to reckon? Certainly at first sight it  
would appear,—*from the journey last  
mentioned.* And Meyer maintains that  
we are bound to accept this first impression without enquiring any further.  
But why? Is the *prima facie* view of a  
construction always right? Did we, or  
did he, judge thus in ch. i. 18? Are we  
not bound, in all such cases, should any  
external reason exist for doing so, to reexamine the passage, and ascertain whether our *prima facie* impression may not  
have arisen from neglecting some indication furnished by the context? That this  
is the case here, I am persuaded. The  
ways of speaking, in ch. i. 18, and here,  
are very similar. **The then** in both cases  
may be well taken as referring back to  
the same starting point. What would  
there be forced or unnatural in a statement of the following kind? “After my  
conversion (ch. i. 15) my occasions of  
communicating with the other Apostles  
were these: (1) after three years I went  
up, &c. (2) after fourteen years had  
elapsed, I again went up, &c.”? This  
(compare Chronol. Table in Introduction)  
would bring the visit here related to the  
year 50: see below.

**again went  
up I:** but nothing is said, and there was  
no need to say any thing, of another  
visit during the interval. It was the  
object of the Apostle to specify, *not all his  
visits to Jerusalem, but all his occasions  
of intercourse with the other Apostles:*  
and it is mere trifling, when Meyer, in his  
love of making discrepancies, maintains  
that in such a narration as this, St. Paul  
would be putting a weapon into the hands  
of his opponents by omitting his second  
journey. That journey was undertaken  
(Acts xi. 30) in pursuance of a mission  
from the church at Antioch, to convey  
alms to the elders of the suffering church  
at Jerusalem. It was at a period of persecution, when James the son of Zebedee  
and Peter were under the power of Herod,  
—and in all probability the other Apostles were scattered. Probably Barnabas  
and Saul did not see any of them. They  
merely (Acts xii. 25) fulfilled their errand,  
and brought back John Mark. If in that  
visit he had no intercourse with the Apostles, as his business was not with them,  
the mention of it here would be irrelevant:  
and to attempt, as Meyer, to prove the  
Acts inaccurate, because that journey is not  
mentioned here, is simply absurd.—That  
the visit here described is in all probability  
the THIRD related in the Acts (4.D. 50) on  
occasion of the council of Apostles and  
elders (Acts xv.), I have shewn in a note  
to the chronological table in the Introduction. The various separate circumstances  
of the visit will be noticed as we proceed.

**taking Titus also]** In Acts xv. 2,  
we read, “They determined that Paul and  
Barnabas, *and certain other of them,*should go up to Jerusalem.” Titus is here  
particularized by name, on account of the  
notice which follows, ver. 3: and the **also**  
serves to take him out from among the  
others. On Titus, see Introduction to Epistle  
to Titus.

**2.] But** not only carries on  
the narrative, emphatically repeating the  
verb, but carries on the refutation also  
—**but I went up** (not for any purpose of  
learning from or consulting others, but)  
**&c.** Of his undertaking the journey **by**  
(in consequence of) **revelation**, nothing  
is said in the Acts: all that is related  
there being, the appointment by the  
church of St. Paul and Barnabas and  
others to go. What divine intimation St.  
Paul may have received, inducing him to  
offer himself for the deputation, we cannot say: that some such occurred, he  
here assures us, and it was important for  
him to assert it, as shewing his dependence only on divine leading, and independence of any behests from the Jerusalem church. Meyer well remarks, that  
the history itself of the Acts furnishes an  
instance of such a double prompting:  
Peter was induced by a vision, and at the  
same time by the messengers of Cornelius,  
to go to Cesarea.

**unto them]** The  
Christians at Jerusalem, implied in the  
word “*Jerusalem*” above. This wide assertion is limited by the next clause.

**but** (limits the foregoing: as if to say,  
“when I say ‘to them,’ I mean”)