inTRopucTION.] THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. (cH. vi.   
   
   
   
 NOTES TO THE CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE.   
   
 I. On the identity of the Journey to Jerusalem related in Acts xv., with that   
 referred to Gal. ii. 1 ff.   
   
 Five visits of St. Paul to Jerusalem are related in the Acts. Now the visit of Gal.   
 ii. 1 must be either (a) one distinct from all these, or (b) with one or other   
 of them.   
 (@ This hypothesis should not be resorted to, till attempt to identify the visit   
 with one of those recorded can be shown to fail. Then only may we endeavour, as in   
 the case of the unrecorded visit to Corinth, (see below, Chap. IIL. § 5,) to imagine   
 some probable place for the insertion of such a visit. So that the legitimacy of this   
 hypothesis must be tried by the results arrived at in discussion of the other.   
 (2) The visit in is identical with one or other of those recorded in the Acts.   
 1. Ié is not the first The identity of the visits Acts ix. 26—29 and Gal. i.   
 18 being assumed (and it is possible to doubt it), this follows as a matter of   
 course.   
 2. It is not the second visit (Acts xi. 29, 30). For we read, Gal. ii. 7, that Paul   
 was already recognized as entrusted with the Gospel of the uncireumcision, and as   
 having preached vv. 8, 9 together with Barnabas amoug the Gentiles. Now the com-   
 mission of Paul and Barnabas to preach to the Gentiles dates from Acts xiii. 1, after   
 the second visit.   
 Also, at the time of the second visit, it is wholly improbable that Paul should have   
 held a place of such high estimation in comparison with Peter, as we find him filling   
 in Gal. ii. 8 ff.   
 Again, on this hypothesis, either the first or his conversion, was fourteen years   
 inclusive before this, which took place certainly before 46 4.p.; for then the famine was   
 raging, and this relief sent up by prophetic anticipation. This would bring, either   
 the first visit, his conversion itself, A.D. 32: a date wholly improbable, whichever   
 way we take the fourteen years of Gal. ii.   
 The question of identity with the third visit is discussed below.   
 4, It is not the fourth visit. For in Gal. ii. 1, read that Barnabas went up with   
 Paul: but in Acts xv. 39, we find Paul and Barnabas separated, nor do we ever read of   
 their travelling together afterwards,—and evidently Barnabas was not with him when   
 he visited Jerusalem Acts xviii. Besides, the whole character of the fourth   
 visit as there related, is against the idea that any weighty matters were then trans-   
 acted. The expression merely is “when he had gone up, and saluted the church, he   
 went down to Antioch.” Again, if we assume the identity of the visit question with   
 the fourth visit, the Apostle can hardly be acquitted of omitting, in his statement of   
 his conferenecs with the principal Apostles in Gal. ii., intermediate occasion when   
 the matters arranged between them had been of the most solemn and important kind.   
 This would be scarcely ingenuous, considering the object which he had in Gal. ii.   
 5. It is not the fifth visit. For after this visit Paul did not return to Antioch,   
 which he did after that in question, Gal. ii.   
 6. It remains therefore, that it can only, if identical with any of the five, be the   
 third visit. Is this probable ?   
 (a) The dates agree. See the Chronological Table, and notes on Gal. ii. 1.   
 (b) The occasions agree. Both times, the important question relative to the obliga-   
 tion of Christians to the Mosaic law was discussed: both times, the work of Paul and   
 Barnabas among the Gentiles was recognized. What need was there for this to be   
 twice done? It is of no import whatever to the matter, that in Acts, the result is   
 a publie decree,—whereas in Gal., no mention of such a decroe is made: the history   
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