ST. PAUL IN ASIA MINOR,

AND AT THE SYRIAN ANTIOCH.


THE PLACES
mentioned in
THE ACTS
and
THE EPISTLES
Scale - Eng. Stat. Miles
0 50 100 150 200
St. Pauls Journeys
1.
Antioch to Derbe & back
2.
Antioch to Corinth & back
3.
Antioch to Ephesus
Ephesus to Corinth & back
Ephesus to Corinth
Corinth to Jerusalem
4.
Jerusalem to Rome
ILLYRICUM
MOESIA
EUXINE SEA
THRACE
MACEDONIA
Philippi
Amphipolis
Thessalonica
Neapolis
Berea
Apollonia
Samothracia
Byzantium
EPIRUS
Nicopolis
ACHAIA
GREECE
Corinth
Athens
BITHYNIA
PONTUS
ARMENIA
Ancyra
Tavia
GALATIA
Pessinus
CAPPADOCIA
Caesarea Mazaca
Mysia
Troas
Adramyttium
Assos
Mytilene
Pergamos
ASIA
Sardis
Philadelphia
Chios
Smyrna
Samos
Ephesus
Miletus
Laodicea
Patmos
Coos
Cnidus
Rhodes
Patara
Myra
Antioch
Pisidia
LYCAONIA
Iconium
Lystra
Derbe
PAMPHYLIA
Attalia
Perga
Taurus
CILICIA
Tarsus
Seleucia
Antioch
SYRIA
Mesopotamia
Charran
CYPRUS
Salamis
Paphos
Chalcis
Sidon
Damascus
Tyre
Caesarea
Joppa
Gaza
Jerusalem
KINGDOM OF AGRIPPA I
Arabia
CRETE
Phenice
Lasea
Clauda
Fair Havens
C. Salmone
THE GREAT SEA
Mediterranean Sea
Alexandria
EGYPT
LIBYA
Cyrene
The Quicksands
Syrtis Major
Melita
Syracuse
SICILY
Rhegium
Adria
Ionian Sea
Tyrrhenian Sea
Puteoli
Rome
Three Taverns
Appii Forum
ITALY
Adriatic Sea
15
20
25
30
35
40

THE HEATHEN WORLD AND ST. PAUL.

ST. PAUL IN ASIA MINOR,

AND

AT THE SYRIAN ANTIOCH.

BY E. H. PLUMPTRE, M.A.,

PREBENDARY OF ST. PAUL'S, VICAR OF BICKLEY, KENT,
AND PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT EXEGESIS IN KING'S COLLEGE,
LONDON.

PUBLISHED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF
THE COMMITTEE OF GENERAL LITERATURE AND EDUCATION
APPOINTED BY THE SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

LONDON:
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.
SOLD AT THE DEPOSITORIES:
77, GREAT QUEEN STREET, LINCOLN'S-INN FIELDS;
4, ROYAL EXCHANGE; 48, PICCADILLY;
AND BY ALL BOOKSELLERS.

New York: Pott, Young, & Co.

LONDON:
WYMAN AND SONS, PRINTERS, GREAT QUEEN STREET,
LINCOLN'S-INN FIELDS, W.C.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

II. GALATIA.

III. PHRYGIA.

ST. PAUL AT TARSUS.

ST. PAUL AT TARSUS.

THE words by which St. Paul describes his own birthplace might well be used of it without any exaggeration. He was indeed a citizen of "no mean city." It was conspicuously, in the language of ancient geographers and historians, the greatest, the most illustrious of the cities of Cilicia. The three Greek letters which appeared on its coinage (Π. Μ. Κ., Πρώτη Μητρόπολις Κιλικίας) marked it out as the first, the *metropolis*, or mother city of that province.[1] At the time of the expedition of the Ten Thousand Greeks, of which Xenophon has given us the record (B.C. 400), it was populous and flourishing, and its history carries us back to a yet more remote antiquity.[2] It shared with Anchiale the honour of being immortalized in the famous epitaph attributed to Sardanapalus, the last of the Assyrian kings, and which told how he,

> The son of Anacyndaraxes,
> In one day built Anchiale and Tarsus.
> Eat, drink, and love: the rest's not worth a fillip.[3]

---

[1] Lewin, St. Paul, i. p. 79. [2] Xen. *Anab.* i.

[3] Strabo, xiv. 5. The translation is from Byron's Sardanapalus, act I. sc. 2.

The coincidence of the name with the Greek word for the flat or inner side of a wing, and so for wing generally, led men to seek somehow or other an explanation of its connection with the city; and after their manner, they suggested two,—one mythical, and the other topographical. It had been given because Pegasus, the winged horse of Olympus, had dropped there one of his pinions, or because the city lay spread out on either side of the river in form like the outspread wings of a bird. The fact that the ancient form of the name was plural (*Tarsi*) gives some colour to this latter explanation; but it is more probable that the true meaning is to be found in a Semitic root (*Tharaz*), signifying strength, like our *burgh*, or *borough*. Josephus,[1] followed by many Jewish and some Christian scholars, identified it with the Tarshish of the Old Testament, the region from which the ships of Hiram and Solomon brought gold and silver and tin; but there is now a general agreement that the latter country is found in Spain; and, as there is no similarity whatever between its products and those of Cilicia, the identification must be rejected as the blunder of an imperfect knowledge misled by similarity of sound.

At some early period, probably altogether prehistoric, the city came, like so many of the towns of Asia Minor, under Greek influence. A colony of Argives had settled there, it was said, in the course of the legendary wanderings of Triptolemus in search of Io. The people, who were afterwards known as Cilicians, had at one time been called Hypachæans,

[1] *Ant.* i. 6, § 1, viii. 7, § 2.

to indicate their Greek or Achæan origin, and their culture, their religion, their language were, at least, predominantly Greek, though with some intermixture of Assyrian and Phœnician elements. At the time when the history of Greece first brings us in contact with it, Tarsus was under the dominion of the Persian kings, and was governed by a satrap. On the overthrow of the Persian monarchy it came into the power of Alexander the Great; and on the break-up of the great empire which he founded, it naturally fell under the kings of Syria, who made Antioch their capital. Following the example of the Persians, they rewarded their ministers, or queens, or concubines by assigning to them certain cities for their maintenance, and under Antiochus Epiphanes, the king whose attempt to crush out the faith and worship of Israel roused the resistance of the Maccabees, Tarsus found itself assigned in this way to the king's favourite mistress, and resented the indignity by a revolt, which compelled him to leave Palestine, in order to take measures for its suppression (2 Macc. iv. 30). When Syria, in its turn, fell (B. C. 62) under the expanding power of Rome, the province of Cilicia, which, in addition to the region properly so called, included the eastern part of Phrygia, as well as Lycia, Pamphylia, and Pisidia, came into a new prominence. The pirates who swarmed from its shores, and burnt villages and plundered ships, were for a time a formidable danger, and tasked for two years all the energies of the great Pompeius. When their subjugation was at last accomplished, the town of Soli, which had been one of their most formidable strongholds, received the

new name of Pompeiopolis, as a monument of the conqueror. It was, indeed, his success in dealing with them that led to the proposal of the Manilian law, supported by Cicero in one of his most famous orations, which conferred on the victorious general, as an exceptional measure, the command over the province of Asia, *i. e.* of that part of Asia Minor west of Cilicia as described above, and placing him at the head of all the eastern armies to finish the protracted war against Mithridates, king of Pontus, became the first step in the gradual revolution which turned the old republic of Rome into the empire. It was, perhaps, in consequence of the part Cicero had thus taken in supporting the Manilian law that, when it came to his turn to be appointed as pro-consul, Cilicia was assigned to him as his province. Thither accordingly he proceeded, leading his forces through Galatia and Cappadocia. With the details of his administration we are, of course, not concerned; but it is of some interest to note that while he distrusts the loyalty of the inhabitants of Tarsus, he cannot find words to express his admiration of its beauty and that of other Cilician cities.[1] In the struggles that followed between the great generals of Rome, Tarsus became for a short time a monument of the fame of Cæsar; and, as if in rivalry of the way in which Pompeius had endeavoured to immortalise his name on the capture of Soli, received the new name of Juliopolis. The people seem to have preferred the old historical name, and Juliopolis

[1] Cicero, Epp. ad Fam. ii. 17, xii. 13; ad Att. v. 21.

never appeared on its coins or public monuments. In the contests that followed on the death of Cæsar, Tarsus at first took part with Brutus and Cassius in their vain efforts to restore the Republic, then deserted them for the cause of the Triumvirate; then, their town being taken by Cassius, had to submit to a fine of 1,500 talents, and to sell even the sacred vessels of its temples to obtain the means of payment. After the vain attempt to bring back the old Constitution had collapsed, Cilicia came under the rule of Marcus Antonius the Triumvir, and the Cydnus became the scene of the memorable visit of Cleopatra. Summoned by Antonius to explain some parts of her political conduct, she sailed up the river in a magnificent galley, its stern covered with gold, its sails of purple, its oars of silver. The rowers kept time to the sound of flutes and pipes and harps. The queen, as in the character of Venus, reclined under a gold-embroidered canopy, and boys, attired as Cupids, stood fanning her on either side, while her attendants, as Nereids and Graces, handled the cordage and the sails. Clouds of incense rose from the crowds that lined the banks of the river, and the tribunal of the Triumvir was deserted for the brilliant spectacle.[1] The memory of that day of marvellous pomp and pageantry must have lingered in the memory of the older citizens of Tarsus, with whom St. Paul came in contact in his boyhood. His own parents may well have been spectators of it, and possibly profited by the decree by which Antonius restored to freedom those who had been sold into slavery.

[1] Plutarch, *Antonius*, c. 26.

Another edict of the Triumvir gave Tarsus a privilege, afterwards confirmed by Augustus, on which it long prided itself. It was made a "free city," was allowed, *i. e.* subject to the sovereignty of Rome, to have its own municipal constitution, its senate ("court of aldermen" would perhaps better express its function), its common council, its popular assembly. It valued this constitution more than the barren honour of that new name which Cæsar had conferred on it, and down to the time of Marcus Aurelius its coins bore an inscription, which recorded that it was a free city, singled out from all the cities of Cilicia for that distinction.

Such had been, in outline, the history of the city which was the birthplace of St. Paul up to the time when his parents settled there. What aspect it then presented, what was the character of its population, what was the environment in the midst of which the life of the future Apostle was formed and fashioned, are the questions that next meet us. The geographical writer Strabo, who wrote circ. A.D. 20, when St. Paul was growing into manhood, has given us a full description of it, which has a special interest, from the fact of its being the report of a contemporary. The city then, at that time, spread out on both sides the river, the region on the eastern bank (now deserted) being probably of the character of a suburb, at a distance of about twelve miles from the sea. The mouth of the river, now choked up with silted mud and sand, and half lost in salt and barren marshes, was then widened into a harbour, and contained spacious docks, and, as the narrative of Cleopatra's

visit shows, was navigable as far as the city. Behind the city, at nearly the same distance, rose the Taurus range of mountains, with their snow-clad heights, and the clear cold waters of the Cydnus were seen flowing from them through the plain. On one side of the river, probably the eastern, was the *stadium* or race-course, for the athletic sports of the youths of Tarsus, and near it the *gymnasium*, or training-school, where they practised, and which served also, as the Athenian gymnasia did in the time of Socrates, as a kind of club, where their elders might meet and talk. In the city itself there was, of course, the *Agora*, or market-place, as the great centre of its life. Round it gathered the dwellings and shops of the citizens. Of its public buildings we have neither remains nor record, but it must have had its share of temples and statues of the gods, more than its share of the "schools" or lecture-rooms of philosophical and other teachers.

The last words speak to us of what was the distinctive glory of Tarsus as a city. Miletus, Sardis, Thyatira, with their woollen manufactures, and dyes of kingly purple, might look down upon the rough sack-cloth and sail-cloth, made chiefly from goats' hair, which formed the staple of Cilician industry, and took its Latin name (*cilicium*) from the province; but Tarsus might boast of a culture to which they could lay no claim. At the time when St. Paul was passing through the earlier stages of his youth, it was classed with Athens and Alexandria as one of the three centres of Greek thought and knowledge,[1] and in some

[1] Strabo, xiv. 51, p. 672.

ways even surpassed them in its thoroughness of work and local fame, though it attracted fewer strangers from a distance than they did. It had its memories of illustrious teachers, representing this or that school of philosophy; one, Athenodorus, who had been the friend of the elder Cato, and tutor of Augustus; another, bearing the strange cognomen of Cananites, indicating probably a Syrian origin, who had been the tutor of Julius Cæsar. These were Stoics. Nestor, who was classed as an Academic, *i.e.* a follower of the later Platonic school, had been chosen by Augustus to be the tutor of the young Marcellus,—whose untimely death dashed to the ground the bright hopes of a golden age that had gathered round his youth,—and was for many years during St. Paul's boyhood the chief administrative ruler of the city. Rome was as full of men who had been trained at Tarsus as of those who had been trained at Alexandria, and the one education was as much a passport to the post of tutor or director as the other. The whole circle of instruction, the systematic course from which we get our word "encyclopædia,"[1] was taught there in its completeness. It will be noticed that Stoics were prominent there, and that Tarsus may be added to the list of places by which it has been shown that Stoicism, as a system, bore a distinctly Oriental character.[2] In one case the epithet Cananites almost suggests, as

[1] ἡ ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία. The term was held to include the general range of school-learning,—grammar, mathematics, ethics, rhetoric, dialectic, and music.

[2] Lightfoot on Philippians, App. on St. Paul and Seneca, p. 271.

above noticed, a more definitely Semitic influence. From such teachers the young Israelite may well have learnt, directly or indirectly, the Stoic thoughts and phrases of which his Epistles show so many traces. When he came across the thinkers of that persuasion in the *Agora* of Athens, it was not as one to whom their system was a stranger, or who had to fence with unfamiliar weapons which he had not proved.

It was, however, characteristic of Tarsus that it was frequented chiefly by the inhabitants of the province; and hence we may well believe that it cherished the fame of its own poets and teachers. Among those poets none was more famous than Aratus (circ. B.C. 270), from whose poem, bearing the title of *Phænomena*, a scientific treatise on Meteorology in hexameters, St. Paul quotes the well-known passage in his speech on the Areopagus.

The fame of Aratus had travelled far and wide, and the book was regarded as a convenient manual of astronomical knowledge both in Rome and Greece. Cicero in his early manhood, as yet little dreaming of ever visiting the birthplace of the poet, translated the *Phænomena* into Latin, and St. Paul could quote it before his Athenian hearers with the assurance that they would recognize the poet whom he cited as one whom they might claim as their own, one of the great brotherhood of Greek literature, though by birth belonging to an Asiatic province.

Aratus differed from most of the physicists of the later schools of Greek philosophy in representing a Stoic and not an Epicurean theory of the universe, a Pantheistic rather than a materialistic solution of its

problems. The passage from which St. Paul quotes the few pregnant words, "We also are his offspring," is remarkable as one of the noblest utterances of that Pantheistic faith:—

> "From Zeus begin we; never let us leave
> His Name untold. With Him, with Zeus, are filled
> All paths we tread, and all the marts of men;
> Filled too the sea and every creek and bay;
> And all in all things need we help of Zeus,
> For we too are His offspring."—*Phænomena*, 1—5.

The fact that the early years of Saul of Tarsus had been brought into contact with this line of thought explains, in great part, the moderation of his language in speaking of the religions of Greece or Rome. He draws back from mocking gibe and railing accusation. Even at Ephesus he is no "blasphemer" of Artemis. He had learnt to recognize and sympathize with the strivings of those who, living in the times of ignorance, were yet seeking after God, "if haply they might feel after Him and find Him," and to read in their aspirations after a higher life the work of the law written in the hearts of all men. And we may, in part at least, ascribe that intelligence and sympathy to the opportunities which Tarsus gave him for acquaintance with the higher forms of Greek culture and religious thought.

The interest which connects itself with this stage of St. Paul's life is heightened when we ask, who among his contemporaries may have been among those with whom he came in contact? Of these we must assign a conspicuous place to the great geographer Strabo. Born in Cappadocia, he studied in

early years at the Cilician Seleucia, and was for some time under the teaching of the Stoic Athenodorus, at Tarsus, and his description of that city is evidently based upon personal observation. His mention of the great earthquake which did so much damage to Sardis, in the reign of Tiberius (xiii. p. 627), shows that he was writing that part of his history as late as A.D. 11, and, if he visited Tarsus at or about that period, his arrival must have been matter of notoriety during St. Paul's boyhood. He mentions among his authorities on the astronomical relations of the earth, Eudoxus of Cnidus, of whose writings the poem of Aratus, quoted by St. Paul, was a metrical paraphrase; and this, together with his personal associations with Tarsus, and the full description which he gives of it, may well have made that part, at least, of his great work familiar to most men of education in that city.

The strange, adventurous life of Apollonius of Tyana, the teacher and thaumaturgist, whose claims to prophetic inspiration seemed at one time likely to make him almost the founder of a new religion, and whose life by Philostratus offers something like a parallelism of contrast to the Gospel records of the life of Christ, presents another instance of contemporary presence, and therefore of possible contact. The date of his birth must have coincided nearly with that of St. Paul, and at the age of fourteen he was sent to study under Euthydamus, a Phœnician teacher of rhetoric, at Tarsus. He found the character of its inhabitants altogether uncongenial. They were given to luxury, and flushed with insolence and

wine, and when he exhorted them to a life of abstinence they mocked and scorned him. Finding so little sympathy among them, he withdrew to the neighbouring city of Ægæ, where there was a temple dedicated to Æsculapius, which, like all such sanctuaries, was much visited by the sick, and became, accordingly, the resort of physicians, who found there material for observation and experiment. There he found, as at Tarsus, Platonists and Peripatetics, and Stoics and Epicureans, and his reception by them and by the priests of Æsculapius was more favourable than that accorded to him in the more famous schools of Tarsus. The thaumaturgic element of his nature, perhaps, also, what we have learnt to call a mesmeric power over the nervous system and imagination of other men, was there developed, and he assumed a character like that of Simon the sorcerer in Samaria, and Elymas in Cyprus. His after-history does not come within the horizon of our inquiry, but the fact that these were early stages in his life is not without interest as reminding us that the vehement indignation of the Apostle when the Jewish wizard of Cyprus was seeking to pervert the right ways of the Lord, may have had a point of contact with his early recollections of the claims of a like impostor in his native city (Acts xiii. 6–10).

Lastly, I venture to think it probable that two of the great preachers and workers of the Apostolic Church may have been brought into personal acquaintance with St. Paul during the earlier stages of his life in the city of which we are now treating. In the case of Barnabas this is almost a matter of

certainty. The Levite of the country of Cyprus, possessing gifts of thought and utterance such as afterwards, when purified and strengthened by a higher illumination, gained for him among the company of the early teachers of the faith, the name of the "Son of Consolation," or, more strictly, "the Son of Prophecy," would as naturally be sent from Paphos or Salamis to what we might almost call the University of Tarsus, as a scholar of one of the minor towns of Italy in the thirteenth century would have been sent to the University of Padua or Bologna, and when there, would be drawn into the society of men of his own race and faith, and especially those of like gifts and aims. An early acquaintance between the two was thus antecedently probable. And when the two names are first brought together in the history of the Apostolic Church, there are, it is obvious, signs, not to be mistaken, of early and intimate friendship. When all other members of the Church at Jerusalem shrank in fear from the converted persecutor, lest what appeared to be a true conversion should be but the insidious strategy of antagonism, it was Barnabas who took him and brought him to the Apostles, and declared unto them "how he had seen the Lord in the way" (Acts ix. 27), as though able, from personal knowledge, to guarantee the sincerity of a nature which he knew to be incapable of baseness. When the work of Barnabas in the Gentile Church of Antioch overtasked his strength, and he needed further help, it was not to the Apostles and elders at Jerusalem that he turned for that help, but he "departed to Tarsus for to seek

Saul" (Acts xi. 25). Together they went up, after some months of joint labour, to carry the bounty of the "Christians" of Antioch to the suffering disciples of Jerusalem, and together they returned (Acts xi. 30, xii. 25). When the voices of the prophets at Antioch were heard giving, as by special inspiration, the self-same oracle, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them" (Acts xiii. 2), we may well believe that they recognised the claims of long-standing friendship as one, at least, of the elements of fitness in the association of the two names. We may, I think, go one step further, and see reason to believe that Barnabas also was skilled in that "tent" or "sail-cloth" manufacture for which Tarsus was conspicuous. For of him also it was true, as St. Paul bears witness, that though entitled to "forbear working" (1 Cor. ix. 6), and to depend upon the bounty of the Church for his maintenance as an Evangelist, he yet did *not* forbear, but worked with his own hands, even as his friend did. More than this, we cannot, of course prove, but it is, at least, infinitely more probable that, when they earned their bread with the labour of their hands on arriving in a Pisidian or Lycaonian city, it was as fellow-workers of the same craft—as Paul afterwards did with Aquila and Priscilla—than that they separated, each to seek his daily wages in the employment of some heathen or Jewish master. On all these grounds, then, we may feel assured that the assumption of an early friendship between the two great preachers of the faith is no idle conjecture, that we have good grounds for believing that they,

as fellow-students at Tarsus, read the same books, cherished the same hopes as to the future of their race, had the same aspirations after righteousness; that they, too, in the words of one who knew the power and the joy of such companionship were,—

> "Together nursed upon the self-same hill,
> Fed the same flock by fountain, shade, or rill."

Even the "sharp contention," the "paroxysm" of alienation which at last divided them (Acts xv. 39) would hardly have been possible but for the depth of tender affection in those who in their youth had been comrades together, and felt that there is no chasm so hard to bridge over as that which yawns between the hearts of divided friends. Of them, also, it was true—

> "That to be wroth with one we love
> Doth work like madness on the brain,
> And each spake words of high disdain
> And insult to his heart's best brother.
> They parted—ne'er to meet again,
> But never either found another
> To free the hollow heart from paining:
> They stood aloof, the scars remaining,
> Like cliffs which had been rent asunder."*

Yet another name may be added to this group of probable fellow-students in the streets of Tarsus. Of St. Luke, also, it is true, that though there is no record of early acquaintance with St. Paul, there is much that implies it. When the narrative of the Acts changes in ch. xvi. 10 from the third person to the first, *i.e.* when St. Luke becomes the fellow-traveller of St. Paul, there is no mention of his con-

* S. T. Coleridge, "Christabel."

version, or of the chances that brought them together. All comes, as a matter of course, with the naturalness of one who had met with an old friend, and joined him in his travels. They may, of course, have met at Antioch or elsewhere, but an Asiatic student, or even an Italian student with Asiatic connections, looking for a medical education, would more naturally be drawn to Tarsus than to either Athens or Alexandria. Not only was it high in reputation, as we have seen, for general culture, but the whole region of which it was the metropolis was famous for its physicians, who, though born in this or that town of less note, could hardly have received their training elsewhere than at Tarsus. There, accordingly, may have been Aretæus the Cappadocian, who wrote a Greek treatise on Acute and Chronic Diseases in the reign of Nero; and Dioscorides, a native of Anazarba, in Cilicia Campestris, who wrote about the same period (probably a little later) on Materia Medica; and Athenæus, the founder of the medical school known as the Pneumatici, who was born at the Cilician Attaleia, in the first century after Christ.[1] And not far from Tarsus, at Ægæ, on the coast of Cilicia, stood, as we have seen in the life of Apollonius of Tyana, a temple of Æsculapius. Such temples were the nearest approach which the Greek world exhibited to anything like a modern hospital. The sick came there to offer up prayers for their recovery, and consulted the Asclepiadæ, or physician-priests, who ministered at the altars of the

[1] Dictionary of the Bible, art. *Medicine*, by Dr. Hayman.

god, and, if healed, consecrated their votive tablets, as a thank-offering for their recovery. The prominence which Strabo gives throughout his great geographical work to the temples of Æsculapius seems to show that he was in part drawn, as an amateur, to such studies; and this, in regard to Tarsus, is confirmed by the singular note made by him as to the cold waters of the Cydnus—which were all but fatal to Alexander the Great—as being serviceable for gout and rheumatism. All these circumstances, insignificant as each may seem in itself, combine to make it probable that the "beloved physician," in whose writings we find so many traces of the study of Hippocrates, and who coloured the language of St. Paul so largely with a like medical terminology, received the same kind of training and at the same place, as others of his order of the same period.[1]

Paul, Luke, Barnabas, Apollonius: there is something of a strange interest in the thought that these men, passing on afterwards into such different paths, and representing such different tendencies, may have dwelt for a time together in the same city, walked in the same streets, sat in the same class-rooms at the feet of the same teacher, and that while they were thus companions, the great geographer may have come to the city and inquired into all that was worth noting in its history, antiquities, and literature. It is, of course, probable that St. Paul, at or about the age of thirteen, when the Jewish boys became "Children of the Law,"

[1] See a fuller treatment of this subject in an article by the present writer on St. Luke and St. Paul, in the "Expositor" for August, 1876.

as bound by its precepts, and, if they were designed for the higher culture of a Rabbi's life, entered on the study of the traditional comments on the Law, went up to Jerusalem, and was for some years a student in the schools there, sitting at the feet of Gamaliel. With that period of his life we are not now concerned; but it is almost certain that, when he had gone through the recognized course of education there, he returned to his native city, and entered on his occupation as a tent-maker. That work, it need hardly be said, was not inconsistent with the continued study of the Law and Prophets, and the comments and traditions that had gathered round them, nor even with the actual discharge of a Rabbi's duties as a teacher in the synagogue of Tarsus. His eminence as a Pharisee, his fame as a pupil of Gamaliel, his personal zeal and intellectual vigour, perhaps, also, his social position as a Roman citizen, would all tend to secure this kind of recognition for him; and we may well believe that when he stood up as a preacher with a "word of consolation," at Antioch in Pisidia, he was taking a position that had for many years been familiar to him. It may be added, that the business which he thus carried on would almost, of necessity, bring him into contact with the other towns and villages of Cilicia. Goats' hair had to be bought, the tents and sack-cloth into which it was manufactured had to be sold, and these trade transactions would, in this way, be among the preparations for that other and higher work in which he was to be afterwards conspicuous. The roads which led to the upland slopes of the Taurus,

perhaps the higher inland districts of Phrygia and Lycaonia with their perils of waters and of robbers, would thus become familiar to him. We are, at any rate, compelled by the narrative of his work to think of him, when he returned to his native city after his conversion to the faith of Christ, as labouring with a zealous activity, not in Tarsus only, but in the neighbouring districts. For six or seven years (Acts ix. 30, xi. 25) he was there, working, as far as any conspicuous fellow-labourers were concerned, single-handed, as an Evangelist; and the very fact that when he started on what we commonly speak of (somewhat hastily, it may be) as his first missionary journey, Cilicia did not come at all within his plan of operations, is *primâ facie* evidence, not that he cared less for it, but that the Gospel had been already proclaimed there by him, and that Churches, partly Jewish and partly Gentile, were to be found in most of its cities and villages. The inference thus drawn is converted into a certainty by the fact that when he started, in company with Silas, on his second missionary journey, he "went through Syria *and Cilicia*, confirming the Churches," which must obviously have been founded during that period of Apostolic activity of which we have no written record (Acts xv. 41).

There is no record in the New Testament of any later visit paid by St. Paul to the city of his birth. If he ever trod its streets again, or revisited the Cilician Churches, of which, as we have seen, he had been the founder, it must have been when he returned by land from Antioch to Ephesus, "passing

over the country of Galatia and Phrygia in order, strengthening the disciples" (Acts xviii. 23). His route on that occasion would naturally have led through the pass known as the Cilician Gates, and so through the province itself.

The after-history of Tarsus hardly falls within the scope of the present inquiry. So far as its relations to the Apostle of the Gentiles are concerned, his name is conspicuous by its absence. No tradition marks out his house; no Church is known to have been dedicated to his memory. In this case, too, as in so many others, it may well have been that the prophet was without honour in his own country and in his father's house. The academic fame of Tarsus, however, continued to flourish down to the Christian period of the Empire, and must have risen to a yet higher glory under Diodorus, one of the great group of the theologians of the fourth century who, after having been a conspicuous defender of the Christian faith against Julian, the Apostate Emperor, and many heretical sects, was appointed Bishop of the city by Meletius, Bishop of Antioch, early in the reign of the Emperor Theodosius (circ. A.D. 378). And among the disciples who studied under him were Theodore of Mopsuestia, and the more illustrious Chrysostom. The latter describes his master as having been, in the austere asceticism of his life, as a second John the Baptist, influencing those whom he taught both by his profound knowledge of Scripture and by the holiness of his life. Later on in the history of the Church, Tarsus is associated with a name which for us, as Englishmen, has a yet deeper interest. From

its schools or monasteries came the Archbishop of Canterbury to whom, more than to any other prelate of the Saxon period, we owe the organisation of the Church of England. The chances of his life had brought him to Italy, and when, on the death of the Archbishop Benedict (A.D. 664), and that of his successor, Wighard, who died at Rome before his consecration, it fell to the Pope to recommend a successor, the fame of Theodore marked him out as the fittest for the arduous task. Accompanied by his friend Hadrian, a man of like culture with himself, he entered, at the age of sixty-six, on his new labours, revived the discipline of the Church, and in his famous Penitential laid down an elaborate system for the ecclesiastical punishment of offenders. Monasteries were founded and became schools of learning; and their libraries were furnished with the stores of Greek as well as Latin, secular as well as sacred literature.[1] It is scarcely too much to say, that we owe to him and to his work, and to the education which, without it, would hardly have been possible, the knowledge and the devotion to study which have made the name of the Venerable Bede a household word among us. It would be out of place to follow in detail the course of his administration, but as the last great name connected with the city whose chief or only interest for us is that which connects it with the history of the Church of Christ, it would not have been right to pass over the name of Theodore of Tarsus.

[1] A MS. of Homer is named as one of the treasures thus brought over.

Like most of the Asiatic cities that have come under the government of the Turks, Tarsus, which, after being once or twice new-named, as Crania or Antioch, still retains its old title under the slightly altered form of *Tersoos*, has dwindled from its ancient greatness. The Cydnus, instead of flowing through it, leaves the town about a mile to the west. The streets are narrow and squalid, and the houses rarely more than one story high. No inscription or monument, beyond the scanty remains of a theatre, between the town and the river, rewards the researches of the traveller. The marshes formed near the mouth of the river and left undrained, expose the inhabitants, and yet more, strangers, to attacks of malaria fever. The population, however, is reckoned at about 30,000; and the old manufactures which made it famous in the days of the Apostle still flourish there. Fifty tanners carry on their business, and from the goats' hair, which they get from the skins which they turn into leather, they make sacks, which are exported on a tolerably large scale (500 loads of fifty pieces each annually) to other parts of Asia Minor.[1]

[1] Lewin, St. Paul, i. c. v. Barker, "Lares and Penates," App. E. The latter gives the population at 6,000.

ST. PAUL AT ANTIOCH.

ST. PAUL AT ANTIOCH.

THE position which Antioch occupies in the history of the Apostolic Age is such as to fix the attention even of the most casual observer. It was in every sense of the word the Mother Church of Gentile, as Jerusalem was of Jewish, Christendom. There the great name of Christian, which was afterwards to echo through the ages to the end of time, was first formed on human lips. There the Word of life was first publicly proclaimed to the Gentiles as such; and there they were, as a body, first admitted to the full privileges of fellowship with the Church of Christ without passing through the preparatory stage of Judaism, or accepting any of its distinctive ordinances. There the Apostle of the Gentiles and his friend or fellow-worker Joses, the Son of Consolation, laboured in the extension of the Church of Christ, while they yet showed by kindly sympathy or liberal gifts that their hearts were with their brethren according to the flesh. Thence they were sent out on that memorable journey which was the type and pattern of all missionary enterprises. There, when they returned and reported that what had been seen in the Syrian Antioch had been reproduced in the

Pisidian, and in the other cities of the inner provinces of Asia Minor, so that the question was assuming more than local proportions, there sprang up the first great controversy that threatened to break up the unity of the new society.

The city which was thus the scene of some of the most momentous passages of that great drama which we speak of as the rise and progress of Christianity might well claim our notice, if only as furnishing the background and the surroundings amid which the actors in that drama played their part. At that time, however, it commanded the attention of travellers and historians on quite different grounds. Of all the cities that owned the sovereignty of Rome it occupied all but the highest place, second only to Alexandria in its fame and greatness. Though it could not boast the remote antiquity of Damascus, or of the old imperial cities on the Tigris or the Euphrates, which had been the centres of the Assyrian and Babylonian monarchies, its career up to this time had been one of unchecked prosperity. The beauty of its position, the grandeur of its buildings, the culture for which it was pre-eminent among the cities of Asia, drew thither visitors even from the remoter West. The early history, the very topography, of such a city, the associations that had gathered round it, cannot be without interest to the student of Christian antiquity.

The foundation of the city belonged, as its name indicates, to the period of the Syrian monarchy, which rose under the Seleucidæ upon the ruins of the great fabric that had risen, with startling rapidity, from the conquests of Alexander the Great, and was shivered

into fragments at his death. Seleucus Nicator, the son of Antiochus, one of Philip's generals, who had accompanied the conqueror on his Asiatic expeditions, and had distinguished himself by his strategical skill and prowess, obtained on his death the satrapy of Babylon under Perdiccas (B.C. 321), and nine years later, after taking a conspicuous part in the struggles of the rival candidates for sovereignty, acquired the independent status which marks the year B.C. 312 in the ancient system of chronology as the æra of the Seleucidæ. In B.C. 306 he followed the example which Ptolemy had set in Egypt, and took the title of king. Conquests in Bactria and the neighbouring provinces justified the assumption of his surname of Nicator "the conqueror," and in the partition of power which followed on the battle of Ipsus (B.C. 301) he obtained Syria, Phrygia, and Cappadocia, and thus, ruling well-nigh from the Halys to the Indus, and with seventy-two satraps who owned his supremacy, reproduced the greatness of the old Persian monarchy. Of all the successors of Alexander he was the truest to the plans which the great conqueror had formed of carrying Greek culture and commerce into the barbaric East, and was distinguished above all who preceded or followed him as the founder of new cities. The glory of his father Antiochus was immortalised by sixteen cities that bore his name, of which the most important were that on the Orontes, which became the capital of his kingdom, and that in Pisidia, memorable for its connection with St. Paul's mission-work (Acts viii. 14). The name of his mother was perpetuated by six Laodiceas; his own by nine Seleucias,

of which that which formed the port of Antioch at the mouth of the Orontes became the most important.

The choice of the site of Antioch gave proof of a sagacity of the same kind as that which fixed on Alexandria and Constantinople as the seats of empire. Its position in the angle formed by the Syrian and Cilician coasts, and in the valley through which the Orontes flows between the ranges of the Lebanon and the Taurus, made it a natural link connecting the eastern with the western provinces of the kingdom. Its port, Seleucia, opened to it the commerce of the Mediterranean, while the caravans that carried on the land trade with inner Asia came to it from Mesopotamia and Arabia. The natural advantages of the site soon led to the expansion of the original city of Nicator, which had been built between Mount Silphius and the river; and the island formed by the river, like that formed at Paris by the Seine, became the seat of a new city built by the second Seleucus and the third Antiochus, while a fourth division on the south, under the craggy heights of the mountain, constructed by Antiochus Epiphanes, completed the *tetrapolis*. The last-named ruler surrounded the city with a wall (afterwards restored by Tiberius, and so receiving his name), and a street, afterwards enriched with colonnades, four miles in length, led from the eastern to the western gate. When the dynasty of the Seleucidæ fell before the arms of Pompeius (B.C. 65), the city, as the capital of the Roman province of Syria, entered on a new stage of greatness.

The name of the victorious rival of Pompeius was perpetuated by an aqueduct and baths, and by the

basilica known as the Cæsareum. Agrippa, the minister of Augustus, added a suburb to the prosperous city, and Herod the Great, seeking, there as elsewhere, the favour of the emperor and the praise of the people by the munificence of his gifts, paved the street that ran through the city, and which till then had been comparatively mean and poor in its surroundings, with marble, and erected on either side of it the colonnade which, when Antioch comes before us in Christian history, was the chief place of public resort. Tiberius. as has been already said, built or restored the walls; and even the short reign of Caligula was made memorable by the construction of an aqueduct and public baths.

No description of Antioch, however, would be complete without some notice of the grove and temple at Daphne, dedicated to Apollo and Artemis. The well-known description given by the historian of the "Decline and Fall" is so vivid and complete, that it will be better to reproduce it than to attempt a paraphrase in words which could hardly fail to be feebler.

"At the distance of five miles from Antioch, the Macedonian kings of Syria had consecrated to Apollo one of the most elegant places of devotion in the pagan world. A magnificent temple rose in honour of the God of light, and his colossal figure almost filled the capacious sanctuary, which was enriched with gold and gems and adorned by the skill of the Grecian artists. The deity was represented in a bending attitude, with a golden cup in his hands, pouring out a libation on the earth; as if he supplicated the venerable mother to give to his arms the

cold and beauteous Daphne; for the spot was ennobled by fiction, and the fancy of the Syrian poets had transported the amorous tale from the banks of the Peneus to those of the Orontes. The ancient rites of Greece were imitated by the royal colony of Antioch. A stream of prophecy, which rivalled the truth and reputation of the Delphic oracle, flowed from the *Castalian* fountain of Daphne. In the adjacent fields a stadium was built by a special privilege, which had been purchased from Elis. The Olympic games were celebrated at the expense of the city, and a revenue of thirty thousand pounds sterling was annually applied to the public pleasures. The perpetual resort of pilgrims and spectators insensibly formed, in the neighbourhood of the Temple, the stately and populous village of Daphne, which emulated the splendour, without acquiring the title, of a provincial city. The temple and the village were deeply bosomed in a thick grove of laurels and cypresses, which reached as far as a circumference of ten miles, and formed, in the most sultry summer, a cool and impenetrable shade. A thousand streams of the purest water, issuing from every hill, preserved the verdure of the earth and the temperature of the air; the senses were gratified with harmonious sounds and aromatic odours, and the peaceful grove was consecrated to health and joy, to luxury and love. . . . The soldier and the philosopher wisely avoided the temptations of this sensual paradise, where pleasure, assuming the character of religion, imperceptibly dissolved the firmness of manly virtue. But the groves of Daphne continued for many ages to

enjoy the veneration of natives and strangers; the privileges of the holy ground were enlarged by the munificence of succeeding emperors; and every generation added new ornaments to the splendour of the temple."[1]

Antioch could boast, moreover, of other glories than that of outward beauty and magnificence. It aimed, though in this respect its fame fell short of that of Tarsus, at establishing a reputation in the republic of letters. Cicero could speak of it[2] as illustrious for men of great learning and high culture, and the poet Archias, in defending whom the great orator has left us what may be called the classical "defence of poesy," owed his birth and his education to that city. The intercourse with Rome, thus opened, drew many of its artists and authors to the imperial capital, and it was one of the charges brought by the great satirist against his countrymen, that the Orontes had polluted the waters of the Tiber with its tainted streams, and had brought with it the speech and the morals, the music and the dances, the vices and the impurity, of the Syrian capital.[3] It lay in the nature of the case, however, that a great city, the capital of a province, at one time the residence of kings, and afterwards the head-quarters of Roman government, should have some culture of a higher kind than that

[1] Gibbon, "Decline and Fall," c. xxiii.

[2] "Orat. pro Archiâ," c. 3.

[3] "Jampridem Syrus in Tiberim defluxit Orontes,
Et linguam, et mores, et cum tibicine chordas
Obliquas, necnon gentilia tympana secum
Vexit, et ad Circum jussas prostare puellas."
—Juvenal, Sat. III. 62–5.

which only ministered to luxury, and we may fairly assume that, like Tarsus and Alexandria, it would have its schools of rhetoric and philosophy, and we may add, with special reference to a question that will hereafter come under discussion, of medicine also.

The population of Antioch, like that of most Eastern cities of the Empire, included many heterogeneous elements. "He who sits in our market-place," said Libanius, in the fourth century, "may study the customs of all cities in the world."[1] The bulk of the slaves and working classes were Syrians. The more wealthy citizens were either Greeks by descent or had adopted Greek language, customs, and religion. The prefect and the officials, civil or military, who accompanied him were, of course, Latins, either by birth or language. Mingled with these, and yet retaining their distinctness, were Jews who had flocked to that city in great numbers. The early monarchs of the dynasty of the Seleucidæ, true to the tolerant policy of Alexander, and emulating the Ptolemies in their application of that policy in increasing the population and the greatness of Alexandria, had attracted many Jews to settle in the new city by offering privileges which placed them on a level with the other citizens. The insane attempt of Antiochus Epiphanes to enforce the religion and the customs of Greece on the Jews of Palestine was but a passing interruption to the concord thus established; and his successors after his death adopted a more liberal policy, and sought to conciliate their Jewish subjects by the somewhat singular step of presenting to

[1] Libanius, "Antiochicus," i. p. 326, ed. Reisk.

the chief synagogue of Antioch some of the brazen vessels which had been taken from the Temple of Jerusalem.[1] The munificence of Herod, in embellishing the city, could hardly have been without fruit in securing the position of those who belonged to the race over which he ruled. Their influence in the Syrian Antioch may be measured by what is recorded of the Pisidian, and of other cities. Men and women who were weary of the religion in which they had been trained, or of the scepticism which had taken its place, would come to the synagogue to seek a higher truth, and the conspicuous position given in the list of the seven so-called deacons to the name of Nicolas, the proselyte of Antioch (Acts vi. 5), may be taken as evidence that at a very early stage in the history of the Christian Church it had attained at least some notice in the Syrian capital.

What has been said will have been enough to indicate the general aspect of the city in its moral and social relations. The vices which made it a by-word of reproach, even at Rome, were dark and flagrant. When Roman generals issued orders that any soldier found within the precincts of the groves of Daphne should be punished with immediate dismissal, we may well believe they looked on the orgies that were held within the precincts of the sanctuary as fatal alike to discipline and manliness. The picture which Spenser has drawn in his "Faerie Queen,"[2] of the gardens of Acrasia, might represent, in no overdrawn colours, the habitual life of its frequenters. At Antioch, how-

[1] Josephus, "Wars," vii. 3, § 3.

[2] Faerie Queen, Book ii. 5.

ever, as in other cities, the profligacy of the inhabitants culminated in its religious festivals. There was the Maiuma, held in spring, in honour of Dionysos and Aphrodite, which kept its position even under all Christian influences, down to the time of Chrysostom, in which the Hetairai, or prostitutes, of Antioch, as Nymphs and Nereids, exposed themselves in the waters of one of the crystal lakes of Daphne to the gaze of the spectators. There was the Adonis festival, such as Milton has described it:

> Thammuz next came behind,
> Whose annual wound in Lebanon allured
> The Syrian damsels to lament his fate
> In amorous ditties all a summer's day,
> While smooth Adonis from his native rock
> Ran purple to the sea, suffused with blood
> Of Thammuz yearly wounded: the love-tale
> Infected Sion's daughters with like heat,
> Whose wanton orgies in the sacred porch
> Ezekiel saw, when by the vision led
> His eye surveyed the dark idolatries
> Of alienated Judah.—"Paradise Lost," i. 446–457.

The races of the Hippodrome offered excitement of another kind. The whole city was divided into factions, distinguished by green and blue badges, each having its own favourite charioteers, and contending for them with a clamorous eagerness, breaking at times into tumultuous fights like those which, under the Eastern emperors, became the scandal even of Christianized Byzantium.

The private life of such a city was sure to be on a level with its public profligacy. As at Corinth, so here, the preachers of a new faith would be en-

countered by a fathomless impurity, stretching beyond the vices which still haunt the streets of all great cities into those darker shades of evil which we have learnt to shudder at, but not to name. The work which lay before the missionaries of the Gospel and the preacher of repentance must have been at Antioch much as it was at Corinth. "Such were some of you," (Cor. vi. 9, 11) might have been spoken, in the one case as in the other, to those who had been snatched as brands from the burning, after they had fallen to the lowest depths of shameless evil.

It would be a labour at once of love and of surpassing interest to trace the working of the new leaven, operating, not to corrupt but to purify, on this seething mass of corruption, to put one's finger on the precise moment when the name of Jesus as the Christ, the Redeemer, and the Saviour, was heard there as a new element of life. This, however, lies almost, if not altogether, beyond the record of the Apostolic work. The widely-spread knowledge of our Lord's life, and works, and death to which St. Peter appeals, in speaking to Cornelius and his friends at Cæsarea, (Acts x. 37) may well be supposed to have already spread to the capital of the province, which had a large Jewish population, of whom many must, in the common course of things, have been present at the feasts in Jerusalem in the course of His ministry. The Procurator of the sub-province of Judæa, Pontius Pilate, could hardly have failed to report to the Prefect of Syria the trial and execution of one who claimed to be King of the Jews. Centurion and chiliarch, passing from one part of the province to another,

may have carried the news of the appearance of the new sect, the followers of the Nazarene, who were taking their place side by side with Pharisees and Sadducees, Herodians and Essenes. Vague as they are, the words of St. Matthew (iv. 24) that the fame of Jesus "went throughout all Syria" suggest the thought of a rumour widening as it went, which may have passed beyond the heights of Lebanon and Hermon to the valley of the Orontes.

After "the day of Pentecost" we begin to tread on surer ground. The prominence of the proselyte of Antioch in the Church of Jerusalem has been already noticed. It is obvious, as the boundaries of the Church had not been yet enlarged by the teaching of the conversion of Cornelius, that he must have been what the Jews called a "proselyte of righteousness," bound by the covenant of circumcision to the observance of all other ordinances of the Mosaic law. He had passed through the synagogue of Antioch before he sought admission into the Church of Jerusalem. It is obvious that his selection by the multitude of Hellenistæ, or Greek-speaking Jews, who had joined the new society, implies that his social position entitled him to respect, and that his character had won their confidence, and it is, at least, probable that he had been chosen as the representative of those who, though Jews, were yet his fellow citizens and had known his probity in their previous intercourse with him. A little further on in the history of the Acts (xi. 20) we read that "they which were scattered abroad, upon the persecution about Stephen, travelled as far as Phenice, and Cyprus,

and Antioch." And it is natural to think that Nicolas may have been among that company, returning to his native city to be there the preacher of the new faith, and the organiser, if not the founder, of the new society which men were beginning to speak of as the *Ecclesia*, the Church or "congregation" of the Christ. It is true that they are reported to have preached the Word "to none but unto the Jews only." But this, we may observe, was precisely what might have been expected in one who had himself accepted the outward sign of Judaism and observed its laws before he had been baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. Soon, however, while the work was in the first stages of its growth, it received a sudden and unlooked-for expansion. There came, in that company of unnamed Evangelists, "men of Cyprus and Cyrene," influenced, in all likelihood, by the burning words in which Stephen had uttered his wider thoughts of the mystery of God in the synagogue which included Cilicians (and therefore, probably, Cyprians also) and them of Cyrene, and they, "when they were come to Antioch, spake unto the Greeks,[1] preaching the Lord Jesus" [Acts xi. 20]. The posi-

[1] The English version gives "Grecians," which our translators, with an accuracy which is often lost sight of, invariably employ as the equivalent for the Greek *Hellenistæ*, or Greek-speaking Jews. It is obvious, however, that this, as being merely a continuation of the work mentioned in the preceding verse, would have called for no special notice. On internal grounds alone we should have been almost justified in assuming a corruption of the text, and reading *Hellenes*, or Greeks pure and simple. Fortunately that reading is found in some at least of the MSS. of the highest authority (the Alexandrian among

tion which this fact occupies in St. Luke's narrative leaves it uncertain whether it followed or preceded the opening of "the door of the faith" to the Gentiles in the case of Cornelius. Probably the two events were very nearly simultaneous. The enlargement of the range of work may have been the result of what the Cyprian and Cyrenian preachers heard as having occurred at Cæsarea. It may have been, on the other hand, the independent witness of that teaching of the Spirit which was leading the Church onwards into fresh regions of the truth and of the secret calling, known as yet only to a few, which both in the first hours of his conversion (Acts xxvi. 17) and afterwards in his trance in the Temple (Acts xxii. 21) had assigned to St. Paul his mission "far hence unto the Gentiles." In any case the Church of Jerusalem had been prepared, by the case of Cornelius, to receive without surprise or alarm, the tidings of the admission of the Gentiles. To the Church, or at least to all but the Pharisaic section of it, the news was simply matter of rejoicing, and without hesitation they sent forth Barnabas "that he should go as far as Antioch" (Acts xi. 22).

The choice of the Son of Consolation as the representative of the Jewish Church in thus holding forth the right hand of fellowship to the

them), and in Chrysostom and other commentators. The Sinaitic MS. has the extraordinary reading, "to the Evangelists" —an obvious corruption of Hellenists. In the first instance, it is probable that the preaching would be addressed to the "devout Greeks" who, as proselytes of the Gate, were worshippers in the Jewish synagogues.

Gentiles was determined, we may believe, by some very obvious considerations. He possessed, as his name, rightly interpreted, implied,[1] that gift of prophetic utterance which carries conviction to the hearts and consciences of men. He was a native of Cyprus, and therefore likely to command the confidence of the men from that island who had been active in the new work. To him, if to no other, we must believe that St. Paul had imparted those wider thoughts which, to the great body of the members of the Jewish Church, were only communicated privately, even when the free reception of the Gentiles had become a ruled point in the mission-work of the Church (Gal. ii. 2). He came accordingly with no hesitation. To him that sight of the crowds of uncircumcised heathen listening to the words of the preachers, offering themselves for baptism, admitted into full communion, brought no misgivings. It was simply an illustration of that "grace of God," of which he had heard from the friend who was now working on the same lines at Tarsus. He threw himself into the work with a zeal worthy of his name. He was the Son of Counsel (that word expresses one side of the meaning of *παράκλησις* as Consolation expresses another) and he counselled (*παρεκάλει*) the people in the fulness of that gift which he had received from the Holy Ghost, the Paraclete, or Counsellor. Short as is St. Luke's condensed report of his teaching, it is enough to characterise it. The counsel which he gave them was not that they should become Jews,

[1] Barnabas. The second part of the word is identical with *nabi*, the Hebrew word for "prophet."

either as proselytes of righteousness or proselytes of the gate. Not a word was spoken as to the necessity of circumcision or of the "customs" of the Law, or the traditions of the elders. They were all, with full deliberate "purpose of heart" to "cleave unto the Lord" (Acts xi. 24). And these last words were obviously meant by the writer of the Acts to be taken in the New Testament sense. "The Lord" was not a mere vague synonym for the divine Name, a mere rendering of the Jehovah or the Adonai of the Hebrew Scriptures, but was definitely and personally the Lord Jesus. But the Name so applied involved much more than the acceptance of his teaching as a rabbi or a prophet. It was as the Lord of men and of angels, as the anointed head of the divine kingdom, as the Messiah of the Hebrews, the *Christos* of the Greek and Hellenistic converts: this was the central article of the faith of the new society, this its bond of union. Those who joined it were believers in Jesus as the Christ, and clave to Him in life, thought, and will.

But the growing work required more labourers; required above all, as Barnabas must have felt, the guidance of a master mind. And it is every way significant that though he himself had come as a delegate from the Church at Jerusalem, it was not to the apostles and elders of that Church that he now turned for the help that he so sorely needed. "Then departed Barnabas to Tarsus to seek Saul, and when he had found him, he brought him unto Antioch." He found him probably carrying on his two-fold work as tentmaker and Evangelist, already giving proof of his power not only to convert but to organise, practically if not as

yet in name, the bishop of the society which was growing up around him. Then followed a year the records of which would have been among the most precious treasures of the *Origines* of Christendom, but which are to us as a blank page, to be filled up hesitatingly by inference and conjecture. There then, as afterwards, we may believe Paul and Barnabas did not "forbear working" (1 Cor. ix. 6), but laboured in partnership in the calling of the former. The first knowledge that the population of Antioch had of the presence of him whom we know as the great Apostle was that a new shop had been opened by a Cilician Jew for the sale of tents and sackcloth. Days spent in labour, followed by conferences with converts or inquirers; attendance at the synagogue services on the Sabbath mornings: probably, at times, a discourse addressed (so far as Paul's character as a Rabbi could command attention) to those who were present as worshippers; then, at the close of the Sabbath, at what was in Jewish reckoning the beginning of the new week, the evening of the first day of the week, the meeting of the whole *Ecclesia* for prayer, and praise, and instruction, for baptizing new converts and for breaking of bread, for appointing elders and listening to prophets, for taking counsel as to the extension and discipline of the Church, for the relief of its sick and poor. The next fact recorded after this year of successful activity is one of surpassing interest and significance. "The disciples were called Christians first at Antioch" (Acts xi. 26). Hitherto they had been known to the outer world as a Jewish sect, the "disciples" of Jesus as a teacher.

They spoke of themselves as those of "the way," the new "way" of life (Acts ix. 2; xix. 9, 23), of a life pure and consecrated in its outward manifestations, of "eternal life" as that to which it led,—as the "brethren," finding their bond of brotherhood in being members of Christ, and, therefore, children of their Father in heaven (Acts ix. 30; x. 23); perhaps, even then, as claiming a new consecration, as the "saints," or "holy ones" (Acts ix. 32, 41). Already it may be, the unbelieving Jews had fixed on them as a by-word of reproach the name of "Nazarenes" (Acts xxiv. 5). The new name bore testimony to the fact that they were emerging from the narrow limits of Judaism. It was essentially Latin in its form, and showed that the Church of Antioch was forcing itself upon the notice of the Roman rulers. As the followers of Marius and Pompey had been known as Mariani and Pompeiani, so those of Christ were recognized as *Christiani*. Like all names that have at first originated from without, and have, so to speak, the character of nicknames, it was but slowly adopted by those to whom it was given. Nowhere do the writers of the New Testament use it of themselves or of those whom they address. It is from the lips of the younger Agrippa that we have the words, "Almost thou persuadest me to be a *Christian*" (Acts xxvi. 28). St. Peter uses it in a manner which implies that it was employed by those outside the community of the brethren rather than by those within. "If any man suffer as a *Christian*," if that name is the ground of accusation, "let him not be ashamed" (1 Peter iv. 16). Possibly there may be a reference to its use, and if so, it is probably the

earliest reference, in the words in which St. James speaks of the rich and powerful, as "blaspheming the worthy name" by which the disciples of Christ were known (James ii. 7).

The records of the period that immediately followed the Apostolical age show, however, that the new name made its way and was gradually accepted. It had obviously much to commend it. It marked out those who bore it as followers of the Lord whom they loved. If they were not ashamed to confess His name, they ought to be ready to say, "Christian I am," when they were challenged with it as a term of reproach, and not to shrink from thus confessing their faith before men. The very dangers which the name brought with it made it thus more and more a name to glory in, and soon it entered on the progress which identified the nickname of the parties of Antioch with all the glory that gathers round the words Christianity and Christendom. Soon, it may be, the Eastern fondness for finding a significance in the sound of words, apart from their true etymological meaning, might lead them, as it afterwards led Tertullian, to accept it for another reason. Between the two words, χρίστος and χρῆστος (Christos and Chrēstos) there was hardly the slightest perceptible difference in sound. As the latter word signified "good, kindly, gracious," it would turn the term of reproach into an involuntary testimony to the character of those to whom it was applied. The *Christiani* were also *Chrestiani*, the good or gracious people.[1] Possibly there is something like a tacit reference to this similarity of sound in St. Peter's quotation from the Septuagint version of Ps. xxxiv. 8,

[1] Tertullian, "Apol.," c. 3.

"If so be ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious," (χρῆστος *i.e.* as well as χρίστος, 1 Peter ii. 3). The likeness of the two words is shown by the confusion into which it led the historian Suetonius, who described Claudius as banishing the Jews from Rome, because, under the leadership of Chrēstos (*"impulsore Chresto"*), they were continually disturbing the quietude of the city where they dwelt with tumultuous riots.[1] There can be but little doubt that in this report of his we have the first record of the introduction of the new faith at Rome, and of the divisions to which there, as in other cities, that introduction gave rise, between those who declared themselves followers of the Christ and those who opposed and maltreated them. To the Roman police the name that was heard on this side and on that, bandied to and fro between the disputants, would naturally seem that of the founder of a new sect, or the leader of a new faction.

The Church of Jerusalem, in the meantime, was watching the growth of the new community with interest and sympathy. Some, doubtless, there were, the converts from Pharisaism, who were content with sewing on the "patch upon the old garment," who thought that the old bottles would do for the new wine, and who were troubled and alarmed, waiting for an opportunity to check the progress of a work which was advancing so far beyond the horizon of their thoughts; but as yet they were in the back-ground, and the leaders of thought and utterance, the "prophets," through whom the Divine Spirit was leading

[1] Suetonius, "Claudius," c. 25.

the Church forward into all the truth, were foremost in their desire to recognise and further it—"In these days came prophets from Jerusalem unto Antioch," (Acts xi. 27). It is the first mention of the revival of that order, of the appearance of "prophets," no less than of apostles and elders, in the Church of Christ. Their main work, it need hardly be said to those who have studied St. Paul's treatment of the gift of prophecy in 1 Cor. xii–xiv, was to bring home the truths of God to the hearts and consciences of men, as with a divine energy. With that there might be united the power of direct prediction.

St. Luke records one remarkable instance of that power—"There stood up one of them named Agabus, and signified by the spirit that there should be great dearth throughout all the world, which came to pass in the days of Claudius Cæsar" (Acts xi. 28.). The reign of that Emperor began A.D. 41, and the earliest local famine that pressed upon Syria and Judæa is fixed by Josephus ("Ant." xx. 2. § 5), in the fourth year of that emperor, A.D. 44. The absence of definite chronological data in St. Luke's records prevents our fixing the time of the prediction; but the facts that precede and follow point to a time close upon the beginning of the reign. The famine mentioned by the Jewish historian does not seem, indeed, severe as it was, to have been more than local, nor do the annals of the Empire record any universal scarcity. The whole reign of Claudius was, however, marked by the recurrence of local dearths, now in Italy, now in Greece or Syria; and St. Luke in his general survey of the reign might well see in it the

fulfilment of what Agabus had foretold. In a city like Antioch the tones of such a prediction must have sounded harshly in the ears of the sensual and luxurious population. As being a prediction, it acted as a test of the faith of the new converts, and led them, in anticipation of the famine, or when it actually came, to make provision against its pressure, both for themselves and others. That pressure, we must remember, was felt severely at Antioch as well as at Jerusalem; but the Church of the former city was better able to meet it than that of the latter. The city, as such, was wealthier. The Church had not been exhausted, as that of Jerusalem had been, by the lavish generosity of a zealous love which, taking the form of a spontaneous (not a compulsory) community of goods and distribution of alms, tended to pauperise the whole society, and as the event proved, disabled it from meeting the unlooked-for contingencies of famine.

In that movement for the relief of the suffering disciples of the Churches of Judæa Saul and Barnabas took a prominent part. They saw in it a means of bridging over the chasm which was beginning to yawn between the Jewish and Gentile Christians. It gave to the former the best of all proofs, that the faith which worketh by love was strong in the hearts of the brethren of "the uncircumcision." It drew out the affections of the latter, and bound them to their brethren of the circumcision by that strongest of all ties, stronger by far than gratitude, the sense of having, at a great personal sacrifice, conferred a benefit upon those of another race. Into this work St. Paul

threw himself with all his characteristic energy. It was one of the articles of the *concordat* between him and the apostles of Jerusalem, that he and his fellow-workers should thus "remember the poor" (Gal. ii. 10). It was the beginning of the good work which St. Paul had at heart during the whole continuance of his ministry, and of which his last visit to Jerusalem with "the alms for his nation" (Acts xxiv. 17) was the crown and consummation. We can picture to ourselves the new element which it introduced into the life of the Syrian city. Acts of self-denial that men might have to give to those in need; weekly collections at the meetings of the Church on the first day of the week; the choice of those who had been most active in promoting the good work to be the delegates of the Church, in conveying the fruits of its liberality to the mother Church of Jerusalem, these must at once have impressed the population of Antioch with the sense that the Christians were more than a mere sect or party, that they "loved one another," with a love to which the history of the world as yet hardly offered a parallel. The testimony which was drawn from Libanius three centuries later by the virtues of Chrysostom's mother, Anthusa, "What women these Christians have!" may well have been uttered then by many a heathen observer.

When the two great leaders returned from their mission, the new-born energy of the Church of Antioch showed itself in another form. Short as the notice given in the Acts is (xiii. 1), it implies a degree of prophetic and ministerial activity, which marks it out as the mother Church of Gentile Christendom,

and the three new names which appear in the text of its "prophets and teachers" are witnesses that that activity was guided by men endowed with special gifts and graces. Of "Simeon that was called Niger," we know nothing more than the name, and the conjecture that he was an African proselyte, and that the name points to the swarthy complexion which indicated his origin, though interesting, is confessedly uncertain. If we could accept Origen's identification of Lucius of Cyrene with the writer of the third Gospel, the next name would be invested with the highest interest, but beyond the surface similarity of the names, and the fact that Cyrene had been famous some centuries before, in the time of Herodotus (iii. 121) as a school of medicine, there is absolutely nothing to support it, and against it there is (1) the improbability that the writer of the Acts, who elsewhere never names himself, even when he is in company with St. Paul (xvi. 10–17; xxi. 1–18; xxvii. xxviii.), should here give such prominence to his name as to place it before that of the Apostle, and (2) the fact that the two names are distinctly different, that of the Evangelist being Lucas, as a contraction of Lucanus. It is more within the limits of probability that this Lucius may have been the "kinsman" whom St. Paul names in the salutations of Rom. xvi. 21, but even then it must be left doubtful whether the word implies personal relationship, or points only to his being of the same race. We can scarcely be wrong, however, in thinking of one who was thus prominent in the Church of Antioch, as having been of those "men of Cyprus and Cyrene," who had been

the first to take the bold step of preaching to "the Greeks" as such, and who were therefore the founders of the Church there, and the pioneers of the great Universal Church of which it was the nucleus. Such a one was, beyond all question, likely to be interested in the work of missionary activity that is now connected with his name.

The name of Manaen who had been brought up with Herod the Tetrarch, opens a wide field for inferences which, if in part conjectural, are at any rate of high probability and of great interest. Early in the life of Herod the Great, Josephus relates,[1] he had come into contact with an Essene that bore the name Manaen, the later form of the Menahem of 2 Kings xv. 21. The name itself, as meaning the Comforter, expressed devout and prophetic hopes, and the Essene whose repute stood high for ascetic saintliness, was also revered as a prophet. One day he greeted the youthful son of Antipater as the future King of the Jews, and when the boy disclaimed the title, entered more fully into the future fortunes of his life, his glory and his greatness, his cruelties and crimes. The seer was still living when Herod reached the height of his ambition, and the King sent for him, paid him all marks of outward reverence, would fain have had him live at his court, as counsellor and friend. The old prophet refused to be of those who live in king's houses, but the King's respect for him was transferred to the community to which he belonged, and above all other Jewish sects

[1] "Antiq." xv. 10. § 5.

he honoured the Essenes. So far Josephus. When we find from the writer of the Acts, that one of the same name had been brought up as a foster-brother with one of the sons of Herod, we are led almost irresistibly to the conclusion that the drama of Barzillai and Chimham (2 Sam. xix. 37) had been acted over again, and that the namesake of that old prophet was also his son or grandson, to whom Herod had transferred the outward tokens of his favour. We can judge what kind of training he would receive in such a court of Herod's, or when he accompanied his playmate Antipas to complete his education at Rome,[1] what scenes of magnificence, and guilt, and passionate remorse he must have witnessed on his return to Palestine. Conjectural as it all is, we cannot help picturing to ourselves the impression which must have been made on one who could never quite have forgotten the Essene type of holiness, when that type appeared, more austerely ascetic than ever, and invested with higher prophetic gifts, in the person of the Baptist. If the foster-brother continued, as was natural, at the court of Antipas, he must have heard the preaching of the Baptist, and been cognisant of the intrigues which issued in his death, must have known the rumours which were floating as to his reappearance in the mighty works of the prophet of Nazareth, and the plots into which the Herodians of the Tetrarch's court were entering against the life of that prophet (Matt. xiv. 1–12). We cannot trace the personal history of the teacher whose name now meets us, but the fact that he had become a prominent teacher

[1] Josephus, "Ant.," xvii. 3.

in the new society shows that the work of conversion must have been effected at some early period of its growth, and we can scarcely exclude such influences as those which have been described from their share in effecting it. When, or how he came to Antioch we do not know, but it may be worth while recalling the fact that the name of the first Herod was held in honour there as that of a public benefactor to whom the city owed much of its magnificence, and that this would at once place his adopted son in a position that would command a certain measure of respect. And when we find him, it is as a zealous and devout teacher, representing the form of spiritual life which had been specially characteristic of the disciples of the Baptist, and joining with the Church of Antioch not only in acts of worship but in a solemn fast, connected, it is obvious, with the great work of evangelising the nations which that Church had at heart, and in which, before all others, it took the lead (Acts xiii. 1–3).

We may, I believe, following both an early tradition and the natural inferences from internal evidence, think of another conspicuous teacher as having been among those who were then at Antioch. According to Eusebius ("Hist. Eccl." iii. 4), the great collector of all facts connected with the early history of the Church, St. Luke was a native of the Syrian capital; and the fulness with which, as in the passage now before us, he records so many details connected with the Church of that city, is, at least, in harmony with the tradition. On this assumption, we might think of him as receiving there the education that gave to his narrative a tone of culture which we do

not find elsewhere in the New Testament,[1] as having gone to Tarsus for the more specific instruction which qualified him for his work as a physician, as having, either as a proselyte of the gate or as a gentile pure and simple, heard the preaching of the word, and been attracted by the purity and charity of the new society that bore the name of Christ. From Manaen himself he may have learnt the many facts connected with Herod Antipas and the Herodian house generally which he alone records, and may have come into contact with those "eye-witnesses and ministers of the word," from whom, in the opening words of his Gospel, he professes to have derived his information (Luke i. 2). There, if not before, in Tarsus, he must have known the great Apostle to whom he afterwards devoted himself with such unwavering friendship, but whose name, at this stage of his history, apparently as if copying from a document made at the time, he placed last of all, as though the others, whose fame was afterwards thrown into the background by his more abundant labours, then took precedence of him (Acts xiii. 1–2).

The prophets and teachers who have been thus brought before us were, we are told, "ministering to the Lord and fasting." The passage is remarkable as being the only one in which the former word is applied to any act of Christian worship. Elsewhere it and its cognate word are used of the ministry or service

[1] The inference of Eusebius, however, can hardly be regarded as more than a conjectural inference from the facts connecting St. Luke with Antioch, and the balance of probabilities is, I think, in favour of Italian parentage, with a Greek training at some period of his life, at Tarsus and Antioch.

done in various ways to man (Rom. xv. 27 ; 2 Cor. ix. 12 ; Phil. ii. 17, 30), but as connected with worship, they are applied only to that of the priest's office in the daily sacrifice of the Temple (Luke i. 23 ; Heb. viii. 6, ix. 21, x. 11). It would probably be an anachronism to confine it in this passage to its later ecclesiastical sense as connected with that which was strictly *the* liturgy of the third century, *i.e.* the celebration of the Holy Communion, but we can scarcely think of the "Christians" of Antioch as meeting on any special occasion without acting in obedience to the great commandment which they had received from their Lord that they should thus commemorate His death, and keep themselves in a living fellowship with Him and with each other. As they were thus engaged, the writer of the Acts adds, "the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them." Through the lips of the prophets, speaking, as with one consent, by a sudden inspiration, the two preachers on whom the eyes of men had naturally been fixed were designated as the chosen instruments for the next great step in the expansion of the Christian community. The "fast," now solemnly recognised as a preparation for all acts requiring a more than ordinary intensity of spiritual life, was continued, and with the "laying on of hands" as the outward sign of benediction and of the bestowal of the gifts which fitted them for their high work, the two Apostles were sent forth on their arduous enterprise.

With their progress through Cyprus, and Pisidia, and Lycaonia we are not now concerned ; but from the point of view which made Antioch, for a time, the

centre of the Christian Church, we cannot pass over the next great event of which that city was the scene. After an absence of some months the two missionaries had returned and made their report. It had, as all such reports have, its share of exciting interest, of opposition, dangers, persecutions, and hair-breadth escapes; but it told also of a very marked success. God had "opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles" (Acts xiv. 27). Along the coasts of Cyprus, in the Pisidian Antioch, in Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe there were now flourishing Christian communities, consisting mainly of converts from heathenism, numbering, we may believe, some hundreds in every city, organised by the appointment of elders, and looking to the Church of Antioch as the mother to whom they owed their allegiance; exposed, it was true, to "much tribulation," but prepared to encounter it, as knowing that it was thus, and at the time, thus only, that they could gain an assured entrance into the Kingdom of God (Acts xiv. 22).

We can picture to ourselves the joy of the disciples at hearing of a success which must have surpassed even their most sanguine hopes, how commanding must have been the influence which the two Apostles exercised, how popular feeling, recognising the merits of both, would yet discern in the excellent gifts and wider sympathies of one of them that which made him greater than his fellow-worker; how that change of estimate would show itself in the common mode of speech which coupled them when they returned as Paul and Barnabas, while they had started on their enterprise as Barnabas and Saul (Acts xiii. 2; xv. 2)!

For some three, or four, or five years (according to the chronology adopted by most critics) the work went on under the guidance of the two Apostles; but their very success brought with it the elements of danger, and Antioch became (*circ.* A.D. 51) the scene of the first great controversy in the Christian Church. A large and influential section of the Church at Jerusalem, consisting mainly of men who, trained in the schools of the Pharisees, had acknowledged the claims of Jesus as the Christ, and looked to Peter, and yet more to James, the brother of the Lord, as their representative leaders, watched the growth of the Church at Antioch and the influence it was gaining over the Churches that had sprung from it, with undisguised alarm. To them Christianity was simply a perfected Judaism. There had been no formal abrogation of the Law. Christ himself had declared that He had not come to destroy but to fulfil it, and that not one jot or tittle of it should pass away (Matt. v. 17). True, there had been the case of Cornelius, whose admission as an uncircumcised proselyte the Church of Jerusalem had recognised; but it was easy to regard this as an exception that proved the rule, and to argue that a like concession ought only to be granted where there was a like extraordinary bestowal of supernatural gifts. What was passing at Antioch was at variance with all their expectations. The Gentile Christians of that city did not care to come up to the Jewish festivals, or keep the Jewish Sabbaths. They did not accept circumcision themselves or circumcise their children. They did not observe the distinction between clean and unclean meats. It was rumoured, truly or falsely,

that they did not shrink from eating the flesh of victims that had been sacrificed in the temples of the idols of the heathen, that they looked on sins of impurity with the same lax indulgence which prevailed through the whole Gentile world. It was obviously with the intention to check at once the liberty and the licence which were thus, as they thought, altering the character of the Christian community for the worse that the emissaries of this party, claiming a delegation from the Church of Jerusalem, which had never been really granted them (Acts xv. 24), appeared at Antioch, trying the desperate game of a reactionary movement, and insisting on circumcision as an indispensable condition of salvation. To St. Paul and his fellow-worker this appeared at once destructive of the first principles of the Gospel which he preached, and fatal to all its prospects of success as a religion for mankind. He knew how inadequate the Pharisaic type of religion was to satisfy the deeper yearnings of the heart and soul of man,—how the observances on which they insisted had been even to the Jews a burden which they could not bear, and to the Gentiles an object of scorn and of derision. After weeks or months of wrangling and debate it was resolved (here also, we may well believe, not without prayer and fasting and prophetic guidance) that the whole question should be referred to the Church, whose authority they both recognised, and whose support they both claimed. Paul and Barnabas, we may assume, suggested or accepted the proposal with no misgiving as to the result. Even on merely human grounds they knew enough of Peter and of James to

feel sure that they would not abandon the cause which they had hitherto supported, and the firm faith with which they looked to the guidance of the Spirit of God, to the wisdom and power of the Lord whose name they bore, would not allow them to doubt that the issue of their appeal would further the progress of the Gospel as it had been revealed to them, and as they had preached it to the Gentiles. When they returned to Antioch from Jerusalem it was to report that the great charter of the freedom of the Gentile Church had been solemnly granted, not by the Apostles only, but by the elders and brethren of the Church there. It had, indeed, some of the features of a compromise. It declared the Gentile converts to be free from the Law of Moses, together with circumcision and all its attendant ordinances; but it imposed on them certain restrictions in matters which were from St. Paul's point of view essentially indifferent in themselves, and it grouped these, as if ignoring their essential contrast, with abstinence from the wide-spread impurity of the heathen world. The Gentile converts were to "abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication" (Acts xv. 29).

It was, perhaps, for this reason that St. Paul never, in his later controversial writings on the same subject, appeals to this decree of the Council of Jerusalem, but contents himself, as in the Epistles to the Galatians, the Corinthians, and the Romans, with debating, on general grounds, the question whether the Law of Moses, as such, was permanent or transitory, —on the facts of man's moral nature, the typical portions of patriarchal history, the intimations of the wider

purpose of God scattered here and there in the writings of the prophets. By the great body of believers at Antioch, however, it was welcomed as an emancipation from the bondage which the Pharisee section of the Church had sought to impose on them. It declared them to be free from the yoke of the Law of Moses in its civil and ceremonial aspects, and it left them to what had been received by the current tradition of the Jews as the "precepts of Noah," which were believed by them to be binding upon the whole family of man, and which the more liberal teachers of the Jews held to be sufficient for salvation. It placed the whole body of Christian converts from heathenism in the position which had been recognized by the more thoughtful rabbis as legitimate in the case of those who were known as "proselytes of the gate," and who did not care to pass on to the higher grade of "proselytes of righteousness," and so to incorporate themselves fully with the commonwealth of Israel. The Pharisees, who had passed their sentence of stern condemnation on this relaxation before the converts had professed themselves believers in Jesus as the Christ, were just as bitter in their opposition after they had made that profession.

The controversy was, however, far from being brought to a close, and Antioch was to witness a painful scene in connection with its next stage. Hearing, probably, of the joy and peace which had followed on the proclamation of the decree of the Jerusalem Council, Peter was anxious, with the same freedom from prejudice which, under the guidance of his vision at Joppa, he had shown in the case of Cornelius, to extend the "right hand of fellowship,"

not only, as he had done at Jerusalem (Gal. ii. 9), to the two great Apostles of the Gentile Churches, but to those Churches themselves. Undertaking, accordingly, a longer journey than he had yet ventured on, he went down to Antioch. We can picture to ourselves the feelings stirred by his arrival, the reverence which would be felt for the great Apostle, who was in some sense identified with the Rock on which the Church was built, who had seen the "vision of the excellent glory" on the "holy mount," the Coryphæus of the whole apostolic company, the bearer of the keys of the Kingdom, who had known the Lord Jesus, not, as St. Paul had done, in visions and revelations only, but face to face, as "a man speaketh with his friend." For some time all went well. He attended the meetings on the first day of the week, and ate and drank with them at their *agapæ* and eucharistic feasts. Paul was then, as afterwards, his "beloved brother" (2 Pet. iii. 15). Judas and Silas were there, with all the influence which attached to their reputation as prophets in the Church of Jerusalem. Mark was there, having come down from Jerusalem (probably, looking to the intimate relations between his family and the Apostle, with Peter) to assist his uncle in carrying on the work from which he had for a time drawn back. All promised well for unity and peace. Too soon, however, the old elements of discord reappeared. The controversy with the Judaisers had been patched up, but not closed. They looked on with ill-concealed dissatisfaction at what seemed to them likely to shake their system to its foundations, and reported, it would seem, to those

who thought with them at Jerusalem, what appeared to them so formidable a danger. Their action was but too successful, and the rift speedily widened into a chasm. Men came once more to Antioch, claiming to be delegates from the mother Church, and, speaking, truly or falsely, in the name of James as its bishop; they protested, taking their stand on the letter of the decree of Acts xv., against Peter's conduct as at variance with the *formula concordiæ* which had been adopted at Jerusalem. They had no wish, they may have said, to impose any greater burden on the Gentile converts than those "necessary things" which had been specified by the Council. But the Council had said nothing that set *Jewish* Christians free from the precepts of the law, or even from the tradition of the elders. It seemed to treat the Gentile converts, if not altogether as aliens and foreigners, yet as if they were (like the *Metœci* of the Athenian polity) but half-naturalised aliens, and not as "fellow-citizens of the saints and of the household of God." Peter was therefore going beyond the compact in recognising their full equality. If the case of Cornelius was urged by him or others as a precedent that sanctioned his conduct, it was easy to reply, as has been said above, that it was rather the exception that proved the rule; that the special circumstances of that case placed it on a different footing from all others; and that the reasoners would be willing to receive into full communion any heathen convert whose reception had been heralded by visions of angels and miraculous outpourings of the Spirit. Their arguments proved only too convincing to the unsteadfast mind of Peter. The oscillation between courageous fervour and

faltering fear which had been conspicuous in two memorable passages of his life in the Gospel history (Matt. xiv. 30; xxvi. 69–75) was repeated once again. He shrank from opposing those who taunted him with unfaithfulness to the law of God and the authority of his brother Apostles. He receded from the position he had taken up, and withdrew from social intercourse and religious communion (both are implied in the "eating" of Gal. ii. 12) with the Gentile converts. The one Church of Antioch was broken up into two separate, if not hostile, communities. What made the matter worse was, that not even the intimate fellowship of Barnabas with Paul, nor his experience in mission work among the heathen, was enough to protect him from the "dissimulation" of those who urged that the middle wall of partition that divided Jew from Gentile should not be thrown down. The "hypocrisy" which veiled itself in the smooth phrases of controversial diplomacy persuaded him also that he was not sacrificing the rights of the Gentiles when he deferred to the claims of conscience that were urged on behalf of the Jewish members of the Church.

We can well understand the consternation which this line of action must have caused among those whose views were clearer and convictions firmer than those of these waverers. The Gentiles heard of it with alarm and indignation. In the public opinion which at such crises forms itself with singular rapidity, the verdict was given against him;[1] and St. Paul,

[1] This is the true meaning of the words mis-translated "because he was to be blamed" in Gal. ii. 14. Literally, "because he had been condemned."

when he withstood him to the face, was but the exponent of a widely-diffused feeling. Happily, as once before in the great crisis of his spiritual life in the porch of the high priest's palace, the great Apostle, though not altogether, even now, free from the fear of man, and consequently less steadfast in his proclamation of truth than the Apostle whose special mission was to the Gentiles, was yet noble enough to receive the frank rebuke in the spirit of fraternal meekness. From that time forward, we may hope and believe, there was no faltering either in word or act; and when years had brought him to full maturity of faith and wisdom, the Apostle to whom some pointed as a rival was still, as before, his "beloved brother" (2 Pet. iii. 15); and, consciously or unconsciously, in his first Epistle he reproduced, not only the broad outlines of his teaching, but its very words and phrases.

The scene just described is the last that connects Antioch with the records of the New Testament; and it hardly lies within the scope of this work to trace its later history in connection with the Christian Church. One illustrious name, however, is so closely bound up with the history of the Apostolic age, and its bearer must have played so important a part in continuing and consolidating what had been begun by the two great Apostles, that it cannot well be passed over. Little as we know of the facts of the life of Ignatius, there are adequate grounds for believing that he must have been at Antioch the disciple of one or both of them, in the period of which we have been writing, and on this assumption we have what probably ex-

plains the conflicting traditions of his life. The "Apostolic Constitutions" (vii. 46) represent him as having been made Bishop of Antioch by St. Paul; Chrysostom ("Hom. in Ignat. Mart." c. 4) as having received that office at the hands of St. Peter. Eusebius ("Hist." iii. 22) makes him the second bishop, as successor to Evodius, while the statement that he was appointed by St. Paul almost of necessity implies that he was the first. Do not the circumstances that have come before us as to the history of the Church at Antioch, make it probable that there were in that city two distinct communities, each with its own organisation of a bishop-elder (at first, as Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii.; Tit. i. 5-7 show, the two titles were used as applied to the same person) and deacons working under him, one representing the Church of the Circumcision and the other that of the Gentiles. The visits of the two Apostles whom those communities recognised as their respective leaders were too transient for them to occupy that position; and we have a hypothesis which includes all the phenomena of the case in the assumption, that Ignatius represented that which looked to St. Paul, Evodius that which looked to St. Peter, as its guide, that after the two societies had become one in the growing sense of the catholic unity of the Church of Christ, Ignatius remained, by the death or retirement of Evodius, the sole bishop of the Church, claiming authority as the representative of both Apostles, and that under him, as the necessities of the times, and the departure of the Apostles made a more complete organisation necessary, the title and the functions of the office of a bishop rose

to the position to which prominence is given in the epistles that bear his name.

We have spoken of this bishop of Antioch as Ignatius. The name may have been simply a grecized form of Egnatius, memorable as having been borne by the great Samnite general in the war of that people with Rome, and occurring not unfrequently in Roman history in the half century before and after the change of government from the Republic to the Empire; but the fact that the Syrian equivalent was *Nurono*, "the fiery one," (Assemanni, *Biblioth. Orient*, iii. P. i., p. 16) suggests the probability either that it was an epithet given to him (as Peter and Boanerges were given by our Lord to Simon and the sons of Zebedee) as expressing the glow of burning zeal which animated his whole being, or that the Latin name which he may have originally borne, as on the above assumption, was modified so as to give it this significance. He, however, delights to speak of himself by quite another name. He begins his letters by describing himself as "Ignatius who is also Theophorus." According as the accent in the Greek form of that name falls on the last or on the penultimate syllable, its significance is passive, "God-borne," or active, "God-bearing." The former view obviously suggested the legend (one can hardly call it a tradition) told by Simeon Metaphrastes, that Ignatius was the "little child" whom our Lord called, and took in His arms, and placed in the midst of His disciples as an example of the humility which was the true note of the greatest in the kingdom of Heaven (Matt. xviii. 4; Mark ix. 36).

The prevalent accentuation of the word, however, in the MSS., and the answer of Ignatius to Trajan, as reported in the narrative of his martyrdom (*c.* 2. ff.) are decisive as to the active meaning of the epithet. He was one who bore God within him, who carried Christ in his heart. So, too, he says, in writing to the Ephesians (*c.* 3), that they too are, all of them, by virtue of their faith, *Christophori*. That thought was, it need hardly be said, characteristic of a disciple of St. Paul's. He too declared that Christ had been revealed in him (Gal. i. 16); that He was present in him and in others, as "the hope of glory" (Col. i. 27); that he was ever carrying about in his body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in that same body (2 Cor. iv. 10). Such a name we might well imagine to have been taken at the baptism or ordination of the man who thus gloried in it. We may think of the Jewish population of Antioch as looking on the name as involving what to them seemed an almost blasphemous assumption, of the unconverted heathen as mocking and sneering at it as resting on a madman's dream.

It is not within our scope to discuss the vexed questions as to the date of the martyrdom of Ignatius, or as to the authenticity of the epistles to the Asiatic and other churches that have been ascribed to him. But some features of those epistles, even in their shortest form, are characteristic enough in connection with the history of Antioch in the Apostolic age, to demand a notice. (1) We note the prominence which he gives to the names "Christians" and "Christianity" (*Christianismos*). They are not found in the

writings of Clement of Rome, or of Barnabas, or Polycarp of Smyrna. To Ignatius, who had lived and worked for many years in the city in which that name had first been applied to the disciples, it was the noblest and most glorious of all names. (2) He habitually begins his letters, not as St. Paul does, with "Grace and peace," or "Grace, mercy, and peace," but with the "Greeting" (χαίρειν) which we find in the apostolic letter of Acts xv. 23, and in James i. 1. He uniformly ends them with "Fare ye well," as in the close of the letter just referred to (Acts xv. 29), a phrase which St. Paul never uses. Looking to the fact that that letter was addressed primarily to the churches of Antioch, it is not too much, I think, to assume that it served in these respects as a model of epistolary form to the disciple who may have been in that city at the time when it was received, and who presided as bishop over the church to which it was addressed. (3) It is significant, looking to the position occupied by the Church of Antioch in the Apostolic age, and particularly, as we have seen, by Ignatius himself, in relation to the two great Apostles of the Circumcision and the Uncircumcision, that when he speaks of the contrast between himself and those who had gone before him, he should refer not to one of these Apostles only, but to both—"Not as Peter or Paul do I enjoin this on you. They were apostles; I am condemned as a criminal. They were free; I up to the present time am a slave" (Rom. c. iv.). These were the two names which, to one who had lived at Antioch and watched over its Church, would be the natural repre-

sentative of the whole apostolic company. (4) It is hardly less characteristic that it is in the epistles of Ignatius that a word first appears which was destined to be almost as prominent as "Christian" itself in the history of the Church. The thought of the fitness of the Gospel to be a universal religion, and the society which rested on it a universal society, had been made familiar by the teaching of St. Paul as to the great family of God, which was to include "Jew and Greek, Barbarian, Scythian, bond and free"; but a new coinage was wanted for its expression, and that was found when Ignatius, either as the author of the term, or accepting one that had become current in the Church over which he ruled, attached to the word Church the epithet of "Catholic." "Wheresoever the Bishop appears," he writes to the Church of Smyrna "there let the people be, even as where Christ is present, there is the Catholic (*i.e.* the Universal) Church."[1]

It was natural that a word which expressed so admirably the true aspect of the new society which was working in the world should soon gain acceptance; and it is noticeable that its next appearance

[1] I have no wish to ignore the fact that the authenticity of the epistle which contains this passage has been questioned on the ground that it is not found in the Syrian text of Ignatius, edited by Dr. Cureton. The discussion of the Ignatian controversy would obviously be out of place in this volume, and I content myself with noticing the fact that though the MSS. which he edited did not contain the Epistle to the Church of Smyrna, he has printed fragments which imply the existence of a Syriac version of it. Whether it contained the passage above quoted we cannot, of course, know.

occurs in the Epistle in which the very Church which Ignatius had addressed, and which may well therefore have learnt the phrase from him, was giving an account of the death of its great master and guide, Polycarp. It addresses its record to all "districts or dioceses of the holy and Catholic Church"; it records the prayer of Polycarp for "the whole Catholic Church throughout the world" (c. 8); it speaks of him as having been both "an apostolic and prophetic teacher, and bishop of the Catholic Church in Smyrna" (c. 16). It is not too much to say that, as "the disciples were first called Christians at Antioch," so it was in the same city that the Church was first called Catholic.

We can here only glance, as before in the case of Tarsus, at the later history of Antioch and its Church. As in the other great cities of the Empire, the work of conversion was but gradually and even slowly accomplished. As late as the time of Julian the games were still celebrated in the theatre, the grove of Daphne still witnessed its profligate and licentious festivals, the Christians were still, though increasing in numbers and influence, a minority. But the position which the Church of Antioch had gained in the Apostolic age, it retained for many centuries. It shared with Rome and Alexandria the position of a Metropolitan Church. When the New Rome of Byzantium rose to an imperial dignity, Antioch was still recognized as holding the fourth place of honour among all the churches of the world. It could boast of a martyr who, as having borne his witness unto death in Antioch itself, was held in a higher local

honour even than Ignatius. Babylas, who was made bishop of the Church in A.D. 237, and exercised his office during the reigns of the two Gordians, Philip the Arabian, and Decius, became conspicuous for his righteous zeal (in which Chrysostom recognised, we may believe, the example which he followed in the case of Theodosius) in closing the doors of the Church against an emperor whose crimes had rendered him unworthy of admission.[1] When the short but violent persecution of Decius fell upon the Church alike in East and West, Babylas was thrown into prison, and died from the ill-treatment he received there, asking, as his last request, that his chains might be buried with him. When they regained their freedom the Christians of Antioch built a church over his grave, and Babylas became the patron saint of the city. The Emperor Gallus, in his wish to purify the city from the licentious heathenism that had so long polluted it, ordered the remains of the martyr to be transferred to the grove of Daphne, and built there a stately church in his honour. When Julian the Apostate passed through Antioch on his way to the Persian campaign which ended in his death, he sought to learn from the priests of Apollo, who still lingered in the consecrated precincts, what was to be the issue of the conflict on which he had entered. But the oracle was dumb, and the priests declared that the silence of the god was owing to the presence

[1] Chrysostom ("Hom. de Babyl."), though he dwells largely on the act, does not name the emperor. Eusebius ("Hist.," vi. 39) identifies him with Philip the Arabian. Others have conjectured Decius.

of the martyr's body so near his sanctuary. The emperor ordered the body to be removed, but the people of Antioch, partly in the fervour of their admiration for their local saint and hero, partly in their irritation at the contrast which the austere philosophy and asceticism of Julian presented to their luxurious effeminacy, made a counter-demonstration, and carried the bones of Babylas in solemn procession from Daphne to the city, chanting as they went the words of the psalm "Confounded be all they that worship graven images;" and on the same night the temple of Apollo was burnt to the ground. It was natural to suspect, as in the case of the Church at Nicomedia in the time of Diocletian, that the fire was the work of some Christian incendiary, but the faithful of Antioch delighted to believe, on the testimony, as they said, of the priests and servants of the temple, that fire had fallen from heaven to destroy the shrine of the God whom they regarded as a demon, and Julian did not dare to adopt any more stringent retaliation than that of closing the chief church of the city and confiscating its gold and silver vessels for the use of the imperial treasury. The name of Babylas was still held in honour, and his burial-place existed in the time of the Crusades, and the cathedral church of Cremona boasts of possessing the bones of the great martyr of Antioch as its most precious relics.

A great writer of our own time (Dr. J. H. Newman) has called attention to the fact that the tendencies which were at work in the Church of Antioch from the beginning made it the natural birth-place of the great Arian heresy. The name which attaches to

that heresy originated, of course, with the well-known presbyter of Alexandria; but Dr. Newman maintains that the heresy itself, or yet more, the temper and frame of mind in which it had its origin, had their birth at Antioch, and he connects this partly with the prevalence of Judaism there, as we have seen it prevalent in the Apostolic age, partly with the luxury and profligacy of its inhabitants, as predisposing them to a purely intellectual and therefore irreverent way of dealing with the mysteries of the faith. The view thus taken of this memorable controversy presents so many points of novelty and interest, and illustrates so characteristically the subtle genius of its propounder, that it may be well to give it, as far as our limits will allow, in his own words.

"During the third century, the Church of Antioch was more or less acknowledged as the metropolis of Syria, Cilicia, Phœnicia, Commagene, Osrhoene, and Mesopotamia, in which provinces it afterwards held patriarchal sway. It had been the original seat of apostolical missions among the heathen, and claimed St. Peter himself for its first bishop, who had been succeeded by Ignatius, Theophilus, Babylas, and others of blessed memory in the Universal Church as champions and martyrs of the faith. The secular importance of the city added to the influence which accrued to it from the religious associations thus connected with its name, especially when the emperors made Syria the seat of their government. This ancient and celebrated Church, however, is painfully conspicuous in the middle of the century, as affording so open a manifestation of the spirit of anti-Christ as to

fulfil almost literally the prophecy of the Apostle in 2 Thess. ii. Paulus of Samosata, who was raised to the See of Antioch not many years after the martyrdom of Babylas, after holding the episcopate for ten years, was deposed by a council of Eastern bishops, held in that city A.D. 272, on the ground of his heretical notions concerning the nature of Christ."

Dr. Newman proceeds to give an account of Paul of Samosata as having been originally a sophist, owing his elevation to the see of Antioch to the influence of his patroness Zenobia, the famous queen of Palmyra, a Jewess by birth or creed, and infers that his heretical views, "derogatory of the doctrine of our Lord's absolute divinity and eternal existence" were probably "a kind of Judaism adopted to please his patroness," "not very profound or systematic, probably not always consistent with itself."

"Indeed, the primate of Syria had already obtained the highest post to which ambition could aspire, and had nothing to labour for; and having, as we find, additional engagements as a civil magistrate, he would be still less likely to covet the barren honours of an heresiarch. A sect, it is true, was formed upon his tenets, and called after his name, and had a place in ecclesiastical history till the middle of the fifth century; but it was never a considerable body, and even as early as the date of the Nicene Council had split into parties differing by various shades of heresy from the orthodox faith. We shall have a more correct notion, then, of the heresy of Paulus if we consider him as the founder of a school rather than of a sect, as encouraging in the Church the use of those dispu-

tations and sceptical inquiries which belonged to the heathen academies, and scattering up and down the seeds of errors which sprang up and bore fruit in the generation after him."

A confirmation of this view is found by Dr. Newman in the fact that Lucian, the intimate friend and fellow-countryman of Paulus, held what were afterwards distinguished as Arian tenets, Paulus himself advocating a doctrine which nearly resembled what is commonly called Sabellianism. In this Lucian, who afterwards renounced his errors, was reconciled to the Church, and finally gained the crown of martyrdom, he sees "almost" the author of Arianism. The connection between him and the party afterwards known as Arian was historical, and not merely doctrinal. "In his schools are found, in matter of fact, the names of most of the original advocates of Arianism, and all those who were the most influential in their respective Churches throughout the East: Arius himself, Eusebius of Nicomedia, Leontius, Eudoxius, Asterius, and others . . . . and these actually appealed to him as their authority, and adopted from him the party designation of Collucianists."

Lastly, he sums up the evidence which fixes, as he thinks, on the Church of Antioch rather than on that of Alexandria the charge of having given birth to the heresy which the Nicene Council condemned.

"Such is the historical connection at very first sight between the Arian party and the school of Antioch: corroborative evidence will hereafter appear, in the similarity of character between the two bodies. At present, let it be taken as a confirmation of a fact,

which Lucian's history directly proves, that Eusebius the historian, who is suspected of Arianism, and his friend, Paulinus of Tyre, one of its first and principal supporters, though not pupils of Lucian, were more or less educated, and the latter ordained, at Antioch. . . . If we continue the history of the controversy, we have fresh evidence of the connection between Antioch and Arianism. During the interval between the Nicene Council and the death of Constantine (A.D. 325–361) Antioch is the metropolis of the heretical, as Alexandria of the orthodox, party. At Antioch the heresy recommenced its attack upon the Church after the decision of Nicæa. In a Council held at Antioch, it first showed itself in the shape of semi-Arianism, when Lucian's Creed was produced. There, too, in this and subsequent Councils, negotiations on the doctrine in dispute were conducted with the Western Church. At Antioch, lastly, and at Tyre, a suffragan see, the sentence of condemnation was pronounced on Athanasius."[1]

In proportion as we recede from the Apostolic age, the facts and names connected with the history of Antioch have less interest for those who look at them from the stand-point of this volume; but as we have traced its history from a remote period till it became what it was in the time of St. Peter and St. Paul, so we cannot part from it without glancing on some of the more memorable incidents in the great drama of history in which it played a part. There was born (A.D. 314) the last illustrious representative of the pagan culture, Libanius the rhetorician, the defender

[1] Newman's "Arians," ch. i.

of the expiring religion of the Empire, the enthusiastic admirer and panegyrist of his native city, the friend of Julian, yet looking on the new religion with a respectful toleration,—the tutor and afterwards the friend and correspondent of Chrysostom and Basil. There, though not a native of the city, in A.D. 360, Meletius was consecrated as bishop; ill-fitted, it may be, for the stormy times of controversy on which his lot had fallen, suspected by the Western Church of semi-Arianism, and by the Arians as a Sabellian, vindicating his character for orthodoxy, and yet attacked by the orthodox headed by Lucifer of Cagliari, as having been consecrated by Arians, the unwilling occasion of a long schism in the Church of Antioch, and yet so beloved by the people for his gentleness and goodness that mothers named their children after him, and men had his portrait painted on their walls or engraved upon their seals. There, in A.D. 362, came Julian in the enthusiasm of his revived Paganism, offending the people of the city by the contrast which his simple and austere life presented to their effeminate luxury, finding some consolation in the acquaintance of Libanius, and retaliating on the sneers and lampoons with which he had been attacked by the elaborate sarcasm of his Misopogon.[1] There, more illustrious than any of these men, was born, in A.D. 347, John, surnamed Chrysostom, the "golden-mouthed," the child of a devout Christian mother, yet sent to receive his education in the school of the Pagan

[1] Literally "the Beard-hater," the title which Julian gave to the work in which he vindicated his right to wear a beard as a mark of manliness against the smooth-faced effeminacy of the citizens of Antioch.

Libanius, trained by him in the culture which afterwards showed itself, inspired by a nobler faith, in his unsurpassed eloquence, baptized after he had come to manhood by Meletius, drawn to the monastic life as his only safeguard against the evils of the time and place, living in absolute solitude in a cavern for two years, and then recalled by Meletius to the more active duties of pastoral ministration, and rapidly gaining the reputation which led to his being chosen (A.D. 398) to the Metropolitan See of Constantinople.

With the name of Chrysostom, the interest of Antioch for the student of Church history practically ceases, and before long its glory began to wane. Its capture by Chosroes, the king of Persia (A.D. 611), involved the destruction of most of its magnificent and stately buildings; and though rebuilt by Justinian II., it never regained its former glory. With the rest of Syria, it passed under the power of the Mahometan conquerors in the seventh century. The army of the Crusades under Boemond and Godefroy brought it (A.D. 1093) into a renewed contact with Christendom; but it was retaken by the Sultan Bibars (A.D. 1269) and its churches destroyed, and under the dominion of the Turks its commerce dwindled away before the rivalry of Aleppo. The few Christians who remain there have not a single church, and meet for worship in one of the caves which formed part of the necropolis; and the modern *Antakieh*, though containing some 10,000 inhabitants, has only the *Bab-Boulus* (the Gate of Paul) to remind the traveller of the great Apostle to whom it owed its position in the history of Christendom.

ST. PAUL AT EPHESUS.

ST. PAUL AT EPHESUS.

THE history of the city which, when St. Paul dwelt in it, was the capital of the proconsular province of Asia, carries us back to a remote, almost a prehistoric, antiquity. Androklos, the son of Codrus,[1] the last of the Athenian kings, was its legendary founder, and the tradition represents, at all events, its connection with the great Ionic migration which led to the establishment of the confederacy of the twelve cities that had their centre of religious unity in the Panonion. The worship which was specially characteristic of Ephesus, however, goes back to even an earlier date than that migration. The Greek settlers found a goddess, with a temple and a priesthood, whom they were content to identify with their own Artemis, just as afterwards their Artemis was identified by the Romans with Diana, as the Woden, Thor, and Friga, of the Teutonic tribes, were identified with Mercury, Jupiter, and Venus. The old aboriginal name of Upis died out under the influence of Greek culture,

[1] Mr. Lewin, apparently by an error of the press, gives the name as Cadmus ("St. Paul," i. p. 319).

and Ephesus, through all its long history, looked on itself as consecrated to Artemis as its tutelary deity.

Its Artemis was, however, very different, in outward form and in the attributes symbolised by it, from the huntress maiden, the daughter of Latona, who appeared as the type of the beauty of a vigorous womanhood in the painting and the sculptures of Greece. A female figure, narrowing to the feet, so as to present something like the outline of a mummy, with five or six parallel rows of pendulous breasts (whence, in later days, the epithet of Artemis Polymammia) with lions creeping up the arm, sometimes with a trident in the hand, the head surmounted by a crown, in the shape of a *modius* or corn-measure, trees, and the heads of bulls and gryphons, and flowers and fruit, on the robes that swathed the tapering form below the waist,—this was the symbolic form embodied in the wooden image, black with age, which men reverenced as "having fallen from Jupiter" (Acts xix. 35), and which was reproduced more or less completely in marble and in metal, on the coins of the city, and probably in the "silver shrines" that were made by Demetrius and his craftsmen. The type was clearly altogether un-Hellenic, and, difficult as it may be to explain the symbols in detail, yet some, at least, the breasts and the *modius*, and perhaps the trees, the flowers, and the fruit, seem to represent the productiveness of Nature, and so we are led to see in the Ephesian Artemis the survival of an older form of Pantheistic Nature-worship, taking the first stage of its development into Polytheism in the group of Chthonian or Telluric deities (*i.e.* earth powers), of which Cybele

became the great representative in later mythology, and received into fellowship by the Hellenic immigrants, who were unable, and probably also unwilling, to extirpate it. Whether the race to which it belonged was, as some have thought, non-Aryan, as well as non-Hellenic, is a question which lies beyond our present scope.

The position of Ephesus on the banks of the Caystros, and so communicating with the sea, and occupying the mountain heights of Prion and Coressus, made it, from very early times, one of the chief cities of the Ionian Dodekapolis. It lay in the natural line of communication from Susa in the far East to Sardis in the west of Asia,[1] and from Sardis to Europe, and so attracted much of the commerce that passed between those regions. The invasion of the Cimmerians, which swept like a wave over Asia Minor in the seventh century B.C., for a time threatened it with destruction, and though it suffered less than Sardis, the Temple of Artemis, probably the earliest structure that bore that name, was in part, at least, burnt. The rising power of the monarchy of the Lydian kings, after the expulsion of the Cimmerians by Alyattes, menaced the independence of Ephesus, as it did that of the other Ionian cities, and under Cyrus it was formally besieged. The inhabitants in their distress appealed to the protection of the great goddess.[2] The ancient city was separated from the Temple by a distance of seven furlongs, and they did not feel near enough to their protectress. They accordingly

[1] Herod. v. 54.

[2] Ib. i. 26.

fastened a rope to the Temple at one end, to the city wall at the other, and thus renewed or emphasized their solemn consecration of the city as the "votary" of the goddess. This recognition by the Greeks of a worship more ancient than their own was probably not without its influence on the minds of the Lydian king, whose devotion led him to propitiate with his golden gifts the gods of all the nations, far and near, with whom he came in contact, and Ephesus obtained comparatively favourable terms. His zeal showed itself by offering columns and golden bulls for the reconstruction of the Temple. On the overthrow of the Lydian monarchy by Cyrus, the Ephesians became subject to Persia. They shared in the Ionian revolt under Darius, became tributary to Athens during the period of her maritime supremacy, then, after the great disaster of the Sicilian expedition, fell back upon Persia, and continued to be governed by a satrap till the conquest of Alexander. In the meantime the Temple of Artemis became more and more one of the world's wonders. Its dedication to a goddess in whom the Persians recognized an analogue of their own Mithraic deities led Xerxes to spare it, as Mardonius had done the shrine of Delos, when all the other temples of Ionian deities were laid waste.[1] Tissaphernes, the Persian satrap, at the close of the Peloponnesian war offered a solemn sacrifice at the altar of the goddess, when the city was besieged by the Athenians.

Once again, in B.C. 356, on the very night of the birth of Alexander, the city was threatened with the

[1] Herod. vi. 97.

loss of that which was its great glory. The Temple, which it had taken a hundred and twenty years to bring to completion, and which was adorned with sculptures by the ablest artists of Greece, was burnt to the ground by the insane ambition of Herostratus to immortalise his name as its destroyer. It soon rose, however, from its ruins to a fresh magnificence. The people gave their money, and the women of Ephesus their jewels. Alexander, after the victory of the Granicus, held a solemn festival in honour of the goddess, and offered to defray the whole cost of rebuilding the Temple, if he were allowed to inscribe his name on it as its dedicator. The offer was refused by the priests, but the conqueror employed the architect to whom he had intrusted the work of building his new city Alexandria to superintend the reconstruction of the Temple, and a portrait of the king holding the thunderbolt of sovereignty in his hand, painted by Apelles, was consecrated as his special gift to it.

We need not follow the changing fortunes of the city under the successors of Alexander, except to note that Lysimachus (B.C. 295) compelled the inhabitants to abandon the plain in which they had dwelt in the immediate vicinity of the Temple, and to settle round the Acropolis on the hill Prion (I follow Mr. Wood's topography in thus naming it),[1] which had

[1] I have to acknowledge my obligations in this and other parts of this short sketch of the history of Ephesus to the interesting article on Wood's "Discoveries at Ephesus," in the "Edinburgh Review" for January, 1877, as well as to Mr. Wood's volume itself.

been the site of the original settlement of Androklos; that on the fall of Antiochus the Great it was added by the Romans to the dominion of Eumenes II., the king of Pergamus; and that it was, under his successor, Attalus, that the mouth of the Caystros began to be choked with the silted sand which ultimately destroyed it as a harbour. On the death of Attalus, in B.C. 133, the kingdom of Pergamus became the Roman province of Asia; and with the exception of the short-lived struggle to regain its independence, in B.C. 88, by joining Mithridates, the king of Pontus, and by the massacre of its Roman occupants, it continued to be the capital of that province during the later years of the Republic, and rose into fresh power and prosperity under the patronage of Augustus. Miletus and the other Ionian cities had dwindled into obscurity, and Ephesus and Smyrna (an Æolian city in its origin) alone remained as the two "lights" or "eyes" of Asia.[1] An Augusteum was dedicated to the emperor's honour within the same enclosure as the Artemision. The city was allowed to name itself on its coins and inscriptions as the "votary"[2] of the great goddess Artemis, and

[1] Plin., "Hist. Nat." v. 31.

[2] The "worshipper" of the English version of Acts xix. 35. The Greek word is a more technical one—Νεωκόρος, the temple sweeper, or sacristan. The title first appeared on the coins of Ephesus under Nero, and hence, perhaps, the emphatic appeal to it in the speech of the town-clerk to the riotous mob that had been brought together by Demetrius at the beginning of that emperor's reign. Among the inscriptions at Ephesus in Mr. Wood's book, we find one which speaks of an assembly of *Neocori* ("Theatre," p. 3).

with this to couple, as the tendency to ascribe divine honours to the emperor for the time being increased, that of being also his "votary." The honour was conferred by a decree of the senate, and Ephesus alone, of all the cities of the province, could boast of having received it not less than four times.

The pre-eminence of this city was asserted in its political as well as religious relations. There every proconsul going to his post in Asia-Minor was obliged to land. There were held the general assizes for the trial of causes from the other districts of the province, as well as for local business. Subject, of course, to the pro-consul, it had its senate and its *ecclesia* or assembly (Acts xix. 39), which met probably every month on stated days in the great theatre. The town-clerk or recorder was to the annals of Ephesus what the *Archon Eponymos* had been to Athens, and what the consuls were at Rome; and his year of office was marked by the appearance of his name on coins and inscriptions. He was *ex-officio* president of the senate and of the assembly. Sometimes he was invested also with the dignity of high-priest or pontiff of the goddess.[1] There also, clothed with functions distinct from those of the priesthood, were the Asiarchs ("the chief of Asia" of Acts xix. 31), whose office, more or less analogous to that of the *choregi* at Athens, was to arrange, partly at their own expense, for the celebration of the public games. Over these they

[1] Inscriptions in Lewin's "St. Paul," i. p. 316. The inscriptions in Wood's Ephesus "Theatre" (pp. 16, 44), make mention of two *Grammateis*, or town-clerks, one of the senate, one of the *demos*, or popular assembly.

presided, clothed for the time being with a *quasi*-sacerdotal character. The office implied wealth; and the lavish expenditure which the holders of it incurred was rewarded with the titular distinction of being οἱ πρωτεύοντες, the *primates* of the province. The appointment probably rested with the representative congress, consisting of delegates from Ephesus and the other cities of the province, or with the proconsul, as choosing from a list submitted to him by them.

A minute description of the topography of Ephesus may be found in Lewin's "St. Paul," i. pp. 320–330; in Mr. E. Falkener's "Ephesus and the Temple of Diana;" and in Mr. J. T. Wood's recently-published "Discoveries at Ephesus." Each of these works abounds in plans and illustrations, and Mr. Falkener's volume presents, in addition to drawings of the remains as they now exist, two interesting ideal views based upon those remains, and enabling us to form a fair estimate of the former magnificence. It will be sufficient here to note the more prominent features as they must have presented themselves to a traveller entering the city at the time when St. Paul first visited it. At present the river (the old Caystrus, the modern *Agia-solouki*) flows through marshes, dotted here and there with lagoons, into the sea. In the remoter periods of its history the sea had flowed up to the city itself, and probably formed a port close to the great Temple of Apollo. The process of silting up, however, had begun in the third century B.C., and the attempt of Attalus Philadelphus to check it by narrowing the course of the

stream had but increased the evil. At the time of which we are now speaking, the old harbour, artificially embanked, was still accessible by the river, and was, of course, commonly filled with shipping.

To the east of the Temple of Apollo was the *Agora*, or Forum, and near it, on the south side, a smaller Temple of Artemis; and on the east the great theatre, in the usual semicircular or horse-shoe shape, the chord of the arc being estimated, on various computations, at from 400 to 660 feet, and the perpendicular drawn from the chord to the arc about 300 feet. Taking the highest of these estimates, the theatre must have been the largest in the world, and capable of holding not fewer than 56,700 spectators. This was the scene of the riot caused by Demetrius the silversmith. From the *Agora* the main street of Ephesus ran with a straightness not often found in Oriental cities to the Stadium and Gymnasium on the north. To the east of all these buildings rose the heights which Mr. Wood has identified with Coressus. Outside the city-walls, and connected by a long colonnade with the Magnesian Gate, was the great Temple, which had become the world's wonder. Till lately, its position had been hardly more than matter of conjecture. One writer (Guhl, "Ephesiaca") placed it to the north-east of the city, another (Mr. Falkener) on the west, near the harbour formed by the Caystrus (which he identifies with Panormos, or the Sacred port), and so in direct communication with the sea. Within the last five years, however, conjecture has been changed by the labours of Mr. J. T. Wood into comparative, if not absolute, certainty. He drew

from scattered notices in geographical and historical writers the inference which Dr. Guhl had drawn before him, and commenced his excavations in that direction. The discovery of an inscription of the time of Augustus, at the angle of two walls, recording the Emperor's recognition of the right of asylum belonging to the Temple, enabled him to identify the wall with the *Peribolos*, or enclosure of the precincts; and after another year of patient digging in the deep alluvial soil of the Turkish village of *Agiasolouk*,[1] came, twenty-two feet below the surface, on the remains of the Artemision. The length of the platform on which the Temple stood was 418 feet, its width 239; the dimensions of the Temple itself 342 by 163 feet. There were eight columns in front (as seen on coins and medals), and the total number Mr. Wood reckons at 100, about 55 feet 8 inches in height, many of them sculptured in relief, many the gifts of kings. Inscriptions at the base of the columns lead to the conclusion that each was the gift of some devout worshipper. The excavations led to the discovery of three pavements, one below the other; the lowest 7 feet 6 inches beneath the highest, and each representing a stage in the history of the fabric. Below the lowest of these

[1] The name is commonly explained as a contraction of "Αγιος Θεολόγος (pronounced in modern Greek as *Aios Scologos*), the holy, "Divine," used as a title of honour, as in the superscription of the Apocalypse of St. John. By others, however (Arundell, "Discov.," ii. 252), it has been identified with *Aiaslik*, the Turkish for a "little moon," as connected with the Crescent, which is, among the Ottomans, at least, the symbol of the faith of Islam; and by others, again (Falkener, p. 149), as being in its true form "*Aios-lik*," the holy place or city.

was found a layer of charcoal three inches thick between two *strata* of a soft substance of the consistency of putty, giving a singular and unlooked-for confirmation to the statement of an ancient writer, that Chersiphron, the architect of the Temple built by Crœsus, under the advice of Theodorus of Samos, ordered the foundations to be laid on fleeces of wool and charcoal, so as to guard against the risks likely to arise from the marshiness of the soil. It seems to follow from this that we have here the floor of the first Temple, that the pavement above it represents that which was built, circ. A.D. 460, by Pæonius, who was also the architect of the Temple of Apollo at Branchidæ, and was destroyed by Herostratus, and that the topmost pavement belongs to the greatest and last of the three temples which replaced it, and remained till its destruction by the Goths. A true estimate of the greatness of the Temple and of the "magnificence" that attracted travellers from all parts of the world, depends, however, on something more than its architectural proportions. It was to the life of Ephesus what the great cathedrals of Europe were to their respective cities in the palmiest days of mediæval Christendom. The revenues of the Temple were large, probably enormous. Its treasury became, as it has been aptly described,[1] a great "bank of deposit," in which vast sums of money were accumulated, of which the Temple authorities had the usufruct. Many of the sums so left for safety lapsed in course of time, as unclaimed stock lapses

[1] "Edinburgh Review," January, 1877, p. 214.

now. Fines and confiscations, gifts and bequests from devout worshippers, were constantly flowing in. An inscription disinterred and deciphered by Mr. Wood tells how one Vibius Salutaris,[1] a Roman of the equestrian, *i.e.*, the capitalist, order, at the beginning of the second century after Christ, dedicated a large number of gold and silver statues, and gave a large sum, the interest of which was to be distributed annually to the officials of the city and the Temple. The total amount of capital is not stated, but its magnitude may be fairly estimated by the penalty of 50,000 drachmæ (about £2,000) imposed for any breach of the conditions of the trust by any magistrate or private person. Partly through the expenditure of the revenues thus received, partly through special gifts, the Temple became, like the cathedrals to which I have compared it, a great museum of art. There were to be seen the masterpieces of painters and sculptors—of Phidias and Polycletus, of Calliphron and Apelles. For one picture, above referred to, by the last-named artist, representing Alexander the Great grasping a thunderbolt, no less than twenty talents of gold had been paid, representing, in modern valuation, £38,650 sterling. The "establishment" of the Temple involved obviously a large expenditure. There were the priests, under the supremacy of their Pontifex, chosen in youth for their beauty, and consecrated to the service of the goddess, as were those of Cybele, by a compulsory and irrevocable celibacy. There were the conse-

[1] Wood's Ephesus ("Theatre," pp. 4–45).

crated virgins in their various grades, as probationers, priestesses on active service, and the superannuated, the functions of the third order being to instruct the first.[1] There were besides these, probably (unless the three grades formed an exhaustive division of the class), the *Hierodulæ*, or female ministrants, occupying a position like that of the Levites or the *Nethinim* in the temple at Jerusalem. Either as subdivisions of the priesthood, or as classes having a distinct existence, there were (as we learn from the inscription of Salutaris) the *Theologi*,[2] who taught, we may infer from the name, the esoteric meaning of the legends of the great goddess, and expounded the manifold symbols that were brought together in the sacred statue, the "image which fell down from Jupiter;" the *Hymnodi*, who composed hymns in her praise; and the *Thesmodi*, who, as the name perhaps implies, regulated what we should call the rubrics of her ritual, or chanted oracular responses. Boys were there, with ministering functions of some kind, sufficiently numerous to

[1] It seems a probable conjecture that the organisation which St. Paul prescribes for the widows of the Church (1 Tim. v. 3–10) was based upon that of which he had the pattern before him in the Temple arrangements at Ephesus.

[2] The title reminds us of the name given to St. John in the superscription of the Revelation as "the divine," ὁ θεολόγος. The name was applied to him only of the Apostolic band, and not to him, till we find him settled at Ephesus. May we not believe that one reason for its use rose out of the local familiarity of the Church of that city with this application of it, and that men wish to contrast the witness of a true "theology" with those who usurped the name, and yet were ministers of falsehood?

form a school under special instructors, supported by endowments. Over and above all these classes directly attached to the Temple, there were those of whom Demetrius and his craftsmen were the representatives—the surveyors and the masons, who were wanted for its repairs; the butchers, who sold victims for the sacrifices; the silversmiths and other workers in metal, who made small models of the Temple or of its famous statue for travellers to carry away with them as memorials of their visit. All these depended on the Temple for their livelihood. Their vested interests were affected by anything that menaced its attractiveness.

Besides these, however, there was another class of persons to whom that attractiveness was important. Partly, perhaps, as drawing together men and women from all parts of the world, partly as having in its dominant *cultus* the type of an Oriental rather than a Greek religion, Ephesus became famous above other cities for its pre-eminence in magic. On the conflagration caused by Herostratus there were Magi at Ephesus who predicted[1] that the child born on that night should be the scourge of Asia. It was the birth-place of the astrologer Balbilus, whom Vespasian employed, as Nero had done before, to predict his future fortunes. There three centuries later was the last great representative of the expiring magic of the ancient world, Maximus, from whom the emperor Julian received his initiation into the Eleusinian mysteries. But the chief development of the magic

[1] Plutarch, "Alexander."

of Ephesus was found in the charms or amulets known as Ἐφέσια γράμματα (Ephesian letters). By them a man insured success in all his undertakings; a wrestler might win the prize of victory for thirty times in succession; exorcists could relieve demoniacs from the presence of their tormentors. A few mysterious words[1] were written on slips of parchment, and then sewn, somewhat after the manner of Jewish phylacteries, in leathern bags, which were worn by the possessor as a preservative against evils. These were probably the most common and popular of the products of the magic art. Others were wrapped in greater mystery, and were sold at a higher price by professed wonder-workers and exorcists. It is probable that shortly before the arrival of St. Paul at Ephesus the arts of the thaumaturgists had received a fresh impulse from the visit of Apollonius of Tyana, the magician whose name has already met us in connection with the early life of the Apostle in the schools of Tarsus.[2] Wandering from city to city in the provinces of Asia, investing himself with mysterious pretensions as forecasting

[1] Clement of Alexandria, the great collector of the "Miscellanies" of classic archæology, gives the very words: Ἄσκιον, Κατάσκιον, Λίξ, Τετράξ, Δαμναμενεύς, Αἰσιον, and says that Androcydes, the Pythagorean, had interpreted them as meaning respectively Darkness, Light, the Earth, the Year (with its *four* Seasons), the Sun (as subduing all things), and Truth ("Strom.," v. p. 46). Elsewhere he ascribes them to the Ideo-dactyli, a Phrygian tribe, as inventors ("Strom.," i. p. 73). It is probable enough that they were a survival of the older Phrygian cultus of the Powers of Nature which had existed prior to the introduction of the name of Artemis.

[2] *Ante*, p. 11.

the future and revealing secrets, and teaching men how to purify themselves from guilt, and to propitiate the favour of the gods, he had appeared at Ephesus, and had preached to the people from the platform below the portico of the Temple, and had, we may well believe, found not a few disciples, whom he initiated into his secrets; and the books of "curious arts," that were burnt when the current of popular feeling was for a time changed by the preaching of St. Paul, could hardly fail to include some of the instructions which he thus imparted, and which they in their turn communicated to others.

About a century before it appears in connection with the history of the Christian Church, Ephesus had received an addition to the mingled elements of its population in the form of a settlement of Jews. The immigration probably followed upon the conquest of Judæa by Pompeius, and the consequent flight of many of its inhabitants. During the dictatorship of Julius Cæsar, John Hyrcanus, the priest-prince of the Maccabean house, applied to Dolabella on their behalf, that they might be released from the obligation of military service, and be allowed the free exercise of the religion of their fathers; and Josephus records the decree which was issued in compliance with his request, granting the exemption on the grounds (1) that it was unlawful for the Jews to bear arms in a foreign army, (2) that they could not travel or march upon the Sabbath, and (3) that their laws as to clean and unclean meats hindered their sharing in the ordinary rations of the soldiers.[1] This was confirmed by Lucius Len-

[1] Josephus, "Ant." xiv. 10, § 12.

tulus, the Consul, and after the death of Cæsar, by a decree of the Ephesians themselves. The Jewish settlers at Ephesus would thus appear to have been, on the whole, liberally treated. Unhappily there, as elsewhere, at this period, they exercised an influence for evil as well as good, perhaps predominantly for the former rather than the latter. They, too, had a magic and demonology of their own. Vagabond exorcists, claiming to be of the house of Aaron, and apparently assuming even the dignity of the High Priest's office (Acts xix. 13), bewitched the people with their sorceries. There are fewer instances at Ephesus than in any other city where the Gospel was preached by St. Paul, of the synagogue furnishing converts to the Church. We read of no devout Greeks and "honourable women" who were already as proselytes of the gate, as we read in the account of Thessalonica and Berœa (Acts xvii. 4, 12). The Jews of Ephesus seem throughout, as a body, to have been hinderers of the Divine work, ready to coalesce with the craftsmen who were roused against the new religion by fear of losing their occupation, perhaps united to those craftsmen by the ties of a common interest, as dealers in the precious metals which were so largely used in the "silver shrines" of Artemis. The antagonism of "Alexander the coppersmith" (2 Tim. iv. 14), who wrought St. Paul "much evil," may best be explained by the appearance, probably of the same man, as the representative of the Jews at the time of the great tumult in the theatre, when he was apparently put forward by the Jews to disclaim any connection on their part with the preaching of the Apostle, because

his occupation had brought him into previous contact with the craftsmen of Demetrius (Acts xix. 33).

We have now to enter on the work of St. Paul, carried on among these surroundings, and on a population trained under their influences. On his second missionary journey he had been drawn by personal inclination, probably also by the interest which he felt in the Jewish population there, and his desire to bear witness of the truth in one of the great centres of Asiatic heathenism, to preach the word in the proconsular province of Asia, of which Ephesus was the capital (Acts xvi. 6), but had been hindered by a higher, overpowering influence, in which he recognised the teaching of the Spirit. It was expedient, in the highest sense of the word, in the warfare on which he was about to enter, that he should first establish a base of operations in Europe, and come, with the experience gained at Philippi and Thessalonica, and Berœa, and Athens, and Corinth to carry on the work in the region which he was now forbidden to approach. And when he first entered the city it was but for a brief passing visit. He was on his way to Jerusalem, hastening to keep the feast that was then near, probably, as afterwards in Acts xx. 16, the Feast of Pentecost, and to fulfil the Nazarite vow, which, either as a personal act of devotion, or to conciliate his brethren of the stock of Abraham, he had taken on himself at Cenchrea (Acts xviii. 18, 19). There was but time to attend one Sabbath service in the Synagogue, and there to tell them that the crucified Jesus was the Christ whom they and their fathers had been expecting. Short as the time was it opened the door of faith.

Those who heard him were roused to inquire further. His very refusal to comply with their request that he would stay and speak to them again left them in an attitude of expectation which was favourable to their conversion. And, in the meantime, the work was carried on by able and zealous teachers. Aquila, the Jew of Pontus, was there, representing, there is reason to believe, the first-fruits of the Christian society at Rome, and Priscilla, whose name connected her with one of the nobler families of the Imperial city. They had received the faith of Christ, it would appear, before they came in contact with the Apostle (Acts xviii. 2); but their intercourse with him for the two years or more during which they had been fellow-workers in their trade of tent-making, must have enlarged their thoughts as to the nature and extent of the kingdom of Christ, and they were now like-minded with him on all essential points. Soon another preacher came with gifts that qualified him for the high position which he afterwards came to occupy among the workers, and it may be also, among the writers, of the Apostolic age. The people of Ephesus heard of the arrival of another Apollonius, or Apollos, resting his claims, not like his thaumaturgist name-sake of Tyana, on lying signs and wonders, but on the power of the truth which he proclaimed. The eloquent Jew of Alexandria, trained in the school of Philo to find new meanings and wider thoughts beneath the letter of Psalms and Prophecies, came as one mighty in the Scriptures, to be a preacher of righteousness. He had heard of the baptism of John as the symbol of repentance, and came calling men to that

baptism as a preparation for the coming of the Lord. If it seems strange that he had heard nothing more than this, and knew nothing of the death, resurrection, and ascension of the Lord Jesus, nothing of the wonder of the day of Pentecost, and the life and the growth of the new Christian society, which had already spread itself so widely both in Asia and in Europe, we must remember that, like other disciples of the Alexandrian school of Jews, he may have lived in almost entire seclusion in some ascetic community, such as that of the Therapeutæ, described by Philo, hearing little or nothing of the outside world. When he did hear of one who had done the work of a Prophet, and had died a martyr's death, he was moved as by a Divine impulse to carry on that work, and went on his way as a mission-preacher, "fervent in spirit," to rouse his people wherever they might be found, from the formalism and worldliness into which they had everywhere fallen. The very phrase in which St. Luke describes him as "instructed *in the way of the Lord*" (Acts xviii. 25), sounds like an echo of that which had defined the calling of the Baptist as "the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye *the way of the Lord*" (Matt. iii. 3). Such an one, faithful to the light he had, and willing to do the will of God, was in the very frame of mind which fitted him to receive a fuller knowledge of the truth, and so, content to sit at the feet of Aquila and Priscilla as they expounded to him "the way of God more perfectly;" he became at Ephesus, as afterwards at Corinth, one who "helped them much which had believed through grace." That a Church, *i.e.* a congregation of believers,

was founded at Ephesus, even before St. Paul's return from Jerusalem, we know from the fact, that "when he was disposed to pass into Achaia, the brethren of that city wrote to the disciples of Corinth, and exhorted them" to receive him (Acts xviii. 27).

He had left behind him, however, among the results of his labours, what might have been a disturbing element in the Christian society. As he himself had come to Ephesus knowing only the baptism of John, so there were some who had listened to his earlier preaching there, and had never advanced beyond it. Almost the only possible explanation of their continuing in this imperfect, transition stage of knowledge, is, that they too, like their teacher, had withdrawn into something like separation from the world, fasting, and praying, and working, after the manner of the Therapeutæ of Egypt, or the Essenes of Palestine, but holding little or no intercourse with others, and so hearing nothing of the teaching of Aquila and Priscilla, and of the change that had come over that of him whom they owned as master. There, at any rate, they were, a small and distinct community, about twelve in number, still preparing, after the manner of the Baptist, for the coming of the Lord. Something there was which drew the attention of the Apostle immediately on his arrival. They lacked, apparently, some of the tokens of the higher life that pervaded the nascent Church; they were devout, rigorous, austere, but were wanting in the joy, the radiancy, the enthusiasm which were conspicuous in others. What he saw led him to put the searching question,

"Did ye receive the Holy Ghost when ye believed?"[1] (Acts xix. 1–7.) Had there been, at that time, any new power bestowed, any new gifts, as the result of the working of that power? Had they burst out into hymns of unpremeditated praise, and ecstatic utterances in their own or in other tongues? Had they been roused to speak burning words, which went home, like those of prophets, to the hearts and consciences of men? The answer showed in what seclusion they had lived. They had never even heard of the Holy Ghost, as in any sense belonging to the present. It was one of the Divine names of the older Scriptures. It had formed part of the teaching of the Baptist that He who should come after him should baptize men with the Holy Ghost and with fire, but the thought of the Spirit as already given to and working in the Church was altogether new to them. In this case, however, as in that of Apollos and many others, what the Baptist had done was a preparation for the higher truth. They at once saw in what St. Paul preached the completion of his work, the fulfilment of his hopes and of their own. They were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus; and as St. Paul laid his hands on them, the Spirit came upon them in its power, and the two great gifts above described, of Tongues and Prophecy, were seen among them, as among the disciples on the day of Pentecost, among the company that was gathered together in the house of the Centurion of Cæsarea (Acts x. 45, 46).

[1] This, and not the rendering of the Authorised Version, "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?" is the right translation.

Three months passed away after the Apostle's usual manner. His own hands ministered to his own necessities, and to those of his companions (Acts xx. 34). Aquila and Priscilla were still there, and the partnership which had begun at Corinth was doubtless renewed at Ephesus. The evening was given to teaching and prayer; the Sabbath to mission-preaching in the synagogue; part, at least, of the first day of the week, probably the evening of Saturday, to the weekly meeting of believers to eat of that supper of the Lord which was then united, as far as time and place were concerned, with their *Agapé* or feast of charity. The rules for that solemn feast, which were given by St. Paul to the Church of Corinth, were written, we must remember, from Ephesus, and must therefore be received as a witness of the order, one might almost say the ritual, which he ordained there as in all the Churches. Soon, however, as at Corinth, the Sabbath services of the synagogue became scenes of confusion and disorder. Those who believed were reviled and attacked by their opponents in the presence of the congregation, and it became necessary to withdraw the disciples, who till then had kept up their attendance at the synagogue, and to form them into a separate society. These would probably meet in the house of some member of the community, and that of Aquila and Priscilla was, as we find from 1 Cor. xvi. 19, one at least of those chosen for the purpose. It was necessary, however, to have some fixed place, not only for the assemblies of the Church, but for those who were as yet inquirers only, and this

was found in the "school"[1] or lecture-room of one Tyrannus (Acts xix. 9). This may have been one of the places to be found at this time in all Greek cities in which a teacher of rhetoric or philosophy gave his lectures; but in this instance there are grounds for a somewhat more definite conclusion, suggesting a coincidence of some interest with other facts in the Apostolic history. The name Tyrannus was, to say the least, not a common one. It does not appear in the Dictionaries of Classical Biography, which may well be considered as an exhaustive list of all names that had the least claim to be preserved as historical. So far as I know, the only other instance in which it is found is in the inscriptions of the *Columbarium* of Livia, the burial-place in which the ashes of the deceased members of the empress's household were stored, each, as it were, in its pigeon-hole (hence the name *Columbarium*), with a brief record of their names and functions. And there the name appears as a physician (*medicus*) attached to the imperial service. He, like the other members of the household, was probably a slave or freedman. Identity of name, in a case where the name was an un-

[1] The history of the word rendered "school" (σχολή) is not without a special interest of its own. In classical Greek it was used (1) in its original meaning of "leisure;" (2) in that of the "study," to which leisure was devoted. Thence, in later Greek, it passed to the "class-room" or "lecture-hall" of philosophers, and it was used in this sense by Aristotle and Plutarch, and so went on its way in the two divergent paths which issued in the meanings that attached to it: (a) as a place for the edu-tion of boys; and (b) as a collective term for the followers of a given sect or party in philosophy.

usual one, may fairly be assumed to indicate relationship, and such callings were so commonly handed down from father to son, that when we find another Tyrannus occupying a position as a lecturer a generation later, we may infer without much hesitation that he too lectured on medicine. It is clear that one who placed his class-room at the disposal of the preacher of a new doctrine must have been, if not a believer, at least favourably disposed towards it, as having a claim to be heard, especially if it connected itself in any way with the work of healing, to which his own studies had been devoted. Add to these facts that Luke, the "beloved physician," himself probably an Italian by descent, if not by birth, would naturally be acquainted with the leading members of his own profession in the cities of Greece and Asia, and we may, I believe, trace, between the lines of this brief record, the interposition of the friend and companion who was still labouring at Philippi, but who must have watched every step of St. Paul's work with interest, and been in frequent correspondence with him. What more natural than that he should seek to help him in his work, by introducing him to one who could give him, at an opportune moment, what he so much needed—a place for carrying on his work as a teacher, public and yet private, open to all inquirers, and yet secure against the "lewd fellows of the baser sort" (Acts xvii. 5), who would have attacked him had he taught in the *Agora* or the open spaces of the city-streets?

Two years passed, or, including the time that preceded and followed the period so defined, three years

(Acts xix. 10; xx. 31), of active and ceaseless labour at Ephesus, and, it may be also, from Ephesus as a centre, of which we have but the brief notice that "all they which dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks" (Acts xix. 10). We may think of other great towns of the province—Smyrna, Miletus, Sardis, Pergamos—as having witnessed the foundation and the growth of Christian Churches. The Apostle's own words throw some light on the nature of that work. There was the constant teaching, "publicly and from house to house"; the labours night and day, warning men with tears, and calling them to repentance toward God, and faith towards the Lord Jesus Christ. There was the daily instruction in the facts of the Gospel history, as they had been handed down orally or in writing by those who had been eye-witnesses and ministers of the word, the daily labour for daily bread at his calling as a tent-maker, and in "the words of the Lord Jesus," as giving precious counsels and rules of life. Churches would be organized, now in this house, now in that, each with its bishop-presbyter and deacons, each having its list of orphans, whom it made it its duty to support and educate, and of widows, who, in consideration of previous good character, were registered as the Church's pensioners. In the work of teaching the Apostle seems to have found a singular readiness to receive the higher as well as the simpler elements of the truth, which we shall scarcely be wrong in connecting with the previous work of Apollos as an interpreter of Scripture. Nowhere in the whole range of his teaching was he able to declare "all the

counsel of God" with greater fulness (Acts xx. 27). While at Corinth he could only speak to men as if they were children, feeding them with the milk that is suitable for babes, and not with the solid food that belongs to those that are of full age (1 Cor. iii. 1, 2), he was able at Ephesus to speak wisdom among those that were perfect, as having attained to the fulness of the stature of Christian manhood (1 Cor. ii. 6; Eph. iii. 10; iv. 13).

It was characteristic of St. Paul's method and plan of working that all this was done quietly. The leaven was hid in the three measures of meal, and was working silently. While he reasoned, as he had done at Athens, on the ground of convictions more or less common to all thinking men, and thus taught the inquirers that they were no gods that were made with hands, there were no outbursts of declamation or sarcasm against the goddess whom the city worshipped (Acts xix. 37). It could not be said of him and his companions that they were like the Jews, whom the police of the city were compelled to watch lest they should show their abhorrence of idolatry by robbing the temples of the idols (Acts xix. 37; Rom. ii. 22). With the tact and the courtesy which made him the pattern of a true missionary, the Apostle gained the friendship even of those who held high official positions in the city. The town-clerk or recorder interposed to protect him; some of the Asiarchs, if not converts, were at least, personally his friends, and would not allow him to expose himself to the attacks of a riotous and fanatic mob.

The work thus carried on was seconded by super-

natural powers of a very exceptional character. Elsewhere the gift of healing was exercised through prayer and the laying on of hands; here it was effectual without contact, and apparently without special prayer. "God wrought *no common* miracles" (this is a better rendering than "special") "by the hands of Paul: so that from his body were brought unto the sick, handkerchiefs or aprons, and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out of them" (Acts xix. 11–12). What has been said as to the probable calling of Tyrannus, explains the precision with which the fact is recorded by one who was not himself an eye-witness of it. Assuming some acquaintance between him and St. Luke, as members of the same profession, the phenomena thus detailed are precisely such as one physician would be likely to record in writing to another. Why the special miracles of this nature were wrought at Ephesus and not elsewhere, is a question which naturally presents itself, and the answer is not far to seek. (1) In themselves the phænomena were clearly analogous to some recorded in the gospel history. When the woman with an issue of blood came and touched the hem of our Lord's garment, so that virtue, *i.e.* the power that healed, went out from Him (Matt. ix. 20, 21), when others followed her example, with the like result (Matt. xiv. 35, 36), there was the self-same principle involved, the self-same method of working. There was not the same intensity of faith as showed itself in the centurion of Capernaum (Matt. viii. 5–13), or the woman of the coasts of Tyre and Sidon (Matt. xv. 21–28) who

believed in the healing power of the Divine Word, without contact or material instrumentality of any kind. There was not the same dependence upon actual contact and symbolic acts as in the case of the blind and deaf, whose infirmity our Lord met when He spat and touched the eyes and ears that lacked their natural powers. The habits of mind that were natural in a place like Ephesus were rather those of men in an intermediate state, believing in the transmission of powers or "virtues," in the technical sense of the word, through this or that material agent, accustomed to depend on them for protection against diseases and other malignant influences. And this state of theirs was met accordingly, as had been that of the others, by a treatment specially adapted to it. They who had trusted in the "Ephesian letters" as protecting charms, could only be weaned, it may be, from their superstition by this demonstration of a supernatural power as dwelling in one who called on them to turn from idols to serve the living and true God. Those who had sat with almost adoring wonder at the feet of an arch-magician, like Apollonius of Tyana, now saw one, who while working greater wonders, laid no stress whatever on his powers as a thaumaturgist, and relied only on the adaptation of what he taught to the reason and conscience of his hearers.[1] The cures that were wrought by handkerchiefs (the *sudaria* that wiped the perspiration), and the aprons (the *semi-*

[1] The absence of any reference to these miracles, either in St. Paul's address to the elders of Ephesus in Acts xx. or in his Epistle to that Church, is, from this point of view, singularly suggestive.

cincta or linen cloth wrapped round the loins during active labour), were to him welcome incidents of his work, but he did not care to dwell on them. Why those who sought for healing in this way chose their articles of clothing as the special media, we may understand without much difficulty, if we realise the scene implied in St. Luke's words. The Apostle is at his daily work, or he is preaching with a glowing and vehement emotion. Men gaze and listen with intense eagerness and reverence. The very drops that gather on the brow, the very moisture which exudes from his body, seem to them, as it were, impregnated with the Apostle's overflowing love. May they not carry them away as memorials and relics to those whom demoniac possession hinders from coming to the Apostle's presence? Will they not, as those who bear them off tell of his indefatigable labour and his holy zeal, kindle in the sick or frenzied souls, a new hope and strength? Was it strange that they should be the channels through which an actual objective supernatural power should flow in upon those who were subjectively fitted to receive it?

The wonder-working power thus exercised, led as one of its results to a strange rivalry. The Jewish exorcists who were accustomed to put their trust in spells and incantations and mystic names, many of which were reported to have come down from the days of Solomon, heard of the power of the name of Jesus, and thought that they would add it to their list of charms. They tried their experiment on a demoniac, wild and frenzied, like him of Gadara, and were miser-

ably baffled. With the cry of scorn "Jesus I *recognise*,[1] and Paul I know; but who are ye?" he leapt on them, and with the preternatural strength of madness tore off their clothes, and drove them from the house naked and wounded. Men were taught to utter that Name with awe; to accept it as it was proclaimed by the Apostle, as the ground of his good tidings of great joy; to see in it a Name that was above every name. And then came a scene that has hardly a parallel in the early history of Christendom. Among the converts, affected, we may well believe, by the disaster which had thus fallen on those of their own craft, were not a few of those who practised "curious arts;" the writers of Ephesian letters, the casters of horoscopes, the interpreters of dreams, the dealers in amulets and charms, the professors of necromancy and the like; and these, panic-stricken by what had happened, came to the Apostle and publicly confessed their tricks and impostures, their tampering with magic and demonology. Their past life was hateful to them, they loathed the arts by which they had gained their living. With a readiness of sacrifice, which was perhaps deliberately reproduced by the multitude of Florence at the bidding of Savonarola, they burnt their books, one after another being flung into the blazing pyre; and one who made a rough estimate of the market value of the property thus destroyed (here, again, Tyrannus may have been St. Luke's in-

[1] The Greek text gives two distinct verbs, the difference between which I have endeavoured to express where the English Version simply gives the one verb, "know."

formant), placed it at not less than "fifty thousand pieces of silver." [1]

The great *auto da fé* thus recorded was probably very closely connected with the measures taken by Demetrius and his craftsmen. Matters were beginning to look serious. There was, it would seem, a perceptible falling off in the demand for their silver shrines, the miniature models of the great Temple of Artemis. What if this were but the beginning of the end! With a prescience which, in some sense, does credit to their sagacity, they felt the necessity of checking the rising tide of new feelings and new convictions. There was a more or less distinct feeling on either side that the struggle was one for life or death. St. Paul, writing at or shortly after the Feast of Passover, declares his intention of remaining till after Pentecost (1), on account of the multiplying opportunities for carrying on his work; a "great door and effectual" was opened to him; and (2) because there were "many adversaries." He saw, we may believe, that a conflict of some kind was not far off. The periods of the year that lay between Passover and Pentecost covered the month Artemision (corresponding more or less closely with our April or May—probably with the latter), and that month was by a special decree consecrated in

[1] Taking the piece of silver as an Attic drachma (=9¾d.), we get £2,031. If we identify it with the Roman denarius, the sum is £1,770. In either case, however, the purchasing power of the sums (remembering that the denarius represents the average day's wages of unskilled labour) would be much greater than their nominal equivalent in English currency.

its entirety to the tutelary goddess of the city. From the first day to the last the month was passed in one round of festivals. Processions of youths and maidens wound their way from the city to the Temple. The theatre witnessed dramatic representations or gladiatorial games. The stadium had its races of runners or of chariots.[1] The crowd of natives and foreigners were wrought up to their highest pitch of excitement, and an appeal to their fanaticism or to their interests as connected with it was more likely to be successful then than at any other season.

It is unnecessary to repeat here what is narrated so vividly by St. Luke as to the uproar thus occasioned. We seem to see the gathering crowd and to hear the murmurs of applause with which they greeted the language of Demetrius. Failing to find the chief preacher of the new doctrine which was robbing their goddess of her magnificence, they seize on two of his companions, and drag them to the theatre, as if for trial and immediate execution. It was then, we may believe, that Aquila and Priscilla incurred that imminent risk on behalf of the Apostle's

[1] It is, at least, as natural to see in St. Paul's allusions to his being "made a spectacle" (*θεατρον*, 1 Cor. iv. 19) as one of those exhibited "last and appointed unto death" (*ἐσχατοι, ἐπιθανάτιοι*), to his running not as uncertainly, and to fighting, not "as one that beateth the air" (1 Cor. ix. 26), to the discipline and temperance which were necessary to the athlete's success (1 Cor. ix. 27)—a reference to what was actually passing round him, as to trace in it, as is usually done, a recollection of the Isthmian games. In the fighting with wild beasts at Ephesus (1 Cor. xv. 32) there is, of course, no room for doubt.

life which he records so gratefully in Rom. xvi. 4; then that, as far as man's purpose was concerned, he "fought with beasts" (1 Cor. xv. 32). His own generous impulse would have led him to face even that danger; but he was hindered first by the devoted affection of his own followers, and then by the prudence or kindness of the Asiarchs, who, it may be presumed, were present in the theatre, and warned him not to run the risk of appearing there. The excited frenzy of the crowd was likely to turn against all who were known not to worship the Gods; and the Jews, apparently in fear lest they should become the objects of the popular fury, as their brethren had but a few years before been at Alexandria, put forward one of their body, Alexander, probably the brass-founder, to separate their cause from that of the followers of Paul. The speech, perhaps the features, of the orator, betrayed his nationality, and the crowd refused to listen, and the shouts of "Great is Artemis of the Ephesians!" drowned his voice. It was time for the chief officer of the city, the town-clerk, or recorder, to see what he could do to appease the tumult, which, if it came to the emperor's ears, might bring some severe penalty on himself or on the city. In a speech, which was a model of rhetorical address, he soothed their fury by reminding them of the undisputed title of the city to be the Νεωκόρος of the great goddess and her heaven-born statue, and warned them that if they had any criminal charge against the two Macedonians whom they had seized, the proconsular court, and not the tumultuous concourse

in the theatre, was the right tribunal for deciding it.[1]

The tumult was thus appeased, and Demetrius and his followers were comforted with the thought that the "magnificence" of the goddess was duly protected by the authorities of the city. It was a singular instance of what has been well called the irony of History that the first blow struck from without at that magnificence came not from the Apostle and his disciples, but from the Roman emperor who had recently followed Claudius on the throne of the Cæsars. The rapacity of Nero, which did not spare even the Temple of Apollo at Delphi, was not likely to show more reverence for that of his sister goddess; and though Ephesus is not named, we may well believe that the general order for plunder which was executed by his satellites throughout Asia and Achaia[2] led to the spoliation of not a few of the art treasures that had been the glory of the seventh wonder of the world, and were now carried off to adorn the "golden house" which Nero had erected as the monument of his own magnificence at Rome.

With St. Paul's departure after the tumult the direct narrative of his connection with Ephesus

[1] The town-clerk speaks of "proconsuls" or "deputies," as if there were more than one. Usually, of course, there was only one proconsul, but shortly after the accession of Nero, Junius Silanus, who held that office, had been poisoned by his two procurators, Celes and Ælius, at the instigation of Agrippina, and they were now holding office together with proconsular authority till the appointment of a successor (Lewin's "St. Paul," i. p. 338).

[2] Tacitus, "Ann.," xv. 45.

ceases. Accepting, however, as most students have come to accept, the hypothesis of his two imprisonments at Rome, and of a return to the scenes of his former labours, we are able to trace some of the changes which had been brought about during his absence. Even before that return he had indeed been brought indirectly into contact with the Churches of Ephesus. When on his way from Corinth to pay what proved to be his last visit to Jerusalem, he halted at Miletus, time not allowing him to visit the city itself, and sent for the elders of the Ephesian Church to meet him there. Even then there were clouds gathering on the horizon. He saw in a future not far off the "grievous wolves" of persecution making havock of the flock, and the false teachers rising up within the Church itself to draw away disciples after them; and he and those to whom he spoke parted with many tears and sad forebodings. His own future was uncertain. He did not then intend to revisit the Church that had been committed to their care, and they sorrowed most of all for the words which he spake that they should see his face no more.

We might naturally turn to the Epistle to the Ephesians, written some four years later, from the hired lodging, in which St. Paul passed his imprisonment at Rome, for some further information as to the state of the Church of that city. As it happens, however, there is no Epistle which is so wanting in personal and local details; and the opinion adopted by not a few commentators, that the Epistle bearing this title was really encyclical in its character, the

messenger who bore it taking with him other copies for other Churches, with blanks in which the name of each was to be filled in, explains satisfactorily what else would be an exception to St. Paul's usual manner of writing.[1] All that we can infer from the Epistle is that it corresponds, in its fulness of statement and warm effusivenesss, to what we have already seen as to the special capacity of the believers at Ephesus for receiving the higher mysteries of the faith, the unity of mankind in Christ, the deep analogies which made human fatherhood the symbol of the fatherhood of God (Eph. iii. 15), and human marriage that of the union between Christ and His Church (Eph. v. 23). The words of counsel addressed to masters and slaves show that there, as elsewhere, the new society included rich and poor, and embraced all orders in its new fraternity. There is no trace of any special danger then threatening the Church, like those which in the Epistle, written at the same time to the Church of Colossæ, were so emphatically condemned, no allusion to any persecutions as having imperilled the lives or fortunes of its members. It is probable enough that, as some years before, the mad attempt of Caligula to violate the sanctity of the Temple at Jerusalem by setting up his own statue to receive divine honours in it caused a lull in the persecutions in Judæa, and favoured the growth of the Christian

[1] The words "in Ephesus" were, as is well known, omitted in very many ancient MSS. So that the opening words run—"Paul, an Apostle of Jesus Christ, by the will of God, to the saints which . . . . are . . . ."—a fact of which the hypothesis stated above forms the only adequate explanation.

community there—so now, at Ephesus and the other cities of Asia, the spoliation of the temples by Nero's agents occupied men's minds, and turned away their thoughts from the less pressing danger, as it might seem to them, of the new society, the members of which were at least free from the charge of being robbers of temples.

When St. Paul did return to Ephesus all was altered for the worse. The storm of persecution had burst, after a temporary lull, upon all the Asiatic provinces. Men were called upon to be partakers of Christ's sufferings, to endure a fiery trial, to bear reproaches for the name of Christ, to suffer because they were Christians (1 Pet. iv. 12-16). The Apostle to whom they owed their very selves found himself slighted and, as it were, forgotten: and all they that were in Asia were turned away from him (2 Tim. i. 15). The Church had fallen into disorder, and evil men and seducers (the Greek word recalls the old magic arts for which Ephesus was famous) were waxing worse and worse (2 Tim. iii. 13). False teachers were spreading their "profane and vain babblings," which were eating, like a gangrene, into its very life (2 Tim. ii. 16, 17). It was with a heavy heart and many tears that the Apostle parted, not now from the assembled elders of the Church, but from his own son in the faith, whom he left to bear his witness of the truth—to restore discipline—to set an example of courage in enduring hardness. The two Epistles to Timothy show at once his sense of the magnitude of the evils which were thus threatening the Church, and the means by which he sought to counteract

them; and with them his connection with the Church of Ephesus comes to its close.

His place was taken, after an interval of which we cannot exactly fix the length, but which, if we accept the early date assigned to the Apocalypse by many recent critics, cannot have exceeded a very few years, by one who becomes, for the remainder of the first century of the Christian Church, the foremost figure in the history of Asiatic Christendom. It would seem as if the two Apostles who had given to St. Paul the right hands of fellowship (Gal. ii. 9) looked on his work among the Gentiles with an ever-increasing interest, and when he was withdrawn from it, sought, as far as lay in their power, to supply his place,—St. Peter, by the two Epistles addressed to the Churches of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia (1 Peter i. 1),—St. John, by leaving his work in the Churches of Judæa, and coming in person to continue what had been begun by St. Paul and his fellow-labourers. It would seem, assuming, as before, the early date of the Apocalypse, that he arrived when the current of popular feeling against the new religion was setting in strongly, and became one of those who were marked out as its special objects. Smyrna was threatened with an attack which was to involve imprisonment and tribulation (Rev. ii. 10) and death. At Pergamos the faithful martyr Antipas had already sealed his testimony with his blood (Rev. ii. 13). An hour of trial was coming upon the Church of Philadelphia, as over the whole Roman world (Rev. iii. 10). There was throughout the Churches of Asia a general decay of faith and

holiness. False apostles were leading the people astray. False prophets and prophetesses were beguiling them with delusive promises (Rev. ii. 20). The Nicolaitanes were encouraging men to avoid persecution by attending heathen feasts and eating things sacrificed to idols, and so to obliterate what was the most distinctive outward badge of their profession as Christians, and to incur the inevitable risk of sinking back again into the sensual impurity of their heathen life (Rev. ii. 6, 20). The Apostle himself was banished to Patmos "for the Word of God and for the testimony of Jesus Christ" (Rev. i. 9), and from that island sent to the seven Churches the Epistles which he was directed to write as from the lips of his Divine Master. Of those Epistles we are concerned only with that addressed "to the Angel of the Church of Ephesus." If we look upon that letter as sent not to an ideal representative of the Christian community, but to an actual teacher and guide, the Bishop, in later language, of the Church, the question who he was can hardly admit of more than one answer. Timotheus had been left in charge of the Church on St. Paul's departure, and, even if he left it for a time, in compliance with the Apostle's urgent entreaty that he would come quickly and see him before the time of his departure (2 Tim. iv. 21), it was not probable that he would delay his return long after St. Paul had fallen before the sword of his Roman executioner. And there is, it may be noted, a singular correspondence between the personal character of Timotheus, as indicated in the Acts and in the Epistles addressed to him, and

the notes of strength and weakness which we find in the Angel of the Ephesian Church. Works, labour, patience, intolerance of evil, a steadfast resistance to those who claimed the name and office of Apostles that they might undo the work of his beloved Master;[1] these were there, as all that we read of the faithfulness and zeal of Timotheus in the Pastoral Epistles would lead us to expect. But as we read those Epistles it is impossible to avoid recognising an undertone of anxiety and fear lest a temperament unduly sensitive, and shrinking from perilous responsibilities, presenting the type of ascetic rather than active holiness, should prove unequal to the arduous task assigned to it. Hence the frequent counsels that he is to "let no man despise his youth;" that he should not "neglect the gift" that was in him; that he should rekindle that gift, "holding fast the form of sound words," and not being ashamed of the testimony of the Lord (1 Tim. iv. 13, 14; 2 Tim. i. 6–8, 13). He is to keep that which is committed to his trust, avoiding "the oppositions of science, falsely so called" (1 Tim. vi. 20). Is it strange, when we read such words as these, that there should mingle with the meed of praise bestowed upon the Angel of Ephesus some words of reproof, because he had "left his first love," and needed therefore to "remember from whence he had fallen, and to repent and do the first

[1] Compare the tone of indignant scorn with which St. Paul speaks of those who assumed a like character, as apostles of special dignity (οἱ ὑπερλίαν Ἀπόστολοι) in the Church of Corinth, and who were there clearly the leaders of the Judaising party (2 Cor. xi. 5, 13).

works" (Rev. ii. 4, 5)? To him, therefore, and through him to Ephesus and to the other Churches of Asia, was addressed the warning which has become part of the proverbial speech of Christendom: "Repent, and do the first works; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent" (Rev. ii. 5).

That removal was averted, we may believe, both by the renewed activity of St. Paul's true son in the faith, and by the return of the beloved disciple to the city which was to be his home, and the centre of his labours as an Apostle during the remainder of his life. All the traditions or legends of his later life, down to its close, connect themselves with Ephesus. Thence, as in the touching story which Clement of Alexandria[1] gives as "not a fable, but a true record of facts," he started on missionary journeys into the neighbouring country, and in one of them noticed among his hearers a youth of special brightness and promise, "fair to look upon and fervent in spirit," whom he commended to the care of the bishop of the district. He returned to Ephesus, and after some years was called to revisit the Church, and on asking eagerly what had happened to the young convert, heard the sad tale of his fall. He was "dead," the bishop at first answered; but the death was explained afterwards to be that of the soul, not of the body. He had been baptized, and had then been beguiled by evil companions, had fallen into lawless ways, had become the head of a company of outlawed robbers. With the fervent

[1] *Quis dives*, c. 42.

impulse which marked him still as one of the Sons of Thunder, St. John, after a few words of grave rebuke to the shepherd who had thus neglected his trust, mounted a horse and rode off in the direction of the robbers' haunt. He allowed himself to be taken prisoner by them, and was brought before their captain. He, at once recognising the Apostle, sought to flee from his presence in shame and confusion, but the earnestness of the loving teacher would not suffer him to escape. With all the urgency of zeal, he invited him to return to his first love; and the guilt-stained man was, as it were, baptized anew with tears, and was led back to the company of the faithful, and received by them as a living proof of repentance followed by pardon. At Ephesus, too, according to a statement which seems at once too strange to be a tradition, and too well-authenticated to be a legend, the beloved disciple was to be seen bearing on his brow the golden *petalon*, or plate, with "holiness to the Lord" engraved on it (Exod. xxviii. 36), which testified that he, as an Apostle of the Lord, was clothed with as true a priesthood as that which had belonged to the sons of Aaron, and of which that *petalon* had been one of the chief insignia. There too, when strange errors were spreading in the Church, denying either the true humanity or the true divinity which had been united in his Lord's person, and losing both in the haze of a science falsely so called, the old zeal of the Son of Thunder showed itself again; and finding himself in the public bath at Ephesus with Cerinthus, the chief propagandist of the Ebionite heresies, and uniting with them a coarsely sensual

view of the kingdom of Christ, that made it like the Paradise of Mahomet, he turned away with indignant horror, and rushed from the building, lest the roof should fall and crush the enemy of the truth.[1] There, in strange contrast with the burning zeal and the ideal exaltation which characterise the two previous traditions, he was to be seen in his old age finding pleasure in his leisure moments in the playfulness and fondness of a favourite quail, and defending himself, when reproved by some rigorous ascetic for what seemed an unworthy trifling, by the familiar apologue of the bow that must sometimes be unbent.[2] There, if we think of the title which is prefixed to the Apocalypse, St. John the Divine (*ὁ θεολόγος*), as having been given to him in his lifetime, we may think of those who had been accustomed to hear from the lips of the *Theologi* of Artemis what they taught as to the mysteries of nature and creation that were symbolized in her ritual, turning to the Apostle, and finding in his teaching as to the Word (*Λόγος*) that was with God in the beginning, and was God, and by Whom all things were made, a truer and more satisfying explanation of the relation between the seen and the Unseen, the temporal and the Eternal, the world and its Creator. There, as that on which we willingly dwell, as more in harmony than those earlier stories with our thoughts as to the mind and character of the beloved disciple, when limbs and brain were enfeebled by age, and the power to teach was all but

[1] Euseb., "Hist. Ecc." iii. 28; iv. 14.
[2] Cassian, "Collat." xxiv. c. 2.

gone from him, the lips of the Apostle, as he was carried into the assemblies of the faithful, were opened to repeat, with an emphatic but not wearisome iteration, the lesson which was the burden of all the teaching of his later years: "Little children, love one another."[1] There too, as we learn from the last chapter of the Gospel that bears his name, there sprang up a belief, partly resting on a confused conception of our Lord's words respecting him, "If I will that he tarry till I come"—partly on his long survival after all the other Apostles had been gathered to their rest, that he was not to die the common death of all men (John xxi. 23). Other stories that were floating about indicated the same belief as to a charmed life. He had been thrown into a caldron of boiling oil, and had escaped unhurt.[2] He had drunk of a cup of hemlock, and had not died. He had raised the dead to life. When the hour of his own departure came, he gave orders for the construction of his sepulchre, and laid himself down in the open grave and died. There were strange movements in the ground after the tomb was closed, and when it was subsequently opened it was found empty, and men fell back upon the counterpart of their old belief about him, and dreamt that he was reserved to reappear again in the last days in conflict with the personal Antichrist, whose coming he had foretold.[3] It was natural that his name should be held in honour

[1] Hieron. "Comm. in Gal." vi.

[2] Tertullian, "De Prescript." c. xxxvi.

[3] The authorities for these statements may be found in Suicer's "Thesaurus," *s. v.* Ἰωάννης.

in the city which thus cherished the memory of his death; and if we accept the current etymology of the name *Aiosolouk*, the Turkish village so called is a silent record of a church dedicated in the immediate vicinity of the Temple of Artemis to the honour of St. John *the Theologos*.[1]

When we pass to the sub-apostolic age, the Church of Ephesus has no name that commands a position of eminence like that occupied by Clement at Rome, or Ignatius at Antioch. There are, however, traces enough that men looked to St. John with special reverence, and were found to rank themselves as his disciples. There may have been the presbyter of the same name, who appears in the traditions of the second century as a mysterious "double," as it were, of the Apostle, to whom not a few of the early fathers of the Church ascribed the authorship of the Apocalypse, and of the second and third epistles ascribed to St. John in the canon of the New Testament. There the fugitive slave Onesimus may have found a home on his return to Asia, and gaining the confidence of the Church and of the Apostle been appointed as bishop of Ephesus after the death of Timotheus.[2] There we

[1] Once, and once only, in the history of the Church has that name been specially applied to any other teacher, and then it was given to St. Gregory of Nazianzus, as having contended against the Arians for the truths of which St. John had been the specially-commissioned teacher (Suicer's "Thesaurus," *s. v.* θεολόγος.

[2] When Ignatius of Antioch, on his way to Rome, writes to the Church of Ephesus, he speaks of Onesimus as its bishop. The identification with the convert who forms the subject of the Epistle to Philemon is, it need hardly be said, conjectural.

may think of the Aristion, otherwise unknown to us, whom Papias, the devout student, bishop of Hierapolis, places almost on a level with the Apostle, and of Papias himself, listening, probably in the last years of St. John's life, to what the beloved disciple had to tell him, but for the most part content to sit at the feet of the elders who survived their master, and to ask what they had heard from him, gathering up their fragments as precious records of what the Christ had said and done, and writing the first known "commentary" on the words of the Lord Jesus. There lastly, in that circle of devout disciples was Polycarp, who afterwards, as bishop of Smyrna, passed through the baptism of fire, and gained the crown of martyrdom. There, too, as following the rule which they had received from the Apostle, the Church of Ephesus continued to observe its Easter festival as the antitype of the Jewish passover, rather than as commemorating the Resurrection, and kept accordingly to the fourteenth day of the Jewish month of Nisan, on whatever day of the week it might fall, instead of adjusting its calendar so that the festival might fall always upon the day of the week on which the Lord had risen, and when summoned, *circa* A.D. 190, by Victor, bishop of Rome, to conform to the general practice of the Western Church, appealed through its bishop, Polycrates, to the high authority of the Apostle, who at the Last Supper had leant on the breast of Jesus.

The history of Ephesus would hardly be complete without some notice, however brief, of the memorable legend which connected it with the persecution of

Decius or Diocletian, and of the council held there in A.D. 431, which has received a place among the great Œcumenical Synods of the Church. There, it was said, when the emperor Decius issued his edict against the followers of the Christian faith, seven youths fled for refuge to a cave in the neighbourhood of the city with their dog. They escaped their persecutors, and fell into a profound sleep, from whence they did not wake till two centuries had passed, and then, in the reign of Theodosius, they rose from their long slumber, went into the city, gazed on the fallen magnificence of the Temple of Artemis and the churches which had risen in its place, and then, giving God thanks, lay down to rest again, and fell into the sleep of death. The grotto of the Seven Sleepers on the east of Mount Prion (or following Mr. Wood's topography, Coressus) still commemorates the legend.

The history of the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies lies outside our scope; but the fact that two councils were held there,—one (the Œcumenical Synod of A.D. 431) gaining a place of honour in the annals of Christendom by its witness to the truth of the hypostatic union of the two natures in the person of Christ, the other stamped with infamy as the Robber Synod (A.D. 449), for the violence and ferocity with which it maintained the heresy of Eutyches, may be referred to as witnessing to the ecclesiastical importance of the city in the fifth century: and with this we may well close our history of the Church of Ephesus.

It remains only to note the several stages of the

decline and fall of the Temple that had been as the world's wonder. The first blow to its greatness and splendour was dealt, as we have seen, by Nero. Trajan sent the richly-sculptured gates of the Temple as an offering to another Temple at Byzantium. The signs of its decay, perhaps also the ravages inflicted by earthquakes, were noted by the Christian seers of the time with triumphant satisfaction; and Clement of Alexandria quotes from the Sibylline Oracles verses that prophesied of its downfall.[1]

> And Ephesus shall wail along her shore,
> And seek her temple—temple found no more.

The final blow was struck by the Goths, who, under the Emperor Gallienus (A.D. 263), poured over Greece and Asia Minor, took the city of Ephesus, and burnt the Temple of Artemis. The fragments that remained probably served as a quarry for the builders of houses and churches; and when the magistrate of Ephesus presented his columns of serpentine to the church which Justinian erected at Constantinople, in honour of the divine Wisdom, they may have been offering to the new faith trophies of its victory over the old religions of the world. We know that this was the end of the sacred tripod from which oracles had been given in the shrine of the Pythian Apollo. It is a strangely suggestive thought, that that church, now dedicated as the mosque of St. Sophia (*i. e.* Holy Wisdom) to yet another worship, may have contained

[1] Clem. Alex., "Protrept.," c. 50. The date of the Sibylline verses lies between A.D. 138 and 206.

the surviving relics of the two temples of Delphi and of Ephesus.

It would seem, perhaps, natural to point to the ruined state of Ephesus as a direct fulfilment of the warning given in the Apocalypse that, unless it repented, its candlestick should be removed. The warning, however, did, for a time, the work which it was meant to do. So far as we have traced its history, there was repentance; and the flame burnt brightly, and the candlestick was not removed. When decay and desolation came, when the Turks swept over the provinces of Asia Minor, Ephesus shared the fate of many another city, and was stripped of its magnificence. But there is, after all, something arbitrary in singling it out as a special monument of the Divine wrath. The decay has, however, been singularly complete. Commerce, population, harbours, markets are all gone. Scattered ruins of stadium, and theatre, and aqueducts, and churches meet the traveller's gaze; but till within the last five years the site of the great Temple remained an undiscovered mystery. Chandler and Fellowes confessed their inability to discover a single trace of it. It was reserved for the indefatigable perseverance of the latest explorer, Mr. J. T. Wood, to dig down to the foundations of the three successive temples, and to place their position and their plan beyond the shadow of a doubt.

THE CHURCHES

OF

LYCAONIA, GALATIA, & PHRYGIA.

THE CHURCHES

OF

LYCAONIA, GALATIA, AND PHRYGIA.

THE activity of St. Paul's work as a preacher of the Gospel lay, for the most part, as the title of this series implies, in the great centres of heathen commerce and culture, of political and intellectual life. It was not, however, confined to them. Led, it may be, by the associations of earlier days of travel, before his conversion, or by that growth of a new and mysterious purpose in his soul, in which he could not recognize anything less than the guidance of God's Holy Spirit, he at times started on an enterprise of another kind, visited regions that were less densely populated, cities which, as compared with others, were of the second order, and races in whom there was but little of the civilization and intellectual refinement that were to be found at Ephesus or at Antioch, at Athens or at Corinth. Of these regions, those which are most prominent in the record of his labours were, to use St. Luke's language, "the upper coasts" (Acts xix. 1), *i.e.* the upland and inland country, the hills and the valleys, which lay far away from what in modern speech would be called the "coasts" of Asia Minor,

the provinces known as Lycaonia, Galatia, and Phrygia. Each region presented some peculiar features in the nationality or religion of its inhabitants. Each had some very interesting points of contact with the Apostle's life and labours.

I. LYCAONIA.

THERE were probably few parts of the Asiatic territory that had come less under the influences of civilization than that of Lycaonia. The range of the Taurus cut it off from the more cultivated regions of Cilicia and Pisidia. The country was for the most part a "dreary plain, bare of trees, destitute of fresh water, and with several salt lakes."[1] A population,

[1] Dean Howson, in the "Dictionary of the Bible," art. "Lycaonia." Comp. the description in Ovid:

> "Haud procul hinc stagnum, tellus habitabilis olim,
> Nunc celebres mergis, fulicisque palustribus undæ;"
>
> "Where men once dwelt, a dreary lake is seen,
> And coots and bitterns haunt the waters green."

The way in which Ovid tells the story, though it is put into the mouth of another, is just that which a poet would use who had heard the legend on the spot:—

> "Ipse locum vidi" ("Met." viii. 621).

Or again:—

> "Equidem pendentia vidi
> Serta super ramos: ponensque recentia dixi,
> Cura pii diis sunt; et qui coluere, coluntur."
>
> These eyes have seen the wreaths upon the boughs;
> These hands have paid their tributary vows;
> And in the act I said, "Ye gods are true;
> We honour these, for first they honoured you."

half shepherds and half robbers, led their flocks over the grassy steppes. The old legend (Ovid, "Metam.," i. 211), that the country took its name from the transformation of the Arcadian king Lycaon into a wolf (*Lykos* in Greek), seems to symbolise too faithfully the character of the inhabitants. They were either non-Hellenic in their origin, or they spoke a *patois* so corrupt as not to be understood by other Greeks. Their religion presented the anthropomorphic features of Greek mythology, from one point of view in their simplest, from another in their most repulsive, form. While the worship of the great cities of the empire had become a pageant of the state or a deification of the emperor, while augurs were smiling at each other as they inspected the sacrifices, while a few noble souls were finding refuge in a stoical pantheism, and the mass of younger men were driven into a fathomless scepticism, like that of Lucretius, or a dilettanti Epicureanism like that of Horace, so that

> "Esse aliquos manes et subterranea regna
> Vix pueri credunt."
>
> "Talk of our souls and realms beyond the grave,
> The very boys will laugh and say you rave,"

these peasants were ready still to believe that the gods might "come down to them in the likeness of men," and that they, as Baucis and Philemon[1] had

[1] The occurrence of the name in the Apostolic history as belonging to a native, if not of Lycaonia itself, yet of a district on its borders, is, in connection with the legend, not without a special interest. The very sound of Philemon's name must have recalled to St. Paul's mind the strange experiences of Lystra, and have shown how deeply the belief of which he had nearly been the victim had stamped itself on men's minds.

done, might receive Zeus and Hermes, Jupiter and Mercurius, under their hospitable roof. Through such a population as this, St. Paul and Barnabas took their way on their first missionary journey, leaving behind them the comparatively populous cities of Antioch in Pisidia and Iconium. They were leaving also the protection which a Roman citizen would find from Roman government, for the part of Lycaonia on which they were now entering was not part of a proconsular province, but had been assigned by Caligula to the rule of Antiochus, king of Commagene. They were leaving, lastly, the fellowship of men of their own race and creed. There is no trace of a synagogue at Lystra or at Derbe. The two devout women, Lois and Eunice, who dwelt at one or other of those cities, though themselves daughters of Abraham, had not dared to bring up the child whom they were rearing as outwardly within the covenant of Abraham. It would have shocked the feelings of the father's kindred. It would have exposed the boy to the jeers and scorn of his companions. Yet here, too, the Apostles had a Gospel to preach; and what we know as to the substance of the Gospel which they preached everywhere enables us to represent to ourselves, without the shadow of a doubt, what that Gospel must have been. They had to tell of a Son of God who had come down from heaven in the likeness of man, who had gone about doing good and healing those whose bodies were suffering from disease, or whose spirits were under the usurped dominion of unclean and evil spirits. One there was who listened, and his eyes brightened and his face glowed with a new-

born hope. Was there such a Healer, then, for him? Would he ever be able to move freely in the market-place or on the hills, as he saw others moving? And the gaze of the Apostle—that fixed, earnest, searching gaze, reading the very secrets of the heart—on which St. Luke so often dwells,[1] saw that the man had faith to be healed, that he was turning with all his heart to the great Father, and believing that He had sent His Son, and that these were the messengers whom the Son in His turn had sent. And so he spake the word, and the man cast off in a moment the infirmities of years, gave one exulting leap, and then another, and walked freely to and fro, in the joy of his newly-recovered power, among the crowd. And they, as they gazed, had drawn their own conclusions. It is obvious from the narrative that the Greek in which the Apostles delivered their message must have been more or less a foreign language to many of their hearers. Those who had listened with open ears to such a message as that which St. Paul must have preached could hardly have rushed in a moment to the belief that he and his companions were themselves incarnate deities, the two who in ages past had travelled through the country to punish the unjust and to reward the good. The fact that they uttered their belief in the speech of Lycaonia implies that they had listened as with Lycaonian ears. They had caught words here and there, had taken in fragmentary sentences, interpreted what they thus heard by their

[1] Compare the use of the Greek verb *ἀτενίζω*, Acts xiii. 9, xiv. 9 (as above), xxiii. 1. It is noticeable that this word is used only by St. Luke and by St. Paul himself.

previous beliefs. They listened to men who spoke in Greek, but they were all the while thinking, as they now spoke, in Lycaonian; and this, it is clear, the Apostles did not understand. Whatever the gift of tongues might be, it did not impart a permanent miraculous power of understanding without study the languages of the several nations of mankind. They noticed a stir and an excitement, but that was natural, perhaps even a hopeful sign that the work of conversion had begun. They went to the house where they lodged, little dreaming of what was soon to meet them there. But meantime the rumour that Zeus and Hermes had reappeared among men spread like wildfire through the city. With an infinite horror, into which we can hardly enter, such as Bishop Patteson might have felt if he had found a cannibal feast prepared in his honour in some Melanesian island, they strove by the natural symbolism of vehement gesture and impassioned action to check the consummation of what was to them so unspeakably hateful. And then, when they had so far succeeded that there was a pause and a lull in that eager and melting multitude, they were able to speak, and they spoke as before, in Greek. But their words were now few, and easy to be understood. And for us, for all preachers of the Gospel to the heathen, for all ministers of the word among the poor and those of little culture, they are, few and simple though they be, of unspeakable preciousness. As the speech at Athens showed that St. Paul could find a common standing-ground in the deepest thoughts and speculations of those who had faced and sought to solve the problem

of the universe, as the second chapter of the Epistle to the Romans shows how fully he recognised, even among the heathen, the work of the law written in men's hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, so here he recognises that they, peasants as they were, had not been left without such witness as they were capable of receiving. And the words are here in some sense more suggestive, because they were less elaborated. At Athens the Apostle had been meditating and discoursing in the Agora for days before he made his great *Apologia* on the hill of Mars. When he wrote to the Romans, he was working out, more fully and systematically than he had ever done before, his vindication of the ways of God to man. What comes from his lips now is drawn out by a sudden emergency, and therefore shows more distinctly what were the thoughts that habitually filled his mind as to the condition of the heathen world. Here, as at Athens, he is content to refer to the times of ignorance, the times past, in which God had "suffered all the nations to walk in their own ways." It was part of God's plan for the education of mankind that it should be so. Only by that terrible experience could they be taught to rise as on the "stepping-stones of their dead selves" to higher things, and feel how little they could do or know, unless the light of God was with them. And he was content also to leave the fate of individual souls in those times of ignorance to the compassion and the equity of God. He had learnt the lesson that the Judge of all the earth will assuredly do right, and that the knowledge which has been given to men is the measure of their responsi-

bilities. But his immediate work now was to lead the peasants, who were about to worship him because he had wrought a sign and wonder in the name of God, to offer worship where alone it could be rightly offered. He begins with a word that disclaimed for himself and his companion all pre-eminence of nature or of race over those to whom he spoke: "Men of like passions with yourselves," subject to like infirmities, to all the material conditions of our mortal life. Whatever power they had put forth to heal diseases, or to give strength to the crippled limbs, was not their own, but the gift of the God who had sent them for this special purpose, to call men to turn from these vanities and worship Him. He had not left men without the witness of His goodness as seen in nature; He was now bearing a like witness through the lips and the acts of men. And then, as has been shown, the language of the Apostle changes. As the words of Aratus, "We also are His offspring," rose to his lips at Athens, so here there came back upon his memory, even in that moment of agitation and distress, words which furnished a common ground on which he and those Lycaonian peasants could meet. It has been shown, with as near an approach to certainty as the case admits of, that the closing words of St. Paul's speech at Lystra are a quotation from a lyric hymn,[1] such as might be sung at harvest or at vintage.

[1] The merit of having been the first to apply the rules of metrical analysis to the Greek of Acts xiv. 17 belongs to the Rev. W. G. Humphry, B.D. See his "Commentary on the Acts," *in loc.*

Knowing as we do that the Apostle's time for travel was commonly in the summer months, it is possible that he may have heard that choral odè from the lips of the Lycaonians themselves. If so, we may see, as Dr. Newman has pointed out in a passage of great beauty,[1] a singular example of the Apostle's humility and sympathy, in the way in which he puts himself, as it were, on a level with his hearers, identifying himself with them, though they were heathens, and he was a child of Abraham. He speaks of God as filling "*our* hearts"; he dwells in a "kindly human way" over the food and the gladness which food causes, as though he himself, with all his deeper sorrows and higher joys, entered into and shared that gladness.

The verse that follows jars harshly with the love, so wide in its extent, so generous in its sympathy, which these words have manifested. A change came over the minds of the Lycaonian peasants as rapid and as great as that which came over the inhabitants of Melita, and it was a change the reverse of that. Gratitude and adoration passed into fear, and the cruelty which is begotten of fear, and we can, with hardly the shadow of a doubt, trace the process. "There came certain Jews from Antioch and Iconium." We can imagine without much difficulty how they dealt with the Apostles and their supernatural gifts. As the Scribes had called the Master of the house Beelzebub, so these did shrink from applying the same term to those of His household. Signs and wonders had been wrought, it was true, but it was not by the

[1] "Sermons on Various Occasions," p. 98.

power of God, but by the powers of evil. These renegades from Judaism had come to entrap the ignorant heathen into a new demon-worship. It was but natural that the Lycaonians should improve on the teaching. The Apostles would seem to them as sorcerers possessed with supernatural powers, which they were likely to use for evil as well as for good, malignant even where they seemed beneficent, to be got rid of somehow with the least possible delay. In the precise form of punishment adopted for this purpose we may perhaps trace the hand of the Jews from Iconium and the Pisidian Antioch, who seem, indeed, to have been the chief agents in inflicting it. "They persuaded the people, and having stoned Paul, drew him out of the city, supposing he had been dead." Never throughout his long career of dangers, and privations, and sufferings had he been brought so nigh unto death. Years afterwards, that "once was I stoned," in the story of what he had endured, stands out in solitary pre-eminence (2 Cor. xi. 25). Still further on, at the close of life, when the crown of righteousness is ready for him as the reward of actual martyrdom, he looks back on the persecutions and afflictions which came unto him at Antioch, at Iconium, at Lystra, "what persecutions I endured, but out of them all the Lord delivered me" (2 Tim. iii. 11). Nowhere was he more impressed with the truth that men must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God (Acts xiv. 22), that all they that will live godly in Christ Jesus must suffer persecution (2 Tim. iii. 12). In spite of this, however—perhaps because of it—there was a fulness and freshness of life in the infant Church of Lycaonia which rewarded the

Apostles for their labours and their sufferings. Even in that hour of extremest danger, disciples were found who were brave enough to gather round what they looked on as the corpse of the Apostle; and when he rose up stunned and bruised, they gave him shelter. From Lystra he and Barnabas went on to Derbe, and there they preached the Gospel and taught many. It is obvious that they felt a very deep interest in the converts that had been the fruit of their labours in this their first great missionary enterprise. They returned, in spite of their previous sufferings, from Derbe to Lystra, and from Lystra to Iconium, confirming the souls of the disciples, and exhorting them to continue in the faith. And here, as elsewhere, their aim was not only to convert individual souls, but to found societies. Elders were appointed, after prayer and fasting, in every city, who were to be to the new communities or synagogues of the Gentiles what the elders of the Jewish synagogues were to them. And so, having thus sown the good seed, they left it for others to water, and returned to the great mother Church of Gentile Christendom to look after their work there.

When St. Paul next came among them, it was with another fellow-worker. Silas, or Silvanus, had taken the place of Barnabas. And now, instead of coming northward from Attaleia to the Pisidian Antioch, and then eastward to Iconium, and Lystra, and Derbe, he made his way up from Cilicia, and so began with Derbe, and passed on to Lystra. It is, perhaps, allowable to think of his course as having been determined in part by personal affection for the family that consisted of Lois, and Eunice, and Timotheus,

and by the feeling that he was likely to find in the last, one who might take the place of which Mark had shown himself unworthy. What he found when he arrived, indicates at any rate not only the personal fitness of the young disciple, but the life and activity of the Lycaonian Churches. Assuming him to have been at this time resident at Derbe, the fact that he was "well reported of by the brethren that were at Lystra and Iconium" shows that he must have been already employed as a messenger between the three communities, and been conspicuous for his faithfulness and devotion. It had, perhaps, been a stumbling-block to the Jews at Iconium and Antioch (in the other two cities, as has been said, we find no traces of them) that the son of a Jewish mother was preaching Jesus of Nazareth as the Christ of Israel, without having taken on himself the sign of the covenant of Israel; and St. Paul's action in persuading him to receive that sign may therefore have been the result of past experience, as well as a calculation of future probabilities (Acts xvi. 1–3). Of the after-history of the Lycaonian Churches we know but very little. There is no record in the Acts of any subsequent visit paid to them by the Apostle; but they lay almost necessarily on the line of his last journey by the "upper coasts," the central regions of Asia Minor, on his way from Antioch to Ephesus (Acts xix. 23). Bishops of Lystra appear as attending some of the synods of the Eastern Church, and the town now identified with it by most geographers, *Bin-bir-kilisseh*, at the foot of a volcanic mountain known as the *Kara-dagh*, contains remains of several churches. The

history of Derbe is yet more obscure, and cannot be said to have been as yet traced with any certainty, but the town had a bishop, who was a suffragan of the metropolitan see of Iconium. That city, lying as it did in the border region of Lycaonia and Phrygia, became more conspicuous in its later history in connection with the Church of Christ. It was made the scene of the apocryphal acts of St. Paul and Thekla, was, as just mentioned, the chief bishopric of the region, and became conspicuous as the city of churches, many of which still remain. After the Mahometans had taken possession of the interior of Asia Minor, it grew into power and wealth as the capital of the Seljukian Sultans, and under its scarcely-altered name of *Konieh* is still a place of considerable importance.

II. GALATIA.

THE name of this province connects itself with one of the great migrations of one portion of the human family in the third and fourth centuries B.C. The older name of Keltæ as applied to that portion appears in Herod. ii. 33; iv. 49, and probably came to him through the Phocæan colony of Massilia, the modern Marseilles. In the fifth century B.C. the Romans came in contact with a powerful section of the race that had established themselves south of the Alps, and in B.C. 390 the city, which was afterwards to be the mistress of the world, passed for a time into the hands of a barbaric horde. These the Romans knew

as Galli. When their migrations turned eastward, as they did in the third century, when they poured into Macedonia and Thessaly, and the Temple of Delphi was only saved from destruction by a heroism which the legends of Greece invested with a supernatural glory, one great division pursued a separate course, crossed the Hellespont, and overran the greater part of Asia Minor. Cities were conquered and plundered, the Syrian kings were forced to make terms of peace that were not far from submission. They were wanting, however, in the element of order and organisation, which transforms a tribe into a nation, and after a time, chiefly by the superior force of Attalus I., king of Pergamus, they were confined to the district which took from them its name of Galatia. Three tribes still retained their local distinctness,—the Trocmi, the Tolistobogii, and the Tectosages, with Tavium, Pessinus, and Ancyra as their respective capitals. In this position they played a part more or less important in the internal quarrels of the Asiatic sovereigns. They were enlisted on the side of Antiochus when the battle of Magnesia decided the fate of the Syrian monarchy. A people of such a character, and occupying such a position, could not remain for any length of time disregarded by the generals of Rome. In B.C. 189, by a singular coincidence, the name of a Manlius is once again coupled with that of the Gauls, and the Galatians became subject to the great republic of the west. They were left at first, however, with a certain measure of independence, and were governed by princes of their own, who occupied much the same

position of semi-independence as the Tetrarchs and Ethnarchs of Syria, Arabia, and Judæa. Under Augustus, Galatia became a Roman province, and for political purposes included regions which were geographically and ethnologically distinct—Lycaonia, Isauria, a portion of the south-eastern district of Phrygia, and a part of Pisidia. It is evident from this history of the Celtic tribes that had given their name to the region, that its population must have included very varied elements. They had conquered the country, but they had not exterminated its old inhabitants. And these were Phrygians, with all the marked peculiarities of character and religion that had distinguished them from their first appearance in history, with wild orgiastic rites, with chants and the clash of cymbals, with a Nature-worship which found its centre in Cybele, the great mother of the gods, and, like the analogous cultus at Ephesus, had eunuch priests as its chief ministers. Of this worship Pessinus would seem to have been the centre. With these elements were mingled, more or less irregularly, bodies of Greek settlers, bringing with them their language and their culture; and when the Romans came into possession of the country, these, who had found their chief centre in Ancyra, and had raised it to such a prominence that it became the capital of the Roman province, had thrown the older inhabitants so entirely into the background that they were practically ignored, and the province became known as Gallo-Græcia. When St. Paul appeared among them, accordingly, the Galatians, in the cities at least, spoke the language of Greece, worshipped

after the ritual of the Phrygians, and retained the chief features of the old Keltic character—its vivacity, its warm impulsiveness, its quick changes of mood and passion. Here and there, even down to the time of St. Jerome, there lingered the old Keltic speech, which could be understood by those who had conversed with the Gauls who dwelt round Treves, in the upper valley of the Moselle. Into this confluence of nations yet another stream had been at least trickling for some fifty or sixty years. Then, probably, as in more recent times, Ancyra (the modern Angora) was the seat of a manufacturing industry of textile fabrics of the fine hair of the goats, for which the neighbourhood was famous, and Jews had gathered there in such numbers that Augustus gave them special immunities by an edict which was suspended in a temple erected to his honour in that city. They were allowed to practise their own customs, their tribute to the Temple was guaranteed a safe transmission to Jerusalem, they were exempted from appearing before any tribunal on the Sabbath day. Heavy penalties were imposed on any one who should steal their sacred books, either from synagogue or school.[1] As elsewhere, we may think of them as in some measure influencing the Heathen round them, making a few proselytes, winning men

[1] Josephus, "Ant.," xvi. 6, § 2. The last clause is interesting as showing the careful provision made by the Jews wherever they were settled in any numbers for the education of their children. In such a school Timotheus may have learnt to know the Holy Scriptures as a daily lesson from the earliest years of childhood (2 Tim. iii. 15).

from the foulness of idolatry. Into this region St. Paul entered on what is known as his second missionary journey, accompanied by Silas, or Silvanus, and the young Timotheus. Starting from Derbe, and travelling by Lystra and Iconium, he passed through part of Phrygia, and thence through the region of Galatia. St. Luke's narrative passes over this part of his Apostolic labours with singular brevity, probably on account of the greater interest which he felt in that which followed, in the events of which he had himself been a fellow-worker with the Apostle. The omission is, however, more than compensated for by the fulness of St. Paul's incidental allusions in his Epistle to the Churches of Galatia. He had come to them when he was suffering from some sharp attack of an excruciating disease, probably the "thorn in the flesh," on which he looked as "a messenger of Satan to buffet him," some form, it may be, of inflammation of the eyes accompanied by acute pain (2 Cor. xii. 7). The attack, brought on possibly by the fatigue and exposure of his travels, was in some way the occasion of his making a longer stay in Galatia than he had planned (Gal. iv. 13). Something there was in his heroic fortitude and gentle patience that called out their love and pity. The tale of the Crucified One, who had borne a more terrible shame and agony than his own that He might redeem men from evil, told with such a vividness that it was almost as though he had come, as Augustine did to our Saxon forefathers, with the cross blazoned on his banner,[1]—came, we must believe, with a marvel-

[1] The word which St. Paul uses, "before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth" (προεγράφη—was deline-

lous power from one who showed the power of the cross in his own life, under the most crucial of all conditions. And so it was that they did not despise the bodily presence that was weak and the speech that was contemptible (2 Cor. x. 10), as others afterwards despised them. They did not shrink in loathing from whatever was offensive and repulsive in the malady which tortured him. If they did not rush, as the Lycaonians had done, to the belief that the gods had come down to them in the likeness of men, saved, it may be, from that thought by the preliminary work of the Law which had been their schoolmaster leading them to Christ (Gal. iii. 24), they at least received him as though he had been "an angel of God." They could not have shown a more devoted love even if the Lord Jesus Himself had come among them, as He had done in the days of His flesh in the villages of Galilee. And the form in which their affection showed itself was eminently characteristic. To them, this arrival of a stranger before unknown was as the great blessing of their lives. They could not desire a higher "beatitude"[1] than to have ministered to his necessities, and to have sat at his feet listening to the glad tidings of great joy which he preached to them as from his couch of anguish. But all this, even their most devoted ministrations, did

ated or placarded) "crucified among you" (Gal. iii. 1) indicates nothing less than this, and shows that there, as afterwards at Corinth, he was determined to "know nothing but Jesus Christ and Him crucified" (1 Cor. i. 23; ii. 2).

[1] The μακαρισμός of Gal. iv. 15 can have, as Dr. Lightfoot has shown, no other meaning than this.

not fill up the measure of their desires. In words which obviously point to the special form which the sufferings of the Apostles had taken, he bears them record that, "if it had been possible," they would have plucked out (literally "*dug*" or *gouged out*) their own eyes and given them to him, if only they could thus have given him freedom from pain and clearer powers of vision. We may well imagine that no converts were dearer to the Apostle's heart or more often remembered in his prayers and thanksgivings, than those warm-hearted disciples of Galatia. And the conversion was clearly followed by its natural fruits. They hurried, in some cases, from the service which they had rendered to those which by nature are no gods (Gal. iv. 3), in others from a Judaism which was hardly less weak and beggarly. They believed and were baptized. The Apostle laid his hands upon them, and the new gift of the Spirit came upon them in its power (Gal. iii. 2, 3). They were organized into a community, or rather into local communities, with elders and deacons, and they met on the first day of the week for the "breaking of bread" and for prayer. Then also, probably, they showed the first-fruits of their new-born higher life in generous self-sacrifice for those of another race, for sufferers and poor whom they had never seen; and the "collection for the poor saints at Jerusalem" assumed among them a systematic, organised form, which made their action a pattern and model for other Churches of the Gentiles (Gal. vi. 1).

Some two or three years passed, and then the Apostle revisited his disciples. Brief as is St. Luke's

account of that journey, he uses one characteristic word which shows something of its nature and extent. When he started from captivity, it was to travel "over all the country of Galatia and Phrygia *in order*" (the same word as in Luke i. 3), "strengthening all the disciples." The word implies that no Galatian Church was left unvisited. At Pessinus, and Ancyra, and elsewhere, he came with words of counsel and "traditions" (as in 2 Thess. ii. 15; iii. 6), *i.e.* rules given orally, of discipline and order; traditions also, in all likelihood, that included a fuller narrative of the facts of the Gospel, and some, at least, of "the words of the Lord Jesus" (Acts xx. 35). His experience, however, of what had passed elsewhere, perhaps what he had seen and heard in his recent visits to Antioch and Jerusalem, taught him that dangers were not far distant. He had to use great plainness of speech, and to press on them unpalatable truths (Gal. iv. 16). The old hereditary sins of their race—sensuality, in its baser forms of drunkenness and lust, egotism, passionate irritability, vehement partizanship—began to show themselves in all their manifold variety of evil; and the Apostle had to warn them earnestly that "they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God" (Gal. v. 19–21). This plain-speaking was met even then by an ominous coldness. He was already becoming their enemy because he had told them the truth (Gal. iv. 16). There is no trace—unless, indeed, we refer the rules which he gave for the "collection of the saints" to this visit—of his looking back on this visit with any satisfaction. The ground was already left open for attack, and St. Paul's

persistent enemies were not slow to use the opportunity.

The tidings that they had used it seem to have reached him some two years later, after his work at Ephesus had come to a close, and when he was on his way to Corinth. We may, perhaps, assume either that there had come no tidings from the Galatian Churches during his stay in Ephesus, or that they had not reported anything that specially disturbed him. The whole tone of the Epistle to the Galatians is that of one who is surprised by unwelcome news.[1] He marvels that they are changing sides with such a strange rapidity (Gal. i. 6). It is as though they had fallen under some spell of fascination like those with which their Keltic or Phrygian superstitions had made them familiar (Gal. iii. 1). The Epistle partly tells us, partly lets us read between the lines, the stages of the process which had brought about this baneful result. Teachers had come who represented the schools of Judaising Pharisee-Christians, who had been defeated at the Council at Jerusalem, but who roused themselves to fresh activity afterwards, and practically treated its decrees as devoid of all authority. They claimed to be delegates from the great representatives of the Mother-Church of Jerusalem—Apostles from the Apostles, clothed with special and extraordinary authority.[2] They insinuated that he

[1] I follow Dr. Lightfoot in fixing the date of the Epistle as just before or just after the Second Epistle to the Corinthians.

[2] I take this to be the most natural interpretation of the "very chiefest of the Apostles" (οἱ ὑπερλίαν Ἀπόστολοι) of 2 Cor. xi. 5, xii. 11. It is not likely that St. Paul would have spoken

had no divine direct commission, and was now disowned by those who had once sent him forth as a preacher (Gal. i. 11, 12). They charged him with a shifty and dishonest versatility, tuning his voice according to the time, and seeking to please men rather than God (Gal. i. 10). Taking hold, we may well believe, of the concession to Jewish feeling which he had made in circumcising Timotheus, they said that he, too, when it served his purpose, was a teacher of circumcision (Gal. v. 11). They came with an affected anxious zeal and care for the Galatian converts, paying court to their prejudices and flattering their vanity, persuading them that there was no hope of salvation unless they received the seal of the covenant of Israel; and seeking in this way to gain the glory of parading them as proselytes, so that they themselves might escape persecution at the hands of the Jews, who altogether rejected the claims of Jesus of Nazareth as the Christ (Gal. v. 12). And with circumcision there came also all that circumcision involved. The Gentile converts were entangled once again in the yoke of bondage (Gal. iv. 1), and were tricked out of the liberty wherewith Christ had made them free. A religion, almost as weak and beggarly in its nature, now that it had done its typical and preparatory work, and was "decaying and waxing old, and ready to vanish away" (Heb. viii. 13), as

in this tone of indignant contempt of those who were, like himself, actually Apostles of the Lord Jesus, or that he, who spoke of himself as "not meet to be called an Apostle" (1 Cor. xv. 9), would have thus boastingly challenged a comparison of their labours with his own.

their old heathenism, was thrust on them as the true Gospel of salvation, in opposition to that which they had received from their spiritual father in the faith (Gal. i. 6, 7). They began, with a superstitious scrupulousness, to "observe days, and months, and times, and years,"—*i.e.*, probably Sabbaths, and New Moons, and the five great feasts of the Jewish Calendar, and the great fast of the Day of Atonement, and the Sabbatical year (Gal. iv. 10). It is probable enough that they, like men of the same stamp at Corinth, like the later Judaisers who gave vent to their embittered antagonism in the Clementine Homilies, spoke of him as the "enemy" of the Church of Jerusalem and its Apostles, and that there is a reference to that opprobrious term in the pathetic words in which the Apostle asks whether he has indeed become the "enemy" of those who once loved him with so warm an affection, because he had had the courage to speak the truth to them (Gal. iv. 16). If they went on, as they or their fellows did at Corinth, to sneer at his personal defects—the "bodily presence weak and the speech contemptible" (2 Cor. x. 10)—we can enter into the half-tender, half-indignant expostulation with which he reminds them that they had once received him, when all those infirmities were aggravated by the pressure of disease, with a loyal and loving affection (Gal. iv. 15).

No one Epistle—not even the second Epistle to the Corinthians—bears the traces of personal agitation and a conflict of emotions more visibly than that which came from the Apostle's hand when he heard of the mischief that had been thus wrought. There are no

traces, it may be noted, of any direct communication from the Churches of Galatia. They had not even condescended to write to him, or they were ashamed to open a communication, when they knew that it would rouse indignation, or at least cause distress. It was left to the Apostle to learn what had passed, through some chance informants, probably (if we accept the date of the Epistle given above) in connection with the action of the emissaries of the Judaising party in the Church of Corinth. And when he heard it, his spirit is stirred within him. According to what is at least a tenable view of the meaning of Gal. vi. 11, his letter was not, as usual, dictated to an amanuensis (possibly, as the absence of any name coupled with his own in the opening words suggests, no one was with him to act in that character), but with his own hand throughout[1] (Gal. vi. 11). After an opening exhortation, in which we may trace the wish to assert, without a moment's delay, at once his personal authority and independence ("An apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father"), and the central truth of the Gospel which he preached, that Christ "gave himself for our sins that He might deliver us from this present evil world"

[1] The Authorized Version of πηλίκοις γράμμασι ἔγραψα ("how large a letter I have written") is now commonly and rightly abandoned, and the only question at issue is whether the words indicate, as, looking to the usual force of the epistolary aorist, they well may do, that it was at this point that the Apostle took up the pen and wrote the concluding verses of the Epistle, or whether the whole of it is referred to as an autograph letter, and therefore as an exception to his usual practice. On the whole, the latter view seems to me the most probable.

(Gal. i. 1-4), he passes, not, as was his wont, to language of praise and thanksgiving for any gifts and graces of which those to whom he writes had given proof, but to words of indignation and wonder that they were transferring themselves so rapidly from Him who had called them into the grace of Christ, unto "another Gospel which was not another," so different in its nature that it had no right to be called by the same name. In language which reminds us of the close of the nearly contemporary Epistles to the Corinthians he pronounces a redoubled "anathema" on those who had so shown their embittered antagonism to the truth of Christ (Comp. Gal. i. 8, 9, with 1 Cor. xvi. 12), and then enters, reluctantly but fearlessly, on his unwelcome task of self-justification. The whole history of his life was a confutation of the slanderous assertions of his opponents. His early career would have made him a doctor of the law, like his master Gamaliel, not the preacher of the Gospel of Christ. And that Gospel had been made known to him, in the first instance, by no human lips, but by the revelation of Christ in him, in the inmost depths of his spiritual being. But after that revelation he had maintained his independence. He had worked at first on his own account, and then his work had been acknowledged by Peter and by James. Then came a long interval, during which he was unknown by face to the Churches of Judæa, and at the end of fourteen years he went up again, and still maintained his position. Unwilling to shock the feelings of the great multitude of devout Pharisees who believed, he had disclosed the whole width of his doctrine that a man,

whether Jew or Gentile, is justified by faith only, that "circumcision availeth nothing nor uncircumcision, but a new creature" to the few who, like Peter, James, and John, were able to receive it, and to no others. They had recognised, frankly and cordially, his character as an Apostle; but they had added nothing to his knowledge or convictions. To the Judaising party, whom they endeavoured to keep in check, he had offered a strenuous opposition, and had resisted successfully their efforts to compel Titus, who accompanied him, so to speak, as a chosen sample of the converts that he had made from heathenism, to receive the badge of circumcision. And so the result was that James, Cephas, and John gave to him, as to Barnabas, the right hand of fellowship, accepted freely the principle of a division of labour, these going to the Heathen, and those to the Circumcision, and stipulated only that they should remember in the future, as they had done in the past, the poor whom the distress that had been caused by the famine exposed to peculiar hardships.[1] Later on in the march of events, when the Judaising party had renewed their aggressive policy at Antioch, and Peter and even Barnabas were swept on with the current,

[1] On the assumption that Gal. ii. 1–10 refers to the visit of Acts xv. 1–30, there is a very real difficulty in the absence of any reference to the decrees of the Council at Jerusalem, which had so direct a bearing on the questions at issue between St. Paul and his opponents. This has led Lewin ("St. Paul," i. p. 343) to the conclusion that St. Paul speaks here of a different and earlier visit, that of Acts xi. 30. On the other hand, there is an equal absence of any reference to the decree of the Council where we might have looked even more confidently for it.

and were practically drawing back from the great charter of the Church's freedom, he, Paul, single-handed, had stood up to rebuke Peter publicly, and had made himself the mouthpiece of the indignant condemnation which had been secretly passed on his conduct by the Gentile converts, who felt that they were being robbed, stealthily but surely, of their right to full communion with the Church of Christ. Peter had, by his momentary weakness, placed himself in the false position of requiring from them, Gentiles as they were, a more rigorous Judaism than he observed himself.[1]

Into the more strictly doctrinal part of the Epistle we need not now enter. It has the interest of being the outline of the great argument which was afterwards developed in the Epistle to the Romans. It grasps with a greater precision than had been attained before, the thought of the history of Israel as a process of gradual education, preparing the way for the higher teaching of the Christ, and so leads on to the wider thought of a like education as traceable in the history of mankind. It recognises that that process might include a period, such as that of the Law of Moses had been in relation to the covenant of Abraham, of apparent or real retrogression. It presses home the analogy, which every Greek would understand, of the boy who is under guardians (this expresses the meaning of the Greek word better than "tutors") and governors until the time appointed of the father (Gal. iv. 1). Israel had passed through such a boyhood, and the law had been, not the

[1] See p. 59.

"schoolmaster," but, as it were, the "usher" (Gal. iii. 24), the slave who conducted the boy to school, kept him from playing truant, and checked each unruly and reckless act by strict rule and discipline. Earnest warnings, pathetic appeals to the memories of past emotions, arguments more or less *ad hominem*, other arguments, going to the very roof of the whole matter, follow each other in quick succession. At last he winds up and dismisses the controversy, as far as any personal element in it was concerned, in one bold and startling wish, Luther-like in its force and its audacity. In our Authorized Version, indeed, there is not much to startle us: "I would they were even cut off that trouble you" (Gal. v. 12); and most English readers rest in the belief that St. Paul was simply expressing a natural wish for the excommunication of the Judaising teachers. There is, however, something like a *consensus* among most recent commentators in favour of a very different meaning. The Apostle's argument had been, as in Gal. iv. 8, 9, that in submitting to those teachers, and accepting as a condition of salvation a religious system that had done its work, and was now decaying and waxing old, the Galatians were practically relapsing into a state that was little, if at all, better than their former heathenism. And this he emphasises by a pointed reference to that cultus which had been most prominent in the religion of the Galatians—the worship of Cybele as the great Nature-goddess. The priests who were consecrated to her service were, like those of Artemis, set apart by self-mutilation for a life of perpetual and compulsory celibacy. Circumcision, from the new standpoint of the liberty

wherewith Christ had made men free, was, the Apostle implies, an ordinance standing on the same level as that mutilation, and his wish is that those who were urging it on men as an indispensable condition of personal salvation and of fellowship with the Church of Christ, would go one step further, and place themselves actually as they had already done, virtually and in spirit, on a level with those priests of Cybele, who with beardless faces offered sacrifice in the temple at Pessinus which was hallowed as near the burial-place of Atys, who was worshipped as the great archetypal instance of that mutilation.

Yet one more bold and vehement utterance, when the whole argument of the Epistle, and its personal counsels and warnings had been brought to their conclusion, calls for notice. "From henceforth" (so the Apostle closes his letter), "let no man trouble me, for I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus" (Gal. vi. 17). Those Galatians knew, partly it may be through the slave-trade, which was actively carried on through all the more barbarous provinces of Asia Minor (Comp. 1 Tim. i. 10), that when a man was bought as a slave, the purchaser marked him as his property by branding him with name, or initials, or other badge, on back or shoulder. What St. Paul reminded them of in these startling words was, that he, too, had been purchased as a slave. Christ had bought him with His own precious blood, and had marked him as His own by the sufferings which were, in their measure and degree, after the pattern of his Master's. The "marks of the Lord Jesus" were the manifold tokens of those sufferings in his flesh, which

nothing could efface, the scars of the scourge and of the rod and the stonings, the mysterious "thorn in the flesh" (2 Cor. xii. 7), all the manifold forms of his "dying daily," these marked him out from other men as the servant, the slave, of Christ. To his own Master, therefore, he would stand or fall, and all the "troubles" that might fall on him from those who were seeking to impose on him and others another yoke of bondage, would henceforth be to him as nothing.

It would have been interesting to hear the effect of such an epistle as this on the excitable, emotional people to whom it was addressed. Was the tide of Judaism stopped by a reaction in favour of the Pauline Gospel? Did they go back to the fervour of their first love? Or did the strong words of the Apostle move anger and resentment? We involuntarily ask such questions, but there are no materials for the answers. Once, and once only, does the name of Galatia occur again in the writings of St. Paul, and there is nothing to supplement that lack of information in the traditions of the Apostolic Church. Even that solitary passage, "Crescens (is departed) to Galatia" (2 Tim. iv. 10) is open to the doubt whether St. Paul speaks of the Gaul of Europe or of Asia. On the latter assumption, which, looking to the uniform use of the term "Galatia" in the New Testament, seems the most probable, we may perhaps infer that communication had been reopened with the churches of that region, and that Crescens was the bearer either of verbal messages or of a lost letter. If this were so, then we have, at least, some evidence that he at least had not forgotten them; that to the

very close of his life they were remembered in his thoughts and prayers; that when he was ready to be offered, and the time of his departure was at hand, he sought to keep them steadfast in the faith. The tradition that Crescens had been one of the seventy disciples of Luke x. 1, that he preached the Gospel in Galatia, or that he founded the Church of Vienne in Gaul, have no historical value, and are probably nothing more than conjectures built upon this occurrence of his name. There is, however, one other passage in the later writings of the New Testament which gives some ground for a favourable view of the effect of the Epistle. The two letters of St. Peter were addressed, among others, to the "strangers scattered abroad" (more accurately to the "sojourners of the dispersion"), to the Hellenistic Jews in Galatia, as well as to those in Pontus, Cappadocia, Asia, and Phrygia (1 Pet. i. 1); and they may therefore fairly be looked on as throwing light on the state of the Churches of that region. And, so far as they go, the result is generally satisfactory. There is no trace of the controversy with the Judaisers. It seems, as far as they are concerned, to have died out. They hear from the Apostle whose name had been set up as that of the antagonist of St. Paul, whom that teacher had openly rebuked, a doctrine which in all its manifold phases and phrases is essentially Pauline, a Gospel as wide and free as that of the Apostle of the Gentiles. They learn from him that, instead of being an "enemy," St. Paul is his "beloved brother" (2 Pet. iii. 15); and, to make the union of heart and mind yet more manifest, the bearer of the letter is none other

than the Silas, or Silvanus (1 Pet. v. 12), who had been St. Paul's companion when he first sojourned among them, whose faith had never faltered, and who found himself able to co-operate as fully with the Apostle of the Circumcision as he had done before with the Apostle of the Gentiles. Momentary as the glimpse is, and faint as are the lines of the picture which it presents to us, it is pleasant to think of the Galatian Churches as witnessing union where there had been division, and established in the faith by the joint teaching of the two Apostles who were so soon to seal the labours of many years by the sacrifice of their lives. If there are traces which cannot be ignored that the rival parties which made use of their names continued their warfare against each other to the close of the Apostolic age, the assumption that the antagonism extended to the Apostles themselves must be classed among the discoveries of the school of criticism which reads "between the lines" of the New Testament records what it certainly cannot find in them.

III. PHRYGIA.

THE labours of St. Paul in Phrygia may be considered as including either (1) the province so named ethnologically, or (2) that which was at the time recognised by that name politically. Looking to the general accuracy shown by St. Luke in his use of political and geographical terms, it is probable that where he speaks of Phrygia he uses it in the latter sense;

and so taking it, we have a record of the Apostle's first visit in that region in Acts xvi. 1: "When they had gone throughout Phrygia and the region of Galatia." Assuming, as is likely, that he and his companions followed the line of the Roman roads, we must think of them as travelling from Derbe to Iconium, and thence probably to Antioch in Pisidia, thence across the central region of Phrygia to Pessinus, the westernmost of the three great cities of Galatia, a reference to the special cultus of which we have already traced in Gal. v. 12.[1] Thence they must have struck westward again through Phrygia, through Abassus, Docimeum, and Conni, cities of no great importance, and then, checked by the inward guidance in which they recognised the teaching of the Spirit, instead of taking the road to the south-west that led to Sardis and Smyrna, in the proconsular province of Asia, they went straight on into Mysia. Again, it was apparently a matter of question and debate what course they should take. Bithynia, with its populous cities, offered doubtless then, as it did afterwards in the days of Trajan, promising opportunities, and, but for the unspoken oracles of the Divine voice within them, Churches that afterwards became so memorable in the history of Christendom as Nicæa and Nicomedia might have boasted of having been founded by the great Apostle. As it was, they were led on to Troas; they looked out for the first time across the waters of the Ægean Sea to the shores of Europe, and were called by that vision of a man of Macedonia to a wider work.

[1] See p. 168.

The next glimpse which we get of the Apostle's work in Phrygia is connected with the journey already noticed in our account of his labours in Galatia. In this case he probably followed nearly the same route as before, save that his steps were not now turned away from the narrower Asia of which Ephesus was the capital. The existence of numerous and organised Churches is implied in the statement that, as he journeyed, he "strengthened all the disciples" (Acts xviii. 23). Beyond this there is no mention of Phrygia in the New Testament, and we must be content to leave the tale of St. Paul's labours there untold. What we know of the Phrygian character, its worship of Cybele, its wild orgiastic ritual, with its chants and timbrels and dances, lead us to think of it as presenting many features analogous to those which we have found in the Churches of Galatia, and it probably passed through the same vicissitudes.

The main interest of St. Paul's labours in this region, however, turns upon his influence, direct or indirect, over cities which were politically within the boundaries of Asia, and not of those of Phrygia—over what will henceforth, after Dr. Lightfoot's masterly and exhaustive treatment of their history,[1] be known as the "Churches of the Lycus"; the Christian communities of Colossæ and Laodicea and Hierapolis, in the valley through which the river of that name flows to its junction with the Mæander. Beautiful as the scenery of that region is, with its rocks encrusted in strange fantastic forms with the calcareous deposit which the river leaves in its course; rich as

[1] Introduction to the Epistle to the Colossians.

were its pastures, flourishing as were its cities, we must not now linger on its outward features. Nor can we indeed, strictly speaking, point to any one of the cities of that valley as one of the "centres" of St. Paul's work. The natural and, on every ground, most probable interpretation of Col. ii. 1, classes the three Churches together as among those that had not "seen his face in the flesh." And yet it is impossible to read the Epistle from which these words are quoted without feeling that those Churches were as dear to the Apostle's heart as if he had actually both planted and watered there as he had done more or less completely at Corinth and at Ephesus. The "conflict" of which he speaks implies at once anxiety and prayer. He knows some at least of those who are most prominent in the Church of Colossæ, Philemon, and Apphia, and Archippus (Col. iv. 17 ; Philem. 1). He knows something of Nymphas and other brethren of the Church of Laodicea (Col. iv. 15). And those who had been with him at Ephesus or were with him at Rome when he was writing, also knew them ;—Tychicus and Aristarchus, and Marcus, and Jesus, called Justus, and Epaphras (himself a Colossian), and Luke and Demas (Col. iv. 7–15). Their interest extends, like his own, to the other Churches of the Lycus, Laodicea, and Hierapolis. He writes an Epistle, unhappily lost to us, to Laodicea as well as to Colossæ. It is not difficult, bearing these facts in mind, to read between the lines in the short condensed account which St. Luke gives of the Apostle's labours as an Evangelist during the two years and a half of his residence at Ephesus.—"All they which

dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks" (Acts xix. 10). The complaint of Demetrius, though probably indulging in a natural exaggeration, is hardly less significant: "Not alone at Ephesus, but almost throughout all Asia, this Paul hath persuaded and turned away much people, saying that they be no gods which are made with hands" (Acts xix. 26). Ephesus had been the centre, as it were, in modern phraseology, of a great missionary society, a college *de Propagandâ Fide*, which had sent forth its preachers in all directions under the Apostle's guidance, and had succeeded, not only in making here and there a few individual converts, but in establishing organized Christian communities. Some names among his friends and companions occur to one as likely to have been active in this work. Tychicus and Trophimus, Aristarchus and Gaius, Titus and Timotheus, possibly Demas and Epaphras, Tyrannus and Erastus. These have, however, no special links connecting them with the Churches of the Lycus, and I venture to reproduce here briefly a series of coincidences to which I have called attention elsewhere,[1] as offering a direct connection, and pointing in all probability to the true founders of the Christian societies of Colossæ, and Laodicea, and Hierapolis. It scarcely admits of a doubt (1) that St. Paul was personally acquainted with Philemon, of the first of these Churches, with Apphia, who was probably his wife, and with Archippus, who was probably his son. Of these, the first owed "his own self" to the Apostle,

[1] See a paper on "St. Paul as a Man of Business," in the "Expositor," vol. i. p. 259.

i. e. had been converted by him to the higher life in Christ, and the third had received a ministry of some kind, possibly the office of an evangelist or deacon (Col. iv. 17). But if he himself had not visited those cities, they must have met elsewhere, and there must have been time not only for the work of conversion, which might, of course, have been accomplished by a single discourse or interview, but for the familiar friendship which shows itself in the Apostle's affectionate memories of their old intercourse, and yet more in the playfulness, passing even into touches of quaint humour and *jeux de mots*, which give to the Epistle of Philemon such an exceptional character. I find a probable explanation of this intimacy in one of the sportive touches of which I have just spoken. When St. Paul is urging on his friend the duty of receiving the runaway slave, Philemon, in the temper of Christ-like forgiveness, he does so in words, the full significance of which has, I believe, been commonly overlooked: "If thou count me therefore *a partner*, receive him as myself" (verse 17). The term has been commonly explained as if it meant only, as it does in 2 Cor. viii. 13, a "partner" in the grace of Christ, a fellow-worker in the Gospel. It admits, however, as the use of the same word in Luke v. 7, 10, shows, of another explanation. The two men may have been partners in the outward work of their lives. At Corinth, we know, St. Paul entered into such a partnership with Aquila and Priscilla (Acts xviii. 3), and it is in the nature of things probable that he resumed it on his arrival at Ephesus. But the character of the

work they carried on together admitted, it is clear, of other fellow-labourers, and the assumption that Philemon joined them during a temporary sojourn at Ephesus supplies an explanation both of the term which St. Paul uses and of his relation to his Colossian convert. The words that follow go far to confirm this view: "If he hath wronged thee, or oweth thee ought, put that on mine account"; or, as we might say in more modern phrase, "*debit* my account with that." And then, as if either actually giving what one might call a promissory note, or playing, in the tone which runs through the Epistle, with their old business relations, he writes out, in more formal style, perhaps taking the pen from the hand of his amanuensis, what made his engagement binding by an autograph signature, "I, Paul, have written it" (better, perhaps, giving the epistolary aorist its proper force, "I write it").—"I will repay it." So far as they still had any outstanding accounts, or even if they had none, that debt was what the Apostle pledged himself to discharge.

We can understand, accordingly, with what interest St. Paul would welcome any further tidings from the Churches that had been founded by so dear a friend. Those tidings would reach him by two distinct channels. First, there was the runaway slave Onesimus, whose return to his master, at St. Paul's bidding, was the occasion of the Epistle to Philemon. He would hear from him what concerned the man and his household; how his house had become, like that of Aquila and Priscilla at Ephesus (1 Cor. xvi. 19), one of the meeting-places of the Christian society; how

he had shown his love and faith by an open-handed, liberal hospitality; how many, travellers and others, owed to him what was a real refreshment of their spirits in the weary labours of their lives (Philem. verses 1–7). But it was scarcely probable that the slave, who was not converted till he came under St. Paul's influence at Rome, and derived his new life from him, should be able to report much of the wider life of the Church of Colossæ, of the graces and gifts which had been bestowed on it, of the perils to which it was exposed. That information came from Epaphras, or Epaphroditus,[1] who was "one of them," and of whom St. Paul speaks in language which suggests the thought that he, more than any other, had been the Evangelist and Apostle of the Churches of the Lycus. For them he laboured fervently, aiming at nothing less than their completeness. Colossæ, and Laodicea, and Hierapolis had a high place in his warm and jealous affections (Col. iv. 12, 13). He had come, as being for them a faithful minister of Christ, and had reported their "love in the spirit," their "order," and the "steadfastness of

[1] The presence of an Epaphroditus at Rome at or about the same time (Phil. ii. 25; iv. 18) has led some to suppose that the same messenger had brought tidings both from Philippi and Colossæ. The difference between the two names, St. Paul's use of the full form in the one case, and the shortened form in the other, is against this view. The name, which had been adopted by Sylla to claim for himself the character of being the favourite of Aphrodite in her character of Fortune, had afterwards been widely adopted by his freedmen, and was, indeed, so common at this time, that its mere recurrence, as in the present instance, affords a very precarious ground for the assumption of identity.

their faith in Christ" (Col. i. 7, 8; ii. 5). But he had reported also the presence of an element of danger hardly less formidable than that which St. Paul had encountered in Galatia. Judaisers were at work there, insisting on the observance of "days, and months, and times, and years," or, as the Apostle, in this instance, states with greater precision, of "a holy-day, of the new moon, of the sabbath" (Col. ii. 16). In this case, however, there was more than the simple Pharisaic type of Christo-Judaism that had shown itself among the Churches of Galatia. An unreal and exaggerated "humility," showing itself in absolute submission to the will of a director or ruler, like that which has, in modern times, been the special characteristic of the Society of the Jesuits, an elaborate "worshipping of angels," based upon speculations as to their order and their powers, like those which afterwards gained a place in the teaching of the Church through the writings that claimed to come from Dionysius the Areopagite, and which had no basis but the wild imaginations of those who "rushed in where angels feared to tread" (the familiar words come in with a strange aptness), or the visions which the man had only seen in the dreams of a fevered fancy.[1] There was the false elevation of which St. Paul was always the firm and resolute opponent; and in these pretenders to a higher spiritual knowledge he saw only those who were puffed up (comp. 1 Cor. viii. 1) by a mind which was not spiritual but fleshly. It is as

[1] The better MSS. present, some of them, the reading "*which he hath seen*," instead of the received text, "which he hath not seen."

though he encountered here something like the strange fantastic thoughts as to the unseen world which we have learnt to connect with modern spiritualism. And so those whom they brought into subjection to the iron rule of their imperious will were robbed of the liberty wherewith Christ had made them free, and of the manliness and independence which are its necessary conditions.[1] They were subjected once more to ordinances,—were, to use St. Paul's own word, half middle and half passive in its meaning, "dogmatized" with the worst form of dogmatism. Every action of life, every article of food, had its fixed and unbending rubric. Rules like "touch not, taste not, handle not," haunted them at every step. The first, in its euphemistic use of a common word (comp. 1 Cor. vii. 1), enjoined absolute celibacy, and probably, as in the rules of many monastic orders, forbade social intercourse or communication of any kind with women. The second went beyond the Mosaic distinction of clean and unclean meats, and imposed a pledge of total abstinence from wine and other luxuries as an indispensable condition of the higher life. The last introduced a developed theory of defilements, like that of the Talmud, compared with which the Levitical code, in itself burdensome enough, a yoke that common men had found it hard to bear (comp. Acts xv. 10), was light and easy. Men's lives were made miserable by a panic dread, like that which haunts the Brahmin, of

[1] The English version of Col. ii. 18 is here misleading, and attaches "voluntary" to the wrong word. The real structure of the sentence is, "Let no man, at his will" (literally "willing it") "rob you of your prize by humility."

forfeiting their caste, failing to attain or keep their spiritual elevation, through some purely accidental contact that did not necessarily involve any act of the will, and therefore brought with it no moral responsibility. And with this there was what the Apostle describes by an expressive word, apparently coined for the purpose, as "will-worship," a complicated ritual, *i.e.* resting not on any Divine sanction, nor on the conscientious practice of other Churches, nor on its fitness as the natural expression of devout emotions, but simply on the "will" of the dreamer, who, himself half mad, had gained what has been called the power of the insane over the idiots, and was exercising his usurped dominion over the weaker wills of his disciples. Lastly, in addition to the exaggerated humility on which St. Paul dwells again, there was a reckless mortification of the body, a disregard of the natural conditions of its healthy action, prolonged fasts, and protracted vigils. On these the Apostle pronounces a sentence which has been confirmed abundantly, except for those who learn nothing by the teachings of experience, and forget nothing of the superstitions of the past, by the experience of religious orders in every age and country of Christendom. They have, he says, a show or repute of wisdom; they offer the semblance of a life raised high above the level of the average Christian, but they are held in no real honour, are, *i.e.* of no value, as a remedy for that "fulness of the flesh" for which they are offered as the only sure specific.[1] The Apostle had learnt by a wide range of

[1] I give this, with hardly a shadow of hesitation, as the true meaning of a difficult passage, which the Authorized Version,

observation, possibly by a personal experience, that the rigour of an extreme asceticism "o'erleaps itself, and falls o' the other side"; and that the one true remedy for a self-indulgent, voluptuous life was to be found in "holding the head" (Col. ii. 19) in fellowship with the divine life of Him who is the true Head of every man, and who can transform those who so cleave to Him into the likeness of Himself.

It has now become an accepted result of criticism, in the judgment of interpreters of very different schools, that the special form of Judaising influence which is traceable in these phenomena is that of which the Essenes of Palestine, chiefly by the shores of the Dead Sea, or the kindred Therapeutæ of Lower Egypt, were the representatives. The latter name indicates clearly enough the end at which they aimed. They were to be *healers* of the diseases of their own souls and of those of others, and for this purpose prescribed a complete course of what may be fitly called spiritual as well as bodily dietetics. One of the most probable etymologies of Essenes, as from a Hebrew verb, "to heal," gives a corresponding meaning for that word; and in the absence of any decisive evidence for any of the other fourteen derivations, the very fact of its

"not in any honour to the satisfying of the flesh," leaves in impenetrable obscurity. The word mistranslated "satisfying" (πλησμονή) is probably one of the medical terms which St. Paul learnt from St. Luke, and denotes what we call "fulness" of temperament, the sanguine, sensual nature, which tempts men to sin. The word "honour," used as it is here used, belongs to the same vocabulary.

embodying the same thought as *Therapeutæ* is to some extent an argument in its favour.[1] If we assume this as probable, it is clear that it gives a special force to the use of a medical terminology in the passage which has just been explained. It is possible, however, that the name may have had a local association, which, even if the coincidence was purely accidental, would tend to promote the acceptance of the Essene system of asceticism. One class of the priests of the great Temple of Artemis at Ephesus bore the name of Essenes, and thus the word had become familiar to the men of Asia and of the portion of Phrygia that had been incorporated with it, as the type of a consecrated purity. Nearly all the features which Jewish writers ascribe to the Essenes agree with those which are sketched for us in the Epistle to the Colossians. They passed through four distinct stages of progress towards perfection, those who were in any of the higher grades holding contact with those in the lower to be a defilement which they were bound to avoid;[2] and this obviously implies an organization resting either on the "will" of the "general" of the order, or on the chosen few who

[1] See Dr. Lightfoot's elaborate *Excursus* on the Essenes, in his "Commentary on Colossians." He pronounces, indeed, against this derivation, on the ground that usage was against assigning the meaning of "healer," even to the Greek *Therapeutes*. He quotes, however, the passage in which Philo gives that as the reason why the name had been adopted, and what an Alexandrian scholar of Philo's culture could thus adopt could hardly have been at variance (even assuming some philological inaccuracy) with an inflexible usage.

[2] Josephus, "Wars," ii. 8.

constituted the oligarchy of the highest class. They bathed in cold water night and day, partly to cleanse themselves from pollution, partly as a help to overcoming sensual temptations; and ate nothing but vegetables cooked in the simplest form, and drank nothing but water.[1] They were stricter than any other Jews in their observance of the Sabbath, and acted on the letter of the command given in Deut. xxiii. 12, washing themselves from head to foot on each occasion. One large section of them held aloof from marriage in the temper of a scornful misogamy, contenting themselves with adopting the children of others, and bringing them up as members of their community. They despised riches and pleasures, and wore their garments and their shoes till they were in holes. They worshipped God at sunrise, and went to their daily labours, and returned to the simplest meal in the refectory of their monastery. They laid claim to the gift of prophetic visions, and made a mystery of the names of the angels which were communicated to the disciple on his initiation under a solemn oath of secrecy. They studied the writings of the ancients, with a special view to healing the diseases both of soul and body, and sought after such roots and medicinal flowers as might cure those distempers.[2] They kept their proselytes under a discipline by the threat of excommunication, which excluded him from all fellowship with the Order, and left him either to starvation or to a life made miserable by the feeling that every morsel that he took

[1] Josephus, "Life," i. 4.

[2] Ib. "Wars," ii. 8.

for his support brought with it an ineffaceable pollution.[1]

It is not an over-bold speculation to imagine that the Phrygian temperament of the dwellers in the valley of the Lycus presented a favourable soil for the growth of these ascetic tendencies. They had always been given to an ecstatic *cultus*. The priests of Artemis and Cybele presented the pattern of a life of enforced celibacy; and the fact that they were already familiar with the name Essene in that connection, as stated above, whatever might be its meaning as so used,[2] would be sure to tell upon their excitable and superstitious nature. The points of apparent similarity between the Essenes and the disciples of Jesus, such as have led not a few modern thinkers of reputation to adopt the bold and baseless theory that the two societies were identical, would give them a hold on those who had risen, through the preaching of St. Paul's disciples, out of the lower forms of Judaism or heathenism. And this may in part, at least,

[1] Josephus, "Wars," ii. 8.

[2] One conjectural derivation makes the Ephesian "Essene" mean "bee," the "*king*" bee, according to the older view of what we call the "queen." The word is used by Callimachus ("Hymn to Jupiter," 60) for Zeus as king of the gods. So the priestesses of Artemis, and Demeter, and Apollo were known as "Melissæ," or bees. In both cases, the name seems to have implied two distinct ideas: (1) that of a sexless purity, which typified the life of chastity; (2) that of the organised industry of a community like that of the historical Essenes of Palestine. The latter idea finds a curious parallel in the statutes of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, which are throughout an elaborate parable, in which the College is a hive, and the fellows and scholars the bees, subject to their king.

account for the fact that the Apostle's efforts to counteract these tendencies were not altogether successful. The repeated warnings against the worship of angels in the Apocalypse (Rev. xix. 10; xxii. 9) show that it was necessary to guard against its extension among the Churches of which Laodicea was one. Theodoret states that in his time (*circ.* A.D. 430) the tendency was still at work in Phrygia and Pisidia. Oratories were found in them, and the countries that bordered on them (this seems intended to include the Churches of the Lycus), dedicated to Michael the archangel; and the Council of Laodicea (A.D. 360) had to condemn those who forsook the Church of God and *called upon angels*, and held forbidden assemblies (Can. 35). A church dedicated to St. Michael, as having preserved the city when an inundation of the Lycus threatened its safety, is still a prominent object.[1] Nor were the other features of the old error absent. The Council had even then to check the tendency to Judaize, which showed itself in observing the Sabbath strictly as a day of rest, instead of the Lord's day (Can. 29), and in sharing in Jewish Passovers (Can. 38), while the working of the old visionary ecstatic leaven is shown by a condemnation specially directed against those who used spells and incantations, or made what were called "phylacteries" in the sense of "amulets" (Can. 36). Possibly the rule which orders baptism to be followed by anointing (Can. 48) was directed against a lingering reluctance rising out of the old Essene antipathy to that practice. Still, later on, in the history of the

[1] Conybeare and Howson, ii. p. 400 (4to edition).

Church, the same tendency is seen at work, and which we may see in the four Churches that were dedicated to the Archangel in Constantinople alone. In the institution of the Feast of St. Michael, by Pope Gelasius, in A.D. 493, or Pope Felix, in A.D. 538, to commemorate his appearance on Mount Gargano,—in the consecration to his honour of the church which transformed the Mole of Hadrian into the Castle of St. Angelo, after a like apparition,—in the "vision of the Guarded Mount," on the coasts of Normandy and Cornwall,—in the Order of St. Michael, which has boasted of its knights both in France and Russia, we may trace the more or less remote developments of the tendency to angelolatry which St. Paul sought, it would seem unsuccessfully, to check in its germinal or nascent stages.

In yet another conspicuous Church movement of the second half of the second century, that known as Montanism or the Phrygian heresy, we may trace the working at once of the national temperament and of the early corruption of the truth, which the Epistle to the Colossians has brought before us. Here, also, there was a predominantly ecstatic element. Montanus himself laid claim to a special prophetic inspiration, and even identified himself with the Eternal Spirit that had been promised as the Paraclete; and Maximilla, and Priscilla, the two prophetesses who attached themselves to him, laid claim to special visions and revelations, rushing into the region which they had not seen. Pepuza, a Phrygian city, became the centre of the Montanist Church, and was looked at by its members as the new Jerusalem. Here, too,

there was the claim to a higher holiness resting on a rigorous asceticism. Their fasts were at once more numerous, and longer and stricter, than those of other Churches. Wine and flesh were strictly forbidden; and they confined themselves during their times of fasting to the diet of dry bread, known as the *Xerophagia*. Marriage was hardly tolerated; and second marriages were treated as an abomination. It denied all hope of pardon to those who offended against its rules. First in Montanus himself, and then in the patriarchs of Pepuza, the community had a head who governed them with despotic authority. Ancyra in Galatia was one of its head-quarters. It invaded Hierapolis, and the other Churches of the Lycus could hardly have remained untainted by it.[1] The old teaching and life of the Colossian heretics, we might add, the old, wild orgiastic worship of the priests of Cybele, were reproduced in the new religion, which had power to bewitch even the ardent spirit of Tertullian. It was, perhaps, a natural reaction against this fanaticism, breaking itself off from the historical continuity of the Church, and resting on new prophecies and visions, that it was reserved for the Churches of the Lycus, when the bishops of what was then the province of Phrygia Pacatiana were gathered at Laodicea, to catalogue, in their completeness, the books of the Old and the New Covenants (Can. 59), as that which seemed to them the only adequate safeguard against the outbursts of these strange forms of error.

Of the later history, and the present state of

[1] See Euseb. v. 17–19.

these Churches but little remains to be added. Colossæ seems to have sunk into decay, and the modern village of *Chonas*, at a distance of two or three miles, to have risen in its place. Hierapolis, famous in early Christian times for the name of Papias, its bishop, to whom we owe much of our information as to the early composition of the Gospels, but who was himself not free from Millenarian and visionary errors, still shows, in the modern town of *Pambouk Kelessi*, the ruins of a theatre and gymnasium, as relics of its former greatness. Laodicea, now *Denisli*, has, in like manner, traces of the wealth which was its besetting danger in the days when it received, as one of the seven Churches of Asia, a warning message from its Lord.

THE END.

WYMAN AND SONS, PRINTERS, GREAT QUEEN ST., LINCOLN'S-INN FIELDS.