide with those described in the visits recorded in Acts.⁹⁸

Manson calculates the date of the Galatian 2:1-10 visit by taking the date of Paul's departure from Corinth as his reference point. By retracing Paul's experiences backwards from the above mentioned time, he arrives

⁹⁶ Manson, "St. Paul in Ephesus," p. 67.

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 68.

at the following dates: Paul's arrival in Corinth mid-winter 49/50 or 50/51. By further calculations, the Famine visit (Acts 11) can be almost definitely established. By using the existing evidence Manson shows that from autumn 45 to spring 46 there was a famine in Egypt; in Judea the evidence suggests that the famine there was in 46 or 47. To add to this dire situation, it is pointed out that the sabbatical year fell in the autumn of 47. This of course meant that the fields were left untilled for the twelve-month period. Hence, the scarcity of grain products would be experienced from autumn 45 until spring 49 and in particular from Passover in 48 to Passover in 49.⁹⁹ Manson's conclusions are that the First Missionary Journey took place in 47 or 48, there were intervening events such as the Jerusalem Council in 48 or 49, and the Second Missionary Journey occurred around 49 or 50. This places the visit of Gal. 2 in 47 or the first part of 48.¹⁰⁰ Hence, Manson concludes that "this does not seem to me to resemble what is described either in Acts xi or Acts xv."¹⁰¹

Looking at Acts 15, Manson feels that the decrees and setting relate to the problems encountered in the Gal. 2:11-14 account.¹⁰² Since this section in Galatians is a

⁹⁹Manson, "St. Paul in Ephesus," p. 68.

¹⁰⁰Ibid., p. 69.

¹⁰¹Ibid., p. 67.

¹⁰²Ibid., p. 72.

problem beyond the scope of this paper it seems unnecessary to treat Manson's discussion of the textual problems contained in Gal. 2:11-14. However, the discussion on Acts 15:1-30 must be treated here.

For Manson the key or "crux of the matter lies in Acts 15:28 f."¹⁰³ His translation of the passage reads as follows:

"It was decided by the Holy Spirit and by us to put no further burden on you than these essentials --to abstain from things offered to idols and blood and that which is strangled and fornication. And if you keep yourselves from them you will be doing right."¹⁰⁴

The problems arising out of Acts 15 are that of the text and the interpretation of the decrees. The four items forbidden, as mentioned above in the text (cf. Acts 15:20; 15:29; 21:25) can be found in the following manuscripts: those of the B family, the Peshitta, and for the reference Acts 15:29, that of Clement of Alexandria.

Manson points out the differences in the Western text. First, the Western text omits "that which is strangled" thus listing only three forbidden things. Secondly, some form of the Golden Rule is added except in the case of the authority Tertullian. Thirdly, three of the authorities of this text type refer to the Holy Spirit after "you will be doing right" (Acts 15:29). Fourthly, the word fornication is omitted by Origen (C Cels. viii,29), the Harris MS of

¹⁰³Manson, "St. Paul in Ephesus," p. 73.

¹⁰⁴Ibid.

the Syriac Didascalia (cited by Preuschen in his commentary on Acts) and (for Acts 15:20) the Chester Beatty Codex P⁴⁵. Fifthly, the items in the list are arranged differently; that is, in Acts 15:20 they appear as "idol offerings, fornication, things strangled, blood" and in Acts 15:29 and 21:25 the order is "idol-offerings, blood, things strangled, fornication."¹⁰⁵

Hence it can be observed that the Western text makes the decrees into an ethical statement. However, by doing so, it reduces the decrees to absurdity. If the Sayings of Jesus were the code for the Christians then the decrees could be seen only as a lowering of the standards. As Manson states, "it would fix for the Gentile Christian a lower minimum standard of conduct than the Jewish Law normally required from the resident alien."¹⁰⁶

This, then, according to Manson, indicates that the decrees are to be seen in the light of the Jewish dietary practice.¹⁰⁷ It makes the decree forbidding "fornication" appear out of place. Though it was included in the Western text, it could have been added for the purpose of placing the decrees in an ethical light since the other two items can be interpreted in two senses.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁵Manson, "St. Paul in Ephesus," p. 73 f.

¹⁰⁶Ibid., p. 75.

¹⁰⁷Ibid.

¹⁰⁸Ibid., p. 75 f.

Manson takes up one other objection to τοῦ πνικτοῦ and that is "that πνικτόν is included under αἷμα, so that if αἷμα in the sense of 'eating meat with blood in it' is forbidden, πνικτόν is automatically forbidden at the same time."¹⁰⁹ However, Manson argues that this is not logically so, because one could have meat which has been slaughtered according to Jewish law and then not prepare it according to the law and thus be guilty of αἷμα. He concludes his argument as follows:

It is perhaps possible that πνικτόν is meant to cover the slaughter of the animal, and αἷμα the preparation of the meat for the table. This would be more plausible if the order πνικτόν αἷμα, as in xv. 20, were the original. But all this is highly conjectural, and we cannot exclude the possibility that πνικτόν is an early gloss on αἷμα. I do not attempt to decide the question here, and am content with the conclusion that, whether the decree covered idol offerings and blood only, it was a provision regulating the dinner tables of the Gentile Christians.¹¹⁰

Manson delineates the problem by noting that the council was convened for the purpose of clarifying the question of circumcision. However, it terminated by issuing decrees regarding the table fellowship. He once again emphasizes that "the decrees are the answer to the question raised in Gal. ii. 11-14: they are not, and cannot be, the answer to the issue raised in Acts xv. 1."¹¹¹

¹⁰⁹Manson, "St. Paul in Ephesus," p. 76.

¹¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹¹Ibid., p. 77.

Manson raises three other points. If Gal. 2:1-10 is equated with the council account in Acts 15, how can Peter's behaviour in Gal. 2:11 be explained? Secondly, Paul (1 Thess. 2:13-16) speaks favourably of the churches in Judea, the only difficulty being that with the Jews and not the Jewish Christians. Thirdly, the problem of circumcision, which supposedly was terminated before the second Missionary Journey, appears as a problem in the documents of Galatians, 1 Corinthians, Philippians, and Romans.¹¹²

After indicating these internal problems, Manson suggests that the data point to Acts 15 being a composite work. The problem of circumcision becomes a side issue while table-fellowship not only predominates the passages but it becomes a "kosher table" as James and his followers wanted.¹¹³ The fact that Paul does not make reference to the decrees implies either there were none, therefore Galatians was written before the council, or the decree is no longer binding, thus leaving the writing of Galatians to shortly after the council, the latter alternative being Manson's choice.¹¹⁴

The decree, according to Manson, can be seen as a working compromise which was broken by those who came as emissaries from James. Paul's apostolic authority was also

¹¹²Manson, "St. Paul in Ephesus," p. 77.

¹¹³Ibid., p. 77 f.

¹¹⁴Ibid., p. 78.

questioned. Paul responds in Galatians showing that circumcision, the demand to follow the Jewish calendar (fasts and feasts), the division of clean and unclean meats "are, all of them, irrelevant to Christianity."¹¹⁵ The Christian is free and must not limit his liberty by becoming ensnarled in the minute details of the law; he must always remember that there is only one great commandment, "Love the Lord thy God and thy neighbor as thyself."¹¹⁶

2. Gal. 2:1-10 Equals Acts 15:1-30

A. J. B. Lightfoot and His Supporters

(a) J. B. Lightfoot

With the results of D. Strauss' and F. C. Baur's New Testament studies circulating throughout much of the continent, there seemed to be only one of two things to do, accept the results, thereby changing the view of Paul, the dating of the gospel material, the understanding of the New Testament, in short, changing the entire position presented by orthodox Christianity, or, secondly, refusing the critical approach and taking a fundamentalistic position.

Bishop J. B. Lightfoot was confronted with this dilemma when he responded to W. R. Cassels who anonymously published the book, Supernatural Religion: An Inquiry into

¹¹⁵Manson, "St. Paul in Ephesus," p. 79.

¹¹⁶Ibid., p. 79 f.

the Reality of Divine Revelation,¹¹⁷ in 1874. It was Cassels who brought some of Baur's radical views and the Tübingen method to England causing a great stir among the press and those of the Victorian age who either questioned or hoped that the gospel was without foundation.

Lightfoot felt that the questions raised by Strauss, Baur, and the Tübingen school about the dating of the primitive gospel, the opposition of Paul and the Jerusalem church, and the man Jesus in the gospel, touched the very heart of Christianity. Since neither of the above mentioned alternatives seemed to be right in Lightfoot's opinion, a third approach was tried. He reasoned as follows:

I feel very confident that the historical views of the Tübingen school are too extravagant to obtain any wide or lasting hold over the minds of men. But even in extreme cases mere denunciation may be unjust and is certainly unavailing. Moreover, for our own sakes we should try and discover the element of truth which underlies the greatest exaggerations of able men, and correct our impressions thereby.¹¹⁸

Lightfoot realized, as did Baur, that the starting point of any critical work of the New Testament would necessarily have to be the Epistles of Paul. That is why he opens his preface of the commentary on Galatians with, "The present work is intended to form part of a complete

¹¹⁷W. R. Cassels, Supernatural Religion: An Inquiry into the Reality of Divine Revelation, 1874, as quoted in W. W. Gasque, "The Historical Value of the Book of Acts," in Theologische Zeitschrift, Vol. 28, 1972, p. 180, n. 10. (This book was unavailable to me.)

¹¹⁸Lightfoot, Galatians, p. xi.

edition of St Paul's Epistles."¹¹⁹

Thus, an historical study, without the presuppositions of Baur, was to be J. B. Lightfoot's approach. The study would be equally as comprehensive as Baur's, based on the historico-critical principles, however employing a new critical edition of the Greek text of the New Testament which F. J. A. Hort and B. F. Westcott¹²⁰ were completing. Lightfoot was convinced that an investigation which considered secular writing as well as Christian literature of the second and third century would clarify the dating of the New Testament records and Paul's position with respect to the rest of the church. Lightfoot's preface stresses his considerations.

. . . I have paid special attention to everything relating to St Paul's personal history and his intercourse with the Apostles and Church of the Circumcision. It is this feature in the Epistle to the Galatians which has given it an overwhelming interest in recent theological controversy.¹²¹

Lightfoot's research on the Apostolic Fathers and early Christian literature assisted in ending for the most part Baur's historical theory that the New Testament accounts

¹¹⁹Lightfoot, Galatians, p. vii.

¹²⁰B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, The New Testament in the Original Greek, Cambridge, Macmillan, 1881-1882. These two Englishmen along with Lightfoot made up the famous Cambridge three.

¹²¹Lightfoot, Galatians, p. xi.

were written over the first two centuries A.D.¹²² Munck praises Lightfoot's contribution.

And the learned and fruitful studies that put an end to the literary fantasies of the Tübingen School, as for example T. Zahn's and J. B. Lightfoot's researches about the Apostolic Fathers, also led to the useful realization that the historical changes in the period from 30 to 200 A.D. are so far reaching and decisive that we cannot unhesitatingly use arguments from the second century to prove what happened in the first century.¹²³

Furthermore, Lightfoot attacked the very cornerstone of the external proofs for the Tübingen theory when he set out to show that, first, the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians was written by Clement of Rome¹²⁴ and the other Clementine writings¹²⁵ were not only doubtful as to their origin but also as to their time of composition, and, secondly, that the conflict of Peter and Simon Magus¹²⁶ was just that and not a reference to Paul. Baur drew a reference to the similarity of the latter event to one mentioned in Acts where Paul is quite certainly to be identified as the Simon mentioned. According to Baur, with time and the transmission of the Acts, this account of Simon Magus

¹²²It is J. Munck who indicates to what degree T. Zahn's and J. B. Lightfoot's evidence was accepted. Munck states, "It is remarkable that this realization has been accepted with regard to the points that were untouched by the Tübingen School's view on the development of primitive Christianity." (Paul, p. 77.)

¹²³Munck, Paul, p. 77.

¹²⁴Cf. Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 338.

¹²⁵Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 340-342.

¹²⁶Cf. Baur, Paul, p. 130, n. 1.

became distorted since the anti-Pauline motive was forgotten. Thus, the conflict eventually appeared to be between Peter and Simon Magus. In this way the Lukan story is further able to depict Peter's ecclesiastical traditions, mission to the Gentiles and death as a parallel to that of Paul.¹²⁷ Holding these interpretations, Baur claimed that these writings clearly depicted the understanding of the early history of Christianity, i.e., the strong opposition between the Petrine and Pauline parties.

The decision of Lightfoot to accept the authenticity of the thirteen older letters ascribed to Ignatius,¹²⁸ letters which Baur considered spurious, gave Lightfoot added proof that there was little ground for Baur's theory of the conflict between the Petrine and Pauline groups and a harmony realized in the Catholic church. The thirteen Ignatian letters must be dated sometime before A.D. 155, the date of the Syrian bishop's martyrdom in Rome. Having been written either before the end of the first century or at the beginning of the second, it should stand as evidence for the position of the relationship of Peter and Paul. Lightfoot finds no trace of a conflict between the two apostles in these letters. In the commentary on Galatians, he expresses how the early traditions treated St. Peter's and St. Paul's

¹²⁷Cf. Howard, Romance, p. 41, where Howard points out that to him Baur used the slightest indication of a possible Tendenz in Luke's writing when he states that, "Baur seized upon this late legend. . . ."

¹²⁸Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 338.

association with one another. The churches of the following generation "delighted to unite the names of the two leading Apostles as the greatest teachers of the Gospel, the brightest examples of Christian life."¹²⁹ This evidence is extremely valuable for, as Lightfoot emphasizes, "Clement wrote before the close of the first century, Ignatius at the beginning of the second."¹³⁰ Furthermore, Lightfoot notes that, "It seems probable that both these fathers had conversed with one or other of the two Apostles."¹³¹

In addition to the early external sources, the primary sources if approached critically and with an open mind according to Lightfoot, support his view. In the last paragraph of the introductory section of the commentary of Galatians, he points out that the critical study of the text of the Epistle to the Galatians which will follow in the main body of the commentary will definitely refute the rationalistic view maintained in the eighteenth century and later, and furthermore, disprove Baur's theory of the constant conflict between Peter and Paul.¹³² He underlines that it is not the doctrinal elements that Baur questions but rather the historical features. In Lightfoot's opinion it is the Epistle to the Galatians that refutes

¹²⁹Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 357.

¹³⁰Ibid., p. 358.

¹³¹Ibid.

¹³²Ibid., p. 68.

Baur's view in that it provides the discovery of "the mutual jealousy and suspicions of the Jew and the Gentile converts. It affords the refutation, for it shows the true relations existing between St Paul and the Twelve."¹³³

Thus, using the historical critical method and the Westcott and Hort recension of the Greek New Testament, Lightfoot examined the problem under study in this paper, i.e., the Jerusalem council account. By following his argument, the application of the principles which he, Westcott and Hort had agreed upon when they set out to produce a complete commentary on the New Testament will be noted. They established that their critical study was to be linguistic, historical, exegetical and not aimed directly at edifying its readers. Thus, the work was based on the most accurate Greek text that could be written, which further implied that minute philological studies of the words' and sentences' meanings were to be carried out. As to the historical aspect, the circumstances of the writing of each biblical book were to be considered as well as the part each book played in the broad picture of revelation. The meaning of the words was to be ascertained on the level of the composer as well as of those who first read it.¹³⁴

It is in Lightfoot's book, The Epistles of St Paul: Galatians printed in 1865, where his view is explicitly

¹³³Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 68.

¹³⁴Cf. Neill, Interpretation, p. 87 f.

developed.¹³⁵ His arguments in favour of the view that

¹³⁵J. B. Lightfoot is one of the best known nineteenth century scholars who maintained the traditional view that Gal. 2:1-10 corresponds with the visit recorded in Acts 15:1-30. Scholars who have taken this view are as follows: J. Eadie, A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1869, pp. 140-145; M.-J. Lagrange, Saint Paul: Epître aux Galates, Paris, J. Gabalda, 1926 (2nd ed., 1st ed. 1918), p. 23; J. Moffatt, An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1949 (reprint from 3rd rev. ed. 1918), p. 100 f.; E. de W. Burton, Galatians, p. 117; C. F. Hogg and W. E. Vine, The Epistle to the Galatians, Grand Rapids, Kregel, 1967 (reprint of 1921 ed.), pp. 55-88; R. Rackham, The Acts of the Apostles, London, Methuen, 1922, pp. 238-240; J. G. Machen, The Origin of Paul's Religion, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1965 (1st ed. 1925), pp. 78-100; H. Schlier, Galater, p. 70 f.; J. L. Leuba, New Testament Pattern, London, Lutterworth Press, 1953 (French ed. 1950), p. 72 f.; M. Dibelius, Paul (ed. by W. G. Kümmel), London, Longmans, Green, 1953 (German ed. 1950), pp. 128-133, and Studies, pp. 93-101; H. N. Ridderbos, Epistles of Paul, pp. 78-80; A. Wikenhauser, New Testament Introduction, pp. 332-336; J. Cambier, "The Life and Work of Paul," in A. Robert and A. Feuillet (Eds.), Introduction to the New Testament, Tournai, Desclée, 1965 (trans. French ed. 1959), p. 376 f.; O. Cullmann, Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr, London, SCM Press, 1962 (trans. revised and expanded German ed. 1960), pp. 41-53; J. Finegan, Handbook of Biblical Chronology, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1964, p. 320; F. V. Filson, A New Testament History, London, SCM Press, 1965 (1st ed. 1964), p. 220; P. Parker, "Once More, Acts and Galatians," JBL, Vol. 86, 1967, pp. 175-182; G. Ogg, The Odyssey of Paul, Old Tappen, Fleming H. Revell Co., 1968, pp. 72-88 (The British ed. has a more accurate title, The Chronology of the Life of Paul, London, Epworth Press, 1968); J. Bligh, Galatians. A Discussion of St. Paul's Epistle, London, St. Paul Pub., 1969, pp. 1-3 and 151-173; S. Wilson, Gentiles and the Gentile Mission, pp. 179-195.

Gal. 2:1-10 and Acts 15 are an account of the same event, are the following. In the first place,

The later of the two visits to Jerusalem mentioned in the Epistle has from the earliest times been identified with the visit recorded in Acts XV. This view is taken by Irenaeus, the first writer who alludes to the subject; . . . the arguments in its favour are sufficiently strong to resist the pressure of objections to which it is fairly exposed.¹³⁶

And secondly,

In support of this view may be urged the positive argument from the striking coincidence of circumstances, and the negative argument from the difficulty of finding any equally probable solution, or indeed any probable solution at all besides.¹³⁷

The strength of his argument seems to him to lie in its affirmations, for the geography, time, persons, subject of dispute, character of the conference and result are seen as the same in both accounts, i.e., in Gal 2:1-10 and Acts 15:1-30.¹³⁸

As to the geography, Lightfoot finds that in both accounts the agitators or false brethren are located in Jerusalem and cause trouble among the Antiochian Christians. In both accounts the journey made by Paul and his companions is from Antioch to Jerusalem and later a return to Antioch. For Lightfoot, the time of the event in Acts and Galatians is approximately A.D. 51. The people involved are Paul and Barnabas as the Gentile representation and Cephas and James

¹³⁶Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 123.

¹³⁷Ibid.

¹³⁸Ibid., p. 123. f.

for the circumcision representation. The Christian Pharisees, in both instances, dispute the issue of circumcision in a long and difficult conference with the result that the Gentiles are free from the law and Paul's and Barnabas' apostolic mission is recognized.¹³⁹ "A combination of circumstances as striking is not likely to have occurred twice within a few years."¹⁴⁰

Lightfoot stresses that Luke was concerned about showing the growth of the church, thus, he relates the council in such a manner as to bring out that which affected the whole church, whereas, Paul was attempting to establish his independence of the original apostles. Furthermore, Paul could relate private discussions, while Luke would neither have full access to all the private happenings nor would he feel that such happenings would be appropriate for his account. However, both authors acknowledged or indicated that the opposite aspect from what they recorded existed.¹⁴¹

Nevertheless, Lightfoot recognized that there were discrepancies, for example, the reason for the journey, the nature of the conference and the relationship between Paul and the Twelve.

In Galatians, Paul explains the motive for his journey to Jerusalem as being a revelation which he received.

¹³⁹Cf. Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 123 f.; also, Wikenhauser, New Testament Introduction, p. 335.

¹⁴⁰Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 124.

¹⁴¹Cf. *ibid.*, p. 125 f.

In Acts, Paul and Barnabas are sent to Jerusalem by the Antioch Church to have a dispute settled. To explain this difference, Lightfoot emphasizes that,

The historian naturally records the external impulse, which led to the mission; the Apostle himself states his inward motive. "What I did," he says, "I did not owing to circumstances, not as yielding to pressure, not in deference to others, but because the Spirit of God told me it was right." The very stress which he lays on this revelation seems to show that other influences were at work.¹⁴²

Lightfoot used Acts 9:29,30, Acts 13:2-4 and Acts 15:28 as parallel cases which indicate how one reason for performing an action often complemented another.¹⁴³

As to the meeting itself, Galatians relates it as a private conference and Acts describes it as a public council meeting. Lightfoot explains away the so-called discrepancy by stating that Paul in Galatians refers only to the private aspect of the conference while the public meeting is only related by Luke. This occurs due to their particular aim when writing, as was mentioned previously. Thus, Lightfoot maintains the trustworthiness of Luke's account as opposed to the view of Baur.

Another aspect of the meeting that Lightfoot considered was that Luke presents a harmonious relationship between Paul and the twelve apostles, whereas, Paul in Galatians indicates a certain tension between himself and the other apostles. Luke has the Jerusalem apostles support

¹⁴²Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 125.

¹⁴³Ibid.

the freedom from the law of the Gentiles, whereas, Paul indicates that he and Barnabas fought against the imposition of the Mosaic law and won the freedom from the law for the Gentiles.¹⁴⁴

According to Lightfoot, the above discrepancy disappears as the scene is reconstructed. It was a meeting where a compromise was worked out which implies the common experienced process of long debates, varying opinions, errors, etc. The Twelve may have been doubtful at the beginning, but they were strongly in favour of "liberal measures towards the Gentiles."¹⁴⁵ Further, Paul and Barnabas relate their efforts and results of missionizing, but leave the active debating of the issue, i.e., circumcision of the Gentiles, to the Twelve in order to avoid any prejudice developing.¹⁴⁶

The greatest apparent omission that Lightfoot had to resolve was that, according to Acts (15:1-30), it was Paul's third visit to Jerusalem, whereas, in Galatians (2:1-10) it was Paul's second visit. An important but lesser omission was that of Paul's not mentioning the decree.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁴Cf. Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 126.

¹⁴⁵Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 126.

¹⁴⁶Ibid.

¹⁴⁷Cf. *ibid.*, p. 127. Lightfoot suggests that the meaning of the decree and the type of opposition Paul encountered in Galatia explain the omission of their mention in Paul's Epistle.

Lightfoot resolves the problem regarding the journeys to Jerusalem by examining the circumstances of the visit. He was of the opinion that the persecution was so greatly felt and caused such a reaction that Christians of any and every rank had fled the city of Jerusalem by the time Paul and Barnabas arrived. Since the mission of Paul and Barnabas was to present the monies collected for the poor of Judea, they did so quickly trusting the collection to the elders (Acts 11:27-30). Thus, having stayed so briefly in Jerusalem without seeing the apostles, Paul feels it is unnecessary to relate this journey. The second journey to Jerusalem in Acts simply has no counterpart in Galatians. Lightfoot explains Paul's reason for this omission accordingly. "His [Paul's] objective is not to enumerate his journeys to Jerusalem, but to define his relations with the Twelve; and on these relations it had no bearing."¹⁴⁸

As to the decrees, they were to be considered as "Articles of Peace"¹⁴⁹ addressed to the Gentile believers in Antioch, Syria and Cilicia (Acts 15:23). From what can be concluded from 2 Cor. and Romans, where eating meats offered to idols was treated with indifference, the decree would appear temporary and directed only to those Gentile churches which were in frequent and close contact with the

¹⁴⁸Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 127; cf. also Wikenhauser, New Testament Introduction, p. 333. See above, p. 10.

¹⁴⁹Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 127.

Jewish Christians.¹⁵⁰ Lightfoot believes that the object of the decree was to remove the burden of Jewish rituals, etc., for the Gentile Christians. However, in the Galatian Epistle the Christian recipients of the letter appear to be willingly taking on the rituals and keeping the festival days, thus Paul does not speak of not submitting to the Judaizers' demands but rather points out that it is sinful to accept the law as a means of salvation. Christ is to be their salvation.¹⁵¹ Lightfoot explains that Paul refused to appeal to a decree designed in Jerusalem after the exaggeration of the Judaizers regarding the power of the apostles and the superiority of the Jerusalem church. Furthermore, it would seem inconsistent to refer to the decree when he had at that time defended his position as a true apostle independent of Jerusalem. To have resorted to the decree would have been to concede to his enemies.¹⁵²

The following portion of this subsection gives a sampling of how subsequent scholars agreed in principle with Lightfoot's work or at least with his choice of Acts 15 as the account equatable with Gal. 2:1-10. These scholars varied either on single points or on the approach to the two types of material used, i.e., the Epistle to the Galatians and the Acts of the Apostles.

¹⁵⁰Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 127. See above, p. 42.

¹⁵¹Ibid., p. 128. See above, pp. 39-41.

¹⁵²Ibid., p. 128.

By examining briefly other proponents of the Gal. 2:1-10 and Acts 15:1-30 theory, it becomes evident how strong the conservative tradition of approaching Galatians and Acts was. It was not until the time of Dibelius, some sixty years after Lightfoot, that radical changes occur in the type of approach applied to the texts. This is not to imply, however, that the traditional approach and arguments have been abandoned in this era because of Dibelius' and Haenchen's new developments. At present it can be observed that two schools of thought prevail, with limited interaction between the two groups of scholars.

(b) J. B. Lightfoot's Supporters

(i) E. de W. Burton. E. de W. Burton, in his commentary on Galatians (1920),¹⁵³ holds the same view as Lightfoot except that he explains the result of the Jerusalem meeting differently. He believes that with the decrees Luke has introduced an element which belongs elsewhere. The evidence for this, according to Burton, is that there is no hint of a food law but rather a dividing of the missionary work and a promise made by Paul and Barnabas to remember the poor. Furthermore, the incident recorded in Gal. 2:11 where Paul confronts Peter regarding his sudden refusal to eat at the same table as Gentiles, who might eat so-called "unclean meat" according to Mosaic law, indicates

¹⁵³Burton, Galatians, pp. 66-100.

that a tableship agreement was not reached.¹⁵⁴

(ii) J. G. Machen. J. G. Machen in 1925 in his book, The Origin of Paul's Religion, basically agrees with the argument of Lightfoot for equating Gal. 2:1-10 with Acts 15:1-35. However, he finds the reason for Paul's lack of enumerating all his visits to Jerusalem in Paul's specific purpose for selecting the content of Galatians. Paul chooses those details which support his view of the gospel, his authority and independence as well as those facts or items which answer to the Judaizers' contestation. Paul indicates his independence in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians, and in the second chapter shows the apostles confirming his independence. Machen felt that the Judaizers most likely misconstrued Paul's first visit in such a way that it pointed to Paul's dependence on the apostles.¹⁵⁵ Most likely the Judaizers misguided their listeners as to what occurred at the conference, too.

Thus, if the famine visit would have involved the apostles or the conference, Paul would have mentioned it. As it appears to Machen, the visit Acts 11:30 and 12:25 did not take place until Paul had been engaged in the Gentile mission work. The fact that Galatians does not include the famine visit has no bearing on the historicity

¹⁵⁴Cf. Burton, Galatians, p. 117. However, contrary to Lightfoot, Burton holds the South Galatian theory (pp. xxv-xxvii).

¹⁵⁵Machen, Origin, p. 85 f.

of Acts nor does it demand the equating of Gal. 2:1-10 with Acts 11:27-30.¹⁵⁶

Machen stresses that the conference in Jerusalem did not point out the agreed division of the church, but rather the unity by the right hand of fellowship.¹⁵⁷

The author deviates from Lightfoot's explanation of the decree by considering the Western Text as attested by Codex Bezae as the correct version. This text, quoted below,

For it has seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us to lay no further burden upon you except these necessary things--that you refrain from things offered to idols and from blood and from fornication, and that you do not to another whatsoever things you do not wish to be done to you.¹⁵⁸

omits "things strangled and adds the negative form of the Golden Rule."¹⁵⁹ In this way it makes the decree a moral one rather than a ceremonial one. And if it is a moral request which is already observed and is not a necessity to salvation, then it added nothing to Paul's message to the Gentiles.¹⁶⁰

¹⁵⁶Machen, Origin, p. 86.

¹⁵⁷Ibid., p. 87.

¹⁵⁸Ibid.

¹⁵⁹Ibid., p. 88.

¹⁶⁰Ibid., p. 88 f.

(iii) J. A. Allan. J. A. Allan, in the Torch Commentary on Galatians, in 1951, follows the same methodology as Lightfoot and holds the same view.¹⁶¹ However, on one point he differs. Allan feels there is a difficulty in trying to explain the apostolic decrees in their present context. It seems to him that the decrees, with the interpretation as food laws, could not have been acceptable to Paul. Therefore, Allan suggests that "Luke is in error on this point."¹⁶² This error could have come about because of some misunderstanding of Paul's attitudes or actions.

(iv) H. Ridderbos. As to the commentary of H. Ridderbos (1953),¹⁶³ the methodology employed appears to be the same as that of Lightfoot, for Ridderbos follows T. Zahn who wrote at the same time as Lightfoot and in the same vein.¹⁶⁴ Dibelius' contribution to resolving the problem, which will be examined further on in this paper, goes unnoticed by Ridderbos and is only taken up later by E. Haenchen. The position of Galatians 2:1-10 and Acts 15 is maintained by Ridderbos.¹⁶⁵ However, the South Galatian

¹⁶¹J. A. Allan, Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians, London, SCM Press, 1964. Allan, however, holds the South Galatian theory as Wm. M. Ramsay did.

¹⁶²Ibid., p. 41.

¹⁶³Ridderbos, Epistle of Paul, 238 p.

¹⁶⁴See above, p. 85.

¹⁶⁵Ridderbos, Epistle of Paul, pp. 78-80.

theory regarding the destination of the Epistle is proposed.¹⁶⁶ Though this is contrary to Lightfoot's theory, it is possible, according to Ridderbos, for he assumes that the Epistle was written shortly after the apostolic council in Corinth around A.D. 50/51.¹⁶⁷ As to the meeting in Jerusalem, Ridderbos states that "there were public and private discussions."¹⁶⁸ As for Paul's concern, the issue of circumcision was clearly ended for even Titus, a Gentile, was not circumcised.¹⁶⁹ The "line of conduct recommended in the enactment [decrees] was already being followed by Paul."¹⁷⁰

(v) O. Cullmann. Though O. Cullmann approaches the problem from another perspective, that of the life, role, and work of Peter, his result is the same as Lightfoot's and his followers, i.e., that the most probable solution is that Galatians 2:1-10 is the same as the account in Acts 15:1-35. However, Cullmann feels that the decrees were of a later period and Luke simply erred by attaching them to the events of the Jerusalem conference.¹⁷¹

¹⁶⁶Ridderbos, Epistle of Paul, p. 31.

¹⁶⁷Ibid.

¹⁶⁸Ibid., p. 81.

¹⁶⁹Ibid., p. 82 f.

¹⁷⁰Ibid., p. 92.

¹⁷¹Cullmann, Peter, p. 51.

(vi) P. Parker. A last example of how the traditional approach is maintained, despite new trends, is the work of P. Parker (1967).¹⁷² The question of historical reliability is continued, although with one difference: Parker attempts to establish which account is historical rather than prove the historicity of both Acts 15:1-30 and Galatians 2:1-10.

Parker realizes that the minor differences between Galatians 2:1-10 and Acts 15 can be explained by the fact that they are two independent accounts of the same event.¹⁷³

There are four discrepancies though, which, in Parker's opinion, cannot be explained in the same way. They are: first, "If the council described in Gal. 2 is the one reported in Acts 15, why does Paul not cite the decree of Acts 15:23-29?";¹⁷⁴ second, "so quickly" seems inappropriate since Galatians was written after the council that it describes;¹⁷⁵ third, that Gal. 2 is "fourteen years after" Gal. 1, a long time for the events in Acts 13 and 14;¹⁷⁶ and fourth, the council in Galatians is during Paul's second trip, in Acts it is during Paul's third trip.¹⁷⁷

¹⁷²Parker, "Once More," pp. 175-182.

¹⁷³Ibid., p. 175.

¹⁷⁴Ibid., p. 176.

¹⁷⁵Cf. ibid., p. 177.

¹⁷⁶Ibid., p. 178.

¹⁷⁷Ibid., p. 179.

From Acts 15, it appears that the decree was addressed to Gentile Christians in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia and not to Galatia. Furthermore, Parker points out, the decree was not a victory for Paul. To allow the Gentiles to attend church services was no victory since this had been permitted in the synagogue long before this time. The dietary restrictions imposed on the Gentiles who wished to be a part of the Christian community was in opposition to what Paul preached. This reversal of requirements accounts for its absence in Paul's writing rather than the explanation that Galatians was written before the issuing of the decrees.¹⁷⁸ The decree was even more damaging in the sense that it did not recognize Paul's apostleship, thereby undermining Paul's strong claim to it.¹⁷⁹ Furthermore, it would appear that the decree was not favorable to Paul for it did not end his struggle against the Judaizers (Acts 21:20 f.; 1 Cor. 9:2).

Since Acts 21:27-26:32 does not record visits or aid from the Jerusalem apostles to Paul while he was in prison, it seems, according to Parker, that even the Jerusalem apostles gave Paul little support.¹⁸⁰

As to the "so quickly," Parker feels that Paul meant that the Galatians at the time of the troublemakers'

¹⁷⁸Parker, "Once More," p. 177 f.

¹⁷⁹Ibid., p. 176.

¹⁸⁰Ibid.

campaign gave up their convictions. This probably occurred during the peak of the Judaizing controversy, i.e., ca. A.D. 55-60. The tone of Galatians corresponds with that of Romans, thus Paul's later development. The internal evidence suggests it was during Paul's fund raising campaign.

As to the problem of Galatians 2 being fourteen years after Galatians 1, Parker explains that this is possible if the ancients' method of calculating time is used. The ancients always counted parts of years as complete years, thus, the time spoken of in Galatians, i.e., the three years after the conversion of Paul and the eleven years in the mission field as described in Acts 13 and 14, is possible.¹⁸¹

The explanation Parker gives about the discrepancy of the journey to Jerusalem which according to Acts 15 is the third visit and according to Galatians 2 is Paul's second visit, is that Paul lists all his contacts with the Jerusalem leaders. Therefore, Parker concludes, Acts is inaccurate, the visit to Jerusalem recorded in Acts 9 did not actually occur. The principle on which he bases his decision is "where Acts and Paul disagree about Paul's own movements, Paul is surely right."¹⁸² In Gal. 1:15-17 Paul departs for Arabia not Jerusalem as Acts indicates. Furthermore, Paul does not suggest that he was threatened

¹⁸¹Parker, "Once More," p. 178 f.

¹⁸²Ibid., p. 179. (This is the same principle that F. C. Baur held.)

on his first return journey to Jerusalem.¹⁸³ Parker feels that Acts 9:26-30 is "an amalgam from three later visits."¹⁸⁴ This he shows by making the following comparisons: Acts 9:26-30 with Acts 11:29 f., Acts 9:27,28 with Acts 15:2,4, and Gal. 2:1,2,9 and Acts 9:29 with Acts 21:27 ff. Thus, his conclusion is that Acts 15 and Galatians 2 describe the same council in Jerusalem.¹⁸⁵

B. M. Dibelius

In 1947 Martin Dibelius tackled the problem of the Apostolic Council, sensing more strongly than all his predecessors the methodological necessity of appreciating the real character of Luke's account (Studies, 93ff.). Hence he gives an analysis of the chapter which surpasses all previous attempts in its precision.¹⁸⁶

For Dibelius, the methodology employed was very important. This is readily observable in all of his works. He believed that the understanding and appreciation of Acts 15 was greatly reduced because Galatians 2 was compared with Acts 15 before the Acts account was fully understood and clarified. He is surprised that

. . . attention has not been drawn more often and more forcefully to its [Acts'] very strange character. Only a few commentators, among them Loisy especially, have even noticed what is so striking.¹⁸⁷

¹⁸³Parker, "Once More," p. 180.

¹⁸⁴Ibid.

¹⁸⁵Cf. *ibid.*

¹⁸⁶Haenchen, Acts, p. 457.

¹⁸⁷Dibelius, Studies, p. 94.

Dibelius draws two conclusions from the study of Acts 15, first, a literary one, that regarding the understanding of the text, and second, a historical one, that which regards which particular text presents the event historically.

First, the literary conclusion will be examined. In Peter's speech at the conference, as recorded in Acts, a vague reference is made to the account of the conversion of Cornelius. In the Jerusalem council it would appear that the people gathered there had forgotten that a Gentile was converted and that Peter had proven that it was God's wish. Thus, the reference which Peter makes cannot be understood by the hearers at the conference but only by the readers of the book. In the account of Acts, the author has, five chapters prior to the Jerusalem council, emphasized and elaborated at length on the Cornelius story. Dibelius points out that this study is the work of Luke, i.e., "by including the vision of Peter, the reference to his vision in 10:27-29, the speech, and the account of the justification of Peter in 11.1 ff., he has extended the story of Cornelius."¹⁸⁸ A simple story of a conversion becomes a story of great significance. Luke regarded "the story as evidence of the fact that the conversion of the Gentiles depended upon the will of God and not upon a decision by Peter or by Paul."¹⁸⁹ Even the ending of the speech

¹⁸⁸Dibelius, Studies, p. 95.

¹⁸⁹Ibid.

indicates Luke's theology, for, Peter says that the burden of fulfilling the law has been unbearable even for Jews, thus indicating that the law is not for Gentiles. This is not the Peter of the Antiochian incident (Gal. 2:11-14). Paul also mentions the unbearable burden of the law but says it is obsolete because of Christ giving us a new law.

After Peter's speech, the author of Acts states that Paul and Barnabas speak of the signs of God's work among the Gentiles but nothing is heard of their view of the circumcision issue. This is a rather strange omission for, at this point, it would seem appropriate to hear Paul's and Barnabas' account of their position, thus settling the issue being debated. The

. . . remarkable fact, that we hear nothing whatever about this account, is scarcely mentioned in the commentaries. And yet this is extremely striking in an author who, in Acts 15. 1-5, gives considerable attention to the way the plot develops and in doing so has already spoken of an account given by the missionaries. The settlement should now have followed; God's deeds in the mission should have reduced to silence every opposition to this type of evangelising!¹⁹⁰

The only reason for this, according to Dibelius, is that the account has already been told, not at this meeting, but in the Book of Acts. Once more this points out the literary character of Acts 15, with the historical aspect considered as a lesser concern at this time.

James' speech can be understood in the same manner. James seems to overlook the description of the missionary

¹⁹⁰Dibelius, Studies, p. 95.

deeds and speaks of the Cornelius event. This, too, would only be understood by the readers of the Book of Acts, particularly the allusion to Cornelius in this phrase, "Symeon has recorded how God took care to win a people out of the Gentiles for his name."¹⁹¹

Thus, for Dibelius, the study of Acts 15:1-29 brings forth the idea that Luke knew of a struggle between the Gentile Christians and the Judaizers over the circumcision issue and that it was settled in Jerusalem. Since his reason for writing is literary and theological, Luke did not simply record a tradition about the Jerusalem conference. Having already stressed that "the unconditional admission of the Gentiles to salvation is not the work of men but of God"¹⁹² by telling the Cornelius conversion, he reemphasizes the same theme in the speeches of James and Peter.

The decrees are the four well known ordinances which the God-fearers, those Gentiles who attended the synagogue, had always kept. Thus, Luke presents the decrees as a concession of the Jerusalem church not of the Gentile Christians, i.e., they are a release from the burden of the law and not something new to be added to the Gentile Christian way of life. Dibelius believes that Luke came across the decrees somewhere and presented the ordinances in such a manner since they seemed fruitful and seemed to

¹⁹¹Dibelius, Studies, p. 97.

¹⁹²Ibid., p. 99.

fit well with the meeting he had just related. However, Dibelius points out that historical criticism indicates that the decrees do not form the concluding resolutions of the apostolic council.¹⁹³

Thus, according to Dibelius, the account of the Jerusalem conference was a literary and theological work of the author of Acts to prove how God willed that the Gentiles be saved through Christianity. Once this is understood, states Dibelius, the fact of Galatians 2 being the only historical account can be accepted. If this is the case, then the Galatians' account cannot be corrected by placing the Acts source against it. This brings the historical aspect of Dibelius' thesis to the fore.

The differences in the two accounts are delineated by Dibelius in the following way. According to Galatians, Paul journeys to Jerusalem because of a revelation; however, Acts has Paul journeying because of a community decision. In addition to this, the final results of the meeting in Jerusalem in each of the accounts are different.¹⁹⁴ The different motive for the journey can be explained by Luke's literary and theological treatment of the material. As to the results, the decree issued in Acts did not belong to this meeting, it was probably of a later date without Paul's awareness of it.¹⁹⁵

¹⁹³Dibelius, Studies, p. 99.

¹⁹⁴Ibid., p. 98.

¹⁹⁵Ibid., p. 99; Paul, p. 130.

As to Titus, mentioned in the Galatian's account, it seems evident to Dibelius that Paul prevented the circumcision of Titus by refuting the Judaizers. This was accomplished because the Jerusalem apostles recognized that God commissioned Paul's mission and that Paul was right regarding the freedom of the law for the Christian Gentiles.¹⁹⁶

Dibelius takes issue with Luke's reference to the famine visit, Acts 11:30 and 12:25. This journey to Jerusalem recorded in Acts is contradictory to Paul's account of his journeys to Jerusalem. For Dibelius, one thing is definite and that is this material is incorrectly placed in Acts¹⁹⁷ and further, "that Luke's references to the undertaking of the collection are nothing more than incidental allusions."¹⁹⁸

Dibelius concludes that the critical study of Acts 15:1-29 establishes Luke's treatment of the account as being of literary-theological value with no claim for historical worth. This is clear from the examination of Luke's intention, for example, in the relating of the baptism of Cornelius, i.e., God willed that the gospel be taken to the Gentiles. The decree is not an original part of the conference. Hence, the Galatian account cannot be corrected in the light of Acts.¹⁹⁹

¹⁹⁶Cf. Dibelius, Paul, p. 130.

¹⁹⁷Ibid., p. 59; Studies, p. 93.

¹⁹⁸Dibelius, Paul, p. 59.

¹⁹⁹Dibelius, Studies, p. 99 f.

It is evident that M. Dibelius, though agreeing with the equation of Galatians 2:1-10 with Acts 15:1-30, has approached the problem far differently from Lightfoot.²⁰⁰

C. E. Haenchen

E. Haenchen agrees also with the conclusion that Galatians 2:1-10 equals Acts 15:1-35. However, in his case, too, it is necessary to note how different his approach is from that of J. B. Lightfoot.

Haenchen not only develops the argument to support his view that Gal. 2:1-10 and Acts 15:1-35 are recounting the same event, but also he refutes the possibility of relating Gal. 2:1-10 with Acts 11:27-30. The discussion of Acts 11:27-30 sheds light on and provides support for accepting Acts 15:1-35 as the same event as the one related by Paul in Gal. 2:1-10. Thus, Haenchen's interpretation of Acts 11:27-30 will be presented before his argumentation for Galatians 2 and Acts 15.

As to the relationship between Gal. 2:1-10 and Acts 11:27-30, Haenchen suggests that a careful study be made of the passage of Acts before considering a comparison with Galatians.

He briefly summarizes the account of the collection at Antioch (Acts 11:27-30) as Luke's way of showing the

²⁰⁰Cf. W. W. Gasque, Sir William M. Ramsay, Archaeologist and New Testament Scholar, Grand Rapids, Baker Book House, 1967 (1st ed. 1966), p. 62.

close link between the mother church and the relatively new Gentile community. The prophets reveal the future and the young community takes immediate measures to relieve the hunger and depressed condition of the persecuted Jerusalem church members. Paul and Barnabas share this dangerous situation since they deliver the collection during the persecution.²⁰¹

Though the explanation appears so clear and simple, E. Haenchen points out,

So long as the reader simply accepts the passage gratefully, and is edified by the meaningful and gracious dispensation of history, all is well. But the moment we attempt to understand this picture historically, then everything becomes problematic-- as the history of research shows.²⁰²

Not only is the question of why the prophets came down from Jerusalem to Antioch difficult to answer but also that of the content of the prophecy. That a group of prophets should go to Antioch presents several problems: Why a group, since history seems to indicate that by this time prophets travelled singly,²⁰³ and why travel to Antioch, a place which had its own prophets? As to the prediction of a universal famine under Claudius, the difficulty arises that, although the word universal is used, no widespread famine occurred during Claudius' reign. As the previous discussion has shown, the exegetes have tried various ways

²⁰¹Cf. Haenchen, Acts, p. 375 f.

²⁰²Ibid., p. 376.

²⁰³See above, p. 31 f.

of relating this account to reality.

Haenchen asks a further question: What was there in Agabus' prophecy to prompt the men of Antioch to make a collection for Judea? It seems to him questionable to accept Bauernfeind's position that the Antiochian Christians had the apostles foremost in mind, for the Antiochian community was established by Hellenists who were fugitives from Jerusalem. He believes that this latter fact was unknown to Luke.

Furthermore, Galatians speaks of only one journey which Paul and Barnabas made together to Jerusalem, whereas Acts mentions two. Haenchen holds the position, which he says is more or less accepted today, that a meeting with the apostles took place and any attempt of Paul to omit relating it would have been the very act of which the Judaizers condemned him. Additional evidence for Paul's mentioning all his journeys to Jerusalem is his recounting of the fourteen-day visit with only Peter and James (Gal. 1:18 f.).²⁰⁴

Haenchen sees Ramsay's and J. Jeremias' attempts at explaining the silence of Acts 11 with regard to the issue of circumcision unacceptable. He thinks, "we will do better to acknowledge the anomalies in 11.27ff."²⁰⁵ However, this is not to call it "tendentious fiction."²⁰⁶

²⁰⁴Haenchen, Acts, p. 377.

²⁰⁵Ibid., p. 378.

²⁰⁶Ibid.

The traditions were there and Luke used them as best he could. According to Haenchen, Luke knew of a tradition concerning Agabus, the prophet.

There were personal legends--understanding the word as a literary designation, not as a historical evaluation--such as popular religious tradition likes to relate about men of God. So it was reported of Agabus that he forewarned Paul of his imprisonment (Acts 21.10f.) and prophesied the great famine. This second prophecy Luke has here developed into a vivid scene, and by the statement "this came to pass under Claudius" has at once provided historical confirmation and stamped it as fulfilled.²⁰⁷

Also available to Luke was another tradition regarding the relief journey to Jerusalem by Paul and Barnabas, although he does not describe it as a great undertaking as Paul does in Corinthians and Romans. In Acts 24:17 Luke has Paul say that he has brought offerings and alms for those in need in Jerusalem. Thus, Haenchen believes, with Bauernfeind, that it is a tradition which has "somewhat strayed from the historical."²⁰⁸ He goes on to say that this is understandable, for in the time of the circulation of oral traditions Paul's journey with the fund and the visit with Barnabas to Jerusalem could have gradually become united so that it was told that Paul and Barnabas journeyed to Jerusalem with alms collected for the poor.²⁰⁹ Haenchen thinks that it was easy enough for Luke to link the two legends because the one becomes the cause of the other.

²⁰⁷Haenchen, Acts, p. 378.

²⁰⁸Ibid., quoting Bauernfeind.

²⁰⁹Ibid., p. 378 f.

The prophet Agabus visits Antioch and forecasts a famine in Judea and Paul responds by collecting monies to aid the needy Christians in Jerusalem. Luke seems to use an Old Testament model regarding the itinerant prophets, and this explains the use of the plural "prophets" in his account. As was mentioned earlier, Haenchen believes that "Luke knew nothing of the deep rift between the Stephenite and the apostolic congregations in Jerusalem (or if any report reached him he considered it unreliable)."²¹⁰ Haenchen draws attention to the fact that Luke has Paul and Barnabas stay in Jerusalem despite a severe persecution there, as an example of how Luke used his material. Another example is the way in which Luke in Acts 15:23 intimates that he has heard that the Antiochian community had been developing independently and pressing ahead in the missionizing of the Gentiles of Syria and Cilicia but does not include accounts of it because he could not find any edifying stories connected with this particular missionizing endeavour.²¹¹

One more reason, according to Haenchen, for Luke to use this material in Acts 12:25 is that it provided a link for the account of John Mark (Acts 15:37) being with them in the first missionary journey, since he could have returned from Jerusalem with them. In addition, it further

²¹⁰Haenchen, Acts, p. 379.

²¹¹Ibid.

impressed upon the reader the close ties with Jerusalem.²¹²

Certainly, today's historians would approach it differently. Underlying Luke's approach to the traditions he used was, according to Haenchen, the fact that, "In everything he was guided by his conviction of the intimate, harmonious relations between the primitive community and Antioch."²¹³

As to the explanation of Acts 15, Haenchen, adapting the methodology of Dibelius, agrees with Dibelius on the point that Luke's version of the Jerusalem council has no historical value;²¹⁴ for Luke writes from a particular viewpoint, viz., "God willed the Gentile mission without the Law."²¹⁵ Furthermore, Luke wished to point out that the Jerusalem church approved the mission; therefore, in Acts 15 Luke has Peter and James allude to the Cornelius episode which was a proof that the Gentile mission was initiated by God and not by man.²¹⁶

Haenchen goes on immediately to state that although Paul's account must be considered as historical, it, too, must be examined carefully. Paul was establishing his independence both from the apostles and the Jerusalem church

²¹²Haenchen, Acts, p. 379.

²¹³Ibid.

²¹⁴Ibid., p. 464; also cf., G. Bornkamm, Paul, New York, Harper and Row, 1971 (German ed. 1969), p. 31 f.

²¹⁵Cf. Haenchen, Acts, p. 463.

²¹⁶Ibid.

as a whole and, therefore, must have selected his material accordingly.²¹⁷ "He [Paul] had no intention of setting down an exhaustive account of his visit to Jerusalem."²¹⁸ Instead, Paul pointed out his independence and the Jerusalem church's approval of his gospel without the law. The Judaists were overruled by the group and the Gentile mission as Paul had established it, i.e., without the law, was authorized.²¹⁹ Paul presents it in such a way that the whole situation was settled by equals and neither a concession nor a permission was sought or obtained.

As to the division of the mission, Haenchen interprets that "we to the Gentiles, they to the circumcision" to mean "'You may waive circumcision in the mission to the Gentiles'--it need not be said that Jerusalem itself left the law intact in evangelizing Jews. This ruling embodies Paul's formula but gives it a different emphasis."²²⁰

²¹⁷Haenchen, Acts, p. 464; so too, Bornkamm, Paul, p. 32.

²¹⁸Haenchen, Acts, p. 464.

²¹⁹Ibid., p. 467.

²²⁰Ibid.

Haenchen briefly summarizes the past scholarship on the apostolic decree²²¹ and takes issue with the methodology which is often employed. He stresses that the Acts' text must be seen in itself first, before making a comparison with Galatians, i.e., a literary analysis must be made before the historical problem is treated. In this, Haenchen supports Dibelius' view as outlined previously. However, Haenchen and Dibelius differ after their study of the Lukan text. Dibelius states that the decree was not the result of the meeting.²²² Haenchen suggests that such a conclusion need not be drawn if the text of the decree is studied in the light of the two previous conclusions obtained from the study of the preceding part of the conference: first, the speech of Peter is Luke's work and therefore is of no historical value; second, the Hellenistic interpretation of the LXX in James' speech cannot possibly be ascribed to

²²¹Haenchen, Acts, p. 468. Haenchen points out that, "According to Luke's account the Apostolic Council adopted an authoritarian resolution to which the criticism of the Tübingen school already took exception. Overbeck thus summarized its unanimous conclusion: 'Paul's account is itself sufficient to rule out the existence of the Apostolic decree (verses 23-29)' (221). It is true that not only has Catholic exegesis (eg. Jacquier 803ff.) rejected this criticism, but such Protestants as Wendt (232ff.), Schlatter (Erläut. 4, 186ff.), Lyder Brun (bibl.), Zahn (539) and Michaelis (Das NT verd. u. erläut. II, 65 ff.) have seen no reason not to attribute the decree to the Apostolic Council. The overwhelming majority of Protestant scholars, however, have followed the Tübingers on this point, and indeed the solution suggested by Weizsäcker in 1886 (Das apostolische Zeitalter der Kirche, 186ff.; ET The Apostolic Age) has won the most support."

²²²Dibelius, Studies, p. 99.

James. This is best perceived, according to Haenchen, if Acts 15:4-18 is seen as "an integral essay on the part of Luke to depict and at the same time justify the ultimate acceptance of the Gentile mission without circumcision."²²³ From this Haenchen concludes that Luke would continue the passage in the same vein and thus, Acts 15:19 ff. is a further source of material justifying Paul's cause, i.e., the Gentile mission without circumcision.²²⁴

Haenchen notes that James strongly affirms that the Gentile Christians must not be overburdened, i.e., with circumcision and the whole of the law. This according to James does not do away with certain obligations; however, they are not moral but ritual ones. The necessity of these observances is not explained by James but he does justify them by making reference to the preaching and reading of Moses in the synagogues each sabbath (v. 21).²²⁵

Once again Haenchen differs from Dibelius²²⁶ in that he does not accept the proposition that Luke came upon the four obligations in some old writing and incorporated it in the account of the council. For Haenchen, it seems more likely that Luke is including a living tradition which could probably stem from the apostles' time. "If Luke reports that it pleased the Holy Spirit to lay

²²³Haenchen, Acts, p. 469.

²²⁴Ibid. ²²⁵Ibid.

²²⁶Cf. Dibelius, Studies, p. 99.

these four commandments on the Gentile Christians, they must still have been fully valid for the Gentile Christians of his own day."²²⁷ The prescriptions seem to be an attempt to bind the Jewish and Gentile sectors of Christianity. This, therefore, does not stem from James who in the Antioch scene stands as a strict Jew expressing the impossibility of a common table for the Jews and Gentiles. According to Haenchen, these prescriptions must have evolved out of a diaspora community.²²⁸ Thus, Haenchen clearly disagrees with those who believe the decrees were of a past generation, i.e., prior to Luke's time.

Hence we cannot assume with Hadorn (Theol. Handkommentar zum NT 18, 55) and Bauernfeind (195) that by Luke's time these prohibitions were already obsolete. This would mean that they were no longer observed as they had once been appointed; but then Luke would be characterizing the Gentile Christians of his day (i.e. the greater part of the Church) as disobedient to the Holy Spirit!²²⁹

Objections could be made to the above argument, as Haenchen points out. First, since Jewish Christianity rapidly declined after the fall of Jerusalem, the Gentile Christians probably did not give in, to any extent, to the demands of Jewish Christianity; and second, that the Western text proves that the mid-second century people had no appreciation for "ritual" prescriptions.

²²⁷ Haenchen, Acts, p. 470.

²²⁸ Ibid., p. 471.

²²⁹ Ibid., p. 470.

However, Haenchen finds that the inferences drawn by the objections are questionable. Since the Western text has the tendency to gloss over or tone down tensions, it seems likely that this text would replace the ritual with moral prescriptions.²³⁰ Thus, there seems to be nothing against the view that the four requirements were still in force among Gentile Christians at the time Acts was written.²³¹

3. Gal. 2:1-10 Equals Acts

11:27-30 and 12:25

Wm. M. Ramsay

After extensive archeological work in Asia Minor, Wm. M. Ramsay became convinced that the traditional view of Galatians and Acts presented by J. B. Lightfoot did not correspond to the historical geography in that time and area of the world. Thus, Ramsay felt obliged to contest Lightfoot's view and to undertake a new task, that of writing in the biblical area. This unique undertaking is brought out by F. F. Bruce in the forward of Gasque's book on Sir Wm. M. Ramsay. Ramsay

²³⁰Haenchen, Acts, p. 471.

²³¹Ibid.

has received no biblical or theological training, but he acquired, by dint of his painstaking archaeological research coupled with his mastery of first-century literature, an unrivalled knowledge of the historical and geographical background of the apostolic age, especially where Asia Minor was concerned, and he used that knowledge effectively to illuminate the New Testament.²³²

Reacting to the German Tübingen tradition²³³ which thought that Acts was untrustworthy, and to J. B. Lightfoot's thesis which explained away the difficulties encountered by Acts' account of the "famine visit" (Acts 11:27-30), Wm. M. Ramsay suggested another solution to the vexing problem of comparing the events related in Galatians with those related in Acts.

The methodology of the Tübingen school disturbed Ramsay to such a degree that it, next after his archeological finds, probably played a major part in prompting Ramsay to undertake New Testament studies. Ramsay turned away from the German position because "it is narrow, and because it judges from erroneous premises and unjustifiable prejudices."²³⁴

²³²F. F. Bruce, in the forward of Gasque's book, Ramsay, p. 8.

²³³Cf. Wm. M. Ramsay, The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1920, p. 37 f. Here Wm. M. Ramsay notes that when he first began his archeological studies in Asia he accepted the Tübingen view regarding Acts. Chapter III, called "The First Change of Judgment," shows how Ramsay came to see the Acts of the Apostles with new eyes (pp. 35-52). The rest of the book outlines the trustworthiness of the New Testament and of Acts in particular.

²³⁴Ramsay, Bearing of Recent Discovery, p. ix.

Ramsay resolved to find an unbiased approach to Paul and Acts. He maintained that before any full understanding of the Epistles of Paul or Acts could be achieved the geography, milieu, social and political history must be known. These factors were even more important for Ramsay than ancient literature and inscriptions.²³⁵ Thus, Ramsay's study was an historical and literary one,²³⁶ which was prompted by his study of Acts 14:5-12. It was here that Ramsay discovered Luke's accurate account of the geographical and political situation at the particular time of Paul's and Barnabas' flight. It is stated in Acts how Paul and Barnabas fled from an angry mob from Iconium to Lystra and Derbe, cities of Lycaonia, and the surrounding region (v. 6). This passage suggests that the two men crossed a frontier when entering the area of Lycaonia. Ramsay proved²³⁷ that Iconium was a city in Phrygia and Luke's description was historical thus disproving past scholars' contention that this passage, Acts 14:5-12, was a typical example²³⁸ of how Luke knew little of the situation since he was writing long after the event and was only out to present a particular picture to his readers.

²³⁵Cf. Howard, Romance, p. 145 f.

²³⁶Ramsay, Paul, p. 16.

²³⁷Ramsay, Bearing of Recent Discovery, pp. 53-78.

²³⁸Ibid., p. 41.

Ramsay's first view of Luke,²³⁹ i.e., the accepted one of the Tübingen school, was changed. His new view was based on the above mentioned discovery. Thus, he held that if Luke was correct here and in other places where it could be checked by archeological finds then Luke should be given the benefit of the doubt where he could not be tested.

Ramsay expressed this principle after studying Acts, the Graeco-Roman society, thoughts and fashions, and the provincial organization existing in the area. He states:

You may press the words of Luke in a degree beyond any other historian's, and they stand the keenest scrutiny and hardest treatment provided always that the critic knows the subject and does not go beyond the limits of science and justice.²⁴⁰

Ramsay believes that one reason why many scholars had difficulties with Luke was that Luke's style expected a lot from the reader. Luke presented his material so briefly and concisely that only the essential facts often remained. Hence, the reader was required to imagine the scene and much of the situation.²⁴¹

However, this very style of writing, as far as Ramsay was concerned, pointed to the fact that Luke was a true historian. For the selection of topics, and the power of seizing upon the facts and the development of the subject were signs of a true historian.²⁴² Where the author

²³⁹Ramsay, Bearing of Recent Discovery, p. 37 f.

²⁴⁰Ibid., p. 89.

²⁴¹Ramsay, Paul, p. 17.

²⁴²Ibid., p. 18 f.

is silent or passes over something quickly there must be a reason for this action. As to Acts and Paul's letters, Ramsay believed that they complemented each other. "If Luke wrote Acts, his narrative must agree in a striking and convincing way with Paul's: they must confirm, explain and complete one another."²⁴³ Luke and Paul were dedicated to their cause. One wrote a formal history, the other faithfully tried to inform and counsel his established churches. Furthermore, "the subjects they speak of were of the most overpowering interest to both: their points of view must be very similar, for they are personal friends."²⁴⁴

Having established this principle, Ramsay, when studying the question of Paul's visits to Jerusalem, took, as K. Lake states, "the obvious step of identifying the second visit in Acts with the second visit in Galatians."²⁴⁵

The equating of Galatians 2:1-10 with Acts 11:27-30 and 12:25 was adopted by many scholars, particularly the British and American.²⁴⁶ As to the destination of Galatians

²⁴³Ramsay, Paul, p. 14; cf. F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, London, Tyndale Press, 1952, pp. 34-40.

²⁴⁴Ramsay, Paul, p. 15.

²⁴⁵Lake, "The Apostolic Council," p. 201.

²⁴⁶The list of scholars who accepted the view that Galatians 2:1-10 can be related to the account Acts 11:27-30 and Acts 12:25 is the following, K. Lake, Earlier Epistles, p. 297 ff. held this view at the beginning of his career, however, adopted another view later on; C. W. Emmet, St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, London, R. Scott, 1912, p. xiv; F. C. Burkitt, Christian Beginnings, London, University of London Press, 1924, p. 116 ff. and 57; A. W. F. Blunt, The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1946 (1st ed. 1925), p. 22 ff. and 77 ff.;

Ramsay encountered more difficulty when trying to convince the great majority of British and American scholars to accept his South Galatian theory. His chief difficulty was to convince the followers of Lightfoot that, had Lightfoot survived long enough to have incorporated the archeological discoveries of the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century, his position on the destiny of the Epistle to the Galatians would have been different.²⁴⁷

As S. Neill and others have indicated, "It cannot be said that unanimity has been reached by scholars on the

H. N. Bate, A Guide to the Epistles of Saint Paul, London, Longmans, Green, 1926, p. 45 ff.; G. S. Duncan, Galatians, p. xxii ff. and 35; F. Amiot, S. Paul, épître aux Galates, épîtres aux Thessaloniens, Paris, Beauchesne, 1946, p. 32; A. D. Nock, St. Paul, New York, Oxford University Press, 1960 (rev. ed. 1946), p. 116 f.; W. L. Knox, The Acts of the Apostles, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1948, pp. 40-53; R. Heard, Introduction to the New Testament, London, A. and C. Black, 1950, p. 183; H. F. D. Sparks, The Formation of the New Testament, London, SCM Press, 1952, pp. 25, 58, and 60 f.; A. S. Geyser, "Paul, The Apostolic Decree and the Liberals in Corinth," in J. N. Sevenster and W. C. van Unnik (Eds.), Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis de Zwaam septuagenarii, Haarlem, De Erven F. Bohn N. V., 1953, p. 124 f.; F. F. Bruce, Book of the Acts, pp. 242-244 and 298-300; R. G. Hoerber, "Galatians 2:1-10 and the Acts of the Apostles," Concordia Theological Monthly, Vol. 31, 1960, pp. 482-491; M. H. Franzmann, The Word of the Lord Grows, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1961, p. 54; S. D. Toussaint, "The Chronological Problem of Gal. 2:1-10," Bibliotheca Sacra, Vol. 120, 1963, p. 339 f.; C. H. Talbert, "Again: Paul's Visits to Jerusalem," Nov Test, Vol. 9, 1967, pp. 27-40; M. C. Tenney, Galatians. The Charter of Christian Liberty, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1969 (rev. and enlarged ed.), pp. 76-82; D. R. Hall, "St. Paul and Famine Relief: A Study of Galatians 2:10," ET, Vol. 82, 1971, pp. 309-311; J. J. Gunther, Paul: Messenger and Exile, Valley Forge, Judson Press, 1972, pp. 25-55.

²⁴⁷Wm. M. Ramsay, Historical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1899, p. 5 f.

subject of the Epistle to the Galatians."²⁴⁸ Not only is there disagreement over the comparative study of the content of Acts and Galatians, but over the destination and dating of Galatians. Up until recently, the British were almost unanimous in maintaining the South Galatian theory and early dating of Galatians, while the Germans continue to hold the North Galatian theory and the later date for the composition of Galatians.

Wm. M. Ramsay's argument as regards the equating of Gal. 2:1-10 and Acts 11:27-30 and Acts 12:25 is summarized in the following. According to both Acts 11:27 and Galatians 2:2, Paul journeyed to Jerusalem because of a revelation.²⁴⁹ Acts elaborates how the prophet Agabus²⁵⁰ came down from Jerusalem to Antioch to announce an impending famine in Jerusalem, whereas, the Epistle to the Galatians simply indicates that Paul "went up on account of a revelation." According to Ramsay, Lightfoot is evading the difficulty that both accounts do not speak of revelations as the motivation for the visit to Jerusalem. Lightfoot explains the difference in the reason given for the journey by stating that Paul can speak of the interior motive, whereas Luke the observer must record an external motive.²⁵¹

²⁴⁸Neill, Interpretation, p. 145.

²⁴⁹Ramsay, Galatians, p. 294, and in Paul, p. 57; also Bruce, Book of Acts, p. 244.

²⁵⁰Ramsay, Paul, p. 51.

²⁵¹Ibid., p. 154.

Lightfoot presents parallel cases which to him indicate how one motive might complement another. However, Ramsay finds that the parallels which Lightfoot quotes merely disprove Lightfoot's idea.²⁵² The object of both visits, in the view of Ramsay, appears identical. Galatians 2:10 defines the object as helping and remembering the poor brethren in Jerusalem while Acts speaks of how Paul and Barnabas administered relief to the poor.²⁵³ Ramsay goes on to say that Gal. 2:3 mentions another secondary reason for the visit, though of a private nature, that of Titus' freedom from circumcision.²⁵⁴ Ramsay finds the second visit to Jerusalem a key event in Luke's account of the development of the church. He states it very strongly by enumerating the results of the visit. Ramsay explains that it was at this time, a time of crisis, that the remote members of the church were united with Jerusalem. The sense of brotherhood with Antioch was experienced by the Jerusalem church and, in turn, the sense of fulfillment by the Antiochian members.²⁵⁵

By equating these two journeys as Paul's second visit to Jerusalem, Ramsay is able to hold that Paul's objective is to prove to the Galatians that on his visits to Jerusalem he neither received instructions nor was anything added or

²⁵²Ramsay, Paul, p. 154 f.

²⁵³Ibid., p. 57; see also Bruce, Book of Acts, p. 244.

²⁵⁴Ramsay, Paul, p. 57.

²⁵⁵Ibid., p. 52.

subtracted from his gospel message.²⁵⁶ Since no mention is made of the apostolic decrees (Acts 15:20, 29) it would seem likely that Paul wrote his Epistle to the Galatians from Syrian Antioch before the third missionary journey. This would make it before or on the eve of the council (Acts 15), hence before any decrees were passed.²⁵⁷

In the Galatian account, the discontent of a certain group regarding the association of Paul and Barnabas with Titus, an uncircumcised Gentile, arose. However, this discontented group did not take public action but acquiesced as they had done previously in the case of Cornelius.²⁵⁸

Ramsay explains Acts' silence on this subject in the following manner. Luke was concerned only with the main development of the church and, since the matter of Titus never became an open public discussion, it was not necessary to include the issue. Nor was it necessary for Luke to mention Titus as one of Barnabas' and Paul's assistants for Luke's objective was not to record all the details but rather to state the purpose of the visit, i.e., that of relief which was carried out by Barnabas and Paul.²⁵⁹ However, Ramsay recognized the fact that nowhere does Acts mention Titus, and thus suggests an explanation for the omission. It could

²⁵⁶ Ramsay, Paul, p. 57, 169.

²⁵⁷ Ibid., pp. 189-192.

²⁵⁸ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 58.

²⁵⁹ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 58 f.

be that, "Luke was a relative of one of the early Antiochian Christians."²⁶⁰ If Luke was a relative of Titus and they served as envoys to Corinth together, Luke may have omitted Titus' name from the account just as he omitted his own name.²⁶¹

Ramsay's final argument for equating Galatians 2:1-10 with Acts 11:27-30 and 12:25 is to point out the importance of the Acts 11:27-30 visit.

According to our view, if it had been a mere episode without influence on the development of the Church, Luke would have passed it unmentioned; but it was a step of great consequence in the development of the Antiochian congregation and of the Church as a whole; and therefore it required a place in this history.²⁶²

4. Gal. 2:1-10 Equals Acts 11:27-30 and 12:25 Plus Acts 15:1-30

A. Kirsopp Lake

Though, in the book Earlier Epistles of St. Paul,²⁶³ K. Lake first accepted Sir Wm. Ramsay's theory as the only way around the difficulty of Paul's visits to Jerusalem as related in Galatians and Acts, he eventually felt that

²⁶⁰Ramsay, Paul, p. 390.

²⁶¹Cf. *ibid.* Ramsay admits that the evidence is insufficient for a solid solution. However, he strongly disagrees with Lightfoot "who solves the difficulty by denying that Titus was important enough to deserve mention in Acts (Biblical Essays, p. 281)." p. 390, n. 1.

²⁶²*Ibid.*, p. 60.

²⁶³Lake, Earlier Epistles, pp. 274-293.

E. Schwartz's²⁶⁴ view presented a better solution.

The obvious difficulty [with Ramsay's answer] is that if the whole question had really been settled beforehand by the apostles at the second visit to Jerusalem, why did they pretend to argue it all de novo at the meeting described in Acts xv., as though they had never discussed, much less settled the problem?²⁶⁵

However, by accepting Schwartz's position that Gal. 2:1-10 was the same account as Acts 11 and Acts 15 together, Lake was able to take the positive elements of both Lightfoot's and Ramsay's theses.

With this theory, Lake did not have to accuse either Luke or Paul of error. The visit recorded in Gal. 2:1-10 can be accepted as Paul's second visit to Jerusalem and Acts 11 and 15 can be seen as accounts of the same event as Gal. 2:1-10 but presented from different perspectives. Not only are the accounts representing two points of view but also two different sources, as will be shown below.

The principle that Lake applies to test the reconstruction of an historical account "is whether it produces a result in accordance with the oldest tradition, especially as to the order of events."²⁶⁶ Thus, Lake feels that the

²⁶⁴Cf. Kümmel, Introduction, pp. 141 and 149 f.

²⁶⁵Lake, "The Apostolic Council," p. 201.

²⁶⁶Ibid., p. 202; also A. C. McGiffert, A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age, Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1951 (5th impression, 1st ed. 1897), pp. 168-172 treat the equating of Acts 11:27-30 with Gal. 2:1-10. The discussions on Acts 13 and 14, pp. 172-192, and Acts 15, pp. 192-234, further support McGiffert's theory which was adopted and promoted by K. Lake in his great project The Beginnings of Christianity; and J. R. Porter, "The 'Apostolic decree' and Paul's Second Visit to Jerusalem," JTS, Vol. 47, 1946, pp. 169-174.

character or importance of the accounts may differ even though they relate the same event.

In his study, Lake sees the difficulty which arises, viz., the order of events in Acts 15 and Gal. 2 differ in the present arrangement of the narrative. For Lake, the solution lies in recognizing the sources and rearranging the accounts according to the sources.

Lake finds an Antioch source and a Jerusalem source in Acts, the former being Acts 11:27-30; 12:25; 15:1-2; 15:36 ff., and the latter being Acts 15:3-30. Taking Galatians as the model of the sequence of events, Lake then equates the various accounts in Acts achieving a new arrangement of the text. He arrives at the following. Paul's second visit to Jerusalem Gal. 2:1-2 is recounted in the Antiochian source Acts 11:27-30. The apostolic council Gal. 2:3-10 is observed in Acts 15:3-29 which is from a Jerusalem source. The remaining sections of Acts, i.e., Acts 12:25, 15:30, 15:1-2, and 15:36 ff. refer to Paul's return to Antioch and the problems confronting Paul when emissaries from James arrive and when Peter and Barnabas refuse to eat with the Gentiles (Gal. 2:11-14).²⁶⁷ A corresponding sequence between Galatians and Acts is achieved by this arrangement, the only difference that remains is "that the dispute in Antioch is represented in Acts as being about circumcision and the Law [Acts 15:36 ff.]

²⁶⁷ Lake, "The Apostolic Council," p. 203.

instead of about social intercourse [Gal. 2:11]."²⁶⁸

As to Acts 13-14 the possibility exists that it would fit between Paul's return to Antioch and Peter's arrival in Antioch, but Lake prefers to consider it as a Barnabas tradition which is misplaced and which most likely should be inserted after the quarrel Paul had with Peter and Barnabas.²⁶⁹

Lake states that Luke having heard the Jerusalem account inserts sections of it into the Antiochian source. This made the Jerusalem narrative appear related to the circumcision problem rather than the table fellowship issue. Thus, according to Lake, the author of Acts

. . . produced the very unconvincing story of a controversy which began in Antioch, and was then removed to Jerusalem by representatives of the Antiochian mission, who, however, said nothing about the controversy which took them to Jerusalem, until it was actually forced on their attention.²⁷⁰

As to the decrees, Lake concludes after a thorough investigation of the wording of the decrees, one can only say that the decrees were connected with the table fellowship between Jews and Gentiles within Christianity.²⁷¹

As to the individual decrees, Lake states that εἰδωλόθυτα in Acts "is defined by vs. 20 as τὰ ἀλίσγηματα τῶν εἰδώλων which cannot be narrowed down to the actual

²⁶⁸Lake, "The Apostolic Council," p. 204.

²⁶⁹Ibid., p. 203 f.

²⁷⁰Ibid., p. 204. See above, pp. 38-41.

²⁷¹Ibid., p. 204 f.

participation in a sacrifice, nor even to the eating of sacrificed meat."²⁷² It specifically means idolatry. Αἷμα according to Lake could have three possible explanations: either it means to refrain from eating blood as a food (explained by Leviticus 7:26 and in Leviticus 17:10) as requested from strangers living in Israel; or second, to refrain from things strangled as expressed both by later Judaism and the Neutral text as a way of refraining from blood; or finally refraining from blood as related to sacrifices (for one would be contaminated by participating in adolatrous worship).²⁷³

Πορνεία has two different meanings of equal weight. In a broad sense πορνεία may mean fornication; on the other hand, it may mean "marriage within the forbidden degrees." The latter definition the rabbis described as "forbidden for πορνεία" and Numbers 25:1 f. described it as marriage of Israelites with Midian women.²⁷⁴

Lake points out that religious prostitution was very much a part of some oriental cults. Thus, he raises the question of whether the word πορνεία is used here in a special sense with reference to religious prostitution.²⁷⁵

Just as the other sections of the decree could be taken in the sense of another way of being contaminated by

²⁷²Lake, "The Apostolic Council," p. 205.

²⁷³Ibid., p. 206.

²⁷⁴Ibid. ²⁷⁵Ibid.

idolatry, so too πορνεία. Putting these three together it would appear as a demand against participating in heathen worship.²⁷⁶

Thus, Lake points out that the decrees can be interpreted in various ways, either as food laws, or as an order to avoid heathen worship, or as moral commands. However, he strongly points out that "no one of these interpretations (and I do not know of any fourth possibility) can be adopted without straining the meaning of one of the three commands, or otherwise raising difficulties."²⁷⁷

Lake's position and argument can be described as follows. Πορνεία seems out of place in a decree on food laws; however, to consider it as a demand to avoid idolatry, which is giving the word a special meaning, is also a questionable interpretation. Not even the early Christian writers understood it in the latter sense. The view that the decrees were moral laws was popular with early Western Christian writers but the point can be raised that "eating sacrifices" (εἰδολόθουτα) would be out of place in a moral law. Lake debates whether it can be even questioned as to whether the decrees were a "food law" or a "moral law" because the Jews' stand to using blood as food was its "wrongness," that is, the "moralness" of it. The guideline to use in this debate, Lake states, is to recall "the terms on which Gentiles who were Christian God-fearers could meet

²⁷⁶Lake, "The Apostolic Council," p. 206.

²⁷⁷Ibid.

with Christian Jews, and these again with Jews who were not Christian."²⁷⁸

Lake examines the rules further with regard to Jewish rules for "God-fearers" and the "sojourners" of ancient Israel or the imaginary Israel of the Talmud. Lake reports that little is known regarding Jewish communication with the "God-fearers." However, the rules established for the sojourners could reflect the Jewish policy required of the pious heathen. Leviticus 17:7-10 ff., 18:6-26 and Exod. 20:10 f. and 12:18 f. indicate the rules for such heathen living among Jews. "These regulations were expanded and ultimately codified by the Rabbis as the Seven Commands given to the sons of Noah, and therefore binding on all mankind."²⁷⁹ Despite the fact that these rules were codified later than Acts, the resemblance of the Noachian commands and the decrees of Acts suggest that these commands were understood as regulations for social intercourse of Jews and God-fearers in the mid-first century.

After comparing Gal. 2 and Acts 15, Lake believes there are two probable conclusions. First, Gal. 2:1-10 is concerned with the outruling of the Judaizers' demand for the Gentiles to observe the Mosaic law and be circumcised. Though Luke regarded the decrees as the solution for the above issue, nowhere in Paul's writings can evidence be found to support Luke. Second, the decrees interpreted

²⁷⁸Lake, "The Apostolic Council," p. 207.

²⁷⁹Ibid., p. 208.

in the light of contemporary Jewish thought are seen as rules to achieve table fellowship between the Jewish and Gentile Christians.²⁸⁰ Hence, Lake believes that the "internal evidence" indicates that Luke connected the decrees as a solution to a different problem than they were originally intended.²⁸¹

Lake draws up an hypothesis which would explain why "Luke represents as a 'minimum-law' requirement what was really the regulation of social intercourse."²⁸² First of all, since very early in the history of Christianity the Jewish Christians were rejected by the Jews, it is very probable that Luke never experienced the situation to which the decrees belonged. Furthermore, Galatians 2 clearly depicts the issue of circumcision as settled, and maintains that Peter and James consented to the non-circumcision of Gentile Christians. As to the problem of social intercourse, according to Lake, it, too, is clear, that is, no agreement had been reached. Also, Luke in Acts 21 mentions the decrees as a new thing as if bringing it to Paul's attention.²⁸³

Thus, Lake supports the hypothesis that the author of Acts "knew of the decrees as an actual document, or at least of the policy which they represent, as the settlement

²⁸⁰Lake, "The Apostolic Council," p. 209 f.

²⁸¹Ibid., p. 210.

²⁸²Ibid. ²⁸³Ibid.

of a controversy between Jewish and Gentile Christians."²⁸⁴ Being uncertain of the controversy, Luke attached the decrees to the end of the very important council meeting which he found in his source material. Lake believes that the decrees actually belonged with the controversial question of social intercourse. Paul had no part in the formulation of the decrees, whereas, he was very actively involved with the discussion on circumcision. As to the composition of the passage, Lake suggests that Luke himself composed it rather than rely on a text, if such a letter regarding the request to abide by the decrees ever existed.

Certainly Galatians and Corinthians indicate that apostolic authority existed. Paul also indicated that questions were often settled by means of a letter.²⁸⁵ Thus, it is possible that a letter was sent regarding the means whereby conflict between Jewish and Gentile Christians over a shared meal could be avoided. The text of the letter may not be that composed by the Jerusalem church but rather by Luke. Nonetheless, according to Lake, the letter may have been sent before the conference or at some other time.²⁸⁶

²⁸⁴Lake, "The Apostolic Council," p. 210.

²⁸⁵Ibid., p. 211.

²⁸⁶Ibid., p. 212.

Thus, Lake, using a source theory,²⁸⁷ believed that the discrepancies he observed in comparing Galatians with Acts were resolved and the solution was that Gal. 2:1-10 equalled Acts 11:27-30 and 12:25 plus Acts 15:1-30.

B. P. Benoit

P. Benoit uses the source theory proposed by K. Lake with some modifications. While Lake assigns Acts 15:1-2 to the Antiochian source that Luke used, Benoit ascribes it to the redaction activity of Luke.²⁸⁸ These two verses simply provide a connecting link to the previous material.

Benoit examines various words in Acts 15:1-2 in relation with other parts of Acts to prove that vv. 1-2 were the result of redactionary work. For example, he takes the word "some," *τινες*, and finds it used in vv. 5 and 24. The same is done with *ἕθος* and *σωθῆναι*, etc. Benoit concludes that these words manifest a Lukan character or the Lukan usage of the words.²⁸⁹

In the discussion of the chronology, he differs from Lake in the placing of Acts 13-14.²⁹⁰ Benoit sees

²⁸⁷ Lake, "The Apostolic Council," p. 201; also cf. J. Dupont, The Sources of the Acts, New York, Herder and Herder, 1964, p. 38 f. Dupont speaks of K. Lake's hypothesis as that of "parallel sources."

²⁸⁸ Cf. P. Benoit, "La deuxième visite de Saint Paul à Jérusalem," Biblica, Vol. 40, 1959, p. 784.

²⁸⁹ Ibid.

²⁹⁰ Cf. Lake, "The Apostolic Council," p. 203 f.

this journey as taking place before the Jerusalem council. His reason for supporting Luke's position of the First Missionary Journey before the council is that Paul's confrontation with the Judaizers over circumcision of the Gentiles in the mission gave a reason for the council.²⁹¹

5. Gal. 2:1-10 Equals Acts 15:1-29
in Place of Acts 18:22

John Knox

John Knox proposes an answer to the Galatian and Acts problem which differs radically from the previously mentioned solutions. His theory has not been widely supported. However, it is presented here to complete the scope of suggested ways of dealing with the dilemma of the sequence of events in Paul's life as recorded in Galatians and Acts.

J. Knox in his work of outlining the life of Paul from Paul's letters came across a noteworthy fact. He found that when Paul's Epistles and Acts are examined "with a view to reconstructing Paul's career as an apostle, the materials furnished us require that we organize it with reference to visits to Jerusalem."²⁹² Thus, Knox examines the occasions wherein Paul goes to Jerusalem. In Gal. 2:1-10, the reason Paul gives for undertaking the risky

²⁹¹Benoit, "La deuxième visite," p. 788.

²⁹²J. Knox, Chapters in a Life of Paul, New York, Abingdon Press, 1950, p. 51.

journey to Jerusalem is that of delivering the fund he has collected in his Gentile churches for the poor in Jerusalem. J. Knox takes Rom. 15:31b as an indication that Paul has more in mind than relief of the poor. It is pointed out by Knox that Paul hopes for a recognition of the collection's "significance." The significance of the collection is to achieve peace between Jerusalem and the Gentile churches. The division between the two Christian groups Knox calls a "terrible schism."²⁹³ It is this situation which has made Paul uneasy and hindered his missionary work. Knox finds that Paul speaks of a collection for Jerusalem in 1 Cor. 16:1-4 and Rom. 15:23-32 and in Gal. 2:1-10. It is in this Gal. 2:1-10 account that Paul stresses once again his independence, his gospel free of the law and the fact that the Apostles of Jerusalem recognized and supported his mission requesting only a remembrance of the poor which thing Paul was eager to do.

Knox examines the possible ways of interpreting the request to remember the poor. There seem to be three possibilities:

- (a) The first is a reference to a regular, more or less constant, effort on Paul's part to raise and send money to Jerusalem, which he is now asked to continue, and which he expresses himself eager to do.
- (b) The second is a reference to some special collection for Jerusalem which antedates the offering being raised in the period of the Corinthian letters.
- (c) The Third is a reference to this offering.²⁹⁴

²⁹³Knox, Chapters, p. 54.

²⁹⁴Ibid., p. 54 f.

Though the first interpretation is often chosen, Knox finds there is no supporting evidence for such a continuous fund raising. Acts 11:29-30 speaks of a special occasion. And even though the word "remember" is used, it is not necessary that the present tense, i.e., that of continuous action be considered to include all Paul's missionary years but rather a couple.²⁹⁵ Knox points out that "the aorist ἐσπούδασα (I made haste) looks much more decisively in the direction of a single effort."²⁹⁶ This particular activity must be seen as one which Paul will carry out after the conference. To consider it as a previous activity goes against the context of the sentence. The request appears as a clarification of an agreement which would make no sense if the agreement had already been carried out.²⁹⁷ The sources seem to indicate that the effort of taking the collection is not something prior to that mentioned in 1 and 2 Corinthians and Romans and for which we have no account, but, rather, the important task recorded by Paul in the above mentioned letters. Thus, the (c) interpretation indicates that the apostles are requesting something new and Paul readily agrees because he sees it as an opportunity of uniting the two groups, the Jerusalem church and the Gentile churches.

²⁹⁵Cf. Knox, Chapters, p. 56.

²⁹⁶Ibid. ²⁹⁷Ibid.

Thus, Knox finds support for his theory in C. H. Dodd's²⁹⁸ work and A. D. Nock's²⁹⁹ for they emphasize the relationship of the collection in Gal. 2:10 with Romans and Corinthians. However, Knox puts this information to a different use. For he then stresses that the request to collect support for the poor in Gal. 2:10 must see its fulfillment in Paul's final visit to Jerusalem wherein the offering is made to the Jerusalem church, 1 Cor. 16:4 and Rom. 15:25-32. And this fulfillment must be completed in a period of several years. Knox states: "We cannot very well suppose that Paul got around to fulfilling his 'contractual obligation' some ten years or so after the contract was made."³⁰⁰ From 2 Cor. 9:2 it appears that the collection took approximately two years. The text reads that there was an interval of not more than three years between the conference visit and the offering visit.³⁰¹

As to the timing of Galatians, Knox believes that when Paul speaks of his fourteen years later he is speaking of the peak of his work, i.e., that he has missionized in Macedonia, Greece and Asia. Thus, Knox holds that Paul comes to Jerusalem after the greater part of his missionizing is completed, because the difficulties he has

²⁹⁸C. H. Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1949 (1st ed. 1932), p. 232.

²⁹⁹Nock, St. Paul, p. 118 f.

³⁰⁰Knox, Chapters, p. 58.

³⁰¹Cf. ibid.

encountered from the Judaizers, i.e., Jewish Christians, are causing a break in the two communities. The conference results in one stipulation, the request to aid the poor. Knox believes that students of the life of Paul would accept this if they had no Acts with which to compare it. He finds that most do not take the letters of Paul and the parts of Acts that fit but rather "believe the Acts story, because it is the more circumstantial, and . . . fit in, as well as possible, the bits from the letters."³⁰² This above mentioned tendency is what Knox challenges in his book Chapters in a Life of Paul. Thus, he clearly indicates that, where Acts differs from the letters and shows particular characteristics of the purpose for writing Acts, this will be used to justify his interpretation for his chronology of the life of Paul. In fact, he explicitly states that in the use of sources the principle upon which he works is that "a clear hint in the letters" will have greater value than an "explicit statement in Acts which contradicts it."³⁰³

Knox agrees that the visit to Jerusalem of Gal. 1:18-21 corresponds to that of Acts 9:26-27, that Gal. 2:1-10 corresponds with Acts 15:1-29, and that the final visit to Jerusalem mentioned in 1 Cor. 16:4 and Rom. 15:25-32 corresponds with Acts 21:15 despite all the discrepancies that can be pointed out in each case. The only

³⁰²Knox, Chapters, p. 60.

³⁰³Ibid., p. 63.

difference here from other scholars is that Knox believes that the conference visit was followed very shortly by the final visit, thus, near the end of Paul's life and work.³⁰⁴ And second, that the conference visit marks the beginning of the relief fund.³⁰⁵

Knox states that Paul and Luke have different ideas as to when the conference occurred. "This problem of the time of the conference visit is really the crucial one in the study of the chronology of Paul's career."³⁰⁶

Arguments that Knox feels support further his theory are the following. First, the interval between Paul's conversion and the conference visit as Paul says "then after fourteen years" makes the position of Luke's account of the conference appear out of place. The later the occurrence of the conference is the more difficult it becomes to accomodate it in the Acts' account.

If the present position of the conference in Acts is accepted it becomes very difficult to feature the time as being adequate to accommodate Paul's conversion and his missionizing work in western Asia Minor, Macedonia and Greece.³⁰⁷ Furthermore, Knox points out that Paul's entire Christian experience occurred outside of the Palestinian

³⁰⁴Knox, Chapters, p. 63.

³⁰⁵Ibid., p. 54 ff.

³⁰⁶Ibid., p. 63.

³⁰⁷Ibid., p. 64.

boundaries which would require a sufficient amount of time in regard to both missionizing and travelling.³⁰⁸ This also points to the more likely date of Paul's conversion, i.e., A.D. 35.

As to the date of the last visit to Jerusalem, Knox has argued from the material of Acts which indicates that this visit was made two years before Festus replaced Felix as procurator of Judea. Paul, in his letters, does not mention anything which would prove or disprove Luke's statement. Hence, it must be accepted or else Luke would be credited with an error "which on any view of the date, authorship, or purpose of that work is almost incredible."³⁰⁹ Therefore, Knox believes that Paul's last trip to Jerusalem occurred just before Festus replaced Felix as procurator of Judea, approximately in A.D. 55.³¹⁰ This date is only accepted by those scholars who date Paul's conversion in A.D. 30, 31, or 32. However, those who take A.D. 35 as the date of Paul's conversion, find A.D. 57 as the date of Festus

³⁰⁸Knox, Chapters, p. 65.

³⁰⁹Ibid.

³¹⁰Ibid., p. 65 f. The evidence on which J. Knox relies is pointed out in the footnote related to the passage quoted. "There are two pieces of evidence. One is the statement of Eusebius that the accession of Festus occurred in the second year of Nero, which would be 55-56 (Chronicon). The other is the statement of Josephus that Felix after his term of office was saved from disgrace by the intervention of Pallas (Antiquities XX.8-9)--this statement taken with that of Tacitus that Pallas himself fell into disfavour apparently in 53 (Annals XIII.14-15)." See also Foakes Jackson and Lake, BC, Part 1, Vol. 5, pp. 464-467.

succeeding Felix. As far as Knox is concerned, the scholars who arrive at such dates are not allowing the evidence to speak for itself, but rather, are determined by "the supposed demands of the Pauline chronology."³¹¹

The difficulty that arises is that if A.D. 55 is accepted as the date of Festus succeeding Felix and thus, the last visit to Jerusalem by Paul being approximately a year before, all of Paul's career must be seen within a nineteen-year interval.

Another difficulty Knox points out regarding Acts' position of the conference is that Acts makes it appear that Paul laboured in established mission areas. This seems highly unlikely of the man who insisted on his independence of the apostles and his call to a special mission.

Knox concludes that Acts 15:1-29 is referring to the same meeting as Gal. 2:1-10, but that Luke has placed the account of the conference too soon in Paul's career.³¹²

Knox examines other pieces of evidence which support his theory; for example, Acts' account of Paul's fourth visit to Jerusalem. No reason is given by Luke for such a visit, although he indicates that the Ephesians urged Paul to stay but Paul insisted he must go as if something urgent called him on to Jerusalem. But then, Luke portrays Paul going down to Antioch after greeting the church in Jerusalem and moving through Galatia and Phrygia eventually returning

³¹¹Knox, Chapters, p. 66.

³¹²Ibid., p. 67.

to Ephesus. Because of this account, Knox questions the reason for Luke recounting such a visit to Jerusalem; if it was an invention, why did Luke not invent a reason for the journey? If it was a real journey, Knox questions whether it could not be the conference visit. This would place the Jewish issue debate in Acts 18 rather than in Acts 15 and "the major discrepancy between the letters and Acts would disappear and, along with it, any awkwardness in fitting the Pauline intervals with the Lucan incidents."³¹³

Knox believes that Luke felt it necessary to solve the Gentile-Jew issue early in Paul's career rather than after much of Paul's missionizing. Luke did not want any shadow to cover the success of the expansion and unity of the church.

As to the visit accounted for in Acts 11:29-30, Knox states that "virtually everyone agrees that it could not have taken place."³¹⁴ As for Paul, such a visit is excluded from his account. Thus, Knox questions whether, then, the simplest solution is to suggest that the offering visit followed the conference visit.³¹⁵

Just as the visit in Acts 18:22 has no reason for its being undertaken, so too, the final visit of Paul to Jerusalem, Acts 21:15. The solution for Acts 18:22 is that Luke used this visit's purpose elsewhere, i.e., in Acts 15.

³¹³Knox, Chapters, p. 68.

³¹⁴Ibid., p. 69.

³¹⁵Ibid., p. 70.

It would seem that a similar explanation can be given for Acts 21:15. From Paul's letters this last visit was motivated by his desire to bring a peace offering of a financial nature despite the danger of such a visit at this time to Jerusalem.

Knox feels there was a deliberate reason for not mentioning any motivation for the last journey to Jerusalem. He also believes that Luke's sources were good. He explains this by the fact that he used a diary for this journey and that Acts' account of Paul's trips just before he arrived in Corinth are the same as those Paul recounts in 1 and 2 Corinthians. If the source was good then it would have mentioned a purpose for the visit to Jerusalem.

Why should this writer slight so important a fact? The obvious answer is the symbolic significance which, as we have seen, made it so important. The offering was essentially a peace offering, but according to Luke-Acts there had been peace in the church for many years--indeed ever since the apostolic council, early in Paul's ministry.³¹⁶

Hence, for Luke, a peace offering would have to come early in Paul's work, whereas, for Paul, the peace offering was a follow-up of the conference.

Thus, Knox maintains that Gal. 2:1-10 and Acts 15:1-29 are the same account, except that Acts 15:1-29 should be placed later, that is at Acts 18:22.³¹⁷

³¹⁶Knox, Chapters, p. 71 f.

³¹⁷Ibid., pp. 51, 58, and 73.

These, then, are the main solutions that were proposed and still are held by various scholars. As has been shown, these possibilities all found their defenders at one time or another. Presently, the equations Gal. 2:1-10 = Acts 15:1-30, and Gal. 2:1-10 = Acts 11:27-30 and 12:25 are those that are found most plausible. However, no conclusive evidence is available which supports any one solution to the exclusion of all the others.

After completing the above survey it is difficult to agree with those who speak about their solution as being one of general agreement. For example, F. W. Beare states that the solution Gal. 2:1-10 equals Acts 11:27-30 which equals Acts 15 is generally accepted and in his opinion is the only possible answer.³¹⁸ However, J. N. Sanders believes that the solution Gal. 2:1-10 equals Acts 11:29-30 and 12:25 is the solution generally accepted.³¹⁹ It would seem much better to say as C. E. Faw did that there is a "stalemate among conflicting reconstructions."³²⁰

³¹⁸F. W. Beare, "The Sequence of Events in Acts ix-xv and the Career of Peter," JBL, Vol. 62, 1943, p. 297, n. 3.

³¹⁹J. N. Sanders, "Peter and Paul in the Acts," NTS, Vol. 2, 1955, p. 136.

³²⁰C. E. Faw, "The Anomaly of Galatians," Biblical Research, Vol. 4, 1960, p. 26.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES

Introductory Remarks

In general, this survey of the Jerusalem council debate indicates that just as in the entire realm of New Testament research, there is a great variety of opinions and, as W. W. Gasque stated, "What to one scholar represents 'the assured results of modern criticism' is regarded by another as 'a most unlikely and, indeed, untenable hypothesis of speculative scholarship',"¹ and further, it brings to light that in many instances, "Scholars do not usually agree: they have opinions."² This study has also shown that not only are the solutions to particular scripture questions or problematics important but even more so the methods employed. The method and "pre-understanding"³ determine the approach to the content to such a degree

¹Gasque, "The Historical Value of the Book of Acts," p. 177. For a summary of some of the authors who examined questions arising out of the study of Paul's writings and Acts, see A. M. Hunter, Interpreting the New Testament 1900-1950, London, SCM Press, 1951, pp. 64-67 and 105-113.

²W. W. Gasque, "The Historical Value of the Book of Acts: An Essay in the History of New Testament Criticism," The Evangelical Quarterly, Vol. 41, 1969, p. 68.

³G. Turner, "Pre-Understanding and New Testament Interpretation," Scottish Journal of Theology, Vol. 28, 1975, p. 232 f.

that only certain solutions are possible.⁴ Hence, the validity of the solutions may become questionable or at least open to debate. The time has come to examine the methods used by the authors discussed and, in particular, the underlying presuppositions, the philosophical principles and the relation to a faith position or stand. It is also necessary to keep in the forefront the core of today's hermeneutical problem, viz., that of distinguishing between the two questions: "what did the scripture passage mean when it was written" and "what does it mean to me."⁵

The search for the meaning intended by the author or authors of the different parts of scripture is an important task. In the first place, it is necessary to determine what the author or authors actually wrote and what has been added or eliminated by later redactors. Thus, the content is examined in the light of the meaning, the impulses and reasons for such a composition and the situational milieu in which the author writes. However, the texts are a composition of the human language which demands further considerations. The meaning of the words and phrases must be sought and the way in which the language is interrelated with the intention and the message. This demands, of course, the understanding of the early Christian language

⁴Cf. S. Terrien, "History of the Interpretation of the Bible," IB, Vol. 1, 1952, pp. 127-141, for a summary of the major methods applied to interpret the Bible.

⁵K. Stendahl, "Biblical Theology, Contemporary," IDB, Vol. A-D, 1962, pp. 418-432.

which in turn requires a sensitivity to the literary, historical, theological elements and hermeneutical principles. The influence of those who transmitted and shaped the scripture for the future must also be considered. This type of research raises many areas of concern; for example, how does the interpreter get inside a text and be aware of his own involvement in the interpretive act?⁶ With such a time span between today's situation and the original situation, original meanings and intentions of scripture are difficult to obtain. Furthermore, the failure to understand how linguistic expression is woven into and part of the original event's linguistic horizons creates misunderstandings and, thus, inaccurate translations and interpretations. Hence, it is important to keep the concept that historians have held in mind, that "all intellectual activities, being the activities of men, are inevitably affected in some degree by the environment in which men work."⁷

As to the direction of today's research, it would seem that what the author was trying to say in the text has acquired greater attention. The when and where of the happenings has recognized value but is considered as a secondary feature.

⁶Cf. A. N. Wilder, "New Testament Hermeneutics Today," in Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation, New York, Harper, 1962, p. 45. Wilder goes further by stressing that "the interpreter is no longer on the balcony but on the stage" thus "it is no longer a question of his apprehending only but of his being apprehended."

⁷A. Marwick, The Nature of History, London, Macmillan, 1970, p. 19.

The further question mentioned earlier, "what does the scripture mean to me" leads the research beyond biblical criticism into theology and pastoral areas. This is not to say that the form and content of scripture should be isolated from its existential application, for it is clear that interpretation in the light of today's world and application to life are interrelated. Ancient texts are not only studied for antiquarian interests, nor for clarifying the process of history alone, but also for arriving at answers or orientations for existential questions. It is important, however, to realize that when the study moves into the field of theology it has then moved from a non-normative study into a normative one.

The dilemma exists that the area of study regarding "what scripture means to me" can stand in the way or influence the thought patterns and understandings of "what the scripture meant to its author and first readers." The common dimension shared by the text and the interpreter is man trying to better understand himself. However, the points of contact between the original author and the modern interpreter often are not explicitly enumerated. Therefore, Wm. Doty wonders, "How can we safeguard the independence of the text so that we do not merely hear our projected meanings but rather hear the author's own meanings?"⁸ The problem mentioned above has been present

⁸Wm. G. Doty, Contemporary New Testament Interpretation, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1972, p. 3.

in much of the New Testament scholarship, as is evident from the accusations made by scholars about other scholars as to their theological and philosophical presuppositions and a priori answers undermining their critical approaches.

The studies and results herein examined were determined by such factors as the differences, particularly in the past, in philosophical and theological presuppositions among the scholars, the differences in methods, the type and condition of texts, archeological data, the impact of the cultural climate on the scholars, and their interests, expectations and attitudes. Therefore, even the application of a rigorous historico-critical method will result in solutions that "always retain a reconstructive and hypothetical element."⁹

This chapter will indicate how the above mentioned elements entered into research on Gal. 2:1-10 and those passages of Acts with which it was compared.

For some New Testament scholars, the traditional views weakened due to the results revealed by historical and critical research. As for Acts, by the end of the eighteenth century, old views were being questioned by a number of scholars. They found that the text revealed a different picture than what was traditionally held. Not only was it discovered that Luke was not writing about all the apostles, but rather about Peter and Paul, but

⁹J. Barr, "Reading the Bible as Literature," BJRL, Vol. 56, 1973, p. 19 f.

more, it was noted that Luke left out many things which we learn only from Paul's Epistles. Haenchen reasons that "this situation could be explained in one of two ways: either the author of Acts was unwilling, or he was unable, to say more."¹⁰ The concept that the author was unwilling to tell more led to "tendency criticism," and the notion that he was unable to write more produced source criticism.

When turning to Paul's Epistles, scholars noted that here, too, it must be recognized that not everything that happened or was preached is recorded. Haenchen states that it is the circumstance that "determines Paul's choice of material, in that he had in mind only what served his proof,"¹¹ while J. A. Fitzmyer points out that Paul's accounts were shaped or conditioned by the role he pursued, that of an apostle, a missionary and a preacher.¹²

Hence, Paul's letters were those of a missionary who tried to support and continue the development of the church. These letters sent either to individuals or communities attempted to further clarify and deepen the understanding of the Christian message, apply the message to practical situations and correct problems which he could not attend to in person. Because the letters were not speeches or essays, ideas were not always thoroughly developed nor

¹⁰Haenchen, Acts, p. 15.

¹¹Ibid., p. 464.

¹²J. A. Fitzmyer, "New Testament Epistles," The Jerome Biblical Commentary, Vol. 2, 1968, p. 225.

did a systematic treatment of the Christian faith emerge.¹³

However, despite the fact that the material in Galatians as well as in Acts is fragmentary and, in some cases, this is due to the purpose or intentions of the author, the historicity of either of the books cannot be dismissed without further unquestionable evidence.

1. F. C. Baur--"Tendency Criticism."

In the study of the changing view on the New Testament and in particular the material relating to the visits of Paul to Jerusalem, the approach with which this paper began is that of "tendency criticism."

(a) Methodological Basis

Since "tendency criticism" was the position of F. C. Baur and the Tübingen school, the first task they undertook was that of revealing why Luke selected the material he did for his Acts of the Apostles. It also follows that with this approach the purpose that the scholar assigns to Luke's writing of Acts determines the explanations given to the text and the difficulties encountered therein.

The following section will specifically show how F. C. Baur's method influenced the solution he arrived at concerning the relationship of Gal. 2:1-10 with Acts.

Baur began his study by pointing out the differences between the Pauline Epistles and the Acts of the

¹³See Fitzmyer, "New Testament Epistles," p. 225.

Apostles. He then established the principle that since Paul's letters were primary documents and Acts secondary material, where these two types of documents differed Paul's letters were to be given preference.¹⁴ The Epistles of Paul are to be seen as the

. . . only authentic documents for the history of his apostolic labours, and of the entire relation in which he stood to his age; and in proportion as the spirit that breathes through them is great and original, we see that they present the truest and most living mirror of what the spirit was.¹⁵

An example of this principle applied to the two documents is the explanation of why Paul never refers to the council; he never mentions it because it never happened, it was invented by the author of Acts.¹⁶ Baur strongly reiterates this idea by pointing out that we would have a different image of Paul if we just had the Acts of the Apostles.

Neill raises an objection to the principle mentioned above, an objection that many British scholars voiced at the time of F. C. Baur. Such a principle appears, according to Neill, "to attribute rather large powers of invention to the writer of Acts; . . . in consequence hardly any value was ascribed to his work as historical evidence for the events of the first century."¹⁷ Though Neill indicates that this view of Luke's writing was widely held a century

¹⁴Baur, Paul, p. 5.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 245.

¹⁶Cf. *ibid.*, p. 137.

¹⁷Neill, Interpretation, p. 144.

ago, Gasque maintains that this view is the origin of today's German scholars who group themselves around people like Conzelmann and Haenchen, i.e., those who apply the Redaktionsgeschichte method.¹⁸ However, it would seem that Gasque underestimates the value which, for example, Haenchen attributes to Acts.¹⁹

As to Baur's historical approach several remarks can be made. First, Baur led the way in overcoming some of the weaknesses of the generation preceding him and, second, his starting point was legitimate.

Baur tried to move away from the concept that historical analysis was a listing or recounting of when and where events took place. His study attempted to disclose the motives that brought about certain historical movements. This analysis of the dialectics and dynamics of the early Christian community development has contributed to the understanding of some of the impulses of the movement.

As to Baur's starting point in his historical study of early Christianity, the position held is well supported by other scholars as Neill points out: "It is universally agreed that New Testament study must begin with the Epistles of Paul, and in particular with those of his earlier period."²⁰

¹⁸Gasque, "The Historical Value of the Book of Acts: an Essay in the History of New Testament Criticism," p. 69 and 87.

¹⁹Cf. Haenchen, Acts, p. 110 and 116 in particular.

²⁰Neill, Interpretation, p. 339.

These early Epistles would include 1 Thessalonians, Galatians, Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians. It is in these writings that the Christian faith and church are explicitly portrayed.

Though Baur's name and works may be rarely referred to today,²¹ a principle which he emphasized still remains. He held that to understand the history of early Christian compositions, the external and internal impulses and developmental forces of Christianity must be examined simultaneously.²²

As to the hermeneutical realm, Baur insisted on considering the cultural setting of the events or movements, the motives or reasons behind the actions of the various individuals. Never did he deal with the material in isolation of its setting or understanding by the one writing it or by those reading or hearing it. However, it is obvious that he saw the setting and reason for writing Acts far differently than many of his contemporaries and many who later examined the Jerusalem council account. Doty, in his work Contemporary New Testament Interpretation, indicates Baur's contribution to hermeneutics by pointing out that he "paved the way for those who followed to place even more emphasis upon the ways contents are evaluated and interpreted."²³

²¹Cf. Howard, Romance, p. 36.

²²Cf. Kümmel, Introduction, p. 27.

²³Doty, Interpretation, p. 13.

Though Baur undertook the study of a very important aspect of the New Testament and with an innovative approach (despite his protest to the contrary),²⁴ critics reproach him for his philosophical position. According to Neill in his survey of the interpretation of the New Testament, "It was a great misfortune that in 1833 Baur became acquainted with the philosophy of Hegel and . . . fell deeply under its sway."²⁵ Baur interpreted the development of the apostolic age in the light of the conflict over the place of the law in Christianity and expressed it in terms of thesis, antithesis and synthesis. Paul held that the Christian was free from the law (thesis); the position of Jewish Christianity, represented by James and Peter, constituted the antithesis: Christians are bound by the law; these two contradictory positions were harmonized by "the old catholic church of the second century" (synthesis).²⁶

A recent full-length study of Baur, published in English, presents a different opinion. The author of this extensive work, Peter C. Hodgson, believes that not only has Baur been neglected but also greatly misunderstood.²⁷ An example of this, according to Hodgson, is that Baur's theory of opposition between Peter and Paul was derived from a detached critical investigation. This research

²⁴Cf. Baur, Paul, p. vi.

²⁵Neill, Interpretation, p. 21.

²⁶Ladd, The New Testament and Criticism, p. 43.

²⁷Hodgson, Formation, p. 1.

preceded by a couple of years his acquaintance with Hegel's theory that history follows the pattern of thesis, anti-thesis and synthesis.²⁸ Another clarification Hodgson wishes to make is that Baur in his overall structure of the various periods of church history clearly indicates that he does not hold the theory that the historical process can fall into the Hegelian triad.²⁹ However, Hodgson does state that Baur himself expressed to his brother and colleagues that not only was he greatly influenced by Schleiermacher, but also was attracted to and influenced by Hegel's work.³⁰ This, as far as it is possible to discern from his writings, seems to have occurred at the time of his research on Paul, at least at the time when the major work was put into book form.

As Baur was influenced by the previously mentioned scholarship of Schleiermacher and Hegel, so too were the scholars of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and later³¹ influenced by Baur.

²⁸Cf. Hodgson, Formation, p. 4; for further discussions, see pp. 22 and 200 f.

²⁹Ibid., p. 4; also, cf. p. 189 f.; 207-212, 251-256; and 196-201 regarding Baur's "tendency criticism."

³⁰Hodgson, Formation, p. 14 f. and 23-27.

³¹Cf. Munck, Paul, pp. 69-86, who treats specifically "the Tübingen School and Paul;" however, the greater portion of the volume discusses aspects of the Tübingen School's view which are present in works of such authors as "W. L. Knox, St. Paul, 1932; H. Lietzmann, The Beginnings of the Christian Church,³ 1953; (ET of Geschichte der alten Kirche I, 1937); A. D. Nock, St Paul, 1946; M. Goguel, Les Premiers Temp de l'Eglise, 1949; M. Dibelius and W. G. Kümmel, Paul, ET 1953." (p. 73, n. 1)

(b) Solution Concerning Galatians and Acts

Baur stated that Paul's gospel was that of freedom from the law which was not the same as the original apostles' who continued on with circumcision and the fulfilling of the law. This, to Baur, indicated that there was a struggle between two groups of Christians, a Petrine Christianity and a Pauline Christianity. With this thesis in mind, Baur finds that the author of Acts appears to be smoothing out these difficulties and reconciling the two groups. However, this development of thought can be understood more clearly if the Hegelian dialectic of history is considered, i.e., that an age can only be understood when its main problem is understood and that in every age there is the struggle of the old power with that of the new until they are reconciled and form a unity which is greater than that with which the age began. Thus, for Baur, Acts was attempting, firstly, to reconcile the two opposing groups by solving the problem of the legitimacy of the freedom from the law for the Gentiles or Gentile missions, and secondly, to present a unified Catholic church. This would indicate that the account of Acts belongs to the last stage of the above mentioned historical process.³² Here, despite Hodgson's protest,³³ strong Hegelian philosophical undercurrents in Baur's work

³²Cf. Baur, Paul, pp. 5-13.

³³Cf. Hodgson, Formation, p. 4.

can be observed, a philosophical structure that was foreign to the author of Acts. This is how Baur's method controlled or allowed only certain results to emerge.

The fragmentary character of Acts was ascribed to the author's unwillingness to say more. Thus, for Baur, the author of the Acts of the Apostles was writing with the purpose of presenting a united church, and hence, his works could not be considered historical. Nonetheless, for Baur, Acts remained a very important source for the understanding of the apostolic age.³⁴

The theory of Early Christianity as advocated by the Tübingen school had strengths and built-in weaknesses. Its strength lay in its lofty goal of sketching and clarifying the development of Christianity to the stage of the establishment of the early Catholic church. Its weakness lay in the structured categories which were applied to the available evidence. Furthermore, the tension that was observed between Paul and Peter on some occasions became the problem which dominated and shaped the entire age.³⁵

Another reason why Baur's theory was attacked was that few theologians were willing to admit "that the New Testament could be contradictory in a central doctrine."³⁶ A further cause for doubting the arguments of Baur was the fact that after the destruction of Jerusalem, Jewish

³⁴Cf. Baur, Paul, p. 13.

³⁵Cf. Haenchen, Acts, p. 17.

³⁶Haenchen, Acts, p. 18.

Christianity was uprooted and forced to flee. With this and the death of the first apostles, Jewish Christianity lost its authoritative position, hence Jewish Christianity could not have played the role that the Tübingen school gave to it in the second century A.D. The stage of the church's growth designated as the early Catholic church must be seen within the Gentile Christian communities.³⁷

2. J. B. Lightfoot and Wm. M. Ramsay--

Traditional Approach

The reaction of the scholars, such as J. B. Lightfoot, Wm. M. Ramsay, T. Zahn, A. Harnack, against F. C. Baur and the Tübingen school indicates that these nineteenth and early twentieth century scholars were concerned about the issue of the historicity or historical value of the New Testament and, secondly, were theologically concerned with the meaning of the New Testament.

As to the historicity of the New Testament, it was the aim of the above mentioned scholars to show that Acts in particular was historical and not a product of the author's imagination. Secondly, with regard to reliability, these scholars were convinced that the author of Acts knew the religious, social, political, geographical, etc. situation of the time in which he wrote. In addition, the theological concern emerged, since Baur questioned the existence of one theology, what might be termed the orthodox

³⁷Cf. Haenchen, Acts, p. 20.

theology of early Christianity, when he suggested that there were two schools of thought, Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity, which were later harmonized and formed into the early Catholic church.

(a) Methodological Basis

Thus, it can be seen how J. B. Lightfoot and Wm. M. Ramsay emphasized the agreement between Paul's account and Luke's account of the Jerusalem visits and thereby tried to prove the historical value and reliability of the New Testament. One stresses the numerous positive features in his argument, the other his archeological finds. The weakness of such a method lies within the understanding of historicity, for this approach over-emphasizes the how and when of events.

The emphasis on historicity by Lightfoot and Ramsay can be seen as rooted in the history of biblical criticism in England. This can be explained simply by the fact that many of the New Testament scholars either came from other disciplines such as classics and ancient history or included these disciplines in their preparation for New Testament studies. Such an academic background impressed upon these critics the necessity of situating the New Testament works in a wider framework, that of the Hellenistic world. Furthermore, when archeology as a science developed, the finds were used to shed new light on scripture studies.

During Lightfoot's time, New Testament studies saw, at least in Britain and America, the restoration of

Luke's authority as well as the maintenance of Paul's. Despite the difficulties encountered in attempting to achieve the above mentioned restoration of authority and the differences seen among the recorded events and meetings of Paul and the other apostles the unity of the church is stressed. However,

. . . not indeed a colorless uniformity of feeling and opinion, but a far higher and more instructive harmony, the general agreement amidst some lesser differences and some human failings, of men animated by the same divine Spirit and working together for the same hallowed purpose.³⁸

Unfortunately, Lightfoot, as well as his contemporaries suffered under the limitations of their time. Only after their century, the nineteenth, did the knowledge of the world of the New Testament become enriched by numerous manuscripts and archeological finds, changes in the understanding of the Greek of the New Testament and later Greek literature, and research into Jewish rabbinism and Hellenism.

However, despite the limitations of his era, Lightfoot advanced New Testament studies by using the new edition of the New Testament, The New Testament in the Original Greek,³⁹ which Brook Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort produced. In this work Hort's greatest contribution was particularly his theory of textual criticism and his implementation of it. By using this edition, Lightfoot

³⁸Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 68.

³⁹Westcott and Hort, New Testament.

was able to base his work on a more refined and updated tradition. For, as Colwell confirms in his Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticisms of the New Testament, Hort's work was comprehensive.

He ignored no major facet of the manuscript tradition. Thus element after element of our later "discoveries" can be found frankly stated in his work. He recognized the early date and wide distribution of the "Western" text long before its champions did. He leaned more heavily upon patristic evidence than we do. He saw clearly that the "canonization" of the New Testament books did not result in accurate copying during the first three centuries.⁴⁰

For over forty years Lightfoot was revered by scholars, particularly in England. As S. Neill notes, "The Cambridge tradition of exegesis is still a living thing, which has found expression in a notable series of commentaries."⁴¹

Ramsay's contributions are also very significant for the advancement of New Testament studies. By supporting the account of Acts by archeological finds, Ramsay proved that Acts was often geographically correct and, furthermore, politically and historically accurate. Using these incidents, Ramsay developed the principle that if the author of Acts is correct in these cases where archeological evidence can be used as a verification, then it must be held that he would strive to be accurate in other areas where presently there is no documentary material to serve as a measuring

⁴⁰E. Colwell, Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism, Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1969, p. 148.

⁴¹Neill, Interpretation, p. 95.

device or proof.

Ramsay's archeological work definitely established the time that was reflected in the conditions recorded in the Acts of the Apostles. His research indicates that Acts depicts conditions in the latter half of the first century. Thus, he conclusively removes one of Baur's arguments, for Baur maintained that Luke wrote much later, that is, in the second century.

This evidence of the time of Luke's writing and his accuracy is both useful and limited. The fact that there is evidence of a careful, accurate account of external data is useful in defining not only the time of composition but also the time of certain events. However, this accuracy cannot be automatically assumed for internal motivations or interpretations of the gospel and its spreading, although it may suggest that Luke would try to be accurate in all that he wrote. Thus, it can be observed that archeology opens many doors to new understandings but when it has contributed its wealth of information, many questions and problems still remain.

Ramsay has made a significant impact on subsequent British and American scholars as regards establishing an awareness that the author of Acts was a first-rate historian, interpreting the word historian as it was understood in the times of the first centuries A.D. He clearly indicates his position regarding the author of Acts.

In maintaining our hypothesis it is not necessary either to show that the author made no mistake, or to solve every difficulty. . . . We are making a historical and literary investigation. The greatest historians of other periods are not above error: and we may admit the possibility that a first-century historian has made errors.⁴²

Gasque, in his work Sir William M. Ramsay, lists those scholars who accept the accuracy and reliability of Acts.⁴³ However, as he points out, there are scholars, especially in Germany who ignore or do not react to the archeological finds of Ramsay.⁴⁴ An example of this can be noted in Kümmel's Introduction to the New Testament, where Ramsay's archeological contributions are not mentioned. But most surprising is the fact that some scholars still maintain that Acts was composed in the second century.⁴⁵

Another contribution of Ramsay is his constant insistence upon the importance of applying a critical historical method to the research of the New Testament, which is particularly evident in the study of the accounts relating the Jerusalem council.

(b) Solution Concerning Galatians and Acts

From the above mentioned type of historical criticism, basically that employed by the British and a few German scholars, two different solutions emerge, each

⁴²Ramsay, Paul, p. 16.

⁴³Gasque, Ramsay, p. 61, n. 2.

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 61.

⁴⁵Cf. ibid., p. 62, n. 3.

solution being supported by a lengthy list of scholars. In fact, these two solutions, of all the solutions offered to solve the dilemma of which account in Acts is the same as that recorded in Galatians 2:1-10, are the best supported of all, if the number of scholars attesting to them is the criterion. S. D. Toussaint dismisses all the other solutions by stating:

It is almost certain Galatians 2:1-10 is not viewing Paul's fourth visit of Acts 18:22 and it cannot be describing the fifth. Unless Luke has omitted one of Paul's visits to Jerusalem, a rather unlikely alternative, the reconciliation of Galatians 2:1-10 with the Acts record is limited to two possibilities. In Galatians two Paul is referring either to his second or to his third visit to Jerusalem.⁴⁶

However, out of these two solutions it appears that as many questions arise as answers, for the evidence is often based on uncertainties and missing pieces of historical documents of events. This is a result of the method employed. By approaching the material with the concept that both authors were reporting the events as they occurred, the emphasis is on a chronological development rather than on intentionality. This is further supported by the fact that the scholars using the traditional method held that there was one theology presented by the early church and that the early church was united. Therefore, the reason for a variety of opinions by the scholars J. B. Lightfoot, Wm. M. Ramsay and followers stemmed basically from differences in

⁴⁶Toussaint, "Chronological Problem," p. 334 f.

philological and archeological interpretations. Furthermore, in Lightfoot's case, the lack of certain historical evidence which shed new light on the research undertaken in the very late nineteenth century and early twentieth century limited his results to some degree and may have affected his particular position.

Thus, a harmonization of all the accounts was attempted. Variances in the texts had to be explained away in order to arrive at one historical and theological view in the New Testament.

Although both Lightfoot and Ramsay have contributed greatly to the study of the New Testament, the solutions they proposed regarding Paul's second visit to Jerusalem in Galatians (2:1-10) and its counterpart in Acts met with opposition for various reasons.

The objections raised regarding the solution Gal. 2:1-10 is the same as Acts 15:1-30 are the following. If these two accounts are relating the same event, why does Paul not refer to the decrees or to the fact that a letter was sent regarding the decrees? Why does Paul in Galatians omit the famine visit that is recorded in Acts 11:27-30? How can the fact be explained that Acts 15 describes a public meeting and Gal. 2:1-10 a private meeting?

These objections are resolved by Lightfoot and the different representatives of this solution in various ways. To the first objections: "why does Paul not refer to the decrees or to the fact that a letter was sent regarding the

decrees" some reply that Paul had nothing to do with the decrees' composition.⁴⁷ Others reply that Paul is attempting to outline to the Galatians his independence from the apostles in Jerusalem and his gospel as coming from God not man.⁴⁸ It would have weakened Paul's position and been contrary to his preaching to have submitted to such decrees. However, opponents to this solution suggest that Acts 15:30-16:5 "indicates that Paul did use the decrees of the council when his position had to be vindicated in the face of opposition from Judaizers."⁴⁹

As to the second objection "why did Paul omit the famine visit, Acts 11:27-30," Lightfoot explained this discrepancy by stating that Paul was only recounting his visits to Jerusalem wherein he actually met with the apostles and since the apostles had fled the city because of the persecution, Paul only saw the elders when he delivered the collection fund spoken of in Acts 11:27-30.⁵⁰ Toussaint emphasizes that this argument is very difficult to establish. He uses the example of Acts 8:1 where during the persecution only the apostles remained. And further, he believes that Acts 12:17 suggests that "James and the brethren" were in Jerusalem during the persecution, and

⁴⁷Cf. Weiss, Earliest Christianity, p. 260. For the opposite view, see Talbert, "Again: Paul's Visits to Jerusalem," pp. 34-38.

⁴⁸Cf. Cullmann, Peter, p. 42 ff.

⁴⁹Toussaint, "Chronological Problem," p. 336.

⁵⁰Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 127.

even more so, Peter was present in Jerusalem.⁵¹ The reason why Paul did not mention the apostles was simply the fact that it was the elders' duty to attend to the needs of the poor.⁵² Furthermore, Paul does not say that he saw no apostles.

The third objection "how can the fact be explained that Acts 15 describes a public meeting and Gal. 2:1-10 a private meeting," is resolved by indicating that the private meeting preceded the public one.⁵³ Toussaint feels that this might be possible, but "it tends to give the impression the Jerusalem council, which Luke so strongly emphasizes, was little more than a rubber stamp."⁵⁴ Besides the nature of the conference appearing different, the results also seem to differ. The decrees in Acts 15:20, 28 f., 21:25 do not seem to coincide with Paul's account that the Jerusalem leaders approved of his preaching and imposed nothing on his Gentile mission. Even the incident Gal. 2:11-14 of Peter and Paul's clash over table fellowship seems to raise questions regarding the relationship of the two accounts, i.e., Gal. 2:1-10 and Acts 15:1-35.

Having reviewed the objections to the above mentioned solution it would appear that another solution is

⁵¹Toussaint, "Chronological Problem," p. 337.

⁵²Ramsay, Paul, p. 52 f.

⁵³Cf. Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 125 f.; Ridderbos, Galatians, p. 78 ff.

⁵⁴Toussaint, "Chronological Problem," p. 337.

the answer. However, when examining the explanation of Ramsay and followers, i.e., of Galatians 2:1-10 and the famine visit Acts 11:27 as being two accounts of the same event, we are likewise confronted with objections.

Ramsay's argument also maintains the authority and respect for the authors of Acts and Galatians, however, not as J. B. Lightfoot did, but by relating the accounts from each, i.e., Gal. 2:1-10 and Acts 11:27-30, that specifically speak of Paul's second visit to Jerusalem. In this way neither account needs to be rearranged or chronologically corrected.

Nevertheless, the very first objection is related to the chronology. It is now established that between the dates of A.D. 44 and 48, a famine was reported by Josephus, that is between the procuratorships of C. Cuspius Fadus (44-46) and Tiberius Alexander (46-48). The approximate date given for the famine is A.D. 46. Thus, it is argued that the time mentioned by Paul in Galatians 2:1 (fourteen years) would have to be added to the three years cited in Galatians 1:18 which would place Paul's conversion in A.D. 31. This leaves very little time for the development of the church as it is described in Acts 1-7. However, it is argued by the proponents of this solution that when Paul mentions the fourteen years in Gal. 2:1 he is counting them from his conversion and then the chronology does not create a problem.

A second objection to this theory is that in Galatians 4:13 Paul implies that he made two journeys to Galatia before he composed the letter to them. This would place the Jerusalem council before the composition of the Epistle. Once again the proponents of this view state that the "apostle retraced his steps through the cities of Galatia on his first journey so he in effect visited them twice."⁵⁵ For this view to be maintained, the scholar must assume that the letter was addressed to the Galatia that is indicated by the Roman province, thus, the South Galatian theory is a necessary consequence.

The sequence of events according to this solution is as follows: (1) Concluding the famine visit in Jerusalem, Acts 11, Paul and Barnabas journey back to Antioch of Syria. (2) The first missionary journey is undertaken with them once more returning to Antioch. (3) It is brought to Paul's and Barnabas' attention that the churches founded by them in Galatia are being upset by Judaizing activities. (4) Paul immediately sends, from Antioch, a letter to the Galatians. (5) Shortly after writing the letter to the Galatians the Jerusalem council is convened.

With this sequence of events, the proponents of this solution can date the Galatian Epistle as one of Paul's earliest, being composed in approximately the year A.D. 48. Furthermore, this explains why Paul could not attend to the

⁵⁵Toussaint, "Chronological Problem," p. 339.

problems in the Galatian churches in person for he had to make haste to Jerusalem in order to participate in the Jerusalem conference. Thus, Toussaint concludes, "If ease of explanation and logical order is to be considered in Galatians, it seems best to equate the visit of Paul to Jerusalem described in Galatians 2:1-10 with the famine visits of Acts 11."⁵⁶

But the question can be raised: is ease of explanation and logical order plus the other proofs sufficient to support the solution, Gal. 2:1-10 is recording the same event as Acts 11:27-30 and 12:25? Certainly the texts should not be manipulated nor forced in order that an answer be found for the troublesome problem of which account if any in Acts relates the meeting described in Gal. 2:1-10. Further development in the study of Acts indicated that another approach to Acts provided new explanations to the problem being treated in this paper.

3. K. Lake--Source Criticism

Moving from the "tendency criticism" of Baur and the Tübingen school which indicated that Luke did not want to say more because of his purpose for writing the Acts of the Apostles, to a reaction to this by Lightfoot and Ramsay who claimed Luke's historicity and reliability yet arrived at different answers, it seemed only reasonable that another reaction would take up a different approach.

⁵⁶Toussaint, "Chronological Problem," p. 340.

This was evidenced in the return to source criticism, a theory which was promoted earlier but then dropped when "tendency criticism" emerged. In regard to the Jerusalem visit that was to be equated with Gal. 2:1-10, Lake developed further the parallel source theory that was put forward earlier by E. Schwartz.⁵⁷

(a) Methodological Basis

In the issue of the Jerusalem council, Lake resorted to the parallel source theory approach so that the best elements of Lightfoot and Ramsay could be preserved. Another scholar writing a few decades later, Benoit,⁵⁸ combined both source criticism and an element from Redaktionsgeschichte.

The aim of source criticism was to reveal and identify the sources Luke used in his composition of Acts. Furthermore, this method attempted to clarify the absence of various accounts of events or activities by pointing out that Luke was unable to write more because his sources were incomplete.

Benoit⁵⁹ went much further when he indicated that Luke not only compiled traditions but edited them as well. He pointed out two major areas of consideration in Luke's

⁵⁷ Schwartz, "Zur Chronologie des Paulus," see above, p. 130.

⁵⁸ Benoit, "La deuxième visite," pp. 778-796.

⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 790.

Acts. Firstly, there are enough traces of variation in vocabulary and doctrine to suggest that different written sources were employed. Secondly, the traditions appear to be reworked independently and then later combined to form a continuous and complete document. The original traditions, therefore, are more difficult to delineate because of this process of composing a work.

However, this hypothesis is subject to criticism because of the difficulty in isolating traditions, yet is recommendable because it recognizes the fact that Luke was more than a collector of traditions.

(b) Solution Concerning Galatians and Acts

The solution of Lake is based on the theory that the visit of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem is recounted twice in Acts. The first report of the visit is according to an Antiochian tradition (Acts 11:19-39 and 15:1-2) and the second according to a Jerusalem tradition (Acts 15:3-41).⁶⁰

Lake held that the New Testament presented a single and consistent theological and historical development. Thus, he felt obliged to reconcile the discrepancy observed by suggesting that Luke confused the various traditions regarding the Jerusalem council and presented each tradition of the visit of Paul to Jerusalem as a different trip, thus relating one more journey than Paul did in his

⁶⁰ See above, p. 131.

Epistles to the Galatians.

This solution is probable in the sense that Luke must have incorporated the traditions which circulated in the various communities. Furthermore, it is possible that if Luke did not know the history of the tradition he could have misunderstood it and recounted the traditions as if they referred to two different visits to Jerusalem by Paul. However, by proposing such a hypothesis it allows the reader great liberty in deciding on the order of Luke's work and thus, rearranging the material without considering the purpose of the present order. Not to consider the present arrangement as meaningful, questions the literary skill and reliability of the author of Acts. It also indicates that the scholar who applies such a method approaches the text with a priori theological and historical concepts which suggest the order of the development of the church.

When source criticism began to lag because of the difficulties encountered in the delineation of the traditions and establishment of definite characteristics of the various sources, the problems of literary form and style surfaced.

4. M. Dibelius--Literary and Style Criticism

(a) Methodological Basis

A new critical method introduced by M. Dibelius changed the approach to the questions concerning Acts, thus affecting the answers to the problem raised by Paul's and Acts' portrayal and account of the Jerusalem council. The

approach of Dibelius was radical and changed the orientation of the questions asked of scripture. Dibelius, in his examination of the style of Acts, brought to the forefront the question, "what is the author trying to say to his readers." Thus, instead of searching for lists of events or chronology of Paul or the historical expansion of early Christianity, Dibelius looked for Luke's message. A new trend for New Testament studies was set in motion.

It is necessary to examine Dibelius' development of thought regarding the "author of Acts" in order to understand how this influenced his approach to Acts 15 and Galatians 2:1-10. It was the attempt to apply the same method, Formgeschichte, to Acts as was applied in the Gospel of Luke which brought to light the differences between the gospel and Acts. This led to a new way of examining the Jerusalem council account in Acts 15 before comparing it with Galatians 2:1-10. The question of sources was forced to recede from the forefront of the New Testament criticism while literary form and style criticism dominated the scene.

Dibelius rejected source criticism for he believed that it did not achieve its purpose; it did not illuminate the evolution of preliterate tradition of the New Testament.⁶¹ In the search for sources the interpretations tended to show the historical reliability of the material, thus being one-sided. However, Dibelius did not entirely reject the

⁶¹Dibelius, Studies, p. 1.

idea that Luke used sources as can be evidenced from his development and use of the section in Acts that he referred to as the itinerary of Paul's journeys.⁶² Outside of this single application of a source theory, Dibelius moved into another direction in his study. He turned to the search for literary forms as developed by H. Gunkel in his study of the Old Testament. He emphasizes that:

When examining a literature such as the Jewish and early Christian, one must first raise the question of the literary forms. This principle has been constantly impressed upon us by Hermann Gunkel. In examining forms in the Old Testament, we learnt to proceed from the collections and larger complexes of narrative to the small units: the song, the single story. In the same way, corresponding works on the Gospel literature have also endeavored, from the viewpoint of the "Formgeschichte" theory, to establish small units as the elements of the tradition.⁶³

It was Dibelius' desire that scholars first "listen to what the story-tellers have to say to us"⁶⁴ before raising the problems of historicity.

He analyzed the origin and development of the oral tradition behind the written documents by examining the form or style of each of the pericopes. It was held that the early Christian communities had traditions and memories of events or sayings which they used to explain their raison d'être and which they handed on to the younger

⁶²As J. Dupont in Sources, p. 13, indicates, "the trend of form-criticism does not entirely exclude the question of the sources and it is not without interest to take account of the particular angle from which it approaches the matter."

⁶³Dibelius, Studies, p. 1.

⁶⁴*Ibid.*, p. 25.

generation. Thus, the method employed in Dibelius' study is well summarized by Kselmann when he says that, "Form criticism is concerned with the forms or patterns of these stories and sayings, and the reasons for their preservation in the Gospels."⁶⁵

In the study of Luke's gospel Dibelius shows that Luke worked with pre-existing material that had been shaped and handed on to the church members because of a particular need in the church. Thus, in the gospel, Luke had predecessors who established a model for synthesizing the existing traditions. Mark, for example, determined the order of the Lukan narrative. Therefore, according to Dibelius, Luke in the gospel was a compiler of pre-existing material and not a true author.⁶⁶

However, in Dibelius' study of the Acts of the Apostles he shows how different Luke's gospel and the Acts of the Apostles are and that they do not belong in the same class of writing. Luke's gospel is editorial writing, whereas Acts contains original compositions and is, thus, of a higher standard than the gospel. Dibelius makes specific reference to the section in Acts of the apostolic council as an example of how Luke not only arranged traditions and joined them but composed speeches and other material.⁶⁷ In saying this, Dibelius did not exclude the

⁶⁵Kselmann, "Modern New Testament Criticism," p. 14.

⁶⁶Dibelius, Studies, p. 3.

⁶⁷Ibid., p. 2.

fact that existing material was incorporated into Acts, for example, "older formulae of kerygmatic or liturgical nature."⁶⁸ However, even where different sources were used the author selected those he wished to include. The approach to the Acts of the Apostles, therefore, had to be different.

The material was of a much more complicated kind; it was more comprehensive, less homogeneous, less clearly defined, more difficult to arrange. The writer could therefore employ no uniform principle of arrangement.⁶⁹

Thus, Dibelius points out that his examination of Acts could not proceed in the same fashion as that of the Gospel of Luke. Since it was not certain if the author of Acts had traditions at his disposal, Dibelius stated that he could not "consider this work [Acts] from the aspect of 'Formgeschichte', but only from that of its style."⁷⁰

In 1923, in the article "Style Criticism of the Book of Acts," Dibelius uses the central part of Acts, i.e., Paul's journeys, as an excellent example of how Luke used the materials at hand and his own creativity. According to

⁶⁸Dibelius, Studies, p. 3.

⁶⁹Ibid., p. 4.

⁷⁰Ibid. It is this short essay of Dibelius which, according to E. Haenchen, "ushered in a new era of research in Acts: 'Stilkritisches zur Apostelgeschichte'. The characteristic of the new era is that interest in reconstructing the early history of Christianity recedes, and its place is taken by an uncovering of new possibilities in the field of Christian literary history." (Acts, p. 34 f.) For a summary of Dibelius' approach, see R. H. Fuller, The New Testament in Current Study, New York, Scribner's Sons, 1962, pp. 92-94.

Dibelius, Luke used an annotated itinerary⁷¹ of Paul's journeys as a framework and interwove this with his own compositions, for example, speeches and editorial observations, and other traditions consisting of stories, legends, etc. Thus arise the difficulties in comparing the journeys mentioned in Galatians with those in Acts. However, the section about the Jerusalem conference, Acts 15:1-34, is not included in this and Dibelius treats the problem separately.

He points out that there were topics on which Luke had no information whether oral or written and that there were topics which he did not wish to elaborate or mention. Thus, the writer's personal stamp is seen in his literary style which, according to Dibelius, "entitles us to call the author the first Christian historian."⁷²

Dibelius then explains his use of the term "historian." Luke did much more than collect and combine traditions. Although he did that too, he went far beyond it. In Dibelius' words, "He tried to make clear the meaning which these events contained."⁷³

⁷¹Cf. Dibelius, Studies, p. 5. The itinerary is first noted in Acts 13:4 and seems to fail in 16:6-8; 18:22 f.; 20:1-3; "it can occasionally be seen in the stories, as well as in the speeches composed by the author, that, because these additions were made, the original basis, i.e., the itinerary, was abandoned." [p. 6] For Dibelius the itinerary consisted of names of places where the apostle Paul and his companions stopped and were received favorably.

⁷²Ibid., p. 125.

⁷³Ibid.

Dibelius indicates that this view is in opposition to that held by German scholars of the generation preceding him (except for Harnack) who were the teachers of his age. For they could not believe that a companion of Paul could make so many errors, that is, what appear to be errors, when Acts and Paul's Epistles are compared. Dibelius believes that this is an exaggeration on two points, that of Luke's closeness to Paul and the number of mistakes. As far as Dibelius is concerned, Luke was presenting and highlighting what was typical and important rather than a minute detailed account of all events. This goal of Luke permitted him to alter, delete or generalize what actually happened.⁷⁴

The distinction Dibelius makes between Luke the historian and other contemporary historians is that Luke writes with a theological purpose.⁷⁵

As to the historical value of Acts, Dibelius states that "the historical reliability of Acts must be measured in each individual case, according to the material which Luke worked upon."⁷⁶ It must be judged according to whether it is the material contained in the itinerary section where Luke links traditions with summary passages, or whether it is a legend or literary speech. However, the question of historicity must be raised after the work of style criticism,

⁷⁴Dibelius, Studies, p. 136 f.

⁷⁵Ibid., p. 192.

⁷⁶Ibid., p. 107.

if the content is to be understood. Dibelius strongly emphasizes this priority and sequence of research when he states that "intrinsically these stories are far removed from the problems of historiography."⁷⁷

Thus, Dibelius redirected the approach to Acts by insisting on the examination of Acts for its theological message. It seems evident from Dibelius' contribution that Acts and the Pauline Epistles can no longer be immediately compared as if they were works of the same level or type.

(b) Solution Concerning Galatians and Acts

Having established that Luke's work in Acts was to be examined for its message with the approach of style criticism, Dibelius examines the Acts 15:1-29 section in this manner. After examining the speeches which both refer to the baptism of the Gentile, Cornelius, and the decrees, he suggests that Luke's theological intent was to prove that it was by God's design and activity that Gentiles were unconditionally accepted into the Christian way of salvation. Luke achieved his theological objective by a literary technique. First, he recorded the story of Cornelius' conversion in Acts 10, and then in Acts 15 recalls the story by the speeches he puts into the mouths of Peter and James. The references made to Cornelius can only be understood by the readers of Acts and not by those who were at the Jerusalem council. Luke wishes to conclude

⁷⁷Dibelius, Studies, p. 25.

the meeting and, thus, attaches the decrees which are interpreted as a concession to the Gentile Christians.⁷⁸ The decrees are seen as a mistake in the sense that Luke discovered them in some old tradition and attached them to the Jerusalem council account.

Thus, by approaching Acts 15 from the perspective of style criticism the account is interpreted as relating the same message as Gal. 2:1-10. The message being: God willed that the Gentiles achieve salvation by believing in Christ and not by fulfilling the Mosaic law nor by being circumcised.

As to the period of history the Acts of the Apostles reflect, Dibelius states that it is that of early Christianity, that is, immediately or just a few years after Luke had completed his gospel.⁷⁹

5. E. Haenchen--Redaction Criticism

(a) Methodological Basis

The development of the New Testament method after Dibelius' major contribution was not a reaction to his results on the Acts of the Apostles but rather to conclusions he drew about Luke's work in his gospel. The concept that Luke as well as the other two Synoptic Evangelists were compilers of existing oral and written traditions without any editorial changes rather than authors, called forth

⁷⁸Dibelius, Studies, p. 98 f.

⁷⁹Ibid., p. 195.

the approach termed Redaktionsgeschichte. Today the two methods, Formgeschichte and Redaktionsgeschichte, are seen as complementary. However, initially the latter approach was a reaction to the former.

The study of redaction or editing by creative writers was applied to the New Testament by G. Bornkamm, H. Conzelmann, and E. Haenchen.

Dibelius' concept that Luke, author and historian, took reality or existing traditions and altered them in order to highlight their meanings led Protestant researchers of Acts in the 1950's to focus on this independence of Luke. Luke the theologian became all important. It was Phillipp Vielhauer's article on the "Paulinism of Acts"⁸⁰ which sparked off new discussions and a new development in the criticism of Acts.

Vielhauer's discussion raised the issue of "whether and to what extent the author of Acts took over and passed on theological ideas of Paul, whether and to what extent he modified them."⁸¹

Vielhauer takes the speeches and sections where the Paul of Acts makes theological statements, and examines these under four topics: natural theology, law, Christology, and eschatology, by comparing them with Paul's statements in his letters. Vielhauer uses the speeches and sections

⁸⁰P. Vielhauer, "On the 'Paulinism' of Acts," in L. E. Keck and J. L. Martin (Eds.), Studies in Luke-Acts, Nashville, Abingdon Press, 1966, pp. 33-50.

⁸¹Ibid., p. 33.

other than the itinerary because he believes that here Luke was the composer. He follows Dibelius' idea that outside of the section 13: 1-14:28, 15:35-21:6 where an itinerary formed the basis of the material, Luke had no predecessor who had formed or arranged the material and, therefore, Luke gave form to it. Thus, "the way in which the author [Luke] presents Paul's theology will not only disclose his own understanding of Paul, but will also indicate whether or not he and Paul belong together theologically."⁸²

It was this desire to understand the author's intention that led the New Testament study of texts beyond the exclusive search for literary forms of individual pericopes.

If Formgeschichte is concerned with the different forms or types of literature in the Bible and the rules germane to them, Redaktionsgeschichte is concerned with the way in which these literary pieces are made to serve the general purpose of the writer.⁸³

Vielhauer finds that the author of Acts, despite the fact that some scholars considered him a companion of Paul, is always differing from Paul. One example illustrated by Vielhauer shows how Luke, because of the parousia not arriving, abandons the idea of the immediate end of the world and tends to deemphasize the redemptive importance of the Cross. Thus, Vielhauer finds that

⁸²Vielhauer, "Paulinism," p. 33.

⁸³R. Brown, "Hermeneutics," The Jerome Biblical Commentary, Vol. 2, 1968, p. 610.

. . . the author of Acts is in his Christology pre-Pauline, in his natural theology, concept of the law, and eschatology, post-Pauline. He presents no specifically Pauline idea. His "Paulinism" consists in his zeal for the worldwide Gentile mission and in his veneration for the greatest missionary to the Gentiles.⁸⁴

Hans Conzelmann's⁸⁵ and E. Käsemann's⁸⁶ work on various themes of Luke further promoted Vielhauer's ideas. Haenchen states that he in his commentary on Acts "joined the chorus of these voices, albeit with some moderation."⁸⁷

Haenchen believes that "the real subject of Acts is the λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ and its growth. It is certainly proclaimed by men and authenticated by God through signs and miracles."⁸⁸ This is not a setback from Pauline theology for Haenchen maintains that Luke's theology never was of the same kind as Paul's. Luke's theology was one among other Gentile Christian theologies which developed alongside of Paul's and certainly after the time of Paul. It is possible that Luke's theology tended to maintain the law and other observances without the influence or pressure

⁸⁴Vielhauer, "Paulinism," p. 48.

⁸⁵Cf. Haenchen, Acts, p. 48.

⁸⁶Cf. *ibid.*, p. 48 f.

⁸⁷*Ibid.*, p. 49. Haenchen systematically applied and developed Dibelius' method to the whole of Acts. Differing mainly on the point of Luke the author, Haenchen does not agree that Luke actually is the author of Acts. W. W. Gasque feels that Haenchen, Conzelmann and their followers "have returned to a more negative judgment concerning the historical value of Acts than that of Dibelius, from whom they drew their initial inspiration." ("Historical Value of the Book of Acts," p. 86.)

⁸⁸Haenchen, Acts, p. 49.

of Jerusalem.⁸⁹

Haenchen's introduction to his work, The Acts of the Apostles, sets before his readers his explanation of "Luke the Writer and Edifier,"⁹⁰ thereby preparing the platform for his interpretations. This subsequently explains his understanding of the Jerusalem council.

Luke lacked "an adequate historical foundation and the right readers"⁹¹ to write a history of the beginnings of Christianity as a historian in the ancient world such as Xenophon or Thucydides. Rather, according to Haenchen, Luke's work was that of edification. This is not to say that Luke did not find the early history of Christianity in itself edifying. Luke realized that what he knew from oral or written traditions needed to be presented in a form that would capture the attention of the people.⁹² Therefore, he takes facts and develops a vivid scene in story form so that the readers will not only become aware of the event but also appreciate other aspects arising out of the event. He uses speeches to teach, speeches which he composed.⁹³ On other occasions Luke summarizes and obtains thereby a generalization which presents the ideal apostolic

⁸⁹Haenchen, Acts. p. 49.

⁹⁰Ibid., pp. 103-110.

⁹¹Ibid., p. 103.

⁹²Cf. *ibid.*

⁹³Ibid., p. 104.

community.⁹⁴ Furthermore, Luke uses traditions with a certain amount of freedom.⁹⁵

Haenchen realizes that his approach may be skeptically considered by some scholars. However, Luke as a writer of another era cannot be assessed by present-day standards of historians nor can his work be forced into today's categories. As Haenchen points out, for Luke

. . . a narration should not describe an event with the precision of a police-report, but must make the listener or reader aware of the inner significance of what happened, and impress upon him, unforgettably, the truth of the power of God made manifest in it.⁹⁶

Many British and American scholars react to the approach just described. For example, Gasque strongly feels that the Redaktionsgeschichte method is more taken up with its own tradition of criticism than with primary material, i.e., with the careful study of the Acts' text in the context of its historical Graeco-Roman setting.

It is a well-known fact that those who have come to the study of the Book of Acts from the point of view of this larger historical context, apart from the presuppositions of a certain critical tradition, have, almost to a man, been convinced of the essential reliability of Acts as a source of early Christian history.⁹⁷

Thus, despite the awareness of the biblical criticism in Germany, almost all British scholars defend the reliability

⁹⁴Haenchen, Acts, p. 105.

⁹⁵Ibid., p. 107.

⁹⁶Ibid., p. 110.

⁹⁷Gasque, "The Historical Value of the Book of Acts: An Essay in the History of New Testament Criticism," p. 87.

of the Acts of the Apostles. Scholars of Redaktionsgeschichte are often ignored; witness, e.g., the list of names of those who made the "most important contributions of the twentieth century" given by Gasque.⁹⁸

In addition to the scripture scholars, a Roman historian has added his voice and that of his colleagues to support the view that Acts is historical. He says, "For Acts the confirmation of historicity is overwhelming.

. . . Any attempt to reject its basic historicity even in matters of detail must now appear absurd. Roman historians have long taken it for granted."⁹⁹

Gasque deplores the fact that the current school of New Testament criticism in Germany does not consider the important British contributions. He stresses that

. . . when the representatives of the Haenchen-Conzelmann point of view begin to interact with the issues raised by those who take a radically different stance from their own, they will, no doubt, find their views taken more seriously outside of their own circle of disciples and friends.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁸Gasque, "The Historical Value of the Book of Acts: An Essay in the History of New Testament Criticism," p. 86, n. 91: "The most important contributions of the twentieth century have been by Wm. M. Ramsay, T. Zahn, A. Harnack, E. Meyer, R. Morgethaler, F. F. Bruce, E. Gartner, B. Reicke, E. Trocome, C. S. C. Williams, J. Dupont, A. N. Sherwin-White, and J. Munck. H. J. Cadbury and the editors of The Beginnings of Christianity (5 vols., 1920-33) take a somewhat equivocal position in regard to the trustworthiness of Acts, but my own view [Gasque] is that they provide the material for a positive evaluation of Acts."

⁹⁹A. N. Sherwin-White, Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1963, p. 189.

¹⁰⁰Gasque, "The Historical Value of the Book of Acts," p. 194.

(b) Solution Concerning Galatians and Acts

Haenchen's solution to explaining the differences between Acts and Galatians evolves out of his firm belief that both authors are using traditions and the gospel message responsibly. However, Haenchen not only bases his answer to the problem under discussion on Luke's method of writing but also on the identification of Luke.

Haenchen's search for evidence that will reveal who Luke is begins with the examination of Luke's and Paul's presentation of the concept of the mission without the law, and of Paul and his work. The results will indicate Luke's relationship with Paul.

Haenchen assesses the writings of Luke and Paul and determines that for both authors the question at stake was the "mission to the Gentiles without the law."¹⁰¹ Though both are confronted with the same problem the same result does not occur. For Paul justifies his mission without the law "on internal evidence: the law leads not to God, but into sin."¹⁰² Paul elaborates on this solution in Gal. 3:19; Rom. 4:13-16; 2 Cor. 3:6; 1 Cor. 15:56; Rom. 10:3; Gal. 3:21 f.; Rom. 10:4. However, Luke does not know of Paul's solution and thus seeks justification in the concept that God willed it, "a justification from without."¹⁰³

¹⁰¹Haenchen, Acts, p. 112.

¹⁰²Ibid.

¹⁰³Ibid., p. 113.

Hence, he refers to signs and miracles as proof that God wills the Gentile mission.¹⁰⁴

Another factor that Haenchen considers in this question of who Luke is, is the discrepancy one observes in Luke's Paul and the Paul of the Epistles. Luke makes Paul into a great miracle worker and orator, the only thing he did not consider him was an apostle. On the other hand, the Paul we see in the Epistles is one who does not stress the miracles, one who found speech, especially improvised speech, difficult and above all, one who claimed his right to be recognized as an apostle.¹⁰⁵

This, coupled with the fact that Acts contradicts Paul's picture of the relations between Jews and Christians demands new thoughts regarding who the author of Acts is.¹⁰⁶ In this regard the latter distorts the position on two points: firstly, by confusing Paul's concept of resurrection with that held by the Pharisees, and secondly, that he believed it was this doctrine of the resurrection that set the Jews against Paul rather than seeing that it was Paul's approach to the law that set him against the Jews. The distortion can only be understood if the author is seen as one from the sub-apostolic age. Haenchen explains his position as follows:

¹⁰⁴Cf. Haenchen, Acts, p. 113.

¹⁰⁵Cf. *ibid.*, p. 113 f.

¹⁰⁶Cf. *ibid.*, p. 115.

For such a person, Christianity and Judaism had already drifted apart; they still spoke against each other, but no longer listened to each other. Only a Christian of the sub-apostolic period could have entertained the "Lucan" viewpoint, according to which Christianity and Judaism were at bottom, in their resurrection faith, really one, and it was only an unfortunate misunderstanding on the part of the Jews which caused the conflict to break out just at this point. This argument could no longer, of course, be expected to convince a Jew. But then, it was not designed to win Jews to the fold; it was designed to win over the Roman authorities.¹⁰⁷

The writer obviously venerated Paul, for half of the Acts revolves around the person of Paul, but he sees Paul from a distance, a later age.

The differences between Galatians and Acts were due to the time that had lapsed between Paul's writing and Luke's as well as to the theologies each one developed. Therefore, in order to compare the two texts, Gal. 2:1-10 and Acts 15:1-30, it is necessary to examine each text independently from the point of view of style and authorship.

This brings to a conclusion the consideration of the methodological dimensions that are involved in the search for a solution to the problem under discussion. From the preceding survey it becomes clear that the theological, philosophical and personal conditionings of the scholars are most important factors in the interpretation of the Bible. S. Sandmel points out how the Zeitgeist shapes the scholars: "Neither a Wellhausen nor a Harnack can be fully understood

¹⁰⁷Haenchen, Acts, p. 116.

except in terms of their age and background."¹⁰⁸ These words could equally well be applied to the major figures of the present work--Baur, Lightfoot, Ramsay, Dibelius and Haenchen.

In conclusion, it may be stated that this chapter has made explicit and drawn together the methodological aspects underlying and determining the solutions that were outlined in chapter two. As has been said above, agreement with regard to the result, viz., a particular equation, does not necessarily mean agreement with regard to the method used to arrive at this conclusion. It goes without saying that method here refers to the whole hermeneutical process.

¹⁰⁸S. Sandmel, The First Christian Century in Judaism and Christianity, New York, Oxford University Press, 1969, p. xi.

CONCLUSION

The aim of this thesis was to give a survey of the results of the research into one of the most difficult questions in New Testament scholarship, viz., the problems connected with the accounts of Paul's second journey to Jerusalem. Moreover, it attempted to draw out the methodological issues involved in the search for a solution to the questions raised by a comparison of Paul's account with those in the Acts.

In order to clearly set out the points to be considered in such an undertaking, an exegesis of Gal. 2:1-10 and the relevant passages in Acts was given, highlighting the historical and philological issues.

The second step to be taken was a study of the various solutions that have been proposed by different scholars.

The five main solutions that emerged are of unequal importance insofar as the majority of scholars adopt either one of two (Gal. 2 = Acts 15 or Gal. 2 = Acts 11).

The third chapter emphasized the realization that the variety of solutions exists not only because of the textual ambiguities in both Galatians and Acts, but because of the methods and hermeneutical concepts employed to interpret the texts. It becomes clear that a scholar's

conceptual matrix and theological interests determine to a large extent the outcome of his exegesis.

The first critical study of the passages concerned was made by F. C. Baur. He insisted on the historical approach to scripture, i.e., biblical texts have to be analyzed in the same way as other writings. This established a whole new frame of reference for the study of the New Testament. Even though isolated attempts at this had been made before, none of them had the impact that Baur's work had. Baur drew attention to the fact that the knowledge of the purpose for which an author wrote is essential for the correct understanding of a text.

As a reaction to F. C. Baur, J. B. Lightfoot and Wm. M. Ramsay tried to reinforce the historical character of the accounts by situating the biblical text within the context of first and second century Christian and non-Christian literature, and by adducing archeological evidence. Their approach can therefore be termed "traditional" since they tried to harmonize the accounts as it was done previous to Baur, albeit with different evidence.

Another attempt at harmonization was K. Lake's theory that Luke had combined two different sources, a Jerusalem and an Antioch source.

The insights of M. Dibelius present a new phase in the analysis of the passages under discussion. Dibelius recognized that Luke in Acts was not just a compiler, but an author who edited the material he used. This he

deduced from an analysis of Luke's style.

E. Haenchen refines further the principles established by M. Dibelius. He ascribes even more creativity to the author of Acts without denying the fact that he used material of a historical nature. What has to be kept in mind is that modern categories must not be imposed on texts which come from a different time and milieu. What is historical writing and authorship varies from one period and culture to another.

This concern for the awareness of the process and the factors involved in interpretation is evident in other disciplines as well. In the literary field, the well-known writer, S. Sontag, in her book Against Interpretation, expressed the same sentiment: "interpretation is not . . . an absolute value, a gesture of the mind situated in some timeless realm of capabilities. Interpretation must itself be evaluated, within a historical view of human consciousness."¹

Thus, it would seem evident that a closer examination of interpretation will bring the two prevailing schools of criticism closer together. The traditional criticism of the British and Americans must come to see the necessity of first examining Paul's and Luke's accounts (Gal. 2 and Acts 15) of the meeting in Jerusalem independently, focusing

¹S. Sontag, Against Interpretation and Other Essays, New York, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1966 (1st ed. 1961), p. 7.

on what was said by the authors and why it was said before comparing the two accounts and asserting the historicity of them. On the other hand the present German school with its emphasis on the style and creative activity of the writers must keep before them the notion that although the authors, Paul and Luke, wrote with a purpose their message and material was rooted in an historical experience. What is important is to continue to develop an awareness of the hermeneutical process which may lead to a greater consensus in the interpretation of biblical texts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allan, J. A., The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians, London, SCM Press, 1964 (1st ed. 1951), 91 p.
- Amiot, F., Saint Paul: Epître aux Galates, épîtres aux Thessaloniens, Paris, Beauchesne, 1946, 387 p.
- Arndt, Wm. F., and F. W. Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (a translation and adaptation of W. Bauer's Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur (4th rev. and augmented ed. 1952), Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1957, xxxvi-909 p.
- Barr, J., "Reading the Bible as Literature," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Vol. 56, 1973-74, pp. 10-33.
- Bate, H. N., A Guide to the Epistles of Saint Paul, London, Longmans, Green, 1926, vi-189 p.
- Baur, F. C., Paul the Apostle of Jesus Christ, His Life and Work, His Epistles and His Doctrine, Vol. 1, London, Williams and Norgate, 1876 (trans. from 2nd German ed.), xi-365 p.
- Beare, F. W., "The Sequence of Events in Acts ix-xv and the Career of Peter," Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 62, 1943, pp. 295-306.
- Benoit, P., "La deuxième visite de Saint Paul à Jérusalem," Biblica, Vol. 40, 1959, pp. 778-792.
- Bligh, J., Galatians. A Discussion of St. Paul's Epistle, London, St. Paul Pub., 1969, xiv-544 p.
- _____, Galatians in Greek, Detroit, University of Detroit Press, 1966, 239 p.
- Blommerde, A. C., "Is There an Ellipsis between Galatians 2,3 and 2,4?" Biblica, Vol. 56, 1975, pp. 100-102.
- Blunt, A. W. F., The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1946 (1st ed. 1925), 141 p.

- Bornkamm, G., Paul, New York, Harper and Row, 1971 (trans. German ed. 1969), xxviii-259 p.
- Brown, R., "Hermeneutics," in J. A. Fitzmyer and R. E. Brown (Eds.) Jerome Biblical Commentary, Vol. 2, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, 1968, pp. 605-623.
- Bruce, F. F., The Acts of the Apostles, London, Tyndale Press, 1952, xx-491 p.
- _____, Commentary on the Book of the Acts, London, Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1962 (3rd ed.), 555 p.
- Burkitt, F. C., Christian Beginnings, London, University of London Press, 1924, 152 p.
- Burton, E. de W., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, New York, Scribner's Sons, 1920, lxxxix-541 p.
- Caird, G. B., The Apostolic Age, London, Duckworth, 1958 (reprint of 1955 ed.), 222 p.
- Cambier, J., "The Life and Work of St. Paul," in A. Robert and A. Feuillet (Eds.), Introduction to the New Testament, Tournai, Desclée, 1965 (trans. French ed. 1959), pp. 373-383.
- Cassels, W. R., Supernatural Religion. An Inquiry into the Reality of Divine Revelation, 1874. (This book was unavailable to me.)
- Clark, A. C., The Acts of the Apostles, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1970 (1st ed. 1933), lxx-427 p.
- Cole, R. A., The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1965, 188 p.
- Colwell, E. C., Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament, Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1969, 175 p.
- Cullmann, O., Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr, London, SCM Press, 1962 (rev. ed.), 252 p.
- Dibelius, M., Paul (ed. W. G. Kümmel), London, Longmans, Green, 1953 (German ed. 1950), vii-172 p.
- _____, Studies in the Acts (ed. H. Greeven), London, SCM Press, 1956 (German ed. 1951), ix-228 p.
- Dodd, C. H., The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1949 (1st ed. 1932), xxv-249 p.

- Doty, Wm., Contemporary New Testament Interpretation, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1972, vii-176 p.
- Duncan, G. S., The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1955 (1st ed. 1934), liv-199 p.
- Dupont, J., Les Actes des Apôtres, Paris, Editions du Cerf, 1958 (2nd rev. ed.), 216 p.
- _____, Etudes sur les Actes des Apôtres, Paris, Editions du Cerf, 1967, 574 p.
- _____, Les problèmes du livre des Actes d'après les travaux récents, Louvain, Analecta Lovaniensia Biblica et Orientalia, Ser. 2, Fasc. 17, 1950, 126 p.
- _____, The Sources of the Acts, New York, Herder and Herder, 1964, 180 p.
- Eadie, J., A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1869, lxiii-480 p.
- Emmet, C. W., St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, London, R. Scott, 1912, xxxi-68 p.
- Epp, E. J., The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1966, xvi-209 p.
- Faw, C. E., "The Anomaly of Galatians," Biblical Research, Vol. 4, 1960, pp. 25-38.
- Filson, F. V., A New Testament History, London, SCM Press, 1965, xi-428 p.
- Finegan, J., Handbook of Biblical Chronology, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1964, xxvi-338 p.
- Fitzmyer, J. A., "The Letter to the Galatians," in J. A. Fitzmyer and R. E. Brown (Eds.), The Jerome Biblical Commentary, Vol. 2, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, 1968, pp. 236-246.
- _____, "New Testament Epistles," in J. A. Fitzmyer and R. E. Brown (Eds.), The Jerome Biblical Commentary, Vol. 2, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, 1968, pp. 223-226.
- Franzmann, M. H., The Word of the Lord Grows, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1961, ix-324 p.
- Fuller, R. H., The New Testament in Current Study, New York, Scribner's Sons, 1962, 147 p.

- Furnish, V. P., "The Historical Criticism of the New Testament: A Survey of Origins," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Vol. 56, 1973-74, pp. 336-370.
- Gasque, W. W., "The Historical Value of the Book of Acts," Theologische Zeitschrift, Vol. 28, 1972, pp. 177-196.
- _____, "The Historical Value of the Book of Acts: An Essay in the History of New Testament Criticism," The Evangelical Quarterly, Vol. 41, 1969, pp. 68-88.
- _____, Sir William M. Ramsay, Archaeologist and New Testament Scholar, Grand Rapids, Baker Book House, 1967, 95 p.
- Geyser, A. S., "Paul, the Apostolic Decree and the Liberals in Corinth," in J. N. Sevenster and W. C. van Unnik (Eds.), Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis de Zwaam septuagenarii, Haarlem, De Erven F. Bohn N. V., 1953, pp. 124-138.
- Giet, S., "Les trois premiers voyages de Saint Paul à Jérusalem," Recherches de Science Religieuse, Vol. 41, 1953, pp. 321-347.
- Goguel, M., La naissance du christianisme, Paris, Payot, 1946, 607 p.
- Goulder, M. D., Type and History in Acts, London, S.P.C.K., 1964, x-252 p.
- Gunther, J. J., Paul: Messenger and Exile, Valley Forge, Judson Press, 1972, 190 p.
- Guthrie, D., Galatians, London, Nelson, 1969, xii-175 p.
- Haenchen, E., The Acts of the Apostles, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1971 (trans. of 14th German ed. 1965), xxiii-737 p.
- Hall, D. R., "St. Paul and Famine Relief: A Study of Galatians 2:10," The Expository Times, Vol. 82, 1971, pp. 309-311.
- Harnack, A., The Acts of the Apostles, New York, Putman's Sons, 1909, xliii-303 p.
- Hay, D. M., "Paul's Indifference to Authority," Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 88, 1969, pp. 36-44.
- Heard, R., Introduction to the New Testament, London, A. and C. Black, 1950, xii-268 p.
- Hodgson, P. C., The Formation of Historical Theology, New York, Harper and Row, 1966, xv-299 p.

- Hoerber, R. G., "Galatians 2:1-10 and the Acts of the Apostles," Concordia Theological Monthly, Vol. 31, 1960, pp. 482-491.
- Hogg, C. F., and W. E. Vine, The Epistle to the Galatians, Grand Rapids, Kregel, 1967 (reprint of 1921 ed.), viii-352 p.
- Howard, W. F., The Romance of New Testament Scholarship, London, Epworth Press, 1949, 164 p.
- Hunken, J. W., "The Prohibitions of the Council at Jerusalem," Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. 27, 1925-26, pp. 272-283.
- Hunter, A. M., Interpreting the New Testament 1900-1950, London, SCM Press, 1951, 144 p.
- Kenyon, F. G., The Text of the Greek Bible, London, Duckworth, 1975 (rev. and augmented by A. W. Adams), ix-275 p.
- Kittel, G., "δοκέω," in G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (Eds.); G. W. Bromiley (Trans. and Ed.), Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, Vol. 2, 1964, pp. 232-237.
- Knox, J., Chapters in a Life of Paul, New York, Abingdon Press, 1950, 168 p.
- Knox, W. L., The Acts of the Apostles, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1948, viii-121 p.
- Kselman, J. S., "Modern New Testament Criticism," in J. A. Fitzmyer and R. E. Brown (Eds.), The Jerome Biblical Commentary, Vol. 2, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, 1968, pp. 7-20.
- Kümmel, W. G., Introduction to the New Testament, New York, Abingdon Press, 1966 (trans. from 14th rev. German ed, 1965), 444 p.
- Ladd, G. E., The New Testament and Criticism, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1967, 222 p.
- Lake, K., Earlier Epistles of St. Paul, London, Revingtons, 1911, xi-466 p.
- , "Note xvi. The Apostolic Council of Jerusalem," in K. Lake and H. J. Cadbury (Eds.), The Beginnings of Christianity, Part 1, Vol. 5, Grand Rapids, Baker Book House, 1966 (reprint of 1933 ed.), pp. 195-212.

- Lagrange, M.-J., Saint Paul: épître aux Galates, Paris, J. Gabalda, 1926 (2nd ed.), lxxxiv-175 p.
- Lampe, G. W. H., "Acts," in Peake's Commentary on the Bible, London, Nelson and Sons, 1962, pp. 882-926.
- Leuba, J. L., New Testament Pattern, London, Lutterworth Press, 1953 (French ed. 1950), 163 p.
- Lightfoot, J. B., The Epistles of St. Paul: Galatians, London, Macmillan, 1914 (rev. text with Introduction, Notes and Dissertations), xiv-384 p.
- Machen, J. G., The Origin of Paul's Religion, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1965 (1st ed. 1925), 329 p.
- Manson, T. W., "St Paul in Ephesus: (2) The Problem of the Epistle to the Galatians," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Vol. 24, 1940, pp. 59-80. (Also reprinted in Studies in the Gospels and Epistles (ed. M. Black), Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1962, pp. 168-189.)
- Marwick, A., The Nature of History, London, Macmillan, 1970, 272 p.
- McGiffert, A. C., A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age, Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1951 (5th impression), xii-680 p.
- McKenzie, J. L., Dictionary of the Bible, Milwaukee, Bruce Pub. Co., 1965, xx-954 p.
- Metzger, B. M., A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, London, United Bible Societies, 1971, xxxi-775 p.
- Michaelis, J. D., Introduction to the New Testament, 1788 (trans. from German 1750). (This book was unavailable to me.)
- Moffatt, J., An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1949 (reprint of 3rd rev. ed. 1918), xxxix-659 p.
- Munck, J., Paul and the Salvation of Mankind, London, SCM Press, 1959 (German ed. 1954), 351 p.
- Neill, S., The Interpretation of the New Testament 1861-1961, London, Oxford University Press, 1964, viii-360 p.

- Nock, A. D., St. Paul, New York, Oxford University Press, 1960 (reprint of 1946 ed.), 256 p.
- Ogg, G., The Odyssey of Paul, Old Tappen, Revell, 1968, xii-207 p. (Also printed as The Chronology of the Life of Paul, London, Epworth Press, 1968, xii-207 p.)
- Orchard, B., "The Ellipsis between Galatians 2,3 and 2,4," Biblica, Vol. 54, 1973, pp. 469-481.
- , "A New Solution of the Galatians Problem," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Vol. 28, 1944, pp. 154-174.
- , "The Problem of Acts and Galatians," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, Vol. 7, 1945, pp. 377-397.
- Parker, P., "Once More, Acts and Galatians," Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 86, 1967, pp. 175-182.
- Porter, J. R., "The 'Apostolic Decree' and Paul's Second Visit to Jerusalem," Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. 47, 1946, pp. 169-174.
- Rackham, R., The Acts of the Apostles, London, Methuen, 1922, viii-524 p.
- Ramsay, Wm. M., The Bearings of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1920 (4th ed.), xiv-427 p.
- , An Historical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1899, x-478 p.
- , St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1897 (3rd ed.), xxviii-402 p.
- Ridderbos, H. N., The Epistle of Paul to the Churches of Galatia, London, Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1961 (3rd ed.), 238 p.
- Robinson, D. W. B., "The Circumcision of Titus and Paul's 'Liberty'," Australian Biblical Review, Vol. 12, 1964, pp. 24-42.
- Ropes, J., "The Singular Problem in the Epistle to the Galatians," Harvard Theological Studies, Vol. 14, 1929, pp. 1-46.
- , "The Text of Acts," in F. J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake (Eds.), The Beginnings of Christianity, Part 1, Vol. 3, London, Macmillan, 1926, cccxx-464 p.

- Sanders, J. N., "Peter and Paul in the Acts," New Testament Studies, Vol. 2, 1955-56, pp. 133-143.
- Sandmel, S., The First Christian Century in Judaism and Christianity, New York, Oxford University Press, 1969, xii-241 p.
- Schlier, H., Der Brief an die Galater, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1971 (14th ed.), 287 p.
- Schmithals, W., Paul and James, London, SCM Press, 1965 (trans. German ed. 1963), 125 p.
- Sherwin-White, A. N., Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1963, 204 p.
- Simon, M., "The Apostolic Decree and Its Setting in the Ancient Church," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Vol. 52, 1969-70, pp. 437-460.
- Simon, R., Histoire critique des principaux commentateurs du Nouveau Testament, depuis le commencement du christianisme jusqu'à notre temps, Rotterdam, R. Leers, 1693, xviii-926 p.
- Sontag, S., Against Interpretation and Other Essays, New York, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1966 (1st ed. 1961), ix-304 p.
- Sparks, H. F. D., The Formation of the New Testament, London, SCM Press, 1952, 172 p.
- Stamm, R., "Introduction and Exegesis of Galatians," in The Interpreter's Bible, New York, Abingdon Press, Vol. 10, 1953, pp. 467-481.
- Stendal, K., "Biblical Theology, Contemporary," in Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. A-D, New York, Abingdon Press, 1962, pp. 418-432.
- Strauss, D., Life of Jesus, St. Clair Shores, Scholarly Press, 1970 (reprint of 1860 ed.), 901 p.
- Talbert, C. H., "Again: Paul's Visits to Jerusalem," Novum Testamentum, Vol. 9, 1967, pp. 26-40.
- Tenney, M. C., Galatians. The Charter of Christian Liberty, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1969 (rev. and enlarged), 216 p.
- Terrien, S., "History of the Interpretation of the Bible," in The Interpreter's Bible, New York, Abingdon Press, Vol. 1, 1952, pp. 127-141.

- Toussaint, S. D., "The Chronological Problem of Gal. 2:1-10," Bibliotheca Sacra, Vol. 120, 1963, pp. 334-340.
- Turner, G., "Pre-understanding and New Testament Interpretation," Scottish Journal of Theology, Vol. 28, 1975, pp. 227-242.
- Vielhauer, P., "On the 'Paulinism' of Acts," in L. E. Keck and J. L. Martin (Eds.), Studies in Luke-Acts, Nashville, Abingdon Press, 1966, pp. 33-50.
- Weiss, J., Earliest Christianity, Vol. 1, New York, Harper and Bros., 1959 (English trans. ed. with a new introduction and bibliography by F. C. Grant), xxx-395 p.
- Westcott, B. F., and F. J. A. Hort, The New Testament in the Original Greek, Cambridge, Macmillan, 1881, text 581 p., and 1882 introduction and appendix xxxi-173 p.
- Wikenhauser, A., New Testament Introduction, Freiburg, Herder and Herder, 1958 (trans. German 2nd ed. 1956), xviii-580 p.
- Wilder, A. N., "New Testament Hermeneutics Today," in Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation, New York, Harper, 1962, pp. 38-52.
- Williams, C. S. C., Alterations to the Text of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1951, xiv-93 p.
- _____, A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles, London, Adam and Charles Black, 1957, xvi-301 p.
- Wilson, S. G., The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts, London, Cambridge University Press, 1973, xi-295 p.
- Wuest, K. S., Galatians in the Greek New Testament for the English Reader, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1966, 192 p.

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS

BC	<u>The Beginnings of Christianity, Part I, Vol. 1-5</u>
BJRL	<u>Bulletin of the John Rylands [University] Library</u>
CBQ	<u>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</u>
ET	<u>The Expository Times</u>
IB	<u>Interpreter's Bible</u>
IDB	<u>Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible</u>
JBL	<u>Journal of Biblical Literature</u>
JTS	<u>Journal of Theological Studies</u>
NTS	<u>New Testament Studies</u>
Nov Test	<u>Novum Testamentum</u>

APPENDIX

ABSTRACT OF

Paul's Second Journey to Jerusalem in the Epistle to the
Galatians and the Acts of the Apostles:
A Survey of the Proposed Solutions

APPENDIX

ABSTRACT OF

Paul's Second Journey to Jerusalem in the Epistle to the
Galatians and the Acts of the Apostles:
A Survey of the Proposed Solutions¹

The objective of the thesis is to bring together the various solutions that were proposed to explain the differences in Paul's account of his second journey to Jerusalem in Gal. 2:1-10 and that of the Acts of the Apostles. The extensive literature on this question and the number of solutions suggested indicate that it is one of the most difficult problems of New Testament exegesis. The wider significance of this study derives from the analysis of the methodological implications in the work of the scholars discussed. The thesis consists, therefore, of two main parts: (1) a synopsis of the solutions to the given problem that were developed from the beginnings of critical New Testament scholarship to the present time; and (2) an examination of the methods used to arrive at these solutions. It is in this second part that the theological, philosophical, and historical presuppositions of New Testament scholarship are made explicit. Thus, the study

¹Lucille B. Pummer, Master's thesis presented to the School of Graduate Studies of the University of Ottawa, Ontario, February 1976, v-211.

of the specific problem of equating Galatians and Acts can be seen as an illustration of different stages in the historico-critical approach to the New Testament.

In Gal. 2:1-10 Paul writes of his second visit to Jerusalem and the events that took place at this occasion. It seems that the same events are also recounted in Acts. However, when trying to find a parallel account it becomes clear that there exist important differences which make a simple equation impossible.

The proposed solutions can be grouped into five main categories: (1) Gal. 2:1-10 has no counterpart in Acts (F. C. Baur; T. W. Manson); (2) Gal. 2:1-10 equals Acts 15:1-30 (J. B. Lightfoot; M. Dibelius; E. Haenchen); (3) Gal. 2:1-10 equals Acts 11:27-30 and 12:25 (Wm. M. Ramsay); (4) Gal. 2:1-10 equals Acts 11:27-30 and 12:25 plus 15:1-30 (K. Lake; P. Benoit); (5) Gal. 2:1-10 equals Acts 15:1-29 in place of Acts 18:22 (J. Knox).

As to methodology, the following considerations emerge from the study of this problem area. The first critical examination of the passages concerned was made by F. C. Baur. He insisted not only on the necessity to analyze biblical texts in the same way as other writings, but also on the fact that the knowledge of the purpose for which an author wrote is essential for the correct understanding of a text ("Tendency Criticism"). J. B. Lightfoot and Wm. M. Ramsay reacted to F. C. Baur's approach and tried to reinforce the historical character of the accounts

by adducing new literary and archeological evidence (Traditional Approach). K. Lake maintained that a harmonization was possible on grounds of the assumption that Luke used two different sources (Source Criticism). A new phase began with M. Dibelius. From an analysis of the style of Acts, he came to the conclusion that Luke was not just a compiler, but an author who edited the material he used (Literary and Style Criticism). Finally, M. Dibelius' principles were refined by E. Haenchen. The latter attributes even more creativity to Luke without denying that Luke made use of some historical material (Redaction Criticism).

The result of the present study is twofold. First, no one solution has won general support. The majority of scholars today adopt either one of the two equations: Gal. 2:1-10 equals Acts 15:1-30, or Gal. 2:1-10 equals Acts 11:27-30 and 12:25. However, the problem has not been solved definitely and will continue to be discussed. Second, the reasons for this are to be sought not primarily in the textual ambiguities but rather in the methods and hermeneutical concepts employed to interpret the texts.