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 relates that which was important for the church,—the Episfle, that which cleared the   
 Apostle personally from the charge of dependence on man: all mention of the decree   
 would in Gal. have been irrelevant. Similarly we may deal with the objection, that   
 in Acts, a public council is summoned, whereas in Gal., it is expressly said that Paul   
 laid forth to them the Gospel which he preached to the Gentiles, but “privately, to   
 them of reputation.” This entirely agrees with Acts xv. 12, where Paul and Barnabas   
 related to the multitude, not the nature of the doctrine which they preached, but only   
 the patent proofs of its being from God,—“the signs and wonders which God did   
 among the heathen by them.”   
 (c) Nor is it any objection to the identity, that in Gal. ii. 2, Paul went up “by   
 revelation,” —whereas in Acts xv. 2, the brethren decreed that P. and B. should go up,   
 in consequence of the trouble given by the Judaizers. How do we know that this   
 revelation was not made fo the church, and so directed their appointment? Or if it   
 understood that the revelation was made to Paul himself, who can say whether the   
 determination of the brethren was not a consequence of it? Who can say again,   
 whether Paul may not have been reluctant to go up, rather willing not to confer with   
 flesh and blood on such a matter, and may have been commanded by a vision to do so?   
 We have here again only the public and the private side of the same occurrence: the   
 one, suitable to the ecclesiastical the other, to the vindication of his office   
 by the Apostle.   
 (d) The result is strikingly put by Mr. Conybeare, Life and Epp. of St. Paul, edn. 2,   
 vol. i. p. 546,—“ The @alatian visit could not have happened before the third visit:   
 because, if so, Apostles at Jerusalem had already granted to Paul and Barnabas   
 (Gal. ii, the liberty which was sought for the “ Gospel of the uncircumcision,”   
 therefore there would have been no need for the church to send them again to Jeru-   
 salem upon the same cause. Again, the Galatian visit could not have occurred after   
 the third visit: because, almost immediately after that period, Paul and Barnabas   
 ceased to work together as missionaries to the Gentiles: whereas, up to the time of the   
 Galatian visit, they had been working together.”   
 (c) It seems then to follow, that the Galatian visit is with that recorded in   
 Acts xv.   
 Those who wish to see the whole question dealt with more in detail, and the names   
 and arguments of the champions of each view recounted, may refer to Mr, Conybeare’s   
 Appendix I. at the end of vol. i. Conybeare and Howson’s Life of St. Paul: or to   
 Dr. Davidson’s Introd. vol. ii. 112 ff.   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 APPENDIX.   
   
 On “rue Crry or Las#A,” AND OTHER PARTICULARS MENTIONED IN Acts   
 xxvii. 7-17.   
   
 Mauch light has been thrown on the interesting questions connected with the topo-   
 graphy of this passage, by letters written to Mr. Smith from the Rev. George Brown,   
 who accompanied the yacht St. Ursula, Hugh Tennent, Esq., on a cruise in the Medi-   
 terranean, in the winter of 1855-6. I have to thank Mr. Smith for having kindly   
 forwarded to me copies of these letters they arrived. The substance of them is now   
 printed as an extract from Mr. Brown’s Journal, in the second edition of Mr. Smith’s   
 “Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul,” Appendix, No. 3. I extract here such portions   
 as regard immediately the geographical points in question, referring my readers to the   
 yolume itself the whole account, which is most graphic and entertaining.   
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