THE PAULINE EPISTLES

THE
PAULINE EPISTLES

AND THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS IN THEIR HISTORICAL SETTING

BY

THE REV. F. J. BADCOCK, D.D.

FELLOW OF ST. AUGUSTINE'S COLLEGE, CANTERBURY

LONDON

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE

NEW YORK : THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Χρὴ τὴν ἀκρίβειαν μὴ ὁμοίως ἐν ἅπασιν ἐπιζητεῖν, ἀλλ' ἐν ἑκάστοις κατὰ τὴν ὑποκειμένην ὕλην καὶ ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἐφ' ὅσον οἰκεῖον τῇ μεθόδῳ.—ARISTOTLE, *Eth. Nic.*, I. 7.

First published - - 1937

MADE IN GREAT BRITAIN

I REGRET that through inadvertence no acknowledgement has been made of my indebtedness to Professor Duncan's book *St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry*, except by mention of his name in the Preface.

PREFACE

MY thanks are due to the Rev. D. R. Fotheringham for permission to print his list of the dates of Passovers and Pentecosts; to the Rev. Dr. W. Emery Barnes for a similar permission to print his transliteration of the original Aramaic of the hymns in the two Epistles to Timothy; to the Rev. Professors G. S. Duncan and H. L. Goudge and the Rev. Dr. C. H. Valentine for helpful criticisms; and especially to my friend the Rev. Ernest Evans, who, besides discussing the whole book, has kindly revised the proofs; and not least to my friend and typist Mrs. Hordern. As this book is primarily intended for students at theological colleges, I have permitted myself a certain amount of repetition, on the principle enunciated by St. Paul (Phil. iii. 1), and the authorities quoted are for the most part such as are easily accessible to them in English.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER V.

CHAPTER VI.

CHAPTER VII.

CHAPTER VIII.

CHAPTER IX.

CHAPTER X.

CHAPTER XI.

SUGGESTED PAULINE CHRONOLOGY

A.D.	
33. April 6.	Resurrection. St. Paul in Jerusalem (Acts xxii. 3).
May 24.	Pentecost.
35.	Deposition of Pilate.
35 or 36.	Martyrdom of St. Stephen.
36.	St. Paul's conversion.
36. April.	Marcellus appointed Procurator.
37. March 16.	Death of Titus; accession of Gaius (Caligula).
38.	St. Paul's first visit to Jerusalem (Gal. i. 18).
	St. Paul goes to Tarsus and Barnabas to Antioch.
39 or 40.	Barnabas brings St. Paul to Antioch.
39-42.	Petronius, Legate of Syria; ordered to set up the statue of Gaius in the Temple at Jerusalem.
40.	Prophecy of Agabus; collection begun at Antioch.
41. January 24.	Death of Gaius; accession of Claudius.
44.	Death of Herod Agrippa.
46.	Famine visit to Jerusalem.
47.	First missionary journey begun.
	Conversion of Luke and Titus.
47. Autumn.	Sabbatical Year.
48. Autumn.	
48. Spring.	St. Paul returns to Pisidian Antioch; first imprisonment (2 Cor. xi. 23-25).
	Return to Syrian Antioch.
49.	Jewish emissaries arrive at Antioch.
49. May.	Third visit to Jerusalem; Epistle to the Galatians (taken by Titus and Timothy ?)
	Council at Jerusalem.
	Return to Antioch.
Between September, 49 and September, 50.	Claudius expels Jews from Rome.
50.	Second missionary journey begun; St. Paul imprisoned at Philippi; 2 *Thessalonians* taken by Timothy from Berœa.
	St. Paul goes to Athens and Corinth; vow at Cenchreæ.
51.	1 *Thessalonians* taken by Titus from Corinth.
51. Summer.	Gallio becomes Proconsul of Achaia.
52. March.	St. Paul leaves Corinth and goes to Ephesus and Jerusalem.
Autumn.	St. Paul arrives at Ephesus.
54. Spring.	Epaphras, Erastus, Onesiphorus and others come to Ephesus.
Summer.	Marcus Junius Silanus becomes Proconsul of Asia.
	St. Paul, Andronicus, Aristarchus, Epaphras, and Junias imprisoned.
October 13.	Murder of Claudius; accession of Nero.
54 or 55.	*Philippians* taken by Epaphroditus and Luke, *Colossians* and *Philemon* by Tychicus and Onesimus.

A.D.	
55.	Silanus murdered; Publius Celer and Helius assume power.
	Timothy and Onesiphorus go to Galatia; St. Paul and his companions released.
	1 *Corinthians* (taken by Sosthenes ?)
	St. Paul and Epaphras go to Colossæ.
	Tychicus goes to Corinth; Titus and Timothy come back to Ephesus.
	Erastus and Timothy go to Macedonia.
	St. Paul, Apollos, Titus (Artemas and Zenas ?) go to Crete.
	Titus left in Crete; St. Paul and the others go to Corinth.
	Epistle to Titus taken by Apollos and Zenas.
	St. Paul goes to Nicopolis.
	Tychicus or Artemas relieves Titus in Crete.
	Titus goes to Corinth; Erastus returns.
	Titus goes to Nicopolis.
56.	St. Paul, Titus, Aristarchus of Thessalonica, Gaius of Doberus go to Philippi.
	The Severe Letter (2 *Corinthians* x.-xiii. 10) taken by Titus and Luke.
	St. Paul, Aristarchus and Gaius go to Ephesus. Riot.
	St. Paul and Tychicus go to Philippi.
	The Joyful Letter (2 *Corinthians* i.-ix.) taken by Titus, Luke and Tychicus.
	St. Paul and Timothy go through Macedonia to Corinth.
	Romans taken by Titus.
57. Spring.	St. Paul goes to Philippi and Timothy to Ephesus.
	1 *Timothy* written from Philippi.
	Delegates go to Troas.
	Titus returns to Philippi; St. Paul and Luke go to Troas.
	Timothy goes from Miletus to Ephesus. Trophimus falls sick and is left at Miletus. St. Paul hears that Erastus has stayed at Corinth, and that Onesiphorus is dead.
	St. Paul and the delegates and others go to Jerusalem.
	St. Paul imprisoned at Cæsarea.
	2 *Timothy* (except iv. 20) and *Ephesians* taken by Tychicus.
	Hebrews.
59. Autumn.	St. Paul, Luke and Aristarchus start for Rome. At Myra, St. Paul and Luke change ships. Aristarchus goes to Thessalonica.
59-60.	St. Paul and Luke winter in Melita.
60.	St. Paul and Luke arrive in Rome.
62.	*Acts* written; St. Paul released.
63.	St. Paul goes to Spain.

ST. PAUL'S TRAVELS

A.D.

Before his Conversion.

36. Tarsus, Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 39, xxii. 3).
Jerusalem, neighbourhood of Damascus (Acts ix. 2, 3).

After his Conversion.

36. Damascus (Acts ix. 8); Arabia (Gal. i. 17).

First Visit to Jerusalem.

38. Damascus (Gal. i. 17); Jerusalem (Gal. i. 18; Acts ix. 26); Cæsarea (Acts ix. 30); Tarsus (Acts ix. 30).
39. Antioch (Acts xi. 26).

Second (Famine) Visit to Jerusalem.

46 or 47. Antioch (Acts xi. 27); Jerusalem (Acts xi. 30, xii. 25); Antioch (Acts. xiii. 1).

First Missionary Journey.

47. Antioch (xiii. 1); Seleucia (4); Salamis (5); Paphos (6); Perga (13); Pisidian Antioch (14); Iconium (xiv. 1); Lystra (7); Derbe (20).
48. Lystra, Iconium, Pisidian Antioch (xiv. 21); Perga (25); Attalia (25); Antioch (26).

Third (Council) Visit to Jerusalem.

49. Antioch (xv. 2); Phœnicia, Samaria (3); Jerusalem (4); Antioch (30).

Second Missionary Journey.

50. Antioch (xv. 30); Syria, Cilicia (41); Derbe, Lystra (xvi. 1); Phrygia-Galatia (6); (Metropolis); Troas (8); Samothrace, Neapolis (11); Philippi (12); Amphipolis, Apollonia, Thessalonica (xvii. 1); Berœa (10); Athens (15); Cenchreæ (xviii. 18); Corinth (xviii. 1).

Third Missionary Journey and Fourth Visit to Jerusalem.

52. Corinth (xviii. 18); Ephesus (19); Cæsarea, Jerusalem, Antioch (22); Galatia-Phrygia (23); (Tralla); Ephesus (xix. 1).
55. Ephesus (xix. 1); Colossæ (Philem. 22); Ephesus, Crete (Tit. i. 5); Corinth (2 Cor. xii. 14; xiii. 1); Nicopolis (Tit. iii. 12);
56. Nicopolis (Tit. iii. 12); Illyricum (Rom. xv. 19); Thessalonica (Acts xix. 29, xx. 4, xxvii. 2); (Philippi); Ephesus (xix. 34, 35); Macedonia (xx. 1); Greece (2).

Fifth Visit to Jerusalem.

A.D.

57. Greece, Macedonia (xx. 3); Philippi (6); Troas (5); Assos (13); Mitylene, Chios, Samos, Miletus (15); (Trogyllium Bezan text); Cos, Rhodes, Patara (xxi. 1); Tyre (3); Ptolemais (7); Cæsarea (8); Jerusalem (15); Antipatris (xxiii. 31); Cæsarea (33).

The Voyage to Rome.

59. Cæsarea (xxvii. 1); Sidon (3); Myra (5); Fair Havens (8); Melita (xxviii. 1).

60. Melita (xxviii. 1); Syracuse (11); Rhegium (12); Puteoli (13); Appii Forum, Three Taverns (15); Rome (16).

After the First Imprisonment.

63. Rome, Spain.

65. Spain, Rome.

CHAPTER I

THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS

SYNOPSIS

THE date of the Crucifixion is fixed for 33 A.D.

The martyrdom of St. Stephen late in 35 or early in 36, and the conversion of St. Paul early in 36.

The visit to Jerusalem " after three years," Gal. i. 18, in 38, and the visit " after fourteen years," Gal. ii. 1, in 49.

The prophecy of Agabus, Acts xi. 28, *c.* 40, and the famine visit probably in 46.

The visit in 49 not the famine visit, and therefore the Council visit.

This dating supported by Gal. ii. 10, and by the date of the proconsulship of Gallio, almost certainly summer of 51 to summer of 52.

The foundation of the Church at Antioch in Syria.

Before the Council, Sts. Peter and Paul visit Antioch, Gal. ii. 11; the " false brethren." Gal. ii. 4, 12; Acts xv. 24.

St. Peter, and Paul and Barnabas with Titus go to Jerusalem, Acts xv. 2; Gal. ii. 1.

The point at issue: should Jewish and Gentile converts at Antioch have one Agape and Eucharist, or not ? Views of St. Peter and St. Paul.

St. Paul confers privately with the leaders at Jerusalem.

News of activities of " false brethren " in Galatia brought by Timothy to St. Paul at Jerusalem.

St. Paul sends Epistle to the Galatians by Timothy and Titus. The Council meets. The Decree: on what terms Jewish and Gentile converts in Syria and Cilicia may have one Agape and Eucharist.

Appendix (1) on the word " Hellenists " in Acts xi. 20; (2) on the difference between Acts xv. and Galatians.

THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS

DR. J. K. FOTHERINGHAM has shown in the *Journal of Theological Studies* (vol. xxxv., pp. 146-162) that "the fifteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar" (Luke iii. 1), in which the preaching of St. John the Baptist began, can only mean part of the year 28 A.D. and part of 29; but he leaves it doubtful whether St. Luke reckoned it as beginning on Nisan 1, as was the Palestinian custom, or September 1, as they reckoned at Antioch in Syria. Even if we adopt the earlier date, we must allow an interval, probably of some months' duration, before the preaching began, and a second interval before it became widely known. Then we have to allow for a third interval before the baptism of our Lord, and for a fourth interval of some six or seven weeks in which to place the Temptation. Thus our Lord's ministry cannot have begun as early as April 19, the Passover of 29. But if it began after the Passover of 29 (say, about Pentecost, June 8; *cf.* John i. 48, Mark xi. 13, xiii. 28), then the Crucifixion cannot have taken place as early as April 8, the Passover of 30, since it is impossible to compress the events of the ministry into a period of ten months. But in that case it must have taken place in 33, since neither in 31 nor in 32 did the 15th of Nisan fall either on a Thursday or on a Friday.[1]

Adopting this date for the Crucifixion, the martyrdom of St. Stephen cannot have taken place before the second half of

[1] This dating is supported by John ii. 20 (*τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἓξ ἔτεσιν ᾠκοδομήθη ὁ ναὸς οὗτος*), where the aorist and the dative of time show that the only possible translation is: "This shrine (or temple) was built forty-six years ago." The building was begun by Herod the Great in the eighteenth year of his reign (Josephus, *Antt.* XV. xi. 1) reckoning from the proclamation of his kingship in the senate in December, 40 B.C., and in the fifteenth year (*id.*, *B.J.* I. xxi. 1) reckoning from his entry into the possession of the kingdom in 37 B.C., and took eight years to build (*id.*, *Antt.* XV. xi. 5), so with either reckoning we arrive at 30 A.D. for the date of John ii. 20 (see Corbisley in *J.T.S.*, vol. xxxvi., pp. 22-32; C. J. Cadoux, *ibid.*, xx., pp. 311-321; and F. Warburton Lewis, *ibid.*, xxi., pp. 173, 174). Thus if we adopt the date 33 A.D. for the Crucifixion, the Johannine account is confirmed both in respect of the length of the ministry, a short four years, and in respect of the day of the Crucifixion, for in 33 the 15th Nisan began at sunset on the Friday, and thus Christ was crucified on the Friday before the feast of the Passover. The date of St. Stephen's martyrdom does not depend on this reckoning, though confirmed by it, but rather on the date of the deposition of Pontius Pilate.

the year 35. The proceedings against St. Stephen were all conducted with due regard to the Jewish law; the High Priest presided over the Sanhedrin, and the mode of execution was in accordance with the provisions of the law of blasphemy.[1] But the Sanhedrin normally could not inflict the penalty of death. Hence St. Stephen's martyrdom must have taken place when the Roman authority was temporarily in abeyance and the Sanhedrin had assumed control. Such a state of things actually occurred between the closing months of 35 and the Passover of 36. In the summer of 35 Vitellius arrived as imperial legate in Syria in view of the possibility of a campaign against the Parthians. In this year also a Messianic impostor arose in Samaria, and Pilate put down the insurrection with indefensible violence. The Samaritans appealed to Vitellius, and he deposed Pilate. Pilate's temporary successor was Marcellus, an officer on the staff of Vitellius, but Vitellius does not appear to have appointed him till he visited Jerusalem for the Passover of 36. We can therefore place the martyrdom of St. Stephen either late in 35, or more probably very early in 36. Accordingly we put the conversion of St. Paul early in 36, and his visit to Jerusalem " after three years " (Gal. i. 18) in 38, at which time Barnabas was still in Jerusalem (Acts ix. 27). So the voyage of St. Paul to Tarsus and that of Barnabas to Antioch were both in 38, and possibly " as far as Antioch " (Acts xi. 22) they may have travelled together. St. Paul was some little time at Tarsus, and then Barnabas brought him to Antioch, and they were together at Antioch for a full year (Acts xi. 25, 26). This brings us to 40, and " in these days " (27) Agabus came from Jerusalem to Antioch. In 39 Petronius, who had succeeded Vitellius, arrived in Syria, with orders to erect the statue of the Emperor Gaius (Caligula) in the Temple at Jerusalem, and this was taken to be " the abomination that maketh desolate " (Dan. xii. 11; *cf.* Mark xiii. 14, Matt. xxiv. 15). Agabus prophesied of the famine probably as one of the signs of the end.[2] The famine is noticed as happening in the reign of Claudius (Acts xi. 28), which implies that the prophecy of it was delivered in the previous reign—that is, in the reign of Gaius, who was assassinated in January, 41.

If the Christians at Antioch had been collecting since about

[1] See W. L. Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem*, p. 52.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 72.

the year 40,[1] they would have sent up their alms to Jerusalem as soon as they had news of the scarcity, and Turner and Ramsay put this visit in 46 (Hastings, *D.B.* i. 424*b*). But even if we put it in 47, the visit of St. Paul and Barnabas with the Antiochene collection cannot be that recorded as being " after fourteen years " from St. Paul's conversion (Gal. ii. 1)—*i.e.*, in 49; while if we reckon this not from St. Paul's conversion, but from the visit three years later, the discrepancy will be the more glaring, and the date will also conflict with that of the proconsulate of Gallio at Corinth. Therefore the visit " after fourteen years " cannot be the famine visit.

Another piece of evidence, to my mind conclusive, that the visit " after fourteen years " was not the famine visit is furnished by St. Paul's own language. He says that the leaders of the Church at Jerusalem urged him to remember the poor, ὃ καὶ ἐσπούδασα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι (Gal. ii. 10). If it had been the famine visit he would have written ὃ καὶ ἐσπούδαζον αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιεῖν, " the very thing which I was there zealously doing "; what he does say is that he then zealously began to embrace the idea of doing it, a reference to the subsequent general collection from the Pauline churches.[2]

The year from the autumn of 47 to the autumn of 48 was a Sabbatical year, when no ploughing or sowing could be done.[3] St. Paul and his party probably arrived some time before Pentecost, which in 49 fell about May 28. The population of Palestine was for the most part agricultural, and the wheat harvest on the high lands of Judæa would certainly not be completed before the end of June, so St. Paul must have come at a time of great scarcity, a circumstance which gives additional point to the request of the rulers of the Church at Jerusalem.

Moreover, if we date the holding of the Council in 49, the Second

[1] ὥρισαν ἕκαστος αὐτῶν εἰς διακονίαν πέμψαι, Acts xi. 29. Field, *Notes on the Translation of the New Testament*, points out that ὥρισεν in the New Testament never means " resolved," and suggests, " They set apart (Greek, fixed a limit) each of them a certain sum . . . for a ministration to send unto the brethren." *Cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 2 for the arrangement adopted subsequently by St. Paul.

[2] There is the same difference between ἐσπούδαζον and ἐσπούδασα as between ἐβασίλευε, " he was reigning," and ἐβασίλευσε, " he became king "; *cf.* the use of the present participle σπουδάζοντες, Eph. iv. 3, " go on doing it," with the aorist imperative σπούδασον, 2 Tim. ii. 15, iv. 9, 21, " make up your mind to do it."

[3] That sabbatical years were still observed is shown by Tac., *Hist.* v. 4, and Josephus, *Antt.* XIV. x. 6.

Missionary Journey will begin in the year 50, allowing time for the settlement of affairs in Antioch and the publication of the decree in the neighbourhood. This will take St. Paul to Corinth for the winter of 50. The suit before Gallio was probably brought soon after he arrived in the province, and the date of his arrival is fixed for one of two years by an inscription found at Delphi (given in *Dict. d'Arch. Chrét.* iii. 2960). This is a letter from Claudius to the City of Delphi written at a time when Claudius had been saluted *Imperator* for the twenty-sixth time, and alludes to information given him by Gallio as proconsul. The twenty-seventh salutation of Claudius took place before August 1, 52. A.D. It would therefore seem more probable that Gallio's year of office ran from the summer of 51 to 52 than for the year following. Thus the dating of the Council in 49 is confirmed from both ends.

We now return to the situation in Antioch before the Council met. The Church of Antioch was founded by certain refugees who fled from Jerusalem and the neighbourhood to escape the persecution that followed the death of St. Stephen (Acts xi. 19). At first they preached to Jews only, but some of them when they came to Antioch spoke the word to the "Hellenists," that is, to the Jews who used the Septuagint in the synagogue and spoke Greek.[1]

The correctness of this conclusion is shown by the order of the narrative. St. Luke gives his general plan in Acts i. 8, "in Jerusalem, in all Judæa, and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." The first seven chapters deal with events in Jerusalem. Then in Acts viii. 1 we get, "there arose a great persecution against the Church which was in Jerusalem; and they were all scattered about throughout the regions of Judæa and Samaria, except the Apostles." The fact that the Apostles and St. James were untouched would seem to show that the persecution was mainly directed against Christians attached to the Greek-speaking synagogues, that is to say, the followers of St. Stephen. The charge against St. Stephen was not that in common with all Christians he held that Jesus was the Messiah, but that he spoke against the Temple and the law (Acts vi. 13; *cf.* vii. 44-47, and Knox *in loc.*). The Aramaic-speaking Jewish Christians attended the Temple and "were all zealous for the law" (xxi. 20).

Moreover, when St. Paul and Barnabas returned to Antioch

[1] On the word "Hellenists," see the Appendix at the end of this chapter.

after their first missionary journey they announced there, as though it was a wonderful piece of news, that " God had opened a door of faith to the Gentiles " (xiv. 27; *cf.* xi. 18), obviously implying that this door had hitherto been regarded as shut against them; clearly, therefore, they had not been baptizing gentile converts at Antioch for the ten years previously. And in xv. 3 St. Paul and Barnabas and certain others, passing through Phœnicia and Samaria, declare the conversion of the Gentiles and cause great joy. Finally, if gentile converts had been baptized in Antioch in 36 or 38 the Pharisaic party in Jerusalem (xv. 5) would have at once protested; even the baptism of Cornelius they seem to have regarded as an exceptional case, and not as furnishing a general precedent. Apart from the notice in xi. 1, it is clear from the visit of Agabus and others to Antioch (xi. 27), and the visit of Barnabas and Saul to Jerusalem (xi. 30), that there was considerable intercourse between Jewish Christians at Antioch and those at Jerusalem, and some of the former doubtless came up to Jerusalem for festivals; if, therefore, Gentiles had been baptized at Antioch by the original refugees, the question that was raised in 49 would have been raised and settled many years earlier. The reading " Hellenes " (Gentiles) would thus seem to be impossible.

What, then, has St. Luke in view when he says that certain of the refugees spoke to the " Hellenists " (Greek-speaking Jews) ? The city of Jerusalem was Aramaic-speaking, with a colony of people whose native language was Greek. In the synagogues of the Aramaic-speaking population the readings from the Scriptures would be in Hebrew, but they were translated into Aramaic, and the term " Hebrew " covered both Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic; and people who spoke Aramaic as their home language would be termed " Hebrews." But those in Jerusalem whose language was Greek attended synagogues in which the Septuagint was used, and they were called " Hellenists " (*cf.* Acts vi. 9); nevertheless, living in an Aramaic-speaking city they must have had a working knowledge of Aramaic; it is even probable that St. Stephen's speech was delivered in Aramaic, though he himself was a " Hellenist." That the distinction between " Hellenists " and " Hebrews " is one of language is shown in vi. 1. Hence both parties were Jews and both were Christians.[1]

Jews who prided themselves on their nationality and observance

[1] See Harnack, *Acts of the Apostles*, p. 52.

of the law might continue to speak Aramaic, even though they or their families had emigrated. St. Paul is an example, and Tarsus was more Grecianized than Antioch. Rutherford (*St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, p. xvii) notes that St. Paul never attained a real mastery of Greek; his vocabulary is meagre, his use of prepositions peculiar, and St. Paul himself tells us why: " Are they Hebrews ?"—they came from Jerusalem—" So am I " (2 Cor. xi. 22); " a Hebrew of the Hebrews " (Phil. iii. 5). Though he lived at Tarsus the family still talked Aramaic, and doubtless attended an Aramaic-speaking synagogue. In Antioch the language of politics and culture was Greek, but the country round spoke Aramaic, in the northern dialect called Syriac. These are merely varieties of the same tongue; and the term " Hebrew," which in Palestine covers the southern variety " Aramaic," in Antioch would cover " Syriac."

The persecution that ensued on the death of St. Stephen was chiefly directed against Hellenistic Jewish converts. For fear of it some of them fled to Antioch, preaching to none save Jews. St. Luke is not here distinguishing by language but by religion—they did not preach to heathens. The persecution ranged as far as Damascus, and St. Paul had been provided with letters to other cities also (Acts xxvi. 11); hence the refugees would be safer if in Antioch they attached themselves to Aramaic-speaking synagogues. But finding that at the headquarters of the Roman authority in the East they were in comparative security, they became bolder and spoke in the Hellenistic synagogues, thus proclaiming that they belonged to the very group against which persecution had raged in Jerusalem.

When, then, did God open the door of faith to the Gentiles in Antioch ? Clearly after St. Paul and Barnabas had returned from the first missionary journey. St. Paul had had a commission (ἐξαπέστειλαν, Acts ix. 30) through men from the Church at Jerusalem to Cilicia and Syria (Gal. i. 21), both parts of the same Roman province, and this might be stretched to include Cyprus, but he had also received a direct mission in Jerusalem which in the future would make him Apostle to the Gentiles (Acts xxii. 21). This apostolate he began to exercise in Pisidian Antioch, and St. Luke marks his sense of the importance of the crisis by the length of St. Paul's speech and by the decisive phrase, " Lo, we turn to the Gentiles, for so hath the Lord

commanded " (xiii. 46, 47; Isa. xlix. 6).[1] From that time onwards St. Paul and his company had been baptizing Jews, God-fearers and heathen, " making no distinction " (xi. 12), on a basis of faith in Jesus. When they returned to Antioch in Syria they proclaimed that " God had opened a door of faith to the Gentiles " (xiv. 27), and did the same thing there. Then certain men came down from Judæa and taught the brethren (at Antioch), " except ye be circumcised after the custom of Moses ye cannot be saved " (Acts xv. 1); they were of the sect of the Pharisees (xv. 5): " Forasmuch as we have heard that certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls; to whom we gave no commandment," say St. James and the Council at Jerusalem (xv. 24).

Now we turn to the Epistle to the Galatians. St. Paul calls them " certain from James " (ii. 12); these are obviously the same people. News of what was going on in Antioch had apparently come to the ears of the Church at Jerusalem, and they sent forth St. Peter to learn the truth of the report. This news had reached Jerusalem from Antioch by means of Jewish converts, who felt that the admission of Gentiles into the Christian Church on a basis of equality with themselves would undermine their superior position; so they made a bid for support from the Pharisaic party of the Church in Jerusalem, and these " Judæans " who claimed that they had the authority of St. James were " privily brought in " by dissatisfied Jewish converts at Antioch to " spy out the liberty " which the gentile converts there enjoyed in Christ Jesus (Gal. ii. 4). St. Peter had arrived before them (so Turner, *H.D.B.* i. 424*a*) and found things outwardly peaceful; Jewish and gentile converts alike joined in one Agape and one Eucharist.[2] These were presided over by St. Paul and St. Barnabas, the former of whom was certainly, and the latter probably, a strict Pharisee,

[1] The " far hence " of xxii. 21 is probably based on this quotation, " unto the uttermost parts of the earth." Notice how, in Rom. xv. 20, 21, St. Paul draws guidance from Isaiah.

[2] Had St. Paul intended to place this visit of St. Peter later in time than the events narrated in ii. 1-10, he would have used another ἔπειτα; *cf.* i. 18, 21, ii. 1; 1 Cor. xv. 6, 7. It is quite possible that these Jewish missionaries had told the Galatian converts that St. Peter and Barnabas had at first acquiesced in St. Paul's arrangements, but had thought better of it and had withdrawn, but had not mentioned St. Paul's action in consequence, and so left them with the impression that in following the advice which they gave they would have St. Peter and Barnabas on their side. St. Paul will then be saying here: " Now as regards Peter's conduct when he came to Antioch, about which you have been told," etc.

so the dissentients could not voice their complaint, nor could they hope to overcome in argument a rabbi who had sat at the feet of Gamaliel.

On the question of circumcision, therefore, these " Judæans " met with the united opposition of Sts. Peter, Paul, and Barnabas. St. Paul would argue on first principles: " If any man is in Christ he is a new creature " (2 Cor. v. 17); in Christ there is neither " Jew nor Gentile " (Gal. iii. 28). He would tell St. Peter that if he ruled otherwise he was false to the revelation given him at Joppa;[1] if the Holy Spirit had testified by signs at Cæsarea, He had done the like in Galatia; though the Church at Jerusalem might try to treat the case of Cornelius as an exception, it was, in fact, a universal precedent.

In consequence, these Judæans passed on to Galatia, in which the mischief had first arisen, a Church but newly established, and where the redoubtable St. Paul was no longer present. That they did so pass on is, I think, clear, almost by the very language. " There are some that trouble you and would pervert the gospel of Christ " (Gal. i. 7) does not refer to the native Galatians, but to foreign intruders who " unsettle " them (Gal. v. 12); the words are very close to those used by St. James. And the whole question is the same: " They compel you to be circumcised " (vi. 12); you had been enjoying liberty (v. 13; *cf.* ii. 4). Their conversion was but recent (i. 6): St. Paul was still painfully conscious of the effects of the stoning at Lystra, he bore on his body the scars of Jesus (vi. 17). They passed on, but they left a sting behind. " Sinners of the Gentiles " (ii. 15) was a phrase which bit; after all the Jewish converts probably were more moral than their Gentile brethren. " This man receiveth sinners and eateth with them " (Luke xv. 2) was a phrase used by people of the same temper and party against our Lord. Before they came St. Peter had lived "as do the Gentiles" (Gal. ii. 14), not at Jerusalem, of course, but at Antioch; now he wanted to make gentile converts live " as do the Jews," and Barnabas also " was carried away with their dissimulation." How had St. Peter " lived as do the Gentiles "? It is probably not St. Paul's own phrase, but in origin a reproach levelled against himself: " Call yourself a

[1] It is noticeable that St. Peter uses at Jerusalem (Acts xv. 7-11) the very argument by which he had been himself convinced; its Pauline tone is unmistakable.

Pharisee! Why, you live as do the Gentiles!" St. Paul was a strict Pharisee in his private life. He not only says that he is a Pharisee and the son of Pharisees (Acts xxiii. 6, xxvi. 5), but the Church at Jerusalem knew that he "walked orderly, keeping the law" (Acts xxi. 24). St. Peter, therefore, it would seem, had no occasion to live as do the Gentiles. But there was one matter, a public one, in which St. Paul himself could be regarded as a transgressor; however strictly he might keep pharisaic rules in his private life, he did not care what he ate at the Christian Agape. The Christian Agape, which preceded the Eucharist (1 Cor. xi. 20, 21), was the survival of the *Kiddush* meal,[1] which had preceded the Eucharist at its first institution. It seems to have been a sort of indoor picnic, to which the guests, possibly in some sort of rotation, each made a contribution in kind. Hence for the Jews not yet emancipated there was the possibility of a double source of defilement: in sharing in it they would eat with people ceremonially unclean, and might partake of food which was ceremonially unclean. By so doing they would more than "lose caste," they would be "defiled." That was the reproach made against St. Peter at Jerusalem: "Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised and didst eat with them" (Acts xi. 3). "Touch no unclean thing" (Isa. lii. 11); "Handle not, nor taste, nor touch" (Col. ii. 21), said they. "The kingdom of God is not eating and drinking," said St. Paul (Rom. xiv. 17); "Nothing is unclean of itself" (Rom. xiv. 14). "Granted," St. Peter might have replied, "but if we waive the question of circumcision—as we have done—could not you tell the Gentile converts at least not to defile themselves and not to bring objectionable food?" "I might advise them out of charity in order not to wound your weak consciences (1 Cor. viii. 7), if you admit them to be weak, but command them I cannot, and will not." "Then why not have separate Agapes and Eucharists?" "Separate Agapes and Eucharists! It is to rend the Body of Christ. One bread, one body" (1 Cor. x. 17).

So the question was referred to Jerusalem, but St. Paul was so certain that he was right that it needed a special revelation to make him go up (Gal. ii. 2), and he insisted on taking with him the uncircumcised gentile convert Titus. Clearly he regarded Titus as a man calculated by his holiness of life and character to

[1] See Oesterley, *Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy*.

make a good impression. And he must have known Titus well to run the risk. Later on we find Titus initiating the collection at Corinth (2 Cor. viii. 6), as one of the bearers of the "severe" epistle to that city (2 Cor. ii. 13; vii. 6, 13, 14), and of the "joyful" epistle (2 Cor. xii. 18). The suggestion is, I think, that St. Paul had had him under his eye in Galatia, which was the original seat of the trouble that had afterwards arisen at Antioch, and this gives an additional reason for mentioning Titus to the Galatians, "Titus, whom you all know."

Arrived in Jerusalem, St. Paul had a private conference with the leaders (Gal. ii. 2). The Epistle to the Galatians, therefore, cannot have been written earlier than this; but it is equally certain that it cannot have been written long after the first visit to Galatia: "I marvel that ye are so quickly removing from him that called you in the grace of Christ" (Gal. i. 6). And it is written quite obviously in hot blood. St. Paul would not after any considerable interval have written of St. James, St. Peter, and St. John, "they who were reputed to be pillars" (ii. 9); "those who were reputed to be somewhat (whatsoever they were it maketh no matter to me; God accepteth no man's person)" (ii. 6; *cf.* vi. 3: "If any man is reputed to be somewhat when he is nothing"). St. Paul may not be suggesting that St. James presided at the Council by the order "James and Cephas and John," nor need that be implied by his speaking last, by the formal opening of his address, "Brethren, hearken unto me" (Acts xv. 13), or by the phrase, "wherefore my judgment is" (19), and its adoption by the Council; but clearly he regarded St. James as the person of most influence, and for the time he thinks of St. Peter as of less importance. If we recall the history of St. Peter in this connexion we shall find that St. Paul was not altogether without justification: "Rise, Peter; kill and eat." "Not so, Lord; for I have never eaten anything that is common or unclean" (Acts x. 13, 14). Does it not go back to the historic occasion: "Be it far from Thee, Lord; this shall never happen unto Thee" (Matt. xvi. 22)? And when St. Peter had come up to Jerusalem "they that were of the circumcision contended with him" (Acts xi. 2); and St. Peter, instead of pleading his authority, or going back to first principles, had used language very much like that of Gamaliel: "Who was I that I could withstand God?" (Acts xi. 17; *cf.* v. 39).

St. Paul, in his idea, was not merely fighting for his whole life's work, but for the truth of the Gospel (Gal. ii. 5). Was God the God of the Jews only or also of the Gentiles (Rom. iii. 29)? Was He the Saviour of all men (1 Tim. iv. 10) or not? And he saw his work ruined and the Gospel betrayed by the crass stupidity[1] of men who could not perceive principles, but thought only in terms of local and temporary expediency. As to Antioch and Galatia, St. Paul knew that he could manage them; it was in Jerusalem that the contest must be fought out. The question in the mind of St. Paul was, What is the truth of the Gospel? The question in the minds of the presbyters at Jerusalem was, How much these myriads who believe and are zealous for the law (Acts xxi. 20) would stand.

St. Paul knew perfectly well what he was doing when he took Titus with him. There was nothing that could be alleged against his moral character; the Church at Jerusalem was not going to be allowed to go off on a false issue; Titus was an uncircumcised Gentile—that was all. Would the Church at Jerusalem admit him to their Agape and Eucharist? If they did, they had given away the whole case of the Pharisees. If they did not, St. Paul did not care to consider what would happen. So he laid before the leaders his unqualified Gospel. They had no qualifications, no limiting clause to add to it (Gal. ii. 6); in principle they accepted it (Acts xv. 17), but they could not admit Titus to the Agape and Eucharist without splitting the Church at Jerusalem, and they were not going to split the Church at Jerusalem for the sake of unity at Antioch.

In the midst of the controversy bad news arrived from Galatia, brought, I imagine, by young Timothy, out of affection for St. Paul, and possibly under pressure from his grandmother Lois and his mother Eunice. St. Paul wrote back a fiery answer. It is not a gentle letter; in places it is a brutal letter (v. 12); it is the surgeon applying the cautery to the festering sore. Who was to take the epistle? Timothy, of course; but Timothy had neither the age nor the strength for such a task. Let Titus go with Timothy. And the whole atmosphere at Jerusalem is changed. That firebrand Paul has endeavoured to force the issue; it is, at the least, extraordinary tactlessness; it amounts almost to contempt

[1] Gal. iii. 1, ἀνόητος is the word used to distinguish beasts from men: the nearest equivalent in English is not "foolish" but "idiotic."

of court. But he has had the good sense to see what a *faux pas* he has made, and has sent Titus away. Let us show our appreciation of his change of mind by dealing with these Gentile converts as gently as we can (Acts xv. 28). You cannot expect Jewish converts to give up Jewish regulations; they are dinned into their ears every week in the synagogue (xv. 21). In their eyes they are bound to be important. We must waive circumcision, of course, but if we go to that length Gentiles cannot complain if we ask them to submit to some minor regulations.

It will be seen that I read four clauses in Acts xv. 20, 29, and xxi. 25. This, I think, is necessary. The MS. evidence is divided. Some MSS. (including Codex Bezæ) omit " things strangled," but these are divided among themselves, and some add, " do not do to others what you would not have done to yourselves." The Bezan text reads this in Acts xv. 20, but omits it in xxi. 25. This addition is read also by the *Didache*, but the *Didache* is certainly later than the so-called Epistle of Barnabas and probably later than the *Shepherd* of Hermas,[1] and may be put down to the latter half of the second century. But a counsel of perfection which, even in its negative form, goes far beyond the ordinary observance of the law, is not fitted for legislative enactment, and still less fitted if it is imposed on a particular class; and this last clause must be here " corrupt."

As regards the things offered to idols, which is read in the Bezan text in Acts xxi., though not in Acts xv., the meaning is quite definite.[2] It is not a prohibition of idolatry in general, but is in the nature of a " food law "; even if " things strangled " is a later addition it is an early testimony that the right translation of " bloods " is not murder, but eating the blood (Deut. xii. 16). Could a legislative body say in one breath, " Do not eat things offered to idols and do not commit murder ?" There was nothing sinful in the first, whereas the second was a crime, and so regarded by the Gentiles.

Moreover, the question as raised at Antioch was not one of

[1] See Muilenberg, *Literary Relations of the Epistle of Barnabas and the Teaching of the Apostles*, p. 9.

[2] In 1 Cor. viii. 1, 4, 7, 10, εἰδωλόθυτα is twice coupled with ἐσθίειν and once with βρῶσις; in Rev. ii. 14, 20, twice with πορνεία and once with ἐσθίειν. Idolatry in general is εἰδωλατρία (1 Cor. x. 14; Gal. v. 20; 1 Pet. iv. 3). On the whole subject of the decree, see Hunkin, *J.T.S.* xxvii. 272-283.

the superior morals of the Jews to those of the Gentiles, but of the observance of Jewish ceremonial regulations.

St. Paul had forced the Church at Jerusalem to admit the " leading case " of Cornelius as establishing a universal precedent, and so far his principle had triumphed. But though he might command the theoretical assent of the leaders to the equality of Jew and Gentile in Christ, in practical application he had received a severe rebuff. Appeal on grounds of principle was useless; it was met by considerations of local expediency. Accordingly he grasped at the opportunity of appeal to the pocket; there should be a great collection; perhaps under the influence of gratitude the sense of pharisaic superiority would thaw.

The decrees were conveyed by Silvanus, apparently a Roman citizen and a Hellenist (xvi. 37), and Judas Barsabbas, probably the brother of Joses Barsabbas (i. 23), and possibly the brother of St. James and of Symeon who succeeded him (Euseb., *H.E.*, III. xi. 2, xxii., xxxii. 4; IV. v. 3, xxii. 4). They were intended to apply to Syria and Cilicia, but St. Paul rightly reckoned that they ought to have an application to Galatia also, where the trouble had begun, and in the following year he published them there. Further than that he would not go; the Church at Jerusalem had no right to demand it of him, and outside this region they were never promulgated; but the fact that St. Paul published them in Galatia shows, I think, that they had not been already passed when he wrote; if they had been he would have quoted them in his letter. And the fact that the question of circumcising the Gentile converts is still a burning issue in Galatia shows that the state of things there is all but contemporary with that pictured at Antioch, for that question also passed out of ecclesiastical politics, and is never mentioned elsewhere except as already decided.

The Term " Hellenists " in Acts xi. 20

There are clearly two questions involved in the term " Hellenists ": (*a*) is it to be read in Acts xi. 20, and (*b*) if it is to be read, what is its meaning ? That is a question of Text and a question of Interpretation.

(*a*) *Text.*—The word Hellenist occurs in three passages of the Acts, and in no other known literature before the fourth century. The testimony of the versions, Egyptian and Syriac,

affords no guidance; in all three passages they make no distinction between Hellenists and Hellenes, except that the Peshitto in the second passage has a free rendering, "those who knew Greek."

In the first passage, Acts vi. 1, there is no textual variant. In the second, Acts ix. 29, Codex Bezæ is defective and the Codex Vaticanus reads "Hellenes," but no support can be quoted for this variant from any other MS. Chrysostom, *in loc.*, explains "Hellenists" by "those who speak Greek," as distinguished from the Hebrews from top to bottom (*οἱ βαθεῖς Ἑβραῖοι*). In the third passage, Acts xi. 20, the Codices Vaticanus, Laudianus, Mutinensis, Porphyrianus, Angelicus, the corrector of the Codex Bezæ, 61, and all other cursives of any importance except 1378 read "Hellenists." The Sinaiticus reads "Evangelists," an obvious error for "Hellenists"; the Codex Alexandrinus and the Codex Bezæ read "Hellenes," but as the former also reads "Hellenes" in Acts ix. 29, this discounts its testimony; there would be a tendency to substitute the more usual for the rarer word, and as the contrast between Jews and Greeks is very common, and "Jews" is the last word of the previous verse, this tendency would be here accentuated. Ropes says the unusual form "Hellenists" is probably right (*Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. iii., p. 106 n.); Westcott and Hort defend it with decision (*N.T.*, vol. ii., pp. 93, 94).

(*b*) *Interpretation.*—In the course of a long and valuable note in vol. v. of *The Beginnings of Christianity*, pp. 59-74, Professor Cadbury makes the position clear. Whatever interpretation we put on the word Hellenists in Acts xi. 20, we must put the same in Acts vi. 1 and ix. 29, for St. Luke is a careful writer, and would not employ a rare word three times in different senses. If, therefore, "Hellenists" means Gentiles in the last passage it must mean Gentiles in the first: "There arose a murmuring on the part of the gentile converts against the Jewish converts (Hebrews), because their widows were neglected in the daily ministration." Before the appointment of the Seven there was, therefore, a large gentile element in the Christian Church at Jerusalem; therefore many Gentiles must have been converted on the Day of Pentecost; therefore, with the Codex Sinaiticus unsupported by any other MS., we must omit the word "Jews" in ii. 5, and account for its insertion in the remainder of the MSS. Therefore St. Luke does not intend to trace the expan-

sion by successive steps of a Church in origin purely Jewish so as to include Gentiles also (*loc. cit.*, p. 65), but merely to show by examples, not necessarily in historical sequence, how Jewish prejudices against the divinely intended universality of the Gospel were broken down.[1]

No one will dispute that St. Luke regarded Christianity as a religion for all men, or that if the interpretation of Scripture in a futuristic or Christian sense is at all justified, as the early Church thought, then the universality of Christ's religion is a theme of prophecy.

But there are cogent reasons why we cannot hold that any large proportion of Gentiles was converted on the Day of Pentecost. In normal times the resident gentile population in Jerusalem was by comparison small, and at Pentecost the Jewish population would be swelled by Jewish immigrants who had come up to the city to keep the festival; the crowd therefore would be almost entirely Jewish. This is implied by the diversity of nationalities in the list given in Acts ii. 9-11, and in the phrase put upon their lips, " the wonderful works of God."

Secondly, it is implied in the tone of St. Peter's speech. Whether the language is that of St. Peter or of St. Luke is in this connexion of no importance; we are concerned with the view held by St. Luke. St. Peter begins: " Men of Judæa " (the permanent residents in Palestine) " and those who are dwelling at Jerusalem " (including the Jews who had come up for the festival). He continues with quotations of a universalistic tone taken from the prophet Joel (with whose writings the heathen were not likely to be acquainted): " All flesh " (17), " everyone that calleth on the Lord " (21) (that is, on the God whom the Jews worshipped, a phrase which would include God-fearers but not unconverted heathen). Then he starts his own speech: " Men of Israel " (21), " in the midst of us " (22), " Brethren," " among us " (29), " let all the house of Israel know " (36). The impression given is that St. Peter is directing his speech to Jews only, and has not fully apprehended the universality of the opening quotations.

Thirdly, if any large proportion of the Christian Church was gentile from the first, why should St. Peter have needed a vision

[1] But *cf.* Cadoux, " Chronological Divisions of Acts," *J.T.S.* xix., pp. 333-334.

to overcome his scruples? How could he have been reproached for going unto uncircumcised persons and eating with them (Acts xi. 3); and why did the Apostles and brethren, after listening to his justification of his conduct, say: "Then to the Gentiles also God has given repentance unto life"? (Acts xi. 18).

However we rearrange the events which St. Luke records, the visit of St. Peter to Cornelius is later than the Pentecost of Acts ii., and the Church at Jerusalem could not have said, "Then hath God given to the Gentiles repentance unto life," as though it was a novelty, if there had been any considerable number of Gentiles in full membership of that Church from the beginning.

Professor Cadbury attempts to weaken this argument by adducing the case of Philip and the Ethiopian eunuch, whom he thinks to have been a Gentile, and suggests that St. Luke cites this instance to show that the Gospel was to be preached to the ends of the earth (*loc. cit.*, p. 67). But whether the eunuch was a Gentile or not, St. Luke does not think that the acceptance of men of any status or condition into membership was the recognized policy of the Church at Jerusalem, since he treats the case as exceptional, and as requiring a special action of the Holy Spirit, as in the case of Cornelius.

But the fourth objection to Professor Cadbury's theory is even more weighty. If the Church at Jerusalem admitted Gentiles from the first, did it, or did it not, require them to be circumcised? In either event that matter would have been decided, and therefore the question of their circumcision could not have been debatable years afterwards. If the answer is no, then the pharisaic emissaries from Jerusalem could not, in the face of a policy which had been in force for years and was notorious, have pretended that they had the authority of St. James for insisting upon it (Acts xv. 24; Gal. ii. 12). If gentile converts were compelled to be circumcised, when was that policy changed? Why does St. Luke give no indication of a step so momentous, and how could St. Paul take so independent a line? It will be seen that in this matter we have to deal not only with St. Luke, who may have been inaccurately informed, but also with St. Paul, who took a leading part in the transaction.

We conclude, therefore, that at the beginning the Church at Jerusalem was entirely Jewish. In that case, within three years of its foundation it could not have contained so large a proportion

of gentile converts that seven men had to be appointed to see that their widows were not neglected. "Hellenists," therefore, in Acts vi. 1, means a class of Jewish converts who had adopted or inherited some Greek usage or other. We infer also from the fact of their appointment to superintend hellenistic interests and from their Greek names that the Seven, or at least most of them, were themselves Hellenists. Obviously, also, these converts had not hellenized on becoming Christians, but had been Hellenists before their conversion to Christianity, and from the numbers involved we conclude that there were hellenistic synagogues in Jerusalem. And as St. Stephen preached the Gospel, and as his persecution had its origin in the synagogue of the Libertines and Cyrenæans and of those from Cilicia and Asia (Acts vi. 9), we should conclude that these were synagogues of Hellenists. Moreover, the Jews of the Dispersion who came up to Jerusalem would naturally attach themselves to their synagogues; hence we should be inclined to equate "Libertines" with "Roman residents" in Acts ii. 10. Professor Cadbury is doubtless justified in referring back to this mixed multitude in Acts ii., but wrong in thinking that this was in any large proportion composed of Gentiles. Further, as St. Paul made a practice of preaching in Jewish synagogues as long as he was allowed to do so, when he preached to the Hellenists in Jerusalem (Acts ix. 29) he preached in these hellenistic synagogues, or some of them, to which the persecutors of St. Stephen belonged. And as the prominent part which St. Paul played in St. Stephen's martyrdom rankled in his mind (1 Cor. xv. 9; Gal. i. 13, 23; Phil. iii. 6; 1 Tim. i. 13; Acts xxii. 20, a vision before St. Paul's Gentile ministry began), one of his motives in so doing was probably in order to perform an act of reparation. Since, therefore, St. Luke is a careful writer and uses the rare word "Hellenists" in three passages only, we follow Professor Cadbury in holding that it must bear the same sense in each; but it means a class of Jews and not Gentiles.

(*c*) *The Origin of the Term.*—Before discussing the meaning of the term we must ask from whom it was most likely to take its origin. It had but a very limited life, since it appears in no other Greek literature until the fourth century, and these later occurrences seem to be based on the passages in the Acts, and as it was applied to some class of Jews it is most probable that it was

first used by some other Jews who disapproved of the hellenizing of their compatriots. Professor Cadbury (*op. cit.*, p. 60 n.) compares the use of Judaize, Judaism (Gal. i. 13, ii. 14; Ignatius *ad Mag.* viii.), where the word is used in a disparaging sense. We may put with these " Messianists," which, in its Latin form " Christians," was coined by the heathen at Antioch, and the later use of the term " pagans." Subsequently, of course—as with the term " Christians "—the disparaging sense may have faded away, and it might have been used by the Hellenists as a name for themselves in a sense either neutral or laudatory. If this is the true account, it would have issued from the party most narrowly Jewish, and opposed to Greek usages. This was, of course, the Pharisees, the party which was the direct result of the wars of the Maccabees, and these wars were in origin an attempt to oppose the forcible imposition of Greek culture with its attendant evils.

(*d*) *What was " Hellenism "?*—Clearly the Hellenists, whatever Greek or heathen usage they adopted, did not hellenize in any grave matter involving a serious break of the Jewish law, or they would not have been allowed to possess synagogues in Jerusalem, the stronghold of Pharisaism.

Moreover, St. Luke says that the Christian authorities at Jerusalem asserted that the myriads of Christians in Palestine were all zealous of the law (Acts xxi. 20). When, therefore, he uses the term " Hellenists " of Christian converts at Jerusalem, he cannot mean that they habitually committed any flagrant breach of the law.

But we do know one point in the hellenism of these Hellenists which met with strong pharisaic disapproval. The Hebrew Scriptures had been translated into Greek in Egypt and were used by Hellenists in public worship,[1] and there were included in the canon books originally written in Greek. This translation was so strongly condemned by the rabbinical Jews that they instituted a fast, called the fast of darkness, to commemorate it, and regarded it as a national disaster.[2] Here there is sufficient reason for the coining of the opprobrious name " Hellenist," while the passage in Acts xxi. 20 warns us against looking for any other " hellenism." " Hellenists," therefore, mean not only Greek-speaking

[1] *Cf.* " Egypt and the parts of Libya about Cyrene " (Acts ii. 10); the " synagogues . . . of the Cyrenæans and Alexandrians " (vi. 9).

[2] Margoliouth, *Expositor*, November, 1900, p. 348.

Jews, but rather " Septuagint-using Jews," an interpretation which fits all the passages in which St. Luke employs it.

The Difference between Acts xv. and Galatians

The important point to remember is that Luke had access to the best sources of information. The terms of the decree were publicly known in Antioch and its neighbourhood, and in Cilicia and Galatia. Luke met St. Paul and Silvanus in Troas in the following year, accompanied them on the voyage, and was with them in Philippi when they arrived. He was also with St. Paul at Jerusalem in 57 when the decree was quoted (Acts xxi. 25), and would then have met St. James and the local presbytery. He cannot, therefore, have mistaken the facts through ignorance. This being so, either St. Paul or Luke is deliberately misleading, or the two narratives must be capable of being harmonized. Some critics who desire to minimize the supernatural element lay stress on that fact that while St. Paul says that he went up to Jerusalem in accordance with (a) revelation (*κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν*, Gal. ii. 2), Luke seems to assert that the motive behind the mission was the opposition of opinions at Antioch (Acts xv. 2). But the supernatural element cannot be thus easily got rid of. It was the Holy Spirit speaking through the prophets that sent St. Paul and Barnabas on that first missionary journey in which the indiscriminate preaching to Gentiles and Jews began (Acts xiii. 2), and the letter of the Council ran, " It seemed good to the Holy Spirit and us " (Acts xv. 28). The key to this phrase is furnished by St. Paul's speech at Rome, " Well spake the Holy Spirit by Isaiah the prophet to your fathers " (Acts xxviii. 25). St. Paul grounds his gospel of gentile freedom on Scripture (Acts xiii. 26, 47); St. James takes the same line at the Council (Acts xv. 16-18); and St. Paul in rehearsing what God had done among the Gentiles (Acts xv. 12) probably included the main points of his speech at Antioch, and may have used against the pharisaic Christians at Jerusalem (Acts xv. 5) the scriptural arguments and illustrations which he had employed shortly before in writing to the Galatians. Consequently, " it seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us " may well mean " we have been led by the inspired scriptures." To St. Paul's mind the truth of the Gospel was at stake (Gal. ii. 14); he had good reason to suppose that the false brethren (Gal. ii. 4)

had voiced the common opinion of the Church of Jerusalem; he was by no means ready to submit to it; he did not reckon himself of inferior authority to any other Apostle. "This public sanction of the journey to Jerusalem, as it is reported in the Acts of the Apostles, is so far from excluding the origin of it as related by Paul himself that, on the contrary, the two accounts admirably complete each other" (Pfleiderer, *Hibbert Lectures*, 1885, p. 103).

St. Paul gives no account of the proceedings at the Council, but only of the preliminary discussions with the leaders of the Church at Jerusalem; Luke gives no account of these discussions, but only of the proceedings at the Council.

CHAPTER II

THE EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS

SYNOPSIS

LUKE and Titus, both Gentiles, are converted by St. Paul on his first missionary journey at Pisidian Antioch, with which they have family connexions, though both are domiciled at Philippi. Titus goes through Galatia with St. Paul, while Luke remains at Antioch, and subsequently makes his way to Philippi. Titus goes with St. Paul to Antioch in Syria and to Jerusalem; thence he goes to Galatia with the Epistle, and later rejoins Luke at Philippi. In the year 50 St. Paul and Silvanus pick up Timothy at Lystra, and meet Luke in Troas and go with him to Philippi, where St. Paul and Silvanus are imprisoned. Thence, accompanied by Titus, St. Paul, Silvanus, and Timothy go to Thessalonica and then to Berœa. St. Paul sends Timothy with 2 Thessalonians from Berœa to Thessalonica, and, leaving Silvanus behind, he and Titus go to Athens and Corinth, where they meet Aquila and Prisca. St. Paul's vow at Cenchreæ. In the spring of 51 Silvanus and Timothy arrive and Titus is sent with 1 Thessalonians. Then follows St. Paul's vision and his appearance before Gallio. In the spring of 52 the party go to Ephesus, and St. Paul, and probably Timothy, go to Jerusalem. Reasons for holding that the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians was written before the First Epistle.

TITUS was a Gentile (Gal. ii. 3), and a convert of St. Paul (Tit. i. 4); he could not, therefore, have been converted before St. Paul began his gentile mission at Pisidian Antioch, while the fact that St. Paul subsequently took him up to Jerusalem implies a lengthy period of acquaintanceship and testing. We may safely assume, therefore, that Titus was converted when St. Paul first visited Antioch, accompanied him on his journey through Galatia, came back with him to Antioch, and was thence taken to the other Antioch in Syria, and so up to Jerusalem. I have suggested that from Jerusalem he was sent with Timothy to Galatia with the epistle, and so returned to Pisidian Antioch, and thence made his way to Philippi, where he is next to be found.

I shall discuss the antecedents of Luke in a later chapter. At present I anticipate the conclusions there reached. In spite of Professor A. C. Clark (*Acts of the Apostles*) I agree with Plummer (*Gospel According to St. Luke*, xix.) that Luke was also a Gentile. The length and character of his report of St. Paul's speech at Pisidian Antioch (Acts xiii. 16-41) leads me to suppose that he had himself heard it, and his whole-hearted admiration for St. Paul suggests that he, too, was a Pauline convert. But unlike Titus, he remained at Antioch until St. Paul's return (Acts xiv. 22), and some time after he also went to Philippi. Eusebius (*H.E.* iii. 4) asserts that he had a family connexion with Antioch (Λουκᾶς δὲ τὸ μὲν γένος ὢν τῶν ἀπ' Ἀντιοχείας), and subsequent tradition, in Jerome and others, is built on this statement, which itself may go back to Julius Africanus. It is quite possible that originally Pisidian Antioch was meant, but in later times it would be taken for granted that the greater and more important Antioch in Syria was intended, and then an attempt might be made to identify him with Lucius of Cyrene (Λούκιος ὁ Κυρηναῖος, Acts xiii. 1). This identification is almost certainly wrong. Eusebius would in that case have written τὸ μὲν γένος ὢν Κυρηναῖος ᾤκει δὲ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ, or words to that effect.[1] As

[1] *Cf.* Arrian, *Ind.* 18 : τὸ γένος μὲν Κρὴς ὁ Νέαρχος ᾤκεε ἐν Ἀμφιπόλει.

it is, the statement may possibly imply that St. Luke was born at Antioch, but would seem to indicate that his usual place of residence was elsewhere.[1]

When St. Paul went to Antioch he did so owing to an infirmity of the flesh (Gal. iv. 13, 14), and as his description of his reception there is paralleled in St. Luke's narrative (Acts xiii. 48, 49, 52), it is not unlikely that Luke's ministrations to St. Paul on that occasion evoked the subsequent epithet "my dear doctor" (Λουκᾶς ὁ ἰατρὸς ὁ ἀγαπητός, Col. iv. 14).

Pisidian Antioch had been founded by Seleucus Nicator, who, in accordance with the regular practice of the Seleucid kings, introduced a large Jewish element into the population, which was organized into a political tribe on the common model of Greek cities. Luke may have found part of his practice among these Jewish inhabitants, and have originally attached himself to the synagogue from commercial motives. In Alexandria the Jewish tribe was known as "the Macedonians,"[2] and this may have been their name in Antioch and other cities of Seleucid foundation also. If Luke was a native of Philippi—and therefore a Macedonian by domicile—as his constant association with that city and the way in which he speaks of it would lead us to believe, he may have found it the more easy to associate with the Jews on this account.

Titus, after leaving Jerusalem, could hardly have reached Philippi until the autumn of 49, and Luke may have awaited him in Antioch, or preceded him to Philippi.

After the Council at Jerusalem in 49, St. Paul and Barnabas returned to Antioch in Syria, accompanied by Silvanus as a representative of the Hellenistic party and Judas Barsabbas as representing the Aramaic-speaking section of the Church, and published the decree in Antioch and its neighbourhood (Acts xv. 30, 35); after which Judas Barsabbas went back to Jerusalem. In the spring of the following year,[3] leaving Barnabas and Mark to go to Cyprus (Acts xv. 39), St. Paul and Silvanus traversed Cilicia and went thence to Galatia, publishing the decree on their way. At Lystra they found Timothy, who had been converted on the previous journey, and St. Paul determined to

[1] See Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 389; *Expositor*, Seventh Series, vol. ii., p. 506; *Cities of St Paul*, pp. 256, 445.

[2] Josephus, *c. Apion.* ii. 4.; *cf. B.J.* II. xviii. 7.

[3] So Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 174.

add him to the party. So he circumcised him, partly to escape the Jewish prejudices which might hinder the success of the mission, and partly to shield him from the treatment meted out to Titus—a bitter memory in the mind of St. Paul—if ever Timothy should go to Jerusalem; and it is probable also that in order to make him a constituent member of the mission it was at this time that St. Paul ordained him. It is especially noted that Timothy had testimony borne to him (Acts xvi. 2; *cf.* vi. 3; 1 Tim. iii. 7), and though he was very young for such an office (*cf.* Phil. ii. 22), any objection on this score was overruled by the voice of the local prophets (1 Tim. i. 18), while the presbyters, who had been ordained by St. Paul on his former journey (Acts xiv. 23), signified their assent to the admission of Timothy into their order by co-operating with St. Paul in the laying on of hands (1 Tim. iv. 14).

Meanwhile, Luke and Titus are at Philippi confirming their faith, according to Pauline, and indeed common Christian, practice, by the diligent study of the Scriptures (*cf.* Acts xvii. 11; 2 Tim. iii. 15; 2 Pet. i. 19, iii. 16), of course in the Septuagint version, and longing to evangelize their own city. But the Pauline method was to begin from the synagogue, and if we may judge from his experiences at Lystra and subsequently at Athens, the Gospel made but little appeal to a purely heathen population. In the synagogue neither Luke nor Titus had any status; their presence was tolerated in the hope that they would become proselytes, but they would certainly not be granted the opportunity to speak or to propagate their views. Accordingly we may picture them as persisting in prayer and being driven to conclude that the only hope of success lay in the coming of St. Paul, whose spiritual power had been strikingly manifested before their eyes at Antioch.

St. Paul had suggested to Barnabas that they should return and visit the brethren in every city wherein they had proclaimed the word of the Lord (Acts xv. 36). But Barnabas insisted on taking his cousin Mark, and St. Paul refused to have one with him who had withdrawn from " the work " in Pamphylia (38), and so he and Barnabas parted company. Barnabas and Mark went to Cyprus, which thenceforth St. Paul left to them, and he and Silvanus to Cilicia, to which the decree had been directed in common with Syria and in which St. Paul had worked (Acts ix. 30);

and having passed through the Phrygian country which belonged to the Roman province of Galatia (Acts xvi. 6) they came to Pisidian Antioch, publishing the decree in the region where the gentile mission had begun. At Antioch St. Paul's scheme would reach its conclusion, and the lie of the land naturally suggested Ephesus as the next objective; but St. Paul felt himself subjected to some unseen influence which indicated that Roman Asia was not at this time to be his goal (Acts xvi. 6), and so on reaching Metropolis he turned north to go to the next Roman province, Bithynia-Pontus, leaving Mysia on his left (xvi. 7). On arriving at its border, however, he felt that he was debarred from evangelizing Bithynia also, so, concluding that he must abandon Asia Minor altogether, he decided to make for the seaport of Troas, and await further guidance. In the night following his arrival at Troas he had a vision; a man whom he recognized to be a Macedonian appeared to him and said: " Come over into Macedonia and help us " (xvi. 9).

If we were to adopt a modern psychological explanation, we should say that St. Luke's phrases " forbidden of the Holy Ghost to speak the word in Asia," " the spirit of Jesus suffered them not " —words written after the event and expressing the feelings of St. Paul—were the record of the telepathic effect on him of the prayers and longings of St. Luke and Titus, and that the Macedonian whom St. Paul saw in his vision was St. Luke himself, who projected himself to give utterance to what had long been in his mind.

In the summer of 50, after hoping throughout the spring that St. Paul would somehow arrive, St. Luke felt that the strain was becoming intolerable, and so resolved to seek out St. Paul, and took ship from Neapolis, the port of Philippi, to Troas as the first stage of his journey. At Troas he naturally went ashore while the ship changed her cargo, and there he met St. Paul, who recounted to him his experiences in Asia Minor and his vision on the previous night. Accordingly, on " comparing notes " (*συμβιβάζοντες*, xvi. 10), the whole party felt assured that they were being divinely guided to go to Macedonia, a conviction that was confirmed to them by their arrival at Neapolis in the short space of two days (*cf.* Acts xx. 6, where the journey from Philippi in the reverse direction occupied five days).

Thence they made their way to Philippi, which St. Luke

designates as the "first city of the region of Macedonia, a colony" (ἥτις ἐστὶ πρώτη τῆς μερίδος τῆς Μακεδονίας πόλις, κολωνία, Acts xvi. 12). It is noticeable that St. Luke gives far greater space to events in Philippi than to those at Thessalonica (Acts xvii. 1-9), which was nevertheless a much more important city; that he refers to Amphipolis, which was a free city of far earlier foundation and also the head of a district, simply as a place which St. Paul passed through;[1] that he emphasizes the fact that Philippi was in Macedonia, and not in the neighbouring territory of Thrace; that he calls it a city four times (*vv.* 12, 20, 39), a usage comparable only to that which he employs of Jerusalem; and that he ends up with the emphatic word "colony," a title which he does not give to any of the other Roman colonies which St. Paul visited—Pisidian Antioch, Lystra, Troas, or Corinth. These are signs of local patriotism, as St. Luke's use of the local phrase "riverwards" (παρὰ ποταμόν, *v.* 13) is of familiarity.

Meanwhile an event had happened which had important consequences in St. Paul's history. Claudius, who had become emperor on the death of Gaius (Caligula) on January 24, 41, had published a decree against the Jews in Rome. Orosius (*Hist.* vii. 6) says that this was enacted in the ninth year of his reign, and refers to Josephus as his authority. There is no such passage in the extant works of Josephus, but the reference probably gives us a clue to the dating, for Josephus reckoned the regnal years of the emperors from the September following their accession, so the decree would be made in the year September, 49, to September, 50. As for its terms, Suetonius (*Claud.* 25) says: "Claudius expelled the Jews from Rome, as they were in a state of constant tumult at the instigation of one Chrestus" (*Judæos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit*). "Chrestus" was a common mispronunciation of "Christus," so we may take it that there had been frequent Jewish anti-Christian riots in Rome. According to Dio Cassius (*Claud.* lx. 6) Claudius found it impossible to expel the Jews on account of their numbers, but suppressed their synagogues.[2]

What actually occurred was probably that leaders on both sides

[1] "Amphipolis was ranked first by the general consent, Philippi first by its own consent" (Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, pp. 206, 207).

[2] Τοὺς Ἰουδαίους πλεονάσαντας αὖθις, ὥστε χαλεπῶς ἂν ἄνευ ταραχῆς, ὑπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου σφῶν, τῆς πολέως εἰρχθῆναι, οὐκ ἐξήλασε μέν, τῷ δὲ δὴ πατρίῳ νόμῳ βίῳ χρωμένους ἐκέλευσε μὴ συναθροίζεσθαι, τάς τε ἑταιρείας ἐπαναχθείσας ὑπὸ τοῦ Γαΐου διέλυσε.

were expelled, and the synagogues temporarily closed, while in future any Jew convicted of an offence would be liable to banishment, a prospect which would prevent any future rising. Dio Cassius implies that the decree was but mildly enforced, so the persons expelled would be merely " relegated " without loss of property, and not " deported."

The ruling class at Philippi were the *coloni*, and these seem to have been more Roman in feeling than the Romans themselves (Acts xvi. 21); hence the decree of Claudius, in the form of it given by Dio Cassius, was probably put in force there also, and the synagogue or synagogues closed. It is quite conceivable that the Jews would nevertheless continue to meet privately; but from such meetings the womenfolk, who were never allowed to take any active part in public worship, would be excluded, and the place or places where they were to be held could not be told to mere gentile adherents. This suppression seems to have been effected before St. Luke's return, possibly before his departure for Troas, so he was unable to give St. Paul any directions, but conjectured that some assembly for prayer might possibly be held " at river," and there they found a small gathering of Jewish women, at which the authorities had connived.[1]

At Philippi the party stopped for " many days " (Acts xvi. 18), and there St. Paul ordained the " bishops and deacons " to whom his epistle was directed some years afterwards (Phil. i. 1), and among them may well have been Titus.

He and Silvanus and Timothy were entertained by Lydia (Acts xvi. 14, 15), who was a native of Thyatira, probably, we should gather, a widow, a seller of purple-dyed garments from her native city, and agent of some firm belonging to the guild of dyers there. She takes her trade name from the finest class of her wares, indicating that she was a dealer of the first rank, and she must have possessed considerable capital. It is not to be inferred that she and her household became Christian on the first Sabbath. St. Paul and Silvanus probably lodged at the beginning with Luke and Titus, and it took considerable persuasion (*παρεβιάσατο*, *v.* 15) to get them to change their residence.

Before he left Philippi St. Paul attached Titus to the party, and this gives the reason for his ordination. Quite clearly he was at

[1] *Cf.* Joseph., *Antt.* XIV. x. 23. Tertullian mentions *orationes litorales* as characteristic of the Jews (*ad Nat.* i. 13).

Corinth with St. Paul on this journey. " Titus my partner and fellow-worker to you-ward," St. Paul calls him in writing to the Corinthians (2 Cor. viii. 23; *cf.* Phil. iv. 3, " true yoke-fellow "), and this cannot refer to the time when Titus began the great collection at Corinth (2 Cor. viii. 6), because St. Paul was not then with him there.

Here alone, until we come to the riot at Ephesus, do we meet with purely heathen persecution, and it was instigated by commercial motives and directed against St. Paul and Silvanus personally, not on account of their Christianity, but on the plea of their being political revolutionaries. " These men, being Jews, do exceedingly trouble our πόλις and set forth customs which it is not lawful for us to receive, or to observe, being Romans " (Acts xvi. 21).[1] No doubt the Jews would sympathize, but they took no overt action, and the cause of their abstinence was the recent decree of Claudius which the *coloni* would be able to quote as a precedent. By the time we come to the writing of the Epistle to the Philippians they had recovered from their fears (Phil. i. 28, 29), and there would also appear to be an anti-Pauline group of Jewish converts within the Church (iii. 2, 3).

On leaving Philippi the party went through Amphipolis and Apollonia to Thessalonica, where they stayed for three Sabbaths[2] (Acts xvii. 2), lodging in the house of a man named Jason.[3] At the end of the period the unbelieving Jews took certain agitators (ἀγοραῖοι) of bad character and assaulted the house of Jason, and, not finding St. Paul or Silvanus, brought Jason before the Politarchs. The Politarchs dismissed Jason and the others, after taking bail for their appearance when called up for trial, and at night the brethren sent away St. Paul and his company to Berœa, thus allowing the case against them to go by default.

We are now in a position to consider certain points in the Epistles to the Thessalonians. These epistles are so Pauline in character that it is only their difference of tone which gives

[1] *Cf.* Acts xvii. 6, 7: " These men that have turned the civilized world (τὴν οἰκουμένην—*i.e.*, the Roman world ; *cf.* Luke ii. 1) upside down," and " these act contrary to the decrees of Cæsar, saying that there is another emperor, one Jesus," said by the Jews at Berœa.

[2] This is a more probable rendering than " three weeks."

[3] His Jewish name was probably Joshua (*cf.* Joseph., *Antt.* XII. v. 1). He may subsequently have gone to Rome (Rom. xvi. 21), an identification made the more probable by the possibility of Sosipater in the same passage being Sopater of Berœa (Acts xx. 4).

any ground for refusing to assign them to him. If they are his, they would not be written with his own hand, but for the most part dictated, with a conclusion which he wrote himself as a guarantee of authenticity (2 Thess. iii. 17, " in every epistle "; *cf.* Gal. vi. 11, which gave the precedent, and Rom. xvi. 22, which was later). And from the inclusion of the name of Silvanus in the opening paragraphs of each, they must have been written during the course of this missionary journey after St. Paul had left Thessalonica and before he left Corinth (Acts xviii. 18). As the date of the proconsulship of Gallio is fixed by the Delphian inscription far more probably for the summer of 51 to that of 52 than for the corresponding period of the succeeding year,[1] and as St. Paul was at Corinth for eighteen months in all (Acts xviii. 11), these epistles were written between the summer of 50 and the summer of 52. We might suppose from 1 Thess. iii. 1, " wherefore, when we could no longer forbear, we thought it good to be left at Athens alone, and sent Timothy," that at least one was written from Athens, but the names Paul and Silvanus and Timothy, which stand at the head of both epistles, show that each was written when all the three were together, so that probably all that St. Paul means is, " we thought it good to leave Berœa without Silvanus or Timothy, and sent the latter to you, so neither of them nor the Berœan escort was with us in Athens."

But that someone was with St. Paul at Athens after the Berœans had left would seem to be indicated by the use of the term " we." Nowhere in these epistles do we meet with a purely epistolary plural; " we " elsewhere means " Paul and Silvanus," or " Paul, Silvanus and Timothy," except in 2 Thess. ii. 2, where it apparently means " I or some other of the Apostles,"[2] and this inference is supported by the conclusion which we drew from 2 Cor. viii. 23 that Titus was subsequently with St. Paul at Corinth. If so, St. Paul must have attached Titus to the party before he left Philippi (*cf.* p. 42 above), and Titus will be St. Luke's authority for this portion of the narrative.

Nor must we overpress the phrase, " receiving a commandment unto Silas and Timothy that they should come to him with all speed " (Acts xvii. 15). " It is St. Luke's way to leave obvious

[1] See Deissmann, *Paul*, p. 281.

[2] Compare the usage in Gal., 1 Cor., Phil., and Philem., where, after starting with an address from several persons, St. Paul uses the singular number throughout.

inferences to the reader" (Rackham, *Acts of the Apostles*, p. 184), and "with all speed" may well presuppose "after they had accomplished the purpose for which they had been left behind"; and as a matter of fact Silvanus and Timothy rejoined St. Paul not at Athens, but at Corinth (Acts xviii. 5), and this was after St. Paul had been working at his trade for some time in company with Aquila and Prisca.

One more preliminary consideration before we consider the internal evidence for the relative dates of these two epistles.

Aquila's wife Prisca, as St. Paul always writes—though St. Luke prefers the more familiar form Priscilla—would seem to have been a lady of some position in Rome.[1] She and her husband had been expelled from Rome under the decree of Claudius (Acts xviii. 2), which would seem to imply that they were leading Christians there, an inference supported by Rom. xvi. 5, where St. Paul sends greetings not only to them, but to the church in their house. That they were well-instructed Christians is clear from the fact that they taught Apollos at Ephesus (Acts xviii. 26). While he was at Ephesus, St. Paul seems to have stayed with them (1 Cor. xvi. 19), as he did when he was at Corinth. After leaving Rome they would make their way by the Via Appia to Hydruntum, south of Brundisium, cross to Corcyra,[2] and thence travel by way of Nicopolis, the most important town in Epirus, where the ship would change her cargo, to the Corinthian Gulf. Probably, also, there would be other Christians with them, with whom St. Paul may thus have become acquainted at Corinth, and to whom, together with Aquila and Prisca, after they had returned to Rome, he sent his salutations in Rom. xvi. The party would doubtless land at Nicopolis, and there may well have started a Christian mission, and it may have been their report which subsequently led St. Paul to select Nicopolis as a place of winter residence (Titus iii. 12). When St. Paul left Troas he had no other plan than that of evangelizing Macedonia. In the normal course of events he would have passed through it to its western border, and then have returned to Philippi, ordaining ministers

[1] See Hort, *Prolegomena to St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans and the Ephesians*, pp. 12-14, following Plumptre, *Biblical Studies*, p. 422, and Edmundson, *Church in Rome*, pp. 11, 242, 243.

[2] The route preferred by Cicero. See *ad Att.* xv. 21, xvi. 6; *ad Fam.* xvi. 9 and *cf.* Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* iii. 11, who says that from Hydruntum to Apollonia was the shortest passage from Italy to Greece.

in every city if he stayed long enough anywhere, as he had done at Philippi, or on the return journey, as he did in Galatia (Acts xiv. 23); but he was expelled from Thessalonica after a very short residence there, as he was also from Berœa. The sole idea of his Berœan friends was to get him away in safety (xvii. 14); their finding a ship sailing to Athens would seem to be accidental, or, as St. Paul would have put it, providential—he could not return east to Thessalonica and so must go south—and their accompanying him to Athens was a method of atoning for any apparent discourtesy in hurrying his departure. He appears to have been forced to leave Athens because the Areopagus refused him licence to preach, and similarly he went on to Corinth because he found a ship sailing that way, and could not return north.

At the beginning of the sailing season in the following year Silvanus and Timothy travelled to Athens, and, not finding him, went on to Corinth, and joined him there. But in Phil. iv. 15 we find that the Philippians had sent him a contribution after he had left Macedonia, that is to Corinth, and it is probable that it was this contribution that enabled him to give up his tent-making at Corinth and devote himself wholly to the ministry of the word (Acts xviii. 5). This implies that there was some communication between St. Paul at Corinth and the Philippian Church, and as he had brought Titus with him from Philippi, Titus may well have been the messenger; certainly the Philippians must have known where St. Paul was to be found.

Having thus cleared the ground, we may ask ourselves first which is the earlier of the two Thessalonian Epistles, and then where each was probably written.

The question is not settled by the order in our Bibles. This order seems to be based solely on their comparative length, and no one now would claim that it gives the historical sequence. Nor is it decided by the phrase in the Second Epistle, " nor yet be troubled, either by spirit, or by word, or by epistle[1] as from us " (ii. 2), as though that were a reference to the First Epistle. The " as from us " probably qualifies all the three substantives, and the " us " may include others of apostolic standing, so that the whole phrase means by false teachers appealing in ecstatic utterance or reasoned argument to misrepresentations of apostolic

[1] Whenever St. Paul refers to a definite letter he invariably inserts the article (*cf.* 1 Cor. v. 9; 2 Cor. vii. 8; Col. iv. 16; 1 Thess. v. 27; 2 Thess. iii. 14).

teaching, or to some letter falsely attributed to one or other of the Apostles.[1] St. Paul is well aware that the letters might be forged, and takes precautions, as we have seen, to authenticate his own. The order of the epistles is, therefore, an open question to be decided by internal evidence.

As compared with the First Epistle, the Second appears to be (*a*) more Jewish and (*b*) written under greater strain, in an excited state of mind rather than in one of calm reflexion. The first of these two characteristics is so strongly marked that Harnack, in a paper read before the Berlin Academy, suggested that they were addressed to different communities, the one gentile and the other Jewish,[2] and even went so far as to doubt the authenticity of the title "To the Church of the Thessalonians." This is a piece of needless violence; the most that we could argue, taking both characteristics into consideration, is that they were written at different dates, with some little interval in between; and since it was St. Paul's method to begin with the Jews and the God-fearing Gentiles who attended the synagogue, as he himself says (Acts xiii. 46), the Pauline Churches would start by being Jewish and tend to become increasingly gentile as time went on.

A second piece of evidence, which demands an interval of some months after St. Paul had left Thessalonica before the First Epistle could have been written, is the statement in it (1 Thess. i. 7, 8) that the Thessalonians had become "an ensample to all them that believe in Macedonia and Achaia. For from you hath sounded forth the word of the Lord, not only in Macedonia and Achaia, but in every place your faith to Godward is gone forth." St. Paul was so short a time in Athens that Achaia must also refer to Corinth and its neighbourhood.

Then in the same epistle we read of "them that fall asleep" (iv. 14), but there is no such reference in the Second Epistle, and this language is more likely to be used in a later letter, written some time afterwards, than in one of an earlier date.

In the First Epistle we read also of a report brought by Timothy on the condition of the Thessalonian Church (iii. 6);[3] but there is no

[1] Compare the false brethren at Antioch, who claimed to have a mission from James at Jerusalem (Acts xv. 24; Gal. ii. 4, 12).

[2] *Cf.* 1 Thess. i. 9, while 2 Thess. shows no trace of Gentile thought or reference to gentile origin.

[3] "There is a lost epistle of the Thessalonians to St. Paul" (Rendel Harris, *Expositor*, Fifth Series, vol. viii., p. 168).

mention of such a report in the Second Epistle, and the inference is that Timothy had taken the Second Epistle to Thessalonica and had brought back his report before the First Epistle was written.

Finally, in 1 Thess. v. 12 we find that there is a ministry already in existence in Thessalonica: "Know them that labour among you (*τοὺς κοπιῶντας ἐν ὑμῖν*), and are over you in the Lord (*καὶ προϊσταμένους ὑμῶν*), and admonish you" (*καὶ νουθετοῦντας ὑμᾶς*); and, as shown by the single article, all these persons form one group. We may therefore compare with these phrases 1 Tim v. 17, "Let the elders that rule well (*οἱ καλῶς προεστῶτες*) be counted worthy of double honour, especially those who labour (*οἱ κοπιῶντες*) in the word and in teaching"; Rom. xii. 7, 8, "He that teacheth, to his teaching; or he that exhorteth, to his exhorting . . . he that ruleth, with diligence" (*ὁ προϊστάμενος, ἐν σπουδῇ*); Heb. xiii. 7, "Remember them that had the rule over you (*τῶν ἡγουμένων ὑμῶν*), which spake unto you the word of God"; 17, "Obey them that have the rule over you" (*τοῖς ἡγουμένοις ὑμῶν*); 24, "Salute all them that have the rule over you" (*τοὺς ἡγουμένους ὑμῶν*); "Judas and Silas, men of rule (*ἄνδρας ἡγουμένους*) among the brethren" (Acts xv. 22).

Who, then, had ordained these ministers? It was obviously not St. Paul himself, because he had only been there a short time before he was forced to leave (Acts xvii. 10). But he did not consider that any Church was fully organized unless it had a ministry, while on the other hand he thought that the minister ought to be chosen with care, and in the first instance, at any rate, those selected would be as much subject to his approval as were the "Seven" to that of the Apostles at Jerusalem (Acts vi. 2, 3). Hence St. Paul and Barnabas had ordained ministers in Galatia not on their first visit there, but on their return journey; "they returned to Lystra and to Iconium, and to Antioch, confirming (*ἐπιστηρίζοντες*) the souls of the disciples . . . and when they had appointed for them elders in every church . . ." (Acts xiv. 22, 23); and similarly we read that at the beginning of the Second Missionary Journey he "went through Syria and Cilicia confirming (*ἐπιστηρίζων*) the churches" (Acts xv. 41). When he arrived at Lystra, therefore, he would have found a presbytery already in existence, and there in all probability he ordained Timothy. At Philippi he stayed "many days" (Acts

xvi. 18), and the Church there at the date of the Epistle to the Philippians possessed bishops and deacons (Phil. i. 1) whom St. Paul had doubtless ordained.

In 1 Thess. ii. 18 St. Paul says that he would fain have come to Thessalonica, " I Paul once and again." He was apparently intending to revisit Thessalonica, Apollonia, and Amphipolis (Acts xvii. 1), and would then make his way back by way of Philippi and Neapolis. If he had returned he would no doubt have " established " these churches by appointing them a ministry, as he had done on revisiting Lystra, Iconium and Pisidian Antioch, but he was prevented from carrying out this plan by " Satan," and therefore sent Timothy (iii. 2) to establish them (εἰς τὸ στηρίξαι ὑμᾶς). " Satan " obviously refers to the Jewish opposition from Thessalonica, mentioned in the previous verses (14-16), which made the brethren at Berœa send him away by sea (Acts xvii. 13, 14), and possibly also to the ingenious " device " (2 Cor. ii. 11) which compelled Jason to get rid of him (Acts xvii. 9). There was nothing of that kind at Corinth (Acts xviii. 9, 10), but the reason for his leaving Corinth was the vow that he had taken at Cenchreæ (xviii. 18, 22). When, therefore, Timothy was sent as a substitute for himself (notice the " I Paul " in Thess. ii. 18) he was probably not sent from Corinth, but from Berœa; and in Thessalonica he acted for St. Paul in ordaining ministers.

But why did St. Paul make this vow? Leaving Antioch in Syria in the spring of the year 50, he had gone through Cilicia, doubtless calling at Tarsus on the way, over the pass of the Taurus, through Galatia, across Asia by land to Troas, thence by sea to Neapolis, and by land to Berœa, and from Berœa to Athens. Such a journey must have taken a considerable time, and when he left Athens it must, therefore, have been at the extreme end of the sailing season. In 2 Cor. xi. 25, which was written in the year 56, he says that he had thrice suffered shipwreck, and had been a night and a day in the deep. I suggest that he went from Athens to Cenchreæ, the port of Corinth, by sea, and that one of these shipwrecks happened on this voyage. There would be added point in St. Paul's remark if on his first visit to Corinth he had arrived as a shipwrecked sea-farer, and if he had barely escaped with his life it would give a reason for his making a vow in thankfulness for his escape as soon as he reached port. More-

over, the Philippians had sent him money when he was in Thessalonica (Phil. iv. 16), yet when he arrived at Corinth he appears to have been penniless, and had to labour for his support (Acts xviii. 3); and it was not till the beginning of the next sailing season, when Silvanus and Timothy came, that he could give himself entirely to the work of evangelization, and about that time further supplies reached him from Philippi (Phil. iv. 15). Normally he would have left Corinth to pay this vow at Jerusalem as soon as possible, but he was detained by a vision, and in consequence he stayed there eighteen months, instead of five or six (Acts xviii. 11).

We may therefore regard the Second Epistle as earlier by some months in date of composition than the First, and as this latter was written from Corinth soon after the arrival of Silvanus and Timothy in the spring of 51 (1 Thess. iii. 6), the Second Epistle may well have been sent by the hands of Timothy before St. Paul left Berœa.

In the Second Epistle the Jewish emmissaries have already arrived (Acts xvii. 13) and made a continuation in the ministry of the word difficult (2 Thess. iii. 1, 2); but St. Paul had not yet given up hope. As one of their weapons of controversy they may have exaggerated the moral laxity of the Gentile converts at Thessalonica (iii. 11); but the Thessalonians also desired information, notably about the "Parousia,"[1] or Second Coming of our Lord, and some Thessalonian converts, possibly Jason or Aristarchus, had come to Berœa. St. Paul had already given them some instruction, probably on the same lines as he used at Athens (Acts xvii. 31) or before Felix (xxiv. 25); but the account he gives in the Second Epistle is somewhat crude and distinctly Jewish. We can trace in it three strands. It has much in common with popular Jewish eschatology; but since learning this in his youth, St. Paul had become a Christian, so he could take up the quotations from the Old Testament on which that eschatology was partly based and apply them to Christ. We must recognize in the apocalyptic passage in 2 Thess. ii. 1-12 quotations from Ezekiel and Daniel, and possibly also from the prophecies of Agabus at Antioch, delivered in all probability soon after Gaius (Caligula) had ordered Petronius to set up his statue in the Temple at Jerusalem; but the quotation from Isaiah xi. 4 in verse 8 has

[1] Parousia is the technical term for the visit of a king or high official; "visitation" is perhaps the nearest English equivalent.

been transferred to Christ. Along with those strands of Jewish and Christian apocalyptic we must also allow something for St. Paul's own experience. " That which restraineth " and " one who restraineth " (2 Thess. ii. 6, 7) doubtless refer to the strong hand of Rome. No violent opposition was possible at Antioch, the seat of the Roman government of Syria and Cilicia and the headquarters of the legions that watched the eastern frontiers of the empire. When the refugees who fled from Jerusalem on the persecution that followed the death of Stephen reached Cyprus, they found themselves under the protection of the Roman power, and there St. Paul converted the proconsul. At Philippi St. Paul appealed to his Roman citizenship, and brought the local magistrates to his feet. But what might happen when the Roman authority was withdrawn (2 Thess. ii. 7) St. Paul could conjecture from the scourgings which he had received in Jewish synagogues (2 Cor. xi. 24) and from the violence at Jerusalem in which he himself had played a leading part. He did not feel that either he or Christianity was in danger from Rome or from heathenism; it was clear to him that paganism could not satisfy the instinctive craving for a living religion, and the more religiously minded were already groping after the God (Acts xvii. 27) who in Jesus had come nigh to men. The real opposition came from those who had a religion of greater vitality and power, from the Jews whose thirst for a righteousness of their own (Rom. x. 3), when mortified by the Pauline Gospel, was corrupted into a thirst for the blood of their opponents. These were they who " both killed the Lord Jesus and the prophets, and drave us out (from Thessalonica, Acts xvii. 5-10), and please not God, and are contrary to all men " (1 Thess. ii. 15); and St. Paul is writing in the heat of the moment and in bitterness of spirit.

As compared with this passage the corresponding section in 1 Thess. iv. 13-17 is much calmer, and indeed very similar in language to that employed in 1 Cor. xv. 50-54. Between the Second and the First Epistles the question itself has altered. In the Second Epistle it would seem to be that certain people denied the future " Visitation " on the basis of an insistence on the reality of present experience. In one sense the Day of the Lord, as St. Peter said (Acts ii. 17), had already dawned at Pentecost. Christians were already living in it; they had been translated into the kingdom of God's beloved Son (Col. i. 13);

they were risen with Him (Col. ii. 12) and made to sit with Him in heavenly places (Eph. ii. 6). All this might be perverted into a denial that there was anything further to hope for; in short, we seem to have here much the same teaching as that of Hymenæus and Philetus at Ephesus (2 Tim. ii. 18), who overthrew the faith of some (*cf.* 2 Thess. ii. 2).

Though we must make allowances for the personification of religious forces and tendencies in St. Paul, which is similar to the representation of kingdoms by beasts and the son of man in the Book of Daniel—possibly the " man of sin " (R.V. " the lawless one ") should be included in this category—yet the passage in the Second Epistle strikes us as crude and bizarre, while in the First we have something deeper and more serene.

This, then, will be our conclusion, that the Second Epistle was written at Berœa before St. Paul left it, towards the end of the sailing season of the year 50, and sent to Thessalonica by the hand of Timothy with instructions to " stablish " the Church there, and the First at Corinth in the spring of the following year, when Silvanus and Timothy had rejoined St. Paul and when further supplies besides those sent to him in Thessalonica (Phil. iv. 16) had arrived; that there are indications in the Second Epistle that it was written while the controversy with the Jewish adversaries from Thessalonica was still raging at Berœa, while time must be allowed between the two for developments both in teaching and in organization; and incidentally that the mission of Timothy to Thessalonica and the coming of Aquila from Rome may have had some bearing on matters recorded in the Pastoral Epistles. Moreover, as Titus was with St. Paul from the time he left Philippi to his arrival at Ephesus (Acts xviii. 19), and was left behind there when St. Paul went up to Jerusalem (Acts xviii. 22), he may well have been St. Luke's authority for the events of the period. And it is confirmatory of this suggestion that only two verses (22 and 23) are given to the time spent by St. Paul between his leaving and returning to Ephesus, a time during which Titus was not with him.[1]

[1] On the priority of 2 Thessalonians see J. C. West, *J.T.S.* xv., pp. 66 *ff.*

CHAPTER III

FIVE EPISTLES FROM EPHESUS

SYNOPSIS

BEFORE writing 2 Cor. xi. 23, 25, St. Paul had been beaten with rods (implying Roman authority) three times and imprisoned περισσοτέρως. This cannot well mean less than three times, and it is hard to fit in more than three imprisonments before his last visit to Jerusalem. Clement of Rome says that St. Paul was imprisoned seven times in all, including two imprisonments in Rome. Consequently we are justified in supposing that the beatings and imprisonments went together (as happened at Philippi, and nearly happened in Jerusalem). In that case St. Paul must have been imprisoned three times under Roman authority. One of these beatings and imprisonments was at Philippi (Acts xvi. 22, 23); a second was more probably at Pisidian Antioch than anywhere else (for the evidence for this view see under the Second Epistle to Timothy). But we have to locate a third, and this probably took place at Ephesus (*cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 32; 2 Cor. i. 8). If this is so, (*a*) Colossians and Philemon, and (*b*) Philippians may have been written at Ephesus.

As evidence for (*a*), St. Paul's fellow-prisoners from Tarsus, Colossæ, and Thessalonica. Others with St. Paul at the time were Mark, Timothy, Luke, Demas, Tychicus, Onesiphorus, and Philemon shortly before (Philem. 19). The Epistle to the Colossians was taken by Tychicus of Asia and Onesimus of Colossæ.

Evidence for (*b*). Four journeys between Philippi and St. Paul; Euodia and Syntyche; Philippian contributions.

Contra. "Prætorium" (i. 13), but this means Residency,[1] not Prætorian Guard; "Cæsar's household" (iv. 22) means not his relatives but his fiscal staff. Timothy was not present when St. Paul wrote 1 Corinthians. He had probably gone to Galatia with Onesiphorus. Obviously he had not gone to Philippi, or to any place very far away, or St. Paul could not have spoken of his proposed visit there in the near future.

Titus had probably gone to Philippi with news of the illness of Epaphroditus (Phil. ii. 26), and is the "true yokefellow" of Phil. iv. 3 ("true yokefellow" could not, obviously, be

[1] πραιτώριον=Lat. *Prætorium*, official residence of a Governor (Liddell and Scott, new edition).

Epaphroditus himself, nor Timothy, nor Silvanus). Philippians was taken by Epaphroditus, probably, as he had been dangerously ill, accompanied by Luke, who was in Ephesus when Colossians was written.

If St. Paul was imprisoned at Ephesus, the imprisonment was ordered by Marcus Junius Silanus, the proconsul, who was murdered early in 55; and he would be set at liberty by Celer and Helius at the intercession of the *prætorium* and some of Cæsar's household.

Being free St. Paul wrote 1 Corinthians, and then went with Epaphras to Colossæ. Hearing that he must leave the province, he sent Tychicus with a note to Corinth, probably to Gaius (Rom. xvi. 23), to say that he would arrive earlier than he announced.

ST. PAUL'S COMPANIONS IN EPHESUS, 52-55 A.D.

Acts xix. 1-22.

ACHAICUS. Arrived in Ephesus from Corinth March, 54, with Stephanas and Fortunatus and supplied to St. Paul " what was lacking on their part " (1 Cor. xvi. 17), (*a*) expressions of affection, or (*b*) additional information; not money (2 Cor. xi. 10, xii. 13); probably went on to Jerusalem.

ALEXANDER. Ephesian, Jewish convert, coppersmith, excommunicated by St. Paul (1 Tim. i. 20); put forward by the Jews in the riot (Acts xix. 33); went up to Jerusalem and opposed St. Paul (2 Tim. iv. 14).

ANDRONICUS. " Fellow-prisoner " (see next list.)

APOLLOS. Alexandrian, Jewish convert, instructed by Aquila and Prisca (Acts xviii. 24, 26); went to Corinth (Acts xix. 1); returned to Ephesus (1 Cor. xvi. 12); went with St. Paul to Corinth and returned to Ephesus by way of Crete (Titus iii. 13).

AQUILA. Of Pontus (Acts xviii. 2); expelled from Rome by Claudius; St. Paul's partner at Corinth; went with him to Ephesus (Acts xviii. 18); church in his house (1 Cor. xvi. 19); went to Rome after the riot (Rom. xvi. 3); church in his house (xvi. 5); returned to Ephesus (2 Tim. iv. 19).

ARISTARCHUS. " Fellow-prisoner " (see next list).

ARTEMAS=Artemidorus, probably Ephesian; went with St. Paul to Corinth; either he or Tychicus to relieve Titus in Crete (Titus iii. 12).

CHLOE'S PEOPLE. Arrived in Ephesus from Corinth March, 54; gave St. Paul information (1 Cor. i. 11); probably went on to Jerusalem.

DEMAS. Probably Thessalonian; sent greetings to Colossæ (Col. iv. 14; Philem. 24); deserted St. Paul (2 Tim. iv. 10); may be the same as Demetrius (3 John 12).

EPÆNETUS. Ephesian; earliest convert of Asia; went to Corinth (Rom. xvi. 5).

EPAPHRAS. " Fellow-prisoner " (see next list).

EPAPHRODITUS. Philippian; brought supplies to St. Paul at Ephesus in 54 (Phil. iv. 18); worked with him (ii. 25); fell sick (ii. 27); returned to Philippi (ii. 25, 28).

ERASTUS. Came from Corinth in 54, helped St. Paul with the Anatolian collection; sent to Macedonia in 55 (Acts xix. 22);

treasurer of Corinth in 56 (Rom. xvi. 23); expected at Miletus in 57, but remained at Corinth (2 Tim. iv. 20).

FORTUNATUS. See Achaicus.

HERMOGENES. An Ephesian who deserted St. Paul (2 Tim. i. 15).

HYMENÆUS. An Ephesian convert who became a heretic and was excommunicated by St. Paul (1 Tim. i. 20; 2 Tim. ii. 17).

JESUS JUSTUS. A Jewish convert at Ephesus; sent greetings to the Colossians (Col. iv. 11).

JUNIAS. " Fellow-prisoner " (see next list).

LUKE. Came from Philippi to Ephesus in 54 (Philem. 24); ministered to Epaphroditus (Phil. ii. 27) and St. Paul (?) (Col. iv. 14; 2 Cor. i. 8; Phil. i. 22-25); probably returned to Philippi with Epaphroditus; joint bearer of the " severe " letter with Titus from Philippi to Corinth, and of the " joyful " letter with Titus and Tychicus (?); went with St. Paul to Jerusalem and thence to Cæsarea and Rome.

MARK. Cousin[1] of Barnabas; in Ephesus in 54, sends greetings to Philemon (Philem. 24); is going to Colossæ (Col. iv. 10); in Ephesus in 57 (2 Tim. iv. 11).

ONESIMUS. Slave of Philemon; converted by St. Paul in Ephesus (Philem. 10); sent back to Philemon with Tychicus (Col. iv. 9).

ONESIPHORUS. Galatian, came to Pisidian Antioch in 48; to Ephesus in 54; helped St. Paul with the collection; returned to Galatia and died (2 Tim. i. 16-18, iv. 19).

PHILEMON. Colossian, convert of St. Paul (Philem. 19); owner of Onesimus; asked to provide lodging for St. Paul in 55 (Philem. 22).

PHILETUS. See Hymenæus.

PHYGELUS. See Hermogenes.

PRISCA. A Roman lady, wife of Aquila (*q.v.*).

SCEVA'S SONS. Exorcists set upon by a demoniac (Acts xix. 14-16).

SOSTHENES. Corinthian, ruler of the synagogue; beaten by the Jews (Acts xviii. 17) (or Greeks) in 51 (see Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 259); came to Ephesus in 54; probably bearer of St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians (1 Cor. i.).

STEPHANAS. Earliest Corinthian convert (1 Cor. xvi. 15); baptized with his household by St. Paul (1 Cor. i. 16); came to Ephesus in 54 (1 Cor. xvi. 17).

TIMOTHY. Of Lystra, son of Eunice, grandson of Lois (2 Tim. i. 5); father a heathen (Acts xvi. 1); converted in 47; went to Jerusalem and returned to Galatia in 49; circumcised and ordained by St. Paul in 50; with St. Paul on the Second

[1] So Lightfoot, *Colossians*, pp. 234, 235.

Missionary Journey; went up with him to Jerusalem in 52 and came with him to Ephesus; in Ephesus, 52-54; went to Galatia, 54; went to Macedonia in 55 with Erastus (Acts xix. 22); went with St. Paul through Macedonia to Corinth in 56 (Rom. xvi. 21); went to Ephesus in 57 and thence to Troas (Acts xx. 4), Miletus, and Ephesus.

TITUS. Of Philippi; went with St. Paul to Corinth on the Second Missionary Journey; bearer of the First Epistle to the Thessalonians in 51; went to Ephesus with St. Paul in 52, remained there till 54; went to Philippi (Phil. iv. 3); returned to Ephesus in 55; went to Crete and Corinth (2 Cor. viii. 6, 10, ix, 2); went to Nicopolis; returned to Philippi, 56; bearer of "severe" letter to Corinth (2 Cor. xii. 18); returned to Philippi (2 Cor. vii. 6); bearer of the "joyful" letter to Corinth (2 Cor. viii. 6, 17), and of the Epistle to the Romans; returned to Philippi in 57, and went to Dalmatia (2 Tim. iv. 10).

TROPHIMUS. An Ephesian, went to Troas in 57 (Acts xx. 4); was left at Miletus sick (2 Tim. iv. 20); went to Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 29).

TYCHICUS. An Ephesian; sent to Colossæ in 54 (Col. iv. 7); thence to Corinth (Titus iii. 12); back to Ephesus (by way of Crete ?); went to Philippi; joint bearer with Titus and Luke of the "joyful" letter to Corinth (2 Cor. viii. 22); returned to Ephesus; went to Troas in 57 (Acts xx. 4); went to Jerusalem.

TYRANNUS. Owner of a lecture-hall in Ephesus where St. Paul preached for two years (Acts xix. 9).

ZENAS. A rabbi; with St. Paul in Corinth (Titus iii. 13); possibly came with him from Ephesus; went to Crete.

ST. PAUL'S FELLOW-PRISONERS

ANDRONICUS and JUNIAS. Rom. xvi. 7. Converted earlier than St. Paul; probably Tarsians of the same Jewish tribe (the "Macedonians"?) in Tarsus (Ramsay); came to Ephesus in 54, and were in Rome in 56.

ARISTARCHUS. Of Thessalonica (Acts xxvii. 2), Jewish convert, came to Ephesus in 54; imprisoned (Col. iv. 10; Philem. 24); returned to Thessalonica in 55; taken by St. Paul to Ephesus in 56; seized by the mob at the riot (Acts xix. 29); returned to Thessalonica; went ahead of St. Paul to Troas in 57 (Acts xx. 4, 5); went to Jerusalem and Cæsarea, 57; went to Myra with St. Paul in 59 (Acts xxvii. 2); probably returned to Thessalonica.

EPAPHRAS. Colossian (Philem. 23); evangelist of Colossæ (Col. i. 7); came to Ephesus in 54; returned to Colossæ in 55.

FIVE EPISTLES FROM EPHESUS

IN Acts xviii. 18 we read that St. Paul shaved his head in Cenchreæ, for he had made a vow. I have suggested that he took this vow upon him when he first arrived, at the end of the sailing season of 50. He had apparently been forbidden to preach by the Court of the Areopagus at Athens, which was a free city, and therefore he was obliged to leave (Acts xvii. 33, xviii. 1). Finding a ship going to Corinth he went on board, in spite of the lateness of the season, but was shipwrecked before reaching his destination (*cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 25), and landed with his bare life. Fortunately, he found a fellow-craftsman, Aquila, who had been expelled from Rome, and so he was able to work with him and support himself. In the spring of the following year supplies reached him from Philippi (Phil. iv. 15), and then he was able to give himself wholly to the work of evangelization (Acts xviii. 5). Moreover, Silvanus and Timothy came from Berœa, where Timothy had joined Silvanus after fulfilling his mission at Thessalonica.

Having made this vow, St. Paul would naturally have gone up to Jerusalem in the spring of 51 to discharge it. But he had a vision assuring him that the Lord had much people in Corinth (Acts xviii. 9, 10), and so he remained, and as a matter of fact stayed there for a whole year longer (11), and in the spring of 52, accompanied by Silvanus, Timothy, Titus, Aquila and Prisca, he crossed the Ægean Sea, probably in a pilgrim ship (*cf.* Acts xx. 3), some time in March, and arrived at Ephesus, where he left Aquila, Prisca, and Titus. Though the Ephesians pressed him to stay, he took leave of them (the Bezan text adds that he told the Ephesians that it was absolutely necessary for him to keep the coming feast—probably the Passover, about April 4—at Jerusalem); so he (and probably Timothy) and Silvanus went to Cæsarea (Acts xviii. 22) and " went up " and saluted the Church. Ramsay (*St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 265) is almost certainly right in saying that " went up " means " went up to Jerusalem "; Silvanus would naturally want to return there, and St. Paul had a vow on him; the Bezan text also implies this meaning. On leaving Jerusalem, he went to Antioch in Syria, and stayed there

for some time; and thence journeyed through Cilicia by way of Tarsus, crossed the Taurus by the Cilician Gates, and traversed the Galatian and Phrygian country to Ephesus (Acts xviii. 23). At the beginning of chapter xix., the Bezan text adds that St. Paul had a personal wish to go to Jerusalem, but was bidden to go to Asia. He made his way to Ephesus, taking the northern route by Tralla, through the valley of the Cayster, instead of that by Colossæ and Laodicea and the valley of the Mæander (Acts xix. 1). He would probably not reach Ephesus before the autumn of 52. When he came, he found that Apollos had been there, and had left for Corinth—the Bezan text adds that it was on the invitation of certain Corinthians who happened to be living at Ephesus. St. Paul began by disputing in the synagogue, and this continued for about three months (Acts xix. 8)—that is, till the close of 52 or the beginning of 53.

On leaving the synagogue St. Paul moved into the lecture-hall (σχολή) of Tyrannus, which was nearby.

The next section of the Acts (xix. 10-20, *cf.* 26) indicates the spread of Christianity in Ephesus and throughout Roman Asia during the following two years. Probably St. Paul remained at Ephesus continuously; St. Luke notices no break in his stay; the extent of the work demanded it, and he had not the means to travel until supplies reached him from Philippi (Acts xx. 34; Phil. iv. 18). We might imagine that he made short journeys into the country round, but even this is unlikely, since he says that he had not visited Colossæ or Hierapolis or Laodicea (Col. ii. 1; *cf.* iv. 13). Probably, also, he lived at Ephesus with Aquila and Prisca, as he would appear to have done at Corinth; in writing to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xvi. 19), he sends greetings from " the church which is in their house." During this period, and probably towards its close, St. Paul wrote a letter to the Church at Corinth. He refers to it in 1 Cor. v. 9: " I wrote unto you in my epistle." The letter itself is for the most part lost, but between 2 Cor. vi. 14 and vii. 2 we have a digression. 2 Cor. vii. 2 follows exactly on vi. 13, and looking back to 1 Cor. v. we see that this fragment corresponds very closely to the kind of letter to which St. Paul there refers. This, therefore, may be part of the " previous " letter to Corinth.[1] But between Acts xix. 20 and 23

[1] There would seem to be a similar break between Phil. iii. 2 and iv. 1, and possibly this is a fragment of another letter.

comes a break; and into this gap we have to fit a visit to Corinth unrecorded by St. Luke; for in 2 Cor. xii. 14, xiii. 1 St. Paul speaks of his next visit as being his third; the first, of course, being that at which the Church at Corinth was founded.

At this point it is worth while considering how much St. Luke has left out.

(1) During this Ephesian period the Emperor Claudius died on October 13, 54, having been poisoned by his wife Agrippina to make room for her son Nero. (2) At the previous midsummer Marcus Junius Silanus had become proconsul of Asia, and would normally have continued in office till the midsummer of 55, but was poisoned at the order of Agrippina early in that year in order to make the position of Nero more secure, for Silanus had the same relationship to Augustus as Nero, being his great-great-grandson, and many people thought that instead of a lad barely out of his teens it would be better to have as emperor a man of ripe age and blameless character. Agrippina also feared that he might avenge the death of his brother Lucius, for which she had been responsible. According to Dio Cassius (xi. 6) she sent to Ephesus some of the same poison with which she had murdered her husband. (3) In 2 Cor. xi. 23 St. Paul says that he had been imprisoned " more frequently " (περισσοτέρως). This can hardly mean less than three times; he also says that he was three times beaten with rods—a Roman form of punishment—and five times scourged by the Jews. St. Luke has recorded up to this point only one imprisonment, one beating, and no scourging. (4) St. Paul says that he had been three times shipwrecked (25); St. Luke up to this point has not mentioned any shipwrecks. (5) During this period St. Paul wrote five letters to the Corinthians: the first, called " the previous letter," has been lost; the second is our 1 Corinthians; the third notified his change of plan for visiting them; the fourth is the second half; and the fifth the first half of our 2 Corinthians. St. Luke never mentions any letter of St. Paul's at all. (6) During this interval Titus visited Corinth, apparently independently of St. Paul (2 Cor. viii. 6, ix. 2), but St. Luke nowhere mentions Titus. (7) During this time St. Paul preached in Illyricum (Rom. xv. 19). (8) He also organized the great collection of which St. Luke tells us nothing at the time, but merely makes allusion to it in St. Paul's speech before Felix (Acts xxiv. 17). It is well to bear these omissions

in mind, because it is sometimes urged that if between 52 and 56 St. Paul had gone to some fresh district or done some particular form of work, St. Luke must have mentioned it. These clear omissions show that such a supposition is unwarranted.

Let us deal first with the imprisonments. These cannot have been less than three, and were probably accompanied by the beatings with rods. With the possible exception of Philippi, behind all the troubles which came upon St. Paul from without appear to have been Jewish adversaries. It was so at Pisidian Antioch (Acts xiii. 45, 50); at Iconium (xiv. 2); at Lystra (19), at Thessalonica (xvii. 5); at Berœa (13); at Corinth (xviii. 12); at Ephesus (xx. 19). But this being so, we need not trouble to look for an imprisonment before St. Paul began his Gentile ministry at Pisidian Antioch. One imprisonment may have taken place there (*cf.* 2 Tim. iii. 11);[1] a second imprisonment and beating took place at Philippi; but there is still a third to be located. If we ask where that is most likely to have occurred, the obvious answer will be, where St. Paul stayed longest—that is, at Ephesus. This conjecture—for so far it is little more—is corroborated when we review his missionary journeys. He was certainly not imprisoned in Cyprus, nor at Corinth, where he stayed eighteen months (Acts xviii. 11); nor apparently at Antioch in Syria; and we have sufficiently detailed information about what happened at the other places (Perga, Lystra, Derbe, Iconium, Attalia, Thessalonica, and Berœa) to make it probable that St. Paul was not imprisoned at any of them. And then we learn in Rom. xvi. 7 that St. Paul had two fellow-prisoners,[2] Andronicus and Junias. If this chapter was really addressed to the Church at Ephesus, as some think, the location would be all but certain; but if it is rightly attached to the Epistle to the Romans, it still creates a high probability, for Andronicus and Junias were Christians before St. Paul's conversion. This takes us back to the earliest days, between 33 and 36, and we should be inclined to think that they were either among those who were converted at Pentecost or those who fled after the death of Stephen. They were also

[1] Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 107, thinks that one beating with rods took place at Pisidian Antioch.

[2] *συναιχμαλώτους*; for the meaning see Lucian II. 295, ed. Reitz. The word is not found in Greek of the classical period, nor in the LXX, but *συνδεσμώτης*, the classical term, does not occur in the New Testament, and St. Paul only uses *σύνδεσμος* metaphorically.

" of note among the Apostles "; this phrase does not necessarily mean that they had an apostolic commission, but only that they were highly esteemed in apostolic circles, and would seem to imply that the Apostles were not yet scattered. At this date they would, of course, be Jews; but more than this is required by the term " kinsmen." Epænetus, " the firstfruits of Asia " (Rom. xvi. 5), would almost certainly have been a Jew, and there must be other Jews in the list. St. Paul's family came from Tarsus, so probably they were also Tarsians. Sir William Ramsay (*Cities of St. Paul*, p. 177) says that the term kinsmen without " according to the flesh " (*κατὰ σάρκα*, when it means fellow Jews) means that they were members of the same political " tribe " at Tarsus—namely, that which was composed of Jews; and this interpretation is probably correct. But if they were Jewish Christians and fellow-prisoners of St. Paul, it is very probable that their imprisonment was the result of an anti-Christian riot instigated by Jewish non-believers. If they were Tarsians, what place is more likely than Ephesus for their joint imprisonment with St. Paul, especially as he had passed though Tarsus (Acts xviii. 23) on the way to Ephesus, so that they would have known where he was to be found ? If, moreover, he had fellow-prisoners who were not Roman citizens, this would explain why St. Paul would not claim his own rights of citizenship. He claimed them at Philippi (Acts xvi. 37), and his language implies that Silvanus, who at least had a Latin name, was also a Roman citizen; but he would not escape from being beaten and imprisoned on a technical plea and leave his companions in the lurch. The same reasoning would apply to Pisidian Antioch, if he and Barnabas were imprisoned there.

But this conclusion is rendered certain by 1 Cor. xv. 32: " If after the manner of men[1] I had fought with beasts at Ephesus,[2] what should I have gained (*τί μοι τὸ ὄφελος*), if the dead are not raised ?" Here there is no doubt that St. Paul is writing

[1] *κατ' ἄνθρωπον* might mean (1) " to use the common phrase "; of course there is no real *fighting*; (2) " As I should have had to do but for a direct intervention of Providence "; or (3) " with only human hopes." In any case the meaning does not affect the main idea.

[2] See C. R. Bowen, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. xliii., Pts. I. and II., pp. 59-68, and *cf.* 2 Cor. i. 9, 10, *ἐκ τηλικούτου θανάτου ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς* (" from so dreadful a death," *cf. τηλικαύτη σωτηρία*, " so wonderful a salvation," Heb ii. 3; *τηλικοῦτος σεισμὸς οὕτως μέγας*, " such a terrible and widespread earthquake," Rev. xvi. 18).

of a death which he might have suffered at Ephesus; nothing less will satisfy the context. If so, then he must certainly have been held in custody. But if we are right in assigning this imprisonment to the latter half of 54—that is, after St. Paul had spent two years and three months at Ephesus—then the proconsul who ordered it would have been Marcus Junius Silanus; and as Silanus' murder was effected to secure Nero on his throne, and St. Paul's subsequent appeal was made to this same Nero, St. Luke would have had even better reason for not noticing this imprisonment than for the other which we have seen that he has omitted.

But as soon as we locate an imprisonment at Ephesus, we at once ask whether one or more of the Epistles of St. Paul's captivity, Colossians and Philemon and Philippians, may not have been written there. Colossians and Philemon go together, and were sent by the same messenger, Tychicus of Asia (Acts xx. 4), and probably of Ephesus, accompanied by Onesimus. In Colossians we have mention of another fellow-prisoner, Aristarchus of Thessalonica (Col. iv. 10; Acts xx. 4, xxvii. 2), and in Philemon (23) of Epaphras of Colossæ (Col. i. 7). It is extremely improbable that at Rome St. Paul had any fellow-prisoners at all. He was arrested on a charge which concerned himself alone, and was permitted to dwell in his own hired house, in " free-custody," as it was called, after a favourable report had been received from the authorities in Palestine, to await the arrival of his accusers. Aristarchus and Epaphras would not be guilty of any ordinary crime, but would be the victims of disorder fomented by the Jews, and, as they were most probably Jews themselves, if they had been condemned at Rome they would, under the edict of Claudius, have been promptly expelled. But it is not likely that any such riots took place in Rome after the issue of the edict, for the aggressors would have been liable to the same punishment; and even if there had been, the persons condemned would not have been granted the exceptional privilege allowed to St. Paul, but would have been cast into the common prison, as St. Paul and Silvanus were at Philippi. It is, therefore, far more likely that Aristarchus and Epaphras were imprisoned with St. Paul and Junias and Andronicus at Ephesus.

In the same epistles we hear of other companions of St. Paul: Mark, whose home was at Jerusalem, and who was expected to

go to Colossæ (Col. iv. 10), and Timothy, both of whom were at Ephesus when St. Paul wrote his Second Epistle to Timothy (iv. 11); Luke, probably at this time domiciled at Philippi—at any rate he accompanied St. Paul there from Troas (Acts xvi. 11) and started from Philippi on the last voyage to Jerusalem (Acts xx. 6); Demas, probably of Thessalonica (2 Tim. iv. 10); and Tychicus. Is it really to be thought that all these, in addition to Epaphras and Aristarchus, journeyed about a thousand miles each and happened to be in Rome simultaneously? To them also we must add the runaway slave, Onesimus of Colossæ. It is said that he was not likely to have gone to Ephesus, where he might have been recognized. But this argument cuts both ways. Even if he did go to Rome he must have gone by way of Ephesus; and if he were known there he may well have had some friend who would hide him until he could find some work in a ship. If we want a likely meeting place for people from Jerusalem—Tarsus, Colossæ, Ephesus, Philippi, and Thessalonica—it would be difficult to find one more central than Ephesus.

Again, St. Paul speaks of going to Colossæ, and asks Philemon to prepare him a lodging (Philem. 22), no doubt out of affection for the churches of the district, but partly also that he might observe the treatment meted out by Philemon to Onesimus, of whom he speaks in warm terms (Philem. 12). Would St. Paul have written to ask Philemon to prepare a lodging for him when it would take him at least two months to get to him from Rome, and he must go through Ephesus on the way, and could easily have sent him a message from there?[1]

It would seem impossible that Cæsarea was the place from which these epistles were written. It is true, of course, that it is nearer to Jerusalem (the home of St. Mark), and that Jews of all kinds, from Tarsus and elsewhere, might go there on their way to or from Jerusalem for the Passover or Pentecost. But it is all but certain that there were no Jewish anti-Christian riots at Cæsarea during the time in which St. Paul was imprisoned there, since the Jews would have damaged their case against him by such behaviour. And if there were not, then St. Paul would have had no fellow-prisoners; and even if he had fellow-prisoners

[1] There is nothing to be made out of "Paul the aged" in Philem. 9. Even if πρεσβύτης is the correct reading, it probably means the same as πρεσβευτής (see Lightfoot *in loc.*); and in any case the difference is a matter of a few years.

at Cæsarea, we should still have to find some other place besides Philippi where Andronicus and Junias had been imprisoned with him, since their names are given in an epistle written before this imprisonment. And it is extremely improbable that Onesimus, when he ran away from Philemon, would go to Cæsarea, whereas in any event he would be all but compelled to go to, or through, Ephesus.

As for Rome, the arguments in favour of these epistles having been written from there appear to be based simply on the fact that we know that St. Paul was imprisoned at Rome; but we are equally certain that he was imprisoned elsewhere, because he himself says so in his epistle to the Corinthians (2 Cor. xi. 23, 25). These arguments, therefore, may be discounted as soon as we recognize that there is a considerable probability that one of these other imprisonments took place at Ephesus; and, conversely, any arguments which tend to show that the Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon were probably written at Ephesus, strengthen the case in favour of an imprisonment there.

The arguments in favour of the Epistle to the Philippians having been written from Ephesus rather than from Rome are similar in character to those used for these epistles.

From Philippi to Ephesus, or *vice versa*, is a matter of a week to ten days, according to the wind (Acts xvi. 11, xx. 6), allowing for the unloading of the ship on the way; from Philippi to Rome is about 600 miles as the crow flies, or a land journey of 740 miles and a two days' passage across the Adriatic. As this is a matter of two months or more, it would not be undertaken at all in the winter except under the urgent pressure of the imperial authorities. The Philippians had heard that St. Paul was in bad circumstances—that implies one journey; they made a collection and sent it by Epaphroditus—two journeys; Epaphroditus fell ill, and the Philippians had heard of his illness and were distressed—three journeys; Epaphroditus had heard of their grief—four journeys. At least one of these journeys must have been in the winter. Allowing for intervals between, this would require nine months or more.[1]

[1] In 341, nearly three centuries later, when presumably means of communication had been improved, it took the legates of the Pope, with the imperial system at their command, from May 11 to July 10 to get from Rome to Ephesus —*i.e.*, more than eight weeks, and at the best period of the year. In 431 the Emperor Theodosius sent to summon the Pope to Constantinople on March 10, and the summons reached Leo on May 13.

Again, there was some " difference " between two ladies of the congregation at Philippi, Euodia and Syntyche (Phil. iv. 2). Would St. Paul have admonished them publicly in church after so long an interval ? Might he not have hoped that they had made up their quarrel and have feared to reopen a wound that had already been healed ?

But the Philippians sent supplies to St. Paul (Phil. iv. 10). Would there have been any need to send supplies to him at Rome, where he was dwelling in a house hired either by himself or for him by some of his friends who, if they would do so much for him, might be trusted to look after him in other ways ? At Ephesus we know that he needed money. Not only had he to labour with his own hands for his support (Acts xx. 34), but he was shortly to undertake journeys to Macedonia and Corinth, and these would need to be paid for. Moreover, he reminds the Philippians that they had sent him contributions when he was in Thessalonica and Achaia (Phil. iv. 15, 16), and would have sent at other times but " lacked opportunity " (iv. 10). Did they lack opportunity in the years preceding his imprisonment at Rome, when he had passed through Philippi twice, if not three times ?

The arguments used to show that this epistle was written from Rome are the mention of the " prætorium " in i. 13, and of Cæsar's household in iv. 22, but neither of these is decisive. If the Epistle to the Philippians were written from Rome, " all the prætorium " would mean the whole prætorian guard, which at this time consisted of about 9,000 men. Is it likely that St. Paul should be guilty of gross exaggeration, or that so large a force should interest themselves in a single Jewish prisoner ? Verres had a prætorium at Syracuse in the time of Cicero (*in Verrem* II. iv. 28, § 65; II. v. 35, § 92); Pilate had a prætorium in Jerusalem (Matt. xxvii. 27); and St. Paul was lodged in Herod's prætorium at Cæsarea (Acts xxiii. 35). In short, " prætorium " means the official house of the local governor, king or proconsul, or procurator, and perhaps had best be translated " The Residency." So, as Ephesus was the seat of the proconsul, there was doubtless a " prætorium " in Ephesus. St. Paul asserts that his " bonds became manifest in Christ throughout the whole prætorium and to all the rest "—that is, that the whole proconsular staff, as distinct from Marcus Junius Silanus, who had imprisoned him,

were aware that the real cause of his condemnation was that he was a Christian, and that " the trial that befell him " was due to the plots of the Jews (Acts xx. 19). But though this was the real cause it was not the legal charge, and very possibly he and some of his fellow-prisoners were accused of stealing the money intended to be sent to the Temple at Jerusalem (*cf.* Acts xix. 37). The money from the Jews of Asia was collected at Ephesus and protected by severe enactments. Augustus had decreed that the Jews should have liberty to make use of their own customs, and that their sacred money should not be touched, " and if anyone transgress any part of what is above decreed he shall be severely punished " (Josephus, *Antt.* XVI. vi. 2). This decree was confirmed by Agrippa, who wrote to the magistrate, senate, and people of Ephesus " that such as steal that sacred money of the Jews, and fly to a sanctuary, shall be taken thence and delivered to the Jews by the same law by which sacrilegious persons are taken thence " (*ibid.* 4). As St. Paul was at this time collecting for the poor at Jerusalem, his action may have been misrepresented to the effect that he was " robbing the Temple," since he was diminishing the amount of the alms tat might else have gone thither, and Silanus may have condemned St. Paul and his companions as a matter of policy rather than of law (*cf.* Herod, Acts xii. 3, and Felix, xxiv. 27), in order to avoid trouble in his province.

But if St. Paul was thrown into prison at Ephesus on charges so serious that he was in danger of being exposed to the beasts in the arena, how did he ever regain his freedom ? This mention of the " residency " and of the " familia " of Cæsar gives the explanation. Claudius was murdered on October 13, 54; even the urgency of Agrippina would hardly prevail to make anyone undertake the sea journey to Ephesus at that time of the year. But one of the corps of " frumentarii "—the " Imperial Service Corps," as we might call them—quartered in Rome could doubtless be sent by way of Brundisium, the Via Egnatia, Neapolis, and thence by sea to Ephesus. This must have taken a matter of two months or more. Accordingly, the command and the poison would not arrive at Ephesus until the end of December. Celer and Helius had to make arrangements not only for the murder, but to secure their own position after it had been accomplished. Nevertheless they dared not delay too long. Silanus was murdered,

therefore, early in 55. But the position of Celer and Helius was none too safe, and they would be wise to keep on the best terms with the double official staff—that of the proconsul and that of the fiscus. The proconsular staff knew that St. Paul and his companions were innocent; and of the procuratorial staff some were Christians, and so favourably inclined to St. Paul that they had sent special greetings to their brethren at Philippi in gratitude for their care of him (Phil. iv. 22). When, therefore, Celer and Helius came into power, they could not refuse to grant the petition of a large portion of their united staffs that St. Paul and his fellow-prisoners should be set at liberty. This would take place in the spring of 55.

Towards the end of St. Paul's imprisonment, or shortly after his release, some members of the household of Chloe arrived from Corinth, probably by pilgrim ship on the way to keep the Passover at Jerusalem, which fell this year about April 2, and brought a report of the state of affairs in the church there. St. Paul began to write a letter in reply, but before he had finished it other pilgrims came with a letter presumably sent by the presbyters at Corinth, asking him certain questions which can be discovered by considering St. Paul's answer, but not disclosing the scandals reported by Chloe's people. Who brought this letter we cannot say; the only point that is clear is that the bearer was not Titus or any other member of St. Paul's personal staff, as St. Paul would not then have had to rely on Chloe's household, and the writers of the letter would have seen that concealment of the true state of affairs was impossible.

St. Paul was now out of prison, and thought himself to be under official protection, and contemplated staying at Ephesus for Pentecost (1 Cor. xvi. 8), completing the arrangements for the collection, and then travelling through Macedonia by way of Philippi (1 Cor. xvi. 5; *cf.* Phil. ii. 24), and possibly staying at Corinth for the winter (1 Cor. xvi. 6). But Celer and Helius could not take the risk of another disturbance, and insisted that all the prisoners should at once leave Ephesus. So Epaphroditus went back to Philippi, probably, since he had been so desperately ill, accompanied by St. Luke; Andronicus and Junias may have gone with them on the first stage of their journey to Rome (Rom. xvi. 7), and Epaphras and St. Paul went to Colossæ, following Tychicus and Onesimus (Col. iv. 7; Philem. 22), leaving

Apollos, Aquila and Prisca, none of whom had been involved, at Ephesus. But Colossæ was too near to Ephesus, and St. Paul would have to return thither when he left the district; accordingly, Celer and Helius demanded that he should leave Asia altogether, and took security from Aquila and Prisca, who were householders and leading Christians as well as St. Paul's host and hostess, under pain of severe penalties (Rom. xvi. 4). So they sent a message to St. Paul at Colossæ, and he saw that he must cancel his plan of staying at Ephesus until Pentecost; and, as he had already promised to go to Corinth, he despatched Tychicus, his only available messenger, probably to Gaius (1 Cor. i. 14; Rom. xvi. 23), to signify his change of plan and say that he would arrive earlier, and asked Tychicus to await his coming. This would be an act of ordinary courtesy, but it was also in accordance with the precedents St. Paul had set in writing to Philemon at Colossæ and to the Philippians, and subsequently he acted in the same way in sending his Epistle to the Romans. Tychicus would pass through Ephesus on his way, and Aquila and Prisca, who of course were unable to leave, would point out to him the seriousness of the situation. He was fortunate in finding a ship going to Corinth direct, perhaps one of the pilgrim ships in which the Corinthians had come to Ephesus, which was now on its return voyage.

In spite of the risk involved, St. Paul felt that he must take the opportunity of visiting Hierapolis and Laodicea, and so arrived at Ephesus somewhat later than his messenger. When he came he would naturally go to the house of Aquila and Prisca, and they would tell him what they had done, and insist that as soon as his arrival was publicly known an assault might be expected on their house (*cf.* Acts xvii. 5 for what actually happened at Berœa); and in that case Celer and Helius would not dare to protect him, and his hosts would be in serious danger. Accordingly, like the Berœans, they hurry him down to the harbour. Meanwhile, Luke and Epaphroditus have arrived at Philippi, and narrated what had happened to St. Paul. There were great opportunities at Ephesus; the collection was not fully organized; there were many adversaries (1 Cor. xvi. 9), and St. Paul was almost entirely staffless. Titus, therefore, went back to Ephesus.

It is almost certain that Titus was at this time at Philippi. In Phil. iv. 3, St. Paul sends a message to his true yoke-fellow

(*γνήσιε σύνζυγε*[1]), and it is almost impossible to find any other than Titus who had ploughed the mission field with St. Paul. Silvanus had gone back to Jerusalem; Timothy and Luke and Epaphroditus were all at Ephesus when the letter was written; Tychicus had gone or was going to Colossæ. I conceive the course of events to be somewhat as follows: When Titus went with St. Paul from Corinth to Ephesus none of the latter's movements were certain, except that he had a vow to be paid at Jerusalem. St. Paul appears to have come to Ephesus on the Third Journey largely in consequence of the invitation of the Ephesians themselves (Acts xviii. 20), and his whereabouts were unknown at Philippi, but in the course of the two years and three months spent at Ephesus it might well have become known to Lydia through her business connexions with Thyatira. In Acts xix. 10 we are told that " all they which dwell in Asia heard the word of the Lord." Though this may be an exaggeration, it was true at least of Colossæ, Hierapolis, and Laodicea—though St. Paul had not visited them—and would doubtless be true of Thyatira, some eighty miles distant, and therefore considerably nearer, as the crow flies, than Colossæ; and when the Apocalypse was written, Thyatira possessed a fully organized church. Lydia is not said to have been a dyer, but a seller of the purple fabrics which were dyed at Thyatira; and possibly the cloak about which St. Paul was so anxious (2 Tim. iv. 13) may have been her gift to him. She probably, therefore, kept up a business connexion with Thyatira, and when that town was evangelized may have heard of St. Paul through business channels; probably she supplied no inconsiderable part of the collection sent by Epaphroditus to St. Paul at Ephesus. Epaphroditus remained in Ephesus and fell sick, and news of his sickness reached Philippi by Titus, I conceive, whom St. Paul had taken with him from Corinth and left there when he himself went to Jerusalem. Then St. Luke came to Ephesus (Col. iv. 14) and Titus was left in charge at Philippi until St. Luke's return.

[1] *γνήσιε* naturally recalls *γνησίῳ τέκνῳ* (Titus i. 4) and the whole phrase is parallel to *κοινωνὸς ἐμὸς καὶ εἰς ὑμᾶς συνεργός* (2 Cor. viii. 23).

CHAPTER IV

AFTER THE IMPRISONMENT AT EPHESUS

SYNOPSIS

THE " Great Omission " of a year between Acts xix. 21 and 23.

The Great Collection: YEAR

- Ordered in Galatia by St. Paul (1 Cor. xvi. 1). 52
- Begun by Onesiphorus (?).
- Organized in Asia by St. Paul, Erastus, Timothy, and Onesiphorus (Acts xix. 22; 2 Tim. i. 18). 54
- Galatia by Timothy and Onesiphorus. 55
- Macedonia by Timothy and Erastus (Acts xix. 22). 55
- Achaia by Titus and Erastus (2 Cor. viii. 10, ix. 2). 55

Acts.	*St. Paul.*	
xix. 21. St. Paul's proposed journey through Macedonia to Corinth.	1 Cor. xvi. 5; Phil. ii. 24.	55
xix. 22. Timothy and Erastus sent to Macedonia.	1 Cor. iv. 17, xvi. 10; Phil. ii. 19, 23.	55
	Went to Corinth (2 Cor. xii. 14, xiii. 1).	
	Sent Titus to Corinth (2 Cor. viii. 10, ix. 2).	
	Went to Illyricum (Rom. xv. 19) and Macedonia (Acts xix. 29).	
	Wrote " severe " letter to Corinth (2 Cor. xii. 18).	
	Went to Ephesus.	
xix. 23. Riot at Ephesus.		

THE FILLING OF THE GAP : SUGGESTED ORDER OF EVENTS

	YEAR
St. Paul, Timothy, Erastus, and Onesiphorus organize the collection in Ephesus and Asia.	54
St. Paul and others imprisoned by M. Junius Silanus.	
St. Paul writes the Epistles to Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon.	
Timothy and Onesiphorus go to Galatia.	
Prisoners released by Celer and Helius; St. Paul sends 1 Corinthians (by Sosthenes ?).	55
Timothy returns to Ephesus, St. Paul goes to Colossæ; Titus comes to Ephesus; Tychicus sent to Corinth.	
St. Paul returns to Ephesus, sends Timothy and Erastus to Macedonia (Acts xix. 22).	
Goes with Apollos, Titus (and Artemas ?) to Crete (*cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 12).	
Leaves Titus in Crete; St. Paul and others go to Corinth (Titus i. 5).	
Apollos and Zenas take Epistle to Titus; St. Paul goes to Nicopolis (Titus iii. 12, 13).	
Tychicus or Artemas relieves Titus (Titus iii. 12).	
Titus goes to Corinth and meets Erastus (2 Cor. viii. 10, ix. 2).	
Titus goes to Nicopolis.	55
St. Paul and Titus at Nicopolis.	56
St. Paul and Titus go to Aulona or Dyrrachium (Illyricum, Rom. xv. 19).	
Pass through Macedonia to Philippi (Acts xix. 29).	
St. Paul sends "severe" letter by Titus and Luke to Corinth (2 Cor. xii. 18).	
Goes with Gaius of Doberus and Aristarchus of Thessalonica to Ephesus (Acts xix. 29).	
Timothy remains at Philippi.	
Riot at Ephesus (Acts xix. 23).	

AFTER THE IMPRISONMENT AT EPHESUS

As this chapter will be somewhat intricate I begin with a brief recapitulation, elaborating a few topics as I go along.

St. Paul arrived at Ephesus in the autumn of 52, and for three months he taught in the synagogue (Acts xix. 8); this will bring us to the close of 52 or the beginning of 53. Then he left the synagogue and taught in the school of Tyrannus for two years (Acts xix. 9, 10). In writing to the Corinthians in 55, he says that he had been five times scourged by the Jews (2 Cor. xi. 24); if one or more of these scourgings took place in the synagogue at Ephesus (*cf.* Acts xx. 19), St. Paul would have a very forcible reason for changing his place of preaching. The whole of the period of two years and a quarter appears to have been one of continuous residence; Philemon, therefore (Philem. 19), like Epaphras (23) and Onesimus, must have come to Ephesus.

In the year 54 St. Paul was engaged in organizing the great collection at Ephesus and in Roman Asia.

St. Paul's regular word in this connexion is " ministry " or " ministration " (*διακονία*).[1] St. Luke uses the verb only twice: in Acts vi. 2, " having left the word of God to ' minister ' to tables " (or " counters," *cf.* Luke xix. 23 and Mark xi. 15; Matt. xxi. 12), and in this Ephesian period, of Erastus and Timothy, " two of those that ' ministered ' to him " (Acts xix. 22). As the word has a technical meaning in the writings of both St. Paul and St. Luke, and as St. Paul was at this time organizing the collection, we may be confident that Erastus, who had arrived from Corinth in the summer of this year, was assisting St. Paul together with Timothy in this particular matter. And these were only some of his assistants; Onesiphorus also was with him, as Timothy well knew (2 Tim. i. 18). Where Onesiphorus came from is not stated, but we need not look far afield. Galatia would seem the most

[1] Rom. xv. 25: " I am going to Jerusalem (*διακονῶν*) to the saints "; 2 Cor. viii. 19: In this gracious gift (*διακονουμένῃ*) by us, *cf.* viii. 20; and Heb. vi. 10 *διακονήσαντες* to the saints and *διακονοῦντες*. So the substantive Rom. xv. 31: My *διακονία* to Jerusalem, *cf.* 2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 1, 12, 13; so of alms given to himself, 2 Cor. xi. 8. Similarly St. Luke, Acts vi. 1, xi. 29, xii. 25.

probable district, since after leaving Jerusalem in 52 St. Paul had passed through it on his journey to Ephesus (Acts xviii. 23), and at that time made arrangements about the collection there (1 Cor. xvi. 1). It would seem likely, therefore, that after assisting St. Paul at Ephesus, Onesiphorus went back to Galatia to organize the collection in that region. And with him may have gone Timothy.[1]

We have seen that in 54 the Church at Philippi made a collection for St. Paul, and sent it to him by Epaphroditus, who for some time worked by St. Paul's side (Phil. ii. 25); later on he fell dangerously ill (27), and news of his illness was carried to Philippi. I suggest that the messenger who carried this intelligence was Titus; neither Timothy nor Tychicus was available; Philippi was the home-town of Titus, and he had not been there since 50. On hearing his report, St. Luke appears to have come to Ephesus (Col. iv. 14), and there to have attended Epaphroditus and possibly St. Paul himself (2 Cor. i. 8).

Early in 55 the proconsul, Marcus Junius Silanus, was murdered by Publius Celer, a Roman knight, and Helius, a freedman. Celer remained in Asia and practised extortion on such a scale that even Nero did not dare to acquit him of the charge which was brought against him by the province in 57, but allowed the trial to drag on until he should die of old age (Tac., *Ann.* xiii. 33). Helius was afterwards Prefect of Rome and Italy during Nero's absence in Greece, 67-68 (Dio Cassius, lxiii. 12).

These had joint charge of the Emperor's fiscus in Asia, and when they had murdered Silanus they exercised the combined powers of the proconsulate and fiscus until the arrival of his successor in the following summer. Not long after they had assumed power they were prevailed upon to release Paul and his fellow-prisoners; none of them had been guilty of any legal crime, but they had been imprisoned on account of their religion (Phil. i. 13), on a trumped-up charge brought by their Jewish adversaries (*cf.* Acts xx. 19).

As soon as the news of their release became known, the Jews would in consequence be enraged against Celer and Helius, while the heathen element in the population would also be angered because they had looked forward to the spectacle of their sufferings. St. Paul's immediate feelings on his release were that he could

[1] I have worked out the details of this scheme in an appendix to this chapter.

now exercise his ministry under government protection, as he had done for the greater portion of a year at Corinth after Gallio had refused to entertain the charge brought against him (Acts xviii. 18).

In the spring of 55 different parties would seem to have arrived at Ephesus from Corinth: Sosthenes (Acts xviii. 17; 1 Cor. i. 1), probably afterwards the bearer of the First Epistle to the Corinthians; Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus (1 Cor. xvi. 17); and members of the household of Chloe (1 Cor. i. 11); and one or other of these brought a letter. They probably came by pilgrim ships, making their way to Jerusalem, and as the Passover this year fell about April 2, their arrival must be timed for not later than the middle of March.

In answer to the Corinthian letter, St. Paul wrote our First Epistle to the Corinthians. He was now a free man, and proposed to remain at Ephesus until after Pentecost (1 Cor. xvi. 8), and then to go through Macedonia (1 Cor. xvi. 5; Phil ii. 24) and to come to Corinth towards the autumn and possibly winter there (1 Cor. xvi. 6). Meanwhile he intended to send Timothy to them (1 Cor. iv. 17). He does not tell the Corinthians that Timothy is to go into Macedonia first, any more than he tells them that he himself is going to Colossæ, but towards the end of the letter he appears less confident that Timothy will reach Corinth (1 Cor. xvi. 10).

After this letter was written I think it highly probable that St. Paul and Epaphras went to Colossæ, whither Tychicus and Onesimus had preceded them (Col. iv. 7, 9), partly because St. Paul had a great desire to see the churches of the Lycus valley (Col. ii. 1); partly because he had a warm affection for Onesimus (Philem. 12) and wanted to assure himself that Philemon would not ill-treat him; partly because he had already asked Philemon to prepare him a lodging (Philem. 22), and, having done so, it would be unmannerly not to go when he had the opportunity; and also because Celer and Helius would almost certainly have insisted on his leaving Ephesus if he had not already departed. After he had gone Celer and Helius, whose position was by no means so secure that they could afford to risk a public disturbance, would seem to have ordered that the Christian prisoners who had been released should leave not only Ephesus but the whole province. Epaphras they may have regarded as a subordinate,

and have been satisfied with his withdrawal to his home at Colossæ, but in the following year we find Andronicus and Junias at Rome (Rom. xvi. 7) and Aristarchus back in Macedonia (Acts xix. 29).

The headquarters of the Church at Ephesus would seem to have been in the house of Aquila and Prisca (1 Cor. xvi. 19), and St. Paul probably lived with them there as he had done at Corinth (Acts xviii. 3), so they were not likely to escape the attention of Celer and Helius. They may have had the choice of leaving and refused, but, however this may be, they would seem to have remained, and it is not unlikely that as householders they were made to give security for the conduct of St. Paul, as Jason was compelled to do at Thessalonica (Acts xvii. 9). At any rate, they remained of their own free will, even though by so doing they put their necks in jeopardy (Rom. xvi. 4).

But even if St. Paul went to Colossæ he must have come back to Ephesus, for the next thing we are certain of is that he abandoned his plan of going to Macedonia and sailed to Corinth, so that the visit he paid after going through Macedonia was not his second, but his third (2 Cor. xii. 14, xiii. 1), the first being that in which he had founded the church there. Arrived in Ephesus (or being still there), he sent Timothy, as he had half promised, to Philippi. This would be the more necessary as St. Paul was not now going there in person, and Timothy would have to explain his reasons and make his excuses; and now that St. Paul was going to Corinth, Timothy would have no cause to go thither also, but would remain in Macedonia. But he attached to Timothy a Corinthian named Erastus (Acts xix. 22), who in 56, when St. Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans, had become the treasurer of that city (Rom. xvi. 23; see Evans, *Corinthians*, Clarendon Bible, p. 156). Erastus had worked alongside St. Paul at Ephesus when he was organizing the great collection there, and the organization of the collection in Macedonia was a task requiring some financial skill; and as Timothy was still very young (Phil. ii. 22) it might well have been beyond his powers, while Erastus, who, if this identification is accepted, was clearly a man of position and ability, would be a most suitable colleague.

Having then decided, probably in consequence of news brought to him from Corinth to Colossæ, to abandon his visit to Macedonia

and go to Corinth some other way, St. Paul would expect to arrive there a good deal earlier than he had announced, and it would be necessary in all courtesy to forewarn his host (probably Gaius, Rom. xvi. 23). If he were at Colossæ, Tychicus would seem to be the only available messenger, but even if he were at Ephesus the case is not much altered, as Timothy was going to Macedonia, while Tychicus had already taken a message from St. Paul to Colossæ. When he wrote his First Epistle to the Corinthians he told them that he had urged Apollos to go to Corinth, but that he was unwilling to go then, but would do so on the first available opportunity (1 Cor. xvi. 12); now that St. Paul was himself going thither this opportunity would seem to have arrived, so in all probability Apollos went with him.

St. Paul and Apollos met with a bad reception at Corinth, finding themselves treated as heads of opposing parties (1 Cor. i. 12, iii. 5), a position which they had not the least intention of occupying, while St. Paul was also personally insulted (2 Cor. ii. 5-11), and so was unable to take any steps towards organizing the collection at Corinth, which was doubtless one of the objects of his visit. After a short time they both left.

Some time later Titus went to Corinth and began the collection (2 Cor. viii. 6). If, as I have suggested, he carried the news of Epaphroditus' illness to Philippi, he would not have been in Ephesus when St. Paul was organizing the collection there, but must have returned thither later. In any event, however, he went to Corinth by St. Paul's orders, and this implies either that he came back to Ephesus, or that he had never gone away. The plan of the collection was St. Paul's own (Gal. ii. 10). He doubtless had all the details at his fingers' ends, but others would need instruction. We may take it, therefore, that Titus went to Corinth from Ephesus. And he would need to spend a longer time in Corinth than had been allowed to St. Paul, and no doubt would have wished to do more than he was actually able to accomplish. That he had only succeeded in making a beginning would seem to imply that St. Paul sent further orders cutting short his activities.

The mission of Timothy and Erastus to Macedonia in Acts xix. 22 is clearly to be identified with the mission of Timothy mentioned in Phil. ii. 19 and 1 Cor. iv. 17;[1] but after Timothy

[1] See W. Michaelis, *J.T.S.* xxix., p. 373.

and Erastus had departed, and before St. Paul himself went to Macedonia after the riot, we have to put:

(1) St. Paul's journey to Corinth (and return to Ephesus ?, 2 Cor. xii. 14, xiii. 1).
(2) Titus' journey to Corinth and his beginning the collection (2 Cor. viii. 6).
(3) A letter to recall Titus (?).
(4) Titus rejoining St. Paul.
(5) St. Paul preaching in Illyricum (Rom. xv. 19), which must have taken place some time in the course of this year.
(6) The mission of Titus and "the brother" to Corinth with the "severe" letter (2 Cor. xii. 18).
(7) A period during which St. Paul waited at Ephesus before the riot.

The actual sending of Timothy to Macedonia was subsequent to the writing of the Epistle to the Philippians and the First Epistle to the Corinthians, and as the letter to the Corinthians is a reply, it cannot have been written until after the opening of the sailing season and the voyage of the bearers of the letter from Corinth; so we cannot put the writing of this epistle before the second half of March or the beginning of April.

Between then and St. Paul's voyage to Corinth there was obviously some interval. If he went to Colossæ, as is most probable, he cannot have left Corinth for Ephesus before the latter half of May, and for the double voyage we must allow at least a month, so he could not have got back to Ephesus until June. The ships of that age, except the corn ships which went to Alexandria and the war vessels, had one large square sail, and could not point to any great extent into the wind, so that a third of the compass was closed to them. They made on an average five miles an hour, and fifty miles a day, and anchored at night under the shore. Moreover, they would call at any port on the way where there was a chance of a cargo, and unloading and loading, including stowage of cargo, was a slow process, for though they were provided with a windlass of some kind for getting up the anchor, yet neither they nor the port of call had our modern facilities for quick loading or discharging, and the goods had to be carried along a gang-plank.

These statements can be checked by the records given in the Acts. The voyage from Troas to Neapolis with a favouring

wind took two days (Acts xvi. 11). In the reverse direction, when St. Paul was going to Jerusalem for the last time, the journey from Philippi to Troas took five days, and Philippi was some nine miles distant from Neapolis. Rackham calculates that St. Paul's voyage from Neapolis to Ptolemais took six weeks (*Acts of the Apostles*, pp. 402, 403), and Ramsay that St. Paul left Philippi on April 15 and arrived in Jerusalem on May 28 (*St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 396). We must also allow at least some small interval between St. Paul's return and his despatch of Titus to Corinth, and a longer time for Titus in Corinth than for St. Paul, since he there made a beginning of the collection. Titus cannot, therefore, have come back to Ephesus before the end of June or the beginning of July.

Then we have the second mission of Titus to Corinth with the " severe " letter, and then another interval before the riot. This last interval is postulated by the fact that we have to allow, not only for a direct voyage to Corinth, but for the delivery of the letter there, and for the beginning, at any rate, of Titus' return to Macedonia, since, leaving immediately after the riot, St. Paul hoped to meet him on his return from Corinth at Troas (2 Cor. ii. 13) and this was a longer route for Titus to take than straight across the Ægean.

It is evident that we cannot pack all these events, including the riot, St. Paul's voyage to Troas and Neapolis, his tour through Macedonia, and his subsequent voyage to Corinth, into the sailing season of a single year.

We might shorten the time by supposing that St. Paul took with him not only Apollos but also Titus, and dropped Titus at some point between Ephesus and Corinth, and wrote to him from Corinth instructing him to rejoin him. This would obviously save the return voyage of St. Paul to Ephesus, and the voyage, or part of it, of Titus from Ephesus to Corinth, and is, I think, what actually happened. If so, then on leaving Corinth St. Paul must have gone to some place west and probably north of it, so that Titus, in order to rejoin him from some point between Ephesus and Corinth, would have to pass through Corinth. In that case St. Paul would make his way back to Ephesus by way of Macedonia. And this is apparently what he actually did, for St. Luke remarks that in the riot the mob seized " Gaius and Aristarchus, men of Macedonia, Paul's companions in travel "

(Acts xix. 29), which can only mean that St. Paul had picked them up in Macedonia and travelled with them to Ephesus.

It may seem a bold thing to suggest that between Acts xix. 21 and 23 St. Luke has omitted a year, but nevertheless that is what he appears to have done. And this suggestion is established by the language of St. Paul, for in the same year in which the riot took place he wrote the "joyful" letter in which he refers to the work of Titus, who had initiated the collection at Corinth, as occurring in the previous year (2 Cor. viii. 10, ix. 2, *ἀπὸ πέρυσι*). Though by Greek reckoning a year with some months at either end might be spoken of as three years, and a year with some months at one end as two years, if the broken period was more than half a year (*cf.* Acts xviii. 11, where the period being only a year and a half is so called), yet this will not here avail. For, in the first place, *ἀπὸ πέρυσι* is not a definite time-period, but a period not longer than a year before a definite event which divided it from the current year, and in the second, this letter was written about midsummer and at a time earlier in *the same sailing season*, which could not be more than two or three months before, could not be twice called by St. Paul "last year." This expression must therefore be taken as decisive, and the visits of St. Paul and Titus to Corinth took place not in the same year as the riot and St. Paul's visit to Macedonia, but in the year previous.

But as soon as we recognize that St. Paul, after leaving Corinth at the end of the summer, went somewhere for the winter and in the spring proceeded eastward through Macedonia, while Titus, after leaving some island in the southern Ægean, went to Corinth on his way to join him, and met him at some point, not in Macedonia itself, for Corinth would not have been on his route, but north of Corinth and west of Macedonia—that is, in Epirus or thereabouts—we clear up another difficulty; for writing in the autumn of the following year, 56, to the Romans (Rom. xv. 19) St. Paul says that he had fully preached the gospel from Jerusalem and in a circle (*κύκλῳ*) unto Illyricum, and that he had no longer any place in those regions (23), but was going to Jerusalem (25), and thereafter would pass through Rome to Spain (28). Some time, therefore, after leaving Corinth, St. Paul went to Illyricum and thence to Macedonia; and if we ask whereabouts in Illyricum, the obvious answer is to the western end of the Via Egnatia—that is, to Aulona or Dyrrachium. Aulona and Dyrrachium were on

the regular route between Macedonia and Rome, and St. Paul, when he left Corinth, was contemplating going to Rome after paying a farewell visit to Jerusalem; so, if from Jerusalem he went to Neapolis and Philippi—that is, if he returned by the same route which he took on the outward journey—he would pass in the reverse direction from Macedonia into Illyricum, and thus St. Paul would seem to be making a strategic preparation for his contemplated subsequent movements. Once more, St. Paul, when he was in prison, sent a message to Titus, who was presumably at his home in Philippi, asking him to go to Dalmatia, apparently in order to meet him (2 Tim. iv. 10), and this will again mean Aulona or Dyrrachium, for both places were in a territory which could be described either as Illyricum or as Dalmatia, the names, though geographically distinguishable, being politically equivalent (Tac., *Ann.* ii. 53).[1] Finally, if St. Paul, and subsequently Titus, went from Corinth to Aulona or Dyrrachium, they would be covering the same route, for the greater portion of its distance, as that by which Aquila and Prisca had gone from Rome to Corinth when they were expelled by Claudius, and just at this time St. Paul was under special obligations to them, as they had risked their lives for him in Ephesus. If a traveller were going from Rome to Macedonia he would journey by road to Brundisium, and thence across the Adriatic to Aulona or Dyrrachium; but if he were going to Corinth he would go by road further south to Hydruntum, cross to Corcyra, and thence, keeping south by the eastern shore of the Adriatic, he would turn east by the Gulf of Corinth. Of course the ship would call at all the ports on the way to pick up or discharge cargo, and of these ports the most important was Nicopolis, which was the chief town of Epirus and possessed a double harbour. Aquila and Prisca were Jews, and as such had the right of entry into the synagogue (Acts xviii. 26); they were also zealous Christians who on account of their faith had been expelled from Rome, where they possessed a dwelling in which a Christian community was wont to meet (Rom. xvi. 5), and they were well instructed. Hence it is extremely probable that if the ship stopped, as it doubtless would, at Nicopolis, they would land

[1] Germanicus entered on his consulship at Nicopolis, a city of Achaia, whither he had arrived by the coast of Illyricum, after seeing his brother Drusus, who was then in Dalmatia.

there, as St. Paul did at Troas (Acts xx. 6, 7), Miletus (17), and Tyre (xxi. 4), and would use their opportunities for evangelistic work (2 Cor. ii. 12, 13). So, knowing that St. Paul was now going to Corinth and would make his way back to Ephesus through Macedonia, they may well have asked him to visit the Christian community at Nicopolis; the ships taken by St. Paul and Titus respectively would be no less bound to call at Nicopolis than was the ship in which they had made their own voyage. Hence St. Paul and Titus may have met at Nicopolis before ever either of them went to Aulona or Dyrrachium, and if St. Paul wrote to Titus from Corinth he may have told him to rejoin him at Nicopolis. St. Paul was suffering under the strain consequent on the bad treatment which he had received at Corinth; Nicopolis had an admirable winter climate, being sheltered by the mountains of Epirus from the northerly and easterly winds; it was, moreover, an important port where a Christian Church was very possibly already in existence; and, lastly, it lay on the route by which St. Paul would be returning if, after leaving Jerusalem, he decided to go to Rome by way of Corinth instead of through Macedonia. It would therefore occasion us no surprise if he elected to winter there, and wrote to Titus to that effect.

That St. Luke has omitted a year is, I think, proved by the language of St. Paul in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians. This is confirmed by the impossibility of fitting the number of events to which his other epistles testify into the space of time allowed by St. Luke's narrative, and incidentally by the hint given by St. Luke himself in mentioning that St. Paul had with him at the time of the riot two men, his companions in travel, who were Macedonians. The way in which this omitted interval is to be fitted in I have shown in my introductory scheme.

And the reason for the omission is clear. The Acts is in large measure an apologia in defence of St. Paul in the form of an historical pamphlet, written, apparently, not only in order to instruct Theophilus in the early history of the Christian Church, but also to enlist his support and influence with the authorities in Rome. St. Luke has accordingly suppressed all the scourgings in the Jewish synagogues, but inserted a detailed account of the occasion when St. Paul's Jewish opponents were worsted before the tribunal of Gallio; he has suppressed two imprisonments and beatings with rods, where power was in the hands of the Romans,

but given a full account of the occasion when the local authorities in a Roman colony, no doubt themselves possessed of the full rights of Roman citizenship, had come to the prison and humiliated themselves before St. Paul and Silvanus for their misbehaviour towards them; and at Jerusalem he has made evident the superior status of St. Paul as a citizen born to that of Claudius Lysias, who commanded the troops there, and has let us see how shocked the latter was to discover that he had ordered and all but carried out the beating of a Roman citizen; and by the size of the escort to Cæsarea he has emphasized St. Paul's importance. Similarly, it is only from his epistles that we gather how unremitting was Jewish opposition within the Church to St. Paul and his gospel of the equality of all converts, Jewish and Gentile alike, in Christ, while St. Luke only tells us of the occasion when St. Paul won a seeming victory at Antioch and in the Council at Jerusalem. In short, while St. Luke is a painstaking and accurate historian so far as his sources permit in all that he asserts, he is by no means impartial.

But in relation to the events of this particular year he had a still stronger motive for omission, for St. Paul had been imprisoned, beaten, and condemned to be given over to the beasts by the Roman proconsul Silanus; irregularly set at liberty by Celer and Helius, who had murdered Silanus at the command of Nero's mother, Agrippina; and at the time when St. Luke was writing his account, St. Paul's appeal at Cæsarea had been made to this same Nero; and it is noticeable that though St. Luke mentions Tiberius (Luke iii. 1) and Claudius (Acts xi. 28, xviii. 2) by name, he never names Nero (Acts xxv. 8, 10, 11, 12, 21, xxvi. 32, xxvii. 24, xxviii. 19, "Cæsar"; xxv. 21, 25, "the Augustus"). It was in consequence of this imprisonment and release that St. Paul was forced to leave Asia Minor, and could not return until Celer and Helius had been superseded by the new proconsul in the midsummer of 56, nor indeed until he was assured of the new proconsul's policy and firmness.

The Epistle to Titus

If, now, we take the Epistle to Titus, we find that St. Paul and Apollos are in Corinth, having come there by way of Crete, and having started, therefore, from some port to the east of

Crete, which we may conjecture with great probability to be Ephesus, the more certainly as the activities of Apollos, when we hear of him, seem to be limited to Ephesus and Corinth. With St. Paul in Corinth are Tychicus the Ephesian and another, Artemas (Artemidorus), whom from his name we should think to have been an Ephesian also. St. Paul tells Titus that on leaving Corinth he will be going to the north-west and will winter at Nicopolis. It is probable that as St. Paul and Apollos left Asia in the early summer, and apparently spent only a short time in Crete, telling Titus to supply what they had omitted to accomplish because they were anxious to get on to Corinth, this letter was written in the late summer or early autumn. St. Paul would doubtless have wished to remain longer in Corinth and organize the collection there, a thing which he had been doing in Ephesus and its neighbourhood, and, in consequence of this journey to Corinth, had sent Erastus with Timothy to do in Macedonia; but because of the bad reception which he and Apollos had met with, they were both compelled to leave earlier than they had wished or anticipated. Apollos would naturally make his way back to Ephesus, and Titus is bidden not to detain him, as he might well have wished to do in order to keep so valuable a helper, being himself single-handed, but to forward him on his journey (*cf.* Acts xv. 3, Rom. xv. 24), and to ask the Christians in Crete to contribute towards his expenses (Titus iii. 13, 14; *cf.* Acts xx. 34, Rom. xii. 13). St. Paul himself is going by way of the Corinthian Gulf and the eastern coast of the Adriatic to Nicopolis, where he intends to winter. Meanwhile Titus is to remain in Crete until he is relieved by Tychicus, if he can be persuaded to take over, or by Artemas, and then to make his way to Nicopolis before the winter. In order to get to Nicopolis Titus would naturally take the route followed by St. Paul and Apollos, and go by way of Corinth. When he arrives in Corinth he finds that he has still time to spare before it is necessary for him to leave for Nicopolis, so he starts to organize the collection in Corinth which St. Paul has been unable to do. In this he would probably be helped by Erastus, who had done the same thing in Macedonia, for, as Erastus left Ephesus at about the same time as St. Paul and his companions, he would naturally return to Corinth before winter, and probably while Titus was still there. But in consequence of St. Paul's command to go to Nicopolis,

Titus is unable to do more than to make a beginning. Before winter he joins St. Paul at Nicopolis, and in the following spring they go together by ship to the western end of the Via Egnatia, Aulona or to Dyrrachium, and make their way through Macedonia to Philippi, where St. Paul could best get news of events in Ephesus.

It looks as though St. Luke had written a narrative of the events of this critical year, had cut it out as damaging to the interests which he had at heart, and then endeavoured to stitch together the edges of the section on either side by the verses Acts xix. 21-23. And in the absence of St. Paul's epistles, which were unknown at the time to Theophilus and to the civil authorities in Rome, he must have been perfectly successful, as the only hint that he has allowed to stand is the statement that at the time of the riot St. Paul had two companions in travel who were Macedonians.

Fortunately, by using the knowledge afforded by St. Paul's letters, we are able to define the edges of the missing piece in the jig-saw puzzle of St. Paul's itinerary. This we have now done, and we perceive that there is yet another of St. Paul's letters by the use of which we can fill the blank. I leave mathematicians to calculate the chances against this coincidence if the Epistle to Titus were written at any other date or in any other circumstances.

I regard the case as very nearly proved by the mere fact that the Epistle to Titus fits so exactly into this position, but for the sake of forestalling contrary arguments I shall endeavour to meet certain questions which might be raised.

And first, why should St. Paul go from Ephesus to Corinth by way of Crete? The answer is that probably there was at the time no better way of getting there. The First Epistle to the Corinthians was written before the Passover of 55, which this year fell about April 2. St. Paul, after writing it, went to Colossæ and other places in the neighbourhood. While there a message reached him from Ephesus about the Church in Corinth which decided him to alter his plans and go to Corinth earlier than he had proposed and omit his journey to Macedonia; so he sent a brief note to his host at Corinth by Tychicus. Tychicus might leave Corinth at the end of April, or more probably in the beginning of May. St. Paul would not arrive in Ephesus till the second half of May, and would very probably find no ship sailing direct to Corinth. He was obliged to leave Ephesus in

a hurry, and what he wanted was a ship engaged in the trans-Ægean traffic; neither ships going north to Macedonia nor south to Miletus and beyond were any use. But ships on this route would only voyage when there was a good chance of trade or of the pilgrim traffic. Those going from Corinth and Athens to Asia Minor and Syria, which would take the Italian pilgrims, as well as those from Achaia and the ships from the northern Ægean ports, would have swept the islands of the Cyclades of trade goods bound for the East, and the same ships on their return would have picked up the cargoes that had accumulated during the winter and were bound for the West. The next fleets, if one may so term them, would be making the voyage some seven weeks later, and these voyages would for the time being occupy all the shipping employed in these waters. If, then, St. Paul wanted to go to Corinth after the return of the pilgrim ships from Palestine for the Passover—by one of which Tychicus may well have travelled—and before the return of the pilgrim ships leaving Palestine after Pentecost, it is by no means improbable that he would have failed to find a vessel to take him to Corinth by any direct route. On the other hand, Crete lay too far to the south to be visited by pilgrim ships, and the position and size of Cnossus proves that it did considerable trade with Ephesus and southern Asia Minor, as that of Cydonia to the west shows that it did with Corinth and Achaia. If we accept the general historicity of the Epistle to Titus—on which I shall say more hereafter—we must admit as a fact that St. Paul went to Crete and almost certainly from Ephesus, and the only question is in what year and at what time of the year, and the reason why I have given this particular year and time is because it would seem far more probable than any other. This is sufficient to confute any objection from those that hold that St. Paul's visit to Crete is not a fiction but a fact. We have also some small indication that St. Paul landed at Cnossus from his quotation from the " Minos " of Epimenides (Titus i. 12), for Cnossus was the legendary city of Minos. Thanks to the habit of the small vessels of calling at intermediate ports for trade and the slow process of unloading and loading, St. Paul might possibly have made his way to Cydonia on foot and still have picked up the same ship there, or of course he may have waited there until he found some other vessel bound for Corinth. That he was somewhat pressed for time and anxious

to get on to Corinth is indicated by his directions to Titus to carry on the work which he himself had left undone, and particularly to ordain a ministry.

The objections to this scheme are: (1) That the style of the three Pastoral Epistles is so similar that they must have been written approximately at the same time, and as the Second Epistle to Timothy was written while St. Paul was a prisoner at Rome, the others cannot be earlier than A.D. 59.

I shall reserve the style of the Pastoral Epistles for subsequent treatment, but I now anticipate the results of my study by saying that the style is due to a later editor or redactor, and in consequence each of the epistles can, as regards its date, be treated independently of the others.

(2) As regards subject-matter, critics are divided into Paulinists and anti-Paulinists, and the former group into two schools, those who would allow 55 as a possible date, and those who would say that 59 or later is a possible date, but not 55. To the second group I would reply that we do not know enough of the conditions of Christianity in Crete to make this objection tenable, and further, that while there is nothing which would make us incline to the later date rather than the earlier, there are positive indications on the other side. This reply will also meet the objections of those who demand a date not earlier than the second century. Dr. Harrison (*Problem of the Pastoral Epistles*) has endeavoured to prove this lateness of date from the point of view of style and vocabulary. I shall point out in a subsequent chapter that from that point of view this position cannot be maintained, and that in consequence we must fall back on the question of subject-matter only. Against those who wish to relegate the Epistle to Titus to the second century I shall have the support of both groups of Paulinists; but the question is not quite so simple, for even if the Pastoral Epistles are the work of a forger, they may yet be based on a true tradition which the forger has worked up into his composition, and the only evidence which can show that in this or that particular he is drawing on his own imagination is that the situation depicted cannot belong to the time represented; nor is it at all likely that a forger would make St. Paul go to Crete unless this were handed down by tradition.

It is probable that Crete was evangelized quite early. In Acts ii. 11 we read of Cretans being present on the Day of Pente-

cost, and on their return home they would in all likelihood carry the " good news of God " with them; Andronicus and Junias were Christians before the time of St. Paul's conversion (Rom. xvi. 7), and appear to have evangelized Tarsus before St. Paul went there; those who fled from the persecution in which St. Stephen was martyred carried the Gospel wherever they went. It is probable, therefore, that there were already Christians in Crete when St. Paul arrived. But apparently there was no ministry. The appointment of ministers would of course be subsequent to the original evangelization, but considering the geographical position of Crete in relation to Corinth on the one side and to Ephesus on the other, and the intercourse for purposes of trade with each of these cities implied in the size and situation of Cydonia and Cnossus, this would seem to point to an early date, for Corinth possessed a ministry when St. Paul left in 52 and Ephesus certainly before 55, as also did Colossæ. St. Paul, as we gather from his action in Galatia, and from the fact that Philippi had presbyters and deacons, no doubt originally ordained by him, would regard this want of a ministry in Crete as a great defect. It would be natural, therefore, for him to direct Titus in his own enforced absence to supply this deficiency, and this letter is not merely a written instruction, probably repeating much of what St. Paul had already delivered verbally, but a warrant for Titus' action if ever it should be called in question. After the ordination of ministers in Galatia in 48 (Acts xiv. 23) there is no ground for questioning the ordination of Timothy at Lystra in 50, nor of Titus at Philippi in the same year. The only point that is open to dispute is whether presbyter-bishops could ordain in the absence of an Apostle if commissioned by him in a letter, and this St. Paul settles in the affirmative. But we notice in the first place that there is no " monarchical " episcopate, for the bishop (*τὸν ἐπίσκοπον*, Titus i. 7) must obviously be taken generically in accordance with ordinary Greek usage, the article being resumptive. This is shown first by the use of the connecting particle " for," and secondly by the sense of the passage, since it would be pointless to instruct Titus to ordain presbyters and then to describe the necessary qualifications of a man to be admitted to another order of which no mention had been made. No forger who was writing in defence of a monarchical episcopate would rest his case on a statement which might possibly

be regarded as ambiguous, but where the weight of probability is against his desired interpretation.

Though it is a tenable view that in the time of Clement the name for the whole body was " the presbytery," but among its members bishops alone exercised liturgical functions (see Bernand, *Studia Sacra*, pp. 295, 296), yet it cannot be said that even so much of a distinction is implied in the epistle; but rather the two terms seem to be co-extensive. Similarly, in Acts xx. 17 St. Paul summons to Miletus the " presbyters " of the Church; in Acts xx. 28 they are bidden to give heed to themselves and to all the flock in which the Holy Spirit has appointed them " bishops " to " shepherd " (*ποιμαίνειν*) the Church, and in 35 thus " labouring " (*κοπιῶντες*) it is their duty to " help " (*ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι*) the " sick." With this passage we may compare 1 Thess. v. 12: " We beseech you, brethren, to know them that labour (*κοπιῶντας*) among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you," where the single article shows that they formed one group; 1 Pet. v. 2: " The presbyters therefore among you I exhort, who am a fellow presbyter, . . . shepherd the flock of God " (*ποιμάνατε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον τοῦ Θεοῦ*); " Helps, governments " (*ἀντιλήμψεις, κυβερνήσεις*) (1 Cor. xii. 28); " Is any among you sick? (*ἀσθενεῖ τις ἐν ὑμῖν*;) Let him call for the presbyters of the Church " (Jas. v. 14).

Finally, though Titus is bidden to ordain presbyter-bishops, there is no mention of deacons, though there were deacons at Philippi (Phil. i. 1) in the previous year, and a deaconess at Cenchreæ in the year following (Rom. xvi. 1). These features all point to an early date. Nor is there anything on the other side. St. Paul, writing to the Corinthians, thinks that " in the present distress " (1 Cor. vii. 26) it is good for a man to remain as he is, and that a woman is happier if she remains unmarried (40), but says that neither party sins by marrying (28); but he also gives similar advice to slaves (21), and yet says a slave had better obtain his freedom if he can. In this epistle St. Paul is not condemning marriage, but is laying down a general rule for all men, that they should abide in the state which they were in when they were severally called (24), in view of special circumstances (26). He regards marriage as having a high symbolical value (Eph. v. 32); he instances St. Peter as being a married man and the " brethren of the Lord " (1 Cor. ix. 5), and says that he himself would be quite justified in marrying if he thought it expedient so to do,

as he would be quite justified in making his maintenance a charge on the Church. In the Epistle to Titus, however, he is dealing with a special class. He is not ordering presbyter-bishops to marry, but he thinks that a presbyter-bishop had better be chosen from among the already married, since the government of his own personal household is a useful experience for the governing of the Church. It is obvious that no forger could make much of this passage.

Nor does St. Paul deal with specific points of what was afterwards called heresy; the " heretic " of iii. 10 is a factious person. Titus, himself a presbyter-bishop, is to " admonish " him (Rom. xv. 14; Col. i. 28, iii. 16; 1 Thess. v. 12, 14). He is " disorderly " (1 Thess. v. 14; 2 Thess. iii. 6, 11; *cf.* Titus i. 10, iii. 1, 2). Nor are the heresies treated of as being fundamental, as they were at Corinth (1 Cor. xv. 12-17); they are merely said to be " foolish," " unprofitable," " vain " (*μωραί, ἀνωφελεῖς, μάταιοι*). And they are of a Jewish type (iii. 9; *cf.* i. 14). There is no advance on the state of things that existed at Colossæ (Col. ii. 8-19).

It is true that Lightfoot (*Biblical Essays*, p. 414), says " the phase of heresy in the Pastoral Epistles is an advance on that exhibited in the Colossians," but first he puts all the Pastoral Epistles together, whereas I shall hope to show that they were written from different places in different years, and secondly, the Epistle to the Colossians is earlier than any of them, and the two Epistles to Timothy deal with affairs in Ephesus, where heresies might well be expected to show an advance on those prevalent at Colossæ.

I see, therefore, no good ground for assigning this epistle to any other time in the life of St. Paul than when he was at Corinth on this intermediate visit of which St. Luke in the Acts makes no mention.

The Movements of Erastus, Onesiphorus and Timothy

St. Paul conceived the idea of a great collection for the Church at Jerusalem from the churches of his foundation in 49. The Pauline churches would, he perceived, become increasingly gentile, and Jewish converts would in all probability continue to contribute their half-shekels to the Temple even after they

had become Christian; thus the collection was bound to be for the most part a gentile contribution. Of the policy involved in the idea I have written elsewhere. When St. Paul passed through Galatia in 50, the churches there were of too new a foundation and too distracted by Jewish agitators to make it feasible to take practical measures to carry the scheme into effect. St. Paul went up to Jerusalem in 52 without having begun to put the scheme into operation; it would be natural, therefore, for the presbyters there to remind him of their former request; accordingly we find that on going through Galatia on his way from Jerusalem to Ephesus he gives orders for the collection to be started (1 Cor. xvi. 1)—that is, five years after his first visit (Acts xiii. 1).

For a similar reason he would not be able to start the collection in Ephesus until the winter of 53 at the earliest, and probably not before the spring of 54, and he was probably imprisoned shortly after midsummer, when Silanus arrived in his province.

Possibly St. Paul thought that when the half-shekel was being collected from the Jews for transmission to Jerusalem for the Passover it would be a good time to make a beginning, and this may have led to a charge of Temple robbing (Acts xix. 37), coupled with that of proclaiming another emperor than Cæsar (John xix. 12, 15; Acts xiv. 22, xvii. 7, xix. 8, xx. 25). Erastus must have arrived before St. Paul's imprisonment—that is, when he was organizing the collection (obviously St. Paul could have had very little time after his imprisonment)—and St. Luke may indicate this kind of assistance when he says that Timothy and Erastus "were two of them that *ministered* unto him" (Acts xix. 22). While in prison St. Paul wrote the Epistle to the Philippians, in which he says that he hopes to send Timothy to them shortly (Phil. ii. 19, 23), and he trusts later on to come himself (24); there is in this epistle no mention of Erastus. During the same period Onesiphorus arrived (2 Tim. i. 18) and "ministered" to him. Onesiphorus is not mentioned among the numerous people that came from Corinth, and we may conjecture that as St. Paul had passed through Galatia in the summer of 52, Onesiphorus came thence and possibly brought the first instalment of the collection from Galatia, and ὅσα ἐν Ἐφέσῳ διηκόνησεν may mean how large a contribution he had with him when he came to Ephesus. It is, as we have seen, quite in St. Paul's way to speak of the collection as a διακονία.

When he comes out from prison in the spring of 55 he tells the Corinthians that he intends to stay at Ephesus over Pentecost (1 Cor. xvi. 8), and that he is sending Timothy to them (1 Cor. iv. 17, the aorist is epistolary)—*i.e.*, after he has been to Philippi, a journey which he does not here mention; but towards the end of the epistle (1 Cor. xvi. 10) he is more doubtful if Timothy will arrive (because he might be detained in Macedonia). He himself will possibly be in Corinth for the winter (1 Cor. xvi. 6), but he is first going to Macedonia (1 Cor. xvi. 5), as he had told the Philippians. Clearly, if St. Paul was freed from prison in the early spring he might still pay a visit to Colossæ and the neighbourhood (Philem. 22) and be back in Ephesus in time to take ship to Philippi on its return voyage from conveying pilgrims to Palestine.

But, as a matter of fact, St. Paul altered his programme (2 Cor. i. 15-17). I think that he probably went to Colossæ and altered it on account of news of the state of affairs in Corinth received there or in that neighbourhood. He went from Ephesus to Corinth (2 Cor. xii. 14, xiii. 1), and therefore he did not go to Macedonia, as he had told the Philippians that he had intended to do. Also, he sent Erastus to Macedonia (Acts xix. 22). By the autumn of the next year Erastus had become treasurer of the city of Corinth (Rom. xvi. 23). The collection was organized in Macedonia during this year (2 Cor. viii. 1-4). It is, I think, obvious that St. Paul selected Erastus to supply his own place in doing this particular task because he knew his competence, of which he had had proof in Ephesus. But Timothy went with Erastus—that is to say, they both went after St. Paul had made the change in his plans—and we may conjecture they travelled by a pilgrim ship returning from Palestine after Pentecost. Now that St. Paul was going himself to Corinth, there was obviously no reason why Timothy should not remain among friends in Macedonia. Ephesus had become a perilous place; Timothy was quite young, and St. Paul had a very warm affection for him (Phil. ii. 20-22), and he would not therefore expose him to danger unnecessarily when he himself was not nearby. Timothy was in Ephesus when St. Paul was in prison, since his name appears in the opening of the Epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon. But he is not named in the opening of 1 Corinthians, but only Sosthenes, who may have been the bearer of the epistle (Acts

xviii. 17). Timothy had already been to Corinth with St. Paul (Acts xviii. 5), and therefore would doubtless have been named if he had then been in Ephesus. As St. Paul was intending to send him to Philippi (Phil. ii. 19) he would not have sent him to Corinth or Athens or Jerusalem or anywhere very far afield, and he had certainly not yet sent him to Macedonia. So the most probable place for him to go to is Galatia—that is, to Lystra—and we may perhaps conjecture that when St. Paul passed through Lystra, Timothy's home (Acts xvi. 1), in 52 (Acts xviii. 23), Timothy's grandmother Lois and mother Eunice (2 Tim. i. 5), may have asked him to send him to visit them as soon as he could spare him, and Ephesus, as we have said, must then have been a dangerous town for a young companion of St. Paul to stay in. Possibly, also, St. Paul may have wished to thank the Galatians for their contribution, and it would be a gracious act to send a member of his own personal staff to do so. In that case Onesiphorus and the young Timothy may have travelled on the outward journey together, and Timothy could well be back in Ephesus in time to take one of the pilgrim ships to Philippi after Pentecost with Erastus.

CHAPTER V

THE FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY

SYNOPSIS

A.D. 56. The Riot at Ephesus. The Speech of the Town Clerk. St. Paul and Tychicus go to Troas. Aquila and Prisca go to Rome (Rom. xvi. 3). Not finding Titus, St. Paul and Tychicus press on to Philippi (2 Cor. ii. 13). The "joyful" letter sent to Corinth by the hands of Titus, Luke, and Tychicus (2 Cor. viii. 18-23). Luke and Tychicus return and report. St. Paul and Timothy go through Macedonia and instruct the Macedonian delegates to meet at Ephesus in time to arrive at Jerusalem for the Passover, about April 10, A.D. 57. They then go to Corinth, whence St. Paul sends Titus to Rome with the Epistle to the Romans.

In the spring of 57, St. Paul is about to sail for Ephesus with Timothy when a plot of the Jews to kill him is discovered (Acts xx. 3). Accordingly he issues new instructions to the Corinthian delegates to meet him at Miletus in time to arrive at Jerusalem for Pentecost, about May 30. He sends Timothy to Ephesus to tell the Asian delegates to assemble at Troas, and himself goes to Macedonia, giving similar instructions there, and arrives in Philippi. Timothy, having carried out his orders in Ephesus, writes to St. Paul asking to be allowed to rejoin him there, and consulting him on certain difficulties at Ephesus. St. Paul writes in answer the First Epistle to Timothy, telling him to stay in Ephesus. The Macedonian delegates pass ahead of St. Paul to Troas, where they meet Timothy with the Asian delegates (Acts xx. 6). St. Paul awaits the return of Titus at Philippi. Being assured of his welcome at Rome he and St. Luke go to Troas. After staying there over Sunday, the delegates sail to Assos, but St. Paul goes across the peninsula by land, leaving his cloak and books and parchments to be put on board. Unfortunately these are overlooked and remain in the house of Carpus. St. Paul picks up the ship at Assos, and travels with the party to Miletus. From Miletus he sends Timothy to Ephesus to instruct the elders to come to Miletus (Acts xx. 17). Timothy remains at Ephesus. St. Paul's speech at Miletus (Acts xx. 18-35). Trophimus, one of the Asian delegates, falls sick and is left at Miletus to pick up a later vessel (2 Tim. iv. 20). St. Paul and the rest of the party go on to Jerusalem.

THE FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY

AFTER leaving Corinth in 55, St. Paul could not return there until he had made a further effort to retrieve the situation and had received a more favourable report of affairs, and though he was anxious to get back to Ephesus to complete the work there, which, owing to his hurried departure, he had left unfinished (1 Cor. xvi. 9), he was obviously unable to do this as long as Celer and Helius were in power, and had to wait until he received news of the character and policy of the new proconsul, who was to arrive in his province about the midsummer of 56.

The best place to receive trustworthy information on the state of affairs in Ephesus, without himself entering the province of Asia, was obviously Philippi. Thence St. Paul could easily send a messenger to Ephesus, or possibly Lydia might inform him through her business connexions with Thyatira (Acts xvi. 14), where the guild of dyers, who supplied her with their products, would keep themselves acquainted with current political and social events at the headquarters of the provincial governor.

Accordingly, in the spring of 56 St. Paul took ship from Nicopolis to Aulona or Dyrrachium, and pushed on through Macedonia, inspecting the work accomplished by Erastus and Timothy. Titus accompanied him, partly owing to St. Paul's dislike of travelling alone, and partly because at Philippi Titus would be at home and would meet Luke and Timothy. Arrived there, St. Paul sent Titus and " the brother " with the " severe " letter (of which 2 Cor. x-xiii. 10 forms part) to Corinth.[1]

By this itinerary two problems are solved which have puzzled commentators. First, why should Gaius of Derbe (Acts xx. 4) be called a Macedonian? Professor Clark (*Acts of the Apostles*, pp. 374-377) has proved that for " of Derbe " in Acts xx. 4 we should have read " of Doberus," a district of Macedonia in Pæonia. Among the delegates, therefore, we have from Macedonia, Sopater of Berœa, Aristarchus and Secundus of Thessalonica, and Gaius

[1] The identity of " the brother " (2 Cor. xii. 18) I shall discuss when I come to deal with the despatch of the " joyful " letter (2 Cor. i.-ix.).

of Doberus, and probably there was a fifth, representing the Church of Philippi, whose name St. Luke does not give. Of these " men of Macedonia " two were St. Paul's fellow-travellers to Ephesus (Acts xix. 29); it is obvious, therefore, that St. Paul must have passed through Macedonia on his way to Ephesus, probably by the Via Egnatia, the western termini of which are at Aulona and Dyrrachium.

The second question is, why, having sent Titus and " the brother " with the " severe " letter to Corinth, and being torn with anxiety to know how they and it were received (2 Cor. ii. 13), and wanting to get news at the earliest possible moment, St. Paul directed Titus to return by way of Macedonia and Troas instead of taking the shorter route across the Ægean to Ephesus direct.

This difficulty is also now removed. The action of Celer and Helius in quashing the judgement of Silanus and releasing St. Paul was highly irregular, and even they had insisted on his leaving the province of Asia. Hence St. Paul could not be certain whether, if he went back to Ephesus, he might not be at once arrested, beaten, imprisoned, and expelled, even if he were not executed. Accordingly he must tell Titus to enquire at Philippi, the nearest and most convenient port outside the province of Asia, whether he had gone to Ephesus and whether he was still there. If he were compelled to leave hurriedly he would call at Troas on his way back to Philippi; if he were still in Ephesus, Titus would come on thither from Troas, and so in any event Titus and he would be sure to meet. St. Paul probably sent off the " severe " letter from Philippi before he had decided to take the risk of going to Ephesus. Later he doubtless heard that the new proconsul had the situation well in hand, that no anti-Christian Jewish riots were to be looked for, and that the Government were not disposed to take steps against him personally; so he decided to return to Ephesus to see if the opportunities of evangelization which he had recognized as being open to him in the previous year (1 Cor. xvi. 9) still existed, and to complete the work of organizing the collection. Events in Corinth had made it manifest that the Judaistic opponents within the Christian body rested on the exclusiveness and sense of superiority maintained by the rank and file of the Church at Jerusalem (see Knox, *St. Paul and the Church at Jerusalem*, pp. 313-314). Accordingly no efforts were to be spared in organizing the collection. St. Paul had no

doubt that the Church at Jerusalem would be glad enough to be helped in the maintenance of its poorer members, but whether he would succeed in obtaining a more generous and clear-sighted attitude towards the gentile converts, which was his ultimate object, he was by no means certain (Rom. xv. 31).

He accordingly sailed for Ephesus from Nicopolis, picked up Gaius of Doberus and Aristarchus of Thessalonica, and brought them with him to Philippi. In the absence of St. Paul the efficiency and activity of the Church in Ephesus had been somewhat relaxed. The memory of the imprisonment of him and his colleagues had checked any propaganda without; whilst within, the Judaistic party opposed to his doctrine of Gentile equality had raised its head, aided partly by returning pilgrims from Jerusalem, and partly by contact with St. Paul's opponents at Corinth, who had been successful in forcing him to leave that city.[1]

Soon after his arrival St. Paul found it necessary to excommunicate certain leaders, Alexander and others (1 Tim. i. 20), who were tainted by a heresy about the Resurrection. Of these, Alexander seems to have relapsed in resentment into the Judaism from which he had been converted, and to have become one of St. Paul's most bitter opponents. In a short time news of St. Paul's arrival was carried to the surrounding districts, and his scattered friends took fresh courage. Externally the proconsul maintained order, and there was no rioting. Meanwhile the festival of Artemis drew on, and simultaneously the Jews were zealously collecting alms for an offering to the Temple at Jerusalem, partly as a counter-demonstration to St. Paul's activities. Both Jews and heathen found their success interfered with by Christian propaganda. St. Paul was busy completing his arrangements for the great collection for the poor Christians in Jerusalem, and this tended to diminish the amount gathered by the Jewish collectors; " Temple-robbery " had been their name for it, and though St. Paul and his companions had subsequently been released, it had proved a very successful weapon in their hands. The pagans caught up the phrase, and fearing that the usual influx of pilgrims to the shrine of Artemis was likely to be diminished, added that St. Paul's action amounted to nothing less than blasphemy of their goddess. The guild of metal-workers saw that their annual

[1] The similarity of the heresies at Corinth (1 Cor. xv.) and Ephesus (2 Tim. ii. 18) would seem to support this inference.

profits were likely to be lessened—probably their fears would lead them to exaggerate their potential losses—and they were led by those who traded in the most expensive forms of "objects of piety," silver models of the shrine. Influenced by passion and cupidity rather than by any real devotion, they rushed into the theatre and attracted thither an immense crowd, most of them not knowing why they had come together (Acts xix. 32). In preparation for the festival the leading men from other towns, whose official title was Asiarchs, all of them Roman citizens, had come to Ephesus. In contempt of the disorderly mob, and recognizing that St. Paul was a member of their own select aristocratic class, some of them, possibly in secret or open sympathy with his views, sent him warning not to venture himself into the theatre. Demetrius and his confrères, the workmen of like occupation, who had seized Gaius and Aristarchus, could shout themselves hoarse; any form of set oration was rendered impossible by the mob continuously yelling, "Great Artemis of the Ephesians." The Jews took alarm; the assembly was thoroughly out of hand; at any moment there might be an ugly rush from the theatre into the city, and not only the residences of the Christians, but their own houses and shops and warehouses in the Jewish quarter of the city might be set on fire.

To avert this possible calamity they put forward the renegade Alexander, himself a member of the guild of metal-workers, though of a humbler sort, since he was only a coppersmith (2 Tim. iv. 14); but perceiving from his manner of speech that he was a Jew (Acts xix. 34), the crowd redoubled their clamour. When the riotous meeting had almost worn itself out with shouting, the town clerk entered, attended by his staff. His speech is a model of diplomacy. He regarded the Christians, in accordance with the usual popular estimation, as a sect of the Jews, and the Jews as being a somewhat turbulent race subject to the might of Rome, holding strange opinions, no doubt, but protected in their practices by imperial decrees. As for the goddess Artemis, her honour was safe; but for some insignificant minorities her cult was acknowledged throughout the civilized world (Acts xix. 27, 35). The whole matter, in his view, was solely a question of possible loss of trade by certain craftsmen. Her temple was still unrobbed and the priesthood were faithful guardians of its treasures. The Jews were protected by special legislation in making collections at

Ephesus, and if they used their privileges it could not be construed as robbing the temple of its dues or disparagement of the goddess. For the rest, if Demetrius and his collegues had any financial grievance, Ephesus had been enjoying for a long time a succession of admirable proconsuls, and no citizen was debarred from access to the courts. This riotous concourse was unworthy of the dignity and traditions of the city. If the matter was such that it ought to be decided in the assembly, it should have been brought before one of the statutory gatherings. The proconsul was not to be bluffed by such proceedings, and the city was in danger of having its privileged constitution suppressed. Having thus brought the mob to a calmer and more judicial frame of mind, the town clerk formally dismissed the meeting in confidence that they would not resort to further acts of violence.

The economic motive of Demetrius and his fellows is clearly an inadequate explanation. There was also a deep and lasting hostility to St. Paul. As long as he was absent things may have been relatively quiet. He could not have reached Ephesus long before Pentecost, which fell in this year about May 11, since he could not leave Nicopolis before the opening of the sailing season, and then had to make his way through Macedonia; so the outbreak must have taken place fairly soon after his arrival. Behind the pagan agitation would seem to have been Jewish wire-pullers (*cf.* Acts xx. 19), and it was only when the riot seemed likely to turn to acts of violence against themselves that they forced forward Alexander to divert it by an open manifestation of sympathy.

St. Paul must have had some deeper motive than that of flinching from personal danger for complying with the advice given him not to enter the theatre, and for promptly leaving the city. And apparently others left also. Aquila and Prisca made their way to Rome (Rom. xvi. 3), and as, in the absence of Timothy at Philippi, Tychicus, on his return from Corinth, either direct or by the way of Crete (Titus iii. 12), had probably been regarded as St. Paul's vicegerent in Ephesus, he would now be compelled to leave with him.

Further evidence of this critical state of affairs at Ephesus appears later when St. Luke says that on his voyage to Jerusalem, St. Paul touched at Samos (Acts xx. 15), but that he " had decided to sail past Ephesus, that he might not have to spend time in Asia;

for he was hastening, if it were possible for him, to arrive at Jerusalem for the day of Pentecost" (ὅπως μὴ γένηται αὐτῷ χρονοτριβήσαι, Acts xx. 16). This phrase suggests that the delay might be not voluntary but forced, and would occupy a considerable period, for that St. Paul had time to spare is shown by his spending a week in Tyre (Acts xxi. 4) and several days at Cæsarea (xxi. 10).

Taken together these scattered hints indicate a large and serious danger, and St. Paul himself tells the same tale when he says to the Corinthians, in a letter written shortly afterwards, that without were fightings and within were fears (2 Cor. vii. 5). The fulness of the Gospel had been welcomed by the gentile converts (Acts xx. 24, 27), but St. Paul had been unable to raise the Jewish converts to such a recognition of the exceeding abundance of their riches in Christ that they would reckon their prerogatives well lost for His sake. To put it shortly, the Church at Ephesus was still not thoroughly welded into one, and the sense of this failure to effect complete unity was a great burden upon St. Paul's mind. In this state of strain and anxiety he arrived at Troas. Had Titus succeeded in his mission to Corinth or was Achaia still in practical revolt against the Pauline gospel? So overwhelmed was he that, though a fruitful field of labour was open to him there, he felt himself unable to work it (2 Cor. ii. 12-13).

He came to Troas earlier than he had anticipated, and not meeting Titus felt compelled to push on to Philippi, and there he found him with "the brother," bringing the best of news. The anti-Paulinists had gone too far and the majority were shocked (2 Cor. ii. 6). The man who had insulted him had been taken to task; they looked on St. Paul as their spiritual father, and had received Titus with fear and trembling (2 Cor. vii. 15). St. Paul proceeded to write to them in all the gladness of reaction the "joyful" epistle (2 Cor. i.-ix.), and he despatched it by Titus and two other messengers.[1] Both his companions had been chosen by the churches as their representatives (2 Cor. viii. 23), and would appear to be already known to the Corinthians ("our brethren"). Of one it is said that his praise in the Gospel was in all the churches (of Macedonia) and that he had been elected by the churches to be a fellow-traveller with St. Paul in the matter of the collection. This is commonly and probably rightly

[1] Notice the distinction in the terms of the mission: I *exhorted* Titus and he accepted the exhortation (2 Cor. viii. 17); I have *sent* the brethren (18, 22).

taken to be St. Luke, who at the beginning had brought St. Paul into Macedonia. The other (" our brother ") is one of whom St. Paul says that he " has many times proved him earnest in many things, but now more earnest by reason of the great confidence that he hath in you " (22). The phrase suggests that this brother had been with St. Paul in Corinth recently, and would apply admirably to Tychicus, whom St. Paul had sent from Colossæ, and who had awaited St. Paul and Apollos at Corinth and been witness of the trying treatment they had there received. He had been regarded by St. Paul as fit to take charge in Crete in relief of Titus, and on his return to Ephesus had probably acted there as St. Paul's deputy.

Both the " severe " letter and the " joyful " letter were of importance, and the deputation could have no more fitting leader than Titus; but even the subordinates had to be carefully selected. If we look at the list of delegates given in Acts xx. 4, we find Sopater of Berœa, Aristarchus and Secundus of Thessalonica, Gaius of Doberus, all in Macedonia, but there is no delegate named from the Church at Philippi, St. Paul's Macedonian head-quarters, which had often sent contributions to him at Thessalonica, Corinth, and Ephesus to relieve his need. But we do know that when St. Paul left Philippi on his journey to Jerusalem he was accompanied by Luke. We need hardly hesitate, therefore, to regard Luke as the delegate from Philippi, and as this letter was written from there he was probably one of Titus' companions. The other would not appear to be Timothy, for his name is added at the end of the list with no mention of the district of which he was the representative. It would, moreover, be fitting that of the two delegates one should come from Macedonia and the other from Asia. But if Luke accompanied Titus on this later occasion he was probably also his companion in taking the severe letter. " The brother " is his introduction to the Corinthians, and must mean more than that he was a Christian, a fact that the Corinthians could have taken for granted. St. Paul does not call him " our brother," as being both known to them and a member of the personal staff, and the only translation that would bring out his force of the article would seem to be " his brother."[1]

[1] " The brother," meaning " his brother," is quite natural Greek. We appear to have the same ellipse in Rom. xvi. 23, " Erastus, the treasurer of the city, and Quartus his brother," where " *the* brother," meaning " the Christian,"

St. Paul instructed Titus to await his arrival at Corinth, and meanwhile he himself took charge at Philippi. On the return of Luke and Tychicus the former was told to remain at Philippi until the following spring, and then to make his way with the other Macedonian delegates so as to be at Ephesus, where St. Paul would join them, in time to reach Jerusalem for the Passover of 57. Tychicus carried similar instructions to the Asian delegates at Ephesus. St. Paul and Timothy then passed through Macedonia, giving the Macedonian delegates the same directions as he had given to Tychicus.

So St. Paul and Timothy go on to Corinth and St. Paul's mind is now made up. He himself will go to Jerusalem and see if, with hearts softened by gratitude for the collection, he can obtain from the Church there full consent to gentile equality with Jewish Christians. That will be the climax and close of his work around the Ægean. Then he will go to Rome and, if the Church at Rome will assist him, press on into Spain.

Accordingly in the late summer or early autumn he wrote the Epistle to the Romans (obviously not in the winter, or he would be unable to send it until the following spring, and he purposed to go there after leaving Jerusalem). The epistle is intended to be as conciliatory as it is possible to make it. The Roman Church was the foundation of someone else, and St. Paul had felt that his mission was to be a pioneer (Rom. xv. 20). His reputation had preceded him, and was that of a dominating personality. St. Paul tries his hardest to show that the fears of the Roman Church are ungrounded. He does not intend to settle there, but merely to pay a passing visit before going on to the West. He plays alternately the part of the Apostle to the Gentiles and of an Hebrew of the Hebrews. He has many friends, and appeals to all whom he can remember, and some whom he only knows

---

would be equally pointless. Moreover, when we consider how closely Titus and Luke are connected both with each other and with Philippi, this translation receives strong incidental corroboration. The division of our Second Epistle to the Corinthians into two parts is necessitated not merely by the difference in tone and subject-matter, but also by the simple fact that the earlier letter was sent by two messengers, Titus and "the brother," and the later by three messengers, Titus and two others, and after the laudatory commendation of all three in 2 Cor. viii. 18-23, St. Paul could not have referred to them as two with the entire omission of the third in 2 Cor. xii. 18. Hence, apart from St. Paul's first visit when Titus was with him, Titus was sent to Corinth three times in all.

by name or by the fact of having common acquaintances, endeavouring to enlist their good offices on his behalf. But much must depend on the messenger whom he selects; an ill-chosen representative might more than counteract any effort of his own by letter, and the choice was limited by the necessity of the return of the messenger with the reply. Whom shall he send who will command their respect and can conciliate differences? Judging by past experience, is there anyone to whom St. Paul would more readily entrust so delicate a mission than to Titus, Titus who was already known to many of St. Paul's friends in Rome, notably to Aquila and Prisca, and who had succeeded so admirably at Corinth? We may take it, therefore, that the Epistle to the Romans was despatched by the same messenger as had taken the severe letter and the joyful letter to Corinth.

Titus was instructed to come back by way of the Via Egnatia to Philippi in the early spring,[1] so that St. Paul might receive the reply of the Roman Church as soon after leaving Jerusalem as possible.

St. Paul and Timothy remained in Corinth for the winter as he had outlined in his earlier plan (1 Cor. xvi. 6). In the spring of 57 they set off to go to Ephesus, but a plot being discovered to murder St. Paul on board the ship (Acts xx. 3) he sent Timothy to Ephesus to cancel the arrangements made with the delegates there and to tell them to assemble at Troas in time to reach Jerusalem seven weeks later, for Pentecost. He formed a quick resolution (ἐγένετο γνώμης, Acts xx. 3) to return himself through Macedonia, and give similar instructions to the Macedonian delegates. When he arrived at Philippi, or soon after, he received a letter from Timothy asking for instructions about certain matters in Ephesus, and requesting to be allowed to join him. St. Paul's answer is the First Epistle to Timothy; "as I exhorted thee to tarry at Ephesus" implies a previous request to be allowed to leave. The "when I was going into Macedonia" of 1 Tim. i. 3 is the "he determined to return through Macedonia" of Acts xx. 3; the "hoping to come unto thee shortly" of 1 Tim. iii. 14 refers to the possibility of the early arrival of Titus at Philippi from Rome, in which case St. Paul might have left a message for the Macedonian delegates at Neapolis or Troas and have met the Asians and Timothy at Ephesus, or somewhere in the neighbourhood, say at Samos or

[1] The Via Appia from Rome to Brundisium would be open in the winter months.

Miletus, from which latter place he sent a message to the Ephesian elders. Titus, however, did not arrive much before Easter, so St. Paul stayed at Philippi until " after the days of unleavened bread " (Acts xx. 6), and let the Macedonian delegates, other than Luke, pass ahead of him to Troas, and so found them awaiting him when he arrived there (Acts xx. 5).

I shall show in discussing the style of the three Pastoral Epistles that there is nothing in the wording which may not belong to the apostolic period, though they have been edited from the notes made by St. Paul's amanuensis, and as regards this epistle possibly by St. Luke. If, therefore, the matter is Pauline, it is obvious that we had better place the epistle within the period covered by the Acts, rather than to suppose that after his first imprisonment at Rome St. Paul went East when he had told the Roman Christians that he had no more place in the lands bordering on the Ægean; that his mission in those latitudes was completed (Rom. xv. 19, 23), and that he intended to go West, to Spain (28). Moreover, the allusion to Timothy's youth (1 Tim. iv. 12) is very like what St. Paul says to the Philippians two years before (Phil. ii. 22), and would be far more suitable in 57 than in 62. The somewhat disjointed list of topics is probably due to the fact that St. Paul is following the haphazard order of Timothy's questions, written as they occurred to him; we can trace a similar background in the οἴδαμεν, οἴδατε, εἰδότες of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. It would be perfectly natural for Timothy, finding himself in a position of responsibility at Ephesus, where St. Paul had many adversaries (1 Cor. xvi. 9), who would at one time show a feigned deference to him as being the mouthpiece of St. Paul and at another take advantage of his youth and inexperience to force him into some ill-advised step for which they would hold St. Paul responsible, to ask for advice and for relief from the burden of his office. The " lay hands hastily on no man, neither be partaker of other men's sins " in 1 Tim. v. 22 probably means " do not yield to pressure in reconciling too soon those whom I have excommunicated. If you do you will be thought to condone the offences they have committed."[1] There must have been a considerable staff of presbyter-bishops at Ephesus, and St. Paul was himself expecting to come there after leaving Jerusalem, so there was no need for Timothy to hold ordinations.

[1] See Hort, *Christian Ecclesia*, pp. 214, 215.

When Titus arrived at Philippi before St. Paul left, he told him that the Roman Christians would be only too glad to welcome him (*cf.* Acts xxviii. 15), and St. Paul was the more assured that in abandoning his work round the Ægean and going to Rome he was following the divine guidance, and so was able to speak to the elders at Miletus in a tone of complete conviction (Acts xx. 25). Pushing on to Troas, therefore, in company with St. Luke, he arrived in time to keep with the delegates the first Sunday after Easter, and after the service which began on Saturday evening and lasted beyond midnight, St. Paul on the following morning set out to make his way by land to Assos, a distance of some twenty miles, where he could pick up the ship before she sailed after anchoring for the night. Naturally on such a journey he did not want to be burdened with his winter cloak, or books, or parchments, so he left them in charge of Timothy, who had brought the Asian delegates. Unfortunately Timothy failed to put them on board, so they remained in the house of Carpus.

After rejoining the ship, St. Paul sailed in her as far as Patara, going direct from Samos to Miletus instead of touching at Ephesus, and from Miletus he sent Timothy to fetch the elders of the Church of Ephesus, instructing him to help the church there while the usual ministers would be absent, and to remain as his deputy until he himself returned from Jerusalem or sent him a relief (2 Tim. iv. 12).

If we leave out of account the resemblance in diction of the First Epistle to Timothy to the Second, there was never any real difficulty in fitting it into the life of St. Paul as given in the Acts, when once we remember that St. Paul went to Macedonia from *Corinth* (Acts xx. 3) on his way to Jerusalem as well as from Ephesus after the riot.

Nor, again, is there any reason why, if we grant the general historicity of the subject-matter—whether the epistle is to be regarded as genuine or as the work of a second-century forger based on an authentic tradition of St. Paul's movements—it should not have been written (or adapted to the situation) as easily in 57 as in 62 or 63. The one thing that is clear is that St. Paul is a free man and cannot have left Ephesus more than a year before.

I have already examined the argument that the heresies dealt with in the Pastoral Epistles are of a more developed type than those alluded to in the Epistle to the Colossians. If we date

the latter as written at the end of 54 or the beginning of 55, and this as written in 57, and if we remember that Colossæ was a church of more recent foundation than that of Ephesus, and the city smaller and more remote from the main current of public life, it is clear that even if this hypothesis be granted—and we know too little of both to be confident—it in no way decides the date.

Lightfoot's other arguments in his *Biblical Essays* are concerned with the moral state of the ministers and with ecclesiastical organization. On p. 408 he says: "The tone of these injunctions (concerning the ministry) is inconsistent with the very first stage of the Church before carelessness and insincerity had grown with the growth of its numbers." This idyllic condition probably persisted for only a very short time anywhere, and in the churches of mixed races for a shorter period than where the congregation was wholly of Jewish origin. At Corinth, at any rate, there were grave scandals which the local ministry had apparently not only taken no adequate steps to punish (1 Cor. v. 1, 2), but had not even reported to St. Paul, so that he had to learn of it from Chloe's household; and at Ephesus St. Paul is convinced that after he is removed not only would grievous wolves enter in from outside, but even some of the very ministers he is addressing will revolt and speak perverse things (Acts xx. 29, 30). So Lightfoot's argument that the ministry at Ephesus was immaculate in 57 but spotted six years later would seem to be founded on pious imagination rather than on evidence.

Nor can it be argued that Phœbe was a unique exception at Cenchreæ, whereas in this epistle "the deaconesses are a recognized class of officials." There is nothing whatever to show that Phœbe did not belong to a recognized class, nor can it be taken for granted that γυναῖκας in iii. 11, standing as it does between a list of the qualifications for male deacons and the injunction "let the deacons be the husbands of one wife" (γυναικός), refers to deaconesses and not to the wives of deacons. Lightfoot continues: "The diaconate of women, however, would not create any serious difficulty. It is more important to observe that 'the widows' also are spoken of as a separate class specially appointed (καταλεγέσθω) with functions of their own, and spoken of in such a way as to show that the institution had been working for some time." All that is actually said in this epistle is that widows

who are to receive the alms of the church are to have the reputation of being given to good works before their names are entered on a list (*κατάλογος*). It is difficult to believe that no such list was kept at Jerusalem in the year 35, where we read of " their widows " (*αἱ χῆραι αὐτῶν—i.e.*, of the Hellenists, Acts vi. 1), while but little later we read of " all the widows " at Joppa (Acts ix. 39) and find them engaged on a pious work. There is no suggestion in any case that they formed an " order," if by that is meant that they were admitted by any ecclesiastical ceremony, but only that their names were entered on a list, and in 57 the institution had been working for some twenty years or more.

Then he says as a third objection, " We find here and there in the Pastoral Epistles traces of a liturgical form, snatches of hymns . . .," but he has omitted to notice that the hymns both in this epistle (iii. 16) and in the Second Epistle to Timothy (ii. 11-13) are apparently Greek translations of Aramaic hymns,[1] possibly composed by St. Paul himself, or perhaps already in use in the Church of Jerusalem when St. Paul visited it in 52; indeed, the second of these, which would seem to be an exhortation to constancy up to the point of martyrdom, may go back as early as the year 35, in which we place the martyrdom of St. Stephen, and others also (Acts xxvi. 10), and, as Lightfoot notes, there is a parallel to these hymns in the Epistle to the Ephesians (v. 14).

Another objection has sometimes been raised on the ground of the strong assertion of St. Paul's apostleship (1 Tim. ii. 7). It is said that in writing to Timothy this would be entirely unnecessary and is, therefore, evidence of forgery. This objection takes too narrow a view, and omits to notice the circumstances in which the epistle was written and part of St. Paul's motive in writing it. St. Paul had recently been at Corinth, where his authority had been impugned, and it would be natural for him to repeat language which he had then been forced to employ, and though the epistle is a private instruction, it is also intended to be available for Timothy's use if he at any time needed apostolic warrant for his actions.

I conclude that, apart from the similarity of its language to that of the Second Epistle, there is no reason why this First Epistle to Timothy should not have been written to him at Ephesus by St. Paul at Philippi before the Passover of 57 A.D.

[1] See the retranslation on p. 134.

CHAPTER VI

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES

SYNOPSIS

THE problem of the Pastoral Epistles. Their style and vocabulary non-Pauline, but not later than the Pauline age. The matter Pauline. Quotations and references. The solution of the difficulty. St. Paul's letters taken down in abbreviated long-hand, with omission of particles and terminations, and the notes collected in Rome soon after his death, and filled out and edited there by a single reviser.

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES

THE problem of the Pastoral Epistles arises from two difficulties. The first is the fact, which is unquestionable, that though they bear St. Paul's name they differ markedly from all his other epistles both in vocabulary (meaning for the most part substantives, adjectives, and verbs) and in style (*i.e.*, in the construction of sentences and in the use of particles, prepositions, and some adverbs). The second, which is more doubtful, is this, that certain parts of their content, notably those which concern heresies and ecclesiastical arrangements, are supposed to postulate a later date.

One other fact must be mentioned before we pass on, namely, that the three epistles are so much alike that they must be the work of one man—St. Paul himself; his amanuensis, who would be responsible, not for the content, but for the form in which it is expressed; a later editor working on Pauline material and possibly adding words or phrases of his own; or a forger using the other epistles of St. Paul, any tradition with which he may have been acquainted, earlier documents, and his own imagination—in which case these epistles would have no higher status than the so-called " Didache," or " Teaching of the Apostles."

From external testimony it is clear that these epistles cannot be later than the middle of the second century. They are quoted as the work of St. Paul by Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Irenæus, and the author of the Muratorian Fragment, and there are marked similarities of language in the Epistle from the Churches of Vienne and Lyons, Heracleon (quoted by Clement), Theophilus of Antioch, Athenagoras of Athens, Hegesippus of Palestine, and Justin Martyr. Tertullian (*adv. Marc.* v. 21) says that Marcion rejected all three, but as the date of the formation of his *Apostolicon* is uncertain, this statement need not carry us any earlier.

Dr. Harrison (*Problem of the Pastoral Epistles*) endeavours to show that the vocabulary is not contemporaneous with St. Paul, but belongs to the age of the Apologists. I shall try to prove

(1) that there are no words employed which might not well have been in use in St. Paul's time, and in this I shall draw on an anonymous article published in the *Church Quarterly Review* of January, 1907; and (2) more generally, that Dr. Harrison has here set himself an impossible task.

It is obvious that any word found elsewhere in the New Testament, whether in St. Paul's admitted epistles or not, might have been employed by him and so need not enter into our discussion.

As regards the words peculiar to these epistles, I shall take the list given in the Appendix to Grimm-Thayer's *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. This list includes also a few phrases, and gives a total of 197 items. From it certain deductions must be made. Ἀδιαφθορία and ἀφθορία, παραδιατριβή and διαπαρατριβή, παρακαταθήκη and παραθήκη are alternatives, and one or other of each pair must be excluded.[1] Another four items are due to the inclusion of words read in an inferior text, but not by the Revisers, or Westcott and Hort; αἰχμαλωτεύειν does not now occur in 2 Tim. iii. 6 (it does in Eph. iv. 8, from the LXX); nor κοσμίως in 1 Tim. ii. 9; nor οἰκοδομία in 1 Tim. i. 4; while μητρόπολις appears only in the subscription to 1 Timothy. Five other items go out as occurring elsewhere in the New Testament: ἀγαθοεργεῖν (Acts xiv. 17);[2] βασιλεὺς τῶν αἰώνων (Rev. xv. 3; *cf.* Tobit xiii. 6); κατηγορία (John xviii. 29); μελετᾶν (Acts iv. 25, from the LXX); στεφανοῦν (Heb. ii. 7, 9, from the LXX).

This reduces our list to 185, ten more than Dr. Harrison enumerates (*op. cit.*, p. 20).

From this list we must deduct any word read in the LXX, including καταστροφή (2 Tim. ii. 14), either on this ground or because it is read by the Revisers in 2 Pet. ii. 6, though not by Westcott and Hort, as obviously available for any Christian writer in the Apostolic period. These amount to 73 words, and to these we must add 10 others, closely similar to words found in the LXX:

ἀνεξίκακος (2 Tim. ii. 24).
ἀντίθεσις (1 Tim. vi. 20).
αὐθεντεῖν (1 Tim. ii. 12).
ἀνεξικακία (Wisd. ii. 19).
ἀντίθετος (Job xxxii. 3).
αὐθέντης (Wisd. xii. 6).
αὐθεντία (3 Macc. ii. 29).

[1] The Revisers and Westcott and Hort read ἀφθορία (Titus ii. 7); διαπαρατριβή (1 Tim. vi. 5); παραθήκη (1 Tim. vi. 20; 2 Tim. i. 12, 14).

[2] So Westcott and Hort; the Revisers read ἀγαθοποιεῖν, as in Mark iii. 4.

γενεαλογία (1 Tim. i. 4; Titus iii. 9).	γενεαλογεῖν (1 Chron. v. 1).
γοής (2 Tim. iii. 13).	γοητεία (2 Macc. xii. 24).
καυτηριάζειν (1 Tim. iv. 2).	καυτήριον (4 Macc. xv. 22).
πάροινος (1 Tim. iii. 3; Titus i. 7).	παροινεῖν (Isa. xli. 12).
πρόκριμα (1 Tim. v. 21).	προκρίνειν (Wisd. vii. 8).
πρόσκλισις (1 Tim. v. 21).	προσκλίνειν (2 Macc. xiv. 24).
ψευδολόγος (1 Tim. iv. 2).	ψευδολογεῖν (Dan. xi. 27).

This reduces the number to 101. But of these 30 are quite classical: *ἀθλεῖν, αἰσχροκερδής, ἄμαχος, ἀμοιβή, ἀνδραποδιστής, ἀνεπίληπτος, ἀνήμερος, ἀπόβλητος, ἄρτιος, διαβεβαιοῦσθαι, διάβολος* (adj.), *ἔλαττον* (adv.), *ἐνδύνειν* (intrans.), *ἐντρέφεσθαι, ἐπιπλήσσειν, ἐπιστομίζειν, καταλέγεσθαι, κόσμιος, μετάληψις, μητραλῴας, μονοῦν, νηφάλιος, πατραλῴας, πλέγμα, σκέπασμα, σωτήριος, σωφρονίζειν, τυφοῦν, ψεοδώνυμος, ὠφέλιμος.*

Aristotle enables us to exclude eight more: *ἀνανήφειν, κνήθειν, κοινωνικός, πλήκτης, τεκνογονία, τεκνοτροφεῖν, φίλαυτος, φιλόθεος.* Polybius gives five: *ἀδηλότης, ἀποδοχή* (frequent in Diodorus Siculus), *ἀπρόσιτος, ῥητῶς, φιλήδονος.* Strabo relieves us of *γραώδης.* The list now stands at 57.

Then we come to non-Christian authors contemporary with the Apostolic age. Philo gives us eight words more: *ἀνάλυσις* = death (*in Flacc.*, § 23), *ἀντιδιατίθεσθαι*; *cf.* Diodorus, xxxiv., exc. 602, *τὸ καθ' ἓν αὐτὸν ἀντιδιατιθέναι*, to retaliate for each injury; *ἄσπονδος διδακτικός, περιπείρειν* (also Diodorus), *πραϋπάθεια, στυγητός, σωφρονισμός* (also Josephus and Strabo). And Josephus two: *ἀνεπαίσχυντος* and *περίστασθαι.* There now remain 47.

Further, words allied by composition or derivation with others in the New Testament must be allowed to be contemporary with it:

αἱρετικός (Titus iii. 10).	αἵρεσις (1 Cor. xi. 19).
ἀπόδεκτος (1 Tim. ii. 3, v. 4).	ἀποδέχεσθαι (Luke and Acts).
αὐτοκατάκριτος (Titus iii. 11).	κατακρίνειν (1 Cor. xi. 32). κατάκρισις (2 Cor. iii. 9, vii. 3).
ἀφιλάγαθος (2 Tim. iii. 3).	φιλάγαθος (Wisd. vii. 22).
διώκτης (1 Tim. i. 13).	διώκειν (Rom. xii. 14, etc.).
ἑδραίωμα (1 Tim. iii. 15).	ἑδραῖος (1 Cor. vii. 37, xv. 58; Col. i. 23).
ἐκζήτησις (1 Tim. i. 4).	ζήτησις (Acts xv. 2, xxv. 20).

ἐπισωρεύειν (2 Tim. iv. 3).	σωρεύειν ἐπί (Rom. xii. 20; *cf.* LXX, Judg. xv. 11; Prov. xxv. 22).
Ἰουδαϊκός (Titus i. 14).	Ἰουδαϊκῶς (Gal. ii. 14).
καταστρηνιᾶν (1 Tim. v. 11).	στρηνιᾶν (Rev. xviii. 7, 9).
συγκακοπαθεῖν (2 Tim. i. 8, ii. 3).	κακοπαθεῖν (Jas. v. 13, LXX, Jonah iv. 10).
ὑπερπλεονάζειν (1 Tim. i. 14).	πλεονάζειν (2 Thess. i. 3, etc.).
φρεναπάτης (Titus i. 10).	φρεναπατᾶν (Gal. vi. 3).

and similarly in classical authors:

τεκνογονεῖν (1 Tim. v. 14).	τεκνογονία (Aristot., *H.A.*, VII. i. 18).
ὑποτύπωσις (1 Tim. i. 16), (2 Tim. iii. 13), "pattern"; Strabo, common in Aristotle, "to sketch."	ὑποτυποῦν,

There is nothing remarkable in these formations. Compounds with *αὐτο-* are frequent in classical times, and many of them have the same form as *αὐτοκατάκριτος—e.g.*, *αὐτεπάγγελτος*, *αὐτοδίδακτος*, *αὐτοκέλευστος*, *αὐτόκλητος*, etc. *Διώκτης* is a perfectly natural formation; *διωκτέος* is in Herodotus and Plato; *διωκτός* is in Sophocles and Aristophanes. Plato has *ἑδραῖοι βάσεις*, which is not far removed from *ἑδραίωμα*. Ἐκζητεῖν is in Luke xi. 50; 1 Pet. i. 10; and *ἐκζητήτης* in LXX, Bar. iii. 23. Ὑπερπλεονάζειν is quite in the Pauline style; *cf.* *ὑπερνικᾶν*, *ὑπερτυγχάνειν*, *ὑπερφρονεῖν*, and in Rom. v. 21, *ὑπερεπερίσσευσεν ἡ χάρις*.

Our list has now come down to 32.

Certain other words might have originated in any period of controversy: *ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν* (*cf.* *ἑτερογνωμοσύνη*, Josephus, *Antt.*, X. xi. 7; *ἑτεροδόξειν*, Plat., *Theæt.*, 190 E; *ἑτεροδοξία*, 193 D), *καλοδιδάσκαλος*, *κενοφωνία*, *λογομαχεῖν*, *λογομαχία*, *ματαιολογία*, *ματαιολόγος* (*ματαιολογία* and *ματαιοπονία* are both in Strabo; Telestes has *ματαιολογεῖν*, *ματαιόφρων*, 3 Macc. vi. 11). This reduces our list to 25.

Others may be ascribed to the particular subject-matter: *ἐπιδιορθοῦν*, *ξενοδοχεῖν*, *ἰκοδεσποτεῖν*, *οἰκουργός*, *φίλανδρος* (*cf.* *φιλότεκνος*, Herodotus, Euripides, Aristotle, Plutarch, *Mor.*, 769 C, has *φιλότεκνοι καὶ φίλανδροι*), *μεμβράνα*, *στόμαχος* (Hippocrates, Cicero, Horace), *φαιλόνης*. The pænula was in use in Rome in

the time of Cicero, and was commonly used for travelling, and the Greek form might well be employed wherever there was a colony which prided itself on its Roman status yet spoke Greek—*e.g.*, at Philippi. Ξενοδοκεῖν is in Herodotus and Euripides and Strabo; ξενοδόκος in Homer; οἰκίας δεσπότης is in Plato; οἴκου δεσπότης in Xenophon; οἰκοδεσποτικός in Cicero, *ad Att.*, XII. xliv. 2.

Our list now contains 17 words or phrases:

Ἀδιαφθορία (Titus ii. 7, marg.) is formed from the perfectly classical ἀδιάφθορος; or if anyone prefers the reading ἀφθορία, we can point to the existence of φθορά in a moral sense in 2 Pet. i. 4. Ἀντίλυτρον is a rare word, but might well have existed in the Apostolic age; it is to be compared with ἀντάλλαγμα (LXX, Job xxviii. 15; Mark viii. 37), ἀνταπόδομα (Rom. xi. 9), ἀνταπόδοσις (Col. iii. 24); the simple word λύτρον is used in Mark x. 45, and λύτρωσις in Luke i. 68, ii. 38; Heb. ix. 12. Γάγγραινα is used by Plutarch (*fl.* A.D. 80), Lucilius, and Varro, and might have formed part of the vocabulary of St. Luke or of any other physician in St. Paul's time.

Γυναικάριον occurs in Diocles, and is formed on the analogy of ἀνδράριον, which is used by Aristophanes, *Ach.* 517. Διάβολος, as an adjective, occurs in Menander, and in the superlative in Aristophanes, *Eq.* 45. Διαπαρατριβή (1 Tim. vi. 5) or παραδιατριβή, "useless disputation," is apparently a coined word, but not necessarily post-apostolic, for διαπαρατηρεῖσθαι occurs in the LXX, 2 Sam. iii. 30, and διαπαροξύνειν in Josephus, *Antt.*, X. vii. 5. Δίλογος (1 Tim. iii. 8), meaning "double-tongued," "shifty," may be another coinage; διλογεῖν διλογία in earlier Greek meant "to repeat," "repetition," but the meaning in the Pastorals is by many analogies perfectly legitimate.

Ἐκλεκτοὶ ἄγγελοι is a phrase which probably belongs to the Jewish angelology (*cf.* Josephus, *B.J.*, II. xvi. 4). Εὐμετάδοτος is used by Vettius Valens and by Marcus Aurelius, and probably belongs to the terminology of Stoicism. Θεόπνευστος might be used by anyone who believed in the inspiration of Scripture. Ἱερὰ γράμματα is used by Philo and Josephus. Ἡ καλὴ ὁμολογία (1 Tim. vi. 12, 13) is a new phrase, but ὁμολογία is used in much the same sense in 2 Cor. ix. 13; Heb. iii. 1, iv. 14, x. 23. Ἡ μακαρία ἐλπίς (Titus ii. 13) is to be compared with Gal. v. 5, where ἔλπις has a similar objective sense. Μεμβράνα, the manu-

facture of parchment, would seem to have been greatly developed under Eumenes II., King of Pergamum (from which it takes its name περγαμηνή), 197-158 B.C. Troas and Assos were the nearest points to Pergamum reached by St. Paul. The connexion is too subtle to be the work of a forger. Πιστὸς ὁ λόγος (1 Tim. i. 15, iv. 9; 2 Tim. ii. 11; Titus i. 8) need not necessarily be ecclesiastical at all; it might be a local or personal term of speech, "this is a sound or trustworthy remark or statement"; some light may be thrown on it by τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδαχὴν πιστοῦ λόγου of Titus i. 9 (*cf.* Acts ii. 42 and Rev. xxi. 5, xxii. 6). Οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι πιστοὶ καὶ ἀληθινοί; (1 Cor. i. 9, x. 13; 2 Cor. i. 18; 1 Thess. v. 24; 2 Thess. iii. 3) suggest that it may be a Pauline formula. Προφήτης, as applied by a Christian to a heathen poet, is possibly used ironically, but is not necessarily post-apostolic. Στρατολογεῖν is used by Plutarch. Σώζειν εἰς occurs in 4 Macc. xv. 3, τὴν εὐσέβειαν . . . τὴν σώζουσαν εἰς αἰώνιον ζωήν, and is a sort of pregnant construction that need not cause surprise (*cf.* Heb. vii. 25).

There are a considerable number of medical or semi-medical expressions in these epistles: "cauterized" (1 Tim. iv. 2); "diseased," used metaphorically (1 Tim. vi. 4); "a gangrene" (2 Tim. ii. 17); "having itching ears" (2 Tim. iv. 3). Νομὴν ἕξει, "will have pasture," of the spreading of a disease (*cf.* Polyb., I. lxxxi. 6); ἡ ὑγιαίνουσα διδασκαλία, ὑγιαίνοντες λόγοι, λόγος ὑγιής, ὑγιαίνειν τῇ πίστει (1 Tim. i. 10; 2 Tim. i. 18, iv. 3; Titus i. 9, ii. 1, 2, ii. 8). None of these expressions need point to a later date, but conceivably they might be due to the influence of St. Luke.

Lastly, the inclusion of ἔλεος between χάρις and εἰρήνη (1 Tim. i. 2; 2 Tim. i. 1) is not likely to have been made by anyone wishing to pass off his own work as that of St. Paul. Titus i. 4 has χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη only; 2 John 3 has all three words; Jude 2, ἔλεος ὑμῖν καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθείη; Wisd. iii. 9, χάρις καὶ ἔλεος τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς αὐτοῦ.

We have now considered the whole of the vocabulary, and we pass on to certain words and phrases which might be overpressed to show signs of a late date.

Αἱρετικός (Titus iii. 10). Of course there were heresies in the Apostolic age; the Epistle to the Corinthians makes that clear; but the word itself does not in this context necessarily, or even probably, mean "heretical," but merely "factious." In

Gal. v. 20 the list runs: ἔχθραι, ἔρεις, ζῆλοι, θυμοί, ἐριθεῖαι, διχοστασίαι, αἱρέσεις, φθόνοι. To give admonition was the duty of the pastors (1 Thess. v. 12, 14; 2 Thess. iii. 15) and even of the laymen (Rom. xv. 14; Col. iii. 16), and the αἵρεσις might be on a point of discipline quite as easily as of doctrine (see p. 92 above). Ὑπὲρ βασιλέων (1 Tim. ii. 2): Holtzmann, following Baur, refers this to the time of the Antonines, when there were two Emperors. But the exhortation is quite general, as the context shows, and may be compared with Acts ix. 15, and might include people like Agrippa. If it meant "the emperors" it would require the article.

Γενεαλογίαι (1 Tim. i. 4; Titus iii. 9). Of course the Gnostics had "genealogies," but in spite of their inclusion of the Æon Christus, the conception was pagan and mythical in idea, and would be denounced and scoffed at by orthodox Jews and Christians. Irenæus shows us how it would be dealt with. But the genealogies in the Pastorals appear to be connected with Judaism (*cf.* 1 Tim. i. 7; 2 Tim. ii, 23; Titus i. 14, iii. 9, which would seem to have reference to much the same kind of teaching); and what the author of these epistles says is not that these things are pestilential heresies, but that they are mischievous trivialities which Timothy and Titus should avoid.[1] If the term "genealogies" is the catch-word of a philosophical school taken over by St. Paul (*cf.* "pleroma," Col. i. 19, ii. 9), the expression of logical relationships in terms of historic succession is as old as Plato's *Republic* and as modern as Hegel's *Philosophy of History*.

The ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως need not have reference to Marcion's book of *Oppositions* of the Old and New Testament, but are to be compared with Luke xi. 52; Rom. ii. 20. There are traces of Gnostic vocabulary in Colossians, and there is no reason to suppose that Jewish Gnosticism could not have begun as early as the latter half of the first century A.D.

The question of the ministry has been already dealt with in connexion with the Epistle to Titus, see p. 90 above.

[1] "The duty laid on Timothy and Titus is not to refute deadly errors, but to keep themselves clear, and to warn others to keep themselves clear, of *trivialities* which took the place of true religion. He condemned such teaching as 'trashy and unwholesome stuff'" (quoted by Dr. Chase, *Credibility of the Acts*, p. 269, from Dr. Hort). See also Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, pp. 133-138; and F. H. Colson, *J.T.S.*, xix., pp. 265-271.

Once more, the slight reference to persecution seems to point to an early date. The persecution under Nero marks a dividing line; up to that time the Roman Government regarded Christianity as a special form of Judaism; Nero drew a distinction between Jews and Christians. Hitherto a Christian might, of course, suffer as a subject of the empire guilty of a specific offence, but not as a Christian. Charges against Christians were charges of inciting revolution, and, in fact, were due for the most part to Jewish hostility, but from the time of Nero the Christian fell under the *crimen læsæ Romanæ religionis*, from which the Jews were expressly exempted; he would be regarded as introducing a *superstitio nova*, which would be taken to imply crimes, as did the earlier Bacchanalian Conspiracy (Livy, xxxix. 18); and he could be punished by any magistrate who had the right of *coercitio* on the ground of majestas, magic, or, in Rome, of incendiarism. And the action taken by Nero set a precedent wherever a provincial governor might wish to take proceedings.[1] On the other hand the references to persecution in these epistles (1 Tim. vi. 1; 2 Tim. ii. 9, iii. 11, 12, iv. 16-18; Titus ii. 3) show that while Christians might be individually guilty of offences against the laws of the State, they are not regarded as criminals solely because they were known to be Christians. The Neronian persecution and the Fall of Jerusalem seem to be still in the future.

Returning to questions of vocabulary, we have seen that it forms no certain guide to the date of composition, writing, editing, or forging, but it may give us help as regards the place. Here, I think, we may pronounce with some confidence that (*a*) there are traces of the influence of Latin; St. Paul uses διό in eight of his ten epistles and 27 times in all, but διό does not occur in the Pastorals, and in place of it we have δι' ἣν αἰτίαν (2 Tim. i. 6, 12; Titus i. 13), *quam ob causam*; so we have χάριν ἔχειν, *gratias habere*, in contrast to εὐχαριστεῖν used by St. Paul 10 times in this sense; ὃν τρόπον, which is not used in any of the acknowledged epistles of St. Paul, *quo modo* or *quem ad modum*; and (*b*) negatively we notice the absence of the article in phrases which occur often in the other epistles—*e.g.*, ὁ μὲν . . . ὁ δέ; with nominative in place of vocative 25 times in other epistles; the article with a numeral about a

[1] See B. W. Henderson, *Life of Nero*, pp. 446-449.

dozen times; τὸ with infinitive nearly 90 times; τοῦ with infinitive 21 times; the article with an adverb ἄχρι τοῦ, etc., some couple of dozen times, or with a whole sentence 7 times (*cf.* καθὼς παρελάβετε παρ' ἡμῖν τὸ πῶς δεῖ ὑμᾶς περιπατεῖν, 1 Thess. iv. 1, with ἵνα εἰδῇς πῶς δεῖ ἀναστρέφεσθαι, 1 Tim. iii. 15). (*c*) There is a greater similarity between these epistles and the Epistle to the Romans than any other; (*d*) also between these epistles and the Epistle of Clement.[1]

Dr. Harrison's contention that on the grounds of vocabulary these epistles belong to the second century would seem to have broken down under examination, but it was always difficult to maintain; almost any word may have been in use before its appearance in literature, especially when a vast proportion of that literature has perished and what survives is little more than a very incomplete set of samples. The exception to this rule is when a new person or thing appears from which a word is derived. "Christian" cannot be earlier than the time of "Christ"; "omnibus," "radio," "Stoicism" have a date written on the face of them. But there is nothing of this kind in the peculiar vocabulary of the Pastoral Epistles; they contain some 300 words not to be found in the acknowledged writings of St. Paul, and of those, 90 per cent. can be shown by quotations to occur before A.D. 60; the odds are that the remaining 10 per cent. were available to a writer in the Apostolic age, and might have been used by St. Paul.

But it is quite another matter to say that being thus available St. Paul would have used them. We have sufficient specimens of St. Paul's writing to be able to form a fairly clear conception both of his vocabulary and of his style, and in style these epistles are remarkably un-Pauline. We have already drawn attention to the absence of certain Pauline usages of the article, and have connected this phenomenon with the fact that no article exists in Latin, but St. Paul employs in the other ten epistles 112 small words of common use, or, including repetition, 932 words at an average rate of 8·9 to the page, none of which appear in the Pastorals.

Some of these we may say he had no occasion to use—ἕκαστος, for instance, appears 42 times, distributed over nine epistles; ὁ αὐτός the same number of times in six epistles; but while

[1] *Cf.* Harrison, *op. cit.*, pp. 177, 178. Marcion made his *Apostolicon* in Rome.

οὔτε appears 35 times, οὐχί 18, οὐκέτι 15, οὐ μή 6, none of these occur in the Pastorals.

And there are other notable absences (the figure after the word denotes its number of appearances in the other Epistles): εἴτε 63, καθάπερ 16, παρά with acc. 14, ἄχρι 14, πάλιν 28, τε 25, ὥσπερ 14, ἄν 25, ὑπέρ with acc. 11, ἆρα 27, γε 13, ἔτι 16, τότε 14, ὥστε 39, διό 27 σύν 38.

I have given only brief extracts from Dr. Harrison's remarks and table (*op. cit.*, pp. 34-43). The whole section should be read and pondered, and the reader must so familiarize himself with the Pauline writings that the differences, which no statistics can do more than indicate, may be felt. In this connexion Professor Clark's words (*Acts of the Apostles*, p. 395) are very apposite: "Vocabulary varies with subject-matter. Too much importance should not be attached to ἅπαξ λεγόμενα. . . . The most valuable evidence is that furnished by the use of particles, prepositions, conjunctions, and other small parts of speech . . . and in the choice between synonyms."

As regards *hapax legomena*, if we reckon thirty-one lines to the page and compare the Pastoral Epistles with the *practical* portions of the accepted letters of St. Paul, omitting repetitions, we get the following table:

1 Thess. v. 12-17	7·5 to the page.
2 Tim.	9·0 ,,
Rom. xii. 6-16	9·1 ,,
Titus	10·0 ,,
Eph. vi. 10-20	10·3 ,,
1 Tim.	10·5 ,,
Phil. iv. 8-20	11·1 ,,

In the last example we have (*a*) an unusual metaphor, ἀνεθάλετε (*cf.* 2 Tim. i. 6, ἀναζωπυρεῖν); (*b*) a doxology similar to 2 Tim. iv. 18; (*c*) a double greeting like 2 Tim. iv. 18-21; (*d*) ἐνδυναμοῦντί με (*cf.* 1 Tim. i. 12). In Eph. vi. we have the doublet προσευχή and δέησις (*cf.* Phil. iv. 6; 1 Tim. ii. 1, v. 5).

In 1 Thess. v. we have 17 imperatives in 15 lines; in 1 Tim. iv. 11-16, 8 imperatives in 10 lines; the same requirement regarding οἱ κοπιῶντες as in 1 Tim. v. 17; ἵνα ἐντραπῇ only here and in Titus ii. 8; περιεργαζόμενοι (*cf.* περίεργοι, 1 Tim. v. 13); and the order to be a τύπος (*cf.* 1 Tim. iv. 12).

In 2 Thess. iii. 6 we have the same warning against disorderly brethren as in 2 Tim. iii. 5.[1] Professor Clark's first remarks would therefore seem to be justified.

As regards synonyms, the absence of *σύν* is supplied in the Pastorals by *μετά*, which occurs 18 times. *Ἧσσον* does not occur, but its place is taken by *ἔλαττον*. We have already mentioned the substitution of *χάριν ἔχειν* for the usual *εὐχαριστεῖν*, and of *δι' ἣν αἰτίαν* for *διό*. Out of Dr. Harrison's list (*op. cit.*, pp. 28-30) we notice that the Pastoral Epistles use *ἐπιφάνεια* 5 times for the second coming of our Lord, which elsewhere occurs in the New Testament only in 2 Thess. ii. 8, *τῇ ἐπιφανείᾳ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ*, whereas St. Paul's regular word is *παρουσία* 7 times and *ἀποκάλυψις* twice, neither of which occurs in the Pastoral Epistles.

But if, abandoning for the moment the Pauline authorship, we think that these epistles were edited or forged at Rome, then it is unlikely that, with other Pauline epistles and the Roman works of other authors to refer to, the editor or forger would resort to writings from Antioch or elsewhere. But in that case the writings of Polycarp and Ignatius, the Epistle to Diognetus, and the so-called Epistle of Barnabas, cease to be sources of language and become repositories of quotations. And if that be so, then the Pastoral Epistles must have been edited or forged before the close of the first century.[2] And, finally, we have now no reason for reckoning Clement and the Roman group as sources of language, and parallels in them become quotations also, which is exactly the effect produced on the mind by looking at these writings. And having got so far we can drop the hypothesis of forgery altogether.

This hypothesis was never very probable. There are too many topical, local, and literary allusions. In spite of the fact that *μάμμη* (2 Tim. i. 5), meaning a grandmother, is first to be found in 4 Macc. xvi. 9 and Plutarch, the mention of Eunice and Lois would appear to be genuine enough, and *μάμμη* may have been Timothy's own way of addressing his grandmother.

Or take " When I was going to Macedonia " (1 Tim. i. 3); the natural inference from Acts xix. 21, 22 would be that St. Paul

[1] See F. R. M. Hitchcock, *J.T.S.*, xxx., p. 277.

[2] On the date of the Epistle of Barnabas see A. L. Williams, *J.T.S.*, xxxiv., p. 344.

remained at Ephesus and sent Timothy into Macedonia; of course if St. Paul went into Macedonia from Corinth (Acts xx. 3) and sent Timothy to Ephesus to notify to the delegates his change of plan, the passage is explained. But such an allusion is not likely to have occurred to a forger.

Similarly, " these things I write unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly, but if I tarry . . ." (1 Tim. iii. 14). It is not the least likely that a forger would invent a passage which appears so pointless, but if St. Paul went to Philippi (Acts xx. 6) after having sent his epistle to the Romans from Corinth in the previous autumn, he might easily have hoped for the return of his messenger with news of the likelihood or unlikelihood of St. Paul's receiving a favourable reception in Rome before the following Passover, but even so have been compelled to wait for his arrival at Philippi until the days of unleavened bread were over, and so let the delegates from Berœa, Thessalonica and Doberus (Acts xx. 4) precede him to Troas.

Then the hymn in 1 Tim. iii. 16 can be shown to be a translation into Greek from the Aramaic, consisting in the original of three couplets of ten syllables each, the conclusion, which is incomplete, being easily restored by the addition of some such a phrase as " Faithful is He." And the other hymn, in 2 Tim. ii. 11-13, which was known to Polycarp and Clement of Rome, similarly falls back into Aramaic poetry, though of different metres.[1] Neither of these is marked as Pauline by Dr. Harrison, but it is obvious that St. Paul, whose home language was Aramaic, is much more likely to have been acquainted with the primitive verses, even if he did not himself compose them, than any forger living in Rome at a later date. And of course the last chapter of the Second Epistle to Timothy must be genuine, at least from verse 9 onwards.

So, no doubt, is the allusion to Crete in connexion with Titus. What is there to lead a forger to connect St. Paul, Titus, Artemas, Tychicus, and Apollos with Crete except the possible suggestion in Rom. xv. 19-23 that St. Paul had preached the Gospel in regions around the Ægean Sea (*κύκλῳ*).

And it is impossible to imagine that a forger would write

[1] By the courtesy of Dr. W. Emery Barnes I am enabled to print a transliteration of what is probably the Aramaic original of these hymns in an Appendix to this chapter. In 1 Tim. iv. 16 we should probably read *ὁμολογοῦμεν ὡς* (two words), with the Greek of Codex Bezæ and a Syriac fragment (see *Studia Syriaca*, No. IV.), so the words following would be part of a liturgical formula.

epistles of this character. They are not like the so-called "Epistle to the Laodiceans," a mere *cento* of excerpts from genuine writings; they have not the romance of the *Story of Paul and Thecla*, for writing which the author was degraded from the priesthood; they have not the doctrinal significance of the Epistles to the Romans, Philippians, or Ephesians; no one would attempt to gather St. Paul's doctrine of faith from Titus iii. 4-8 or 2 Tim. i. 9, 10, though it is undoubtedly there; no one wanting to find support for a monarchical episcopate would be content to rest it on τὸν ἐπίσκοπον in Titus i. 7. And when we have taken out the passages which have a genuine Pauline ring, or those certified by quotation in other writers, especially Clement of Rome, the remainder is not worth the while of any forger to construct.

So Dr. Harrison's first contention, that these epistles, though they contain Pauline fragments, belong to the second century, may be said to have broken down. They belong to the time anterior to the First Epistle of Clement, and are at least substantially Pauline.

But in style they are very different from the accepted epistles of St. Paul, with which they must in the main be contemporary—that is, with any of his epistles later than Galatians and Thessalonians. And this difference is not to be accounted for by a change of amanuensis. The three epistles are so much alike that they must owe their form to a single man, and as they were probably not all written at the same time, and very possibly not in the same place, either this amanuensis must have taken extraordinary liberties with St. Paul's actual utterances, or, *per impossibile*, we have here the only specimens of St. Paul's true style, and the character of the other epistles is due to his varying secretaries, which no one would be prepared to maintain. On the other hand, it is not at all probable that St. Paul altered his style to the extent which these epistles manifest. We are, therefore, thrown back on the hypothesis that what we possess is a large amount of Pauline matter worked over in Rome by a later editor, possibly soon after St. Paul's death.

Before considering this theory in detail, let us try to picture to ourselves what was probably the actual process by which St. Paul's epistles were written.

Professor Deissmann (*Biblical Studies*, chapter i.) divides the correspondence of the Apostolic age into two classes—real letters,

to which he includes all the epistles of St. Paul except the Pastorals (p. 43), and epistles, that is treatises which adopt the epistolatory form as a literary device, and it is to this latter class that he thinks that the Pastoral Epistles belong. But the matter is not so simple. All St. Paul's writings are true letters in the sense that they spring from the heart of the writer, rise out of the situation in which he conceives his readers to be placed, and are unaffected by any thought of publication to a larger circle of readers; but they express general principles of life and conduct, religion and ethics, applicable to a far wider public than the persons immediately addressed. And they are for the most part written to churches and not to individuals. Nor are any of them, even the most intimate like the Epistle to Philemon, devoid of a certain literary formality which appears especially in their beginnings and endings, as it does in the letters of Cicero and in the papyri. But even the main body of the letter is by no means always an extemporaneous effusion; enclosed in it are passages of obviously studied composition. In parts St. Paul would appear to have thought out his letter beforehand, and to have made notes of headings, leading ideas, and catchwords, which guide his paragraphs and give the impression of a considered scheme. All this is natural enough to a man who is constantly delivering sermons, speeches and addresses on kindred themes, and it is by no means unlikely that St. Paul would preserve notes or memoranda which he would have by him when he started to write a letter, and might even, in the course of composition, have reproduced them as alternative beginnings and endings of subjects or paragraphs. So we may expect to find organic passages incorporated like fossils into a less organized deposit.[1] Such fossils would be represented by the hymns in Eph. v. 14, 1 Tim. iii. 16, 2 Tim. ii. 11-13, and other items of a similar character.[2] By the exercise of a little ingenuity we might, no doubt, take out conventional phrases, personal messages, stereotyped forms, recurrent expressions, but it is quite another matter to intercalate genuine fragments into the effusion of someone else so as to give an impression that the whole is the work of St. Paul. For the Pastoral Epistles are not mosaics but organisms, and it is this close-meshed weaving of personal notes, of personal sympathy, with more or less formal

[1] See Robson, *J.T.S.*, xviii., pp. 288-301.
[2] See Burney, *J.T.S.*, xxvii., pp. 160-177, on Col. i. 15-18.

and ecclesiastical exhortation which is the strong evidence of their genuineness.[1] St. Paul was on the one side a visionary and a mystic, but he was also a strong sacramentalist and a writer of ethical precepts. It is useless in the face of his action in ordaining elders "in every city" to assert that because he dilates on justification by faith he therefore took little or no interest in ecclesiastical organization. He writes of God's providence as if he were a strong predestinarian, and turns at once to insist on individual and social responsibility. The characteristic notes of St. Paul are at once his singleness of purpose and his versatility of mind. When we set the Pastoral Epistles over against those of other New Testament writers, in spite of a certain strangeness of diction and phraseology, their Pauline character stands out. The hand is the hand of an editor, or a redactor, but the voice is the voice of Paul and of no other. They would, of course, be dictated, and though in St. Paul's time, as in that of Cicero, there were shorthand writers, yet ability to write genuine shorthand, as distinct from abbreviated longhand with occasional interjection of signs, was by no means common. It demanded a prolonged apprenticeship, and shorthand writers were a professional class, mostly slaves owned by men who got their living by letting out their services, or belonging to the private households of the great and wealthy. We should gather that St. Paul was not a rich man, and that his letters must have been taken down in longhand with abbreviations. But we have the impression that St. Paul was an impulsive speaker, sometimes talking with great rapidity and at others pausing to reflect, and his amanuensis may well have found it impossible, even with this aid, always to keep pace with his principal, and must at intervals have been content to put down the gist of his remarks. There would then have been a first draft with abbreviations and omissions, to be subsequently written out at length.

The letters were written on rolls of papyrus, the price of which varied not only according to quality but also according to length. A long piece of a dozen feet or more would cost far more than a sequence of narrow pieces making up the same total when glued together. We may imagine, therefore, that this first draft was written

[1] "Such a mixture of character could only spring from the intimate friend and leader, whose interest in the work which his two subordinates were doing was at times lost in the personal relation." (Ramsay, *Expositor*, Sixth Series, viii., p. 420.

on a set of small pieces stuck to one another, some of which had possibly been already used and thrown aside, with the original writing possibly only partially washed off. Having made the notes the secretary, if he were wise and had the opportunity, would write out the letters in full as soon afterwards as possible, so that his memory might help him to give an accurate transcription of what had been said. If he was a member of St. Paul's staff or was acquainted with his mind and habitual modes of expression, the result would differ but little from the words that St. Paul had actually used, but before the letter was sent off St. Paul would have to add his own postcript, and the whole would be read over to him for any alteration he might wish to make. And if, as is the case with most of St. Paul's letters, they were to be sent not only in his name, but in the name of some companion or companions also, then the draft would " go into committee." Certain portions of it would no doubt stand, others would be emended, and often a new section or paragraph could be inserted simply by writing on a fresh piece of papyrus and placing it in the room of the one withdrawn. Before the fair copy was despatched it would of course be trimmed and made tidy.

We are not without some evidence that this is what actually took place. The Second Epistle to the Corinthians seems to be made up of three or four sections: one section was despatched by three messengers, Titus and two others (2 Cor. viii. 22); another by two messengers, Titus and one other (2 Cor. xii. 18); 2 Cor. vi. 14 to vii. 1 looks like a fragment of the " previous " letter mentioned in 1 Cor. v. 9; and there is a small section at the end (2 Cor. xiii. 11-14) which may or may not have formed the conclusion of the first section into which the second has been inserted by re-sticking. Again, when St. Paul was dictating the First Epistle to the Corinthians he seems to have forgotten that he baptized the household of Stephanas (1 Cor. i. 16), but when the draft was read over to him he remembered it, or was reminded of it, and in order to be accurate he had " and I baptized also the household of Stephanas; besides, I know not whether I baptized any other " inserted into the letter. So " Erastus abode at Corinth, but Trophimus I left at Miletus sick " (2 Tim. iv. 20) seems a separate fragment written to Timothy obviously from Miletus or from the next stopping place on the journey.

We have, therefore, three stages in the writing of an epistle:

the original notes, the transcript, and the fair copy; but at least in some cases the transcript and the fair copy may have been identical, or identical in large measure, with certain sections of the transcript detached and others substituted in the fair copy. The fair copy was of course sent to its destination. When that was a church and not an individual St. Paul might have kept the transcript himself for reference. In our First Epistle to the Corinthians he refers to what he had said in a previous letter, and it is quite possible that he is depending not solely on his memory, but on the draft which he had with him.

Some of the fair copies have perished—for example, the "previous" Epistle to the Corinthians and the Epistle to the Laodiceans. Copies of the others could have been readily obtained at Rome, where the first collection would appear to have been made, from Corinth, Macedonia, Asia, or any other portion of the empire. If St. Paul kept the transcripts from the notes, they may have been lost in the shipwreck on the way to Rome or at any other time. The original notes would be valueless as soon as the fair copy had been made, and the amanuensis would doubtless have been able to retain them for himself if he wished to do so.

Now suppose that Tertius (Rom. xvi. 22) had taken notes for the Epistle to the Romans at Corinth, and someone, after the fair copy had been sent off, had begged this from him, and subsequently turned up at Rome. The notes would have neither particles, prepositions, nor often pronouns, so that the message "Mr. Smith has carried his coals to Newcastle" would read, "Smith carried coals Newcast"; and ΠΑΥΛΟCΑΠΟCΤΟΛΟCΙΗCΟΥΧΡΙCΤΟΥ would appear as ΠΑΠΙΥΧΥ, or something very like it. This may explain why the Pastorals do not contain ἐμός, ἐμαυτοῦ, σός, or ὑμέτερος. Certain other words might be represented by signs; σύν let us say by +; ἧσσον by − or <; διό by ∴ or ⁘; καθάπερ by : : or : . When a collection of St. Paul's writings was made in Rome the possessor of these notes may have been told to expand them, and he might write μετά for +, ἔλαττον for − or <, δι' ἣν αἰτίαν for ∴ or ⁘, and καθώς for : : or :, which is what we find. And of course some of the writing might be almost illegible, and if an editor in Rome came across ΧΑΡΙ-Ω he might have read it ΧΑΡΙΝ ΕΧΩ instead of ΕΥΧΑΡΙCΤΩ, which St. Paul most probably said. So St. Paul might have said

πιστὸς ὁ λόγος once or twice, but the possessor of the notes may have been struck by some sentence and added an expression of approbation, and the phrase would in consequence occur four times.

It is not the least strange that St. Paul should pour out a list of vituperative epithets (*cf.* Rom. i. 29-31; 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10; Gal. v. 19, 20; Eph. v. 3-5; Col. iii. 5-8); nor are such lists specially Pauline, but rather a commonplace of Jewish literature of the period preceding and contemporary with the New Testament (see Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem*, p. 23, n. 49; and *cf.* 1 Pet. iv. 3; Rev. xxi. 8, xxii. 15). St. Paul might well have learnt to abuse the Gentiles in such terms when he was a student at Jerusalem; but there are a number of such words in the Pastorals beginning with ἀ—, ἀν—, or φιλ—, which have no parallel in the other Pauline writings. If St. Paul were at all excited, his secretary may have had to leave blanks here and there, and have put in the merest indications, and a subsequent editor may have had to fill out the notes as best he could and draw on his own stock, perhaps partly derived from the Greek tragedies or from Seneca. Suetonius (*Nero*, c. xxi) says that Nero played in the Canace Parturiens, Orestes, Œdipus Coloneus, and Hercules Furens, and other dramas, and quotations and catchwords from Greek or Latin tragedy may have been part of the popular parlance in Rome.[1] Nor is there the least difficulty in supposing that the Pastoral Epistles were edited in Rome at so early a date. They were certainly known to Clement; and the veneration of St. Paul may have begun immediately after his martyrdom, and the corpus of his writings have received a similar care to that bestowed on his physical remains. Polycarp writes to the Philippians (c. 13): "The letters of Ignatius which were sent to us by him, and others as many as we have by us, we send to you, as you gave charge." So the collection of the Ignatian Epistles must have been taken in hand almost before his body was cold, and we need not be surprised if the collection of St. Paul's letters was formed equally quickly.

We conclude, therefore, that the Pastoral Epistles do not belong to the second century and are not forgeries, but substantially

[1] Of Dr. Harrison's list of 175 *hapax legomena*, 44 are in the Greek drama (Æsch 20; Soph. 7; Eurip. 7). Æschylus has over 200 words beginning with ἀ (privative), and a couple of dozen words compounded with φιλ.

Pauline, and their pecularities are due neither to St. Paul nor to his secretary or secretaries, but to an editor working over Pauline matter, a process which most probably took place at Rome, certainly before the date of the Epistle of Clement, which Edmundson (*The Church in Rome*, p. 189), following Hefele, assigns to the early months of 70 A.D., though Lightfoot puts it in 95.

THE HYMNS IN THE EPISTLES TO TIMOTHY RETRANSLATED INTO ARAMAIC

1 Tim. iii. 16

dēthgli vavsar — 4 syllables
ὃς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί

wēzdaddak brūḥ
[*καὶ*] *ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι*

wēthḥzi lmalachē
[*καὶ*] *ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις*

wēthkrēz bēth ʻammē — 5 syllables
[*καὶ*] *ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ἔθνεσιν*

wēthhaiman bʻālmā
[*καὶ*] *ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ*

wēstallak bshuvḥā
[*καὶ*] *ἀνελήμφθη ἐν δόξῃ*

2 Tim. ii. 11-13

ēn gēr mīthn ʻammeh — 5 syllables
εἰ γὰρ συναπεθάνομεν

āph ʻammeh nīḥē
καὶ συνζήσομεν — (ammeh = " with him ")

wēn nsaibar āph namlech ʻammeh
εἰ ὑπομένομεν καὶ συμβασιλεύσομεν

ēn dēn nechpūr beh āph hū nechpur ban
εἰ ἀρνησόμεθα κἀκεῖνος ἀρνήσεται ἡμᾶς

wēn lā nhaimen beh[1]
εἰ ἀπιστοῦμεν

hū bhaimānūtheh mkauwe — 7 syllables
(he in his faithfulness abideth)
ἐκεῖνος πιστὸς μένει

dnechpur ger bnaphsheh la meshkaḥ[2]
ἀρνήσασθαι γὰρ ἑαυτὸν οὐ δύναται

[1] beh = " in him."
[2] Seven syllables if you leave out " ger." " ger " and " den " are borrowed from the Greek *γὰρ* and *δέ*.

CHAPTER VII

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY

SYNOPSIS

2 Timothy iv. 20—a fragment of a separate epistle.

i. 16-18 to be treated subsequently.

Date of iv. 13 obvious.

For the rest three hypotheses: (*a*) written from Cæsarea; (*b*) from Rome during the first imprisonment; (*c*) from Rome during the second imprisonment. (*b*) implies an interval of three years between the events mentioned and the writing of the letter. (*c*) almost equally difficult. Everything points to (*a*) except the Onesiphorus passage, i. 16-18. Evidence against "Rome" in the passage. The most probable site historically, and the simplest source of textual corruption, "Antioch" instead of "In Rom(e)."

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY

I HAVE already discussed the style of the Pastoral Epistles and reached the conclusion that although the form is due to the fact that our copies are based on abbreviated notes taken down from dictation, and subsequently worked up in Rome after St. Paul's death by some editor who may have known him only from his correspondence, yet there was nothing in the original notes which was not Pauline, and matter added by the later editor probably amounted to no more than forms of expression and possibly some interjectional remarks, which may have originally stood in the margin and been subsequently incorporated with the text. I shall, therefore, assume that all the historical allusions are due to St. Paul himself, and that in consequence these epistles must belong in substance to the period of about ten years between the year 55 and St. Paul's death.

In the Second Epistle to Timothy the first point that we notice is that it was not composed all at one time, but embodies at least two documents; for in i. 8 St. Paul is a prisoner, while in iv. 20 we read, " Erastus abode in Corinth, but Trophimus I left at Miletus sick."[1]

Timothy, to whom this note was addressed, was presumably at Ephesus; at any rate he was not with St. Paul; he knew what Onesiphorus had done for him at Ephesus (i. 18). Phygelus and Hermogenes (i. 15) and Hymenæus and Philetus (ii. 17) appear to have belonged to Ephesus, and so does Alexander the coppersmith (iv. 14); and Mark (iv. 11) was in Ephesus when we last heard of him (Philem. 24; Col. iv. 10), so we may take this point for granted. Obviously this little note, possibly a detached portion of a longer letter, must have been written when St. Paul was a free man, either at Miletus itself, or very soon after he had left it, at Trogyllium, according to the Bezan text, or at Cos or Rhodes or Patara (Acts xxi. 1). Sir William Ramsay (Hastings, *D.B.* iii. 388*b*) points out that though Miletus and Ephesus

[1] The tenses of both verbs are epistolary, and it would be more in accordance with the English idiom to translate " Erastus has remained (or is staying) at Corinth, and I am leaving (or have left) Trophimus at Miletus sick."

are only some twenty-eight miles or less apart in a direct line, yet a messenger from one to the other would have to travel at least seventy-five miles if he went by land, and that a better way would be for him to take ship, if he could get one, for the whole distance, or to sail across the gulf between Miletus and Priene, and then go by road, upwards of twenty-five miles, to Ephesus, or *vice versa*.

But if this note is thus detached, we need take no account of the setting of the epistle as a whole, but may date it independently; and if we do this we know within a few days when it was written. St. Paul on his way to Jerusalem had met Timothy and Trophimus at Troas (Acts xx. 4, 5), and they had gone together from Assos to Miletus (15), and from Miletus St. Paul had sent some member of his staff, presumably Timothy, to Ephesus to summon the elders of the Church (17), and when the elders had left Ephesus probably Timothy would remain in charge there until their return. Rackham (*Acts of the Apostles*, pp. 402, 403) reckons that the elders would arrive at Miletus on the Friday after the second Sunday after Easter, and would stay there at least until the following Sunday morning, and so, in their absence, Timothy would be needed for duty at Ephesus; and even if he left Ephesus at once on their return, he would have found that St. Paul's ship had gone.

As a matter of fact, Timothy probably remained at Ephesus and did not go to Jerusalem at all. The occurrence of his name in Acts xx. 4 merely shows that he was a member of St. Paul's party, having brought the Asian delegates to Troas; and this visit to Jerusalem was an official rather than a merely friendly one, made by the representatives of the various districts that were sending up their contributions, and in the list there given Timothy's name has no district attached to it.

In the absence of Tychicus, Trophimus, and other leaders who were going to Jerusalem, St. Paul would probably have wished Timothy to take charge of affairs at Ephesus, a position which he had already occupied for a short time (1 Tim. i. 3). Moreover, St. Paul was contemplating the abandonment of his work in these regions (Rom. xv. 23), and it would be good policy for Timothy to get well settled in the saddle while St. Paul was near at hand, and would naturally expect to call at Ephesus with the Asian delegates on his return journey.

In addition, if Timothy were to wait at Ephesus until the return of the elders, and pick up Trophimus at Miletus, this would involve four journeys between Ephesus and Miletus, including also any delay there might have been in finding a ship, and Timothy might well have come too late to go to Jerusalem in time for Pentecost.

Trophimus was in a different case. He was on the spot at Miletus, and his illness does not seem to have been severe, or Luke would have remained with him; and at this time of year, though there may have not been many vessels going from Miletus to Ephesus, there would probably be a fair number in the reverse direction carrying pilgrims for the festival, so Trophimus could have taken a later ship and still have got to Jerusalem in time for Pentecost, since St. Paul could afford to spend a week at Tyre (Acts xxi. 4) and several days at Cæsarea (10).

Timothy was sufficiently interested in St. Paul's plans, as well as personally in Trophimus and Erastus, to make the message a natural one, especially if this note formed part of a larger letter giving St. Paul's good wishes and directions. And now what of Erastus ?

In the year 54, before his imprisonment, St. Paul was organizing the collection at Ephesus and in the neighbourhood, and Erastus was helping him (Acts xix. 22). In the spring of 55 he came out of prison, and wrote a letter to the Corinthians, saying that he intended to stay at Ephesus until the following Pentecost (1 Cor. xvi. 8) and would then pass through Macedonia, no doubt organizing the collection there on his way, and would visit them at Corinth in the autumn (xvi. 5). For some reason he altered his plan and went to Corinth by another route (2 Cor. xii. 14, xiii. 1; I have suggested that he went by way of Crete); and so, not being able to go to Macedonia himself, he joined Erastus to Timothy, and sent him in his own place (1 Cor. iv. 17, xvi. 10; Acts xix. 22), and they organized the collection in Macedonia (2 Cor. viii. 1-4), and probably Erastus took the chief part. As Timothy knew that St. Paul had gone to Corinth, there was now no reason for his going there also, and he probably remained at Philippi or thereabouts; but Erastus, being a Corinthian, would naturally go back to Corinth when his task was finished. And there he would meet Titus; and Titus, probably with the assistance of Erastus, started organizing the collection in Achaia (2 Cor. ix. 2).

But Titus could not complete the work, as he had to go elsewhere (2 Cor. viii. 6), I think to Nicopolis. By the autumn of 56 Erastus had become treasurer of the city of Corinth (Rom. xvi. 23). In the spring of 57 St. Paul was in Corinth, and had instructed the delegates with the collection to meet him at Ephesus in time to arrive at Jerusalem for the next Passover. The natural man to select as delegate to represent the Church of Corinth was Erastus, and it is possible that he may have secured permission to absent himself from his public duties for this purpose; but a plot to murder St. Paul on shipboard was discovered (Acts xx. 3), and he was compelled to cancel his arrangements, sending Timothy to Ephesus to instruct the Asian delegates to meet at Troas in time to arrive at Jerusalem for Pentecost, and himself going to Macedonia to give similar instructions there. Erastus accordingly remained at Corinth, and St. Paul would tell him, if he could get away, to join the party at Miletus. But when St. Paul arrived at Miletus he learnt from the Corinthian delegates that Erastus had been unable to leave (2 Tim. iv. 20). This scheme seems to fit all the allusions so exactly that it is arbitrary to invent the hypothesis of some later occasion of which we know nothing at all.

There is also a second passage which we can date with almost equal confidence. "The cloak that I left at Troas with Carpus, when thou comest bring with thee, and the books (*τὰ βιβλία*), but especially the parchments" (iv. 13). Again, we know precisely the circumstances to which this message would be relevant, and it is superfluous to try to imagine any others. St. Paul, Timothy, and the delegates met at Troas after Easter, 57, and St. Paul went across the isthmus, a distance of some twenty miles or more, and picked up the ship at Assos on the following day. At that time of year he would not want to be burdened with a thick winter cloak and books and parchments.

As for *τὰ βιβλία* it is not impossible that this means the rolls of the books of the Septuagint. St. Paul quotes from the Old Testament with the greatest frequency, almost always from the LXX. In his student days at the feet of Gamaliel he would have become familiar with the text in Hebrew, with explanations in Aramaic; but as he would have to use the Septuagint in dealing with the Jews and God-fearers of the Dispersion, he would probably feel the need of the Greek text. The Old Testament is called *τὰ βιβλία τὰ ἅγια* in 1 Macc. xii. 9, and *τὰ βιβλία* may be simply

an abbreviation of this phrase made either by St. Paul himself or by his amanuensis (iv. 22 looks like St. Paul's authentication in his own writing of the preceding letter).

In any event, this epistle is subsequent to the First Epistle to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus, and St. Paul was, as we have seen, at this time a prisoner. If we can fit these two earlier epistles into St. Paul's lifetime before his imprisonment at Cæsarea, as I have shown to be possible, then this epistle might have been written either from Cæsarea or from Rome during one or other of his imprisonments there. In this case St. Paul would remain between two and three years at Cæsarea, arriving there soon after the Pentecost of 57 and leaving in the late autumn of 59, spending the winter at Melita and getting to Rome in the spring of 60. (Ramsay's dates, *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 396.)

It is very probable that St. Paul was imprisoned at Rome twice. In Rom. xv. 24, 28 he expresses his intention of paying a passing visit to Rome, and then going on to Spain, and there is good evidence that he did so. Writing to the Corinthians from Macedonia shortly afterwards, St. Paul indicates his intention of preaching in the parts beyond them (2 Cor. x. 16). Clement of Rome (1 *Ep. ad Cor.* v.) says that he went " to the bound of the West " (ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως), a phrase which in a Roman writer will naturally mean Spain and cannot mean Rome, which was regarded rather as being at the centre of the Roman world (see Lightfoot *in loc.*); this is supported by the *Muratorian Fragment*, by the earliest *Acta Apocrypha*, and by the *Hypomnema* of Symeon Metaphrastes, parts of which have been traced to a second century source.

There are, therefore, three possible views: (*a*) that this epistle was written during St. Paul's imprisonment in Cæsarea; (*b*) that it was written during his first imprisonment at Rome; and (*c*) that it was written during his second imprisonment there. If the other topical allusions favour an earlier rather than a later date, then the only evidence that it was written from Rome rather than from Cæsarea is the allusion to Onesiphorus in i. 16-18; and if of these two localities they are in favour of Cæsarea, then either this passage is a second note from another letter, like iv. 20, or the name " Rome " must be a corruption. For the present I shall omit the passage about Onesiphorus and consider the allusions in the remainder of the epistle independently of it.

The evidence against St. Paul's having written this epistle at Rome during his first imprisonment there (hypothesis *b*) would appear to be all but decisive. Our first impression on reading through the rest of the epistle as a whole is one of intimacy and immediacy; St. Paul, we should say, is so obviously writing from personal knowledge and not from hearsay that he cannot have left Ephesus, at least four years before at the time of the riot. And this impression is deepened as we study it in greater detail. He clearly regards himself as still in effective command. He sends Timothy on a mission to Troas and tells him to be sure to come back before winter (iv. 21), and instructs him that he is commissioning Tychicus to take charge in his place (iv. 12).

And then we remember that in writing to the Romans he had said that he had fully preached the Gospel, starting from Jerusalem, round about the Ægean (xv. 19), and that he had no more place in those latitudes (23), but intended to pay a farewell visit to Jerusalem (25) before going to Spain, taking Rome on his way, and hoping to be forwarded on his journey thither by the Roman Church (24; and *cf.* Titus iii. 13). Yet in this epistle he is still in charge, and he has by no means taken his hand off these regions; but Titus has gone to Dalmatia, doubtless at St. Paul's instigation, and Crescens to Galatia, the land of Timothy's home (iv. 10). This makes against both (*b*) and (*c*).

Tychicus, too, was he ever in Rome? We have no reason to think that he was (on the Epistle to the Ephesians, see later); whereas we know that he went to Jerusalem as one of the delegates of the Asian Church (Acts xx. 4), and was with St. Paul at Cæsarea on his way back to Ephesus after leaving Jerusalem. This makes against both (*b*) and (*c*) and in favour of (*a*) (Cæsarea).

Hymenæus again (ii. 17); this must be the same Hymenæus as in the First Epistle (i. 20), and there St. Paul says that he had excommunicated him. Is St. Paul writing to Timothy about a state of things that existed years ago and warning him on matters of which he knew only at second hand? This is against (*b*). Or Eubulus and Pudens and Linus and Claudia (2 Tim. iv. 21). If this epistle was written from Rome, Timothy had not yet been there; how then should these people, and "all the brethren," have been on such familiar terms with him that they send him greetings? And why does St. Paul send no greeting to Timothy from any of those mentioned in the long list in Rom. xvi., some

of whom, like Andronicus and Junias, would have been known to him? Whereas if they had gone to Jerusalem for Pentecost they would have heard his name at Corinth if they went that way, or at Berœa, Thessalonica and Philippi, if they went by the Via Egnatia, at Ephesus, where they might have met him, and at Miletus, and even in Jerusalem itself, for Timothy would seem to have been there in 49, and was very probably with St. Paul when he went there after making his vow at Cenchreæ (Acts xviii. 22) in 52, and may even have gone there from Ephesus during St. Paul's stay there. It is even possible that St. Paul circumcised him (Acts xvi. 3), not only for the sake of his work among the Jews of the Dispersion, but in view of this eventuality, since he would not wish him to encounter the treatment meted out to Titus by the Church at Jerusalem, which was then in St. Paul's mind. This is in favour of (*a*) and against (*b*) and (*c*).

In any event, it would take at least five months for Timothy to arrive from Ephesus in Rome (iv. 21) after this letter was written, if it was written there. Is it at all likely that there would have been this interval between St. Paul's being lodged in prison at Rome and his martyrdom, or that St. Paul would have expected it? This makes against this epistle being written during St. Paul's second Roman imprisonment (hypothesis *c*.)

Moreover, if we put this epistle as being written during this second imprisonment, would St. Paul still have been in supreme command at Ephesus and from Dalmatia to Galatia? For the First Epistle of St. Peter would seem to imply that he had made a personal journey through Asia Minor (1 Pet. i. 1), and he certainly regards the Christians in Roman Asia as being under his charge. This makes against (*c*) and probably against (*b*). If again we suppose that this epistle was written during St. Paul's second imprisonment in Rome, we can put his arrival in Cæsarea in 56, and his arrival in Rome in 59; then we must allow for a two years' residence in Rome, and probably for some months after the Acts was written before St. Paul would be a free man, so that he would not leave for Spain before the spring of 62, and we can hardly reckon on less than one winter in Spain, so that he would return to Rome in the autumn of 63, and leave for the East in the spring of 64, spend the winter of 64-65 at Nicopolis and get back to Rome in the autumn of 65. This of course

is possible, but the dates are getting inconveniently crowded, and this also tells against hypothesis (*c*).

" Alexander the coppersmith . . . greatly withstood our words " (iv. 14, 15). St. Paul is obviously not referring to any events in Ephesus, when Timothy was with him, but is giving him information. This passage, therefore, refers to Rome or to Jerusalem. But what was Alexander the Ephesian doing in Rome, and what opportunity had he there to withstand St. Paul's words ? In the second imprisonment presumably none at all. St. Paul's conviction was probably a very summary process. But why should he be there at all ? Presumably he is the Alexander who was excommunicated at Ephesus with Hymenæus (1 Tim. i. 20), and if the First Epistle to Timothy was written before the riot at Ephesus, as I suppose, then he may have lapsed into Judaism after being expelled from the Christian Church, and have thrown in his lot with his fellow-guildsmen, the makers of silver shrines and the workmen of like occupation (Acts xix. 25); and if he went up to Jerusalem, he may have resolved to take the opportunity of revenging himself on St. Paul which had been denied him at Ephesus (Acts xix. 33, 34). And at Jerusalem he might well have embittered the Jews against him. Thus this allusion also makes against (*b*) and (*c*) and in favour of (*a*).

Or " all that " had been with St. Paul had returned home, and " are (now) in Asia " (i. 15). Here we have the same difficulty. During his first imprisonment they might have refused to have anything to do with St. Paul, but during the second would they have any opportunity of coming in contact with him, or could they be blamed if they had not ? And again we ask the same question. To Titus, St. Paul may have merely sent a message, but here we have Tychicus, Alexander, Hymenæus, Philetus, and this group of Asians all going to Rome from Ephesus. And then there is a second non-Anatolian group. " Only Luke is with me " (iv. 11). This is obviously not to be taken literally, for Tychicus was with St. Paul, and was probably the bearer of this letter (12), and Eubulus and Pudens and Linus and Claudia (21). It must refer to some group known to Timothy, and " only Luke is with me " will mean " when I have sent Tychicus away (Crescens may have already gone and Titus could be reached by messenger) only Luke will remain of the group whom you know of, and who have been here," a group which will apparently

include Demas, who may have been a native of Thessalonica, and have gone home, but whom we last heard of as being at Ephesus (Col. iv. 14; Philem. 24).

But we shall be told it was an easy matter to go from Ephesus to Rome. In a sense that is true. It was about as easy as to sail from Ephesus to Rome by way of Hydruntum or Brundisium or Puteoli as it is in our day to go by steamer from New Zealand to London by way of Plymouth or Southampton; it would take about as long, and having regard to the difference in the value of money, would probably cost about as much. But if this epistle was written from Cæsarea the analogy would be more like going from New Zealand to Sydney. All the members of these two groups may well have gone to Jerusalem for Pentecost, and the Anatolians could have given valuable testimony if they had so desired on St. Paul's behalf before the Sanhedrin, but they either deserted him or opposed him. If we heard of certain named individuals, in addition to two different groups, going from New Zealand, either to London for some unknown purpose, or to Sydney for the Sydney races or the test match, and their destination was uncertain, which of the two places would seem the more likely? Moreover, in the first imprisonment we can be fairly certain that no such groups were present in Rome, since St. Paul went to Rome from Cæsarea accompanied only by St. Luke and Aristarchus of Thessalonica (Acts xxvii. 2), and Aristarchus probably went home when they changed ships at Myra (Acts xxvii. 5, 6); whereas if St. Paul is referring to his fellow-passengers from Assos, among whom Tychicus and Luke were included, all would be well known to Timothy, since he had sailed with them from Assos as far as Miletus.

Again, in iv. 16 St. Paul speaks of " his first defence," implying at least one subsequent speech. Before his release from his first Roman imprisonment it is improbable that St. Paul was called upon to defend himself at all. He had now been imprisoned for about five years. All the official papers from Claudius Lysias, Felix, and Festus were in his favour. The centurion who had guarded him and had allowed him to spend a week at Puteoli (Acts xxviii. 14) had doubtless sent in his report. Meanwhile his accusers had neither turned up in person nor forwarded documents to be submitted to the court (Acts xxviii. 21). No doubt an application for discharge would have to be made, but

by this time there was apparently a statutory limit after which, in the absence of accusers, uncondemned prisoners might not be kept in custody, and on application release would be granted (see Ramsay, *Expositor*, Eighth Series, vol. v., pp. 280-281). But even if we refer this allusion to the second imprisonment, the case is no better. It presupposes that at a first *actio* a verdict of " not proven " (*non liquet*) was returned, and that St. Paul was remanded. If St. Paul was martyred in the Neronian persecution we may be certain that the proceedings would be exceedingly summary; but even if his martyrdom took place earlier, a remand is extremely improbable. On the other hand, we do know of a first " apologia " at Jerusalem. St. Paul himself says, " Brethren and fathers, hear ye the ' apologia ' which I make unto you " (Acts xxii. 1), and previous to writing this letter he had made a second speech of some sort before the Sanhedrin (Acts xxiii. 1-6), and a third formal oration before Felix (Acts xxiv. 10, 21), and at his first defence none of the Christians in Jerusalem had done anything to help him. Nor would it be strange if, when he was speaking of his vision of the Lord on the way to Damascus (Acts xxii. 6-11), he should feel the same Lord standing by him and strengthening him (2 Tim. iv. 17). As for the deliverance from the mouth of the lion, no lion threatened him in his first imprisonment at Rome, and he was not delivered from his mouth after his second. St. Paul is here very probably quoting the phrase from Ps. vii. 2, and the whole psalm is singularly appropriate to his circumstances: " O Lord, my God, in thee do I take refuge. Save me from all them that pursue me, and deliver me, lest he tear my soul[1] like a lion and rend it in pieces while there is none to deliver me," etc., and the rending in pieces is exactly what very nearly actually happened (Acts xxiii. 10).

" Titus (is going) to Dalmatia " (iv. 10). Titus was probably at Philippi. If this epistle was written from Rome, St. Paul could send him a message by Tychicus, who appears to be the bearer of it (iv. 12); if, on the other hand, it was written from Cæsarea, by one of the Macedonian delegates, Sopater or Secundus or Gaius (Acts xx. 4). But why to Dalmatia? By Dalmatia is probably meant Dyrrachium or Aulona at the western end of the Via Egnatia, which lay on the road from Philippi to

[1] " *My soul*=my life: me, regarded as a living individual " (Kirkpatrick, *in loc.*).

Rome or *vice versa*. St. Paul, then, would seem to be fixing a meeting-place for himself and Titus. But he would hardly, we should think, have hoped to get free from his second imprisonment, and if not this allusion will make against hypothesis (*c*). But if the epistle is written during St. Paul's first imprisonment, on getting free he would not be going east, but west, to Spain. This makes against hypothesis (*b*). If, on the other hand, it is written from Cæsarea, it is perfectly explicable. St. Paul has been called a man of moods; it might be truer to say that at one time he expresses his feelings, at another his faith. We have an example of this in the Epistle to the Philippians (*cf.* i. 21-26, ii. 17). So here, in iv. 6-8, St. Paul would seem to be expecting his death almost at once—a passage which by itself might seem to refer to his second imprisonment—but in iv. 17, 18, the Lord has delivered him from the mouth of the lion and will deliver, and in this confidence he makes arrangements for the future, as well as begging Timothy to come to him before the winter (iv. 21).

St. Paul seems to have hoped to be set free from captivity at Cæsarea almost up to the end, and to have been constrained to appeal to Cæsar as the only apparent way of getting to Rome. If he were set free he would naturally carry out his deferred plan of going to Rome on the way to Spain. Nor does this view conflict with his begging Timothy to bring his cloak from Troas before winter, since on leaving Cæsarea St. Paul would go by the same route by which he had come, at least as far as Ephesus; and if Timothy had not arrived at Cæsarea before St. Paul left, he might meet him on the way; or if Timothy had not arrived at Ephesus by the time that St. Paul reached it, he could go to Troas, thence to Neapolis and Philippi, and along the Via Egnatia; or if he found Timothy in Ephesus, sail across the Ægean to Corinth, and thence to Nicopolis, and pick up Titus that way. In any event, therefore, this allusion is perfectly intelligible if this epistle is written from Cæsarea, but inexplicable if it was written from Rome.

And now let us take i. 15-18, the section about Onesiphorus.

In the first place, why this abrupt mention of the household of Onesiphorus in close connexion with, " You may be assured of this (*οἶδας τοῦτο*), that all those who are (now) in Asia deserted me, of whom are Phygelus and Hermogenes "? If we are right

in supposing that these Asians, including Phygelus and Hermogenes, had come up to Jerusalem for Pentecost, and their desertion of St. Paul took place there (*cf.* iv. 16), then a rumour would seem to have reached St. Paul at Cæsarea that they had, on their return to Ephesus, been making some excuse for themselves: "They had not really deserted St. Paul, but——" and St. Paul is telling Timothy that he might take it from him that their excuse was valueless, and is reflecting how different would have been the conduct of Onesiphorus; he, if he had been in Jerusalem, would never have deserted him. Timothy knew well how he had ministered to him in Ephesus when Timothy was himself there to see; and when St. Paul was in prison at an earlier time, when Timothy was absent, Onesiphorus had sought him out and found him.

Such would appear to be the connexion. Onesiphorus, when St. Paul was writing, would seem to be dead. But how did St. Paul know of his death? Onesiphorus had been in Ephesus, as we have seen, when St. Paul, aided by Timothy and Erastus, was organizing the great collection in Asia; and after visiting Jerusalem in 52 St. Paul had given orders for a collection to be made in Galatia (1 Cor. xvi. 1). We concluded that Onesiphorus had very probably come to Ephesus from Galatia, and having been one of St. Paul's assistants at Ephesus had returned to Galatia in 55, and was very possibly accompanied by Timothy.[1]

If, then, Onesiphorus had come from Galatia in 54, and assisted St. Paul with the collection there, and gone back to Galatia in the following year, he would have been the most suitable delegate from that part of the world, and St. Paul, when he arrived at Miletus, or earlier, may have heard of his death from the other delegates or from Timothy. Thus we have a close connexion between Onesiphorus and Timothy, and a parallel to the news about Erastus in 2 Tim. iv. 20.

When we examine the passage in detail, we at once notice three features in it. St. Paul had been in prison and Onesiphorus had experienced some difficulty in finding him: "he sought me diligently and found me." The difficulty, we should imagine, was not that the public authorities desired to keep the place of St. Paul's imprisonment secret—they would have no fear of publicity, or of a rising on St. Paul's behalf—but there were few

[1] On the movements of Onesihorus and Timothy, see above pp. 92-95.

people who knew that St. Paul was in prison, and Onesiphorus had to search for someone who could give this definite information. Secondly, Onesiphorus had ministered to St. Paul in Ephesus when Timothy had been there; and thirdly, that apparently Timothy was not with St. Paul on this other occasion. This is, of course, fatal to the place being Rome during St. Paul's first imprisonment there. A number of Roman Christians had flocked out to welcome him as far as the Market of Appius and the Three Taverns (Acts xxviii. 15), and he was in *custodia libera* in his own hired house, where not only Christians but Jews had access to him (17). Thus there could be no difficulty in discovering him, nor any special merit in paying him a visit. But it is almost equally fatal to Onesiphorus having visited St. Paul during his second imprisonment in Rome. The Roman Church was large and fully organized, and St. Paul was a person of very special prominence, hence a Christian arriving in Rome from elsewhere, probably provided with letters of commendation to the heads of the community (*cf.* 2 Cor. iii. 1, and St. Paul's commendation of Phœbe, Rom. xvi. 1, to the Romans, and of Mark, Col. iv. 10, to the Colossian Church), would have no difficulty in coming across a Roman Christian who could tell him a thing which must have been a matter of common knowledge in the Church, while its officers would regard it as part of their duty to ascertain whether any Christians were in prison, and, if so, why and where.

What the passage suggests is that St. Paul was imprisoned in a town where the Christian Church was small and the organization, if it existed at all, very incomplete—a condition which implies that St. Paul had preached there only for a short time—and the small body of converts may have been intimidated by opposition, probably in the last resort arising from Jewish antagonism. The site of the prison would most likely be fairly well known; what was difficult to discover was someone who could say whether St. Paul was in it or not; and, if so, this would seem to suggest that he had previously left the town owing to the action of the civil authorities, and that on his venturing to return he had been promptly incarcerated.

To return to our main argument. I do not think we need discuss further the possibility of this epistle having been written in Rome during St. Paul's *first* imprisonment there; no critic

maintains it, and the arguments against it seem overwhelming.[1] The real alternatives are between its being written either at Cæsarea or during St. Paul's second imprisonment at Rome, and of these the former has an immense initial advantage. It is almost incredible that St. Paul could be writing either about events in his own knowledge which happened more than a year before, or not from his own knowledge but from hearsay. Could he give such minute information and directions when separated by such intervals both of time and space? And would he do so after telling the Romans that he regarded his work in those regions as brought to a close?

And secondly, Timothy's mission to Troas cannot readily be detached from the remainder of the epistle, and the situation implied corresponds so exactly with that depicted in the Acts that the two seem inevitably to go together. Would St. Paul, dwelling in the house hired by himself, or for him by his friends, tell Timothy to be sure to bring before the ensuing winter his cloak which he had left at Troas three years ago? If he had needed a cloak in Rome, would not the same friends who paid his rent supply it? Whereas if we suppose the letter to have come from Cæsarea all is explained. Timothy is in charge of the work throughout Roman Asia (Acts xix. 10) as St. Paul's deputy; the church at Troas will therefore be within his jurisdiction. St. Paul sends him on personal business, but doubtless also with an eye to the oversight of that community; meanwhile, during his absence from Ephesus, before he has returned thither after visiting St. Paul, Tychicus is commissioned to take charge. Tychicus had previously been sent to Colossæ; he was considered by St. Paul to be eligible to relieve Titus in Crete (on any view the Epistle to Titus is earlier than this Second Epistle to Timothy); he had come up with St. Paul to Jerusalem, and was now with him in Cæsarea on his way home to Ephesus. Why must we drag Timothy, Tychicus, Alexander, the Asian contingent, Demas and the Macedonian contingent to Rome, especially when we know for a fact that many of them were with St. Paul in Cæsarea?

I do not wish to recapitulate in detail all the arguments I have

[1] "The Second letter to Timothy, therefore, cannot be placed during this period of two years. The circumstances are irreconcilable." (Ramsay, *Expositor*, Eighth Series, vol. v., p. 277.)

already advanced; let it suffice to say that they are conclusive against this epistle having been written from Rome during St. Paul's first imprisonment and almost equally conclusive against its having been written during his second imprisonment, while every single allusion is consonant with its having been written in Cæsarea; in fact, the only reason why this is supposed to be impossible is because it has been thought that the two Pastoral Epistles which preceded it, the First Epistle to Timothy and that to Titus, cannot by any ingenuity be fitted into the period of St. Paul's Ephesian ministry, and this I have shown to be untrue. But if this epistle is written from Cæsarea, then the words " in Rome " in relation to Onesiphorus must be corrupt. This is a serious charge to bring against the reading of the MSS., and not to be lightly advanced, but it will be more than justified if we can show that such a corruption might easily arise. On purely textual grounds we shall ask ourselves what place-name—for place-name it must be—and what conditions could give rise to our present reading; then we shall enquire what place best suits the section which deals with Onesiphorus, looked at from the historical point of view. If each method gives the same result we shall have no reason to doubt of the truth of the answer to our enquiries.

Now let us ask ourselves what sort of corruptions were likely to occur.

(1) St. Paul dictated his letters. This is generally admitted and may be taken for granted.

(2) His amanuensis wrote in longhand. This is extremely probable.

(3) If so, he wrote in detached letters with no division between the words.

(4) He would write using as few strokes of the pen as possible. That Μ was written in one line beginning at the foot we know, the MSS. show it; and the small letter μ, which is derived from it, is written in that way, as is the case also with Ν and ν, giving the last two strokes of Ν; ϵ was written in two strokes beginning either at the top or bottom as most convenient, and so are Ι, Θ, Ο, C, and Α and Λ would begin at the bottom, and this might give a rounded form at the top.

(5) The amanuensis *must* have abbreviated. It is impossible to take down any ordinary speaker at full length even in English

running hand; and the case would be worse if detached letters had to be used.

(6) If he abbreviated he might leave out the middle of words, writing ΘC for ΘΕΟC, for instance, and he might, and frequently would, leave out terminations; and he would often omit prepositions, so that, *e.g.*, " I am going to St. Pancras " would appear " GOINGSPANC," and ΕΛΘΟΝΤΕCΕΙCΕΦΕCΟΝ would be ΕΛΘΕCΕΦΕC, or something like it, a form perfectly intelligible to the original scribe when he wished to write out his fair copy at length.

That St. Paul's amanuensis did leave out prepositions is not only an almost necessary supposition, but is supported by the apparent substitution in the Pastoral Epistles of μετά for St. Paul's customary σύν. In this case he may have made some signs such as + to signify " with," and subsequently would give the sense quite accurately by translating this sign into Greek, the terminations in either case being left out, but would alter the precise form; but when the preposition to be supplied was obvious, it might be omitted in the notes altogether. Now let us take an imaginary case and see how these practices will work out.

Mr. A dictates to his secretary B a letter to his correspondent Mr. C, in the course of which he says, " Meet me at Enderby (a town in Leicestershire) at 11 a.m." Mr. B takes it down " meet me Enderb. 11 a.m.," or in capitals, MEETMEENDERB-11AM. The transcript is written out fair and sent to Mr. C and is lost; the notes are retained and get into the hands of an editor living at Dereham in Suffolk. They are somewhat rubbed and worn, and appear to read MEETMEINDERI11AM. Is there any doubt whatever that the editor will translate this, " Meet me in Dereham "? But suppose that from the rest of the letter Dereham seems an impossible place for Mr. A to meet Mr. C, and that it was all but certain that the notes on which this reading were based omitted prepositions, would not the restoration ENDERB (y) 11 A.M. possess a high degree of probability? Suppose we knew also that Mr. A had often been in Leicestershire and that he had actually met Mr. C at Rugby in the neighbouring county, and suppose further that this was some sort of a story, no doubt for the most part untrue, but probably having some foundation in fact, that Mr. A had picked up Mr. D in Leicester-

shire and that Mr. D had met Mr. C in the neighbourhood of Leicester and introduced him to Mr. A, should we not be convinced that " Meet me at Enderby " was the right reading ?

We are here dealing with a closely parallel case. ΕΝΡΩΜΗ appears to me to be an impossible reading; if this is true it follows that it must be corrupt, but I do not wish to overstate the case, so I say that it is almost certainly corrupt. But the argument would be rendered so strong that it would amount to a practical certainty if we could suggest even a plausible original; and if, having arrived at a place-name which might, without great difficulty, have given rise to the reading ΕΝΡΩΜΗ, we could show that this particular name had a probability in its favour on historic grounds, we ought then to have no scruple about accepting a conclusion independently supported from both sides.

Our original scribe left out prepositions when they were obvious, as with place-names, and abbreviated by omitting terminations. In consequence we have to consider not ΡΩΜΗ or ΡΩΜ, but ΕΝΡΩΜΗ or ΕΝΡΩΜ, since it was clear that παραγενόμενος would be followed by a place-name, and that in the sense, though not in the abbreviated script, it must be preceded by ΕΝ. The final Η of ΡΩΜΗ may be an editorial addition, or it may represent part of an original termination, which in this case could hardly be anything else than ΕΙ. If from ΕΝΡΩΜΗ we could get back to a name of which ΕΙ were part of the termination, this might be regarded as some slight confirmation of the correctness of our restoration of the original word represented by ΕΝΡΩΜΗ, but I think it more probable that the final Η of ΕΝΡΩΜΗ is an addition.

If the Ν, or at least the heavy down strokes of the Ν, was fairly distinct our editor, in view of the fact that a place-name must have followed the preceding participle, would write ΕΝ in bold confidence, and he would then be faced with some short combination of blurred letters for which he has written ΡΩΜ. Nevertheless, owing to the original scribe's practice of omitting prepositions the editor would be wrong, and ΕΝ represent the beginning of the original word.

The only consonants that could stand before Ν which look the least like Ε are Θ and C, and of vowels Α, Ε, Ι, Ο, so provisionally we may assume that the original place-name began with ΑΝ, ΕΝ, ΘΝ, ΙΝ, ΟΝ, or CN, and if it began with ΑΝ the heavy

down-stroke of the A might take the place of the light and half-obliterated up-stroke of the succeeding N.

If we proceed to build up from this, we shall be liable to jump at conclusions and may biased, so we will go on to consider the Ω. The only single letter that takes the same amount of space as Ω is M, which is not the least like it, so either Ω remains unaltered or it must represent two letters. A double Θ never occurs. OO would obviously best give the form, but this combination is very rare and does not occur in any place-name; nevertheless, one O would obviously be the best letter to give one half of the Ω. If O is the first half, the second might be a mere fragment, which in the original might well have been an I, the combination OI is common enough. If O is the second half of Ω, the first must be C, Ε, I, or possibly Γ. So we get for Ω Ω, OI, ΓO, ΕO, IO, or CO.

Now let us consider the P. This might have been P, B, Γ, I or T, but if the previous letter is N that will exclude B and Γ and also P. P occurs in some few place-names after N when the first letter is E, but these are rare, and they have no connexion with St. Paul.

Finally, we come to M, and if this is not M it must be K, N or X.

Now let us tabulate.

A			Ω		+
E			OI	K	+
Θ		I	ΓO	M	+
I	N		ΕO	N	+
O		T	IO	X	+
C			CO		+

It is obvious that the only combination that will give a place-name is ANTIOX, and if we add H to ΕNPΩM that will give ANTIOXΕI, but probably both the ΕI and the A were cut off and the H of PΩMH is, as I have said, an editorial addition.

This result may seem strange, but (1) it is all but certain that ΕNPΩMH is corrupt, and (2) every other original would seem to be impossible.

Now let us consider Antioch as a possible place of St. Paul's imprisonment in connexion with this passage about Onesiphorus. Of course there are two Antiochs, and from the point of view of textual corruption either would do equally well; but we may

exclude the Syrian Antioch, because, though we hear of opposition there on the part of the Jews towards St. Paul, it is an opposition within and not without the church, and as the Syrian Antioch was the headquarters of the Roman legions, it is likely to have been extremely well policed, and improbable that anti-Christian riots would occur there. But if we look at Pisidian Antioch it would suit the Onesiphorus passage admirably, *if* St. Paul were ever imprisoned there. St. Paul preached there for only a short time; he was expelled by the action of the chief men of the city (Acts xiii. 50), the *coloni*, who would include the local magistrates. Though the number of hearers was large—it is obviously exaggerated by St. Luke—the number of believers was probably small. St. Paul returned in the following spring, probably before any notice of his coming had been received, and the local magistrates were likely to apprehend him as soon as they learnt that he was there; and at that time Timothy was not with him. If Onesiphorus, then, arrived, it would be quite likely that he would have some difficulty in ascertaining the fact that St. Paul had come and had been imprisoned. Moreover, if Onesiphorus visited him, he probably was living in some part of Galatia at the time, since that was the only district where St. Paul had preached after leaving Cyprus; and if he resided in Galatia, that would account for his presence in Ephesus at a later period, because St. Paul had passed through Galatia on the way to Ephesus from the other Antioch, and in the narrative this puts Antioch and Ephesus in the historic order. But was St. Paul imprisoned in Pisidian Antioch ?

St. Paul was beaten with rods, a Roman form of punishment, three times after he had become a Christian and before the writing of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, and imprisoned at least as often. We can increase the number of imprisonments, but the three imprisonments had better be coupled with the beatings. One was at Philippi, a Roman colony, and one at Ephesus, which was the seat of the Proconsul of Roman Asia. We must needs find room for a third, and several places are ruled out—Cyprus, Athens, and Corinth, for example, and all the other places are improbable. Moreover, the imprisonment must be placed before St. Paul picked up Timothy at Lystra on the First Missionary Journey, as apparently Timothy was not with St. Paul when this visit of Onesiphorus to him took place, and the town must almost

certainly be a Roman colony to account for the beating with rods. By a method of elimination, therefore, Pisidian Antioch is left as by far the most probable site. And St. Luke makes St. Paul in the Acts say to the Christians at Antioch, " Through many tribulations *we* must enter into the kingdom of God " (xiv. 22), and in this Epistle he calls on Timothy to remember what afflictions and persecutions he had endured at Antioch and Lystra and Iconium (2 Tim. iii. 11).[1]

Finally, was Onesiphorus in Galatia when St. Paul was in Antioch ? Even for this point we have some support. The *Acts of Paul and Thecla* are for the most part a work of fiction. The relevant sections run as follows: (1) " When Paul went up to Iconium after he had fled from Antioch there journeyed with him Demas and Hermogenes the coppersmith, who were full of hypocrisy and flattered Paul. . . . (2) And a certain man named Onesiphorus, when he heard that Paul was come to Iconium, went out . . . to meet him, that he might receive him (into his house); for Titus had told him what kind of man Paul was in appearance. . . . (3) And he went by the royal road that leads to Lystra (' he went and stood where the roads met on the highway which goes to Lystra,' Syriac translation), and stood expecting him, and looked upon them that came according to the description of Titus. And he saw Paul coming, a man of little stature, thin-haired upon the head, bow-legged, strongly built, with eyebrows joining and nose somewhat hooked, full of grace."

Thecla is introduced in section 7, and Queen Tryphena in section 27.

Demas and Hermogenes may be at once dismissed. They are brought in to give interest to the story. Timothy was a native of Lystra, and their names are lifted from St. Paul's Second Epistle to him, and the designation " the coppersmith " transferred to Hermogenes from Alexander.

But the unflattering account of St. Paul's appearance seems to embody an early tradition, and is not like the invention of a forger.

The " royal road " (*βασιλικὴ ὁδος*, *via regalis*) is a remarkable title, but in the ruins of Comana, the most westerly of the Pisidian colonies founded by Augustus, there is a milestone saying that the Emperor Cæsar Augustus constructed the " royal

[1] See Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, pp. 106, 107.

road" by the care of his lieutenant, Cornutus Aquila. The roads built by Augustus in this neighbourhood are two, one leading to Olbasa, Comana, and Cremna, the other to Parlais and Lystra. The former is called *Via Regalis* on the milestone, the latter in the Acts of Paul and Thecla. Moreover, after 74, when Vespasian remodelled the arrangement of the provinces, Lystra ceased to be of importance, and the road to it from Antioch was no longer called a highway. This part, therefore, of the story must go back to an early author familiar with local topography. Queen Tryphena is, of course, an historical person. Her father was Polemon, king of part of Lycaonia and Cilicia, and also of Pontus, who married Pythodoris, granddaughter of Mark Anthony the Triumvir and first cousin of the Emperor Claudius; her son Polemon was made king of Pontus in 37. The dynasty is known to us almost solely by inscriptions and coins and has left no mark on history or place in the memory of posterity. She is represented on coins as a middle-aged woman with a young son, which is true to the picture of her given in the *Acta*. After 54 she was no longer a relative of the reigning emperor, and probably lost her influence with the Roman officials, so this much of the tale must be almost contemporary.

Thecla, also, was probably a real person, and incidental details of her story would seem to go back to the first century, and the language of Tertullian (*Sciant in Asia presbyterum, qui eam scripturam construxit, quasi titulo Pauli de suo cumulans, de Bapt.* 17) is not inconsistent with the use by the presbyter of an earlier narrative.

And now we come to Titus. Demas and Hermogenes were both in Ephesus (Col. iv. 14; Philem. 24; 2 Tim. i. 15), and St. Paul passed through the Galatian and Phrygian country on his way to Ephesus on the Third Missionary Journey. Later additions transfer the site of the story from the Pisidian to the Syrian Antioch (*e.g.*, the mention of Daphne, section 23; of the proconsul, section 32; and of Seleucia, section 43), and it is to this later stratum that Demas and Hermogenes belong. But in the text of St. Paul's epistles the only places with which Titus is connected are Jerusalem, Crete, and Dalmatia; the bringing of him, therefore, to Lystra and Iconium is not derived from any scriptures known to the author of the *Acta*. But there is good reason to think that Titus was with St. Paul in Galatia on his First Missionary

Journey, to which the earlier form of the story goes back. Hence the mention of Titus in this connexion would seem to be derived from an authentic tradition. The *Acts of Titus* say that St. Paul sent Titus before to announce his coming in every city which he intended to visit; but these Acts are all of later date, and the idea is probably taken from the mention of Titus here. But if we grant the historicity of this part of the narrative, then we have reason for placing Onesiphorus in this neighbourhood also. And this is not improbable, since when St. Paul had passed through the Galatian and Phrygian country he went to Ephesus, where he was imprisoned, where Junias and Andronicus from Tarsus were imprisoned with him, and where Onesiphorus ministered to him (2 Tim. i. 18).

The two arguments are independent. We could argue from the rest of the epistle that ΕΝΡΩΜ is corrupt and that ΑΝΤΙΟΧ is textually far the most probable original, or on the basis of the history of Onesiphorus that Rome is almost certainly wrong and that the Pisidian Antioch is the place that best suits the context. Each argument supports the other, and in combination their common conclusion is all but irresistible.

But if we read Antioch instead of Rome in this passage there is no reason for asserting that the epistle was written during St. Paul's second captivity in Rome, which on other grounds is improbable, and it was certainly not written during his first captivity there. It follows that it must have been written from Cæsarea. But in any event it is preceded by the First Epistle and the Epistle to Titus. Hence these were written at the times we have already assigned to them, and our whole system of dating is confirmed.

CHAPTER VIII

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS

SYNOPSIS

THE Epistle to the Ephesians, a circular letter to the Churches of Asia. St. Paul's last testament. Its non-Jewish tone as compared with Romans. The reason for the change. The bearer, Tychicus, who took the Second Epistle to Timothy. The " middle wall of partition."

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS

NEARLY all critics now admit that the Epistle to the Galatians, the two Epistles to the Corinthians, and that to the Romans are the work of St. Paul, whose name they bear; Van Manen's ingenuity in attempting to ascribe them to another author is acknowledged to have been misplaced. And starting from this basis, and with this warning before them, they now admit also the Epistles to the Philippians, to the Colossians, and to Philemon. This being so, there is no sound reason for rejecting the Epistle to the Ephesians. If St. Paul could write the Epistles to the Philippians and Colossians, there is no reason for not ascribing to him the Epistle to the Ephesians. Whatever advance it may be thought to show upon these epistles, the difference is no greater than that between these and those of the former group. If St. Paul's mind was capable of this comprehensiveness and flexibility, the Epistle to the Ephesians cannot be said to be beyond its scope. Nay, more, if this epistle had been anonymous, instead of bearing his name, there is no other author to whom it could more readily be ascribed. The writer must have been a Jewish Christian who had been proud of his ancestral privileges (ii. 12, 19); who is steeped in the symbolism of the Old Testament (vi. 14-17); who is an original thinker, able to trace out a philosophy of history through the ages (iii. 1-13); who moves with familiarity among the heavenly places, and yet can come down to earth and apply the great principles which he has perceived to the ordinary details of common life. All this is characteristically Pauline, as is also the general structure of the letter. He is writing to Gentiles (ii. 11, iii. 6), and St. Paul considered himself to be the Apostle of the Gentiles (Rom. xi. 13), endeavouring to make them understand what is the unity of the Church as founded on the oneness of Christ, and what obligations of conduct spring from this great fact; and St. Paul, as we know, devoted his energies and his thought to the promotion of this internal unity.

If the Epistle to the Ephesians is not by St. Paul, it is a deliberate

forgery. But it is difficult to imagine any forger capable not merely of imitating the Pauline style—the so-called Epistle to the Laodiceans is a mere *cento* of Pauline excerpts and will give us an idea of what a forger could do—but also, while endeavouring to pass himself off as the great Apostle, of being able to rise to the sublime heights on which this epistle moves. In fact we know of no forger who ever made the attempt. The Pastoral Epistles have at least a basis of Pauline matter, however they may have been elaborated, and the only analogy we have is in the *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, which Tertullian (*de Bapt.* 17) says were the production of a certain presbyter of Asia who put them together "out of love of Paul," and was degraded from the presbyterate in consequence.

We shall therefore take it for granted that this epistle was written by St. Paul. He is now a prisoner (iii. 1, iv. 1) and absent from his correspondents, but able to write to them and receive letters from them. Some of those whom he addressed he had never seen face to face (*cf.* Col. ii. 1); but he had heard from them, apparently recently, or from others about them (i. 15). Moreover, the absence of personal messages, which are so marked a feature in his other epistles, inclines us to believe that this is rather a circular letter to a group of churches than directed to a single particular community. And this inference is supported by the fact that in some MSS. "in Ephesus" is omitted. If the epistle were in the nature of a circular letter it would go first to some central church, and copies of it be distributed thence, and the particular address of each would be the last words to be added, and might at times be omitted. All this, which is generally acknowledged, would best suit the churches of Asia Minor, and more especially of the Ephesian district, which, even if St. Paul had not visited them all, would be familiar with his name and with his teaching (Acts xix. 10, 26).

Even before his imprisonment in Cæsarea St. Paul had decided to abandon his work in Asia Minor and the East. The earliest light we get on his plans is in Acts xix. 21: "Paul purposed in his spirit (ἔθετο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι),[1] when he had passed through Macedonia and Achaia, to go to Jerusalem, saying, After I have been there, I must (δεῖ) also see Rome."

[1] *Cf.* John xi. 33, ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πν.; xiii. 21, ἐταράχθη τῷ πν.; Acts xviii. 25, ζέων τῷ πν.; v. 4, ἔθου ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου.

Here it is obvious that St. Paul regarded his going to Rome as a matter of obligation (δεῖ), and, on the face of it, it looks as if he thought of this visit to Jerusalem as a visit of farewell; but much will depend on the interpretation to be put upon this word "must," and on this matter we shall have to consult other examples.

Next, in Rom. xv. 19 we get " from Jerusalem, and round about (κύκλῳ) unto Illyricum, I have fully preached (πεπληρωκέναι) the gospel of Christ." And in verse 23 we have something yet stronger: " Having no more any place in these latitudes (κλίματα), and having these many years a longing to come unto you, whensoever I go unto Spain," etc. The κλίματα would be the sphere of St. Paul's labours. The first group embraced Syria and Cilicia (Gal. i. 21), and with them we may put Cyprus. His tour through these regions might be taken to be included in his original mission from the Apostles at Jerusalem. His real " work," as he calls it (τὸ ἔργον, Acts xv. 38), the work from which Mark had turned back (Acts xiii. 13), began with his visit to Pisidian Antioch. His second sphere of labour started from Ephesus and extended to Troas, Macedonia, Illyricum, Achaia, and perhaps Crete, and St. Paul is now embracing this in a round view (κύκλῳ), and the word πεπληρωκέναι seems to have an air of finality, as though this second chapter also were now closed; he " has no more any place in these latitudes." He contemplates paying a final visit to Jerusalem, and thence passing through Rome to go to Spain.

The real comment on these words is in St. Paul's own language in 2 Cor. i. 15-17, 23: " I was minded (ἐβουλόμην) to come before unto you . . . and by you to pass into Macedonia, and again from Macedonia to come unto you, and of you to be set forward on my journey unto Judæa. When I therefore was thus minded, did I show that want of consideration for you of which you complain?[1] or the things that I purpose (βουλεύομαι), do I purpose according to the flesh, that with me there should be the yea yea and the nay nay? I call God for a witness upon my soul, that it was to spare you that I forbare to come to Corinth." St. Paul here tells us his plan, which he had announced to the Corinthians. He had not carried it out, and they wanted to imagine that they had a grievance, as though he had thought

[1] τῇ ἐλαφρίᾳ ἐχρησάμην. The verb ἐλαφρίζειν, when used metaphorically, means to make of little account, to scorn.

them of little account. He says that his plans are not made according to the flesh, and that he does not abandon them except for very grave reasons.

The other comment is in Acts xvi. 6, 7: "Being forbidden of the Holy Ghost," "the Spirit of Jesus suffered them not."

And now we come to the word δεῖ. Sometimes it is used of a moral obligation on the conscience, but repeatedly, especially in St. Luke's Gospel and in the Acts, it is used of a kind of providential necessity: "I *must* be in my Father's house" (Luke ii. 49); "I *must* preach the good tidings of the kingdom of God to the other cities also" (iv. 43); "the Son of man *must* suffer many things" (ix. 22); "the Holy Spirit shall teach you . . . what ye *must* say" (xii. 12); "I *must* go on my way to-day and to-morrow" (xiii. 33); "but first *must* he suffer many things" (xvii. 25); "these things *must* come to pass first" (xxi. 9); "this which is written *must* be fulfilled in me" (xxii. 37); "the Son of man *must* be delivered up" (xxiv. 7); "*must* not the Christ have suffered these things" (26); "all things *must* be fulfilled, which are written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms concerning me" (44).

Similarly in the Acts: "The scripture *must* be fulfilled" (i. 16); "whom the heaven *must* receive" (iii. 21); "it shall be told thee what thou *must* do" (ix. 6, Christ to St. Paul); "how many things he *must* suffer for my name's sake" (16, Christ to Ananias about St. Paul); "Christ *must* have suffered" (xvii. 3, St. Paul); "as thou hast testified concerning me at Jerusalem, so *must* thou bear witness also at Rome" (xxiii. 11, Christ to St. Paul).

So here St. Paul seems to himself to be moving in an atmosphere of spiritual compulsion. A charge is laid upon him, and it is not a matter of his own desire or preference. He goes up to Jerusalem for the last time bound in the Spirit[1] (δεδεμένος ἐγὼ τῷ πνεύματι, where notice the contrast between the emphatic ἐγώ, St. Paul's own personal wishes and designs, and τὸ Πνεῦμα, (Acts xx. 22); he is a captive led about as God wills. The whole arrangement is providentially organized, as was that journey to Macedonia (Acts xvi. 6-10).

And in the same speech (Acts xx. 25): "And now, behold, I know (καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ οἶδα) that ye all . . . shall see my face no more";

[1] So Harnack, *Date of the Acts*, 71.

we have had it already in verse 22, " *And now, behold,* I go bound in the Spirit unto Jerusalem . . . the Holy Ghost testifieth unto me . . . saying that bonds and afflictions abide me." St. Paul is speaking of a personal revelation to himself and declaring it to others. And in this phrase where every word is emphatic the whole closes with the word *οἶδα*.

What is St. Paul's use of *οἶδα*? In the plural (*οἴδαμεν*) it is often used to introduce a quotation, meaning " you tell me and I agree with you "; this enables us to reconstruct part of the letter from the Corinthians to which St. Paul's First Epistle was the answer (1 Cor. viii. 1, 4, etc.); but St. Paul repeatedly employs it in the plural of the general Christian revelation (1 Cor. iii. 16, vi. 2, 3, 9, 15, 19, xv. 58; 2 Cor. i. 7, iv. 14, v. 1, 6; Eph. vi. 8, 9; Col. iii. 24, iv. 1, etc.); and in the singular of a private revelation to himself, " I *know,* and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus " (Rom. xiv. 14); " and I *know* that, when I come to you, I shall come in the fulness of the blessing of Christ " (Rom. xv. 29); " I *know* a man in Christ," " And I *know* such a man " (2 Cor. xii. 2, 3); " I *know* that this shall turn to my salvation, through . . . the supply of the spirit of Jesus Christ " (Phil. i. 19). And in the immediate context, " I *know* that grievous wolves shall enter in " (Acts xx. 29), where St. Paul is using the very language of the Hebrew prophets (Jer. v. 6; Ezek. xxii. 27; Hab. i. 8; Zeph. iii. 3), and of our Lord Himself (Matt. vii. 15, x. 16; Luke x. 3) (*cf.* 1 Tim. iv. 1, written to Timothy at Ephesus a few weeks before, " the Spirit saith expressly," etc.).

And St. Paul distinguishes between what he knows by revelation and what he does not so know, " *not knowing* (*μὴ εἰδώς*) what shall befall me there " (Acts xx. 22). His language throughout is not that of predilection but of obedience, not of conjecture but of prophecy. It is easy for the armchair critic to say that St. Paul was mistaken—easy but not convincing; for criticism must be guided by experience, and one may well doubt whether such a critic knows by experience what it is to have a vivid sense of being providentially guided at all; but it is impossible in the face of this language to doubt that St. Paul thought himself to be in the hands of " a divinity that shaped his ends." Accordingly, the Epistle to the Ephesians, wherever it may have been written from, is in the nature of " last words," and is to be compared with the speech of Samuel in 1 Sam. xii.; it is St. Paul's last

will and testimony; in a short time St. Peter will have covered all and more of the ground, if the address of his First Epistle is the record of a personal journey; later, after his release from Patmos, St. John will have taken over much the same field, if the Apocalypse is his.

There are three, if not four, notes of time struck in this epistle which give us a clue to where it was written.

St. Paul had obviously been at Ephesus for a long period, and still regarded himself in charge of the district, and he is a prisoner. He must therefore be in prison either in Ephesus, or in Cæsarea, or in Rome. But the claims of Rome may be dismissed; they rest on a double basis: the marked similarity between this epistle and that to the Colossians both in style and subject matter, and the fact that Tychicus was the bearer of both (Col. iv. 7; Eph. vi. 21). But as soon as we recognize that the Epistle to the Colossians was written not from Rome but from Ephesus, these arguments tell against and not in favour of the Roman claim. For between writing the Epistle to the Colossians and the beginning of St. Paul's imprisonment at Rome there is an interval of at least four years, and while we know that Tychicus was at Ephesus, Colossæ, probably Corinth, Cæsarea, and Jerusalem, there is no reason to suppose that he was ever at Rome. There is no message from Timothy or from any of those who had been with St. Paul at Ephesus and subsequently gone to Rome, such as Aquila, Junias, or Andronicus, or from any member of St. Paul's staff except his messenger, Tychicus (*cf.* 2 Tim. iv. 12). Moreover, if the Epistle to the Ephesians was written from Rome, the next before it in order of writing would be the Epistle to the Romans; and while this epistle resembles strongly the Epistle to the Colossians it disagrees markedly in tone with that to the Romans. In the Epistle to the Romans St. Paul is by turns the Apostle of the Gentiles and an Hebrew of the Hebrews; in that to the Ephesians he would appear to have shed his Judaism almost completely; in fact, the Epistle to the Ephesians might be written to churches which contained no Jewish element at all. Take as a test the use of characteristic words, "Abraham," "Isaac," "Jacob," "Israel," "Moses," "David," "Fathers" (=Patriarchs), "Israelite," "Jew," "Circumcision," "Law," "Commandment," "Covenant," "Promise"; there are nearly one hundred and fifty occurrences in the Epistle

to the Romans of one or other of these expressions; in the Epistle to the Ephesians the total number is ten, and of these ten, six are contained in three verses, so that there are only four occurrences left for the whole of the rest of the epistle.

In Rom. x. 1 St. Paul writes: "Brethren, my heart's desire and my supplication to God is for them (the Jews), that they may be saved"; in Rom. xi. 1: "I also am an Israelite, of the stock of Abraham"; in Ephesians there is no trace of this passion or patriotism; indeed, the whole mention of Judaism is confined to a single passage in chapter ii. 11-15, "Wherefore remember, that aforetime ye, the Gentiles in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called Circumcision in the flesh, made by hands (a scornful phrase), that ye were at that time separate from Christ, alienated from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenant of the promise, having no hope, and without God in the world. But now in Christ Jesus ye that were once far off are made nigh in the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who made both one, and brake down the middle wall of partition, having abolished in his flesh the enmity, the law of commandments contained in ordinances."

Nor do the claims of Ephesus fare better. This epistle is undoubtedly subsequent to that to the Colossians. But Tychicus went to Colossæ, and would not be available to take a circular tour until after his return, and when he came back, according to our reconstruction, he went to Corinth. As regards St. Paul, when he came out of prison he wrote the First Epistle to the Corinthians, and contemplated remaining in Ephesus or its neighbourhood until the following Pentecost (1 Cor. xvi. 8) and returning thither in the following year, after passing the winter in Corinth; a letter written from Ephesus, therefore, during this period would by no means take the form of a last will and testament. Nor, if he were writing at this time, would St. Paul so completely ignore the Jewish element in the Church. The Pauline churches started by being composed almost entirely of Jewish converts or of God-fearers—that is, Gentiles who adhered to the synagogue. St. Paul had for three months preached in the synagogue at Ephesus, as Apollos had done before him, and Prisca and Aquila, who had heard Apollos there and instructed him mōre fully, were themselves Jews (Acts xviii. 26, xix. 8), and St. Paul's example was generally followed. At the end of

the next two years St. Luke says that all those who lived in Asia had heard the word of the Lord, both Jews and Greeks (xix. 10); and in his speech at Miletus, delivered, on this theory, subsequent to the writing of this epistle, St. Paul declares that he had testified both to Jews and Greeks (xx. 21). And the plots of the Jews (xx. 19) and their opposition at the riot (xix. 33, 34) tell the same tale.

Clearly the proportion of converted Jews in the churches of Asia cannot have been so insignificant that St. Paul would entirely ignore their existence, unless something had happened; and that something great and important had happened which, for the time being, at any rate, had altered the tone of St. Paul's mind, is shown by the contrast between this epistle and that of the Romans.

And if we suppose that this epistle was written from Cæsarea, we know precisely what it was that had had this effect. Eight years previously, being unable to persuade the Church at Jerusalem to give open recognition to the complete equality of Gentile and Jew in Christ, St. Paul had grasped at the request that he should remember the poor. Here was an ever-present anxiety which weighed on the leaders, a burden under which their followers laboured. If he could persuade the churches of the Dispersion, which in course of time would, as St. Paul foresaw, become increasingly gentile, to contribute to the material needs of the Church at Jerusalem, that would be a demonstration of sympathy on their part, a manifestation of loyalty and of unity in the Spirit, and Jewish hardness and exclusiveness might be thawed by the fervour of gratitude. It was a large and statesmanlike scheme. It matured in the mind of St. Paul for five years, and more and more clearly he saw that attempts to make Jewish and gentile converts realize their oneness abroad depended on oneness at home. From the days of the controversy at Antioch onwards, Jewish opposition within the Church to St. Paul's teaching had regarded Jerusalem as its base, and annual pilgrimages had made the tone of the Church at Jerusalem dominant over Jewish converts throughout the Christian world. And in Jerusalem the Pharisaic party retained their ascendancy as they had done in their pre-Christian days. St. Paul, though he can use military metaphors of the Christian warfare, did not regard himself as a soldier fighting an enemy, but as a prophet (Eph. iii. 5)

endeavouring to make his brethren, both in the flesh and after the Spirit, blinded by the survival of Jewish prejudice, see what are the " unsearchable riches of Christ " and " the mystery which from all ages hath been hid in God," " that the Gentiles are fellow-heirs, and fellow-members of the body, and fellow-partakers of the promise in Christ Jesus through the gospel " (Eph. iii. 6, 8, 9), for which they might count all their former privileges as loss (Phil. iii. 7, 8). Indeed, these words from the Epistle to the Ephesians may well be recollections from a speech made to the Church at Jerusalem. If he succeeded he could sing his *Nunc dimittis, Domine*, and go elsewhere; the Church united at its centre would soon be united at the outskirts; he need not subject himself to the obloquy which would follow from disappointed ambition and mortified pride. If he failed, he would have no heart to continue the work, and it had better pass into the hands of another who might use more successful methods.

And he failed. Some five or six years previously, probably in gratitude for the saving of his life from drowning, he had made a vow on landing at Cenchreæ (Acts xviii. 18) which could only be paid in Jerusalem. Again he stood in Jerusalem surrounded by a band of disciples whose presence and whose alms would testify not to the success of the labours of Paul, but to the grace of God which had been with him (1 Cor. xv. 10; Acts xxi. 19). The Church at Jerusalem was glad enough to receive the alms, but they would not advance beyond their previous decision (Acts xxi. 25), but rather thought it a matter of pride that they did not draw back from it. And their first speech to St. Paul himself was: " Thou seest, brother, how many myriads there are among the Jews of them which have believed; and they are all zealous for the law: and they have been informed concerning thee, that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, telling them not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs. . . . We have four men which have a vow on them; these take, and purify thyself with them and be at charges for them . . . and all shall know that there is no truth in the things whereof they have been informed concerning thee " (Acts xxi. 20-24). That is to say, St. Paul was asked to manifest his Judaism by going into a part of the Temple where no gentile convert could possibly follow him, and as a proof of their gratitude for the alms which he had brought

he was to pay the expenses of his Jewish companions! What he had intended to be a demonstration of Christian unity was turned into a demonstration of a fancied Jewish superiority. St. Paul could not refuse. He had done the same thing for himself, and he could not be offensive to his hosts. But he was bitterly disappointed. Not yet, however, was his cup full. He was arrested on an entirely false charge of polluting the Temple by bringing a Gentile within its sacred court. He made a speech to the crowd; he was brought before the Sanhedrin; not a single Christian stood by him or offered evidence on his behalf. St. Paul, but for the comfort of Christ's presence (2 Tim. iv. 16, 17; Acts xxiii. 11), was a broken-hearted man. It was in these circumstances that the Epistle to the Ephesians was written. It resembles the Epistle to the Colossians because they were written by the same author to much the same people; Marcion's guess that this is the Epistle to the Laodiceans has so much truth in it. But it resembles also the last speech of St. Paul at Miletus;[1] and it would seem more probable that the epistle is later than the speech than *vice versa*. And there is one phrase in it which appears nowhere else in St. Paul's utterances, "the middle wall of partition." Though St. Paul had been familiar with Jerusalem from his youth, and had been labouring persistently for years to effect a solid and lasting union between the groups, Jewish and Gentile, into which the churches were divided, never elsewhere does it occur to him to employ this apt metaphor. Yet here it flashes out. Why? Obviously because some recent occurrence had given it a striking impressiveness. We know what this was. It was beyond this wall that St. Paul was said to have taken the Gentile, Trophimus, and this was the reason for the subsequent riot and the cause of his imprisonment. This phrase dates the epistle. It must have been written at Cæsarea soon after St. Paul arrived there, and sent by Tychicus, who had come up to Jerusalem as one of the delegates with the collection (Acts xx. 4) and was returning to his home at Ephesus as an apostolic messenger.

[1] See Westcott, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*, pp. xlix, l, where the resemblances are tabulated.

CHAPTER IX

ST. PAUL AND JUDAISM

ST. PAUL AND JUDAISM

MAN, it has been said, is the creature of habit. Like other aphorisms this is no doubt only partially true, but it is true in part; if thought tends to issue in act, action tends also to mould thought; if creed influences conduct, conduct reacts upon creed.

Of these habits some have been held to be innate, but the controversy as to whether acquired characteristics are transmissible need not be settled here; most habits, at any rate, are acquired by the individual in the experience of his life. Some are acquired almost instinctively and very largely by imitation in infancy; they are caught rather than taught, and in this irreflective stage it is of the utmost importance that children should acquire good habits of speech and action almost irrespective of their motive and meaning.

Then follows the period of a discipline enforced from without which at first may command only a reluctant assent; but if its precepts and provisions are wisely ordered, that assent becomes increasingly willing as the aims and purposes of the discipline are better understood. Finally, we come to the habits acquired through a discipline which we impose upon ourselves, often at first in agreement and sympathy with the society in which we live, but sometimes maintained without external support or even in opposition to our surroundings, and such isolation and opposition frequently has the effect of indurating habit, till it becomes all the more powerful on this account.

But excellent as may be the habits acquired in youth, advance in age or change in outlook and circumstances should often lead to their abandonment. It is in such conditions that the adage is apt to show its force. Habits originally amply justified, and maintained from a sense of duty, tend to persist when the reason for their formation has lapsed; the breaking of them would call for moral effort, and often be attended by a sense of loss and of discomfort. In such case, since men like to regard themselves as logical and rational beings, they will be inclined to justify their retention by a process of " rationalization," that is by finding

grounds in expediency for habits of thought and action which they are reluctant to forsake.

St. Paul had been brought up in a pharisaic household at Tarsus (Acts xxii. 6), and afterwards had been a pupil of Gamaliel in Jerusalem (xxii. 3), and as regards external conduct he had been by pharisaic standards blameless (Phil. iii. 6), living after the rule of the most scrupulous of Jewish parties, and by this means he had trained himself to acquire an habitual self-discipline. In contrast, therefore, with St. Peter (Acts xv. 10) and others, he did not feel obedience to the law to be an intolerable burden. To him the law was holy and righteous and good (Rom. vii. 12), and he was willing, as he himself says, to go beyond its precepts, and become a complete vegetarian, if that would the better avoid giving offence (1 Cor. viii. 13).

But by this method he had never succeeded in obtaining the peace of mind which he sought; he could not actualize his own ideals, nor was he satisfied with himself nor thought that God was or ought to be satisfied with him. Then came to him in vivid and concrete fact the vision of a triumphant righteousness and peace, when everything would seem to conspire to render it impossible. If we may accept the inference of Moulton[1] and J. Weiss[2], he had seen the death of Jesus. This was the death of the righteous (Num. xxiii. 10; *cf.* Acts iii. 14), so his heart told him; but nevertheless He died under God's curse (Gal. iii. 13; *cf.* Acts v. 30, x. 39), so his pharisaism protested.

And then came the martyrdom of St. Stephen, in which he had himself played the leading part, and there again he saw the same holiness, not as an external garment in which a man might wrap himself to hide the nakedness within, but burgeoning from somewhere within the soul, like the beauty of a flower (Matt. vi. 28; Luke xii. 27). Nor, we may conjecture, was St. Stephen the only Christian victim of persecution who exhibited these characteristics.

Then in rapid succession followed the first and greatest crisis in St. Paul's life, the vision of the glorified Jesus on the road to Damascus. Jesus was then the Messiah that He had claimed to be; God Himself had borne witness to His integrity; the conflict in St. Paul's mind was laid to rest; intellectual conviction forced upon him allowed him to give free play to his emotions; he bowed

[1] *From Egyptian Rubbish Heaps*, pp. 73-77.
[2] *Paul and Jesus*, pp. 39-56.

down in adoration, and rose to find himself in love with Jesus, and his expression of that great fact, " Christ's love grips us " (συνέχει 2 Cor. v. 14), " The Son of God who loved me and gave Himself up for me " (Gal. ii. 20) is as characteristic as that of the author of the Fourth Gospel, " the beloved disciple." It was the kind of love to cast out all fears but one (1 John iv. 18)—the fear of being accursed from Christ (Rom. ix. 3; *cf.* viii. 35), only that it had not yet acquired its full sway, love was not yet perfected in him (1 John ii. 5), he had not yet attained, he had still to press on and to stretch himself out towards what lay in front of him (Phil. iii. 12, 13).

This vision with the outward eye, as St. Paul regarded it (1 Cor. ix. 1), was followed on his return to Jerusalem by a vision seen in a trance which spoke to him of a future mission to the Gentiles (ἀποστελῶ or ἐξαποστελῶ Acts xxii. 21, contrast ix. 30 and xi. 22). This sense of a divine mission rested on his mind until the time should come for its fulfilment, when events should wake it into activity. Until that hour struck St. Paul preached Jesus as the Messiah of prophecy, through whom men might obtain forgiveness and peace, and yet as someone without the soul, drawing and uplifting it to Himself by His own astounding grace and attractiveness. Then, as he stood before Sergius Paulus the proconsul, he became aware of a power of working miracles in Christ's name welling up within him, to use St. Luke's language, he felt himself " filled with the Holy Ghost " (Acts xiii. 9), and he recognized that the Christ without was also the Christ within, and that the promised hour had come. So in Pisidian Antioch he entered on his gentile ministry, and for the first time those gentile adherents of the synagogue heard themselves saluted as " brethren " by a Jewish rabbi from Jerusalem.

In the following year he had to take up the cudgels in the cause of gentile freedom, and now we can discover from St. Paul's own letters how he stood towards Judaism. In practice he taught that each convert should remain in that state in which God had called him (1 Cor. vii. 17). Gentile converts already possessed in Christ the righteousness which the Pharisee vainly tried to produce in himself (Rom. viii. 4, ix. 31); to attempt to acquire a high degree of sanctity by submitting himself to the Jewish law would be for him to fall away from that state of grace into which he had in Christ been admitted (Gal. v. 4).

But except in two particulars St. Paul himself remained a strict Pharisee; he could not, of course, continue to attend the festivals in Jerusalem three times in the year, and though in his private life he observed the rule of not " eating with the blood " (Deut. xii. 16, 23), that did not prevent him from joining with the gentile converts in a common Agape whatever contributions they might bring; in this regard the demands of Christian charity and unity superseded the Jewish rule.

And as in his own conduct he remained a strict Jew, so he considered that his Jewish fellow-converts should remain. To forsake the customs of their fathers would give needless offence to their unconverted co-nationalists (1 Cor. viii. 13), and so be a hindrance to the spread of the Gospel, and he dreaded the possible laxity of morals which departure from the observance of the Jewish law would be all but certain to bring in its train.

But St. Paul's Jewish opponents drew the logical conclusion which he had himself evaded. He had, in fact, shifted the basis of obligation; keeping the law was, according to his teaching, merely a matter of Christian expediency. This was their main charge against him, that he had destroyed the permanent obligation of a divine ordinance, and it was in vain that he might protest, however sincerely, that neither against the Temple nor against the law had he ever said a single word (Acts xxv. 8).

The second count was perhaps felt as deeply, though not as explicitly avowed. Feeling the law to be a constraint, the Jews had, in order to secure its more ready and complete observance, taught themselves to regard the keeping of it as a privilege.

The appeal to the imagination to support the dictates of authority is a psychological method constantly employed by all sorts of rulers and governors, and it is true enough that if a man can persuade himself that some work of obligatory drudgery is a personal hobby in which he can find pleasure, he will perform it with greater generosity and thoroughness than if it is a mere burden on his conscience. If he be carried no further than this no great harm is likely to ensue; excellence in some particular hobby may lead to vanity, but rarely penetrates deeper. It is only when this sense of superiority teaches its possessor to regard himself as a better man in consequence that real harm is done, and nowhere is a man more exposed to the temptations to spiritual pride than in matters connected with religion. It was into this

snare that the Pharisee fell; he boasted in the law (Rom. ii. 23), and glorified in his righteousness as though it was a personal achievement and not a divine gift (1 Cor. iv. 7). This boasting St. Paul emphatically disallowed.

On the other hand his gentile converts often failed miserably to rise to the high demands of their calling in Christ (Phil. iii. 14), and they were inclined to argue that it was on account of their greater moral weakness that their Jewish brethren required the assistance provided by the law (Rom. xiv. 1). To such a pose the Jews possessed a ready answer; they could reply with justice that they were at least more moral than the unconverted Gentiles.

Thus St. Paul's theory might seem to be suitable to men so far advanced towards Christian perfection that each party would easily acknowledge its own shortcomings and respect the peculiar strength of the other; it was ill-adapted to converts only very imperfectly Christianized.

St. Paul's description of his own conduct is " to the Jews I made myself as a Jew, that I might gain Jews; to those under the law as under the law, not being myself under the law, that I might gain them that were under the law; to those without law as without law, not being without law to God, but under law to Christ " (1 Cor. ix. 20, 21). But he was, in fact, not so completely emancipated from the Judaism in which he had been brought up as he imagined, nor was charity the sole impulse that actuated him to keep the law; the law had a hold upon him, he was psychologically tied to it, anchored to it, and he had a subconscious fear of cutting himself adrift from it, and so from God's mercies covenanted to Israel.

His very patriotism (Rom. ix. 1) and earnestness of purpose tended to distort his vision. His conduct had not really succeeded in conciliating Jewish opposition either within or without the Church, and though he might ascribe his want of success to mere prejudice which, at least within the Church, he might hope to overcome, it needed the hard logic of events to open his eyes. Arrived in Jerusalem, he discovered that the leading Christians, so far from being prepared to make any advance towards him, not only thought that they had made the largest possible concessions in the decree passed years before, but extended its provisions to heathen converts in all mixed communities, and not merely in Syria and Cilicia. What St. Paul had regarded as a

measure of temporary and local expediency, they treated as a permanent and universal policy, and at the very moment when he was most anxious to promote internal unity, from fear of external hostility, they compelled him to take part in a demonstration of Jewish exclusiveness. The unconverted Jew showed towards him an intense and malignant hatred; his Jewish fellow-Christians refused to give testimony on his behalf, or to render him any particle of aid. He went to Cæsarea a broken-hearted man.

And then the light broke. If he had really maintained the obligation of the Jewish law solely as a matter of policy, events had showed clearly the failure of that policy to effect its designed end, and the whole basis of that argument had crumbled away. He could now perceive that all along there had been a subconscious middle wall of partition between him and his gentile brothers within his own mind; he had never been so entirely disinterested as he had pictured, and he must re-think his philosophy of the history of his own life and of the Jewish dispensation.

Outside the ranks of the Pharisees the Jew of the Dispersion with whom St. Paul had come into contact had fed his soul on prophecy and on apocalyptic. He did not feel the incubus of Roman government so galling as did the fanatics of Palestine. For the time being he was quite prepared to make terms with it, precisely because in the very nature of things it was doomed to have an end; and, in fact, Roman protection and exemptions, such as those from military service and from the outward observances of the State religion, gave room for two influences to grow in strength which already promised to assist in its dissolution. The first was the power of money, exhibited in the fact that there was a colony of Jews at work in each of the depots of the world's commerce, and in the inability of the emperors to enforce their total expulsion from the capital. And the second was the Jewish religion, which appealed to the more thoughtful non-Jew as having a solid substance at its very core different from the hollow pageantry which was all that the State religion provided, while the morality of the Jew was in marked contrast to the obscenity which attended the exciting eastern-imported cults. And the Jewish religion was spreading. Attending the Jewish synagogues scattered throughout the empire was always a number of heathen adherents whose children, if not themselves, might one day pass within the portals of Judaism. For the moment the Jew might be living

in Egyptian darkness, but he looked forward to a time when a new day would break and the God of Israel should be named over strange cities (*cf.* Isa. xviii. 19, 22; Zech. viii. 23) and the riches of the nations poured out at the feet of a Jewish sovereign (*cf.* Isa. xlix. 23, lx. 5-22). In short, the non-Jewish world existed for the glory of Judaism and the Jew.

To St. Paul that King had come and been rejected by all but a remnant of His own people, while the Gentiles were pressing into His kingdom. But the gifts and calling of God were without repentance (Rom. xi. 29), eventually all Israel was to be saved (xi. 26), and meanwhile, if the natural branches had been broken off that the Gentiles might be gathered in, it was into the Jewish olive tree that they had been grafted, they partook of its fatness, they did not bear the root but the root them (ix. 18), and it was more in the order of nature to regraft the Jewish into their own than the gentile branches into an alien olive tree.

This was the position which St. Paul had reached when he wrote the Epistle to the Romans in 56, and now—and now for the first time he had seen and understood God's purposes and methods, and the light flashed upon him with all the dazzling splendour of a new revelation (Eph. iii. 18). Yes, the Jew had been elected, segregated, trained, disciplined, educated; he alone of all the nations of the earth had known the one true God (Eph. ii. 12), but nothing was for the glory of the Jew, all was for the service of the true Messiah and of the world, and only if in that service he would be content to lose himself could he hope to find himself in finding the vocation for which he was made. The law, the Temple, all were transitory and to be superseded (*cf.* Heb. xii. 27). The acceptance of the Christ entailed sacrifices on the part of the Jew no less than on that of the Gentiles, but in either case to make them was infinitely worth while. St. Paul the Jew has now become the catholic Christian; he has forgotten his own people and his father's house, put away the last of the childish things; he is a new man, made one in Christ (Eph. ii. 15), or, in modern language, a wholly integrated soul.

To a person of smaller calibre of mind the discovery of his own ignorance and error might have rendered him all the more obstinately tenacious of his opinions. Not so with St. Paul. His original conversion had been all but forcible; his recent re-orientation felt to him like the sweeping away of a confining wall

which allowed the sense of the greatness of God's redemption to flood his soul and pour itself forth in passionate adoration. He marvelled at the subtlety of the divine wisdom, whose operation had been hidden throughout the ages, precisely because man's mind was too firmly compacted in narrowing prejudices to be able to take it in (Eph. iii. 18).

The Epistle to the Ephesians is written in this mood of exaltation. Its arrangement is torn asunder by bursts of feeling. Had the topic been one over which St. Paul had had leisure to reflect, he would have reached a greater serenity and the argument would have flowed in a more sustained and orderly sequence. He has been uplifted into the holy mount, and each particular duty, however homely, is treated from that lofty view-point. The Epistle to the Colossians, with which Ephesians stands in closest relationship, is that of a man working out in meditation the logical sequences; its language may be much the same, but it does not move with the same impetuosity nor thrill with the same fulness of vitality. The Epistle to the Ephesians is that of a prophet fired with a glowing fervour which overlaps the bounds of logical sequence in the sheer splendour of spiritual insight. St. Paul now sees that his whole Jewish education had but one end and object, it was to fit him to be the master-builder of a church in which the terms "Jewish" and "Gentile" had lost their relevance and meaning. God, the Lord, the Spirit, the body, baptism, eucharist are all one, with one exuberant and masterful oneness. Old things are passed away, Christ makes all things new with a splendid and unimagined novelty. To continue in thought a Gentile or a Jew is to have failed in being wholly re-born a Christian.

This is not the place to discuss the argument of the Ephesians; all that is needed is to grasp the fact, obvious as soon as it is pointed out, that such an epistle could only have been written within a short time of some in-rush of illumination in the history of St. Paul, brought about by the violence of external circumstances, which had torn him from his Jewish moorings and left him borne along by the full floodtide of the Spirit in unshackled and unhindered course whithersoever He listed to go.

CHAPTER X

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

SYNOPSIS

THE Epistle to the Hebrews known to Clement. The date of Clement's Epistle. Written to Hellenist Christians at Jerusalem. Substantially the work of Barnabas, but with a Pauline postscript. Timothy and his mission. "They of Italy." Written from Cæsarea about the same time as 2 Timothy and Ephesians.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

IN the best MSS. this is simply "to the Hebrews"; but the title forms no part of the original document, but was added as a headline when the epistle came into general circulation. It is probably an inference from the contents, but if "Hebrews" is taken to mean "people who speak Aramaic" it is almost certainly wrong, for the author uniformly uses the Septuagint, with no reference to the Hebrew even where the two texts differ (i. 5, ii. 7, x. 5, xii. 13, 15). It must therefore have been written by a Hellenist to Greek-speaking readers.[1]

It is the New Testament classic on the doctrine of the Atonement. When we speak in terms of priesthood and sacrifice, our ideas and language are derived not from pagan sources but from the Jewish sacrificial system, and these are the leading thoughts of this epistle.

But it is Christian; the author uses these terms and ideas as metaphors or parables, the real meaning and explanation of which is to be seen in the slaying of Jesus and in His present work and life within the heavenly sanctuary. It may therefore be regarded as a treatise, but only in the same way as St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans may be so regarded; though it gives neither the author's name nor the address or destination—in this respect resembling the First Epistle of St. John alone among the books which form the New Testament—it is a genuine letter and contains salutations at the end. But it is a work of composite authorship. Except for the single conventional phrase, "And what shall I more say? for the time will fail me . . ." (xi. 32), the whole is written in the plural number until we come to the personal messages of the last chapter; so, though it is convenient to speak of the "author," it would be more correct in regard to the main bulk of the epistle to speak of the "authors." The "author," then, describes his work as a word or treatise of exhortation (λόγος παρακλήσεως;

[1] *Cf.* Westcott, *Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 479: "The writer regarded the Greek version as authoritative; and, it may be added, he nowhere shows any immediate knowledge of the Hebrew text."

xiii. 22)—that is, he pictures himself as acting as a paraclete (παράκλητος) of those to whom he writes. Παράκλητος is a term of Greek legal practice. The Greeks had no barristers—in this respect differing from the Romans—though they had professional speech-writers, and the defendant was compelled to plead in person, but the Greek system allowed someone to stand by his side, give him moral support, prompt him on technical points, and instruct him how best to meet his opponent's case. As applied to the Holy Spirit the word "Paraclete" is exclusively Johannine, though parallels to St. John's description of His function and work are to be found in the Synoptic Gospels (Matt. x. 18, 20; Mark xiii. 11; Luke xii. 11, 12, xxi. 12-15). In the First Epistle of St. John the title is given to Christ, and this use is also implied in the Gospel (xiv. 16), "another Paraclete." If we seek instances of the Holy Spirit acting as Paraclete, we naturally think of St. Stephen (Acts vi. 10), and of St. Paul before Felix and Drusilla (Acts xxiv. 25); and St. Paul uses corresponding language about himself (1 Cor. ii. 4, 6, 7, vii. 40); while he says in the Second Epistle to Timothy (iv. 16, 17) that our Lord enacted the part of a paraclete towards him: "at my first defence no one took my part. . . . But the Lord stood by me and empowered me" (παρέστη καὶ ἐνεδυνάμωσέν με).

This, then, is how the author views his own position towards his correspondents; to use the Hebrew or Aramaic expression, he is to them a "son of paraclesis" (Acts iv. 36),[1] acting by his letter in much the same way as did St. Barnabas when he brought Saul to the Apostles (Acts ix. 27), who regarded him with suspicion, "not believing him to be a disciple," or when he exhorted (παρεκάλει) all the disciples at Antioch "that with purpose of heart they would cleave to the Lord" (Acts xi. 23). So here the readers were inclined to "drift away" (ii. 1), and had need of patience (ὑπομονή): "Cast not away therefore your boldness . . . for ye have need of patience, that, having done the will of God, ye may receive the promise" (x. 35, 36). They had been made a spectacle (θεατριζόμενοι, x. 33; *cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 9), and endured reproaches and afflictions, and lost a good deal of money, partly owing to their generosity, a loss which the author describes as the spoiling of their goods (x. 33, 34). Others, as they had themselves seen, had suffered far worse, "resisted

[1] *Cf.* 1 Peter i. 14, τέκνα ὑπακοῆς.

unto blood striving against the sin " (of apostasy from the Lord, xii. 4; *cf.* xiii. 7)—in other words, been martyred. Though the Gospel proclaimed is universal in its scope—Jesus " tasted death for every man " (ii. 9) and has been appointed " heir of all " (i. 2), " all shall know me " (viii. 11)—there is no trace of any heathen converts, nor of any of the topics of heathen controversy; and if the epistle had been addressed to a mixed community the author would not have written, " He taketh hold of the seed of Abraham " (ii. 16), but of Adam, or of man (*cf.* Rom. v. 12, 14; 1 Cor. xv. 22, 45; Phil. ii. 7, 8; 1 Tim. ii. 5). The epistle is therefore written to a Greek-speaking Jewish Christian community in a wholly Jewish Church.

Moreover, the author writes as if the Jewish worship were still being carried on;[1] if it had come to an end he would have had so complete a vindication of his thesis that it was bound to disappear (viii. 13) that he could hardly have failed to mention its cessation. The vividness of the narrative supposes that his correspondents had the right of participation in the Jewish sacrificial system. Hence the choice would seem to lie between Jerusalem and Leontopolis. But it is obvious that both Timothy and certain Italians (xiii. 23, 24) are known by those to whom it is addressed, and it is unlikely that Timothy ever went to Egypt; nor was Leontopolis a place of pilgrimage for Italian Jewish converts, while even in Egypt the Temple at Jerusalem was recognized as the true centre of worship. Nor does the apparent indebtedness of the Epistle to Philo[2] require for it an Alexandrian origin; there is a large amount of similarity between St. Paul's writings and Philo (see Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem*, pp. 130-132), so Philonic ideas must have been fairly common in Jerusalem; there was a synagogue there of the Cyrenians and of the Alexandrians (Acts vi. 9), and these ideas would be especially prevalent among the Hellenistic Jews. Lucius of Cyrene and Symeon called Niger, and, therefore, probably an African, were at Antioch (Acts xiii. 1). Moreover, Philo's treatment of the Tabernacle is markedly different from that of our author (Westcott, pp. 239, 240; *cf.* p. 201 on Melchizedek). We may conclude, therefore, that this epistle was written to Hellenistic Jewish Christians at Jerusalem while the Temple was still standing. And they are

[1] See Westcott, *Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. xlii.
[2] Tabulated in Farrar, *Epistle to the Hebrews*, Cambridge Bible, pp. 38-41.

men of some age (Heb. v. 12); there is no allusion to an earlier generation which has passed away; they are exhorted to be worthy of their own past (x. 34, 35, xiii. 7).

Moreover, in common with St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, his Epistle to the Romans,[1] and the First Epistle of St. Peter, this epistle is quoted in the Epistle of Clement.[2] Lightfoot dates the Epistle of Clement shortly after the persecution under Domitian, 95 or 96, but Edmundson (*Church in Rome*, pp. 189-205) has given good reasons for supposing that it was written not later than A.D. 70. Thus in chapter five, after mentioning Old Testament saints, Clement writes: "Let us cease to speak of examples of ancient days, and come to those champions who lived nearest to our own times (ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐγγιστα γενομένους); let us take the illustrious examples of our own generation (τῆς γενεᾶς ἡμῶν). . . . Let us set before our eyes the good Apostles Peter . . . and . . . Paul." Lightfoot remarks that the epithet "good" (ἀγαθούς) "may be most naturally explained by supposing that Clement is speaking in affectionate remembrance of those he had known personally"; the other phrases show that they belonged to his own generation and lived very close to the time at which he was writing. Further, if he had only just previously passed through the persecution under Domitian, would he refer to that in the first chapter in the words, "By reason of the sudden and successive troubles and calamities which have befallen us, we . . . have been somewhat slow in giving attention to the questions in dispute among you"? Does not so short and allusive a phrase seem by itself inadequate to such recent and terrible experiences? And this feeling is strengthened when we observe how graphically and at what length he describes the persecution under Nero: "To these men of holy life there was gathered a great multitude of the elect, who, having suffered through envy many indignities and tortures, become most illustrious examples among ourselves (ἐν ἡμῖν). Persecuted through envy, women, after suffering as Danaids and Dirces terrible and monstrous outrages, feeble though they were in body, attained the goal in the race of faith, and received a noble reward."

[1] Pauline parallels are tabulated in Forster, *Apostolical Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, pp. 445-540.

[2] On Clement, see Nairne, *Camb. Gk. Test.*, pp. xxx-xxxii.

These scenes of horror have not been obliterated by the intervening thirty years of peace, or by a later persecution, but were still haunting Clement's eyes. And in chapter xii. he writes as though the Jewish sacrifices were still being offered: " not in every place . . . are the perpetual daily sacrifices offered . . . but in Jerusalem alone; and there not in every place is it offered but before the sanctuary . . . after the victim has been inspected." Of course this may be merely description, but if Clement had been describing a past system would he not more probably have said " they were offered," or " must be " or " had to be " offered ? If the sacrificial worship had been overthrown, could not his opponents have retorted that the event had proved that such a system could not claim divine sanction ?

Again, Church organization at Corinth would appear to be on primitive lines. Besides the deacons we read of bishops, presbyters, notables (ἐλλόγιμοι ἄνδρες) and leaders (προηγούμενοι). Lightfoot and Edmundson identify bishops and presbyters, as in New Testament times, but Bernard (*Studia Sacra*, pp. 285-297) points out that eucharistic worship is mentioned only in connexion with bishops, and not with presbyters. Accordingly we seem to have a local governing body composed of bishops and presbyters conjointly, and among them certain individuals to whom was confined the privilege of celebrating the eucharist. There is no trace whatever of a monarchical episcopate. Gore, and apparently Turner (*Church and Ministry*, ed. 1919, pp. 284, 285), identify the ἐλλόγιμοι ἄνδρες with the προηγούμενοι, and suppose that they are " visitors " or Apostolic delegates, either non-local or provincial; but both these authorities are to some extent influenced by the *Didache*, and we now know that the *Didache* is to be dated in the latter half of the second century,[1] and consequently its evidence carries no weight. Nor, if the Epistle to the Hebrews is directed to Christians at Jerusalem, can we instance the term ἡγούμενοι (xiii. 17, 24—in xiii. 7 it refers to an earlier time), for at Jerusalem the governing body was localized and consisted of St. James and the presbyters (Acts xxi. 18). If these (προηγούμενοι) are " visitors " or " superintendents " from outside the local body, such as were Timothy and Titus, a date about 95 or 96 would seem too late; if, on the other hand,

[1] Muilenburg, *Literary Relations of the Epistle of Barnabas*, 1927, p. 168.

we have a local governing college of bishops and presbyters among whom the bishops only differ from presbyters by possessing liturgical privilege, that state of affairs would seem primitive. Of course if an Apostle or apostolic delegate were present, he would naturally preside at the eucharist, but in his absence the local body could still function, and the bishop-celebrant, or bishops-celebrant, if there was a concelebration, supported by the presbyters, would be the officials for all purposes, including the raising of others to their own rank, ordination being regarded as an occasional part of the eucharist, and not as a separate religious service; but just because an ordination was occasional, the presence of one at least of the bishops would come to be held necessary. At a later period we get a single bishop with his presbyteral colleagues, instead of several bishops. At Rome there were special difficulties, since in the time of Irenæus, and probably much earlier, there were congregations of eastern origin who differed from the local use even in the date of keeping Easter. Hence, while elsewhere the unity of the Church might be manifested by allowing a visiting bishop to celebrate the eucharist, as Anicetus allowed Polycarp, and as is ordered by the canon of the Council of Serdica, at Rome there was established the custom of sending the *fermentum* to the presbyters of the *tituli, ut se a nostra communione separatos non judicent* (*Epistle of Innocent*, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xx., col. 556). This, however, is to pass to a far later date. The important thing to notice is that at Corinth certainly, and at Rome probably, there was at the time of the letter of Clement no monarchical episcopate. In consequence, the idea of a succession of monarchical bishops, except at Jerusalem and in Asia Minor subsequent to the organization of the Churches there by St. John, is an antedating of later arrangements into more primitive times. There was a joint episcopo-presbyteral college, in which the episcopi were only to be distinguished from the presbyters, if at all, by their liturgical privileges, while during the lifetime of the Apostles these were subjected to the supervision of the Apostles themselves, or of delegates appointed by them. Thus, though Polycarp is a strong advocate of monarchical episcopacy, the governing body at Philippi, according to his epistle, would seem to be the presbyters, and a similar state of things may have existed in early times at Alexandria. In consequence, in Apostolic times, and the period which immediately succeeded them,

we should not speak of the " Bishop of Rome," but only of the " bishops of Rome."

It is as proceeding from this body that Clement does not put his name to his letter; it is the letter of the Church of Rome—that is, of its governing body. So Dionysius of Corinth, writing to Soter (Euseb., *H.E.* iv. 23), says, " We have read your epistle. . . . From it . . . we shall always be able to draw advice, as also from the former epistle, which was written to us through Clement " (διὰ Κλήμεντος γραφεῖσαν, with which we may compare 1 Pet. v. 12, " I have written to you by Silvanus," Διὰ Σιλουανοῦ ὑμῖν ἔγραψα)—that is, Clement was a kind of foreign secretary to the governing board, probably one of the bishops, but not necessarily so. But there are difficulties about the date of the *Shepherd of Hermas*, and Hermas says (*Vision* iii. 4): " Clement will then send to the cities that are without, for to him this has been committed." Turner suggests that this reference to Clement is symbolic (Gore, *op. cit.*, p. 292). In short, though the letter was written by Clement, there was nothing to show that he was at the time monarchical Bishop of Rome. The idea that the writer of an epistle in the name of a church must be its one and only bishop belongs to a later development.

But with the removal of the idea that Clement must have been the monarchical Bishop of Rome when he wrote, the whole case for a Domitianic date falls to the ground. The troubles referred to in the first chapter will be those of the Neronian persecution, afterwards noticed at great length, or the martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul. Moreover, Lightfoot himself writes: "One important test of date in early Christian writings lies in the *Biblical quotations*. . . . Now the quotations from the Gospels in this letter exhibit a very early type. They are not verbal; they are fused; and they are not prefaced by ' It is written,' or ' The Scripture saith,' or the like, but a more archaic form of citation is used, ' The Lord spake,' or some similar expression " (*Ap. Fathers*, Pt. I., vol. i., p. 353). It is noticeable that there are no quotations from St. John (Lightfoot gives four possible reminiscences, but these do not appear in the index in the Ante-Nicene Library nor in Harmer); and Lightfoot's close resemblances to St. Matthew are limited to three chapters (xiii., xxiv., and xlvi.), and in these there are parallel passages in St. Mark or St. Luke, or both. This means that no critic would rely on this epistle as evidence that St. Matthew's

Gospel was in circulation when it was written. But if this be so, then a doubtful reference to that Gospel in this epistle will not prove its late date. Nor does the fact that the Church at Corinth is called " primitive " (ἀρχαία) mean that it was founded nearly fifty years before, since the same epithet is used of Mnason in Acts xxi. 16 (ἀρχαίος μαθητής). There is, therefore, a probability in favour of dating the Epistle of Clement at least as early as A.D. 70, and as it quotes the Epistle to the Hebrews that must have been written before this date. In short, Hefele's dating is to be preferred to that of Lightfoot.

Thus external and internal probability alike incline us to date the Epistle to the Hebrews before the fall of Jerusalem, and, as we have seen, to regard it as addressed by some leader of the hellenistic Jewish converts there to other members of this group.

As soon as we adopt this view as the most probable hypothesis light seems to be thrown on other passages. Thus the allusions to persecution in chapters x. 32-35, xii. 2-4, xiii. 7, are to the persecution which followed on the death of Stephen, who was one of the former leaders of the hellenistic group. This persecution fell on hellenistic Jewish converts, and apparently on them only (Acts viii. 1).[1] St. Paul says that he " persecuted the church of God, and made havock of it " (Gal. i. 13); " I both shut up many of the saints in prisons, having received authority from the chief priests, and when they were put to death, I gave my vote against them. And punishing them oftentimes in all the synagogues, I strove to make them blaspheme " (Acts xxvi. 10, 11).

As soon as St. Stephen is mentioned we are immediately struck with the marked similarity not only of substance but also of diction between Heb. xi. 8-29 and St. Stephen's speech in Acts vii. 2-53;[2] notice especially, " ye who received the law by the disposition of angels " (Acts vii. 53), and Heb. ii. 2, " If the word spoken through angels proved stedfast." Though our author is compelled to allude to the Tabernacle rather than the Temple because the former was " like in pattern to the true " (Heb. ix. 24), he is but following St. Stephen, who says that Moses was commanded to make the Tabernacle " according to the figure that he had

[1] See Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem*, pp. 1-3, with the notes.
[2] These are tabulated in Ayles, *Date, Destination and Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 61.

seen " (Acts vii. 44). Notice also the epithet " made with hands " (χειροποίητος) which occurs in Acts vii. 48, St. Stephen's speech; Acts xvii. 24, St. Paul's speech at Athens; and twice in Hebrews, ix. 11 and 24. Again the treatment of faith is in contrast with that of St. Paul and in line with that of St. James. In St. Paul the righteousness of God becomes the justification of man; for " justification " the nearest equivalents in this epistle are " purification," " sanctification," " bringing to perfection." Righteousness in Hebrews is faith manifested by obedience, and earning the commendation of God; compare, for instance, Heb. xi. 17-19 with St. James ii. 21-24. Faith in St. James is the conviction of the existence of God and of the reality of His rewards and punishments (Jas. ii. 19); compare this with Heb. xi. 1, 6.

The similarities between the epistle and the speech of St. Stephen and the Epistle of St. James confirm the assignment of its destination to Jerusalem, and references to Jerusalem and to happenings there seem to come from all sides. There is, for instance, an added point if the Mount Zion to which in Christ Christians had come (xii. 22) is compared with the literal Mount Zion on which the Temple stood, frequented at festivals by general assemblies of descendants of Isaac, who were the heirs of Abraham and had the privileges of the firstborn.

So, again, it is the practice of pilgrimages to Jerusalem that explains the emphasis on brotherly love and hospitality in xiii. 1, 2, 16. If Jewish Christians came up to Jerusalem they would be Christians of the Dispersion, for the most part speaking Greek, and would certainly attach themselves to their co-hellenists and expect to be entertained by them; they would be " strangers and pilgrims " (xi. 13). Now both these phrases and many others (see Ayles, *Epistle to the Hebrews*, pp. 65, 66; and Ferris, *C.Q.R.*, vol. cxi., pp. 123-127) occur in the First Epistle of St. Peter. So, also, the use of " house " (οἶκος) as a figure of the Christian community, but in Heb. iii. 5 it is in a quotation from Num. xii. 7, and carried on further into the following verse, and not derived from St. Peter; in 1 Pet. ii. 5 it is the equivalent of a temple (*cf.* Acts vii. 47), and so the allusion in the second half of the verse in St. Peter is slightly forced, for how can a house built of living stones offer up sacrifices? Whereas to offer up a sacrifice to God through Jesus Christ (Heb. xiii. 15) is part of the meaning of the whole argument of the epistle, so also is the

type (Heb. ix. 24 compared with 1 Pet. iii. 21).[1] In short, considering how original the Epistle to the Hebrews is, it is far more probable that St. Peter's is dependent upon it than *vice versa*, and St. Peter could easily have become acquainted with this epistle through Silvanus or Mark, both of whom apparently lived in Jerusalem. And if this is so, then this epistle will have been written before A.D. 65.

The Italian pilgrims (Heb. xiii. 24) had obviously gone up to Jerusalem, and were at the time with the writer of the epistle, or had only just left him and not yet dispersed to their several homes, as they would have been if they had returned to their native country. If the epistle had been written from a town in Italy greetings might have been sent from that particular section of the group—*οἱ ἐκ Ῥώμης*, for example—but not from the whole of it. They are therefore at some point of the journey home, and the place possessed a race track (xii. 1) and a harbour ("drift away," ii. 1; "hope the anchor," vi. 19). These allusions would all be met by Cæsarea. Moreover, if the epistle had been written from Rome or Ostia or Puteoli, we should expect to find a strong Roman tradition as to its authorship.

The language of the Epistle to the Hebrews would seem to show that the author was acquainted with either St. Paul or his writings, particularly his Epistle to the Romans (*cf.* Heb. x. 30; Rom. xii. 19; Heb. x. 38; Rom. i. 17; Heb. i. 5; 2 Cor. vi. 18), and the principle underlying the argument is precisely the same as that enunciated by him—namely, the sufficiency and completeness and efficacy of Christ; but it is applied to persons in a different situation, and in regard to a different portion of the law. Among the Jewish converts of the Dispersion the liturgical portion of the law was in partial abeyance. Only a minority of the Jews outside Palestine ever went up to Jerusalem, and they but rarely, and in consequence the law, to those with whom St. Paul had to deal, meant so much of it as could be observed in foreign countries —that is, the non-liturgical portion. St. Paul had in mind those Jewish converts who insisted upon the keeping of this portion with some strictness and thought themselves as in some way superior to their Christian brethren who had been converted from paganism, and attempted to bring them under this yoke (Acts xv. 10; Gal. v. 1). Against such St. Paul's contention is

[1] *ἀντίτυπον* in Heb. and 1 Pet. is used in exactly opposite senses.

that in Christ all alike are in heavenly places (Eph. i. 3, ii. 6), and that there can be no distinction between Jew and Gentile (Col. iii. 11), and therefore the demand that gentile converts should observe this portion of the Jewish law in order to attain to a higher spiritual state was one that had to be fought to the death. But in thus contending for the freedom of his gentile converts St. Paul necessarily implied that the keeping of the law was no longer of obligation even on Jewish Christians. If they continued to observe it, as he did himself (Acts xxi. 24), it must be by way of charity in order to avoid giving offence, and to disarm Jewish prejudices against Christianity (1 Cor. ix. 20, x. 23).

Our author is dealing with certain hellenistic Jewish converts at Jerusalem. Probably they would not lay the same emphasis as Aramaic-speaking Jews or Jewish converts on the observance of the non-liturgical portion of the law, though in this regard they would doubtless conform to public opinion—even Galilean Jews were regarded as lax by the inhabitant of Jerusalem—but they also were inclined to claim a superiority over their gentile brethren in that they could participate in the worship of the Temple in in a way that was not allowed to Gentiles. The " middle wall of partition " (Eph. ii. 14), which in St. Paul is a metaphor, was in Jerusalem a very real and concrete thing. Here, then, there would be no question of imposing Jewish observance on gentile converts, since in matters liturgical the Gentiles could not participate on an equal level with the Jews. But these hellenistic converts were inclined to regard their Jewish worship as in some way supplementary to their Christianity, and the language used by St. Paul is seen to be singularly appropriate in their case also. " We being Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles, yet knowing that a man is not justified by (the) works of (the) law, but only by faith in Jesus Christ, even we believed on Christ Jesus, that we might be justified by faith in Christ, and not by (the) works of (the) law " (Gal. ii. 15, 16). If we remember that for St. Paul's word " justify," which does not occur in this epistle, we must substitute " make perfect " (ix. 9, x. 1), " sanctify " (xiii. 12), " cleanse " (ix. 14, x. 2), " take away sins " (x. 4), and that the " works of the law " are in this epistle liturgical ordinances, the argument is identical. " Received ye the Spirit by (the) works of (the) law, or by the message of faith ? Are ye so foolish ?

having begun in the Spirit, do ye now make an end in the flesh?" (Gal. iii. 2, 3). "Ye are severed from Christ, ye who would be justified by the law; ye are fallen away from grace" (Gal. v. 4).

All that is typified by Jewish sacrifices is realized in Christ and mediated by sacraments (Heb. x. 3, 4). Jewish ordinances are merely foreshadowings of benefits to be conferred; they can never take away sins, or make the worshipper perfect (x. 1), and participation in peace-offerings cannot stablish the heart in grace (xiii. 9). In the importance which some of these hellenistic converts attached to the worship of the Temple, and their consequent claim to superiority over their gentile fellow-Christians, some had gone even further than this and forsaken the Christian liturgical assemblies (x. 25). The end of the law, the fulfilment of the law, the substance and reality of the law on both its liturgical and non-liturgical sides is Christ (*cf.* Rom. x. 4; Heb. x. 4-7), and because Christ is common to all Christians, whether they have been converted from Judaism or from paganism, the possession of Christ is the ground of the oneness of the Church (Col. iii. 11). Thus St. Paul and the author of this epistle are really working out the implications of the same principle, but in relation to different circumstances and by different methods. St. Paul's controversial epistles are polemics; our author is a man of peace, and his epistle is an eirenicon. He is content with establishing the principle, and though he says Christ died on behalf of every man (ii. 9) the practical consequences are for the most part left over for oral instruction after his return, except for one particular on which he is explicit.

We have already seen that St. Paul had conformed to that portion of the law which could be obeyed among the Dispersion. He had become a Jew to the Jews in order to win them to conversion (1 Cor. ix. 20), but with a very limited success. On his first missionary journey at Pisidian Antioch we get, "Seeing ye thrust it from you . . . lo, we turn to the Gentiles" (Acts xiii. 46); and we have much the same thing in Rome at the close (Acts xxviii. 25-28), while in 1 Thess. ii. 15 we are told that the Jews "drave out us and please not God, and are contrary to all men." Thus his personal concessions in conduct to Jewish prejudices do not seem to have been very effective in winning converts. Nor did he succeed much better with the Jewish Church at Jerusalem.

He had forced the issue of Jewish and Gentile equality in Christ by taking up Titus (Gal. ii. 1), and he had been defeated; all that he could get from the authorities was that in churches of a mixed population (Acts xv. 29) there should be one eucharist and one agape if the gentile converts observed certain regulations in order not to wound the Jewish converts' susceptibilities. But while accepting these regulations St. Paul had eagerly snatched at a hint. When it was suggested that he should remember the poor (Gal. ii. 10), he at once made the great collection one of the objects of his life; and that plan had now been carried through. The Church at Jerusalem was glad enough to get the money, but the only concession they would make was that in quoting the decree they omitted the words " those which from among the Gentiles turn to God," so that a gentile convert, such as St. Luke, would be received as a participator in the agape and eucharist at Jerusalem, where the observance of the regulations would fall on the shoulders of his hosts. But whatever may have been the feelings of the leaders, they would not openly declare themselves on St. Paul's side, or endeavour to win over the main body of their followers to the doctrine that in Christ there can be neither Jew nor Gentile. On the contrary, they faced St. Paul with a terrible dilemma. Some years previously he had taken a vow in Cenchreæ (Acts xviii. 18) which he had paid in Jerusalem (xviii. 22). He could hardly refuse to share in the payment of a vow taken by others. But the consequences were pointed out to him. " Thou seest, brother, how many myriads there are among the Jews which have believed, and they are all zealous of the law: and they have been informed concerning thee, that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, telling them not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs. . . . We have four men which have a vow on them; these take and purify thyself with them . . . and all shall know that there is no truth in the things whereof they have been informed concerning thee; but that thou thyself walkest orderly, keeping the law " (Acts xxi. 20-24). But he so acted, not because he thought that he was under any legal obligation to do so, but out of charity. Not being himself under the law he was free, but he voluntarily put himself under bondage (1 Cor. ix. 19), and he held that he had this freedom in common with all other Christian Jews. He had not forbidden the Jewish Christians

to circumcise their children—that was an exaggeration—but if he acted as he was asked, his action was sure to be exaggerated on the other side, and Jewish believers would consider that he insisted that his fellow-Christian Jews were under obligation to keep the Jewish law.

He yielded, but he did not win Jews to conversion, nor the Jewish Church to unity with the Gentiles; and St. Paul must have regarded his whole scheme as a failure. A second time he had endeavoured to force the issue and it had been turned into a counter-demonstration. As regards the Jewish Church at Jerusalem, St. Stephen seemed to have died in vain; the two halves of the law, its liturgical and its non-liturgical sides, were still barriers which hindered the unity of the Church. On the non-liturgical side there was nothing more to be done; would the liturgical side yield? If so, the appeal could only be made by one who had felt all the attraction of the Jewish system, who had endeavoured to find peace by its observance, as St. Paul had by his pharisaism, who had discerned that this portion also was a pædagogue unto Christ (Gal. iii. 24), and who in Christ had grasped the reality, and was prepared to forgo the shadow.

The earthly Jerusalem, which was the symbol of the Jewish system, was not the abiding city (xiii. 14); the Jewish altar gave no grace; to retain the shadow might be harmless if it was not confused with the substance, but to regard the shadow as substantial made the substance shadowy. "Let us" (the writer includes himself) "go forth without the camp" (xiii. 13). They would be regarded as renegades, but it was the reproach of Christ. It was perhaps a resolution new to himself that the writer is commending to his readers, a resolution called forth by some striking event which had made it plain that there was still some sort of barrier between his readers and Christ on the one side, and between them and their brethren on the other. If they were to abandon Jewish worship in what position would they be? There can be only one answer: they would by a voluntary act range themselves alongside those Christian converts from heathenism who could not venture beyond the wall of partition. It was, in a certain sense, heroic, but it was most definitely a Christian proceeding. The rulers of the Church at Jerusalem had tied their own hands. After urging on St. Paul an act intended to be a demonstration in favour of Judaism, they could not range themselves on his side

in his campaign for freedom (*cf.* 2 Tim. iv. 16). If hellenistic Christians were to sever themselves from their Aramaic-speaking brethren by refusing to participate any longer in Temple worship, it would be an act of censure on the policy of the Christian rulers; hence the need for the exhortation to obedience. "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit to them" (xiii. 17). But the Pauline policy of being a Jew to the Jews had at Jerusalem broken down and placed him in a false position; it was necessary now to be a Christian to the Christians at the cost of forsaking not so much Moses as Aaron. It would be unpalatable advice, and there was much to be urged against taking it. The unconverted Jews might be hardened and embittered; the Aramaic-speaking Jewish converts might even be unlikely to follow it; they could quote St. Paul's own action in their favour; it would make not for unity but for schism; the service of the Temple was of Divine ordering; they had themselves for years found a strong appeal in it. All this could be urged with much plausibility. It might lead to exclusion from the synagogue, and entail boycotting and minor persecution. "Yes, but," the writer urges, "you must make your choice. Are you on Christ's side?" In the last resort it was a question of a conflict of loyalties, Christ or Judaism, and to prefer Judaism to Christ was sin, none the less because the sin was exceedingly specious (εὐπερίστατος, xii. 1).

If he is urging these hellenistic Jewish converts at Jerusalem to forsake the worship of the Temple—and no other interpretation of xiii. 13 seems possible—then there must have been some special occasion, some notable and recent event, which would make such a reversal of past practice seem obligatory; some occurrence must have emphasized the privilege of participation; the question must have become a burning one. Put thus, and considering that from the earliest days Temple worship was the regular practice of the Christian community at Jerusalem, we can find no other occasion that can have made necessary the re-thinking of the entire Christian position in this regard than the tumult that ensued on the supposed introduction of a gentile convert within the barrier and the consequent defilement of the Temple (Acts xxi. 28); while the arrest of St. Paul must have given a great emotional shock not only to the leaders who had urged him forward, but to the whole hellenistic community and the gentile converts who had come up with him, and not least to

St. Barnabas, if he was in Jerusalem at the time, as is probable both from the fact that his home was there and that as a Levite he would be more punctilious than most at being present, whenever possible, at the great festivals. And if St. Barnabas was there, he, who had stuck by St. Paul when St. Mark had left him, would almost certainly have made the two days' journey to Cæsarea to give St. Paul support and encouragement.

And so there would be gathered at Cæsarea just such a group as might be the joint writers of the epistle—St. Paul, St. Barnabas, St. Luke, and Philip the Evangelist. The voice is the voice of Barnabas the Levite, but the hand is the hand of St. Luke, to whose style it shows a marked resemblance (Westcott, pp. xlvii, xlviii); Philip may account for likenesses to St. Stephen's speech, and behind all is the mind of St. Paul.

Internal and external evidence alike favour this solution. The epistle is, as we have seen, of composite authorship. The close resemblance of the language to that of St. Luke was noticed by Clement of Alexandria, and frequent use is made of words characteristic of St. Luke among the writers of the New Testament.[1]

The ideas contained in the epistle are Pauline, and it must have been written either by one personally acquainted with St. Paul or familiar with his epistles, and notably with the Epistle to the Romans. But St. Paul never uses the word "priest"; Christ is to St. Paul the crucified Redeemer, to our author He is a sympathizing and glorified high priest. And there is nothing in this epistle of St. Paul's mystical union in Christ, but of freedom of access to the Father by Him. And the treatment of faith is different and more akin to that of St. James.

Tertullian (*de Pudic.* 20) attributes the epistle to Barnabas, and apparently knows of no other tradition; and the view that Barnabas wrote an epistle may have been the early tradition of Alexandria, and account for the attribution to him of the spurious epistle.[2] Barnabas would have been well acquainted with Philonian ideas both from his residence among Hellenists at Jerusalem and as

[1] For example, of the words in 2 Maccabees, 35 per cent. recur in Luke and 57 per cent. in Acts and 22 per cent. in Hebrews; and of the words in 3 Maccabees, 43 per cent. recur in Luke, 44 per cent. in Acts, and 28 per cent. in Hebrews; and the Gospel and the Acts are each more than three times as long as the Epistle to the Hebrews.

[2] See Muilenburg, *Literary Relations of the Epistle of Barnabas*, p. 30.

coming from Cyprus, where Egyptian influence was strong. As a Levite he would take especial interest in the Temple, and if he appears to misplace the altar of incense this is due to his eye being fixed on the antitype. He was a leading Hellenist, and must have had great personal authority; but though he may have been one of the " five hundred brethren " he was not one of the Twelve, and must have obtained much of his instruction in the faith from one or other of these. His great generosity (Acts. iv. 34) would have re-enforced his appeal, but it is unlikely that he had reduced himself to labouring with his own hands for a living by this act (1 Cor. ix. 6), and this points to some spoiling of his goods; and having acquired the spirit of self-sacrifice he might well urge on his readers a course of conduct which for both them and him would be felt as a severe deprivation.

There can be little doubt that this epistle proceeds from a group of friends—the use of the plural number shows that —but among them one was the substantial author. He is obviously a Hellenist writing to Greek-speaking Jewish converts at Jerusalem before the destruction of the city. The Temple worship was before their eyes, and the crowds of pilgrims still thronged Mount Zion at festivals, and the city was still abiding. He and they are people of some age, and he bids them remember their former leaders and to consider their end, since they themselves have endured persecution in a less extreme form. They were acquainted with certain Italian citizens who had most likely come up to Jerusalem for one of the festivals, and with Timothy, and the former may still be with the writer.

In conclusion, then, this epistle is not Pauline in its diction or in its mode of approach. Nevertheless, there is nothing in it with which St. Paul would not be in fullest sympathy. If it were written from Cæsarea, of course its recipients would know where it came from, and that St. Paul was there, and they would naturally want to know what St. Paul thought about it. St. Paul's method of authenticating his own epistles was by writing a postscript in his own hand, and now if we look at the last three verses we find characteristic Pauline touches. There is first the " grace " at the end. Neither in the epistles of St. Peter, St. James, St. Jude, nor St. John do we find the phrase " grace be with you," but it occurs in all the Pauline epistles. It is therefore a characteristically Pauline form. Then we notice " our brother Timothy."

There is no one who stood in so intimate a relation to Timothy as St. Paul, and no one as likely to call him " our brother." This is also a characteristically Pauline touch. Constantly St. Paul says " the brother " or " my brother " of his fellow-workers: " Sosthenes our brother " (1 Cor. i. 1); " Apollos the brother," (1 Cor. xvi. 12); " Timothy the brother " (2 Cor. i. 1; Col. i. 1); " Ephaphroditus my brother " (Phil. ii. 25); and in 1 Thess. iii. 2, " Timothy our brother," exactly as here; but elsewhere the phrase occurs only in 1 Pet. v. 12 and 2 Pet. iii. 15, and each time with an epithet, " Silvanus the faithful brother," " our beloved brother Paul." So here, I take it, the hellenistic Jewish converts of Jerusalem had been enquiring after Timothy, whom they were disappointed not to have seen, and St. Paul had told them that in consequence of the absence of so many Ephesian presbyter-bishops who had come to Jerusalem he had been compelled to bid him stay in Ephesus until their return. He now informs them (γινώσκετε) that Timothy's mission at Ephesus is fulfilled—on what Timothy is now engaged he does not say, any more than he had told the Corinthians that Timothy was going to Macedonia before he went to Corinth (1 Cor. iv. 17; *cf.* Phil. ii. 19), or that he himself intended to go to Colossæ before visiting them (1 Cor. iv. 19) —and that he hopes to have him with him shortly; and that if he arrives in good time (τάχειον, St. Paul wanted to get to Rome before the winter) he will himself come to Jerusalem with him and pay the remainder of his visit, which had been so abruptly cut short. So in the course of these three verses we have a mention of Timothy, of some mission on which he had been engaged and from which he was now free (ἀπολελυμένον), of certain Italians who had been with the author's correspondents and had come back to him on their way home, and of the " grace," and three of these notices are characteristically Pauline.

And now turn to the last chapter of the Second Epistle to Timothy, verses 9-21, an epistle written shortly before and carried by Tychicus to Ephesus with the Epistle to the Ephesians. Timothy is in charge at Ephesus; St. Paul is sending Tychicus to relieve him (ἀπέστειλα sending with a commission). Timothy is to go to Troas and to rejoin St. Paul without undue delay (ταχέως), and in any event before winter; certain Italians, as is shown by their names, are with St. Paul at Cæsarea, and send their greetings to Timothy exactly as they do to their fellow-

hellenistic converts at Jerusalem; and the epistle closes with a "grace." The manner in which these three epistles—Ephesians, 2 Timothy, and Hebrews—dovetail into each other is as near proof positive as we could hope to obtain that they were all written from the same place and within a short period of time.

CHAPTER XI

THE ACTS, ST. LUKE AND TITUS

SYNOPSIS

THE Acts written before 62 A.D. An apologia for St. Paul and Paulinism.

St. Luke and Titus, Gentiles; converted by St. Paul at Pisidian Antioch; brothers. Their movements.

THE ACTS, ST. LUKE AND TITUS

IF we had only the Acts to deal with, the sole reason for dating the book after the death of St. Paul would be the passage in the speech of Gamaliel, in Acts v. 34-39, dealing with Judas and Theudas, which is said to be based on Josephus. But (*a*) Blass has suggested that in Josephus (*Antt.* XX. v. 1) the Christians may have inserted the name "Theudas"; (*b*) Josephus was quite as capable of making a mistake as St. Luke; in his *Antiquities* he would seem to correct many mistakes which he had previously made in the Jewish War; (*c*) Professor A. C. Clark (*Acts of the Apostles*, pp. liv, lv, 342, 343) has put forward a far simpler view, that there has been a transposition of two lines, made easier by the double occurrence of "rose up" (ἀνέστη), so that we should read: "For before these days rose up Judas of Galilee in the days of the enrolment; to whom a number of men, about four hundred, joined themselves; who was slain (himself alone, Bezan text), and all, as many as obeyed him, were dispersed, and came to naught. After this rose up Theudas, giving himself out to be somebody ("some great one," Bezan text), and drew away some of the (Bezan text, "much") people after him; he also perished, and as many as obeyed him were scattered." Professor Clark points out that with this emendation the text is much more in accord with actual history. Holtzmann suggested that St. Luke had before him the passage in Josephus, but Schürer answered that if this theory were true, St. Luke would appear to have read only one passage of Josephus and neglected others, and that he read this one passage very carelessly. If Gamaliel's speech is a Lukan composition, and not a report of what was actually said, he might have drawn on the same sources as those used by Josephus,[1] and need not have read Josephus at all; and there are indications that in this section St. Luke is dependent on Aramaic narratives, and that he is not here relying on Josephus is shown by the fact that St. Luke, who is not prone to understatement (Acts xiii. 44, xix. 10), here says "four hundred," while Josephus has τὸν

[1] See H. S. Cronin, *J.T.S.*, xviii., p. 150.

πλεῖστον ὄχλον. With the explanation of this single allusion the whole case against an early date for the Acts, regarded in isolation from the Gospel, fades away. The argument on the other side has been stated by Rackham in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, i., pp. 76-87.

Now we come to the Gospel. Professor Clark thinks that but for the Preface we should judge from the difference between the style of the two that they were by different authors. For their differences, however, which he enumerates, more than one explanation might suggested. There are four characteristics of the Acts to be noted:

(1) In spite of the stylistic differences between the first fifteen chapters, down to xv. 35, and the remainder, the resemblance between these two portions is such as to make it clear that they proceed from the same author, and that he wrote the "We" sections.

(2) There are many ruggednesses about the Acts which contrast with the elegant Greek style of the Prologue, and suggest that St. Luke had not given it its final revision.

(3) The style of the Acts as a whole differs markedly from that of the Gospel, and this difference extends to both portions of the book.

(4) There are two different versions of the Acts, one which may be called the Greek, that is the version of the most important of the Greek MSS, and the other the Bezan, the version given in the Codex Bezæ and its congeners.

All these features can be explained by a single hypothesis. The Gospel had a wider function than the instruction of Theophilus, and it is probable that St. Luke retained a copy for his own use. On the other hand, in the Acts St. Luke had no intention of writing a manual of early Church history for the edification of the whole Christian body. The Acts was written as a brief in favour of St. Paul to be used by Theophilus in order to secure St. Paul's release from prison. St. Luke probably made a full draft of it and sent the fair copy to Theophilus. This fair copy has perished, and neither text as we have it is the original draft, but the draft worked over by the later editors, the one possibly resident in Rome and the other most probably, according to Professor Clark, in Egypt (*Acts of the Apostles*, pp. ix, 3), or possibly in Palestine, to which the draft may have travelled after

the Roman edition had been made. Both editions were issued before the latter half of the second century, and the editor of one may have been St. Luke himself, but he was unable to complete his revision.[1]

Professor Clark's analysis of the style of the Acts suffers from two minor defects: he does not distinguish between the two sections of the Acts nor between the Pauline Epistles and the edited Pastorals; but these defects are not sufficient to vitiate his general conclusions. It is, however, noticeable that of the eleven words given on p. 404 as present in St. Paul and St. Luke but absent from the Acts, seven are also absent from the Pastoral Epistles—ἐκεῖ, ἐμός, ἐπάνω, ἔπειτα, μείζων, ὁμοίως, παλαιός; and of the words, rare in the Acts (p. 402) but common in St. Luke and the Pauline Epistles—ἐάν, ὃς ἄν, ὅταν—none occur in the Pastorals.

Apart from peculiarities of style the general outlook of the Gospel and the Acts is identical. Substantially, at any rate, they are so clearly alike that the hypothesis that they are by different authors is not tenable.

And if, as Dr. Streeter supposes, St. Luke made a complete Gospel before ever he came across that written by St. Mark, part of which he afterwards discarded in favour of St. Mark's account, then it may have been the earlier version, "Proto-Luke," which St. Luke calls "the former treatise," and gave to Theophilus. In that case the dating of St. Mark's Gospel would not come into the question.

But the dating of St. Mark is to be decided by its internal evidence, and by the testimony of Clement of Alexandria (*ap.* Euseb., *H.E.* VI. xiv. 6, 7) and Jerome, who both assert that it was written while St. Peter was still alive. The passage in Irenæus (*adv. Haer.* III. i.) which is said to maintain that the Gospel was written after the death of St. Peter and St. Paul has been shown by Dom Chapman (*J.T.S.* vi., pp. 563-569) not to bear this meaning. Its whole object is to show that the teaching of the Apostles Peter, Paul, Matthew and John has not been lost, but transmitted to us in writing, and is the common property of Christendom, having been proclaimed in Rome, Palestine and Asia Minor. Two Apostles, St. Matthew and St. John, wrote

[1] A list of passages showing a want of revision is given by Rackham in *J.T.S.* i., p. 85, n.

down what they preached; the teaching of the other two has been reported by their followers.

"Matthew among the Hebrews (in Palestine) in their own language published a writing also of the Gospel (besides preaching it, see the previous section), Peter and Paul preaching the Gospel (not to Jews but) at Rome (without writing it down), and founding the Church there. But (although they wrote no Gospel) after their death (their preaching has not been lost to us, for) Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, has handed down to us, he also in writing (like St. Matthew), the things which were preached by Peter, and Luke besides, the companion of Paul (the other of the two), set down in a book the Gospel preached by that Apostle. Finally, John, the disciple of the Lord (as Mark was of Peter), he also published a Gospel while he was living in Ephesus of Asia."[1]

This interpretation is accepted by Harnack (*Date of the Acts*, pp. 130, 131), who entirely endorses Rackham's arguments, and says that "St. Mark must have written his Gospel during the sixth decade of the first century at the latest; this date may be regarded as certain" (*loc. cit.*, p. 133); and as regards St. Luke that "it seems now to be established beyond question that both books of this great historical writer were written while St. Paul was still alive" (*op. cit.*, p. 124).

As regards the Acts, this conclusion would be certain if we were to take Hefele's and Edmundson's date for the First Epistle of Clement (see above, pp. 176 *ff.*). Compare—

Acts.	*Clement.*
xx. 35: μνημονεύειν τε τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπεν μακάριόν ἐστιν μᾶλλον διδόναι ἢ λαμβάνειν	13. μεμνημένοι τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ οὓς ἐλάλησεν 2. ἦιον δίδοντες ἢ λαμβάνοντες
i. 25: παρέβη Ἰούδας εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν ἴδιον	5. (Πέτρος) ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τόπον . . . (Παῦλος) εις τὸν ἅγιον τόπον ἐπορεύθη
xiii. 22: Εὗρον Δαυεὶδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί [ἄνδρα] κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου	18. Εὗρον ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου, Δαυεὶδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί
xxiii. 1: πάσῃ συνειδήσει ἀγαθῇ πεπολίτευμαι τῷ Θεῷ.	41. Εὐχαριστ εἰτω Θεῷ ἐν ἀγαθῇ συνειδήσει.

The translation is Dom Chapman's.

Indeed, the only reason for putting either of the two Gospels later than this would seem to be that both contain prophecies of the fall of Jerusalem, and it is assumed that no prophecy has any predictive element, but must always be a prophecy after the event with which it deals. This objection dismisses as untrustworthy all the modern evidence, such as that accumulated by the Society for Psychical Research, of prevision of subsequent events by persons of peculiar gifts. Even if we grant that the prophets of the Old Testament were but far-seeing statesmen, what are we to make of the prophecies of Agabus, and of our Lord's prediction of His Passion? Or was it beyond the capacity of St. Paul, for instance, to anticipate that affairs in Palestine were moving towards a crisis in which the Romans would be compelled, in the interests of the world's peace and good order, to stamp out Jewish turbulence, which was a perpetually recurring menace to their authority, and that if they began they would not stop until they had made a full end, including the complete destruction of the capital?[1] And is there anything in the accounts in these Gospels which goes beyond such an anticipation? The methods of the Romans in besieging cities were well known, and there were the records of previous sieges of Jerusalem, and prophecies of a future siege (*e.g.*, Zech. xiv. 1, 2; Dan. vii. 25, viii. 13, xii. 1, 7) in the Old Testament to draw upon; notice the significant phrase, " so that all things which are written may be fulfilled " (Luke xxi. 22). Harnack, at any rate, can find nothing, and as a matter of fact we know that before Jerusalem was encompassed with troops the Christians withdrew from it to Pella in obedience to what they believed to be a prophecy.

In agreement, therefore, with Rackham, Harnack, and Clark, I hold that the Acts was written in 62, and I see no good reason for disbelieving that the Gospel, or at least Proto-Luke, was composed earlier than this.

And in support of this early date we notice the character of the book itself. By the year 62 narratives were already current dealing with our Lord's ministry, His death, and His resurrection. The Acts forms a sequel to such, and particularly to the Gospel of St. Luke, and in its earlier portion it gives in outline, dependent

[1] *Cf.* 1 Thess. ii. 16. Knox (*St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem*, p. 17) makes the very plausible suggestion that the amplification of St. Mark's narrative by St. Luke may go back to St. Paul, who himself drew on *The Testaments of the XII Patriarchs*.

on such authorities as St. Luke thought worthy of credit, a sketch of the spread of Christianity and of the growth of the Church during the first three years. Then St. Paul comes upon the scene, and forthwith not only is he the leading actor, but other characters are introduced solely in connexion with him, and pass out of sight as soon as that connexion ceases. Thus, up to the time of St. Stephen's martyrdom St. Peter is obviously the most prominent among the Apostles; afterwards he appears in certain detached stories; he and St. John are sent by the whole body to Samaria, and St. Peter deals with Simon Magus, Æneas, Dorcas and Cornelius; then there follows the story of his imprisonment and release, and then he appears only in connexion with the Council. Moreover, there is an obvious parallelism between the doings and sufferings of St. Peter and those of St. Paul, and wherever we can compare the two the balance appears to be on St. Paul's side.[1]

After the joint mission to Samaria, St. John is only mentioned as being the brother of St. James, while St. James appears only in the list of the Apostles and in a short notice of his death, and St. Andrew in the list alone; of the other Apostles there is no mention at all except in the list in chapter iii.

When we compare the prominence of these four, and particularly of the first three, in the Gospels, we are at once struck by the comparatively little notice taken of them in the Acts. So, again, it is only by reading between the lines that we recognize the high regard given to St. Barnabas in the early Church, but he is mentioned in Acts iv. 36, and thereafter only in connexion with St. Paul. It is, therefore, hardly unfair to say that the Acts is the book not so much of the Acts of the Apostles as of St. Paul, though prefaced by an historical introduction.

In modern times the Acts has been called " The Gospel of the Holy Ghost," but this is a gross exaggeration due to an unthinking delight in a picturesque phrase. The word " gospel " is, of course, taken from the works of the four evangelists, but even if we give to it its largest scope, the earthly life of our Lord began with His conception and ended with His ascension, the earlier matter dealing with previous events being in the nature of an introduction; while if we restrict the " Gospel " to His messianic or ministerial life, we shall begin with His baptism. Similarly

[1] See Rackham, *Acts of the Apostles*, pp. xlviii, xlix.

the Acts has a short introduction, and thus the " Gospel of the Holy Ghost " begins at Pentecost. But it is by no means yet ended, nor will be until the final consummation of all things, and we may be living now in the very early days of Christianity. Accordingly this phrase is as great a misnomer as if we were to call the first four chapters in St. Luke's Gospel, and the corresponding chapters in the others, " The Gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God " and omit all the remainder. Or, again, the Acts has been spoken of as " the history of the expansion of Christendom during the first thirty years." But here also there is an exaggeration, though not so extravagant. But for a few bare allusions, such as " Lucius of Cyrene," the Acts deals with nothing south or west of a line drawn from Jerusalem through Malta to Rome, and north and east from Rome to Philippi, and thence by Troas, Antioch, and Damascus back to Jerusalem. But not only *must* Christianity have overstepped these limits within this period, but we have good evidence in the list of districts mentioned in the First Epistle of St. Peter that it actually did so, while in respect of persons the Acts deals with none of the labours of the original Apostles outside Palestine.

Nor can it be said that St. Luke's intention was to show how the Church expanded in a definite direction, that is towards Rome. He tells us nothing of how it reached Crete, which lies on the direct route from Jerusalem, its original birthplace, though he tells us that there were Cretans at the Pentecostal outpouring, and although he mentions Rome in connexion with the expulsion of the Jews under Claudius, his first reference to it in any Christian context is in A.D. 56, when he says that St. Paul intended to go there. Yet there was in Rome a strongly established church of the foundation of which St. Luke tells us nothing at all. In short, if we are resolved to look at the facts and not be led away by pleasant sounding phrases, the book of the Acts is, as I have said, the book of the Acts of St. Paul, with an historical introduction; or, to put the matter slightly differently, it is written to provide an answer to three questions: How did it come about that there is such a thing as Christianity? How did St. Paul become a Christian? And what did he do when he was a Christian?

In the later chapters there is an obvious parallel, noticed by Harnack and Rackham, between the life of St. Paul and that of our Lord, and this comes out markedly in the prophecy of Agabus

(Acts xxi. 11): "So shall the Jews at Jerusalem bind the man that owneth this girdle, and shall deliver him into the hands of the Gentiles," the more so because the binding was actually done by the Gentiles in both cases. The whole story, as Rackham and Harnack[1] have said, is leading up to a climax, and then it ends before the climax has arrived, with St. Paul dwelling in his own hired house. The only conclusion we can come to is that there was some pressing reason why it should end at this point. And that reason is not far to seek. Sir William Ramsay has drawn attention to St. Luke's accuracy whenever he could get first-hand information.[2] Among St. Luke's sources of information for events in Jerusalem may well have been St. James.[3] Another may have been St. Paul. If the Crucifixion took place in 33 and St. Paul's conversion early in 36, he was probably in Jerusalem at the time of the Passion and onwards.[4] St. Luke has nothing to say of St. Paul's work in Tarsus, little of his work in the Syrian Antioch[5] or in Cyprus, except for the incident of the conversion of Sergius Paulus; but from the time of his reaching Pisidian Antioch the story is told with great fulness of detail. But though throughout the narrative from this point onwards we may trust St. Luke's accuracy in all that he affirms, we should be much misled if we treated the Acts as an impartial account. Thus we are never allowed to see to what length ran the opposition of the Jews outside the Church; there is, for instance, no mention of the five scourgings in synagogues, and we only hear of Jewish opposition within where St. Luke would have us to understand that St. Paul triumphed over it—namely, in the attempt to impose circumcision on the gentile converts. So we should gather from St. Luke's account that the Roman authorities were uniformly favourable. The story of the defeat of Elymas at Paphos and of the impression made on Sergius Paulus is recounted at length. At Jerusalem, Claudius Lysias is shocked to think how nearly

[1] Rackham, *J.T.S.* i., pp. 76-79; *Acts of the Apostles*, pp. li, lii; Harnack, *Date of the Acts*, chapter iii., pp. 93-99, but the whole chapter should be read.

[2] *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 20.

[3] This is suggested by the extract from Hegesippus given by Eusebius, *H.E.* iii. 32.

[4] See Moulton, *From Egyptian Rubbish Heaps*, pp. 72-75; Weiss, *Paul and Jesus*, pp. 39-58.

[5] "Luke gives us no detail whatsoever about the city. He speaks only of the congregation, and even in regard to it he mentions little except names and generalities. In his narrative at Antioch there is nothing that even remotely suggests personal knowledge and eyewitness."—Ramsay, *Cities of St. Paul*, p. 80.

he has come to committing a crime in having St. Paul beaten, and he provides him with a large escort and with a letter to the Governor. The centurion in charge of the ship that conveyed St. Paul obviously had a high regard for him and allowed him to stop for a week at Puteoli. In Melita the chief man, Publius, received St. Paul and St. Luke and lodged them three days courteously. The local authorities at Philippi who had laid violent hands upon him were compelled to come and humiliate themselves before him. St. Luke dwells on acquittals by Roman authority—*e.g.*, in the Gospel: "I find no fault in this man" (Luke xxiii. 4); "I, having examined him, found no fault in this man . . . no, nor yet Herod" (14, 15); and in the Acts: "Pilate, when he had determined to release him" (Acts iii. 13); "who (the Romans), when they had examined me, desired to set me at liberty" (xxviii. 18). We should never guess that at two places other than Philippi St. Paul had been beaten with rods and imprisoned. If we were dealing with secular history we should say that the Acts was a definitely pro-Pauline historical pamphlet; and that being its tendency we should judge that whatever other purpose it was intended to serve, it was written to induce Theophilus, a man, from the title given to him in the Gospel, in some high civil position, to use his influence for St. Paul's benefit in order that he might recover his freedom.[1]

St. Luke was, to judge by the character of the Acts, a whole-hearted admirer of St. Paul, and we should guess that he was one of St. Paul's converts, and this may be implied by Tertullian (*adv. Marc.* iv. 2). The general tone both of the Gospel and of the Acts would lead us to believe that St. Luke was a Gentile (see Plummer, *Gospel According to St. Luke*, pp. xxxiv, xxxv). This is shown not only by their universality, but also negatively by their want of any feeling of affection for Judaism and Jewish institutions; indeed, in this respect St. Luke resembles St. Stephen (see Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem*, p. 54, n. 24) rather than his master, who always regarded Judaism as a preparation for Christianity. Thus in his account of the prophecy about Jerusalem, St. Mark (xiii. 14-17) writes as a Jew or Jewish Christian who abhors the entry of the "abomination of desolation" into the sacred Temple, while St. Luke (xxi. 20-26) seems to have

[1] The title κράτιστος is omitted in Acts i. 1, probably because by that time Theophilus had become a Christian.

no sense of desecration, but lays stress on the fact that the Romans by their siege and capture of the city would be but carrying out the decrees of God's justice on the people that had rejected His Messiah. He speaks of the " desolation " but not of the " abomination," and the days are days of vengeance, and the judgement is the beginning of the days of the Gentiles.

Eusebius (*H.E.* iii. 4) asserts that St. Luke had a family connexion with Antioch (Λουκᾶς δὲ τὸ μὲν γένος ὢν τῶν ἀπ' Ἀντιοχείας), and later tradition, in Jerome and others,[1] is built upon this statement, which may itself go back to Julius Africanus. This does not imply that St. Luke himself was an Antiochene, and Ramsay (*St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 389) asserts that it implies the opposite. In later times it would be taken for granted that the greater Antioch in Syria was meant (*cf.* the traces of transference from one to the other in the *Story of Paul and Thecla*), but it is equally possible that St. Luke's family was connected with Pisidian Antioch. Both cities were founded by Seleucus Nicator, one of the generals of Alexander the Great, and both had almost certainly Macedonian elements in their populations.

The difficulty in holding that St. Luke was a Gentile is his knowledge of Aramaic and his possible knowledge of Hebrew. On the other hand he writes Greek with elegance, as though it were his native tongue, in a way which St. Paul, whose home language was Aramaic (2 Cor. xi. 22; Phil. iii. 5) could not achieve.[2] Nor is it surprising that travelling as he did with St. Paul, St. Luke should have learnt Aramaic. A stronger case may be rested on the fact that all the ten hymns in the first two chapters of St. Luke's Gospel are most probably translations of Hebrew poetry (see Aytoun in *J.T.S.* xviii., pp. 274-288). This is not really so surprising. A person who used Aramaic for ordinary social purposes and was well acquainted with the more poetical parts of the Old Testament might easily run into Hebrew poetical forms for the purpose of devotion, since the service of the synagogue would be in Hebrew, though the lessons might be translated into Aramaic, and certain portions of the Hebrew scriptures were learnt by heart and used for religious purposes in the home. The

[1] Jerome, *Vir. Ill.*, Lucas medicus Antiochensis; Euthalius, Migne, *P.G.* lxxxv., p. 633. Ἀντιοχεὺς γὰρ οὗτος ὑπάρχων τὸ γένος, *cf.* pp. 37, 38 above.

[2] The sophisticated Corinthians thought St. Paul's Greek was very provincial; his *logos*, they said (that is his diction), was contemptible (2 Cor. x. 10, *cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 6 ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ; and on St. Paul's Greek see Rutherford's *St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, pp. xvii, xix).

rhythmical structure would make it more easy to commit psalms and songs to memory. Dr. Charles has made out a strong case for an original Hebrew text of the Assumption of Moses (*c.* A.D. 7 to 30) and of the Apocalypse of Baruch (*c.* A.D. 80 to 120), and Wellhausen has argued for the Hebrew origin of 4 Ezra (*Skizzen* vi., pp. 234-239), which is probably to be dated between A.D. 80 and 130, and Burney (*J.T.S.* xiv., pp. 414-424) argues strongly that Matt. xxv. 31-46, the parable of the Last Judgement, was spoken as a Hebrew poem. Thus there is no difficulty in supposing that the early Christian Church at Jerusalem employed a large element of Hebrew, and probably of Hebrew verse, in its religious exercises; and so the use of the New Testament canticles may go back to very early times. But if this is granted, it would not necessarily follow that these Hebrew hymns in St. Luke's Gospel were translated by him. There must have been considerable intercourse between the Greek and the Aramaic-speaking portions of the Church at Jerusalem, and the hymns known in the latter may easily have been translated into Greek and used in the former before the year 57.

If St. Luke were a Gentile, then he could not have been converted before St. Paul's mission opened in Pisidian Antioch. The only reasons to the contrary would seem to be the occurrence of the name Lucius of Cyrene at Antioch in Syria, who is by no means certainly to be identified with St. Luke, and the Bezan reading, " when *we* were gathered together " (*συνεστραμμένων δὲ ἡμῶν*), in Acts xi. 28. Ropes thinks that this is due to the Bezan reviser, and based on the tradition that St. Luke himself was an Antiochene; but perhaps a simpler explanation would be that St. Luke is here quoting from his source without alteration of the person, and, as we have seen, the Acts does not seem to have received St. Luke's final revision. Certainly a stronger case may be made out for St. Luke's presence in Pisidian Antioch, where we read (Acts xiv. 22), " through much tribulation *we* must enter the kingdom of God," and here the " we " occurs in both texts.

If we turn to St. Paul's speech there (Acts xiii. 16-41) we notice first of all the extraordinary vividness of its setting (see Ramsay, *Cities of St. Paul*, pp. 299-314). Paul " stood up " to be better heard, though the usual attitude of a teacher or preacher in a synagogue was to sit down (*cf.* Luke iv. 20); he beckoned with the hand to obtain silence, as St. Peter did (Acts xii. 17, St. Mark's

account; Harnack, *Acts of the Apostles*, p. 193), or Alexander at Ephesus (Acts xix. 33, when Tychicus was probably present), and St. Paul himself at Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 40; *cf.* Acts xxvi. 1, " stretched forth his hands "), and as also did Felix at Cæsarea, on both of which occasions St. Luke may have been there. These details would seem to show that the report is that of an eye witness. Then we remark the language of St. Paul's address. It begins: " *Men of Israel*, and ye that fear God, hearken. *The God of this people Israel chose our fathers*," and so far all is perfectly correct Judaism. In verse 26 we get the same distinction: " *Brethren, children of the stock of Abraham*, and those among you that fear God "; but St. Paul continues, " to *us* is the word of this salvation sent," including both his Jewish and his Gentile audience, himself and Barnabas in one category. Then in verse 38 he addresses the whole group as " *brethren*." St. Paul, as we know, lived as a strict Pharisee, and so probably did Barnabas. Up to this time there was no general Jewish opposition to Christianity of the Pauline type, as distinct from the extreme form of St. Stephen. The Gospel, but for sporadic cases in Samaria and St. Peter's action towards Cornelius, which was regarded as exceptional, had been preached to Jews only. St. Paul and Barnabas were recognized by their dress and deportment as belonging to the most punctilious class of Jews, and the invitation to them to speak implies as much. But here was a Jewish rabbi calling his Gentile hearers " *brethren*," and it was probably the first time that they had heard themselves so addressed. Then we notice points in the speech itself. The designation of Samuel as a prophet (xiii. 20) may mean nothing, though St. Paul also was a prophet (xiii. 1), but " Saul the son of Kish, a man of the tribe of Benjamin " (21), St. Paul's own tribe, is a genuine Pauline touch.[1] In short, this speech is to be compared with the two other great speeches of St. Paul in the Acts, that delivered at Athens (xvii. 22-31), when Titus was present, and that delivered at Miletus (xx. 18-35), when St. Luke was with St. Paul.[2]

[1] *Cf.* Rackham, *Acts of the Apostles*, p. xxx: " But for the previous notice (in the Bezan text) of St. Luke's presence in the Church of the Syrian Antioch, we might almost be convinced that he was among the crowd of *devout proselytes* who followed Paul and Barnabas home from the synagogue, and thenceforward ' continued in the grace of God.' "

[2] For the very Pauline character of this speech see Rackham, *op. cit.*, p. 384, who notes also the close relationship of its language to that of the Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians and to Timothy.

Notice also the effect of this speech on the mind of St. Luke as indicated in the subtle distinction of epithet applied to this class of adherents of the synagogue to which he himself belonged. Up to this point they are called " God-fearers " (*φοβούμενοι*, Acts x. 2, 22, 35, xiii. 16, 26), but henceforth they are called " God-worshippers " (*σεβόμενοι*, xiii. 43, 50, xvi. 14, xvii. 4, 17, xviii. 7).

We may therefore take it that St. Luke was a Gentile who owed the beginning of his conversion to St. Paul's speech at Pisidian Antioch, and there is a high probability that he was the brother of Titus. This is based on a phrase in St. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians (2 Cor. xii. 18), on the probable connexion of both with Pisidian Antioch, and on the certain connexion of both with Philippi. A confirmation of this view is that in the Acts St. Luke mentions neither himself nor Titus, in spite of the esteem in which St. Paul regards him and the numerous missions in which he took part. This omission is only to be paralleled by that of the name of St. John, and the obvious avoidance of the mention of St. James in the Fourth Gospel, in which they are only once referred to, and then as the sons of Zebedee; and this Gospel is now generally allowed to be substantially Johannine, whatever the number of intermediaries through whom the narrative may have passed.[1]

I add a table of the movements of Luke and Titus in accordance with the discussion in the previous chapter.

	LUKE.	TITUS.
Before 47.	Philippi.	Philippi.
	Pisidian Antioch.	Pisidian Antioch.
	,, ,,	Galatia (Iconium, Lystra and Derbe).
48.	Pisidian Antioch.	Pisidian Antioch.
	Philippi.	Syrian Antioch.
49.	Philippi.	Syrian Antioch.
	,,	Jerusalem.
	,,	Galatia (*Galatians*).
	,,	Philippi.
50.	Philippi.	Philippi.
	Troas.	,,
	Philippi.	,,

[1] See Dom Chapman, *Names in the Fourth Gospel*, *J.T.S.* xxx., pp. 16-23.

	LUKE.	TITUS.
50.	Philippi.	Thessalonica.
	,,	Berœa.
	,,	Athens.
	,,	Corinth (2 Cor. viii. 23).
51.	Philippi.	Corinth.
	,,	Thessalonica.
	,,	Corinth (Phil. iv. 15).
	,,	Thessalonica (1 *Thess.*).
	,,	Corinth.
52.	Philippi.	Corinth.
	,,	Ephesus.
54 or 55.	Philippi.	Philippi.
	Ephesus (Col. iv. 14).	,,
	Philippi (with Epaphroditus and *Philippians*).	,, (Phil. iv. 3).
55.	Philippi.	Ephesus.
	,,	Crete.
	,,	Corinth (2 Cor. viii. 6).
	,,	Nicopolis.
56.	Philippi.	Nicopolis.
	,,	Illyricum.
	,,	Philippi.
	Corinth.	Corinth (*severe letter*).
	Philippi.	Philippi.
	Corinth.	Corinth (*joyful letter*).
	Philippi.	,,
	,,	Rome (*Romans*).
57.	Philippi.	Rome.
	,,	Philippi.
	Troas.	,,
	Miletus.	,,
	Jerusalem.	,,
	Cæsarea.	,,
	,,	Dalmatia.
59.	Cæsarea.	
	Myra.	
	Melita.	
60.	Melita.	
	Rome.	
62.	Rome.	

EPILOGUE

ANYONE who, after examining the numerous allusions in the Acts, comes to the conclusion that St. Luke, when he has access to good sources of information, is a painstaking and accurate historian, and that St. Paul tells the truth about his own movements, must find himself under obligation to attempt a reconciliation of their two accounts. There are, no doubt, gaps in the available evidence, and these must needs be filled by what is called " conjecture," but, while to the superficial observer a " conjecture " may seem little more than a guess in the dark, every conjecture should rest on indications of some kind, though these may be so minute as to escape the casual eye; or, to resort to simile, the tracing of the movements of St. Paul and his companions is at times like tracking a traveller where an overset stone, a torn-off leaf, or a broken twig may show by what route he has passed. As illustrations of this method I take two connected instances where criticism is likely to fall most heavily.

The date of the writing of the Epistle to the Romans is fixed relatively to other events within a few months; it must have been written towards the end of the year previous to St. Paul's final visit to Jerusalem (Rom. xv. 25), and this visit was paid after the close of St. Paul's work in Ephesus. If we date his arrival in Ephesus in the autumn of 52, and this visit to Jerusalem shortly before the Pentecost of 57, the Epistle to the Romans will have been written towards the end of 56. It is conceivable that these dates might be a year wrong, but in that case we should have to shift the whole scheme.

And it is almost equally certain that the Epistle was written from Corinth. Phœbe was a deaconess of the Church of Cenchreæ (xvi. 1); St. Paul was staying with Gaius (xvi. 23), and he had baptized a Gaius at Corinth (1 Cor. i. 14); he sends greetings from Erastus, the treasurer of the city, and this points to a city of some importance, and in 2 Tim. iv. 20 we read that Erastus had remained behind in Corinth. In short, all indications converge

on St. Paul's visit to Achaia of some three months' duration mentioned in Acts xx. 2, 3.

In Rom. xv. 19, 23, St. Paul connects his visit to Illyricum with the close of his work around the Ægean, and there are other grounds for thinking that he did not travel any considerable distance from Ephesus before the spring of 55; hence this visit must have taken place not long before the writing of the Epistle to the Romans. Illyricum is the Latin name of the Roman district, its Greek name being Ἰλλυρία or Ἰλλυρίς; St. Paul's language cannot therefore be satisfied by a visit to, let us say, Berœa, or any other city in the Roman province of Macedonia, especially as he is writing to the capital of the Empire; but obviously Northern Illyricum will be further off his track than the southern portion.

When he wrote the Epistle to the Romans he was contemplating passing through Rome, after leaving Jerusalem in 57, and going thence to Spain, but though he did not intend to reside in Rome for a long period, he was obviously thinking of paying something more than a flying visit (Rom. i. 11-13), and he is no less clearly anxious to know what sort of reception he is likely to receive from the Roman Christians.

From this it follows that: (1) He must choose a messenger who could testify of him with the authority of intimate knowledge; (2) who was likely to make a good impression on the Roman Church, and, if possible, was already known to some members of it; and (3)—and this is important—one who would be returning eastward and whom St. Paul could arrange to meet before he himself went there. Consequently, Phœbe, as bearer of the letter, is precluded, because (1) we should judge by the absence of any greetings sent by St. Paul in her name that she and he had no common friends in Rome; (2) she was not a member of St. Paul's staff, and St. Paul had probably no long acquaintance with her; and (3) there is no knowing that she would be coming back so soon, and if she did she would probably return to Cenchreæ.

When the letter was sent, St. Paul was intending to go to Jerusalem for the *Passover* of the following year (Acts xx. 3); the postponement of the time to Pentecost was due to the discovery of a plot to murder him on the pilgrim ship by which he was to travel. If he had gone to Jerusalem and events had turned out as he hoped, he would have left Jerusalem to go to Rome. This would be too early in the year for any of the corn vessels to be found east of

Alexandria, and private passengers could not command the services of the imperial fleet. Hence St. Paul's most natural route would be by Philippi, the Via Egnatia, and Southern Illyricum, and he would therefore instruct his messenger to return by this route in the reverse direction.

We ask next, then, what member of St. Paul's staff, or which of his intimate friends, had been at Corinth shortly before these times and might be supposed to be still there? And the obvious answer is Titus, the chief bearer of the joyful epistle a few weeks earlier. Titus had been with St. Paul at Corinth when the church was founded (2 Cor. viii. 23); he had started the collection there in the autumn of the year before (2 Cor. viii. 6), and he had been the chief bearer of the severe letter in the spring of this year. We are therefore justified in assuming provisionally that the bearer of the Epistle to the Romans was Titus, and we shall be confirmed in our view if this hypothesis throws light on subsequent events. Titus must have left Corinth towards the end of the summer or in the early autumn of 56, since the ship by which he travelled would have to go through the Gulf of Corinth and face the waters of the Adriatic, making its way along the eastern coast, stopping to anchor at night, and calling at all the important ports to change cargo—a lengthy process—and it must reach Hydruntum before the winter storms began (*cf.* Horace, *Odes* iii. 3, *Auster, Dux inquieti turbidus Adriæ*). Arrived in Rome, Titus would probably stay with Aquila and Prisca (Rom. xvi. 3-5), and outside the Pauline list he would become acquainted with other Roman Christians, such as Eubulus or Pudens or Linus or Claudia (2 Tim. iv. 21). And in Rome there would be at any rate two persons of position and eminence who, if they were not already Christians, were at least interested in Christianity. One of these would be Sergius Paulus, formerly proconsul in Cyprus; the other the " most excellent Theophilus "; and a possible third would be Gallio, formerly proconsul of Achaia and the brother of Seneca, so that we may reckon that on his return journey Titus would be " set forward on his way " as St. Paul expected to be (Rom. xv. 24; *cf.* Titus iii. 13, 14), and would be able to cover his fifteen miles a day along the Via Appia to Brundisium, a road which would be almost continuously open throughout the year.

Titus had probably been ordained at Philippi in the year 50; at any rate, he was by this time a " bishop " (Phil. i. 1), and would

be a leader of the local " presbytery " (1 Tim. iv. 14). He would therefore probably be anxious to keep the great festival of the Christian Church among his own people at Philippi (whence, as we have seen, he had originally gone with St. Paul to Corinth).

St. Paul, when he sent him to Rome from Corinth, had made arrangements to meet the delegates with the collection at Ephesus in time to be at Jerusalem for the Passover, approximately April 10. He was by no means certain that he would be received with favour (Rom. xv. 30, 31), and might be able to remain there only a very short time, and on leaving he would, as we have said, be going to Rome on his way to Spain, and would travel by Neapolis and Philippi along the Via Egnatia to Southern Illyricum; and, as the leading dates in the Jewish calendar were the names of the festivals and other reckoning was rather indeterminate, St. Paul's instructions to Titus would be to meet him in Philippi soon after the Passover, or, if that proved impossible, he would pick him up at some point on the Via Egnatia to the west of it, and the two words that would be impressed in the mind of Titus would be " Philippi " and " Passover."

When, after leaving Rome, Titus reached the westernmost Christian Church of Macedonia, possibly Berœa, he would learn that St. Paul had gone to Philippi and intended to make his way to Troas and thence to Jerusalem so as to be in time for *Pentecost*. Titus may have been detained by the state of the roads in Epirus, but now he would push ahead as rapidly as possible in order to meet St. Paul and St. Luke before they left.

Now let us go back to St. Paul. St. Paul was in Philippi, probably lodging in the house of Lydia (Acts xvi. 14). Lydia must keep up her connexion with Thyatira and would be informed of all ships sailing from Neapolis to Asia Minor. Neapolis was some nine miles from Philippi, connected by a road used by Roman officials travelling to the East, and therefore maintained in a good condition. On foot the distance could be covered in less than three hours, or by horse in less than two. Ships would lie at anchor in the harbour for the night and change cargo by day, and their passengers would go ashore. Among these at the time were the Macedonian delegates whom St. Paul had instructed to proceed to Troas, and who would be expecting to take him aboard with them. St. Paul was a man of good family (his father was a Roman

citizen) and a gentleman (see his Epistle to Philemon); if he did not go with them, but let them pass ahead of him to Troas while he remained behind (Acts xx. 5), it must be for some better reason than that he had a personal preference for spending Easter in the house of Lydia rather than with Carpus at Troas. Nor could he, apparently, plead ill-health. The passage from Philippi to Troas took him five days (Acts xx. 6) instead of two (xvi. 11); yet St. Paul prolonged his speech at Troas till midnight, and the next day took a twenty-mile journey by land to Assos. Are we not almost compelled to conclude that the real reason for the delay was because St. Paul was awaiting the return of his messenger from Rome, whose report would have a considerable effect on his subsequent movements ?

But did Titus and St. Paul meet before the latter left ? We may hope so, and as the answer must be either " yes " or " no," of the two I think we may say " yes." Let us assume, at any rate, that they did, and see how it works out.

St. Paul is assured by the encouraging report brought by Titus that his plan of visiting Rome and afterwards Spain has the divine approval, and so speaks at Miletus to the elders in a tone of confident conviction. He goes on to Jerusalem and is sent as a prisoner to Cæsarea, but he knows that his adversaries have no case against him. He had not brought an uncircumcised Gentile within the sacred enclosure of the Temple; he had not even attempted to do so; nor had he created any disturbance (Acts xxiv. 12); and the letter of Claudius Lysias threw the whole of the blame upon his Jewish opponents (xxiii. 26-30). For the time being he was remanded (xxiv. 23) in free custody, but he had every reason to think that Roman justice would set him at liberty. Meanwhile the weeks were lengthening out. If he were set free there were two alternative routes to Rome: by Corinth or by the Via Egnatia. If he went by Corinth he could take ship thence to Corcyra, and it was but a short way further to Aulona or Dyrrachium. St. Paul does not like travelling alone, so he sends a messenger to Titus to make his way to Dalmatia (2 Tim. iv. 10). Dalmatia is an alternative name for Illyricum. But why of all his friends does he choose Titus ? May we not say, " Because Titus had already been to Rome and been well received there " ?

Titus, then, met St. Paul and St. Luke at Philippi before they left, and, among other things, told them of Theophilus, a convert well

worth the winning, but disturbed by the conflicting stories which he had heard about the life of Christ (Luke i. 1-4; *cf.* for the use of the word κατηχεῖσθαι, Acts xxi. 21, 24; and see *J.T.S.* Colson in xxiv., pp. 300-304). Luke already knew that fragmentary and sometimes inaccurate narratives were afloat, and he had met Mark at Ephesus (Col. iv. 10, 14).[1] He had been selected by the Church at Philippi to carry its contribution to Jerusalem (2 Cor. viii. 23), and he decided to make the best use of his opportunities and acquire as good information as he could, so at Cæsarea he composed his gospel and sent it to Rome. Theophilus' difficulties were resolved and he became a Christian, and in his second volume St. Luke drops " your excellency " out of the title.

These narratives contain large elements of conjecture, but if we use them as a key to unlock the mysterious course of events, do we not seem to hear each separate ward clicking into its place as we turn it; and, if it opens the lock, is it not the right key ?

Now let us return and trace St. Paul's route after leaving Ephesus at the time of the riot in 56. He went to Troas hoping to meet Titus, who had been sent to Corinth with the severe letter. Though there were good opportunities of doing evangelistic work at Troas, he was so torn with anxiety that he could not take advantage of them, and pushed on to Macedonia, obviously Philippi (2 Cor. ii. 13). There he found Titus and wrote the joyful letter to Corinth, which he despatched by Titus and two others, of whom one was most probably Luke (2 Cor. viii. 23). In the absence of Luke and Titus he would naturally himself remain in charge at Philippi, more especially as he had had a nerve-racking time and might very likely be suffering from his old " thorn in the flesh." On the return of Luke (Luke was at Philippi in the spring of the following year, Acts xx. 6) he went through Macedonia giving instructions about the collection. When he reached Berœa, or any Christian church there might be to the west of it, what did he do next ? It has been suggested that he went to Illyricum. This suggestion must be rejected on much the same grounds as we rejected the suggestion that Phœbe was the bearer of the Epistle to the Romans. But for the bare fact that Phœbe went to Rome, and for the bare fact that St. Paul preached in Illyricum at some time or other,

[1] Harnack (*Date of the Acts*, p. 29) notes that wherever in the Pauline epistles St. Luke is mentioned, St. Mark's name is also found, and St. Luke actually knows the name of the maidservant in St. Mark's house.

neither has any argument in its favour. (1) Illyricum would be far out of St. Paul's beat; (2) he must have arrived in Corinth in time to send off the Epistle to the Romans, and he would endanger the possibility of so doing if he went to Illyricum; and (3) it would be more courteous to follow the letter without needless delay.

But if he did not preach in Illyricum at this time he must have done so earlier. Where had he come from when he arrived at Ephesus? He had sent off the severe letter by Titus, and, almost certainly Luke, not many weeks before. The collocation of the names Titus and Luke inevitably suggests Philippi. How then had he come to Philippi? As he was travelling from Philippi east to Troas and Ephesus, we should naturally think that he came there from some city of Macedonia to the west of it. Here we meet with one of those displaced stones or broken twigs which shows us that we are on the right track. The mob at Ephesus seized Aristarchus of Thessalonica and Gaius of Doberus, "Paul's companions in travel" (Acts xix. 29); St. Paul had therefore come to Philippi from Thessalonica. Whence had he come to Thessalonica? Clearly from Illyricum, since he had been there before he wrote the Epistle to the Romans and had not been there *after* the riot. And we now know the significance of Illyricum. It means the western end of the Via Egnatia where it starts from the coast. St. Paul therefore left Illyricum in the spring of 56 and made his way by Thessalonica and Philippi to Ephesus. But in the summer or autumn of 55 he was in Corinth, where he had wished to organize the collection, but had been prevented in consequence of the bad reception that had been given to him, so that Titus, knowing what St. Paul had intended, had followed him and started it (2 Cor. viii. 6).

St. Paul had left Corinth in the summer or autumn of 55, and in the following spring was at the western end of the Via Egnatia, "Illyricum." Titus had gone to Corinth after St. Paul's departure and had started the collection there, and had left towards the end of the year, and we next find him with St. Paul at Philippi. Would not St. Paul want to receive the report of Titus on the state of affairs in Corinth, and, if so, must he not send him information where to find him? Now let us look at the map and see what are the ports between Corinth and Aulona or Dyrrachium of such importance that both the ship conveying St. Paul and that conveying Titus would be bound to call. In my former chapter I have

worked forward in the historical order from Ephesus to Corinth, here I have worked back from Ephesus through Macedonia, and, building thence from either bank, the two ends of the bridge are found to meet at Nicopolis; is it a far-fetched supposition that St. Paul and Titus wintered there together?

But why did St. Paul postpone writing his letter to Corinth until he reached Philippi? Because within a short time of Titus' arrival at Nicopolis communication with Corinth would be impossible, and the letter which St. Paul intended to send would need to be established by the mouth of at least two witnesses. Whom then could St. Paul send: (1) on whom could he thoroughly rely; (2) who had a great respect for him personally; (3) who would go at his bidding; and (4) whom Titus could sponsor? The answer is Luke of Philippi, and at Philippi St. Paul would receive news of affairs in Ephesus and learn whether he could safely adventure himself there.

This construction implies that the Epistle to Titus was written to him in Crete by St. Paul before he left Corinth, and necessitates the reconsideration of the whole "Problem of the Pastoral Epistles." Hitherto those who asserted that the matter was Pauline have felt constrained to maintain that the style might be his also, while those who rightly demurred to the style being St. Paul's have been obliged to deny the contemporary character of the larger part of the matter, and have invoked that well-known Pauline (or similar) "ghost," the second century forger, who, by their account, would seem to have been responsible for a considerable portion of the New Testament. This, however, is a being who has ceased to frighten us, and his repetition of "the assured results of criticism" is no longer impressive; but the "Problem of the Pastoral Epistles" is the title of another story, too long to be retold here.

I have brought forward these illustrations of the method of "private detection" as employed in unravelling the tangled history of St. Paul's journeys. The conclusion when it flashes on the reader's mind, though every step has been prepared for by the course of events, is nevertheless unexpected. We are not, however, constructing a work of fiction, but dealing with authentic history in which the occurrences must have taken place in an actual sequence, and I might challenge my critics to produce a more satisfactory scheme which does justice to the language of

St. Paul and of St. Luke without trying to explain away its natural meaning.

But if this challenge is thought to be too boldly advanced, let me take refuge under the " pragmatic sanction," and say that a reconstruction which shows the interdependence of hitherto uncorrelated events renders them far more easy for the student to memorize than a mere agnostic *non possumus*, which leaves them floating at random in a baffling and impalpable mist.

DATES OF PASSOVER AND PENTECOST A.D. 27-70.

	Passover (Nisan 15)	Pentecost
	Exact Dates	
27.	April 12.	June 1.
28.	March 31.	May 20.
29.	April 19.	June 8.
30.	April 8.	May 28.
31.	March 28.	May 27.
32.	April 15.	June 4.
33.	April 4.	May 24.
34.	March 25.	May 14.
35.	April 13.	June 2.
36.	April 1.	May 21.
37.	April 20.	June 9.[1]
38.	April 9.	May 29.
	Approximate Dates[2]	
39.	March 30.	May 19.
40.	April 17.	June 6.
41.	April 6.	May 26.
42.	March 26.	May 15.
43.	April 14.	June 3.
44.	April 3.	May 23.
45.	March 23.	May 12.
46.	April 12.	June 1.
47.	March 31.	May 20.
48.	April 19.	June 8.
49.	April 8.	May 28.
50.	March 28.	May 17.
51.	April 15.	June 4.
52.	April 4.	May 24.
53.	March 25.	May 14.
54.	April 13.	June 2.
55.	April 2.	May 22.

[1] Possibly a month earlier.

[2] Not more than one day wrong.

DATES OF PASSOVER AND PENTECOST (*continued*)

A.D.		
56.	March 22.	May 11.
57.	April 10.	May 30.
58.	March 30	May 19.
59.	April 17.	June 6.
60.	April 6.	May 26.
61.	March 26.	May 15.
62.	April 14.	June 3.
63.	April 3.	May 23.
64.	March 23.	May 12.
65.	April 12.	June 1.
66.	March 31.	May 20.
67.	April 19.	June 8.
68.	April 8.	May 28.
69.	March 28.	May 17.
70.	April 15.	June 4.

INDEX

PERSONS, ANCIENT

PERSONS, MODERN

SCRIPTURE REFERENCES

OLD TESTAMENT

APOCRYPHA

NEW TESTAMENT

GOSPELS

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

PAULINE EPISTLES

CATHOLIC EPISTLES

INDEX OF PLACES AND GRID REFERENCES

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher

THE PAULINE WORLD

A.D. 44-60

(Syria and Palestine as in Jan. 44)

Scale 1:5,000,000

REFERENCE.

Provinces of the Roman Empire

Dependent Kingdoms and Principalities

St. Paul's Routes — — — Other Roads .....

MARE HADRIATICUM
MARE TUSCUM
MARE IONIUM
MARE AEGAEUM
MARE INTERNUM
ADRIA
PONTUS EUXINUS
PROVINCIA DALMATIA
PROVINCIA MOESIA SUPERIOR
PROVINCIA THRACIA
ILLYRICUM
PAEONIA
PROVINCIA MACEDONIA
EPIRUS
THESSALIA
PROVINCIA ACHAIA
ITALIA
SICILIA
CRETE
CYRENE
SYRTIS
PROPONTIS
PROVINCIA BITHYNIA ET PONTUS
PAPHLAGONIA
GALATIA
PROVINCIA GALATIA
REGNUM POLEMONIS
ARMENIA MINOR
MYSIA
PHRYGIA ASIANA
PROVINCIA ASIA
LYDIA
CARIA
PROVINCIA CAPPADOCIA
PHRYGIA GALATICA
LYCAONIA GALATICA
LYCAONIA ANTIOCHIANA
REGNUM ANTIOCHI
COMMAGENE
CILICIA CAMPESTRIS
CILICIA TRACHEIA
PROVINCIA CILICIA
PROVINCIA PAMPHYLIA
PROVINCIA LYCIA
CYPRUS
PROVINCIA SYRIA ET PHOENICE
ARABIA
TRACHON
BATANAEA
AURANITIS
GAULANITIS
PERAEA
SAMARIA
JUDAEA
IDUMAEA
REGNUM HERODIS
AEGYPTUS

Rome, Ostia, Ad Tiberinas, Forum Appii, Tres Tabernae, Appii Forum, Capua, Beneventum, Puteoli, Neapolis, Via Appia, Brundisium, Tarentum, Hydruntum, Messina, Rhegium, Syracuse, Gaudos, Malta, Dyrrachium, Via Egnatia, Doberus, Philippi, Neapolis, Apollonia, Amphipolis, Thessalonica, Apollonia, Beroea, Pella, Methone, Samothrace, Corcyra, Larissa, Pharsalus, Nicopolis, Delphi, Chaeronea, Corinth, Cenchreae, Athens, Argos, Chios, Samos, Ephesus, Priene, R. Maeander, Miletus, Pr. Trogylium, Patmos, Cos, Rhodes, Cnidus, Cythera, Gortyna, Lasaea, Phoenix, Pr. Salmone, G. of Messara, Fair Havens, Cauda, C. Matala, Cyrene, Alexandria, Byzantium, Constantinople, Heraclea, Nicomedeia, Nicaea, Cyzicus, Artemes, R. Rhyndacus, Troas, Adramyttium, Assos, Lesbos, Mytilene, Tergamos, Smyrna, Sardis, R. Hermus, Philadelphia, Tralles, Pergamos, Eumeneia, Metropolis, Apamea, Hierapolis, Laodiceia, Colossai, Attalia, Perga, Side, Olbasa Col., Comama Col., Gregoria Col., Parlais Col., Lystra Col., Derbe, Iconium, Claud Iconium, Tyana, Antioch, Caesarea, Nazianzos, Venasa, Dastarkon, Amaseia, Amisos, Sinope, Tavium, Ancyra, Dorylaion, Pessinus, Kotiaion, Synnada, Caesareia, Romana, Tarsus, Korykos, Korasion, Seleucia, Anemourion, Korakesion, Iotape, Selinus, Cromnyon Pr., Salamis, Citium, Akamas Pr., Paphos, Laodiceia, Arados, Tripolis, Berytus, Sidon, Damascus, Tyre, Caesarea Philippi, Ptolemais, Caesareia, Samaria, Joppa, Lydda, Jerusalem, Gaza, Alexandria, Road to the East, Road to Antioch, Via Egnatia, Via Sebaste, Via Nova Traiana, Via Militaris, Mons Taurus, Mons Amanus, Mons Libanus, Mons Antilibanus, Mons Hermon, Mons Casius, Mons Sinai, Mons Seir, Mons Hor, Mons Nebo, Mons Gilead, Mons Gerizim, Mons Ebal, Mons Carmel, Mons Tabor, Mons Gilboa, Mons Olivet, Mons Moriah, Mons Zion, Mons Ephraim, Mons Judah, Mons Seir, Mons Hor, Mons Nebo, Mons Gilead, Mons Gerizim, Mons Ebal, Mons Carmel, Mons Tabor, Mons Gilboa, Mons Olivet, Mons Moriah, Mons Zion, Mons Ephraim, Mons Judah

Long. East of Greenwich

1486

John Bartholomew & Son, Ltd., Edinburgh