*Why no longer,* see in Acts ix. 29; xxii.  
17—21.

**19.]** This verse admits of  
two interpretations, between which other  
considerations must decide. (1) That  
James, the Lord’s brother, was one of the  
Twelve, and the only one besides Peter  
whom Paul saw at this visit: (2) that he  
was one **of the Apostles,** but not necessarily of the Twelve. Of these, (1) apparently cannot be: for after the choosing of the Twelve (John vi. 70), the  
brethren of our Lord did not believe on  
Him (John vii. 5): an expression (see  
note there) which will not admit of *any*  
of His brethren having then been His disciples. We must then adopt (2): which is  
besides in consonance with other notices  
respecting the term *Apostle*, and the  
person here mentioned. I reserve the  
subject for full discussion in the Introduction to the Epistle of James. See also  
notes, Matt. x. 3; xiii. 55; John vii. 5.

**20.]** This asseveration (compare  
2 Cor. xi. 31) applies most naturally to  
the important fact just asserted—his short  
visit to Jerusalem, and his having seen only  
Peter and James, rather than to the whole  
subject of the chapter. If a report had  
been spread in Galatia that after his conversion he spent years at Jerusalem and  
received regular institution in Christianity  
at the hands of the Apostles, this last fact  
would naturally cause amazement, and  
need a strong confirmatory asseveration.

**21.]** The beginning only of this  
journey is related in Acts ix. 30, where  
see note. Mr. Howson suggests (edn. 2,  
i. p. 129, f.) that he may have gone at once from Caesarea to Tarsus by sea,  
and Syria and Cilicia may afterwards  
have been the field of his activity,—these  
provinces being very generally mentioned  
together, from their geographical affinity,  
Cilicia being separated from Asia Minor  
by Mount Taurus. In Acts xv. 23, 41, we  
find churches in Syria and Cilicia, which  
may have been founded by Paul on this  
journey. The supposition is confirmed by  
our ver. 23: see below.

**22, 23.]** ‘So  
far was I from being a disciple of the  
Apostles, or tarrying in their company,  
that the churches of Judæa, where they  
principally laboured, did not even know  
me by sight.’ The word **Judæa** must be  
understood as excluding Jerusalem, where  
he *was known.* This seems to be required by Acts ix. 26—29.

**23.] They**(the members of the churches) **heard**  
**reports** (not, ‘*had heard,*’ as A.V.), **That  
our former persecutor is now preaching  
the faith which he once was destroying**(see **ver. 13). And they glorified God in  
me** (‘in my case:’ i.e., my example was  
the cause of their glorifying God. By  
thus shewing the spirit with which the  
churches of Judæa were actuated towards him, he marks more strongly the  
contrast between them and the Galatian  
Judaizers).

**II. 1—10.]***On his subsequent visit  
to Jerusalem, he maintained equal independence, was received by the Apostles  
as of co-ordinate authority with themselves, and was recognized as the Apostle  
of the uncircumcision.*

**1. after fourteen years]** *From what time* are we